



<http://kentarchaeology.org.uk/research/archaeologia-cantiana/>

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© 2017 Kent Archaeological Society



Drawn by J.F. Neale

Engraved by T. Jeavons

MEREWORTH CASTLE,
KENT

MEREWORTH CASTLE
where the Society was founded on the 19th September, 1857

Archæologia Cantiana

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

By FRANK W. JESSUP
Honorary General Secretary

THE Kent Archæological Society was born in the old State Bed Room at Mereworth Castle on 19th September, 1857. On that day a party of eleven noblemen and gentlemen of the county met at the Castle, at the invitation of the Viscount and Viscountess Falmouth, and decided to form a Kent Archæological Society. Thus the origin of the Society is chronicled in the official records. However, a less official journal, kept by the Rev. Lambert B. Larking, Vicar of Ryarsh and the Society's first Honorary Secretary, shows that he, in fact, was the only author and true begetter of the Society, and that the initiative in its formation lay elsewhere than with Lord Falmouth.¹

It is scarcely to the credit of Kent that, with its richness of archæological and historical material, it was not amongst the first of the south-eastern counties to possess an archæological society. The Sussex Society was established in 1845, to be followed within the next decade by the Surrey, Middlesex and Essex Societies. Apparently there were some unsuccessful attempts to form a Kent Society in the early 1850's, one of them associated with the name of J. J. Howard, and another with which Roach Smith was concerned, but they came to nothing. By 1857 the Surrey Society, then three years old, was firmly established, with 470 members, and its Honorary Secretary, George Bish Webb, put forward a proposal for an Archæological Society for the United Counties of Surrey and Kent, for which he sought the support of a number of men of Kent and Kentish men, including Larking. On 9th August, 1857, Larking received a letter from Bish Webb suggesting that the county of Kent should be joined to the county of Surrey, on the ground that, for some years, a fruitless attempt had been made to establish an independent Kent Society and that such

¹ Larking's Journals are in the possession of the Society. They, the Minutes and other official records, correspondence at Maidstone Museum, and the reports of proceedings in *Archæologia Cantiana* are the main sources of the information on which this paper is based. It has benefited from the comments and suggestions of the Honorary Editors and of Sir Edward Harrison; for their kindness in reading the paper in MS. I am very grateful.—F.W.J.

a measure was scarcely practicable. There was a good deal that might be said in favour of Bish Webb's proposal: the two counties are contiguous, they have a number of topographical features and historical experiences in common, they both enjoy a close association with London, and it could fairly be argued that one society for the combined counties would be more powerful than two separate societies.

However, people of Kent are not renowned for lack of *amour propre*, and even if Bish Webb's proposition had been put to Larking with the utmost tact it is unlikely that it would have commended itself to him. In fact, Bish Webb seems to have shown more zeal than tact, and Larking replied at once to the Surrey overture that he could not believe in the impracticability of a Kent Society, and that his first services were to his native county. On the same day Larking wrote to Lord Amherst of Montreal, Riverhead, and to Mr. Hussey of Scotney, urging the establishment of an independent Kent Society; he secured the support of Lord Camden of Wildernessee; and he saw Lord and Lady Falmouth, whose private chaplain he was, and persuaded them to invite a few prominent and interested people to come to Mereworth Castle to establish a Kent Society. The meeting was fixed for a day towards the end of August and, having made this amount of progress, Larking wrote again to Bish Webb, asking him to hold his hand, because of the probable formation of a Kent Society. Nevertheless, Bish Webb continued to canvass support for his proposal amongst Kentish people, assuring them that no Kent Society was practicable.

Larking, meanwhile, canvassed for his proposal with a vigour which can only command respect, tinged with a slightly envious surprise at the amount of time that a mid-nineteenth century country parson was able to devote to duties other than parochial and domestic. He got the promise of assistance from that redoubtable antiquary Charles Roach Smith, who nevertheless firmly declined to take the Secretaryship, and indeed hesitated to join any Society after his experience of the British Archæological Association (a reference to the unfortunate secession of a large number of members of that Association, within a year of its foundation, to establish the separate Archæological Institute); the Reverend Beale Poste of Bydews, Maidstone, consented to join the Society, but "foretells small success to us"; and Larking put a notice in the Maidstone Journal informing "the County that an Independent Society was on the tapis." Unluckily the notice was altered before being printed (the printer may have had some difficulty with Larking's writing, or perhaps the editor thought the wording colourless and in need of invigoration), so that Bish Webb's party was referred to as "interlopers"—"thus making the passage actually offensive, and very different from what I really wrote," as Larking recorded in his Journal.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

Bish Webb was not to be deterred, and possibly by now it would have been difficult for him to draw back. On 25th August, 1857, he issued a printed circular¹ to the Nobility, Clergy and Gentry of the County of Kent, reminding them (again, perhaps, not very tactfully) that "while each of the surrounding Counties of Sussex, Surrey, Middlesex and Essex possesses its Archæological Society—Kent possesses none; and a proposal, made so long ago as 1854, to establish such a Society, has met with so small amount of favor that no result has ensued." Here he was being a bit disingenuous; and when he went on to say that nevertheless the County was not lacking in matters of archæological interest, of which he instanced several, it is probable that some of the Nobility, Clergy and Gentry felt the information to be gratuitous and unnecessary. Bish Webb described himself in the circular as Honorary Secretary to the Surrey Archæological Society, but although the Council of that Society had expressed itself as willing, if acceptable to the County of Kent, to recommend an extension of their association to Kent, the active campaigning for the proposed joint society was the work not of the Surrey Society but of Bish Webb and a few of his friends, from Kent as well as from Surrey, who had formed themselves into an *ad hoc* committee.

No doubt some of the recipients of the circular were interested, many were indifferent, but a few were incensed. Amongst the latter was Larking. He wrote at once to Bish Webb (on 26th August) charging him "with gratuitous intrusion into our County, disturbing its peace, and damaging the cause of Science." He said that he would accept no more letters from Bish Webb and three days later returned one unopened.

It was unfortunate for Larking that the Mereworth Castle meeting, which was to have been held just at this time, had to be postponed, because of the illness of Lady Falmouth. Bish Webb's machinations, according to Larking, continued (if Webb's attitude at this time was zealous rather than tactful, Larking's, it must be admitted, was enthusiastic rather than charitable), but support came from across the southern border of the county, for Blaauw, the Honorary Secretary of the Sussex Archæological Society, strongly urged an independent Kent Society, and promised every support.

At last the Inaugural Meeting took place at Mereworth Castle on 19th September, 1857. Viscount Falmouth was in the chair, and the others present were the Marquis Camden, K.G., the Earl Amherst, the Hon. and Rev. Sir Francis Stapleton, Bart., Charles Wykeham Martin, M.P., James Whatman, M.P., Edward Hussey, George Warde Norman, the Rev. W. J. Moore Brabazon, the Rev. Middleton Onslow, and the

¹ There is a copy of it amongst the Roach Smith papers in the Society's collections.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

Rev. Lambert Blackwell Larking. Mr. Norman expressed doubt, which was obviously to some extent shared by others, whether this private and preliminary meeting could do more than call a public and general meeting expressly to form a Kent archæological society, but Larking feared what Webb might do if there were any delay, and after long discussion it was decided to form a Society, to be known as the Kent Archæological Society, with the Marquis Camden as President and Larking as Honorary Secretary, and to adopt bodily the rules of the Sussex Society, as tested by experience. The propriety of this step was ultimately accepted on the understanding that the appointment of officers and the adoption of Rules would be conditional, and that an interim committee should be appointed to invite the adherence of others wishing to join and to call, when all was ready, not a public general meeting, but a General Meeting of the Society to ratify all the proceedings. At this point Larking was able to announce the names of fifty-two gentlemen of substance or of learning who had already expressed a wish to join the Society.

For Larking the inauguration of the Society was a personal triumph. He had not sought the Secretaryship; he records in his Journal, "I have neither health, nor vigor, nor youth, nor time—nor capacity for it," and that this is not just idle modesty is proved by the efforts which he made, unsuccessful though they were, to get others to take the office; his true modesty appears, I think, in his remark that "it would have been ungracious and unbecoming to have refused." But whatever fears he may have had about his own shortcomings as the first Honorary Secretary, in his Journal he makes no attempt to conceal the jubilation he felt on "this memorable day, the day of our Foundation. . . . 'In perpetuum rei memoriam' I will here insert the list of those original members who had the honour of constituting the 'Kent Archæological Society' when the sun went to his rest on the 19 September 1857"; and at the end of the list, as indeed often when under the influence of any strong emotion, he finds expression in a Latin tag or two:

"manentem mansurumque"—¹

"Fortunati—si quid mea carmina possunt
Nulla dies unquam memori vos eximet aevo."²

The next step was to enlist an impressive number of members—and it must be done quickly, because Bish Webb's rival scheme was still afoot. Those members who joined the Society before the first General Meeting required neither proposer nor seconder, and were to be elected

¹ "In being now and for ever."

² "Blest names: if verse of mine hath any power
They'll live on History's page till Time's last hour."—Aeneid, ix, 446-7.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

as Original Members, without the ballot. Canvassing went on vigorously, and within a few weeks the Archbishop of Canterbury, Viscount Sydney (Lord Lieutenant), Lord De L'Isle and Dudley, Lord Hardinge, Lord Stanhope, the Bishop of Rochester, Sir Edmund Filmer, M.P., Sir Norton Knatchbull, M.P., A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P., and the Rev. Professor A. S. Stanley were amongst those who had joined the Society. Perhaps it was the almost overwhelming support of the nobility that caused Lord Falmouth, in a letter to Larking on 4th October, 1857, to advocate a more energetic canvass of the Middle Classes. Help came from many quarters: *Notes and Queries* gave a complete page to the Kent Society, Larking noting in his Journal: "I dined with my good friend Thoms, and when sufficiently primed for work, with good Falernian, we sketched out the article." The present-day Secretary of the Society, unhappily, must sketch out his articles with less adequate preparation.

But in spite of this evident and gratifying progress, Larking was still worried about Bish Webb and his intentions. On 1st October he records: "The dogged perseverance and malevolence with which this man prosecutes his antagonism is incredible. He rests neither day nor night. With him the whole affair is one of rivalry . . . He is madly bent on carrying his union, '*per fas et nefas*'¹—again, I say, Let him go on

‘tamen—sevus adulteros

Crines pulvere polluet”²—mark that.”

Moreover, within the county there were some—no doubt those who were aggrieved at not having been invited to the Mereworth Castle meeting—who referred to the Kent Society as a "Hole and Corner Affair." The United Counties Society committee, it was discovered, were to meet on 22nd October to consider further the proposal for a junction of Surrey with Kent. The Editor of the *Illustrated London News* urged Kent to independent action: "If Kent goes into coupling chains, in this matter, with Surrey, we shall expect to hear that a wind, for the occasion, has unroofed its earliest antiquity, Kit's Coty House." Larking suspected that Bish Webb's motive was a sordid, financial one, that he wanted to create for himself a salaried post as Secretary of a large Extra Metropolitan Archæological Society. Here Larking was almost certainly wrong, for Bish Webb was an architect with an

¹ By hook or by crook.

² "Yet still shall the tyrant sully
In dust his lustful locks."

A misquotation of Horace, Odes, I, xv, 19-20. *Polluet* is evidently a slip for *collines*; see the repetition of the quotation on p. 6, although the perfect of *collino* is *collevi*, not *collivi*. This may be pedantry, but Larking would have approved of it.

extensive practice.¹ James Crosby, F.S.A., of London, a well-wisher to both counties, tried to bring about a compromise. Larking offered to express his regret for anything he had done to offend Bish Webb—"anything for the sake of peace"—but nothing seems to have come of Crosby's efforts.

