FRITTON APSE

Showing groined roof and splay of east Saxon window, with Norman enrichment (lateral window-adornment is modern). The lateral pilasters batter considerably. Outside this apse is the sole example of Lisene strip-work in the county. Between roof and groining is a chamber.

This excellent drawing is compiled by Miss Stephanie de Jacobs from a photo kindly lent by Julian Francis Cubitt.
ON TRACES OF SAXON ARCHITECTURE YET REMAINING IN THE COUNTY OF SUFFOLK.

BY CLAUDE MORLEY, F.E.S., F.Z.S., ETC.

I. HISTORICAL.

It is not improbable that J. R. Green goes somewhat beyond the limits of exact knowledge when he considers that, “before the landing of the Saxons in Britain, the Christian Church comprised every country in western Europe, save Germany.” Certainly the profession of Christianity by the Romans and Romanised Celts here is now very generally accepted (cf. Story of British Nation, 1922, p. 102); but the extent of such profession and the degree of its stability, especially in East Anglia, are still open questions to which our records afford no more than indirect and very partial answers. Wright has shown at p. 302 of his “Celt, Roman and Saxon” that this alleged profession rests almost solely upon the now usually discredited word of Gildas the Wise, which is confuted, at least in one direction, by the fact that excavation has failed to reveal the faintest inkling of Christian burial or buildings during the Latin occupation. Some authors, on the other hand, yet quote Gildas, who asserts in his Eighth Chapter, “de religione,” that the Cross was
preached in Britain before A.D. 37; and Baldwin Brown in 1903 goes so far as to believe at p. 1 that "at the date of the [Gildasan] Teutonic descents, Romano-British Christianity was an established institution" among us. Certain it is that Eastengle now bears no trace of it.

Another argument to the contrary is its ignorance by the Anglo-Saxons, after an association, be it auxiliary or antagonistic, of at least a hundred and thirty-five years, those from 285 to 418, during which the Romans had certainly inculcated upon them such polities as the Trinoda Necessitas (Earle, p. xciv. and Coote, p. 465) and a similar system of agriculture (Seebohm 1884, p. 410). For the presence of the East Angles' gods is more plainly traceable by place-names and other internal evidence throughout the Saxon Shore of Suffolk than anywhere else in the County. This coast district is shown in 1876 by Kemble, at p. 14, to have been occupied under comes littoris Saxonici per Britannias by, and therefore not liable to the attacks of, the Teutons. Investigation is more and more clearly demarkating this hinterland, upon or near which yet linger corrupted forms of that Æscir hierarchy which has been not very definitely traced (e.g., by Haigh 1861, p. 56), to Assyrian and Egyptian sources. Thus Hamar seu Thunor, the Norse Thor, is preserved in Homersfield; Pol seu Baldaeg in Palgrave, and the Pol Hill tumulus at Brightwell; Sotterley is the lea seu meadow of Saetere, whence our word Saturday; and Woodbridge may well have been Woden's-beorh seu mound. But the most popular deity would appear to have been the god Frea, for we still have Friday Streets in Benhall, Chillesford and Rendlesham to the east of the county, as well as at West Row in Mildenhall to the west, where I believe Nicors, the plural gods of the Mark, to be perpetuated in Knettishall.
Everyone of these places is actually upon or close to the superficial junction of boulder-clay with lighter soil; and nowhere upon the broad expanse of the former throughout High Suffolk do we meet with a single place-name suggestive of the Æscir gods. This, coupled with the fact, to take a concrete example, that the ten churches on the scarp of the high land from Belstead Brook at Hintlesham southward to the river Brett at Raydon all stand exactly upon the above junction, goes far to prove all our boulder-clay to have been uninhabited forest till at least the year 600. Actually the date was pretty surely a good deal later, since that the sturdy gods of Saxon Paganism took a strong combating and were very long a-dying is shown by the Council of Nantes’ exhortation of the seventh century; then, following its nominal triumph, fully half the country was again merged in Thor’s worship by the Norse incursions two and a half centuries afterwards; and even in the eleventh century it was not dead, as is shown by the prohibition of the “barbarous worship of Stones, Trees, Fountains, and of the Heavenly Bodies” contained in Knút’s statute.

The advent of Saxon Christianity in Suffolk is related exclusively by the Northumbrian Bede, whose information was derived indirectly through Canterbury, pretty surely in consequence of the marriage of King Anna of Eastengle’s eldest daughter, Seaxburh, in or about the year 640, to King Æorconbeorht of Kent. Bede shows that Anna’s uncle, our King Raedweald, set up a semi-christian temple at Rendlesham, about the year 600; and that the latter’s stepson, our King Sigebeorht, “vir doctissimus,” retired to an unlocalised monastery of his own erection, usually ascribed to Bury St. Edmunds, about 630. At the same period Sigebeorht gave Fursey the land on which to erect a cell within the walls of Burgh Castle; and Felix “had the see of his bishopric appointed him in
the city Dommoc," which we need not quibble in regarding as Dunwich. These four are the earliest church-foundations in Suffolk; but of them it is at all likely that Rendlesham alone now occupies the original site. The date of our parochial churches' building is almost invariably unrecoverable; but quite doubtless the vast majority was already in being before our suzerain, King Æthelwulf of Wessex, on 9th November, 854, enacted the system of tithes, which naturally produced parishes; though new church sites continued to be consecrated till the time of Knút.

