

## Excursion: Wednesday.

The members of the Society met about 10 a.m., in the churchyard of

### The Abbey Church.

Mr. FREEMAN addressed the meeting from the south-east corner of the churchyard. He said that in speaking of Sherborne Minster there was really nothing new for him to say, as the whole had been thoroughly described by Mr. Petit and Professor Willis. It must, he said, strike every one at once that here is a Perpendicular church, the outline of which is rather Norman

than Perpendicular. This is the main history of the building. It is a Norman church, rebuilt and recast, so that nearly all of it has become Perpendicular. But, besides that, you see by the remains of masonry that there have been some considerable buildings to the west. It would strike any one, at the first moment, that here we have a case of the double church, at once monastic and parochial, where the problem which was always turning up, that of reconciling the claims of the monks and the people, has been solved in a rather unusual way. The changes that have taken place with respect to that matter are very curious indeed; but, before we come to that, let us look at the minster itself. You see at once that it is a cross church, not of the first rank, but of the second; and, considering that it is a Norman building and keeps its Norman proportions with very little change, the nave strikes one as remarkably short. One would not have been surprised, taking the length of the Norman eastern limb, to find the nave stretching away a considerable distance to the west; and one might be tempted to believe that this destroyed building stood on a part of the Norman nave to the west. But here is a Norman doorway in the west front; it is therefore plain that the nave did not go further, and that the building at the west was strictly an addition, and did not supplant any earlier building. You may remember that there are two names, one in the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, and another in the twelfth, which are specially connected with the place; these are Ealdhelm and the famous Roger of Salisbury. Now there is no reason to doubt that this church stands on the site of the church of Ealdhelm, which William of Malmesbury himself had seen, and which he tells us was a wonderful work. William of Malmesbury, with the new

church before him, did not altogether despise the old one, a fact which must be borne in mind. In 1122 the Abbey of Sherborne and the Priory of Horton were joined together; and then, no doubt, Ealdhelm's church was pulled down and Roger's built instead. No doubt Roger was the founder, and probably the architect, of the Norman church. I cannot doubt that the dimensions of the nave were determined by those of the original church of Ealdhelm. I see no remains of the earliest building. Here is nothing earlier than Roger's time, 1122. But bear in mind that, as it is a remarkable thing for a church of the eighth century to be standing now, it was almost as remarkable for a church of the eighth century to be standing in the twelfth. Ealdhelm's church lived through a great many periods of church building. It lived through the days of Eadgar, Cnut, the Confessor, and the Conqueror—theirs were all great church-building times—and it lived on into the reign of Henry I. Then you get the present minster. It starts afresh as an abbey at that date. Then we come to this building at the west, built no doubt late in the fourteenth century. Thereby hangs the very curious story which is to be seen in all the Histories of Sherborne. Professor Willis gives it at full length. You read that there was a dispute between the monks and the parishioners in 1436. Up to that time the nave of the minster was "the chief parish church." Those words would seem to imply that there was some other building belonging to the parish; and, according to Professor Willis, this western building called the Chapel of All-hallows had been built up at the west end of the monastic church, as a chapel belonging to the parish, though the parish still kept some right in the nave of the minster. It often happened that the constructive

nave of a minster was the parish church, while the eastern part only belonged to the monks or canons; and this is the reason why, in many cases, the eastern part of the church has gone, while the nave is still standing. If you want to see the whole thing in perfection, to see the monastic church and the parish church absolutely untouched, you can do so at Dunster. But, if you would do so, you must make haste, for Dunster is being "restored," which means being destroyed. They are going to move the high altar of the parish church from its old place, and stick it up against the eastern wall, thus destroying the whole history of the building. Sherborne Church has passed through many changes. As to the modern restoration, Professor Willis seems to have approved of it in all points but one, namely, the treatment of the south porch. In the fifteenth century they made the upper story of the porch to fit on to the aisle. They made an addition to the Norman porch, and carried a parapet round it to match that of the aisle. Then come the modern restoration people, and they find out that the Perpendicular is all very bad, and ought to be swept away; and so the perfect and harmonious design into which the fifteenth century people worked the whole building is smashed, and the porch made as it is now. That change both Mr. Petit and Professor Willis have spoken very strongly against, and I think anybody who cared for the porch would so speak. But in every other respect Professor Willis speaks well of the restoration; and when Professor Willis speaks well of a restoration, you may be sure there is not much fault to be found with it. Now we come to this Chapel of Allhallows. It appears that, after its building, the parishioners still kept some right in the nave of the minster. In 1435, or thereabouts, a great question arose between the parishioners

