Clevedon Court.

The Members of the Society then proceeded to Clevedon Court, the residence of Sir Arthur Elton, where they were hospitably entertained at luncheon in the great hall. After the repast,

Dr. FREEMAN returned the thanks of the Society for the hospitality accorded, and remarked, in proposing the healths of Sir Arthur and Lady Elton, that any words of his would be far too feeble to express his respect for Sir Arthur, whom he had known for many years and had always found in all respects worthy of being the owner of that noble old house.

Sir ARTHUR ELTON in response, expressed the great pleasure it gave himself and Lady Elton to entertain the members of the Society. He remembered that the last time when he entertained a large party of his friends and neighbours in that hall, was on the occasion of the starting of the volunteer artillery in that place, and it seemed to him that there was something analogous between the promotion of the volunteer movement and the promotion of Archæology; for, while the volunteers had to make themselves efficient in order to protect their country and their homes, archæologists went forth to protect, as far as they could, the ancient monuments their country contained.

Sir ARTHUR ELTON then read a paper on "Clevedon Court," which is printed in Part II.

Getting to the railway, not hurriedly, the party proceeded to the Yatton station, whence a walk brought them to the parish church.

Mr. B. Edmund Ferrey, f.r.i.b.a., speaking outside, in pointing out its architectural features, said it was a fine specimen of a cruciform Decorated church, which had been added to and altered in later times. There seemed little doubt that the nave at some period had been cased. This had been done in other instances; William of Wykeham having cased the Norman nave at Winchester. The clerestory had been added to the Decorated church. They would see, inside, a window which was formerly external, on the west side of the tower. The tower, up to the under part of the bell-chamber, was of the Decorated period, and in the south transept there was another instance of the remains of the Decorated church. This window had been shortened in more recent times. The west front was one of the finest specimens of any church in this county, except, perhaps, Crewkerne, with its four turrets and magnificent tower. He would draw attention to the way in which a kind of flying-buttress arrangement was made to the side of the south porch outer archway; a feature which was not very common. To speak of the ground-plan, he might say that there had been several additions. The chantry on the north side of the chancel was a much later addition. The chancel seemed to be a portion of the church built in early Perpendicular times, and not rebuilt or altered, and that was out of character and of an anterior period to the rest. In the ornamentation of the church there had been a profuse use of the four-leaved flower, which might be seen both outside and inside. With regard to the spire, he was informed by Prebendary Barnard that it was quite a moot-point whether it was ever completed or not. There was a very beautiful north doorway without a porch, of an unusual character, as it was very uncommon to find one in such a position treated in such an ornamental way. Speaking inside the church, Mr. Ferrey said the nave must always strike them as certainly one of the finest in Somerset, being almost cathedral-like in effect. Before the excellent restoration effected in 1871, by Mr. Street, there was a lath and plaster ceiling.

The roof of the nave was one of those very characteristic of Somerset, being something between a panelled ceiling and an open roof. The peculiar feature in the aisles was the design of the roofs, the composition being brought down by ornamental wall panelling on to the arches. At Congresbury there was the same feature, although in that church the peculiarity was not in the aisle, but in the nave, roofs. The clerestory was of quite a Somerset or southern type. Proceeding to the north transept, Mr. Ferrey noticed two recessed wall arches of late Decorated period, but he had no doubt the effigies now in them were not *in situ,* but had been removed from elsewhere. He then noticed the beautiful altar tomb or high tomb, as it was formerly called, of Judge Newton, pointing out his legal costume and bag on his side.

Mr. GREEN remarked that the dress of the lady was especially good. The head-dress was of the smaller horned fashion, which developed into the higher, such as had come down to us as worn until lately in Normandy. They were to be seen there now, but not generally. This marked the date, the latter half of the fifteenth century. It was early in this century that we first read of an article of dress called a pair of bodies, and with it came more decided evidences of lacing, as clearly seen in this effigy. The jewellery was profuse, after the fashion of the time. The effigies in the recesses would be early thirteenth century; the first quarter after 1200. The man, a civilian, has flowing curls and beard, and a robe which originally would be rich. The lady wears a gown, not as became necessary with lacing, a fashioned dress, and also the wimple round the chin, which marks the date. This was worn by all, but of different colours and material, according to rank; white being worn by nuns, who still retain it. The tomb westward was then noticed, Mr. Green pointing out that the head of the knight rested on a garb or wheat-sheaf, the Newton crest. He wears no sword-belt, but the sword, half-drawn, lies quite detatched by his right side, implying that he died defeated.

The armour has the small flaps over the groin or thigh, called *tuiles*, which would mark the date as after 1470, when, or just before that, this fashion came in. The lady has the horned dress of this time, before it became enlarged. Her fingers appear tied.

Mr. FERREY pointed out the collar of SS., or *Sanctus Spiritus*, worn by the man.

Mr. GREEN suggested it was more properly the collar of esses, the SS. forming the pattern being taken from the word Souveraine, which was the motto or word round the jewel attached. The collar was simply the evidence of knighthood; this being formerly not so much a personal distinction as implying a military duty severely due to the king, as chief of all knights and sovereign lord *in capite*.

