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TRANSACTIONS OF THE

Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæological Society,

AT THE SUMMER MEETING HELD AT DURSLEY,

August, 1886.

The Annual Summer Meeting of the Society was held at Dursley on the 3rd, 4th and 5th of August. The arrangements had been carefully made by a Local Committee of which General Vizard was Chairman, assisted by the following gentlemen:—the Revs. C. C. M. Brown, A. Blomfield, E. M. Farquhar, W. Lett, Canon Madan, A. W. Mayow, T. Philpotts, and A. Trevman; Colonel Bayly, Colonel Forbes, R.A., (Hon. Local Secretary) Colonel Millman, R.A.; Messrs. A. G. Clarke, W. Leigh, F. Madan, A. H. Paul, V. R. Perkins, C. Tylee, and W. F. Rogers.

A room at the The Old Bell Hotel was appropriated as a General Reception Room for the use of the members, for writing letters, &c.

At 12.30 the members and their friends assembled at the Town Hall, where they were received by General Vizard and other members of the Local Committee. General Vizard, on behalf of himself and colleagues, cordially welcomed the Society to the town, and expressed a hope that much would be found in the town and neighbourhood worthy the attention of the members. Sir Brook Kay (President of the Society), returned thanks for the hearty welcome given to the Society and for the excellent preparations which had been made, and said he had no doubt the members would be much gratified in visiting the town and the various places set out in the programme. Beside the President there were present Sir William Guise, Bart., Sir Henry Barkly, K.C.B., &c. (the President Elect) Sir John Maclean, F.S.A.; Revs. W. Bazeley, (Hon. Sec.) W. S. Davies, J. M. Hall, S. E. Bartleet, W. H. P. Harvey, W. Bagnall-Oakeley; General Vizard, Col. Forbes, Col. Bayley, Col. Millman, Surg.-Gen. Hefferman; Messrs. W. Leigh, C. C. M. Brown, W. P. W. Phillimore, A. Le Blanc, E. D'Argent, F. Madan, H. D. Skrine, W. Jennings, E. Hartland (Gen. Treasurer) W. Mabbett and others, and many ladies.

Sir Brook Kay, Bart., President, took the Chair, and called upon the General Secretary to read the Report of the Council for the past year, which he did as follows:—

REPORT OF COUNCIL.

In presenting its Report for the year 1885-6 to the members of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæological Society the Council would remind them that ten years had passed away since this Society was formed for the
study of local archaeology. During this decade many changes have of course taken place in the roll of the Society's members. Many who took an active part in the foundation of the Society have been taken from our midst. It is a source of consolation to us that a record of their labours and researches has been preserved in the Society's Transactions.

During the last year we have lost ten members by death, amongst whom we may mention:—

The Revd. Henry Thomas Ellacombe, M.A., F.S.A., who died on the 30th July, 1883, at the ripe age of 90 years. His chief study was Campanology, and in 1881 he published The Church Bells of Gloucestershire. In the same year, and in 1883, he published The History of the Parish of Bitton, from materials which he had been collecting for seventy years. These two valuable contributions to the history of Gloucestershire this Society has acquired by subscription.

James Herbert Cooke, F.S.A., who died Oct. 20th, 1885, contributed six papers to the Society's Transactions, relating for the most part to the Lords of Berkeley, their retainers and possessions. It was mainly through Mr. Cooke's influence with Lord Fitzhardinge that the Council obtained permission to print Synth's Lives of the Berkeleys and The Hundred of Berkeley for subscribing members of this Society. Whilst these invaluable works were passing through the press, Mr. Cooke gave every assistance in his power to the Editor, Sir John Maclean. At the time of his death Mr. Cooke was occupied in transcribing for the Society another MS. of Smyth's, and the Council has decided to print this in the next volume of the Society's Transactions.

Kedgwin Hoskyns Fryer, who died October 14th, 1885, was a member of this Council, and contributed two papers—on the Archives of the City of Gloucester, and Lanthony Priory.

Thomas A. Stoughton, who died in Aug., 1885, it will be remembered received the members of the Society at his very interesting manor house of Owlpeth at their annual meeting in 1880.

The Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P., who died April 5th, 1886, was a member of the Society for three years and a subscriber for the Berkeley MSS.

The office of Chief Secretary for Ireland, which Mr. Forster filled so courageously at a time of great danger, is again filled by a member of this Society, the Right Hon. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, M.P.

The number of members on the Society's list is 416 annual members and 79 life members, making a total of 495 as against 510 in the corresponding period of last year. The general depression in agriculture and trade has no doubt affected the list of the Society's members as it has the list of almost every other society, whether literary or charitable; but it is nevertheless a subject for congratulation that the income of the Society for 1885-6 is little less than it was at the most prosperous period of the Society's existence.

The number of subscribing members elected in 1885-6 is sixteen. On the 21st April, 1886, the balance at the Society's bankers was £157 4s. 6d. On the 21st April, 1885, it was £165 11s. 1d. When the surplus copies of the Berkeley MS. in the Society's possession have been sold to the members
this balance will be very largely increased. Besides this balance at the bankers this Society has a funded capital of £132 3s. 5d., representing the composition fees of the life members.

There were three Meetings of the Society held in 1885-6:—

The annual Summer Meeting, held at Tewkesbury in July, 1885, included visits to the Abbey Church and many old houses in the town of Tewkesbury, to Ripple, Upton-on-Severn, Hanley Castle, Severn End, Birt's Morton, Pendock, Strensham, Pershore, and Bredeon. A detailed account of this meeting, as also of the others, will appear in the Society's Transactions.

An Autumn Meeting was held at Newent, and included an excursion to Barber's Bridge, Uppeaton, Newent, Dymock and Kempley.

On the 7th of June, 1886, the meeting having been unavoidably postponed on account of the floods in May, the Society visited Deerhurst with a special view to inspecting the recently discovered Saxon Chapel. It may be well to state what steps have been taken to insure the protection and preservation of this most interesting relic of early ecclesiastical architecture. The chapel, until very lately, formed part of a dwelling-house, known as Abbot's Court, belonging to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, a timbered house of Tudor date being attached to it on the east and a more modern range of buildings on the west. The removal of a tree led to the discovery of a tablet, inserted in one of the central walls, recording the dedication of an altar. A further search on the part of the Vicar, the Rev. G. Butterworth, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' local architect, Mr. Collins, led to the discovery of a Saxon chancel arch and Saxon windows and doorway. A great deal of interest has been awakened by communications made to various journals and learned societies by Mr. Butterworth, Professor Middleton and others, and a committee, consisting of the following gentlemen has been appointed to superintend the work thought necessary for the preservation of the chapel: Sir William Guise, Bart., President, Sir John Maclean, F.S.A., J. Reginald Yorke, Esq., Rev. E. R. Dowdeswell, Algernon Strickland, Esq., W. M. Baker, Esq., J. T. Agg-Gardner, M.P., Professor J. H. Middleton, Rev. E. J. Bower, S. H. Gael, Esq., Rev. F. E. Broome Witts, Rev. G. Butterworth, and the Rev. W. Bazeley, General Secretary of this Society. A specification has been presented by Mr. T. Collins, of Tewkesbury, for the necessary repairs to the chapel, which meets with the approval of the committee, and Mr. Collins is prepared to complete the work for £120. The Council has issued a notice relating to this Saxon Chapel with the invitation circular for the general meeting, and hopes that the members of this Society will contribute to the fund which has been started with subscriptions of £3 each from Sir W. Guise, Bart., and Mr. Butterworth, and £1 1s. each from Mr. Parry and Sir John Maclean. Contributions will be received and acknowledged by Mr. Butterworth, or by any other member of the Deerhurst Saxon Chapel committee.

The visit of the Society to Ashwellworth in May, 1885, has led to the proposed restoration of the very interesting village cross, fragments of which were scattered here and there. The cross, when restored, will be about 13ft. 6in. high. It will be placed in the village churchyard for greater security.
Drawings may be seen at the office of Mr. J. P. Moore, architect, of Gloucester. It is certain that many Gloucestershire village and churchyard crosses, besides those which Mr. Pooley has somewhat imperfectly described in The Old Crosses of Gloucestershire are still extant; and it is to be desired that the example set by the inhabitants of Ashwellworth may be followed elsewhere. The Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882, has given facilities which it would be well for this Society to avail itself of. The schedule of the monuments brought under the Act might be considerably enlarged in Gloucestershire, and it is to be hoped that owners of property on which there are such monuments will hasten to place them under the guardianship of the Commissioner of Works.

The last portion of The Abstracts of the Wills in the Council House, Bristol, will be soon in the hands of the members, and the work will be ready for binding. The Council is of opinion that the Society should, as a mark of appreciation of the Rev. T. P. Wadley's skilful labours, appoint him an honorary member of the Society with all the privileges belonging to that position.

The Council has had under consideration the sale of the surplus copies of the Berkeley MSS.; but it has determined to retain these copies for such present and future members of the Society as may wish to subscribe for them at the increased price of £4 4s. for the three volumes. The Council congratulates the Society on the very marked expressions of approval in literary periodicals which have greeted the issue of the Berkeley MS., and hopes that the series may be continued at no very distant date.

The Society exchanges Transactions with the following societies:—The Society of Antiquaries of London, The British Archaeological Association, The Royal Archaeological Institute, The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, The Royal Institution of Cornwall, The Archaeological Societies of Derbyshire, Essex, Kent, Montgomeryshire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, & Yorkshire, and the Wm. Salt Archaeological Society of Staffordshire. Besides the Reports of these Societies the Council has acquired for the Society's library in 1855-6:—Clarke's Architectural History of Gloucester, presented by Mr. Jacques; the Annual Volumes of the Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute at Winchester, York, Norwich, Lincoln, Salisbury, Bristol, Oxford, and Chichester, presented by Sir John Maclean; The History and Registers of S. Mary Woodstock & S. Mary Woolchurch, presented by the compiler, the Rev. A. W. Cornelius Hallen; The Visitation of Gloucester, 1623, printed by the Harleian Society and edited by two members of this Society, various reports and papers of the Associated Architectural Societies, nine volumes of the Camden Society's works, two volumes of the Journal of the House of Commons in 1843, and a Catalogue of the Museum formed at Gloucester in 1860, by purchase. The Council has also subscribed for Gloucestershire Notes and Queries, and for the publications of the Pipe Roll Society. The Council has thought fit to order the binding of more than seventy volumes of the Archaeological Journal, the Journal of the British Archaeological Association, of the Royal Institution of Cornwall, the Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries, and other works.

