Proceedings at Meetings of the Royal Archaeological Institute.

February 5th, 1908.

Mr. Mill Stephenson, Vice-President, in the Chair.

Mr. Francis Bond, M.A., F.G.S., on behalf of the author, Mr. Albert Hartshorne, F.S.A., who was absent through illness, read a paper on “Oxford in the time of William III. and Anne.”

Votes of thanks were accorded the author and the reader of the paper.

March 4th, 1908.

Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, in the Chair.

Mr. Leonard M. May, on behalf of the author, Mr. Albert Hartshorne, F.S.A., who was absent through illness, read a paper on “Holdenley Manor, Church and House,” illustrated by plans and drawings.

Mr. May also called the attention of the meeting to the alterations which were being carried on at Long Stanton church, Cambs., in opening up the Hatton chapel, which had been blocked up for over a hundred years, thus displaying from the inside of the church three very beautiful and uncommon flamboyant windows. The President and Mr. Etherington Smith joined in the discussion, after which votes of thanks were accorded the author and the reader of the paper.
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April 1st, 1908.

Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, in the Chair.

Professor Haverfield, M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., read a paper on "Roman Inscriptions in Britain."

Mr. Reginald Smith spoke in favour of the method adopted at the British Museum for exhibiting certain of the Roman inscriptions. Till more space could be procured, the monuments found in Britain had to be placed against a wall below windows and the light was very defective. For the benefit of the public some of the inscriptions, which were not deeply cut, but of which the reading was fairly certain, had been coloured with red water-colour paint which was quite innocuous and could be easily removed if necessary. They could thus be read and recognised both by the ordinary visitor and the specialist; and the alternative to painting them was to withdraw all but the most boldly cut specimens from exhibition, for unless the lettering could be seen, in their present position they were practically meaningless, and would be occupying valuable space to no purpose. The system had been adopted years ago in other departments of the museum, and worked satisfactorily.

The President, Mr. Walters, and Mr. Stephenson also took part in the discussion, and a vote of thanks was accorded to the author of the paper.

May 6th, 1908.

Mr. Mill Stephenson, Vice-President, in the Chair.

Mr. J. W. Willis-Bund, F.S.A., read a paper on "South Wales and the Religious Orders."

Messrs. Dewick, St. John Hope, and the Chairman took part in the discussion, and a vote of thanks was accorded to the author of the paper.
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June 3rd, 1908.

Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, in the Chair.

Mr. Herbert Jones, F.S.A., on behalf of Dr. Munro, M.A., LL.D., read a paper on “The Transition between the Palaeolithic and Neolithic Civilizations of Europe.” The paper is printed in the Journal at page 205.

The President, Sir Edward Brabrook and Mr. R. Garraway Rice took part in the discussion, and a vote of thanks was accorded the author and the reader of the paper.

On the motion of Sir Edward Brabrook, seconded by Mr. Herbert Jones, it was resolved that the members of the Royal Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland desire to place on record their sense of the great loss they, and the science of archaeology, have sustained by the death of Sir John Evans, M.A., K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, etc. He had been a member of this Institute for forty-seven years, and had laboured with great learning and infinite skill in the prosecution of those researches into the arts and monuments of the early and middle ages which the Institute is formed to promote. To him more than to any other man is due the encouragement in this country of the study of prehistoric archaeology, upon which his works are the chief authorities, and there is no branch of historic archaeology which he has left untouched and unadorned.

This meeting desires that a copy of its resolution may be transmitted to Lady Evans, in testimony of the sympathy of the members with her in her irreparable loss.

July 1st, 1908.

Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, in the Chair.

Mr. Thomas Ashby, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., read a paper upon “Some Drawings with Views of Rome in the time of Gregory XIII., in the possession of C. W. Dyson Perrins, Esq.” The paper is printed in the Journal at page 245.

A discussion followed, after which a vote of thanks was accorded the author of the paper.
ANNUAL MEETING AT DURHAM.
JULY 21ST TO JULY 28TH, 1908.

President of the Meeting. The Right Hon. LORD BARNARD, D.L., D.C.L.


Secretary for the Meeting. W. H. Knowles, Esq., F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A.

PROCEEDINGS.

July 21st.—Inaugural meeting at the Town Hall. Reception by the Mayor of Durham. President's Address. Durham Cathedral, Church, described by Mr. Bilson. The Buildings of the Benedictine Monastery, described by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope. Evening Meeting: The Rev. Dr. Gee, on "Some Points in connection with the History of Durham Castle."


July 23rd.—Escombe Church, described by Mr. C. R. Peers. Auckland St. Andrew's Church, described by the Rev. J. F. Hodgson. Brancepeth Church, described by the Rev. Dr. Fowler. Evening Meeting: Mr. Bilson on "Durham and the Evolution of Gothic Architecture," illustrated by lantern slides.

July 24th.—Monkwearmouth Church, described by Mr. C. R. Peers. Hylton Castle, described by Mr. Hope. Durham Castle, described by Mr. Hodges. In the Cathedral Library, Canon Greenwell gave an address on Saxon Crosses, etc. Evening Meeting: Mr. K. C. Bayley on "Some Early Points in connection with the History of the City of Durham."

July 25th.—Gainford Church, described by Mr. Peers. Gainford Hall and Wycliffe Church, described by Mr. Peers. Eggleston Abbey described by Mr. Hope, and Barnard Castle, described by Mr. Hope.

July 27th.—Pittington Church, described by Mr. Hodges. Lumley Castle, described by Mr. Hope. Chester-le-Street Church, described by Mr. C. C. Hodges. Finchale Priory, described by Mr. Hope. Annual Business Meeting.

July 28th.—Easby. Premonstratensian Abbey of St. Agatha, described by Mr. Hope. Richmond Castle, described by Mr. Hope; the parish church, described by Mr. Peers; the site of the Grey Friars Monastery, described by Mr. Peers. Evening meeting: the plate belonging to the Corporation, University and Freemen of Durham, was shown at the Castle, and was described by Mr. Hope.
July 29th.—Extra day. Hexham Abbey, described by Canon Savage, and by Mr. Hodges. Aydon Castle, described by Mr. W. H. Knowles. Corstopitum, described by Mr. R. H. Foster and Mr. Cheesman.

Tuesday, July 21st.

After an interval of forty-three years the Institute again held its annual meeting at Durham. The difficulty of obtaining in that city sufficient lodging accommodation for the large numbers now yearly attending the meetings has been met on this occasion through the kindness of the University authorities, who were good enough to house many members in the Castle and at Bishop Hatfield’s Hall.

The meeting opened on Tuesday, July 21st, in the Town Hall, where the Mayor of Durham, Alderman Brownlees, formally welcomed the Institute to Durham. He stated that it was upwards of forty years since the city was honoured by a visit from the Institute. On that occasion they were received by the Duke of Cleveland, the noble ancestor of the president of that year’s meeting, and he graphically described the various attractions of the place. In the unavoidable absence of Lord Barnard through indisposition, the President of the Institute, Sir Henry Howorth, acknowledged, on behalf of the meeting, the hospitable and graceful words spoken by the Mayor, and assured him that the Institute had not visited in his time a place having as many attractions as that splendid city of Durham. It reminded him of the former capital of the Christian kings of Spain in their long fight against the Moors, the city of Toledo. The next thing he had to do was to tell them the real reason why they had come there. They came with the expectation that they might have as their president the man whom they looked upon as the doyen of English archaeologists, whose distinction had been won in every field of archaeology: he was a great master in the prehistoric field; he was equally a master amongst charters, the most trying of all fields archaeological: he had written admirably about the history of his county: he was a good fisherman, and a good fellow; but he had pleaded that, in view of his great age, he did not feel equal to the fatigue of the Presidential chair. It was equally a grief to them that, in the absence of Canon Greenwell, Lord Barnard, who had kindly undertaken to preside, was unfortunately unwell. He had the advantage of owning two of the most magnificent and lordly castles in the country, Raby, in that county, and Shrewsbury, the great frontier castle in Shropshire. He was also the owner of Uriconum, that wonderful Roman site which was awaiting the spade, and he had told him he was very anxious that it should be excavated scientifically under his own patronage. He only heard that morning that Lord Barnard could not be there, and he had to say a few words to them about that part of England in the presence of those who knew it far better than he did.

