Proceedings at Meetings of the Royal Archaeological Institute.

1st February, 1911.


Mr. Ernest Woolley sent for exhibition two photographs of the early chalk foundations of the Merchant Taylors' Hall, Threadneedle Street, recently disclosed by building operations, and now covered up again.

Mr. J. W. Willis Bund, M.A. LL.B. F.S.A. read a paper on some ancient bridges and their impending destruction, with lantern illustrations.

After shewing on the screen a representative series of old bridges, mainly in Worcestershire, Mr. Willis Bund drew attention to the danger which threatened them. At the instance of road users, especially motorists, these bridges were being straightened, levelled, widened, disfigured with iron railings and footpaths on brackets, in many cases even being swept away to make room for unsightly steel and ferro-concrete structures.

In the discussion which followed the Chairman drew attention to the persistence of the round arch in bridge building right through the middle ages, even in the fourteenth century, when the pointed arch was so popular elsewhere. He also expressed a hope that as a result of Mr. Bund's paper, it might be possible to formulate some recommendations as to the best means of preserving old bridges.

Mr. Keyser, M.A. F.S.A. felt that there was much to be said in favour of the motorist's objection to old bridges, which were quite unsuited to modern fast traffic. In his opinion efforts should be made to divert this ever-growing stream by building new bridges, and to leave the old bridges alone, instead of endeavouring to adapt them to changed conditions.

Mr. R. Garraway Rice, F.S.A. pointed out that the great rise in the middle arch of mediaeval bridges, the feature to which most objection was taken nowadays, was due to the necessity of giving room for the passage of river traffic.

The Rev. F. J. Chanter, M.A. referring to Mr. Willis Bund's difficulty as to wooden bridges being mentioned as existing with or alongside stone ones, suggested that the explanation might be that the terminal arches were in some cases wooden ones while the rest were of stone. For military reasons this might have been a frequent occurrence. As an instance of this he mentioned the thirteenth-century bridge at Barnstaple, which, like many of those illustrated by Mr. Willis Bund, had its chapel and toll house. The bridge consisted of sixteen arches, of which the three nearest the town were originally of wood, but in the sixteenth century the wooden arches were taken down and replaced by stone ones.

Mr. W. R. L. Rawnsley said that concern for the fate of old bridges should not be confined to the larger or more important ones, and that the smaller bridges were in even greater danger.

On the motion of the Chairman a vote of thanks was passed unanimously to Mr. Ernest Woolley and Mr. Willis Bund.
8th March, 1911.

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

Mr. H. H. E. Craster, M.A. F.S.A. read a paper on the Abandonment of the Roman Wall. It is hoped that the paper may be printed in the Journal.

Mr. Craster said that excavations now in progress at Corbridge-on-Tyne have produced a series of several thousand coins, closing with a few coins of Arcadius minted in or shortly after A.D. 395. No coins of later date have been found along the Roman wall, though coins of Honorius are not wholly wanting in the south of England. Hence it seems possible that the wall was abandoned within a very few years of 395. The list of garrisons along the wall given in the Notitia Dignitatum is probably of Constantinian date, and the remainder of the British section shows garrisons only in the district round York and down the east and south-east coasts. The sixth legion was then stationed at York and the second at Richborough; the twentieth is wanting, and had perhaps been wiped out at the beginning of the reign of Valentinian I. In 402 Stilicho withdrew from Britain the legion that guarded the island against the Picts. This can only have been the sixth, and its withdrawal would involve the restriction of military occupation to the south-east corner of the island. A further withdrawal of troops from Britain by Constantine III in 409 appears to have included the second legion, which is afterwards found in Gaul. The result was to leave Britain destitute of any organised defence, and an immediate prey to the Saxons, but probably still more to the non-Romanised Celts of the Scottish lowlands.

Upon the motion of the Chairman a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Craster.

5th April, 1911.

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

Dr. Philip Nelson exhibited a fifteenth-century finial, fifteen inches high, cut from a bench end, found in Suffolk (plate i). Upon the front is a curious armed figure, clothed in a hooded tunic, a scaled skirt, with a scimitar by its side: the head is unfortunately mutilated. The figure is playing on the bagpipes and riding on a composite beast. This remarkable creature has a human cowled head, with the horn of a unicorn, its human right hand is extended as though in greeting, while its left front limb is that of an eagle: its hind quarters are those of a bull, and its beaded tail ends in an amphipsabaena-like head, which extrudes its tongue in the direction of the rider. Dr. Nelson suggested that the figure might represent Pride riding on the Seven Deadly Sins.

Dr. Nelson also exhibited a small heraldic boss from the centre of a mazer. The Rev. H. R. Wilkinson then exhibited the embalmed head of Oliver Cromwell (plates iii, iv and v), and read some notes upon it.
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FINIAL OF A BENCH-END FROM SUFFOLK, IN THE POSSESSION OF DR. PHILIP NELSON.
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PORTRAIT OF OLIVER CROMWELL, BY COOPER, AT SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
Professor Gilbert Bourne also sent for exhibition a skull, which had been in the old Ashmolean Museum at Oxford since the days of Elias Ashmole, and also reputed to be that of Oliver Cromwell.

In introducing Mr. Wilkinson, the Chairman read letters from Professor C. H. Firth, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, and Mr. Keith of the Royal College of Surgeons, expressing their regret at being unable to be present.

The Rev. H. R. Wilkinson, before beginning the notes upon the head, desired the members to understand that although it had been in the possession of his family for four generations, the head had never been exhibited publicly since it had come into the possession of his family. It was no ordinary relic, but human remains, and human remains of a very famous man, and he would consider it a very improper thing to keep it above ground if it were not treated with reverence and respect. As this was a private meeting and the Institute a society of people who would look at the matter in a proper spirit, he had great pleasure in bringing it there that day.

Mr. Wilkinson then read the notes which his great grandfather had made. They are as follows:

A NARRATIVE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONCERNING THE HEAD OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

By the late Mr. Josiah Henry Wilkinson.

"Oliver, the second son of Robert Cromwell, Esq. of Huntingdon, by his wife Elizabeth, daughter of William Steward, Esq. of the city of Ely, was born in the parish of St. John in the town of Huntingdon, 25th April, 1599, was inaugurated Protector 12th December, 1653, died at Whitehall Palace, aged 60, 3rd September, 1658, and was buried with more than regal honours in Henry VII’s chapel, Westminster Abbey. After the Restoration in January, 1661, the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, his son-in-law Henry Ireton, who had been Lord Deputy of Ireland, and John Bradshaw, who, as President of the pretended High Court of Justice, had pronounced sentence of death on king Charles I, were by a vote of the House of Commons, of 8th December, 1660, taken out of their graves by John Lewis, a mason, as appears by his receipt as follows: 'May the 4th day, 1661, received then in full of the Worshipful Sargeant Norfolke (of the Heralds' Office) fifteen shillings for taking up the corpses of Cromwell and Ireton and Bradshaw, received by me, John Lewis.' The coffins containing the bodies of Cromwell and Ireton were taken up on Saturday, 26th January, 1661, and on the Monday night following were drawn in two carts from Westminster Abbey to the Red Lion Inn in Holborn, where they remained all night: Bradshaw was not taken up until the following morning: and on the anniversary of king Charles's death, 30th January, 1661, all the three bodies were conveyed on sledges to Tyburn and there hanged at the three several angles of the gallows until sunset. Though the conveyors left the Red Lion Inn before break of day, in the hope of avoiding the populace, the latter were upon the watch and pelted the regicides with stones, brickbats, and mud all the way to Tyburn. At sunset they were cut down, beheaded, the trunks
thrown into a deep pit under the gallows; and the heads spiked upon oak poles, and set or fixed upon the top of Westminster Hall. In this situation the head of Oliver Cromwell remained, exposed to all the vicissitudes of the season for twenty-five years; and though it exhibits strong marks of severe treatment and great abuse, yet, consideratis considerandis, it is wonderfully preserved.

"This may be accounted for by the fact related in Mr. Sainthill's manuscript quoted in Noble's Memoirs, vol. i. page 290, where the author mentions his being an eye-witness of the state of the body, and that 'Cromwell's was so carefully and elaborately embalmed that it was at that time very fresh in green cere-cloth.'

"The tradition respecting the head of Oliver Cromwell is that, being on a stormy night, in the latter end of the reign of James II, blown off from the top of Westminster Hall, it was taken up by a sentinel who was on his parade, and at whose feet it fell, and who, perceiving what it was, placed it under his cloak till he went home: there he hid it in the spacious chimney of his room without acquainting his wife and daughter of the circumstance. Having concealed it for two or three days before he saw the placards which ordered any one possessing it to take it to a certain office, he was afraid to divulge the secret, till on his deathbed he discovered it to his wife and daughter. The latter being married, her husband looked out for the best market, and sold it to one of the Cambridgeshire Russells, through which family it descended privately, in the box in which it is now deposited, till it came into the possession of the late Samuel Russell, who being an indifferent comic actor of dissolute habits, and very needy, exhibited it at a place near Clare Market. Here Mr. James Cox, formerly proprietor of the celebrated museum which bore his name, first saw it, about the year 1780. Being struck particularly by the appearance of the embalmed head, and convinced by all the circumstances attached to it that it was the identical head of Oliver Cromwell, Mr. Cox offered Russell £100 for it; nevertheless, poor as he was, and considerably in debt, he refused to part with it, so dear to him was that which he knew to be the sacred relic of his great ancestor.

"However, Mr. Cox said that he assisted Russell from time to time with money till the debt amounted to £100, and then by paying an additional sum he obtained the head which Russell by a legal deed transferred to him. Mr. Cox giving up his museum, sold the head to the three late proprietors for £230, and these three gentlemen, being strong democrats, at the beginning of the French Revolution, bought it for the purpose of exhibiting it publicly, which they did, in Bond Street (at half-a-crown from each person). It is rather remarkable that each of these three gentlemen met with a sudden death: the last, who was a friend of mine, dropped in an apoplectic fit from his horse, and his daughter, whose property the head became, marrying, her husband sold it to me in 1815. Examining this wonderful matter critically, a consideration of the greatest importance is that you will not find in all history an account of a head being first embalmed and then spiked, except Oliver Cromwell's; for these circumstances, being the two extremes of honour and disgrace, they never met before nor

1 See note1 on page 242.
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since, in the same person. The noblemen who were traitors were beheaded, and their heads spiked but not embalmed; Oliver was embalmed and buried as a potentate, and afterwards hung and spiked as a delinquent.

"This is a most important fact, because unless it can be proved that this head has been embalmed and spiked for a deception, we should need no other circumstance to establish it as the identical head of the great Protector. Now the object itself bears such characteristic marks of age that at the first glance one may be almost convinced that it can be no modern deception. And when you observe it more closely you may perceive that the oak staff is in such a state that, as the late Mr. Kendal, a connoisseur in wood, remarked, it would require a hundred and fifty years to reduce an oak staff of such size to such a state of decay. And to prove that the head and the staff were exposed to the atmosphere at the same time, the same worm which has perforated the one has perforated the other.

"Then again no deception would have been attempted so far back as a hundred and fifty years ago, for some lived, Oliver's son Richard, for instance, to eighty years of age, who could have proved and have exposed the deception. Finally, no one living at the proper time for practising such deception could have procured by any means a head like this combining so many characteristic features of the head and face of Oliver Cromwell. Deception, therefore, is out of the question.

"We shall next exhibit what we call the positive proofs, the particular features of Oliver's head and face; and these were not only stated to me by the late Mr. Flaxman, before he saw the head, but have likewise been collected from the best authors and portrait painters of the time.

"His hair was of a chestnut colour, which seldom, if ever, turns grey; and, therefore, though he was sixty years of age, there is not a grey hair on the embalmed head. No doubt but exposure to the atmosphere, and the embalming liquor, might make some little alteration in the colour, but it is evident that it was a true chestnut originally. When the head came into the possession of the last Russell, he said that it had three times the quantity of hair which it now exhibits, but that different people to whom he shewed it, and he was often drunk at the time, cut off portions of it to take away with them. Cromwell's forehead was low and broad, his eyebrows were strong and grew near to each other. His cheekbones were high. The septum of his nose was high and inclined to the left side, and the end large and fleshy. His chin was not prominent, the lower jawbone particularly short and straight, and the orbits of his eyes large. The wart was close above the right eyebrow, at the angle nearest the nose. All these particulars, which I knew previously, were stated to me by the late Mr. Flaxman before he saw the embalmed head, in which they are all evident. This eminent sculptor said that if I could exhibit to him one feature which was peculiar to all the Cromwell family, and most strongly marked in the Protector, he should believe it to be Oliver's head, before he examined the other peculiarities. This feature was a particularly short, straight lower jawbone. Mr. Flaxman was immediately convinced by the manifestation of it in this embalmed head.

"I shall now notice, as a presumptive proof, the fleshy part of the nose being knocked down flat, to the side of the right cheek, where it has stuck, destroying, of course, all shape or resemblance of the nose. This was done
most probably by the executioner, who, not furnishing the regicide body with a block, laid his face upon a stone, or the ground, and by the blow which severed the head from the body knocked the nose flat, as represented. The same wantonness or negligence directed the first blow of the axe so near to the occiput that it could not effect the decapitation, and the division or gap made by that instrument in the solid flesh of the neck is another striking circumstance. Now if we were to procure a head and be at the trouble and expense of embalming it, for the purpose of imposing it upon the world as the head of Oliver Cromwell, we should certainly not take pains to destroy any likeness by knocking the nose flat, but we should endeavour to mould it or form it as much as possible into the shape of the nose we wished to exhibit.

"So of the wart: we should not be content with shewing merely the excavation made by the loss of it, but we should contrive to make an artificial wart, which might be easily effected. In the same manner the lips are destroyed and the cheeks beaten in, which would not have been the case if the head had been preserved for deception.

"Another corroborating circumstance, related to me by Mr. Flaxman, the intimate friend of the late Mr. Oliver Cromwell, is that during the last illness of the Protector his mind became remarkably debilitated, indeed to such a degree of timidity and superstition, that he would not suffer himself to be shaved, so that his beard, which during health he wore in a particular type, grew promiscuously over his cheeks and chin, and even long, like a Jew's; and when the cast was taken after his death, which was in the possession of the late Mr. Oliver Cromwell, the Protector's relations objected to it, because the impression which it had received of the beard very much diminished the natural resemblance of his countenance. The beard is grown in exactly the same manner over the face of the embalmed head. Beside other abuse and mutilation which it has encountered, one of the ears was cut off and taken away, during the exhibition of it by Russell.

"The manner in which the spike is thrust through the skull, and the oxygenated point of it, is worthy of notice."

Mr. Wilkinson then spoke of the skull in the Ashmolean museum at Oxford, which used to be exhibited and labelled as Cromwell's skull, and of the fortunes of which, before it came into the possession of Ashmole, a long account was given in the old catalogue. But somewhere about 1870 Dr. Rolleston, the great authority on craniology and at that time curator of the Ashmolean museum, paid a visit to his (Mr. Wilkinson's) father and spent a whole morning in examining and measuring the Wilkinson head, and comparing it with the death-mask. On his return to Oxford the Ashmolean skull was relegated to a back shelf; and in the new catalogue prepared by Rolleston, it is entered as "No. 561. Imperfect calvaria, with hole in right parietal: once supposed to be that of Oliver Cromwell." It is now in the new university museum at Oxford under the charge of Professor Gilbert Bourne, who very kindly allowed it to be brought to the Institute meeting that it might be placed side by side with the Wilkinson head. Dr. Bourne pointed out that the hole in the skull has sharp edges at the external surface, splaying towards the inside. This shows that the hole was made by a blow from the outside and not from a pike being thrust
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through from the inside: the hole also is not in the centre, on the line of
the sutures, as it would be if the head had been impaled on a pike.

In 1857 Dr. A. P. Stanley, the well-known dean of Westminster, paid
a visit to Mr. Wilkinson's grandfather, and spent a considerable time in
examining the head. In a letter to his sister (see Prothero's edition of his
letters, page 287), he thus describes what he saw:

"Now for the head itself. Out of the two strong boxes and many
wrappings its present owner produced it, and it is its own best witness.
An embalmed head like a mummy, with the marks of two strokes of the axe
on the neck, and the ancient oak staff and iron spike running through its
skull. The hair still remains, so that you see the moustache, beard, and eye-
brows meeting. There is the mark of the mole on the right eyebrow. The
nose is slightly turned to the left. The under jaw is short, as was his. A
very awful apparition, and I myself believe it can be no one's but Cromwell's
own . . ."

Mr. Wilkinson in displaying the head said it looked very small, but that
was to be expected in a mummy: measure for measure it was hardly more
than a skull, so shrunken was the flesh, but for a skull it was extremely large.
The short, straight lower jawbone was particularly marked, and if one were
to add in imagination the flesh necessary to make the one remaining ear its
natural size, one would find it a very large head.

The Chairman, Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, then read a paper on
the same subject.

THE HEAD OF OLIVER CROMWELL.


You have heard Mr. Wilkinson's most interesting remarks on the
wonderful relic he possesses. I should like with your permission to
supplement it and to fill up some gaps in its history, especially in view
of some opinions which have been lately expressed in regard to it, and in
doing so I desire on behalf of the Institute and of myself to thank
Mr. Wilkinson very cordially for entrusting to this Society the head which
has kept so long and so reverently.

The head in question has been known for a long time, and there has
been an intermittent revival of interest in it. The only occasion, however,
on which it has been the subject of a dissertation was in 1905 when
Dr. Welldon wrote an article in the Nineteenth Century Review, in which
he comes to an adverse conclusion about it. The article in question was
largely based on evidence collected from printed and other sources by
Mr. Herbert of the manuscript department of the British Museum,
and very much the larger part of it was in no sense polemical nor did
it deal with the authenticity of the head, but with the last days, the
death, the burial, and the disentombment of the remains of Cromwell,
and with the subsequent decapitation of the body and the exposure of
the head at Westminster Hall. The question of the authenticity of any
particular head which claims to have been Cromwell's occupies only a
few paragraphs at the end of this long paper.
One may say at once that it is only, or rather mainly, with the latter issue that we are concerned this afternoon, and that with nine-tenths of Dr. Welldon's paper we have no quarrel. The facts referred to in this, the greater part of the paper, are not questioned nor are the inferences denied. They are obviously unanswerable and have never been disputed.

We need therefore merely glance at them. The facts relating to the last days of Cromwell are set out quite plainly in the famous organ of the government which was issued weekly and answered in some measure to the modern *Gazette*. It was known as the *Public Mercury*, *Mercurius Publicus*. In this newspaper every stage in the illness of the Protector and in the subsequent disposal of his body is set out, and the whole story has been very well condensed by Dr. Welldon. We may pass it all by until we come to the post mortem examination of the great man's remains.

In the Commonwealth *Mercury*, under the date 4th September, 1658, we read: "This afternoon the Physicians and Chirurgians appointed by Order of the Council to embowel and embalm the body of his late Highness, and fill the same with sweet Odours, performed their duty."

Of this proceeding we have an account by Dr. George Bate, M.D. Cromwell's own physician; he attended him at his death and his testimony is unimpeachable. He gives us what he calls "the account of the embalming of the body" which is contained in a tract entitled *Elenchi motuum nuperorum in Anglia*, written in Latin. This is a most important element in the case, for if the body of Cromwell had been merely examined by the doctors in the usual way and then buried, this very interesting if very gruesome relic would not have been here to-day. It is because the body of Cromwell was embalmed and because the head before us is an embalmed head and not a mere skull that the prima facie case in its favour is so strong. Let us see then what Dr. Bate says about it. He tells us that after Cromwell's death there was an autopsy on his body which showed that he had some internal complaint but not any very serious disease: in fact one of the surgeons reports that it is rather remarkable that he should have died at all. Bate goes on to say, and I will give the words in his own Latin: "Corpus, etsi excuteratum, aromate repletum, quadruplicis ceratis involutum, loculo plumbo, dein ligneo includeretur, obstacula tamen omnium fermento perrupit, unde necessarium erat ante solennes exequias terrae mandare. "i.e. The body, being disembowelled and filled with spices, was wrapped in a four-fold cere cloth. It was placed in a leaden coffin, then in a wooden one. Notwithstanding these precautions the body began to ferment and it became necessary to put it in the ground before the solemn ceremonies of the funeral.

This makes it plain that, like those of the kings who preceded him, Cromwell's body was embalmed. The process of embalming does not entirely stop the changes in the body, which until the flesh becomes dry continues to suppurate. This may be still seen in some royal vaults abroad, and notably in that of the Portuguese royal family where the process of embalming has not prevented for some time afterwards the occurrence of some noisome experiences. It is necessary to say this because it has been urged that what Dr. Bate calls fermentation of the body raises doubts as to it having been really embalmed. The result in the case of Cromwell was that the body was immediately placed in a hastily prepared vault in
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4.—LORD PROTECTOR MEDAL, 1653.
Henry VII's chapel. It has been sometimes suggested that this haste was due to some fear of an outbreak. The doctor explains it by a perfectly natural and very different motive.

The body having been put away in the vault just named, there was prepared, as had been customary in many royal funerals, an effigy of the dead man, which took its place at the funeral pageant. We have an account of the payments for this effigy, and full details of the lying in state, not of the body, but of the effigy, and we are further told that after lying in state for three months the same effigy was put alongside of the monument under which the body had already been placed, that is to say, in Henry VII's chapel, where a special vault had been prepared for it, and close to it were buried two or three of his family, including Ireton, and also one or two more of his principal supporters. Bradshaw does not appear to have been buried there. In this vault Cromwell's, where a special vault had been prepared for it, and close to it were buried two or three of his family, including Ireton, and also one or two more of his principal supporters. Bradshaw does not appear to have been buried there. In this vault Cromwell's body lay until the restoration, when by a special motion in parliament it was taken up. The accounts for expenses of the subsequent proceedings are extant, including the receipt given by John Lewis, the mason, for the money paid him for opening the vault. These have been given by Mr. Wilkinson. 1

The next step in the case was the removal of the remains of Cromwell, Ireton and Bradshaw to Tyburn, on 28th January, 1661. The body of Cromwell had then been buried three years and would in ordinary circumstances have been entirely disintegrated, but instead of this we have the witness of one who saw it then that it was extraordinarily preserved, and that it was so carefully and elaborately embalmed that it was at that time very fresh in cere cloth. This evidence has also been given by Mr. Wilkinson from Noble's Memoirs (i, 290). I iterate it here because it emphasises very much what is a crucial point in the whole controversy, namely, that in this case we have not to do with a mere skull as Dr. Welldon supposes but with an embalmed head which after three years would become hard and dry, with skin like parchment.

The bodies of the three men were hung in chains at Tyburn, and at sunset cut down and decapitated. While the heads were moved to Westminster the bodies were buried in a deep pit at Tyburn, where it would have been a very dangerous and difficult thing, in view of the popular opinion of the times, for any one to dig for them or remove them. Various legends, however, have arisen professing that Cromwell's body was nevertheless disinterred privately and taken elsewhere. Mr. Alfred Holt of Liverpool, in a paper entitled Cromwell's Burial Place, has dissected the different forms of the legend with considerable skill, and I must refer you to his pages for further information. My own view is that in all forms the story is a very suspicious and incredible one. What we have to do with, however, is not the body but the head, and to this we must return.

At Westminster, Cromwell's embalmed head and what remained of those of Ireton and Bradshaw were placed on three oak-shafted pikes and exposed to view at Westminster Hall. Here I must mention a curious point which does not affect the actual issue but is worth naming at this point in the story. There is a slight divergence between the statement in the official document as published in The Mercury and the statement of Pepys. In The

1 See page 233.
it is said: “The heads of those three notorious regicides, Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, and Henry Ireton were set upon poles upon the top of Westminster Hall by the common hangman.” Now Pepys himself paid a visit, I believe on the day on which the impalement took place, and this is what he enters in his journal, and he was generally accurate: “I went to Westminster Hall, where I saw the heads of Cromwell, Bradshaw and Ireton set up at the further end of the hall.” This seems to imply that the heads were exposed not outside but inside the hall. If so they must have been fastened in some way we cannot explain to one of the beams or have been attached to the back wall of the hall. This would defeat the whole object of the impalement which was to strike terror into regicides: they would not be visible to the people in the streets surrounding the hall, and only to the casual visitors, and it would in fact seem that Pepys’ statement, which is cryptic, was not meant to bear this meaning.

The next time the heads are mentioned is in respect of 1684. We read in the third edition of Eichard’s History of England, published in 1720, that in 1684 Thomas Armstrong, one of the leaders of the Rye House Plot, was executed, and that his head was put on a pike between those of Bradshaw and Cromwell. This statement points to one of the heads having then disappeared. We may well doubt whether it was possible after twenty years’ exposure to the weather that any one could distinguish from the ground whose head had gone. As Armstrong’s head was put in the middle, the very great probability is that it was Cromwell’s head which had indeed gone, for it is incredible that the head of much the most important of the three should not have occupied the central place and been supported on each side by those of his satellites, and it is very probable that the head of the Protector was no longer on the roof of Westminster Hall in 1684. This is the last direct notice of the head in connexion with Westminster.

The next reputed reference to it is in the old catalogue of the Ashmolean collection at Oxford, where we find on page 67 an entry of “a cranium said to be Oliver Cromwell’s.”

