St. John's Church.

After luncheon, the Society, under the guidance of Canon T. Scott Holmes, President of the Glastonbury Antiquarian Society, paid a visit to St. John's Church, Glastonbury.

Canon HOLMES said he did not pretend to know any details about the church, although he had been acquainted with the building for a great many years. It was a church with very little history indeed. It was originally a Norman church, but he did not know whether there were any remains left of the first building, which was completely pulled down by Abbot Selwood, in the year 1457, and he rebuilt it between that year and 1493. The present beautiful building was all of one style. The point that interested him with regard to that church was almost a unique point—that the Abbot himself should have agreed to have built so beautiful a building in the neighbourhood of the Abbey. It was a popular fallacy to suppose that great monasteries built good parish churches, but the opposite was the truth. They starved them; and it was the parishioners who set about building the fine parish churches which they now possessed in the county of Somerset. The screen formerly went right across the building, from the north aisle to the south aisle, cutting off the eastern part from the western. There were several chapels, as could be noted, and outside the church could be seen two interesting little bits of ornament, which were pointed out to him some years ago by the late Canon Liddon, who knew that church very well and loved it

very much, and who was interested in the mortuary crucifixes there. There was a fine tomb there to a man who, he believed, was chapman to the Abbey. At any rate, the tomb showed that he was of some importance. The original church was a cruciform structure, with a central tower, and when Abbot Selwood pulled down the building, he transformed it into a Perpendicular building, with the tower at the west end. The glass was very beautiful, but nearly all modern ; the only portion that was ancient being that in the south-eastern window of the sanctuary. In conclusion, Canon Holmes referred to the wooden supports at the entrance to the chancel, which were put up recently, because the central shafts were showing signs of buckling in.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver having asked a question as to the mortuary crucifixes, Canon Holmes said that one was at the basement of the staircase outside the church, and the other was at the corner of the north wall of the tower.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver remarked that there was an outside crucifix over the north porch of Bruton church.

Lieut.-Colonel Bramble observed that St. John's Church was one of the most glaring instances of endeavouring to do away with solid substructure altogether. The pillars supporting the clerestory and roof were so slender that they really afforded very little support. But they had managed to hold their own in the nave, notwithstanding the weight of the roof. The pillars at the east end of the nave had been cut down so fine to make the church look "nice," open, and airy, heedless of the fact that, at the intersection of nave, chancel, and transepts, the weight on the angle pillars was enormous ; that they had, as they saw, to be supported by an extensive system of timbering. The wonder was that they had continued to stand so long. He expressed a hope that in the restoration now in progress a little more attention might be given to the strength of materials and the principles of construction. Arches were valuable as a principle, but *some* material must be left.

The Rev. H. L. Barnwell, the Vicar, gave some further particulars respecting the church. He quite agreed with the previous speaker as to the church being an instance of an endeavour to do away with solid work, with the result that they had to do a great deal to strengthen the structure at the present day, and it was difficult to say how far the work of restoration would have to be proceeded with. The sum of £3,000 had already been spent on the tower, and he thought that they would agree that it had been done in a very careful and conservative manner. It had been repaired, rather than restored, as the term was used in these days. For the present they had done with the west end of the structure, and now they hoped, as soon as funds would permit, to start on the repair of the chancel arch and northern pillar. Some forty years ago the church was restored, in the then sense of the word, and it was found to be honeycombed with vaults. How deep they were it was not known, and they did not know now how far they might have to go down to get to the foundation for the new north pillar, when they proposed to deal with it. One did not like to do what Canon Homes had suggested, to appeal from their admiration of the church to the depth of their pockets. The Vicar of Lyng had done it that morning, and pleaded for a cause with which they all had sympathy. At the same time, he (the speaker) ventured to say that Glastonbury was a more touching word than Alfred, and he did hope that some of the members of the Society would be able to tell some of their friends in different parts of the diocese of the restoration of St. John's Church, and any little help that they might be able to give would be greatly appreciated. Glastonbury was not a rich place, but they had been able to raise £2,000 there. It was encouraging, considering the many other appeals that had been made upon the inhabitants on account of the war in South Africa, and they could not expect much more money from Glastonbury people just now towards that work of restoration. He was glad to welcome the Society

to Glastonbury, and he hoped that when they visited the town again they would not see that church as at present, on crutches, but in a beautiful state of preservation.

