

younger friend, yet it is singular how in both identity of name was accompanied to a certain extent by a coincidence of taste and pursuits. The fame of the one by what he performed in gathering together a harvest of north country history is firmly established; the other, by adding to the amount of knowledge previously reaped, has left also a name that will continue to be remembered throughout our district long after the present generation shall have passed away.

ROBERT WHITE.

---

### THE SCREEN AND CHANCEL ARRANGEMENTS OF DARLINGTON CHURCH.

THE church at Darlington was built in that transitional period which, when the pointed arch became thoroughly established, produced a peculiarly vigorous phase of the Early English style in the North of England. In the counties of Northumberland and Durham the finest examples occur at Hexham, Brinkburn, Tynemouth, Hartlepool, and Darlington.

The discovery of the late Saxon sculptured stones proves that a church must have existed at Darlington about the time that Styr son of Ulphus gave the town to the church of Durham. It was one of the places selected for the reception of the ejected canons of Durham when the constitution of the cathedral was changed in the time of the Conqueror. These, it will be remembered, were hereditary priests, and the state of things in their various parishes must have strongly resembled the livings of modern times where a younger son of the patron from time to time succeeds to the benefice. In the parishes of ancient days, however, the eldest son would inherit. At what precise time the marriage of priests ceased in the North of England it is difficult to say. The question has peculiar interest with reference to the relations of bishop Pudsey with Adelidis de Percy, whose son Henry de Pudsey exchanged Perci in Normandy for some estates in Durham. Some curious evidence on the subject, of a much later date than one would have expected to find it, appears in canon Raine's book on the register of archbishop Walter Gray.

The rights of the ejected seculars, whatever they were, at Darlington, seem to have died out before the time of bishop Pudsey, who decreed that the order which was formerly at Durham should be restored in the church which, notwithstanding all his mischances and troubles, he was

building at Darlington. The year referred to was 1192. The new establishment consisted of four prebendaries.

From the first, therefore, the present church must have been both collegiate and parochial. As usual in churches of exceptional dignity, the plan is cruciform, with a central tower. Although, at the exterior, the architect seems to have insisted that the plan should be kept uniform, just as at Tynemouth, where we have the rich work of the east end appearing also at the west end of a humble parochial nave, yet, as at the latter place, the interior is divided into splendid and homely provinces. The more sumptuous work at Darlington stops with the eastern bay of the nave, and there must, one would think, have been some sort of screen at that point, though no trace of it now exists. Marks of a screen of some height across the collegiate church of Middleham occur at the same placē. At Tynemouth, a massive stone screen, through which two doors penetrate, crosses the church at the extreme end of the nave. There is a tradition at Darlington that there was a screen across the nave at its west end, further eastward than the modern one which used to sever the western bay only. The Glossary of Architecture remarks that "in some churches there are indications of the west end of the nave having been parted off from the rest, either by a step in the floor, a division of the architecture, or some other line of demarcation; it was considered to be somewhat less sacred than the other portions of the buildings." At Darlington the distinction had perhaps a local significance. In the 15th century it was supposed that the dedication of churches to st. Cuthbert identified the spots where his body had rested. Darlington church is so dedicated. Originally women were forbidden to set foot even in the cemeteries attached to them, but, as time rolled on, provision was made for females in the west end of the cathedral, and doubtless the same relaxation of rule would prevail in smaller churches.

There is reason to believe that an interruption in the erection of the fabric took place. In the north wall of the chancel, below the first tier of windows, mr. Pritchett, the architect entrusted with the restoration of that part of the church, found the effects of exposure to the weather of a winter or two at least. During the interruption the style would be rapidly changing, and the circumstance doubtless accounts for some anomalies which, strangely enough, occur less in the upper stage of the north transept than in the chancel itself. We have mouldings intended for square abaci resting on round ones, some of which present the transitional volute below them, and show that the capital had been altered. But, after the best consideration available has been given to the subject, we may be inclined to think that the work was resumed by Pudsey.

himself, and that the church, if not quite finished by him, had made very considerable progress under William the Engineer, the bishop's second architect, who survived his master; Pudsey dying in 1194. The work is the most advanced in style in the south transept, still it is not typical Early English. Putting the early detail in the chancel out of sight, as being of materials prepared before the interruption, we cannot help noticing that above the tower arches we have the nutmeg ornament, decidedly an early detail, and that the uppermost story of the chancel, near the tower, presents shafts arising out of shafts, a peculiarity found in the same position at Hexham church, a building which also shows transitional work at the east end, and progresses by imperceptible gradations of style into comparatively rich transepts. At the west end of Darlington church we have an effigy of a female in the costume of Berengaria, the queen of Richard I. It was found in the chancel.