Thus we see that History helps us not at all to come at a date of the erection of any given church. Nevertheless it appears to me pretty plain that throughout High Suffolk the earlier ones invariably approximate the banks of then-navigable streams running through the dense timber; and that all those standing upon high sites on champaign country may be regarded as of distinctly later foundation, probably even after the naturalised Norse conversion of the tenth century. History does, for all that, afford one link between the Æscir hof and the modern church; at the time when our Rendlesham church was instituted, Pope Gregory wrote to the English clergy on 17th June, 601, that "the temples of the idols of the English ought not to be destroyed. Let the idols be destroyed, altars erected and relics placed. For if those temples (fana) are well built, it is requisite that they be converted from the worship of devils (a cultu daemonum) to the service of God." So it is perfectly positive that in at least a certain percentage of cases our churches still occupy the sites consecrated to the Anglo-Saxon Pantheon in the fifth century. Doubtless most of these would, for defensive reasons, be situated in the river-hollows; and, when converted into churches, the proximity of water must be regarded from both a strategic and ritualistic point of view, because Bede
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says, the first clergy did not wait for the construction of baptisteries but immersed their proselytes in rivers of running water.

Other interesting though not very profitable deductions, touching the date of our churches' foundation, are to be drawn from the dedications of those to local saints. The earliest of these was Botwulf, who died on 17 June in or about 680; all the six churches bearing his name stand close to streams in east Suffolk that were then navigable. Iken, the site of his monastery, is on the Alde, North Cove on the Waveney Thurlston* on the Gipping, still broad rivers; Culpho and Burgh are on or near the little Finn stream; and Botesdale, which carries his name, is on another, running from Hinderclay Fen. Hence we may argue that permanent churches were already being erected only in the most accessible districts soon after 680; and this is supported by the lack of a dedication to any of the ten saints in King Anna's immediate family, since he had died so recently as 654; note that Ely's ascription to St. Æthelthryth seu Etheldreda, Anna's daughter, was after Botwulf's decease. *Tannington, Parker says, bears St. Æthelred's name; but this seems an error for St. Æthelbeorht. Our king, thus canonised, was murdered on 20 May, 793; and the fact that only three churches are dedicated to him suggests that few were being erected at that time; Falkenham*, Herringswell where Æthelbeorht may have lain the first night of his final journey, and Hesset a few miles west of his Bury home: all these were doubtless new foundations. Our King, Saint Eadmund, was slain on 20 Nov., 870, and is commemorated in six Suffolk places among the seventy in England; the much greater number of his ascriptions in Norfolk

*Misprinted Fakenham in Vict. Hist. 1907, p. 7, which also ascribes Redgrave to St. Botwulf, whose church 'at Ipswich' was in Thurlston (sec. Domesday) and not, as the Parkers say, in Whitton.
renders that county apparently less fully sanctified then' : Hargrave, Suffolk, is omitted from the Corolla list. Our last local saint is Olave, whose name one of the Creeting churches bore, as did the Herringfleet priory founded so late as 1236. He is that Olaf Tryggvason, King of Norway, who married our King Swegen's sister, and died in the year 1000, so we may attribute the former dedication to some late Scandinavian holder of the lordship.

II. DOMESDAY BOOK.

The earliest enumeration of Suffolk churches took place at the end of the Saxon regime here; in fact, the Normans had been in power twenty years but we may rest assured that no alterations had been effected during this interim, for so small a circumstance as the modification of a glebe-plough is referred to under Thorpe Morieux. Birch, in 1887, has computed, at p. 256, the total of our churches as given in Domesday to be 364, but I do not know how he came at this computation; and it has been erroneously stated by Redstone (Suff. Inst., 1904, p. 2) to be "impossible so to reckon the parts as to form a whole" church. The fractions of each "ecclesia" there set forth can be assembled into a homogeneous unit by bearing in mind the following notes.

(1) In 1086 the village church was attached to an estate, most often though by no means invariably to the main manor; in a very few cases it was severally held in capite by an Abbey (e.g., Worlingham) or individual (e.g., Ælfgifu of Thorndon) having no other interest in the parish. (2) The presence of a church under a given village, though strong presumptive evidence that it is the one of that village, is by no means conclusive that it should be there treated. This is rendered very obvious by the presence of Peasenhall.
and Knoddishall under Saxmundham, and of the medity of Mellis under Thrandeston. It may, however, be safely accepted where no alternative emerges. (3) In the case of collective patronage, it is rare for more than one of the fractions to be exactly stated; the first-mentioned is usually so, the rest only vaguely or not at all (e.g., Higham), unless their glebe be of unequal extent. (4) When churches are held in moieties, an extremely common custom at the end of Saxon times, and but one of these is indicated, it is practically impossible to detect the fact if the words "half of" should be omitted, as is obviously sometimes the case in other instances (e.g., the second under Higham); but this does not affect the total computation. Although there is high probability of such omission where ever the later glebe exactly doubles that actually stated in Domesday, I do not consider we are justified, in view of mediæval endowment, in altering such a statement from its face value. (5) By no means uncommonly fractions of the same one are given as entire churches (e.g., Offton); and part of these fractions, lacking in the actual village, will be discovered in an adjacent one (e.g., idem: Crettingham), because the glebe lay there, as Debenham Gracechurch in Mickfield. (6) Churches with no glebe, though existent (e.g., Ilketshall), are certainly omitted; though not always: e.g., Denham and Undley in Lakenheath, upon which is expressly remarked "without glebe." The fabric itself was not assessed; and the commissioners' business was solely with the glebe, which was. (7) In fact, one gradually arrives at the conclusion that it is neither the building nor the benefice to which Domesday refers, but solely to the glebe; and the word "ecclesia" is added to indicate it to be churchland; cp. the three fractions of one church under Offton.

