Second Day's Proceedings.

The second day's proceedings consisted of visits to Whitchurch, Stanton Drew, Chew Magna, Chew Stoke, and Dundry. A large party, numbering altogether nearly one hundred persons, left the Royal Hotel at 9.30 in the morning, in several conveyances, and the weather being delightfully fine, the drive proved very enjoyable.

Whitchurch.

The first stop was made at Whitchurch, where the members were received by the Rev. E. J. Franklin.

Mr. Edmund Buckle, diocesan architect, gave a description of the Church. He said that was a very good Church to start their expeditions in Somerset from, because they had there a very characteristic example of the early Somerset style—the style which started from Wells and Glastonbury, and of which they found fragments in various parts of Somerset, and which spread itself into South Wales and Ireland. He drew attention to the arches under the tower. The arch itself was not round, but pointed, built of stones left perfectly square, without any moulding on it at all. The jamb which supported the arch was also a perfectly square plain mass of masonry, except for a little piece of very delicate moulding just below the spring of the arch. This was quite an early example of transitional gothic, and it was carried out in a manner which was very local in its nature.

The small shafts not reaching down to the ground but just supporting the capital were characteristic of the style. He then explained how, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Somerset masons carried this style to Ireland, and mentioned instances in Dublin where it can be seen. The east window and the window of the south transept had retained their original tracery, which was of a rather advanced geometrical style, which they might call early decorated, and all mullions and divisions were worked in a very delicate fashion, and out of very narrow stone in all cases, and there were very delicate mouldings to be seen both inside and outside, and also the capitals were particularly to be noticed. They were on a very small scale; they had some tiny leaves upon them and they were clearly what they might call original efforts—an aiming at something which later on developed into naturalistic carving. Up to that time the Church was a cruciform church, but in the Perpendicular period they wanted to enlarge it, so they added a north aisle. They saw there the tendency which they found in so many cases to give up the cruciform shape, and to convert the Church into the form of a nave and chancel with aisles. In many cases the central towers had been taken down from the original Church, and a west tower put up instead, so as to completely change the plan of the Church. Something of that kind was very likely in the minds of the persons who added on to the Church, for they had carried the aisle straight past the central tower, taking no notice of it. They took down the gable of the original transept and ran their aisle straight through, and in order to do it they had to make the woodwork of their roof cut right across the tower arch, some distance below the point.

Lieut.-Colonel Bramble added that in this Church they had coloured glass of various degrees of badness, and among other things he had remarked particularly that they put a window with very dark glass over the pulpit in order to make it as difficult as possible for the incumbent to read his sermon.

He supposed they wanted to force him to do it from memory. It showed the importance, when stained glass was going to be put into a Church, that it should be done in conjunction with the architect, or someone who was capable of looking a little beyond the window.

The Wansdyke.

Soon after leaving Whitchurch a halt was made at the top of a hill to enable Professor LLOYD MORGAN to give a brief description of the Wansdyke. He called the attention of the party to a portion of the Wansdyke which could be seen from the summit of the hill. He described its course from Maes Knoll, on the western end of Dundry Hill, to the Wiltshire Downs, where it reached Savernake Forest, then split into two branches, and could not be traced with definiteness any further. He could not say exactly what the Wansdyke was. It was probably a boundary line. But the researches of the late General Pitt-Rivers proved that some parts of it were post-Roman in date, and Roman pottery had been found in it in the course of excavations. One curious point about the Wansdyke was that it was always much more developed on the uplands than in the valleys, where perhaps the boundary was constituted in the main by a stockade.

Stanton Drew.