One of the first things that struck anyone who went over the history of the county of Durham was not only the fine things it contained, but that there were so many things it did not contain. It was most remarkable that, planted as it was between the very rich prehistoric district of Yorkshire and the similar district of Northumberland, the
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county of Durham should have so few relics of the stone and bronze ages. Remains of pagan Anglo-Saxon times were also peculiarly scarce in Durham, and only one Anglo-Saxon cemetery of the pagan time had ever been found in the county. Passing on to Christian Anglo-Saxon times a curious feature of that county was the settlements of monks and hermits which it contained. This could hardly have been the case unless the district at the time had been very thinly populated, nor could the Northumbrian kings have made over the whole region between Tyne and Tees as the special patrimony of St. Cuthbert, cutting their realm in two, but for the same reason. It was these monks and hermits, most of them Kelts, who, at their romantic home at Lindisfarne, made Northumbria at this time an offshoot of Ireland, then in the plenitude of its artistic and literary pre-eminence. From the ranks of these secluded monks sprang such famous fathers of early English culture and Christianity as Benedict Biscop, St. Cuthbert, St. Chad and the Venerable Bede. The Danes ruthlessly swept it all away, and presently the life had to start again at the spot where the peripatetic relics of St. Cuthbert found a resting place, first at Chester-le-Street and then at Durham itself. At Durham they would have an admirable guide to the cathedral and its architectural puzzles in Canon Greenwell, whose handbook is a masterpiece, and in the skilled archaeological instinct of Mr. Bilson, who on this ground would not mind being treated as a pupil of "our Canon." No problem invites more analysis than the puzzle of how this gigantic building could have been put together so quickly if the problem is to be explained in the received fashion, for we must never forget not only that Durham was a poor county, but that north-east England had been terribly ravaged by the Conqueror just before the main part of the cathedral is supposed to have been built. The town was the child of the cathedral, and together they formed a powerful frontier fortress against the Scots. The bishops, who had the real duty of guarding this part of England against invasion, became great feudal lords with exceptional jurisdiction answering to those possessed by the earls of Lancaster and of Chester, who were also planted on dangerous frontiers, and the great families in the county were their feudatories and tenants. Among these none assuredly were more famous, nor deserved to be so, than the northern branch of the Nevilles, the owners of Raby and Brancepeth, and, perhaps the most signal feat in our long wars with the Scots was the famous victory of Neville's Cross. If David had won that battle the whole course of our history would have been changed. Let it not be forgotten that one of the great changes in our domestic architecture in the fourteenth century, namely, the embattling of country houses, was largely due to the panic caused by this invasion of the Scots. When these rough times had passed away the bishops of Durham retained their great incomes and proud and pompous surroundings together with their palatine courts. They included some famous names, among which we must remember those of John Cosin, a great builder, whose hand is especially visible in the stately episcopal castle of Auckland, of Butler, the author of the *Analogy*, of Lightfoot and of Westcott. The speaker referred in conclusion to their old and distinguished friends, who were not able to be present, being prevented by ill-health or the burdens of
age, notably Judge Baylis and Mr. Fox, and he extended a warm welcome on behalf of the Institute to the distinguished French antiquary, M. Pontalis, who was attending the meeting.

Through the kindness of the City Guilds, a fine series of punch-bowls, tankards, and drinking-cups, and other articles of silver plate were displayed in the hall.

A move was next made to the cathedral church, where Mr. John Bilson described the earlier architectural history of the building with special reference to its plan and setting-out, and the early dates of its vaulting (see plan). The following is the substance of Mr. Bilson's remarks. What is known from documentary sources of the history of the building is derived chiefly from Symeon, whose history ends in 1096, and from his continuator, who finishes in 1144. The material passages may be summarized thus. Bishop William of Saint-Calais took down, in 1902, the "white church" of Aldhun, and in the following year began to build a nobler and larger church. The foundation stones were laid on August 11th, 1093. There is no record of the progress of the work when William died in 1096, but it is noted that the bishop had undertaken the erection of the church, while the monks went on with the monastic buildings, and that, when the bishop's death put an end to this agreement, the monks devoted themselves to the works of the church. When Ralph Flambard became bishop in 1099, the works had advanced as far as the nave, which, of course, does not imply that all the eastern parts were then finished. In 1104 the body of St. Cuthbert was translated to the shrine at the east end, which clearly marks the completion of the choir. Flambard proceeded with the work "modo intentius, modo remissius." When Flambard died in 1128, he had carried up the nave as far as the vault ("usque testudinem"). In the interval between Flambard's death and the accession of bishop Geoffrey Rufus in 1133, the monks finished the nave ("navis...peracta est"). Such is the evidence of the contemporary historians. It remains to fill in the rest of the story from the structure itself. To begin with the plan. The longitudinal and transverse axes are perfectly true and square, without any of those "refinements" which it has been left for modern writers to discover. The plan of the eastern termination shows three parallel apses, a great apse to the choir, and smaller apses at the ends of the aisles, finished square externally. The beginning of this plan, so far as the Norman school is concerned, is to be found in the abbey church of Bernay, founded in the first quarter of the eleventh century. It was the original plan of Jumièges, begun in 1040, and probably that of Saint-Étienne, Caen, and it still survives at Montivilliers, Cérisy-la-Forêt, Lessay, Saint-Georges-de-Boscherville, and Saint-Gabriel. In England it was probably followed at Lanfranc's Canterbury, at Lincoln, and at Ely, and it is known to have been the plan of St. Albans, Peterborough, and Selby. All the examples in Normandy have choirs of two bays in length, except Montivilliers, which has three bays. At St. Albans, Durham, and Peterborough the choir is expanded to four bays in length. Durham has eastern aisles to each arm of the transept, instead of apsidal chapels, and three towers, a lantern tower over the crossing, and two towers at the west end. In addition to the four bays of the choir, there was an oblong bay in front of the apse, and it
is to be noted that the centre-to-centre width of the choir, repeated eastward of the four choir bays, gives the springing line of the apse. The bay design of the choir is obviously inspired from the nave of Jumièges, which was finished in 1067, and the proportions of height are much more like those of Jumièges than of Saint-Étienne, Caen, and Winchester, where the arcade and triforium stages are much more nearly equal in height. The alternate system of piers, for which a Lombard origin is usually claimed, certainly receives its logical expression in the single quadripartite vault over the double bay of the Lombard churches, which, so far as is known, is not the case in any existing Norman church of early times. The double bay at Durham forms a pronounced oblong from east to west, which is also the case at San Michele, Pavia, and Jumièges, but whereas the proportion of the clear width to the width of the double bay at Jumièges is as 1 to about $1\frac{1}{2}$, at Durham it is as 1 to more than 1. Whatever may have been the first intention of the builder of the choir of Durham, it is certain that the double-bay plan does not find its logical expression in the vaults actually built, but it is equally certain that the form of the vault had been already decided when the triforium stage was reached, as is proved by the vaulting shafts set on the recessed wall-face, and by the rudimentary flying-buttresses under the roof of the triforium. The original stone vaulting of the choir threatened ruin in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, and was replaced by the existing vaulting, which was finished circa 1280. The lines of the lunettes of the original vault are still to be seen on the wall of the clerestory, and the inference from the vaults of the choir aisles is that the original vault over the choir finished in 1104 was a ribbed vault of the same type as the actual vault of the north transept. The absence of the usual wall-passage is doubtless due to the desire not to weaken the wall. The vaults of the choir aisles, which may safely be said to have been built by 1096, present the earliest known example of a ribbed vault in the Anglo-Norman school. As in the earlier unribbed groined vaults, the geometrical setting-out is controlled by the semicircular transverse arch or arcade arch, and the diagonal ribs are segments of circles, struck from centres placed much below the springing-line. The vaults of the aisles of the transept and nave and the high vaults of the north and south transepts follow the same system, which is constant, both for the earliest ribbed vaults of the Anglo-Norman school, and for the sexpartite vaults of Caen and its district. The question of the date of the Durham vaults, which was first decided from the documentary evidence by Canon Greenwell in 1881, has been the subject of much controversy during the last ten years, especially in France, but the evidence is incontrovertible. The strongest opponent of the views here expressed, M. le Comte de Lasteyrie, has argued, from the fact that at their springing over the minor piers the diagonal ribs of the choir aisles mask the springing of the outer order of the arcade arch, that the existing ribbed vaults are a later reconstruction of unribbed groined vaults with ashlar springers to the groins, as at Saint-Étienne, Caen, Winchester, etc. But he has failed to notice that this bad fitting, which does not exist at the three other angles of the bay, necessarily results from the plan of the minor pier, and that, if the diagonal rib be suppressed, there is no room for the projecting
springer of the groin which he supposes. The peculiar plan of the vaulting-shafts at the angle of the choir aisle and transept aisle, repeated nearly a century later at Lisieux, is an additional confirmation of the view that these vaults are original, and it cannot be reconciled with M. de Lasteyrie’s theory of reconstruction, which, moreover, is emphatically contradicted by the sequence of profiles (mouldings and chevrons) in the vaults of the church, and of the chapter-house which was finished by 1140. The south transept was pushed forward, on account of its being next to the cloister, a little in advance of the north transept, and the idea of vaulting (hitherto unknown for transepts in the Norman school, though usual over choirs) was abandoned, possibly from motives of caution, possibly because of the more restricted means of the convent following the death of bishop William. The clerestory of the south transept was then built with a continuous arcade for a wooden ceiling. In the north transept, however, the idea of vaulting was again taken up, and the existing vault was built during the first twenty years of the twelfth century on the supports and with the abutments originally designed for a vault on the east side, and on the corbels inserted in the west wall. This north transept vault is the earliest high-ribbed vault of the Norman school, and was probably closely followed by the high vaults of the eastern parts of Lessay, which, however, have a complete system of transverse ribs, while at Durham the transverse ribs are absent in the middle of the double bay in all the high vaults. The second change of plan and consequent construction of the existing vaults of the south transept closely followed those of the north transept, but the ribs, instead of being simply moulded, are decorated with zigzags. The same decoration commences in the diagonal ribs of the nave aisles vault westward of the eastern double bay. In the nave there is evidence of the same abandonment of the idea of vaulting, and of its later resumption. The corbels and ribs below the clerestory string are let into the wall, except in the western bay and eastern side of the next bay, where the ribs were evidently built with the walls. The nave vault, built between 1128 and 1133, presents an early example of an important innovation in setting out the rib-curves. Here the semicircular curve is employed, not for the transverse arches, as in the earlier work, but for the diagonal ribs, an advance which Viollet-le-Duc calls the only innovation of the first builders of Gothic vaults, and the transverse arches are pointed, the curves springing somewhat awkwardly from centres placed below the capitals. All the vaults have cells of rubble, plastered, whereas in the earliest ribbed vaults of the Île-de-France, which date from about 1130 or 1135, the cells are constructed from the first in worked stones in regular courses. A decisive proof that the high vaults of the choir, north transept, and nave are original is to be found in the fact that the clerestory centres with the vault, and not with the triforium, showing conclusively that the vaults were built with the clerestories. No claim is advanced here that these Durham vaults were the first ribbed vaults ever constructed. Perhaps they were not even the first of the Anglo-Norman school; but their importance lies in the facts that their chronology is precisely fixed, that they explain the subsequent development of the sexpartite vaults of Caen and its neighbourhood, and that these vaults of the Norman and
Anglo-Norman schools, with their whole structural system of abutment, triforium stories, wall-passages, and the rest, had a much more powerful influence than the works of any other school on the formation of the school of the Île-de-France.