Mr. E. BUCKLE also made a few observations respecting the church, and regretted that he had arrived rather late, and consequently was not able to hear what Canon Holmes had been telling them about the building. They must, therefore, pardon him if he should repeat what they had already heard. Like so many of our large Somerset Perpendicular churches, St. John's began by being cruciform in shape. There was a XIII Century church there, with central tower and transepts, and apparently about the same size as the present church. There was the south transept remaining pretty much as when it was originally built, except that there was a large Perpendicular window inserted in the end of it, and the walls were now higher than originally, only the centre of the roof rose higher than the ceiling, and the outside of the transept had been refaced. There was a strong probability that the early church occupied the whole space of the present building. As regarded the fact of there having been a central tower, that could be seen by looking at the arcades. The two arches nearest to the chancel were a little narrower and less in height than the others. The two arches occupied the position of the previous central tower. It appeared that the nave, as they saw it now, was built before the central tower fell or was taken down. Otherwise the whole range of arches would have been alike. One thing which was very noticeable about that church was the marked difference between the nave and the chancel, with, at the same time, great similarity. One very curious feature about the church was the row of pillars, which were quite uniform throughout the church. The pair which carried the chancel arch were exactly like the rest, and this gave great lightness to the appearance of the interior. But it did not give strength. The consequence was that, some thirty years ago, one of the pillars had to be rebuilt, and now

it was found necessary to rebuild the other one. They had both given way under the great weight on them. The arches in the chancel were quite different from those in the nave. The latter was treated in a lofty manner, while the arches of the chancel were particularly flat, although the piers all had their capitals at the same level. The east window was one to which attention ought to be drawn, because of the very curious cusping in the bottom series of lights, which was repeated also in the west window. It was a form of cusping found in West Somerset—in Cleeve church, for example—and also over the border, in Devonshire. There was an interesting monument in the south-west corner of the aisle, which had been clearly removed from some other place. It was ornamented with sculptured camels, for a man of that name. Then there was the great tower, that they all admired so much. On the inner side of the tower was a piece of fan vaulting. The curious feature about it was that one quarter of the fan was treated differently from the other three. In most fan vaulting, the horizontal lines were circular, but in this particular fan the peculiar thing was that one quarter was treated polygonally and three circular; as if the workman who had worked there had not made up his mind how he would treat the fan. The tower was a very fine structure, the principal characteristic being the great height of the recesses in the belfry windows, which gave a fine, commanding appearance to the tower. The stair turret was treated in a curious fashion; it was not external, but was built inside the tower, so that it did not interfere with the make, or the outside appearance, of the tower. They would notice that the elaborate battlements at the top of the tower had been substituted, as was very nearly always the case, for something that went before. It would be seen that the great pinnacles at the corners of the tower were a mis-fit, and put up independently of the earlier design; though what the original design was he did not know.

The Rev. Preb. DANIEL described the altars of the church.

Besides the high altar there were three other altars, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Nicholas, and St. George. The present church was not erected from the foundations as a new church, but was built upon the old foundation. The records of the church told them a good deal about the building in the XV Century. Those documents had already been printed in "Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset," and was in the hands of persons to form their own opinion. The roof was not mentioned in the documents, but the seats and the screen were, and there was an interesting account of the way in which they were purchased.

The Abbot's Kitchen.

