Second Day's Proceedings.

At 9.30 on Wednesday morning the members left the Market Place in private motor cars and two motor omnibuses

for Holwell Quarries, *viâ* the Butts and Nunney Catch. The quarries are in Cloford Parish.

Holwell Quarries.

The conveyances having landed the members on the opposite side of the little stream that runs through the Vallis, the Rev. H. H. Winwood, F.G.S., called their attention to the fine expanse of Mountain Limestone before them. Just before reaching the bottom of the hill they had passed on their left the "Marston road section"—another example of what he had described yesterday at the Hapsford Mills, viz., beds of Inferior Oolite, Lias, and Rhætic, only about ten feet thick, resting on Mountain Limestone, the top of which they could just see from their present position. He was not going to weary the members with a repetition of what he had said before. They must accept the fact that the limestone beds have here their upturned edges worn down; they must realize the absence of the true Coal Measures, and then the deposit of the Mesozoic strata on their sea-floor. On looking at the section opposite they might at first sight suppose that the whole was Carboniferous Limestone, but such was not the case. Certain masses of rock stood out in front like buttresses. These were of quite a different age to the rock between them and were what have been called "dykes." After the disturbances and dislocations before alluded to, the numerous fissures that were the result were filled with deposits from the Liassic and Rhætic waters which washed over the submerged floor of the limestones. These infillings have been consolidated and hardened into the "dykes" as you see them, and though limestones yet are of such an inferior character that the workmen leave them as not so suitable for commercial purposes as the intervening beds which they work out; these infillings not only contain fossils of Liassic and Rhætic age, but also mineral veins in strings and pockets, *e.g.*, barytes, calamine, galena, and hæmatite iron ore.

Attention having been called to the freshly exposed yellow beds of the Oolite resting on the mountain limestone in a quarry further down the valley, the members regained the road and visited an exposure of the limestone on their left. The same "dykes" here existed, and from one of them, a looser material, formed of yellowish clay, had been washed out by careful manipulation that mass of fish-teeth, scales, and vertebræ, now in the Bath Museum; amongst them the molar and cutting-teeth of the earliest mammal found in England, named after the discoverer, the *Microlestes Moorei*. Before so literary an audience of ladies and gentlemen he need hardly translate those words into vernacular English. This vein of loose stuff which he saw some twenty-five years ago ran diagonally towards the road and its existence is not now traceable, though some fish-scales and teeth are reported to have been picked up from the material covering the floor of the quarry.

Nunney Church.

At the Church of All Saints, Nunney, the members were welcomed (in the unavoidable absence of the Rev. W. Powell Davies, Rector), by the Rev. J. E. W. Honnywill, of Leigh-on-Mendip.

The Rev. Preb. W. E. DANIEL, said they were told that the Church was Early English in all its main features, but there had been alterations. The western end of the two aisles had been extended within the last fifty years. There was a chapel on each side of the nave. The earliest information they had about the Church was that in 1219 the advowson was given to the Bishop, but the arrangement did not hold good for long, as the rectors were afterwards presented by the de Montforts, and those connected with them. The de Montforts were in possession of the place in the early part of the XIII Century, and in the loan museum at Frome, would be seen a grant by Henry III, in 1259, giving Henry de Montfort and his heirs

the right to hold a market at Nunney, provided it did not interfere with the rights of the Branche family, who had a market at Frome.

A few years ago the Church was called St. Peter's, the reason for that being the representation on stone of a great key, surrounded by a cable, which was built into the outer wall of the tower. That stone probably came from the tomb of the warrior whose effigy lay on the sill of the window in the north chapel, a chapel which was dedicated to St. Catherine and endowed with property at Fisherton Delamere, Wiltshire. The chantry was founded in 1390 by Philip Delamere, and the figure in the window-sill was in all probability intended to represent him.

On the other side of the Church was a chapel successively held by the Mawdley, Samborne and Flower families, who owned the manor house. Only a few years ago the fine hall of that house was pulled down : it had a minstrels' gallery at one end. The block of buildings now in a state of decay, which people sometimes called almshouses, was formerly the Bell Inn, as some of the villagers still remembered. The bridge used to be a little farther up the stream than it is at present. About 1430 an augmentation of endowment for 120 years was given to the Delamere Chantry. There were two sixpenny endowments for a light kept burning in the Church. The first presentation to the chantry was made by the Bishop, and the next two by the Hungerfords of Farleigh. The two castles at Nunney and Farleigh were crenellated about the same time—after the French wars. (It was in 1373 that Sir John Delamere obtained a license to crenellate his castle at Nunney ; whilst the similar license for Farleigh was dated in 1383). There were two manor courts connected with Nunney—one called Nunney Delamere, and the other Nunney Glaston, although there was no record of Glastonbury Abbey having any property there. The connection between Glastonbury and Nunney must have been very ancient and of very short duration.

Prebendary Daniel drew attention to the carved mediæval screen at the entrance to the chancel (which he understood in all probability originally stood across the entrance to the chantry chapel), and to the squints on either side. As to the monuments in the chantry chapel, he said that the second one, behind the organ, was a knight in complete armour and collar of S.S., whilst the lady was veiled in a remarkable way. The knight bore the Delamere arms, but as three swords in pale—the Poulett arms—were quartered on one of the shields it showed that the date of the erection of the monument was after about 1420, when the heiress of the Delameres married a Poulett. The figure in the window-sill was in chain-armour. The third monument was much later, commemorating Richard Prater and his wife, of the time of Queen Elizabeth.

There was a chalice given by the Whitchurch family, who, he believed, built and lived at the large house near the castle which is now used as a farm-house. They started the first bank in Frome. There was one pre-Reformation bell in the tower. In 1547 the registers began. They were copied in 1597, as was the case with most other registers. There was a considerable charity in the parish founded by a man named Turner, who died in 1839. It was "for the instruction of youth, the alleviation of suffering and infirmity, and the solace of old age." An ancient stone bearing carving of a Saxon character was in the vestry. It was dug up in the churchyard some little time ago.

The Rev. F. W. WEAVER mentioned that an interesting water-colour drawing of the interior of the old Court House at Nunney was in an extra-illustrated "Collinson" at the Society of Antiquaries.

Mr. BLIGH BOND said the Church was certainly Early English, probably of the end of the XIII Century, which took it almost into the Decorated period. The building had not been very well treated, and a good many of the original features were lost. Two windows in the large chapels were

later, belonging to the Decorated period, and were good of their kind. The chancel had been rebuilt, but a little piscina, dating from about the end of the XIII Century, had been retained. One of the original arches of the nave arcade had been left and was more pointed than the others, which were later and rather puzzled him. There was a knight in armour painted on the wall over the spandril to two of the arches on the north side: the painting appeared to be of earlier date than the arches, and yet the wall could not be kept standing for inserting later arches.[1] Both ends of the chancel screen were gone, and it had been much patched. In an old drawing of about 1800 the screen was shown in the wider arch to the chapel on the south. All traces of any rood-loft were gone. He would put the hagioscopes down to about the end of the XIV Century. Apart from the Saxon stone in the vestry, the oldest thing in the Church was the Transitional Norman font, which had a cover dated 1684. The roof of the nave was, perhaps, original, and the dormer windows might represent an ancient feature of the Church. There appeared to have been a thatched roof with a thick thatched ridge, to the nave.