The history of the later work in the cathedral was also described, but it is too well known to need repetition here.

M. Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, the President of the Société Française d'Archéologie, referring to the eastern aisles of the transept, said that in some recent excavations beneath the present cathedral of Orleans he had found that the church of the beginning of the twelfth century had both eastern and western aisles to its transept, as at Saint Rémi, Reims, and at Winchester and Ely. Referring to the question of the Lombard origin of the double-bay plan, he said that M. Gsell had recently discovered an example of alternating larger and smaller pillars in an early basilica in northern Africa. As to the chronology of the vaults of Durham, he entirely accepted the dates given by Canon Greenwell and Mr. Bilson, and admitted the importance of Durham in the story of the evolution which led up to the beginnings of Gothic in the Île-de-France.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope next took charge of the party for an examination of the monastic buildings. The earliest portions of these have been assigned, on somewhat uncertain evidence, to Bishop Walcher, between 1072 and 1080. But the introduction of the Benedictine monks was actually due to Bishop William in 1083, and to that date belong apparently the remains of the first dormitory subvault in the basement of the present deanery. The frater on the south side of the cloister is recorded to have been built by the monks between 1088 and 1091, but only its vaulted cellarage now remains. Recent excavations in connexion with the site of the destroyed laver, or conduit, opposite the frater door, had disclosed the fact that the Norman lavatory had been built in the angle of a smaller cloister than the present, and Mr. Hope showed that if the square of this were set out, the site of Aldhun's "white church," supposing that followed the type of the Dover church, could be pretty closely located. Its nave would then have stood parallel and side by side with the present south aisle, and an existing difference in the levels of the plinths on the western side of the south transept occurs exactly at a point where the large corner turret could have been built up to the older church. The transepts and presbytery of Aldhun's church could easily have continued in use while the presbytery and choir and much of the transepts of the new church begun in 1093 were built up round them. The architectural remains of the Norman lavatory pointed to a continuation of the first cloister until its enlargement by Bishop Pudsey. Mr. Hope dealt at length with the architectural history of the later buildings, and at various points during the perambulation of them read extracts from the famous "Rites" of the quaintly-worded descriptions of the uses to which they were put, as recorded after the Suppression by a former inmate of the monastery. Mr. Hope subsequently conducted a large section of the party round the cathedral church, and explained the ancient arrangements, the nature of which had also been fortunately laid down in "Rites."

At the evening meeting the Rev. Dr. Gee read a paper on "Some
points in connexion with the History of Durham Castle." This paper is here printed in extenso.

It may be well to ask at the outset why a castle was built at Durham: it is common knowledge that the history of this peninsula is quite modern when compared with the record of Ripon or of York. There is absolutely no trace of any occupation of this river-girdled position before the year A.D. 995. In that year, Uchtred, earl of Northumbria, if I rightly read the later legends, persuaded the congregation of St. Cuthbert to make this impregnable site the final resting place of the body of the saint. He saw clearly enough the magnificent asset that the precious relics would be in the pacification of this part of Northumbria, and he was fully alive to the wonderful natural fortification of Durham. And so St. Cuthbert came to Durham as the most secure position between the Tyne and the Tees. Thus Durham history began, and though walls and defences were raised, no castle was built, despite more than one siege in the restless eleventh century. Then came the Norman Conquest, and, in the fluctuation that followed, the congregation of St. Cuthbert took the wrong side. The Conqueror laid a tyrannous hand upon Durham. The English bishop was deprived, and in 1071, a foreigner was promoted in the person of Walcher. It can scarcely be supposed that the inhabitants of Northumbria were ready to acquiesce in the ruler of the Conqueror or to receive the prelate whom he sent, and, indeed, it is probable that the men of Durham would have extruded the bishop as they had extruded the Norman earl, sent to hold the district in 1069. But Waltheof, an Englishman, was promoted by William, in 1072, to be earl of Northumbria. It is directly to the friendship which sprang up between the bishop and the earl that we owe the erection of the castle. Waltheof built it in 1072 for Walcher. The whole region north of the Humber seethed at the moment with discord and rebellion, and William had harried the whole district. The Northumbrians were ready to rise at the first opportunity, and to shake off the Norman yoke. It would be difficult to conceive a more dangerous position for the bishop, suddenly placed in the midst of men who could and would fight, and were violently nationalist. He owed safety and what success he had in the nine troubled years of his episcopate to Waltheof, the earl who built, and probably garrisoned for him this great fortress in which, as Symeon, the Durham historian, tells us, "he might keep himself and his train safe from invaders." Walcher was safe so long as he kept to the castle, but he lost his life at Gateshead, in 1080, in a sudden tumult which his unpopularity seems to have provoked. His murderers rushed at once to pull down his castle, but a four days' siege only showed them how useless their efforts were. From the reign of William I. to the end of the reign of William IV., the castle continued to be the residence of the bishop of Durham. We can only conjecture the general plan of Walcher's castle, and I must content myself at present by saying that we still have the undoubted chapel of 1072, and certain other fragments of that date as well.

The castle arose as a necessary citadel for the bishop in troublous times, and for fully four hundred years it continued to be a strong military fortress. We have seen how it stood its first siege, in 1080, and resisted
its assailants. It was again attacked in 1087, and safely withstood the attempt. It watched the cathedral being built, and, in or about 1120, itself received some final touches from Flambard, who finished the nave. Then came the desperate anarchy of Stephen's reign, when the whole countryside was again drenched in blood. Stephen on the one side tried to force back the intruding Scots, who were seeking to annex Northumbria. On the other side the Scots, fully alive to the importance of Durham as a stronghold, were able to place a bishop in the castle who actually held the fortress for two years and only surrendered when his communications were cut and he himself was virtually starved into submission. We are fortunate enough to possess a curious Latin poem which gives a contemporary description of the miseries of this usurpation and, what is more to the point, presents us with a description of the castle itself. All investigation into the early character of the buildings must begin with this poem of Laurence, afterwards prior of Durham. I may be permitted perhaps to give a translated specimen of what he has to say about the castle. After a general account of the peninsula, with its encircling wall and its three gates, its lofty position, its impregnable character and its precipitous river-banks, Laurence expends all the resources of his vocabulary in painting a word-picture of the castle itself as he knew it, and as he loved it.

Upon the motte the keep sits like a queen;
With threatening aspect reckons all her own.
Grim from the gate below, straight up the mound,
A wall makes for this donjon's pleasant site.
Whilst to the upper air the keep ascends,
Massive within, without in brave array.
Within, a base three cubits thick doth rise,
A base compact of solid earth beat hard;
Above this looms the fortress higher still
Conspicuous and comely in its show,
'Tis seen to rest on twice two pillars here,
Each firm-knit angle boasts a pillar too,
Whilst at the sides connecting walls unite,
Then from the building to the battlement,
A stair gives easy access by its steps,
And thus arriving at the top the way
Gives frequent access to the summit there.
The keep itself presents a rounded form:
Position, art, conspire to give it grace.
Hence to the castle downward looks a bridge
Affording quick return both up and down,
Wide as it is descending to the base
With narrow steps not headlong in its flight.
Beside it from the keep a wall runs down
And turns its face toward the setting sun,
Then bending back right up the air-swept bank
Comprises in its course an area large,
Until at last it feels the northern blast,
Strong as before, and gains the keep once more.
The space surrounded by this lofty wall
By no means void, of buildings holds a store;
Two mighty palaces with many a vault beneath,
Attest the skill of their artificers.
Here too there gleams on columns six upreared
The chapel not too large but beautiful.
Here room joins room, and house joins house
For everything and everyone its use.
Here vestments, sacred vessels, polished arms
Arrest the eye. Here money, meat, and bread
Are stored—fruit, wine and beer, whilst purest flour
Has its own place. And yet in all the array
Of clustered buildings none is idle here.
The castle's inner court unoccupied
Contains a well of water always full.

* * * * *
There is a gate of lofty height so strong
That few, nay women weak, could hold it safe.
In front a bridge is laid across a moat
And stretches widely to the other side.
Till safely flanked with walls it meets the green
Where joyous youth so often held its sports.
The castle wall wards off the northern blast
So does the keep upon the lofty mound;
Another wall runs from the keep full south
Protracted to the church's eastern bound.

Such was the castle in the reign of Stephen; but a great disaster befell it about 1155, when fire, which has always been the most formidable foe to Durham, wrought irrevocable havoc upon the stately buildings. It was fortunate that the princely Pudsey was bishop then. He built anew the Norman hall and the constable's gallery above it, and gave us that beautiful doorway which led into his hall. Pudsey's buildings have been the pride and the despair of succeeding generations—their pride, because of stately magnificence, their despair because of structural defects which have proved a constant expense and difficulty, not least in our own days.

