

## ORFORD MEETING, July 9th, 1872.

President—LORD JOHN HERVEY.

Leaving Woodbridge at nine o'clock, the excursionists drove direct to BUTLEY PRIORY, where they were met by Mr. Richard Day. Little remains of the original buildings except the fine old gateway. (*See Davy.*) The paper which Mr. Day kindly read upon this occasion has been printed in the 4th Volume of our *Proceedings*.

Leaving the Priory, a short halt sufficed for BUTLEY CHURCH, St. John the Baptist, which had been restored but two years before.

CHILLESFORD ST. MICHAEL. A small building of the 14th century. Some discussion arose as to the date of the tower, which is quite plain, having no buttresses, string-course, nor quoins. The stone of which it is built, though probably native, was not recognized by anyone present.

SUDBOURNE ALL SAINTS. Here Mr. Phipson, F.S.A., kindly said a few words in explanation. The building dates from about 1350, with later Perpendicular insertions. The font is Norman, the bowl supported by four shafts, two of which are modern; the whole has been recut. The pulpit is a Jacobean erection with sounding-board complete. On the north side of the chancel is the tomb of Sir Michael Stanhope. Mr. Almack, F.S.A., had kindly brought with him a work upon the Stanhope family prepared by the Earl of Stanhope for private circulation. In it the inscription upon the tomb is given as follows:

*Memoria Justorum in Manu Dei est.*

Sir Michael Stanhope, Knight, of the county of Nottingham, left 5 sons: Thomas Stanhope, Knight, of the said county; Edward Stanhope, Knight, of the county of York and of the council there established; John Stanhope, Knight, Lord Stanhope, of Harrington, of the privy council to Queen Elizabeth and King James, vice-chamberlain to them both, and treasurer of the chamber; Edward Stanhope, Knight, doctor of the civil law; Michael Stanhope, Knight, lord of this manor, who, mindfull of mortality, while he lived erected this monument.

Here resteth, in assured hope to rise in Christ, Sir Michael Stanhope, Knight, who served at the feet of Queen Elizabeth of most happy and famous memory, in her privy chamber XX years, and of our sovereign King James in the same place the rest of his days, who married Anne, daughter to Sir William Read, of Osterley, in the county of Middlesex, Knight, by whom he had two daughters, Jane, married to Henry Viscount Fitzwalter, son and heire-apparent to the Earle of Sussex; and Elizabeth, married to George Lord Berkley, Mowbray, Seagrave, and Bruce, of Berkeley Castle, in the county of Gloucester, this George being the XXI. baron by descent. All honour, glorie, praise, and thanks be unto thee, O glorious Trinitie. Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. 1 Tim. i., 15. Thou hast redeemed me, oh Lord God of Truth. xv. Psalms, 31. I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ. Phil. i., 23. Death is to me advantage. Phil. i., 21. I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord. Psalm cxvi., 13. He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. 1 Cor. i., 31.

RESTAURAVIT

PHILIPPUS HENRICUS COMES STANHOPE.

A.D. MDCCCXXVIII.

The manor of Sudbourne was granted to the monastery of Ely A.D. 970. The Abbey having been destroyed by the Danes, King Edgar instructed Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester, to repair the church and establish a monastery. Many were the possessions Æthelwold bestowed upon the new monastery, and among them this manor of Sudburne, which he had obtained by gift from King Edgar, for translating

the Rule of St. Benedict into the Anglo-Saxon or English tongue.\* A MS. copy of the Benedictional, beautifully illuminated, is preserved in the library of the Duke of Devonshire, and the 24th Vol. of the *Archæologia* contains a learned and fully illustrated article upon it, by the late Mr. John Gage Rokewood, F.S.A. The manor continued attached to the Abbey until the Reformation, when it passed to the King. The living still remains in the Crown.

