

Manor,* we have in later times the Rev. Dr. John Beridge, the Rev. J. Jennings, who kept a School in Kibworth Harcourt, and had the eminent Dr. Doddridge for a pupil, who at his death in 1723 succeeded to his school. Dr. John Aikin, the physician and literary writer, was born here in 1747; Mrs. Barbauld and Lucy Aikin, both well-known writers, were his sisters.

S. Wilfrid's Church has looked down from its "Church Hill" on many interesting changes and events for more than five hundred years, which we should like to have seen with our eyes, or respecting which we should like to have heard some trustworthy account, *e. g.*, How was the first Kibworth Feast kept? But our work lies with the present, and so to do it, that we may each of us leave some mark for good behind us for the future.

MR. VINCENT WING next contributed the following Paper (read in his absence by Mr. North), on

THE PRESENT REQUIREMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE IN ORDER TO A SUCCESSFUL COMPETITION WITH ANTIQUITY.

AT the beginning of the present century, and for some time previous, our cathedrals and the great works of antiquity were placed amongst the "*Seven Wonders*," without a thought of any future rivalry; now, however, such immense strides of art and engineering are made, that the time has arrived when it ill becomes us to strike our colours ignobly to a less tutored age. The institution of this and like societies having for its object the promotion of architecture, we have to expand the narrow views that are taken; nor are we to yield to the feeble imputations of absurdity when we propose to emulate the successes of former times. Progress is the rule of life, and it behoves us, gigantic as the task may be, to strive to come up to, and excel, those who as yet leave us so far behind.

To improve the system in the practical working, and to increase the encouragement, are the two points to be attended to. With this view it is important, in our efforts for the advancement of architecture, to inquire into the secret of its success when it most flourished; we therefore propose to consider the advantages of former periods, with the suggestions for the recovering of them. We shall confine ourselves to the Gothic style; and intend to corroborate our remarks with criticisms upon some examples both ancient and modern. This latter part of our Paper must form a sequel at a bi-monthly meeting, as time and circumstances forbid

* In the absence of any known derivation, I can only conjecture that the "Warwick Road," from Kibworth Harcourt to Saddington, takes its name from the Warwick family.

its being so extended on the present occasion. The ancient remains which we possess are chiefly ecclesiastical, and they show that an almost incredible amount of interest in the art was sustained for some five centuries; after which the interest subsided, and the indigenous style was abandoned for such as was more or less borrowed and wretchedly insipid in comparison. Now we ask—What was it that kept up this great architectural movement, and secured so great success? And what past advantages, or equivalents, can we regain?

We will name for consideration five things, which we imagine mainly contributed:—1. The demand for cathedral and abbey and other churches of great splendour. 2. The fascination of Gothic design. 3. Seclusion allowing concentration of the architect's whole mind upon his work. 4. No more being carried out under one individual than could receive unlimited attention. 5. Collective help: valuable suggestions in design being accepted by the chief architect from ecclesiastics or others, including the trained body of Freemasons, and not rejected as officious; the religious and artistic object over-riding every other interest. We venture to say it is not that our professional men are inferior in taste and skill to their forefathers—it is owing to a change in the system and patronage of art—that such prodigious fruits do not now appear; and it devolves upon us to make every effort to recover as much as is practicable of the facilities and helps which we have lost.

1. As to ecclesiastical demand—which we mention in the first place; no doubt the feudal system, united with some conscientious feeling of duty on the part of the lords of the soil, was favourable to pecuniary supplies, whilst peculiarities in religious ceremonies and religious life rendered imposing edifices a matter of all absorbing consideration; and we do not expect, nor do we wish for, a return of such times—as one of our poets has it in an exquisite effusion on the *Ruins of Kendal Castle*—

“Times of rude faith, and ruder men—
God grant they never may come again!”