The tower arches were probably only intended to carry a spire constructed of wood and lead, but in the 14th century they received the weight of the stone spire and its supports. Upon this addition the whole fabric seems to have given away. The windows of the transepts and choir near the tower on its east side were built up, and something was done internally to its eastern piers, but the two western piers of the tower were left to bear the brunt as best they might. In the nave the walls of the aisles were heightened and rebuilt, the old doorways being retained. The choir at this time received the addition of three sedilia, and two niches in an unusual position, namely in the east wall, the northern one being plain, the southern one containing a basin divided into two parts, apparently for some double use of the piscina. The sedilia are identical in style with the renovated walls of the aisles, and bear the shield (*an estoile*) of Henry de Ingleby, rector of Haughton, near Darlington, and prebendary in Darlington church. He died in 1375, having inserted a low-side window of the same style in his church of Haughton, which window was discovered lately. The same style also appears in the Fulthorp porch of Grindon church, in the southern aisle of Easington church, and in the church of Monkwearmouth. The windows of the Darlington aisles seem to have been glazed with coloured glass immediately after their change. They contained the arms of bishop Hatfield (1345 to 1381), those of Beauchamp, lord of Barnard-castle, and a coat *B. a lion rampant O.*, which is given for the older Nevilles of Essex, and which is not yet identified with the north country at that period.

In the blocked windows north and south of the choir are two curious lights, the south one having a trefoiled head, the north one presenting

a cinquefoiled head, and a cinquefoiled transom. These lights would be of little or no use as rood-lights, and yet are too high for confessional purposes. For almsgiving they might serve, if the dispenser had a loft inside, or persons outside might *hear* service through them. The subject is very perplexing. Mr. Hodgson is of opinion that these and low-side windows were for the communication of light from lamps to affright evil spirits, after the use of lamps in continental churchyards. No opinion is here offered as to an usage which was so soon lost to the memory of the church which adopted it.

What had been for the strengthening of the tower seems to have been insufficient, or thought to have been so, and, between 1381 and 1407, a substantial screen of stone was thrown across the church under the choir arch, after the fashion of cathedral screens, not perhaps more solidly than ordinary rood-screens in such a position, but resembling the arch of a bridge more than usual, in consequence of the aperture being ribbed transversely instead of being vaulted diagonally. There is the usual rood-stair in the south end of this screen, and at the restoration some indications appeared, on the top, of the places where the rood or crucifix and the accompanying images of Mary and John had been placed.

On the west front of the screen, and above the point of the arch, but not reaching across the whole of the screen, if I understand the subsequent language rightly, were five shields carved in sandstone. As to their style, I need hardly remind you that they were executed in the most palmy days of heraldry. The shields were these:—

1. Quarterly A. and G. a bend S. charged with three escallop-shells A.—EURE, Lord of Witton-on-Wear.
2. Barry of eight A. and B. three chaplets of four roses each G.—GREYSTOCK, Lord of Coniscliffe and Neasham.
3. Quarterly :
  - i. iv. O. a lion rampant B.—PERCY, Earl of Northumberland.
  - ii. iii. G. three lucys or pikefish A.—LUCY, Lord of Cocker-mouth, quartered by the Earl after his marriage with Maud Lucy between 1381 and 1384.
4. G. three escallop-shells A.—DACRE, Lord of Dacre.
5. Quarterly :
  - i. iv. B. semy of fleurs de lis O.—OLD FRANCE, disused by Henry V., who gives only three fleurs on his seal.
  - ii. iii. G. three lions passant guardant O.—ENGLAND.

The Percys, in after days, held a burgage in Darlington, and the other persons entitled to these shields may or may not have been burgesses, seeing that Darlington was on a great thoroughfare. The only landowner, properly so called, but such in a trifling way, in the parish,

among them, was sir Ralph Eure, who, among the many odds and ends with which he had increased his hereditary possessions, held three acres in Derlyngton, called Hell, a messuage and half an oxgang in Blakwell, and a messuage and a place (whatever that may mean) in Cockerton. As to Dacre, he was not even a neighbouring proprietor, for we are dealing with times long before the period of the great match between Dacre and Greystock of Coniscliffe.

Little tenements, for the mere convenience of travellers, would not account for the presence of the arms of the king and four lords in exclusion of those of the Nevilles and other distinguished neighbours. Rather do the shields betoken substantial subscriptions from outsiders, placed by reason of liberality of purse and without regard to the local parishioners, who would, doubtless, be bled at much less uncertain intervals of time.