The Assistant-Secretary read a note from Dr. F. J. ALLEN, to the effect that the tower of Nunney Church was almost certainly built by the same masons as that of Bruton: the relationship was evident in the parapet and the window tracery; but at Nunney there were single windows instead of groups of three, and the simple diagonal buttresses replaced the complex ones of Bruton and other great towers of the district.

Nunney Castle.

When the members were standing outside the moat, a short distance from the Church, the Rev. Preb. W. E. DANIEL made a statement regarding the ruined castle.[2] He said the plan of

1. The date of the fresco is about 1375.

2. A plan of the Castle will be found in Mr. E. Green's paper on "The Parish and Castle of Nunney," *Proc.*, xxii, ii, 71.

the Castle was a parallelogram, with round towers occupying the four corners. In one of the turrets was a chapel; as the piscina and the place for the altar could still be seen. In another tower was a round staircase leading to the upper stories. The side of the Castle which had recently fallen was that in which was the entrance to the building. In that wall was a weakness, due to the presence of a staircase which went up over the doorway. When the Castle was under siege by the Parliamentary soldiers, under Fairfax, a deserter gave information as to the weak point. By means of artillery the wall there was battered in, and the garrison surrendered. It was said that they had kept themselves in good heart by every-day pulling the tail of a solitary pig in order to make outsiders think they were having fresh pork. Formerly there was a wooden gallery or platform all round the outside of the building at the top, and there were conical roofs on the towers as shown by a sketch in Richard Symonds' "Diary."

After a few words from Lord Hylton explaining who Richard Symonds was, and some remarks by the Rev. R. G. Bartelot who claimed to be a descendant of the Delameres through the Mompessons, members took advantage of the permission which Mr. R. Baily-Neale, the owner, had given them to view the interior of the Castle. It was with feelings of dismay they saw the ruin caused by the collapse of the north-west side of the building at Christmas, 1910. Most of the wall had fallen inwards, and other large blocks of masonry appeared as if they must soon fall unless something was done speedily to keep them in position. To view the interior it was necessary to clamber over large heaps of *débris*.

When thanking the owner for allowing the members to inspect the Castle, the PRESIDENT mentioned that in a conversation, Mr. Baily-Neale told him he should be pleased to see if any steps could be taken to preserve the ruins from further damage. It seemed a very great pity that the Castle should be allowed to collapse, and he was sure they would

all be glad to do anything in their power to prevent further decay.

By the kind permission of Mr. G. P. Whitlock, tenant, some of the party visited the Manor Farm, near the Castle.

Wells Church.

A pleasant drive brought the party to Wells, where the Church of St. Andrew was firstly visited.

Mr. Bligh Bond, speaking inside the Church, said it was described by Leland as having been built "in time of mind." That would imply that it was a work of the latter part of the XV Century; and it might certainly be believed that the greater part of the fabric was of that date, though there were a few peculiarities which appeared to suggest an earlier one. Abbot Selwood, of Glastonbury, was engaged in building at Wells about the end of the XV Century. He certainly built the houses facing the street which led to the Church. Above one of the entrances was a panel with his initials. The suggestion that the Church was built at an earlier date was prompted by the nave arcades, which gave one the impression of belonging to the XIV rather than the XV Century. The cap-moulds to the engaged shafts had a XIV Century appearance, and the wave-mouldings in the arches might also give the impression of earlier date; but the general proportions of the piers and arches were undoubtedly of the later period. Moreover, the little cap-mouldings were repeated elsewhere in the Church, on a different scale and in a connection which pointed more strongly to the later era. They were on a much larger scale in the tower-arch, which was clearly a later work of the XV Century. The external archway of the porch was also manifestly a late piece of work, with attenuated members, but the little caps showed a similar section. The porch was a fine work, and of a type peculiar to the district. With its

bold concave sweep to the gable, it might be compared to the porches of Wellow and Doulting. The interior had a finely vaulted ceiling, of fan-work—without doubt a late XV Century feature. The depressed arch to the parvise entrance was another indication of late date. It was only when they came to the chancel that any positive traces of an earlier building were discoverable. There was some reason for thinking that the wall between nave and chancel might ante-date the nave, since it bore marks of an older high-pitched roof, on the east side. The other walls of the chancel also might be, in part, XIV Century work. The piscina was of that period, and the tracery of the east window (which, in spite of modern reconstruction, might yet represent the older stonework), was a very favourable specimen of the curvilinear type of Decorated work. As to the side windows, about which so much had been said, he unhesitatingly pronounced them to be late Perpendicular, but there was nothing he could find to confirm the theory once entertained that they were Carolean. The arch on the north side of the chancel seemed a late and clumsy copy of its opposite neighbour on the south, and he judged that it was put in when the north chapel was added and the side windows of the sanctuary inserted—say, at the beginning of the XVI Century. That chapel on the north side of the chancel was clearly a later addition to the north aisle. All the external mouldings were slightly different in section, and the cornice was disjointed. The east wall had been a good deal pulled about, and might be later than the rest. The window-tracery was modern. The only point of interest was the parapet. Everywhere else in the Church they saw a crenellated parapet, but just over this gable it quite abruptly terminated, and a length of traceried parapet jobbed in without much effort to make it fit. A comparison had been made between that feature and a supposed complementary arrangement at Leigh-on-Mendip, but whereas the Mells piece of

tracery-work was on the east gable of the north chapel, the plain section at Leigh was not in a similar place: it was right at the west end of the nave clerestory, close by the tower. The date of the octagonal vestry or sacristry, on the south side of the Church, had been ascertained. It was the gift of a master-draper named Garland in 1485, and the shield which was attached to its walls bore the arms of the Drapers' Company. It was probably coeval with the north aisle chapel. There was no need to enlarge upon the beauties of the tower—a noble specimen of its class—as all those towers had been the subject of a special research by Dr. Allen. As to the woodwork in the Church, they saw that an entirely new series of carved oak benches (very good of their kind) had replaced the very fine Jacobean benches, most of which were being used as a dado round the vestry. It was to be hoped that the old ones would always be preserved. It was satisfactory to know that the parclose screens of the two side chapels were faithful reproductions of the old ones. They had an excellent effect. The modern rood-screen was rather heavier in treatment, and was, of course, an entirely new design. There were some small fragments of traceried panel-work and vine-leaf cornice, both in oak and with old gilding on them, incorporated in the credence-table and the Gospel lectern. They might be from the old rood-screen. A little old glass could be seen in the upper part of the central window of the north aisle. The turret for the sanctus bell appeared original, and was well preserved.

Dr. F. J. Allen's observations on Mells Church tower (which were read by Mr. H. St. G. Gray) pointed out that the tower was a late development from the East Mendip type, its immediate predecessor being that of Bruton. The chief points of difference from Bruton were: (1) the repetition of the top windows as blind panels in the stage below, and (2) the abolition of the stair-turret. The window-tracery

was not as good as in the earlier towers, and the absence of weather-mouldings over the windows was rather a defect; but if those details were inferior, the general composition of the tower was unusually good. The neighbouring tower of Leigh-on-Mendip was very similar—rather smaller, with more elaborate parapet and pinnacles. Chewton Mendip tower had the top windows repeated as blind panels below, but in other respects the towers were very different.