The Abbot's Kitchen was next visited, and here the Rev. Canon HOLMES gave some valuable information respecting the interesting building. He explained by way of preface that it was not the Abbey Kitchen, as sometimes called, but the Abbot's Kitchen. A great monastery like Glastonbury had three kitchens, of which the Abbot's was probably the largest. In the south-east cloister there was the Abbey kitchen, then there was the Abbot's kitchen, which he did not use himself, but gave for the use of his guests. Then there was the Infirmary kitchen for the preparation of another kind of food. This kitchen of the Infirmary was somewhere near the house now occupied by Mr. Austin, but the Abbot's kitchen was close to the great chamber, built by Selwood, called the "King's Lodgings," because Henry VII stayed there one or two nights. The Abbot's house was very conjectural, because no traces now remained of it. The hospitality of the Abbey was enormous. Every great man, every King's messenger, every ecclesiastic passing through Glastonbury stayed there and was fed. The stables were of enormous size, and the kitchen was built probably by Abbot Frome, between the years 1302—1322. At least he began it, and his successor, John de

Breynton, finished it in the first half of the XIV Century. Having been built all of stone it survived, but if the roof had been of wood it might have been pulled down and the lead sold. Canon Holmes pointed out the four fire places, and in one of them was a little oven. The only other kitchen to compare with that building was at Newnham Harcourt, Oxford, which was built a little later. They would notice that the system of ventilation at the top was by means of louvres, which by being pulled up let extra smoke out from the top. The monument to be seen there was of a mitred abbot: he dared not venture to say whom it represented—probably some abbot of the XIII rather than the XIV Century.

The Abbey Ruins.

A move was next made to the Abbey ruins, where the Rev. Canon Holmes again acted as conductor, and gave an exhaustive and learned address on the ruins now remaining, dealing principally with the Arthurian legend and the story of Joseph of Arimathea. The rev. gentleman said he wanted to speak to them that afternoon on one or two interesting points. Critical historical students most noticed how legends grew. How was it that from the XV Century, and from the time of the dissolution, such questions had so great an attraction for English Churchmen? How was it that they came to locate there Arthur and Joseph of Arimathea? The earliest historian, William of Malmesbury, spoke of four churches surrounded by the buildings of the Abbey. Those churches owed their origin—the first to the disciples of St. Philip and St. James, the second to St. David, the third to some unknown disciples from Britain, and the fourth to St. Aldhelm and King Ina. William of Malmesbury knew nothing of St. Joseph of Arimathea, but Arthur was to him an historic warrior of the ancient Welsh. What he said about the legendary Arthur and the Holy Grail was of later interpolation. When Dun-

THE TOWER OF ST. JOHN'S, FROM THE ABBEY RUINS, GLASTONBURY.

From a Photograph by H. St. George Gray.

stan was Abbot in the middle of the X Century, he was said to have rebuilt all except the old church, so that by the time of the Conquest, there were only two churches—the old Vetusta Ecclesia and Dunstan's Church to the east of it. The old church seemed to centre in itself all the legends, which grew more definite as they were separated by time from the events connected with them. In the XIII Century the Grail legends took definite form and got woven into the Arthur legend, and definitely located at Glastonbury. In 1278 Edward I paid a visit, and, wanting to find Arthur, he was, of course, dug up with the lead tablet describing the fact that "these are the bones of Arthur." In 1345 the Joseph of Arimathea connection with the Holy Grail and with Glastonbury Abbey reached its perfection of definiteness. John Blome, of London, obtained a licence by patent roll to search for the remains of St. Joseph, and, of course, he found them; and from the end of the XIV Century to the Dissolution, the Lady Chapel at the west of the great church, formerly called the old church, became known to the popular mind as St. Joseph's Chapel. Let them account for the strange antiquity of the legends. Avalon and Glastonbury were later forms of a mythical person in a pedigree of ancient Celtic lore. Avall and Glast were Celtic gods of the lower world, and gods of the lower world were connected with the fairy world. So the Island across the Summer Seas became to be known as the Glassy Island—the Island of the Fairies—Inys Witrwyn.