The date of the heraldry is confined between that of the quartering of Lucy (1381-4) and the forfeiture of the estate of Maud Lucy's husband, the earl of Northumberland, in 1407. The Percy lands were not restored until the reign of Henry V., when the old arms of France had disappeared. If it could be assumed that the stalls of the chancel which bear the arms of bishop Langley, who acceded in 1406, were contemporaneous with the screen against which they turn, the date would be reduced to much greater nicety, the earl of Northumberland having been slain in rebellion in March, 1407. One would like to clinch so pretty a piece of architectural evidence, and to think that the arms of Langley, "*sculptum super primum stallum ad introitū chori*," were on the screen itself. But we must not close our eyes to the likelihood that there would be some short lapse of time between the construction of the stonework and its supplement of work in wood, that the cardinal's arms would probably be on the destroyed wainscot above the stalls or on the first stall itself, and that the minority in the Dacre family did not cease until 1408-9, when the inheritance was delivered to Thomas Dacre, the heir. The facts are now fairly before us; but we had better not come to any opinion on this point. We do not know how much pocket-money was allowed to wards for expenditure on rood-screens and such objects, but Darlington was a very likely spot to see its expenditure. When Dunbar, the good old Scottish poet, speaks of "preaching in Derntoun kirk, and eik in Canterbury," he proves, by no uncertain sound, that the church of Darlington was famous in the minds of travellers.

Next in order of time come, of course, the stalls in the chancel, with "bench ends full five inches thick," the "most massive specimens" ever met with by Billings, who remarks that "their numerous edge mouldings would seem rather to belong to a large archway." They

bear the arms of cardinal Langley, and his badge (an eagle). The misereres present a legend resembling that of Jack the Giant-killer, also a royal figure with two sceptres (st. Oswald, king of Bernicia and Deira) supported by collared griffins, and other subjects. The whole arrangements are suggestive of an intention by Langley to re-found the college, an act effected by his successor, bishop Neville, in 1439, two years after his accession. The vicar was made dean, and as the parish was rapidly increasing, and the transepts were chantries, it seems not improbable that the parochial part of the church was extended to the new stone screen, even if the whole church did not then become parochial; which it possibly did.

Before 1509, a treasure-house, probably where the present vestry stands, on the south side of the chancel, had arisen, and an easter sepulchre, to the north of the altar, can hardly be assigned to an earlier date. Leland, about-1539, saw "an exceeding long and fair altar stone of variegated marble, that is, black marked with white spots, at the high altar in the collegiate parish church of Darlington." There is perhaps no very distinct evidence as to whether one altar generally served both parts of the double churches. At Darlington one would infer that such was the case.

After the Reformation, the Darlington rood-loft assumes a new interest. The history of church architecture previous to that event had to be elucidated by Rickman, a quaker. That of our churches since demands the attention of some other desperately honest dissenter. At present the antiquary will act wisely if he confines his attention to the printed rubrics and canons, and the various injunctions collected in the valuable blue-book of 1868, in attempting to grope his way freed from strange questions of doctrine. While, from the first, when it was determined to allow the chancels to remain, "as they have done in time past," there appears to have been a lingering affection for those parts of the churches; every arrangement was, nevertheless, made so as to be subservient to the convenience of the congregations. In 1547, Edward VI. enjoins that when there was no sermon, the pater noster, the creeds, and ten commandments were to be recited after the gospel, but "in the pulpits," "to the intent the people may learn the same; "and so also, in the time of high mass, the epistle and gospel were to be read "in the pulpit, or in such convenient place as the people may hear the same." The prayer-book of 1549 still speaks of an altar, and of the priest "being in the quire" for the ordinary prayers, and after the offertory the partakers are to "tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy com-

munion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks." The order of communion in 1548 speaks of the administration to the people "still reverently kneeling," and of the priest going "again to the altar," or "God's board," as the previous injunctions also call it. Doubtless, therefore, from the first, the communicants were "conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy sacrament," as the rubric still has it, and so remained until, as it also has it, the celebrant, after delivering the elements, returned. The locality of the altar, under these circumstances, was of small consequence; but matters were greatly simplified by the destruction of the altars and the substitution of tables, which in 1552, as now, are directed to be placed, "at the communion time," "in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where morning prayer and evening prayer be appointed to be said," the ordinary prayers being said "in such place of the church, chapel, or chancel, as the people may best hear." The priest was to stand then, as now, "at the north side of the table," and, therefore, it was intended to stand, and in those days it doubtless did stand, east and west, as it stood in after times, though not lately. When there was no communion, the priest would follow the injunctions, and read the commandments, &c., from the pulpit. The college at Darlington had now fallen, and no question seems to have arisen about the rights of the inhabitants to use the chancel; but the parish of Darlington being large, and the chancel small, prayers would naturally be said, and the table placed, in the nave, and so the screen was no nuisance. The chancels of collegiate churches, where they had not been parochialised, were frequently destroyed, as at Howden. It does not appear where the tables were placed, during the reign of Edward, out of communion time, but we may assume that they would, as enjoined afterwards by Elizabeth and James, be taken to the east end as the most convenient place between communions.