Lord HYLTON mentioned that Mells and Leigh formed one of the comparatively few liberties in the county. Originally, Mells belonged to the hundred of Kilmersdon. For hundreds of years it was one of the manors belonging to the Abbey of Glastonbury, and since the Dissolution it had belonged to the Horners. At the time of the Civil War, the then Sir John Horner was one of the leading men on the side of the Parliament. For two days, in 1644, King Charles occupied Sir John's manor house, but the owner was not at home to receive him! His son, Sir George Horner, had an interesting monument in Cloford Church. Lord Hylton added that he need not take up time by exploding the legend that the Horner of the time of the Dissolution acquired the title-deeds of Mells manor by "pulling the plum out of the pie." He was a well-to-do man in the neighbourhood, his family were already owners of the manor of Cloford, and he paid a considerable sum of money for the manor of Mells.

The Rev. E. D. LEAR, Rector of Mells, called attention to the font, which was, he said, a piece of Norman work (1100–1135).

Mells Manor House.

From the churchyard, the members of the party passed into the courtyard of the Manor House, the residence of Sir John F. F. Horner, K.C.V.O. The PRESIDENT, acting as guide, said they were standing in front of the building described by Leland in the XVI Century as "a praty Maner Place of

Stone," though what remained was only a portion of what the house was in its zenith. Sir John Horner had no plan, or picture, or drawing representing the house as it was built. He thought, however, that there were two courts—one where they were standing and another on the south side. The reason why the greater part of the house was pulled down, was not that it was in a bad state, but, about 110 years ago, the Horner of that day preferred to live in his deer park on the other side of the village, and having built a large house there, he allowed the greater part of the old manor house to be pulled down. Subsequently, what was left was used as a farm-house and a school; but, latterly, it had been carefully restored inside, and was used by Sir John as his own residence. There was a story that Sir John Horner, the Parliamentarian, was at Mells at the time of King Charles's execution, and that when, on receipt of the news, people ran to the church tower to ring the bells, thinking it would please him, he sallied forth with a big stick to stop the ringers.

The Rev. E. D. LEAR said there was a slight sketch on wood of the house in its perfect state, and apparently the building was like a capital H, with the front door in the middle of the cross-piece. He believed that the projecting portion of the house was brought out when the other part was taken down. When digging there, he came across some old tiles which had come from Normandy.

Kilmersdon and its Church.

Lunch was partaken of at the Jolliffe Arms Inn, Kilmersdon, in the room which was formerly used by the magistrates of the Kilmersdon Petty Sessional Division for police court business. Subsequently, whilst members were assembling in the churchyard, preparatory to inspecting the Church, Lord HYLTON called their attention to the house on the north side

of the churchyard, which is known as "The Old Vicarage." He said it was described in a survey he had, of the year 1571, as a "stone-healed house" appertaining to the vicarage. No doubt it had been occupied by the vicars of Kilmersdon for many years previous to that date, and it continued to be so occupied as their vicarage house until 1852, when a new residence was built at the top of the hill. The roof was no longer "stone-healed," or tiled, but thatched. It was surmounted by a small stone turret, which Canon Holmes thought was perhaps as early as XIV Century date, through which the smoke escaped out of the original chimney. There was, in one of the rooms, what was, in one respect, a remarkable floor, as it was of exactly the same type as the hut floors in the lake villages, consisting of nothing but beaten clay. No doubt, for many centuries, that was the ordinary floor in domestic dwellings throughout the district. Directly opposite the north door of the Church was a blocked-up doorway, with a round arch, which was probably the way, used by the vicars in former days, in walking across from the house to the Church.

Many members availed themselves of the kind permission given by the Rev. C. G. Norton, vicar of Kilmersdon, to view the interior of the house.

When the members had assembled inside the Church, Lord Hylton said he thought that everybody who looked round the building would see that it was the result of XV Century additions to a building of Norman origin. There were still traces of Norman work in the south wall. One of the original Norman windows still existed; outside was a fish-scale moulding alternating with boldly-carved corbels; and a Norman arch led into a modern vestry, which occupied the site of a former south porch. There were also the remains of a Norman arch in the north wall of the chancel. Mr. Ferrey, a former Diocesan architect, thought the builders of the XV Century were very conservative of the Norman work, and

though they pulled down the north wall of the nave in order to add their aisle, they merely raised the south wall and inserted two rows of windows. The chancel was entirely restored in 1878 and a new east window inserted. The existing Perpendicular chancel arch must have replaced a low Norman arch. The modern iron grille, made by Messrs. Singer in Frome, was erected in 1878. The angel-corbels and roof-cornice in the nave did not support the existing roof, and evidently the old roof was higher. The work in the ceiling of the north aisle was of very rich character. Local tradition said that the screen to the chapel at the end of the aisle was removed from the Church of St. Andrew, Holborn; but he (Lord Hylton) thought it was built for its present place. 8s. 8d. was charged on land in that parish for the maintenance of a light in this chapel in pre-Reformation times. The Church tower bore a strong family resemblance to the towers at Mells, Leigh-on-Mendip, Hemington, and Chewton Mendip. There were some very massive Perpendicular bench-ends in the Church. Richard Symonds, writing in 1644, said the east window was then very ancient and contained two coats of arms, but the only pre-Reformation glass still existing were some tiny pieces in the upper part of the chantry chapel windows. The oak communion table was Jacobean, and the rails which stood in front of it in Collinson's time recorded that they expressed the thankfulness felt at the staying of the plague in 1625. There were no mediæval brasses or tombs in the Church. The brasses appeared to have been sold in 1636. William de Erlegh was owner of the advowson in the XII Century and passed it on to the prioress of Mynchin Buckland. The presentations to the vicarage were afterwards made by the prior of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, to which order Mynchin Buckland Priory belonged. This arrangement continued until the monastic houses were dissolved.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver, in thanking the President for his interesting address, stated that there was a very fine water-

colour drawing of the north aisle screen (by W. W. Wheatley) in Mr. Adlam's extra-illustrated "Collinson;" and alluding to the connection between Lady Botreaux and Kilmersdon and North Cadbury Churches, said she obtained permission to turn North Cadbury Church into a collegiate church for four priests and assigned land for the endowment, but the whole idea collapsed: she probably died before she had time to make over the land.

Mr. Bligh Bond said there was one great peculiarity about the Church, and that was the extraordinary shortness of the chancel. The original Church was Norman, and seemed to have been a parallelogram, of which only the south and east walls, with a few feet of the north at its eastern extremity, remained. The date was probably not much later than 1100. Both nave and chancel of the existing Church were built in the Norman shell. Hence there was no elongated chancel, and the total space comprised within the chancel arch was little more than a square on the plan. As the nave was now a good length, that gave a very shallow appearance to the chancel. Late in the XV, or perhaps in the XVI Century, the north wall of the Norman nave was pulled down, and a north aisle constructed. At the same time both north and south walls were raised and a clerestory added, the windows of which were still open on the south side, though for some mysterious reason they had been blocked up on the north. At the same time, he judged, the old narrow and low Norman arch dividing nave from sanctuary was opened up, and the existing Tudor work introduced. In order to give lateral support, a companion arch of the same sort was thrown across the new north aisle, where it made a distinction between aisle and chapel beyond. This chapel was carried eastward and communicated with the sanctuary by another late Perpendicular archway. That archway had debased detail, and the rest of the aisle arches to some extent shared that character, but the ceilings, windows, and outer detail of the aisle were

