

THE TREATMENT OF OUR CATHEDRAL CHURCHES IN
THE VICTORIAN AGE, BEING THE OPENING AD-
DRESS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL SECTION AT
DORCHESTER.¹

By The Rev. J. CHARLES COX, LL.D, F.S.A.

It is proposed in this address,² as president of the architectural section of the Institute, to adopt the bold course of taking a general and necessarily rapid survey of the treatment that our English cathedral churches have received during the sixty years of her Majesty's happy reign.

Time does not permit any introductory remarks beyond those of the briefest character, but it does not seem right either as an antiquary or a churchman to begin the attack, for an attack it is intended to be, without a short paragraph or two by way of preface.

It is readily admitted that the fabrics of our cathedral churches are for the most part in more substantial repair in 1897 than they were in 1837, or in 1867, from which year my own closer observation of them dates. But substantial repair may be secured at a very great cost to the history and charm and real worth of these venerable buildings. The contention is that these fabrics might have been equally well preserved without the shocking and irreparable destruction of much that is ancient, brimful of interest, and fragrant with the memories of the past. Many details, too, that have been excellently carried out, as well as larger works of a useful and unpretentious character, have been passed over in the following remarks, because the avowed object of this

¹ Read at Dorchester, August 6th, 1897.

² In the preparation of this address, use has been made of the several volumes of Murray's excellent hand-books to our cathedral churches, as well as the works of Britton and Winkle. Monographs on the different churches have also been consulted, as well as reports and articles in the publications of our respective provincial archæolo-

gical societies. With all these cathedral churches, save Carlisle and Chichester. I am acquainted, and of several I have an intimate and close knowledge; but in venturing on my remarks and criticisms I am much indebted to a few friends of great antiquarian knowledge or tried architectural experience, foremost among whom it is a pleasure to mention Mr. W. H. St. John Hope and Mr. J. T. Micklethwaite.

address is the exposure of the grievous faults of a pernicious and irresponsible system.

Justice and a sense of religion also demand that it should be frankly and thankfully admitted, at all events by all of us who are churchmen, that the condition of our cathedral services and their reverent rendering, and more especially the revival in so large a number of the daily offering of the Holy Eucharist, are in most happy and wonderful contrast in 1897 to what was customary in 1837. For all this we devoutly say *Laus Deo!*

The cathedral church appeals to us not merely as an ancient and majestic fabric which has claims upon the regards of all who can derive gratification from the contemplation of the achievements of human skill and art through successive generations of our forefathers, but also as the venerable and beautiful mother of our Faith—the mother of all the parish churches of the ancient widespread diocese around her feet. For these early monuments of ancestral piety tell us of the first days of the planting of the Cross, whence radiated, as from some great missionary centre, the converting knowledge to the valley settlements or the hamlets of the plain. The cathedral church, and its community life, is, in its very essence, something older and more venerable than the parish church with its more isolated action.

It will be noticed, as each old cathedral church of our two provinces is brought before us in rapid survey, that two factors are mainly responsible for the mischievous treatment and spoiling of the interior of our minsters during the latter half of Victoria's reign. These are, firstly, the playing at parish church with the whole of the cathedral (combined with the idea of rendering it a great preaching-house), and hence endeavouring to obliterate the proper division between quire and nave; and, secondly, an undue giving way to the rage for gigantic organ effects, an idea involving music-hall arrangements, where everything has to give way to the pervading influence of sound.

The great church of CANTERBURY has been a grievous sufferer during this century at the hands of reckless, ignorant, or ill-instructed restorers. Some of their more prominent works may be mentioned.

In 1840, one of the distinguishing features of the church of the first Norman archbishop—the north-west, or Lanfranc's tower—was destroyed by Mr. Austin because it did not match with its fellow. There was no necessity for this modern tower; it is said that gunpowder had to be used to get rid of its Norman predecessor. The greater part of the stone work of the west front and of the south porch is also unnecessarily modern.

When the quire was originally completed by Prior Conrad, the high altar stood isolated, without any reredos. Behind it, to the east, was placed the ancient patriarchal chair of Purbeck marble, assigned to St. Augustine. This was the true position for the metropolitan chair, as still can be seen in several early Continental churches.

In Charles II time the quire was stalled throughout with beautiful Renaissance work, and an elaborate altarpiece with a stately baldichino was placed behind the Holy Table. The fine appearance of this work can be judged from a good plate in Dart's volume on the cathedral church of Canterbury, published in 1726. The altar screen was removed about 1870, and a poor reredos "imitated from the screen-work of the Lady chapel in the crypt" erected in its place. The altar was moved to the top of the steps, thereby displacing the ancient archiepiscopal chair from the highly interesting position that it had occupied since the days of Anselm.

The beautiful canopy work over the side stalls also disappeared. The stalls themselves were at a still later date replaced by the usual Scottian Gothic; but by great good fortune some of the majestic Caroline woodwork still remains at the back of the returned stalls, as an evidence of the once sumptuous fittings of the seventeenth century quire.

A handsome Corinthian throne, carved by Grinling Gibbons, and presented by Archbishop Tenison in 1704, was replaced by a tall stone canopy of debased Gothic, the gift of Archbishop Howley. The 1704 throne now stands unmeaningly in the further south transept.

In 1872 a fire took place which destroyed much of the roof of the quire and necessitated its restoration.

Mr. Pearson's late restoration of the chapel of St.

Anselm is in some respects most unhappy. The vault of the apse has been skinned of its plaster, the rough Kentish rag of which it is composed being carefully scraped and picked out with dark mortar. If that learned prelate, or those who erected his memorial chapel, could but revisit the scenes of their earthly career, nothing would probably fill them with more amused amazement than to find the ridiculous way in which two or three of our leading architects insist in exposing that which was meant to be covered up. We wonder sometimes if Messrs. Pearson, Blomfield, and Co. thus treat the walls of their own residentiary houses?

Still more recently has Sir A. W. Blomfield tampered with the crypt. Members of the Institute who had the good fortune to attend last year's meeting at Canterbury will remember how Mr. St. John Hope pointed out the wanton destruction of the walls that enclosed the vestry behind the altar of our Lady Undercroft; the alteration of the old levels and the substitution of a floor level that had never existed at any previous period; and the removal of the earth from the apsidal portion, whereby the proper proportions of the screen work and tombs had been nullified. Since the Canterbury visit of the Institute, more mischief has been done in repairing the Early English portions of the crypt; the remains of the stone benches against the wall, for the guardians of the tomb of St. Thomas, have been taken away.

This present summer has seen a yet further "restoration" from the hands of Sir Arthur Blomfield. In this case the Chapter House has passed through the mill. The roof required repair and some of the masonry about the windows, and that was all. But what has happened? New stone work has been inserted to supply every missing chip and flaw, or sign of its six centuries of age; the marble work has been repolished; every atom of the old plastering and decoration has been stripped, to be reproduced in nineteenth century imitation; and the beautiful and unique wooden ceiling made new. The chapter house is now bright and garish, and new and clean after the smartest of fashions, but more fitting to be the vestibule of Madame Tussaud's Waxworks than the conference hall

of the assembled chapter pertaining to the primatial see of our ancient church. We ask, with confidence, whether any one on entering this newly-decorated building, unaware of historic facts, could have the dimmest notion that in its main features it had stood for six centuries? And this is the proper test to which to put any restoration of an ancient fabric. If a restored building loses all trace of antiquity, the restoration is utterly false in its first principles. A clever Chinaman, at that rate, could not be beaten at church restoration, for he always excels in the production of an accurate but dull and vapid copy.

Recent events, such as the holding of the great Pan Anglican conference, have focussed our attention on the metropolitan church of Canterbury; so it is just as well that something should be said with emphasis by way of repudiating all share in the gush of vulgar praise over the tinsel decoration of this spoilt chapter house, so appropriately opened by a play-actor. Adapting good words, written originally of that sorry changeling, the restored Temple church, it may be said—the show is not the mediæval chapter-house of Canterbury, but a smart, meretricious overlay, in which historic interest and workmen's sympathy are wholly wanting. Human nature, save its vulgar side, is banished from the place; it has no memories nor any aspirations, but is just the sordid and prosaic fashion of the day.