Time had now passed too quickly, and on emerging from the church rain threatened, making the prospect of the walk back to the station not quite pleasant. Some Members not to be hurried started homeward, whilst the young and more brisk proceeded to make a hasty examination of the old Rectory House.

Dr. HARDMAN said it was believed to have been built about 1440, and was a fine example of a mediæval rectory. It was also one of the first examples of lay impropriation, having passed into lay hands in the time of Henry VIII, but it now belonged to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. There was originally another wing, and there was still a fine hall within.

Mr. GREEN said that in the British Museum (Additional Charters, 7667–8–9–70–71) there are some Court Rolls of the Manor of Yatton for the years 1341, 1347, 1350, 1351, 1364 and 1461 and 62.

A brisk walk brought the party again to the station, where, at the solicitation of those who had arrived first, the station master, considering the greatest happiness of the greatest number had kindly detained the train. Clevedon being reached those who knew the distance took carriages, those who did not

know it, walked to the old church, which was described by Mr. B. E. FERREY, as having a peculiar—almost unique, he believed—cruciform west window to the nave. The nave and transepts were between the Early English and the Decorated periods. The arcade to south side of the nave was peculiar; there were no capitals, but discontinuous arches, the way in which these stop on the piers being very picturesque with their curious arrangement of corbelling. He considered the arcade a very remarkable one altogether, and that it was of the Early Decorated period. At Lostwithiel there was something of the same kind, and Tickenham was another plainer example. The south aisle was of the flowing Decorated period. There was a good Perpendicular ceiling to the porch. The font was very plain, and there was little from which to judge its date, but he would take it to be of the Decorated period. The poppy-head bench-ends were late Perpendicular, about 1500. The four arches to the central tower were very interesting, the west and south arches being of the Early Decorated period, the north arch was semi-transition Norman, rather later than the east arch, which latter was rather remarkable among transition Norman examples. In the south nave aisle there were curious corbels, with one head to two animals, which were of the same date as the windows of the aisle. The south transept roof was of the characteristic Somerset type, probably an accurate restoration of the mediæval roof, with some remarkable corbels. The chancel, evidently Norman, was restored by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners about twenty years since. As they would observe, the steps up to the rood-loft still remained. There was a tomb on the north side, the date of which was about 1592. The church had been a Norman cruciform building, and the lower part of the tower still remained, the Norman portion being that below the corbel table which ran round the outside of the tower. With reference to the miniature monumental effigy in the nave, he should think that it was of the Jacobean period.

Mr. GREEN suggested that it was later as it had the lay down collar of the time of Charles, not the ruff of the time of either James or Elizabeth. Say of the time of Sir Baldwin Wake, the first baronet.

Mr. GREEN pointed out the incised slab in the south transept, remarking that such early slabs were peculiar to this district. A description of them was about to be published by Mr. R. W. Paul, a Member of the Society. Some of the inscription around this one could be made out, as at the head, where it reads "Hic jacet Sir Thomas dominus de Clevedon." The armour was clearly all plate, and judging by the close-fitting head-piece, he would say it was of the last quarter of the 14th century. It would be noticed that the inscription did not say that it commemorated a Sir Thomas Clevedon, but a Sir Thomas, lord of Clevedon, and he would suggest that this was Sir Thomas Hogshaw, who married the daughter of the last De Clevedon. This would be seen better in

The Descent of the Manor of Clevedon.

In the Gheld Inquest of 1084, taken before Domesday, as also in Domesday book of 1086, Clevedon is returned as having 1029 acres more than at present, and there were attached to the manor 3240 acres of pasture. It was found to be held by one Johannes Danus, but was transferred to Mathew de Moreton, as tenant of the king *in capite*, the under tenant being one Heldebertus. There were within it seven wild or untamed mares.[1]

After this there is a missing link. Whether De Moreton or his immediate descendents took the name De Clevedon, or when the name was first assumed, must be left to conjecture. About 1162, in the time of Henry II, *filius Imperatricis*, William de Clevedon is returned in a list of scutages due to the king, as holding two knight's fees in Somerset of Henry Lupellus (Lovell).[2] In the *Exchequer Red Book—Transcript*, vol. iii.

(1). *The Gheld Inquest of Somerset*, by R. W. Eyton.

(2). *Black Book of the Exchequer; Queen's Remembrancer; Miscellaneous;* vol. xii. p. 21.

p. 511, he is also returned as holding the same. In a list of oblations due to the king in 1198, Mathew de Clevedon occurs as owing 100s. for the right to a knight's fee in Ken, one in Hiwis, and one in Penna, *versus* Richard de Ken;[3] and in 1211 he is again returned as holding the same,[4] "as will appear on the Roll of 10th Richard I." Mathew seems to have got into trouble, as in 1215, the year of Magna Charta, all his lands were given to Robert de Baiocis.[5] This name written generally Baiocensis, for Bayeux—is the origin of, and is usually translated Bacon, but as Baiocis it seems to have become Bayouse or Bayhouse. By 1217, 1st Henry III, the lands were restored to Mathew, as in that year he did homage for them.[6] In this same year he was succeeded by Roger, to whom the Sheriff was ordered to write for an account of all lands *in Balliva suâ*.[7] In 1225-26 Mathew de Clevedon is found holding offices in Somerset;[8] his successor being Raymond, who is mentioned in 1275.

