

Thursday's Proceedings.

On Thursday the members of the Society had a tour through the district west of Bridgwater. The party, numbering about 150, left the "Clarence Hotel" in brakes and carriages at about 10.30, and drove direct to Stogursey. A visit was first paid to

Stoke Courcy Church

which is a fine one and possesses many interesting features which were explained to the members by Mr. E. BUCKLE. He said it

was a splendid example of Norman work, the tower arches being examples of the earlier Norman period and the chancel arcades of the later. There was every indication that the very large and handsome nave was (in its general outline) of the same date as the cross arches; for the west doorway was also of Norman date and of the same character as these four central arches, and the great width of the arch across the nave clearly implied that the nave must always have been as wide as it now is. In the case of many Norman central towers the nave arch was very small and narrow, with the result that the chancel was completely shut off from the nave. Here, however, exactly the contrary was the case. They would notice that while the arches across the nave were of this great width, those across the transept were decidedly narrow, and the form of the tower above was consequently very oblong. On the outside this irregularity in the plan of the tower was decidedly conspicuous. He then pointed out the varying shapes of the arches; those across the transepts being stilted, while the chancel arch was struck from below the level of the capitals, and only the nave arch was a true semi-circle. This was the way Norman builders had of getting over the difficulty of arching spaces of different widths; they either started the arch above or below the capital. The carved capitals of the four arches were worthy of attention. They were unusual examples of great decoration, and were founded upon a reminiscence of Roman Corinthian capitals. All this work must be put down to the earlier part of the Norman period, viz., before 1100, and the font was also of this early date. Then came a great change, William de Falaise gave the church to the Benedictine Abbey of Lonley, in Normandy, and they founded an alien priory here. The choir of the church was then enlarged by the addition of the side aisles, which were examples of the work of the twelfth century. There were two fine arcades on each side of the chancel, and they were quite of the latest period of Norman work, or rather, perhaps, of transitional character. On the south side of the

chancel there was a Norman window, which, however, was not in its original position, but was moved at the time of the restoration. While the restoration was in progress, the east wall was evidently entirely taken down and rebuilt, for it was all modern. The bases of the side arcades were at a very high level. He drew attention to the extraordinary number of steps in the church leading from the nave to the chancel, and from the chancel to the altar, and remarked that the arrangement of the floor of the transept was clearly not what was intended ; it was now too high and hid the bases of the pillars. After passing from the Norman work there was nothing of interest, until the Perpendicular period. The churchwardens' accounts, dating back to the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII were of great interest, because they showed that there was about that time much work being done to the church, the materials being brought from Bristol, landed at Combrich, and carted to Stoke Courcy. Practically all the windows of the church were of the Perpendicular period. He next alluded to the peculiar position of the rood-loft door, some feet west of the tower arch, and to a curious arch near, intended as a recess for a tomb or perhaps to lead to a small chapel not now existing. The bench-ends, in the centre of the nave, were principally of the sixteenth century and of English character, but with some Flemish intermixture. The spire was an uncommon feature for a church in this district. Under the south arcade of the chancel, he pointed out a monument of Sir William Verney, of Fairfield, of the time of Henry VI, the bases of which had a series of niches all round, containing figures, and in the cornice over coats of arms of himself, his mother (Brent), and his wife (Broughton)—the coat of arms of the Verneys being three ferns, and the crest a panache of ferns. The plate was well worth looking at and was dated 1712. Collinson stated that there was a painting of Christ and the Twelve Apostles in the north aisle, and that the north aisle was dedicated to St. Erasmus. And from Mr. Weaver's

Wills it appeared that there were services of the B.V.M. and St. Anne, and that the high altar was being painted and gilded in the years 1533-1535.

The Vicar, the Rev. F. MEADE KING, in the course of a few observations, called attention to the "cable" band around the font and to a curious stone vessel supposed to be an alms box.

The company afterwards inspected the old registers of the church and the old communion plate.