With regard to Wren's masterpiece of St. PAUL'S, notwithstanding the just pride that all churchmen take in the present continuous use of all parts of this great church for its holy purposes, there is not a little which gives just cause for regret in the change and alteration of its fittings.

The destruction of Wren's organ screen ought never to have been permitted. However much it may be pleaded that the usual presence of a congregation under the dome, whilst the quire offices are being sung, justifies the change, the whole principle and *raison d'être* of a cathedral establishment, with its round of offices in their quasi-private chapel, is thereby nullified. Admirable as it is, from every point of view, to give opportunity for all who wish it to join in the daily mass or matins or evensong, in this great central seat of England's worship, the true course to have taken would have been to leave the quire

alone, and to place a fine altar for general worship beneath the dome. Such a course was ably advocated by Messrs. Micklethwaite and Somers Clarke, about a quarter of a century ago, in the pages of the *Sacristy*.

It will be remembered that one of the last feeble waves of a happily moribund Puritanism broke in scattered spray, a few years back, round this cathedral church in consequence of a small statue of Our Lady and the Holy Child finding a subordinate place in the ornamentation of the big erection then placed behind the high altar. Many a man of taste and judgment, who disliked this new erection, then held his peace for fear of being supposed to be in the least degree sympathetic with an ignorant Protestant attack. But it is well that it should be stated, from time to time, that this enriched wall, mistakenly spoken of as a reredos, stretching across in front of the apse, is quite out of place, destroys much of the presbytery that might be otherwise available for congregational purposes, and (as was seen at the recent enthronement of Bishop Creighton) proves singularly inconvenient at any great function by materially dwarfing the available space.

Another recent blunder is the moving of the font from its original position under one of the arches of the nave, and turning a chapel on the south side of the nave, formerly used as the consistory court, into a baptistry. Our English use is, and always should be, that the Sacrament of Holy Baptism should be administered before the congregation, and not made a hole-and-corner affair for a select few.

The noble cathedral church of WINCHESTER, giving evidence in its fabric of the work of a series of bishops extending over a period of five centuries, has happily been less mutilated than most of its fellows during the present reign. The west front was carefully restored between 1858 and 1863, when little harm was done, and much decay arrested. The church has not however passed scatheless through the storm of ruthless clearing for organ extensions. The chapel of Our Lady of Pity, on the north side of the quire crossing, was partly destroyed not many years ago for the convenience of an enlarged organ.

The quire screen, a good design of Inigo Jones, was removed early in the reign, and replaced by a stone screen of Mr. Garbett's. This screen has, in its turn, now been removed, to pander to the "unbroken vista" notion, the returned stalls only being left to form the separation between the nave and quire. The backs, however, of even these stalls were taken out; but the canons, finding their natural protection gone, and not being able to withstand the draughts, were actually compelled to glaze these foolishly made apertures. The side screens of the presbytery have also been glazed with plate glass!

With regard to reckless monument shifting, Winchester affords a single but striking example. Up to September, 1869, a plain coped tomb of Purbeck marble stood in the centre line of the quire, 15 feet westward of the lowest step of the high altar. The tomb was popularly supposed to be that of William Rufus. Its contents were examined in 1869, and there is practically no doubt whatever, on all grounds, that it is not the tomb of Rufus, but of his nephew—that powerful prelate Henry de Blois, who was Bishop of Winchester from 1129 to 1131. The tomb was removed about 100 feet eastward from the presbytery and placed on the site of the shrine of St. Swithun. Dean Kitchin recently brought back the tomb to the quire; but instead of restoring it to its old place, where it had remained for seven centuries, he caused it to be placed between the stalls (under the mistaken notion that it was the tomb of William Rufus), where it seriously blocks the gangway.

The cathedral church of ELY, the longest Gothic church in Christendom, contains noble examples of every style—from early Norman to late Perpendicular. The chroniclers of the abbey having recorded the exact date of nearly every portion of the fabric, this church is of the highest value and interest to the student and lover of architecture.

Dean Peacock was the first to set on foot any general scheme for the repair and decoration of the great church.

The quire of the monks at Ely stood beneath the octagon and extended to the second pier of the nave, terminating in a Norman stone screen. This arrange-

ment continued till 1770, when the screen was demolished, and the quire removed to the six eastern bays of the cathedral. At the general restoration by Sir Gilbert Scott, begun in 1862, the quire arrangement was again altered, an oak screen with brass gates being placed at the eastern arch of the octagon. The restorer, having apparently no idea of the true use of a cathedral church, made the screen "sufficiently light and open to permit the use of the octagon, as well as of the choir, during service."

The so-called restoration of the coloured decorations of the vaulting of the octagon was done in 1879. This destroyed the original delicate decorative work.

One of the most curious incidents of the restoration was the polishing and cleaning up and renovating of the quire half of the effigies between the quire and the quire aisles, and the leaving of the half on the aisle side in their decayed condition, reminding the observer of the advertisements of hair restorers, representing a head grey and thinly covered on one side of the parting, but thick and glossy on the other! The old couplet, slightly amended, may appropriately be applied to this quaintly mean and deceptive method of effigy restoration:—

"They brightened up the monuments within the ancient abbey,
But, thinking to deceive the Lord, they left the aisle sides shabby."

The great Early English church of LINCOLN in its noble situation has fared better at the hands of the Victorian restorers than its equally grandly placed sister of Durham; but this is only qualified praise, for the exceeding newness and smug evenness to which some of the parts have been reduced is much to be reprobated. This is particularly noticeable in the repaved and smoothed over Chapter House, the entrance to which has been completely though cleverly falsified.

Mr. Pearson has committed the inexcusable blunder, after the same fashion as at Canterbury, of picking off all the original plaster from the vaulting of the quire, and pointing it up with dark mortar.

The same architect proposed a few years ago to pull down the admirable Wren library and north walk of the cloisters, and to reproduce his notion of what early

Decorated work should be. He obtained the sanction of the Chapter, but happily the protests of the Society of Antiquaries and of other bodies and individuals were so strong and sustained that this good and historic work of the seventeenth century was spared. He was permitted, however, to work his will in all the rest of the cloisters.

Saving the roof, the exquisite quire, together with its fittings, has fortunately been left almost intact; but Lincoln Minster being the first big church to adopt gas, somewhere in the "forties," discarded the beautiful double row of charming little brass candle-sockets, which were given to the church in 1660.

The triple-spired cathedral church of LICHFIELD suffered terrible things at the hands of Wyatt, who in 1788 began to maltreat the whole fabric on similar lines to those named under Salisbury and Hereford. He moved the high altar to the further end of the long Lady-chapel, and made the whole place snug for canons and their wives and retainers by walling up the arcades of the quire, and closing the eastern tower-arch with a glass screen. Everywhere he patched with Roman cement, chopping off sculpture and twisting in wire and tarred rope to make it hold. He was specially lavish with this wretched stuff at the west front, supplying even a whole row of kingly figures, grotesquely modelled in cement upon the old cores.

The south side of the nave was refaced in 1842, by Sydney Smirke.

The quire arches were opened out in 1856, and in 1860 the building was placed in the hands of Sir Gilbert Scott. From that time to the present there has been but little rest for the fabric, the restoring works of Sir Gilbert Scott and afterwards of his son Mr. J. O. Scott being almost invariably in progress. Much of the stonework had sadly perished, and much of it undoubtedly required renewing. Nor can anyone be blamed for getting rid of the Wyatt enormities. The reproductions, too, of that which he had recklessly smashed up, such as the lovely canopies round the Lady-chapel arcade, were in many instances beautifully accomplished.