Because no "ecclesia" is mentioned in or assignable
to them, we may be comparatively certain that there then was at the least no assessable glebe in eighty-five of our villages. The consequent presumption is, of course, that they possessed no parochial church; and I am by no means sure that such is a weak presumption, when we remember that land constituted the basis of Saxon economics. They are: Barton Mills, Little Bealings, Bedfield, Belton*, Benacre, Benhall, Beyton*, Blaxhall, Boxstead, Great Bradley, Bradwell*, Brantham, Bruisyard*, Campsey Ash, Carlton, Carlton Colville, Charsfield, Chedburgh†, Chelmondiston, Cockfield, Corton, Covehithe, Cransford, Culford, Denston, Easton Bavents†, Ellough, Erwarton, Exning, Falkenhain, Farnham, Little Finborough†, north Flixtan†, Fritton*, Gedgrave†, Gorleston, Grundisburgh, Gunton*, Halesworth, Hasketon*, Henham† (as now), Herringfleet*, north Holton*, Iken, Ixworth Thorp, Kessingland, Kettlebarston, Kirkley, Lavenham, Lidgate, Lound*, Lowestoft, Marlesford, Nayland, Polstead; Ramsholt*, Rushbrooke, Saxstead†, Shaddingfield, Shelley, Shipmeadow*, Earl’s Soham, Somerton, Southwold, Spexhall*, Sternfield, Stoven, north Stratford, Tattingstone, Troston, Ufford, Waldringfield, Wattisham, Westhall, Westhorpe, Wickham Market†, Withersfield, Witnesham, and Yaxley.

To complete the list we must notice (a) places referred to, but not as villages, in Domesday; these are Boxford under Cavendish, Withersdale† under Mendham, Southolt† (church under Occold), Gazeley and probably Moulton under Desning, and Bradwell; only the last one was churchless. And (b) places not named at all there; these are Ashby*, Blundeston*, Botesdale†, Eyke, Kentford, Leavenheath†, Metfield, Naughton, Needham†, Newmarket, Oulton, Sproughton, Stowupland†, Thwaite; and Wissington†; the

*It is significant that we here find the large proportion of 15 out of the total 42 extant circular towers in the County.
†These churches now possess no, or quite modern, towers. This dozen, and the fifteen with round towers, are amongst the “meanest” architecturally in Suffolk.
second Stradbroke ecclesia may have been at Atheltingham or Brundish. The only monasteries enumerated are at Wissett and Bury St. Edmunds, with another at Thetford. The daughter-houses seu chapels appear only at Stow Market and Wissett.

Actually, we find that, of our 468 Domesday townships, churches are unmentioned in no more than 96; while the remaining 372 contained as many as exactly 450 among them in the year 1086. Of these places with churches, all had one, except:—Ipswich and Thetford, which each possessed 12; South Elmham, with 8; Bungay and Creeting, 5; Coddenham-Olden, Debenham, Dunwich, Forham, Sibton, Stonham, Trimley-Altenston and Whitton-Thurlston, each with 3; while those with 2 churches apiece were:—Aldeburgh-Thorpe, Ashfield-Thorpe, Blakenham, Bredfield, Cornard, Eriswell-Cocclesworth, Friston, Glemham, Hemingstone, Hinderclay, Lakenheath-Undley, Levington-Stratton, Linstead, Palgrave, Pettistree, Rickinghall, Stanton, Stradbroke, Thurlow, Waldingfield, Wenham, Whelnetham, Worlingham, Wortham, and Wratting.

III. The Argument.

It is not from a matter of choice but from one of necessity that we have recourse to religious structures for our early architecture. Any owner may pull down his house, and build a more comfortable one; and owners have invariably done so! But, through callousness or veneration, those of God, more especially when located in remote districts, have been allowed to devolve with more or less extensive modifications throughout the centuries to our own time. There is no further reason why domestic architecture, even if it be but of wood, should not have survived as well as the Chipping Ongar nave, said to have been erected for
the reception of Saint Eadmund's relics in 1013:
"Apud Aungre hospitabatur ubi in ejus memoria lignea capella permanet usque hodie" (Bury Abbey deed; quoted by Dugdale, iii., 139). But of Suffolk as well as in general Brown truly says in 1903, p. 71, that "Anglo-Saxon domestic structures in so far as they were of wood [or any other material in our County] have not survived. The manor house of the period may, however, have been in part at least of stone, and the picture of Harold's aula at Bosham [like his other at Harkstead, perhaps] in the Bayeux Tapestry may be quoted as evidence of this. There is no reason why portions of pre-Conquest manor houses may not still exist embedded, as was the case with Deerhurst in Gloucester, in later mediæval structures, and investigation may yet bring some of these to light," though improbably here where stone was so rare a commodity and timber ubiquitous.