and the monks. The parishioners, it seems, had set up a font in the Chapel of Allhallows; this the monks looked on as a breach of their privileges; they held that all children born within the parish of Sherborne ought to be baptized in the nave of the minster. There was a quarrel also about another thing. The monks had narrowed a door which led from Allhallows into the minster. The Bishop of Salisbury was appealed to, and he came down and gave judgement, first, that the new font was to be destroyed—so far, that was in favour of the monks—but he also ordered that the door should be made the same width as before. That order does not seem to have been obeyed, for the original Norman doorway is there, much wider than the Perpendicular one which has been made within it. You can easily see what this Chapel of Allhallows was like. It was a good sized building, with a nave and aisle; a choir was not likely to be made within it till after what happened next. For the dispute between the monks and the parishioners went on, and it would seem that the parish priest was very zealous on the side of his parishioners. A secular priest, of course, would be more at enmity with the monks than any layman. This zealous priest got up on the roof of Allhallows, and shot "a fiery arrow" towards the tower; the eastern part of the church caught fire, and was burned down, and rebuilt soon after 1437. It would seem that after this the parishioners must have lost their right in the nave of the minster, and Allhallows must have become the only parish church. When the monasteries were suppressed, it often happened that the monastic church came into the hands of some one who was not bent upon destruction; sometimes he gave, and sometimes he sold, the church to the parishioners. In this case the parishioners bought the church

of the grantee, and, having got so much finer a building into their hands, they let the old Allhallows go to ruin, and took possession of the monastic church for themselves. Such then is the general history of the building. You can mark the great height of the clerestory; the original height of the Norman church can be seen by the transepts, which were not raised. The pinnacles are small, and this falls in with the general look of the building. The tower, though Perpendicular, has something about it of the air of the Norman tower which it supplanted, and whose proportions it seems on the whole to have kept. The monastic buildings lie on the north of the church.

On entering the church, Mr. FREEMAN observed that the church of Ealdhelm had utterly vanished. Of the church of Roger, he said, we have but a small portion; the whole was largely recast in the fifteenth century. But it is plain that Roger built a Norman church of the ordinary type, and put the stalls of the monks under the central tower. For we can see that the eastern and western arches were given as little projection as possible. Of these the fifteenth century people cut away the eastern arch altogether, but they left the western. If you compare the western arch with those to the north and south, you will see how much wider the one is than the other. It is not that the tower is not square; the difference is in the projection of the piers. On the north and south sides the piers have great projection, consequently the arch is much narrower; and some shift or other had to be made, in order to bring the springings and the tops of the arches of different widths to range with one another. If it had been done a generation after Roger, they would probably have made the northern and southern arches pointed, and have left the eastern and western arches, which are wider, still

round. Here the arches were brought to the same level by stiling the narrower pair. This shews that, although Roger was introducing a new style, he had not got as far as to use pointed arches. His eastern limb must have been about the same size as the present one, of three bays. In the greater churches it is commonly of four bays; Norwich, and Peterborough, and Ely all have four. Here, in a somewhat smaller church, there were three. Whether there was an apse or a square end, I cannot say. Most of the churches of that date had apses, but some had square ends, like Old Sarum. The transepts were left by the remodellers of the fifteenth century at their original height. At the east end of the transepts we might have expected to find one or more small apses, but Roger does not seem to have made them. At the eastern end of the north transept he seems to have made a square substitute for an apse. Next some thirteenth century additions were made to the church. The Lady Chapel was now added. You will understand that the procession-path ran round the high altar, as it always did. Go round behind the high altar, and you will see that it led to the Lady Chapel, which is now taken into the school buildings. In the thirteenth century another little chapel was also added on the other side of the aisle. Go there, and you will see a large piece of the outside of Roger's work; and you will see how very like it is to his work in the Castle. The addition of the chapel has now brought this outside work within the church. Besides these additions, no great change seems to have been made till after the disputes of the fifteenth century. Between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries the body of the building remained much as it was first built, though additions were made at both ends. But after the disturbance in the

fifteenth century the whole minster was rebuilt. Now I had always taken for granted that in the eastern part of the church the Norman pillars were cased by the Perpendicular builders, in somewhat the same way as at Gloucester ; and I had always fancied that the extraordinary bigness of these piers was due to their having the Norman piers within them. It struck me that a builder of the Perpendicular period would not have made his piers of that bigness, unless he was driven to do so by some special cause. It is not so at Bath or at St. Mary Redcliff. The general style of this church is very like St. Mary Redcliff. Bath is later, and more meagre. The principal difference is in the size of the pillars. I had therefore always supposed that they were the Norman pillars cased. However, Professor Willis says that it was not so. At all events, mark how the style is influenced by the great size of the piers. The great height of the clerestory comes out strongly, but not so strongly as at Christchurch. In that church, to walk from the nave into the choir is like walking into a college chapel. Then comes, somewhat later, the building of the nave. At the first respond on each side you may see a great piece of the Norman pillar. Professor Willis holds that the pillars of the nave are simply the Norman pillars cased. Above the string-course they built freely after their own plan. Everybody must admire the vaulting of the choir, of the finest fan-tracery. Now bear generally in mind the history of the church :—The choir, of course, was under the tower ; then, at one time, the parish was in possession of the western limb, which afterwards the monks got back again ; then came the rebuilding of the eastern part ; then the rebuilding of the western ; leaving only those small remains of the original church which are seen under the



tower. And also bear in mind that this minster that we stand in now came at the Dissolution into the hands of the Crown; that it was granted out, like a barn or anything else, and that it became a parish church, because the parishioners here had, as they had at Tewkesbury, the public spirit to buy it; whereas at Bath the parishioners had not the public spirit to buy the church when it was offered to them. Therefore Bath Abbey stood roofless and empty for a good many years, until Bishop Montagu bought it and set it up again. So much depended upon the character of the men into whose hands the monastic churches fell. In this case the grantee, if not disposed to give, was at least disposed to sell, and not to destroy.

