

Thursday : Excursion.

The Members left Yeovil by the 9.22 train for Martock station, where carriages were in waiting to convey the party to

Martock Church.¹

Mr. FERREY said this noble Church was rightly considered to possess one of the finest naves in the county of Somerset. The proportions of the building were considerable : the tower being 24 feet square ; the nave 83 feet long, and 28 feet wide ; the chancel 53 feet long ; the north aisle 20 feet wide ; the south aisle 17 feet wide ; the total width from wall to wall, 65 feet. These figures relate to the *internal* measurements. The tower was a very fine one, being 85 feet high. The architect had brought out the buttresses and constructional details of the tower in an elegant manner into the nave. By that treatment he had contrived to make an ornamental feature, with niches on each side, and had given great effect to the tower arch. The way in which the spandrels of the nave arcade were decorated reminded one of the Norfolk and Suffolk treatment, as at Lavenham Church. When the clerestory was examined, this resemblance became more striking. The latter, with its niches, reminded one also very much of the beautiful Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Taunton. Unlike the latter example, however, the niches did not now contain

(1). An engraving of the nave will be found in vol. iii, p. 40, of the Society's *Proceedings*.

figures, although there was no doubt they originally did so. The substantial string-course under the clerestory helped to bind the piers and the other parts into one beautiful and harmonious whole. The roof of the nave was one of the noblest in the county, although there were very fine examples of carved roofs at Queen Camel and Somerton; but they were not so large or grand as this one. Turning to the chancel arch, one was almost surprised at its excessive plainness, after the rich ornamentation of the nave arcade. But there was originally a beautiful rood-screen, which was pulled down many years ago, and its remains are now scattered about in different parts of the county. So there was a reason for the simplicity of the chancel arch. As in other Churches in Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset, the rood screen was not merely confined to the chancel arch, but extended the whole width of the building. The other roofs were modern, but exact reproductions of the old ones which existed before the restoration of the Church, in 1860. There had, however, been an earlier roof to the aisles, with principals, carried on stone respond shafts. The groining of the noble south porch was of a beautiful description. The porch on the north side was built in 1860. Although the Church was mainly of the 15th century, there were traces of an earlier structure. The east wall of the chancel was evidently of the 13th century. A very peculiar feature in the east wall was an aumbry, on a level with the floor behind the altar. It was probably used for the deposit of relics or sacred vessels. Mr. Ferrey had never seen another aumbry in such a position. The pulpit was modern, being designed by Mr. Christian, the architect who carried out certain works in the Church quite recently. Mr. Christian had succeeded in working into the pulpit specimens or suggestions of the various styles of work contained in the Church; and so well has the detail been carried out, that it will be, perhaps, difficult to say in 150 or 200 years' time, that the present pulpit was not the original one. This was the idea of

the Vicar, the Rev. Prebendary Salmon. In conjunction with many other Churches of the Perpendicular style, this building was stripped of all its internal fittings some 150 or 200 years ago; consequently, there are now no mediæval screen, bench-ends, tombs, or anything inside of a decorative description left. In this respect the building presented a great contrast to some smaller Churches in Somerset, which had fittings of antiquarian interest, but the general features of which were not nearly so fine as this.

Mr. BUCKLE pointed out indications of what he thought was the line of the original roof of the 13th century. He believed there had been an Early English tower, and that the present one was built at a later period than the nave.

Mr. FERREY observed that the buttresses were older, and in passing out of the Church drew attention to the font, which was of the early Perpendicular period. He then described the tower from the exterior. Although fine, it was almost eclipsed by the grander nave. The proportions were excellent, and it was a good specimen of a Somerset tower. There were two shafts beside the western doorway, which must have originally carried figures. He had no doubt that the east window was the original one, which existed in the 13th century Church. The junctions of the label mouldings had been treated in an ornamental manner. He saw no reason why the buttresses to the east wall should not have been carried up the usual height. The whole of the Church was built of Ham Hill stone.

Mr. F. T. ELWORTHY drew attention to the staircase near the west doorway, which was a most unusual position.