The Council has received from the Society of Antiquaries a memorandum on the subject of Court Rolls and other Manorial Records, which, in consequence of changes in the tenure of lands, forcibly brought under the notice
of the Council of that Society by a Bill brought into Parliament for the Compulsory Enfranchisement of Copyholds, and the general tendency in the present day in favour of freehold tenure, under which, within a comparatively short period it seems probable that manors, with their attendant formalities will become things of the past, and the documents relating to them become practically valueless for legal purposes, and even more liable to heedless destruction than they have hitherto been.

Impressed with the vast amount of light these documents throw upon the habits and civilization, the legal and social position of the inhabitants, and the great and important historical interest they possess in questions of genealogy, and in tracing out the development and gradual growth of those institutions under which the country has so long flourished, the Council of the Society of Antiquaries is most anxious for their preservation, and requests the co-operation of this and other like societies in making an effort to secure the safety of any of the documents alluded to, which may hereafter become an useless incumbrance to Lords of Manors and their Stewards. And the Council of this Society respectfully suggests to those gentlemen that the Librarian will gladly receive into the library of the Society any such documents as may be placed under his charge for safe custody, with the right retained to the owners, if desired, of access to them and of resumption.

The Royal Historical Society has lately determined to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the completion of the Domesday Survey, and has invited the co-operation of this Society. The Council heartily approves of the scheme but awaits further details before taking any active part.

The Council, considering the very inconvenient arrangement that has existed for some years of dividing the Society's books, recommends the following scheme for the foundation of a County Archaeological Library in connection with this Society, and invites offers of archaeological and historical works and donations of money from the members and others.

I. All the Society's books, antiquities and surplus copies of Transactions and Berkeley MSS. to be deposited in the Museum, Gloucester, the books and Berkeley MSS. in the Society's two cases, the antiquities in the cases of the Museum committee, but labelled with the Society's name, and the surplus copies of Transactions, for which there is no room in the Society's cases, in boxes to be stored in such dry and convenient place as the Council and the Museum Committee may agree upon.

II. All the Society's books to be placed under the care of an officer of the Society—the General Secretary, if he lives in or near Gloucester and is willing to undertake the responsibility and work of librarian.

III. The duties of a librarian to be as follows:—

1. To take charge of the Society's books, keep them under lock and key, and see that they are insured against fire.

2. To make a catalogue of the Society's books, a copy of which shall be sent to every member of the Society showing the cost of postage of each book.

3. To attend in person at the Museum, or provide a suitable deputy, every Monday morning from 10.30 to 11.30 for the purpose of issuing books to members who may apply for them in person or by post.
4. To make entries in a book of the loan and return of each volume issued.

5. To receive and acknowledge on a printed form the Transactions of other societies which are sent in exchange for the Society's Transactions.

6. To arrange for the binding of volumes at the end of each year.

7. To make such purchases of back numbers of Transactions and other books as the Council may authorize.

IV. A letter and parcel box to be fixed at the Museum, into which the Custodian of the Museum shall place all letters and parcels that may arrive for the Society.

V. The annual sum of £25 to be voted from the Society's funds to be expended as follows:—

£10 a year to be paid to the Librarian.

£10 a year to be expended in binding the Society's books and purchasing such works on History and Archaeology as the Council may direct.

£5 a year to be paid to the Gloucester Museum Committee in consideration of the accommodation afforded, and also for the privilege extended to each member of the Society of entering the Museum without payment on such days and times as it is open to the public.

During the year 1885-6 it was found that owing to illness and other causes the Bristol District was inadequately represented at the meetings of the Council, whereupon the Council invited the Bristol Local Committee to nominate four gentlemen to act on the Council provisionally. The committee nominated Messrs. A. T. Martin, P. D. Prankerd, T. S. Pope, and A. E. Hudd, and these gentlemen were provisionally appointed. Mr. A. E. Hudd was not able to serve on the Council last year, but has kindly consented to do so this year if appointed. The other gentlemen assisted at the meetings of the council, and it is hoped that they will continue to do so, provisionally, until vacancies occur which they will be invited to fill.

The Council now nominates for re-election the President of Council, Sir William Vernon Guise, Bart.; the Vice-Presidents; the General Secretary, the Rev. William Bazeley; the Treasurer, Mr. Ernest Hartland; and the Secretaries, sectional and local. The following members of Council retire by rotation, but are eligible for re-election:—Messrs. G. B. Witts, Christopher Bowley, Thomas Kerslake, S. H. Swayne, I. B. Evans, and Major Fisher. There is a vacancy on the Council owing to the lamented death of Mr. K. H. Fryer, and Local Secretaries are needed for Winchcombe, Tetbury, Wotton-under-Edge, Stroud and Tewkesbury. The Council nominates the following gentlemen:—Mr. A. H. Paul as Local Secretary for Tetbury, Mr. Vincent Perkins as Local Secretary for Wotton-under-Edge, and Mr. Allard as Local Secretary for Tewkesbury. In doing so the Council would remind the Local Secretaries that they would further the Society's interests in their respective localities by interesting their neighbours in the Society's work and inducing them to become members, by informing the General Secretary of any archaeological discoveries, by assisting him in correcting the list of members, by obtaining papers from members and others on local archaeology, and suggesting places of interest to be visited at the annual and other meetings.
The Council has held six meetings during the past year—two at Bristol, three at Gloucester and one at Dursley, and desires to express its acknowledgement to the Mayor and Town Clerk of Gloucester for their great courtesy in permitting the Council to hold its meetings in the Tolsey.

On the motion of the Rev. W. S. Davies the report as read was adopted, and the gentlemen named therein were requested to accept the respective offices.

Mr. Le Blanc proposed, and Mr. D'Argent seconded, that the following gentlemen:—Major Fisher, Rev. G. B. Witts, Messrs. S. H. Swayne, C. Bowley, F. Day, A. E. Huddl, and W. H. Brunton, be appointed members of the Council, which was unanimously agreed to.

It was proposed by the Rev. S. E. Bartlett, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, that the best thanks of the Society be given to Sir Brook Kay, Bart., for the efficient, courteous and able manner in which he had executed the office of President during the past year.

Sir Brook Kay suitably replied, and introduced Sir Henry Barkly, K.C.B., G.C.M.G., &c., as President for the ensuing year, who, he remarked, was well known not only for his contributions to the Society but also throughout Great Britain for the valuable services he had rendered to his Queen and the Empire in various parts of the Queen's dominions.

Sir Henry Barkly, having taken the chair, delivered his

Inaugural Address,

which will be printed as a substantive paper.

On the conclusion of the President’s address Sir William Guise proposed a vote of thanks to Sir Henry Barkly for the able and instructive address he had delivered, to which, he said, he was sure the members present must have listened with both pleasure and profit.

Sir John Maclean said he had great pleasure in seconding the proposal, and congratulated the members upon the fact that a gentleman, in every way so well qualified, had accepted the office of President of the Society for the ensuing year. He said it would be presumption in him to speak of Sir Henry's qualifications. He need only refer to the papers which Sir Henry had recently contributed to the Transactions of the Society as evidence of his persevering and careful research and accuracy. Sir John added that he was sure Sir Henry Barkly fully recognised the great value of the medieval Manor Rolls in their bearing upon the social condition of the country and tenure of lands in past times, and also their importance in regard to manorial and family history; and he was very glad Sir Henry had added his personal influence to the suggestion in the Report of the Council, that the members of this Society should, severally, co-operate, as opportunities occurred, with the Society of Antiquaries in the endeavour to preserve, for those purposes, such records, now, in consequence of the changes in the tenure of lands, no longer of any legal use.

On the conclusion of the meeting most of the members adjourned to the Old Bell Hotel, where lunch had been provided. The President occupied the chair, and at 2.30 they assembled at the Parish Church, under the guidance of the Rector, the Rev. Canon Madan. It is a large building consisting
of a noble chancel, built during the incumbency of the present Rector, nave, north and south aisles, south porch, the vaulting of which is particularly good, with a chamber over it, and a western tower of three stages with a pierced parapet and pinacles. The structure is striking in appearance, but very poor in details. There was a chapel in the eastern bay of the north aisle, but this now, as a chapel, has been obliterated. The earliest existing portion of the building, with the exception of indications of Early-English work in the nave, is found in the north wall of this chapel consisting of a small door and a good window of three lights above it of Decorated work. The north door of the nave has been walled up. The eastern portion of the south aisle forms a chapel of two bays, and is separated from the aisle by an arch. It was carefully inspected by the members. Afterwards Canon Madan delivered an address on the History of the Church up to the present time. He commenced by referring to a little volume entitled "Dursley and its Neighbourhood, &c." by the late Rev. John Henry Blunt, Rector of Beverston, afterwards D.D., and a well known author, in which he treats somewhat fully of this church and parish. Canon Madan remarked that as Mr. Blunt had access to the oldest and best histories of Gloucestershire, and also to the old Churchwardens' Registers, which contain many interesting parochial records, he thought he could not do better than read a few short extracts from Mr. Blunt's work. Mr. Blunt mentions that in mediæval times Dursley was one of the livings belonging to the Abbey of Gloucester... that in 1475, by agreement with the Bishop of Worcester, the Archdeacon of Gloucester gave up to the abbey his official residence in Gloucester in exchange for all the rights of the abbey in the parish of Dursley. Thus the Archdeacon of Gloucester became, ex officio, Rector of Dursley, and this arrangement continued until the death of Archdeacon Timbrell in 1865—a period of 390 years—in which year it was separated from the archdeaconry under an order of the Queen in Council.

Mr. Blunt was of opinion that the ancient church was not so large as the present, and consisted only of the nave with a much lower roof, a chancel, probably much smaller than at present, and a western tower surmounted by a spire, both of which fell down on Saturday, January 7th, 1698-9. Blunt says there might also have been small aisles on either side of the nave, but if so they were replaced by the larger ones, now existing, at a period not very long before the Reformation. He adds that the two larger aisles were built in connection with chantry chapels which occupied their eastern ends, the one in the north aisle dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, that in the south to the Holy Trinity, but Atkyns says (p. 215) that this chapel was dedicated to St. James. Blunt states that it is traditionally known as the foundation of Thomas Tanner, a merchant who lived in the middle of the 15th century. It was called the "Tanner Chapel" in the churchwardens' accounts in the middle of the following century. Mr. Madan remarked that this is perhaps the most interesting part of the church.