The least satisfactory part of Sir Gilbert's restoration was the practical abolition of a quire by inserting in the

eastern arch under the central tower a light screen of metal bedizened with imitation fruit and other ornaments. The great organ screen of Wyatt's re-erection was not satisfactory, but at all events he did not abolish the whole notion of cathedral quire offices in the way the Victorian architect thought well to do. By pandering to the idea of one great quasi-parish church, for congregational use, Sir Gilbert upset the true idea of cathedral worship such as had more or less prevailed in that fabric ever since its first foundation. Even the returned stalls were done away with; but as though half ashamed of the completeness of the transformation, the dean and precentor's stalls are respectively placed askew, so that the occupants look neither east nor across the quire.

A good quire screen or pulpitum is the manifest need of this beautiful church, and with the happier trend of church and devotional feeling of these days, it is not rash to prophesy that that and an effective nave altar will be the main characteristics of the next restoration.

The fine restoration of the west front by Dean Bickersteth, begun in 1877 and carried out by Mr. J. O. Scott, and the supplying all the niches with figures is to be commended, for the ragged, unsightly mess of Wyatt's cracking cement, tumbling off in all directions, made new work absolutely imperative.

Early in 1892 the dean and chapter of Lichfield made a big appeal for £22,000 for what, by a complete misuse of the Queen's English, they dared to term "needful reparation." They did not get, and have not yet obtained, we are glad to think, anything like that sum, but, alas! they succeeded in gathering sufficient to do irreparable mischief. So little good work was done to our great churches at the Restoration, that it might have been thought that the Lichfield authorities would have been only too glad to preserve the excellent rebuilding and restoration of good Bishop Hacket begun in 1661. But, no; the Scottian rage for imitation lancet windows prevailed. The proposal was to modernise the north transept, to raise the nave roofs (though in most excellent repair) to "Early English pitch," and to otherwise modernise all round under the plea of getting back to the beauty of the thirteenth century. The dean and chapter

called in Mr. Pearson to comment on Mr. Scott's proposals, and needless to say he altogether blessed them.

The *Athenæum*, *Antiquary*, and *Builder* all raised earnest protests, as well as several of the Birmingham and local papers. On the motion of Sir John Evans, seconded by Sir J. C. Robinson, the Society of Antiquaries resolved, on December 1st, 1892, that it heard

"with great regret that considerable portions of the cathedral church of Lichfield, the work of Bishop Hacket after the sieges of the Great Rebellion, though substantial and well-looking, have been replaced by modern imitations of supposed thirteenth century work, thereby destroying the traces of one of the most remarkable epochs in the history of the Church of England. The Society is also informed that further destruction of good seventeenth century work is in contemplation, and ventures to earnestly urge the dean and chapter of Lichfield not to permit any such destruction to take place."

The dean curtly and impetuously attempted to deny the propositions contained in this resolution; but after listening to the defence of Mr. J. O. Scott, delivered *viva voce* on January 12th, 1893, the Society unanimously reaffirmed and strengthened their former resolution.

The wholesale work done at the north transept, and to a considerable extent at the south transept, and round the base of Bishop Hacket's restored central spire, is a sad and grievous wrong done to church and national history (Lichfield being the only cathedral church satisfactorily treated at the time of Charles II's restoration), a complete waste of public moneys, and an unhappy exhibition of bad taste. Wyatt and his compeers ruined much of Lichfield Minster and other great churches by striving to drag them back to classical and renaissance styles, which were to their mind the perfection of beauty. Are Messrs. Scott and Pearson, and those who are their tools, any better in fixing up the thirteenth untraciated style as their beau-ideal of church beauty, and recklessly dragging out and putting in all that tends to reduce a great fabric stamped with the life and teaching of some eight centuries to the dead level of an imitation of some fifty years of the reign of Henry III? One idea is as monstrous and bad as the other.

Last year the generosity of Dean Luckock led to the reparation and restoration to its proper use of the beautiful Early English chapel of St. Chad's Head on the south

side of the quire. We have no quarrel with this work.

Happily the protests of 1892-3 led to some good results : funds ceased in a great measure to flow in, and for the present, we believe, Bishop Hacket's roofs are safe.

Terrible and irreparable mischief was done to the exquisite cathedral church of SALISBURY by that iconoclastic barbarian of the end of the last century—Wyatt—who was let loose upon the building, under Bishop Barrington (1782-1791). In a comparatively short time he swept away screens, chapels, and porches ; broke up monuments of knights and ecclesiastics, and marshalled the remainder in two rows down the nave ; obliterated ancient paintings, and flung the stained glass by cart-loads into the city ditch ; and levelled to the ground the thirteenth century detached bell-tower, as well as the Beauchamp and Hungerford chapels. And yet there were those, and not a few, of his day who pronounced his work to be "tasteful, effective, and judicious." Nor need we smile at such encomiums, for some of the Victorian restorers, who have approximated to Wyatt in the horrors they have perpetrated (he has been out-heroded at St. Albans), have won, and still win, much continuous praise from the thoughtless, the professional, and the ill-instructed.

That noble octagonal building the chapter house, which was dangerously out of repair, was begun to be repaired in 1854 as a memorial to Bishop Denison. The restoration extended over many years at a great outlay, and has on the whole been worthily accomplished. Recently the new painting has been scraped off.

In 1862 Sir Gilbert Scott undertook to spend £10,000 from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and a large sum from the public in restoration. Endeavours were made to undo Wyatt's barbarisms, and not a little good was effected ; but it was a sad mistake to remove the quire screen, to refloor the Lady chapel, and to use so much diligence in scraping the walls and replenishing the Purbeck marble. The interior, for the most part, looks sadly new, but that is what the thorough restorer desires.

The recently-detected dangerous condition of the far-

famed Salisbury spire has been caused by the drainage of the city which has considerably reduced the water level, with the natural result of a shrinkage in the subsoil. This shrinkage has brought about an uneven settlement. The work of underpinning the four great piers of the central tower and spire, and forming a bed of concrete beneath their shallow foundation will, it is trusted, make all secure. An architect of much experience and intimately acquainted for years with Salisbury Cathedral Church, tells us that the stone quire screen ought for safety's sake to be replaced, as it would tend once again (as it did before) to tie the piers together in their weakest part.

As to the work now going forward on the face of the tower, we express no positive conclusion beyond saying that in the opinion of some competent judges much of this work is excessive and unnecessary.

On the south side of the presbytery of the cathedral church of WELLS was the beautiful chantry chapel of Bishop Beckington, the great benefactor of both Bath and Wells, who died in 1464. In 1681 a pew was arranged for Dean Bathurst's lady within the fine iron grate of this memorial chapel, but (to use the recent words of Canon Church) "it was reserved for the restorers of this nineteenth century to thrust aside that historic monument in order to obtain a few more feet for the 'free seats' which now crowd the presbytery." The canopied reredos over the chantry altar was torn down, and placed in the east aisle of the south transept. The effigy of the good bishop, in its two stages, was at the same time removed to the south quire aisle. It may thus be again noted that this mischievous idea of a parish church in a cathedral quire is responsible for the irreparable destruction and dispersion of a highly interesting and tasteful chantry chapel, where the mayor and corporation of Wells were wont to repair in solemn annual procession, to pray for the repose of the bishop, who had done so much for them and for their city.

The Lady chapel and west front were restored by Mr. Ferrey in 1842, at a considerable cost.

A reconstruction of the quire of Wells was unhappily made about the middle of this century, wholly destructive

of the ancient order. The wooden stall-work—the very best of English wood carving—was removed, the stalls themselves being thrown back between the columns. The prebendal stalls were pulled up from their proper place in the upper row, and ten of them were lost in the process. The misericords were roughly refitted in the lower range of seats. This unhappy disarrangement, artistically bad, and wholly inconvenient for the due seating of an ecclesiastical community, was the work of Mr. Salvin. It was begun in 1848, and finished in 1854.

At a later date the Decorated quire screen was much spoilt by being enlarged and brought forward for the purpose of supporting a bigger organ.

A recent project for having a nave altar for congregational services unfortunately dropped through when nearly completed. It is much to be hoped that it will shortly be revived.