And so the meeting called for 22nd October took place. Crosby wrote Larking a long account of it, which is thus recorded in the Journal:

"The weather was terrific and only 15 were present. Crosby's suggestion that a Kent Society being now formed, it would be impertinent in Surrey to interfere, was scouted, as was also the list of our 215 Members, including the chief men of the County, gathered in one month. A Resolution was proposed for carrying the Junction into effect—Crosby moved an amendment, to the effect that the attempt at amalgamation was needless and ungracious, and thanking the Surrey people for having aroused Kent to action. The amendment was lost, there being 7 for and 8 against. The Original motion was then put, when oddly enough that was lost too (neither the proposer nor the seconder voting for their own motion); there being 7 for, and 8 against it—so 'there is an end of it' says Crosby—I doubt, seeing the mood of Webb—my prophecy, however, thus far is true:

'adulteros

Crines pulvere collivit'

—though in the past tense it don't exactly scan . . . neither could that selfwilled, headstrong, reckless man scan his task and capabilities—'adulteros crines pulvere collivit'—peace be with him—and if he attempts to revenge himself by fresh assaults, as I fully expect that he will—mark me, his second fall will be heavier and fouler than the first."

Thus the threat of what, to Larking, appeared to be little short of annexation by Surrey seemed to have been disposed of. Now he could get on with the affairs of the Society, and deal with its own, internal, problems, of which perhaps the most serious was the dilatoriness of the printer to whom was entrusted the printing of the many circulars which at this time Larking was sending out by the hundred. His exasperation with the printer is only too plain—"that man is incurable," "helpless and hopeless," "arousing from his slumbers and blunders," "his paltry excuses about the delays," are a few of the entries in the Journal.

But a more sinister entry appears on 12th November: "The

¹ For this information I am indebted to our member and very good friend, Mr. A. W. G. Lowther, F.S.A., the present Honorary Secretary of the Surrey Archaeological Society.

Creature's at his dirty work again." Bish Webb was nothing if not persistent, and he decided that his committee should meet again on 26th November, giving as his reason for a further meeting that, on 22nd October, the question of a union between Surrey and Kent was left undecided, the Chairman declining to give a casting vote—not surprisingly, seeing that on neither division had there been an equality of votes. In Kent it was suspected that Bish Webb would try to pack the meeting, but several of the Kent representatives went with clear instructions from Larking, and indulged in pretty plain speaking. Crosby again faithfully sent an account of the meeting to the Kent Society. It was a long meeting: "Some people went before the division, bored out with the twaddling of some old prozers, who went off from the subject, to lecture on Archæology in general." Finally, the committee decisively threw out the proposal by 26 votes to 13, and no more is heard of it. Most of the Kent supporters of the United Counties Society joined the Kent Archæological Society, and, indeed, a few had already joined both. Bish Webb came to our first Annual General Meeting on 30th July of the following year, whether to find fault or whether to hold out the olive branch, is uncertain; Larking, I am afraid, imputed the baser motive to him, especially as Bish Webb did not make himself known. However, the press of business and of people could easily account for that, and Bish Webb's death in 1859 prevented any other chance of a meeting and reconciliation between the two men. At no time, apparently, did their estrangement prevent the growth of a cordial relationship between the two County Societies.

Apart from the Surrey or, more accurately, the Bish Webb threat, and trouble with the printer, all went well with the Society's affairs during the remaining months of 1857. By the end of the year the membership stood at 446. Some of the questions which were asked about membership reflect a state of society quite remote from that of 1957; for example, may ladies join the Society?; and would it be permissible to propose the son of a tradesman? To the second question Larking answered "Of course," and to the former "I had hoped that ladies would grace us by their presence"; indeed, following the gallant custom of Sussex, the Kent Rules at this time provided that any lady desirous of becoming a member of the Society need not suffer the hazards of the ballot. The interim committee met on several occasions, to revise the rules, and to organize the Inaugural Meeting. On 20th January, 1858, the Maidstone Museum (the Charles Museum, as it was then called) was formally opened, and a few weeks later the Museum trustees offered to provide the Society with accommodation, and with the services of a curator, for £25 a year. Thus was begun a connection which still happily continues. From Professor Stanley, Larking extracted a promise to write the introductory paper for the Society's

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

first volume—clearly a valuable promise, for such was Stanley's fame that, as Larking wrote to Canon Robertson on 3rd April: "I had letters anxiously asking if Professor Stanley was to speak (*sc.* at the Inaugural Meeting) because if so there were many ladies who would come expressly to hear him."

In all this preparatory work, Larking had the active support of a few members of the Society, especially Lord Camden and Lord Falmouth, and the no doubt stimulating, but less practically useful encouragement of many others. The great bulk of the work undoubtedly fell to the Secretary; by 31st March, 1858, he had written 1,125 regular letters, and had despatched 1,077 circulars, many of them containing personal letters, a total of 2,202. The unquestioned success of the Inaugural Meeting, which was held at the Charles Museum on 14th April, 1858, must have been, to him, a keen personal gratification. The company which attended the meeting was both numerous and distinguished. The Marquis Camden was in the chair, and he was supported by Viscount Sydney (the Lord Lieutenant), Earl Amherst, Viscount Falmouth, the Countess Abergavenny and Viscountess Nevill, Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P. and Lady Mildred Hope, Sir Brook Bridges, Bart., M.P., Sir Walter James, Bart., Sir Walter Stirling, Bart., the Rev. Professor A. S. Stanley, and some eighty others who are recorded by name, as well as an unknown number whose only memorial is "etc., etc., etc., etc."

At the Inaugural Meeting the proceedings of the interim committee were ratified and adopted, numerous resolutions were proposed, seconded and carried unanimously, and speeches were made, some of them of no mean length. Beresford Hope expatiated upon the science of archæology, the county's singular felicity in the possession of antiquities, and the merits of photography; the Rev. W. M. Smith Marriott spoke of ecclesiastical architecture, and the skill and taste being displayed in current church restoration; Professor Stanley, who was received with especially loud cheers, gave a thumbnail account of the county's history. The Rules were approved, the thanks of the meeting were accorded to Larking, and he replied in an extempore but eloquent speech, from which the following sentences at least deserve to be rescued: "But, above all, remember that the sole object of your researches ought to be *Truth*. Have as many theories as you please—I have had thousands in my time—but always be ready (as I have been) to discard them at once, the moment you find the Truth opposed to them. Without this devotion to Truth we are frivolous triflers."

The Society was now decently and officially launched; no longer could anyone sneer at it as a Hole and Corner Affair. But, the launching accomplished, what course was the ship to steer? Wisely, neither the Society as a whole, in General Meeting, nor the Council has ever

tried to define, in specific terms, the activities that it should undertake, but from entries in Larking's Journals, and from passages in his letters and the Minutes, it is evident that he had a pretty clear idea of the things which he wished the Society to do: the publication of a periodical volume of transactions, the holding of annual meetings at places of archæological and historical interest, the encouragement of excavation and discovery, and the preservation of buildings, of documents, and of objects of all kinds which might bear upon the history of the county. An example of the threatened destruction of an historic building occurred within two months of the Inaugural Meeting: alarming reports were received of the intended demolition of the Roman (*sic*) church in Dover Castle, the materials of which were to be used to build a chapel for troops. Larking acted at once; he asked Lord Camden and Lord Stanhope (then President of the Society of Antiquaries) to intercede with the Minister, and Sir Brook Bridges and Mr. Deedes to question him in the Commons. Within a few days they were able to report that the church would not be destroyed. Whether the Government had intended to pull it down, and, if so, whether they were deterred by the Kentish representations, I do not know; but it is a pleasing conceit that the infant Society may have been instrumental in preserving the Roman and Saxon ruin of St. Mary-in-Castro.

In matters of excavation also Larking was prepared to act speedily, and if necessary himself to oversee the work. On one occasion at least his enthusiasm seems to have run away with him, for after an excavation on Wye Down in May, 1858, Larking was accused of trespass by the land-owner, Mr. Erle-Drax, who demanded that the objects found should immediately be handed over to him. However, Larking's apology was not only handsome but also so persuasive that Mr. Erle-Drax allowed the finds to be exhibited at the Society's First Annual General Meeting.

That Meeting took place at Canterbury on 30th July, 1858. The organization of the meeting, as became the practice during the Society's early years, was left to a local committee, with Edward Foss, the author of *The Judges of England*, who was then living at Chartham, as its secretary. Nevertheless, a great deal of the work fell upon Larking's shoulders. He it was who negotiated with the railway companies for special trains, one from London via Tonbridge and Ashford to Canterbury, and another, to meet it, from Blackheath via Maidstone to Paddock Wood. The companies' first response was disappointing—"I may reply, 'thank you for nothing'—So much for this detestable monopoly," was Larking's comment, but through the intervention of several gentlemen of the county, who were doubtless shareholders, it was possible, in the end, to get not only the special trains, but also reduced fares. It was Larking also who persuaded prominent members

of the Society to promise hampers of fruit, and similar contributions, for the dinner which was to be an important social part of the meeting.

The meeting began at the Guildhall, Canterbury, at 11 o'clock on 30th July, 1858, with the noble President in the chair and about 450 members and their friends in attendance. The Society was able to congratulate itself upon the progress made during its brief life, and no less than forty-one new members were elected. The President had asked Larking to see that ballot-boxes were available, but I think he forgot to do so. Certainly with over 400 members present the balloting for forty-one candidates would have been an interminable process, and in the end they were elected *en bloc*. Time was required for other and, archæologically, more interesting things. A paper by Roach Smith on the remarkable Saxon antiquities collected by Mr. Gibbs at Faversham was read, Mr. Gibbs having generously lent them for exhibition at the meeting. The party, which by this time had grown to over 500, then adjourned to the Cathedral, where Professor Stanley gave a series of interesting discourses. Then Beresford Hope conducted the cavalcade around the ruins of St. Augustine's, where he "gratified them with a luminous and detailed account of the early history of the monastery, its subsequent desecration, and the recent restorations so munificently completed by himself." Afterwards smaller parties were formed to visit St. Martin's Church, the Castle, and the towers, walls and gates of the City. At 3 o'clock the company reassembled for Divine Service at the Cathedral, every seat being occupied from the Dean's stall to the altar. On this occasion, as in the following year at Rochester, the music selected was by Kentish composers.

The Dinner which followed, and over which Larking and Foss had nearly fallen out, proved to be a much less successful affair. It was held at 4.30 in the Music Hall. The number of those who sat down at the tables was 310; "above 100 more were disappointed of seats owing to their not having made sufficiently early applications" (certain traits discernible amongst archæologists are evidently primeval), but perhaps, after all, these were the fortunate ones, for the caterer, whom Larking did not hesitate to say had cheated, had "shamefully provided insufficient food, and that of bad quality." In the following year, the local committee which was to be responsible for arranging the meeting at Rochester, was enjoined by the Council "to secure us as much as possible from the disappointment to which we were subjected last year in the deficiency of provisions at the dinner table, and that an increased price per head be allowed if necessary to secure us the accommodation we require"; (in fact, the charge was put up from 4s. to 6s.). It can only be hoped that the many speeches at the first dinner were not merely sufficiently substantial, but also sufficiently engaging to remedy the deficiencies on the tables.

After dinner, so many of the party as had not to take to the trains attended a *soirée* at the Deanery, where they were most hospitably entertained. (The way in which, in these early years, the members of the Society, often in their hundreds, were entertained to luncheon or tea by the owners of houses or the parsons of churches visited during the annual meetings is eloquent both of the generosity of the County, and of a distribution of resources very different from that which now prevails.) Even this did not conclude the day. "At a later hour some of the party entered the Cathedral, and enjoyed the effect of moonlight upon its windows and tracery, the enjoyment being richly enhanced by the magic effect of Luther's hymn unexpectedly chaunted by unseen performers which it was afterwards understood was a gratification devised by the Dean and Precentor, thus finishing a day of intellectual enjoyment such as the County had not before experienced and which easily surpassed our most sanguine expectation. It was a day not easily to be forgotten."

A feature of this first meeting, and of the Society's Annual General Meetings for many years, was the exhibition, or temporary museum, that was regularly arranged for the benefit of the members. Accustomed as we are to well-filled, and often well-arranged, public museums, it is difficult for us to realize the fervour with which these opportunities to see unusual and interesting exhibits were seized upon by our predecessors a century ago. Some of the exhibits were curious rather than important—a brick from Babylon and King Charles I's toothpick, for example; some were valuable, but not particularly associated with the archaeology of Kent, such as the Canalettos and the Gainsborough shown at the fourth Annual General Meeting at Maidstone; but many were of first-rate interest and importance, including such things as Mr. Gibbs's antiquities from the King's Field at Faversham, already referred to, Saxon, Norman and other charters from the Surrenden collection, a bronze Roman statuette of Minerva, found at Plaxtol,¹ leaden seals of Constantine, found at Richborough, medieval ivories, gold ornaments from a Saxon cemetery at Sarre, and Roman remains from Hartlip, Upchurch, and Ightham, to mention only a few of the exhibits shown at the first two Annual General Meetings. The enthusiasm with which the annual temporary museum was invariably received led, soon, to the decision that the Society should establish its own permanent collection.²

¹ It was illustrated as the frontispiece to volume LXIX of *Archæologia Cantiana*.