1 The Registers here referred to consist of four volumes: I. 1506-1758; II. 1758-1805; III. 1855-1859; IV. 1849-1883. The last contains minutes of vestries only, and is now filled. The first volume was lent to Dr. Blunt when engaged in the preparation of his work, and is at present unfortunately missing. It is not traced to have been returned, and Dr. Blunt's effects were sold on his untimely and lamented death. This volume contains many entries which curiously illustrate the course of church feeling during the last three centuries.
Blunt considered that the oldest portion of the church dates from the 14th century, but this consists only of a single window and small part of the wall, and Mr. Madan remarked that there are now no remains of the more ancient church with the exception of a slab of stone incised with a cross, portion of a coffin-lid, which would appear to be of 13th century date, lying at the foot of the newell-staircase which gives access to the room over the south porch. Mr. Madan further observed that two points connected with the original plan of the church appeared to him to be worthy of notice. 1. That the tower was not built centrally with the nave, and though the present tower was built in 1707 there is no reason to suppose that it was not built on the old foundation. 2. That it does not appear that there ever was a chancel arch, no sufficient abutment being found, when the church was restored, on either side from which a stone arch could have sprung. The extent of the chancel westward was only marked by the projecting stonework of the first pillar of the north arcade, and by the roof, which was of a much higher pitch than that of the nave, and rose to a height of 5 or 6 feet above it. The space between the two roofs was simply filled up with lath and plaster. On the south side there was nothing whatever to mark the boundary between the chancel and the nave.

Mr. Madan, referring to the previous statement that the church had a tower with a spire, both of which were destroyed in the year 1699, proceeded to give some account of this calamity. He said: "It appears from the Churchwardens' Accounts that as early as 1688 some suspicion existed as to the safety of the structure, for in that year the large sum of 2/6 is charged as having been paid for advice about it, and immediately afterwards is a charge of £1 10 0 for a piece of timber and drawing it up into the tower." As Blunt remarks this temporising with danger gave a sense of security; and in 1694 a charge of £10 10 0 appears for painting the tower and steeple. In the year 1698 some extensive repairs were executed on the roof of the church. As regards the tower, however, the parishioners had lulled themselves into a false security, for on the 7th January, 1698-9, whilst, according to Bigland, a peal was being rung upon the bells the spire and a considerable part of the tower fell to the ground and several persons lost their lives. Happily it fell outwards, and not to any great extent on the church, so that the latter structure was not seriously injured. The damage was estimated at £2000.

The inhabitants do not appear to have shewn any willingness to put their hands into their own pockets to rebuild their tower. In the following March an effort was made to obtain from William III. Letters Patent, usually known as a Brief, authorising collections in every parish in the kingdom "towards the great charge and plious worke of rebuilding it," but this application was not successful. In 1707, however, a Brief was obtained upon an estimate of about £2000. The Brief produced £569 13 9. The inhabitants still abstained from taking anything from their own pockets, and were content to expend what they had begged from strangers, which they did in this manner. They got the tower built for . . . . 500 0 0

[They bought a treble bell of Rudhall for . . . . 36 10 0

1 This is alluded to above.
A clock and chimes of Thomas Sleight, of Painshaw, with carriage from Berkeley, cost 32 18 0
And the balance of 0 5 9
they put into their own pockets, from which they had not taken anything. This account appears in the Register of 1711. 569 13 9

Mr. Madan went on to say that since he had been in residence in the parish he had received two applications for donations towards the restoration of churches on the other side of the kingdom, founded upon the fact that their respective parishes had made a collection, in obedience to Queen Anne's Brief, for rebuilding the tower of this church. Mr. Madan further stated that he had found a curious corroboration of the date of rebuilding the tower. In 1874, when he took down the greater part of the old rectory house, he found a quantity of old moulded stones of church windows, and that in a dark attic closet he found, traced in the plaster whilst it was wet, plainly with a stick, the date 1709. He also mentioned that there is built into one of the walls of the old rectory house an old piscina, or perhaps holy water stoup, which, probably came out of the church,—not when the tower was rebuilt, but when the chancel was re-edified about 30 years afterwards.

Of the foundation of the chapel, Mr. Madan said nothing was known beyond that it is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. But the sedilia in the north wall is worth inspection. He mentioned a curious tradition that there was formerly a public right of way across the church through the north and south doors. He said an old man now living, named Ephraim Mainstone, told him that he well remembers his grandfather talking of it. The people residing on the north-west side of the church used to pass through to fetch water from the Broad Well on the south-east side.

The next event in the history of the church, Mr. Madan remarked, was the rebuilding of the chancel which took place in 1738, being the same year in which the market house was rebuilt. As this was done at the expense of the Rector there is no record of it in the churchwardens' books. The work, he said, was executed in a very shabby and debased style, inferior to the other parts of the church,—being a bad specimen of what is commonly known as "Churchwardens' Gothic." The walls were not even of "range work," but of the commonest "random work." The windows had no cusps in the tracery, and the mouldings of the joints and mullions were nothing more than simple splays. He added that he distinctly remembers in taking down the old walls many pieces of ancient church windows being found.

Mr. Madan observed that it was remarkable how early the bad system of letting the seats in this church began. As early as 1579 the churchwardens received payments for seats, a sufficient evidence that the church was pewed at that time. Indeed when the pews were taken away at the last restoration in 1867 a quantity of oak panelled work was found used up wherever it would be least seen, which must have been part of some earlier pewing. The rest of the history of this church, he said, up to the present time, is simply the same story which many an other of England's old parish churches could tell as well as Dursley. He said he was anxious, however, to mention briefly a few events recorded in the Churchwardens' Register, because they will help to show that in the last restoration, just mentioned,
nothing was done of which archaeologists could disapprove, indeed the architect, Mr. T. G. Jackson was most careful to preserve everything which could have the least antiquarian interest consistently with making the church suitable for the purpose of the worship of the Almighty God.

In 1785, an order was given that the roof of Tanner's Chapel should be "sealed." In the same year the ten commandments were "wrote in gold in the altar piece." In 1804, a resolution was almost unanimously passed to remove the desk and pulpit to the centre of the church, near the entrance into the chancel. This, he said, was accordingly done, and the pulpit now used was then made, though it stood on a very much longer leg than at present, to form the upper storey of the well known "Three-decker." In the same year the tower arch was blocked up by a lath-and-plaster partition between the belfry and the church, to make the congregation more warm and comfortable, and leaving the ringers to amuse themselves as they pleased without any danger of being seen. They were also exalted to an upper storey about half way or more up the tower-arch, and for their greater convenience a private entrance was made from the outside, with stone steps on the north side of the tower to reach it.

In 1813 a meeting was held with a view to erecting a gallery at the west end of the church from north to south. A Mr. Purnell opposed, but was at length propitiated by the condition that a certain part of the gallery at the south end should be appropriated to his own use and benefit, and in the following year a faculty was obtained for the purpose, nevertheless some hitch arose; for the gallery was not erected until 1817, and in the same year £129 3s. was paid for completing the organ in it. On 11th July, 1828, the churchwardens paid 1s. 3d. for the carriage of a marble basin from Bristol, and in the next year's account there is a charge for an Oak Font, which was intended as a stand to hold this basin. Doubtless, Mr. Madan remarked, with the best intentions, the then churchwarden conveyed away the ancient stone font which now stands at the west end of the north aisle, into his own field for a horse-trough. About twenty years afterwards it was happily recovered and restored to the church. In 1832, the whole church was renewed by subscription, and the pews were allotted to the chief parishioners with the usual result, that the remainder of the parishioners to the number of more than two thousand were consequently left without any accommodation in their parish church. The three-decker was not very long lived. Greater knowledge and a better feeling began to prevail, and about 1847, in the absence of the Rector-Archdeacon, the pulpit was removed to the place it had previously occupied. About 1850, a small vestry was built, Mr. Madan believed at the expense of the late Mr. Henry Vizard, in the angle formed by the south wall of the chancel, and the east wall of Tanner's Chapel.

And so, Mr. MADAN remarked, we come to church as it was when the last restoration was undertaken. He stated in detail what was then its exact condition, which it will be unnecessary to repeat, inasmuch as from what has been said it will readily be pictured to the mind's eye. What we did in 1866-7, Mr. Madan said, is what you now see. The chancel was rebuilt and extended about 25 feet eastward, adding about the same area to the church, and a chancel arch was built ranging with the east end of the north aisle,
a new choir vestry with organ chamber above was built on the south side, into which the organ was transferred from the west gallery, which was altogether removed. The roof of the nave was raised, repaired, and lengthened, and clerestory windows erected on the north and south sides. The two arcades were restored exactly as they were before, stone for stone, on solid foundations of concrete from 8 to 12 or 13 feet deep. The north and east walls of the north aisle were rebuilt (except about 10 feet at the west end of the north wall), exactly as it was before. The old roof remains, repaired where required, and a boarding substituted for the white plaster. In Tanner’s Chapel, the white coved ceiling, put up in 1785, was removed, and the timber work cleaned and exposed to view. The tower arch was opened out, the ringers’ floor, set up in 1804, was taken away, and the bell-ropes brought down to the floor of the tower. The pews erected in 1832 were replaced by the present open benches.

On the conclusion of Canon Madan’s address, Sir John Maclean requested permission to say a few words upon one or two subjects to which Canon Madan had alluded. With respect to the canopies of the triple niches of tabernacle work now affixed to the north wall of the north, or St. Mary’s, Chapel, he said he had no doubt that these formed the canopy of the triple sedilia pertaining to the high altar in the ancient chancel, and that when the chancel was rebuilt in 1738 they were removed and placed in their present position, out of the way. They are of about the end of the 14th or beginning of the 15th century, or of rather late Decorated work, and he believed that the piscina, mentioned by Canon Madan as being built into a wall at the Rectory, belonged to the same chancel. Although plainer in character it is of the same period. It is not a Holy Water Stoup, or Aspersorium, as Canon Madan supposed it might be. It possesses a rectangular basin with a drain. The Holy Water Stoup, which is a very good one, he was glad to say still remains in its original place by the south door. Sir John also asked two or three other questions which were satisfactorily explained.