good and full of merit. At each side of the chancel arch were traces of niche-work, indicative of former altars under the rood. There might have been a rood-loft stair in the south wall, but nothing could be seen now, as a modern organ-chamber entirely masked that part of the wall. However, the wall was hollow above a certain height, and the opening not improbably existed beneath the plaster. The shafts on the jambs of the chancel arch were left square as for a screen, and there were other indications in the stonework corroborative of that feature. A curious point was the base of the east respond of the nave arcade. That was entirely in the rough, whereas the rest were well finished. Another similar puzzle was in the windows of the north aisle. The west window of the series was carefully finished, the mouldings being worked to a nice junction with the sill. But in the rest the jamb-moulds descended on to a rough stooling, and thus ended off abruptly. There was a parallel to that at Hemington. Both in nave and chancel large angel-corbels were provided for the support of the roof trusses, and the cornice-mould was mitred down on them, just at it was at Mells and at Hemington. Obviously the stone screen did not belong to its place, and tradition spoke of it having come from another church—St. Andrew's, Holborn, to wit. He had always thought that that must be a mistaken origin, since neither in design nor in material (oolite) did the screen suggest so remote a birthplace, and the probabilities were against it having been transported so far. He thought that the story might have an authentic substratum, but that it was most likely vitiated by some clumsy error. Though too early for a definite theory on that subject, it would be interesting to speculate on it, and the following was therefore to be regarded as a mere speculation. The problem was to find a church in the neighbourhood dedicated to St. Andrew, and having a name not unlike "Holborn,"—a church to some extent mutilated or dismantled. That seemed capable of a ready solution, though the truth

could only be determined by examination of the church, which was an out-of-the-way one. He referred to St. Andrew's, Holcombe, about three miles from Kilmersdon—a little church about a mile from its village, superseded by a new one, and used for occasional services only. Stone screens were by no means rare in small churches near the north-east border of the county, though they were more common in Wiltshire. The old oak benches in the Church would appear to be about a century older in date than the aisle, and as they could never have fitted the narrow Norman nave, it seemed reasonable to suppose that they came also from another church. The tower seemed of very late date, yet good in conception and detail. There was an unusual and graceful taper to the buttress and pinnacle faces in the upper stage. The weakest feature was again in the interior, which exhibited a very flat and tame panelling to the soffit of the arch at the entrance to the nave. Two other features of a miscellaneous order claimed attention. They were the fine iron strap-hinges on the north door ; and the excellent niche-work in the eastern angles of the wall of the north chantry.

Lord HYLTON was of opinion that there could not have been in Holcombe Church a screen of the kind of that at the east end of the north aisle of Kilmersdon Church.

Dr. F. J. ALLEN sent the following notes upon Kilmersdon Church tower: "The lower portions of this tower are akin to those of Bruton, Nunney, and other East Mendip towers; but the top-stage is of different character, and rather resembles those of the peculiar towers at Hemington and Buckland Dinham. It is possible that all these three towers, after a temporary cessation of building, were completed by the same masons. It may be noted how much more effective is the top stage at Kilmersdon, with single windows below, than the rather similar top-stage at Hemington and Buckland Dinham, with double windows below."

Hemington Church.

Hemington Church, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, was the next place to be visited, but on account of the steepness of the descent from the Radstock-Frome main road members walked down the hill.

Inside the Church, Mr. Bligh Bond said the building was full of architectual interest. The unusually narrow chancel arch was Norman, *circa* 1100-1120, and had some delicately cut ornamentation on the capitals. It appeared to be the sole structural relic of the earlier church, though there was a curious Norman font, with a double ring of escallops. The south aisle and a chancel chapel were continuous, with remains of very fine Early English work in the south door and the internal arches and jambs of the windows, but the original window-tracery or lancets had been removed to make room for XV Century tracery. The ceiling (Perpendicular—flat-panelled, and restored) was supported by brackets on grotesque stone corbels, some with distorted figures suggestive of folly (cap and bell), greed, avarice, etc. One represented a crafty abbot, with a goose hanging over his shoulder; another was a fat monk with a money bag. The work appeared to be of about 1230, and was probably done by someone who had a grudge against the monks. The arcade to the nave was of about the middle of the XIII Century, as also were the two arches at the south side of the chancel. Purbeck marble shafts were employed. The mouldings were rather rough in the caps, but the arches were far better. There was an Early English piscina in the west face of the jamb of the arch nearest the east end. The north wall of the nave contained three windows in the lower part, and up above, in the clerestory, were four. One of the lower windows—that to the extreme west—was a beautifully finished Decorated window of about 1340; the other two were imitations of more than a century later, and were very roughly finished. The clerestory was late Per-

pendicular. There were large clumsy angel-corbels for support of trusses—just like those restored at Mells. The nave-roof was modern and horrible. There was an interesting survival of the rood-loft staircase in the wall on the north side of the chancel arch : the threshold of the upper exit was very low, and only about 7 feet 6 ins. from the floor. The tower arch was probably of the XV Century, with double flat wave-moulding. The tower was very late Perpendicular—in design like Buckland—with poor detail. Its date was about 1500 ; the arch might be earlier. Some figures on the west wall outside were very curious ; one in the cornice had a small head over a large one. Those below had (1) a basket, (2) a pilgrim's hat or friar's hat and staff. He would like to know what the opinion was about the figures, which were of about the same date as the south aisle corbels to ceiling. The parapets to the clerestory were of rather late date (1480-1500). The pewing appeared to be of the early Stuart period or rather later. There were two XV Century wooden doors on the south and west. The porch was rather eccentric Victorian work, and the vestry on the north side was of the same character. Altogether the Church was very well worthy of attention.

Dr. F. J. ALLEN'S observations on the towers of Buckland Dinham and Hemington Churches are as follows :—"These two similar towers have a peculiar arrangement of the windows which can hardly be called artistic, there being double windows in the middle stage, and single windows in the top stage. It is known from long experience that the best result in a tower is obtained by increasing the interest towards the top ; but in these two towers the middle stage is made the most important. Since the windows in the two stages are of different designs, it is possible that a change of builders took place. It would be charitable to suppose that the masons began these towers with the idea of building elaborate upper stages, as at Mells and Leigh, but were unable to carry out the design for lack of funds, the towers being finished cheaply after an interval."

Visit to Ammerdown Park.

After mounting the hill from Hemington, members made their way to Ammerdown House, the seat of the President, most of them taking the very pleasant walk across the park from the main road. At the house the members were welcomed by Lord and Lady Hylton, and entertained to tea, after which a group photograph was taken at the end of the bowling-green. The gardens were greatly admired by the visitors, who also had opportunity of seeing the pictures and other objects of interest in the mansion. Before they left, Sir Edward Fry, on behalf of the members, cordially thanked the President and Lady Hylton for their kind hospitality.

Conversazione and Loan Museum.

In the evening the members of the Society were entertained at a Conversazione, arranged by the Frome Literary and Scientific Institution. This function took place in the Mechanics' Hall, and its success was due mainly to the efforts of Mr. Herbert E. Ames, hon. secretary to the Institute, who was assisted in the matter of a very interesting loan exhibition by Messrs. A. Newport and G. W. Thick, as well as by the Society's local secretary for Frome (Mr. John Coles, junr.). The hall presented a most attractive appearance with a fine display of some two hundred "club-brasses," chiefly Somerset (belonging to Mr. P. E. Le Gros, J.P.), on the right-hand wall, and with a varied assortment of pictures, books and objects of local interest on the opposite side, some of the more valuable and smaller articles being exhibited in glass cases in the centre of the hall.