Whether the Saxons were originators of the timber-framed house is a question beyond our scope of enquiry; but I am sure that this method of building has survived in unbroken sequence from their time to our own. Clarke in his 1921 'Norfolk and Suffolk,' considers at p. 152 that in Eastangle this "half-timber work is fairly common [actually it is universal outside towns] in Suffolk, but less so in Norfolk, and differs little from that of other parts of the country, except for somewhat lighter timbers and more delicate mouldings. Between the studs the space was filled with clay [many villages yet retain their "clappits," excavated for this material] and chopped straw, with hazel sticks locally known as "rizzes" from the Saxon [recte Old Norse] word hrís, meaning branches of trees or brushwood." Early churches have also been assumed to be built of half timber; but they were more probably in the compact block-house style, capable of defence.
Whatever the exact form it may have taken, no doubt can remain that in the popular mind of to-day the Saxon churches were in a general way of wood. "During the Saxon era, wood was almost the only available material for building; and, though we have isolated cases, in which stone was employed, yet we have many records which point to the former having been the most customary material," wrote Corder in Suff. Inst., 1891; p. 371. Almost obvious reticence is maintained throughout his article upon the period immediately preceding the Conquest; and other writers are hardly more explicit upon the subject, which is very generally regarded as constituting such dangerous ground whereupon to trench that our ignorance is accepted as proof of the Saxon masons' absence; a ridiculous conclusion.

The Parkers in 1855 consider that in all Suffolk "no remains really known to be more than a few years older than the Conquest" exist at any church; in a Prefactory Note at Suff. Inst. so recently as 1916, p. 29, the old Glossary of Architecture is still accepted thus: that no more than three of the still-used churches (Barham, Claydon and Gosbeck) exhibit Saxon features, while even here "the remains are inconsiderable in extent"; and Baldwin Brown's standard work adds nothing whatever to our knowledge in this respect. Though all writers seem in conspiracy touching the paucity of the relics, diverse of them mention diverse scraps. Thus Raven in 1895 is also of opinion at p. 69 that "remains of Saxon architecture are scanty enough. Here and there, as at Syleham and Holy Trinity Church, Bungay, the well-known long and short work may be seen; and Saint Nicholas's Church, Ipswich, is thought by some to claim a like antiquity." White, in 1885, is the only author who is at all more generous, but later observers have denied the majority of his assignations; and Bryant, in
1912, is extremely chary of committing himself by any original opinion.

Now, surely this is to a very appreciable extent contrary to common sense. The piety, not to say superstition, of the Saxon nobles is among their leading characteristics from the earliest churches' establishment, when Kemble assures us that their officers took precedence over the Kings themselves, to that time when Dunstan and Saint Eadward's priests ruled the realm in their names. Let us allow the lack of hewn stone in Eastengle, and the greater facility of walling with oak than with surface-stones; let us allow, since all evidence to the contrary is long swept away, that every house up to the royal dwelling was here of wood; let us even include that most potent of all factors, that the adoption of stone was contrary to the Saxons' custom—even so, there is left a residuum, exemplified at a remarkably early date in the Elmham Minster. With such a pattern before them as this stone church with hewn quoins, attested by no less an authority than J. T. Micklethwaite in 1916 to be the sixth oldest church in England and erected 670-4 (cf. Archæol. Journ., liii., p. 293), is it likely that the great Ælfgar, Ealdorman of Essex, would consign his body and that of his wife to be interred in a circular chapel of timber uprights at Nayland-Stoke Priory in 953: is it likely that the King's son-in-law, the gallant Earl Ulfcytel of Eastengle, did not erect Saint Andrew's at Ilketshall (Ulfcytel's Hall), whereof Bryant says the "walls of nave and tower are Norman; the north and south doorways are good Norman, with zigzag ornamentation; and the walls batter very much internally"? The fact of the matter appears to be that no student of the Saxon style has investigated the subject: even the full twenty feet of bold and typical long-and-short work at Debenham are not allowed by the Parkers to be Saxon.
Actually there seems to me excellent reason for believing that a considerable proportion of the Suffolk church architecture, that is generally assigned to the "early Norman period," was executed before the Conquest; and Hollingsworth in 1844 had the courage to assert at p. 35 that he "more than suspected that nearly all the churches in Suffolk at this period [the Conquest] had their walls composed of stone." Redstone has computed that three hundred and ninty-eight (but cp. supra, sub cap. Domesday) of such rateable structures are referred to in the Conqueror's Survey, compiled no more than twenty years after his accession and but sixteen after the tenants-in-chief were allotted their respective fees; besides such non-rateable churches as that at Harpole in Wickham Market, and numerous chapels. If we make full allowance for the scintillating piety and assured affluence of the County throughout the Middle Ages, succeeding the Dark ones whereof we treat, it is difficult to believe that the meagre scraps of so durable a substance as stone, and that good Barnack Rag, which have hitherto been conceded to the Saxons, can in reality be all that bridge their time to our own.

Another factor for consideration is that the Norman influence at the court of the zealous Confessor, during the majority of his long reign of five and twenty years, was so potent that it is now impossible to distinguish the native work of the middle eleventh century from the imported labour which immediately succeeded it. Malmesbury distinctly says in 1125 that Westminster Abbey, consecrated on 28th Dec., 1065, was the first church erected throughout England in the Norman style; but this by no means precludes earlier Norman embellishments to older churches. All this tends to throw back those features of indigenous skill, now known to be Saxon criteria, e.g., the long and short angle quoins and hole-pierced lancet
windows, to an even earlier date than that hitherto so grudgingly allowed them.