The PRESIDENT pointed out an apparent distinction between the eastern and western portions of the south aisle. The battlements and other details of the western portion were quite different in style and construction to those of the eastern, and he suggested that the latter may have been originally an arm of a transept, or perhaps a Chantry Chapel, and after-

wards lengthened and altered into an aisle. The Church, at a very early period, belonged to the Norman Priory of St. Michael, and in 1226 was granted by the Abbot to Joscelin Bishop of Bath,¹ who annexed the vicarage and a portion of the tithes to the Treasurership of the Cathedral. The remainder of the tithes, subject to certain charges, was conferred by the Abbey on its daughter Priory of Otterton, Devon; and on the dissolution of alien Priories, was given by Henry V to the Abbey of Sion in Middlesex. After the general dissolution of religious houses, the impropriate rectory was granted to, or in trust for, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, whose descendants retained it down to modern times.

The Mediæval House.

The party then proceeded to a house occupied by Mr. Chubb, cooper.

Mr. CHISHOLM-BATTEN said the building the company were then inspecting, as described by Mr. Parker, in his *Domestic Architecture*, was one of the most remarkable buildings in England; because, as regarded the stone-work, it was a perfect specimen of a Manor House of the 14th century. In explaining the details of the building, Mr. Chisholm-Batten pointed out a ceiling, and also some windows, of the 15th century. Two brackets in the hall, similar to those at Tickenham Court, near Clevedon, were conjectured to be for carrying lights. It was evident that alterations had been made to the building in the 15th century; unmistakeable proof of which later work could be seen in the buttresses (always a good guide), some of which were at least a hundred years later than the original ones.

On the party reaching

Tintinhull Church,

Mr. FERREY said this was an excellent specimen of the

(1). See some extracts from ancient charters relating to this Church, in vol. xix of the Society's *Proceedings*, p. 94.

13th century, but later additions had been made to it. There was a very interesting south porch, of the 15th century; the vaulting being very remarkable in its arrangement. The tower was in an unusual position for a Somerset tower, being on the north side of the nave, instead of at the west end, and was built about 150 to 200 years since. There was a window near the pulpit which now opened into the tower, but there was no doubt that it was originally an external window of the 13th century. The roof of the nave, before the recent restoration, was a plain, plastered one. As the tower was built after the other parts of the building, it would account for the presence of some corbelling at the level of the nave roof cornice. The chancel arch was unusual in its design for a Somerset Church. It was of the Decorated period. The way in which the shafts carrying the arch had been corbelled out was very picturesque. The base of the original stone rood screen still remained, with the piscina of an altar against the west side—an arrangement not unusual in large churches, but uncommon in small ones. The architects of the 15th century had been very conservative in the manner of inserting their characteristic windows, leaving the Early English jambs and arches intact. On the south side of the chancel was a very beautiful double piscina, of the 13th century. The pulpit was a good specimen of the Jacobean date, and it was pleasing to note the sounding-board still remaining, as, unfortunately, was not the case in many other instances. The font was of the 15th century, and some carved bench-ends were of the date 1511. There were also some encaustic tiles of the 14th century.

The PRESIDENT thought it would be appropriate here to remark how desirable it was that lovers of antiquities should keep a record, however imperfect, of the objects of interest they met with in churches and old buildings. He was in this Church, in August, 1833, and made a rough drawing of three heraldic tiles on the chancel steps: on the first were the Plan-

tagenet royal arms, three lions or leopards ; on the second, a lion rampant within a bordure bezanteé ; and on the third, three chevrons, for Clare. He did not visit the church again until about a week ago, when, on looking at his notes, he found No. 2 was missing ; and he should be glad to know what had become of it. The arms were those either of Richard, King of the Romans, brother of Henry III, or, more probably, of his son Edmund, Earl of Cornwall, the chief lord of the adjoining manor of Ilchester, who married a daughter of Richard Clare, Earl of Gloucester, and died in the year 1300. The introduction of his arms here strongly confirms Mr. Ferry's account of the date of the chancel. Similar tiles were exhibited some years since by Mr. Hugo, from Glastonbury Abbey.