The objects brought from the permanent museum of the Institution included two Sedan chairs; a charter for a weekly market and two fairs at Frome, granted by Henry VII to Robert Lord Willoughby de Broke and Edmund Leversedge;

an enormous pair of shears, formerly used in Frome for finishing off cloth ; Frome tokens ; an iron battle-axe, found at Cottle's Oak, Frome ; model of the foundations of the Roman villa at Whatley ; a bronze celt found in a barrow near Bristol ; and woodwork from the old nave roof of Frome parish church. Contributions by the President included the staff of the constable of the hundred court of Wellow, and a silhouette portrait group of the children of Mr. T. S. Jolliffe at Ammerdown about 1790. There were a number of paintings by Mr. W. W. Wheatley, of old buildings in Frome and the district (many of them now destroyed), lent by Mr. E. R. Singer and Mrs. W. C. Penny. Mrs. Penny also lent cases of old keys, and Mr. Singer a number of old processional crosses. The charter of Nunney market was lent by Mrs. G. A. Daniel. Other things on view included a box belonging to Hannah Withers, one of the young girls who presented a bible and flag to the Duke of Monmouth at Taunton ; a bronze celt found by Mr. H. G. Chislett in a rabbit burrow at Axbridge in the spring of 1910 ; a number of books relating to Frome ; and a cannon-ball recovered from the moat of Nunney Castle.

The Vicar of Frome and Mrs. Randolph received the visitors, and Prebendary RANDOLPH expressed the pleasure it gave those connected with the Institution to entertain the members of the Somersetshire Archæological and Natural History Society, and said he hoped they would enjoy their stay in Frome.[1]

In addition to violin solos and songs, the programme included the reading by Prebendary DANIEL of a paper on the "Street Names of Frome," but which embraced much other interesting matter. (This paper was printed in 1897 from a newspaper report).

1. The Frome Literary and Scientific Institute kindly made the members of the Som Arch. & N. H. Society honorary members of the Institution during the Meeting.

Mr. P. E. Le Gros gave a short but interesting address on his collection of club emblems or brasses. He said the date of their first introduction was not known. He had one from Sherborne, which was dated "1761." The designs of a great many of them were very much alike, and the spear shape predominated, although the crown was also a common design. The emblems came generally from very small villages, and very often the smaller the village, the larger and more ornate the "brasses." The small village of Horningsham, just over the Wiltshire border, possessing a population of but a few hundred people, had three distinct clubs, each with its distinct brass. Within ten miles of Frome there were twenty or more benefit clubs which had these brass emblems. Mr. Le Gros proceeded to point out the "brasses" of places in the neighbourhood, and explained that they were carried on poles at the annual festivals of the clubs.

Third Day's Proceedings.

The excursion on Thursday was also very successful. According to the programme the first place to be visited was Wellow, but a stop was made at Beckington to view St. George's Church, which is known as the resting-place of the body of the poet, Samuel Daniel. Neither Mr. Bligh Bond nor the great majority of the members present had visited the Church before.

Beckington Church.

Mr. Bligh Bond said the tower (which is at the west end of the nave) was clearly an example of Norman work, of the very earliest years of the XII Century. It might possibly have occupied a different position in an earlier church, seeing the very large arch on the west. It looked as if it might have been the central tower in a Norman church. There was a very large variety of most interesting work in the

building. The nave arcade was of the very best Perpendicular work, whilst the beautiful roof was very different from any others they would see in the neighbourhood, simpler and more like the type of roof used in the XIV Century. It still had a fairly acute pitch. There was a very simple and solid style of treatment in the timbers, which gave it a very remarkable character. There were indications in the north aisle of a similar roof. They might note the curious way in which the corbels were brought round to support the trusses which came over the windows. Some very well-preserved effigies were to be seen on the north side of the chancel, one or two of which were of the XIV Century. The aisles appeared to be Perpendicular, though the stonework (which showed signs of alterations) might be earlier, with the later windows as insertions. There was a piscina of the XIV or early XV Century in the south aisle. In the north aisle was an exit to a rood-loft erected at a lower elevation than that which crossed the chancel arch—something like what existed at Mere Church, Wiltshire. The XV Century hagioscopes at the sides of the chancel arch should be noticed, and there were features suggestive of sedilia in the south wall of the chancel; but something had happened to them. The chapel in which the organ stood was evidently a very late addition to the Church, and the west window looked like the very latest Perpendicular work. Evidently the north porch had suffered a great deal of alteration. It had traces of a little staircase going up in the corner, probably to a gallery over the inner door, where the choristers would go up on Palm Sundays to sing the *Gloria*. The Church would well repay the most careful examination. Externally, he noticed a very good and simple bell-cote. After calling attention to the fan-tracery under the tower, Mr. Bligh Bond said he imagined that the arches in the masonry on the north and south sides of the tower were both for windows. There was a Jacobean screen to the organ chamber. The

nave had a more pointed roof before the existing one. He referred to a brass in the chancel floor (figured in the *Proceedings*, Vol. XXXIX), a little one with a shield bearing a dragon rampant and crosses on the wall to the right of the chancel arch, a merchant's mark to the right of the entrance to the organ chamber, and some XV Century reredos work in the north aisle. He pointed out that at least three of the corbels in that aisle had charges on the shields; one had three escallops, another had three escallops impaling a bend lozengy, and a third some animal salient. The roof showed that a XIV Century church erected on the spot was very much altered in the XV Century. The font was of the early XII Century.

Wellow Church.

After a long drive the members arrived at the parish church of Wellow, which is dedicated to St. Julian.

Mr. Bligh Bond (who made use of some notes contributed by him to the *Proceedings* of the Bath Branch of the Society, 1904) said the building was one of the finest and best preserved mediæval churches in the Bath district. It consisted of a nave with north and south aisles, a chancel with a chantry chapel attached on the north side, and a western tower. The Church was founded by Henry I, who granted it in 1133 to the Abbey of Cirencester. The existing nave and aisles probably date from the end of the XIV Century, as it was recorded that the Church was almost entirely rebuilt in 1372 at the cost of Sir William Hungerford, one of the Hungerfords of Wellow, who were a junior branch of the Hungerfords of Farleigh. It was of a very early type of Perpendicular, and represented one of the rare instances of the use of Perpendicular forms in what was generally considered the Decorated period, of which Edington, in Wiltshire, was a noteworthy example. An example of the mouldings and other features revealed a difference be-

tween them and the usual run of Somerset Perpendicular. The tower, which had been described as dating from Henry VII's time, but probably was much earlier, was of a singular type. On the tower wall were marks of an older roof, with a lower and more acute pitch, showing that the clerestory was later than the lower portion of the nave. The nave and aisles were spacious and well proportioned, and the nave-roof was good of its kind. The oak benching was probably of XV Century date, having sunk panelling in the bench-ends and poppy-head finials. There were indications of a former rood-loft across the chancel, there being an opening in the form of a staircase with upper doorway in the east wall. The chancel screen survived, and was in fairly good condition. It was of oak and of the kind he regarded as the North Somerset type, consisting of a range of narrow upright divisions divided by moulded standards and having tracery of Perpendicular character in the heads, enriched with crocketted ogee canopies. There was a good vine-leaf cornice, and the spandrils of the central doorway were extremely well designed and bold. It probably had a very much older roof. There were small hagioscopes, just like those at Beckington, and the rood-lofts were probably about the same style. The mediæval screen in the archway at the end of the north aisle still bore some of its original colouring. The chantry chapel, once the chapel of the Hungerfords, was at one time extremely rich and still retained its very fine oak ceiling, with carved and coloured enrichments. It was reconstructed in 1878 under the superintendence of Mr. Browne, architect, of Bath. The shields on the ceiling displayed the arms of the Hungerfords of Wellow, and the Tropnells of Hassage, a local manor. In the chapel were monuments of some of the Hungerfords, and remains of beautiful reredos work were to be seen on the east wall, where there still existed some traces of fresco painting, thought to represent apostles and prophets, with