But we hope to succeed without those auspices. A sense of what the house of God ought to be in priority over the dwellings of men is all that is required, and that is reviving amongst us; instances are not entirely wanting, where the mansions, or superb “ceiled houses,” as the lament of the prophet expresses it, are surpassed, as they should be, by the costly character of the temple. To this quarter—the Church—it is not only right still to look, but we are compelled to do so; for it is not sufficient, in the higher interests of architecture, that secular public buildings and domestic structures be required; the church is infinitely the best sphere, and until the erection of magnificent and gorgeous ecclesiastical edifices comes again into vogue, encouragement to architecture cannot

recover its full proportions. We know it will be said—having as a nation done with monastic establishments and gorgeous ceremonial, the scope for such grandeur is gone. Still, we demur to the inference; and we aver that it is not idle to contend for, at least, the erection of cathedrals of great magnificence. This we must insist upon, much as the contrary impression may prevail; and we can do so on principle as well as in the interest of art. We recommend to be read Mr. Beresford Hope's *Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century*. The notion is erroneous that our Protestant ritual is so precise and simple that it forbids altogether imposing processions; the inspired sentiment of the Hebrew Psalmist teaches better. Much less can it be said, that our principles are so ultra-puritan, that the "sublime and beautiful" of the cathedral are incompatible with Anglican worship. What man, having taste united with his piety, every found it to be so? Who would not deplore the loss of those noble buildings which we possess? Who would condemn the efforts expended on the modern Cathedral of St. Paul? Who would not like to see the insufficient ones of Manchester and Oxford exchanged for better?—or, with the demanded extension of the episcopate, a corresponding provision for the highest solemnities of our religion in the new dioceses? The procession and the large gathering at an ordination, at a visitation, or confirmation, or on any other great occasion, so much aided in effect by cathedral grandeur, with its concomitant sublime tones of music, are not empty pomp pandering to a pseudo-religious feeling, but legitimately impress the mind and heart that the spiritual benefit may be the more lasting. Nor, independently of this, is vacant space in the cathedral a waste, as we hear it objected. The nave as a spacious avenue is most effective for solemnity: the house of God naturally symbolizes heaven, the dwelling-place of the Infinite, and is not necessarily a mere pale for a congregation. The influence of immensity is felt to be not a little potent, and that even in the ordinary services. Witness the confessions of those great men, Milton and Robert Hall, to which even their unecclesiastical spirits were constrained to give utterance. The former, referring to cathedral architecture with the "pealing organ," has the glowing lines,—

"Dissolve me into ecstasies,
And bring all heav'n before mine eyes."

And the latter remarked that "he could not enter York Minster without the sublimest and most devout imaginations pouring into his mind." Equally fallacious is the objection, that higher claims would have their support diverted. Our ideas may seem large to those who are not prepared for the demand we make, and they may be greatly distant from realization; but it is little more than a dream of despondency, arising out of the niggard spirit in honouring

our Great Creator, that at present represses nobler aspirations. England's elder University rests content with a provisional cathedral!—an interesting antiquity, but a priory fragment, and little better than a village church! Could we but stir up the people to it, and combine in a new one at Oxford the continental grandeur with the English superiorities—the high vault of Amiens, with the higher lantern, the spacious transept, and “the long drawn aisle” of York—it would produce a consciousness of national advance and universal congratulation. Nor is there occasion for despair: individuals are found now whose offerings to church architecture amount to the hundred thousand; and, with the rapid increase of the country's wealth, it is but reasonable to bespeak this standing acknowledgment and honour to the Giver of our substance. Such becoming employment of the highest class of talent would go far to guarantee to architecture the culmination to be aimed at; for edifices of transcendent magnificence are necessarily very many years in hand, and their erection would furnish what the art most needs, namely, an enduring field for its highest cultivation. On the contrary, if cathedral building is to be passed off as visionary, it is equivalent to quitting in despair: the very sphere required being abandoned, antiquity will only mock the modern architect's attempts at rivalry. In the promotion of architecture, then, our views must be expanded in reference to the Church; the Church must not be left, as it is, in dwarfed proportions, but partake of the general progress. We ought no longer to allow the huge tavern to be looking down on the steeples of our churches! And we hesitate not to say,—if our attainments in the art are to equal those of the ancients, if we are to resuscitate its bygone splendour, and to bequeath to far-off generations equal monuments of our times, magnificent cathedrals and churches must, as formerly, furnish the leading encouragement. To this then it behoves us to stir up the people. We have the superiority in wealth, in intelligence, in mechanical power, and in advantages generally, together with purer inducements,—why are we not in this chief sphere, as in others, aroused to surpass our less favoured predecessors?