The following account is taken from a book containing memoranda of presents made to the museum:

“In the year 1672, Oliver’s skull was blown off the north end of Westminster Hall down into the leads of the same, and taken from thence by Mr. John Moore, then in the old Petts. Sometime after this he gave it to Mr. Warner, apothecary, living in King Street, Westminster. Mr. Warner sold it for 20 broad pieces of gold to Humphrey Dove, Esq. then deputy paymaster to the treasurer of the chamber, but had been secretary to Fines when keeper of the seals to Oliver. This skull was taken out of Mr. Dove’s iron chest at his death in 1687 by his daughter, Mrs. Mary Fishe of Westminster, with which family it hath remained until given to Mr. E. Smalterrell (?).

“Westminster, October 10th, 1720.”

This entry, which was made as 1720, is very circumstantial. It refers to a number of people who must have been well known then, and it emphatically states that Cromwell’s skull was blown from the roof of Westminster Hall in 1672, and professes to give its subsequent history till the year 1720. It implies that the skull just named is the one which has been so long in the Ashmolean Museum, and which has been sent for exhibition to-day.
by the courtesy and kindness of Professor Bourne, to whom we are under great obligations.

That the Ashmolean skull is that of Cromwell or of either of his two friends seems most improbable if not impossible. This is the opinion of all the competent people who have examined it.

Professor Rolleston, in a letter written to Mr. Wilkinson in January, 1875, throws doubt upon its authenticity.¹

In a manuscript catalogue of the Ashmolean Museum made by Dr. Rolleston, but not in his handwriting, we have the entry: “No. 561, imperfect calvaria with a hole in the right parietal. Once supposed to be that of Oliver Cromwell.” This last clause is a very damaging testimony against the authenticity of the skull on the part of its curator, who would hardly have ventured on such an opinion if he had believed the relic was as precious as some had made out. Dr. Rolleston therefore came to a negative conclusion about it.

Dr. Bourne, the present custodian of the skull, writes to me that it had long since lost all character of authenticity and he draws attention to the fact that the hole in the parietal bone proves on examination to have been made from above, for the clear-cut aperture of entry is external and the bone has flaked away internally. That is only consistent with an instrument having been driven into it, not from the bottom, but from the top, and the hole therefore never could have been made by a pike thrust up from below. The skull has no trace of skin or flesh or hair to show that it had ever been embalmed, but looks as if it had been macerated.

It is therefore very satisfactory that two custodians of the museum have both arrived at that opinion, and that the skull is now labelled with a most sceptical and doubtful label, and it is plain that whatever be its origin the skull which we have here to-day cannot be equated with that described in the document at the Ashmolean as having been blown off

¹ He writes as follows:

"Anatomical Department,
Ashmolean Museum,
Oxford.

Dear Sir,

I venture to address you in my capacity of Professor of Anatomy in this place upon the question of Oliver Cromwell's skull, the reason for my writing being that we have here in our museum a skull which has often been measured and referred to as being that skull. I have, however, never so referred to it, having never been satisfied as to its authenticity. Its history so far as I know is this: When our new museum was built and the natural history collections of the old Ashmolean Museum were transferred to it, and put so far as their anatomical specimens went, into my hands, I had the so-called skull, or more properly speaking calvaria of Oliver Cromwell handed over to me. Knowing that it had often been measured and referred to by craniographers and craniometricians, I had it carefully mounted on an oaken stand and covered with a glass shade, but all that I had to refer to as evidence for its authority was the accompanying extract from the Ashmolean catalogue, which I enclose (i.e. the document previously quoted). I had heard some years ago that the real skull was in the possession of a gentleman of your name, but I never obtained your address.

I should very much value the opportunity of being allowed to see your specimen, the evidence for the authenticity of which seems so much more complete than I had any idea, and if it should meet with your approval it might be well to publish what such an examination enabled me to say about it.

I am, dear sir,

Yours truly,

George Rolleston,
Professor of Anatomy.

Horace Wilkinson."
Westminster Hall in 1672, and giving its history for some fifty-five years after.

Let us now turn to the history of Mr. Wilkinson's embalmed head. First in regard to its later history. This begins when it was in the possession of a certain Samuel Russell, who claimed to belong to Cromwell's family, and who had become a comedian and was very impecunious. One of the first documents in regard to it is the contract for its sale by Russell. This document is in Mr. Wilkinson's possession. Some doubts have been expressed as to its authenticity, but these doubts are quite unfounded. It has been especially examined for me by my friends, Sir George F. Warner, Mr. Gilson and Mr. Herbert, of the manuscript department of the British Museum, the best judges I could find, who all attest its genuineness. The paper, the watermark, the ink, the writing, the form, the stamp, and the attestation are all perfectly right.

To this contract is appended a short memorandum affirming the delivery of the head to James Cox, the purchaser, and signed by a witness named Magnial or Magniac. This document is conclusive evidence that on the 30th day of April, 1787, the head was sold with a warranty by Russell to Cox for £118, £101 of the sum having been already advanced by Cox to the impecunious vendor. Cox is described in it as a jeweller living in Shoe Lane in the city. He is otherwise known to have had a museum of curiosities.

The next important document that we possess is a copy of a letter written to Cox: it is dated 10th January, 1799, and shows that the latter

Know all men by these presents that I, SAMUEL RUSSELL of Keppel Street, in the Parish of Saint Saviour's, in the County of Surrey, as well for and in consideration of the sum of One hundred and one pounds heretofore advanced to me by James Cox of Shoe Lane in the City of London, Jeweller, as for and in consideration of the further sum of Seventeen Pounds, making together the sum of One hundred and eighteen pounds, to me in Hand paid by the said James Cox at and before the sealing and delivery of these Presents the receipt of which said several sums of money I the said Samuel Russell do hereby acknowledge and thereof and therefrom and of and from the same respectively and every part thereof do acquit release and discharge the said James Cox his executors and administrators for ever by these Presents have Bargained and Sold released granted and confirmed and by these Presents do bargain and sell release grant and confirm unto the said James Cox all that skull or head supposed to be the skull or head of Oliver Cromwell to have and to hold the said skull or head unto and to the only use and behoof of the said James Cox his executors administrators and assigns absolutely for ever free from and without any interruption or disturbance whatsoever of from or by me the said Samuel Russell or any other person or persons whatsoever and I the said Samuel Russell for myself my executors and administrators do by these Presents covenant and promise that I the said Samuel Russell shall and will warrant and for ever defend the said skull or head unto the said James Cox his executors administrators and assigns against me the said Samuel Russell my executors and administrators and against all and every other person or persons whomsoever and I the said Samuel Russell have put the said James Cox in full possession of the said skull or head by delivering him the same at the time of the sealing and delivery hereof. IN WITNESS whereof I the said Samuel Russell have hereunto set my hand and seal the thirtieth day of April in the Year of Our Lord One thousand seven hundred and eighty seven.

SAMUEL RUSSELL.

Sealed and Delivered and Livery and Seisin of the said skull or head given to the said James Cox by the said Samuel Russell delivering seizin thereof to the said James Cox in the presence of F. Magnial.
had then disposed of the head. A copy of it is preserved among Mr. Wilkinson's papers.  

The letter is especially important since doubts have been cast on this part of the story by Dr. Welldon on the ground that the head is not mentioned among the curiosities sold at the sale of Cox's museum, of which a catalogue is extant. The fact is he did not acquire it until after the sale of his museum, as the dates show. It would seem that the Hughes who signed the letter was the agent through whom the sale took place. Having passed out of Mr. Cox's possession the purchasers, three brothers, seem to have at once prepared for an exhibition of the head, and the next document in its history is one of remarkable importance. It is a pamphlet of twenty pages, entitled, "Narrative relating to the real embalmed head of Oliver Cromwell now exhibiting in Mead Court, Bond Street, 1799." On the front page is a very beautifully and delicately made etching of the head, and representing it as far as we can judge in precisely the same condition that it is in at this moment (plate vi). A copy of this tract is in Mr. Wilkinson's possession, and, what is still more curious, the correspondence with the printers and the etcher in regard to it are also preserved by him.

In this tract, after describing the death, embalmment, decapitation and impaling of Oliver Cromwell's head, we read that the tradition respecting the head was that, being on a stormy night in the latter end of the reign of Charles II or James II blown off from the top of Westminster Hall, it was taken up by one of those many persons "whom the flagitious conduct

---

1 It reads thus:

"To James Cox, Esq. Watford.

Sir,

As I am on the treaty for the disposal of the O. C. skull which was purchased of you as the original article, I am desired to get some further information if possible on the points which I now take the liberty of submitting for your answers and observations as far as you have been able to collect them.

I learn from Dr. Combe, F.A. and A.S. that some years ago he saw a skull in Butcher Row, which was shown him as the real O. C. skull, and the doctor then concurred in that opinion and still does so. Pray was that exhibition of the present head, or did you ever hear of any other in Butcher Row?

I wish particularly to hear further about Samuel Russell of Keppel Street in the Borough, who sold the skull to you, and how he came by it, and whether it was not with much reluctance and after a long poverty he parted with it. What relation he was to O. C. or his son Henry, and where it is most likely this Samuel Russell (if living) can be found.

See the account of the Russells (which were connected with the Cromwells by 3 marriages) in Mark Noble's Memoirs of the political House of Cromwell. I am, etc.

T. M. Hughes."

[Copied from document that was written by Hughes at his house.]

2 Among the papers is the following note about the advertisement of the head:

"To Downes, printer.

No. 5 Mead Court, Old Bond Street, 18th February, 1799.

If the handbill is not yet printed, print it conformally to the enclosed. If it is printed then keep the enclosed by you for future operations.

J. C." (i.e. J. Cranch.)

The enclosure is as follows:

"The remains of the real embalmed Head of

The powerful and renowned usurper,

Oliver Cromwell,

styled Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland; with the original dyes for the medals struck in honour of his victory at Durham, etc. etc. are now exhibiting at No. 5 in Mead Court, Old Bond Street. Admittance and printed copy of a genuine narrative relating to the acquisition, concealment and preservation of the articles exhibited, two shillings and sixpence."
of these monarchs had by that time converted” to a more favourable opinion of Cromwell. By this person it was soon after presented to one of the Russell family, and in the possession of one branch or another of that family it remained many years until the last possessor, Mr. Samuel Russell, sold it to James Cox, Esquire, formerly proprietor of the celebrated museum which bore his name. The head was first seen by Mr. Cox about 1780 when exhibited, as far as he recollects, not far from Clare Market. On that occasion Mr. Cox first became acquainted with Russell, who then possessed the head, and who, being in indigent circumstances, requested Mr. Cox to assist him with money for his support. With a view to the acquisition some time or other of such a curiosity, Mr. Cox did this till 30th April, 1787, when in consideration of upwards of one hundred pounds which had been advanced, and a considerable sum then laid down, Russell by a legal deed, i.e. the document above quoted, transferred the head to Mr. Cox. “That gentleman having since retired from business and from town has lately sold it to the present proprietors. Mr. Cox says he purposely concealed it from his own family in order to prevent the trouble of incessant applications which he conceived would be made for a sight of it, and in case it should be publicly known that he possessed so extraordinary and interesting a curiosity, that he even denied the request of Mr. Alderman Wilkes, with whom he was well acquainted, and who being at the Globe Tavern in Fleet Street with a party of friends sent a deputation to Mr. Cox expressly for that purpose.” The pamphlet in question further says that one of the ears of the head was wanting, which is of course the case now, thus further identifying the present head with that just described. It was a family tradition with the Russells that the Protector's relations and admirers were occasionally admitted to see the head, and took those opportunities to pilfer such small parts as could well be got at or were least likely to be missed. The ear is said to have been taken away by one of the Russells of Fordham.

It will be seen that the story told in this tract completely confirms that in the contract of 1787, and traces the head into the hands of those who had bought it from Mr. Cox, and are there called “its present proprietors.” In the account of the head written by Mr. H. R. Wilkinson’s great grandfather in 1827, it is said that Mr. Cox on giving up his museum sold the head to the three late proprietors for £230, and these three gentlemen being strong democrats at the beginning of the French Revolution bought it for the purpose of exhibiting it publicly, which they did in Bond Street at 2s. 6d. from each person.

While still in the possession of the purchasers just named, it continued apparently to be shown occasionally for some years. A proof of this is contained in a document dated 1813 found among the Coles manuscripts and sent to me by Mr. J. P. Gilson and Mr. Herbert, of the British Museum (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 6306, fo. 84.)

---

1 21st April, 1813.

The Head of Oliver Cromwell.
The Head of Oliver Cromwell (and it is believed the genuine one) has been brought forth in the City, and is exhibited as a favor to such curious Persons as the Proprietor chuses to oblige: an offer was made this morning to bring it to Soho Square to shew it to Sir Joseph Banks, but he desired to be excused from seeing the remains of the old Villanous Republican, the mention of whose very name made his
Another document, in which the head is named, has recently been found by Mr. Stewart of the same department, while cataloguing the Liverpool papers in the British Museum. It is also dated in 1813, and consists of a letter by the proprietor of Bullock's Museum addressed to Lord Liverpool and a minute of the latter's reply.\(^1\)

It is plain from these documents that in April, 1813, the head still remained in the hands of the family of the three purchasers, who were brothers and who had purchased it from Cox. In his memorandum on the head, written in 1821, Mr. Josiah Henry Wilkinson, who was a doctor living in Kent, says the survivor of the three was a friend of his, and it was from the daughter of the latter that he bought it. She was no doubt the person mentioned in the earlier document just quoted, as "a young lady who had recently inherited the head."

A ludicrous circumstance occurred not long ago at the British Museum: there is, it seems, in the Ashmole Museum at Oxford, a skull said to be that of Oliver Cromwell: a Visitor at the British Museum after having seen the Curiosities that were there shewn him, enquired of the Assistant, "pray, Sir, have you a skull of Oliver Cromwell in this House," to which the Assistant answered, "no, Sir"; "well, Sir," said the Stranger, "I wonder at that, as they have one at the Ashmole Museum at Oxford!"

\(^1\) My Lord
I have just been offered for sale the Head of Oliver Cromwell still intire with the flesh on, having been embalmed and fixed on part of the Pike on which it was exposed by order of Charles the second.

Not being certain of the propriety of exhibiting such an article I have taken the liberty of soliciting your Lordships opinion on it—at the same time declaring that I am induced to think of it as a mere matter of curiosity uninfluenced by any political opinions respecting Cromwell's character.

I am my Lord
Your Lordships
very obliged and devoted Servant
Museum Piccadilly 24 April 1813.
To the Earl of Liverpool.

*The above letter is endorsed as follows:*—
(96.) 24 April 1813; Mr. Bullock requesting to know Lord L's opinion as to the propriety of exhibiting the head of Oliver Cromwell in his Museum

Ans\(^3\) by L. stating the strong objection which wd. naturally arise to the exhibition of any human remains at a Public Museum frequented by Persons of both Sexes and of all ages.

---

\(^{1}\) My Lord

---

\(^{3}\) Ans: Answer
The profession to which Mr. Wilkinson belonged is one not given to credulity and apt to be sceptical, and we may be sure he sifted the story about the head with considerable pains before he bought it. From Mr. Josiah Wilkinson the head passed to his son, who was for some time member of parliament for Lambeth. From him it again passed to Mr. Horace Wilkinson who lived at Sevenoaks in Kent, the father of the present proprietor. Thus its history from the year 1787, when it was sold to Cox by Russell, to the present day is perfectly continuous and without a break.

Let us now say a few words about the history of the documents. The etcher of the portrait in the pamphlet above named was John Cranch, an antiquary as well as an artist, who died at Bath in 1851. His initials J. C. are attached to a letter above quoted.

Mr. Wilkinson also has the invoice for printing off 260 copies of the etching paid by Cranch to the printer. It would seem that the proprietors of the head deposited the various papers and documents relating to the head, including the contract for its sale by Russell to Cox, with Mr. Cranch as a security for the moneys owing to him in regard to the exhibition and the pamphlet. As this was never paid, the documents in question remained in his hands. Some years later, namely in 1819, Mr. Wilkinson entered into negotiations with Mr. Cranch for their purchase, as appears from the papers in the possession of his descendant, but they failed, and the papers remained in his possession till his death in March, 1831, when they passed to his nephew John Cranch, who lived in Devonshire and afterwards went to America, taking with him the contract of 1787. The other papers remained with his family in England and were brought by Mr. W. A. Wilkinson from the granddaughter of the elder Cranch in April, 1856, for £5, the receipt for which is among Mr. Wilkinson's papers.

On the death of Mr. John Cranch, Junr. in America, one of his nieces, named S. C. Bond, found the contract of 1787 among his papers. An interesting letter from this lady to Mr. Horace Wilkinson tells the rest of the story. 1

Therefore, both in regard to the head and to the documents concerning it, the story is perfectly consistent and reliable from the time of its original

---

1 No. 1 Sea View Terrace, Babbicombe, S. Devon. 28th January, 1878.

Mr. Horace Wilkinson.

Dear Sir,

The correspondence you have recently had with my cousin, Mr. J. C. Willcocks of London, will explain my purpose in addressing you. I understand from him that you are willing to pay ten pounds for the assignment (i.e. the document of title) of the Head of Oliver Cromwell from Samuel Russell to James Cox, the date of which paper is April 30th, 1787. This amount is quite satisfactory to me as I hope it is to yourself, and I make no delay in transmitting (by Registered letter) the document to your address at Seven Oaks, hoping it may be received in the same good condition as it now is.

I may add that my attention was first called to this subject by an article in the Boston (U.S.) Herald of November 4th, 1895, recollecting then that I had seen amongst family papers some relating to Oliver Cromwell. I looked through those at hand and to my great surprise found the identical document in question. I can only suppose that it was brought to the United States many years ago by Mr. J. Cranch, who was my uncle and who resided for some time in my father's family there, and that on his return to England this, with some other similar effects, were left behind. I am very glad now to transfer it to an appropriate place amongst other relics of one of England's greatest men.

I am, Sir,

Yours very respectfully,

S. C. Bond.
possessor Russell down to to-day, and if the head is a sophisticated or forged relic it must have been sophisticated before the year 1787, the date of the contract conveying the head from Russell to Cox. The evidence as to its history does not stop here, however, for one of the documents above quoted carries back the story of the head to about the year 1773, when Sir Joseph Banks refused to look at it, because he thought Cromwell a villain.

In his memorandum on the head Mr. Wilkinson’s ancestor, who bought it, says that it appears by papers delivered by Mr. Cox with the head to the late proprietors that in the year 1775 the learned and ingenious Doctor Southgate, late librarian of the British Museum, had been applied to for his opinion of its identity; and that after a very attentive consideration of it and comparing it with medals, coins, etc. he had delivered his opinion in these words, “Gentlemen, you may be assured that this is the real head of Oliver Cromwell.”

Again the celebrated medallist, Mr. Kirk, gave his opinion in writing as follows: “The head shewn to me for Oliver Cromwell’s I verily believe to be his real head, as I have carefully examined it with the coin, and think the outline of the face exactly corresponds with it so far as remains.”

To about the same time or perhaps earlier we may probably assign the story told in the following document: “Mark North, the author of The Protectoral House of Cromwell, writing in 1799, says that a document was lent to him with permission to copy it by the Rev. Thomas Weeks Dalby, vicar of West Farley in Kent, and Chippenham in Wiltshire. He received it from a clergyman at Cambridge.”

We thus have very reliable evidence from several sources that the head was in the possession of its original owner Russell, and was exhibited by him several years before it came into the possession of Cox, who, it has been suggested, was probably a dishonest person and had the head prepared and palmed off upon the public. It will be noticed that Russell’s statement in regard to the head having been blown off Westminster Hall in a gale

It runs:

“Some years since a comedian went to Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and showed the head to the master, Dr. Ellison, which he thought he might be disposed to buy, as Oliver belonged to that college. The story he told them was that some time after the heads had been spiked a high wind one night broke that on which Oliver’s was fixed, a soldier going by early in the morning took it up with the spike in it and carried it home. The head being missed and it being supposed that it was taken away by one of Oliver’s party, a considerable reward was offered for the discovery of the person who had it in his possession. This frightened the soldier, who concealed it and at his death it remained in the family. The comedian married the granddaughter of the soldier, and as Dr. Ellison humourously observed, had Oliver’s head to her portion. Dr. Ellison declined to purchase it, and some time after it fell into the hands of Cox, who had the famous mechanical exhibition and jewellery museum at Spring Gardens, and who is supposed to now have it in his possession. Cox, inconvenienced by the number of persons who came to see it, changed his residence and kept the removal secret, and he now only shows it to those who go to see it with particular commendations from friends. Some time after Dr. Ellison’s interview with the comedian, he happened to be dining with Dr. Powell, the master of St. John’s, when the subject of the head was mentioned. Dr. Powell observed that he had heard his father say that the head was in possession of a person whose name he then mentioned, as well as the street and the part of the town where it was to be seen, which, as Dr. Ellison said, confirmed the statement of the comedian.”
and picked up by some one is so far the same as the independent story
told in the notice in the Ashmolean Museum.

The facts here reported enable us to give an unbroken and continuous
history to the head extending back as far as the year 1775. There our
actual documents stop, as it is inevitable they should stop, for it is hardly
likely that the head of a man who in the first three-quarters of the eighteenth
century was generally treated by the educated classes of this country as
a successful rebel, and a mere vulgar regicide who had put to death a
saintly king, would have been made the subject matter of public exhibition
or public discussion, especially in view of the fact that the relic, a head
which had been impaled, if existing anywhere, had been privately
appropriated.

At this point, therefore, we have to leave the external and to rely on
the internal evidence, the evidence of the object itself, which in many
cases is far more valuable than a mere oral or written testimony, since it
is much more difficult to sophisticate and to invent.

What then is the story which the head itself has to tell us. As I have
said, those who have referred to it as a mere skull, including Dr. Welldon,
have entirely mistaken the nature of the object. It is not a mere skull, and the
sole virtue of this particular relic as a piece of evidence is that it is not a
mere skull but a skull still covered with its flesh, that it is in fact an
embalmed head. Mr. Wilkinson in his remarks has given some of its details.
I propose to supplement them by some others. I shall not waste time in
proving that the head has been artificially preserved, that is, embalmed;
nor in arguing that it is only by some process of scientific and not merely
amateur embalming that it could have been preserved as it is.

As a correspondent, apparently a doctor, writing in The Times some years-
ago under the name of Seneca, says, the work has been so beautifully done
that the cellular process of the gums and the membranes of the tongue
are still to be seen, the membrane of the eyelids remains, as do several teeth,
while the pia mater and the dura mater, those membranes which lie over the
brain may be seen clinging to the inner and upper part of the skull.

It has not been realised what a difficult process embalmment was in
former times, and how it could only be done by skilled surgeons or other
practised hands. I have tried at times to find other instances, except
those of royal personages and very great grandees. There was a duke of
Albemarle who was embalmed, and I believe one of the Marlborough
family was embalmed, either the second or the third duke, but at the
beginning and in the middle of the eighteenth century embalming was
very rare indeed, and required a good deal of care and skill.

Again, it is a most extraordinary thing that the tradition that this
head was Cromwell's should go back to a time when very few people indeed
can have been aware that Cromwell had been embalmed at all, for the
account occurs in a very obscure tract written in Latin. The evidence
of his having been embalmed was only published in English a good deal
later, and therefore the notion of getting an embalmed head and passing
it off as Cromwell's would not occur at all to a man who wanted to pass
off a fake or a forgery.

Again, what motive could induce any person to go to the great expense
of having a head specially embalmed in those days and then to pass it off as
Cromwell's? Such a thing would be entirely out of the reach of the poor bibulous actor in whose hands it is first heard of, and who, no one suggests, stole it. It was certainly not for purposes of getting money for its exhibition, for we can trace it back to a time before it became the object of public exhibition. It must be further remembered that it is not a head merely with which we have to deal but an embalmed body as well. Rolleston and others are emphatic on the point that the head was cut off from a body already embalmed, as is shewn by the condition of the hacked neck. If the object was to fake a mere head in order to exhibit it, why should those who faked it have gone to the trouble and expense of embalming a whole body?

Again, the decapitation of the body after it had been embalmed is surely an almost conclusive fact. I know of no other instance in history, except Cromwell, of a man who was embalmed and remained so for two or three years until the tissues hardened, and was then decapitated. It will be remarked that the decapitation was most rudely and roughly done, not by a skilled executioner, but by a man who used a rough axe and actually hacked it off with more than one blow, as was no doubt the method employed when Cromwell's head was hacked off at the foot of the gallows at Tyburn.

Again, the head of Cromwell, after being embalmed and cut off, had a pike driven through it; so has this one. In regard to this an account which appeared in *The Daily Chronicle* of 6th November, 1895, accompanied by a large engraving of the head, contains some apt comments. It says: “A halberd end or a long iron pike on a wooden handle pierces the head right from the neck to the top of the skull. The wooden handle has been broken off by violence, being jagged and uneven, and the iron which projects through the bone is much eaten by the weather. It is quite clear that the halberd head and the human head have been locked in their revolting contact for a great period; they seem indissoluble companions.” This lucid statement of the facts entirely confirms the view of Mr. Kendal, the expert in wood, quoted in Mr. Wilkinson's memoir, who argued that it would take 150 years to reduce an oak staff of such size to such a state of decay, and who further urged that the staff and head were clearly exposed to the air at the same time, since one of the worm holes pierces both.