A very superficial study of our few published records will at once reveal the fact that such architects as we have possessed always, with the notable exception of Raven, accepted Norman as the earliest style to be expected or regarded, with the result that almost anything before Early English has been callously thrown into the "Norman period." Individual parts of the early work thus congregated into a heterogeneous heap, Prof. Baldwin Brown has segregated into piles apart; and it is no longer permissible to treat the subject in a general manner. The very fons et origo of Saxon building is proved by him to be distinct from that of Norman, for the fundamental sources of the former he traces to Germany, though also showing that up to circa. 800 its inspiration most likely came from France. At p. 48 he explains:—"The whole architecture of the great region north-east of the Rhine, won for Christianity under the Carolings, assumes a special character. The region embraces Thuringia, Saxony, Westphalia, Rhenish Prussia and the provinces of the lower Rhine; and the architecture of it differs from that of the other parts of the vast Carolingian empire. The old political distinction between Neustria and Austrasia is here reproduced, and the Romanesque of the western or Neustrian part of the empire develops on lines distinct from that of the Austrasian regions extending eastwards beyond the Rhine. The first is represented centrally by the architecture of Normandy, and Norman forms differ in many marked characteristics from those of Westphalia or of Saxony. This fact lies at the foundation of any systematic treatment of the later Anglo-Saxon buildings. In several of their most characteristic features these only produce what is common in the Trans-Rhenane provinces, and, though Anglo-Saxon buildings have
other very distinct features which give the style independence, yet they have so much in common with German ones that we shall probably be right to reckon our own country, in the century before the Conquest, an autonomous province of Austrasian architecture. Until the Norman element definitely makes its appearance the two styles have very little in common, and for this reason it is as a rule comparatively easy to distinguish a Saxon from a Norman structure."

He further divides Saxon history into three architectural periods at p. 35. The early one of roughly 600-800 A.D., by no means the rudest; the middle or Norse one, about 800-950, ending with the revival under Eadgar and Dunston; and the last one, which is further split at p. 290 into the late 10th century revival, the restorations under Knút, and the zealous erections during the Confessor's influence.

More exactly, the same writer plainly indicates that our churches are not, with most probability, attributable to the last period so fertile of erection on the Continent, for (p. 333) "in England it seems to have been the last half of the tenth century, the time of Edgar, that showed this special activity. Certain bishoprics [particularly that of Eastengle] were in abeyance during the 'Danish' ravage, and were reconstituted in the time of Edgar. The revival of the bishopric meant the rebuilding or restoration of the episcopal church, and considerable building activity in the parishes. This points to an extensive restoration of monasteries for which we have other evidence, while we know that some abbey churches were restored at the same time as parochial. Hence a certain amount of English work, that might be of the eleventh century, but which shows early indications, has been assigned to the last half of the tenth."
In Eastengle the "Danish"—recte Norse—ravage extended from the death of King Eadmund at Heckfield in Hoxne during 870 to the battle of Tempsford in 921. Then they began to be converted; and I am much inclined to ascribe the timber churches, still dear to the popular mind, to these seamen's craft before 950. One can quite believe Collingwood when he says in his 1908 Scand. Britain, p. 142, that they "were at first destroyers but the work of rebuilding churches, which had begun in the southern part [Suffolk, etc.] of the Danelaw, must have made progress. Their churches were thatched or tiled fabrics of wood or wattle-and-daub. They were no architects or masons, and their earlier monuments in imitation of the beautiful Anglian crosses [the present Hengrave war memorial is said to be one of these] were mere slabs picked from the surface of rocky land and chipped over with a pattern. It was not until 970 that Ely was restored as a monastery; and it is possible that some of the "Saxon" churches of the north were restored and others built under the influence of the revival of arts in the reign of Eadgar."

It does not strike me as extravagant to suggest that all true "Norman" style in Suffolk is the output of monastic houses, and few or no churches were built by the tenants-in-chief—by this time the people had become a negligible quantity—till "Early English" was introduced; simply because the Norman nobles regarded their possessions here as a mere source of revenue for some time after the Conquest, whence naturally they would prefer to place their shrines in their Neustrian homes. This view is quite separately endorsed by Raven, who truly considers in 1895, p. 71, that it is "remarkable that the latter part of the eleventh century witnessed no independent monastic foundations in Suffolk. It was not till A.D. 1120 that the Benedictine nuns were settled at Redlingfield."
There were, however, three cells to abbeys in Normandy by the end of the Conqueror's reign; two of them to Bernay (Creeting St. Mary and Eye) and one to Greistein (Creeting St. Olave). The abbey of Bec, in Normandy, had cells at Blakenham and Clare. And William of Malmesbury, who wrote be it noted in 1125, pertinently adds: "King William gave many possessions in England to foreign churches, and scarcely did his own munificence and that of his nobility [scattered throughout the entire country] leave any monastery unnoticed in Normandy, so that their poverty was mitigated by the riches of England." While from Normandy itself comes William of Poitiers' "wonder at the spoils of England, with which the Conqueror enriched the churches of his own land." Such treasure, whether intrinsic or sentimental, had surely not been housed in the usually-depicted wooden hovels.