During the long absence of Henry III from England, his tenants endeavoured to avoid their services due to him as lord *in capite*, and also claimed various rights and privileges which did not belong to them; hence on the king's death, his son, Edward I, on returning to England found his revenues much diminished. A Commission was issued in 1275, for every county, to enquire in every hundred by what warrant or title the various lands were held or privileges claimed. In the report made, Raymond de Clevedon was returned as claiming wreckage, but by what warrant the jury knew not. He was also reported as having built a wall which obstructed the king's highway.[9] In 1294, when the king of France announced his intention of taking all the English possessions in France, Edward ordered his tenants to appear at Portsmouth on the

(3). *Pipe Roll*, 10th Richard I.
(4). *Pipe Roll*, 12th John, roll 7.
(5). *Close Rolls*, 17th John.
(6). *Close Rolls*, p. 303 *b*.
(7). *Close Rolls*, p. 300 *b*.
(8). *Close Rolls*.
(9). *Hundred Rolls*, 4th Edw. I, pp. 130, 131.

1st September, ready for war, and amongst those named was Raymond de Clevedon.[10] Raymond was succeeded by John, who on a proclamation in 1296, 25th Edward I, for all knights to meet the king properly equipped to go beyond sea, appears in the list for Somerset.[11] He perhaps never returned, and there now appears Elizabeth de Clevedon amongst the women having £20 a year in lands and rents held *in capite*. Three years later, in 1299, on the occasion of another muster for service in the north of England, there again appears John, who is described as the son of John.[12] In 1307, 1st Edward II, William de Clyvedon had succeeded, and there occurs with him a curious instance of feudal custom and watchfulness; for, having taken to wife, without royal license, a widow, whose dower would be held of the king, he was fined 20s. for his breach of duty.[13] William was succeeded by Mathew, who in 1313, 6th Edw. II, on the occasion of another muster for foreign service went abroad with the king. In 1324, when Edward II hanged at Bristol two gentlemen whom he called enemies and rebels, their friends and those who sided with them announced that a miracle had been done around the corpses. As this could not then be allowed to pass uncontradicted, John de Clyvedon was one, with others, appointed to enquire into the truth of the report.[14]

By 20th Edward III, John had disappeared, and was succeeded by Edmund his son, who was then returned as holding the fee formerly held by John, value 40s.[15] The next year, 1347, he was appointed to arm men in Somerset during the king's absence abroad. There now appear other De Clevedons prominent, as in 1359, 33rd Edward III, when with Edmund, others were appointed to array men and raise archers[16] in

(10). *Fœdera.* (11). *Harleian MSS.*, No. 1192, No. 7.
(12). *Harl. MSS.*, No. 1192, No. 5.
(13). *Excerpta Rotulis Finium*, Mem. 6.
(14). *Fœdera.*
(15). *Exchequer; Queen's Remembrancer; Misc. Books*, vol. ii. p. 254.
(16). *Fœdera.*

Somerset. Edmund died in 1375, and left an only daughter, Emeline, and with her the Clevedon holding ends.[17] She married Sir Thomas Hogshaw, of Milstede, in Kent, who dying, left a son, Edmund, and two daughters, Johanna and Margaret. Edmund Hogshaw died childless, in 1389, and so the Hogshaw holding ended, and the property passed in equal shares to the sisters; Johanna, who was married to Thomas Lovell, and Margaret, who married John Bluet.[18] In 1389, 13th Richard II, there was a partition effected as between Johanna and Margaret, of the lands of Edmund Hogshaw and the manors of Edmund de Clevedon, when the manor of Clevedon was allotted to Margaret and her husband, John Bluett.[19] Johanna Lovell died in 1409, leaving a son, Thomas. Margaret died childless, 8th June, 1st Henry IV, when Thomas Lovell, her nephew, a minor, was declared her heir; the jury also declared that the said Thomas Lovell was heir of the manor of Clevedon, as the "son of Johanna the sister of Margaret."[20] Thomas Lovell appears to have parted with his property by deed of gift, and no record of his death is found. He left an only daughter, Agnes, who carried the property by her marriage to Thomas Wake. In 1448, 27th Henry VI, the king confirmed to Thomas Wake and Agnes, his wife, heirs of William de Clyfden, free warren in their lands of Clifton, as granted originally to the said William by Henry II.[21] In 1451, Thomas and Agnes are again found dealing with the lands late of Edmund de Clevedon.[22] Thomas Wake died in 1459, when it was found that he held his lands with Agnes his wife, "by the gift" of Thomas Lovell, and that his son Thomas was his heir.[23] This Thomas died in 1476, in Lincolnshire, having