With regard to the cathedral church of EXETER there is not so much fault as usual to be found with the work of the Victorian age. The beautiful pulpitum or quire screen, the work of Bishop Brantyngham (1370–1394), still supporting the organ, most happily remains in its proper place. The rage for “opening out” was content in this instance with taking out the backs of the two broad ogee-arched altar recesses, supported on Purbeck marble shafts, which are on each side of the lower part of the pulpitum. The folly of this mutilation now again became apparent by the practical inconvenience of the draughts; so having made these holes the ‘restorers’ were next compelled to glaze them.

Much, however, of the work accomplished here by Sir Gilbert Scott (who began in 1870) is of a satisfactory and worthy character.

The upper part of the fine west front has quite recently undergone repair, but the repair seems to have been necessary and not wantonly nor lightly undertaken. The screen, with imagery below, has fortunately been left untouched.

The cathedral church of NORWICH, in addition to the unfortunate tinkering of the west front, obliterating almost every trace of its Norman origin, has suffered by the needless renewal of the tracery of many of the windows

With regard to the interior, Dean Goulbourn was unfortunately induced not only to destroy all the fifteenth century levels of the presbytery, but to begin to reconvert that part of the church back again into the Norman style, owing to Norman bases being found when the pavement was lowered. The result is that the fifteenth century bases are left hanging in the air, whilst bogus Norman shafts are carried right up to the clerestory string, where they have to stop in a meaningless fashion!

In more recent days, under the present dean, the floor levels of the quire have been further tampered with; the eastern portion of the stalls deposed from their original level and set up on the new floor; and the transepts thrown open to the quire—and all this for mere preaching-house purposes, for which this portion of the splendid historic fabric was never intended, and is wholly unsuitable.

The cathedral church of WORCESTER, abounding in good examples of English architecture from the earliest Norman to the latest Perpendicular, has suffered many and grievous things at the hands of the Victorian restorers.

Extensive works of restoration were begun in 1857 under Mr. Perkins. The large east window was taken out and ten lancet lights of sham Early English put in its place. The south end of the eastern transept was rebuilt, and it was flanked by "improved pinnacles."

In 1858 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners appropriated a sum of £15,000 towards "the substantial reparation of the fabric," and a considerably larger sum was raised by public subscription during the next few years.

Between 1860 and 1874 continuous "restoration" was in progress of the most vigorous and destructive character. The whole of the valuable and historic alterations of the fifteenth century were swept out of the quire and Lady-chapel, the Perpendicular windows giving place to sham Early English lancets. A somewhat similar course of wholesale alteration, rebuilding, and effacing of history went on throughout the nave and transepts. Mr. Perkins was responsible for the exterior and Sir Gilbert Scott for the interior.

The cathedral church at last emerged from their hands

smart and garish, but a piteous travesty of what an ancient minster church should be. Had they utterly pulled it down and built all afresh it would have been in many ways better. As it is, the result is as painful and forbidding as a venerable old lady overlaid with paint and cosmetics and bedizened in youthful attire.

Many a detail and interesting component part of the fabric disappeared during the prolonged process of "thorough restoration," but the crowning act of absolutely wanton destruction, before which in its enormity everything else pales into insignificance, was the demolition in 1862 of the ancient Guesten Hall of the cathedral priory, a beautiful example of Decorated work. Mr. J. H. Parker, writing at the time in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, said :—

"This magnificent guest-chamber of the fourteenth century was an historical monument of considerable importance, as shewing the splendid hospitality of the clergy of those days, and as illustrating in a remarkable manner the manners and customs of the time of Edward III. It was the last of these structures that we had remaining, and with it we have erased a chapter out of the history of England."

This splendid hall was pulled down from the meanest of motives, simply because the dean and chapter were afraid of what it would cost them to keep it in repair. Not the slightest effort was made to procure funds for its salvation. Moreover, it was in no specially bad condition; and even if it had not been touched, the walls and roof would be now standing.

The shocking treatment of the cathedral church of Worcester and its adjuncts provoked most vigorous protests even thirty years ago; foremost in the opposition were the *Athenæum* and *Saturday Review*. The latter journal, in the midst of this revel of restorationists, thus let fly with stinging effect, but, alas! the mischief was mostly done, and the rest was obstinately continued :—

"Whoso would see the penny-a-liner's power transferred to stone, let him turn aside and look at the renovated outside of Worcester. Here is verily the fustian of architecture and the doggerel thereof. The old race of sloths and slovens could never compass such devastation in centuries as this which has been achieved in a single lifetime. The deans and chapters, vergers and sacristans, of other and

less 'æsthetic' periods did not, at any rate, do much more harm below than the rooks and jackdaws did above. They merely pecked and clawed a nook or angle here and there. Now, 'as by the stroke of an enchanter's wand,' we see a grand transformation effected. The beautiful and deep mouldings are frittered away. The windows keep their outline, but there is a spirit of impoverishment and shallowness in every detail. A featureless face is upon everything. It is not merely new and sharp, which of course it could not help being if it were scraped; but it is meagre, and pawky, and vapid. It is smug and spurgeonised. . . . What then do we find this Dean and Chapter doing? They are letting loose a local genius to work his will on the venerable walls which other and better men have raised, and the form of which they themselves could never have even distantly approached in conception. They are making havoc of all that the centuries have bequeathed us, and that the touch of time has spared. They are effacing the only elements in which yet lingers the possibility of a revival of church architecture. They are destroying the title deeds and credentials of art under the pretence of restoring. Thus they break up the very patterns which convey first principles, and give back in their place the bauble conceptions of the nineteenth century."

The Queen, even, was made to contribute her share to this renovation run mad, through the Board of Works. Because certain of the royal effigies at Westminster are of gilded bronze, the remarkably good effigy of King John, in Purbeck marble, nobly figured by Stothard, was absolutely plastered all over from head to toe with gold leaf, and a crown of glittering brass thrust over the damaged one of marble! The only thing to be said is that the vulgar gilded effigy is worthy of the garish general restoration, and *vice versa*.

Quite recently the unwholesome mania for ever growing, and huger organs has been responsible for a further maltreatment of the very little work not already hopelessly spoilt. The overgrown organ required more wind, so an electric motor-engine was provided, and the engineer, to find it room, blocked up a chapel of the crypt below the slype with brick walls. The chamber thus formed was daubed with tar to make it damp-proof, with the result that some ancient wall-paintings on the old side walls were hopelessly destroyed. Vigorous remonstrance has since caused the clearing out of these obstructive brick walls, and a change of place for the engine, but the destructive effects of the tar cannot be effaced.

Much as the very interesting cathedral church of HEREFORD has suffered from the hand of time during the

many centuries of its existence, it has assuredly suffered more from the hand of the restorer.

In 1786 the western tower fell, carrying with it the west front. That arch-destroyer Wyatt was then in the thick of his evil works at Salisbury, and unhappily he was also given Hereford to devour. Between 1788 and 1797 he spent £20,000 on the church, shortening the nave by an entire bay, destroying the Norman triforium and clerestory, and running up a west front of his own.

The east gable of the Lady-chapel threatening to fall in 1841, Dean Merewether called in Mr. Cottingham, the Temple church restorer, as architect, when it was found that the piers of the central tower were also in jeopardy. Another big scheme of repair and restoration was set on foot. The Victorian architect did not prove quite so wantonly destructive as his Georgian predecessor, but yet most grievous mischief was done between 1841 and 1852, at a cost of £27,000. The tower and quire were the parts that chiefly fell into Mr. Cottingham's hands. Almost all that he accomplished was of the nature of imitative rebuilding, and in no sense reparation, and he permitted the masons to re-work, and therefore spoil, the ancient sculptures.

The cathedral church yet suffered a third period of restoration, the second of the Victorian age, from 1858 to 1863, under the direction of Sir Gilbert Scott, and this was the least harmful of the three. The "Grecian" quire screen of 1710, which was a refacing of the old Norman pulpitum, was destroyed by Mr. Cottingham. Sir Gilbert Scott put up a great painted and gilt screen of iron work, "which by its extreme lightness would permit the whole building to be used for congregational purposes"—a false idea of cathedral use, which, as we have seen, has been responsible for so much that it is hopelessly wrong in the later Victorian treatment of our great minsters.