a figure in the centre in the act of benediction. During the restoration of the chapel two specimens of old oak panelling, carrying remains of early painting on them, were found supporting the lead flat adjoining the chancel roof; they were probably part of the screen forming a parclose to the chancel. The existing chancel was modern and had been twice rebuilt, the last rebuilding having been undertaken a few years ago and followed the design of Mr. Bodley. Some windows of Geometrical character, which were taken from the former chancel were stored in an outhouse at the vicarage: they were of very doubtful antiquity, and very likely were a part of the work of 1845, when the Church was first "restored." The chancel seemed too narrow. Another noticeable feature of the Church was the south porch with its fine ogee canopy and niche in which a modern statue of St. Julian had been placed. The saint was represented as holding an oar, the legend being that, as an act of penance for having caused the death of his father, he devoted his life to the work of a ferryman.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver stated that in the late Mr. Adlam's extra-illustrated "Collinson," were six pictures of the frescoes discovered in the north chapel of Wellow Church in 1845.[1]

Mr. Bligh Bond afterwards drew attention to the stone effigy of a priest lying in the north-east corner of the nave. The fact that the head was to the east showed that it was a priest, as also did the cross on the forehead and the outline of a chalice sculptured on the body. The figure probably belonged to the early XV Century.

When members were looking round the Church, the following inscription was noticed on a canopied tomb under the north window of the chantry chapel:

> "ffor the love of Ihū and Maryis sake,
> Praye for them that this lete make."

1. Most of the illustrations referred to by Mr. Weaver as being in the Adlam Collection are also to be found in the Braikenridge Collection in the Society's Library.—H. St. G. G.

Under the tower was a XIII Century stone coffin and lid, the latter bearing a foliated cross. It was found in the churchyard, outside the chancel.

Hinton Priory.

On leaving Wellow, the members retraced the road to Hinton Charterhouse. A visit to the Church had been planned, but had to be abandoned owing to the lack of time, and the members proceeded direct to the remains of the Carthusian Priory situated in the north-east of the parish.

Outside the building, which contains the chapel and two pigeon-lofts, the Rev. F. W. Weaver, F.S.A., gave some particulars about the Priory. He said the Benedictines were the most learned of the religious orders. The Carthusians were much lower in the social scale. He believed that all ranks in that order laboured with their hands. The order never took very deep root in England. They had only nine houses in this country, and it was rather remarkable that two of them were in Somerset—at Witham and Hinton.

The buildings at Hinton were begun in 1227 and apparently completed in five years; for, on April 16th, 1232, says Tanner, Ela, Countess of Salisbury, and widow of William Longespée, Earl of Salisbury (a natural son of Henry II), who died in 1226, laid the foundation of two monasteries, namely, the Abbey of Laycock in Wiltshire for nuns of the order of St. Augustine in the morning, and the Priory of Hinton in Somerset for Carthusian monks in the afternoon. Both the Carthusian houses in Somerset were founded to the honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. John the Baptist, and All Saints. Moreover, all the Carthusian houses in England were priories, so that it was a pity that one of the principal houses in the parish was misnamed Hinton Abbey.

Mr. Bligh Bond said the date of the building containing the chapel was about 1230. In the chapel he pointed out an

aumbry and two shelves or brackets on the east wall; also a consecration cross which had been let into the north wall, just outside the sacrarium.

At the time of the Society's visit the chapel was used as a store for petrol and the building appeared to be getting ruinous.

The XIII Century building which contains the refectory and the kitchens were also inspected, and a few articles of interest in the post-Reformation residence close by were also seen, by the permission of the new occupier, Mr. F. M. David, whose kindness was duly acknowledged.

Farleigh Hungerford.

VOTES OF THANKS.

Luncheon was served in the grounds of the Hungerford Arms Inn, Farleigh Hungerford.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver, Hon. Sec., presided, and at the close of the repast, said the time had come when the members would be thinking of their departure, and it was their duty, before dispersing, to return thanks to those who had helped to make the meeting such a pleasant one. Firstly, to the President and Lady Hylton—Lord Hylton for acting as President and both of them for their hospitality. Then to the Rev. W. A. and the Hon. Mrs. Duckworth for entertaining them; to the clergy who had kindly thrown open their churches to the Society, and with them should be coupled the Rev. Preb. Daniel, who spoke at Frome and Nunney; also to Mr. F. Bligh Bond, who had kindly given so much of his valuable time for the edification and the pleasure of others; to Mr. St. George Gray, their Assistant-Secretary and Curator, for his untiring energy in managing the details of the meeting; to the Frome Literary and Scientific Institution for kindly entertaining them at the conversazione on Wednesday (special

mention being made of Prebendary and Mrs. Randolph and Mr. H. E. Ames); and the Society's local secretary for Frome (Mr. John Coles, jun.)

The Rev. W. T. REEDER pointed out that Mr. Weaver had omitted one of the chief names—his own. Almost at the last moment he had to act as excursion secretary, owing to the Rev. E. H. Bates Harbin's family bereavement. It had been a most successful meeting in every way, and the weather had been glorious.

Farleigh Castle.

After lunch the members proceeded to examine the scanty remains of Farleigh Castle, under the guidance of the Rev. F. W. WEAVER, F.S.A. The late Canon J. E. Jackson contributed to the third volume of the Society's *Proceedings* an excellent account of the ruins, with illustrations and a plan. This was afterwards amplified into a valuable guide.

In the chapel Mr. Weaver pointed out the different monuments of the Hungerford family, beginning with that of Sir Thomas Hungerford, who died 3rd December, 1398. He is the first person formally mentioned in the rolls of Parliament as holding the office of Speaker. In March, 1369, he purchased Farleigh from Bartholomew Lord Burghersh, who died in the course of the next month. The charters in the Hungerford Chartulary (*sub* Wellow) show that seisin was finally given on 10th January, 1371. He then determined to settle in Somersetshire, and in 1380 was confirmed in the office of forester of Selwood. Farleigh was rebuilt as a castle; and on 26th November, 1383, he received a pardon for crenellating the mansion house of his manor of Farle Mountfort without licence, but for this he paid a fine of one mark (Pat. Rolls, 7 Rich. II, i, *m.* 6). His son and successor, Walter Lord Hungerford, rebuilt the parish church, as appears by an entry in the episcopal registers at Wells—"6 Nov., 1443, commissio

Jacobo Akadensi episcopo ad dedicandam ecclesiam cum cimiterio de Ferle Hungerford quam dominus Walterus dominus de Hungerford nuper de integro edificari et construi fecit." This date was that of the festival of St. Leonard, to whom the Church is dedicated. From this, Canon Jackson has inferred that the parish church was then rebuilt on a new site, and the original building, being now enclosed within the walls of the Castle, converted into a private chapel, and rebuilt at the same time, as the tracery of the windows in the two buildings is of the same design. As the font is apparently Early English it must have belonged to the earlier church. Attention was also called to the very fine iron-work round the oldest tomb in the side chapel, and to the early Decorated doorway, regarded by Mr. Bligh Bond as being about 1340.

On leaving the building many of the visitors entered the vault to see the curious leaden cases containing the bodies of members of the Hungerford family.