The Rev. Wm. Bazeley called attention to the bosses in the roofs of the south aisle and to the six corbels in the Tanner’s Chapel, some of which he said were very remarkable on account of the carvings on them. One of the bosses bore a shield marked with two lines in saltier and one in pale, and on another an angel was represented bearing a shield decorated with the same device, which he considered were masons’ (? merchants’) marks. The two western corbels in the Tanner Chapel he considered represented the founder and his wife. The lady’s hair, he said, is dressed in the style of the 15th century, being gathered into a caul on either side over the ear and into a sort of crescent over the forehead in what is called the horned or reticulated headdress. The man, he said, wore a cowl, and he supposed him to have retired into a monastery before his death—probably the Priory of St. Leonard Stanley or the Monastery of St. Peter’s, Gloucester. The two heads in the middle he suggested were those of King Henry VI., and opposite that of Queen Margaret, whilst the easternmost ones, he thought, represented the Abbot of Gloucester and the Prior of St. Leonard’s, and he remarked that on the exterior of the chapel there is a shield, on which there is a cross with a letter T on either side of it.
Sir John Maclean asked Mr. Bazeley to look at outside of the chapel again. Sir John said he had examined it, and could see only one T on a small shield within a quatrefoil which decorated one of the merlons of the parapet. It is a text capital intersected by the stem of a cross-crosslet-fitchet. He had not had an opportunity of examining the corbels in the chapel, but he did not think the architecture of the chapel could be so early as the time of Henry VI., for two others of the merlons to which he had alluded bore small shields charged with the Tudor rose, and the architecture was certainly not earlier than the accession of Henry VII.

The party next proceeded to Broadwell, or Ewelme. Mr. Bazeley said the first name was given it in consequence of the number of springs which arose within a very narrow area, and the second from the “whelming” up of the water. These springs were the making of Dursley, and gave it its name. The water from this magnificent well became a rapid and powerful stream which, lower down, turned the wheels of the machinery of clothing and other manufactories.

The next place visited was an ancient building close to the Broadwell, known as the Nunnery, but we do not know that any evidence exists that a community of women was ever established at Dursley. The building is of the late third-pointed period, and apparently of a domestic character. It has some square-headed, two-light mullioned windows. The whole is in a very dilapidated condition, and now forms the outbuildings of a public house. After inspecting a fine swimming bath, lately constructed and supplied with beautiful bright water from Ewelme, the party proceeded to the residence of the Misses Hodgkin, called the Priory, but in this, as in the case of the Nunnery, we believe without any foundation, nor do we know that, notwithstanding its name, it has any pretension to have ever been a religious house.

The first thing which attracted the attention of the visitors was some letters in relief, carved in the spandrils of the arch of the entrance door-way. In the spandril on the left are the letters E W in Roman characters, apparently of about the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century. Following these letters is a minim resembling a crossed I (£) in use about the same time, or this may have been an ornament to fill up the space. In the spandril on the right is the Roman letter M and a Α of a late gothic character, with two other ornaments or characters similar to that described as being on the other side, though the last of them somewhat resembled a merchant’s mark. Some of the party wished to read the letters on the right as Roman numerals and by turning the C round reading it as Α, making the date 1500. Sir John Maclean took exception to this. He said the letter is distinctly a C, and that we were not justified in altering it to convert it into a D. It being demanded how he would read it, he replied that he understood that at one

1 Of Ewelme, Blunt writes:—In the old English days, of which it is the custom to speak as Anglo-Saxon, Dursley was known as “Darselege” or “Dureslege”; and though injustice is done to it when the town is called scantily watered as regards manufacturing power, yet its name is explained as being derived from “Dwr” and “ley” or “lege,” which are very old English for water and pasture. If such be really its derivation Dursley gives a happy illustration, even in its name, of the way of which the ancient Briton and the Saxon mingled together to form the great nation of mixed blood; for “ley” is undoubtedly Anglo-Saxon, and it is equally certain that brethren across the border would claim “Dwr” for Welsh.—“Dursley and its Neighbourhood,” p. 3.
time a manufactory was carried on in the premises, and possibly the E W and M C might have been the initials of the respective partners in the firm, and the last figure their trade mark.

On the east side of the morning room, under the cornice of the ceiling, are the following words in very bad Latin. Some letters and one word are deficient. Supplying the omissions it may be read as under:


The whole may be paraphrased somewhat thus: Do good while you live if you wish to live after death. There is an end to all things. Give of your goods while they are yours, after death they are then yours no longer. They were probably written by the same person who placed the letters in the spandrels of the doorway, after the word “vis,” there is a character resembling a square and compass.

The next object on leaving the priory was to endeavour to discover the site of the ancient Castle, and for this purpose Mr. Bazeley conducted the party to the upper part of the “Lower Castle Field.” This spot commanded a view of a garden in the rear of the National Provincial Bank, which Mr. Bazeley supposed to be the castle site, and said there was a tradition to that effect. In the first place he observed that his hearers must get rid of the impression that Dursley Castle was a fortress. In his opinion it was nothing more than a residence affording some sort of protection in the troubled times in which it stood. Leland had stated, he said, that the castle site was situated a quarter-of-a-mile from the town. This site, however, was within 100 yards of the church and market house. To meet this objection, he said that originally the town was situated at the foot of the hill, which was about the distance required, and churches were often built near the manor house. Mr. Bazeley mentioned two other traditions placing the site of the castle elsewhere. On the conclusion of Mr. Bazeley’s address,

Sir John Maclean said that in the few observations he was about to make he had no intention of supporting a theory of his own, but simply to offer a few remarks in the endeavour to elicit the truth. There is something, he observed, to be said for Mr. Bazeley’s theory, and in support of it he would allude to the circumstance which that gentleman had omitted to mention. He, Sir John, had yesterday, through the courtesy of the tenant, been permitted to examine the interior of the Castle Farm House, and in the midst of it he found a wall 10 feet thick. If the castle had stood where Mr. Bazeley supposes, this thick wall might well have formed a portion of the entrance gate-way. He could not, however, accept Mr. Bazeley’s theory. Supposing that the original site of the town was formerly where the manufactures were carried on down in the little valley, and thus approximate to the distance stated by Leland, the direction would not suit as the castle would be N.W. of the town instead of S. He believed that the market place was always where it now is, at the junction of the three principal roads, and this with the church would form the site of the town. But apart from this, he remarked that the site referred to would not be defensible. Arrows could be easily shot, or even stones could be thrown from the spot on which the party stood, into the heart of the fortress. Mr.
Bazeley had suggested that what was called the castle was not a fortress but simply a fortified manor house. He would recall to their recollection that the President in his address had read from an ancient record the castle was described as a castrum, which surely must mean a regular castle or fortress. It must also be borne in mind that when King Henry II. took away from Roger de Berkeley the Baronies of Berkeley and Dursley, granting the former to Robert Fitz Harding he gave again to Roger the Barony of Dursley as his own inheritance. It is scarcely therefore to be supposed that the Berkeleys of Dursley would have a simple manor house as the Caput of their Barony. Sir John further remarked that in the Upper Castle Field there was a spot which possessed a favourable appearance as a castle site. So far as he knew there was no evidence whatever upon the subject. The whole question was involved in darkness. Not a stone of the castle could be produced. It was not merely that not one stone had not been left upon another but that not a single stone could be found. The whole has entirely disappeared as if it had never been.

Sir Henry Barkly suggested that possibly the two sites forming the subject of this discussion might have been occupied as the Berkeley seat. That in the Upper Castle Field, by the original castle, and upon the demolition of that building, a manor house had been erected upon the Bank Tump, perhaps using up some of the old materials. This has also now disappeared. He mentioned that a slight excavation had been made on the supposed site of the castle in the upper field, but not a vestige of building stone or of lime could be discovered.

The meeting now broke up, but some of the members accompanied Sir John Maclean to the Rectory to see the piscina which had been mentioned in the church, and a remarkably fine chimney-piece in a room in the old parsonage house, which he supposed to have been the hall.

**THE ANNUAL DINNER.**

The Annual Dinner of the Society took place at the "Old Bell" Hotel at 6.30. The President took the Chair. There were present Sir William Guise, Bart., Sir Brook Kay, Bart., Sir John Maclean, Major-General Vizard, Colonel Forbes, the Rev. Canon Madan, and numerous other clergymen and gentlemen, and many ladies, numbering altogether about 50 persons. After dinner, when the health of the Queen and Royal Family had been drunk, the President gave the usual toast: "Prosperity to the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society," coupling it with the name of Sir William Guise, President of the Council.

Sir William Guise returned thanks for the Society and for himself, and proposed the health of the President, which was very cordially received, and Sir Henry Barkly having acknowledged the compliment, the company adjourned to the Town Hall for the

**EVENING MEETING.**

After an examination of the few articles collected for the Temporary Museum the President took the chair and the reading of the papers was commenced. The first paper was read by the Rev. C. C. Murray Brown, Rector of Uley with Owlpen, *On the Decline and Fall of the Cloth Trade in Dursley and its Neighbourhood*, as follows:—
The Paper which I am about to read is not, strictly speaking, on an Archaeological subject, but I hope it may be of interest at the present time as shewing something of the past history of the town and neighbourhood in which our Society is holding its present Annual Meeting. It is of interest also as shewing how history repeats itself, how the changes and the losses which at the present day are affecting trade so seriously are no novelty. Trade rose and fell, and removed from place to place, in our fathers' days quite as much as in our own, and inasmuch as human nature always remains the same, the causes which produced the disastrous results I am about to relate in our fathers' time are, in a great measure, the same as in our own.

An old friend who has lived in this part of the country all his life, and who himself recollects the circumstances, in answer to enquiry as to the cause of the failure of the Cloth Trade," replied, in one emphatic word—"strikes." So if any one thinks that "strikes" are a mischievous development of our own day, he will hear that there is nothing new in them, and that they produced terribly disastrous consequences in the same manner, if not with the same organized force, 60 or 70 years ago.

The Cloth Trade in this neighbourhood is believed to have been an ancient industry. It existed here in the reign of Edward IV. when the ancient cloth trade of England was being revived, indeed almost newly created, by the introduction of Flemish weavers into this country. From that time it was carried on, apparently to a considerable extent, for the next 300 years, until it failed about 1830.

How largely the people were employed in this trade two centuries or so ago is shown by the Parish Registers in the neighbourhood, wherein persons are frequently designated as "Clothier," "Weaver," "Broadweaver," and other such terms, while such local names as Webb and Woolwright are supposed to indicate the same thing. Tombstones also tell a similar tale. Most of the principal residents were clothiers. In Uley Church there is a tablet to the memory of John Eyles, who died in 1731, aged 91 years, who is described as "the first that ever made Spanish Cloth in this parish."

Many large fortunes were realised in those days of unexampled prosperity. There is a tradition that in one mill at Uley £24,000 was made in one year.

It was about the early part of this century that the Cloth Trade in Dursley and its vicinity rose to its climax of prosperity. Within the memory of persons still living the change that has taken place has been enormous. My own knowledge is mostly what I have learned about the adjoining parish of Uley, well known to the members of our Society as possessing the tumulus just outside the walls of Uley Bury, though probably they are not aware that Uley has a history of human destitution and misery which, perhaps, could not be equalled, if those old walls and ramparts could tell the tale of all that has taken place around them since the day they were built.