Under this mistaken notion of a parish church, another serious blunder has been made, for the new iron screen is not set up on the old line west of the crossing, but stands beneath the eastern arch of the tower, with the result that the quire and presbytery are now crushed into the space which formerly served only for the presbytery. The organ has been pushed away from its ancient

position over the screen under one of the arches on the south side, assisting to materially darken a part of the church which was already imperfectly lighted, and compelling the daily service to be frequently sung by gas-light.

The elegant octagonal spire of CHICHESTER, dating from the end of the fourteenth century, was in jeopardy in the time of Sir Christopher Wren. He took down and rebuilt the upper portion and devised a cunning great pendulum of wood to swing inside the spire as a counter-balance to the force of the wind.

On February 21st, 1861, the spire collapsed like a telescope, and fell into the crumbling ruins of the tower piers. The rebuilding of the tower and spire by Sir G. Scott after this great disaster was well accomplished, provided the slavishly imitative principle is admitted to be the best. The rough-hacked Norman stonework and the delicate Decorated traceries were all reproduced. Had this disaster happened in mediæval days, it would have given an opportunity for greater dignity and beauty in the succeeding structure; but all our big architects, when patching cathedral churches, seem afraid of consciously doing anything that is nineteenth century. A cunning imposture is their ideal of meritorious work.

The quire was formerly separated from the nave by a dignified stone screen or pulpitum carrying the organ. It was usually known as "Bishop Arundel's Oratory," and dated from the end of the fifteenth century. This pulpitum was not only beautiful in itself, but gave considerable dignity to the whole interior of the church, and was of peculiar and most interesting construction. The unhappy rage for "affording greater accommodation to the public at the cathedral services," an intention absolutely alien to the whole conception of cathedral quire offices, brought about the removal of this noble screen in 1859. Moreover, in the opinion of many competent folk, the taking down of the quire screen, which banded together two of the great tower piers, gave the first impetus to the fall of the spire. This mischievous work of destruction originated in a bequest of £2,000 from the late Dean Chandler "for the decoration of the cathedral"! The sum was increased by public subscrip-

tion, and then the work went gaily on under Mr. Slater; not only the screen, but the returned stalls were swept right away, "as a measure imperatively necessary for the opening out of the choir into the nave"; and when the whole character of a cathedral church had been successfully obliterated, and historic traces of previous centuries and former deans and bishops entirely stamped out, the committee looked round on what they had done, and said that it should serve as "a worthy memorial to Dean Chandler."

The 1859 "restoration" also restored out of existence a Perpendicular reredos, for which Mr. Slater substituted the present most unfortunate erection; but it was left for Sir Gilbert Scott at a later period of restoration effort to absolutely needlessly efface all the traces of St. Richard's shrine behind the high altar by destroying the platform on which it had stood, and laying down in its place a plain pavement level with the aisles.

At the present moment many thousands are being asked for to enable Mr. Pearson to "restore" the south-west tower.

The quire of the cathedral church of ROCHESTER underwent a complete remodelling between 1825-1830, under Mr. Cottingham. The greater part of the central tower was also renewed and raised under like direction and at the same period.

As to the treatment of the fabric and its fittings during the present reign, the work of Sir Gilbert Scott, from 1871 to 1877, was in this instance mainly confined to necessary and useful repair, though with his usual perverseness in that direction he placed the high altar too far back, on a site which it had never previously occupied, and insisted on substituting his favourite imitation Early English lancets for sound later work.

During the last few years, however, there have been most unfortunate changes made in the west front under Mr. Pearson's direction, money being again squandered in the production of bogus Norman work in a weak effort after uniformity. The Norman west front is flanked by two turrets, and by two wings that terminate the nave-aisles. The turret on the south side is original, but that on the north side (until lately) was octagonal and

of the same Perpendicular date as the nave clerestory. Mr. Pearson in his wisdom has unnecessarily pulled down this interesting bit of architectural history, and has made a turret of his own in stupid imitation of the one on the south side. He has also treated after a like fashion the wings on both sides. And then, forsooth, they call this pulling down of fifteenth century work, and the substitution of Pearsonesque Norman, "restoration," and the public seem still willing to subscribe to bring about such treatment of our historic buildings! It is some satisfaction to know that two of the more eminent fellows of the Society of Antiquaries retired from the Rochester restoration committee rather than be participators in this destructive measure.

Funds, we understand, are now being earnestly sought to provide a new central tower. Certainly Mr. Cottingham's effort of 1825 had a mean result; but in our opinion a new central tower implies such a displacement of and interference with an old fabric that it is a most questionable proposition, and certainly in no way a necessary work.

The crypt, one of the finest in England, suffered under Sir Gilbert Scott, the eleventh century portion, built by the famous Bishop Gundulf, being built off for the organ bellows and machinery. It has also been a more recent sufferer, for the whole of the south aisle has been partitioned off into vestries with Dean Hole's American dollars.

Happily, Sir Gilbert Scott suffered the fourteenth century quire screen or pulpitum to remain. The west side of the pulpitum was left plain and unadorned, for even that great restorer rightly refrained from ornamenting it. As a memorial, however, to the late Dean Scott, Mr. Pearson has been suffered to hopelessly deface and modernise this screen. He has scooped out the face of the ancient wall so as to make eight niches for saints, and they are now filled with mean sculpture.

The see of OXFORD was established in 1546 at the church of St. Frideswide's priory, which then became both the cathedral church of Christ Church and the chapel of the college.

The alterations that were begun in this church in 1856

brought to light various interesting matters. In 1870 the church was put into the hands of Sir Gilbert Scott for thorough treatment, and the work was in active progress from 1872 to 1876.

The rather awkward screens and other woodwork of Wolsey's date were re-arranged after a capricious fashion. The restorer also took out the great Decorated window at the east end, and substituted sham Norman openings. The treatment of the south transept, which had been cut off and used as a verger's house, was unnecessarily wholesale.

The noble Benedictine abbey church of PETERBOROUGH became the centre of the newly-formed see in 1541. So great a building demanded constant care and expenditure, and the chapter seems fairly to have maintained the fabric for the three and a-half centuries that it has been theirs. At all events, they never handed the church over to the tender mercies of Wyatt or his crew at the beginning of the century.

Towards the end of the seventies several thousand pounds were wisely expended in the strengthening and underpinning of the foundations on the north side.

The more recent rebuilding of the great central tower (1883) was a far more serious undertaking. The work was absolutely imperative, but probably would not have become so had it not for a long time been neglected. Under the capable control of Mr. J. T. Irvine the work was undoubtedly well done, but surely there was no necessity for the introduction of so many new or dressed stones. One gentleman of considerable powers of observation assures us that as large a proportion as sixty per cent. of the stones are new. The tower has been raised seven feet.

With regard to the hopeless muddle and confusion that our two or three big architects have been making of cathedral quire arrangements during the present reign, it may be noticed that at the same time that Mr. Pearson was advocating the parish church notion at Rochester, he was responsible for reproducing the lost monastic quire at Peterborough, by carrying the quire through the crossing into the nave, and by giving designs for a solid screen! Both notions cannot be right.

Last year the memorable question of the West Front came under consideration. The vehement controversy is so fresh in our minds that it need now be only briefly summarised. The chief glory of the church of Peterborough is its magnificent triple portico. It is not only one of the most splendid features of English architecture, but causes Peterborough to stand out pre-eminently among the cathedral churches of all Christendom. Hence the vigour with which the battle was waged, although the nature of the chief point at issue was practically the same as that which had been fought out on many previous occasions.

The school of restorationists advocated, to save trouble, the rebuilding of the front piecemeal as its only chance of salvation, quite overlooking the fact that by taking it down the thirteenth century building thereupon ceased to exist. If a shirt of mail is divided out into its component rings, or the quarries of an old stained glass window separated and unleaded, both the mail shirt and the window come to an end, and no amount of cunning re-adaptation can make either of them in any true or artistic sense what it was before.