This adds a third factor to the proof and makes it really overwhelming. As we have seen there is no recorded case other than that of Cromwell in which a man was embalmed and after his flesh had become hardened was then decapitated. If this is so, it is still more certain that no head in all our history which had passed through these ordeals was impaled immediately after the decapitation, as we have seen this one was, except that of the great Protector.

There still remains another factor, however, of the first importance to the argument, namely the question of whether the head is like that of Cromwell or not. On this issue I believe every one who has seen it is firmly convinced that it can be nothing else than the Protector's head. Remember the class of people who have affirmed their conviction on this point. Not merely amateurs but professed artists of great distinction accustomed to notice and weigh the small and delicate nuances which constitute proof in such cases. Flaxman, the sculptor; Reynolds, the painter;
Kidd, the medallist; Southgate, the chief librarian of the British Museum; Dr. Samuel Gardiner, the great historian of the seventeenth century, whose delicate and sage judgment has made his work on the Caroline and Cromwell periods an English classic; Mr. Frederick Harrison, another historian of Cromwell, with very keen wits, and prone to that excellent form of scepticism which is the best scalpel for separating legends from facts, who has expressed his opinion on the head in several recent and vigorous letters in The Times.

Dean Buckland, the author of Reliquiae Diluvianae, examined the head carefully, as did his son, Frank Buckland, and they have left a graphic account of it, with an emphatic expression of opinion about its genuineness. Dean Stanley, a practised judge of historical and archaeological evidence, who, it will be remembered, was the person who first traced the burial place in the abbey of the remains of Cromwell's son-in-law, General Worsley, and proved their identity, not by documents but by an irrefragible chain of circumstantial evidence, also examined Mr. Wilkinson's head, and writing to his sister, says of it: "The head is its own best witness ... a very awful apparition, and I believe myself it can be no one's but Cromwell's own." He also emphasises the virtual impossibility of explaining the existence of a mummified head with the features of Cromwell, which had been decapitated a considerable time after embalmment and then impaled, and whose external history can be carried back to a date when the process of embalmment was so rarely practised.

This is surely a remarkable list of names, and it is only a sample of those who have seen the head and have written about it. The only people who have had any suspicions about it are those who have never seen it. The only one who has written an actual memoir on the subject is Dr. Welldon, who confesses naively that he was not permitted to see the head. "Argul" the evidence of every skilled observer who has done so must go for nothing. Pontifical judgments upon objects which the critics have never seen are not those we trust in this room.

In addition to these witnesses we have another set in the shape of the portraits of Cromwell, notably the fine one at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (plate ii), the miniatures of Cooper, the splendid medals and coins by Oliver (plate vii), and lastly more than one mask taken from his head after death, in which the resemblance to this head is most marked in every feature, even down to the wart on his cheek and the scanty whiskers and moustache, the colour of the hair, the beautiful modelling of the nervous forehead and cheek bones (plate vii). The process of embalming has necessarily and inevitably caused drying and shrinking in the fleshy parts, which are not therefore so full as in the masks and portraits, but otherwise the resemblance is complete.

To conclude, those who dispute the authenticity of the head and consider it a fake have to argue that a bibulous and impoverished man like Russell, or some unknown person from whom he had it, was lucky enough to find a fresh corpse of which the head was so like Cromwell's that it has convinced some of the very best judges in our annals that it must have been that of Cromwell himself, and no one else. Surely a miraculous discovery! Who has ever seen Cromwell's double? That having found the corpse this person, who must have known that Cromwell's body was
DEATH MASK OF OLIVER CROMWELL IN THE POSSESSION OF MRS. WOOLMER.
embalmed, when the fact was only known to two or three persons in the
realm, should have embalmed it in such a perfect way as was only possible
in the case of a skilled embalmer, at a time when skilled embalmers could
be counted on the fingers of one hand. That he then should have
beheaded his corpse by blows from a rude axe and having done so should
have thrust a pike through it, the iron head of which in 1787 was decayed
and oxidised, and the part of it outside the skull was much more decayed
than the part inside, while the handle was so worm-eaten that a skilled
witnes pronounced it a century ago to be one hundred and fifty years
old. That all these concurrent things should have been done in order to
make believe that the head was a genuine head of Cromwell at a time
when Cromwell’s reputation had not been rescued from his detractors, and
when even a scientific man of high repute, like Sir Joseph Banks, should
speak of him as a mere villain.

Those people who can believe all this can believe anything.

THE DISCUSSION.

Professor Boyd Dawkins, D.Sc. F.R.S. F.S.A. who voiced the thanks
of all present for the privilege of viewing the head of Cromwell, recalled the
time when he was an undergraduate at Oxford working out under Dr.
Rolleston several points connected with the skull in the Ashmolean museum.
Dr. Rolleston was never convinced that it was the skull of Oliver Cromwell,
and when he had examined the embalmed head of Mr. Wilkinson any
uncertainty he may have had disappeared. On craniological grounds
Professor Boyd Dawkins considered that the Oxford skull could not have
been Cromwell’s, both because it does not fit his capacity and because it
appears to belong to a younger man. While therefore the Ashmolean skull
might be dismissed, the evidence regarding the embalmed head was in his
opinion absolutely clear and distinct.

With regard to the colour of the hair the professor said that in his ex-
perience there is a shade of red in all hair, even the blackest, but it is obscured
by the black pigment; and as this fades the red shade comes further and
further to the front.

The Rev. F. S. Eld, M.A. F.S.A. drew attention to the fact that the
upper part of the skull or the calvarium had been entirely cut off in the
process of embalming in order to get at the brain. In the old days the
Egyptians extracted the brain through the nostrils, but here they had lost
the art and sawed off the whole of the upper part of the skull to get the
brain away. Another point was that Professor Rolleston, than whom
there had never been a greater craniologist, spent a whole morning measuring
and comparing the skull with the death mask. Though the latter looks
so much stouter and fatter, Dr. Rolleston made allowance for the flesh
having sunk, and he went away quite convinced that the death mask faith-
fully represented the embalmed head.

Mr. Eld added that it might be possible to say something about Dr.
Welldon’s article in the Nineteenth Century, June, 1905. He begins by
saying how very uncertain the details about the death of Cromwell are.
The day of his death is not quite certain, the day of his funeral is uncertain,
and the day of his exhumation is uncertain. About the funeral all sorts of theories have been started. One was that the body was taken away by his adherents because of the vengeance which would be wreaked upon it if the Royalists were restored, and it was said that it was thrown into the Thames. Other accounts make it to have been taken away secretly and buried at night at Naseby Field. There are various places where the body is said to have been buried, in addition to the tale that Charles I's body was substituted for it. Dr. Welldon came to the conclusion that the accounts of the actual funeral, upon which the nation spent no less than £30,000, and the execution, may be taken without further support. But Dr. Welldon objects altogether to the story of the Cox and Wilkinson head. He requires external evidence, or as he calls it "historical support," and entirely neglects the internal evidence afforded by the head itself. He objects to it because there is a gap between 1684 and 1787 not bridged over by any evidence of identity. But the deed set out above, by which Samuel Russell sold the head to James Cox in 1787, is only the last act in the possession of the head by the Russell family. He objects, somewhat illogically, that the head was not sold by Cox when he sold his museum in 1775, though it was not till 1787, twelve years later, that Cox is alleged to have bought the head. He objects also that the head "could not well have been sold by Cox privately without attracting attention." This seems to be pushing the demand for "historical evidence" to an absurd extreme. But Dr. Welldon admits that the Wilkinson head is probably the head sold to Cox in 1787. This traces it back into the possession of the Russells; and it is quite natural that they should have had it. For as Dean Stanley said, the Russells were an obscure family in Huntingdonshire, but they were related three times over by inter-marriage with the Cromwells, and it is most natural that the skull should come into their possession, and not into the possession of the Cromwells themselves, because the Cromwells during the eighteenth century preferred to lie low. One need not say they were ashamed of their descent from the great Protector, but they were reticent about it, and did not put it forward, but kept it as secret as they could because it created great odium and unpopularity in those times, and it seems very reasonable that the Russells should have the head. Mr. Eld fully agreed with the verdict with which the late Dean Stanley closes his account of it, that it had undergone these three vicissitudes, unparalleled in the history even of royal heads, embalmment, decapitation, and transfixment on a pike. Referring to the decapitation after death, in an ordinary decapitation the skin shrinks, but in this case the skin has not shrunk after the strokes which severed the head from the body.

Dr. Pegler drew attention to a statement to the effect that some time after Wilkinson came into possession of the head a boy came to his surgery for treatment with a head exceedingly like that of the reputed head of Oliver Cromwell. The boy's name was Williams, and Dr. Wilkinson satisfied himself that he was a direct male descendant of Oliver Cromwell, whose name had been orginally Williams.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope thought it would be desirable to have some expert opinion as to a comparison of the skull with all the various contemporary portraits, miniatures and medals. The historical evidence, after the skull passed into the hands of the actor Russell, appeared to Mr. Hope
genuine enough, but there was a period of one hundred years to bridge over between the time when it was set up upon a pike in Westminster Hall, and the time when it comes to light again as the reputed skull of Cromwell. It was difficult to come to any satisfactory conclusion as to whether the head was fixed outside or inside the Hall. Pepys spoke of the further end of the hall, and in Mr. Hope's opinion he spoke of one of two existing ends of Westminster Hall, one being the nearer end, as regards either him or some place he had in mind, and that other gable opposite at the further end. Then, again, the interior construction of the roof of Westminster Hall is not one on which it would be easy to display any skull because there are no beams going right across, and moreover had the skull been fixed inside the hall, it would not have been blown down by a storm.

3rd May, 1911.

Mr. G. C. Druce in the Chair.

Miss E. K. Prideaux read a paper on the sculptured figures on the west front of Exeter cathedral church, all of which were illustrated on the screen. It is hoped that the paper may be printed in the Journal.

In the discussion which followed Mr. Aymer Vallance, F.S.A. pointed out that in the sculptures apostles were represented barefoot, while the prophets wore shoes, and that some of the figures were crosslegged as a mark of particular dignity.

Mr. P. M. Johnston, F.S.A. observed that the pedestals between the figures correspond with those of the mid-fourteenth-century reredos at Christchurch, Hants. He also drew attention to the decadence which set in at Exeter after the early years of the thirteenth century, and pointed out that this loss of vigour and suppleness in design was regained in the reign of Henry VII, marking the close of the Gothic period.

The Chairman made a few remarks as to details, after which a cordial vote of thanks was passed to Miss Prideaux.

14th June, 1911.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, M.A. Director, in the Chair.

Mr. G. C. Druce read a paper entitled "Notes on the history of the Heraldic Jall or Yale," with lantern illustrations, which is printed at page 173.

In the discussion which followed Mr. C. D. Olive suggested that the derivation of Yale from Eale could be explained by the tendency to add a Y before a vowel.

The Rev. H. F. Westlake commented upon the silence of heraldry with regard to the name "jall." He ventured to think that in the later instances at least the heralds had lost the distinction between the jall and the heraldic antelope, and he asked Mr. Hope if he could say how it came about that the yale was among the king's beasts of Henry VIII. There did not appear to be
any particular reason for its inclusion. Professor Lethaby had said that great delay took place in the work in Henry V's chantry chapel, but the beast in question is on a part not affected by the delay, and its date may be fixed at about 1420–1440.

Mr. Hope said that in his opinion the yale was included among the king's beasts because it came from Lady Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII.

Mr. Westlake then asked why upon her tomb an antelope was represented, but Mr. Hope could not answer this question.

Mr. Ernest Law, F.S.A. supported the view that Henry VIII used the antelope, and said that antelopes and yales appear contemporaneously in Hampton Court at the time of Jane Seymour.

In proposing a vote of thanks which was carried unanimously, the Chairman expressed the opinion that the limits of investigation into the subject of the hall had been reached for the present, a view in which Mr. Druce, in replying, concurred.

5th July, 1911.

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

Mr. W. H. Knowles, F.S.A. read a paper on the excavations at Corbridge-on-Tyne.

After mentioning the historical references to the site Mr. Knowles reviewed in detail the work done during the past four years, and by numerous lantern slides depicted the principal objects discovered. The town was bordered on the south by the river Tyne and on the west by Dere Street, which was continued across the river at this point by a bridge, the stone part of which can be seen when the water is low. About one third of the area of the town has been uncovered: it comprised a number of *insulae* occupied by the "forum," two granaries, and various industrial and domestic buildings. These frequently exhibit three periods of occupation, which within narrow limits have been determined with the assistance of inscribed and sculptured stones, articles of pottery, iron and bronze.

Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L. F.S.A. who moved a vote of thanks which was carried unanimously, said that gratitude was due to Mr. Knowles and to Mr. Forster for the admirable way in which they had carried out the excavations at Corstopitum, and also to the students from Oxford and elsewhere who had assisted in the work and in the preparation of the excellent little handbook tabulating the results. Too often the excavators postponed the publishing of their results till a too late period, and consequently visitors to the excavations did not derive from them the help which they might. In this case that mistake had been avoided. The feature which must impress all careful observers of the excavations was the particular fineness and solidity of the architecture of some of the buildings, which pointed to the Antonine period as the probable date of their foundation. He believed that the theory generally accepted by those who were concerned in the excavations was that this station (we must not call it a camp) was established as a base of Roman occupation of north Britain at a time when the rulers of Britain believed that they had definitely established their rule
at least as far as the Wall of Antoninus, which stretches from Forth to Clyde. It was even suggested that under this impression they contemplated moving their base of operations further north and making this, rather than Eboracum, the head-quarters of the government. All these anticipations, if they ever existed, were dissipated by the fierce attacks of the Caledonians towards the end of the second century. It was interesting to reflect that if the calculations of the builders of this station had come true, Corbridge might have taken the place of York in the medieval history of our island, and the present archbishop of the northern province might have had to sign himself not "Ebor" but "Corstopit."

Messrs. Mill Stephenson, Bushe-Fox and Hudd also spoke.
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SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.


Monday, 31st July. Reception by the Mayor of Tenby. Tenby. Lunch. Steamer to Caldey island. The priory. Steamer to Tenby. Conversazione by invitation of Captain Hughes Morgan, the Worshipful the Mayor of Tenby.


Tuesday, 25th July, 1911.

After an interval of forty years the Institute again held its summer meeting in South Wales. A visit was paid to Cardiff in 1871, but no meeting has ever been held at Tenby.

The proceedings at Cardiff (fig. 1) began with a visit to the city hall, where the Institute was received by Alderman F. J. Beavan, the Lord Mayor being detained elsewhere in his endeavours to bring about a conciliation in the local labour disputes, then at their height.

Alderman Beavan warmly welcomed the Institute to the city, and expressed a hope that the members would go back considerably benefited from the point of view of enjoyment and general interest. Sir Edward Brabrook, in the unavoidable absence through indisposition of the President, acknowledged the welcome, and said they were delighted to meet in a city which had such very great archaeological and modern interest.

An inspection was then made of the corporation insignia and plate. The most conspicuous piece was the silver-gilt loving-cup presented in 1891 by the late Lord Bute. The whole cup is encrusted with precious stones, and weighs 389 ozs. 5 dwt. and cost £3,000. Other good pieces are an epergne (1820), which was formerly the property of Charles X of France when he was exiled and living at Holyrood Palace, and a very handsome and heavy jardiniere (1786). The corporation have four maces, dating probably from the period of Charles I (1600–1649): two are small and two are of a considerably larger size. Among the other objects displayed were the chains of the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress and some coronation plate (1902).

1 The previous meeting at Cardiff is reported in *The Archaeological Journal*, xxviii, 318.
ROMAN: The rampart consisted of a strongly built wall, 10 ft. 3 ins. thick, with polygonal bastions at regular intervals, and a small earthen bank behind. It had two gates, one on the north and one on the south, each consisting of a single archway between two bastions or towers, and probably in addition two lateral posterns. There is some evidence of a surrounding ditch.

POST-ROMAN: After the Roman period the defences became ruined. At some time in the eleventh century a large moated mount was thrown up within the north-west angle of the enclosure, doubtless strengthened with palisades, etc.

MEDIAEVAL: Subsequently, a shell-keep was erected on the mount, constructed apparently with stones stripped from the facings of the Roman walls. The Roman lines were brought into requisition, and a great ditch was cut on the north, east and south sides, the upcast of which was thrown over the remains of the Roman defences on the former two sides. The circuit was completed by a strong wall, the interior being divided into two wards.

FIG. 2. SKETCH-PLANS SHOWING CARDIFF CASTLE AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.
The serious work of the meeting began in the afternoon with a visit to Cardiff castle (fig. 2), which was described by Mr. John Ward, F.S.A. and Mr. J. S. Corbett.

Mr. Ward said that the Roman origin of Cardiff was apparently unknown to Gerald the Welshman, Leland, Rice, Merrick, Speed, and Camden. The last suggested that the Taff was the Rhostatabybius of Ptolemy. Baxter regarded it as the Jupania of the Ravenna chorographer, and Harris in his paper on the Julia Strata in Archaeologia, 1763, reiterated this. In 1777, the discovery of a hypocaust within the walls confirmed the Roman origin, but for a long time the discovery was lost sight of. Towards the end of the century, the Welsh name of Cardiff, Caerdydd, was held to prove that the “gaer” or camp was the work of “Aulus Didius,” the Roman propraetor, Avitus Didius Gallus, who succeeded Ostorius in A.D. 55. Others affirmed that it was Ratostabius Ostium, overlooking the fact that this was a river, possibly the Usk or Wye, and that it was founded in A.D. 53. Then came Bertram’s forged Itinerary of Richard of Cirencester, which gave it the name Tibia Amnis. All these guesses have more or less held the field ever since, and they reappear regularly in directories, guide books, and other topographical literature. Quite recently it was said that Cardiff was a place of prehistoric importance, and that it gloried in more than one Roman name.

To-day the Roman castellum is nameless and without history. All that is known for certain is that in late Roman times there was a strongly constructed fort, with bastioned walls of remarkable strength, of the same type as the well-known coast-forts of the Saxon shore, such as Burgh castle, Richborough, Lymne, Pevensey and Porchester castle. In its symmetrical form, large size, and the disposition of its bastions, it closely resembled Porchester, except that the bastions were polygonal instead of rounded. The walls were 10 feet 6 inches thick, reduced to 8 feet 6 inches by step-like offsets at the back, with a low bank about 11 feet high behind. It had two gates, north and south, and probably two posterns, one on the east and one on the west. Perhaps the bastioned fort was the successor of one of the earlier and more usual type on the site, for which there is some evidence.

The Roman castellum, set back in a well-sheltered haven, at the mouth of the Taff and near the mouths of the Ely and Rhymney, was well-placed as a marine base to bar the access of pirates into the fertile hinterland watered by the Severn, the Usk, the Wye, the Avon and their tributaries.

After the Roman period the fort became a ruin, and so remained for centuries. The silence is broken by Jestyn ap Gwrgan’s “Founding of Cardiff” in 1070, referred to in the Brut y Tywysogion. Perhaps to him may be referred the mount. Anyhow, so far as we know, that mount represents the beginning of the mediaeval utilisation of the Roman remains. This was followed, probably after a short interval, by the utilisation of the Roman lines. A huge ditch was cut on the north, south, and east sides, and the upcast was thrown over the Roman wall and bank; while on the west, where an arm of the Taff, the old mill-leat, was a sufficient water-defence, the wall was rebuilt, and is now known as the “Ten-foot Wall;” this wall, however, was continued half-way along the south side. The interior was divided into two wards by a transverse wall from the west side.
of the south gate to the keep, and from the keep to the north end of the west wall. The Norman castle was thus divided into an outer ward entered by the south gate (on the site of the south Roman gate); an inner ward, entered from the outer; and the mount with its keep entered from the inner ward. The inner ward was wholly enclosed by strong walls, the outer on its external sides by a huge bank, at the angles of which were small mounds or "cavaliers." The polygonal keep is the only example of a shell keep in Wales.

The outer surface of the north wall was reconstructed twenty years ago. The junction with the Roman work at ground level is marked by two courses of red stone. The gatehouse, with its core of Roman masonry, which was rebuilt at the same time, is going to be taken down and reconstructed in a more satisfactory manner.

The subsequent history of the castle was sketched by Mr. J. S. Corbett. He said that during the last ten years of the eleventh century Cardiff and the vale of Glamorgan were conquered by Fitzhamon and became to all intents and purposes an independent lordship. Fitzhamon died in 1107, and his heiress was his daughter Mabel, who married Robert, earl of Gloucester, son of Henry I. Robert lived until 1147, and during his lifetime the keep appears to have been built, and from 1126-1134 Robert, duke of Normandy, eldest son of William the Conqueror, was a prisoner at Cardiff. Robert was succeeded by his son William, during whose tenure the castle was captured by Ivor Bach, the Welsh lord of Senghenydd. William, earl of Gloucester, left three daughters: Isabel, who married John, afterwards king of England; Mabel, who married the earl of Evreux and died childless; and Amicia, who married Richard, earl of Clare. For some years the lordship was in the hands of king John, but on Isabel's marriage (after her divorce from John) to Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Essex, the estates were restored. Failure of issue of Isabel resulted in the castle passing on her death in 1217 to Gilbert de Clare, son of Amicia and Richard. For nearly a hundred years it remained in the hands of the de Clares. In 1266 Gilbert de Clare had dispossessed the last Welsh lord of Senghenydd and had afterwards built Caerphilly castle. The last de Clare was killed at Bannockburn in 1314, leaving three sisters, the eldest of whom was married to Hugh le Despenser. On the partition of the Clare estates being made, Hugh le Despenser received Glamorgan in right of his wife. For a hundred years the Despensers retained Cardiff, until in 1414 failure of male heirs brought the estates to Richard Beauchamp, earl of Worcester, husband of Isabel, daughter of Thomas le Despenser, earl of Gloucester. On the earl of Worcester's death, Isabel married his first cousin, another Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick. Their son, Henry, earl of Warwick, left no surviving issue, and his sister succeeded. She married Richard Nevill, earl of Warwick, the king-maker, upon whose death in 1471 the estates passed to the duke of Clarence, and then to Richard III. Henry VII granted the lordship to Jasper, duke of Bedford. Edward VI granted it in 1550 to Sir William Herbert, afterwards created earl of Pembroke, from which family it passed by marriage in 1703 to viscount Windsor. In 1766 Charlotte Jane Windsor, daughter of Herbert, viscount Windsor, married John lord Mount Stuart, who in 1796 was created marquess of Bute. The present owner is the fourth marquess.
Before leaving the grounds a somewhat hurried tour was made of the residential part of the castle, which is so strongly assertive of the individuality of its architect, William Burgess. It is impossible to admire everything he did there, though a great deal of it is both ingenious and beautiful. His inventiveness and his mediaevalism seem in some cases to have swept aside his discretion and that restraint which is essential to the best work. Apparently he was given by the late marquess of Bute carte blanche as to cost, and this resulted in both exquisite and gaudy work.

To the west of the castle, and in the grounds, is the site of a Dominican friary, of the history of which very little is certain. It was founded about 1250, and until its suppression it continued to be a very small and poor establishment. Portions of the church walls and of other parts were standing as recently as 1840, but in that year they were levelled to the ground and the site turned into a lawn. The late Lord Bute, however, afterwards had the foundations followed up, and wherever they were traced their lines were marked by dwarf walls; where their outline was unmistakable yellow and black bricks were employed, and when there was a doubt about it red bricks were utilised. Some of the latter walls are, according to Mr. Ward, very conjectural indeed; but, as he remarked, it gives, in a general way, a clear idea of the plan of a Dominican friary in the thirteenth century. Mr. Hope mentioned that he had been consulted at the time these walls were being erected, but he had then declined to express any definite opinion, as he was not present when the foundations were laid bare. In many places the outline was, he thought, decidedly conjectural. There was a church with the broad nave usual with a preaching order like the Black Friars; nor could there be much mistake about the square of the cloister, though whether the alleys were as wide as shown was doubtful. The general arrangement did not always comply with the normal contemporary arrangements, so far as there could be said to be any normal arrangement. The fountain in the centre of the cloister space, said Mr. Hope, most certainly would not have been there, for not a single mediaeval cloister in this country was provided with such a feature. Whenever a water conduit was erected it served a different purpose. Other parts of the ground plan suggested a frater, a yard, a kitchen, and possibly a chapterhouse and an infirmary.