(17). *Inquisitions Post Mortem*, 50th Edward III, No. 14.
(18). *Inq. P.M.*, 12th Richard II, No. 25.
(19). *Close Rolls*, 13th Richard II, part 1.
(20). *Inq. P.M.*, 11th Henry IV, No. 24.
(21). *Patent Rolls*, 27th Henry VI, part 1, Mem. 19.
(22). *Close Rolls*, 29th Henry VI, part 1, Mem. 30 *dorso*.
(23). *Inq. P.M.*, 38th, 39th Henry VI, No. 43.

apparently followed the example of Thomas Lovell, as it was found that Roger Wake was the feofee of the said Thomas, and seised of all his lands, and that said Roger was his son and heir.[24] This Roger got into trouble, being on the losing side at the battle of Bosworth Field, the final contest in the war of the Roses, 1485. The victor, taking the crown as Henry VII, by Act of Parliament, in his first year, proclaimed that—"not oblivious, nor puttinge out of hys godly mynd the unnaturall, mischievous and grete treasons against God and man, committed and done by Richard, Duke of Gloucester, calling himself by usurpation King of England, the which, with several others, had assembled with banners spred, mightily armed and defenced with gunnes, bowes, arrowes, speres, gleves, axes, and all other necessaries to gef and cause mightie battaile—he decreed that the said parties, including William Catesby and Roger Wake, should stand convict and attaint of High Treason, disabled and forejugged of all honors and estates in England, Wales, or Caleys." The right of the wives to their dower was excepted.

Clevedon thus passed to the king, and was then granted, one half to Humfrey Stanley, Knight, or his heirs male, or to John Waller the younger, and his heirs male, with the fees, advowson of the church, chapel, prebend, chantry, or other ecclesiastical benefice to the same belonging, rendering therefor a red rose at the Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist.[25] A moiety of the other half was granted to John Parker, Knight, and his heirs male; the residue to John Crokker and to John Dudley, "Squyers of the Body."[26] After waiting quietly for about three years, Roger ventured to send in his petition, and as "a true and faithfull subjette in humble wise beseeched the King his Soveraygne Lord," that

(24). *Inq. P.M.*, 16th Edward IV, No. 45.

(25). *Memoranda Rolls, Queen's Remembrancer*, 4th Henry VII, *Communia*, Mem. 3 (63).

(26). *Patent Rolls*, 1st Henry VII.

the attainder might be reversed.[27] To this the king answered—"Soit fait comme il est desiré," and consequently Roger once more got possession, but minus the rents and dues accrued during the forfeiture. For some purpose, not at first clear, in 17th Henry VII, Michaelmas term, George Catesby, John Catesby, and Richard Wake, with others, brought an action against Roger Wake, to recover possession of three parts of the manor of Clevedon. According to a custom of the time this was a feigned suit, and was for the purpose generally of re-settlement. Roger, as usual, called a witness, perhaps non-existent or simply an underling in the court in which the trial took place, to vouch for his being the lawful possessor, but this witness would not appear, or as in this case, as the formal document says—he, *in contemptu curiæ recessit et defaltum facit.*[28] The Court would then decree that the property was vested in the Catesbys and Richard Wake, as we should now say in trust. Roger died 19th Henry VII, 1504, when it was found by inquisition 20th Henry VII, that he had no land or tenements, but that George and John Catesby, Richard Wake, and others, held three parts of the manor of Clyffuedon by agreement made in the life of Roger. By his will Roger declared that his wife Elizabeth (Catesby) should hold Clevedon for her life, and that then, with the *scitum et mansum*, it should go to Richard, his son. To Margaret Garnard, his daughter, he bequeathed all his lands called Hoggishaws, in Milsted in Kent, for her life.[29] He also declared that John, his son, who already had the one-fourth of Clevedon, should beside it take all the manor of Milton Clyffuedon.[30] John died, 1541, seised of 300 acres and belongings in Clevedon, and Dorothea, *æt* 21 and more, his daughter, was declared his heir.[31] Richard

(27). *Rot. Parliament*, vol. vi. p. 393.

(28). *De Banco Rolls*, Michaelmas, 17th Henry VII, No. 24.

(29). *Testamenta Vetusta*, p. 463, by Sir N. H. Nicolas.

(30). *Exchequer Inq. P.M.*, W. Bysseley, Escheator, 20th Henry VII, No. 11.

(31). *Inq. P.M.*, 33rd Henry VIII, No. 163.

succeeded to Clevedon, and did homage for three-fourths of the manor in 37th Henry VIII;[32] and dying in 1st Elizabeth, the various settlements are mentioned in his inquisition, as also that he held under the honour of Gloucester; and John, his son, was declared his heir.[33] John succeeding, he, in 2nd and 3rd Philip and Mary, 1556, bought of Dorothea and her husband, John Wurley or Wyrley, their fourth part of the manor, for which he paid them forty pounds sterling.[34] This was the first time that any part of the manor had been sold. All sales of land were obliged to be proclaimed in the market or some public place, and on the back of this document appear the number of times, with the dates, that this sale was so announced. John died 15th Elizabeth, 1573-4, now possessed of the whole manor,[35] and was succeeded by his son John, then aged 30 years. This John married Margaret Goodwyn, who died 28th Elizabeth, and with whom he got the manor of Portbury Priors.[36] He died 23rd January, 19th James I, and was possessed of Clevedon, *alias* Clevedowne, with other lands in Tickenham, Kenn, Walton, Nailsey, and Wracksall. By arrangement made 43rd Elizabeth, Clevedon was settled on Baldwin, his son and heir, who, on the death of his father was aged 40 years and more,[37] and held of the honour of Gloucester by military service. Baldwin was created a baronet, 5th December, 19th James I, 1621, just before his father's death. He married Elizabeth Digby, on whom Clevedon was settled for life by the above arrangement, a daughter of Sir George Digby of Coleshill, Warwickshire, and sister of John Digby, first Baron Digby and Earl of Bristol.[38] Sir Baldwin, "Knt. and Bart.," died early in 1628 (new style),