A century passed. Henry III. and Edward I. were successively entertained in the castle. In 1284 Antony Bek, patriarch of Jerusalem, became bishop of Durham. It was the dream of Bek to provide for the union of the English and the Scottish crowns by promoting the marriage of the first Prince of Wales with Margaret, the child queen of Scotland. If that marriage had taken place as a result of the far-sighted statesmanship of Edward and of Bek, the whole of the later history of England and of Scotland would have been differently written. The death of the little Margaret cut short the plans of union, and introduced the terrible strife that followed with its memories of Bruce and of Balliol and its battlefields of Bannockburn and of Neville's Cross. That most tragic and yet most magnificent century of Durham history saw not only the erection of Hatfield's throne in the cathedral, but the building of the new castle hall, which still exists, the hall which Bek began and Hatfield probably completed. We have no information as to the reason which prompted the erection of the hall, or the rebuilding of the keep by Hatfield, and are free to suppose that the needs of the Palatinate power, then being carried to its greatest height, demanded an adequate reconstruction of buildings which were probably too small for the growing business of the bishop of Durham.

But I must leave the work of the fourteenth-century bishops. I must pass by the story of the banquet which bishop de Bary gave in 1333 within the castle hall. I must also pass by the fortunes of the castle during the period of the Wars of the Roses, and take my stand
for a moment in the early Tudor days, when a new stage in the history begins, for Durham Castle ceases to be a strong mediaeval fortress and figures rather as an ordinary English mansion. This 23rd day of July happens to be the anniversary of a picturesque incident in the new chapter. It will be remembered that Henry VII. called to his aid the great statesman bishop Fox, and set him here at Durham to watch the wiles of the Scottish king, who was well pleased to aid the schemes of Perkin Warbeck. Fox garrisoned and rebuilt Norham Castle and other fortresses, whilst in Durham he made many changes, erecting the present kitchen, improving the hall, and this, it may be, to accommodate an increased soldiery, but not improbably in some connection with a plan which he resolved and essayed for several years. At all events there recurred to him the old scheme of the builder of the castle hall which had come to such a tragic end. The idea of a permanent union between the Scottish and the English crowns now floated before him, and it became the constant policy of Fox to promote the marriage of another Margaret, the eldest daughter of Henry VII., with James IV. of Scotland. Margaret was little more than a child, and by the time that all arrangements were complete Fox had left Durham and had gone to Winchester. Then came the famous progress of the princess to her future husband's capital, the story of which has been so quaintly recorded by one of the royal heralds. At the moment no successor had been appointed for Fox, and he obtained permission or commission (I scarcely know which) to accompany the young Margaret to Scotland, and so to witness the successful completion of the long-debated alliance. At place after place on the road the wedding procession was sumptuously entertained, and it is almost tempting to suppose that the long journey of Fox was prompted in part by his desire to welcome the bride in the castle hall which he had so recently beautified and improved. So Margaret fared northwards, and all the circumstances of her extreme youth and her uncertain prospects made Englishmen vie with one another in the warmth of her send-off. She passed through York, Northallerton, and on to Croft, where the sheriff of the bishopric met her; thence to Darlington and so at last to Durham, where at the cathedral gate the bishop and the prior received her with the monks all vested in rich copes and in processional order. Then, to quote the chronicle itself, "After this she was nobly conveyed to the castle where her lodging was prepared . . . The 21st, 22nd and 23rd days of the said month [July, 1503] she sojourned in the said palace of Durham, where she was well cherished and her cross borne by the said bishop, who, on the 23rd day, held whole hall and double dinner and double supper to all comers worthy for to be there. And in the said hall was set all the noblesse as well spirituals as temporals, great and small, the which was welcome, for this was his day of installation." In other words it was the ninth anniversary of Bishop Fox's enthronement at Durham, and he could not let the occasion pass without a final leave taking to all his late neighbours of high rank in the presence of the young princess.

But again I must hurry on. I have no space to tell of Tunstall's new chapel and new gates, of his conduit, or of other things that he did, nor how in Edward's reign the unprincipled Northumberland (a Dudley, not a Percy) strove for the suppression of the see and designed
to make himself Earl of Northumberland indeed by stepping into the dignities of the Earl Palatine, or how he calculated to seize Durham castle and make it his headquarters, from whence he might rule, like a Pudsey or a Hatfield, over the county of Durham. Over all this and over other events we pass and come to another scene connected with the castle. A hundred years have passed since Fox's great banquet. In the meantime the famous mitred abbey of Durham had been swept away to reappear as a cathedral of the new foundation with dean and canons. The old guilds of the city had been reconstituted. The general face of the church had been changed in rite, in ceremony, in furniture. Nowhere in England had the alterations been more sullenly received, until the irritation flamed out into angry revolt, when, in 1569, the whole county rose to place Norfolk and Mary Stuart upon the throne. And nowhere did the resistance of recusants give greater trouble, whilst Jesuits and seminary priests, carrying their lives in their hands, strove to effect another revolution of the faith. And now at last in the year 1603 another procession approaches Durham, from the north this time, and not, as in 1503, from the south. The great grandson of the princess Margaret, who is drawing near the old city, and the dream of Bek, dreamed again by Fox, is at last fulfilled. James VI. of Scotland is on his way to London to be crowned as James I. of England. A modern historian says: "for a month of spring weather James rode south. The land seemed bursting into bud to welcome him, growing greener each day as the ever-increasing train of courtiers wound slowly down out of the north country into the Midland valleys; the rough shouting market places where the masque of welcome and the corporation with its address were lost in the press of men; by ancient steeples rocking with the clash of bells; along open roads hedged with countrymen who had come on pilgrimage across whole counties."1 Or let us hear the contemporary chronicler who describes the Durham scene: "His Majesty set forward toward Durham . . . and when he came near, the magistrates of the city met him, and behaving themselves as others before them, it was by his Highness as thankfully accepted. And passing through the gates [i.e., on Tranwellgate bridge] whence his Excellence entered the market place, there was an excellent oration made to him, containing in effect the universal joy conceived by his subjects at his approach, being of power to divert from them so great sorrow as had lately possessed them all. The oration ended he passed towards the bishop's house, where he was royally received, the bishop attending his Majesty with an hundred gentlemen in tawny liveries. Of all his entertainment in particular at the bishop's, his merry and well-seasoned jests, as well there as in other parts of his journey, all his words being of full weight, and his jests filled with the salt of wit, yet so facetious and pleasant as they were no less gracious and worthy regard than the words of so royal a Majesty, it is bootless to repeat them, they are so well known."2

In this manner then "the wisest fool in Christendom" was entertained at Durham. I must again pass over much that is interesting connected with the castle; how James came again in 1617, how Charles was

1 Trevely: *England under the Stuarts*, 74.
2 J. Nichols: *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 3, Appendix, 10.
entertained here by bishop Neile in 1633 and set the seal of his approval upon the "innovations" at the cathedral brought in by the Arminian prebendaries, how six years later Charles held council in the hall at the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars, how he passed through as a prisoner years later still, and how the castle was turned into a hospital for the sick and wounded prisoners who were dying off like flies in the cathedral after the battle of Dunbar. I have no space to describe the short-lived attempt to forestall the present use of the buildings, when Cromwell bestowed the cathedral and castle to form the nucleus of his northern university; nor how, after the Restoration, when all Durham was rebuilding, Cosin, who loved Durham with all his heart, gave Stapylton, his man of affairs, carte blanche to rectify the castle "which the Scots spoiled and mined with gunpowder."

Then Crewe comes before us, Baron Crewe of Stene, who lived in the castle with much magnificence, and entertained here royally when he had purged himself of Jacobite suspicion. And after Crewe, at an interval, follow Butler and Trevor and Egerton and Barrington, each one of whom left his mark upon the castle buildings.

I conclude with the merest reference to one more great meeting in the castle hall, when a kind of farewell was taken of all that the castle had been, an episode that fitly closes the long chapter of its episcopal history. In the autumn of 1827 the Duke of Wellington passed through the county of Durham, and was everywhere received with enthusiasm. As the guest of Lord Ravensworth he came over to the city in company with Sir Walter Scott, and I cannot do better than give Sir Walter's own description of the entertainment given by bishop Van Mildert in the castle hall:

"October 3 [1827] went to Durham with Lord Ravensworth betwixt one and two. Found the gentlemen of Durham county and town assembled to receive the Duke of Wellington . . . The Duke arrived very late. There were bells and cannon and drums, trumpets and banners, besides a fine troop of yeomanry . . . We dined about one hundred and forty or fifty men, a distinguished company for rank and property.

Lords and Dukes and noble Princes
All the pride and flower of Spain.

"We dined in the old baronial hall, impressive from its rude antiquity, and fortunately free from the plaster of former improvement, as I trust it will long be from the gingerbread taste of modern Gothicizers. The bright moon streaming in through the old Gothic windows contrasted strangely with the artificial lights within. Spears, banners and armour were intermixed with the pictures of the old bishops, and the whole had a singular mixture of baronial pomp with the grave and more chastened dignity of prelacy."

A letter from Dr. Phillpotts, then a prebendary, and later the famous bishop of Exeter, adds a few touches: "Sometimes I doubted whether the hero or the poet was fixing most attention. The latter, I need hardly tell you, appeared unconscious that he was regarded differently from the others about him, until the good bishop arose and proposed his health."

1 Described in Dr. Fowler's History of the University of Durham.
Wednesday, July 22nd.

The members first went by train to Bishop Auckland and thence drove to Raby Castle (for ground plan see opposite), where Lord Barnard received them and gave a short address. The county, he said, was overshadowed by Yorkshire on the one hand, and by Northumberland on the other. It was principally a thickly populated industrial district, but nevertheless it contained in the western parts some of the most beautiful scenery in England.