² The Society's collections are, by now, extensive. They are housed at Maidstone Museum, except the Twysden portraits, which are at Bradbourne House, East Malling, and deeds and other original documents, which are housed at the County Record Office. Lack of space and time has prevented the inclusion, in this paper, of a description of the collections. It is hoped to make good the deficiency in the next volume.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

At the first Annual General Meeting it was reported that "the printer is fast progressing with our first volume, which we hope to have ready for delivery to Members in the course of a very few weeks." In so reporting, Larking was being more hopeful than truthful. He did, indeed, attach the utmost importance to the quality and regularity of the Society's publication, and, doubling the roles of Secretary and Editor, he had already sent a certain amount of material (probably in the main his own) to be set up. But, for one reason and another, a year was to go by before the first volume appeared. In September, 1858, Larking was given the assistance of an Editorial Committee, consisting of the Marquess Camden, Beresford Hope, Duffus Hardy (of the Public Record Office), and the Rev. J. S. Brewer (Professor of History at King's College, London, and Reader at the Rolls Chapel). Brewer wrote the Introduction, which appeared anonymously in Volume I of *Archæologia Cantiana*; evidently it was regarded as rather too flowery, even by mid-nineteenth century standards, and the most highly empurpled passages were excised by his fellow committee men. Larking, in writing to the other members of the Committee, calls it Brewer's "beautiful preface," adding (surely with just a touch of scholarly sarcasm?) perhaps "we should draw his attention to a few oversights in the exuberance of his eloquence". But, apart from Brewer's introduction, and a decision that the volume should be bound in cloth, preferably Kentish grey in colour (a decision which later had to be modified in favour of purple), Larking seems not to have had much active help from the Editorial Committee, and the work of seeing the volume through the press fell almost entirely upon him. On 22nd November, 1858, he was cheerfully promising publication before Christmas, although three days later he was still sending some of his own copy to the printer. Then, at the end of November, the printer decided to equip himself with a new fount of type "and set up all again".

Not only were there problems with the printer. The Editorial Committee decided that, to strike the right note, the volume should open, on the frontispiece page, with the apt quotation from Bacon's *De Augmentis*, which has appeared in every subsequent volume. As a concession to members with little Latin an English translation was to be appended, but here difficulties occurred, for the members of the Editorial Committee questioned the accuracy of each other's translations, and I judge the exchanges on the subject to have been a little tart. Larking, with his customary resource and desire to prevent trouble, solved this problem by proposing that Bacon's *ipsissima verba* from the parallel passage in *The Advancement of Learning* should be included, so avoiding any need for a translation of the Latin, a practice which every subsequent Editor has followed.

Another problem was the Society's badge. Larking thought that we ought to have one, and he asked Thomas Willement, F.S.A., the Faversham antiquary, to try his hand at a design. Willement objected to the Kent horse, as too reminiscent of the Fire Office device, but Larking said that we must have the horse "rendered medieval by giving it the character of a Barb—or Cart Horse—and expelling reminiscences of Fire Office plates, by diapering." When Willement's design came, Larking, who disliked it, had placed himself in an awkward position by having already asked Herbert Smith, a London artist, also to produce a design. The motto *Cantwara Maegth* (the tribe of the Kent men) was Larking's own suggestion, and met with the approval of Thomas Wright and of the Rev. J. Bosworth, Rawlinson Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford, who supplied the following note on the interpretation of the words:

"As to the meaning of the motto '*Cant-wara maegth*'—'*Cant-wara maegth*' does not merely mean the *tribe*, people, district, or county of Kent or of Kentish men, but *Wara* denotes *Kent-dwellers, those who inhabit Kent, those who are bound together, who dwell in all their domestic comforts as husbands*; for '*ware*' is allied to '*wer*,' a man, a husband.

"'*Maegth*' has a still more extensive meaning; it denotes a *tribe, people, the locality of a tribe, a district, province*; *what has influence or power, originates or increases as woman*; from '*maeg*,' a woman; '*magan*,' to be able, to prevail.

"Hence '*Cant-wara maegth*' may be paraphrased and may include, *whatever has been done by men, husbands of Kent, spell-bound to the district, and influenced by the noble deeds and the great works of antiquity, by the gentle and all-persuasive power of woman.*"

Bosworth also designed the lettering of our badge. The horse, unfortunately, gave a lot of trouble. Smith produced a design, in the shape of the Alfred Jewel, which met with the commendation of Larking and of those to whom he showed it, but the engraver, who was set to work on Smith's drawing, proved unskilful. There was acrimonious correspondence, the artist blaming the engraver, the engraver complaining that the artist could not draw horses. The advice of Wollaston Franks, Director of the Society of Antiquaries, was obtained, but all to no avail: "the beastly Tattersall nag was retained," wrote Larking feelingly, ". . . the horse more like a unicorn than a horse." It so happened that, at this time (December, 1858), Landseer was paying a visit to Larking's friends, the Betts of Preston Hall, and all was arranged for Larking to consult Landseer ("to coax a horse out of him"), when Landseer "was called to London to draw a portrait of the Lion which

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

has just died in the Zoological Gardens." So, if it had not been that Landseer wanted a model for his Trafalgar Square lions, the Society's badge might have been designed by Landseer himself. As it was, Smith finally sent a drawing which met with the approval of Larking and his advisers, and which the engraver was able to copy successfully.¹ Larking, by getting the three Ladies Nevill to meet the cost (this is the true meaning of the ambiguous note which appears on page 22 of Volume I), was able to get himself out of the predicament that he had placed himself in *vis-à-vis* Willement, who gracefully withdrew his design in favour of that of the ladies.

These delays, the dilatoriness of the printer (Larking was constantly going to London to "quicken the printer," "to stir them all to immediate activity," "to hurry (or should it read harry?) the printer," or was writing "angry" or "very angry" letters to the printer's agent), the complications of having to deal separately with block-makers, engravers, and lithographers, and the usual editorial problem of getting authors to correct proofs quickly, meant that Volume I of *Archæologia Cantiana*, as it was decided to call the Society's publications, did not appear until towards the end of July, 1859, almost on the eve of the second Annual General Meeting. As Larking was still making alterations to the proof of Brewer's preface as late as about 5th July, the printers, in the end, must have moved with exceptional speed for the volume to be "out" by 20th July. The *Saturday Review* gave the Society's publication an unfavourable notice, but, on the other hand, it inspired a highly satisfactory article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

The Second Annual General Meeting was held at Rochester on 3rd and 4th August, 1859. Lord Stanhope suggested that the company should dine in a tent at Kit's Coty House, but neither then nor since has the Society adopted the idea, more remarkable perhaps for its romanticism than for its practicality. By this time the Society numbered 696 members, of whom no less than 400 were present at the Rochester meeting. After the formal business had been disposed of on the first day, the company toured the Cathedral, the Castle, and the city walls; attended Divine Service in the Cathedral at 3 p.m.; to the number of 250 sat down to dinner at 5 p.m. in a marquee erected in the castle garden; at 8 p.m. enjoyed an exhibition of antiquities at the Deanery, which were explained for two hours by Roach Smith; and at 10 p.m. returned to the Cathedral for a full choral service. This must surely have been a full day, and it exhausted poor Larking, who was often in ill-health. However, the next day, if anything, was even more strenuous: it began with three interesting and learned papers read at Rochester during the morning (a fourth being omitted for want of time),

¹ The design was altered slightly, when the horse was re-drawn about 1873. I have not been able to trace the name of the artist on that occasion.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

the party then progressing to Cooling Castle, Cliffe Church, Cobham Hall (where the habitual cold collation was enjoyed) and Cobham Church.

Thus was set the pattern which the Annual General Meetings followed until the 1914-18 war halted, temporarily, the Society's activities. It is impossible, when reading accounts of the early meetings, to withhold admiration for the stamina which our predecessors showed. They sat through business meetings, they sat through the reading of numerous papers, some of them, as even contemporary judgment admitted, "of considerable length," they undertook lengthy excursions, either by horse carriage or on foot, they listened to sometimes prolix descriptions of the buildings visited (usually churches), they examined attentively and enthusiastically the temporary museums assembled for their benefit, and they despatched a substantial dinner.¹

Saumons à la Mayonnaise
Salades de Homard à la Rachael
Galantines de Volaille
Anguilles en Aspic
Salad de Saumon à la Tartar
Galantine de Veau
Cotes de Boeuf roti
Quartiers d'Agneau
PRESSED BEEF
Galantine de Dindon
PIGEON PIES
VEAL AND HAM PIES
TONGUES
HAMS
Roast Fowls
Braised Fowls à la Creme

WINE JELLY
Cremes Françaises

WINE LIST

Champagne (Roederer)	10	0
Moselle	8	0
Still Hock	7	0
Bucellas	6	0
Claret	6	0
Sherry	6	0
Port	7	0

In time it became the practice for papers to be read at the evening meeting on the first day. At Maidstone, for example, in 1882, five papers were read at the evening meeting (which began at 7 o'clock) and George Payne, one of the lecturers, is specifically mentioned as "having

¹ The menu of the "Déjeuner" held at the Bull Hotel, Dartford, on the 25th July, 1867, having chanced to survive, I cannot resist the temptation to include it *verbatim*:

spoken for some time." After the solid repast with which the members had just fortified themselves it seems likely that some part of the audience must have found the attractions of antiquarianism and of sleep nicely balanced during the reading of the papers. Perhaps this was why, at Rochester in 1887, the procedure was varied: "an amateur band discoursed sweet music; and at intervals papers were read."

To give an account of all the Annual General Meetings would be tedious; they are faithfully recorded in the volumes of *Archæologia Cantiana*, and the records often make surprisingly interesting reading. If it would be tedious to give any detailed account of the Society's early proceedings, it would certainly be misleading to suggest that they were always trivial, or intended to tickle the ears of the groundlings. *Autres temps, autres mœurs*; there is much that, to us, seems quaint and amusing in the behaviour of our members of a hundred years ago; let us hope that our conduct will seem no worse to our successors in the middle of the next century.

For the Society, at the end of its first decade, could look back upon a solid and serious achievement. It was essentially an *amateur* achievement, in both senses, in that it was a labour of love, and that it was non-professional. Few of the 1,100 members which the Society numbered by 1868 (when it could claim to be the largest of the County Societies in the south-east; how egregiously wrong Bish Webb had proved!) made any pretension to a profound knowledge of archæology, but their enthusiasm showed no abatement. It was thanks to the support of the many lay members that the erudite few who became prominent in the affairs of the Society were able to do so much to advance archæological and historical learning in the county.