The screen at Darlington, from its constructional character, was in no danger from the orders to convert rood-lofts into partitions between chancels and churches, by removing the gallery portions. Its rood and images would alone suffer, and the service, after Mary's time, would have to be conducted again as it had been in Edward's days. The injunctions of Elizabeth direct that the table shall be set where the altar stood, "saving when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number, communicate with the said minister. And, after the communion done, from time to time the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." Whether the restriction

to chancels was intentional or not, or whether it is enlarged by the prayer-book or not, the clause agrees with bishop Middleton's injunctions of 1583. "When there is a communion to be ministered, that the communion table be placed at the lower end of the chancel, as near unto the people as may be convenient, and when the ministration is done, remove it to the upper end of the said chancel." In large churches a low pulpit was to be provided "in the body of the church" for divine service. In smaller churches, some convenient seat "without the chancel door" was allowed, and, where the churches were very small, archbishop Grindal, in 1571, considered it to suffice that the minister stand in his accustomed stall in the quire, so that a convenient desk or lectern with a room to turn his face towards the people be there provided." Bishop Middleton enjoined "that there be no recourse by the minister to the communion table, to say any part of service there, saving only where is a communion to be ministered, for it doth retain a memory of the idolatrous mass. For the avoiding whereof, all the service shall be said by the minister in his own seat or pulpit, with his face turned down towards the people." And Grindal "provided also that the prayers and other service appointed for the ministration of the holy communion be said and done at the communion table, except the epistle and gospel, which shall be read in the said pulpit or stall, and also the ten commandments when there is no communion." In Elizabeth's time, therefore, the ministers of Darlington, following the law and practice of the church of England, would, notwithstanding the screen, be always fully heard and seen, as no part of their ministrations, in or out of communion time, would be performed at the east end of the chancel.

King James's canons of 1603 agree with Elizabeth's Injunctions in saying that the table is to stand in its certain place, saving when communion was to be administered, when it is to be placed within the church or chancel for the same reason that Elizabeth assigns. Accordingly archbishop Bancroft in 1605 asks whether "at the communion time—is the table then placed in such convenient sort within the chancel or church as that the minister may be best heard in his prayer or administration, and that the greater number may communicate?" These last words probably refer to the question as to whether the use of the nave or chancel would be most efficient, the present practice of successive rows of communicants along a rail being unknown, rail there being none, and all the communicants having been disposed, according to rubric, in readiness to receive before the administration began. In 1599, archdeacon King inquires "whether the communion be administered monthly where the parishes be great, or else so often every year



as that the parishioners may receive three times at the least yearly; and in 1603 bishop Thornborough asks "whether your parson, &c., doth—minister the communion—to any of his parishioners—not in their several seats, where they usually sit in the church, but kneeling in the seats severally appointed in your several churches for the communicants to receive the same." The fine post-Reformation fittings of such chancels as that of Brancepeth had probably reference to sacramental purposes.

Towards the end of James I.'s reign a change of practice had set in. Advantage of a vacancy of the see was taken in 1617 to remove the communion table in Durham cathedral from the midst of the quire to the east end, "as far as possible from the people," says Peter Smart 11 years afterwards, "where no part at all of the evening prayer is ever said, and but a piece of the morning, and that never till of late." Smart informs us that the direction from east to west was the custom of all reformed churches, and had been observed in Durham cathedral from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, save when the rebels possessed the church (in the Rising of the North). After Charles I.'s accession in 1625, matters ran fast indeed. About 1631, archdeacon Kent makes this extraordinary addition to Bancroft's lawful inquiry of 1605: "To that end [*i. e.* that the minister may be best heard, and that the greater number may communicate!] doth it [the table] ordinarily stand up at the east end of the chancel, where the altar in former times stood; the ends thereof being placed north and south." In 1636, bishop Wren enjoins the same illegal act: "that the communion table in every church do always stand close under the east wall of the chancel, the ends thereof north and south, unless the ordinary give particular directions otherwise. And that the rail be made before it, according to the archbishop's late injunctions, reaching across from the north wall to the south wall, above one yard in height, and so thick with pillars that dogs may not get in. That all communicants come up reverently, and kneel before the rail. That the minister's desk do not stand with the back to the chancel, nor too remote or far from it." By 1638 another element had been introduced. Bishop Duppa asks if the "communion table or altar is set, according to the practice of the ancient church, upon an ascent;" and in the same year bishop Montagu enquires if the table is "fixedly set, in such convenient sort and place within the chancel as hath been appointed by authority, according to the practice of the ancient church, that is, at the east end of the chancel, close unto the wall, upon an ascent or higher ground, that the officiating priest may be best seen and heard of the communicants, in that sacred action?" And then he proceeds