Living in these green quiet valleys it is strange to think that seventy years ago they were full of the smoke of factories—that the gaunt skeletons of mills, some of which still exist in Dursley and Uley and Wotton-under-Edge, were (with scores that have been pulled down) full of busy life and swarming with hundreds of "hands."
The difference in population in Uley alone, between those days and the present time sufficiently marks the change that has taken place. Uley contained nearly 3000 inhabitants sixty years ago, and at the last census the number became reduced to 1043. ¹

In a letter which I received six weeks ago from my uncle, Mr. Barwick Baker, he writes:—

"I remember my father telling me—about 1830—that he remembered six large mills and twelve small ones—all going. In 1830 the six large mills were doing very little, the small had all shut up. Five of these six were closed while Uley Rates were lowering, and the last failed awfully about 1834. Strikes were, of course, not the only cause of this great failure of trade. The general depression which followed upon the peace at the end of the great French wars had a great deal to do with it. Railways did not then exist, and there was no water carriage in these Gloucestershire valleys. The men refused to work for reduced wages, and the end was that Yorkshire was able to undersell us, and the trade went away there. And the people starved!" I want you to bear with me a few minutes while I say something about the destitution that ensued, and about the measures that were taken, happily with much good result, to allay it. It is not strictly an archaeological subject, but it has an importance and an interest of its own as it explains the history of the immediate neighbourhood.

In a paper written a few years ago, Mr. Barwick Baker says: "It was in 1830, when I had just left Oxford, and become a Justice of my County, that my grandfather died and my father came into possession of a small property in a very beautiful valley in Gloucestershire, through which ran a fine stream of water. This water . . . . . . was employed to turn a large number of mills where the finest cloth in England was made. The trade, chiefly with Russia, was very profitable for that day. The men earned 40s. a week, and, alas! I drank very hard. Wheat cost during the war from 16s. to 21s. the bushel, but this left enough money to enable the men to drink a good deal, though they earnestly longed for the blessings of peace, when they hoped to spend less on bread and to spend more on beer. The good time came at length, but with it other nations, which had hitherto been engaged in war, began to make some cloth for themselves, and the demand for cloth fell. The masters then said to the men: "What has fallen in price and you can work for less wages." The men (the word was not invented in those days) struck and refused to work. In those days everyone lived on credit. To appear poor was to lose credit. The masters gave way, and for a while carried on their business at a loss in hopes of better times. These not coming, in a few years, one after another gave up business or broke, and the men were kept without work or wages and in fearful distress."

A pamphlet, written at the time, to give information about the working of the poor law—for the case of Uley was brought forward in the Parliamentary Commission which led to the Poor Law Act of 1834—describes the then

¹ The population of Uley was in 1801—1724; 1811—1912; 1821—2655; 1831—3041; 1841—1723; 1851—1327; 1861—1292; 1871—1048. The most prosperous period would therefore have been from 1811 to 1831, when the population had already slightly fallen off. In the Census Returns of 1851 the decrease in the population is attributed to the discontinuance of the Woollen Cloth manufacture in the parish.—Ed.
condition of things thus:—"The trade fell off by degrees and, in 1830, one of the larger and all the smaller ones (mills) had ceased to work, and the work at the remainder was vacillating and uncertain. There appeared to be scarcely any employment for any but the very best workmen, and not always for these. The Poor Rates rose from £1,900 in 1828 to £3,200 in 1829. This increase was alarming, and in the spring of 1830 the poor were idle, ill-employed, insolvent, and inclined to be turbulent. They were seen standing about in groups of eight or ten, and they often abused the parish officers and the principal ratepayers, and threatened them increased demands, which they claimed as their right. They appeared ripe for riot and mischief of any kind. When receiving their pay they once broke into the room where the overseer was, and so behaved that it was necessary to obtain the assistance of a constable."\(^1\)

Well, that was the state of things as described at the time by an eye witness. Mr. Barwick Baker continues:—"This was just about 1830, when my father took the management of the Parish, and I helped as well as I could. I have heard people in latter years complain bitterly of poor rates being 5s. or 6s. in the £, but ours were then nominally 27s. Of course they were not really so. As was the custom of those days, land worth 30s. was rated at 20s., but 27s. out of 30s. is equal to 18s. out of 20s., thus, of every 20s. that the land was worth 18s. went to the poor and 2s. to the landlord.

I believe that for two or three years my father (nominally receiving £700 a year) paid in rates, private charity, assisting emigration, &c., about £1,000 a year.\(^1\) (I may mention that a great deal was done in assisting emigration from Uley for a number of years.)

Of course Landlords who had no other means were simply ruined. But this was not the worst. Of nearly 3000 people in the Parish, the greater part were supported wholly by the rates, with the usual sadly demoralizing effects. As low payments were given as it was calculated they and their families could live on, but the men usually drank half of it, and the women and children starved. There were families with several children with clothes for only half the number, and half lay in bed by turns while the others wore the rags and went out of door.

After consultation with many people my Father adopted the plan—then little known—of refitting the workhouse and taking a few families into it. The men when they found that they and their families were sufficiently fed but that they got no beer, and were obliged to conform to regular rules, soon tired of it, and went out and found work, and were so anxious to avoid a return to the workhouse that, though their wages were sadly low, they struggled on and maintained their families in a state which, to the very poor, was comfort compared with their former wretchedness.

The rates were lowered in, I think, two years from the nominal 27s. to 10s. in the £, with which we were, for the time, well satisfied. But that was really nothing compared with the improvement in the condition of the

\(^1\) By T. J. Ll. Baker, 1834.

Great distress prevailed also in Bristol about this time. In April, 1827, the magistrates granted a Poor's Rate of £36,000. In the year 1804 it was only £9,000 (Contemporary MS. pences Mr. E. F. Eberle, Clifton).—Ed.
people. They were, it is true, still poor, and wages were often low. The trade once so lucrative has passed away, and, I believe, that not a yard of cloth has been made in the parish these fifty years . . . . This experience first led me to the opinion, which every succeeding year has tended to strengthen, that if we desire the real good of the poor, the truest means to benefit them is to advise them, to encourage them, to assist them, and if that be not sufficient, to drive them by a threat, not of starvation, but of discomfort, to take care of themselves."

There is one correction in the above remarks which I have to make, and that is that it is hardly correct to say "not a yard of cloth has been made in Uley for the last fifty years." When I came to Uley near twenty years ago, there was indeed no cloth-mill in Uley, though plenty of the old mill hands were left, and very poor many of them were; but there were four hand-looms still in work, the remains of a time when, as an old man said to me the other day, every house in the parish had its own loom in it.

There were four, I say, then left—but one of the old men very prudently married one of the old women, and another gave up work—and so now there is only one left—but he goes on merrily still, whenever he can get any work.

Mr. F. Madan, of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, then read a few Notes on Dursley and the Neighbourhood. He began by illustrating the last paper with evidence of the growth and decay of the cloth trade in Dursley itself, from the parish registers of the 17th century. The commonest trades in the town were baker, bookbinder, broadweaver, butcher, carpenter, clothier, mercer, millman, scrabler, shearmen, shoeman and weaver: among the occasional ones, apothecary, carlmaker, carrier, chyrurgion, cutter, drawer, fiddler, glazier, glover, hatter, husbandman, milter, mason, matmaker, pargiter, silkweaver, tankardmaker, Thatcher, victualler, vintner. But even when the Government Blue-Book on the woollen trade was issued in 1808 there were many signs of decay, and a great strike affecting the whole Uley Valley in about 1840 put an end to all weaving: at the present time the cloth mill of Mr. A. B. Winterbotham, M.P., is the only one turned by the Cam. The common names in the town between 1640 (when the earliest existing register begins), and 1700, were Atwood, Dangerfield, Partridge, Phelps, Purnell, Tippett, Trotman, Vizard, Wallington, Webb.

The evidence for associating Shakespeare with Dursley was next presented in a connected form, although nothing new was adduced. It is—1. The description of Berkley Castle as seen from the hill, in Rich. II., Act II., sec. 3. 2. The mention of Visor, Woncot and Perkes of the Hill, all suitable to the locality, in 2 Hen. IV., Act III., sec. 1. 3. The Shakespeare and Hathway entries in the Registers, from 1679 to 1707. 4. "Shakespeare's (or Parry's) walk" on the knoll immediately above the Rectory. Mr. Madan only contended that the convergence of evidence showed that Shakespeare knew the place personally.

The Hermitage was next mentioned, which was certainly in the "Hermitage Wood" immediately above the Broadwell; and a stone from the supposed site exhibited, of octagonal shape and certainly no part of an ordinary cottage.
Lastly, allusion was made to five local customs, which occasioned some discussion—1. The Pancake Bell on Shrove Tuesday, at 1 p.m., undoubtedly, as was subsequently suggested, a shriving bell. 2. The Squirrel Hunting on Good Friday, to the existence of which in full vigour twenty years ago the Rector bore witness, though it hardly now exists. 3. The Muffled Peal on the Holy Innocents' Day. 4. The making of "Whiteput" or "Whitepot" (a mixture of balm, beer, treacle, etc.) at Easter time. 5. The Christmas Mummers. This last mention evoked some interesting remarks, the Secretary, Mr. Bazeley, saying that he had himself acted as muncher in Cornwall with the name of "Guise-dancer." Sir William Guise and Sir John Maclean described the varieties which had come under their notice: Mrs. Bagnall-Oakeley testified to the practice in Herefordshire and Monmouthshire, where one of the boys is dressed as a white horse; and the Rev. S. E. Bartleet, of Gloucester, spoke of the custom in Lancashire under the name "Pace-eggers." It was clear from the scattered remarks that there is a common story in all these parts, introducing St. George, the King of Egypt's daughter, a fight and a revival from the dead. It is in print in at least two places, Giles's History of Bampton, co. Oxon., and among Mr. Heywood's Penny publications, at Manchester, as edited by Mr. Atkinson: and Mr. Madan, expressed a hope that he would be able to "edit" the various versions for some Christmas number of Notes and Queries.

Mr. V. C. Perkins followed with a Memoir on Kingswood Abbey, which will be printed post.

WEDNESDAY, 4th August.

This morning at 9.30, a large party assembled at the "Old Bell" Hotel, to take part in a carriage excursion to visit Calcot Barn, Beverston Church and Castle, Tetbury, and Weston Birt.