Mr. Buckle, on being asked to make a few remarks, said that after the very interesting historical discourse which Canon Holmes had given them, he was afraid that anything he had to say would be regarded as dry matter. His own opinion was that the little chapel, the ruins of which they saw, was first of all a completely detached building, and at the time it was first put up there was no contemplation of uniting it with the big building. The great church was begun at the same time, and begun at the other end. Practically, all the ruins that were

left now were almost of the same date as the chapel. Their builders were the Somerset school of masons—the same men that built the older part of Wells Cathedral; and they found here a similar change in the style of architecture as they saw at Wells. The west door, which was all that remained of the west end of the great church, was in the ordinary Early English style. Along with the west door was built the large porch which now forms the eastern half of the chapel, but which originally formed the main entrance to the great church. Later on this porch was completely changed from its original purpose; the outer door was closed and the altar was moved and placed against the west door of the great church. That was the arrangement when Worcester came to Glastonbury. The building was actually seven feet shorter than Worcester's measurements give, and there could be only one explanation of that, namely, that the screen behind the altar stood seven feet in front of the west door. But he thought that there was never a time when it was possible to look straight through one end of the building to the other. The Somerset masons, in 1184, seemed to have built that chapel in an old-fashioned manner, so as to keep up the idea of its antiquity. The same people who built that chapel also built the north porch at Wells; of that there could be no doubt. There was a peculiarity in the setting out of the building, inasmuch as the windows were set out from the inside, while the buttresses were set out from the outside, with the result that no window comes centrally between the buttresses. Referring to the crypt, Mr. Buckle remarked that some time in the XV Century it was decided to build under the chapel and form a crypt. The builders could not go down very far, with the result that the floor of the main building above was raised about eighteen or twenty feet above the original level. The vaults underneath were of a most curious character, because they were formed out of old Norman stones; the result being a Perpendicular building with Norman mouldings. About the same time they

did a very curious thing with the Early English porch, which was then thrown into the lady chapel. In order to harmonise it more with the old building, the builders took out the Early English pairs of windows, and put in single lights, to match to some extent the windows of the chapel. The whole chapel was a most curious conglomeration of features of different periods of architecture ; it had been altered again and again, until it was most difficult to trace out with any accuracy what had actually occurred there.

After the inspection of the Abbey ruins the party was photographed in group at the eastern end of the ruins, by Mr. H. St. George Gray. At the kind invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Austin, the visitors attended a Garden Party at the Abbey House, a large number of guests from Glastonbury and Wells being also present.

The Church of St. Benignus.

The Church of St. Benignus was afterwards inspected, the Vicar, the Rev. Preb. C. Grant, R.D., giving some interesting particulars of the building. He said the church, now erroneously called St. Benedict's Church, was originally built and dedicated to the memory of St. Benignus. It was recorded of him by John of Glastonbury that he came from Ireland, and spent the closing years of his life at Glastonbury ; that he died and was buried at Meare, probably about 470. In the year 1091 his remains were taken up, placed in a coffin, and carried by bearers to be buried in the great church at Glastonbury. The bearers halted at various stations on the way, and at the last resting-place an oration was delivered, setting forth the excellences of the saint. An appeal was made to the faithful, and offerings came in so liberally that a church was built upon the spot as a memorial of his piety. It was dedicated to St. Benignus by the Bishop of Bath, John de Villula, probably about 1100. William, son of John de Sancto Benigno,