From the church the party wended its way to

Stoke Courcy Castle

the only entrance to which was through the kitchen of the caretaker's house. As very few of the company knew anything of the history of the castle, Mr. BUCKLE was again requested to make a few explanatory remarks. He said he knew very little of the castle himself, but it was stated to have been fortified by one Falk de Brent in Henry III's time, and it was destroyed by Lord Bonville in the time of Henry VI. Judging from what remained the building seemed to belong to Henry III's time, or the Edwardian period. It consisted now of nothing whatever but the moat and a roughly circular wall with bases of towers at intervals. If it ever was a habitable dwelling-house there was no trace now in existence of the domestic buildings. They came in by the front entrance to the castle over a small bridge, which had evidently replaced the old drawbridge. It did not appear to him to have ever been a castle lived in by a great man to any extent, because if they looked at the small size of the enclosure they would perceive that if they had a number of troops there as well as a dwelling-house it would render the house very uncomfortable indeed. In conclusion Mr. BUCKLE alluded to the spring under an arch in the village, from which even to this day the inhabitants procured their water supply.

Stoke Courcy, or Stogursey as it is now better known, was very soon left in the rear, the party proceeding to

Dodington Manor House,

an interesting old residence now in the occupation of Mr. Alfred Berry, who had very kindly given the party permission to inspect the place, which, needless to remark, was taken full advantage of. Here again, Mr. BUCKLE's services were requisitioned. He remarked that first thing that struck them about the house was the fact that they approached it through the farm yard. At the top of the farmyard there was another small courtyard at a higher level, forming a sort of terrace, which enabled the master of the house to keep an eye on the farm. The principal feature of the inside of the house was the small but interesting hall, complete with screens and gallery in spite of its tiny size. The roof was varied to some extent from the ordinary hall roof of the fifteenth century. There was a tendency for all the beams to be cut to wavy lines. To a large extent this was due to the natural curvature of the wood, the carpenter having cut his timber from bent branches; but in other cases a wavy outline had been deliberately given to timber cut from straight logs. The panels of the roof were all of different shapes, the carpenter having worked according to the shape of the timber to hand. The windows were very curious, having Elizabethan mouldings inside and Gothic outside. The mantelpiece, which bore the date 1581, was an elaborate piece of stone work, but of the crudest possible class, and was evidently the work of some uninstructed country mason. The fireplace was very like some they found further west: there was one at Dunster of very much the same crude style of work. Others, however, were carried out in plaster and not in stone. A small arch led to the oriel, which formed a quiet room, practically distinct from the hall, a private parlour for the master of the house. The withdrawing room at the end of the hall contained some interesting plaster work, with the Dodington arms worked in

at intervals. It was of the sixteenth century, or may be a little later, but it was a distinctly rough piece of work, giving one the same idea of the country workman as the rest of the work throughout the building.

Lieut.-Col. BRAMBLE drew attention to the coat of arms over the mantelpiece of the hall, and remarked that the third coat was that of the Trivett family, which were marked on the old bridge in Bridgwater, which was to a great extent built by them.

Nether Stowey Castle.

The next move was to Nether Stowey to inspect the site of Stowey Castle, known as Castle Hill. Here the Rev. W. H. P. GRESWELL, Rector of Dodington, read a paper in which he stated that the position of Stowey Castle in former days must have been a strong one naturally, far stronger than the site of Stoke Courcy Castle. In vol. viii of the *Proceedings* of the Society, the Rev. F. Warre considered that this mound was one of a line of British earthworks held by the Dumnonii. He ranked it with Rowborough, in the parish of Broomfield, connected by beacon on Cothelstone with the earthwork on Norton Fitzwarren, commanding the Tone, and so on with the strong fortress on Castle Neroche. Castle Hill was the most northerly of them all and overlooked the Parret.

It may be instructive, therefore, to look out for any of the old features of a British earthwork existing here before the mound was occupied by a Norman stronghold.

In 1858 the Secretary of the Society announced that he had discovered the outlines of a Roman Camp on the Quantocks, not far from Ely Green, of which, however, the brief time allowed to the members for their drive, precluded a closer examination.

To the west lies the height of Danesbarrow, or Dousborough, no doubt, a Belgic fortress originally, and subsequently held by the Romans.

Just here, therefore, at the northern side of the Quantocks we get two or three distinct strongholds of very early date. It was somewhere near here that a subsidiary Roman road came over the Quantocks, and united the Vale of Taunton Dean with the mouth of the Parret and Caerleon on the Welsh coast higher up.

The exact point where this old road and trackway ascended the Quantocks is probably not far off the site of Stowey Castle. It can be traced very clearly from Cannington Park westwards, past Oakley Oak, and came up at the entrance of Ramscombe, near the chapel of Adscombe.

Thus we may possibly see the *raison d'être* in the beginning of Nether Stowey Castle—a stronghold commanding a line of communication.