Excavations, for example, were undertaken at a number of important sites, including Richborough, Horton Kirby and Sarre. The discoveries were reported in *Archæologia Cantiana*, and many of the objects found a permanent home in the Society's collections at Maidstone, including the magnificent finds from the Saxon cemetery at Bifrons, where, in 1867, Godfrey-Faussett, on behalf of the Society and with the permission of Lord Conyngham, opened more than one hundred Saxon graves, and Lord Conyngham's gamekeeper opened as many more. "The whole charm of archeology is in making discoveries—at least with most of our archeologists," wrote Larking in a letter to Canon Robertson. This indeed was manifested in the nature of the Society's activities, and modern scientific investigators may shudder at the muscular optimism of the Council's exhortation, in 1872, that nothing was required "but an energetic member . . . to superintend the work of laying bare such treasures." For Larking "discovery" meant the discovery of archæological and historical truth, but for many of his contemporaries it meant, simply, the finding of objects of

beauty, or of intrinsic value. It was to ensure that the Society's excavations were kept on proper lines that Larking continually, but unsuccessfully, tried to persuade Roach Smith to become our "Director of Primeval Antiquities." Roach Smith was very conscious of his reputation and standing in the world of archæology, and clearly was a prickly character. He was quite well disposed towards Larking, but still refused to join the Society. Resident as he was in the county, at Strood, he was ineligible, under the Rules, for election as an Honorary Member, but eventually the Rules were suspended so that, exceptionally, he might be made an Honorary Member. Roach Smith never held office in the Society, but for many years was influential in its affairs, and his advice was often sought. For most of his life he was engaged in business in London, where he was outstanding in connection with the Roman antiquities of the City. On retirement to Kent he was able to devote himself to wider archæological and social interests.¹

In addition to the finds which were added to the Society's collections as the result of their own excavations, many purchases were made of objects which might otherwise have been lost, or, through coming into private hands, might at least have been lost to archæologists. These included such spectacular objects as the gold *armillae* found at Aylesford and Maidstone. Unfortunately their intrinsic value has rendered their safe custody such an embarrassment to the Council that few of our members have ever seen them and their sale has more than once been proposed. Less spectacular, but perhaps even more important, objects were also added to the collections, especially large numbers of documents, including the charters purchased in 1864 when the Surrendering collection was, alas, dispersed. Moreover, through the reports in the local newspapers of the Society's activities, more and more people were coming to realize that objects, even if not of beauty or of intrinsic value, might have archæological importance. Thus, for example, Mrs. Stickings (who mentioned elsewhere that she held "but a humble position in life") writes to our Curator in January, 1867: "On Friday last there was a discovery made while digging for brick earth opposite my house in Charlotte Street, Milton, of three skeleton forms, one is a skeleton of a very noble man being six feet in length, the bones are in good preservation the skull being nearly whole there is also a small earthen jar which is almost whole one form was carted away with the brick earth before I arrived. One is still imbedded in the earth. If you think the jar or skull worth your attention, Please write by return of post has I am anxious to dispose of it." It has often been through

¹ A letter to Roach Smith from W. Alfred Lloyd, dated the 22nd March, 1867, gives an interesting glimpse of him as a pharmacist in the City of London: "Do you remember that you sold 'citratated Kali' in powder in bottles with a bit of poetry by Milton on the label? Long before I knew you personally I used to look in at your window and say to myself: 'that is no common chemist and druggist.'"

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

intimations such as this that notable discoveries have been made, and that our collections, from time to time, have been enriched.

The Society, too, used its influence to prevent the destruction of several buildings of historic importance. No public authority, local or central, then had any such responsibility, and although the Society sometimes failed—it could not secure the reprieve, for instance, of Astley House, Maidstone—a number of buildings would not now be standing if it were not for the vigilance of our members in the last century. Where a building could not be saved from demolition the Society busied itself in getting a photographic or other record made of it before the opportunity was lost. We were also able, on occasion, to intervene effectively when an old building was to be altered. The War Department was persuaded to consult the Society when the Constable's Tower at Dover Castle was modernized in 1882 for the use of the Commanding Officer, and although the Tower now wears a somewhat incongruous look, it is certain that, left to their own unaided inspiration, the Royal Engineers would have produced an even less happy effect. The Council was not making an unsupported claim when, at the 1871 Annual General Meeting, it referred to the Society's influence in conservative Church-restoration and in the tasteful handling of domestic architecture, ancient and modern; to the very general respect and preservation now given to all antiquities in place of the ruthless sacrifice to convenience of a few years ago; to the largely increased general knowledge, and desire for knowledge, of the minuter, but not always less important, History of our County and Country . . . "a considerable share of this advance may be traced distinctly to the influence of the Society."

The one cloud in the Society's sky during these early years of youthful zeal was the problem of money. The subscription was only ten shillings a year (and it is a tribute to the way in which our affairs have been managed that it remained at this figure until after the 1939-45 war) but members were lax in payment. The same phenomenon is noted by Mr. L. F. Salzman and by Mr. A. W. G. Lowther in the histories of the Sussex and the Surrey Archaeological Societies. At every Annual General Meeting a *cri de coeur* went up from the Honorary Secretary about arrears of subscriptions. Certainly the method of collecting them through the Local Secretaries, who were also responsible for distributing *Archæologia Cantiana*, seems, in retrospect, to have been clumsy, especially as the Local Secretaries paid in the subscriptions collected by them either to Messrs. Randall, Mercer's Bank at Maidstone, or to Messrs. Hammond's Bank at Canterbury, and the only way in which the Secretary could compile an up-to-date list of subscribing members was from the Bank pass-books, which were often wrong, or at least required explanation. Some of the Local

Secretaries proved to be poor men-of-affairs, and either failed to collect subscriptions due, or demanded subscriptions which had already been paid. Errors of the latter kind were embarrassing, so that Larking explicitly reserved to himself the right of dunning certain distinguished defaulters, such as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

It was true that the Society had comparatively few expenses, except the publication of the volume. That, however, was a heavy expense; Volume I cost £370, and Foss got a small committee appointed to prune editorial expenditure ("Old Foss is in a most awful fidget about our Book," wrote Larking, "he is too fond of dictating—I wish he would take the Secretaryship off my hands, and then he could dictate to himself, a new game of Solitaire").

By 1861, Larking, who had wrought nobly in the Society's behalf, was beginning to fail. The regular entries in his Journal come to an end on 31st December, 1860, and he then procured for himself a Manifold copy book, his opinion of which was consistently unfavourable: "I am beginning the year with a new dodge of a 'Manifold Writer.' I am sick of it already and covered with smut . . . it is an execrable invention and I have 1000 pages to fill before I have got through with it . . . it is 'Manifold' devilry, but the world now is ruled by devilry. . . . Like all patent things it is a fudge—as bad as the Reform Bill, and as great a cheat" (after that remark it comes as no surprise to find that some of Larking's writing bearing on the constitutional dispute of the seventeenth century had to be submitted to impartial editing in the interests of the Parliamentary cause). To Beresford Hope he writes: "Did you ever find yourself in the House between Bright and James—if so you can form an idea of my miseries—Bronchitis and Lumbago—between the two I am demented." To several of his friends he sends moving letters about a sense of his increasing inadequacies, especially, as he feels, his inability to express his thoughts on paper, although the few extracts from his letters quoted in this paragraph show that the gift had not really deserted him. His handwriting does, indeed, become shaky, and at times scarcely decipherable. In May, 1861, he writes: "I have been forbidden all mental exertion, and all undertakings of exertions¹ by Dr. Watson, who suspects mischief at the heart—I have been overworked and overworried—the fact is my shattered system is not fitted for my undertakings . . . I believe no wise or thoughtful man, at my age, should do more than keep his loins girded for passing the Jordan."

At last Larking was able to persuade another to take on the Secretaryship, and he laid down the office at the Annual General Meeting in 1861. He lived on for another seven years, still playing an invaluable, though less active, part in the Society's affairs. It is impossible to read

¹ This may not be the right reading: the word is almost indecipherable.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

through his Minutes, his Journals, and his letters without a growing feeling of respect, and affection, for him. The work that he did for the Society was prodigious. Perhaps at times he was a little hasty in judgment, although that impression, in part, may spring from the greater forcefulness of expression which was enjoyed by the nineteenth-century writer compared with the unemotional neutrality now felt to be seemly. No subsequent Secretary, I am sure, would deny the supreme importance of the indefatigable Larking's work in the Society's formative years, and the resolution which Council passed on his death might fittingly be the epitaph of the most devoted of the Society's servants: "The founder of the Society, and its Secretary during its first and most anxious years, and its foremost counsellor since his resignation of the Secretaryship . . . his name and fame will never be forgotten in a Society whose very existence is a monument of his energy and learning."

Because Larking's successors worked in what were, from the Society's point of view, less exciting times, and because they were less prolific of records, it is neither necessary nor possible to trace the Society's history through the remainder of its first century in the same detail as has been possible, and seemed proper, for the first few years. Larking's immediate successor was J. G. Talbot of Edenbridge (later the Rt. Hon. J. G. Talbot, M.P. for West Kent) who, however, soon found the work more than he could manage with his other commitments, and in 1862 T. Godfrey Faussett (later T. G. Godfrey-Faussett), then of London and later of Canterbury, took on the Secretaryship, which he held for eleven years. It must be remembered that, at this time, the Honorary Secretary was responsible for editing *Archæologia Cantiana* and that, with some clerical assistance from the Curator, he was also the Society's financial officer, in so far as anyone had that responsibility.

During Godfrey-Faussett's term of office, the Society's first President, the Marquess Camden, died, in 1866. He was no mere figure-head President, but took a regular part in the Society's business, both in its more formal aspects, such as presiding at the Annual General Meetings, and also in other, less formal, ways. In his place was elected Earl Amherst, who remained in office until 1884, presiding over no less than fourteen Annual Meetings. When at last failing strength compelled him to retire, the Council referred to his "genial courtesy and considerable kindness which . . . have won from our members such esteem and grateful recognition as approximate very nearly to affectionate regard."

Godfrey-Faussett, at one time a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was a scholar (his publications include hymns in Latin and English) and a patient antiquary. Probably, even if the word had been fashionable at the time, he would not have been termed a dynamic character. Under his gentle guidance the Society proceeded along the

lines which had, by now, been clearly laid down during the first decade, with the two-day Annual General Meetings as the most spectacular of its activities. At the 1863 meeting held at Penshurst, the 800 members who were present (including the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Lieutenant) were entertained at a magnificent banquet by Lord De L'Isle and Dudley; in 1871, 600 members attended the meeting held at Knole; and when the Society went to Leeds Castle in 1882, the 400-odd members had to be marshalled into groups, with military precision, and the excursions through the Castle timed meticulously to ensure that the party was able to accomplish during the day the formidable tour which had been set for it. The organization of these meetings, when trains were customarily anything up to an hour and a half late, and when horse-carriages had to be hired by the dozen to transport such numbers, was a task likely to daunt any but the sternest Excursions Secretary: perhaps there is some significance in the fact that at this time the title used was "Honorary Director of Locomotion."

In 1871 Godfrey-Faussett was joined as Joint Honorary Secretary by the Rev. W. A. Scott Robertson. Two years later, on Godfrey-Faussett's resignation, Scott Robertson became responsible for all the secretarial and editorial work, and so remained for sixteen years. At that time he was Rector of Elmley, in the Isle of Sheppey, although he lived at Whitehall, Sittingbourne. Except on Sundays, it seems improbable that his remote and few parishioners saw much of him. He was greatly interested in Foreign Missions, and he took part in many matters that concerned the welfare of the town and neighbourhood of Sittingbourne, but both at that time and later, when he was successively Vicar of Throwley and Rector of Otterden, it was to the Society's affairs that, after his parochial duties, he devoted most of his energies. "His learning, zeal, tact, indomitable energy, and remarkable power of organization well fitted him for the onerous task he had undertaken," runs the obituary notice in Volume XXIII of *Archæologia Cantiana*, "and all these qualities he ungrudgingly devoted to the advancement of the science of Archæology and the welfare of the Society." He contributed something like one hundred papers to *Archæologia Cantiana*; on excursions he was an indefatigable guide and a ready expositor; on his instigation the Society undertook several new projects; and he attended, in a business-like way, to all the communications that fall to the lot of the Secretary.