The next halt was made at Stanton Drew, where the members visited the megalithic remains. Here again Professor LLOYD MORGAN acted as guide, and halting on the edge of the great circle, he drew their attention to the size of the stones, and said that a few of them were approximately in their original positions, but many of them had fallen, some had been completely buried since they fell, and their presence was only disclosed during dry seasons by the brownness of the earth, that being given as an indication. They had further been proved by working with the crowbar, as described by Mr. C. W. Dymond, C.E. The majority of the stones had

come apparently from West Harptree, on the edge of the Mendips, about four-and-a-half or five miles away. Having described the north-east circle and the avenues, he said that the circles had appeared to have been associated in some definite plan of construction, explaining how a stone known as Hackville's Quoit, and the centre of the large circle and the Cove, which was probably an old dolmen, were in a straight line. It was a question which was the older, the larger or the smaller circle. It was possible that the small circle with the very large stones was the earlier, but that was almost entirely a matter of conjecture. With regard to the stone the Professor explained how it had been curiously altered by silicified water apparently percolating through it, dissolving out some of the material and replacing it with chalcedony. The stones had the appearance of having been burnt, but the old idea that they had been fused was erroneous.

The company then adjourned to what is known as the Cove, near the Church. Here

Professor LLOYD MORGAN pointed out the two uprights and the cross piece, now lying on the ground, of the supposed dolmen. It was not, he said, certain what it was; the uprights were rather far apart, and of different levels, but possibly one had been broken off. It was difficult to understand how the cross stone was put into position with primitive appliances; possibly it was done by the use of sand, afterwards cleared away, which was a method adopted in India. He was sorry that with regard to the whole question of Stanton Drew there was so much conjecture. Mr. C. W. Dymond has published an excellent account of the megalithic remains, with plans and drawings.

Stanton Drew Church.

This Church was next visited, and the Rev. H. T. PERFECT, the vicar, gave a description of the building. He said the foundations of the Church—the Church of St.

Mary—were evidently laid within the precincts of the surrounding Druidic remains. The larger and more imposing circles, with connecting avenue, are to be found on the north-east, a smaller circle on the east, and what is generally known as the Cove on the south-west, besides two other stones further west. The oldest remaining portion of the Church is the font, the base of which seems older than the bowl, and belongs to the early Norman, if not Saxon period. There are some fragments of Norman work lately found amongst the stones of the old bell-turret, which apparently once formed part of a Norman Corbel Table. They are now placed for safety under the cap of the new bell-turret. The tower has undergone two or three considerable changes. The top was taken down as far as the bells, A.D. 1847, and in some degree lowered. That part as low down as the roof of the Church had evidently been rebuilt at a much earlier date. The date 1629 is to be seen deeply cut on one of the beams of the belfry, which perhaps indicates the period of a great alteration of the fabric. The lowest part of the tower belongs to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The porch was a much later addition; perhaps belonging to the time of Henry VII. This inside doorway (fourteenth century) of the porch no doubt at one time formed the outside doorway of the Church. The corbels under the buttresses are worthy of notice as indicating an Early English period.

The lower part of the interior of the tower has the traces behind the plaster of an early groined roof, as well as the flooring above. When the plaster was removed A.D. 1889 these traces were unmistakeable: their position has been purposely preserved in the new plastering as a guide to antiquarians. The shaft in the north-west corner is worthy of notice, as forming the support of the north-west corner of the groined roof.

The Lyde Chapel, which is of later date than the tower, must also have had originally a groined roof, as shown by its

east window. The stone bracket in the north-east corner was evidently one of the supports of the flooring of the Parvise above, which was intended as a chamber for the Priest, the window of which is still to be seen on the east outside. Originally there was a large mullioned window between this chapel and the nave, which was removed A.D. 1847.—Window now built in Churchyard Wall.

The interior of the Church has undergone much change since the fourteenth century. The entire south, west and north walls were taken down and rebuilt A.D. 1847, excepting that portion from the Lyde Chapel eastward. In this wall you see the old spiral staircase leading to the roodloft, which passed in front of the original chancel, now Mr. Coates's property. Over the upper doorway of this staircase the traces of a text in Old English blackletter were to be seen, and above that the remnant of a coloured cornice or frieze, running along under the wall-plate; but these were unfortunately destroyed too soon to be reproduced.