It had long been known that something must be done to sustain the west front. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings had been in active correspondence on this very point with the dean and chapter as long ago as 1886. The storm of March, 1895, which did some very trifling damage, at last concentrated the attention of the authorities on this too long delayed question; a great scaffold was erected, and in July, 1896, Mr. Pearson advised the taking down and rebuilding of all three gables, beginning with that on the north.

The anti-restorationists, represented by the Society of Antiquaries, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and their numerous supporters throughout the country, while recognising the necessity of repairing the west front and arresting the gradual settlement (which was the only cause of the mischief), advocated (1) the effectual underpinning of the thirteenth century front, and (2) the gradual removal of the disintegrated backing of the gables, and its piecemeal replacement with material properly bonded into the original facing which would be

in no way disturbed. This is exactly the same principle as relining an old painting, a process with which all artists are familiar as applied successfully to many of the art treasures of Europe. The anti-restorationists, backed in their opinion by practical engineers, builders, and architects, offered to defray the cost of this treatment of the north gable; but they were repulsed with scant courtesy. To save their *amour propre*, and to end the controversy, the dean and chapter began in haste to pull the north gable down. It has now been completely rebuilt with almost the whole of the old stones, the cross having been replaced only last month.

We suppose that the chapter will now flatter themselves on the signal success of their undertaking; but it is well to remind them that the thirteenth century north gable has been destroyed, that it is as dead as Queen Anne, and that what they have got in its place is a work of the nineteenth century built of thirteenth century stones! The process, too, of restoring it to the perpendicular has not been accomplished without a considerable departure from the original lines, and a deliberate twisting of the walling to make it coincide with the unstraightened bulk of fabric beneath the gable.

It need not, however, be thought by the anti-restorationists that their energetic protests have been thrown away; contrariwise they have effected much good. The attention that this controversy aroused brought about far greater care in the rebuilding of the north gable than was shown in the rebuilding of the central tower. We are assured that the central gable will not be taken down, and that the south gable will receive milder restorative treatment; the reckless flow of subscriptions has been checked; and the piers have escaped their threatened removal. There are, however, some misgivings as to whether the underpinning of these piers, as carried out by Mr. Pearson, has as yet been thoroughly accomplished.

GLOUCESTER's great church of a mitred Benedictine abbey, "the cradle of the Perpendicular style," became in 1541 the cathedral church of the newly established bishopric.

Between 1853 and 1863 very considerable restorations

were made within and without the church by Mr. F. S. Waller, with far less damage than in most similar cases. The work was continued by Sir Gilbert Scott in 1867.

The quire or organ screen, which dates from the time of Edward III, though much interfered with in 1741, and again in 1823, still happily divides the nave from the choir, though those who ought to know continue in their ignorance to persist that it "materially interferes with the utility and beauty of both."

The Lady-chapel has of late been put into the hands of Mr. Pearson with unhappy results.

The dignity and massive grandeur of York's great minster church is still well maintained. The chief harm done to the fabric and its fittings during the present century has been the result of fire.

In 1829 the quire was set alight by the lunatic Martin, with the result that the stalls and organ and quire roof were entirely consumed. The sum of £65,000 was spent on the restoration and replacement of the destroyed work, which was on the whole satisfactorily accomplished.

In 1840 a fire that originated in the south west tower reduced that tower to a shell, destroyed the bells, and completely consumed the wooden vault roof of the nave. It cost £23,000 to make good the damage, and again it may be said that the work was well done. The architect was Mr. Sidney Smirke.

The whole of the vast nave was fitted, in 1863, for congregational purposes, with movable benches and choir seats, and with a good organ of suitable size. This is a most commendable feature of the church, the quire offices thus remaining distinct from those for big congregations. It is much to be hoped that the old use of an altar at the east end of the nave will be ere long restored, for worship of the Church without its central feature is as meaningless as would be the House of Lords without the throne, or the House of Commons without the Speaker's chair.

There is not much to find fault with in the treatment of this noble minster in the Victorian age, save the undue and unnecessary newness of the clerestory of the south transept when restored by Mr. Street in 1874-5.

The Chapter House, however, received very bad treat-

ment in 1844, when a bequest of £3,000 was expended upon it. All traces of ancient painting and gilding were then cleared away, and the old pavement taken up to make way for Minton tiles. Nevertheless, as has been well remarked, "no amount of restoration has as yet deprived this building of its right to stand at the head of English chapter houses," and it remains fully entitled to the distinction implied in the ancient verse painted on the left side of the entrance—

*Ut rosa flos florum,
Sic est domus ista domorum.*

The glorious church of DURHAM, in its inspiring situation, built in all its imposing proportions by Bishop Carilef in the three short years of 1093–1096, has suffered most acutely during the present century. So careful and eminent a writer as Rev. Dr. Greenwell, F.R.S., F.S.A., who knows and loves its every stone, does not hesitate to say that

"it is impossible to speak in too strong terms of the stupid and unintelligent manner in which the whole cathedral has been treated not only in Wyatt's time, but even in these later days of architectural revival. Many important features which, in part at least, told the story of the church, and which might have remained to tell it to future times, have been ruthlessly swept away. Windows and doorways and mouldings, historical and architectural facts, of high moment as they were, have been destroyed without any apparent reason, and are now as completely gone from us as though they had never existed."

The beautiful Early English eastern extension, termed the Nine Altars, has a platform on the west side upon which the shrine of St. Cuthbert was placed, and within which his bones still rest. Until about 1844, this platform was surmounted by an oak screen of excellent though late design, and of good workmanship. In all probability it dated from the time of Queen Mary. The Victorian restorers, however, pronounced it "inferior and obstructive"; it was dragged out and mostly destroyed, but a piece of it, robbed of its cresting, serves as a screen in the University Library.

In 1620 Dean Hunt and the Chapter gave a handsome large white marble basin to serve as a font. "This was recklessly removed," says Dr. Greenwell, "not many years ago, with many other treasures, by those who ought to

have had more regard for possessions which had been handed down to their care by the pious liberality and taste of great men of old." The substitute is "a contemptible piece of pseudo-Norman sculpture in the shape of a font."

Nor does it seem possible to forgive, from an historical or archæological standpoint, the destruction by the Victorian restorers of the grand and characteristic quire screen of richly carved oak placed here by the great Bishop Cosin in 1662. This screen, which bore the organ, was pulled down in 1847, and the whole church thrown completely open. The stall work of the quire, which had remained in all its comeliness and beauty as erected by Bishop Cosin, was, about the same time, cruelly chopped up and pushed back between the piers. By this iniquity it was stated that "about thirty sittings were gained," so once again the mischievous idea of playing at parish church in a collegiate quire, combined with the "open vista" notion, were the main causes of this irreparable damage.

Again, Cardinal Langley (1406-1437) effected many improvements and repairs in the Galilee and at the west end of the church. Behind his own tomb he placed the altar of the Blessed Virgin. Here again we quote at some length from Canon Greenwell:—

"The woodwork of the reredos of that altar, of great interest, containing paintings of the early part of the fifteenth century, was taken away not many years ago and not a vestige of it now remains. Why it was thought necessary to destroy this I cannot say, though I have been told it was to obtain an uninterrupted view from one end of the building to the other. It is difficult to speak of the wanton destruction which has taken place in the cathedral with any degree of patience. There has been more mischief done during the last forty years than was done previously during a couple of centuries. Beautiful pieces of work, containing many interesting features, have been swept away under the ridiculous notion of restoring the building to what was called its original state of Norman simplicity."

"All the Perpendicular tracery in the windows of the nave has been destroyed, the south front having been at the same time defaced, during which process much Norman detail disappeared. The screen dividing the nave from the choir and those separating the transepts from their aisles, and the clock case, which had been originally erected by Prior Castell and still contained much of his work, with later additions of the time of Dean Hunt, have all been removed."

The exterior of the great central tower was entirely

refaced in 1859, and much altered in detail, a wanton and absolutely inexcusable piece of extravagant mischief.