The number of these communications, reported Robertson Scott, exceeded 1,500 a year, and the number of letters that he wrote annually was 1,000. This information was produced at a meeting of Council in 1883, when an application from the Curator for an increase of salary was being considered. The Curator based his application on the

volume of work that he was required to do—he must, he said, be at the disposal, at any moment, of any member of the Society; on the contrary, alleged Scott Robertson, the Secretary had to do all the work, whilst the Curator sat in his house behind locked doors. A consultation with the Museum Trustees was proposed, and thereupon Bartlett resigned as the Society's Curator, although two years later, when the curatorship was again vacant, he was reappointed. He was a great ornithologist, and, in retrospect, we may allow the value of his publications in that field to go far towards condoning his passivity in the Society's affairs.¹

The project which certainly caused Scott Robertson most trouble was the copying of the mural paintings in the dark chapel of St. Gabriel in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral. The paintings were thought to be of such importance as to justify their reproduction, in colour, in *Archæologia Cantiana* and in January, 1878, James Neale, F.S.A., was commissioned, on behalf of the Society, to copy them, at an agreed remuneration of one guinea per diem plus expenses, the Chapter supplying lights, scaffolding, and a boy or man to assist. As a rough estimate it was expected that the work would cost £50. Six months later, Neale reported that the work already done would cost £48, and that he expected the completion of the drawings would involve about £32 more. Nine months later the total figure had increased to £200, and the work was still unfinished. The artist was paid off, and the drawings were reproduced in Volume XIII of *Archæologia Cantiana*, but such was the cost of chromolithography that, in the end, only one plate could be reproduced in colour, the Naming of St. John the Baptist. That one plate cost £62; possessors of the volume will certainly agree that it is a handsome illustration, but in several letters to Scott Robertson the artist complained of the indecent haste with which the Secretary was proceeding to have the reproduction made, explaining, but to no avail, that the drawing was unfinished. Evidently Scott Robertson was exasperated by the fifteen months' delay, and perhaps he allowed zeal to outstrip discretion. Subsequently he was involved in a sharp argument with the Chapter about the failure to hang Neale's drawing (which was to become their property) in the Cathedral Library, where it was intended to remain on permanent exhibition, but after the exchange of letters, some passages of which would do credit to that other nineteenth-century clerical letter-writer,

¹ That the Honorary Secretary and the Curator did not get on well together seems to emerge from certain of their correspondence; for example, in June 1880, the Secretary writes to the Curator about the Annual General Meeting: "If you can obtain envelopes *without* gum, it will be a good thing, as we shall put halfpenny stamps on them and send them open"; a note pencilled on the letter runs: "This created a great robbery of Members' Rail-way tickets and most damaging to the Secretary." The note is not initialled, but I have no doubt that the author of it was Bartlett.

Sydney Smith, all was smoothed over, the drawings were duly hung, and Neale joined the Society.

Another project, dear to the heart of Scott Robertson, was the publication of a list of the communion plate belonging to every parish church in the county. The archdeacons gave their support, and a very large number of incumbents gave the information asked for—surely testimony of the Society's standing in the county, and of Scott Robertson's own enthusiasm and tact. Inevitably it proved impossible to obtain returns from some parishes, and for one reason or another—perhaps because this was not an aspect of "archæology" that appealed to the next Honorary Secretary—the project was laid aside for a time, until in 1899 Council was persuaded by the Rev. C. Eveleigh Woodruff to take it up again, and at length the publication of the returns was completed in Volumes XXV to XXVIII of *Archæologia Cantiana*. "Many sacred vessels of some age have through this enquiry been saved from alienation," Council reported, and within the past two years the published inventories have again proved of practical use in helping a Kent church to reacquire some of its ancient plate which had found its way out of the county.

In the field, several pieces of work, large and small, were carried out, either by the Society or with the help of a grant from the Society, during the last thirty years of the century. These included excavations of Roman villas at Maidstone, Darenth, and Wingham; of the ruined church at Stone-near-Faversham; at Joss Farm, North Foreland; at Milton-next-Sittingbourne; at St. Radegund's Abbey; at St. Pancras' chapel, Canterbury; at Richborough (on several occasions); in the Dean of Rochester's garden; and at the Praemonstratensian Abbey at West Langdon. Some of these excavations, such as that of the Roman villa at Darenth, were of the first importance, and were fully reported in *Archæologia Cantiana*.

Several of these excavations also resulted in further additions to the Society's collections housed at Maidstone Museum. One interesting object, given to the Society in 1887, almost failed to find its way to Maidstone. It was the leaden coffin of "a Roman lady" discovered at Plumstead, and given to the Society by the owner of the land on which it was found. Before it could be conveyed to Maidstone, it came into the hands of the Vicar of Plumstead, who insisted on interring it in the cemetery, much to the Society's indignation. Legal action was discussed, but was thought to be inappropriate. It seems likely that the Vicar had initially assumed that the Roman lady was of the Christian faith, and that subsequent doubt on this point lessened his sense of the impropriety of the gift to the Society; in any event, the Society was interested in the coffin, not in the skeleton, and eventually George Payne, on behalf of the Society, obtained a faculty to remove the

coffin, the bones being re-interred, and it duly came to Maidstone Museum, where it still reposes.

George Payne moved with such celerity that he had the coffin on the train, *en route* for Maidstone, less than 24 hours after he had obtained the faculty for its exhumation. He was indeed an energetic field antiquary, and had already undertaken numerous excavations, some on behalf of the Society. For several years he had been prominent at Annual General Meetings, and when, in 1889, Canon Scott Robertson decided that the time had come for him to resign the Secretaryship (though he retained the Editorship, now constituted a separate office, for another three years), he was succeeded by Payne, who was also appointed "Chief Curator" at a salary of £50 a year. This was the nearest that the Society ever came to employing a paid Secretary, and the arrangement was not continued after Payne's departure. In 1892 Council was persuaded to accept his suggestion that he should be appointed as a salaried Inspector of Antiquities for the county, part of his salary to be borne by the twenty or so boroughs, who would be able to seek his advice in organizing their museums, and generally on antiquarian matters. In spite of an approach by the President to all the mayors, none of the boroughs was interested in the proposition, and it fell through.

Payne's term of office as Secretary was not an especially successful one. His genius lay in the field, not in the study. He had not the comfortable financial security of his predecessors, and he was obliged to spread his energies widely. Probably he tried to take on more than any one man, however energetic, could manage. It was unfortunate, too, that by the nineties the initial impetus that had carried the Society so far in its early years had spent itself. The enthusiasm of the '60s and '70s had gone. Council meetings were poorly attended, the business was rarely of much importance, and Payne's Minutes make dull reading. The Annual General Meetings saw the same familiar rounds of visits; imagination was lacking. Not surprisingly the numbers of members at the annual meetings fell, and by the end of the century the annual dinner attracted only 40 or 50 members, in place of the two or three hundred who had once been accustomed to sit down during the Society's early years. The membership was steadily shrinking, and continued to diminish throughout the first decade of this century, until by 1910 the total number of members was down to seven or eight hundred, compared with 1,100 in 1868—and this in spite of the fact that in the meantime the population of the county had largely increased. Some members of Council realized that all was not well: C. E. Woodruff, for example, suggested posing, at the 1902 Annual General Meeting, the questions—how can the meeting be made more profitable and instructive to members; and how can the usefulness and popularity of the

Society be increased? However, it seems that the questions were not even discussed, still less answered.

Our finances, too, were in a muddle—in a “state of almost inextricable confusion,” as was afterwards admitted. Payne was less successful than his predecessors in operating the cumbrous system of dealing with subscriptions and the payment of bills, and quite clearly this side of the Society’s business held no attractions for him. Late in 1902 it was decided that the accounts should be professionally audited; hitherto the audit had been carried out by two or three of the members. In March, 1903, Council set up a Finance Committee, but Payne, with truly Freudian forgetfulness, omitted to minute its appointment. This omission was made good at the following meeting of Council, when the Secretary reiterated the promise, made at an earlier meeting, to co-operate with the auditors. Nevertheless, he failed to produce the books for their inspection, possibly because they had been kept so casually as to be unintelligible to anyone but himself, and at the end of 1903 he had bluntly to be asked to resign the Secretaryship. This he did in the spring of 1904. It was, therefore, more polite than ingenuous for Council to express, in the report presented to the Annual General Meeting in 1904, its deep regret that he had found it necessary to resign. For a time relations between Payne and the Society were strained, but his election, in 1910, as an Honorary Member was a proper recognition of all that he had done for archæology in Kent. The Eastgate House Museum at Rochester is his lasting memorial.

The straightening-out of the finances was almost entirely the work of the Rev. Waterman Gardner-Waterman, who had already demonstrated his business capacity in the organization of carriages for the annual excursion meetings, and for whom, as his obituary notice stated, “figures had no terrors.” He was appointed to the new office of Honorary Financial Secretary (the Honorary Treasurer at this time having little more than nominal responsibility), an office which he held until 1924. It was during his term of office that, in 1916, the clumsy and often criticized method of collecting subscriptions through Local Secretaries came to an end. For a time, in 1909, he also acted as Honorary Secretary to the Society, after the resignation of Sebastian Evans, of Canterbury, who had succeeded Payne in 1904. Meanwhile, the Honorary Editorship had passed through several hands. Ill-health compelled Scott Robertson, in 1892, to give up the responsibility for *Archæologia Cantiana*, and he was followed by Canon C. F. Routledge, who in turn was succeeded, in 1900, by the brothers Woodruff—the Rev. C. Eveleigh, and Cumberland. Cumberland Woodruff died in 1904, and the Rev. Eveleigh Woodruff resigned in 1906. From 1907 to 1913, the Rev. (Canon) G. M. Livett acted as Honorary Editor.

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

There had also, inevitably, been changes in the Presidency. Earl Sydney, Lord Lieutenant, was elected in place of Earl Amherst in 1884, and he remained President until his death six years later. His successor as Lord Lieutenant, Earl Stanhope, also became President of the Society. On his death in 1905, Lord Northbourne was invited to accept the office. He, as Earl Amherst earlier had done, held the Presidency for eighteen years. By many of our older members he is still remembered with affection for his kindness and courtesy, and with respect for the skill which he showed in presiding over the Society during some of its most difficult years.

During the years before the 1914-18 war, the Society, on many occasions, made grants towards the cost of excavations—e.g. at Lesnes, at Coldrum, and at Tonbridge Castle—but the work which most regularly engaged their sympathy was the excavation at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, a scheme which owed much to the enthusiasm of our member, the Rev. (Canon) R. U. Potts. A substantial grant was made towards the cost of repairing Bell Harry Tower at Canterbury Cathedral in 1907, Council deciding that this appeal could properly be distinguished from the many appeals received for parish churches, which, as a matter of policy, were reluctantly but consistently passed over. The 1907 precedent was followed again in 1946, when a donation was made to the Canterbury Cathedral Appeal Fund. Interesting, smaller, grants were those for repairing and rebinding the Bishops' Registers at Rochester in 1905, and for rebinding the monastic register in the Dean and Chapter Library at Canterbury in 1909.

These two latter grants, in fact, reflect the increased interest which the Society was beginning to take in written records, due, in part, to the prompting of H. W. Knocker, then of Sevenoaks, who himself was Steward to, I believe, thirty or forty manors in the county. He urged fellow solicitors and others to send old documents to the Society for preservation, and, as our Honorary Registrar of Deeds, began a County Register of Archives, which, in intention, although not in achievement, was a local forerunner of the National Register of Archives—not in achievement because war broke out, and Captain Knocker was soon engaged in less pacific activities. It was Knocker who, in 1913, persuaded Council to pass *nemine contradicente* a resolution deprecating any statutory interference with the Kentish custom of gavelkind. However, it was scarcely likely that this piece of antiquarianism would escape the reforming zeal of Lord Chancellor Birkenhead in 1922, and, in spite of Council's resolution, the incidents of gavelkind disappeared in 1926.

Knocker was one of those who, in 1910-12, took a leading part in the discussions which led to the setting up of the Records Branch of the Society for the publication of records. From time to time, records had

been published in *Archæologia Cantiana*, especially in the earlier volumes under the influence of Larking, but their publication was not popular with those members whose interest lay in ecclesiastical architecture or in the antiquities of prehistoric Kent, and the establishment, in 1913, of a separate Records Branch, with a subscription of 10s. a year, was widely welcomed. Miss Irene J. Churchill was appointed Honorary Editor of Kent Records, an office which she still holds, and by November, 1914, three volumes of records had been published, a performance which is eloquent of the Editor's energy and of the moderation of pre-1914 printing costs.

Indeed, by 1914 there was considerable indication of a revival in the Society's affairs. Hubert Elgar succeeded Payne as Curator in 1904, and for twenty-seven years devoted himself to the Society's affairs, earning the respect of the learned for his authoritative knowledge of the archæology of Kent, and the affection of all for his gentle kindness; Richard Cooke, of Detling, became the Honorary Secretary in 1912; the members were now conveyed, generally more expeditiously although sometimes more precariously, by motor coaches at the annual meetings; and Council firmly resolved, when Major Lambarde and Leland Duncan were appointed as Joint Honorary Editors in 1913, in succession to Canon Livett, that every effort should be made to publish *Archæologia Cantiana* annually, or at least biennially. Annual publication had always been Council's ambition, but an unrealized one, and in the second year of the Society's existence Larking had thought it wise to get Council to say, explicitly, that there was no promise of an annual volume. In fact, by 1913, that is 56 years after the Society's foundation, only 29 volumes had been published, and on several occasions three years went by without the members receiving any tangible evidence of the Society's activities. All this Council was determined to rectify.