When the use of the old chancel was discontinued, and the present chancel substituted in its room, cannot be ascertained. The nave was evidently re-constructed about the fifteenth century, at which time the elevation of tower arches was raised; another again perhaps about 1629. How could so great a change be made in the substructure of the tower without the tower itself being almost entirely pulled down? Was it rebuilt then in the fifteenth century, or delayed for want of funds till a later period, 1629? (date in the tower) Would not this bear upon the old drawing? The south aisle and central arcade rather bear the appearance of a later date, and look like an inferior imitation of the older work. The bosses under the roof, and the date, A.D. 1629, in the belfry, rather tempt me to refer the date to the Caroline period. There are marks in the north wall of the old chancel, outside, of a window which seems to have belonged to the thirteenth century. In A.D. 1847, amongst other changes, the central

arcade was moved about three feet to the north, thus making the south aisle the broader, instead of, as before, the narrower, of the two aisles. The gallery was removed from the space under the tower, from the extreme west of the south aisle; the solid wall at the end of the arcade was converted into a proper archway; the south porch was pulled down; the pulpit and reading desk were removed to the middle of the south wall; the seats, of a most inferior character, were placed to look in every direction; the chancel was allowed to remain still unfurnished, excepting with a low altar table, and was used only at the Communion service. In A.D. 1880 the chancel was substantially restored by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In A.D. 1889 the whole Church was brought to its present condition and made more suitable for the worship of Almighty God. The registers date back to 1652, and the Communion plate to 1605. Some years ago I was interested in a supposed View of this Church, lithographed by mistake in the *British Archæological Journal*, 1877, page 298. It was one of four drawings, three of which were representations of the so-called Druidic Stones in this parish. In 1847 the greater part of this Church was rebuilt, but on its old foundations. The drawing is supposed to belong to the year 1784. One would expect, therefore, to see some resemblance between the drawing and the reality; but there is scarcely any.

Where is the tower? where the present two parallel aisles? where the pond, and the step projecting into the water? where the panel work under the east window? and how about the modern writing, or rather so much of it as has not been cut off to accommodate the framing of the picture?

The almost necessary conclusion is that it cannot be a view of the Church.

Before, however, we accept this conclusion, I ask may not the writing and the date have been added after the drawing had been made, by the person who came into possession of it?

No one would have added the inscription at the bottom without some reason.

If the possessor knew that there was no resemblance he would rather have avoided such inscription, unless he had some reason for it: he certainly would not have put himself out of the way to add it without reason.

If, however, the owner knew the drawing to be a view of the Church in olden days, and he knew, too, that in 1764 there was no resemblance between the view and the reality, he would very naturally add the inscription to prevent its being disallowed on that account. But can the want of resemblance be explained? The Churchyard walls exactly correspond. How about the pond? There *was* a large pond exactly where represented within the memory of persons still living, and which has been filled up in their time. Along the pathway which bordered that pond on two sides the parishioners used to come to church. Those pathways still exist, though closed to the public. How about the *tower* of the Church? The outside appearance of the tower shews distinctly that it had been taken down and rebuilt above the level of the porch some time after the decay of the thirteenth or fourteenth century building. The top of the tower again required to be taken down and rebuilt in 1847. This structure to have so far yielded to decay must be dated back some two or three centuries from 1847. Was this earlier than 1629? The internal structure of the south aisle, the bosses under the roof, and the date 1629 in the tower, tempt one strongly to believe that the south aisle, new chancel, and greater part of the tower belong to that time. May not the drawing have been made just before this restoration, when the tower had not yet been rebuilt? Again, in the drawing there is one gable-end with a tree apparently in front, and certain panel work beneath the window. That gable-end may be seen now: it is the old chancel, and there is the old yew tree, larger perhaps through growth, yet much the same. But where is

the panel-work? In opening a drain some ten years ago a portion of such panel-work was found immediately under the window as a stone covering the drain. I take it that the old chancel, now Mr. Coates's property, was partly rebuilt in the Georgian period, and the panel-work never replaced. The window and interior of this portion of the building bear evident traces of this period. I cannot therefore but believe that the drawing after all is a drawing of this Church, and that it represents the Church as it existed before A.D. 1629, when the Church was probably entirely reconstructed, the south aisle and new chancel added, and the tower above the level of the porch rebuilt. The inscription would seem to be, if restored, something like this: "a view from the Pond outside Stanton Drew Church."