The principal charm of the county of Durham was its glorious traditional history under the prince-bishops. As they were all aware, it was to a certain extent independent of the rest of the country, but what the origin of the palatinate was he was not clear. There was still a remnant of the time of the prince-bishops in the holding of the Chancery Court at Durham with its own chancellor. As to the origin of Raby, John de Neville was granted a licence to erect a “chastel” in 1379. It was stated that there was a mansion at Staindrop called Canute’s Hall, but that could hardly have been on the same site as the present castle. There was probably a dwelling at Raby when the prince-bishops held courts, and exercised almost royal functions: they had a mint, raised armies, and had admiralty jurisdiction on the coast. They were great statesmen, and spent perhaps a great deal too much of their time out of their principality.

Raby Castle, like other castellated buildings, was crenellated and fortified by licence granted by bishop Hatfield in 1378. It was originally the home of the very old northern family of the Brancepeths, from whom it passed to the Nevilles by marriage, and until about a century and a half ago there was a village just outside the castle. There was probably in early times a small mansion house, with a Danish settlement, and he would be surprised if the original site of the mansion house was not the same as that upon which the castle was built. The castle was associated with the Neville family, who were very properly looked upon as one of the great northern families of the country.

Lord Barnard traced the history of the castle to modern times, and pointed out that although successive occupiers had regarded it as small for their requirements, and had erected additional buildings, its main outline had been very little altered since the time of the Nevilles. The castle occupied about two and a half acres. The walls were of enormous thickness and great strength, and those of the tower were battered. The castle was built on solid rock, only one part was vaulted, and that was the cellar under the kitchen. An interesting feature of the castle was the fact that little or no timber was used in its construction. All the floors up to the second and third stories were built of stone. The castle itself is outwardly a noble and picturesque building of irregular plan, and mostly of the last quarter of the fourteenth century, unencumbered by any attached buildings or modern surroundings, but internally, like so many other feudal castles, it has been much altered to accommodate it to changes of fashion. Beyond one side of the hall, parts of the chapel and the kitchen with its vaulted chamber, little of the original interior remains.

Sir Henry Howorth, in thanking Lord Barnard for his hospitality, reminded the meeting that it was in that hall that the Institute was
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entertained more than forty years before by the Duke of Cleveland, the ancestor of the present owner.

The drive was next continued to Staindrop, where, after luncheon, the parish church was visited, and described by the Rev. J. F. Hodgson, who was congratulated on this being his eightieth birthday. The first mention of Staindrop was in the reign of Canute, who had a manor there. It was included in the grant to St. Cuthbert. Mr. Hodgson pointed out that it contains traces of its Saxon nave and the lower part of the chancel arch, through the walls of which arcades were cut in the twelfth century for the added aisles. It was considerably enlarged early in the thirteenth century by the addition of another bay and a western tower to the nave, and by north and south transeptal chapels. The chancel underwent reconstruction about the same time, and still retains triple sedilia and a drain of rich work, reminiscent of the Nine Altars at Durham. The south aisle was enlarged as a chantry chapel about 1344, and the thirteenth century chancel partly rebuilt in 1412, when the church was appropriated to a college of secular priests established here by Ralph Neville of Neville's Cross, first earl of Westmorland. For their accommodation a fine series of stalls was put in, and in the middle of the chancel was set up the magnificent alabaster tomb with effigies of the earl and his two wives. To the north of the chancel is an original vestry with living-room over, and the nave has a south porch with a stone roof. A small stone porch at the south-east corner of the south aisle is actually a fireproof vestry to the chantry altar, with its east window cut down into a doorway. The chancel is at present undergoing "restoration," and the large wooden monument with effigies of the fifth earl and his two wives is in a similar condition. Both Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Hope condemned the removal, during a former restoration, of the plaster from the walls of the nave and its aisles. They also pleaded for the restoration of the great alabaster tomb to its original position in the chancel. On the proposal of Sir Henry Howorth, it was agreed to make an appeal to Lord Barnard in favour of the replacement of the old tombs if it were feasible.

From Staindrop the journey was continued to Winston station, and thence by rail to Darlington. Here the fine parish church of St. Cuthbert was inspected under the guidance of the Rev. J. F. Hodgson, who was inclined to agree with the old view that the building was the work of bishop Pudsey between 1193 and his death in 1195. In the light of later knowledge, however, this opinion may have to be modified. The so-called "rood-loft" in front of the chancel is actually part of an early fourteenth century support to prevent the collapse of the eastern side of the central tower.

The evening meeting was occupied by an address from the veteran Canon Greenwell, now in his eighty-ninth year, on the evidence afforded by Great Britain as to the origin and development of the spear and dagger during the bronze period, which he claimed largely to have taken place in Britain. In illustration of his remarks the Canon exhibited
his magnificent and unrivalled collection of objects of this period, including the famous and now historic series of implements and family treasures found together in the Heathery Burn cave in the county of Durham. The Canon concluded with an expression of regret that he had not been able to take a more active part in the meetings of the Institute and they must put it down, he said, not to want of will but to want of power.

Sir Henry Howorth expressed the delight of the meeting with the extraordinary knowledge and lucidity of the address.

Thursday, July 23rd.

The programme for Thursday began with a visit to Escombe, where the perfect pre-Conquest church, consisting only of a small square chancel and a lofty nave, with later porch, was described by Mr. C. R. Peers, who said that from a comparison of the work with other and particularly dateable buildings, he was inclined to ascribe it to the ninth century, a view in which others present concurred. A large number of Roman stones had been used in the construction of the church. The chancel arch was, in his opinion, not so early as the work they would see at Monkwearmouth. M. Lefevre-Pontalis referred to churches of similar plan and section in the Asturias, which apparently belonged to the same period. Mr. Francis Bond thought that the long-and-short work visible in the building pointed to a much earlier date, and that the chancel arch, like many of the stones used in the walling, was Roman work re-used.

Mr. Hope pointed out that until the nineteenth century the walls had retained the plaster with which they were meant from the first to be clothed, and that probably the exterior had been similarly treated. Such buildings, when whitewashed, as they certainly were, were no doubt the "white churches" of the chroniclers, and Aldhun’s church at Durham had been a case in point.

A visit was next paid to St. Andrew’s Church at South Auckland, an interesting cruciform structure with aisles to the nave and a western tower, which the Rev. J. F. Hodgson was inclined to ascribe in the main to bishop Robert Stichill, who held the see from 1261 to 1274. A college attached to the church was founded and re-organized by bishop Anthony Bek, who was apparently responsible for certain changes in the chancel and other parts of the building. The uppermost stage of the tower was added about 1417, and the fine choir stalls put in by cardinal Langley. At the west end of the north aisle is an extensive collection of fragments of Saxon crosses and tombstones, together with a wooden effigy of a cross-legged knight and a stone figure of a lady. With these is a large limestone slab with the casements of a small monumental brass, remarkable for having been so cut as to form part of the altar steps, with a section of the brass laid in each of the three divisions.

After luncheon at Bishop Auckland a visit was paid to the splendid chapel of the episcopal residence, which was described by the Rev. J. F. Hodgson. This, he pointed out, had originally been the great hall begun by bishop Pudsey, and almost entirely reconstructed by bishop Anthony Bek; and consisted of a middle alley with broad side alleys
divided from it by four wide and lofty arches on either hand. Owing to
the destruction of the castle chapel under the Commonwealth, the great
hall was converted in 1662-4 into a chapel by bishop John Cosin, to
whom are due the clerestory and the splendid flat wooden ceiling,
originally richly painted and gilded, the stall-work, the screen from
the first bay, which forms an ante-chapel, and the "wind organ" now
in a gallery at the west end. The floor was re-laid by bishop van
Mildert, and the reredos added by bishop Lightfoot. The only other
interesting part of the castle is a wing begun by bishop Ruthall and
finished by bishop Tunstall, both of whom have carved their arms
upon the work done by them.

From Bishop Auckland the journey was continued past the site of
the Roman fort of Vinovium at Binchester, to Brancepeth, where the
curch was described by Canon Fowler. It was dedicated, he pointed
out, in honour of St. Brandon, and was interesting chiefly for its rich
and remarkable wood fittings, believed to be the work of bishop Cosin
when rector here from 1626 to the usurpation. They include the
whole of the stall-work and chancel screen, the altar, the pulpit, the
font cover, several enclosed pews in the transeptal chapels, and the
pews throughout the church. From notes taken by him in 1863
Dr. Fowler showed that the church then possessed a reading-desk of
equal beauty to the pulpit, and that the pews retained an original
disposition, which had since been most unnecessarily destroyed, as
well as the doors with which they all were fitted. Over the chancel
arch was the original fifteenth century canopy of the rood-loft, and
below that was fixed a piece of panelling with exquisite geometrical
tracery, believed to have been brought from Durham after the
Suppression. It forms the subject of a memoir by Billings. The
chancel, together with the vestry of the south chapel, was late
fourteenth century work, and Mr. Hodgson had that day furnished him
with evidence that it should be dated between 1371 and 1381. In the
chancel now lie the truly colossal stone figure of a cross-legged knight,
believed to represent Robert Neville, who was killed at Berwick in 1319,
and two very fine oaken effigies of Ralph, second earl of Westmorland,
and his wife, Margaret Cobham. Both wear the Yorkist livery collar
of suns and roses. These figures now lie upon the base of what was
once a high tomb that stood in the middle of the chancel. The
church is also of considerable interest architecturally, and chiefly of
the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At the west end of the
north aisle is a good collection of ancient monumental slabs, and in
the south chapel a fine "Flanders kist," of a date circa 1360-70.