One of the heartening features of history is the countless examples it affords of men's fears proving, in the event, to be unfounded; conversely, the illustrations of hopes doomed to disappointment conduce to more sober reflection. Ineluctably the events of 1914-18 severely limited the Society's activities, and retraction, not development, became the order of the day. Major (afterwards Brigadier-General) Lambarde was soon at the Front, and Leland Duncan's work at the War Office kept him so busy that he had no time to spare for *Archæologia Cantiana*. Aymer Vallance, then living in London, took on the interim editorship, and managed to bring out volumes in 1915, 1917 and 1918, but costs were increasing sharply, paper was hard to get, and the 1917 *Archæologia Cantiana* was the last of the thick, opulent volumes which, until then, had been the rule. Excavation at St. Augustine's, with continued help from the Society, went on for a short time, but field work

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

generally came to an end. Year by year, membership declined, and by the end of the war it totalled scarcely more than 600. Some members left the county for safer parts of England; others left the country on active service, several of them never to return. The traditional two-day annual excursion meeting was replaced by a one-day lecture meeting at Maidstone. Council found no answer to the letter from a member who, in 1917, plaintively asked that there should be less "flatness" and more "life" at our meetings. The most that Council could do was to hold on, in the hope that at last the day would come when the Society could resume its normal way of life.

By 1919 our fortunes were recovering. Not only was there a two-day summer meeting in that year, but also the annual dinner was revived. The excursions again became a regular part of the Society's activities, and their popularity grew; in 1928 a one-day autumn meeting was instituted in addition to the two-day summer meeting, and in 1929 the excursion to Romney Marsh drew over 200 members and their friends.

The membership, which the war had so seriously reduced, slowly grew again—by 1923 it stood at 760, and five years later it had climbed to 916, only to suffer a set-back during the economic depression of 1929-32. Compared with the 1,100 members that the Society could boast by 1868, these post-war figures seem unremarkable, but it must be remembered that in the 1920s several local societies were established, with no intention to rival the County Society, but to cater for the needs of those whose interest in antiquarian pursuits was sometimes not accompanied by the leisure or means to indulge them on a county scale. The Canterbury Archaeological Society was founded in 1919, the Ashford Society in 1920. They, and many of the other newly formed local societies, affiliated to the County Society. A cordial relationship has always existed between the County and the local societies, and there is no doubt that, through them, many more men and women have been introduced to the delights of archæology, and some valuable field work has been accomplished.

Another sign of the return to normal conditions was that the Society was soon renewing its grants towards the cost of the excavations at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, whose merits were so ably canvassed by Canon Potts, Sub-Warden of the Abbey and for many years a beloved and respected member of Council. These grants went on at irregular, but fairly frequent, intervals until 1929. In 1932 excavations were undertaken by Mr. F. C. Elliston Erwood, on the Society's behalf, at the site of the Abbey Church at Malling. Help was also given, during the years between the wars, with excavations at Ospringe (Roman cemetery), the Roman forts at Reculver and Richborough, Finglesham (Jutish cemetery), and the Early Iron-Age hill-fort at Bigbury. In

1938 excavations were carried out, under the direction of Mr. J. B. Ward-Perkins, at the hill-fort at Oldbury, the necessary funds being raised by an appeal, in which the County Society joined with the Society of Antiquaries. Other large-scale excavations also were undertaken, notably by the Office of Works—Richborough Castle, and the Folkestone Roman villa, for example. In 1931 Dr. R. E. M. Wheeler had been obliged to record that “save in the matter of Pleistocene flints, Kentish archaeologists have fallen short of many of their neighbours in their researches into their earlier antiquities.” A quarter of a century later would Sir Mortimer Wheeler, I wonder, take the same view?

The importance of field-work was certainly very evident to those members of the Society who advocated setting up an Excavations Branch, on the analogy of the Records Branch. The idea was first mooted in 1916, revived after the war, and carried into execution in the 1920s. The intention was that not only money, but also a band of willing and more-or-less experienced helpers, should be available to aid any excavation work at short notice. It was, in part, the rapid industrial and residential development of north-west Kent that emphasized the need for some means of mounting “rescue” operations at short notice, but the Excavations Branch, sound though the idea seemed, and still seems, failed to attract the support that its promoters hoped for, and it came to an end in 1931.

The Records Branch, on the other hand, with a membership never much exceeding 100, continued its steady progress, publishing as often as its funds would allow, and giving increasing attention to the preservation of documents. H. W. Knocker, and F. W. Tyler (the Honorary Secretary of the Records Branch) were diligent in their collection, and effectively persuasive in getting solicitors and others to part with documents, great numbers of which, after the legislation of 1922-25, ceased to have any practical, legal, value. Their storage presented a problem; for many years, and indeed until after the 1939-45 war, some were kept at Maidstone Museum, but a large mass of them migrated with the Honorary Secretary of the Branch, first from London to Canterbury, and later, on a change of Secretary, from Canterbury to Aylesford.

In 1922, the Society embarked on another new responsibility, namely the collection of place-name material for the English Place-Names Society. A good deal in the way of collecting modern place-names was done through the schools, but as the work proceeded, it became more and more patent that some philological learning, as well as local knowledge and enthusiasm, was necessary to place-name study, and that the County Society could help, in the main, by acting as a referee, in particular, by answering questions which called for an acquaintance with the topography of the county. Meanwhile, the

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

publication of Professor J. K. Wallenberg's two works on the place-names of Kent has made the publication of the English Place-Names Society's Kent volume both more difficult yet easier, and more imperative yet less urgent.

Increased co-operation with other bodies was one of the characteristics that marked the Society's work between the wars. The new local committees concerned with town and regional planning, for example, regularly turned to the Society for advice, and often invited the Society to nominate a member of the committee. Today, planning is recognized as being far more complex than was realized in the 1920s, and the County Council has now become the planning authority, but the mutually useful connection between planning and archæology established thirty years ago continues. In the field of ecclesiastical architecture Diocesan committees were set up to advise the Bishops' consistory courts on the granting of faculties, and although the Society has never been officially represented on these committees, some of our members have, from the first, served upon them, and the Diocesan committees have cordially recognized the nature of the Society's interest in their work.

It was in 1937 that the Society received perhaps its most munificent gift, the Twisden family portraits and papers. By his will, Sir John Ramskill Twisden, 12th and last Baronet, bequeathed certain family portraits to the National Portrait Gallery, and the remainder to the Kent Archæological Society. The Society were able to arrange with the East Malling Research Station, the purchasers of Bradbourne Hall, which had been the home of the Twisdens since 1656, that the portraits should remain there, and the National Portrait Gallery thereupon generously returned the portraits specifically bequeathed to them, so that the collection might remain complete in its most appropriate setting. Beginning with Roger Twysden (*circa* 1587) and ending with Sir John Ramskill Twisden, the last of his line, they form a fascinating series of portraits of a family which has, at times, been prominent in Kent history. The Society are fortunate to have received so rich a legacy, and fortunate in the friendly co-operation they have had from the Research Station, who have bestowed upon Bradbourne the affectionate care that the building seems always to have elicited from its occupiers. Would that some of our other country houses were assured of an equally happy future!

By 1939 the Society could look back with a good deal of satisfaction over the last twenty years. That it had achieved so sound a position was largely the work of its Officers during the inter-war years. Both Lord Conway of Allington, who was President from 1923 until 1937, and Sir Reginald Tower, who then held the office until his death in 1939, played a notable part in the deliberations of the Society. G. C. Druce,

who as a member of Council had from time to time been critical of, as he thought, the unbusiness-like handling of the Society's affairs, was properly requited by being elected Honorary Secretary in 1925. He, and Sir Edward Harrison who succeeded him in 1935 and remained Secretary throughout the difficult years up to 1950, showed that even a society of antiquarians could manage its affairs with thorough competence. Charles W. Stokes, Honorary Treasurer from 1925 until his death in 1947, tended the Society's finances *con amore*, and explained the accounts with such pride of craftsmanship that not to have understood them would have seemed plain ingratitude. Aymer Vallance continued to edit *Archæologia Cantiana* until 1929, when he was succeeded by Mr. Alec Macdonald; and when Mr. Macdonald left the county in 1934, Mr. W. P. D. Stebbing took over from him. Finally, a transformation was wrought in the Society's Rooms at Maidstone Museum by the industry of Walter Ruck, that most friendly and helpful of Librarians.

Then, for a second time in one generation, came the disruption of war. Until the late spring of 1940, Kent was as relatively peaceful as the rest of the country, but from then on, until the end of the war, conditions here were hardly conducive to routine archæological pursuits. Excursion meetings were cancelled, and Council itself met only once a year. Membership fell, from almost 1,000 to 750. In spite of all the difficulties, *Archæologia Cantiana* appeared each year, admittedly no more than a slim version of its former self, but an encouraging reminder of the existence of other things than the drab monotony that largely constituted everyday life. In two directions the Society—or, more accurately, some of its devoted members—was stimulated into energetic activity directly by the war: large quantities of documents, many of potentially historical importance, were rescued from the indiscriminate collection of salvage campaigns; and quick investigations were made of a number of archæological sites exposed by military action, friendly or hostile.

The twelve years since the end of the war have been a period of vigorous revival. Excursion meetings began again almost at once, and now there are five or six such meetings every year, as well as a residential week-end meeting at Kingsgate College, an innovation of 1948 which has proved an annual success. Membership rapidly increased, and by 1948 had passed 1,000. The raising of the subscription to £1, for new members in 1949, and for all members in 1951—the first and only alteration in the subscription since the Society was founded in 1857—inevitably led to a small decline in numbers, but the membership has consistently remained at about 1,000 to 1,100. *Archæologia Cantiana* has resumed something more like its pre-war appearance, and in quality of content certainly has manifested a high standard. The Records

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

Branch publications have continued as fast as finances have permitted, and the Branch and the Society have been able to come to a satisfactory arrangement with the County Council whereby our large, and constantly growing, collection of documents has been deposited at County Hall, where they are admirably housed and available for inspection by members. Finally, help has been given towards a number of important excavations, including those in the war-damaged areas at Canterbury and Dover, the Roman Villa at Lullingstone, and Holborough Roman barrow, and the Society itself undertook the excavation of a Jutish cemetery at Lyminge.

Through the kindness of the landowner, Mr. A. Hall, the objects found during the Lyminge excavations, many of them of archaeological importance and of aesthetic grace, have been added to the Society's collections. A most notable addition to the collections was Major F. W. Tomlinson's gift in 1954, with the approval of Lord Mountcharles, of Saxon grave-finds from Bifrons in the last century. In the same year the Society received, from Dr. Gordon Ward, his extensive collection of documents, papers, pamphlets, etc. There have also been important monetary legacies and donations: £100 in 1941 under the will of Richard Cooke; £100 in 1954 under the will of Aymer Vallance; and, in 1955, £500 under the will of Miss S. M. Taylor. Meanwhile, in 1954, Mr. I. D. Margary, recognizing the problems facing societies such as ours in a period of inflation, very generously gave £500 towards general publication costs. Substantial donations towards the cost of publishing particular papers have also been received from the Council of British Archaeology, from the Ministry of Works, and from Kent Oil Refinery Ltd.

To set down the record of the last ten years, even in this brief fashion, is proof enough that the Society has not only recovered from the effects of the war, but also possesses a vigour and a vitality with which it can hopefully, on 19th September, 1957, embark upon its second century.