IV. CHURCH CONSTITUENTS.

As to the actual ground-plan, the Saxon churches that remain to us would appear to differ in little but detail from those of later times. My personal observations go to show that (1) stone aisles and porches were unknown here, though where Saxons built aisles their division from the church is said to be by narrow walling and not pillars; that the style of the doors is indefinite, though the jambs are frequently narrower above; and that the roof was thatched with straw or reeds, though very rarely (9) stone-groined. The stone screen with lateral entrances, towards the west end of the nave, seems to have fallen into disuetude at a somewhat early period, probably soon after the whole land became familiarised to christianity about our King Æthelbeorht's reign: Elmham is our sole remaining example. The only other differences from later styles are exhibited by (8) the apsidal chancel,
obviating the need of stone quoins, and borrowed
from the East; but this, though it extended so far
into the Norman times that it is no sure mark of a pre-
Conquestal church, continued semicircular from at
least the year 673 to the end of the Saxon regime;
Mackinlay does not indicate Knút's Bury church in
this form, nor indeed is its form known, but from
excavation of 1921 its east end appears to have con-
sisted of three such apses side by side. A very few
apses; always single, yet remain throughout the
county from Fritton in the north to Wissington in the
south. Of the tower, when present, I am gradually
coming to consider (17) the interesting circular kind
less and less likely to be Saxon—see note under the
churchless villages of Domesday; and in (18) other
kind of towers, the four angles are finished with (21)
alternate long and short, i.e., vertically and horizontally
placed, quoins, and never in my experience with
original buttresses; "the buttress is common in
Norman and later architecture, but its place in Saxon
work is filled by (9) the plaster strip," says Baldwin
Brown, 1903, p. 89. All towers have distinct put-
log-holes; but Flixton near Bungay possesses the
only saddle-back roof.

The nave and chancel walls were usually externally,
sometimes also (23) internally, long-and-short quoined,
and seem to have been (5) comparatively low, faced
with surface stones* which are invariably in (2) very
distinct longitudinal layers† and, though certainly not

*These surface stones, for the most part flints, were pretty surely local
throughout the County in Saxon times. But of this we cannot be absolutely
certain, for a Rochester chartulary records that flints, of which Walton Hall in
Colneis Hundred was built in 1292, were transmitted by water from Gravesend.

†How far beyond the Conquest the custom of level stone-rows may have
extended is a question I have not seen discussed. Certainly the sixth oldest
existing church in England, which is our Old Minster at Elmham, dated 673,
has them; and equally certainly the Norman chapel at Bures, dated 1120,
lacks them. Hence we see the custom's existence during some four centuries
of the Saxon period, and less than 60 years under the Normans: all which
throws a great preponderance of probability upon the former. Is this level
mode of walling peculiar to us? Baldwin Brown in 1903 says simply at p. 296
'Saxon masonry, commonly of irregular rubble-work, was compacted in walls
of remarkable thinness.'
always for see Bradley tower, so (3) obliquely placed as to have acquired the name of "herringbone-work," now often traceable at the base of rebuilt walls; but this also is said to have extended beyond the Conquest, when it became a good deal more regular than in Saxon times. There is nothing distinctive about the surface stones themselves which were, in like manner, gathered from the surrounding fields, etc., up to the employment of faced flint flushwork in the fifteenth century; though the Saxon ones are nearly always smaller, rounder and of more uniform size. But coralline-crag as at Chillesford and London-clay as in many churches by the Stour, the only local strata available for such a purpose, were certainly used to some slight extent for building, perhaps in Saxon times; their consistency however is too friable for quoins one would expect. Interior and rarely exterior lateral walls are said (4) to "batter" when so much thicker below than above that they appear to lean outwards; a method adopted to counteract the thrust of the roof, and not confined to our especial period.

Throughout it the windows (10) in the church were single lights as at Barsham; and splayed equally both externally and internally during 950-1000, but before and after those years, says Baldwin Brown, in 1903, p. 298, internally only; or else (20) in the tower at most double lights as at Brundish, narrow, straightly triangular as at Herringfleet, or roundly curved above, with their base rectangular and the outer edges of their stones quite rough. Such single windows were (11) high up and close to the wall-plate, usually (12) about four in number on each side of the nave, as at Wissington, and (13) sometimes pierced as at Hasketon, for the reception of osier twigs across which bladder was tightly stretched in place of glass. Window-quoins are not often distinctly (22) long-and-short work; but both these and the quoins of the angles are found
longitudinally incised with one as at Stoke by Ipswich, or two as at Shimpling, rebate lines to retain the rough-cast of the wall.

Nearly all our few remaining sculptures have been termed Norman at varying periods. The church windows show (24) the interlaced cable-pattern at Stutton, an elaboration of (29) the simpler round cable preserved in the Norse Halesworth tombs; and (30) the concentric rings of Hunston and Gedding, developed into (25) the interlaced arches of Nettlestead. Sculptured human figures, animals and foliage upon tympana (26-8) above nave doorways are preserved in very few places, such as Wordwell in the north-west and Ipswich in the south-east.

I have been unable to discover anything definite respecting (14) our early niches, piscinae and other mural recesses; nor can we yet refute Bryant's assertion that no Saxon fonts survive, though several (15) plain or (25) but lightly sculptured bowls remain, sometimes with (16) Purbeck bases. The (6) continuity of nave with chancel, and (7) lack of a bisecting arch between them, are said to constitute another feature of our period; but really, I think, exhibit no more than the simplest and most economical form of construction at all times.

How far each of these individual features is to be relied upon as pre-Conquestal, archaists are not agreed; nor does the following summary of our churches in each constituent greatly illumine the subject, though it does show that we here preserve the entire gamut of such as are now termed Saxon.* Doubtless the surest

* I fear I must plead guilty to having paid a good deal less than the attention they deserve to the respective diagonal seu Norman, and criss-cross seu Saxon, adze-marks on dressed stone.