It may have taken the place of Danesborough, as that was chiefly a *castra æstiva* of the Romans.

It is not recorded when the Norman stronghold arose. It would appear from Eyton (*Somerset Domesday*, vol. ii, p. 35) that *Alured de Hispania* succeeded to one portion of Stowey, *Estalweia* (in the Hundred of Williton), which was Count Harold's (Earl of Wessex) T.R.E., in Saxon times. Stowey Castle, I imagine, was this portion. The other portion belonged to Dodo de Cory, a Saxon, which I take it was Dodington, especially as I find that, in 1335, the Chapel of Dodington is described as being in the parish of Nether-Staweye, and paying 2s. to Mynchin Buckland Priory (*Som. Arch. Proceedings*, vol. x, p. 24).

Dodington does not appear in Domesday. Collinson says that Stowey belonged collectively to Ralph de Pomeri, but if we look at Eyton's comparative list and see who are the Saxon owners, Count Harold's portion, held as it was "in dominio," by Alured de Hispania, is more likely to have included the important stronghold of Stowey Castle. This is a point archæology may settle. Although Eyton is decisive enough (vol. i, p. 65) and says that Nether Stowey was the *caput* of

Alured's barony. Collinson fails, says Eyton, through not collating Domesday and the Gheld Inquisition, to find the Domesday type of Alured de Hispania's manor of Nether Stowey. I find that Collinson has copied the Palmer MSS.

Eyton says that the male line of Alured de Hispania vanished in an heiress, but the succession is not known for certain. She is called *Isabella*, and married Robert de Candos, described as a Norman, who came over with William the Conqueror.

II.—With the de Candos *régime* we come to more certain history.

From Nether Stowey, de Candos sets out upon his Welsh conquest at Caerleon, where he founds the alien priory of Gold Clive, in Monmouthshire. He died in 1120. We may picture from here the course of conquest, following the old route to Cannington parish, to the Parret, and thence to Caerleon, perhaps by boat.

This Welsh conquest from West Somerset is worth noting, as the Irish conquest from Stoke Courcy.

III.—The de Candos family ended very shortly in an heiress, Maude de Candos, wife, in 1166, of Philip de Columbers.

In King Henry II's reign (Collins *Peerage*, vol. viii, p. 36) the charter of Philip de Columbers, still extant in the Red Book of the Exchequer, shows that he held ten knight's fees, Nether Stowey being the head of the barony. Honibere was held under it, also Woolavington, Puriton, and Monksilver.

The Columbers family continued at Nether Stowey Castle for several generations, no fewer than four of them being called Philip. They formed connections with the Stawels, of Cothelstone, and the Vernais, of Fairfield, and many others.

In the Palmer MSS., I find that Fairfield was anciently held of the Castle of Stowey, and was originally part of the lordship of Honibere. In the same MSS., I find that the first Philip de Columbers, son of Maud de Candos, granted Fairfield to William Russell.

IV.—The fourth change is when Alicia de Columbers dies (17 Edw. III, 1334), and James Lord Audley, her nephew, succeeds. He is son of James Lord Audley and Joan her sister. These Audleys, or Touchets, were Norman by extraction, and a North Country family, from Boglatton, in Cheshire. The Audleys held also Heleigh Castle, in Staffordshire, and Red Castle in Shropshire.

The member of the family who is locally most interesting, who lived at Nether Stowey, was Sir James Touchet, in Henry VII's reign, who led the Cornish insurgents in 1497.

Mr. Palmer in his MSS., says that the particulars of the life of this Lord Audley deserve a book in themselves. He resided chiefly at Stowey, and at the time of the Cornish insurrection was enlarging a manor house at the place where the present Court House stands.

The same authority would appear to have been indebted to Leland, who, in his *Itinerary* (1540-1542), wrote "The Lord Audeley that rebelled in Henry the VII's time, began great foundations of stone work to the enlargement of his house, the which are yet to be seen half on perfect."

Leland says "Stowey a poor village standeth in a Botome among hilles. Here is a goodly manor place of the Lord Audleys standing exceeding pleasantly for goodly pasture and having by it a Park of redde deer and another of falow, and a fair brooke serving all the offices of the manor place." This would evidently be the present Court House.

I think somehow that both these extracts refer to the Manor House.*

(*) In vol. xxv of *Som. Arch. Proceedings* (1880) Mr. Batten, in his account of Henry VII in Somerset, gives several notices of the Insurrection, and of Lord Audley.