The ancient and only parish church of Cardiff was St. Mary's, and from it sprang St. John's. St. Mary's was situated immediately within the south gate, and near the bank of the river Taff. Evidently its proximity to the river was recognised to be dangerous long before 1607, when its undermined foundations collapsed. St. Mary's was in existence in Fitzhamon's time (1090-1105) and was probably then built. The first mention of St. John's, said Dr. C. T. Vachell, in his description of that building, is contained in an undated charter given between 1173 and 1183 by the bishop of Llandaff. St. John's was then a small chapel-of-ease belonging to St. Mary's. In 1473 it was determined greatly to enlarge it and virtually to convert it into the parish church. At present it consists of a chancel with side chapels, a nave with four aisles, and a beautiful western tower of the best Somerset type. The cost of this great work is believed to have been borne by Lady
Anne Neville, daughter of Warwick, the king-maker. The most ancient portion of the existing building (and probably the only portion of the original church left remaining) is the south arcade of the chancel (1290-1310), which has never formed a part of or been bonded into the walls of the existing nave. The special objects of interest in the church mentioned by Dr. Vachell were: (1) A perfect rood turret with door and steps complete; (2) a Jacobean marble tomb in the Herbert chapel; (3) some good painted glass, notably a window in the north-west corner of the nave, designed by Ford Madox Brown; and (4) a reredos to the high altar by Sir Goscombe John, R.A. About twenty years ago the church was greatly enlarged by the addition of two side aisles. At the same time the unsightly galleries were removed and other work carried out at a cost of £23,000. The latest addition, an oak chancel screen, designed by Mr. Comper, has just been put up.

The Austin friary, which is almost opposite the city hall. The site was excavated in 1897, when the foundations of the church were discovered and their outline marked by the erection of low walling. The monastic buildings were converted after the suppression into a house, which was for many years the seat of the Herberths.

At 4.30 tea was served by invitation of the Lord Mayor in the city hall. This was followed by an inspection of some of the chief exhibits in the Welsh Museum of natural history, arts, and antiquities, of which Mr. John Ward, F.S.A. is the curator. Its unique feature is a collection of Welsh (Swansea and Nantgarw) porcelain, now very scarce, as the factories were of short duration. The museum, it may be mentioned, will be transferred to the national museum of Wales, which is to be erected in the Cathays Park on a site to the east of the city hall.

At the evening meeting in the city hall Mr. J. W. Willis Bund, M.A. LL.B. F.S.A. read a paper entitled "Glamorgan and Pembroke," in place of the address which was to have been delivered by the Earl of Plymouth, President of the meeting, who was unable to leave London owing to the political crisis. This paper is printed at page 261.

Wednesday, 26th July, 1911.

The excursions to places of interest outside the city of Cardiff began with a short train journey to Caerphilly castle (fig. 3).

Certainly no castle in South Wales, perhaps few even in Great Britain, is quite so impressive as Caerphilly, whose wide-spread massive ruins are all that remain to us of one of the largest mediaeval fortresses erected in these islands. Caerphilly is the largest and earliest of the concentric castles, popularly called "Edwardian." It belongs to the same class as Carnarvon, Harlech and Conway, but far excelled all these in size. It differed from the castles of Cardiff, Coity, St. Donat's and others in that it had no feudal or landed ties; it was simply a strategic fortress built to command the mountainous country of the Welsh to the north, and to guard the fertile vale of Glamorgan to the south. Perhaps Gilbert de Clare, who built it, hoped to assert for himself a strong position as supporter neither of the English nor of the Welsh, yet to hold the balance of power between them.
Little is known of the history of Caerphilly. That it was several times besieged is certain, though that it was ever captured is unlikely except by Glyndwr, whose mining operations are believed to have brought about the destruction of the great tower. For a long time it was in the possession of the Despensers, the last of whom surrendered it to Edward III shortly before it was allowed to fall gradually into ruin.

The castle was described by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, who pointed out that the most striking and unusual feature of the place was the vast and elaborate system of water-defences by which the whole castle could easily be surrounded with a broad and deep stretch of water from the neighbouring brook, the Nant-y-Gledyr. The presence of this water explains a good many points in the plan which otherwise might bewilder the visitor. The main entrance was through a gate in the curtain wall on the eastern side. This eastern curtain wall is 250 yards long, and forms an extremely clever piece of mediaeval fortification well worthy of careful study. The gatehouse on this side was a massive structure surmounted with a tower rising to the height of 60 feet. On the inside of this curtain wall was a great earth embankment, which acted as a retaining wall for the water; and with the object of resisting the pressure of the water the wall was strengthened by buttresses and towers on its outer face. From the earth embankment a bridge, partly fixed and partly movable, gave access to the castle mound. Its gatehouse had a turret on each side; there was a similar gateway on the opposite side. Behind this yet another strongly fortified entrance-gate confronts the visitor before the inner ward is reached. On the south side of this enclosure was the lofty hall 73 feet by 35 feet, the cellars with the chapel above, the private apartments, a tunnel-like entrance-leading to the water level, and other features. In its general lay-out the castle bears some resemblance to Berkhamstead. Mr. Hope expressed his conviction that it was all according to one definite plan, although the time covered by its erection may have been fairly extensive. The material throughout is coursed ragstone, very little ashlar having been used. To most people the most attractive feature of all is the great hall. The surface still retains the Edwardian whitewash, which, as Mr. Hope remarked, was not a modern churchwarden's vice, but a virtue of the middle ages. The wooden roof was supported on clustered corbel shafts. The present simple roof was erected by the Marquess of Bute, the owner, forty years ago. Looking into the inner ward are three narrow and high windows, from which the tracery is missing. The glass for these was inserted into wooden frames which were wedged into a rebate on the outer face of the jambs, while saddlebars prevented their blowing inwards. On the same side is the broad Tudor fireplace.

The party returned to Cardiff by rail. After lunch, a motor journey of some two miles brought them to the ancient city of Llandaff, where they were welcomed by the Very Rev. the Dean, who gave the following account of the cathedral.

No part of the present structure has a date earlier than the time of the Norman occupation of this part of the country in the early half of the twelfth century. Llandaff was chosen by Dyffrig (Dubricius) a church teacher of the royal family of Morganwg, as a missionary centre for the district and settled with a church
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and body of clergy on land gifted to him for that purpose by his kinsman, Meurig, the son of Teudrig, king of Gwent.

The diocese, however, which eventually had its chief seat and name from this Christian settlement beside the Taff, though thus brought into being and founded by Dubricius, seems, from the earliest times succeeding its establishment on this spot, to have been called rather after its second bishop, Teiliau, or Teilo, pupil and successor of Dubricius.

Hence Llandaff was known continuously for some centuries, in fact during pre-Norman times, as the church of Teilo and the bishop of the district for the time being had the title of “Esgob Teilo,” as he is named throughout the Brut y Tywysogion with the single exception where he is spoken of as “bishop of Morganwg.”

So the altar of Teilo at the place of his burial became the locus of the chief worship of the district. Miracles were recorded as having taken place there. To it was brought and presented the book of the Gospels, now existing at Lichfield cathedral and known as The Book of St. Chad, which contains the record of its purchase and presentation to God and St. Teilo, and is most probably the book on which the petty kings of Gwent and Morganwg took their oaths in their public covenants before St. Teilo’s shrine.

The church here existing was burnt down in 987 by the Danes, along with other churches of the district, but the shrine still continued under its successor to be the favoured place of burial for distinguished men, whether princes or ecclesiastics.

When Urban, the first bishop appointed under Norman influence, entered upon his see at the beginning of the twelfth century in 1107, he found the old church of Teilo with its shrine ruined almost to the ground, whilst the property of the see had been impoverished and despoiled by the rapacity of the nobles.

He at once set to work to erect a new church; whilst in carrying out this good object he was anxious further to utilise the occasion and secure greater dignity to his foundation by the transfer of the relics of St. Dubricius, the founder of the see, from their resting place in Bardsey island to the scene of his old labours and episcopate.

In the condition of ruin and poverty, however, which had fallen upon the church lands and property, as well as on its buildings, it was necessary to fall back upon external aid, and an appeal for contributions to the church in England and Normandy was made by a general letter issued by Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1120, which was followed by a bull of pope Honorius to the same effect, and a re-dedication of the new building in the name of St. Peter and St. Paul in addition to those of the first three bishops, Dubricius, Teilo, and Oudoceus.

The present cathedral dates from Urban’s time, and traces of his work are still shown with continuations under his successors of the twelfth century.

(a) The present arch at the east end of the presbytery, which originally led into a quire or eastern apse. (b) Remains of Norman arcading in the south wall of what was then the nave of the church, interfered with by later work.

After Urban’s time the further work was doubtless delayed during the
troubulous years of the century which succeeded the accession of Stephen as king, and preparations at least were made for an extended nave with aisles.

The work was probably carried on no further, and left so far incomplete until quite the end of the century, though the cathedral church as such was sufficiently in order to admit of mass being said at the high altar by archbishop Baldwin when he visited Wales and its cathedrals and preached the crusade at Llandaff in 1188.

With the episcopate of Henry of Abergavenny (1193–1219), a second stage in the architectural history of the cathedral church was entered upon by him, and continued during the episcopate of his successor, William de Goldcliffe (1219–1292), the nave being carried out with its clerestory to its full length westward, though apparently in two portions, as evidenced by the varied treatment of the vaulting shafts and the changes made in the ornamentation of the capitals of the columns; aisles were added throughout, and the general ground plan of the whole building was completed.

Soon after the middle of the thirteenth century we can trace from the style of the work the date of the additional building of the chapterhouse, which was followed soon after by the erection of a lady chapel, mainly through bishop Braose (1266–1289), when all the Norman work east of the chancel arch was cleared away for the site of this new feature. To reach the chapel, however, from the cathedral church proper with its necessary approaches for processions, etc. it was requisite that the Norman aisles should be extended by a new bay carried eastward.

This addition therefore was made and chapels were formed at the extreme east end of the aisles so extended. There remained still the incongruity of the old Norman portion (now forming a presbytery), having in continuance the new quire and nave. So further alterations were needed to meet the new condition of things, and about the middle of the fourteenth century the Norman work, still remaining in what had hitherto been the old nave, was removed with the exception of the old eastern arch, and some arcading on the south side still left, but with a new arch intersecting it, and a new presbytery with corresponding arches on the north side was introduced in its place with corresponding clerestory, whilst a new high altar was raised under the old Norman arch.

The aisles of the nave were remodelled towards the close of the century, and new windows with later ogee mouldings were inserted.

The cathedral was now complete, the only additional alteration taking place some century or so later when a fifteenth-century bell tower, based on the foundations of a thirteenth-century tower already existing on the north-west end of the nave, was erected by Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, brother of Edmund, earl of Richmond, and uncle of Henry VII, of sufficient strength and character to carry a peal of bells.

With the period of the reformation troublous times set in involving confiscation of property belonging to the see, and decay and devastation to the fabric of the cathedral.

Under Henry VIII the church was robbed, the altars were dismantled, the treasures and sacred ornaments were stolen or carried off by the royal commissioners to London. The buildings lapsed into ruin, the services and public worship were discontinued, and at the end of the century the
church itself, as described by bishop Blethin in 1574 appeared "digged and delved in pits and unpaved, and more like a desolate place than a house of God."

During the next century under Cromwell the wreck and desolation of the place became still further intensified, "the building used as an ale-house, the quire a calfpen, the font a horsetrough, one arm of the aisle a stable, the other a post-office."

An effort towards a return to better things was made after the restoration, but in vain. At the beginning of the eighteenth century even a removal of the see to Cardiff was contemplated.

Between 1720 and 1730 severe and disastrous storms shattering the south-west tower reduced the nave to a roofless ruin, till in the middle of the century a hideous Italianised temple, enclosing the eastern half of the desolated nave, was erected for services. So things continued till, with the nineteenth century, first the renovation of the lady chapel and then the complete restoration of the whole cathedral to its original and probably more than its original architectural beauty in 1869, at a cost of between £30,000 and £40,000, recovered it once more for more worthy worship.

At the conclusion of the Dean's remarks the Rev. W. Done Bushell related his impressions of Llandaff as he saw it during the summer of 1847. At that time service was held in the lady chapel, which had recently been restored at a cost of about £1,100. The music, as was so common in many parish churches at that time, was contributed by a string band of village minstrels, "a fashion more indigenous perhaps, and better in accordance with the simplicity of village life than are our surpliced quires."

At this time the nave was open to the air like Tintern, Glastonbury, or Fountains. The plight of the quire was even worse: the walls had been encased in plaster, and it had been given an elevation which suggested a town hall. The work of restoration had been begun, and the noble arch of bishop Urban had been opened out and bishop Marshall's screen exposed to view. The traditional tomb of St. Teilo had also been brought to light, or rather the sepulchral recess in which it had once been placed.

Leaving Llandaff, a short drive brought the party to St. Fagan's castle, which was entered through a pair of extremely beautiful iron gates. What little is known of the history of St. Fagan's was related by Mr. Harold Brakspear, F.S.A.

To call this a castle now is somewhat misleading, for it is nothing more than a charmingly gabled sixteenth-century house standing on the site of a castle. Very little of the earth or stone work of the preceding structure remains, except a small forecourt with terraced wall. It was in Norman times held directly under Robert Fitzhamon, earl of Gloucester. The various apartments contain some fine oak panelling and old furniture. One of the most interesting things is the fine circular lead cistern in the forecourt dated 1520, with a double row of panels all of the same formal design. An invitation to tea had been extended to the party by the Earl of Plymouth, and with it permission to visit the beautiful grounds. These latter depend for their charm on the flowers rather than on architectural disposition in relation to the castle. The gardener's triumph
is complete in the number of blooms, the beauty of colour and their striking contrasts of massed beds, and in the rosaries, pergolas, sunk beds, and other devices. If it were not invidious in a guest to find fault, one might be tempted to protest against the numerous raw brick chimneys lately put up all over the castle roof, and for which a pressed brick of most unsympathetic texture has been selected. The castle walls are of stone, with a coating of stucco to counteract the porosity of the local quarries.

At the evening meeting a paper, illustrated by lantern views, was read at the city hall by Mr. John W. Rodger on the Stone Cross Slabs of Glamorgan.

With regard to the earlier cross slabs of South Wales little can be said. The workmanship is rude, the stones frequently unshaped and the crosses themselves very much exaggerated.

In some instances the lines are incised, while in others the design is obtained in relief by sinking the background. Some of the crosses are equal limbed and others are shafted, the former, generally speaking, being the earlier of the two. Several are decorated with small rings or bosses which appear to take the place of the characteristic bosses used on stones, jewellery, and elsewhere in Celtic art. All but two of the series have the cross surrounded by a ring, which in several instances takes an oval form. It is difficult to date individual stones, as they have no connexions that can be traced in history; but as a group they may be contemporary with the Celtic knot-work designs, say from the seventh to the tenth centuries.

In the Vale of Glamorgan many of the slabs from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries are flat stones, from one of the thinner beds of the blue lias formation, selected with a fairly smooth face, but otherwise entirely unprepared, and on this the design is traced by a process of freehand and cut with an incised line, having little regard for regularity. The Vale of Glamorgan is rich in its possession of rudely incised thirteenth-century stones bearing floreated crosses, in many elegant designs, some with a circle and some without. These may be divided into two classes, crosses in which the stem terminates at the bottom in a fleur de lys representing the processional cross carried in the hand, and those in which the stem appears to rest upon steps, often referred to as Calvary steps. None of these stones bear inscriptions or emblematic devices.

A stone of this type may be seen at Cowbridge, bearing a double triangle, but the moulded base to the cross stem, together with the regularity of execution and the parallel form of the stone, shew it to belong to the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

From the thirteenth to the fifteenth century the stones generally tapered in their length, being widest at the head, followed later by stones parallel in their width. An exception to this rule occurs in the fifteenth century, when both shapes were used concurrently.

About the middle of the twelfth century heraldry became a science in this country, and from that period onwards it is not unusual to find heraldic crosses carved on tombstones. The Latin cross, the Greek cross, and the Maltese cross were all known to heraldry and are of common occurrence upon tombstones.

The Coity stone bears an incised cross fleurette and the Merthyr Mawr
stone a raised cross potent. An interesting example of the patriarchal cross is painted on the south wall of the lady chapel at Llandaff.

The altar cross is another form, probably the most familiar to the working stone-cutter of that time, and it is interesting to see how the feeling and features of crosses in latten or brass were copied into stone. It is not known when the cross was first placed on the altar, but in a document of 1246 an altar cross is mentioned. It is, however, most probable that it existed in that position long before its recorded time.

The Llandaff stone bears a raised cross fleury between two heads, with an illegible border inscription in Norman-French. The Merthyr Mawr example, which tapers in its length and is pointed at both ends, is the only one of that shape met with in these examples of South Wales, but it is occasionally found elsewhere.

A slab at St. Pierre in Monmouthshire bears a cross with a sword and has a border inscription in Norman-French to Sir Urian de St Pierre, lord of that place, who died A.D. 1239. Other instances of inscriptions in Lombardic characters are at Merthyr Mawr, Oxwich and Nicholaston in Gower, and at Christchurch, Caerleon, Mon. This latter is a fourteenth-century example bearing a cross between two figures, inscribed to Johannes Colmar and his wife Isabella, and serves as a useful illustration of the costumes of the period.

Another graceful design of fourteenth-century type occurs at Tintern, the cross being accompanied by two devices of fishes. The sinister compartment of the stone is occupied by the figure of a fish and the dexter compartment by a device of three fishes intertwined.

At Tintern and Pentyrch very beautiful examples of fifteenth-century incised cross-slabs may be seen, with the stem of the cross terminating in a moulded base, true to architectural style and following in appearance the altar crosses of that period.

The semi-effigial gravestone at Cardiff castle is one of a few in South Wales, the chief feature of which appears to be to combine an effigy and a cross on the same monument. It is probably of the thirteenth century. Another similar stone but later in date is at Llanvihangel near Cowbridge.

One of the local productions subsequent to the decline of Gothic art is a type of gravestone bearing a plain rudely incised Latin cross on steps. Some are unlettered, but the majority bear both inscriptions and dates on spaces specially prepared. The dates on these examples range from 1534 to 1628, and although devoid of all ornament, they shew considerable refinement in their proportions.

From the time of Elizabeth to that of Anne, in place of the delicate and refined features of the earlier crosses, we have a heavy expressionless type, devoid alike of artistic feeling and sentiment. Of these heavier crosses the Llangynwyd stone bears a chalice, or as some say, a bell, on the dexter side and two saltires of keys on the cross stem. An arch under the cross typifies the outflow of the river of life. Of the Margam examples one bears a key and another a sword, both in the dexter compartment of the stone. The irregular steps on the Margam stone occur again on the branching cross at Llangynwyd and may be a more correct expression of the Calvary than are the uniform steps on other stones.
A distinct local production is that of a Latin cross upon steps, but with the addition of two subsidiary crosses of the same pattern, springing or growing from the stem of the central cross, one on either side. These have been referred to as "Calvaries," having reference to the continental calvary, which for its chief features has the central cross with figures of St. Mary and St. John on either side. Possibly these three crosses are a survival of the continental calvary in Glamorgan.

Following, if not actually contemporary with, the triple branching crosses there is a class of monument of the same type, but in which the two subsidiary crosses are replaced by two bars or billets. Having in mind the continental calvary with a central cross and an isolated figure on each side and the triple crosses of Glamorgan, it is not difficult to imagine the process of evolution by which the billet slabs would come to represent the same idea.

The shears and other emblems of professions common elsewhere do not occur in these examples of South Wales, the one exception being at Brecon, on a stone ornamented with the tools of a blacksmith as a rebus on the name SMYT to whom the monument is inscribed.

Thursday, 27th July, 1911.

Still favoured by the perfect summer weather, which it had hitherto been the good fortune of the Institute to enjoy, the party trained to Llantwit station whence the motors conveyed them to St. Donat's castle.

It is difficult to speak in terms of moderation about this ST. DONAT'S CASTLE (fig. 4), which has been described truthfully as "one of the most perfect of the ancient baronial halls of Wales."

Though the greater part of the morning was spent here, few if any of the party were able to see all the treasures owned by Mr. Williams, who, with Mrs. Williams, welcomed the members, and threw open to them both the grounds and the castle. Its charm is in no small degree due to the sense of homeliness and life, in contrast to the museum-like deadness so often met with. The position occupied by the castle is well chosen, standing as it does at the head of a narrow valley descending by a series of terraced gardens to the shore of the Bristol channel, from which the distant coasts of Somerset and Devon can be seen.

The earliest reference to the castle is found in the twelfth century, when this and Marcross were held by a family who, in virtue of their office as cup-bearers to the earls of Gloucester, assumed the name of Butler. Then either by marriage or by change of name, it came into the possession of Hawey, alias De Alweia. The last Haweys were people of property in Somerset and Dorsetshire. The family became extinct in the male line, and an heiress of the Haweys married a man of the name of Stradling.

Legend has gathered round the early history of the Stradling, or to give it in its earliest form, Esterling, family. A sixteenth-century Stradling pedigree begins with "Conradus de Esterlinge from the citie of Danske," who came to England in A.D. 1000 with "Swannes, kinge of Denmarke." Such pedigrees must be placed on one side as fruits of the fertile imagination of the Elizabethan pedigree-makers, and we must be content to believe that the Stradling who married the heiress of the Haweys was probably a new
arrival from the Low Countries. In the fifteenth century one of this family, Sir Harry Stradling, was a great traveller. Sir Harry's father, Sir Edward, had married a daughter of cardinal Beaufort, while Sir Harry himself married a Herbert of Raglan. Previous marriages with the two great Glamorgan families of the Berkrolls and the Turbervilles had brought wealth and position. The fifteenth-century marriages above mentioned added still greater wealth and importance to the Stradling family. The effect of this high standing is seen in the castle, which has the unmistakable stamp of the best fifteenth-century workmanship.

Sir Edward Stradling, whose monument is to be seen in the north chapel in the adjacent church, was a great patron of arts and letters. As
he had no family of his own, or nephews or nieces to inherit the property, he selected a cousin's son as his heir and adopted him. This was the Sir James Stradling who was created a baronet in the first batch by James I. During the civil wars the family took an active part in the interests of the king, and greatly impoverished themselves, and towards the end of the seventeenth century their means were reduced. The last baronet died abroad in 1738. After his death the property was claimed under various wills and settlements by several parties, and the estate thrown into chancery, but as the result of a compromise St. Donat's castle fell to the lot of Lord Mansell, who only partially used it and by whom the structure was neglected. A recent purchaser, Dr. Nicholl Carne, made most commendable efforts to repair the damage done, and his good work was continued and completed by the father of the present owner, Mr. Morgan Williams.

The earliest part of the castle dates from the fourteenth century. The range of buildings is remarkably compact, and is within a practically circular wall. At the time of Elizabeth considerable alterations were carried out, although the general external aspect was allowed to remain unchanged.

In his description of the castle Mr. Hope was emphatic in his praises of what had been done in the course of this most judicious of restorations. The aspect of everything was preserved as far as possible, and only the necessary repairs were carried out. Mr Williams put into the rooms many valuable pieces of old furniture, and a good collection of armour. The hall is arranged on the customary plan, with a screen at one end with gallery overhead, and a dais flanked by an oriel window at the other. Below the castle and close to the sea is an extensive range of barracks in ruins. Mr. Hope mentioned that a Sir William Stradling held an important trust at the time of some threatened invasion of the coast in the reign of Elizabeth, and that these buildings were, presumably, the range of barracks for accommodating the soldiers and others who were to hold the Bristol Channel.

Not the least charming feature of this castle is the hanging gardens which descend in great broad terraces to the sea-level, the lowest terrace being the enclosure for the soldiers' exercising ground.

From the castle the party proceeded to the church, situated on a shelf of ground on the slope to the west of the castle.

ST. DONAT'S CHURCH.

The Rev. L. E. Richardson, in his description, said that St. Donat was regarded as the protector of shipwrecked sailors, and the situation of the church on the rock-bound coast close to the dangerous reef of Nash renders its dedication singularly appropriate. The church (fig. 5) is of twelfth-century foundation, but the greater part of the present building dates from the fourteenth century. It consists of belfry, nave, chancel, and lady chapel on the north side of the chancel. There was a large rood-loft, the staircase leading to which is preserved in the north wall of the nave.

The nave is divided from the chancel by a narrow Norman archway, and a door leads from the north side of the chancel to the lady chapel, or "Stradling chapel," as it is usually called. This contains some interesting monuments, one especially fine one of marble, and three monumental paintings on oak, set up in 1590 by Sir Edward Stradling. The chapel
was the family burial place. A large tomb in the centre marks the grave of the last of the Stradlings.

There are two features of interest in the chancel, first, a fourteenth-century stone altar, raised and restored in 1907, built up on solid masonry, having six incised crosses; secondly, a late fifteenth-century latten procession cross, now used as an altar cross. The upper portion of this was found in the church some years ago, fixed as a handle to the font cover, and was restored in 1907. It bears symbolical representations of the four evangelists, and on the back four Tudor roses. The church possesses a font decorated with Norman scale ornament, and a fourteenth-century holy water stock by the northern door. In the churchyard there is a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century stone cross with steps, which, in spite of all disturbances, has remained in perfect preservation. On one side is carved the crucifixion, on the other the Virgin and Child and St. John. The parish registers date back to 1570.

The conveyances then returned to Llantwit Major, where the party took luncheon in the town hall, a picturesque fifteenth-century building,

**St Donat's Church**

**GROUND PLAN**
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reached by a flight of external stone steps. In the bell-cot is a mediaeval bell bearing an inscription.