to treat the observance of the law as something improper: "Whether is the communion table removed down at any time, either for, or without communion, into the lower part of the chancel or body of the church? by whom, at whose instance, direction, or command is it done?"

There was this inconvenience about the new acts of the clergy. They found that their chancels were too small. Montagu, who asks if the "parishioners sit bare all service time, kneel down in their seats, bowing towards the chancel and communion table," has also to enquire as follows:—"are the names of such as intend to receive taken by the minister over night—that he may proportion the multitude of receivers according to the capacity of his chancel, and not be pestered or crowded with multitudes, who thereby may be occasioned and desire to sit in their pews in the church, and not come up and draw near unto the altar." It is plain that Montagu intended the whole of the communicants to be in the chancel, for he directs that the exhortation is to be read "before the communicants ascend up into the chancel out of their seats in the church," and that the "draw near" clause is to be said "when after this exhortation the communicants are come up into the chancel before they dispose themselves to kneel in their several places, which are orderly and decently to be appointed for them." That anything like the present practice was wholly unknown is evident from other questions whether the sacrament was given "to every communicant, not standing, sitting, or going up and down, but humbly expecting till it be brought and given to him in the place appointed for him by the ordinary,"—and again: "Do all your parishioners draw near, and—come to the Lord's table—and not (after the most contemptuous and unholy usage of some, if men did rightly consider) sit still in their seats or pews, to have the blessed body and blood of our Saviour go up and down to seek them all the church over?"

The same state of matters is illustrated by the subtle canons passed at archbishop Laud's illegal synod in 1640. Suppressing the context of Elizabeth's injunctions as to the position during communion, and only noting her order that the tables should stand in the place where the altars stood, and suppressing the canons of 1603 also, he judges that place to be convenient, admitting the matter to be indifferent, and saving "the general liberty left to the bishop by law, during the time of administration." For severing the tables with rails the reason given is the irreverent behaviour of many people, "some leaning, others casting their hats, and some sitting upon, some standing, and other sitting under the communion table in time of divine service." The insufficiency of some chancels to hold all communicants is

also alluded to. "According to the word of the service-book—'draw near,' &c.—all communicants—shall draw near and approach to the holy table, there to receive the divine mysteries, which have heretofore in some places been unfitly carried up and down by the minister, unless it shall be otherwise appointed in respect of the incapacity of the place or other inconvenience." It is observable that Laud does not venture in express terms to condemn the existing law that the table was to be brought from its extreme eastern position during communion, a practice which was not necessarily inconsistent with the table being enclosed with rails at other times.

Let us, however, do Laud justice. We may not unreasonably suspect, from Smart's silence as to the removal to and fro, that at Durham cathedral and elsewhere the opposite party had also transgressed the law by having the table continually standing east and west in the body of the church or chancel, and never removing it to the east end at all. During the early days of the long parliament, in 1640-1, the house of lords ordered the bishops to take care that the communion-table "do stand decently in the ancient place where it ought to do by the law, and as it hath done for the greater part of these three score years last past." In 1641 bishop Williams asks, "Doth your said communion table stand in the ancient place where it ought to do, or where it hath done for the greatest part of these 60 years last past, or hath it been removed to the east end, and placed altar-wise, and by whom, and whose authority hath it been so placed?" "Do you know of any that refuse to give the communion to any that will not come up and receive it at the rails?" "Are all the steps raised up in the chancel towards the altar (as they call it) within these 15 years last past levelled? or whose fault is it that they are not so?"