Many members joined the party this morning who were not present at the meeting on the previous day. Among those present, were Sir Henry Barkly, President, Sir William Guise, Sir Brook Kay; General Vizard, Colonel Bayly, Colonel Forbes, Dr. Drew; the Revs. W. Blathwayt, W. T. Allen, W. Bagnall-Oakeley, F. E. B. Witts, W. Bazeley, Hon. Sec., S. E. Bartleet, F. J. Poynton, W. Lett; Messrs. V. R. Perkins, A. Le Blane, W. Leigh, E. Hartland, E. A. D'Argent, and W. H. Bruton.

The first place visited was Calcot Barn, in the parish of Newington Bagpath, at which the Rev. A. K. Cornwall acted as guide. According to Bigland, this barn is 130 feet long and capable of containing 900 loads of corn, Mr. Cornwall said it was built by the Abbot of Kingswood in the reign of Edward I., but an inscription in the interior states that the then barn was burnt down by lightening on 9th October, 1728, and was rebuilt at the cost of Thomas Estcourt, Esq., by John Pill, carpenter, and finished Oct. 20th, 1729. Within the doors is a bas-relief which Mr. Cromwell described as Baalam and his Ass. It was also suggested that it represented an ox treading out corn, and by others that it was a Roman altar.

The party next proceeded to Beverston and visited the Castle under the guidance of the General Secretary. Previous to entering the ruins he read the following notes on the history of the fortress.
The earliest mention I have found of Beverston is in the Saxon Chronicle. We have all heard how Eustace the French Count came to Gloucester in the year 1051 and craved from his brother-in-law, King Edward the Confessor, vengeance on the men of Dover, because they had resented the insolence of his Frenchmen and driven them from their town. Then the King bade Godwine Earl of Kent go and punish them with fire and sword, and he refused. No man in his earldom should be punished till he had been tried and convicted. Then the king sent for all his witan and they came to Gloucester to hear the quarrel between Eustace and Godwine. Godwine fearing violence, gathered all his men together, and his two sons Harold and Swyn, Earls of East Anglia and Wessex, gathered all their men together at Beverstone, in order that they might go to their royal lord and learn from him and from his witan how they might avenge the wrong that the Frenchmen had done. As it was, Godwine's army remained on the Cotteswolds, and drew no nearer Gloucester than the old Roman camp of Kimsbury, now known as Godwine's Camp, that overlooks the plain a mile north of Painswick. The witan decreed that every kind of evil should cease, and the king gave the peace of God and his full friendship to either side.

Beverston was at that time a portion of the great manor of Berkeley, and if the story of Walter Mapes be true, Godwine or his son Swyn had obtained it from the Nuns of Berkeley by the foulest treachery. Rudder says, but he does not give his authority, that Godwine and his sons seized the castle of Beverston. I have seen no mention of a castle here earlier than 1225, though when Stephen was King Robert Earl of Gloucester seems to have encamped with his relieving followers at this place.

The year after this gatherings of the followers of Godwine and his sons at Beverston, Swyn was outlawed, and died, and his possessions were confiscated by the crown.

The Domesday Survey of 1086 says, "In Berchelai King Edward had five hides... in Beuerstane ten hides." Roger de Berkeley had a fee farm of the whole of the royal manor of Berkeley and paid 170l in weight of lawful money.

Our President has written a very valuable paper on this Roger de Berkeley and his descendants, and has cleared away a good deal of the confusion into which our County historians have fallen concerning them.

These Berkelys, as we have heard, had their principal seat at Dursley, and there is no direct testimony, that I know of, to their having a castle at Beverston: though it is not at all unlikely that some kind of fortress at this spot had from very early times commanded the road which led from Cirencester and Tetbury to Symond's Hall, and from thence through the plain to the ford across the Severn at Aust.

Sir Henry Barkly has told us how five Roger de Berkeleys held Berkeley and Beverston in direct succession from father to son, and how at last on the accession of Hen. II. the fifth of them was deprived of most of the possessions he held from the crown in favour of a foreigner, Robert Fitz Harding, who had earned the king's gratitude by loans to carry on his war with Stephen,
Robert Fitzhardinge who died in 1170, left Beverston to his third son Robert, who took the surname of de Weare, which manor was granted to him by his father. Robert de Weare left a son Maurice, who took his mother’s name “De Gaunt,” and he it was who has the credit for building or re-building, A.D. 1225, the Castle of Beverston.

In 11th Henry III. Maurice de Gaunt was questioned for building or repairing his Castle of Beverston without the King’s license, and also for fortifying it. He seems to have satisfied the King and was allowed to complete the work.

Thomas ap Adam, a descendant of Maurice de Gournay, sold Beverston in 1331 to Thomas, 8th Lord Berkeley. This was four years after Edw. II. was murdered in Berkeley Castle, and Lord Berkeley was still lying under the suspicion of having instigated the murder. He was not finally acquitted until 1338.

The great antiquary, Leland, writing some 200 years after this event, says that “I have been told by olde Sir William (the great, great grandson of 8th Lord Berkeley), that this re-building of the Castle was paid for by means of the ransoms which Lord Thomas obtained from the prisoners taken by him at the battle of Poictiers in 1356.”

This story, as the late Mr. Cooke pointed out, is not quite consistent with the fact that Lord Berkeley’s eldest son was taken prisoner by the French in the same battle, and remained in France till his father’s death in 1361, because the 6000 nobles were not forthcoming which were demanded for his ransom.

Again on the death of Lord Berkeley, Beverston became the patrimony of a younger son, Sir John Berkeley, then only nine years old, and his descendants held it for 236 years. Sir John Berkeley, the last of the Berkelyes of Beverston, sold it in 1597 to Sir John Pointz, and then emigrated to Virginia, where he was massacred by the Indians.

The Beverston estates, according to Fosbroke, changed hands often and rapidly. Sir John Pointz sold them to Henry Fleetwood, Master of the Court of Wards, and he sold them to Sir Thomas Earstfield. Then Fleetwood bought them back again and resold them to Sir Michael Hicks, Knight, a barrister, and secretary to Lord Burleigh. The Hickses held Beverston till 1842, when it was sold to R. J. Holford, Esq., of Weston Birt. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was styled “of Beverston” in his creation as a Baronet, and is, of course, still so styled, and were it not for the sale in 1842 we might expect ere long to see that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for his courage and self-denial in accepting the Chief Secretaryship for Ireland, is to be created “Baron Beverston.”

Beverston Castle took an important part in the Civil War of the 17th century. The castle was garrisoned in 1644 by a body of Royal troops, and Col. Massey, Military Governor of Gloucester, determined to take it if he could, but his first attempt was unsuccessful. Fifty musketeers ran up to the gate at noon and fixed a petard which they had fired; but, although none of the garrison were able to hit them with grenades from within, the petard did no mischief, and the fifty musketeers ran up to the gates again and

---

1 Rot. Claus. 11th Henry III. mcm. 14, Rot. Pat. 13th Hen. III.
carried back the petard. Then the Puritans withdrew. But the next attempt was more successful. Othelthorpe, the Governor, had been made prisoner whilst off duty, and Massey suddenly appearing before the castle demanded its surrender. The garrison, seized with a panic, and deprived of their leader, gave up the castle, and were allowed to depart without arms, ammunition, bag or baggage. From this time the castle was held by the Puritans. Nevertheless, on Sunday, July 14th, 1644, Charles I. marched by the castle at the head of 2000 troops, resting the night of the 13th at Saperton House, the residence of Sir Henry Pool, and on the 14th at Badminton, then Lord Herbert's of Raglan.\footnote{Symond's Diary, 36, and Iter Car. ii. 434.}

Bigland says that the castle was burnt down soon after the siege, and that a large dwelling house, which was built within its walls, was burnt down about 1691, being replaced by the present farm house.

The earliest view of the castle that is known to exist is among Buck's engravings of 1732. The next is in Grose's Antiquities, Vol. V., or supp. Vol. I. 1785. There is a view from the Barbican side, No. IV., in Hearne's Antiquities of Great Britain. There is a view of the castle, with the church beyond, given in Bigland's Gloucestershire, Vol. I., page 175, published in 1791. (Blunt, p. 147).

I have exhibited at the Temporary Museum a Gold British Coin found some years ago at Beverston, and preserved in the collection of the late J. D. Niblett, Esq.

For a description of Beverston Castle, see Blunt, 107 and 116-119.

"The lower parts of the Castle are all of the date of" Maurice de Gaunt, 1225 "massive Norman piers and groining still remaining in a perfect condition, with external walls many feet in thickness."

"The re-construction of the Castle by" Thomas "Lord Berkeley" in 1356-1361 "left it a fine quadrangular structure.\footnote{Blunt, pp. 116-119—"to liberal taste."}

SIR HENRY BARKLY, being called on, said that he had nothing to add to the information just given by Mr. Bazeley, but that there were a few minor points in it on which he would touch. It was the third, and not the fifth, of the five Roger de Berkleys who was deprived of Berkeley; and he must add that he thought it rather hard to call Robert Fitz Harding, who succeeded him in the possession of the manor, "a foreigner," seeing that his father had been "Prepositus" of Bristol, and his grandfather, as now generally believed, "Staller" or Master of the Horse to Edward the Confessor.

With regard to the present ownership of Beverston, he had not been aware previously that it had passed away from the family of Hicks-Beach, but as their Barouetey was styled "of Beverston," he hoped that Sir Michael would not be precluded, when the time came, from being summoned to the House of Lords by that title. He would detain them no longer from visiting the ruins of the castle.

The members then visited the ruins of the Castle, which they inspected with great interest, and afterwards paid a visit to the ancient church close by. Time permitted of but a short stay here, when the party proceeded
to Tetbury, where lunch had been provided at the White Hart Hotel. After this repast, at which Sir Henry Barkly presided, a visit was made to the Town Hall, under the guidance of Mr. A. H. Paul, who had kindly collected a few objects of interest for the inspection of the members. Among these were the following:

1. Two perspective drawings of the old Parish Church, taken down in 1777, one of which Mr. Paul obligingly presented to the library of the Society.

2. Manuscript Survey of the Manor and Borough of Tetbury, taken in 1594, written on parchment, 32 leaves remaining.

3. An order signed by King Charles I. on his march from Bristol to besiege Gloucester, dated 8th August [1643], commanding his troops not to plunder Tetbury. This document has been printed in fac-simile in Lee's History of Tetbury, p. 19.

4. A manuscript census of the population of Tetbury taken in 1737. This is a very interesting and valuable record. It gives the names of all the householders, and the numbers of their children, servants, and lodgers, and states to what religious community they respectively belonged. The number of inhabited houses was 566.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Householders and their wives</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgers</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers belonging to the several Religious Communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterians</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccounted for</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MS. the sums are incorrectly cast up, and the inaccurate total has been quoted by Rudder and Lee, who give it as 3115.