After a vote of thanks to Mr. Freeman for his interesting remarks, the party spent some time in the church.

### *The Abbey Buildings*

were next visited, under the guidance of Mr. R. HERBERT CARPENTER, who first read a paper on their former and present uses, and then led the party round the buildings. The substance of the explanation, which Mr. Carpenter offered to the Society and which he has revised since the meeting, was as follows :—

The "King's School" was founded by letters patent bearing date May 13th, 1550, the fourth year of King Edward VI, and rather more than eleven years after the resignation of the Abbey by Abbot Barnstaple, (it is, however, doubtful whether the first school founded by the King was here at Sherborne, or at Bury St. Edmunds); he endowed his foundation with lands and houses belonging to the lately suppressed chantries at Martock, Ilminster, Thornton, and Lytchett Matravers, and arranged that its revenues should be administered by twenty inhabitants of

the parish of Sherborne, as a Corporation with a common seal, and to them was given the right of making statutes for the school, subject to the consent of the Bishop of Bristol for the time being.

In 1550 the first head master, Mr. Myddelton, was appointed, but it is uncertain in what buildings the school was opened, as it was not until 1554 that Sir John Horsey, of Clifton Maybank, conveyed to the Master and Brethren of S. John's House (who were *ex-officio* Governors of the King's School), the Lady Chapel, and the Chapel of S. Mary-le-Bow, together with the Abbey dormitory, Chapter-house, Prior's house, and some other buildings, in order that they might be utilized for the purposes of the new school.

It is a subject of great interest to try and determine as nearly as possible what was the original plan of these abbey buildings, some of which still remain, while others are destroyed; and after careful study of them, and by comparing them with the plans of other Benedictine Monasteries, I believe that the block plan which I have drawn as nearly as possible represents a restoration of them, for the information about Benedictine Abbeys is very meagre compared with that about Cistercian Abbeys, the plans of which can be restored with almost certainty. I must here gratefully acknowledge the very valuable notes and suggestions sent to me by the Rev. Mackenzie E. C. Walcott and Mr. E. Sharpe, by which I have been enabled in a measure to clear up not a few difficulties and to throw some light on disputed points.

The principal buildings of a Benedictine Abbey were always grouped round the cloister garth, which was as a rule on the south side of the church; at Sherborne, however, the cloister is on the north, as it is also at Canterbury,

Lincoln, St. David's, Chester, Gloucester, Buildwas, Milton Abbas, Tintern, Magdalen College, Oxford, and in some continental instances, as Pontigny.

Here, in the centre of the garth, was a fountain within the hexagonal groined structure known as "The Conduit," now standing in the town; it was also used as at Durham and Canterbury for a lavatory.

The cloister had on each side eight bays of groining, with six windows in each alley into the garth. It was of 15th century construction, built into walls of an earlier date. The south wall I consider is Norman; it forms the north wall of the north aisle of the church, and is, together with the lower part of the west wall, the porches, the tower piers, south transept, and part of the north wall of the choir aisle, the only remains of the church built by Bishop Roger; for I am unable to accept the theory advanced by Professor Willis and adopted by Mr. E. Freeman, that the Norman nave piers are cased up within the 15th century piers, my reason being that there is not sufficient height for the rise of a semicircular arch from them between the two string courses, of which portions remain in the western tower pier; the lower one is the level of the abacus, while the upper one was continuous over the tops of what must have been low small arches of greater number and placed closer together than the later 15th century piers and arches are. The north walk of the cloister abutted on a Norman substructure which was built in a line not parallel with the church, and thus resulted the irregular plan of the court. The cloisters were groined in fan groining, very similar to the western chapel of the south transept, the springing stones, wall ribs and shafts remain more or less mutilated in the south and west walls, and it will be noticed these springers and bosses are executed in soft Tisbury stone,

while the rest is in harder Ham Hill or Sherborne stone. The destruction of the cloisters probably is due to Fairfax; and I may here mention that in the contemplated new works it is our intention to rebuild the western alley.

On the east side of the cloister, and forming a continuation of the north transept, stood the dormitory of the monks. This invariably adjoined the church, for the convenience of those attending the night services; stairs being often found existing, as at Tintern, into the transept from the dormitory itself.

Under the dormitory, or projecting eastwards from it, would be the chapter-house, probably square or oblong in plan, entered from a vestibule on its west side. There would also be the parlour calefactory and monks' day room with the slype or passage to the cemetery; this slype still exists, and it is of 13th century date (its western end is now blocked up by a buttress built in 1560); over it is a portion of the dormitory with a single light window, the outside of which is modernized.