The Rev. J. B. HYSON, the Vicar, in reply, stated that when the Church was restored he gave special injunctions respecting the preservation of the tiles, but regretted to find, on returning from a visit, that the one in question was missing. He corroborated many of the statements made by Mr. Ferrey, and added that there was an entry in the old records of the double piscina having been repaired. The feast days of the Church fell upon the days of SS. Philip and James, and he thought the double piscina had been made in order to represent the two Apostles. The only alteration which had been made at the last restoration was the lowering of the wall which divided the nave and chancel by about one foot.

The old parish records, dating back to 1433, were exhibited, and Mr. Hyson read some extracts relating to the carving of the bench-ends, and other matters, which will be found fully dealt with in his paper on the subject in Part II, p. 68.

Some discussion took place as to the derivation of the word Tintinhull.

The Rev. Professor EARLE pointed out that the "hull" might apply to "hill" or "hall." He had formerly, before he visited the place, thought of the former, but now he in-

clined rather to the latter, namely, "hall," which seemed to be countenanced by the Domesday spelling, Tintehalle. As to the former part of the name, he imagined it might be one of those which owe their initial letter to the remnant of the preposition *at*; as, for example, Tackley, means At Oak Leigh. Supposing this to be the case, it remained to account for the two syllables—*inte*—and the only parallel he could think of was that of Inkberrow (Worcestershire), which in early deeds is written Intebergan. As Intebergan had changed to Inkberrow, so also Tintehalle, as this place is called in Domesday, has changed, in at least one durable monument, to Tyncnell; for in this shape the name appears on a brass in the Church to the memory of a rector who died in the year 1464.

Tintinhull Manor House,

the property of Viscount Arbuthnot, and in the occupation of Mr. Hallett, was next visited.

Mr. Green pointed out that a part of the building, which originally belonged to the Napper or Napier family, bore the date 1675. There were several examples of style in the house, the earliest room being Elizabethan.

The VICAR drew attention to the old

Church House,

in which the common bakings and brewings of the parish formerly took place. He believed the original walls and stone roofing existed, although somewhat modernised.

Luncheon was supplied in a barn, kindly lent by Mr. Hallett, and prettily decorated by some ladies of the village for the occasion.

On the motion of the PRESIDENT, a cordial vote of thanks was carried by acclamation to the Rev. Mr. Hyson, for the assistance he had rendered the Society, and for the valuable remarks he had made at the Church. The President said that he was specially pleased at the exertion the village authorities at Tintinhull had made to welcome the visit of the

Society. They had not been much indebted to the authorities elsewhere for any such genial reception, and this attention was therefore more gratefully acknowledged.

The Rev. J. B. HYSON, in acknowledging the compliment, said that it had afforded himself and the villagers generally much pleasure to welcome the Society to Tintinhull. The people of the village had entered heart and soul into the arrangements, and the Churchwardens had manifested great interest in the occasion.

From Tintinhull, the Members proceeded through Ilchester, to

*Limington Church.*¹

Mr. FERREY said this was a very interesting specimen of the Decorated period in the main, although later additions had been made. The tower was of the early Perpendicular style, and a representative of an unusual type of Somersetshire tower, being very plain and severe in its treatment; one of its most remarkable features, which Mr. Ferrey thought was almost unique, consisting in the small, circular windows in the bell chamber stage. These had quite a Flamboyant feeling, and this Continental style of architecture was almost contemporaneous with our Perpendicular. The north transept roof was also very unusual in its treatment, no timber being apparently used in its construction. The roof was externally formed of a series of flat coping stones, placed very near together, terminating at the top in little gablets. Stone roofs were to be found to Churches in Ireland and in Spain, but in England were very rare. Internally this transept had a stone barrel vault, with moulded ribs at intervals.² There were also windows on the east and west sides, with peculiar tracery of the Decorated period. Above the window of the north elevation was a niche, which no doubt originally contained the

(1). An engraving of this Church will be found in vol. vii of the Society's *Proceedings*.