Moving on, the party assembled beneath the walls of the Castle, where the President read a paper he had kindly prepared for the occasion. He said that he was not aware of the existence of any documentary evidence to show when the Castle was originally built; its Norman origin was, however, evident from its being coigned and in some places cased with Caen stone. As Orford was not mentioned in Domesday, it probably had no existence at the time of the Conquest. The earliest mention of it was in Camden's *Britannica* where the author quoted a passage from Radolphus de Coggeshall relating to the capture of a wild man by fishermen in their nets, in the time of Henry I., when Barth de Glanvil was warder of Orford Castle. Stowe, quoting the same authority, and naming the same constable, gave that prodigy in the 33rd year of Henry II., 1187, and other writers placed it almost a century later, sixth of King John, 1205. The tale would not, however, he feared, greatly help them to fix the date of the foundation of Orford Castle, and they must rely upon conjecture, and upon the evidence afforded by the style of the building. Orford probably had no existence at the time of the Conquest. The lands which are called by that name, and on which the Castle now stands, were probably part of Sudbourne. To this day Sudbourne with Orford form a single ecclesiastical benefice, and the style of the Manor Court is *Sudbourne cum Capella de Orford*. The Manor of Sudbourne and the advowson of its Church, he remarked in passing, belonged formerly, according to Grose, to the Prior and Convent of Ely. Grose also said that castles in England were for the most part of no higher antiquity than the Conquest, those which existed before that time being few in number and much decayed. This was also asserted by many historians and antiquarians, and was also assigned as a reason for the facility with which William made himself master of the country. The circumstance was not overlooked by so good a general as the Conqueror, who, effectually to guard himself against invasion from without, as well as to awe his newly acquired subjects, immediately began to erect castles all over the kingdom, and likewise to repair and augment the old ones, with such assiduity, that Rous said "*Rex Wilhelmus Conquestor ad castella construenda totam Angliam fatigabat.*" Besides, as he had parcelled out the lands of the English amongst his followers, they, to protect themselves from the resentment of those who had been so despoiled, built strongholds and castles on their estates. The turbulent and unsettled state of the kingdom in succeeding reigns served also to multiply them, and by the end of the reign of Stephen, the number of castles amounted to the prodigious total of 1115. As the site of Orford Castle overlooked the haven which, when it was serviceable, was a convenient landing place from Flanders, he (the President) thought it was highly probable that Orford might have been one of those which the Conqueror caused to be built as part of a comprehensive plan of defence for his newly acquired dominions, and if that were so, it was most likely that the earliest fortifications erected on that spot were built by Robert Malet, to whom the Manor of Sudbourne, with many others in Suffolk, was granted by the Conqueror. Whether built by Malet or not, a Castle was erected at, or near, the Ore-ford, in the Manor of Sudbourne—the river Alde, after its junction with the Ore, near Snape Abbey, being generally called by the latter name—and around the Castle no doubt there soon began to cluster dependent habitations, and the Castle and houses naturally assumed

\* Ædgarus Rex and Alfreth dederunt Sancto Æthelwoldo manerium, quod dicitur Sudburne, and cyrographum quod pertinebat; quod comes, qui dicebatur Scule, dudum possederat; eo pacto ut ille regulam Sancti

Benedicti in Anglicum idioma de Latino transferret; qui sic fecit. Deinde vero beatus Æthelwoldus dedit eandem terram Sanctæ Ætheldryde, cum cyrographo ejusdem terræ. *Historia Ecclesie Eliensis*, Lib. 1., cap. xlix.

the name of the Castle and hamlet of Orford. As the population grew with the importance of the place, a Chapel of Ease to the Church at Sudbourne was built for the convenience of the dwellers in the hamlet. Grose said that Orford had a market as early as the time of King Stephen, and we know that the right to hold markets was often conferred upon the owners and wardens of Castles. Looking, therefore, to the importance of constituting at that point a defence against the foreigner, which the Conqueror would be likely to observe, to the fact that there was a market there in the time of King Stephen, and to the story which represented the Castle as existing in the reign of Henry I., the son of the Conqueror, he thought it likely that the place was first fortified in the reign of William the Conqueror. The Manor of Sudbourne was given by Henry I. to one of the descendants of Peter de Valoines, after the attainder of Robert Malet. According to Dugdale, the house of Valoines made Orford the capital seat of their Barony. He, therefore, thought there must have come into existence a separate Manor of Orford, and that it must have been detached from the Manor of Sudbourne, to the detriment of the Monastery of Ely. He gave a sketch of the career of the De Valoines family, but said he could find nothing to connect them personally with the possession of Orford. In the year 1204 Hugh Bigod and John Fitz Robert were appointed joint governors of that and Norwich Castle, and upon their removal in 1215, the command of both was given to Hubert de Burgh, whose name was familiar to all through the affecting scene in the play of King John, where young Arthur of Bretagne pleads so touchingly and so successfully against the loss of his eyes. In the 45 Henry III., 1361, the office of governor of the Castle was conferred upon Philip Marmion, son of the elder Robert Marmion, who during the troubles in John's reign had attached himself to the side of Arthur and Constance and the French. He had the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk committed to his charge, with the custody of the Castles of Norwich and Orford, by special patent. It appeared from *Dugdale's Baronage*, that divers of the Barons, soon after 47 Henry III., 1263, put themselves in arms to enforce the King's assent to those unreasonable ordinances which they had made at Oxford, tending much to the diminution of the Royal authority. The King was obliged to submit to the determination of the French King in the matter, and to bring in divers of the Peers and other eminent persons to give oath for his performance thereof. Amongst the Peers who were thus sworn was Philip Marmion; and in 1264, when the Barons had taken the King prisoner, they entrusted Orford Castle to Hugh Le Despencer, who was also governor of the Castle of Devizes in Wilts, Barnard Castle in Durham, and the Castles of Oxford and Nottingham. He stood high in the counsels of the rebellious Barons, and, fighting with them at the battle of Evesham, there lost his life. It might be that De Valoines again came into possession of Orford Castle, after the death of Le Despencer. It might even be that Orford had always belonged to them, but by some kind of right, or by encroachment, the Crown and the Barons had enjoyed the power of appointing governors, which they had exercised during the disturbed period. At any rate, in the fourth of Edward III., 1331, Robert De Ufford, who married Cecilia the daughter and co-heiress of Robert de Valoines, had a grant for life of the town and castle. William de Ufford died seized of it in the fifth Richard II., 1382, and it was part of the dowry of Isabel his wife. Upon her death, fourth of Henry V., 1419, Robert Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, whose ancestor married Cecilia daughter of Robert de Ufford, had livery of the town and castle. William, Lord Willoughby, died seized of the Lordship of Orford, the 18th of Henry VIII., 1527, and assigned it to his wife for life. It probably came afterwards with the estate of Sudbourne to Sir Michael Stanhope, and descended as that did to the Right Hon. Pryer Devereux, Lord Viscount Hertford. Early in the present century it had been proposed by its then owner to pull down the keep for the sake of the materials, but as it serves as a guide to ships coming from Holland the Government of the day interfered to avert this misfortune. The estate had recently passed into the possession of Sir Richard Wallace, who had recently had the singular good fortune of laying two great capitals under a debt of gratitude. He then