It is a surmise of Mr. Batten, that the names of the King's councillors, Cardinal Morton, Reginald Bray, were furnished to the Cornishmen by Lord Audley.

The petitioners marched through Devon and Taunton, and thence to Wells, where they were headed by Lord Audley, *who was building his mansion at Nether Stowey* at the time they set out.

Lord Audley was cousin of Sir Hugh Luttrell of Dunster Castle, and brother-in-law of Lord Daubeny. The battle took place at Blackheath, 17th June, 1497. The King executed Lord Audley, Flamanx, and Michael Joseph, the smith.

But why or when was the Castle dismantled? I do not think that it was because of the Cornish Insurrection, *i.e.*, before 1500, as some would suppose.

Would not Leland have mentioned the Castle if it had been standing? Why only the Manor House? Collinson thinks that it was garrisoned here for Charles I, in the Parliamentary War. I have not been able to find, as yet, any notices of the dismantling. Much of the stone at the Court appears to have been brought from the Castle Hill. Some of the stones in the arches seem too heavy for their object.*

Local traditions and names.—Old men have told me that “they beat down the Castle from Dowsboro, and then the Stowey men beat down Stoke Courcy Castle.” Stoke Courcy Castle was finally destroyed by Lord Bonville in Henry VI’s reign, for its lawlessness.

Could Stowey Castle have suffered the same fate? as local tradition connects the two together. As is usual with ancient encampments and hills, old people have told me that as children they used to be frightened at the giants under Castle Hill mound. Figures of men would appear and threaten them with their hands.

“Hack Lane” is the lane on the west of Castle Hill.

“Stow Here pat” is on the Quantocks.

“Cochley Lane” is on the south side of Castle Hill.

“Butcher’s Lane,” just under Castle Hill, on the north side. On the south side “Portrey Mead.” Perhaps something to do with the porta or portreeve, and the entrance.

(*) In Archbold’s Religious Houses the following interesting fact appears that, in 1538, John Dycensen, rector of Holford, goes down to Athelney from my master, the Lord Audley, as a messenger or commissioner about the surrender.

From the Audleys the property descends in a very mutilated condition to several proprietors. The last Audley lived here in James I’s reign. One of the families who inherited the Castle and “Red Deer Park,” and the farm of “Row-bear” was the Walkers, from 20 Henry VIII. He was a Staffordshire man. and probably obtained it through the Audleys. Of a member of this family Mr. Palmer says, “Edward Walker, third son to Edward and Barbara Tothall, was bred in the family of the Earl of Arundell, Earl Marshall of England,” and gives an account of the Walker family (1639). Related to *Bourne* family of Gotherley in beginning of eighteenth century (1730-40).

Close by was an old well, under a willow, at the turn of the road, where people used to wash their eyes. Also they fetched water thence. It was filled up within living memory, so old men say; but fifty yards nearer the mount, and near "Stakes Barton," the well has appeared again. The old man who lived at Castle Hill Cottage had a blind wife, over eighty, and she used to bathe her eyes in the water.

There is another well in the grounds of Castle Hill House, also Blind Well just to the east, all flowing north.

Down in Nether Stowey there is still "The Parks," in Mr. Govett's farm, to mark the old park, and also a "Deerleap," distinctly observable at intervals. It runs from the Court House westward, below Pinnacle Hill, and adjoins the glebe.

Just opposite is Tom Poole's farm, and the land below belongs to a Mr. Lansdown.

Yonder, on the Quantocks, are several hundred acres of "Customs," which have never paid rate or tax and on which the Stowey poor have privileges.

The parish boundaries are peculiar, just here the boundary line runs up to the cottage. The Castle stood in Nether Stowey, and, historically, Nether and Over Stowey are distinct.

Below is "Bincombe Tything" in two Hundreds, Williton and Cannington, and in two parishes, Over and Nether Stowey.

Close by was a bull-baiting arena. The Castle mound was used as a kind of amphitheatre when the local champions at fisticuffs met, the fame of whose encounters remain.

The ground plan of the Castle shows a small rectangular keep. Not many years ago the late Sir Peregrine Acland had the foundations cleared. The outside walls were six feet six inches in thickness, but the material has been constantly removed. There appeared to be an entrance on the north side, where it was supposed the church or chapel of St. Michael stood. The whole site is too small to be a residentiary castle. The Court House with the Church close by and the village Pound adjoining it, and the two parks stretching round it on

all sides, as Leland saw it, was probably always the dwelling-house of the chief family.