At the evening meeting Mr. John Bilson read a paper, illustrated
by lantern slides, on "The Place of Durham in the Evolution of Gothic
Architecture," of which the following is a summary: The beginnings
of the Norman school are discernible in the abbey church of Bernay,
a work of the first half of the eleventh century. By the time of the
conquest of England the school was fully formed, and achieving such
masterpieces for the time as Jumieges and Saint-Etienne at Caen. The
accident of the conquest led to the transference of the centre of
activity from Normandy to England during the last quarter of the
eleventh century. The Normans developed here the logic of con-
struction, and they were innovators in the practice of expedients
which only needed fuller development to reach the essentials of what we call Gothic. Their structural advance receives its most pronounced manifestation in the cathedral church of Durham, which is quite Gothic in construction, though still Romanesque in expression. After the opening of the twelfth century the centre of the Norman school returned to Caen, and there was another important development in vaulting, the sexpartite and similar systems, which contributed much towards ultimate Gothic solution. It was not given to the Normans to achieve the final solution; having done so much, they had built up powerful traditions, which in themselves were a bar to further rapid advance. Thus the architecture of lower Normandy in the latter part of the twelfth century retains more Romanesque character than contemporary English work, which again retains far more than does upper Normandy nearer to the Île-de-France. This last school, one of the poorest of all until the second quarter of the twelfth century, had no well-established traditions to hamper its advance; and, profiting by the experience of its predecessors, adopted and improved upon their expedients, giving them a new and fitting expression, and achieved the final steps in the evolution of Gothic. The glory of its achievement is in no way diminished by the fact that others had preceded it in the earlier stages of the journey, nor are the partial successes of the earlier stages less noteworthy. And one of the buildings which looms out largest in this earlier story is the cathedral church of Durham.

Friday, July 24th.

The members journeyed first by train to Sunderland, and thence by road to the ancient church of St. Peter, at Monkwearmouth. Mr. C. R. Peers, who described the building, said that the church was of extremely early construction, and its earliest parts could satisfactorily be dated to probably the year 674. To this date belonged the western portions of the nave and the lower stages of the western tower, which originally consisted of a porch with arched openings in each of its three free sides and a chamber above. This was subsequently carried up as a tower, but at what date is uncertain, the work being apparently of the ninth century, which was seemingly an impossible date historically. The piers of the chancel arch are contemporary with the tower, and had been supposed at one time to belong to a second church of St. Mary, which perhaps stood in line with St. Peter's to the east, but this view could not be upheld. Mr. Peers also called attention to the remarkable sculptures in the lower stories of the tower, and to the extraordinary collection of early carvings, etc., now stored in the vestry. The vicar, the Rev. H. S. Boutflower, pointed out that according to a passage in one of the Venerable Bede's sermons it was the aim in his time to build churches of the same dimensions as those of Solomon's Temple, and the measurements of the Monkwearmouth church in feet corresponded exactly to those of the Temple in cubits.

The journey was next continued to Hylton Castle, where the party was hospitably received by Mr. W. M. Parrington, who had generously provided refreshments. The castle, Mr. Hope explained, had owed its origin to one Roman of Hylton, to whom the prior and convent of Durham, in 1157, had granted the privilege of having a chaplain to perform divine service in his chapel of Hylton. From Roman down to
1739, the castle had continued as the home of the Hyltons in unbroken male descent, an unusual thing in so unsettled a district. The existing building was but the gatehouse to a large mansion which had never been built, and was the work of William of Hylton, between 1376 and 1435. On the inner or eastern face was a large and finely carved representation of the white hart badge of king Richard II., but the royal banner on the west front bore the arms first adopted by king Henry IV., about 1407. This front is also decorated with a large number of shields of arms, as well as a large banner of the Hylton arms within a canopied niche, now moved from its original place. But the heraldry showed that the shields were of more than one date, and had apparently been collected into their present position. Mr. Hope called attention to the machicolated parapets surmounted by stone figures, among which were the remains of two large images of St. George and St. Michael, each standing on a dragon.

The shell of the chapel, on rising ground to the north-east, was also inspected. This was entirely rebuilt in the third quarter of the fifteenth century by William, lord Hylton, whose arms it bears, as an aisleless parallelogram, but early in the sixteenth century semi-octagonal transepts were thrown out, divided by floors, each into two stories. This interesting structure is now roofless, and falling rapidly into decay. The party then returned to Durham by rail, and after luncheon reassembled at the castle, which was explained by Mr. C. C. Hodges. (See plan facing page 328.)

Mr. Hodges addressed a few words to the visitors on the castle generally, and said that the site of the city of Durham was one of great interest from every point of view. Geologically it was of interest as a piece of sandstone rock isolated by the action of the river round it, so conspicuously that there was a tradition that the stone was taken out of the bed of the river and used to build the cathedral and castle. As far back as 1532 that tradition was extant. The actual historic evidence they had of any occupation of the plateau on which the cathedral was built was the coming of St. Cuthbert's body. The building of the castle did not date earlier than 1072, but there was probably some kind of defensive earthwork on the spot before. The city occupied an oval space of ground something like 1,550 yards in length and 500 yards in width. The castle was built at the north end of the promontory and the cathedral occupied the termination of it. The site was surrounded by a wall which had two gates and two bridges. The principal gate was the gaol gate in Queen-street, and the other gate the water gate at the end of the North Bailey. Another gate crossed the Bailey near the church of St. Mary-le-Bow, which got its name from the Bow or arch that crossed the street, and which was taken down when the church was rebuilt. The plan of the castle was a triangle of considerable extent. It was a very large castle, because it was the centre of the palatinate of Durham, where the bishops lived in regal splendour. They had every regal right over the palatinate, except that they could not levy taxes to go to war and could not go to war without the permission of the king.

Taking the castle chronologically, Mr. Hodges first conducted the visitors to the Norman chapel, which he described as one of the most interesting that could be found. Mr. Bilson called attention to the
remarkable similarity of the capitals to those of the nave of Graville-Sainte-Honorine, near Havre, photographs of which he exhibited. The unusual quarter-round profile of the abacus also occurs in the nave of Graville, and in the choir of Montivilliers. Mr. Hope suggested that the so-called chapel was only a sub-vault to the actual chapel which stood over it.

The Norman gallery was next visited. This was built by bishop Pudsey, and here Mr. Hodges remarked that that munificent prelate had two architects, who, while skilled in detail, were not successful as constructive architects, and the building he had erected had failed from structural debility. That part of the castle showed signs of giving way, and had it not been for the action of bishop Langley in buttressing all the west end would have been in the Wear. Passing down the noble black oak staircase, the visitors descended to the Tunstall Gallery, with its tapestry of the time of bishop Cosin and its beautiful Norman doorway, and thence returned to the great hall. The bulk of the hall, said Mr. Hodges, was of the time of bishop Bek, and dated from the fourteenth century. The great door and two of the windows belonged to the original building. He lamented that the magnificent oak panelling of the time of bishop Cosin was destroyed many years ago. A walk along the terrace, from which beautiful views of the city and vicinity were obtained, completed the afternoon's proceedings.

After tea Canon Greenwell met the party in the cathedral library, once the monks' dormitory, and gave an address on the history and character of the library itself and of the books that composed it. He also discussed the fine collection of Saxon crosses and gravestones from various parts of the bishopric, and referred to the long-standing controversy as to the body of St. Cuthbert, whose skeleton, he had no hesitation in saying, was that now lying beneath the site of the shrine behind the high altar of the cathedral church. In thanking Canon Greenwell for his address Sir Henry Howorth took the opportunity of suggesting what a safe home the cathedral library would be for many remains of Saxon crosses, now lying sadly neglected in many churchyards in the diocese. Here they would be placed with other similar stones, a comparison with which would greatly facilitate their explanation.

In the evening Mr. Kenneth C. Bayley, F.S.A., read a paper in the castle courtyard on some early points in connexion with the history of the city of Durham. The speaker said that Framwellgate and Elvet bridges were built in their present position so that they could be commanded from the castle, for in the days when they were built Durham was the great fortress of the North. The first great change came shortly after the Conquest, when bishop Flambard levelled the space between the castle and the cathedral, which was then occupied with mean houses, and made it as plain as a field, in order to lessen the danger from fire to both buildings and to keep them clear of filth. Mr. Bayley went on to narrate many interesting facts about the early history of the city, which was then divided into several divisions, each with its own court. In 1179 bishop Pudsey granted a charter, which conferred certain mercantile privileges on the inhabitants. In the middle of the fifteenth century a reactionary policy set in, and the bishop again exercised a more direct control over the affairs of the
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city. In 1565 a charter of incorporation was granted, and in 1602 this was succeeded by a more liberal charter. At the end of the seventeenth century the episcopal borough of Durham was virtually independent of the bishop. Amongst other incidents mentioned in the paper was one which occurred in 1674, when the archdeacon of Durham was arrested for debt within the cloisters.

Saturday, July 25th.

Gainford church was described by Mr. C. K. Peers, and is an interesting building, mostly of the early part of the thirteenth century, with a fine eastern triplet to the chancel, and an engaged western tower with arches to the aisles as well as the nave. On the north of the chancel is an ancient vestry, and in the north porch is a fine collection of fragments of early crosses and gravestones. In the churchyard in the angle of the chancel and south aisle is a good mediaeval tomb to Sir William Pudsey and Elizabeth, his wife, which Mr. Peers suggested would be better cared for if room could be found for it inside the church. A short visit was also paid, by the kindness of the present occupier, Mr. George Harrison, to Gainford Hall, a picturesque structure built by John Cradock in 1600, with a good stucco cornice and oak panelling in one of the lower rooms.