added some particulars as to the building, and quoted Grose's account of it. The keep is a polygon of 18 sides, described within a circle whose radius is 27 feet. This polygon is flanked by three square towers placed at equal distances on the west, north, east, and south-east sides. Each tower measures in front nearly 22 feet, and projects from the main building 12 feet. The towers are embattled and overlook the polygon, whose height is 90 feet. The thickness of the walls at the bottom is 20 feet, and at the lower part they are solid, but above they are interspersed with galleries and small chambers. Round this building there were two circular ditches, one 15 feet and the other 38 feet distant from its walls. They were 15 feet deep, and six feet wide at the bottom when Grose wrote. Between the ditches was a circular wall, part of which, opposite the south-east tower, was still remaining.

The inspection of the Castle completed, luncheon followed, served in the great room of the keep. As usual, the President proposed, in a few well chosen words, votes of thanks to those who had made arrangements for the meeting, and especially to Mr. Day for his paper upon Butley.

ORFORD CHURCH, the last place on the programme for the day, was next visited. Here Mr. Dewing read some notes. The chancel has long been in ruins, the arcading being the only remains of a Norman building of high order; *Vide Archaeologia*, Vol. XII., and *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1788. This chancel must have fallen into disuse at some time not much earlier than 1720; for in that year the monument of Francis Mason, chaplain to James I., which had been placed in the chancel in 1621, was removed to the place it now occupies in the nave. In 1643 Dowsing visited the church, breaking down 28 superstitious pictures, and taking up 11 Popish inscriptions in brass. In all probability the chancel was in use at this period, the neglect and apathy of the succeeding half century reducing to ruins a building of exquisite details and rare beauty. The nave now in use is of the Decorated period, but this was preceded by an earlier building of Norman work; in proof of which the Rector states that when restoring the north door the workmen found a capping of one of the shafts of the same turned inwards and worked in the moulding of the jamb, while the plinth was in the ground below. There is, likewise, a doorway at the east end of the north aisle leading to the steps of the rood-loft, to afford a passage to which one of the original Norman pillars has been cut through, thus indicating the more modern introduction of the Rood-loft. Davy, who visited the church in 1808, gives the following dimensions: the chancel consists of a choir and two aisles equal in length to the choir; choir, 50ft. by 20ft.; width of north aisle, 6ft. 9in.; width of south aisle, 22ft. If these measurements be correct, the width of the south aisle was three times that of the north aisle. The pillars measure 13ft. in height, with a diameter of 3ft. 3in; the space between each pillar being 21ft. 11in. The body of the church, which consists of a nave and two aisles, measures 94ft. 7in. in length, by 23ft. 1in. in width. The tower has five bells: 1 dated 1732; 2 and 3, 1679; 4, 1639; 5, 1694; the fourth bell is by Miles Graie. In 1830 the top of the tower fell with a great crash between the hours of eight and nine on Sunday morning, May 23. This tower seems to have been under repair in 1707, for in that year an entry in the register of Westerfield states that the sum of 2s. 8d. was paid to an Orford brief towards the repairs of the church and tower. The register of Middleton has a similar entry for the sum of 1s. 3d., so late as the year 1824. The 15th century font has on its octagon basin emblems of the crucifixion, the Blessed Virgin, and the Trinity. The shaft has the wild man alternating with animals of the usual conventional type. On the base is this inscription: "*Orate pro animabus Johannis Cockerell et Katerina uxoris ejus qui istam fontem in honore Dei faceri fierunt.*" The name of Cockerell first occurs about 1302, in connection with the parish of Buxhall; somewhat later, mention is made of a Sir W. Cockerell at Hadleigh; another branch held a manor at Ryburgh, Norfolk. Towards the end of the 14th century, Johannes Cockerell, described as of Orford, married Katherine, daughter, and after the death of her brother and nephew, heir of Thomas de Ickworth. Katherine had an only son, John Cockerell, who died in his mother's lifetime, leaving one daughter Katherine, who died unmarried some four years after her grandmother.