PUBLICATIONS

The original Rules, following those of Sussex, make no mention of publication as being amongst the Society's objects. Publication was, however, recognized as being a normal, and indeed an important, part of a county society's function (the paucity of the Surrey publications up to that time was one reason why Bish Webb's approach was so indignantly rejected in Kent) and almost from the outset Larking was busying himself with the preparation of the first volume. In the sonorous prose befitting a mid-nineteenth century Professor of History at King's College, London, the purpose of publication was thus set down

in the Introduction to the first volume of the series which Council decided should be known as *Archæologia Cantiana*:

“ If it be asked what is the scope and object of our design, we shall best answer in the words of the philosopher which we have chosen for the motto of our work. From the memory of things decayed and forgotten, we propose to save and recover what we may, for the present generation and for posterity, of the wrecks still floating on the ocean of time, and preserve them with a religious and scrupulous diligence. We propose to gather into one the neglected fragments and faint memorials that remain to us of ages long gone by; to reclaim and preserve the memories of men who, with common passions like ourselves, have stood and laboured in this soil of Kent; to save from the submergence of oblivion their manners and their traditions, their names, their lineage, their language, and their deeds. To reproduce the past in its full integrity is perhaps impossible; yet for those who have hopes somewhat beyond the present,—vision and affections somewhat more extended than the narrow shoal of earth and time on which they stand,—it may be sufficient, if we can collect some feeble and scanty remnants, which, failing to ensure a higher purpose, may help them in some degree to link the present to the past, and serve as stepping-stones to bridge over the broad chasm and torrent of time.”

For a hundred years successive editors and contributors have been constructing stepping-stones for our use in making the backward journey through history. Our gratitude for their labours will best be shown by the continuation of their work.

This present volume is numbered seventy in the series. Annual publication was the original intention, but, because of lack of money, or the printer's tardiness, there were many occasions when it was not achieved. The first four volumes appeared at yearly intervals, but then came a gap of two years, and then three, and even four. In the Society's first fifty years only twenty-seven volumes were published, although many of them ran to as many as five or six hundred pages: since 1907, in spite of the upsets caused by two world wars, and in spite of rising prices, forty-three volumes have been issued. Since 1925 *Archæologia Cantiana* has been published every year. The volumes for 1941 to 1947 may lack the exterior expansiveness and something of the grand spaciousness of the tomes which Scott Robertson was editing with leisurely scholarship in the '80s and '90s, but that publication continued at all during the alarms and dangers of 1939-45 in the county which stood closest to enemy-occupied Europe is an encouraging demonstration that there were to be found Men of Kent and Kentish Men who

held fast to the values so eloquently enunciated by Professor Brewer in his Introduction to Volume I.

The format which should be adopted was a subject of some controversy at the first meetings of the Editorial Committee. Larking was in favour of a large paper-size but the majority preferred Demy 8vo, as being cheaper and for the ordinary householder more manageable. It was, however, agreed to print off 60 copies in Royal 8vo for members who were willing to pay a small extra subscription, and Larking, as a private venture, had a further 25 copies printed in Royal 4to. For these volumes the type had to be re-set, and they could not be sold economically at less than two guineas each. Eventually the Society acquired the stock of extra-large volumes from Larking, but they were always an unprofitable luxury, and the special arrangements involved in their printing hindered publication. Council therefore decided in 1876 that the ten volumes already issued should be regarded as completing the first series, and that no more 4to volumes should be printed. The Royal 8vo volumes were not discontinued until 1918.

Volume XI bears no outward and visible sign that it is the first in a new series. Fortunately no attempt was made to introduce a new method of numbering, and the decision to begin a fresh series seems to have been merely a convenient fiction for sloughing off the awkward practice of publishing in different paper sizes. Volume XI, as were its two predecessors, was printed by Mitchell and Hughes of London, who continued to be the Society's printers until 1926. The first eight volumes were printed by Taylor and Co. of Lincoln's Inn Fields, but there were constant complaints of delay: "Our eighth volume ought to have been in Members' hands two months ago, and the printer alone can tell why it was not so," says the Honorary Secretary in the Report to the Annual General Meeting in 1872. Probably authors and printers always have a more acute appreciation of each other's shortcomings than their difficulties. Since 1927 the Society's printers have been Messrs. Headley Brothers of Ashford, a Kentish firm who, even under the most difficult conditions, have consistently shown something more than a mere business interest in the Society's work.

The Editorial Committee, at their first meeting, found it necessary to set some limits to the scope of articles for inclusion in *Archæologia Cantiana*. They decided that they would welcome papers contributed by members (although, in practice, papers from distinguished non-members also were accepted, to the enrichment of our volumes) on the following subjects: "British, Roman and Saxon Antiquities; Biography of Kentish Worthies; Genealogies of Kent Families; Ancient Heraldry of Kent Families; Ancient Seals of Kent Families and Officials; the Archbishops of Canterbury; the Bishops of Rochester; the Cathedrals of Canterbury and Rochester; the Deans and Chapters

of Canterbury and Rochester; ancient Charters; the Cinque Ports; the Ancient Castles of the County; Architecture, ecclesiastical and civil; Ancient Bridges, Roads, etc.; Ancient Customs in the County; Ancient Proverbs in the County; Ancient Traditions and Folk-Lore in the County; Dialects and Provincialisms of the County; the history of Gavelkind and its peculiarities; and any other subjects calculated to throw light on the Topography and early history of the County." In the course of one hundred years almost every one of these subjects has been touched upon, and some have been treated exhaustively.

For himself and for the other contributors, Larking insisted upon a high standard of scientific detachment and scholarship. "In an antiquarian volume like ours," he wrote to Canon J. C. Robertson, "we are bound to be as dry as Truth itself. If I give swing to the imagination in dressing up an article to make it pretty reading, and to draw a pretty picture as it presents itself to my mind's eye, the occupation is charming . . . but recollect we may be not only beguiling the reader by these imaginative paintings but may be actually misleading historians and laying the foundations of a series of solemn fictions." Writing at about the same time to Roach Smith, he says: "We labour after Truth, not the triumph of an opinion. . . . I see no cause of offence in a writer differing from me." Larking's tolerance on the latter point was by no means universal in archæological circles; Roach Smith himself had his meed of impatience, but the thrust here was intended, I think, for Beale Poste, some of whose "learned twaddle" Larking had declined to publish.

Most of the early volumes reflect clearly the Editor's personal interests. The first few volumes include many of Larking's own papers, and a mass of record material translated by him. He had, for years, been working on the Twysden papers (his wife was the eldest daughter of Sir William Jervis Twysden, Bart.), and on the Surrenden collections, as well as on the public records, and the fruits of this work appear in Volumes I to VIII. Evidently Foss was critical of the quantity and nature of Larking's contributions to Volumes I and II, for Larking writes to him on 1st January, 1861: "If more than half the volume is mine it is not my fault—I inserted every single paper sent to me and was compelled to make up the volume with my own rubbish." One of Foss's objections was to the publication of *Feet of Fines and Inquisitions Post Mortem* which appeared, volume by volume, for the first ten years of the Society's existence. Although it is not so stated anywhere in *Archæologia Cantiana*, these were "worked out" (his own phrase) by Larking himself.

Scott Robertson, who acted as Editor from 1871 until 1892, was equally insistent upon the necessity for painstaking scholarship. The papers for inclusion in the volume, he enjoined, must "in all cases, be

prepared and edited with deep research, and with the greatest care, accuracy, and completeness (without which Archæology, of all subjects, ought not even to be touched upon)." His own contributions were generous in number and in length; of the 560 pages of Volume XIII, more than one half are from the pen of the Editor himself. During Scott Robertson's editorship a fairly large proportion of the papers dealt with ecclesiastical subjects, not surprisingly, seeing how many of the authors were clerics. Apart from a paper by George Payne on the Roman villa at Darenth, there are comparatively few excavation reports, and those, in contrast with current techniques, mainly devoted to a description of the objects found. Excavation had not yet become a science, with its own established methodology: "We began by running parallel trenches across the field, and then using an iron probe; but soon found that the probe was all that was required," is all that Brent has to say about the methods he adopted in excavating, on the Society's behalf, the important Saxon cemetery at Sarre.

Record material has always proved awkward to handle. Foss's complaints about it still have a topical flavour, yet many members, and many students outside Kent, must have had reason to be thankful to Larking for the Feet of Fines, Inquisitions Post Mortem, and Sir Roger Twysden's Journal in the first six volumes; to Greenstreet, for the Assessments in Kent for the Aid to Knight the Black Prince (Volume X), and for the continuation of Feet of Fines (Volumes XI to XV and XVIII); to Scott Robertson for the Expense Book of James Master of Yotes Court (Volumes XV to XVIII); to J. M. Cowper for the Churchwardens' accounts of St. Dunstan's, Canterbury (Volumes XVI to XVII); to Leland Duncan for abstracts of Kentish Administrations (Volumes XVIII and XX); to Arthur Hussey for the Visitations of the Archdeacon of Canterbury (Volumes XXV to XXVII), and for the abstracts of Wills which formed a regular feature of most volumes from 1909 up to the time of his death in 1941; to A. A. Arnold for the transcription and translation of a fourteenth-century Rochester court roll (Volume XXIX); to C. Eveleigh Woodruff for Visitation Rolls (Volumes XXXII and XXXIII); to Charles Cotton for the Churchwarden's accounts of St. Andrew's, Canterbury (Volumes XXXII to XXXVI); and to Sir Edward Harrison for the Ightham Court Rolls in Volumes XLVIII and XLIX. But, however valuable these records may be for reference, few of them make light reading, and it was for this reason that *Testamenta Cantiana* was issued as an extra volume in 1907, and that the Records Branch, for the publication of Kent Records, was established in 1913.

If record material was sometimes unappreciated by the ordinary reader, the opposite is true of illustrations, which have always been popular. Every volume of *Archæologia Cantiana* has been illustrated,

and except under stress of wartime economies, has been well, and sometimes lavishly illustrated. The early volumes contained woodcuts and wood-engravings, and also lithographs, a few in colour. Some of the lithographs, especially those of Netherclift, have a genuine pictorial quality which perhaps, in a few years' time, will cause them to become collectors' pieces. About 1880 two new processes of reproduction were used, photo-lithography, and "Ink-Photo," to be followed before the end of the century by half-tone blocks from photographs. There were many keen photographers amongst the members (E. C. Youens, of Dartford, was for many years the Society's Honorary Photographer) and *Archæologia Cantiana* benefited from their work. More recently, silhouettes and sections of pots have been a conspicuous feature—scientifically important, and invaluable for reference, but lacking the picturesque quality of the early lithographs. And, in mentioning illustrations, it would be wrong to omit reference to the many plans, especially the magnificent sets of plans of the Christ Church Monastic Buildings at Canterbury (Volume VII), Rochester Cathedral and the Monastery of St. Andrew (Volume XXIII), and St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury (Volume XLVI).

The 1914-18 war marked the end of more spacious days in many different fields. Certainly it was so in the matter of publication of archaeological papers, and it is unlikely that we shall ever again be confronted with the sesquipedalian articles that fill the 500 and 600 page volumes issued during the last century. Probably few of our members will regret that papers are now shorter, and their subjects more varied. Fewer still, no doubt, will deplore that editors no longer publish page after page of Latin, without translation. Some, on the other hand, will regret that we can no longer find time and space for the leisurely and elaborate periods of the '70s and '80s. Our style has more of terseness than elegance about it; if Larking was right in regarding dryness as the voucher of truth, we are perhaps nearer to truth than he and his contemporaries managed to attain. Archaeology has become science rather than art, and the contribution of the professional archaeologist has become greater. Never again will Council be able to claim proudly, as it did in 1880, that "among the contributors of matter are included a Bishop, a Baronet, two Commanders of the Bath, an Iclander, and such Antiquaries as Mr. Roach Smith and Mr. R. Furley."

The nature of a journal such as *Archæologia Cantiana* imposes upon its editors the necessity of performing a perpetual balancing feat. If too many recondite articles are included, the ordinary members (upon whose support the Society depends for its existence) will feel that their interests are being ignored; if the papers are all popular re-hashes of existing knowledge we are failing in our duty to "save and recover somewhat from the deluge of time"; if too many papers deal with

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

prehistory the medievalists will grumble, and *vice versa*; reinterpretation of existing knowledge is needed as well as the recording of fresh discoveries; for some members the volume is primarily a work of reference, for some it is simply a book to be read—it would be tedious to continue this list of the conflicting pressures that bear upon the editors, even omitting the financial anxieties which they share with the Honorary Treasurer. These last anxieties have been much relieved during the last four or five years by a number of generous donations, but it can scarcely be expected that these will continue on the same scale. A review of the seventy volumes of *Archæologia Cantiana* makes clear how successful the editors have been, on the whole, in walking their tight-rope. There is little that one could wish away; there are many papers which have distinctly advanced the bounds of archæological and historical knowledge; there are still more which retain their capacity to interest and please the general reader. From the shipwreck of time many precious vessels with their varied cargoes have been rescued and piloted into the capacious haven of *Archæologia Cantiana*. Most of them still repay inspection.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE RECORDS BRANCH

The problem of publishing amassments of record material in *Archæologia Cantiana* has already been touched upon. It was the existence of this problem which led to the formation, in 1913, of the Records Branch whose "first object . . . shall be to supplement the work of the Society by printing for distribution to subscribers to the Branch, under the general title of Kent Records, documents or other materials relating to church, parochial, manorial, and family history in the County." Canon G. M. Livett, Honorary Editor of *Archæologia Cantiana*, L. M. Biden, Local Secretary for Bromley, and H. W. Knocker, were all active in the formation of the Records Branch. From that time until the present moment it has had the good fortune to have, as its Honorary General Editor, Dr. Irene J. Churchill.