Since the meeting the Rev. E. H. Bates Harbin has sent the following notes:—The Castle was sold in 1686 by Sir Edward Hungerford, who is best known for his reckless extravagance, and with his death in 1711 the history of the Farleigh family of Hungerford practically closes (*D.N.B.*, xxviii, 256). Sir Bernard Burke, in his "Vicissitudes of Families" (1860), devotes several pages to an account of Sir Edward, and *more suo* confusing him with his uncle, makes him die at the age of one hundred and fifteen years.

Since the date of the meeting the Right Hon. H. Hobhouse has presented to the Society the chartularies of the families of Molines and of Hungerford, contained in two large volumes. By the marriage of Robert Lord Hungerford (grandson of Walter mentioned above) with Eleanor, daughter and heiress of Sir William de Molines, of Stoke Poges, co. Bucks, the chartulary containing the register of her large possessions, drawn up about 1350, would come under her husband's notice; and he had a similar record drawn up for himself about 1460.

It contains 346 folios of parchment, whereon the title-deeds of his manors in Wiltshire and Somersetshire are elaborately recorded. A table of contents on the first leaf is of interest, as the numbers of the pages are given in Arabic numerals of very early form, many being now obsolete.

Norton St. Philip Church.

On leaving Farleigh the members were conveyed to Norton St. Philip, where the parish church of SS. Philip and James was the first place to be visited.

Speaking inside the Church, Mr. Bligh Bond said the building was one of exceptional character and had been a standing puzzle to antiquaries. Its architecture followed no definite school, and in many respects violated all precedent. At first sight it gave the impression of being a work of the Perpendicular period, but the singularity of its proportions at once set it apart from the products of any recognised school of design of the mediæval period, and proclaimed it as the work of an individual designer, who, whilst in sympathy with the forms and the traditions of XV Century church building, was himself entirely outside the influence of the ancient building schools and had no training in their principles or methods. It seemed the work of an amateur and an eclectic. That opinion, arising from an intuitive feeling inspired by almost every line and feature of the work, had received reinforcement through a study of local records, and those, pieced together, told a story of singular interest. The story of the Church, as it shaped itself in his mind, would first be related; afterwards the architectural evidence, with its documentary support, would be submitted.

That place, called Norton in Domesday, and by the same simple appellation in 1227 in the foundation deed of the Carthusian house of Hinton, received, in the year 1291, a charter empowering the parish to hold a weekly market. Even in

those early days, the district seemed to have been an important centre of the cloth trade, and there was a relic of its past greatness in the wonderful old inn, "The George." It was the opinion of the Rev. J. E. Jackson that when the monks of Hinton obtained a charter to hold a market and fair, they built the inn for a market-house and hostel to accommodate cloth-sellers and frequenters of the market. The license given for the fair directed that it should be held on the vigil, feast and morrow of SS. Philip and James, to whose honour that Church was dedicated. The cloth industry continued to be a staple industry in that part of the country right down to modern times, and brought great wealth to many. The prosperity of the cloth and wool trades had left its mark on the architecture of the west country, not only in domestic, but also in ecclesiastical architecture; and many a fine church in Somerset and Devon was built or re-edified by the munificence of prosperous merchants in pious recognition of benefits received.

In 1527 the living of Norton was united with the chapelry of Hinton, and the two churches were coupled until 1825. At the dissolution of the monastery of Hinton, the lands belonging to the priory were alienated and passed to Lord Craven. It was probable that the greater part of the priory buildings were demolished in his time, and used as building material for works in the neighbourhood. Much would naturally have gravitated to Norton, always a well-to-do place, as the records on the old monuments (now removed) testified.

In the time of Queen Elizabeth, there was a prosperous resident of Norton, named Jeffrey Flower, who had a dwelling-house not far from the market cross in Norton, on the opposite side to "The George." That house he leased, about the year 1584, to one Richard Parsons, and it became an inn, the owner's name being perpetuated by its sign, the "Flower de Luce." Jeffrey Flower was a staunch church-

man, a lover of the old order of things, and one who lamented the destruction of so much that was beautiful in the architecture of the former time. But little chance was there during the Queen's reign to give expression to his tastes and feelings in that respect. His time was to come later, when James succeeded to the throne and echoes of the old Catholicity were sounding afresh. He had now, after years of prosperous commerce, laid by enough to enable him to indulge his zeal for revival. The beautiful Abbey Church of Bath in particular appealed to his emotions in the forlorn and dismantled state in which it had been left after the Dissolution. True, it had been given to the city as a parish church, but little had, as yet, been done to restore it. However, a great effort was to be made, and all friends of the Church were uniting as benefactors towards the completion of the fabric. The names of those contributors were preserved, and amongst them was Jeffrey Flower. The restorers worked well; no mere utilitarian motives actuated them. Nor did they heed the voice of fashion, which would have persuaded them to adopt the "Classic" innovations of the day, though those had already displaced the older "Gothic" principles, and the latter had fallen into contempt with the large majority of the builders. They steadfastly adhered to the ancient design, working with an intelligent appreciation of the old forms, and the result was that they had to-day, in Bath Abbey a building largely post-Reformation, but showing a striking unity of style throughout, and free from Italian admixture.

Flower's ambition had meanwhile been growing to do something for his own Church which might be worthy to compare with what had been done at Bath. The place had grown, and there was perhaps urgent need of greater accommodation for worshippers. So, having leave, he set to work, and his first thought was to save from decay or ignoble uses certain ancient and hallowed stones remaining of the monastic church at

Hinton. Accordingly he procured many choice stones of fine workmanship, and those he planned to incorporate in his new design. A great tower he planned to stand at the west. In it he inserted some fine niche-work, and to add to the beauty of the ground-stage he put windows in three sides, vaulting the space within with moulded ribs, with imperfect science, but, nevertheless, well. The great arch to the east was boldly schemed and well wrought. Above the vaulted ceiling he constructed a chamber as a small oratory for private use, and there, free from invidious comment or malicious intervention, he could worship in peace according to the older use. Tradition still said that a chapel was made in the tower, and that traces of its altar yet remained. To give greater space, the eastern wall was recessed, and a gable with a stone ridge was formed outside the tower, and might still be seen. Within, on the north side, he built a little niche, close to which was the aumbry. He carried the tower up two stages more, and finished it with battlements and corner pinnacles, all very solid and strong. Buttresses of bold outline stood square to each corner. All the detail was the work of his own gifted instinct, and though architectural critics would term it debased, since it did not follow the canons of the style it attempted to imitate, yet it was not without a certain truth of proportion and sense of effectiveness. He planned a spire, and built in the pendentives for it, but was possibly well-advised to leave that particular ambition unfulfilled. It had been thought that the tower was first built. They then came to the body of the Church, which seemed to have been pulled down in great measure before Flower started his building. He left standing a part of the south aisle wall, with the little staircase in the porch wall, by which, in old days, the choristers would go up on Palm Sunday to a narrow gallery over the inner door to sing hymns (just as they had it at Weston-in-Gordano), and the staircase to the rood-loft against the south side of the chancel arch. Most of the

rest he rebuilt, and he was not content to follow one style, but tried to make the work an epitome of successive styles, like an old church which was the growth of centuries. His love of variety led him into the region of the eccentric, and if, as seemed to be the case, the middle arch in the north arcade was his, and not supplied by Sir Gilbert Scott (who "restored" the Church in 1847), then they had at least one feature in which the desire to be original had totally eclipsed all other motives. It was, of course, easy enough to find fault with the detail, but little exception could be taken to the proportions of the Church and its general arrangements. The desire for conformity to old principles was manifest in the screen-work, which was a rough but effective imitation of the work of the previous century; but it was certainly Jacobean. There could be no doubt that the screens were part of Flower's work. They had also documentary evidence of his work in the Abbey Church of Bath, as follows:—

"Jeffery Flower, of Philip's Norton, in the countie of Somerset, Gentleman, at whose only charge was built upp the newe walle, with the doore therein, and the window as it now standeth at the east end of the north allie of the quire."