An error.—Camden writes “At Stowey, on the side of a hill above the church, rises a large spring which is never dry, which water, at about forty yards from its source, as it runs through the village, encrusts with stone whatever it meets with, but has no such effect at the source, nor within twenty yards of it.

Probably at Stowey in Chew Magna.

[Collinson, ii, 110, mentions this spring under Stowey in the Hundred of Chew.—Ed.]

The party next proceeded to

1400941

Quantock Lodge,

where the newly-elected president, Mr. E. J. STANLEY, M.P., most hospitably entertained them to luncheon, and some considerable time was spent in inspecting the interior of the fine mansion with its magnificent library, paintings, and statuary.

The first place visited after luncheon was

Sparton Church,

and here Mr. BUCKLE again acted as spokesman for the party. The first thing to which he drew the attention of the company was the east window, which was a specimen of quite the earliest Geometrical tracery, in fact of the very beginning of tracery of any kind. The only other fragment in the church which was of an earlier date than the Perpendicular period, was the little window facing the south entrance. That window was only half the height of the other two on that side of the church, and if they went to the outside they would see there was a clearly marked line where the character of the masonry entirely changed. At an early period the wall of the

church was only as high as the top of that little window ; and it was at a subsequent period, in the 15th or 16th century, that the walls were raised to their present height, and this window was blocked up ; but in recent times it had been opened again. Work was going on here in 1530 [*see Wells Wills*] and all else in the church was of the Perpendicular date to which the greater part of that Somersetshire architecture belonged. In that part of the country they had got out of the range of freestone. There was no proper freestone to be found in this neighbourhood, although there was a great quantity in other parts of the county. The chancel arch was built of sandstone from the Quantocks, and as sandstone did not lend itself to elaborate work, like freestone, they always found in the sandstone country work of a rougher character. In the chancel there was a rather curious little arcade with the carving carried round the bell of the cap, which was not at all usual in this county, although it was quite common farther west. The people of Spaxton did, however, think it worth while to import some freestone for the tracery of the windows, the parapets and the buttress slopes. The porch on the south side of the church, being carried to the full height of the aisle, added dignity to that side of the church. The tower was one of the rough class he was speaking of at Bridgewater, containing no freestone which it was possible to avoid. The majority of the windows of the tower were made of sandstone, and the general effect was a rugged mass carried up to a considerable height, which, however, was distinctly imposing on account of its simplicity and the excellence of its outline. Cannington was a tower of the same kind with great height, but no detail, and the tower of Stogursey, leaving out the spire, was a perfectly plain oblong mass, but with its character to some extent altered in its external appearance on account of the fact that it was plastered all over. But he took it that the towers of West Somerset were generally plastered over, and that it was a purely modern idea to show the rough sandstone.

Coming to the fittings of the church, which were perhaps in some respects the most interesting feature there, there was a great deal of oak carving. Some of the panels of the pulpit were of a distinctly English character of design, but the bench ends appeared to have been put in at a good many different times. One of the bench ends bore the date 1536. The set to which this belonged had a Renaissance character with a slightly Flemish feeling. On the other hand, some of the bench ends were clearly English, and in a very different style. Then there were others, dated 1561, which were emphatically Flemish in character. On one in the nave was a portrait of a fuller at work. This was interesting on account of the shape of a tool he was using—a mallet with two handles. The fuller was generally pictured with a large two-handed club. Here, however, he was using a heavy plank, apparently of wood, with two handles, which he lifted up and stamped down upon the cloth. At a later time when machinery was introduced, the fulling was done by means of similar mallets, but of greater weight. The purpose of fulling was to draw the cloth together, the finer class of cloth requiring more fulling than the coarse. Somerset was, of course, until comparatively recent times, one of the principal places in which cloth was made, and consequently they had indications of the power of the weavers and fullers in many Somerset churches. Another remarkable piece of oak carving was the alms box at the side of the door, which was dug out of a great chunk of oak, so as to form a box, and secured with three locks in the old-fashioned manner. One of the keys was kept by the rector, and the other two each by one of the churchwardens. There was in the chancel a monument of a knight and his lady, which appeared to belong to a period at the end of the 14th century. Outside the church there was another thing of great interest, a churchyard cross, which was remarkable, inasmuch as it had a representation of the rood on both sides—a most unusual thing.