In short, it is simply marvellous to find, when we consider all the miserable treatment that this glorious fabric has sustained during the present reign, that the cathedral church of Durham is still so imposing and noble a structure.

Extensive restorations of the cathedral church of CARLISLE were begun in 1853 and finished in 1857, under the direction of Mr. Christian, at a cost of £15,000. The result of this and of subsequent restorations by Mr. Street, though doubtless effecting some good and doing much that was necessary, was to substitute a great deal of sham Early English work in the south transept and elsewhere in the place of decent and substantial fifteenth century insertions.

The remarkable roof of the quire had been concealed in 1764 by a plaster vaulting. This was properly removed, but the tawdry colouring in blue and gold is much to be reprobated; the original colours were red and green.

There was a scare in 1880 as to the refacing of the old fraternity of Carlisle Cathedral, but the protests subsided on an assurance from the dean that there would be no unnecessary interference with a single stone.

The perversity of Victorian restorers with regard to the historical arrangement of our cathedral churches received a curious illustration at Carlisle. Generally speaking, an overwhelming desire is shown to play at being a parish church. At Carlisle, on the contrary, the building was an ancient parish church before it became the chair of a bishopric, and parishioners rightfully used the mutilated nave. Yet in this instance the restorers ejected them, and built for their use a new adjacent church!

The great church of the Benedictine monastery of St. Werburgh became a cathedral church on the founding, in 1541, of the see of CHESTER. In 1075 Peter, the first Norman bishop of Lichfield, removed his chair from Lichfield to Chester, but placed it in the monastic church of St. John Baptist, and not in that of St. Werburgh. Bishop Peter's successor, Robert of Limesey, again however transferred the see, moving it from Chester to Coventry.

The whole eastern portion of the church is Early English of much beauty, and the rest Decorated, with Perpendicular alterations and additions.

In 1844 the "restoration" of the quire was begun by Mr. Hussey, under Dean Anson. The fabric of the Lady-chapel was taken in hand in 1856, and subsequently this building was decorated. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners assigned a sum of £10,000 for "general restoration" in 1868, which was very materially increased by the chapter and general public, Sir Gilbert Scott being entrusted with its disposal.

If but one-tenth of the great sums expended on this ancient building during the Queen's reign had been applied with judgment and taste to this interesting Benedictine church, it would now be standing as a comely and carefully repaired example of ecclesiastical work originating in the twelfth century, and suitable in every way for the nineteenth century centre of a bishop's see; but as it is, can anyone admire the big church of St. Werburgh as a whole, or find beauty in most of its restored parts?

The quire screen, which was plain but good work of the fourteenth century, was moved and "restored" almost out of recognition prior to 1868, and was then swept away, organ and all.

The whole of the levels of the quire and presbytery were altered, and reduced to one common term.

The episcopal throne, at the end of the stalls on the south side, was formed, in the time of Henry VIII, from the base of the shrine of St. Werburgh. Alas! the restoration mania could not even leave this interesting relic alone, though in substantial repair. In 1846 Canon Slade restored it in memory of Bishop Law, and made much confusion of the parts. Recently the throne has been taken to pieces, and the parts of the old shrine rightly removed behind the high altar. The re-erected shrine is not, however, even now in its original place. The filling up of the missing portions with modern masonry left in the block is much to be commended.

The Lady-chapel was clean swept of everything later than the Early English period, a great deal of excellent old Perpendicular alterations and insertions being dragged

out to make way for the bogus thirteenth century work of Messrs. Hussey and Scott.

But the worst feature of the whole of the work by Sir Gilbert Scott was the deliberate obliteration of the good south side chapel of the Lady-chapel, simply to gratify the restorer's pleasure in an endeavour to show his cleverness in reproducing an imitation of an apse of the time of Edward I, crowned with a great heavy pyramidal erection which has been pronounced to be the ugliest conception that ever proceeded from the mind of a Gothic architect.

A really comic bit of foolishness was also perpetrated during Chester restoration. The cloisters were "restored," and a row of closets ("carrels") such as the Benedictine monks would have used for study in the fifteenth century, was actually set up, all brand new, in the south alley! As if either the canons of Chester or anyone else would ever dream of using them? Indeed, if Benedictine monks went back there, they would not want them, for the whole conditions of study have changed. It is as silly a bit of wasteful work as it would be to replace (in these days of cheap clocks and watches) an hour-glass in a pulpit!

To Worcester pertains the discredit of being the most thoroughly "restored" of our old cathedral churches, but Chester is a good second.

The wooden spire above the central tower of RYPOX (which became a cathedral church in 1836) was blown down in 1660, destroying in its fall the quire roof. The roof was restored, and the spires of the west towers removed for fear of a like calamity. The nave was re-roofed and the choir groined with lath and plaster in 1829. This work was done by Mr. Blore at a cost of £3,000. In 1842 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners made some inadequate repairs.

The chief Victorian restoration took place between 1862 and 1872, when about £40,000 was expended by Sir Gilbert Scott. Much of the work then accomplished was simple, necessary, and well done, but there are two serious blots. The early Perpendicular windows of the west front, with their beautiful tracery, were destroyed, their place being taken by insipid Scottish imita-

tions of the work of the thirteenth century. The high altar was most unfortunately removed to the easternmost arch, thus destroying the ancient processional path.

The collegiate church of MANCHESTER became cathedral on the foundation of the see in 1848.

The old work is almost entirely of fifteenth century date. Since it became cathedral, the church has been extensively restored throughout, and most parts rebuilt often not on the old lines. The brown sandstone from Collyhurst of which it was composed had suffered much from the weather, so that its refacement in many places with millstone grit from Ramsbottom became a necessity, and no blame, but credit, is due to the chapter architect, Mr. Holden, who carried it out.

The western tower was rebuilt from the foundations, apparently on insufficient evidence as to its instability. It is not, however, a copy of its predecessor; and when such new work was being done, it seems a pity that it did not assume the form of a more dignified west front.

Mr. Holden's restorations lasted from 1845 to 1868, the west tower being the conclusion. Since then much has been done to this modernised church by Mr. Crowther, but not of a character to call for any special comment. The parapet of the clerestory has been mistakenly broken up into battlements. It was originally in one long straight line, an arrangement which added much to the apparent length of the building, and hence to its dignity.

From the time of the surrender of ST. ALBANS abbey church in 1539, it remained deserted until 1553, when it was sold to the mayor and burgesses of the town for £400. The Lady-chapel was then turned into a grammar school, and the great church made parochial. The parish or town proved fair custodians. The church was far too large for their requirements, and therefore only the old quire and transepts were used. Up to 1870 the building enjoyed an almost complete immunity from the tricks and mischiefs of the restorationists.

In that year restorations began well by the ejection of the grammar school from the Lady-chapel, and was followed by the difficult and necessary task of the repair and sustaining of the great central tower.

The establishment of a bishopric at St. Albans gave a

great impetus to the restoration schemes. Controversy waxed fast and furious; that "wealthy, overbearing architectural charlatan" (we quote from the 2^d vol. of the *Sacristry*) Sir Edmund Beckett, now Lord Grimthorpe, appeared upon the scene, and eventually, through brazen effrontery and the power of a bottomless purse, carried everything before him.

For over twenty years this one man, by the power of a faculty that casts a slur upon all concerned in its granting, has worked his own sweet will upon this once beautiful church, and by what he has destroyed and by what he has put up has made himself the laughing-stock of the architectural world and the scorn of all who love to see the evidences in stone of the history of their nation and their church. It would be going over very old ground to recite even in the briefest way the miserable wrongs done to this ancient fabric. The plates of contrasts, showing the lovely old work and the baldness and poverty of this coronetted builder's conceptions, drawn by the late Mr. Steinmetz, ought to be in the hands of every learned society or working ecclesiologist to serve as awful warnings.