(2). The peculiarity of this roof is noticed by Bloxam, in his little work on *Gothic Architecture*, p. 204.

image of the patron saint to which the north transept or chantry chapel was dedicated. Its north front was much more ornamentally treated than was usual in a transept. With regard to the interior, the tower arch was of the early Decorated period. The roof of the nave was quite modern. The rear arches of the nave windows were very beautiful, and of the Decorated style. The arches on either side of the chancel arch were at present mere panels, and do not, as in some other Churches, open into the chancel. Near the pulpit, on the north side of the nave, there was an arch, which no doubt originally led to the rood-loft. The chancel, as far as could be seen, was of the Perpendicular period entirely. There were also some elaborately carved bench-ends, one of which bore the arms of Bonville and Harrington, with the initials "W." and "C." interlaced—*i.e.*, William [Bonville] and Catherine [Harrington], but heretofore mistaken for "Wolsey, Cardinal."

Mr. GREEN described the effigies in the north transept: the two side by side as being of late 13th century, and the lady alone of about the year 1300. It had been stated that the other effigy was that of Sir Richard Gyvernay, who founded a chantry at Limington. The costume of this effigy was remarkably fine. The chantry was founded in the time of Edward III, but it had been suggested that the costume of the effigy was of the time of Edward II. Mr. Green was of opinion that this figure dated from about 1360.¹

The PRESIDENT made some remarks respecting the early Lords of this Manor, which are reserved for a future volume; and pointed out a mistake that was prevalent, of confusing the family of Givernay with that of Gournay of Stoke-sub-Hamdon. The late Mr. Bucker fell into this error in his *Ilchester Alms House Deeds*, and mentions this effigy as probably "that of a Gournay." The Gournays had no connection with Limington.

(1). See vol. vii for engravings of these effigies.

Mr. CHISHOLM-BATTEN made a few remarks on the connection of Cardinal Wolsey with the Church. He read the entry from the Bath and Wells Bishop's Register of the institution of the Reverend Thomas Wulcy M.A., to the Rectory of Limington, on the presentation of the Marquis of Dorset, the Queen's half-brother, in October, 1500. Mr. Chisholm Batten adverted to the story told in Collinson's account of this parish, of Wolsey being put in the stocks by Sir Amias Paulet, for getting drunk at a fair. Sir Amias Paulet was a man of great power in the west at this time. He built the present Manor House at Hinton St. George, and was much employed by King Henry VII, and appointed Steward of the Bishopric by Bishop Fox. The story was not well authenticated. Lord Dorset lived till September 20th, 1501. In November, 1501, Wolsey was of sufficient importance to obtain from Pope Alexander VI a dispensation to hold a second preferment with this rectory. (Rymer's *Fœdera*, Nov. 3rd, 1501.) Although inducted to the rectory of Limington, the speaker was of opinion that Wolsey did not, for the purpose of induction, visit the place, being inducted by proxy. Nor did he think that Wolsey ever entered into residence at Limington. He was an active resident Fellow of Magdalene College, Oxford, until 1502, when he became domestic chaplain to Archbishop Dean of Canterbury, whose obsequies he is recorded to have performed in February, 1503. He then became domestic chaplain to Sir Richard Nanfan, who held high office at Calais in 1503, and, through Sir Richard, was introduced to Bishop Fox and Sir Thomas Lovel, by whose assistance he became chaplain to King Henry VII himself.¹

Although not in the programme, a halt was, at the sug-

(1). Wolsey was Senior Bursar of Magdalene College, Oxford, when presented to Limington; elected Dean of Divinity of his College in 1500; and through Archbishop Dean's assistance, obtained the Pope's dispensation, of November, 1501. It is most improbable that an old courtier, like Sir Amias Paulet, should have inflicted an indignity of this kind upon a protégé of such powerful men at Court as the Marquis of Dorset, and Dean, the Primate and Lord Keeper.

gestion of the PRESIDENT, made at ASHINGTON, to glance at the little Church and Manor House adjoining.