Beyond this dormitory block, eastwards, it is said the Prior's house and garden were, and there is little doubt the infirmary also, as at Canterbury, Winchester, Peterborough, Westminster, and Ely, but of it no traces exist. We find that at Canterbury the Prior lived east of the cloister near the "Green yard," and at Gloucester his lodge was on the west side; at Sherborne, owing perhaps to the parish church of All Hallows being on the west of the abbey church, the eastern side would be more convenient; at Ely the Prior's house and chapel are west of the cloister.

We now come to the consideration of the buildings on the north side of the cloisters, and here we find a large low block (now used as studies) with its north side of 15th century date; the east and south are modern; there is a fine

old chimney with panels carved with the symbols of the Evangelists, and there are two stories of two-light windows, and a very fine doorway with canopy and niches above it. This, there is no doubt, was the Abbot's lodge, and the doorway was his northern entrance; on the left of it, in the projecting octagonal block were the stairs to the upper floor (there were not originally so many windows as now), and on its roof are some fine gurgoyles like those of the Abbey church. In some instances the Abbot's lodge adjoined the church, but at Tynemouth it is north-west, and at Eastby and Castle Acre it is north of the north transept. The great chimney was that of the Abbey kitchen.

Next to the northern entrance there was (according to Hutchings), before the restoration of 1853, the original porter's doorway and hatch remaining; after passing by this, the doorway to the western alley of the cloister would be immediately opposite.

Next to the Abbot's lodge, and westward of it, is a very fine building of the 15th century date, on a substructure (before alluded to) of late Norman work. Much of this building is now modern, and is consecrated as the Chapel, and its proportions are the same as they were before (excepting the two westernmost bays, which are a more modern addition); but at least four bays and one of the low pillars of the substructure are ancient, not having been rebuilt, and the magnificent roof was simply replaced on the new walls. The windows are all modern, and formerly there must have been some building on its north side, the ancient doorway to which is carefully replaced as before on the upper level. This Norman substructure or crypt would have been used for cellars, malt house or storage. At Ely these substructures are most extensive and could not well have been used for any other than such like purposes.

Now concerning the former use of the grand hall over the crypt I can speak almost confidently, but will consider it together with the buildings on the west side of the cloister. I will here draw attention to the plan, by which it will be seen that between this building and the dormitory there is a space almost equal in length to the north alley of the cloister. Now at Chester and Gloucester the refectory occupied this position, at Westminster it was in the same relative position to the cloister, and at Ely, it is likely that, it either adjoined, or is partially included in the present deanery. I therefore am disposed to place the refectory here, supposing that it was destroyed with the dormitory for the sake of its materials, as it stood on the ground conveyed by Sir John Horsey to the school, while those buildings which now remain doubtless owe their preservation to their not having been so conveyed.

We now come to the buildings on the west side of the cloister, and here we find another fine 15th century hall, on a substructure of undoubtedly 13th century date.<sup>1</sup> This substructure was reached by a small doorway (now blocked up) from the Norman crypt before spoken of. This block was not taken down and rebuilt, but the windows were repaired and added to in number, and the present flying buttresses were added, as well as two small ones on the west side. We therefore see this building as it was—except for the removal at some period of a small adjoining block on its west side. It has a very fine roof, somewhat similar to that of the other hall; but it is curious to notice that the three northern bays are of simpler detail than the others, and may indicate the former existence of a partition. The great flight of steps to this upper hall are modern, and the only ancient stairs to it which still exist are in a circular

(1). There were before the works of 1853 some lancet windows in the north wall.

turret at its south-east angle; there is a doorway at the foot of the stairs, opening into the southern alley of the cloister, and also a doorway into a former upper storey of this cloister. The stairs are lighted by what appears to be a 13th century window.

This building has been called "Refectory," "Hospitium," "Guesten Hall," and "Domus Conversorum," so it is im-

(2). For the following extracts I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. Mackenzie Walcott, they bear upon the position in a monastery, of lay brothers, "conversi," and servants:—By the LXVI. Chapter of the Rule, "Monasterium ita debet construi ut omnia necessaria, i. s. aqua, molendinum, hortus, pistrinum vel artes diversæ intra Monasterium exerceantur." By the Council of Aix 816, rubric 23, "Servitores non ad unam mensam sed in propriis locis refectionem Fratrum reficiantur quibus eadem lectis quæ Fratribus recitata est recitetur." By rubric 29, "Novices during probation served the Guests in Cella Hospitum," and by rubric 3, "in coquina in pistrino et in ceteris artium officinis propriis manibus monachi omnes operentur." And it is recorded that Theodanar Abbot of Monte Casino told Charlemagne "Pauci aut omnino nulli istius temporis monachi student more Patrum labori aut exercitu operis," shewing the necessity of lay brothers. At Westminster the servitors dined "sub gradu servitorum" in the refectory, after the monks had dined, with the kitchener or sub-kitchenier sitting at the head of the table, or else a priest or deacon. The novices sat in hall at the two lowest tables. As regards "conversi," the chronicle of Evesham terms them "Fratres vocati conversi," and they had charge of the Manors of the Vale. At Abingdon the conversi acted as thuriblers in the choir. At Meaux in the 13th century, it is recorded that the conversi proved troublesome, and the Abbot sent them to "officio servientium custodiis porcorum animalium!" and in the 14th century "Conversi omnes de monasterio defecerunt," the monks taking their place and duties. At Canterbury the servants had their meals after the convent in Hall. At S. Gall the places of meals were the Refectory, Infirmary, Guest House, and Abbot's Lodge, the monks having one dormitory and one refectory. At Evesham, Westminster, and Bury St. Edmunds there was a long list of "Servientes qui monachis ministrare tenentur." At Rochester the servants included, the porter, two cooks, two butlers, tailors, laundrymen, &c., these were in the Bishop's gift. (Angl. Sac. I. 359). We may gather from these extracts that the conversi or lay brothers acted as delegates of the monks in their duties, that they possibly dined in the same refectory as the monks, no other being mentioned, but had their own separate dormitory as in Cistercian Monasteries. Also that the servants were a distinct class, had defined duties, and that they dined in the refectory after the monks.