was one of the witnesses of a Deed of Savaric, Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury, 1195—1206. In the year 1274, Adam le Eyr of Sowy charged 12 pence per annum upon his house in Glastonbury, to maintain a light constantly burning in the Chapel of the Blessed Benignus. Abbot Breinton died 1341, and gave to the Chapel of the Blessed Mary one other pall "rubeam" interwoven with gold, which brother John Payn, the sacristan, afterwards gave to the Church of St. Benignus. In 1540 a lease was granted to John Champernowne, of the rectory of St. John's, Glastonbury, with the tithes of Bradleigh and West Pennard, for 21 years, at £72 rent. He was to pay £10 to the chaplain of St. John, and £6 13s. 4d. for the stipend of another chaplain in the Church of St. Benignus. King Edward VI gave the rectories of St. John the Baptist and St. Benignus to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in exchange for several manors. In the Town Hall there was the original appointment of Jeffery Strode to the curacy of St. John the Baptist, by William Strode, with the Chapelries of St. Benignus and West Pennard. It bore date 1663. Richard Attwell, a great benefactor to St. John's Church, who died in 1475, bequeathed to the use of the Chapel of St. Benignus one qtr. of woad. John Cammell also, 1487, bequeathed to the fabric of the Church of St. Benignus, Glastonbury, 6s. 8d. Stephen Lane, 1495, willed that Joan, his wife, immediately after his death, should find a fit chaplain to celebrate in the Chapel of St. Benignus for the space of three years, for his soul, and the soul of John Lane, his father, and Margaret, his wife, and all the faithful deceased. Sybil Cammell, 1498, to the fabric of the Chapel of St. Benignus *unam pipam ferri.* In the Churchwardens' account books of St. John the Baptist, Glastonbury, lately published, there are several references to the church or chapel of St. Benignus. In none of the old Glastonbury records is there any mention of *St. Benedict's* to be found. Thus there was abundant evidence to show that the church was dedicated to St. Benignus, and that down to the middle of

the XVII Century it was called the Church or Chapel of St. Benignus or St. Benning's. The church was restored by Abbot Bere. He also added the north aisle. His initials, R.B., with the mitre, were over the north porch. There was a small chapel on the north side, called the Sharpham Chapel. In 1884 it was found necessary to restore again, and a new aisle was added on the south side. The small chapel on the south side of the choir was built by the Rev. W. Allnutt, as a memorial to his daughter. There were two objects of interest he would be glad if some of those present could give him some information about. They were the little window in the porch and that other object on the right hand side of the porch coming in. It was not a holy-water stoup, and he had not been able yet to ascertain what it was intended for. When the church was restored the architect of that addition was Mr. Sedding, and his idea was that it was for an alms-box. It was quite square, and it looked as though an alms-box could be made to fit it. Whether it was so he did not know. Then as, to the little window. He was told when he came to Glastonbury, some years ago, that it was for the use of lepers, when they came to receive the Holy Sacrament. It was handed to them through the little window, and they then remained outside. The work on the South side of the church was an exact imitation of that on the north. The north wall was pulled down entirely in 1885, and rebuilt from the foundations, the porch only being allowed to stand. The pillars on the north side were some of Abbot Bere's work. The roof was entirely new throughout. Some portions of the timber of the old roof were used, but very few, owing to its dilapidated condition. The lectern was made from old wood of the original church. From the time of the Reformation he believed that church was held in connection with St. John's by one vicar; also the chapel of West Pennard. It was in 1846 that the separation was made, when this and West Pennard were formed into separate ecclesiastical parishes, independent of St. John's.

When St. Benignus was formed into a separate benefice in 1846, Rev. Walter Allnutt was appointed the first Incumbent by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. He died in 1879, and was succeeded by Rev. James Augustus Miller. He held the living till his death in 1884, and was succeeded by the present Vicar, Rev. Charles Grant.

The Rev. F. W. Weaver, on behalf of the Society, thanked Mr. Grant very much for his interesting remarks, and mentioned that he was also kindly acting as their local secretary. He congratulated him on restoring to the church its ancient dedication. They had all heard of St. Benedict, but not of St. Benignus. Mr. Grant would now have to get the authorities of the town of Glastonbury to alter the name of the street from Benedict Street to Benignus Street. He congratulated him on bringing forward an obscure saint, as in some parts of England his name was not known, and it was news to many of them that his name was handed down so late as 1650 or thereabouts. Mr. Weaver then asked Mr. Buckle if he would kindly give a few particulars about the alms box and window.