At the church (fig. 6) the party were welcomed by Mr. John LLANTWIT Williams, Mr. J. C. Thomas, and the Rev. H. Morris, vicar, CHURCH who said that Llantwit Major's chief claim to interest rests in the honoured name it bears in the annals of early christianity in Britain. Of its antiquity as a christian centre there can be no doubt. It is said that St. Illtyd founded a monastery here in the year 508 and made it a place for instruction in general learning, as well as in religion. It was, in fact, a university; no less than 2,400 students, occupying 400 houses and seven halls, were resident at the same time. This university or school became a centre of religious life from which missionaries went forth to labour among the heathen or half-christian peoples of Britain and Gaul. Many of these are still reverenced in Brittany. But it was also famous for the bishops and scholars it produced. St. David (the patron saint of Wales), St. Patrick (the patron saint of Ireland), St. Teilo (the second bishop of Llandaff) were, it is said, among its students.
CHURCH OF ST ILLTYD, LLANTWIT MAJOR, GLAM. GROUND PLAN.

FIG. 6.
No traces of the first monastery exist, though the famous crosses collected in the western church, curious monuments of that early period, witness to the world of its antiquity and importance. Outside and around the church are other interesting remains, including those of a Roman villa to the north-east, a bold fragment of a mediaeval gatehouse to the west, and a thirteenth-century pigeon-house with domical vault. On the south side of the churchyard is a two-storied house supposed to have been the residence of the priest.

The church consists first of a chancel, a nave, north and south aisles, and a tower inserted in the west end; next of a western church with a south porch and parvis; and further west still is a third building in a ruinous condition which, when perfect, consisted of an undercroft with a chapel on the first floor. To this building is attached on the north side a sacrist's house. The inner door of the south porch to the western church and the lower tiers of the masonry of this part are considered to be part of the Norman church built early in the twelfth century. The piers of the porch are transitional Norman. It would seem, therefore, that the western church, known locally as the "old church," was originally the nave of a cruciform Norman structure which had also transepts and chancel. To this nave was added late in the twelfth century a central tower. In the following century changes were made, for the south porch was built with a parvis. In other respects the Norman nave remained intact, and was used as a parish church. The tower also remained untouched. But the Norman transepts and chancel were removed to make room for a thirteenth-century conventual church with an engaged tower, arcades, and north and south aisles forming an extension of the transept eastward. Then a new chancel was built, with four lancet windows on the north side and an arcade and narrow aisle on the south. At the same time a two-storied structure was added to the west end of the "old church." In the fifteenth century this western, or "old church," was taken down and rebuilt, leaving the Norman south door and portions of the lower probably pre-Norman masonry in position, and it was re-roofed with the present oak roof. A door was inserted instead of a window in the south aisle of the eastern church, the south aisle of the chancel was removed, and the arcade built up with stone-work, two windows and a priests' door being inserted between the piers. The east window of this chancel aisle was inserted at the east end of the south aisle of the nave, and a sacrist's house was added to the western or lady chapel on its north side. A few additions were made when the church was repaired in 1905. Flying arches were inserted in the south aisle to support the arcade, and buttresses built on the west side of the tower in 1732 were partly removed.

There is, then, at present a thirteenth-century church with fifteenth-century insertions, a late twelfth-century tower, a fifteenth-century western church with a thirteenth-century porch, and a chapel of the same date in ruins, with a fifteenth-century sacrist's house attached to it on the north side. The reredos is of stone of late-fourteenth-century date. In the south aisle of the eastern church is a niche with a Jesse tree. The roof of the western church has bosses carved with the arms of the local families.

Mr. Iltyd Nicholl, F.S.A. in supplementing Mr. Morris's account, pointed out that, practically speaking, the clerestory windows are now of exactly the same appearance as before they were interfered with and blocked up. An altogether recent alteration was the large springing arches inserted in
the south aisle of the eastern church for the purpose of propping up the walls, which still lean at an alarming angle. The floor of the nave was also slightly lowered, thereby removing its different level, and as a result the two squints are too high for use. The restoration of the fine stone reredos behind the altar was a simple affair, as it was only necessary to replace a few of the castellations on the top. In the eastern church there are remains of wall-paintings, including a great figure of, possibly, St. Christopher, of the two Marys, and a large royal coat-of-arms.

Mr. Brakspear pointed out that this church contained two features frequently met with in this part of the country: freestone was sparingly used, and, in consequence, arches had to be of the full thickness of the walls; and the belfry windows were mere slits. The western or lady chapel had galleries at both ends, that at the east end being for the exhibition of relics, and that at the west, with its separate ascending and descending staircases, for the accommodation of pilgrims who came to view the relics.

Standing about half a mile from the road and approached over fields is the ruined manor-house of Old Beaupre, which, for architect and archaeologist alike, is of great attraction, if for no other reason than for its beautiful renaissance gateway and inner porch. The party were met by Mr. D. T. Alexander. The name, he said, is linked in the annals of Wales with Basset, for the Bassets of Beaupre figured largely in the history of Glamorgan. The first of the family to enter Glamorgan was John Basset, the younger son of one of William the Conqueror's generals. He came as an esquire of the body to Robert Fitzhamon, and acted as his deputy. His great-grandson, Sir Philip, was the first to settle at Beaupré. Tradition says he married the heiress of the Sisielts of Beaupre, a family better known as the Cecils of Burleigh. In course of years the Bassets of Beaupre intermarried with their neighbours, and, like other Norman families, by adding Welsh blood became Welsh in spirit and sentiment, as they were also Welsh in tongue.

Mention has already been made of the inner porch, built in the days of queen Elizabeth. This is commonly attributed to the first great Welsh artist of the renaissance, Gwilym Twrch, of Sutton, near Bridgend. Mr. Alexander, in speaking of that artist, said it was to “Old Iolo” that all the scanty knowledge of him is due. Gwilym Twrch and his brother Richard were young country stonemasons who had a quarry at Sutton, and found employment in repairing the churches after the ravages of the reformation, but Gwilym, according to the account, quitted Glamorgan to see the world, with his tools on his back, and in his wanderings reached Rome. On his return he was engaged by Richard Basset to build the present remarkable porch. The story is that there had been a quarrel in the Basset family, and that this porch was a memorial of the reconciliation. On the front, in six compartments, are the arms of Basset, De la Bere, Turberville, De Clare, Griffiths, and Morgan. Below is the following curious inscription, in three rectangular labels:

| Say Cowldst thou E     | A Faythful Frynde              | Sir Thomas Johns Knight       |
| Ver Fynde or Ever Hea  | To be. Richard                 | Bwylt this Porche with         |
| Re or See A Wordly Wret| Bassett having To Wyf          | The Tunnes in ano 1600         |
| Che or Coward Prove    | Katherine Daughter to          | His Years 65. His Wife 55.     |
In 1681 Colonel Sir Richard Basset, a great Welsh nationalist, called the bards of Glamorgan together, and, at the subsequent famous Gorsedd and Eisteddfod of Beaupre, all the rules of bardism and the metres of Welsh poetry were revised. After Sir Richard came his son Philip, who was the last of the old line to live at Beaupre, which was vacated by the family in 1715. After changing hands several times it was purchased by Mr. Daniel Jones, the first of the great local philanthropists. When he died in 1841 without heirs he bequeathed the Beaupre estates to Colonel Thomas Basset, a grandson of the Philip Basset just mentioned. So once more there was a Basset at Beaupre, as there had been for seven hundred years before.

From Old Beaupre the party drove over an extremely hilly road to Cowbridge where tea was served.

Cowbridge nowadays is best known for its grammar school, which is connected with Jesus College, Oxford.

Formerly the town was strongly fortified, it is said in 1091 by Robert de St. Quintin. Considerable portions of the walls remain, and these were kindly shown to the members by those in whose private grounds they now are.

Cowbridge church, which was visited by some of the party, is a chapel-of-ease to the neighbouring church of Llanblethian. The only notable features about the building are the massive tower, evidently designed for defence, and the curious arrangement of the aisles, a north aisle to the chancel and a south aisle to the nave.

In the evening a paper was read at the city hall by Mr. F. King on Recent Excavations at Caerleon (Isca Silurum) and Caerwent (Venta Silurum).

These two important Roman sites are situated in South Monmouthshire, the former three miles north of Newport, and the latter eleven miles to the east of that town. They are both of the same area and shape, but Caerleon was the fortress of the second legion and Caerwent was a civil town.

Excavation indicates that Caerleon was founded in the reign of Vespasian, about A.D. 78, and that from that time to the latest period of the Roman occupation it was an important centre. Caerwent was first of all a temporary camp on the line of march westwards, and later, towards the middle of the second century, developed into the walled city we know it to have been.

So far little excavation has been done at Caerleon, but that little gives promise of interesting finds when the whole of the work is completed. By the kind permission of Sir Arthur Mackworth, Bart. it had been possible to explore the south angle of the fortress within the priory grounds, and here the early earthwork, angle tower and other walls came to light. A trial excavation was also made in King Arthur’s Round Table, as it is called, and quite unexpectedly it was discovered that here had stood what was probably the finest amphitheatre in Britain. The outer wall is 5 feet 6 inches in thickness, and has buttresses inside and out, and part of the south gate and inner or arena wall were opened out. Into the latter was built a centurial stone, recording the fact that that portion of the wall was built by the third cohort of the legion.

Caerwent has been the scene of careful scientific excavation for the last twelve years, and some twenty-five out of the forty acres within the walls have been explored.
Sufficient has been done to plan the streets accurately as well as most of the public and other buildings in the city. The site of the public baths has been identified, but so far it has not been possible to obtain permission to excavate them. Outside the city the cemetery and two or three Roman villas still remain to be examined.

The basilica, with the forum to the south of it, a temple, a small and probably incomplete amphitheatre, besides some forty dwelling houses, shops, and workshops, have been uncovered, and detailed plans of all have been made.

The streets of the city were well laid and drained, the houses were well planned, and the sanitary arrangements were on the whole good; in fact, much better than often at present obtain in some of our modern country towns and villages. Water was obtained from wells, of which about twenty have been cleaned out, and from a service of wooden pipes laid in the streets. These pipes occasionally burst, and were repaired with pieces of sheet lead nailed down over the break.

The city walls and the buildings were well built of the local stone, and the quoins and large moulded and ornamental blocks were of the soft yellow sandstone which is found on the banks of the Severn at Portskewett, or of the easily worked freestone probably from Dundry, near Bristol.

The roofs were covered with old red sandstone tiles, which were fixed with iron nails, and the ridge pieces and ornamental finials were of freestone.

Mr. King had no time to describe the pottery and small iron and bronze objects that had been found, all of which can be inspected in the museum at Caerwent.

- Friday, 28th July, 1911.

Still favoured by the perfect weather which had hitherto been their lot the party took train to Bridgend, a small town built on both banks of the river Ogmore.

COITY CASTLE. Motors conveyed the party to Coity castle, which was described by Mr. Hope as an interesting though somewhat scanty ruin, built early in the twelfth century by Payn Turbervill. Most of the work that survives belongs to a rebuilding in the thirteenth century. The plan shows that there were two wards, a circular inner ward, and a rectangular outer ward. On the south-west of the inner ward stood the hall and its adjuncts. The main living-rooms were, as usual, on the first floor, the basement being given up to menial offices and cellars, where food could be stored for the winter months. One curious feature is the passage and staircase leading to the round garderobe tower projecting from the curtain wall. This is of the thirteenth century, and has its sides slightly flattened. Presumably this was done with the object of giving as little protection as possible to anyone attacking at that point. The flat sides were commanded by windows in the main wall, so that anyone creeping round the tower would be exposed to a hail of missiles.

Coity castle has an interesting if somewhat legendary history, and this
was explained by Mr. Iltyd B. Nicholl, who said that there were no epoch-making events of history connected with any of these small "private" castles, as they are called in this part of Wales, in contradistinction to fortresses such as Caerphilly or Cardiff. Smaller castles like Coity formed a continuous chain, and were strongly defended by their owners, who kept in touch with each other in view of any possible rising of the Welsh. The name of Turberville is found in the neighbourhood in the first half of the twelfth century. When Robert Fitzhamon conquered Glamorgan, and parcelled out the land among his followers, the Turberville of that day found himself unprovided for. So he hurried to his leader and demanded what was going to be given to him for his services. Fitzhamon suggested that he could look after himself, and Turberville came to Coity, which was owned by a Welsh lord named Morgan, a grandson of the dispossessed native prince. The Norman knight summoned the castle to surrender. Morgan stoutly refused, but hinted that if Turberville would undertake to marry his daughter the gates would be thrown open and he would be received peaceably. This compromise was agreed upon, and for many generations the Turbervilles married exclusively into Welsh families, becoming more Welsh than the Welsh themselves, and taking their part in some of the risings which soon broke out. The Turbervilles, however, are generally found fighting side by side with the English in the Scottish and French wars of the next two centuries. The family came to an end in the direct male line about 1350. Coity estate was strictly entailed in succession upon the sons of the four sisters of the last Turberville. The first to inherit was Sir Laurence Berkrolls. Additional fortifications were erected at the time of the Welsh rising under Owen Glyndwr. In 1400 this descendant of the last Welsh prince raised the flag of rebellion and laid claim to the throne of Wales. After meeting with considerable initial success against the English, he profited by a lull to attack those Welsh chiefs who had stood aloof, among whom was the owner of Coity castle. The story is that Glyndwr, wishing to obtain knowledge of the fortifications at Coity, gained admittance to the castle under the guise of a bard, and only revealed himself when, after obtaining all the desired information, he rode away.

The castle was besieged in due time, and a loan was raised in both houses of Parliament for the purpose of effecting the rescue of its owner. This turbulent Welshman died a natural death in 1415 at the house of one of his daughters. The Gamages succeeded the Berkrolls at Coity. The last of this line was a very considerable heiress in the time of Elizabeth, and had several important suitors for her hand. But she was unwilling to regard herself as a pawn, and gave her affections to Robert Sydney, brother to Sir Philip, the favourite of the queen. The greatly daring couple were married in St. Donat's castle just before the arrival of Lord Burghley's messengers, who had come to carry off this eligible parti. In the middle of the eighteenth century the estate passed from the Sydneys, who sold their Glamorgan estates to the Wyndhams, though by that time the castle had become more or less dismantled. It now forms part of the Dunraven estate.

COITY CHURCH. Close to the castle, and behind it, is the small late-thirteenth-century aisleless church, with a central tower. It was built all at one time, with the exception of the top of the tower, which dates from the sixteenth century. The chancel has been recently
restored. The nave roof and the stone chancel roof are, according to Mr. Brakspear, original. On either side of the western arch of the crossing are small pointed recesses, in each of which was placed an altar, and on either side of the eastern arch is a squint giving a view of the high altar. All the lower parts of the walls are of ashlar work battered for about three feet in height; the batter is carried higher in the tower piers. In the north transept are two small stone effigies of the Turbervilles, which Mr. Brakspear considered belonged to heart burials, or covered the graves of two children. In the chancel is a very curious oak chest on the sides of which are several carved panels decorated with the emblems of the Passion. The panels are unquestionably mediaeval, though their framing seems to be of later date. In the south transept stands a hexagonal font of the same date as the church; it has been supplanted for practical use by a modern font in the nave. In the churchyard is the base of a cross. The gargoyles at the four corners of the tower over the crossing are noteworthy productions.

Though Coychurch, the next place to be visited, lies but a short two miles from Coity, it was found necessary to drive thither by Bridgend owing to the badness and narrowness of the road connecting the two.

The church, which is the only object of interest in the village, was described by Mr. Brakspear as the most architectural of any of the small churches included in the programme. It is an exceedingly interesting one, mainly of the end of the thirteenth century. It originally consisted of a chancel, transepts, central tower, and an aisleless nave. One reason for believing in the absence of aisles to the nave is that for some ten feet west of the tower the nave is not arcaded like the rest of its length but has solid walls. Mr. Brakspear was of opinion that here stood the quire stalls. About the middle of last century the central tower fell down and wrecked the chancel. When the rebuilding was begun, funds were, it is said, insufficient to complete the whole scheme. Against the advice of the architect the committee decided to leave work on the tower to a later day. As a consequence of another storm, what was left of the tower fell, and again wrecked the rebuilt chancel. The wooden waggon roof of the nave is of striking beauty, with its adornment of angels and carved bosses, and most especially for the simplicity of its construction. Clerestory windows are on the south side only, and are placed in the wall with but little regard to the arcade beneath them. These cinquefoil windows make interesting comparison with the curious quatrefoil windows in the west wall of each aisle. In the north transept are two effigies: one is of a layman and has no inscription; the other is dated 1591, and shows an Elizabethan priest in his surplice. In the churchyard are the remains of two Celtic crosses, a large stump to the east of the chancel, and fragments of a cross on the south side, which was broken in the fall of the tower. There is also a mediaeval cross raised on five steps. In the vestry are a few pewter vessels and other plate, one of the pieces being of an unusual shape. It was interesting to hear that at least one of these had been recovered by the present incumbent from among the household goods of his predecessor's wife after her removal. The obvious moral is that an inventory should be made as soon as possible of all property belonging to each church. In the cases elsewhere where this has been done some surprising results have
occurred. There is little consolation in the thought that spoliation is usually committed in all innocence.

Lunch was taken at the Dunraven Arms, Bridgend, and afterwards time was allowed for visiting the church of St. Leonard’s, Newcastle, and other objects of interest in Bridgend.

Bridgend is divided into Oldcastle and Newcastle. In BRIDGEND, the latter district is the steep wooded eminence on which stand the scanty remains of the fortress, with its fine late-twelfth-century doorway, and the church of St. Leonard. This latter is a very old foundation, for about 1106 the tithes were granted to the abbey of Tewkesbury, and remained in the same hands until they were sold at the suppression to the Mansells of Margam, by whose descendant, Miss Talbot, they have been recently presented to the church. The church in its present state is practically a modern building. One of the old doorways is preserved as an entrance gate to the vicarage.

A few members of the Institute by leaving Bridgend early were able to pay a visit to the scanty ruins of Ogmore castle, which stands in a picturesque position near the meeting of the rivers Ogmore and Ewenny. Hardly anything of this small castle survives, and, unless the growth of shrubs and ivy be soon checked, what little there is will quickly perish. The walls that still stand belong to a small square Norman keep of which the only interesting part remaining is a fireplace with holes at the back for the escape of the smoke.

Ewenny priory (figs. 7 and 8) stands close by the side of the little river of the same name. The two fine and well-preserved gateways into the priory grounds still survive. The history and architectural features of the building were explained by the owner, Col. J. P. Turbervill.

Ewenny priory was founded in the early part of the twelfth century by the lords of Ogmore. In 1141 one of these, Morice of London, gave it to the Benedictine abbey of Gloucester. Such is its first historical date; but, if we are to believe tradition, a Welsh church dedicated to St. Michael is said to have occupied this site. The priory was founded originally for a prior and ten monks, and the form taken by it was largely the result of external circumstances. This part of the Welsh coast was a weak spot in the line of Norman defence, and to this is due the fact that within a radius of six miles we find no less than ten castles. Ewenny priory was not at first fortified, but had a precinct wall with a gateway on the north and south which enclosed an oblong space 190 yards long by 130 broad. The fortifications as we see them to-day date from the fourteenth century, at which time the north gate was practically rebuilt, and a strong tower was added to the south gate for defence. The wall was further defended by towers at each corner. The church, which lies on the north side of the precinct, was strongly defended, and from an architectural point of view is of the greatest interest. The twelfth-century work is of the strongest and simplest description. The nave had an aisle on the north side only, separated by four arches with simple mouldings. The church has been somewhat shortened at the west end in modern times, but the old walls without the covering roof stand in the stable yard. The beautiful west doorway has been re-erected in the garden. The accompanying plan
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shows that the church was originally cruciform, with a central tower, but the north transept and the twelfth-century north aisle fell down in 1803. The present north aisle was erected in 1895. Formerly there were two chapels, *en échelon*, on the east side of each transept, but these have disappeared. Across the western arch of the tower is a stone screen of thirteenth-century date, separating the nave or parish church from that reserved for the monks. This screen is pierced by doorways on each side of the nave altar. Thus it served at the same time as the reredos of the parish church and the rood screen of the priory church. When the part east of the crossing was reserved exclusively for the monks they would only need an enclosure to the monastic quire, which came up almost to the solid wall, leaving merely sufficient room for processional purposes and for the monks to enter their quire. The former consideration, as Mr. Hope explained, accounted for the existence of every one of the numerous door-openings which puzzle many people. The stone rood screen and reredos combined is one of the few existing instances of such a feature in monastic churches; other places where it occurs are Boxgrove, St. Albans, Tynemouth, and Crowland. The wooden screen now dividing the presbytery from the space under the tower has fourteenth-century tracery with fifteenth-century solid panels below. Mr. Hope claimed that it must have been removed from the nave, where it served as a fence screen to the altar of the parish church; the cuts for its fixing still remain. It will thus be seen that the western limb formed the parish church; while the quire, the presbytery, transepts and chapels formed the church of the priory.

Ewenny presbytery is one of the rare instances in England of Romanesque vaulting on a large scale. Over the two western bays there is a barrel vault, but the eastern bay has ribbed vaulting. The object of the difference clearly is to allow of the presence of windows in the eastern bay. The two bays of the barrel vault are divided by square-edged arches, rising from square pilasters, whose capitals are connected by a string forming a sort of stone wall-plate. These pilasters are corbelled off at a lower string, which is enriched with a chevron. Between each pair of these flat arches a moulded rib is thrown across; the vault of the eastern bay has also moulded ribs, rising at the east end from shafts set diagonally. The barrel vault is semicircular; it seems always to have been a little flattened, but now the crown has given way considerably. The vaulting is slightly flattened; the east window is a plain round-headed triplet. The small windows on each side of the eastern bay appear to have been tampered with.

The south transept has remained almost untouched since the day when it was built. It is lighted at the south end by three plain round-headed lights arranged in the form of a triangle. One peculiarity of these windows is that the centre one is by no means in the centre of the wall. This arrangement can be accounted for partially by the fact of the stair tower taking up part of the wall; but this irregularity is in entire accordance with the style of the whole building, in which it is difficult to find two parts exactly alike. In this entire want of uniformity consists, to some minds, one of its greatest charms. Another instance of this variety of treatment is seen close at hand, in the two blocked-up arches which led through the east wall into the two chapels, now in ruins. The northern arch has its label
adorned with the billet, the southern is quite plain. The arches are divided by a square pier, in which an elegant trefoil niche has been inserted during the thirteenth century. The south transept also contains several old tombs, amongst them being that of “Morie de Lundres le fundur,” which is in an extraordinary and suspicious state of preservation after seven centuries. Another is an imposing mid-seventeenth-century tomb, and there are also slabs showing early and pre-Norman workmanship. High up in the west wall of this transept is an arcade of seven small round arches behind which is the passage to the central tower.

In the south wall of the stair turret, at a height of 12 feet from the ground, is a blocked-up aperture only 4 feet 11 inches by 1 foot 9 inches in size, the original object of which it is difficult to divine, especially as the style of the masonry proves that the opening must have been made at the time the church was built. A yard to the east, in the south wall of the transept, at the same level, is a blocked-up doorway which evidently communicated with the dorter over the chapterhouse.

The battlements of this church are a remarkable feature. They are very lofty and are arranged in steps. Each merlon is pierced with a large cross eyelet, and the whole is supported upon a corbel table. At the corners are very small pinnacles, which serve to lighten the otherwise heavy appearance produced by the battlements.

The house itself, although it incorporates thirteenth-century fragments, is conspicuous for its lack of external interest. The greater part shows a typical early nineteenth-century front in stucco.

Ewenny priory remained as a monastery until 1527, and was then leased by the crown to Sir Edward Carne on the understanding that he was to keep the prior and the two monks as guests. This arrangement apparently proved unsatisfactory, because Sir Edward shortly after bought the priory outright. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the then lady owner allowed the place to become greatly neglected. Part at least of the church was utilised as a farm shed, and as such it appears in a drawing by Turner. John Carter, the antiquary and architect, writing in The Gentleman's Magazine in 1804, after an itinerary in this part of the country, said: “I hailed the sacred walls of this Priory Ewenny and exclaimed, I behold thee in the very moment when thou art about to lose some of thy ‘time-revered honours.’ Already is your southern boundary falling beneath the mattock; your porches, halls, chambers, galleries are waiting their final overthrow, even while the modern staircases, saloons, and drawing-rooms are rising on their blasted sites. Quick, let me note particulars... To mention the condition of the edifice (the church) would be to combine all the thoughts given way to in the course of these essays on such occasions; let us, however, observe that the roofs in the transepts are falling in, their windows and those of the choir unglazed, and in a manner overgrown with ivy. The apparent neglect in every part, the accumulation of rubbish, and the real gloom around drove me from these ruinous walls, which to me at least imparted many a desponding thought.”

About forty years ago the brother of the present proprietor carried out some much-needed work, and Professor Freeman was called in to advise. To the south of the church a square-built dovecote remains in a singularly perfect state of preservation.
Without breaking the laws of guesthood, we may be permitted to endorse the remarks made by Mr. Hope concerning the prevalence of ivy, which clings to the time-honoured walls. Colonel Turbervill is obviously a man keenly aware of his responsibilities as the owner of such an historic place.

The visit concluded with tea in the priory grounds, and the return to Cardiff was made by motor-car and train.

In the evening a paper was read by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope on the excavations which are being carried out at Old Sarum.