(32). *Memoranda Rolls, Q.R.*, Mem. 3.
(33). *Inq. P.M.*, 1st Elizabeth, No. 33.
(34). *Feet of Fines*, Somerset, Hilary, 2, 3, *P. and M.*, No. 47.
(35). *Inq. P.M.*, 15th Elizabeth, No. 5.
(36). *Chancery Inq. P.M.*, 2nd Charles I, part 3, No. 24.
(37). *Chancery Inq. P.M.*, 2nd Charles I, part 1, No. 16.
(38). Hutchins' *Dorset*, vol. iv. p. 133.

leaving issue John (by whom he was succeeded), George and Baldwin, Abigail and Elizabeth.[39]

Sir John, with the concurrence of Lady Elizabeth, sold Clevedon and Portbury on the 10th August, 1630. The deed is between Elizabeth Wake, of Clevedon, widow; Sir John Wake, of Sawsey Forest, Northampton; and Philip Digby, of London, Esq., of the first part: John, Earl of Bristol, of the second part: Anthony Low and Richard King, of the Inner Temple; Walsingham Greisley and Thomas Harris, of Sherborne, of the third part: and Robert Stickland and Hugh Hodges of the fourth part. In accordance with the usual puzzling manner of conveyance, Elizabeth and John Wake agreed, for the sum of £17,000 by the Earl, and the sum of 10s. by Robert Stickland and Hugh Hodges, well and truly satisfied and paid, to sell to the two last named the manors of Portbury and Clevedon, with all rights, etc., and before Michaelmas next ensuing to "vouch to warranty, and after imparlance to depart in contempt of Court, that judgment may thereupon be had and given; the said Walsingham Greisley and Thomas Harris then to hold the manors."[40] At Michaelmas, accordingly, there was the usual action for recovery, and the transaction was completed with the usual final concord. Four proclamations of the purchase are recorded; the first on the 29th November, 1630; 29th January, 1631; 13th May, and 17th June.[41] The fine for license to sell, paid to the Crown in silver, was six pounds.[42] The result of all this was that the property passed to John, Earl of Bristol, now the owner of Sherborne, formerly the beloved seat of Sir Walter Raleigh.

Lord Bristol was sent twice to Spain, to treat for a marriage

(39). *Royalist Composition Papers*, 1st Series, vol. lxvii. fol. 67.

(40). *Close Rolls*, 6th Charles I, part 28, No. 27.

(41). *Recoveries Index*, fol. 384; *Recovery Roll*, 6th Charles I, Roll 175; *Feet of Fines*, 6th Charles I, Somerset, No. 41.

(42). *King's Silver Book*, Michaelmas, 1630, fol. 101.

of the Infanta with Prince Charles; paying his own expenses in 1617 as the price of Sherborne.[43] By these embassies he gained his earldom and many favours; an episode commemorated in Bristol by the "Procession of the Don," after the annual dinner, in November, of the Antient Society of St. Stephen's Ringers.

It has been always stated that Clevedon was sold by Sir John Wake on account of his losses during the Civil War, but it is clearly seen now that this was not so; and it may rather be suggested that his connection with the great Earl ran him to an expensive life, and at least did somewhat to help him to poverty. Besides this sale of the Somerset property, in 1637 he is found giving a bond for £600, and for which he was sued, and judgement given against him in 1642.[44] In 1639, he, with others, was bail for the sum of £2,600, and this becoming forfeited, an action was brought and judgment given against him in 1641 for that amount, with five pounds costs. In 1639 he mortgaged messuages and farms for £1,000, and in 1641 he borrowed £190, for which he became bound by his "Statute Staple" for the sum of £300. Then came the Civil War of 1642, when he took the Royalist side, and surrendered under Lord Hopton at Truro, in 1645. With a pass he marched away, but was met when in Hampshire by some "unruly and strong parties," who despoiled his troopers and took from him £2,000. He appealed to Sir Thomas Fairfax, who ordered the Hants Committee to enquire into the affair, which they did, but "their order took little effect." In 1646 Sir John thought it advisable to take the Covenant, before the minister of "John Zacharies," in London, but, his property being sequestrated, this did not relieve him. The Commissioners for compounding fixed his fine at a moiety of his estate; but in the composition there is no Somerset property. Sir John petitioned against this decision in 1654, and towards getting the value reduced

(43). *State Papers*, vol. xc. p. 131.