Wycliffe church, which was next visited, was also described by Mr. Peers, who pointed out that its chief feature of interest was the early painted glass still remaining in the large fourteenth century windows in the south wall. As regards the tracery openings, the glazing, though somewhat “restored,” is complete, with figures of angels with musical instruments and representations of the Holy Trinity, the Majesty, and Our Lady and Child respectively. The lights were filled with saints under canopies, but portions only of these now remain. Built into the south wall externally is a good gravestone with ornate cross and a pair of shears and incised inscription inlaid with lead to Isode de Hielagh, wife of Thomas de Thorp.

After luncheon at the Morritt Arms at Greta Bridge the journey was resumed to Eggleston abbey, the picturesque ruins of which occupy a charming site overlooking the river Tees. Mr. Hope explained briefly the history and peculiarities of the order of Praemonstratensian or White Canons to which the abbey belonged, and referred to the foundation of Eggleston from the neighbouring abbey of St. Agatha during the closing years of the twelfth century. To this period belong the north wall and west end of the aisleless nave; but in the middle of the thirteenth century the church was extended eastwards and followed later by a new crossing and enlarged south transept. The north transept was reconstructed about the same time, but its ruins had been removed within the last few years to pave a stable-yard! Lastly, about a century after the foundation, the nave was widened by 6 feet, instead apparently of carrying out a scheme for adding to it a south aisle. Only some remains of the outer walls of the church are now left, with such portions of the eastern range of buildings as have escaped the destroyers of the north transept. These included the vaulted substruction and other parts of the reredorter and what may have been the abbot’s lodgings. In the nave of the church are a
number of interesting indents of brasses, and a large marble slab, now in three pieces, with the name of Thomas Rokeby, "bastard," and the prayer, "Thou for thine passions serv, have mersi of thine sinnful her." Mr. Hope pointed out that the abbey, although suppressed with the lesser monasteries, was refounded by letters patent in 1536–7 and survived till the overthrow of the greater houses three years later. M. Pontalis, president of the French Archaeological Institute, also spoke on the characteristics of the abbey buildings, compared with similar contemporary ones in France.

Barnard Castle, which was the last place in the day's programme, was also described by Mr. Hope. The castle is grandly situated on a series of rocky platforms forming the several baileys on a high cliff overlooking the Tees, but its subdivisions are now gardens and orchards, and no general survey of the castle can be made. Mr. Hope pointed out that its plan conformed to that of the Norman mount-and-bailey type, but had been fortified from its foundation by Bernard Baliol before 1130, with walls of stone instead of banks of earth, derived from the rock on which it stood. The motte, or highest part, was encircled by a wall, in the ring of which a later tower had been intruded, as at Conisborough, probably late in the thirteenth century. The basement of this afforded an unusual example of a nearly flat domed vault of stones set on edge. After visiting the castle, the Institute was hospitably entertained by Dr. and Miss Richardson.

Monday, July 27th.

The party first drove to Pittington church, an interesting building, which was described by Mr. C. C. Hodges. It has suffered much at the hands of "restorers" and rebuilders, but retains the side walls and remains of the windows of a late Saxon or early Norman nave, with later arcades into the added aisles. The older portions of the north arcade are late Norman with bold spiral bands round the pillars. Outside the north aisle, below the level of the original windows, are two blocked loops, some distance apart, which apparently lighted a destroyed chamber of some kind that stood within the aisle. Mr. Hodges said that in 667 the pope sent relics of St. Laurence to the church at Pittington. The manor is mentioned in 1258 and the new hall was erected in 1450. Pittington Hall Garth was a favourite residence of the priors of Durham, the last one having lived there from 1524 to 1540.

Lumley Castle, which was next visited, was described by Mr. Hope as one of a group of late fourteenth century buildings which illustrated the transition from such great towers as that of Rochester or the White Tower in London to the courtyard type of house, consisting of an open quadrangle with ranges of chambers on all four sides and towers at the corners. The Institute had within recent years visited other examples at Middleham, Bolton (begun 1379), Bodiam (1385), and Wressle, and another was to be found at Sheriff Hutton (1382). Lumley castle was built by Sir Ralph Lumley, who obtained a licence to crenellate from bishop Skirlaw in 1389, and another from the king in 1392. To him was due most of the existing structure, including the fine display of heraldry over the eastern entrance, but his grandson,
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John lord Lumley (1544–1609), was responsible for all the uncusped Tudor windows and the double pile of shields on the west side of the quadrangle. The later alterations to the south and west fronts were carried out by Sir John Vanbrugh between 1721 and 1728 for Richard, the second earl of Scarborough, but had been projected by the first earl. Mr. Bilson pointed out that the several builders of the northern group of houses, like Lumley, were all related by marriage, and had fought together abroad, and he thought it not unlikely that their castles were built out of the spoil of the French wars, e.g. Bolton in Wensleydale, Sheriff Hutton, Wressle, Lumley (all houses of the quadrangle type of plan), Raby and Gilling. John lord Neville was the builder of Raby (the licence to crenellate is dated 1378) and Sheriff Hutton (licence to crenellate, 1381). One of his daughters, Matilda, married a cousin of Richard lord Scrope, who built Bolton in 1379. Another daughter, Eleanor, was the wife of Ralph lord Lumley, who crenellated Lumley de novo in 1392. Sir Thomas Percy, the builder of Wressle, was a nephew of John Neville's first wife, and his sister-in-law, Hotspur's mother, was John Neville's sister. Thomas de Elton, the builder of Gilling, was one of the executors of John Neville's will. The names of John Neville and three of the executors of his will (including Thomas de Elton) occur in the list of letters of protection for John of Gaunt's expedition in 1369. Sir Henry Howorth, on behalf of the members, thanked Lord and Lady Scarborough for allowing them such free access to their castle. He reminded them that the Lumleys took their name from this estate, and they had an unbroken record as typical English gentry. After a perambulation of the principal chambers and an enjoyment of the fine view from the top of the castle the party continued its journey to Chester-le-Street. Here, after luncheon, a visit was paid to the church, which was described by Mr. C. C. Hodges. The building is architecturally not remarkable, except for its stone spire and the curious anchoridge at the west end of the north aisle, but is noteworthy, apart from its historical associations with the body of St. Cuthbert, which so long rested here, for the curious series of posthumous effigies of ancestors, collected or placed here by John lord Lumley, the author of the late sixteenth century changes at the castle.

Finchale priory (see plan) was the last objective, and was described by Mr. Hope. Its story, he said, began with that of St. Godric, who was successively a pedlar, a pirate, a Palmer, and a pious person, and eventually settled here as a hermit about 1110, and died in 1170. He built at Finchale first a wooden chapel, but afterwards a stone church, in which he was buried. The priory was founded in 1196 as a cell of Durham, and endowed with the lands of an earlier foundation of Black Canons, established at Baxterwood, nearer Durham. The inmates first used St. Godric's church, but soon began to replace it by a larger structure, with attached monastic buildings, of which considerable remains exist. The church was cruciform with a tower and spire over the crossing and aisles to both choir and nave, but was nearly a century in building. In 1364–1367 the aisles were unroofed and pulled down, the arcades walled up, and new windows inserted in the blocking; probably, as suggested by Mr. C. C. Hodges, to give more light to the unclerestoried choir and nave. The unusual length of the
eastern area was no doubt due to the existence therein of St. Godric's tomb, and the church was also remarkable for the cylindrical piers of the steeple. The buildings round the cloister, with the exception of the frater, which stands upon a very perfect subvault, are much ruined, but a large group to the south-east containing the infirmary and prior's lodging, is also fairly perfect, though much encumbered with rubbish and fallen masonry. The site of the priory is of unusual beauty, on a gentle slope beside a bend of the river Wear, with a wooded rocky bank opposite.

In the evening the annual business meeting was held, when reports of the Council and of the Treasurer were presented, showing a most prosperous state of affairs. The report of the Council and the cash account for the year 1907-1908 will be found on pages 345 and 346. Various suggestions were also received as to the place of next year's meeting, Lincoln, Oxford and Tenby being amongst those mentioned, but the choice was, as usual, left to the Council. Votes of thanks were afterwards passed to the University authorities, the owners of houses and castles, the incumbents of the churches visited, to the readers of papers and demonstrations of buildings, and to Mr. W. H. Knowles, the Honorary Secretary of the meeting, through whose untiring efforts its great success was so largely due.

Tuesday, July 28th.