Though the hill of Old Sarum has been occupied by a fortress from pre-Roman times the present excavations have revealed nothing of a date anterior to the Norman period.

There can be no doubt that the smaller earthwork was thrown up immediately after the Conquest as the stronghold of a castle of which it formed the inner bailey. At the same time the outer area was probably subdivided into an eastern and a western section by two transverse ditches, extending from the inner ditch to the outer bank. The eastern section perhaps formed the outer bailey of the castle, and the western half, at any rate as to its northern part, was the bishop's precinct and contained the cathedral church. This was the work of Osmund (1078-1099), and was hallowed in 1092. The foundations can still be traced in the turf after a prolonged drought, and during the autumn of 1835 a partial uncovering proved that the church was cruciform in plan and about 270 feet long.

The castle area was probably defended at first, as was usual, by timber palisades disposed along the crests of the outer banks, and continued from those of the transverse ditches down into the inner ditch and up the steep scarp of the inner bailey so as to form unbroken lines of defence.

When the wooden ramparts began to be replaced by walls of masonry is not recorded. From evidence contained in the Pipe Rolls the great tower appears to have been built about 1130, though the encircling walls of the castle were probably not built until about 1173.

The bleakness of the site and the scarcity of water caused the bishop to desert his cathedral church on the hill and build a new one in the valley. The work began 28th April, 1220, and the translation was approved by the king on 30th July, 1227.

The castle of Old Sarum seems to have been kept in repair throughout the fourteenth century, but with the invention of artillery and the changed condition of things it eventually became useless as a defensive work, and in 1446-7, when it was granted by letters patent of 17th March to Sir John Stourton, treasurer of the household, it was described as "now fallen into decay so that no yearly rent thereof is answered for to the king."

The excavations commenced on the 23rd August, 1909, on the site of the gatehouse in the inner enclosure. The entrance was flanked by two drum towers and consisted of one wide archway probably of some 9 feet span.

After the clearance of the gate and the consequent opening up of the original entry into the castle area, operations were begun upon the high bank forming the western side of the inner bailey. The broad top of this was suggestive of a group of chambers beneath, and a very small removal
of turf and soil soon disclosed the rubble core of a considerable length of wall. This was gradually followed downwards, and proved to have, towards the bailey, a battering front, which along the base fortunately retained its ashlar facing. When exposed to its full length the battering wall, which runs nearly north and south, shows a frontage of 85 feet and a height of about 20 feet.

At its northern end the wall was originally interrupted by a covered passage or postern through the defences. Towards the bailey the archway of this has been destroyed, and but for the drawbar on the south side no traces of it remain. Just within the archway there opened out of the passage on the right a broad flight of steps ascending northwards and a shorter flight on the left ascending southwards. The latter opened into a room. The stair ascending northwards had been despoiled of the whole of its steps and ashlar wall facing, apparently at the same time, at any rate as regards the steps, as a curious alteration in the passage itself. This consisted in walling it up at both ends, and filling up the whole of the intervening space, a length of about 34 feet, with loosely laid rubble. This blocking of the passage by no means did away with the postern, but a new entrance from it was made which enabled it more easily to be defended.

In 1910 the work of excavating the great tower began. This tower was found to be a rectangular structure measuring 104 feet along the north wall and 81 feet from north to south. The unusual plan of this tower is at present without a parallel in this country.

On the ground floor of the southern side of the tower were the chapel and kitchen, while along the east side was a building of at least two stories. The rest of the area of the great tower is not on the same level as the kitchen and chapel, but on the first floor, and what should have been the basement is filled up solid with chalk. The walls, nevertheless, are carried down to a considerable distance below the main floor, and seem to have been built, like the kitchen and chapel, upon the level of the bailey, and the chalk filling thrown in as the work proceeded. The first-floor divisions of the great tower consist of one large chamber or hall in the middle, with another chamber to the west, which no doubt had somewhere in its thick west wall the main entrance probably covered by the barbican.

Following the work on the great tower a series of garderobe pits were excavated and provided many objects of value and interest. The size, workmanship and number of these garderobe pits make them an extremely noticeable feature of the buildings.

The last discovery to be made in 1910 was the castle well, in the very middle of the bailey, 10 feet south of St. Nicholas’ chapel.

Saturday, 29th July, 1911.

The great heat of the past week reached a climax on Saturday; so oppressive was it that sight-seeing could scarcely be described as a pleasure. Training to Pyle station the party motored to Margam Abbey. On their arrival light refreshments were provided in the immense orangery, through the kindness of Miss Talbot.

The first Cistercian house in England was founded in 1128 at Waverley
in Surrey and within twenty years a house of this order was established at Margam by Robert, earl of Gloucester, who granted to the monks of Clairvaux all the land between the Kenfig and Afon streams for founding an abbey. It appears that before the Norman Conquest there was a religious settlement on this site, but no trace of it remains.

In 1224 the abbey was attacked by the Welsh, but there is no record of any damage having been done. About that time, said Mr. Harold Brakspear in his description of the buildings, a number of small Cistercian houses in Ireland got into low water, and applied to their mother-house at Mellifont for aid. Owing to their poverty the mother-house could do nothing. At least one of the Irish houses was at once handed over to Margam to maintain, and three others followed. In 1326 the abbot appealed against the general taxation, on the ground that his house was a poor one, as he had to support thirty-eight monks and forty lay brothers. The yearly revenue of the community at its suppression was £188 14s. gross, or £181 7s. 4d. clear. The site was granted to Sir Rice Mansell, for which he paid £936 6s. 8d.; Miss Talbot, the present owner, is a direct descendant of his. The nave of the church, of the date of the foundation, remains, and is now used as a parish church. This, said Mr. Brakspear, is the only Cistercian church which has round arches in the main arcade instead of pointed ones, and the fact is especially noteworthy as the first convent came direct from Clairvaux. In the thirteenth century the church, which up to then had the usual type of aisleless presbytery, was lengthened eastwards. Aisles were added and the transepts rebuilt. The east end of the south aisle of the present church contains four beautiful alabaster tombs, which were apparently executed all at one time and in the same place. They begin with Sir Rice Mansell and his wife, whose figures are on top, while their children are carved in high relief round the base. The three other monuments commemorate the successive holders of the property.

Apart from the church the remains of Margam abbey are very scanty. The chapter-house, roofless but otherwise in good preservation, is worthy of the greatest admiration. Internally circular but externally twelve-sided, this building retained its vaulting until 1800, the beautiful central shaft to carry which remains. Behind the abbot's seat is a quatrefoil opening for which it is difficult to account. The chapterhouse was approached from the cloister through a vaulted vestibule. Margam is famous for its remarkable collection of Celtic crosses, many of them inscribed, brought from many places in the district and thus preserved from destruction.

Miss Talbot kindly allowed the members to inspect the gardens of Margam. The orange trees, about whose origin accounts vary, are famous and the grounds abound in rare and tender plants which could flourish only in a climate as mild as that of this beautiful and sheltered spot.

A somewhat long and uninteresting drive brought the party to Neath, where lunch was served immediately on arrival, before proceeding to the abbey, which lies about a mile to the west of the town. Proclaimed in the sixteenth century as the fairest abbey in Wales, Neath has degenerated sadly, and John Carter's lurid account of it in 1804 more nearly approaches accuracy. To-day it is surrounded by tip heaps and dirty canals, and a network of railway lines has to be crossed before it can be entered.
The abbey was founded, according to Mr. Brakspear, in 1129 or 1130 by Sir Richard Granville, for twelve Savignian monks and an abbot. This reformed Benedictine order was established by Vitalis, a Norman, after many vicissitudes at Savigny, in Avranches, 1112; they founded thirteen houses in England and Wales, one of the earliest being this at Neath. The monks were so closely related to the Cistercians that in 1147 the fourth abbot handed over his abbey and those dependent on it to them. All that remains of the buildings is Cistercian work. The reasons for none of the original buildings remaining are that these were of very small size and as the foundation seems to have increased very rapidly they had to provide greater accommodation, and also that in 1224 Morgan ap Owen burnt the abbey. There is no work standing earlier than the thirteenth century. The buildings were still in progress in 1289, for in that year Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester, granted all the timber for the new work. In 1326 Edward II took sanctuary at Neath for ten days after his escape from Caerphilly castle, pursued by queen Isabella and the barons. It was not a rich house, for in 1534 the gross revenue was returned at £150 4s. 9d. At the suppression, it ought to have been given up at once, but by paying a fine of £150 in 1537 the monks were allowed to continue for a further two years. In 1539 it was finally suppressed, and was converted into a manor house by Sir Robert Williams, alias Cromwell, nephew of Thomas Cromwell, the trusted minister of Henry VIII. Great alterations were carried out to the buildings by Sir Peter Hoby in the middle of the seventeenth century to convert them into a more convenient mansion.

As in all monastic buildings, as Mr. Brakspear remarked, the cloister was the centre of everything. The ruins of the church show late thirteenth-century work. On plan (fig. 10) it was a very blunt-proportioned building, and a curious feature about it is the porch at the west end of the nave, which, according to precedent, ought to have gone right across the west front. The church was vaulted in its main span, as well as in its aisles. About fifty years ago the eastern end was excavated, and a number of fine tiles were brought to light; some of these are now in the Swansea museum. The most perfect part of the buildings is the vaulted chamber beneath the monks' dorter and the vaulted bridge leading thence on the first floor to the reredorter on the east. The warming house, monks' frater and kitchen have almost entirely disappeared, but the lay-brothers' frater, above which was their dorter, is in a good state of preservation. Considerable excavation would have to be carried out before the plan of the abbey could be exactly determined.

From Neath abbey the party motored to the railway station, where tea was served in the reserved coaches. Unfortunately the trains were very unpunctual, and it was only after an extremely tedious journey that they arrived at Tenby.

Monday, 31st July, 1911.

This year the Institute made a most successful innovation in the plans of their summer meeting. Having spent the first five days at Cardiff the members passed the last four in the neighbourhood of Tenby, some hundred
miles further west. The change of centre was carried out successfully, and the stay at Tenby proved most acceptable after the heat and attendant discomforts at Cardiff.

On Monday morning the party assembled in Tenby town hall, where they were accorded a most hearty welcome by the mayor (Captain D. Hughes Morgan) and corporation.

The mayor said that he welcomed the members of the Institute on this their first visit to Tenby. They had come to a town which was full of interest and they would find in the country round objects well worthy of their attention.

Sir Edward Brabrook acknowledged the mayor's greeting. He said they were fortunate in having been able to have a preliminary look round Tenby on Sunday, and to see the remarkable character of the walls, the beauties of the church, and the other attractions of that lovely spot. They were well prepared for the enjoyment of the two or three days that were before them in Tenby, and he was certain they should leave the town with a very strong desire that those two or three days might have been extended into a week or more, and with the conviction that they would not have exhausted all the charms and all the attractions of Tenby in the short time that remained to them. They were pleased to see the Caroline maces of the town, and in the arms which stood above the mayor they had a considerable proof of that reverence for antiquity which had distinguished and always should distinguish the municipal corporations of this country. In conclusion, on behalf of the members of the Institute, and their friends who were present, he had gratefully to acknowledge his worship's most gracious and most kindly reception.

The party then walked to the de Valence gardens where Mr. E. Laws, F.S.A. gave a short account of the history of Tenby and of the existing ancient monuments.

The visitor to Tenby is neither in England nor Wales, but in Little England beyond Wales. Its existence came about in the following fashion. Very soon after the Norman Conquest certain adventurers, by reason of their mastery of the sea, settled themselves in Pembrokeshire, built castles, and established a strong base from which they could thrust into the heart of Wales. From this same base Ireland also was invaded. But, owing to this latter movement, Pembrokeshire was so depleted of its men-at-arms that the Welsh rose and burnt Tenby, and it lay waste for over half a century. Then Henry II, seeing that a strong man was necessary, gave the earldom to William Marshall, and the government became a palatinate. Under the Marshalls, de Valences, and Hastings, the palatinate was pretty well independent. The king's writ did not run here. But when John Hastings the younger was killed in a tournament in 1389, Richard II murdered Edward Hastings, the heir, and made his queen countess of Pembroke. This broke up the palatinate, though there followed notable earls like Humphrey of Gloucester and Jasper Tudor.

The jurisdiction in the county was very peculiar. South Pembrokeshire was ruled from Pembroke. Haverfordwest was a lordship more or less independent, of which the queen consort was generally lady. Dewisland, or St. David's land, was under episcopal jurisdiction. Kemeys was a march ruled by a lord marcher, who, by the way, survives in the person of Sir
Marteine Lloyd, he being the only lord marcher extant. As may be supposed, these various and often hostile communities were a happy hunting-ground for rogues; a gentleman in trouble slipped from one of them to another with the greatest ease. If he was very hard pressed he sought hospitality from the knights of St. John of Jerusalem at Slebech, informing them that he was a christian in distress and demanding sanctuary from them in performance of their vows. So the good hospitaliers had to take him in and look after the stolen cows. Church matters were also affected by the palatinate. In very early days Arnulph de Montgomerie gave Monkton church to the abbey of Seez, and it became an alien priory. As home church of the palatinate one might expect to find a building such as Tintern, the earls being powerful, rich and pious. Nothing of the sort ever existed.

They did endow the priory with all the church patronage on the south coast of Pembroke from Angle to Laugharne. But they never spent much on its adornment. As an alien priory it was half its time in the hands of the crown, which led to innumerable disputes between king and earl. When Henry V finally seized the alien priories, his brother Humphrey, as earl, demanded and obtained the priory of Monkton, with its dependencies; these he gave to his friend, the abbot of St. Albans.

Mr. Laws next led the party to the various points of interest in the mediaeval fortification of Tenby (fig. 11). The work is divided into five periods: (1) Such works as were in existence before Tenby was a walled town. These are on a headland called Castle Hill, and perhaps belong to the twelfth century. (2) Towers, gates, curtains, encircling the town, probably built
by William de Valence (1275–1300). (3) Additions to and enlargements of these in 1457 by Jasper Tudor. (4) Elizabethan restorations, 1588. (5) A few unimportant alterations made between 1643 and 1648. On the land side the defences are still almost complete. They commence at the north gate (also known as the Great or the Carmarthen Gate), overlooking the sea, but which is now the site of the Royal Lion Hotel. The wall ran for fifty yards to a corner bastion. This part of the wall was originally about 18 feet high on the outside and 13 feet on the inside, with one line of loops. Behind was a masonry walk 4 feet 6 inches wide and 8 feet high, from which to serve the loops. In 1457 Jasper raised the height of the wall, including the crenellation, to 25 feet, and also raised the masonry platform to 13 feet 6 inches. Although he thereby covered up the lower loopholes he substituted a higher series. At the semicircular bastion the wall turned at right angles, and still goes in an unbroken straight line over 20 feet in height for more than 400 yards to the sea. Including the two corner ones there are now seven bastions along it. The most important is, and always was, the south-west gate, or "Five Arches," in the middle, the last noble survivor of the five gates which once defended Tenby. The internal area of this semi-circular bastion is 40 feet by 20 feet. It is worth mentioning that in 1873 the corporation ordered the gate to be removed, and, in fact, the materials had actually been sold. Fortunately a local doctor bestirred himself so effectually that an injunction was obtained in the Court of Chancery to prevent this act of vandalism being carried out then or at any future time. These two sides of the wall were defended by a moat 30 feet wide, which was for the greater part dry. When the wall had reached the high and rugged cliff it turned east again, following the irregular line of the shore with a somewhat weaker line of defence. In several places this portion has disappeared. About in its centre stood Brechmaenchine (or the Chine of the Spotted Stone) Tower. Where the wall came to a narrow neck of land leading to the castle hill it turned once more so as to link up with the northern gate. Here again the line of walling only remains in short lengths.

The castle hill is a separate fortress, forming, as it were, an inner bailey round the little mount capped by a tower, while the town, encircled by its walls, completed the arrangement as an outer bailey. The castle hill was under the jurisdiction of a military governor.

By the time the circuit of the walls and the visit to the castle had been completed it was time to return to the town hall, where the members had been invited by the mayor to meet and accompany him in procession to the formal opening of St. Margaret’s fair. The procession was marshalled and set out, halting at certain intervals so as to allow the crier to ring his bell and announce that the fair was now open, and would continue for three days by royal charter of queen Elizabeth, and that if any grievances arose a pied poudré court would be held by the mayor and magistrates to redress the same. From the fair ground the party returned to the church, where Mr. Laws explained the history of the building.

The church at Tenby is a capacious one; in fact, with the exception of St. David’s cathedral, it is the largest in Pembrokeshire. It is now dedicated in honour of St. Mary, but Mr. Laws, in his account of the building, suggested that its original dedication
was St. Bridget, as St. Mary was not very popular among the Welsh as a patroness, being distinctly a Norman saint. In 1186 the church that stood on the site of the present south aisle was destroyed, with a considerable part of Tenby, by the Welsh, who “by plain force won the town and burned it to ashes.” The excrecent wall on the west side of the tower is thought to be part of the old church, which probably had a chancel where the tower now stands. It lay in ruins until 1245, when Warren de Munchensy rebuilt it. He had married Joan Marshall, and though it is very doubtful if he was ever elevated to the earldom of Pembroke, he enjoyed palatinate powers in right of his wife. His additions seem to have been the tower, nave, both aisles and the chancel. He covered them with a vaulted roof, remains of which may be seen, though none of his pillars exist. Guy de Brian, one of the early knights of the garter, and a mighty church-builder, seems to have had a hand in building Tenby church. He probably built the spire, St. Anne’s chapel, and altered the chancel roof. But the existing structure owes most to a fifteenth-century architect who had a long lease of power in Tenby church. He widened the south aisle, remade all arches and piers in the church, built a north chancel aisle which was used as a baptistry, raised the high altar by a flight of eleven steps, and covered the original altar space so as to make it into a bone-hole, and levelled the floor of the church. A remarkable feature is the west door, originally the inner door of a great cruciform porch erected in 1490 at the same time as St. Mary’s college, which once stood in the churchyard. Other notable features of the structure are the west windows, the wooden roof of both quire and nave (dating from about 1470), and the monuments. Professor Freeman admired Tenby church “both on account of its architectural features and by reason of its rich store of monumental antiquities.” The most elaborate of the latter are two tombs of late-fifteenth-century merchants, father and son, each with their two wives, who were of considerable importance in Tenby. The earliest monument is to the east of the north entrance, and shows the figure of a woman (probably the wife of a governor) under a cinquefoiled canopy. A modern slab has been put up to commemorate Robert Record, who “was born in Tenby about 1510, and to whose genius we owe the earliest important English treatise on algebra, arithmetic, astronomy, and geometry.” He also invented the sign of equality (=) now universally adopted by the civilised world. Robert Record was court physician to king Edward VI and queen Mary. He died in prison in London in 1588.

After lunch the party embarked on the abbot’s steamer CALDEY ISLAND to cross the two and a half miles of water which separate Tenby from Caldey island. On landing they proceeded at once to the village church standing to the east of the new monastic church, at some distance from the old priory buildings on the hill.

This little church is possibly of Celtic foundation. It now consists of a chancel, a nave, a vestry and a porch. Of these the vestry is modern and the porch cannot be dated, though it is probably not very old. The nave is approximately square in shape, each side measuring about 20 feet, while the walls are 3 feet thick. The chancel too is a square with 18-foot sides, but only its west and north walls are old, the south and east walls having been rebuilt, together with the roofs, in 1838, when the structure was doing service as a blacksmith’s shop.
In 1907 the west doorway, of twelfth-century date, was discovered, and about the same time the chancel arch, 8 feet in width, was brought to light. The Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. F.S.A. compares this church with the little chapel of St. Govan on the mainland, and the chapels of St. Justinian and St. Nun near St. David's. It may be assumed with safety that the present building belongs in the main to the twelfth century, but it may have been built on the plan of an earlier building, and perhaps the lower portion of the walls may belong to this earlier structure. The building was described by Mr. Coates Carter.

The party next proceeded to the priory (plate 1 and fig. 12), the residence of the Rev. W. Done Bushell. This range of buildings is particularly interesting since it provides us with a primitive example of a fortified mediaeval priory. As will be seen from the plan we have a
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THE CALDEY STONE.
cloister with the church on the south, the warming-house on the east with the dorter over. The "prior's tower," a building evidently designed for defence if necessary, occupies the north-east corner. On the north is the frater, now used as a kitchen, on the west the gatehouse and guesthouse.

In the priory church Mr. Bushell gave the following account of the history of the island:

"Our island's ancient name was Ynys-y-pyr, Pyr's island, though who Pyr was we do not know. He may possibly be identified with Vortiporis, the Protector, whose name appears on the Llanfaltreg stone, and recurs in Manorbier, which means 'Pyr's domain.' Caldey is first mentioned in the Lives of the Celtic Saints. We gather from the lives of St. Paul de Leon, St. Samson and others in the Acta Sanctorum and elsewhere that in the sixth and probably the following centuries there was a well-known monastery on the island which was in close connexion with Saint Illtyd's celebrated house at Llantwit in Glamorganshire; and the ecclesiastical importance of the island was indeed so great that Professor Williams of Bala goes so far as to express an opinion that Caldey and not Llantwit was the original Iltuti.

"How long the Celtic monks survived upon the island is not known, but in the reign of Henry I it was, as Dugdale tells us, given by that monarch to Robert, son of Martin of the Towers, who gave it to his mother Geva, that she might in turn convey it to the important Tyronesian monastery of St. Dogmael's. The priory in consequence became a cell of St. Dogmael's, and so it remained until the dissolution, when it was granted by the king to one John Bradshawe of Presteign.

"One undeniable piece of evidence of Celtic monastic occupation remains in the Caldey stone (plate 11), a sandstone monolith with an incised cross, a Latin inscription and some Ogam lettering round the edge; there is also a cross on the back, and a small cross on either edge. A portion of the stone has long been broken off, and one of the smaller crosses comes in the way of the Ogam inscription. The earlier inscription, however, that in Ogam characters, as deciphered by Sir John Rhys, is MAGL DUBR, which may perhaps stand for MAGICL DUBRACUNA or the (tonsured) servant of Dubricius. The Latin inscription is thus given by Sir John Rhys: 'Et signo crucis in illam fingi rogo omnibus ammulantibus ibi exorent pro anima Catuoconi;' which he translates: 'And I have provided it with a cross; I ask all who walk in this place to pray for the soul of Cadgan.'

"A special feature of the priory buildings is the 'prior's tower,' a battlemented fortalice of military type which apparently preceded the monastic buildings, and was originally meant to stand alone. It is a rectangular structure, nearly square, the internal measurements being 18 feet by 15 feet, while the walls are 4 feet thick. It was probably built by Robert Fitzmartin, or his father, Martin of the Towers, who came from Devon, where Combe Martin still records his name. To Martin the king had given the lordship of Demetia, now Pembrokeshire, and it was doubtless necessary to have a well-assured access from the opposite coast of Devon. Hence this tower, to which in later times the monastic buildings were added. When this was done the upper portion of the tower became the prior's chamber and the existing doorway was cut through the wall into the dorter of the monks."
“On the northern slope of hill beneath the priory are a series of
terraced fishponds, now for the most part laid out as gardens.”

Circumstances did not allow the party to visit the neighbouring island
of St. Margaret, on which there are certain remains believed to be of an
ecclesiastical character. These buildings were, in the nineteenth century,
converted into cottages for quarrymen, and so lost many distinctive features
which might help us to determine their exact use.

Before embarking for Tenby the members were entertained to tea by
the abbot of Caldey and the Rev. W. Done Bushell.

In the evening a conversazione was held, by invitation of the mayor,
in the assembly rooms. On the platform the maces and charters of Tenby
were to be seen and other objects of interest were kindly lent for the occasion
by Mr. Laws and Miss Edwards. A most enjoyable evening was spent,
and the music provided by Mr. W. C. Williams and his son was much
appreciated.

Tuesday, 1st August, 1911.

Tuesday was devoted almost exclusively to the castles in the district
west of Tenby. These are grouped together very closely.

A hilly drive of six miles brought the party to Carew castle. Gumfreston
church with its mineral springs in the churchyard was reluctantly omitted
from the programme; nor did time permit of a visit to Carew church
which is, for the most part, a fourteenth-century building with a fine
tower, and a detached chapel to the west over a bone-hole.

The first object of interest was the remarkable cross
which stands by the wayside near the entrance to the castle.
This is a singularly perfect example of the ninth or tenth
century, not unlike those at Nevern in Pembrokeshire, and Golden Grove
in Carmarthenshire. The late Mr. Romilly Allen considered that all
these were the work of the same artist, and formed an interesting comparison
with the crosses of Devon and Cornwall. Mr. Romilly Allen and Sir John
Rhys are agreed as to the inscription, which runs thus:

MARGIT
EUT RE
CETTF.

and they translate it “Margiteut of Recet made it.” The cross stands
14 feet high and the shaft is covered with panels of knotwork pattern.
According to Mr. Romilly Allen three typical forms of ornament occur
on all the Welsh crosses mentioned above: “First a square divided diagonally
and filled with an L-shaped fret; second, two oval rings interlaced cross-
wise; third, a square with four T’s arranged like a Chinese swastica.”