The Rev. F. W. WEAVER, on behalf of the Society, thanked the vicar for his remarks.

Mr. BUCKLE said he did not think he had anything to add to what Mr. Perfect had already told them. He seemed to have gone very thoroughly into the history of the Church. There was, however, just one thing he would like to point out. With the exception of the windows the architecture of that Church was of the Decorated period. This was rare in Somerset, as for the most part the architecture in the county was Early English and Perpendicular. Some might wonder why the work in the Church should be called Decorated, because it was of the plainest character possible. The fact was, the bulk of the Decorated work was the plainest to be found in the country, and the name was a misleading one.

Chew Magna.

The drive was continued to the Church at Chew Magna.

Mr. BUCKLE, in describing the building, referred to the Norman doorway, and said there were various signs outside the Church if not of Norman work, of very Early English. They observed inside that the arcade on the south side was

Early English in date. This arcade ran right through the length of the Church, became finally the chancel wall, and was finished outside with a pilaster buttress. It looked to him as if the pilaster buttress, which at first sight appeared to be Norman, were really of rather later date, and they continued to be used there along with the Early English work, just in the same way as at Wells Cathedral. It was not a Church which suggested an early plan. The building to start with must have been a nave and chancel, without any intermediate tower, and without anything to suggest the cruciform shape which they generally met with. If the tower was not in the centre of the Church, it was generally on one side of the nave; whether or not that was so there, there was nothing to guide them. The bulk of the Church seemed always to have followed the present lines, and to have consisted of a rather wide nave with aisles and a chancel beyond. In the chapel at the end of the south aisle they would notice that there were two windows, one above the other, indicating that that chapel was a two-storeyed building, and on the outside a place where the wall had been filled up, where obviously a doorway had been, that doorway being at the level of the upper floor. The manor house of Chew Magna stood on the side of the Church, and they might have noticed what a long circuit the road made in approaching the house, in order, apparently, to come round the manor house at a distance which would not interfere with its pleasure grounds. That manor house had belonged to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and they were told that there was a bridge or gallery connecting his house with the Church, and that in the Church he had a private pew in an upper storey, which was approached by the gallery. In the year 1887, the last time the Society visited Bristol, they did not go southwards into Somerset, but northwards into Gloucestershire. One of the places then visited was Thornbury Church, where the Duke of Buckingham had had a similar privilege. The same arrangement

occurred at St. George's, Windsor, where the Royal Pew was in an upper floor overlooking the altar. The screen ran right across the Church from side to side, and appeared to have been made up out of fragments of the old screen, and that was why it looked so poor and thin. Mr. Buckle proceeded to explain a coat-of-arms, *a chevron between three eagles.* Those were the arms of Thomas Cornish, suffragan Bishop of Bath and Wells. These arms occurred, with slight variations, over a window in the south aisle and on the Prayer Desk.

Mr. WEAVER said he believed that the suffragan Bishop was at one time incumbent of Chew Magna Church.

Mr. BUCKLE, after mentioning that there were three fine monuments in the Church, respecting which, no doubt, Colonel Bramble would have something to say, made a few remarks concerning the tower. He said they would notice that the belfry storey was treated in a different manner to the storeys below, and there was a want of delicacy in the mouldings compared with the work lower down. The parapet was evidently not the one the designer intended. The buttresses were set some distance from the corners of the tower, but the parapet was finished with four pinnacles placed right in the angles, so that the buttresses looked unfinished and the pinnacles unsupported.