(44). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 2nd series, vol. xxvii. fol. 707.

set out the debt of £2,600 and the other mortgages above-mentioned, as still in force against him and "no part thereof satisfied," he being "closely restrained" in the upper Bench, where "he had been a long time a prisoner."[45] No deduction being made, he again petitioned, setting out that he had already totally lost his personal estate, and that, having a wife and six children, there "remained not to him or his a bed to lie upon." The last paper relating to him bears a memorandum, "Fine at a moiety £1,130—paid nothing."[46] Sir John died in 1661, and his will was proved 28th January, 1662.

During the Civil War, Lord Digby, too, sided with the king, and his property was consequently sequestrated, and afterwards sold, without privilege of composition. As to a part of it, on the 13th November, 1650, Colonel Owen Rowe, of London, petitioned the sequestrators, that his late wife had, for above 30 years past, a small tenement with several parcels of ground in Clevedon, by virtue of a lease granted by Lady Elizabeth Wake, and prayed to have this continued. To this it was ordered that the value be "signified," the lands not to be disposed of until further order. The survey was returned, 26th February, 1651, of these lands in Clivedale, and they were offered to Colonel Rowe at 50s. a year for seven years, he to bear the charge of "the wall," the State paying all taxes.[47] Rowe refused it, and, considering that he had well served his party he might have been better treated. He was a Commissioner for Relief upon Articles of War, and sat 17th February, 1653, to consider the claim of Sir John Wake, after the Truro surrender.[48] His name is signed to the death warrant of Charles I, and he appears named in the Act, 12th Charles II, 1660,

(45). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 1st series, vol. lxvii, fols. 43, 45, 61, 67, 68, 71, 75.
(46). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 2nd series, vol. xxvii. fols. 721, 728.
(47). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, vol. liv. fols. 371, 373.
(48). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 1st series, vol. lxvii. fol. 55.

cap. 30, as one of the "wicked and active instruments" in compassing the death of the late king. On the 12th November, 1650, came in the petition of Anne (Russell), wife of George, Lord Digby, heir-apparent of John, Earl of Bristol, wherein she states that the capital messuage of the manor of Clevedon with as much land as should be of the yearly value of £1,200, was charged, 23rd June, 1632, with £800 per annum as a settlement on her marriage, and praying that it may be continued for her support.[49] A special Act of the Parliament had been passed to secure such provision for widows and children, but no endorsement or memorandum tells what was done in this case.

On the 23rd March, 1651, the trustees for the sale of estates forfeited to the commonwealth for treason, sold Clevedon to Carew Raleigh, his heirs and assigns for ever, "in satisfaction for a yearly value of £500"; and on the 24th March Carew Raleigh signed his acceptance of this settlement, when it was ordered that the commissioners for compounding at Goldsmith's Hall should direct the commissioners for sequestration in Somerset to allow the said Carew Raleigh quietly to enjoy and take the rents thereof.[50] Thus, as Digby had secured Sherborne from Raleigh, the latter now ousted Digby from Clevedon, perhaps as some compensation. Other messuages, lands, and tenements, parcel of the manor, were assigned, 27th July, 1652, to Lady Brook, with the names of Hugh Hodges, Thos. Chafe, and Wm. Sansom.[51] In 1658 there was some transaction by deed between these parties and Sir John Wake, perhaps with the idea to confirm their title.[52]

On the 3rd March, 1652, Baldwin Arthur, Esq., contracted for the purchase of messuages, tenements, and lands, in the occupation of Thomas Arthur, and having paid down a moiety

(49). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, vol. xx. fol. 557.
(50). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 1st series, vol. x. fol. 555.
(51). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 1st series, vol. x. fol. 559.
(52). MS., Sir Arthur Elton.

of the money "on the 23rd April last," was put in possession.[53]

John, Earl of Bristol, died in Paris, 16th January (the 6th, English style), 1652,[54] and was succeeded by George, 2nd Earl, to whom the estates were restored on the return of Charles II, 1660.[55] He was succeeded by John, 3rd and last Earl, who died, September, 1698, without issue, and was buried at Sherborne. He married twice, his second wife, Rachel, daughter of Sir Hugh Windham, Knight, of Silton, Dorset, judge of the Common Pleas, a son of Windham of Orchard, surviving him. By his will he left directions for the sale of the Clevedon property, and it thus passed by purchase, in 1709, to Mr. Abraham Isaac Elton of Bristol, created a baronet in 1717.

There were other transactions with land within the manor, not noticed here. In 1630 there was an agreement between Robert Wynbowe and Richard Holworthie and his wife, for lands and common rights in Cleevedon, Weston-in-Gordano, Walton, Portishead (*alias* Possett), Clapton, and Tickenham.[56]

In the British Museum[57] are some Court Rolls of the manor of Clevedon for the years 1321, 1327, 1389, and 1396, from which the then income can be learned.

After these discussions and the examination of the church,

Mr. Green mentioned that at the Dissolution there was in Clevedon the Chantry or Free Chapel of Hydall, hitherto entirely unknown and not mentioned in any of our histories. It occurred to him that as the road which passes the Court is known now as Highdale there would be some connection with it, and that Hydall was the chapel of and near to the Court House, which it would be noticed was here unusually distant from the church. These chantries being dissolved, the lands

(53). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, 1st series, vol. x, fol. 561.