2. The next thing we have to allude to is, the fascination experienced by those who designed the structures of the Middle Ages. The extreme pleasure afforded to them is seen unquestionably in the effects. And on this it is unnecessary to dwell, for we doubt not that it will be felt again in a similar degree, if the unlimited opportunities of indulging it return. The sphere itself has no bounds; if the seven notes in music are found inexhaustible, the combinations in Gothic art must be as much so. Be it that a peculiar charm would accompany when all was new; yet, notwithstanding, if the means and demand be presented, the gifted practitioner, finding no limit to his encouragement, will have the same fascination in design as formerly, and revel in a luxury that will never satiate.

Those only who have a true taste for it know its untiring interest. As far as the pleasure in the work is essential in order to recover the success of former times, all is assuring, provided that equal munificence can be called forth.

3. We have, in the third place, to consider, that formerly the whole mind of the man of genius was, in a manner, concentrated unremittingly on his creations. We may imagine how some Peter Lightfoot, or cloistered monk, would pursue uninterruptedly his avocation, as if he lived only to beautify his abbey church; or the æsthetic brilliancy that would be brought to bear from some archbishop devoted to the work, as William de Melton, it may be, during the rise and progress of the nave of York Minster. In this respect past advantages are not to be recovered, for we cannot ask for such seclusion again; but we submit the question,—Can we in our great works, upon the adoption of a more perfect practice and study, obtain its equivalent? If less were undertaken in order that increased attention might be given, possibly equal excellence in design might be attained to; but the difficulty is in the compensation, which must be so regulated as to admit of the required application.

4. This brings us, in the fourth place, to inquire more particularly into the system of practice in the olden time, which gave a circumscribed and a more fixed sphere of labour to the responsible architect. Upon this somewhat obscure subject we cannot enter without first briefly referring to an institution which has its bearing on more than one point before us, we mean Freemasonry; not in the form it has existed in since its revival in the seventeenth century, but in its mediæval system. Much secrecy and mystery attended it, which, connected as it was then with architecture, partly accounts for the obscurity in which history leaves us as to architects and their operations. We know, however, that from a very early date there was an organized fraternity of masons, who, from travelling and observation, as well as practice, gained intelligence, and by well devised plans, communicated the benefit to their whole body as far as practicable; the members constituting an order, partly religious, in some sort, and partly professional, with one object and interest in common. The importance which architecture then possessed as an art can scarcely be overrated; for which reason the organization was fostered by the clergy, the rearing of religious structures was allowed to be monopolized by the freemasons, and it is a fact that ecclesiastics were frequently *associated*; which circumstances render more intelligible the zeal of the masons, both in accumulating, and in confining to themselves the knowledge of their art. It is also evident, from the curious correspondence in the details of work, that the organization was very complete; and, as it is to be inferred from the remains of structures of the later period of the Roman empire, from an universal similarity of

arrangement, that there was a central control, the same principle may have been transferred from Roman usage. The silence of history leaves us very much to conjecture concerning the main agents in the erection of our ancient edifices. The rearing of them, as a trade, would be in the hands of the freemasons (that name implying workers in freestone, or *freestone masons*), and much would depend on the wardens, who were the foremen of parties of ten of them, and upon the masters; but in a great undertaking some presiding man of genius, whose skill alone qualified him, must have had the chief control. Priests possessing a taste for it were not only associated in freemasonry, but really initiated, and from that class sometimes would arise the preeminent architect. Whether or not practice without association was allowed as legitimate may remain a question, but architectural ability seems, in a great measure, to have worked its way to this position by association with, or development amongst, the freemasons. With the mysteries and emblems that are said to have come down through this channel, from the Greeks and Egyptians even, our enquiry has no concern; but it is material to note that the secrets of the masonic art, whilst confined to themselves, were disseminated unreservedly amongst that body. Selfish ambition and jealousy would thereby be obviated; every man of taste could enter the association, and thereupon his suggestions became the common stock of the fraternity, available to the architect, who would be associated with them in his labours. Hence we may infer that architecture derived no small advantage from freemasonry. In proceeding to consider the limited sphere of the chief architect, we have to note how originality in design was prized as a principal item of merit. For, in contemplating the extraordinary productions of the Middle Ages in the better period, one is struck with the variety and the prolific invention. How diverse is York cathedral from Lincoln for example; how unlike are both to Ely; and so on to Salisbury, Wells, and almost all others. Now this indicates as many chief architects as varieties, and the sphere of labour accordingly limited. It would be a historical problem, to find the same architect to have been the designer of many cathedrals; rather was he engaged only for what he could entirely devote himself to. And, unless similar advantages can be secured, it is vain to look for equal originality and beauty in modern productions. Is it possible then, we are tempted to ask, in any way to bring about a change in the present system? To apportion in some degree, for instance, to leading architects what is more strictly design only; relieving them of much of the constructional responsibilities, and giving such compensation as would command their time more exclusively for the important part devolving upon them? This is a question, which, we are aware, the profession only are competent to grapple with; but as those great attainments