portant to try to arrive at its correct designation. Referring to other Benedictine houses and to Cistercian houses, we find at Chester in the time of the Dissolution, the buildings on the west side were described as "Abbot's Hall," and "Stranger's Hall." At St. Alban's the "Abbot's Lodge," and "Guest Houses," adjoined the West Alley. At Norwich there was a door of the so-called "Guest Hall" in the West Alley. At Winchester the "Stranger's Hall" was on this side. At S. Gall there are three lines of buildings on the west side : 1. The cellarage. 2. Guest house, offices and workshops ; and 3. The servants' buildings. At Battle, on the west side is the dormitory of the "conversi;" so also at Fountains and Beaulieu.

In Cistercian Monasteries, such as Fountains, we find the "*Domus conversorum*" stood on the west side of the cloisters, and that there was on the west side of the "*Domus*" a projecting building which formed a porter's lodge and staircase ; there are the roof lines of such a building at Sherborne, but on the other hand the building here is of such grand proportions and has such fine windows and a roof of so noble a design, that it is difficult to believe that it was only a dormitory of the conversi, but, if it is not the "*Domus conversorum*," we must consider it as the "Guesten Hall," though we should have to put aside the probability and tradition that the building near the east gateway (which was sold for £10 to the town) was the Guest House and almonry, instead of being the almonry alone, as it would in that case be.

As an additional support to the first theory, the other great hall near the Abbot's Lodge being certainly neither "Guest House" nor "*Domus conversorum*," nor refectory, I should without hesitation pronounce it to be the Abbot's Hall, for there is a fine example of this hall at Battle



Abbey which is in plan singularly like Sherborne; there the Abbot's Hall, 51 ft. by 37 ft., is on a basement, together with the solar, 50 ft. by 22 ft., reached from the porch by a staircase, identical in plan to that which existed here, and adjoining these on a substructure was almost without doubt the "*Domus conversorum*;" the Guest House at Battle is a detached building and near the gateway as at Ely.

We now come to the remaining or southern alley of the cloister, which had an upper storey, reached from a doorway opening out of the circular stair turret, before described. It is possible that this was the library, though if a piscina is in its original position, it indicates a chapel over a part of it. At Westminster, Chester, Salisbury, and Wenlock there are rooms over the cloister.

There is no door from this cloister into the church, *possibly* the arched recess on the inside of the north aisle may have been one, but if so, the groining of the cloister must have been specially treated on a corbel, or otherwise the shaft would stand in the centre of the doorway; there was, before the restoration of the nave, a doorway in the west wall of the north transept; it is now blocked up, but I am inclined to think there must have been an ancient doorway there, as at Ely for instance. It will be noticed that the four-light second Pointed windows in the north aisle wall come below the levels of the groining, but these are modern, and were put in by Mr. R. C. Carpenter; one in place of an old and similar window which must have been blocked up by the upper story over the cloister; the three great buttresses too are modern additions.

There was evidence before the work of 1853, that this upper storey was as high as the adjoining building, for the cornice returned just over where the wall joined the other

at right angles; this cornice *now* runs on to the south gable, therefore it is important that this alteration should be noticed.

The ancient Early English Lady Chapel was of three bays in length, with chapels on each side of one bay, similar to the choir aisle, they were separated from the ambulatory by stone screens, parts of which remain. The fan groining of one chapel, and the western bay of the Lady Chapel, with its rich painted and gilded carving, are still perfect, but the rest has disappeared; for about eight years after Sir John Horsey conveyed this to the school, the governors converted the chapels into a head master's house, building new outer walls; the south wall is surmounted by the royal arms, below which are the arms of Bishop Jewel of Salisbury, Horsey of Clifton-Maybank, Lewaton of Lewaton, Mullins of West Hall, and Thornhill of Thornhill.<sup>3</sup>

In 1670 the school room was built, and the block of buildings next to it.