(54). *Roy. Comp. Pap.*, vol. x, fol. 564.

(55). Collins's *Peerage*, vol. viii, p. 253.

(56). *Recovery Rolls*, 6th Charles I, 1630, Roll 175. *Feet of Fines*, Michaelmas, 6th Charles I, Somerset, No. 30.

(57). *Additional Charters*, Nos. 7,659, 7,660, 7,661, 7,662.

belonging to Hydall were leased in 1534; the value, per annum, one Robert being chaplain of the same, was £6 8s. 2d., from which 12s. 10d., the usual tenths, were to be deducted.[58] A second Survey of these properties took place in the 2nd Edward VI, 1548, when the return names: "one messuage callyd Hydall being within the Towne of Clyvedon with all and singular landes meadowes pastures and fedinge thereunto belonging letten to farme to John Bulbecke for terme of 63 yeares by Indenture datyd the 12th daye of Marche in the 26th yeare of the reigne of our late souveraigne lorde Kinge Henry VIII. Plate and ornaments therein none.

Memor: There hath ben neyther incumbent nor other mynister resident upon the saide free chapell syns the date of the foresaide Indenture, but the lessee receyveth the proffects of the same to his owen use as may appere by the first booke of Survey of College Chantries &c. and ther is nothing presented concerning the free chapell at the last Survey, howsoever the matter goeth."[59]

Notwithstanding a determined search for it, this first Survey cannot be found. Probably however the weight of the plate and lead and bells would be all the further information gained.

Proceeding now to the churchyard the tower was again critically examined. The possibility of pre-historic remains being near in the fields around was suggested, the ground being closely searched by the eyes of an active Member.

Mr. Green then mentioned that there had occurred here as in most parishes squabbles on the question of tithe paying, which were set at rest by the timely Commutation Act. In 1733 the Vicar brought his action against a parishioner for non-payment, setting out that he claimed tithe on cattle, sheep, lambs, and wool, but that the defendant, just before his sheep were shorn, and just before they dropped their lambs, drove off his stock to other lands in another parish and then asserted

(58). *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, vol. i. p. 186.
(59). *Chantry Certificates*, Somerset, Nos. 42, 99.

that no tithe was due in Clevedon. The defendant answered that he occupied twenty acres called Warth land, and other ground, but denied that he had driven away any stock to defraud. He believed there was due to the plaintiff by ancient custom one penny for each calf, and one penny for each lamb. He acknowledged a tithe was payable on wool, but denied it as claimed for cattle depastured, as there was a custom of one penny yearly and no more for every acre depastured by unprofitable cattle; this being four pence per acre for strangers depasturing their cattle but not residing in Clevedon. He was willing to pay and had tendered what he considered was properly due. The Court eventually decreed that the defendant must account and pay, but appointed the deputy of the Court to arrange the amount and to make all fair allowances.[60]

In 1753 another quarrel arose, when the Vicar exhibited his bill against some parishioners, and claimed that he had been always entitled to all tithes of agistment, milk, calves, lambs, wool, and other small tithes and offerings, and from apples, pears, and other fruit, but as the defendants refused to pay, he with Sir Abraham Elton and others had agreed, in February, 1744, on a terrier of the tithe, by which a modus of five pounds a year was to be paid for the capital messuage of the demesne lands of the manor, and one shilling and sixpence in the pound for agistment tithes. The defendants answered that they did not reside in the parish, and that their father also had never occupied his land but leased it for years, they were therefore not recompensible to the plaintiff as the tenants ought to have paid, and they claimed further that such tithes should in consideration of the years elapsed be considered as paid. They knew nothing of any terrier. The court ordered that the defendants should pay twenty shillings for agistment of dry and unprofitable cattle for two years demanded, with costs, but that all other claims should be dismissed, without costs.[61]

(60). *Exchequer Decrees*, Michaelmas, 7th Geo. II, No. 10.
(61). *Exchequer Decrees*, Hilary, No. 3.

The party now dispersed somewhat, proceeding leisurely homeward. Passing through the meadow by the sea, Mr. GREEN gave an episode of some litigation about the repairs of the sea wall. It seemed that there was in Clevedon a farm, known as Perry's Marsh farm, worth about £80 a year, and there belonged to it a large piece of ground called the Warth adjoining the sea shore by the Severn, but about seven feet higher than the shore, forming a natural bank of earth against the sea, and which had never been repaired by anybody. Within this marsh ground was a ditch and a bank cast up about three feet high, forming a second barrier. The sea breaking in, in 1667, destroyed the outer bank, and carried away about four score acres several feet in depth, and not only were the other forty acres left threatened with a like destruction, but the marsh land further in was also in danger. The question was who should repair. As the owners of the shore land refused to do so, an action was brought in the Exchequer by the inland owners, who alleged that it was from carelessness on the part of the shore owners from not keeping out the "woose" soil brought down by the river that the wall then lay "lacerated and worn down." The owners asserted to the contrary, and claimed that the whole district should be assessed, as the whole level would be preserved and benefited.[62] The court decreed that this was right, but the plaintiffs not liking the judgment refused obedience and as local magnates endeavoured to intimidate their opponents by inflicting a heavy fine for their asserted neglect. The consequence was that Mr. William Strode and others the more inland owners found themelves committed to "ye p'son of ye fleete" for their contempt. On their bringing another action (Michaelmas, 33rd Chas. II) the former decree was confirmed,[63] and in the end of a long account occupying thirteen skins of parchment written on both sides, Mr. Strode and the others were ordered

(62). *Exchequer Decrees*, Michaelmas, 27th Chas. II, p. 208.