Leaving Tetbury, the party commenced their journey towards Weston Birt, calling at Doughton to see the old Manor House.

In a letter dated 26th February, 1849, the Rev. R. W. Huntley, then Lord of the Manor of Boxwell, and Rector of the parish, writes that the Manors of Upton and Doughton were held by his family from the reign of Queen Elizabeth till the Usurpation, when they were sold to meet some fines and other political expenditure. "This, he adds, is all I knew about them (the manors) till last year. I held several deeds relating to them, together with Court Rolls of both manors, but when Holford purchased Upton and Charlton, I then gave the Court Rolls to him on the condition of 44 in the house of Mr. Henry Bagnall, who, it was suggested, was the Master of the Workhouse.

1 Inclusive of 44 in the house of Mr. Henry Bagnall, who, it was suggested, was the Master of the Workhouse.
2 Including 57 at the Grammar School.
3 The population of Tetbury at the several decades in the present century was as follows:—1801 = 3524, 1811 = 3566, 1821 = 4106, 1831 = 4297, 1841 = 4506, 1851 = 4729, 1861 = 3274.
that the papers should be searched and that the Court Rolls of Doughton should be separated and given to Paul, now Lord of Doughton, &c.”

It is, however, stated in Lee’s History of Tetbury (p. 77) that on the 20th January, 1627, Richard Talboys, Esq., descended from the Talboys, of Whiston, co. Wilts, bought the Manor of Doughton (which appears to have been granted by Letters Patent from Queen Elizabeth) to Edward Alehorne, Clerk, and Ann his wife (for which he cites Title Deeds). He states further that Richard Talboys, grandson of the above Richard, died leaving issue an only daughter named Alice, and that in 1720 he devised this estate to his nephew Thomas, son of his brother Benjamin. This Thomas died in 1763, and left the estate to his kinsman, Thomas son of Charles Talboys. Thomas was succeeded in 1802 by his son Thomas, who, in 1818, sold the manor to John Paul Paul, Esq., for £25,000.1 From this latter date it descended to Walter Matthew Paul, who, in 1860, sold it to Colonel E. J. Stracey, and the latter, in 1864, sold it to its present owner, Mr. Wm. Hamilton Yatman.

From this statement it would appear that the Huntleys never had any estate in Doughton Manor, though they had some lands in the parish. They were, however, owners of Upton, as appears from Fosbrooke, who adds, that at Doughton the family of Talboys still continue on the original purchase of their ancestor.

This discrepancy is very remarkable, and we hope, at some time, to be able to clear it up.

The Manor House is a fine picturesque gabled mansion consisting of a centre and two wings, with mullioned windows. On the gate-posts is the date 1641, which is considered to be the date of the present building, but we are inclined to think that the house was built somewhat earlier, probably immediately after the acquisition of the property by Richard Talboys. In a large room on the ground floor, now used as a kitchen, on a fine carved mantel-piece, is a shield of the arms of Talboys: a salter, on a chief three escallops. The tinctures are not given, but on the pedigree of Talboys, of Tetbury, recorded at the Heralds’ Visitation of Gloucestershire in 1682-3, it is stated that “these arms are set up in Tetbury Church for Richard Talboys, Esq., but better proof must be made. See an entry in C. 17 without arms.” The blazon here given us is: ar. a salter gu. on a chief of the second three escallops of the first. This Richard Talboys was the purchaser of Doughton in 1627. He is stated in the Heralds’ Visitation of Gloucestershire, 1682-3, to have been Sheriff of that county. The year is not given, and I have been unable to authenticate the statement. He died 6th August, 1663, having married Elizabeth daughter of Sir William Barrow, of Chawford, co. Hants, Knight. She died in 1650. In an upper room, on another mantel-piece two shields of arms occur: viz., Talboys as before, differenced with a crescent, ar., and the other: sa. two swords in saltier ar. pommels and hiltz or, between four fleurs de lis of the last for Barrow, identifying them with the aforesaid Richard Talboys, doubtless the builder of the house, and Elizabeth Barrow his wife.

Since the purchase by Mr. Paul in 1818, the Manor House has been occupied by tenant farmers, the Lords of the Manor residing in the neighbouring house of High Grove built by John Paul Paul in 1796-8. It has

1 Lee’s History of Tetbury, p. 77.
been very much pulled about, and is greatly out of repair. There are some
good rooms lined with fine oak panelling, apparently of somewhat earlier
date than the house, and inasmuch as it does not quite fit the rooms, it was
probably brought from elsewhere.

About three o'clock the party reached Weston Birt, the seat of Mr. R.
S. Holford, in whose absence they were received by his agent Mr. D. Lindsay.
After a ramble over the gardens and grounds, by the invitation of Mr.
Holford, the party partook of refreshments, which had been hospitably
provided in the great hall, after which they were invited to walk over the
mansion to inspect the pictures and other works of art and virtu which it
contains. They were also shown a stone with a Roman inscription in the
rectory garden, hitherto unknown, which will be described hereafter. Before
leaving Weston, the President, on behalf of the Society, requested Mr.
Lindsay to convey to Mr. Holford the thanks of the Society for the hos-
pitality the members had received, and for granting them permission to
inspect the art and archaeological treasures with which the house is stored.
Mr. Lindsay promised to fulfil the President's request, and assured him that
it would have afforded Mr. Holford great pleasure to have been present to
receive the party in person.

The return journey to Dursley was then made.

THE CONVERSAZIONE.

At eight o'clock a Conversazione was held in the Town Hall, when the
following papers were read:—*A Doubtful Point in the Genealogy of the House
Bazeley, M.A. This paper created great interest, and gave rise to an
animated discussion, in which it was mentioned that *Puff Stone* was also
found, and was in process of formation, near Bath, Chalford, and Nailsworth.
Mr. E. Box lent a very fine specimen to illustrate the lecture, which was cut
from the quarry at Dursley some 20 years ago, when quite soft. The subject,
however, was rather of a geological than antiquarian or historical character.

The following interesting *Notes on the Chapel of Wortley, by Wotton-
under-Edge,* were read by Mr. V. R. Perkins:—

Wortley is one of the hamlets of the parish of Wotton-under-Edge. It
was formerly part of the great Berkeley estate, but now the property of
Major-General Hale, of Alderley.

In the fourth year of Edward III, A.D. 1331, Thomas Lord Berkeley
granted to Walter de Combe and the heirs of his body, a place of land
called Church Hay, containing 20 perches, at Wortley, to build a "Chappel"
there in honour of St. John the Baptist, paying one penny rent; for which he
faithfully promised that all Chaplens there celebrating should for ever have
the said Lord Thomas and his heirs in memory, in life and death, in all
masses and orisons in that Chappel.

In 17th Edward III. Thomas Lord Berkeley (iii) founded four chantries
in the four villages of Newport, Sido, Cambrid, and Wortley, and endowed
them with possessions competent to the maintenance of a priest at each.
A messuage and one yard land and 50 shillings rent per annum in Wotton
were assigned for a Chaplen and his successors, Divina singulis diebus cele-

1 Berkeley MSS. (Maclean's Edin.), Vol. I., p. 333.
bratura in capella de Wortley licensed by the King and confirmed by Wolston Bishop of Worcester; "and by his charter of foundation appointed what kind of masse and prayers should bee said and sunge upon usall dayes, ordinary holidays, and spetiall festivalles, in see devout and holy a manner. That unlesse hee had been a schollar to John Wicklefe (who now lived) hee could not have come neerer to the doctrine of these present days in the Church of England, forbidding this his priest to take any money of any, or to be servant or chaplen to any but God only in spiritualities and to himself in honest and necessary temporalties; and that hee should live chastly and honestly and not come to Markettes, Alehouses, or Tavernes, neither should frequent plays or unlawfull games. In a word hee made this his priest by these ordinances, to be one of those honest men whom we mistake and call puritanes.1

In 1468 the advowson of this chantry was vested in Margaret, Countess of Shrewesbury, who was grand-daughter of Thomas Lord Berkeley, the founder of the chantry, and through her it passed to William Marquess of Berkeley, who levied a fine on the advowson of the chapel in 1488, 3rd Henry VII.

Posbroke tells us Wortley Chapel was repaired in 1506, and in 1514 the chantry priests' wages were £6.

The last incumbent was John Gobins (Atkyns) John Collins (Rudder) and received a pension of £2 10s. in the year 1553 (Willis).

In the Chantry Certificates, by Sir John Maclean, in Vol. VIII. of the Transactions of this Society, we find:—

"Wortleye ffree Chapell beinge noe pishe Churche

founded by lyeence of mo'ntmayn for the fyndinge of a Chaplyn there to singe and praye for the founders sowlez and all xpen sowlez for ever & the same is distjnte from the scid pishe Churche about halfe a mile.

Sir John Collins Incitent there of thage of xlvi yerez whose ys pson of Lyttleton & vicar of Oldestone beside e his stipende in the Juice wch ys yerelye

The land e and ten e belonging to the same are of the yerelye value of

In reprisez yerely
And so rennyth elcre by yerexj
Ornament theerto belonginglxii
Two bell e wayeng C weight valued atxx

Henry Lord Berkeley, by deed dated 20th May, 14th Elizabeth, 1567, released all his right in those lands in Wortley, late parell of the Chantry of St. John the Baptist, in Wortley, and in divers lands in Wortley, called the Lampe lands.2

All that remains of this chapel at the present time is one buttress at the east end; another similar one was taken down some few years since. The chapel itself was long ago converted into a dwelling house, in which the

1 Berkeley MSS. (Maclean's Edn.), Vol. I (p. 335, 336).

2 The grant of the possessions of this Chantry was doubtless acquired by Sir Nicholas Poyntz, like the possessions of the Abbey of Kingswood, and with those conveyed to Thomas Rivet, with the release of Henry Lord Berkeley.—See post under Odensworth.—Ed.
carpenter to the Alderley estate now lives. This man, now over seventy years of age, was born in this house, and he tells me he recollects very well, when he was a little boy, the doorway into the chapel, and also two gothic windows which were in the sitting room, and the bedroom in which he used to sleep was unceiled, showing the timbered roof of the chapel.

Among relics found at various times was a small gilded statuette of the Virgin Mary—this, he says, after lying about his premises for many years, was sent up to the Squire’s house at Alderley. On my remarking that the chapel was dedicated to St. John the Baptist, and that it was singular to find a statue of the Virgin, his reply was he believed it to be the Virgin Mary, but she had lost her head. This little relic has been discovered. It is very weather-worn, and without head or neck, one arm is broken off, the other holding the ample folds of the dress, but it still shows traces of some colour, which was originally blue and gold.