In 1835 the block of buildings known as the "Bell Buildings" was erected.

Up to 1853 these buildings, and some mean modern erections against the present vestry and north aisle of the choir, served for school purposes, but in that year the late Earl Digby presented to the King's School the block of abbey buildings which I have described, then used as silk mills. These buildings had been grievously mutilated;

(3). At one time it was in the mind of Mr. G. D. W. Digby to rebuild the lost bays of the Lady Chapel, and restore it, and its adjoining chapels, as a Morning Prayer Chapel, and plans were prepared for it by the late Mr. Slater. The house was conveyed to Mr. Digby in consideration of a sum of money which was expended in providing the new house for the head master.

floors had been inserted at the level of the wall plates, and the roofs cut through for dormer windows.

The restoration of these ancient buildings was put into the hands of my father, the late R. C. Carpenter, and about £5,000 was expended on the work. The western building became the school room, and a new outside stairs was erected to reach it, and three massive flying buttresses were then built, and the lower storey was converted into class rooms, with new windows inserted. The Abbot's hall was rebuilt, as the chapel with the crypt below it, but there was left intact the original pier and bays of groining before-mentioned, and also the ancient doorway on the north side. There were no ancient windows in the crypt, the present ones are fac-similes of those in Boxgrove Abbey.

The Abbot's Lodge was converted into studies, and, excepting the north wall, was entirely rebuilt, and the fine entrance doorway was very carefully reproduced.

With regard to the subsequent new works, there was erected a new head master's house, dormitories, day room, and library for boys, which cost about £4,500, from Mr. Slater's designs, and at the same time some alterations were made in the old "Bell Buildings," to convert them into offices for the new buildings.

In 1865 the chapel and cloisters were extended two bays towards the west, the details of the original work being reproduced.

In 1870 the new class room block was erected from the designs of Mr. Slater and myself; it forms the west side of the new quadrangle, of which the chapel, school room, and Allhallow's Church are the other sides; this building is also used for science and art purposes.

During the past year some old factory buildings were

converted into laboratories, music room, museum, and workshops; a new swimming bath has been built, and the road diverted in order to prepare for the great works to be undertaken in 1876 and onwards.

And now, after having traced back the history of the Abbey from the present time to the 11th century, and having made ourselves acquainted with its various buildings, we must feel that its history is a most exceptional one, for it was anciently a centre of learning and education, and it still remains as the great central school of the west of England, with hardly a break in the continuity of its existence; its ancient buildings even still remain and serve for a kindred purpose, as of old; its grand church, too, is as perfect as on that still observed Monday when the masons left their work complete.

From the suppressed abbeys some cathedral foundations sprung, and to them Oxford and Cambridge owe much; most of them are in ruins, but by their decay they testify to that mistaken policy of destroying instead of reforming and adapting them to the educational wants of later and more enlightened ages. That policy did not prevail at Sherborne, and for that reason we must value those buildings which join so many centuries of thought and learning to us.

Mr. PARKER disagreed with some of Mr. Carpenter's opinions, and more especially considered that he was mistaken in what he said about the *Domus Conversorum* and the Abbot's Hall. The party passed somewhat rapidly through the buildings, and little discussion took place. The Vicarage which was next visited is a pretty Perpendicular building. It has been much altered and rearranged to suit modern convenience. It once, as Mr. Parker

pointed out, contained a fine hall of the height of the whole building.

### *The Alms House,*

or the Hospital of St. John, is a building of the middle of the 15th century. The present chapel is only the chancel of the older chapel. The western part is now turned into a hall, with a dormitory above it. This hall and dormitory are together the height of the present chapel or *sacrarium*, and are divided off by a screen. This arrangement enabled the sick brethren to see the elevated host, and to join in the devotion of those who were in health without leaving their beds.

Mr. PARKER remarked that the seats in the present chapel cumbered it sadly, and were much out of place, as it was not designed for a congregation, however small, but only for the officiating priest.

Mr. DICKINSON said that in some nunneries he had seen the same arrangement, and that then the upper storey was used by the nuns.

In one of the rooms there is a powerfully painted triptych, representing three of the miracles of our Lord. It is said that it was executed by an Italian painter, resident in England, expressly for this building.

Rev. W. HUNT considered that it was earlier than the building, and put it down to some Tuscan artist of the earliest part of the 15th century. He remarked on the connexion between England and Florence during the reign of Edward III, and the effect which this connexion had in calling out a taste for the art of painting in England.

Almost exactly at one o'clock the party to the number of 150 left for the first Excursion, and made a halt first at

### Bradford Abbas Church.

MR. CARPENTER said that this church was given to the abbot of Sherborne by a Bull of Eugenius III, and that after the Dissolution the right of presentation passed to Sir John Horsey, of Clifton. In the north aisle are a piscina and a hagioscope, and in the south aisle a chantry chapel. The roof is a curious and ungraceful mass of timber, ornamented with the roses of York and Lancaster. There was a fine old stone rood-screen, which has been much tampered with of late years; the lower part only is in its original state.