63). *Exchequer Decrees*, p. 311.

to be freed and their bonds for four hundred pounds to be cancelled.[64]

The Members dined at the Royal Hotel, where the host had provided an unusually good entertainment, after which, at eight o'clock, there was a meeting at the Public Hall, when

Major C. E. Davis, F.S.A., of Bath, first gave some interesting details of recent discoveries made in that city, but as a full account will be printed by the Corporation of Bath, his remarks are only noticed here. In 1871 he found a Roman drain at a great depth, which had been made to carry off hot water from the Roman baths. By clearing out this drain they were enabled to carry their excavations to a greater depth, and the result was that they discovered recently a large bath, 80 feet long and 40 feet wide, within a large hall exceeding 120 feet in length, built of the most massive masonry. The excavations had revealed the fact that these baths must have occupied about one-fourth of the ancient city of Bath, so that really Bath must have been built for the purpose of bathing alone.

Mr. Jerom Murch said he thought the meeting ought to be made aware how much, not only the city of Bath, but the archæologists of Somerset, owed to Mr. Davis for these interesting discoveries. They had not been made in consequence of any precise commission given to him by the Corporation, but were the result of untiring energy and hard work, pursued in the face of many discouragements. The large baths which had been discovered occupied a space four times the size of the Abbey Church, and that would give them some idea of the extent of them, and also some idea of the grandeur of the buildings which the Romans constructed for bathing purposes.

The Rev. Prebendary Scarth said he considered this was one of the most remarkable discoveries that had yet been made. This, he believed, was the finest system of baths that had been discovered in Britain, or perhaps on the continent.

(64). *Memoranda Rolls*, Michaelmas, 33rd Chas. II, Roll 135.

There was nothing on this side of the Alps that had yet come up to it, with the exception of those found in Paris. It might be that they had not yet discovered the limit of the system. He might explain that these baths were 19 feet under ground, and it was only by going down with the aid of lamps that they could see them.

Bishop CLIFFORD asked if it were supposed that these baths were used by the Romans simply for the purpose of bathing, or as in the baths at Rome, where the bathing places occupied but a small portion of the buildings.

Prebendary SCARTH said, as far as had been ascertained, it appeared that they were made like the ancient Forum, with halls and other rooms surrounding them. When they were examined some years ago, it was stated that they were probably of the time of Titus. A few fragments of decorated work which had been found belonged to the best period of the Roman Empire.

The Rev. H. H. WINWOOD observed that in his opinion it had been by no means clearly shown, at present, that the remains were Roman, as the finding of a few fragments which were Roman did not prove that the works themselves were Roman. He did not wish to throw the slightest doubt upon Mr. Davis's statements, but when the operations had reached a more forward stage they would be better able to judge as to whether they were Roman or not.

Mr. E. SLOPER said it was a matter of general acceptation that the Roman towns of Britain were destroyed before the incoming of the Saxons, and he would like to know whether there was any sign of the destruction of these baths by means of fire.

Bishop CLIFFORD asked if there were anything to show when the baths were disused.

Prebendary SCARTH said there were no signs of fire. With regard to the other question, he was inclined to think that the baths were used up to about the fifth century; and as the pro-

cess of demolition had been going on for at least 1200 years, it was no wonder that other remains besides Roman things were found.

The Rev. H. H. WINWOOD suggested that the discovery Mr. Earle made, some time ago, might throw some light on the matter. The destruction might have taken place between the departure of the Romans and the incoming of the Saxons. That would give them a sort of approximate idea.

The Rev. Dr. HARDMAN, Lecturer of Yatton Church, next gave some notes on that building, as printed in Part II.

Mr. GREEN said he missed the western gallery that was in the church when they visited it twenty years ago. It was a fine example, and was put up by Lysons, the antiquary. It was so perfect an imitation of ancient work that it even deceived antiquaries as to its date.

Dr. HARDMAN said the gallery had been removed.

The PRESIDENT having thanked Dr. Hardman, next called upon Mr. J. MORLAND who read a paper on "A Roman road between Glastonbury and Street." Mr. Morland's paper will be found in Part II.

The Rev. H. H. WINWOOD objected to the name Roman as applied in this case, but time being very short there was unfortunately no discussion.

The PRESIDENT having thanked Mr. Morland, called on Mr. GEORGE, who read a short biographical notice of Judge Choke of Long Ashton.

The CHAIRMAN having thanked Mr. George for his paper, the meeting then terminated, soon after ten o'clock.