Mr. F. A. WOOD followed with some particulars of the Church. He said that 1215 was the date of the appointment of the first vicar of Chew Magna, and the Church was probably built at that time. In 1348 the vicarage was erected by the then Bishop of Bath and Wells. The registers of the Church dated from the year 1560.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE afterwards described the monuments in the Church. He first of all dealt with the monument to Sir John St. Lo and his wife. The husband was in complete plate armour, and it had the appearance of having

* Thomas Cornish, "Tinensis Episcopus," resigned Chew Magna in 1499. —*(Somerset Incumbents,* 252*).*

been restored. It had been scraped so nice and clean as to have had a good deal of the history scraped off it also. The monument probably dated from the year 1475. The lady wore a horned head-dress, with robe over a long dress fastened with a cord and tassels. Both effigies wore collars of SS—the meaning of which was doubtful, but was the Lancastrian badge, as the collar of Suns and Roses was that of the Yorkists. It was still worn by some of the chief officials, for instance by the Lord Chief Justice of England. The year 1399 was the earliest date at which it was seen. The effigy of the husband is seven feet one inch long, which is traditionally supposed to be the actual height of Sir John St. Lo. Proceeding to the monument of Sir John de Hauteville, which bore the following inscription :—"Sire Johann de Hauteville, Temp. Hen. R. III," the VICAR, the Rev. J. Galbraith, said that it was considered to date from the year 1272.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE remarked that they could be perfectly certain that the gentleman who was represented by the monument never lived in that year, for whoever he might be, if he had lived at that time he would have been in complete chain armour. This monument referred to something like the period of 1450.

The VICAR replied that that upset, then, the whole theory about it.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE added that the armour represented on the monument was of a period two hundred years later than the time of Henry III.

The VICAR contended that it was the monument of Sir John de Hauteville.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE : "Then he must have adopted the armour of two centuries after that time."

The Rev. F. W. WEAVER pointed out that tradition says that this monument came from Norton Hautevill Church, and at the time it was removed they did not know who it

was, and so they assigned it to the most distinguished man that could be remembered in the parish.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE afterwards described the monuments to Edward Baber and his wife, 1578. He said that they were of a totally different style from anything else that they had seen in the Church, and they belonged to the Renaissance of the Elizabethan date. They were heavy, cumbersome monuments, and there was nothing special to be said about them, unless they went into the history of the family, which was one of the old families who occupied a prominent position in the parish at Sutton Court, where the Stracheys now lived.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE afterwards referred to the indications of a gallery in the south porch, which was used at the service on Palm Sunday, when a procession came round to the door and sang, "Open your heads O ye gates that the King of Glory may come in." The response was "Who is this King of Glory?" and then came the reply, "The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory." Then the door opened and the procession entered the Church. He mentioned that he had seen a similar procession at Rome on Palm Sunday, and he had no doubt that one of the reasons for putting up that gallery in the porch of the Church was for that service. There were several other instances in the district, but the erection of such galleries as permanent structures appeared to be a local custom. They were frequently additions to an older porch.

Mr. BUCKLE next gave a description of the Church House, near the Church, and alluded to it as being in a remarkable state of preservation. The present building in earlier days served as a club and public house of the parish. It was there that the churchwardens brewed their ale and baked their bread, and there was a room in which entertainments were held, called "Church Ales." There was probably no charge made to admit to the entertainments, but those who went to them

were expected to contribute liberally before they went out. The contributions obtained in that way were the primary source of income for the Church, and it was, therefore, the duty of the churchwardens to brew good ale and give good entertainments. The churchwardens used to invite the people from neighbouring parishes, and the hospitality was no doubt returned. Fragments of church houses were very common, but a perfect room like the one they were now looking at was rare. There was an outside staircase leading to two large rooms. The present building, if not erected by the St. Lo family, was probably helped by them, for there was a St. Lo coat-of-arms represented in two places. Both those coats had a label of three points, which was the difference of this branch of the St. Lo family.