In the spandrels of that door there were probably still to be seen two small shields—one bearing a fleur-de-lys and the other the initials "I. F."

Jeffrey Flower died in 1644, and was presumably buried in the Church, but there was no inscribed stone discoverable. Against the south aisle wall, however, was a curious tomb, which he had reason to think might be Flower's memorial. There had been various theories as to the figure represented. Pepys, in his "Diary," spoke of "a very ancient tomb of some knight templar, I think," and might possibly be referring to that one; but it was most unlikely, since the figure was that of a merchant, dressed in a long surtout, with a curious tall cap and a belt from which hung an ink-horn. The canopy-work over the figure was a passable imitation of

Tudor work, with the crudeness of the Carolean copies, and the work in the lower panels gave a like impression. When death overtook Jeffrey Flower, the work to which he had so freely devoted his substance was still in process of completion. Prior to the "restoration" in 1847, the old roof of the nave showed a Carolean ceiling, with pendants executed in plaster, and those were dated 1645. Again, in the mention of those pendants they had another link with Bath Abbey and its restorers.

If no carved inscription commemorated the donor of the Church, yet his death was not suffered to go unrecorded. When the walls were stripped in 1847, there came to light, above the little door which then stood in the east corner of the south chapel (where now was the piscina), the following lines:

TE, FLOS, JAM JVSTI
RAPVERVNT STAMINA FVSI
VIRTVTIS REMANET
NOBILIS VMBRA TVAE.

(Now, Flower, the Fates have thee of life bereft,
Large shadow of thy virtues thou hast left.)

What "large shadow"? A visible token, surely, of his benefactions. Not simply the memory of a philanthropic mind and virtuous life, but the impressive shadow of a great church and a stately tower!

In pointing out the different features of the Church, Mr. Bligh Bond said that a great deal of what was to be seen inside was "restoration" work, done by Sir Gilbert Scott, when he had not, perhaps, got that knowledge of the principles of Gothic architecture which he developed later. The font appeared to be Perpendicular, but not a good specimen of its kind. The canopy of the tomb already referred to was very late. He was not quite clear as to the costume of the figure, but he imagined one would not be far wrong in putting it down to about the reign of James I. The west doorway probably came from Hinton Priory. Inside it was a mass of fragments of old work put together.

The following notes by Dr. F. J. Allen, on the Wellow and Norton St. Philip towers were afterwards read :—"These two towers have several features in common, but I have not hitherto found any other tower related to them. They seem to be of very late character. Prof. Freeman used to say that the design of Norton tower looked as if it had been turned upside down,—referring to the accumulation of ornament in the lower portion, instead of at the top, where it would have been much more telling. The defect is probably due to the lateness of the tower and the loss of the fine art of tower-designing."

When members were inspecting the Church, particular interest was taken in the tower oratory with its gabled window to the east, and in the variety of old work incorporated in the lower part of the tower.

The George Inn, Norton St. Philip.

On leaving the Church, members made their way to the famous George Inn, where tea was served in the room the Duke of Monmouth is said to have slept in (June 26th, 1685), a few days before the Battle of Sedgmoor. The interesting features of the inn were viewed, including the spacious loft at the top of the house where cloth was placed for the fairs held at Norton in past centuries. The broadcloth industry was at one time the chief business of the surrounding country. The George Inn has been the centre of the life of the village for over six hundred years, being first licensed as an alehouse in 1397. It is figured in the *Proceedings*, Vol. III, frontispiece. Several references to the inn will be found in Miss Foxcroft's paper on "Monmouth at Philip's Norton," in Part II.

Lullington Church.

The Church of All Saints, Lullington, was the last item on the programme. It is prettily situated just outside the large Park of Orchardleigh.

The Vicar, the Rev. J. G. MARSHALL, said the manor of Lullington belonged to Harold until he was killed at Hastings. William the Conqueror then gave it to Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, who held it with many other manors, and he may have built the Church. The font and the north door were extremely good specimens of Norman work, and if Bishop Geoffrey got some of the guild of workmen over from Coutances, that would explain the fine character of the work. The original Church was Norman, but the present tower appeared to have been rebuilt about 1200 or 1250, and the chancel arch made pointed, the Norman carved stones being made to go as far as possible. He was anxious to get information about the stone (perhaps a coffin cover) in the vestry. On the stone is carved an unusual type of cross, above which is a hand in the attitude of benediction reaching down from a cloud, an emblem of the Almighty Father, especially in the early middle ages. There was the same symbol at Romsey Abbey, and the Rev. S. Cooper found another one at Coutances. He drew attention to the pretty little priests' door on the south of the chancel.

Mr. BLIGH BOND stated that he had never visited the Church before and he was not sufficiently familiar with the building to advance any theories. Coutances Cathedral dated from about 1220 to 1230—about the same time as Salisbury. The chancel arch before them was undoubtedly rebuilt in the Early English period. The date of the Norman work in the Church was about 1100. He pointed out the remains of the opening leading up to the rood-loft in the chapel.

It has been suggested that the stone coffin-lid in the vestry may have covered the remains of the warrior-bishop Geoffrey, but "he died at Coutances on 3rd Feb., 1093, in the presence of Odo of Bayeux and other prelates, and was buried in his cathedral church" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XXI, 32).

When the members were viewing the beautiful north door of the Church (illustration in *Proceedings*, II, ii, 91), Mr.

Marshall described the various features. Over the door is a niche containing the figure of the Lord in glory surrounded by four circles representing the powers of nature, all contained under a rude triangular canopy. The outer member of the circular arch is carved with grotesque heads representing the powers of evil trodden under foot by the effigy overhead. The tympanum contains the figures of two animals on either side of a tree which may represent the Church feeding on the tree beside the waters of life. The capitals of the two attached shafts on one side of the door show a stag being pursued by centaurs. On the other side was Samson breaking the jaws of the lion, symbolical of their Lord breaking the bonds of Death. Many representations could be found elsewhere of the Christian soul as a stag and the devil with a spear or net. There was at least one with the bow and arrow as weapons, and that was at St. Pierre, Caen, whilst at the same place was a representation of Samson breaking the jaws of the lion.

Mr. Bligh Bond elicited the facts that some years ago the doorway, which was then built up, was nearly covered by the earth which lay against the north wall of the Church, and that the whole doorway was taken down and set up afresh. He thought the date of the doorway was from about 1100 to 1120. The top stage of the tower was Perpendicular. About 1340 was the date of the priests' door and the Decorated windows in the chancel. He pointed out that the coffin-slab in the vestry was much too short for a coffin containing a person of anything like average height. (It is illustrated in the *Proceedings*, xxxix, i, 27).

The Vicar called attention to a carved stone built into the churchyard wall to the south-west of the Church, which was perhaps part of a churchyard cross.

Frome was reached at 6.30 p.m., and the Society's annual gathering for 1911 came to an end.