MR. PARKER said that it was a strange thing that the squint commanding the high-altar was blocked up, while that which commanded the south aisle altar was still open. It was a fine church of the 15th century. The tower was especially worthy of notice. It was of a Somersetshire type, divided into four compartments. Two of the images on the western side of the tower have escaped Puritan destruction, the central image is probably the patron of the church, though it seems to have a crowned head. The churchyard cross is fine and unusually perfect. Two corbels of the north side of the chancel seem to represent a king and queen. On the south side the chantry chapel is rich and uncommon. Over the doorway is a pretty niche. The gurgoyles are grotesque and various. The font Mr. Parker observed to be raised too high, and he strongly recommended that it should be lowered.

At a distance of less than a mile from this church stands the

### Manor House of Clifton Maybank,

or Maubank. This house has been much mutilated. The remaining wing was, Mr. Parker said, built by the Horsey

family in the reign of Henry VII. An oriel window, decorated in the lower part with boldly-cut quatrefoils, adorns one of the gables.

Rev. F. BROWN said that this was the original Manor House of the Horseys, who inherited it from the Maubanks. The will of John Horsey, dated 1521, requested that the testator might be buried in the Church of *Eatminster*, and remembered there in prayer continually. His son, Sir John Horsey, obtained a grant of the Abbey Church and some of the lands of Sherborne, and sold the church to the parishioners for £320 ; he also sold some of the abbey lands to the governors of the new school. He was succeeded by a second and a third Sir John Horsey. All three were buried in the Sherborne Abbey Church. The last Sir John married one of the Howards of Bindon, and, as a second wife, Lady Dorothy Speke. He died without issue, and his property went to a distant relation, Sir Ralph Horsey of Hertfordshire. After some years the property passed to the Harveys. The whole Horsey family came to decay, and nothing certain is known of them. There are persons of the name living in Martin in Wiltshire.

Dr. GOODFORD said that there were Horseys now living in Clifton.

Rev. W. HUNT pointed out the terrace surrounding the bowling green and pleasure ground.

Mr. J. BATTEN observed that Clifton was interesting from its connexion with one of the Danish ravages in this country, recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The Danes, in the year 1001, appear to have landed on the Hampshire coast, and after several engagements in that county they went west into Devonshire, where they burned Teignton and other towns. The Chronicle then goes on

—“And they went thence to Exmouth so that they proceeded upwards in one course until they came to Pen—and there Cole the King’s high-reve and Edsai the King’s reve went against them with the forces which they were able to gather together, and they were there put to flight, and there were many slain, and the Danish-men had possession of the place of carnage. And the morning after they burned the village of Pen and at Clifton and also many goodly towns which we are unable to name and then went again east until they came to the Isle of Wight.” Another text of the Chronicle, speaking of the same battle, says:—“There was collected a vast force of the people of Devon and of the people of Somerset, and they then came together at Pen, and, so soon as they joined battle, then the people gave way, and there they [the Danes] made great slaughter, and then they rode over the land.” Gibson (in his notes to Camden) and Collinson, both erroneously, Mr. Batten thought, fix the scene of this battle at Pen near Wincanton, now called Pen-Selwood. This Pen is no doubt the “Peonna” of the battle with the Bretwallas in 658; and the later battle, in 1016, is expressly recorded to have been fought at Pen near Gillingham (which is in the immediate neighbourhood of Pen-Selwood), and these writers, he imagined, hastily concluded that the intermediate one also occurred at the same place. But, had they paid more attention to the account, they would have seen that the battle field of 1001 must have been Pen near a village of Clifton—so near that the conquerors were able to reach and burn that village the next morning in their one course eastward; and, moreover, that it must have been a place not far from the confines of Devon, as the men of that county were collected in great numbers to assist in the defence. It



might also have occurred to them that the Pen of 1016 was said to be near Gillingham to distinguish it from the Pen of 1001, which was sufficiently identified by its contiguity to Clifton. Gibson, in his edition of the Chronicle, so far rectifies the error, that in the index of places he fixes Pen as four miles distant from Clifton, but does not mention two villages of that name. Whereupon Hutchins, in his account of Clifton—having his eye towards Gillingham—states roundly, “it is a mistake it being nearly twenty,” and adds, “This looks as if there was a place of the same name near Pen, but we do not find it in any of the maps.” Now, if he had tried the converse case, and looked for Pen near Clifton, or had walked to the top of this field, and asked a native the name of the commanding hill lying about four miles south-west of him, he would have found it was *Pen Hill*; and that sheltered under it was *Pen Village*—now called *Pendomer*, from its ancient lords, the *Domeras* or *Dummers*. For these reasons Mr. Batten submitted that the battle of 1001 was fought at *Pendomer*, and not at *Penselwood*.

Dr. GOODFORD spoke of the panelled work of the Manor House, which, he said, had been carried away to Montacute, where it now forms a screen.

The church of Clifton stood outside the gate of the Manor House; it has now quite disappeared.