Chew Stoke.

The party, after luncheon, drove on to Chew Stoke, where they were hospitably entertained to tea by the Rev. R. V. S. Penfold, at the Rectory. The Church was afterwards inspected and described by Mr. Buckle. He said it had been entirely rebuilt in modern times, therefore there was nothing of any archæological interest with the exception of the two aisles, which were entirely different in character. One was very florid inside, with angels sculptured all over it, whereas the other was of excessive plainness. When the place was taken down and rebuilt, the then rector desired to have one part of the Church rebuilt as it was before, and the south aisle was so rebuilt. It happened to be a Decorated aisle of the plainest description, but when he was rebuilding the Church the rector wanted to have some decoration in it, so he decorated the other aisle to make up for the plainness of the original "Decorated" one. The arcade was interesting from the point of view of showing that the builders of the Decorated period would stop at nothing in the matter of plainness. The great point of interest was the lovely tower

with its angle spire : it was quite one of the most elegant erections in Somerset. It was on a small scale, but the acutely pointed spire, with the charming battlements around, and the figures preserved in their niches on each side of the parapet, and the nice outline of the buttresses, altogether made a very perfect picture. Only one of the figures could be identified ; that was in the niche looking out over the Church, and the figure was, as we would expect, the patron of the Church, St. Andrew. One of the altars was dedicated to Maid Uncumber, who was not a very moral sort of Saint, for wives were in the habit of petitioning her when they wanted to get rid of their husbands, and conciliated her with offerings of oats.

One of the members suggested that they were wild oats.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE, in a few remarks, humorously defended the character of Maid Uncumber. He mentioned that some years ago he was inspecting some old records at Bristol, and he found one relating to Maiden Uncumber (otherwise St. Wilgefort), who was a saint of the strictest morality. Someone wanted to make her an offer and she bolted for her life, and afterwards grew a large beard. She was consequently always represented in art as having a beard. She had an altar at St. Paul's Cathedral, in London, and St. Mary le Port, Bristol, and in Germany she was one of the most popular saints. In England there were very few dioceses which had not five or six altars dedicated to her.

Dundry.

Leaving Chew Stoke, the next halt was made at Dundry, where an extensive view can be seen from the Churchyard of the surrounding country, with Bristol in the distance. There was nothing particular to describe about the Church itself. In the Churchyard is an old cross in good preservation.

Professor LLOYD MORGAN made a few remarks on the geology of the quarries here. He said much of the stone in

the churches near had been obtained from the quarries at Dundry, which were exceedingly old. The stone had been used in the structure of Bristol Cathedral.

Mr. BUCKLE said that it was a quarry which in his opinion had had a very serious influence upon the course of architecture. As Professor Lloyd Morgan had pointed out, that stone had been used in the building of Dundry Church, as well as others.

Mr. BUCKLE drew the attention of the company to the absolute perfection of the outlines of the buttresses of the tower. The beauty of the outline showed what a perfect stone it was to build with. They all knew that Ireland was invaded from Bristol in the twelfth century, and it was from the neighbourhood of Bristol that the early settlements were made at Dublin. There was no stone there, and he believed that the Somerset masons who went over took this Dundry stone with them, the only style known in Dublin in the twelfth and thirteenth century being the Early Somerset style. In the first period in the history of Dublin oolite stone was used, in the second period Portland stone, and the modern buildings of Dublin were all built of Sandstone, which comes from the north-west portion of England. He would go further and say that not only was the stone used for buildings in Ireland brought from Dundry, but the stone for Christ Church Cathedral was worked at Dundry and exported from Bristol ready to be laid.

On the motion of Mr. TUCKETT a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Professor Lloyd Morgan for his readiness to assist the Society and for the help he had given.

The PROFESSOR briefly acknowledged the compliment.

This concluded the day's programme and the return journey was made to Bristol, which was reached about half-past seven, the excursion being pronounced a very successful one.