to which we aspire seem in some measure dependent upon it, we shall not be out of place in pressing it on public attention. We conceive such a change is not altogether impracticable. Progress has, in the present century, completed a separation of the labours of the architect from those of the builder; a diversion has been made too in favour of the civil engineer; and we may suppose that a further subdivision of labour in the highest sphere is within the range of possibility. Or we may ask the question,—can the labours of leading men in any other way be lessened? At present any one, whose brilliant attainments have raised him to eminence, has his reward in a killing amount of work, whereby one great genius, at least, has already fallen a victim; only the same percentage is paid as to the inexperienced. How much better would justice be done on both sides, if, instead of advantage being obtained by the ablest men in the extent of their employment, it were given in increased percentage; this might secure the necessary limitation of labour, and therewith more satisfactory results. It must be evident, that they, whose works are to endure in a manner for all time—being ecclesiastical and national, or of the first class—can only receive and do justice when the opportunity of sufficient application is secured to them; unlimited application carried the day formerly, and without it equal success is not attainable. In a small way France seems to be taking the lead in this matter: there, “some architects, having private property of their own, only make use of their professional acquirements, in the carrying out of the design of one or more tombs, either for their friends or for some great personage: a tomb being regarded by French architects as the highest possible ideal of the art.” It is, we apprehend, mainly a question of large and adequate compensation. If so, to obtain it we must look to a greater appreciation of design; this will advance in proportion as a general taste is cultivated; and whilst the effect of such cultivation will be also a corresponding improvement in the art, success in design will attract attention and reciprocally encourage the cultivation of taste. Then, if the movement be fairly commenced such is the disposition of the various influences to run in the same current, that we need not despair of a revolution that will eventually advance architecture again to its supremacy in the school of arts; and the result will leave vestiges, which will command for us an honourable position in the estimate of succeeding generations. The munificent offer for designs for the Liverpool Exchange may be regarded as a good experiment, and encourages what we have ventured to advocate.

5. Lastly, it has been intimated that in mediæval practice help was acceptable to the architect from any quarter. There must have been encouragement to, and ingenuousness in receiving suggestions. At all events, the chief architect would accept them from

his ecclesiastical employer, whether an associated mason or not, in many cases; and in others, where the ecclesiastic might be chief, he would be on terms of candid partnership with his masons. In present circumstances, the amateur part of our question is difficult to be brought to bear, and delicate to broach; but it is necessarily connected with the subject, for the part borne by the amateur in the old system is a leading feature. That formerly Wykeham and others, not professed architects, had their fingers in work which is now held in such rapturous admiration, can scarcely be denied. Alan de Walsingham, the sacrist at Ely, became architect of the cathedral, and after the fall of its centre gave its culminating grandeur. A bishop of Noyon was originally an artisan, and rose to that eminence from his skill as a goldsmith. Other examples might be referred to; but these are sufficient to show how, in those days, the interests of the church, excluding considerations of personal fame, gave to skill and taste an open door. Assistance then was accepted wherever merit recommended it, and taste was invited in whatever brain it existed; appetite for beauty, together with religious zeal, having sway over every other feeling. The bishop, with the clergy around him and a troop of freemasons, would form a college of artists; eager, not only to devise, but to obtain from every source, whatever would tend to the adornment and splendour of their cathedral. It is true that circumstances are now very different; we live not in a recluse, but a mercantile age, and the trade element is perhaps unavoidably too preponderating to give free course to the practice of art. We shall venture to say, however, that the crudeness which attends the amateur need not make his suggestions contraband now any more than formerly; and—in recovering past advantages—does it not enter into the question, what auxiliary service he can be useful for? Can this suggestive element, if we may call it so, any way re-enter, and the amateur again take his part?—or, in other words, can we have a benefit by adopting some plan for taking advantage of the drawings of non-professional persons, when anything new and valuable occurs to them? If institutions for exhibiting and rewarding designs were candidly open to amateurs in competition with others—whilst every advantage would still remain with the educated architect, exceptionally an amateur might be brought forward, and, not