It would be invidious to compare Carew castle with either Manorbier
or Pembroke. Each has so distinct an individuality that any real comparison
is impossible and unnecessary. Carew (plate 111) has a charm of its own
which neither of the other castles possesses, and to the
archaeologist it is so full of problems that only frequent
visits and the provision of an accurate and large-scale plan
could enable anyone to grasp the true interpretation of its architectural
CAREW CASTLE.
puzzles. Mr. Laws explained the history of the building, and Mr. St. John Hope pointed out the chief architectural features. Carew (which is now pronounced as if it was spelt "Carey") is a corruption of Caerau, the plural of gaer or caer and thus the word means "camps." Here, at the head of a far-stretching creek of Milford Haven, there may have been two early strongholds, but of this history and the landscape are silent.

We first hear of Carew when it was given as part of the dower of Nesta, by her father Rhys ap Tudor, on her marriage with the Norman, Gerald of Windsor, castellan of Pembroke in the reign of Henry I. From this union have sprung the Carews and Careys, Fitzgerals and Geraldines of succeeding centuries, and even now after many wanderings from the old family Carew castle is in the hands of a descendant of Nesta and Gerald of Windsor. Until the end of the fifteenth century the Carews owned it, when it was sold to Sir Rhys ap Thomas, perhaps the most remarkable man that Wales produced during the Tudor period. A warm supporter of Henry VII, this keen politician entertained Henry at Carew on his way to Bosworth field, and accompanied him thither: one Welsh tradition claims that Richard III received his death wound at the hands of Rhys ap Thomas, who was knighted on the field of battle. Honours were heaped upon him and among them the order of the Garter, to celebrate which the first and last great tournament was held at Carew castle in 1507. The festivities lasted five days, and the elite of Wales, to the number of one thousand, attended.

Sir Rhys' grandson, Griffith, failed to find favour with Henry VIII, his head fell on the scaffold, and Carew castle became a royal possession. Queen Mary granted it to Sir John Perrot, who, however, died in the Tower before his building schemes here could be carried to completion. Once more it reverted to the crown until James I gave it back to the descendants of its original owners; in their hands it has remained, and from them the Hon. Mrs. Trollope, the present owner, is descended.

Architecturally Carew has little of the grimness of Pembroke, it appeals to us rather as a residence than as a fortress. What its strength originally was it is difficult to say, for Sir Rhys ap Thomas and Sir John Perrott completely changed the west and north sides.

It consists of two wards, the outer entered through a little gatehouse of late date. Mr. Hope thought that the original entrance must have been an arch cut in the wall and presumably defended by gates. In plan the castle is a square with a drum tower of Edwardian date at each corner. There is a very strong inner gateway through the main curtain wall on the east side, and here we must look for the oldest remaining masonry, which may possibly be that of the castle of Gerald of Windsor. The apartments on the eastern side are the oldest, and most interesting among them is a quite perfect chapel, with a niche by the entrance door for the holy water stock, and an adjacent robing chamber. Increasing grandeur and comfort led to this chapel being disused, and when it was put to other purposes a fireplace was inserted. Evidence of Sir Rhys ap Thomas' attempt to make the castle more comfortable is found everywhere in the windows which he caused to be inserted. To him also is due the great hall on the west side. Raised above a series of cellars, this hall is approached by an outside stairway and porch into the covered passage or screens. The north side is
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taken up with the vast banqueting hall, begun but never finished by Sir John Perrott.

From Carew the motors passed through Pembroke, and over the bridge to Monkton priory church, which stands on the hill facing the remains of Pembroke castle.

The church has little distinction, for it has suffered much. From the time of the dissolution the building was neglected, so that it was to all intents and purposes a ruin in which but six persons worshipped. However, in 1887 active preparations, too active in the opinion of many, were made for its restoration. The result is a long aisleless church with south transept and a detached chapel on the north. The wall which formerly divided the parish from the monastic church was unfortunately destroyed. The most remarkable part of the building is the twelfth-century north wall which is of great thickness, being in reality composed of two walls. The nave is covered with a waggon vault on which the roof is bedded. A few remains of the priory buildings exist in the adjacent farm, while the "Old Hall" to the east of the church dates from the fourteenth century and perhaps formed the gatehouse.

Monkton priory was a cell of the abbey of Seez in Normandy, founded in the twelfth century. When the alien houses were suppressed in the reign of Henry V it was given by Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, to John of Whetmestep, and by him to the abbey of St. Albans.

A glance at the plan of Pembroke (fig. 13) will show the situation of the town. On the west and north it was strongly guarded by a broad tidal waterway, while on the south a salt marsh protected it. The narrow east end was the only really vulnerable point. There were three gates, one at the north, one at the east, and one at the west, of which latter traces remain. Here and there fragments of the town walls still bear witness to the course they took.

At the west end of the town is the castle (fig. 9), the strongest in South Wales.

The first castle is believed to have been built about 1094 by Arnulph de Montgomery. This, according to Giralanus Cambrensis, was a slender fortress of stakes and turf, and such we should expect it to have been at so early a date. After Arnulph's time the castle passed into the hands of the king who appointed the governor. In 1138 Stephen created the earldom of Pembroke, and the first earl was Gilbert de Clare, surnamed Strongbow. Pembroke was a palatinate and thus achieved more independence than was possible to an ordinary earldom. From 1148 to 1176 Gilbert's son Richard was earl and the castle served as a base of operations during the Irish war. Richard's infant daughter Isabel became a ward of the king's on her father's death, and was by him married to William Marshal, earl of Pembroke. In 1245 when William's five sons had died childless, the castle passed to Warren de Munchensy, who had married William's daughter Joan. The castle passed next to William de Valence, who is supposed to have built the town walls. His son, Aymer de Valence, was succeeded by the Hastings family until 1389, when Richard II took the palatinate into his own hands. Henry VI granted the earldom and castle to his half-brother, Jasper Tudor, and here the future king Henry VII was born. Henry VIII created Ann Boleyn marchioness, and after her death
abolished the palatinate. The castle played a prominent if complicated part in the civil war of the seventeenth century, until it was dismantled by Cromwell's orders.

Mr. Hope, in describing the building, said that Pembroke was a royal fortress built for the defence of this part of the country, and to control effectively the passage of the river. The present structure contains nothing earlier than the thirteenth century, though it is said to have been established by Gerald of Windsor in 1105. The so-called Norman hall has nothing Norman about it. Entrance to the outer ward is gained first through an archway and barbican which stand at right angles to the great gatehouse. This is of very strong construction, and was equipped with several means of preventing an entry. The area of the castle enclosure amounted to four acres and was divided into a large outer ward and a much smaller inner ward by a deep ditch (now filled up) with its gate. One of the facts usually mentioned is that the Welsh king, Henry VII, was born in the outer courtyard of the castle. The present idea is that he was born somewhere in the great gatehouse. But from this theory Mr. Hope differed. One reason for doing so was the fact that it had not been so recorded by Leland. Moreover Leland states that the event was marked by placing the royal arms over a fireplace. And in the gatehouse no such fireplace is to be seen. It seemed more probable that the birth occurred in one of the chambers of a large group of buildings formerly standing just within the gate. The principal buildings were in the inner ward. Near the inner gate was a chapel and a comfortable apartment which may have served for the soldiers on guard. What is marked on the plan and generally known as the keep Mr. Hope said ought to be called the great tower, the word "keep" not being found in use much before the reign of Elizabeth. This great tower (plate iv), standing by itself upon a rock, was described by him as almost without parallel in this country, and it might be compared with the great tower at Coucy in France. It used to be divided into five stories. Leland says that there was a millstone on the top as a finish to the capping, but this has disappeared. The tower stands 75 feet high and is 60 feet in diameter at the base, where the walls are nearly twenty feet thick. The arrangement of the other buildings must be somewhat uncertain. The so-called Norman hall may or may not have been a hall of the thirteenth century. Towards the end of the thirteenth century was erected alongside of it a much finer hall with beautiful two-light windows of delicate tracery. One of the curiosities of Pembroke castle is the Wogan cavern underneath the north hall just mentioned. It measures 76 feet long by 59 feet broad, and is approached by a flight of stone steps. It is, no doubt, a natural cave enlarged by the early builders and incorporated into their buildings. The outer face to the river was covered by a wall, in which an opening was left protected by an iron gate. It would seem admirably fitted for storage purposes.

After luncheon at Pembroke the party, re-entering the motor cars, drove a short two miles to Lamphey palace, (plate v) where they were met by Mr. Mathias, the owner of the ruins.

Many of the facts stated about Lamphey rest upon the rather slender basis of tradition, and the riotous and destructive growth of ivy and other
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weeds makes it well-nigh impossible to obtain much confirmation or denial from the buildings themselves.

There appears to have been some kind of a residence here at the end of the eleventh century, but little if any trace of this remains, and it is doubtful whether anything earlier than the work of bishop Gower (1328-1347) in the eastern block survives, though it is possible that some of the buildings may belong to the thirteenth century. The chapel on the first floor has a beautiful east window which is attributed to bishop Vaughan (1509-1523). Henry VIII compelled bishop Barlow to surrender the palace, and it was sold to Walter Devereux, afterwards viscount Hereford. His grandson, who became earl of Essex, erected the western block of buildings. His son, in turn, was Robert Devereux, the favourite of queen Elizabeth, and he spent his early days at Lamphey. The last Devereux to hold the property was Robert, the son of Elizabeth’s favourite. He was, in 1642, commander of the parliamentary forces in this district. On his death in 1646 Lamphey passed to Lady Hertford, who sold it to the Owens of Orielton. From these, in 1821, it was purchased by Charles Mathias of Llangwarren. Such is the history of the palace as given by Mr. Laws.

Mr. Hope said that the arrangement of the buildings was a little obscure because the curtain wall had been pulled down, but notwithstanding this obscurity there was no doubt that Lamphey had once been a very fine house surrounded by a deep ditch. The small square gatehouse now standing isolated in the middle of a large garden is remarkable for a peculiar treatment of the parapet similar to that in another part of the buildings. The same treatment is to be seen at the episcopal palace at St. Davids and at Swansea castle. It appears to have originated with bishop Gower, who built the first about 1340, and rebuilt the second about 1330. The great hall could be accepted as unquestionably mediaeval, though it is impossible to see the detailed features owing to the ivy and other creepers. It seems to have had a peculiar apartment on its upper floor. On the outside the windows inserted by the Tudor owners may be seen. On the ground level of another building is a very fine cellar-like apartment, with a roof having cross ribs. Above it was a series of rooms, as is indicated by the presence of three fireplaces. The chapel (1509-1523) is another detached building of two stories, and is noteworthy for the charming tracery in the six-light east window.

From Lamphey the road to Manorbier was rough and extremely narrow. On the way the motors passed Hodgeston church, but time did not permit a visit to the beautiful small chancel, probably the work of bishop Gower. Manorbier is inseparably bound in memory both historical and sentimental with the name of Giraldus Cambrensis, who was born within the walls of the castle about the year 1147. His parentage is interesting as giving us some clue to his strangely mixed character. His father was a Norman, William de Barri, his mother was Angharad, offspring of that important union of Gerald of Windsor and Nesta, daughter of Rhys ap Tudor, the last independent prince of South Wales. Born from the union of Norman adventure and Celtic patriotism and romance, Gerald de Barri, to give Giraldus his correct name, could hardly fail to have lived an interesting life or to have been an attractive personality. This is no place to put on record the life story
of this "vivacious, cultured, impulsive, humorous, irrepressible Welshman," who had travelled much and seen much with an intelligent eye, a man whose ambitions were frustrated, whose hopes all came to nothing. Many writers have described Gerald, and they have called him many complimentary names, but no one has come quite so close to the truth as John Richard Green when he spoke of Gerald as "the father of popular literature." "The first great journalist" is another phrase whose truth will appeal to those familiar with his works. Gerald loved Wales, but of all Wales Manorbier was dearest to him. In his Itinerary through Wales he writes: "Demetia, with its seven cantreds, is the most beautiful, as well as the most powerful district of Wales; Penbroch, the finest part of the province of Demetia; and Manorbier the most delightful part of Penbroch."

On arriving at Manorbier the party climbed the hill on which stands the somewhat gaunt looking church. Manorbier church has the reputation of being the most peculiar in Pembrokeshire; whether this is the case or not it can with truth be said that it was the most extraordinary church visited by the Institute in South Wales. Though of simple cruciform plan with a tower on the north in the angle between the transept and the chancel, the building conveys an impression at once irregular and incoherent, yet withal simple and crude to an unnecessary extent.

Some doubt exists as to the history of this building, and confusion has been caused by the assumption that there was a Benedictine monastery founded in 1301 as a cell of Monkton priory. There is no documentary evidence for this belief, which is disproved by the Patent Rolls, which record that the abbey of St. Albans had a licence on the 14th July, 1445, to appropriate Tenby and Manorbier churches. This was repeated on 17th November probably owing to an intermediate presentation to Manorbier rectory by the king. The actual appropriation evidently did not take place till the death of Thomas Wylkoc, rector in 1445-6. The cell of Monkton, which had been granted to St. Albans in 1441, was regarded as impropriator, and the church was served by a vicar. Had a religious house existed here from 1301 it is only reasonable to assume that the church would have been appropriated, while this actually did not take place till the middle of the fifteenth century.

Manorbier church was originally aisleless and when the present aisles were formed they were connected with the nave by cutting arches in the existing walls. One of the original twelfth-century windows can be seen on the south side. The building is the work of many different dates. The tower was built towards the end of the thirteenth century; the north transept, originally of the same century, was lengthened in the fourteenth century to form the de Barri chapel, in which may be seen an effigy of one member of this great family. The north aisle is of about the same date, while the chancel, south transept, and south aisle belong to the fifteenth century. The church is covered with a pointed waggon vault, upon which the roof is bedded, and that part over the north transept is peculiar in having square ribs placed very close together. There is a wooden gallery, resembling the canopy of a rood screen, across the east end of the north aisle.

To the south of the church, raised above it on the hillside, are some ruined
LAMPHEY PALACE.
MANORBIER CASTLE.
buildings and a cottage. There can be little doubt that these formed the mediaeval rector's dwelling house.

The description of Manorbier castle (plate vi) written by Gerald de Barri is well worth quoting in full:

“The castle called Maenor Pyrr, that is, the mansion of Pyrrus, who also possessed the island of Chaldey, which the Welsh call Inys Pyrr, or the island of Pyrrus, is distant about three miles from Penbroch. It is excellently well defended by turrets and bulwarks, and is situated on the summit of a hill extending on the western side towards the sea-port, having on the northern and southern sides a fine fish-pond under its walls, as conspicuous for its grand appearance, as for the depth of its waters, and a beautiful orchard on the same side, inclosed on one part by a vineyard, and on the other by a wood, remarkable for the projection of its rocks and the height of its hazel trees. On the right hand of the promontory, between the castle and the church, near the site of a very large lake and mill, a rivulet of never-failing water flows through a valley, rendered sandy by the violence of the winds. Towards the west, the Severn sea, bending its course to Ireland, enters a hollow bay at some distance from the castle; and the southern rocks, if extended a little further towards the north, would render it a most excellent harbour for shipping. From this point of sight, you will see almost all the ships from Great Britain, which the east wind drives upon the Irish coast, daringly brave the inconstant waves and raging sea. This country is well supplied with corn, sea-fish, and imported wines; and what is preferable to every other advantage, from its vicinity to Ireland, it is tempered by a salubrious air.”

Nowadays we shall look in vain for the great fishponds, for marshes have taken their place; orchard and vineyard, too, are gone, but all the rest is there, and no one who has once seen Manorbier will fail to appreciate the description just quoted.

Manorbier has practically no history. From the de Barri family it passed in 1358 to the de Windsors, with whom it remained until, in Henry V's reign, it became crown property. Queen Elizabeth sold it to Thomas Bowen of Trefloyne, from whose family it passed by marriage to the Phillippes.

Manorbier castle is best regarded, said Mr. Hope, as a castellated mansion. In plan it is an irregular oblong with the buildings grouped round a courtyard. On the east is the strong gatehouse flanked on the south by a circular tower called the Bull Tower and abutting on the north against a strongly built square tower which may be part of the building mentioned by Giraldus. Opposite to the gatehouse are the chief domestic buildings on the first floor, approached by an external stairway. These consist of the hall, chapel, dwelling room, and cellars beneath, but there is some doubt as to the exact arrangements, which can only be cleared up by the aid of a plan.

These buildings appear to have been built together with the gatehouse about 1270. The kitchen was in the courtyard and there is every reason to believe that it remained there during the occupation of the castle.

From Manorbier the party proceeded to Lydstep Haven where Lord and Lady St. Davids entertained them to tea. Lord St. Davids welcomed the party most heartily, and regretted that Lady St. Davids had found it impossible to be there as well.
In the evening the Annual General Meeting was held in the assembly rooms.

In the absence of the President, Sir Henry H. Howorth, the chair was taken by Mr. Henry Longden.

After the minutes of the preceding annual general meeting had been read and passed, the secretary read the report of the Council for the session 1910-1911, and the accounts for the preceding year were presented. These are printed on pages 447-450. The Chairman then moved and Sir Edward Brabrook seconded the adoption of the report and accounts, and the re-election of the President for a further term, which were carried unanimously.

Following the precedent set at the last annual meeting a comprehensive vote of thanks was then passed unanimously to all those persons who had contributed to the success of the meeting, whether by organisation, hospitality or by descriptions of buildings.

The Chairman then announced that subject to practicable arrangements for the meeting being possible, the Council had fixed upon Northampton as the centre for the year 1912. Some suggestions were then made as to the place of meeting for 1913, some members favouring the selection of Cambridge.

Wednesday, 2nd August, 1911.

The last day of the summer meeting was devoted to a visit to St. David's, a spot so inaccessible that it is perhaps the least known of the cathedral churches. A special train conveyed the party to Fishguard whence the motors brought them over sixteen hilly and inhospitable miles to St. David's, standing back a little way from the sea, in as bleak and bare a coast as it would be possible to find in these islands. The precinct of St. David's is enclosed by a wall, defended originally by four strong gates, only one of which, that in the south-east corner, remains (fig. 14).

Throughout the day the party were guided by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, who described the bishop's palace before lunch and the cathedral church after.

The bishop's palace is a fine group of ruins lying almost due west of the cathedral (plate vii). According to Mr. Hope, the precinct of St. David's is unrivalled for picturesqueness, though for general interest it must yield the palm to Wells. Through the middle of it runs a stream called the Alan, on one side of which was the palace and on the other the church. The wall of the close, which extends to a mile, dates from about 1330. Only one of its four gateways remains. It was erected by bishop Gower (1328-1347), who belonged to a noble family which had settled in the English-speaking peninsula of Gower. He seems to have been more of an architect than a politician, for during his twenty years of office he was conspicuous for his building activities and munificence rather than for his prominence in affairs of state. His work on his cathedral came at a critical time. But it was in the erection of the palace close by that his genius had full scope. Here is the great arcaded parapet which is only to be seen, as already mentioned, at two other places. The following description of the parapet,
ST. DAVID'S FROM THE WEST. THE BISHOP'S PALACE IN THE FOREGROUND.
by Mr. Philip A. Robson, A.R.I.B.A. appears in Bell’s guide to the cathedral.

“...It consists of a series of arches, with a hollow ornamented by Gower’s four-leaved flower carried down on octagonal shafts, which rest on corbels of considerable variety about two feet down the wall. Above the arcade is a corbel table carrying a projecting battlemented cornice. The battlements have extremely narrow embrasures and loopholes. The sills of the arcade are steeply slanted outwards. Great richness is obtained above the arcade from the various coloured stones employed. They are set in squares alternately purple and grey, in the voussoirs of the arches and the spandrels above them, and make a mellow and harmonious chequer-work which greatly adds to the character of the whole building.”

The buildings were apparently ranged round three sides of a quadrangle. On the east side were successively a room generally accepted as a small chapel, the bishop’s hall (about 60 feet by 23 feet) and its kitchen (about 26 feet by 23 feet). On the south side was the great hall (about 96 feet by 31 feet) and the west chapel. Of the domestic buildings on the west side little remains. The whole forms, as Mr. Hope remarked, an extremely valuable example of fourteenth-century domestic architecture carried out on a large scale. The plan was simple: the principal buildings occupied two sides, the third was given up to those of less importance, and the fourth was filled by a wall with the gatehouse. This disposition was curious, though paralleled by that of Wells; the latter was mainly built by Jocelin...
(1206–1242), who seems to have been much the same kind of bishop as Gower. The kitchen at St. David’s stands between the two halls, and no doubt served both. Each hall was entered from the quadrangle by its own porch and staircase. As usual the first floor was given up to the principal apartments, while on the ground floor were cellars or crypts which may have been utilised for domestic offices, as they are lighted by good lancet windows (once glazed), as well as for storing food at such times as the bishop and his considerable retinue chose to reside here. The vaults are of the plain barrel type without ribs. The building immediately adjoining the gatehouse, which is usually described as a chapel, was believed by Mr. Hope to have been rather the almonry. The kitchen was a curious apartment. It was evidently domed. During the last fifty years the great stone chimney collapsed, and the masonry now lies on the floor. The arrangement was similar to that at Fountains abbey, namely, four fireplaces back to back in the centre. The great hall had at one end a withdrawing chamber and other rooms. In the south-east wall is a beautiful rose-window which, unlike all the other windows, still retains its tracery. Evidently a very considerable amount of decoration was lavished on the windows. Mr. Hope suggested that the range of buildings on the south side, and not those on the east, formed the bishop’s apartments. A curious feature about the palace is the lack of accommodation for servants. But it has to be remembered that the attendants were accustomed to sleep on palettes of hay and straw laid on the floor of the great hall.

The ruinous condition of the buildings is believed to have begun with an unworthy successor of bishop Gower called William Barlow (1536–1548). He is said to have initiated the work of destruction by removing the lead from the roof to provide marriage portions for his daughters, who married five bishops, but some doubt has been cast on this story. Another reason given for this action was in order to make the buildings so unhabitable that the government might be compelled to accede to his proposal of transferring the see to Carmarthen and the episcopal residence to Abergwili. In the latter he was successful.

After lunch the party assembled in the quire of the cathedral church (plates vii, viii and ix, and fig. 15), where Mr. Hope gave a brief account. The plan, he said, was in itself peculiar, because the east end now included so many additions that its original disposition had become almost obliterated. On this site stood the church founded by St. David which was destroyed by fire in 645. Of this and the two others which followed no traces remain. The present building was begun in 1180 by Peter de Leia, the third Norman bishop, who died in 1198. It is therefore contemporary with the work at Wells of bishop Reginald de Bohun (1174–1191). But whereas at St. David’s they rigidly kept to Romanesque, at Wells a new fashion was followed. A more accurate comparison is afforded by the ruined lady chapel at Glastonbury. Of the church of bishop Peter we have the entire nave and parts of the transepts, and the lower part, apparently, of the eastern gable.

What the east end was like must remain uncertain, for what exists now was not his work but is usually assumed to represent a rebuilding which took place about twenty years after. Leia’s Norman detail was then closely
followed, though the arches were made pointed instead of round. Soon after the completion of Peter’s work, in 1220, the central tower fell. Mr. Hope doubted whether this mishap could have done as much damage to the adjacent parts as is usually represented. One reason was that the tower being Norman would not have been carried to any great height. Probably the tower collapsed into the open space immediately underneath it and left the eastern arm practically untouched. While the necessary rebuilding was taking place the parishioners seem to have utilized the gateway to the south-east of the church as a belfry, or rather erected a detached semicircular tower adjoining one side of it. This would obviously be a more logical place for it than a campanile buried in a hollow.

Very soon afterwards the aisles were extended eastwards, first to the high altar and then about 40 feet beyond it, so as to form chapels. A cross piece was then erected so as to give a means of communication between these two projecting aisles and to allow of processions making a complete circuit. Next they struck out still further eastwards by adding a lady chapel. As will be seen from the plan, this was by no means in accordance with the axial line of the church, being nearly five feet to the south of it.

The presbytery was originally meant to be vaulted; but, like many other intentions in the building, this was never carried out. In the second quarter of the fourteenth century a great deal of reconstruction seems to have been begun under the great bishop Gower. It included the south quire aisle, the pulpitum, and St. Thomas’ chapel, now the chapter-house, with the treasury over. This chapel corresponds in position with a large two-storied chapel at Lincoln which was destroyed in the beginning of the eighteenth century. It may have served as a vestry, treasury, or as a storage place for the large stock of vestments. The arrangement of the imposing stone pulpitum is most unusual, and is only approached by that at Southwell, which has practically the same treatment of vaulting. The pulpitum seen by the party at Ewenny priory was different from that at St. David’s, for whereas the former has an arched opening at each side and the altar in the centre, the latter has an altar on each side and the entrance to the quire in the middle.

St. David’s being a church of secular canons the arrangement of the quire is, said Mr. Hope, exactly what might be expected. The stalls, with their fascinating misericord carvings are believed to have been executed in the time of bishop Tully between 1460 and 1480. The reigning sovereign of Britain holds the first prebendal stall here. It is marked by a small brass plate bearing the royal arms. The quire is separated from the presbytery by a so-called “sanctuary” screen. Mr. Hope clearly showed that this was not a sanctuary screen and was not in its correct position, and that it originally served as a fence screen to the pulpitum altars standing on the top of the steps across the first bay of the nave. It is now askew and obviously too wide for its position. The wooden screen has traceries of a simple but very pleasing character.