### *Melbury House,*

the seat of Lord Ilchester, was next visited. The party assembled in the library, a handsome room, which has lately been built in the form of a college hall, under the direction of Mr. Salvin. Here Mr. Parker first read some quotations concerning the history of the house from Leland and Coker, and one from Hutchins written by

the late Earl in 1858. From these it appeared that there was now no building left of earlier date than the 15th century.

Mr. PARKER explained the plan of the house, from a drawing prepared by Mr. Holderness, the clerk of the works. He said that the form was that of three limbs of a cross—the stem wanting. The plan seems to be unique. The lower part of the tower is square, and contains a stone staircase, with a peculiar, long, narrow window in the angle; which is scarcely seen, and yet gives light enough. The upper part of the tower is octagonal, with a lantern chamber at the top. The way in which the change from the square to the octagon is managed, and the peculiar and picturesque room with the squimches across the angles, and an original fire-place, is very ingenious and clever. Some of the offices are of the time of James I, with imitations of the original gables and bay windows. Large additions were made to the house in the reign of Queen Anna. They run parallel to the original front of the house, and are of the same length.

The house contains a fine collection of paintings by Rembrandt, Canaletti, Salvator Rosa, and Rubens; also a noteworthy picture painted by Hogarth. The replica of Queen Elizabeth's progress hangs in the dining-room.

In a slight hollow near the house is

### *Melbury Sampford Church.*

It is cruciform in shape, and of very small size. It is of the reign of Henry VIII.

Mr. PARKER said that the tower over the crossing was once open to the church as a lantern. Lord Ilchester proposes to restore this feature, and to add another bay to the nave, which is at present shorter than the choir. It is possible that the church is of a little earlier date than the

house—the material is different, and the work is rather more rude and plain. The church is full of canopied and other tombs. There is a small statue by Chantry in the chancel, and some well-cut woodwork of the Renaissance age.

The drive home was through the Blackmore Vale, and, on the way, a visit was paid to

### Helminster Church.

On the outside of the building are many consecration crosses, most of them very perfect; one is placed on the apex of the west window, which is a very unusual position. The church is perfectly unrestored. It has a handsomely-painted, but decaying wooden roof, and is full of mouldering oak pews.

Mr. PARKER pointed out traces of a very large rood loft. This loft, platform, or gallery evidently stretched over the whole of the eastern bay of the nave, and of the two side aisles. There are traces of a wooden staircase to it having wound round the north-east column of the nave, the stone of which has been cut away in places in order to fit the staircase to it. There were three altars upon this loft. One in the centre, with two windows to give it light over the chancel arch; the one at the south end had one window, and that at the north two windows. These altars at the ends were doubtless chantry altars. The central altar was probably dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. There were two other chantry altars under the rood loft. The Epistle and Gospel were often read from the loft.

The eastern compartment of the nave roof has been plastered and white-washed by the zeal of churchwardens; the walls of the little chancel have also been coloured in a fearful and wonderful manner by other hands.

The party were provided with refreshments by the kindness of the Vicar. Sherborne was reached at about seven o'clock, and a large company dined together at the Digby Hotel.

---

## The Evening Meeting

was thinly attended.

Rev. W. HUNT said that he had received a paper from Professor Buckman on the geology of the district, and, he was sorry to say that, severe indisposition prevented the writer from being with them that evening. With the sanction of the President, he begged to hand the paper to the Rev. H. Winwood, and begged him to read it, either in whole or in part.

Rev. H. WINWOOD stated the general line taken in the paper. He then took occasion to complain that too little attention was paid by the secretary in charge of the annual excursion to the interests of those who especially cared for Natural History, while everything was arranged to suit the tastes of the Archæological section. He considered that it was most lamentable that the Society should have thus been led to neglect visiting the Inferior Oolite Sands near Professor Buckman's house.

Rev. W. HUNT explained that his colleague, Mr. Malet, and himself were anxious that the Natural History section should be as prominent as that of Archæology, but the fault lay with the geologists who belonged to the Society. Last year he succeeded in getting one paper only; this year, after some trouble, he was promised two papers, but only one of these was forthcoming. He spoke of his great admiration for Professor Buckman's talents, and regretted

his absence ; and promised that if Mr. Winwood would in any way help the arrangements for the next meeting by procuring papers, or making suggestions for the excursions, every attention should be paid to his wishes.

Prof. Buckman's paper was then received, and the thanks of the Society voted to him for it.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. JOHN BATTEN read a paper on "Trent."<sup>2</sup>

Mr. G. T. CLARK said that he paid a visit to Trent Barrow with Mr. Dickinson, and that instead of a barrow they found a great hollow, and a pond in the middle of it. Had it been smaller he should have thought it artificial, but it was so gigantic that he thought that it must be natural. He hoped that when the Society visited it, as it was proposed to do to-morrow, some one would be able to decide what it was. He hoped that the President would allow an accurate plan to be made of it.

The PRESIDENT agreed to Mr. Clark's request, and said that it was a subject of great interest to him.

Mr. BATTEN felt some delicacy in speaking on so interesting a matter ; but he might be allowed to remark that there was a general belief that Trent Barrow was an old marl pit.

---