“born to blush unseen,”

quit his false position and join the profession. Taste has its occasional inspirations in the rough, and sometimes of the richest quality, possibly, without the pale of professional cultivation. Provided amateurs could—not by botching on their own account, but in some legitimate way—be made useful, it would moreover tend as much as anything to that general diffusion of taste, which is the only atmosphere in which the profession can vitally prosper. As a polite

accomplishment, architecture to some extent (we refer to artistic design only) admits of private pursuit like other fine arts; and it is important to remark, that the public, since they have the patronage, should be adequately educated that they may better exercise it. The mediæval system, like the ocean, received the stream from every channel; and if architecture for its own sake is to be promoted,—if a general taste is to be fully cultivated, and the attainments in this age rival the past,—whilst the responsibilities rest with the profession, the practical study of the art, it would seem, should be open to all who are capable of it, and, in a subordinate form, non-professional help again become tributary.

Upon reviewing, however, the circumstances that favoured architecture in times gone by, it must be owned that the difficulties of competing with antiquity are great. The advantages grasped by the art were more than peculiar,—human faculty was then in a manner sold to it; in the *Dark Ages* we see genius arbitrarily extinguished save in this one phase; and the whole light of the intellectual firmament at that time may be regarded as absorbed from others to be concentrated on this subject. We can point to a hundred years, in which about a hundred abbey and cathedral churches of first class character were erected in this country, when it possessed but a tithe of the present population and means. Now, the modest demand for only one such cathedral to recommence with may be too much to be realized; and, if so, puny in comparison is the revival of Gothic architecture. Without going to mediæval extremes, to impart but the necessary feeling is no small matter; for, not the despotic potentate and feudal lords, nor a paramount hierarchy, but a whole people have to be moved to do themselves credit. Yet, notwithstanding, the present age having the ability demanded, with far greater wealth, greater facilities for travelling, and various better helps for acquiring intelligence and proficiency, we ought not to succumb to the past. And if taste received only the utmost rational fostering and encouragement, it is not presumptuous to say that, instead of being behind, we might hope to distance our forefathers in the race of architectural development.

At the close of this paper :

SIR HENRY DRYDEN, BART. was invited by the President to address the meeting, which he proceeded to do, descanting upon topics recently brought by him before the notice of the Society in connection with the South Kensington Museum: "the framework of roofs, the construction of pews, &c., &c.," his remarks being illustrated by a series of diagrams drawn by himself. He, however, principally directed his remarks against so-called Church "Restoration" which he said so frequently meant Church "Destruction," and he earnestly protested against the practice too com-

mon among professional architects, of removing all vestiges of ancient work in churches and substituting their own work in its place. He contended that the churches were national monuments, and that people had no more right to destroy them than the officers of the British Museum had to burn the ancient documents belonging to the nation. They and the churches were for the public well-being, and should be preserved in their integrity. The churches especially; for they, more than the manuscripts, could at all times be read by any one going along the road. Castles, houses, and churches, formed a history in themselves if left as they originally stood. The foreigner was attracted by the churches. He contended that no one had any right to destroy the churches any more than a gentleman had a right to melt down his family plate. He maintained that they had no moral right to mutilate, mess, or to "restore" their old churches. What they called restoring when they came to deal with an old church he called unredeemable destruction. If they would give twenty millions of pounds they could not put in the east end of a church as it originally stood, after doing what they called restoring. That part was lost—lost for ever; a part of the history of the church was gone, and could not be recovered. They destroyed so much of the ancient history of the place when they removed one and added another piece of architecture.