Mr. Buckle said he had nothing to say about the porch, except that it was a great puzzle. He would, however, like to point out the very fine corbels which supported the roof. On one were the initials R.B. for Richard Bere. Another had the Courtney badge, which was associated with Bere in other places, and which showed that he must have had some connection with the family. On the other side they would observe Bere's coat-of-arms.

Col. Bramble said that with regard to the altar in the porch, he thought it would be almost conclusive against the leper theory, if there was anything in that theory. It could hardly be supposed that lepers could be assembled on that side, the porch forming a principal entrance to the church, and thus subject those entering to infection. It looked to him as if the window on the North of the porch altar—looking

Eastward—was made to show a light right up the road. The window was at the side of the altar in the East wall, and from its position would be useless on the theory that these windows were used to enable anyone looking through them to see the elevation of the host. With regard to the niche in the North wall of the porch on the western side of the door, he thought that it was originally a receptacle for holy water. That an alms box should have been fitted into an exterior space such as this he thought improbable. He had never seen anything like it in form, except in a church porch near Newton Abbot, and that was undoubtedly a place for a lamp.

Mr. JOHN HIGGINS, of Pylle, said there was a similar niche at Pylle Church, near Shepton Mallet.

The Rev. F. W. WEAVER agreed with Col. Bramble that it was not a lepers' window. Dr. Cox had written a paper to explode some vulgar errors about leper windows. He gave twelve theories with regard to these low side windows. He explained that lepers had their own chapels outside the towns in which they dwelt. Saint Giles was the patron saint of lepers, and they very often found a Saint Giles' Church outside the town. It was quite an exploded idea that these low side windows had anything to do with lepers. There was a curious example at Othery.

The Museum.

A visit was afterwards made to the Museum, where Mr. J. MORLAND gave an interesting account of the valuable relics that are now in safe keeping in the building. He described the Lake Village, which the members of the Society were to view on the following day, and said that the village must date from about 2,000 years ago. Iron tools were found, which must certainly have been there previous to the Roman occupation; and in their searches no Roman coins had been found. The village was built up in a shallow mere or lake, and it

rested upon the peat common to all the levels, of which there was a considerable accumulation before the village was commenced. The village was constructed partly of peat, clay, and stone. The people built upon an island, which was above the water except, possibly, in flood times. The huts were generally circular in shape, the walls being composed of daub-and-wattle work, and must have been fairly comfortable habitations. The inhabitants were by no means savages; but some puzzles existed in connection with the remains found. One puzzle was that there were remnants of primitive civilisation side by side with comparative luxury. In the Museum they had got a few of the articles which the people lost or broke during their occupation, but everything they could take away, it might be supposed, they took away. The visitors would see numerous examples of pottery; some built up by hand, others certainly turned on the wheel; much of it ornamented by a considerable amount of art, in many instances having patterns typical of the "Late-Celtic" period. The animals associated with the 'finds' were also interesting. The roe deer was there, and the beaver was still in the land, and most likely had a great deal to do with baying back the water. There were twenty-eight species of birds, ten of which were ducks. They found bones of the bittern, the coot, the puffin, the sea eagle, and the crane. More remarkable and most abundant were the bones of the pelican, a bird that had never been considered British; the nearest place now where they would find a pelican was the marshes of the Danube. The people had short-horned cattle; possibly two breeds. Horses were used for riding, remains of harness having been found. They also had pigs and sheep. The inhabitants of the village were very clever with wood-work, being able to cut out thin strips and often decorate them considerably with incised lines. There must have been some inland traffic and foreign trade during the occupation, for a ring of amber and one of jet were found. As far as they knew, the people did not weave any-

thing but wool, which they used for their clothing and fishing nets. It was not known whether the village was merely an occasional place of refuge or a permanent habitation. It seemed scarcely possible that some 200 or 300 people could live upon those five acres without cultivating land or feeding their flocks elsewhere. It rather looked as if the place was a refuge.

On the proposition of the PRESIDENT, Mr. Morland was heartily thanked for the information he had given.