Ashington Church

is a small structure, consisting of a nave, lighted by elegant Perpendicular windows, and a chancel of the early Decorated period, the sides of which are pierced with very small pointed windows, having trefoil-headed rear arches in the interiors, widely splayed. Surmounting the western end stands a bell turret of the same character, but not so elegant as that at Chilthorne, supported by a massive tabled buttress in the centre of the wall. On the floor of the chancel, within the communion rails, there was visible, until the recent restoration, an incised monumental slab, of an armed knight, which, from its peculiar characteristics, attracted the attention of antiquaries; but it is now overlaid with the tessellated pavement, and consequently no longer to be seen. Engravings of it are, however, to be found in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xc, pt. ii, p. 209, and in the *Journal of the Arch. Inst.*, vol. viii, p. 319. In the latter publication it is described as follows:—"The upper portion of the figure alone remains: it is rudely designed, but the costume is very curious. Around the margin of the slab may be traced a few letters of the inscription, so imperfect, that they are not here shown: they suffice merely to indicate that it was in old French, and that the characters used were the large uncial letters commonly found on tombs of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The curious *chapel de fer* worn over the *cervellière* of plate, does not occur in any other sepulchral portraiture hitherto noticed: the spear held in the right hand is very unusual: the *coudière* and the curved shield, by which the left shoulder is surrounded, deserve notice. The hand grasping the sword is much damaged. The arms, a bend fusily, have been supposed to be those of Raleigh, but they were borne by other Somersetshire families. There was, however, a connexion between that family and the possessors of

Ashington, about the time to which this effigy may be assigned. Sir Matthew Furneaux, lord of the manor, and sheriff of Somerset, 34th Edward I, married Maude, daughter of Sir Warine de Ralegh, of Nettlecombe. The basin-shaped helm appears not unfrequently in illuminations of that period, for example, in Roy. MS., 2 B. vii. It may be seen also in the curious subjects from the Painted Chamber (*Vet. Monum.*, vol. v. pl. 30, 32). The singular obtuse projection at the top is unusual. This part of the design on the slab is not damaged, and the blunt peak of this singular "Mambrino" head-piece seems to have been originally represented precisely as here given."

Ashington Manor House

has been sadly mutilated and reduced since 1820, when an engraving of it appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, which has been reproduced in etching, and forms the frontispiece to the present volume, as an interesting memorial of an Elizabethan mansion. The drawing is of the south front, but the whole of the eastern half of the building, including the porch gable, has been swept away, and nothing remains but the western portion, with the large, handsome bay; which, judging from the drawing, was an alteration and enlargement of the original structure. But the western front exhibits remains of a much earlier house, against which the Elizabethan front was built. It is crowded with windows; some of them of the time of Henry VII, if not before, with a narrow, flat-arched doorway, of coeval date.

After a hasty visit, the party proceeded to

Mudford Church,

which Mr. FERREY said was a good specimen of a 15th century Church. On the east side of the priest's doorway, in the south wall of the chancel, was a curious little opening, now blocked up, having bars, and which was generally called a "low-side" or "leper" window. The Church was of con-

siderable proportions, and it struck one as being remarkable that there were no aisles to it—it being rare to find an aisleless nave of such length and size. The north transept was very late Tudor, whilst the arch opening into it from the nave was of still later date. The old pews were lowered some years since. They were of the Jacobean period, as was also the pulpit. The bench-ends have been carefully preserved, and were good examples of the style. The Church of Mudford belonged to the Priory of Montacute, and bore the arms of the Courteney, Lords of one of the Mudford Manors, who, no doubt, assisted in its erection. The tower was a fine specimen of the best period of the Perpendicular. On its west wall were the remains of what was once a representation of the Crucifixion. It was somewhat unusual to see this on the western portion of a Church, but it was to be found at Yatton Church, and elsewhere.

The Hundred Stone,

where the Courts of the Hundred of Stone were formerly held, was the last place visited.¹

In modern times the Courts were only opened here in the early morning, by proclamation, and then adjourned to Yeovil. The Bailiff invariably, according to ancient custom, refreshed himself and his attendants with a bottle of generous port, the stone being also “wetted” with a glassful poured into the hollow made for receiving it, and which still remains.

The usual vote of thanks was then given to the President, on the motion of Mr. W. DAUBENY, and seconded by Mr. F. T. ELWORTHY.

The PRESIDENT acknowledged the compliment, and called on the Members to express the obligations of the Society to the Local Committee for the pains they had taken in making arrangements for the meeting.

(1). See the President's Address.

In the absence of Mr. Norman, who had performed the duties of Local Secretary, Mr. TITE returned thanks.

On the motion of the PRESIDENT, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the Hon. General Secretary, Mr. GREEN, and the proceedings then terminated.