With some, possibly with many, of the protestant dissenters, the primitive and free church methodists for instance, something of the old order of the church of England is retained. For the communion the recipients readjust themselves into alternate pews, giving room for the convenient administration by the minister. The present practice in the church of England, varying in detail, of table-fulls of people filling the line of rail in succession, and thence departing to their usual seats, was probably of gradual growth. One of our clerical associates

<sup>1</sup> In the 3rd Report of the Historical MSS. Commission, p. 214, will be found a note of a letter from Williams to the minister of Grantham, insisting on his having a table and not an altar, and that it must stand altar-wise, but that the minister must officiate at the north side and not at the north end, and that in the first and second services he is not to officiate at the table, but in the place of the church or chancel where he may be most conveniently heard.

remembers seeing the stalls at st. Mary's, Oxford, laid with "houssing-cloths" for the communicants in readiness for the sacrament being brought round, and states that the same ancient custom was retained in ordination services at the cathedral there. Rare examples of churches having the table standing in an east and west position exist. The wording of the prayer-book, leaving it an open question (had we not had the evidence of the practice in Elizabeth's time) as to the position of table and clergyman during the reading of part of the communion service when there was no communion, but speaking very decidedly as to his position on the north side of the table where there was communion, his ordering the communicants in a body, his return to the table after ministration, and the position of the table itself during communion in the body of the church or chancel where prayers were said, was not altered at the Restoration. In 1662 bishop Hacket asks, "Have you a comely table placed conveniently in church or chancel?" Yet in the same year bishop Wren asks: "Are there steps or ascents in your chancel up to the communion table? Have you also a decent rail of wood, or some other comely inclosure covered with cloth or silk, placed handsomely above those steps before the holy table, near one yard high—with two convenient doors—and if it be a rail, are the pillars or ballusters thereof so close that dogs may not anywhere get in?" If dogs might not get in, neither might they get out, and a recent work on pews gives a singular instance of the enclosure being used to contain the dogs of the lord of the manor during service. In 1710 bishop Fuller asks whether the sacrament was administered so often that the parishioners might receive at least three times a year, and the frontispiece of Wheatly's Church of England Man's Companion, in 1714, shows all the communicants, in five rows, kneeling on the chancel floor in front of the rails. With the curious reasons there given for the general disobedience of ecclesiastical law, this summary of the history of position which has been rather forced upon me may appropriately conclude, after noting that one of our most distinguished south-country archaeologists has suggested, as a compromise between protest and practice, that the table might well be brought down into the nave once a year, after the manner of protecting disused public and private rights, for the purpose, as intended, of clearly distinguishing it from its predecessor the altar. Wheatly's reasons to which I have alluded are these. The first (which Wheatly himself has his misgivings about, thinking that in large towns willing ministers would find recipients) is as to the minister reading the communion service partially at the table, although there is no communion. "The minister, in obedience to the church's order (!), goes up to the Lord's table,

and there begins the service appointed for the communion, and goes on as far as he can, till he come to the actual celebration of it; and if he stops there it is only because there are none, or not a sufficient number of persons to communicate with him. For if there were he is ready to administer it to them. And therefore if there be no communion on any sunday or holy-day in the year, the people only are to be blamed. The church has done her part in ordering it, and the minister his in observing that order. And if the people would do theirs, too, the holy communion would be constantly celebrated in every parish church in England, on every sunday and holy-day." This is inconsistent with previous arrangements for arranging the communicants' receptions according to the size of chancels, but let it pass. The other reason is rather clever. After giving the injunction about the removal of the table for more convenient hearing and communicating, and the placing of it afterwards where it stood before, he argues thence that the latter was its proper place, and that wherever the churches are so built as that the minister can be heard and conveniently administer at the place where the table usually stands, he is not bound to remove it, but is rather obliged to administer in the chancel. And further, if the table be in the middle of the church, and the people consequently round about, the minister cannot turn himself to the people, as he is sometimes directed to do, any more at one time than another.

This last argument is sufficiently answered by the orders to have the table at the lower end of the chancel, so that, standing at the the north side of the table, the minister would have to turn to the people, eastward or westward, as he might have arranged them in chancel or in nave; and, as to the preceding one, Darlington church is not so built that the minister can be well heard if he retires from his congregation to the extreme end of the chancel, even did the premises justify Wheatly's ingenious deduction; and the alteration of churches and the destruction of objects of interest are not required where the clergyman, even on Wheatly's assumption, has an option. What may be the number of communicants at Darlington church, and whether, with decent arrangement, it would, by means of monthly or weekly communions, enable them to communicate thrice a year, are best known to the ministers.

From ruminating upon the probable arrangements at Darlington in common with other churches let us revert to the screen, the existence of which has been considered as interfering with the edification of the congregations in the nave.