Among the various articles in the Museum which attracted the interest of the visitors was the original bronze bowl, which was found in the Lake Village, and of which *facsimiles* have been made.

The Annual Dinner took place afterwards at the George Hotel, the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Evening Meeting.

A Meeting was held in the evening at the Victoria Rooms, for the reading of papers and discussion thereon. The PRESIDENT occupied the Chair, and there was a fair attendance of ladies and gentlemen.

The Rev. Prebendary DANIEL read an instructive paper on "The Churchwardens' Accounts of St. John's, Glastonbury" (see Part II).

On the proposition of the CHAIRMAN, the Rev. Prebendary Daniel was heartily thanked for his paper.

The Rev. Prebendary GRANT then read an interesting paper on "Edward Dyer of Sharpham Park" (see Part II).

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking the Rev. Prebendary Grant for his admirable paper, mentioned that he regretted he would be unable to be present at the proceedings during the two following days, on account of his having to go to London to give evidence in a law-suit.

The Rev. C. S. Taylor, F.S.A., has kindly written the following note on a subject shortly discussed at this meeting.

Somerset and Somersetshire.

It is clear that the form "Somersetshire" occurs in the Exon Domesday. It is found in at least two places; in the heading of the lands of the Bishop of Coutances, Sumersetæsyra, f. 127, and in the heading of the lands "Anglorum Teignorum," Summersetæsyra, f. 453.

So far as I can discover, the next instance of the use of the form occurs in the Peterborough Chronicle (E) f. 1122; on the night of July 25th, there was a great earthquake throughout Sumersetescire and Gleaweceastrescire. The history of this form is curious. The MS. is written in one hand to 1121, at Canterbury at any rate down to 1067, and Mr. Plumer (Two Saxon Chronicles parallel, ii xlvii—lv) thinks that it was brought to Peterborough in consequence of the fire of 1116; that then it was interpolated with the Peterborough additions, and continued as a local Chronicle. The very first annal entered at Peterborough is the one containing the form *Somersetshire*. It is clear that the recording monk, living in a district where all counties were "shires," treated Somerset as he treated Gloucestershire, and made it also into a "shire."

After that time both forms were used; though there is no doubt that Somerset was the more usual form. Much was said at Glastonbury concerning Mr. Freeman's objection to the form Somersetshire; and no doubt he did sometimes wax emphatic in his later days on the point that Somerset is not truly a "shire"; as, of course, strictly speaking, it is not. It was never carved out of a larger district, as Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire and the rest were carved out of Mercia.

It is a people's region like Sussex or Essex; but while no one has ever spoken of Sussexshire or Essexshire, men have spoken of Somersetshire for at least seven centuries; and after all we are dealing with a name and not with the thing implied by the name.

But, in fact, Mr. Freeman in this matter did not practise

what he preached. His earliest and probably his best known articles in the *Proceedings* are the two on "The Perpendicular Style as exhibited in the Churches of Somerset." But in the articles themselves the form Somersetshire occurs at least as often as Somerset; and the two forms are intermingled as though there was no difference between them.

In his little book on Wells Cathedral, published in 1870, the form Somersetshire is the prevailing one; he even writes—(p. 121)—"the Perpendicular Style was introduced into Somersetshire very early." A Somerset vicar wrote a work about one hundred and ten years ago on "The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset," which appears in Mr. Freeman's index as "Collinson's History of Somersetshire." The fact that Mr. Freeman never revised this book would seem to shew that he did not think there was much amiss with it; his precept may have been in favour of Somerset: his example certainly favours the longer form.

For myself, if we were beginning *de novo*, I should prefer Somerset, because it is the older form, and it represents the district in its true aspect, as the district of a people, and not as a shire of a larger district. But I should not vote for a change of name now. Somersetshire as a title of the district is more than seven hundred years old, and the Society has done good work under that title for more than half a century.

Still, there is a precedent for abolishing Somersetshire. I remember well when Stuckey's cheques were marked "Somersetshire Bank." I was sorry when the title went, and do not think the existing device an improvement.