The important detail that there yet exists at Ashby a doorway, with drip-stone, over the tower-nave door must not be omitted. "Last year I took the opportunity of displaying the tower arch, and also of opening out a small door-way over this arch and about sixteen feet from the ground, leading from the first floor of the tower into the nave; I also came across a slab with interlacing work built up in the tower. The small doorway over the tower arch seems to be characteristic of most of such circular towers " as Beachamwell in Norfolk (J. F. Williams, rector there, in lit. 7 viii. 1921). The only other instance of this elevated doorway in circular towers I have noticed in Suffolk is at Burgh Castle. C.M.
sign, seu "the most certain test," as was indicated as long ago as 1843 by the Camden Soc.'s "Few Hints," of Anglo-Saxon work is still provided by the long-and-short quoins, traceable in more than a hundred and forty of our present churches, and best represented in the Debenham tower. These quoins are unmistakable on account of their shape and they invariably come from a single stratum, are full of mollusca, and weather longitudinally. St. Benet's tower in Cambridge is the typical example of this the only Saxon hewn stone, which is to be seen in the four angle-quoins, the two stone-courses dividing the three slightly decreasing stories, and in the belfry windows of which the central is of two lights (not unlike Brundish) and the lateral are single lights, each surmounted by a square and pierced stone. Prof. Bonney, the antiquarian and geologist, tells me "the long and short work in the tower is formed of a rather shelly Oolite. I have no doubt it is a Barnack stone, since no other of the Stamford Oolites were worked till after Norman days. I think the Barnack quarries were replaced by the Ketton ones about the twelfth or thirteenth century. Comparing it with Ketton, Weldon, Ancaster and other building stones of the Lincolnshire and north Northamptonshire limestones, the Barnack stone seems to be rather more variable in character than the rest; sometimes coarser and fuller of bits of broken shell than the others. I have no doubt your specimen is from some quarry at Barnack" (in lit. 25 May, 1920). I have not seen what Prof. Baldwin Brown, who obviously had no personal acquaintance with our County, may have to say upon this subject in his "Life of Saxon England," though no reference is anywhere made to such strata throughout his 1903 "Arts in Early England." However, the Geological Museum in Jermyn Street, fully endorses (in lit. 2 June, 1920) Bonney's identification, and considers this an oolitic limestone closely resembling that of Lincolnshire and other strata of the Inferior Oolite.
In order to here present an adequate account of the Saxon remains, I have examined with some care every church yet wholly or partly extant in the County; and such omissions of their details, belonging to that period, as are sure to occur must be ascribed to personal ignorance rather than to lack of assiduity in this respect. Wherever doubt existed the record is noted, in order to draw future attention to the point; hence doubtless too many instances have been included as Saxon. In many cases the debris of the early structures, now visible in later ones, are so small that they might be thought negligible; but Brown has well said (1903, p. 73) that "a few cubic feet of walling are sufficient to establish for us on the spot a Saxon village church of stone and this is a monumental link between ourselves and the older Britian of a millennium ago, and a point round which the patriotic imagination may fitly love to play."

V. Saxon Features in Suffolk Churches.

1. *Door-jambs contracted above.*
   Wordwell, Worlington, etc.

2. *Walls with level stone-rows.*
   Acton, Alpheton, Ashfield Magna, Badingham, Barsham, Battisford, Belstead, Benacre, Beyton, Blakenham Magna, Blaxhall, Blundeston, Bradley Magna, Bradley Parva, Bruisyard, Brundish, Burgh, Burgh Castle, Coddenham, Copdock, North Cove, Cransford, Darsham, Debach, Debenham, Drinkstone, Elmham (3 churches), Eyke, Farnham, Flempton, Flixton by Bungay, Fornham, Fritton, Gislehain, Gunton, Harleston, Hartest, Hasketon, Hawkedon, Hawstead, Hengrave, Herringfleet, Herringswell, Higham, Hunston, Icklingham, Ilketshall (3), Kenton, Knettishall, Knoddishall and Buxlow, Livermere Parva, Mettingham,

3. Walls with herringbone-work.

Ashfield Magna, Barsham, Blaxhall, Bradley Parva, Bungay, Charsfield, Cornard, Creeting, Dallinghoo, Darsham, Elmham, Hasketon, Henstead, Hunston, Ilketshall, Kelsale, Mildenhall, Pakefield, Stanningfield, Stradishall, Thwaite, Ubbeston, Weston.

4. Walls batter.


5. Low wall-plate.

Bruisyard, Chelsworth, Coddenham, Elmham, Falkenham, Fritton, Hacheston, Halesworth, Mettingham, Whitton.

6. Nave and Chancel under one roof.

Aldringham, Ashby, Barnby, Benacre, Bricett, Carlton, North Cove, Debach, Elmham (2), Falkenham, Friston, Frostenden, Gunton, Harleston, Hen-
stead, Hoo, Ilketshall (2), Ixworth Thorp, Kesgrave, Livermere Parva, Pakefield, Rushmere near Beccles, Stanningfield, Swilland, Theberton, Thornham, Waldringfield, Wangford by Brandon, Whixoe.

7. *No chancel arch.*


8. *Apsidal chancel.*


Fritton, Herringswell.


11. Windows close to wall-plate.
Harkstead, Lackford, Ringshall, Wissington, and Withersdale.

12. About four windows in each wall.
Elmham, Wissington.

13. Window-jambs pierced.
Fornham, Hasketon (two examples), Knettishall, Thetford, Thurston.

Bricett, Finningham, Fritton, Frostenden, Ilketshall, Whixoe.

15. Font of stone.
Alpheton, Ash Bocking, Barton Magna, Blundeston, Brandon, Eleigh, Elmham (2), Flempton, Fornham, Fritton, Gosbeck, Hemley, Hunston, Layham, Onehouse, Wordwell.