A curious feature of the cathedral plan was an open space or well left between the east wall and the passage connecting the projecting aisles. This was in the fifteenth century described as “vilissimus sive sordidissimus locus in tota ecclesia.” Bishop Vaughan (1509–1522) took possession of
ST. DAVID'S CATHEDRAL CHURCH FROM THE N.E.
it and converted it into a most beautiful vaulted chapel, which is known by his name, though dedicated in honour of the Trinity. To do this he filled in the three large lancet windows at the back of the high altar. It is probable that he substituted for them a broad and low Perpendicular window above. At present the three original lights are blocked up, while above are a group of four lancets introduced by Sir G. G. Scott in his extensive works in the middle of last century, in the place of a decayed fifteenth-century window.

The present unique nave roof is generally accredited to the treasurer Owen Pole (1472–1509). Mr. Hope said that the elaborate wooden carving, and particularly the pendants, showed traces of Flemish renaissance work such as is not generally seen in this country at the end of the fifteenth century, and he was inclined to date this example about 1530.

For its monuments alone St. David's would be remarkable. These include the shrines of St. David and St. Caradoc on the north side of the quire. It was suggested that the former was moved to its present position from some other part of the building. It is obviously a piece of patchwork. Particular attention was drawn to four unusual effigies of clerks in holy orders clothed in amices, albs, crossed stoles, and dalmatics. Mr Hope thought that the presence of the dalmatics instead of the ordinary chasubles may be taken as proof that they commemorated archdeacons who were often figured so vested on their seals. Bishop Gower's tomb is under the pulpitum.

ST MARY'S COLLEGE. The college of St. Mary was founded jointly by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, his wife Blanche, and bishop Adam Houghton in 1377. The ruins stand to the north of, and parallel to, the nave, from which it was separated by a square cloister, of which nothing is now left. There are considerable remains of the large hall over a subvault.

The headland of St. David's is remarkable for the number and interest of its prehistoric remains, but owing to the absence of roads and the shortness of time no organised visit was possible.

The party were entertained to tea by the dean of St. David's, and subsequently were conveyed in motors to Fishguard, and thence the majority travelled by special train to Tenby, while a few caught the express direct to London.

This closed the summer meeting. Judged by the figures of the preceding year, the party was more compact. At Oxford the numbers were between 100 and 150, while in Wales they did not exceed 90. The attendance at Oxford was unprecedented in the history of the Institute, and although at that meeting it had been possible to adhere strictly to the time-table and examine the places visited at leisure, the smaller numbers this year enabled the members to see as much in the shorter times which the long distances imposed.

It is satisfactory to be able to record that the experiment of holding a meeting at two centres proved a complete success. Arrangements had been made for the independent conveyance of the members' luggage, and the Institute moved its headquarters from Cardiff to Tenby during the course of a full day's excursion without having to curtail the programme.

It is to be hoped that this precedent will now enable the Institute to.
visit many parts of England which it has hitherto been obliged to neglect on account of their not affording sufficient material for the full eight days' meeting.

Note.—The Institute is greatly indebted to the Editor of *The Architect and Contract Reporter* for material assistance in drawing up the foregoing account of the meeting. It has also to thank Mr. W. M. Dodson of Bettws-y-Coed for the loan of the blocks illustrating plates I, III, IV and V, which appeared in Miss Edwards' book on *Castles and Strongholds of Pembrokeshire*, published by him; the Rev. W. Done Bushell for fig 12, and plate v; the Corporation of Tenby for plate vi; and Messrs. George Bell & Sons for plate viii, which is from the handbook to St. David's in their Cathedral Series. Mr. John Ward, F.S.A. has drawn fig. 2; Mr. G. E. Halliday, F.S.A. F.R.I.B.A. has drawn figs. 5 and 6; while Mr. Harold Brakspear is responsible for the remainder of the plans with the exception of fig 12.
ST. DAVID'S CATHEDRAL CHURCH. THE NAVE, LOOKING EAST.
AUTUMN MEETING AT WESTMINSTER,
20th October, 1911.

In continuation of the arrangements made by the Council for spring and autumn meetings at places of interest in and around London, the study of Westminster Abbey was completed in October, when, under the direction of Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, the mediaeval monuments and furniture were examined.

The members first collected in the Jerusalem Chamber. Sir Henry H. Howorth, K.C.I.E. D.C.L. F.R.S. F.S.A. said that the chamber in which they met was an ideal meeting-place for an antiquarian society such as theirs, and most especially because of its memories. Their work that day would be limited to the monuments of feudal times reaching down to the Tudor period.

Mr. Hope next, by the aid of a large scale plan, described the mediaeval arrangement and use of the abbey church down to 1540.

The former visit of the Institute, he pointed out, was for the purpose of examining the abbey church architecturally, and the remains of the monastic buildings. The present visit was for the examination of the mediaeval monuments and furniture down to the suppression of the monastery.

The monuments, with few exceptions, were little known through being overshadowed by later memorials; the furniture could not be appreciated without a preliminary study of the arrangement and uses of the several parts of the church.

As he had often pointed out to the members in parallel cases, the abbey church was not built for public worship. Such folk as could claim parochial rights had long been provided with them so far back as the days of the Confessor by St. Margaret's church, and the abbey church was emphatically that of the abbey alone, and its convent of Benedictine monks.

The middle of the church formed the chapel of the convent, and was enclosed on all sides by screens to ensure privacy, for warmth, and for greater safety of its contents. It was enclosed on the west by the solid screen called the pulpitum, a thirteenth-century structure which seems to have had against it for a long time the altar of St. Mary "by the north door," and that of the Trinity on the south. Upon the loft were the "ij payre of organs in the quire" mentioned in the suppression inventory. The loft filled a whole bay, and between the next pair of pillars was the rood-screen with the altar of the Holy Cross. This screen was no doubt

1 The first meeting at Westminster Abbey was held 4th and 5th October, 1910: it is reported in the Archaeological Journal, lxvii, 397-406.
PROCEEDINGS AT MEETINGS.

continued across the aisles, on the north towards "north door," and on the south for the altar of St. Helen. In 1251 Edward of Westminster was ordered to have a large cross placed in the nave, with two cherubim to stand on each side. This cross was perhaps the "crokyd rood" of the suppression inventory.

It will be noted that this arrangement coincides with the termination of the work of Henry III. The present west face of the pulpitum dates from 1831, and the quire stalls (by Blore) from 1848. The thirteenth-century stalls were destroyed in 1775. They were 64 in number: 28 on each side and 8 returned. In the quire was a desk (an iron lectern bought for £5 in 1396-7) for the chanters, and three bells. At the east end of the stalls were two steps, the gradus chori, up to the "lower pavement," which was shut off from the transepts by screens, with probably the "upper entrances" into the quire. Here stood the quire altar, Ware's altare matutinale, and behind it was placed from Easter to the Ascension day the great seven-branched candlestick which, as at Durham, served for the Paschal. On either side were the graves of abbot Henley (1344) and abbot Kedington (1315). Here, too, the kings of England have always been anointed and crowned.

From the crossing three steps, the gradus presbyterii, led up to the presbytery, and over them in Lent were hung "ij drawyng perpull curteyns for the vayle afore the highe awlter."

On the north side of the presbytery were the three existing splendid tombs, and on the south side the painted and gilded wooden sedilia, and the cauagium regis or king's closet, in the bay now filled by the unfinished, or mutilated, tomb of Anne of Cleves.

The east end of the presbytery was closed in by a wall against which stood the high altar and its reredos. The extraordinarily beautiful tabula that undoubtedly belonged to this is now in Jerusalem Chamber, and not improbably, as suggested by Mr. Lethaby, was made for the decoration of the altar at the hallowing of the new church in 1269. Over the altar was a loft in which stood images of St. Peter and St. Paul, and above it a tester put up in 1338, surmounted by the Rood, Mary, and John, and two seraphim, possibly the successor of a Norman one like that once at Canterbury. North of the altar stood "a fayer lecturne of latten" with an eagle, for singing the Gospel from; a charge for cleaning it occurs in 1422-3.

Doors in the ends of the wall led into the chapel of St. Edward beyond. Here stood the shrine and its altar, and formerly (probably) the altar of relics, together with the coronation chair and a sword and shield said to be Edward III's.

The shrine was encircled by tombs protected by iron grates, which not only continued the quire enclosure, but guarded the shrine as well. One curious feature of the eastward arrangements is the absence of any public access to the shrine. Before the tombs of Edward I and Richard II were set up, it would have been possible to have had stairs up on either side. But from 1307 onwards there cannot have been any general access to the shrine, since the only way to it was through the

1 So-called in the inventory of 1388.
reredos wall, and the public must have been content with viewing it from the ambulatory.

The arrangements of the chapels are best seen from within them.

The party then passed into the nave, where the heraldry of the carved shields in the spandrels was examined. Some of the spandrels in the north transept are carved with beautiful foliage and others with figure subjects. Unfortunately much of it is now mouldering away through the effects of the London atmosphere.

The mosaic pavement in the presbytery, laid down in 1268, was next inspected. This is usually covered with three layers of carpet as being far too precious, as Mr. Hope pointed out, for ordinary people to walk upon. The reredos behind the altar is, of course, modern, being part of the restoration under Sir Gilbert Scott. Its large mosaic of the Last Supper was executed by Salviati. In the famous tombs on the north side “weepers” were introduced. At the back of the tombs to Aymer de Valencia and Edmund Crouchback heavy iron grates took the place of the wall (still behind the tomb of Aveline) which originally enclosed the presbytery, but they had long disappeared. In Henry VIII’s reign the royal pew on the south side was cleared away entirely, and its site was now occupied by the probably unfinished monument of Anne of Cleves. The portrait of Richard II, which is now hung in that bay, is considered to be one of the finest royal portraits in the world. Difference of opinion exists as to its authorship; Mr. Hope believed it to be English work. The whole groundwork was originally covered with gesso, in which material the crown and sceptre were also modelled. About fifty years ago the picture was given to an eminent painter to clean, and he removed all the gesso surface under the impression it was a modern accretion. Fortunately, a friend came into his studio in time to save one small patch. The present frame was designed by Sir Gilbert Scott, on the model of an old one round a painted reredos in Norwich cathedral. Behind the stone screen, which forms the reredos of the high altar, is a series of representations of legends connected with the life of the Confessor, forming a frieze, probably carved in the time of Edward IV. Below this frieze the screen is divided into panels with elaborate canopies. Against the screen are placed the oak coronation chair and a sword and shield. The former was made for king Edward I in 1300 by Master Walter, the king’s painter, to contain the stone of Scone. The original order was for a chair of bronze, but after this was completed the king was not satisfied, so another one was carved in wood, covered all over with gesso decoration, of which traces still remain. In 1901, said Mr. Hope, the stone of Scone was taken out and examined in the presence of himself and others. It was found to have been cut at the back and front to fit the chair, and hanging rings had been let into the ends so that it could be carried on a pole. The four small gilt lions supporting the chair are modern. The long two-handed sword and battered wooden shield of state are accepted as having belonged to Edward III. The shrine of St. Edward is remarkable for being one of the few which still contain the original bones. It always had an altar at its west end, which was used in connexion with the coronation service. The pall suspended above the shrine was put up at the instance of the late Mr. Micklethwaite. The whole chapel used to be paved with beautiful
FIG. 1. DIAGRAMMATIC PLAN OF THE SANCTUARY AND CHAPELS, WESTMINSTER ABBEY, SHOWING THE MONUMENTS (see opposite).
LIST OF MONUMENTS ILLUSTRATING FIG. 1.

The order of the mediaeval monuments in a chronological scheme is given by Roman figures.

CLASS A. THE FIRST WESTMINSTER STYLES.

(a) Marble monuments with bronze effigies, c. 1270—c. 1300.

I. The Lady Catherine (d. 1257) and young children of Edward I . . . . c. 1270
II. Henry III (d. 1272) Mosaic tomb, c. 1260. Effigy 1291—1294
III. Queen Eleanor of Castile (d. 1290) . . . . c. 1297
IV. William de Valence (d. 1296) . . . . c. 1305 (i)
V. Edward I (d. 1307) . . . . c. 1305 (i)
(b) Caen-stone monuments with gesso enrichments, c. 1280—c. 1320.

VI. Aveline, countess of Lancaster (d. 1273) . . c. 1280
VII. Edmund Crouchback, earl of Lancaster (d. 1296) c. 1295
VIII. Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke (d. 1324) c. 1320 (i)
(c) Monument of marble, alabaster and stone, with alabaster effigy.
IX. The Lord John of Eltham (d. 1336) . . c. 1340

CLASS B. THE SECOND WESTMINSTER STYLES.

(a) Royal monuments in marble, alabaster, and bronze, c. 1365—c. 1400.

X. Queen Philippa of Hainault (d. 1369) . . 1367 & 1377
XI. Edward III (d. 1377) . . . . c. 1378
XII. Richard II (d. 1399) and queen Anne of Bohemia (d. 1395) . . 1396 & 1397
(b) Monuments of ecclesiastics and nobles in alabaster, stone, and brass.

XIII. Cardinal Langham (d. 1376), marble and alabaster . . c. 1380
XIV. Sir Bernard Brocas (d. 1395), stone . . c. 1395
XV. John de Waltham, bishop of Salisbury (d. 1395) Robert de Waldeby, archbishop of York (d. 1398) “Brasses” in marble 1395—1400
   Eleanor Bohun (d. 1399) .
XVI. Philippa, duchess of York (d. 1431)
XVII. Abbot Colchester (d. 1420) Free-stone monuments 1420—1435
XVIII. Abbot (i) . . . . Free-stone monuments 1420—1435
XIX. Sir Lewis Robesart (d. 1431)

CLASS C. CHAPEL MONUMENTS.

XX. Henry V (d. 1422) . . c. 1425
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mosaic, though of a less elaborate design than that of the adjoining presbytery: fragments of it may be seen in front of the coronation chair.

The party next divided into two groups to inspect the six chapels entered from the ambulatory; the first went round with Mr. Hope and the second with Mr. C. R. Peers, Sec. S.A. and Mr. E. S. Prior, F.S.A. Mr. Prior had drawn up a block plan and table showing certain broad divisions of the monuments in the presbytery and chapels, which are printed at pages 424 and 425.

In speaking of the tomb of Henry VII Mr. W. H. St. John Hope made some interesting observations as to its possible connexion with Windsor. Henry VII conceived a desire to build a lady chapel at Windsor and to accommodate there the shrine of Henry VI and his own tomb. The accounts reveal that between 1501-1503 large sums were expended on the king's tomb. It would appear as if the present bronze grate enclosing it was begun for Windsor and then brought to Westminster. The tomb within it was undoubtedly made by Torrigiano, though even here it is suspected that a little of the original English work is incorporated.

Among other features of Henry VII's chapel are the carved misericords of the stalls, of which there are seventy examples, consisting of two rows of seventeen each on each side, and two in the return stalls. They are of different dates; one is of the thirteenth century, presumably preserved from an earlier set, thirty-eight (or perhaps thirty-nine), including those in the return stalls, date from about 1520, and the rest either wholly or in part date from the rearrangement of the stalls in the reign of George I. The appearance of the five easternmost misericords in the upper row on each side would suggest an even later date. The various groups may be distinguished by the jointing, those of about 1520 being carved out of a single block; they are arranged towards the western end of the chapel.

The subjects are of the usual mixed character. The more recent are wholly classical, showing many examples of foliage with animals or birds. The labours of Hercules are indicated on one, the three subjects shown being the head of Hercules with the lion's skin, the seven-headed hydra, and the head of Cerberus. The phoenix, a rare subject, occurs on another. It is to be seen upon a late thirteenth-century frieze in Strassburg cathedral church, and on a fourteenth-century pillar-cap in the nave of the church of St. Peter at Caen in company with the pelican and unicorn (these three symbolic subjects being derived from the bestiary), and scenes from mediaeval romances. The phoenix in the chapel is more likely to be due to direct classical inspiration. On the other hand the mermaid and the lion lying down with open eyes would appear to be due to the bestiary, where they are the subjects of moral or religious symbolism. The mermaid holds a standard mirror. These two are of the earlier set, c. 1520. Of the same date are three or four misericords with scriptural subjects, including scenes of the Judgment of Solomon, David and Goliath, and David or Samson and the lion.

About ten subjects are more or less connected with morals: one shows a man seizing a woman, who represses him and clings to a branch of a tree. This corresponds closely to one of Albert Dürer's engravings, as illustrated in Amand-Durand's Oeuvres de Albrecht Dürer, where it has the title of "Le Violent." Another shows a man and woman seated, the man offering
her money from a purse; it corresponds with an engraving in the same work entitled, "Les offres d'amour." Others are said to correspond with works of Israel von Meckenem.

Two misericords show the chase and capture of an avaricious monk by a demon. The monk's money is scattered, and a gold angel and silver pennies are visible. Another shows a man being thrashed by his wife. He is winding yarn on to a winder of unusual design, which is more likely Flemish than English.

There are three or four of sports and games: boys trussed, playing at cock-fighting, a subject which is found also in St. George's chapel; boys on hobby-horses tilting with sticks with windmill heads, to be seen also at Dordrecht cathedral; a boy with his head in chancery, being thrashed by another boy, probably a form of the game of hot-cockles; and other boys playing with a barrel.

There are many animal subjects: a fox in armour riding a goose, and vice versa; sow and bear playing bagpipes; nine or ten monkey subjects, which are difficult to interpret; a wild boar; a dragon; grotesque beasts and snakes.

Miscellaneous subjects include a bird perched on a tree stump, to which are chained a lion and a dragon; savage men fighting; musicians; a fool and grimacer; and Henry VII's shield of arms with supporters.

There are many carvings of foliage and flowers, beautifully if conventionally treated.

The workmanship of the older series is good; and in style the later misericords are evidently carved to match them. The work appears to have been done in this country, but probably by Flemish workmen or under Flemish guidance.

After luncheon the members reassembled in the Jerusalem Chamber. The first contribution was a short paper by Mr. W. R. Lethaby, F.S.A. on the Confessor's shrine, which is printed at page 361 of the Journal.

Mr. Edward S. Prior, F.S.A. then read a note on the London schools of mediaeval sculpture.

**The London Schools of Mediaeval Sculpture.**

The monuments of the abbey, said Mr. Prior, had certain characteristics and methods of sculpture which, in the course of his remarks in the abbey, he had called "The Westminster Style." But the king's masons and craftsmen engaged at Westminster appear to have had their shops in the city, and many of them were described in the records as "citizens of London." The proposition to be stated, therefore, was that London, from 1200 to 1500, was the mart of English art, and that at the back of all provincial styles of sculpture there was the school of London, its workmanship, and its ideas of representation.

It is true that London influence does not come markedly into evidence till the middle of the thirteenth century. But it was spreading widely by the end of Henry III's reign, particularly with regard to sculpture, as can be seen in the figure work of the judgment porch at Lincoln, where the style is immediately derived from Westminster. In effect this was
the spread of a shop style over architectural or builders' styles. The London method of doing things made sculpture a shop speciality, and the political position of London, as the usual residence of the sovereign and the usual place where parliament met, made obvious reasons why this style should prevail. Mediaeval art was peculiarly ecclesiastical, and concerned most largely with the building of churches and with the monuments put into them. The bishops and other clerics at the head of affairs had to come constantly to London; they observed its fashions and ordered their monuments from its workshops, so that, as in the case of bishop Marcia's tomb at Wells, London works may be conjectured in various cathedrals and abbey churches throughout England.

Two points should be noticed as to London school. First it would be directly in connexion with continental art, for in the metropolis lived the nobles and heads of estates who had affairs abroad, and consequently fell under the fashions and influences of the continent. Secondly, there were peculiar conditions, in that London lies in a basin of clay; consequently it never possessed a sculpture craft exercised in the working of local stone. It was not as with Durham, Wells, Exeter, or Lichfield, in which places a local quarry-craft nourished sculptural style. London had to import stone in order to build, and this it got from Reigate, Caen, and, as we read in the Westminster accounts, from the "north countries." We have evidence in Westminster abbey itself of the employment of a variety of stones, particularly the use of mixed materials in the monuments. The beds of Reigate stone did not as a rule give blocks suitable for effigy-making. Accordingly, marble, alabaster, and clunch were specially imported; also wood and bronze were used. The London producer of sculpture exercised himself as an *imaginator*, a maker of figures in all materials dissociated from building.

Since London bred no masons of her own, because she had no quarries, stoneworkers came from the outside. There are in the abbey accounts constant references to masons called after their country habitats. At the end of the thirteenth century they seem to have been drawn chiefly from the county of Kent; fifty years later, just before and after the Black Death, there was a run on Gloucester masons. But the mason coming up from the country got into touch with workshop art, and developed in a different way from his practice in the quarry crafts of his native place. And when he returned there afterwards he took back with him the London style. Also, as has been already pointed out, the works of the London shops were distributed about, and from them provincial masons took up their ideas of art.

From the twelfth to the fifteenth century we note this dissemination of London style. In the first London production of monumental effigies English figure-sculpture developed a marble method. The abbot-figures we see at Peterborough and the knight-effigies of Northamptonshire, owed the distinction of their Purbeck marble sculpture to the fact that workshop art of London had developed it. But there came a time when it was realised in London that it was just as easy to import and carve Caen stone for figures as Purbeck marble. Immediately we find a freer sculpture of recumbent figures forming the basis of the English memorial representation in all parts. Since freestone was capable of being carved in much more vigorous fashion than the Purbeck marble had been, we have lively figures
of knights drawing their swords, worked in the local stones in imitation of the London production. Then in London other materials were tried, memorial figures were made in wood faced with gesso, and brasses began to be engraved with flat figures. And immediately these London wares became the basis of local imitations.

In the abbey the great gabled monuments in the sanctuary were the most indicative of the Westminster genius. As Mr. Burges and Count Paul Biver have shown us, they set a fashion throughout England, and were widely copied by local crafts. One marked feature in the figures of these tombs was the new habit in the treatment of the drapery. The architectural handling of drapery was replaced by an imitative modelling of folds in the figure of Aveline, countess of Lancaster, her tomb being dated c. 1280. There can be little doubt that natural draperies came into stone-sculpture from the habit of image sculpture, which drew largely from continental sources. In attitude also the effigies on the tombs of Crouchback and de Valence are new departures. The Westminster carvers have represented their “knights” not drawing the sword but languidly recumbent, with their hands clasped in prayer. Abroad the knight had always been sculptured with folded hands, and following the Westminster lead this became after 1340 a universal habit in this country. In material the Westminster alabaster begins a special use for English monuments. The alabaster figure of John of Eltham (died 1337) must, in its sculpture, be immediately associated with that of Edward II at Gloucester as both from the same hand. In both cases the monuments are composed of the three materials so typical of the Westminster style, namely, alabaster, Purbeck marble, and Caen stone. Also the effigy of John of Eltham is just like the stone figures to be found close to London, such as the “knight” at Horley, which we cannot but suppose carved in London. It is the same with the earliest alabaster effigies of bishops; they were evidently carved in London, for they show identical details and embroidering as do the stone “bishops” at Rochester. Afterwards, the London make of these monuments was disseminated as the model for the local productions at Chellaston, such as the “Green” tomb at Lowick made entirely of alabaster. In the same way, later, the carvers of Henry VII’s chapel have left another work of theirs, or a close copy of their style, in the great tomb at Paignton, in Devon. Illustrations of the close connexion of English sculpture with London models might indeed be multiplied indefinitely.

The meeting terminated with a cordial vote of thanks being passed on the motion of Sir Henry Howorth to those concerned in the conduct and organisation of the meeting.
Wednesday, 1st November, 1911.

Sir Henry H. Howorth, President, in the Chair.
Mr. A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A. F.S.A. read a paper on "The Registers of John Gynewell, bishop of Lincoln, for the years 1347–1350," which is printed at page 301.
Upon the motion of the Chairman a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Hamilton Thompson.

Wednesday, 6th December, 1911.

Sir Henry Howorth, President, in the Chair.
Professor T. McKenny Hughes read a paper "On some sources of error in assigning objects found in sands and gravels to the age of those deposits, with special reference to the so-called eoliths," with lantern illustrations, which, it is hoped, will appear in the Journal.
In the discussion which followed, Professor Boyd-Dawkins shared the scepticism of Professor Hughes as to the so-called eoliths being evidence of the presence of man at the time when the sands and gravels in question were being formed in the pliocene and pleistocene ages. He called attention to the paper in L'Anthropologie in 1910 by MM. Breuil and Cartailhac in which it was proved that well recognised types of palaeolithic implements as well as "eoliths" have been formed by the pressure of the superincumbent strata on flint pebbles in French eocene deposits. In this case the so-called implements were imbedded in the gravel in close proximity to the flints from which they had been broken under conditions that proved that they were the result of slight movements of the gravel under high pressure, of movements that are going on in all superficial sands and gravels above the level of the sea.
Mr. Garraway Rice, F.S.A. said that the case for eoliths had been spoilt by trying to prove too much.
After the Chairman had summed up, a vote of thanks was accorded to Professor McKenny Hughes for his paper.