The Rev. EDWARD TROLLOPE, F.S.A., of Leasingham, was then invited to give the meeting his views respecting the tumulus at Kibworth, which the Local Committee had taken measures to open on the occasion of the Society's visit. He described it as a "ring barrow," and probably as that of a Roman military officer or agricultural colonist. Mr. Trollope minutely explained the mode of disposing of the bodies of the dead by burning, in Roman times, and stated that portions of pottery were thrown upon the funeral pile. As far as the excavations at Kibworth had gone, it was quite clear it was a Roman tumulus from the discovery in the earth of pieces of pottery (which he exhibited) called "Samian" ware, and of other fragments, which he also exhibited to the audience. A bone bodkin had also been found, and traces of burnt material, and of a paved flooring. These details were listened to with the closest attention.*

* The following bit of folk-lore appeared in a local newspaper shortly after the visit of the Society to Kibworth:—

THE LEGEND OF THE TUMULUS AT KIBWORTH.

Our correspondent at Kibworth has supplied us with the following legend, which is current in the locality:—"The field in which the mound is situate, is called the 'Hall Field,' and before the present owner held it—was in the possession of the Rev. Thomas Thomas, D.D. The owner then let a farm, including this field, to a farmer named William Gilbert, who appears to have been somewhat of a favourite with his landlord, and also on the most familiar terms with him. This mound for many years was known as Gilbert's 'Munt,' which is the corruption, no doubt, of

On the motion of Mr. JAMES THOMPSON, seconded by Mr. S. SHARPE, votes of thanks were accorded to the Rector, to Sir H. Dryden, to Mr. Levien, and to Mr. V. Wing for their papers. Mr. Thompson confirmed the views of Mr. Trollope respecting the Roman origin of the tumulus; the site of which he said, near the old Roman-road formerly called by the Rev. Mr. Leman the "Via Devana," which crossed the county from south-east to north-west, with the size, indicated the mound to be that raised over some Roman of military rank.

Thanks were also given to the contributors to the Museum and to the President, and the company then separated.

THE EXCURSION.

AFTER a public breakfast on the following morning, Wednesday, the 5th August—a large party left the Inn at Kibworth for the Annual Excursion, arranged according to a programme supplied, as usual, to all the members of the Society.

It was a cause of much disappointment and regret to all present, that the serious illness of the Rev. Canon James, who had under-

'mount.' It was also affirmed that a King Kibbeus was buried here, and that this king was either brought from Wales, or came from that country; but of his whereabouts, at the time of his reign, no one ever appeared to know anything. We give this as an old tale which used to be very prevalent, and always used to be repeated with great evidence of belief. It is said that the former owner, Dr. Thomas, was a native of Wales. The present owner (John Phillipps, Esq.) is also a native of the principality. We said Dr. Thomas was on the most friendly and familiar terms with his tenant, Gilbert. At that time, the legend of King Kibbeus being buried beneath the mount was very strongly believed, and Dr. Thomas caused one of the sons of the farmer to be named Kibbeus; the Doctor promising the child that this field should become his property, and that when he arrived at the age of twenty-one, this mound should be opened, to see what it contained. We may say, unfortunately for the boy, his proposed benefactor did not live to carry out his intention. The will was made, and the close was devised to Kibbeus; but through some neglect or other, the will was not signed; so Kibbeus did not obtain the field, nor was the mound then opened, as promised. This said Kibbeus Gilbert (who is about fifty years of age) is still living, and carrying on a respectable business at Atherstone, Warwickshire. The notion of some one being buried under the mount still clung to the inhabitants, and about twenty-seven years ago, a number of gentlemen obtained permission of the owner to be allowed to open it. An entrance was made from the western side to the centre, and some articles were found, which were sent to the late Proctor's Office, at Leicester. Since that date, but little has been said of King Kibbeus; but the visit of the Archæological Society to Kibworth, and the reopening of the mount caused much speculation. The mound has again been excavated, and it was cut through from north to south. The depth of the cutting was in the centre eight to nine feet. About five deep was found a layer of black soil, and what sometimes appeared ashes and pieces of burnt wood. In this layer were found bones, teeth, and one or two pieces of Roman pottery. On a level with the same layer a pavement of large stones about four feet by two, was discovered. A bone bodkin was also found, and an iron candlestick. At the depth of from eight to nine feet there was a regular layer of black soil; looking as if that was the old natural ground, and the above the made-up ground."