Tradition knew it as an organ loft. I see no reason why, as over the quire door in Durham cathedral, there might not be pairs of organs;

and a lectern upon it, even in pre-Reformation times, in company with the rood. In 1634, the churchwardens paid 6*d.* to George Langstraffe for washing the organs, not valuing them as printed by Surtees. The instrument at Sedgefield in our own days has borne no trace of such antiquity, but, as we have no further evidence until the 18th century, there may be truth in the idea, that an organ was removed from Darlington to Sedgefield. In 1707, the roofs of the nave and transept were somewhat lowered. In 1748, the east gable of the chancel was rebuilt in very humble fashion, the mouldings of the windows being fortunately used as building materials; and the roof, then or before, was flattened. In 1750 the spire, which had been struck by lightning, was rebuilt. And still the screen was to the fore in its pristine condition. But now an ugly charge was impending. Cade, the local antiquary, in his tract about Hell-kettles, in speaking of Darlington church, lamented "the destruction of the arms of benefactors to the fabric, cut in stone, and properly blazoned over the entrance into the quire, by a late reformer." Cade published his tract in 1791. He was baptized in 1734, and two years afterwards, in 1736, George Allan, the antiquary, was born. Allan fixes the date of the reformation to which Cade alludes (however lately, in 1791, the reformer may have died); in the year 1756, and the chancel, he says, is separated from the nave by a low pointed arch of three ribs, "like bridge-arches, above which is the old rood-loft. Organs were formerly placed on this loft. Tradition says they were removed from hence to Sedgefield church. The loft still retains the name of the organ-loft, and at the north end thereof there was a projecting gallery made of the painted panels of the organ case, wherein the scholars of the grammar school usually sat, and in the centre the blue coat charity boys also sat; and at the south end of the loft was placed the machinery of the clock, with a dial plate into the church. On the front of the wall, and above the point of the arch, I well remember the following escutcheons of arms were placed, all properly emblazoned. [Here the antiquary provokes the reader by drawing five blank shields.] In the year 1756, the projecting gallery and clock were taken away, and a new gallery uniformly erected with a wainscot front; and appropriated to the same purposes as before; but the said several shields of arms were all taken down, totally defaced, and, as I also remember, were sold as sandstone by the sexton." In another place "the same purposes" are more satisfactorily defined. "In 1756, two galleries were erected at each end of the organ-loft for the scholars of the free school, and between them the charity boys sit. Below, against the wall, were the arms. The clock stood on the south pillar where the gallery is now erected, and was then removed into the

loft under the bells. Above this loft hang the king's arms from the roof, where they are with great propriety placed in all churches, the king being acknowledged to be the supreme head, in the temporal sense, of our protestant national church." The royal arms in our time were on the modern western screen, and were dated 1733. The old projecting gallery, with the quaint panelling of a departed organ, and the clock, might not be very satisfactory in appearance; but there was then no great organ, mounting from between them, and the five shields, sculptured in stone and coloured, (in the intervening space immediately above the arch, and not dispersed across the whole screen, if the language is rightly understood), must have produced a picturesque effect. For, as we have seen, they were carved during the best days of design and execution of heraldic works; and, if the sexton made much out of his bargain, they must, moreover, have been of considerable boldness, and probably accompanied by ornamental canopies and panelling. Seeing that Cade was aged 22, and Allan 20, when the destruction, the real motive for which is not readily intelligible, took place, it was tantalising that the five shields had, by some forgetfulness, been left unfilled in the ms. There was no idea that the matter could be carried further.

But, in a recent collation of some of Surtees's shields from Dugdale's drawings of arms at Durham cathedral and Staindrop church, it was, much to the astonishment of the examiner, found that the excellent herald had recorded the armory in Darlington church also.

He was at "Darnton" on Sept. 6, 1666, and, besides noticing cardinal Langley's arms sculptured "*super primum stallum ad introitū chori*" (which stall was, with two others, destroyed in our own days, by a curate), and the arms in the windows, already alluded to, he records as "in the church, formerly collegiate, of Darlington, *alias* Darnton," what is more to our purpose, the lost heraldry of the five shields, "*sculpta super murum supra introitū chori*," as I have already described them. Cade's notion, that they were those of benefactors to the fabric, might be a mere guess; but, for reasons previously submitted, we may put it to his credit that he was correct in his surmise.