The term to *grimthorpe*, that is, to spend lavishly after a destructive fashion upon an ancient building, has recently come into use in several of our high-class papers and magazines, and has even found its way across the Atlantic. The headstrong spoiler of St. Alban's has certainly, after this fashion, attained unto fame. The end of the eighteenth century had its Wyatt, and the end of the nineteenth has its Grimthorpe; both doubtless well intentioned after their lights, but both of them devastators of the most extreme type.

Byron must have had this overbearing chancellor of York prophetically before him when he thus satirised the Lord Henry of his days (the italics are original) :

"There was a modern Goth, I mean, a Gothic
 Bricklayer of Babel, call'd an architect,
 Brought to survey these grey walls, which though so thick,
 Might have from time to time acquired some slight defect;
 Who, after rummaging the Abbey through thick
 And thin, produced a plan whereby to erect
 New buildings of correctest conformation,
 And throw down old, which he called *restoration*."

England's old cathedral churches have now been all separately named, together with the special Victorian achievements of those responsible for their custody. Nothing has been knowingly exaggerated, and naught has been set down in malice, or from a spark of ill-will towards any member of a capitular body or restoring architect. The indictment is a heavy one, and might have been most materially extended had it included some of our great collegiate or minster churches such as Westminster, Selby, Beverley, or Hexham.

Lack of time and space have also excluded almost every reference to the wanton removal, disfiguring, or ejection of monuments, in which sorry work many of our deans and chapters have set such an evil example during Victoria's reign. Another branch of the same subject is the irreverent readiness they have shown to gratify their own curiosity or that of morbid antiquaries by routing into the graves or coffins of distinguished Christian ecclesiastics or civilians, whose remains were supposed to be laid to special rest within the minster's hallowed walls. Westminster Abbey is a notorious example of these two once rampant evils, as I showed in detail in the annual address for 1893 that I had the honour to deliver before the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.

Cathedral restorers have also been prominent in a variety of bad works that tend to effectually demolish the ancient character and interest of the building, or to disfigure its walls—such are undue scraping of masonry, and polishing or varnishing of Purbeck or other marble; the filling up of all surface scars and chips, and renewing of slightly decayed or irregular stones; the casting out of old flooring stones or pavers; the cleaning off of paint and gilding from old woodwork, or its revarnishing; and the plastering of the walls with ugly bright brass blisters below newly-glazed windows, of which York and Rochester are conspicuous examples.

It is anything but a pleasant or congenial task to draw attention to these sad proceedings. Those who do it run some real risk of endangering friendships, of being accused of interested, mean, and personal motives, and of being coolly regarded by those for whom, in all other save anti-

quarian respects, they may have the greatest regard and esteem. But these protests are by no means useless. Their continuance and repetition warn others from like mistakes, and to my certain knowledge many a blunder and irreparable mischief has been checked by timely protest in cathedral as well as in parochial churches. It was the deliberate opinion of the late President of the Society of Antiquaries, whose loss we all so deeply lament, that the great protest as to Peterborough has borne and will continue to bear much fruit.

But may we not do something more than merely protest individually or corporately in our societies? Does it not become us to resolutely endeavour to check the unlimited power of mischief now possessed by deans and chapters? The time seems ripe for such concerted action, and it is necessary if the remnants of our old minsters are to be saved from the further vandalism of the restorer.

Deans and chapters have at present the power—and some of them are not loth to exercise it—of riding rough shod over educated and reverent opinion. In 1864 the following words were addressed to the dean and chapter of Worcester :

“I feel bound to suggest that these are scarcely questions which should not be left to the decision of architects, without calling into council representatives of the historical and archæological elements which are involved. The antiquities of our cathedrals, though legally under the trusteeship of their respective chapters, are morally the property of the diocese and of the country at large : and when any considerable change is contemplated (especially if it involves the removal of any objects which, whether beautiful as works of art or not, have become objects of history), would submit that it is desirable to seek the opinions and advice not only of architects, but of eminent antiquaries and ecclesiologists.”

Thus wrote even Sir Gilbert Scott, but what little attention have either capitular bodies or their selected architects paid to this suggestion !

Professor Freeman, some two years later, when contemplating the havoc wrought at Worcester, wrote :

“Deans and chapters all over England may riot unchecked. These bodies are practically uncontrollable. Who is there that can touch them? A dean and chapter, so long as they paddle their own canoe, may bid defiance to all the architectural, all the archæological, all the palæographical wisdom of the world. There is positively no outrage which they may not perpetrate so long as they maintain the specious name and form of a church and a worship.

There is no amount of wreck and ruin that they may not consume under the plea of restoration. The law and constitution in Church and State knows nothing of art, its interests, its monuments. By some lucky accident we have come by those priceless and peerless possessions—our cathedrals. But though held in trust for us, the trustees have absolute power so to dispose of them as to make them worthless.”

If societies, such as the Society of Antiquaries or that for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, approach deans and chapters, with all respect and with much knowledge, about the repair of the fabrics they hold in trust, they are usually snubbed with a modicum of courtesy, and the proposition that a deputation of experienced and learned men should wait upon those in authority to state their views has more than once met with the curtest of rebuffs by that chance medley body, a cathedral chapter. Not even a Government department declines to receive a deputation when drawing up a bill, but chapters, as a rule, when undertaking with a light heart the most devastating works on their revered buildings, pour out nothing but contempt on those who merely wish to point out the more excellent way.

In his last public utterance, delivered on April 23 of the current year, the late Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks, K.C.B., gave utterance to these weighty words with respect to the conflict between the Society of Antiquaries and the dean and chapter of Peterborough :

“It need scarcely be said that the political aspect of archaeological questions does not in any way concern this Society. But it is scarcely to be expected that the high-handed action of the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough, in a matter which should have been the subject of their grave deliberation, will be forgotten by those political parties who are opposed to the existence of all Deans and Chapters. This controversy, therefore, though it seems now to have resulted in a victory for the Dean and Chapter and the advocates of ‘restoration,’ may have sown seeds that will bear bitter fruit for the ecclesiastical foundations of England

The destruction of the west front of Peterborough, and the threatened disfigurement of St. Cross Hospital, near Winchester, by their legal guardians, have again shown the urgent necessity that exists for some legislation to enforce publicity, and the restraining influence of some external sanction, before the trustees of ancient monuments are allowed to destroy or deface them by so-called restorations or incongruous additions.”

Valuable information has been officially collected during the past twelve months with regard to the action of

other civilised countries in like cases, which will probably ere long be issued in a Blue Book. It will then be found that France, Germany, Bavaria, Saxony, Austria, Spain, Greece, Sweden and Norway, Denmark and parts of Italy, all place their historic monuments, such as old cathedral and parish churches, in the hands of a State-appointed commission. It is only with Russia that England shares the dishonour of having no national legislation on the subject.

Has not the time come for England to move? By her backwardness she has lost most sadly, but there is much yet to be saved. Surely a commission consisting of the First Commissioner of Works and three Government nominees, in conjunction with the President of the Society of Antiquaries, the President of the Royal Academy, and the Principal Librarian of the British Museum (or their representatives), associated with the capitular body of the cathedral church proposed to be treated, would command general confidence? If sufficient pressure was brought to bear, the strongest Government of modern days, now in power, might be induced to initiate or to give substantial support to a measure of this character, and thereby prove the genuineness of their conservative convictions.

I would have no professional architect on such a commission, for I desire entirely to identify myself with the recent remarkable and golden words of our late friend Sir A. W. Franks, when he said last April

"I, for one, greatly doubt whether the restoration of ancient buildings should be confided to an eminent architect whose business is rather to construct new ones. As has been already observed, if we want to restore an old painting we do not go to a Royal Academician, but to some clever picture restorer. If an ancient porcelain vase required reparation, it is not Messrs. Minton that we should consult, but some expert china mender. I do not, therefore, see why ancient buildings should be treated differently from any other works of art."

It is much to be hoped that the Institute by general resolution, or by the vote of its trusted council, will identify itself with the conservative forward movement for the safeguarding by the State of the grandest monuments of our country's gradual progress, for our cathedral churches have been truly and wisely termed "great national epochs carved in stone, and magnificent evidences of the faculty which is the shadow of God's own creative power."