16. Font of marble.
Alpheton, Beccles, Drinkstone, Elmham (2), Hemley, Layham, Tattingstone, Thorington.

17. Tower circular.
Aldham, Ashby, Thorpe in Ashfield, Barsham, Belton, Beyton, Blundeston, Bradley Parva, Bradwell, Bramfield, Brome, Bruisyard, Bungay, Burgh Castle, Debenham (olim), Elmham (2), Fritton, Frostenden, Gisleham, Gunton, Hasketon, Hazlewood (olim), Hengrave, Herringfleet, Holton by Halesworth, Ilketshall (2), Ipswich (olim), Buxlow in Knoddshall, Lound, Mettingham, Mutford, Onehouse, Ramsholt, Rayingham Inferior, Risby, Rushmere near Beccles, Saxham Parva, Spexhall, Stuston, Syleham, Thorington, Walpole (olim), Weybread, Wissett.

18. Tower unbuttressed.
Akenham, Badingham, Barrow, Barton Mills, Bayham, Belstead, Benhall, Blakenham Magna and Parva,

19. **Saddle-back roof.**
Flixton near Bungay, unfortunately rebuilt.

20. **Double-light windows.**
Brundish, Flixton near Bungay, Herringfleet, Ilketshall, Thorington.

21. **Long-and-short work at angles.**
Akenham, Alpheton, Ashby, Ashfield Magna, Bardwell, Barham, Barking, Barnby, Barrow, Barton Magna, Barton Mills, Belstead, Beyton, Blakenham Magna, Blaxhall, Boyton, Bradley Parva, Braiseworth, Brockley, Brundish, Bungay, Burgh, Capel, Chattisham, Chediston, Chevington, Clare, Claydon, Cockfield, Combs, Cookley, Copdock, Cornard, North Cove, Cretingham, Culpho, Dallinghoo, Debenham, Dennington, Depden, Downham, Dunwich (olim), Eleigh, Eriswell, Erwarton, Eye, Fakenham, Flempton, Flixton by Bungay, Fornham, Frostenden, Gislingham, Glemham Magna, Gosbeck, Groto, Hacheston, Halesworth, Harkstead, Hartest, Hasketon, Haughley, Haverhill, Hawstead, Hemingstone, Hengrave, Henley, Herringfleet, Heveningham, Higham, Hinderclay, Hitcham, Hollesley, Honington, Hopton by sea, Hundon, Huntingfield, Icklingham, Ilketshall, Ipswich, Kedington, Kentford, Kirton, Knettishall, Lakenheath, Lindsey, Livermere Parva, Lound, Melton, Mendham, Milden, Mildenhall, Moulton, Newton, Nowton, Oakley, Onehouse, Otley, Oulton, Pakenham,

22. Long-and-short work at window-jambs.
Brundish, Elmham, Elveden, Hasketon, Milden, Onehouse.

Bradley Parva, Felsham, Heveningham, Wordwell.

Aldham, Burgh Castle, Harkstead, Ixworth, Stutton.

25. Sculpture in interlaced arches.
Elmham (2); Lavenham, Nettlestead, Westhall, Withersdale.

26. Tympana sculpture; human.
Ipswich St. Nicholas, Wordwell.

27. Tympana sculpture; mammalian.
Santon Downham, Holton near Halesworth, Ipswich St. Nicholas, Wordwell.

28. Tympana sculpture; botanical, etc.
Baylham, Bradley Magna, Santon Downham, Herringfleet, Ousden, Wordwell.

29. Tombs sculpture; human hands.
Halesworth, three specimens.

30. Tombs sculpture; arches and bosses.
Beyton, Gedding, Ipswich St. Nicholas (dragon), Hunston.
### VI. SUMMARY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No aisles, nor porches; style of doorways indefinite; roof thatched.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Walls faced with LEVEL stone-rows (rarely visible internally), often placed obliquely as HERRINGBONE work</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal and very rarely external walls BATTER outwards</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low WALL-PLATE, some ten feet or less above the ground</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nave and chancel continuous, under a SINGLE ROOF, indicated by</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No CHANCEL ARCH between them</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. APSIDAL chancel at east end; extremely rarely with</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Groined roof and Lisene STRIP-WORK</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Church WINDOWS broad-splayed, round-headed lancets, in nave usually HIGH up close to wall-plate, and apparently originally</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. about FOUR on either side (1 or 2 pairs sometimes in a galilee); their jamb-stones PIERCED for the reception of osier-twigs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No or indistinguishable niches, piscinae and other MURAL recesses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FONT unsculptured or nearly so, sometimes possibly with a Base or bowl of Purbeck MARBLE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tower CIRCULAR (doubtless often wanting in early times) or, if square, of small breadth and (still) UNBUTTRESSED; hardly ever with Double SADDLE-BACK roof; and also rarely with lofty Double-LIGHT windows, divided by a single central shaft.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. LONG-AND-SHORT work at any external angle (later rebuilt into walls), and at the tower or church WINDOW jambs; very rarely now visible at all INSIDE the church, which is almost invariably plastered over</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sculpture of windows and coffin-lids interlaced CARLE-PATTERN; or (at a very late period only?) INTERLACED ARCHES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sculpture of tympana allegorical, portraying HUMAN figures SOLITARY or vis-à-vis figures of ANIMALS,</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. of Foliage, LOZENGES, etc. SCULPTURE of tombs (Norse); HANDS grasping the Eternal Circle; or</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Concentric ARCHES and intervening bosses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Churches lacking the least visible indication of possible Saxon work: 203.

Monks' Soham, August (herpetis), 1922.