After a long reign of fiddles and pitchpipes, a good 500*l.* organ was placed on the screen in 1821. The then east gable was so objectionable that no complaint of it being hidden could well be made. Billings considered the screen to be, as far as he knew, unique. However, in 1862, when Mr. Scott was busy with the restoration of the nave and transepts, there was a strange cry for the destruction of the screen. Intelligent persons, sane on every other point, went mad on this one. A plea was put in for the preservation of the collegiate

arrangements, which the Auckland people had, in their case, foolishly destroyed, and Mr. Scott did not allow his fair fame to be imperilled by the dull whims of churchwardens or commissioners. He, of course, at once answered that, although his assistant had mentioned that the idea had been entertained, he had not supposed that it had seriously been so entertained, and that it certainly must not be thought of. In 1865, however, when the chancel was restored, and when the details, which had been entombed in 1748, enabled a faithful reproduction of the beautiful east gable, there was again an outcry and a demand that the building should be deprived of its historical and picturesque interest. In some way it again escaped the fate of Durham cathedral, and retained the royal and baronial benefaction. One might have supposed that those who wished to remove the screen would now have taken measures to show the pretty termination of the church to as much advantage as possible. On the contrary, an organ with appurtenances, larger and more hideous than before, was placed upon the screen, to the serious detriment of the appearance of the improved chancel, both within and without. And now the question of sacramental proprieties cropped up in an amusing way.

Archdeacon Thorp, among divers other gifts of ornaments, good, bad, and indifferent, to churches, gave a fair oaken table for communion purposes to Darlington church, identifying it with himself as usual. After the restoration of the church this "decent table standing on a frame, for a communion-table" (though not as capable of removal as might be desired), was discarded, and it now forms a vestry table, denuded of its "carpet, silk, or other decent covering," while at the east end of the chancel we see an undignified object, like a box or packing case, of doubtful material, probably of some wood cheaper and less appropriate than oak, if we may judge from the care with which, in communion time and out of it, it is closely covered on the top and ends; and at least one side, with some kind of velvet. There is a cross on the velvet on its side. It also is not conveniently formed for removal at the sacramental administration, and it apparently was in the church at the re-opening, because there were complaints that the whole congregation could not see "a communion table, with its rich covering; on the front of which" was a cross; that the service was a sort of pantomime, being nearly all performed in the chancel beyond the bridge; and that the clergyman's utterances were inarticulate as regarded the congregation in the nave. The newspaper recorder of the day, possibly a dissenter, ignorant of rubric and canon, said with delightful simplicity:—"It is contrary we suppose to ecclesiastical *etiquette*, or we should suggest that the reading and praying clergymen



should take their stand outside the chancel somewhere by the pulpit, then the congregation will have a chance of hearing what is being said."

On this restoration, the panels containing the names of donors of charities which had in modern times supplanted cardinal Langley's paneling above the stalls in the chancel, were placed against the vestry wall. It was not attempted to reproduce the cardinal's work, the effect of which may be realized at Staindrop. Since then some ugly warming apparatus has been erected in front of the stalls. The east windows are devoid, not of colour, but of stained glass, and altogether the chancel, in spite of its fabrical excellence, presents an unsatisfactory aspect. In its present state, or, perhaps, in any state, it must, one would think, be very inconvenient for the lawful administration of the holy communion in so important a parish as that of Darlington.

W. H. D. L.

---

#### NOTES OF AN EXCAVATION OF A TURRET ON THE ROMAN WALL.

BETWEEN the stations of Cilurnum and Procolitia, the 6th and 7th *per lineam Valli*, and between the Mile Castles at Towertye and at the Limestone Corner, have been recently exposed to view the remains of one of the turrets on the Roman Wall, hitherto concealed by an accumulated mass of debris and a dense thicket of mediæval copsewood.

It is difficult to account for the total disappearance of the numerous turrets which must have originally existed, if indeed they possessed the solidity of these remains, but it is possible that many of them were placed on the Wall itself, and disappeared with its upper courses. Before describing the remains of this turret it may be useful to advert to the historical notices of this particular feature of the Roman line of fortification.

Camden, who visited the Roman Wall in company with Sir Robert Cotton in the year 1599, is the first historian who supplies us with any of its structural details. In his *Britannia*, under the head of "Vallum sive Murus Picticus," he thus expresses himself: "The Wall had a number of castles, separated a mile from each other, which they call Castle Steeds, and inside the Wall little fortified towns, which at this day they call Chesters (the foundations of which, of square form, are seen in some places), and placed between these were Turrets, in which the soldier posted could watch the barbarians."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Castella murus habuit crebriora millenis passibus disparata quæ "Castle Steeds" vocant et interius oppidula munita quæ "Chesters" hodie vocant, quorum radices quadratâ formâ alicubi visuntur et his Turres interpositas in quibus dispositus miles Barbaris immineret.*—Pa, 652. Folio edition of 1607.