After leaving Spaxton, the party drove to

Blackmore Manor Farm,

which was the next place visited, and the old domestic chapel and its surroundings, including some stone carving on the walls and a stone staircase, etc., were viewed with much interest. It was suggested that what is now requisitioned as a bedroom was formerly a pew for the use of the lord and lady of the manor, and was probably provided with a screen front, seating accommodation being provided below for neighbours during divine service.

An adjournment was then made to Brymore, where tea was most kindly provided by Mr. H. H. Pleydell Bouverie.

Cannington Church.

A start was afterwards made for home, but on reaching Cannington a halt was called for the purpose of inspecting the church. Mr. BUCKLE remarked that that church was something almost unique in their part of the world. The shape of the building was quite different from that which they generally found in their parish churches. In this church there was only one single slate roof, which covered the entire building—the nave, the aisles, and the chancel. There was no external sign on the roof to show where the chancel ended or the nave began. The result was a nave of great height, but without clerestory windows. There was a series of exceedingly lofty arches on each side of the nave, and above them there was nothing but bare wall, the effect thus produced being very grand indeed. The general effect of the church was in many respects foreign. They in England, and especially in the West of England, had a tendency to keep their roofs as low as possible. In any case they rarely had a church anything approaching the height of this one. There was nothing either inside or outside to divide

the chancel from the nave, except the screen across the front of the chancel. Norton-sub-Hambdon somewhat resembled that church, for the same roof covered both nave and aisles. But in Norton church there was a distinct chancel arch, and this chancel roof was a little lower than the nave roof. There was another such church at Winsford on Exmoor, but although the same roof covered both nave and aisles, it was not of any great height, as in the present instance. Here they had, without doubt, exceeding dignity inside the church, but the slate roof on the outside gave it a somewhat poor and modern appearance, but the great height of the chancel walls was very effective externally. There was a splendid large east window and a fine window on the south of the chancel. But the church was not, of course, always like this. The church they were now looking at was a late Perpendicular church, and on the tower they could see the original roof mark which indicated the height of the earlier church. They could see from that that the side walls of the old church were little more than half the height of the present ones. The tower, they would no doubt observe, was set at a very oblique angle to the rest of the building. That of course could not be produced by accident, and a very curious thing was that the present church was made at an even more oblique angle than the former building. In the vestry they would find a fragment of a Norman arcade, showing that the Norman church which occupied that site, was not in a line with the present church, but took a direction sloping more towards the north; so that on the rebuilding the pillar got left in the vestry, about two or three feet further north than the existing line of pillars. The Norman church then was not so oblique as the present one, but even then the church was not in a direct line from the tower, which was of course later than the Norman church, and must have been deliberately set at an angle with the existing church. When the old church was taken down, and the present church built, for some reason—there must have been a reason—they

deliberately shifted the church further round, and increased the divergence between the direction of the tower and of the rest of the church. There was only one suggestion he could make as to why this should have occurred. There was now a very fine building adjoining the church, with a 17th or 18th century front, occupying the site of the old Cannington nunnery, which formerly joined on to the parish church. The churchyard did not go all round the church: the nunnery occupied the whole of the adjoining land on the north side, and abutted on the east end of the church. In the year 1138, one of the de Courcy family founded a nunnery of Benedictines there, and the church was subsequently appropriated to that nunnery. The only reason by which they could account for the obliquity of the present church, was that the nunnery wanted more room for extensions, and so caused the parish church to be shifted three feet or so further to the south. In the chapel on the north side of the church they would find a collection of iron railings which had apparently belonged to a monument of the Clifford family, which previously stood in the chancel, but which he supposed was removed to make more room. They were fine specimens of the hammered iron work of probably 150 years ago. Another point about that church of unusual interest was the series of consecration crosses. If they walked round the outside of the building, they would find, starting from the west end of the south aisle, and going round towards the east, twelve such crosses. There were probably no consecration crosses on the other side, that side being practically inaccessible, and there were none on the tower, because the tower belonged to an earlier period than the church, and when the church was newly-consecrated there was no necessity to put one on the tower. The old form of consecration involved the anointing with chrism by the Bishop of twelve crosses on the walls. In the modern Roman use the crosses were marked on the inside, but in mediæval times these crosses were often on the outside. Generally speaking, the crosses were mere scrat-

ches, with little holes bored at the four corners to hold the chrism. Here, however, the crosses were formed in pieces of freestone, about 12 inches square, and they were all floriated.