This day was devoted to a joint visit of the Institute and the Yorkshire Archaeological Society to Easby and Richmond. On arrival at the latter place by special train the party first proceeded, some on foot and some in carriages, to Easby, when the extensive remains of the Premonstratensian abbey of St. Agatha were inspected under the guidance of Mr. Hope. Its plan, he pointed out, was exceptionally irregular, the cloister being lozenge-shaped instead of square, and the dorter had been squeezed out of its normal position over the chapter-house, etc., and built out on the west. The infirmary block was disposed on the north, but the only way to it was through the church, instead of by the usual passage. For all these irregularities it was difficult to account, inasmuch as there was ample level ground to the east and north. Although the abbey was founded in 1152 there were few traces of any important work before the close of the twelfth century, to which date most of the church had belonged. The infirmary block, the chapter-house, etc., and the western range of buildings were early thirteenth century work, and the frater and its subvault circa 1270-80. The western range is partly of two and partly of three stories, and combines in a most ingenious manner the sleeping and other quarters of the canons, with ample but separate accommodation for guests. A move was next made to Easby parish church, where Mr. Peers pointed out its architectural features and the remarkable series of early paintings on the walls and window jambs of the chancel. The party then returned to Richmond, and, after luncheon, proceeded to the site of the Grey Friars monastery. Here Mr. Peers described the main features of friars' houses, and showed how the usual narrow crossing had been surmounted at Richmond by a fine and lofty late fifteenth century tower, which fortunately
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remained perfect, with an interesting fragment of the south aisle; but all else had been destroyed. The grandly situated castle was next visited, under the guidance of Mr. Hope, who explained that it was still enclosed by the rubble walls, with herringbone work in places, erected by its founder, Earl Alan, before 1086. To him was also due the small chapel in one of the mural towers, and the remarkable hall in the south-east corner of the bailey, with its coupled window lights. The early date claimed for these buildings by Mr. Hope was confirmed by Mr. Bilson, who said that the carved capitals of the original entrance, now within the great tower, with volutes over a row of leaves, are precisely the same character as some in the nave of Saint-Étienne at Caen, and the cushion capitals are without mitres at the angles, like the earliest of those in the wall-arcades at Durham cathedral. The latter characteristic is found also in the capitals of the wall arcades in the chapel. There could be no doubt too as to the early date of the great hall. The great tower, which forms so striking a feature of the castle, was shown by Mr. Hope to have been built over and outside of the original early entrance, probably by earl Conan, who died in 1171, and from an entry on the Pipe Roll for 1171-2 to have been completed the year after his death, while the castle was in the king's hands. Mr. Hope also referred to the information afforded as to the old arrangements of the castle by an early fifteenth century drawing of it in the Register of the honour of Richmond, and by an elaborate survey made, in view of its repair, in 1537-8. The day's proceedings concluded with a visit to the parish church, which was described by Mr. Peers. On Tuesday evening the whole of the plate belonging to the University, Corporation and guilds of Freemen was on view at the castle, which was described by Mr. Hope.

Wednesday, July 29th.

The last day of the meeting was actually an extra day for visits to Hexham abbey, Aydon castle, and the excavations in progress on the site of the Roman town of Corstopitum, near Corbridge. On arrival at Hexham the members were received at the abbey church by the rector, Canon Savage, who referred briefly to the works now being carried out in the building and to the new nave lately added, from the designs of Mr. Temple Moore. Those members, he said, who visited Hexham abbey twenty-six years ago could not but be struck by the changes that have occurred in the interval. Yesterday, on the first occasion for centuries, probably not since the Early English fabric was built, the old pilgrims' way into the crypt was once again open, as it will be for the future, thus giving easy access to what is without doubt one of the most remarkable ecclesiastical interiors in England. And remarkable was another coincidence, that just prior to the visit of the Institute to the north on this occasion, there should have been discovered the apse of St. Wilfrid's church. Built in 674 these remains, wonderfully preserved, were discovered under the quire floor last May, and round them a remarkable group of Saxon graves. The finding of the apse has given an added interest to the ancient frith stool, the cathedra of the kings and bishops of Northumbria, the stool of peace, and the chair of sanctuary, which formerly stood in St. Wilfrid's
apse. The new nave itself, now completed, makes Hexham a complete church from end to end for the first time since the fourteenth century.

Mr. C. C. Hodges next gave an account of the architectural history, and conducted the party round the building. Some remarks were added by Sir Henry Howorth and Mr. Francis Bond, and by Mr. Aymer Vallance, who called attention to the recent destruction of the ancient staircase within the choir screen and to the cutting out and hingeing of the hitherto fixed panels of the screen itself to provide a view from the nave.

After luncheon the party drove to Aydon castle, a very perfect example of a fortified manor-house of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with the living-rooms all on the first floor, the features of which were described by Mr. W. H. Knowles. The journey was next continued to the site of the excavations at Corstopitum, where Mr. R. H. Forster and Mr. Cheesman described the works now in progress under their direction. A very perfect and interesting fountain-base, discovered late last year, has again been opened out and further explored, and two large granaries west of it have also been uncovered. One of these is constructed of exceptionally well-built ashlar, and had mullioned loops to ventilate the drying channels beneath the stone floor. To the east of the fountain a massive arch, lying just as it fell, had been partly uncovered, with numbers on the stones to mark the order of their building. In the course of the excavations, which have only just been begun for the season, besides the usual finds of pottery, etc., a number of interesting architectural and sculptured fragments have already come to light, including a large slab with the bust of a sun-god or emperor, another with part of the figure of a horse, and sundry portions of moulded stonework.

With the visit to Corstopitum the Durham meeting ended. The weather throughout, with the exception of the day at Barnard Castle, was delightfully fine, and the success of the meeting may be measured by the fact that upwards of 120 members and their friends took part in it. The arrangements, planned by the local secretary, Mr. W. H. Knowles, were excellent in every way.

Wednesday, November 4th, 1908.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, Vice-President, in the chair.

The Chairman referred to the loss which the Institute had sustained through the recent death of Mr. G. E. Fox, M.A., F.S.A., one of its Vice-Presidents.

Mr. William Davidson read a paper on “Norfolk Screens and their Paintings,” with lantern slides and a number of coloured detail drawings of examples.

The paper contained a general description of the subjects represented on the screens of Norfolk, and dealt with their colour schemes, the main features of which were a harmonious combination of red, white,
green and gold, the effect of which was heightened by bands of gesso and inlaid leaden stars. The author was of opinion that the screens of Norfolk were painted by an English school of artists, but that their work showed traces of influence by Italian art, probably through Flemish channels.

A large number of coloured drawings, reproducing the colour values of the designs as originally painted, added greatly to the interest of the paper.

In the discussion which followed, Sir Charles Holroyd said that it was satisfactory to think that these screens represented the work of an English school.

Mr. Francis Bond welcomed the growing interest which was being taken in church screens; he testified to the excellent work being done by Mr. Davidson, and expressed a hope that some means would be found of preserving and publishing the results of Mr. Davidson's efforts to record the paintings in their original colours.

Mr. Aymer Yallance called the attention of the meeting to the fact that Norfolk screens, unlike those found in other parts of the country, were designed specially for decorative painting: this fact explaining their extreme lightness, height, openness and "subarcuated" character, whereas, elsewhere, the screens relied for their effect upon their architectural features alone.

Mr. Yallance pointed out that in one of the screens referred to, St. Stephen and St. Lawrence were represented wearing dalmatics of a type not adopted outside England, and in his opinion, this fact supported the view that the paintings were the work of English artists. The speaker called attention to the very rare painting of St. John, represented on the fourteenth-century screen at Edinthorpe, bearing the golden palm. He also reminded the meeting that St. Cytha, a secular, usually represented bearing a bunch of keys, was the same as St. Zita of Luca, the saint of the household, and must not be confused with the religious known as St. Osyth.

Mr. P. M. Johnston re-echoed the hope expressed by Mr. Francis Bond that the detail drawings so carefully prepared by Mr. Davidson might be published. With negligent and indifferent custodians, year by year the originals were fading away. The Chairman thought that more light might be thrown upon the origins of the paintings: the view that some of them, at any rate, were painted by subscription, would appear to be supported by the inscription on the screen at Cawston. He was also of opinion that a systematic tabulation of the paintings, in relation to their date and authorship, would also be of great value: in a recent visit to Norfolk, he had noticed the screens in the three churches of North Elham, Stanton and Thornham, all of which were clearly the work of one man. The information was only awaiting a careful search in the magnificent series of early wills preserved at Norwich.

Mr. Davidson briefly replied, and stated that it was his intention to devote next summer to a tabulation of the screens from the point of view of their authorship.

A hearty vote of thanks was accorded the author of the paper.
Wednesday, December 2nd, 1908.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, Vice-President, in the Chair.

In the absence of the author, the Honorary Acting Secretary read "A Note on a Leaden Font at Haresfield, Gloucestershire," by Mr. A. C. Fryer, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A., illustrated by a lantern slide of the bowl.

The paper is printed at page 287 of the Journal.

Mr. Francis Bond suggested that the bowl could not be dated earlier than the seventeenth century. In his opinion, the bowl in question betrayed a post-Reformation character, when the spirit had departed from the art of the Gothic craftsman. In support of this opinion he pointed out the inartistic way in which certain diagonal lines, well shown in the illustration facing page 287, run right across the vertical shafts. Mr. Garraway Rice also spoke.

The Rev. H. Bedford Pim, M.A., exhibited a series of about eighty slides of St. David's Cathedral, to which he added some explanatory notes. Mr. Pim raised several points during the exhibition, which he invited the members to discuss. The first of these arose out of the so-called tomb of bishop Morgan, of Bath stone, quite different from the effigy—which was of Painswick stone. The latter undoubtedly represented a bishop, while the initials T.W. on the tomb were, as had been suggested by Mr. Bligh Bond, very probably those of one John Wogan, a great benefactor to the church. The name Wogan was some times spelt Worgan in Cornwall and so perhaps created confusion with Morgan.

A second point was that the large ruined building of the college, frequently described in guide books as a chapel, was actually the frater of the canons who lived there, and whose chapel was the cathedral church itself.

It was also pointed out that the very remarkable open arcaded parapet, which surmounted the walls of the palace, had its counterpart at Swansea castle.

A point was made of the coastwise connection between St. David's and Bristol: Bristol masons worked at Dublin, and the great similarity visible between the work at St. David's, at Bristol and Glastonbury was evidence in favour of the existence of a great West-of-England school of architecture.

Mr. Herbert Jones exhibited a photograph of the west front of St. David's before the restoration, which was interesting as showing in the foreground Dr. Basil Jones, the bishop of St. David's, Canon Allen, Sir Gilbert Scott and Professor E. W. Freeman.

Messrs. W. H. Fox, P. M. Johnston, Francis Bond, W. P. D. Stebbing, and the Chairman, took part in the discussion, after which a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Pim for his interesting exhibition.