The first volume of Kent Records, *The Parish Registers and Records in the Diocese of Rochester*, by the Rev. W. E. Buckland was in fact published a few months before the Branch was formally constituted. Volume II, Miss Churchill's *A Handbook to Kent Records*, still a valuable guide, appeared in 1914, as did also the Rev. C. Eveleigh Woodruff's *Sede Vacante Wills*. "It was decided to issue, if possible, two volumes yearly to the subscribers," wrote Miss Churchill in 1914—and that on an annual subscription of ten shillings! The war, and vastly increased costs of printing, soon made that ambition appear hopeless.

The Records Branch now has sixteen volumes to its credit. Some of them are mainly works of reference, such as H. R. Plomer's *Index of Wills and Administrations at Canterbury*, Leland Duncan's *Index*

of *Wills Proved in the Rochester Consistory Court*, and the Rev. C. E. Woodruff's *Calendar of Institutions by the Chapter of Canterbury Sede Vacante*; the *Strood and Bethersden Churchwardens' Accounts* are typical of important series of records, and have useful introductions by H. R. Plomer and F. R. Mercer; other volumes, such as Miss Scott Thomson's *The Twysden Lieutenancy Papers*, and Miss K. M. E. Murray's *Register of Daniel Rough, Common Clerk of Romney*, are books that can be taken up and read, and are of more than county significance; no student of seventeenth-century political institutions will neglect the *Lieutenancy Papers*, and *Rough's Register* is an important contribution to English borough history. The Records Branch were associated with the Canterbury and York Society in the publication of *Registrum Hamonis Hethe*, edited by Mr. Charles Johnson. Volume XV, a *Calendar of Feet of Fines up to 1272*, the first part of which appeared in 1939, was sadly delayed by the war, and the final part was not published until 1956.

Whether this will also be the final publication of the Records Branch is a question to which, at the time this article is written, no answer can be hazarded. But the fact seems inescapable that, with printing and paper costs at their present levels, some additional source of revenue must be found if the publication of Kent Records is to continue.

A HUNDRED YEARS' ACHIEVEMENT

Would Larking, if he were writing this report, think that the Society had justified its formation, and had lived up to the expectations of the small group who met at Mereworth Castle in September, 1857? His report would be couched in phraseology very different from the prosaic, unemotional style that now seems proper to an archaeological journal; it would have contained plenty of examples of those flights of imagination, manifestations of emotion, and classical embellishments that were acceptable to, and expected by, a generation whose novelists were Dickens, Thackeray and Disraeli. But as to the content, Larking would not, I fancy, find much to disapprove of in this account of the Society's first century.

Much, indeed, has altered since the Society gaily embarked on its career. A comparison of the 1857 with the 1957 list of members gives some indication of the profound social changes which have taken place, their range often unnoticed because they are not the result of any revolutionary movement but of quiet, unspectacular development. Of the 600 or so members who constituted the Society in 1858, not far short of one quarter were in holy orders; nearly fifty bore a title, or were sons or daughters of a peer; the qualities of esquire and mister (a poorly represented class) were carefully distinguished in the list of

members; only thirty ladies graced the Society with their membership; the list of vice-presidents was more notable for social than for archaeological distinction, including six earls, an archbishop and a bishop, three viscounts, two barons, five baronets, and eleven Members of Parliament (of whom two were baronets). Undoubtedly much of the early support of the Society was born of county patriotism, rather than of any instructed interest in archaeology, but the 1850s and 1860s were a period when such works as Darwin's *Origin of Species* were spreading amongst the upper and middle classes an intellectual curiosity about antiquity that perhaps has its mid-twentieth century counterpart in the widespread following of the televised *Animal, Vegetable and Mineral* programmes. This more general interest in archaeology and local history is reflected in the support which the Society today receives from all sections of the community, and from the sex that has now demonstrated that the fair may also be the learned. One regret it is, perhaps, permissible to voice, that present-day conditions make it impossible for the clergy of the county to play much part in the affairs of a Society that their predecessors did so much to create.

The antiquarian intellectual curiosity of Larking's day has developed into a more ordered, a more scientific, understanding of archaeology. This change, as already mentioned, is most apparent in the meticulous care of modern archaeological excavation compared with the light-hearted throwing-open of tumuli of the nineteenth century. A similar change is noticeable in the attitude to antique pots, which are now seldom admired for their beauty (in any case, many are downright ugly) but are valued as type-specimens, and are illustrated abundantly in the archaeological journals. Our collections of antiquities are now systematized and laid out with precision, where once was heterogeneity and confusion. These are changes which Larking would have approved, as tending to the more rigorous pursuit of Truth. But, however improper the question might be if asked in the counsels of the great, national, learned societies, cannot a county society permit itself some element of the romantic and the picturesque in its affairs? That last visit, late in the evening, to Canterbury Cathedral, on the day of the Society's first annual meeting, when an unseen choir sang Luther's hymn—surely that was a legitimate play of imagination, not just false romanticism. It was in this spirit that the Society held a luncheon at the Royal Star Hotel, Maidstone, in 1949, to mark the 1,500th anniversary of the coming of Hengist and Horsa with their Jutish followers. Perhaps it was unhistorical (*pace* G.W.) but it misled no one, and pleased many.

For the pursuit of harmless pleasure, as well as of Truth, is the proper business of a county archaeological society. In seeking to assess the achievement of the last hundred years, it is easy to point to areas of

knowledge where progress has been made, thanks to the efforts of the Society and of its members; this is evident, for example, in the fields of prehistory, of the Roman occupation, of the Saxon conquest and settlement, of medieval political, social, ecclesiastical and economic history. It is impossible to demonstrate, in the same way, how the Society has been a source of pleasure to tens of thousands of our fellow county-men and -women, or to estimate the number of valued friendships which have grown from common membership of the Society. These things, as well as the additions to knowledge, deserve to be remembered in any attempt to assess what the Society has achieved. "One of the charms of archæology at least, like that of natural history," wrote the Rev. Professor Brewer in Volume I of *Archæologia Cantiana*, "consists in its eminently social nature." It is one of its charms that still remains.

The Society has shared the experience of many voluntary organizations of being joined in some of its activities by public, statutory, bodies. Here there is nothing to be regretted; we must rather rejoice that public bodies have accepted responsibilities which the Society undertook *faute de mieux*, and was not always able to discharge effectively. The establishment of museums, the control of building developments and the preservation of sites and buildings of archæological and historical importance, the collection and storage of muniments and records, and the publication of municipal and legal records are examples of fields where the efforts of archæological societies have been augmented by those of government departments and local authorities. But even in these fields the work of the Society has not become superfluous, as the public authorities have themselves recognized, and the cordiality of the relationship which exists between such bodies as the Ministry of Works, the County Council, and the Town and District Councils, on the one hand, and the Society on the other, is a subject for gratification. Especially must we value the continuous friendly co-operation with Maidstone Museum, an institution whom we greet affectionately in this, our common centenary, year.

To speak of the Society's having achieved this, or having done that, is, in a sense, misleading, for the achievement is that of its members. The Society is not some self-activating mechanism, but a body which for its progress and its success is entirely dependent upon the efforts of its members. The Kent Society has been supremely fortunate in the number of distinguished archæologists, antiquarians and historians whose loyalties it has commanded. To mention those still active would be invidious; those who are no longer with us include such men as Larking, Roach Smith, R. C. Hussey, John Brent, Godfrey-Faussett, Edward Pretty, Dowker, George Payne, Scott Robertson, J. C. Robertson, James Greenstreet, A. J. Pearman, Robert Furley, A. A. Arnold,

THE ORIGIN AND FIRST HUNDRED YEARS OF THE SOCIETY

G. M. Arnold, T. S. Frampton, G. M. Livett, Leland Duncan, C. Eveleigh Woodruff, J. Cave-Brown, C. F. Routledge, St. John Hope, Arthur Hussey, R. U. Potts, Gardner-Waterman, Colyer-Fergusson, F. F. Giraud, Lord Conway, H. W. Knocker, Hubert Elgar, Ralph Griffin, Richard Cooke, Aymer Vallance, Charles Cotton, S. W. Wheatley, William Whiting, Henry Hannen, F. W. Hardman, and F. W. Cock, many of whom were known far and wide outside the county. If the next hundred years produces names of equal distinction the author of the paper recounting the Society's history from 1957 to 2057 will have plenty of material to build upon. But he will, I am sure, want to end his account by quoting, as I do with some verbal alteration, the exhortation with which Council closed its Report to the First Annual Meeting:

“ Encouraging as this state of things is, it must not be forgotten that every energy will be requisite in all our Members to continue the Society in that state of permanent prosperity and usefulness which we conceive it has in the past hundred years attained.”

THE OFFICERS OF THE KENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY

President

1857-1866	The Marquess Camden, K.G.
1866-1884	The Earl Amherst
1884-1890	The Earl Sydney, G.C.B.
1890-1905	The Earl Stanhope
1905-1923	The Lord Northbourne
1923-1936	Sir Martin (afterwards Lord) Conway
1937-1939	Sir Reginald Tower, K.C.M.G.
1939-	Major M. Teichman Derville, O.B.E., D.L.

Hon. Secretary and Editor

1857-1861	Rev. Lambert B. Larking
1861-1862	J. G. Talbot
1862-1873	T. G. Faussett (afterwards T. G. Godfrey-Faussett)
1871-1889	Rev. W. A. Scott Robertson

Hon. Secretary

1889-1904	George Payne
1904-1910	Sebastian Evans
1911-1925	Richard Cooke
1925-1935	G. C. Druce
1935-1950	Sir Edward Harrison
1950-1951	R. H. D'Elboux
1951-	Frank W. Jessup

Hon. Editor

1889-1892	Canon Scott Robertson
1892-1900	Canon C. F. Routledge
1900-1906	Rev. C. Eveleigh Woodruff
	Cumberland Woodruff (died 1904)
1907-1914	Rev. G. M. Livett
(Leland L. Duncan and Major Fane Lambarde were appointed joint edi- tors in 1914 but they were not able to act because of the war)	
1914-1929	Aymer Vallance
1929-1934	Alec Macdonald
1934-1948	W. P. D. Stebbing
1948-1950	Ronald F. Jessup
1950-1956	Ronald F. Jessup
	John H. Evans
1956-	John H. Evans

Hon. Treasurer

1903-1904	Sir Thomas Colyer-Fergusson
1904-1925	C. W. Powell, D.L.

Hon. Financial Secretary

1904-1924	Rev. Waterman Gardner-Waterman
-----------	-----------------------------------

Hon. Treasurer and Financial Secretary

1925-1948	Charles Stokes
1948-	S. Mendel

Hon. Librarian

1916-1918	Hubert Bensted
1919-1925	Rev. C. Eveleigh Woodruff
1925-1927	E. C. Frend
1927-1941	Walter Ruck
1941-1947	A. J. Golding
1948-1950	J. Dove
1950-1951	W. N. Terry
1951-1954	A. Joyce
1954-1955	A. Warhurst
1956-	Rev. Bernard J. Wigan

Assistant Secretary

1857-1865	Edward Pretty
1865-1875	W. J. Lightfoot

Clerk and Curator

1875-1883	Edward Bartlett
1883-1885	T. E. James
1885-1891	Edward Bartlett

Chief Curator

1889-1904	George Payne
-----------	--------------

Curator

1904-1931	H. Elgar
1931-1937	Norman Cook
1937-1946	C. E. Fisher
1948-	L. R. A. Grove