THURSDAY, 5th AUGUST.

In the morning at 9.30., the closing meeting of the Society was held at the “Old Bell” Hotel, the President in the chair. There were present:—Sir John Maclean, General Vizard, Colonel Bayly, Colonel Forbes; Messrs. E. Hartland, A. le Biane; The Revs. F. J. Peyton, W. Bagnall-Oakeley, W. T. Allen, S. E. Bartleet, E. A. D’Argent, Rev. W. Bazeley (Hon. Sec.), and others.

The following resolutions were proposed from the chair, and unanimously adopted:—

I. The question of the place where the summer meeting for the year 1887 should be held, was then considered. Several places were mentioned, e.g.:—Wales, Shipton-on-Stour, Stratford-on-Avon, &c., and it was finally resolved:—

II. That the annual meeting next year, shall be held at Stratford-upon-Avon, or some other place convenient for visiting the northern part of the county, to be determined by the council, and that the choice of the President be left to that body.

III. The Rev. W. T. Allen proposed, that such a number of the volumes of the Transactions as could conveniently be spared, be presented to the Rev. T. P. Wadley, who had been elected an Honorary Member of the Society, in further recognition of the great service he had rendered the Society in abstracting the Bristol Wills. This having been duly seconded, was unanimously adopted.

IV. Proposed, seconded, and unanimously adopted, that the hearty thanks of the Society be given Sir Henry Barkly, for the great interest he had taken in the proceedings of the meeting, and for the courtesy and cordiality he had uniformly displayed.

THE EXCURSION.

A carriage excursion was then made to Ozleworth, Kingswood, and Wotton-under-Edge. There were present:—Sir Henry Barkly (The President), Sir John Maclean, General Vizard, Colonel Forbes, Colonel Bayly; The Revs. S. E. Bartleet, W. T. Allen, F. J. Peyton, W. Letts, W. Bagnall-Oakeley, and W. Bazeley; Messrs. E. Hartland, V. R. Perkins, and others, and several ladies.
After a beautiful drive over the hills, the party reached the very remarkable Church of Ozleworth, at which Mr. Perkins acted as guide, and he remarked that on the exterior of the chapel there is a shield on which is a cross with a letter “T” on either side of it.

He then read the following Paper on

**The Manor of Ozleworth.**

In Domesday Book we find that King Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror had half a hide of land in demesne in Osleuaro.de: in the Red Book of the Exchequer this is spelt Essleward, now it is Ozleworth, or, as the inhabitants of the neighbouring parishes call it, Wozleworth. William the Conqueror granted this manor to Roger de Berkeley of Dursley.

Roger de Berkeley granted the advowson of the Church of Ozleworth, and also that of West Newenton to the Priory of Stanley St. Leonards, which was a cell to the great Abbey of St. Peter's, Gloucester. After a writ, *ad quod damnum* dated 10th April, 1307 (35th Edw. I.) and an Inquisition thereupon in the same year, it was purchased by the Abbot of Kingswood by Wotton-under-Edge, together with the advowson of West Newenton, and an acre of land in Bagpath of the Abbot of Gloucester in exchange for £10 rent in Hasleden and Cullerton: the £10 rent being held of Peter de Breuse in *puram eleemosynam*.

In the reign of Henry III. a great deal of land in Ozleworth was in the hands of the family of Rochford, and by them given to the Abbey of Kingswood.

By deed dated 1272 (56th Hen. III.), Henry de Berkeley, of Dursley, received 80 marks of the Abbot and Convent of Kingswood for the Manor of Ozleworth, and this manor continued with the Abbey of Kingswood till the dissolution of the monasteries in 1540.

The Priory of Stanley had a portion of 6s. 8d. and Kingswood Abbey in great and small tithes, 16s. 8d. In the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* it is rated at £6 10s. 4d. In the 31st Hen. VIII. it was, after the dissolution, granted to Sir Nicholas Pointz, yet we find that Sir Robert Pointz, grandfather to Sir Nicholas, died seized of it (probably as tenant) in the 12th Hen. VIII.

Sir Nicholas Pointz, who had the grant of the manor, died on 4th of March, and Nicholas Pointz his son had livery of the manor granted him the same year. He sold it to Sir Thomas Rivet, alderman of London, and from him it was purchased by another London alderman, Sir Gabriel Low. Sir Thomas Low his son was lord of the manor in 1608. It remained in this family until 1722, when it was sold to —— Harding, and the exors of John Harding sold it about the year 1770 to James Clutterbuck, of Claverton House, near Bath, and in this family it still remains, J.E.Clutterbuck, M.D., being the present lord of the manor. The manor house is situated on the top of the hill and commands very extensive views of the country round. It was built in the reign of King Edw. VI. (1547-53) by Sir Nicholas Pointz, the elder, partly with the stones and timber of the demolished Monastery of Kingswood, and partly with the stones pulled from the crosses in the surrounding parishes. Smyth describes it thus: "An house whose seition
may seeme (with small helpe from the figure hyperbole) to overlook the North Pole from whence may be seen the Church and Village of Owseworth seated in the depth of a deepe valley where the inhabitants may (if usually they do not) cut, make, and cast their billet wool and fagots in at their chimney pots to save further carriage.” The north and east sides of the house are old, but the south front was added by Wyatt early in the present century. It was originally called Ozleworth House, and on 26th May, 1572, at the request of Sir Nicholas Pointz, Henry Lord Berkeley, by deed released all his right and interest in the capital messuage called Owseworth House, alias the New Buildinge, and in the lands thereto belonginge. This dwellinge house called the “new worke” is now “Newark,” from its position on an eminence—a scriptural allusion once in fashion, as appears from Newark, a house of the Prior of Lanithony of like situation, near Gloucester, and other instances gave the seat the same appellation, and Ararat, the name of the farm near by, on the brow of the same hill, looking on to the town of Wotton underneath.

The mansion near the church is a modern building, purchased some years ago by the late Sir John Rolt, who spent most of his leisure time in this quiet retreat, and died here in 1871. It is now the property of his grandson.

Referring to the Church of Ozleworth, Mr. Perkins observed, it is remarkably singular and curiously beautiful in its architectural character. It contains many traces of early Norman work. The tower, which before the elongation of the nave in 1873, was in the centre of the building, is an irregular hexagon, a form very rarely met with, and is supposed to have been

1 We can add a few particulars in continuation of what has been stated by Mr. Perkins. Mr. Perkins says he finds that Sir Robert Poynitz, grandfather of Sir Nicholas, died seized of the Manor of Ozleworth in 12th Henry VIII. (1529), and suggests that he probably held it as tenant, but he omits to cite his authority for this statement. We may remark, however, that as an ordinary tenant, or occupier, he would not have been described as seized. Sir Robert Poynitz died 5th Nov. 1520, as shown by the Inquisition taken thereupon at Bristol, on 23rd September in the following year, of the messages and tenements which he held in that city (Inq. p.m. 13th Henry VIII. Exch. No. 5), and in the Inquisition held at Thornbury on the 4th November following, of his possessions in the County of Gloucester, no mention is made of the Manor of Ozleworth, nor is the manor named in his will dated 19th October, 1520. The fact is that the Manor of Ozleworth continued parcel of the possessions of the Abbey of Kingswood until the dissolution of that House, when it fell to the King, who, on the 10th of March, 1538, granted a lease of the whole of the Kingswood estate to Sir Nicholas Poynitz, of Iron Acton, for the term of 21 years at the annual rent of 245 8s. 6d., the Manor of Ozleworth itself being then valued at £10 9s. per annum. (Dugdale’s Monasticon, Vol. V., pages 426, 428), and the following year granted the whole to him in fee. This Sir Nicholas was the builder of the new house on the hill, “partly,” Smyth states, “with the stones and timber of the foresaid demolished Monastery of Kingswood, and partly with the stones pulled from the crosses in the parishes thereabouts,” pp. 426, 428. Sir Nicholas died seized in 1557, the exact date is illegible in the Inquisition p.m. 3rd and 4th Philip and Mary, part 1, No. 51), but his will, dated 20th February, 1555-6, was proved 8th July, 1557, by it he devised to his wife Dame Johan his new house in Oxleworth that standeth on the hill, and the park, for her life, with remainder to his son Francis Poynitz for his life. This will, as stated above, was proved on 3rd July 1557, by Johan Poynitz, the relife, and executors of the deceased. How these bequests were set aside we are unable to state, perhaps under some family arrangement, but Nicholas Poynitz, the son and heir, was granted livery of seisin in the same year, who sold it to Thomas Rivet, as stated by Mr. Perkins. What interest Henry Lord Berkeley could have had in it we are unable to say. Probable it was under some mortgage, for from this date the Poynitzs of Iron Acton never flourished.—Ed.

2 Swindon Church, not far from Cheltenham, is another instance of the hexagonal tower.
the original church. It is also said to have been a Mortuary Chapel of the Knights' Templars, but upon what authority he said he could not understand. The present and only entrance to the church is on the south side through the porch. Above the doorway is a circular arch, richly ornamented with foliage, and is of a most unusual—if not unique—design; there is said to be only one other arch at all like it, and that is in Normandy. The capitals of the columns on each side are also similarly ornamented. There was formerly a north door in the nave, now walled up, and against it, on the outside, is fastened a very fine old stone coffin, which was dug up many years ago. In the interior of the church the nave is divided from the tower by a sharp-pointed early English arch, covered with very highly relieved zig-zag tracery—"a bold open work of cylinders forming angles with each other but of different inclinations and of different planes"; this is also an example of rare occurrence. The ornamentation of this arch is said to have been continued down to the floors, the grooves being left where it has been cut away. He called attention to the rood-loft staircase in the wall by the chancel arch and to the doorway at the side in the tower above the present pulpit leading to the loft. The chancel is of 14th century work, the nave and font are early English. The nave was elongated, and the gallery pew at the end removed in 1873. This gallery pew belonged to the great house, and was entered from the outside by a flight of steps and door leading into the pew direct. The Church is a Rectory in the Deanery of Dursley, and is dedicated to St. Nicholas. It was given by Roger de Berkeley, of Dursley (to whom the Manor of Ozleworth was granted by William the Conqueror), to the Priory of St. Leonard Stanley, which was a cell to the great Abbey of St. Peter's, Gloucester.

The Church of Ozleworth appears in the list of patronage of St. Peter’s, Gloucester, 1164-1179.

The existing Registers date only from the year 1698.

1511. Roger Cawhill, Clerk, was presented the Church of Ozleworth by Abbot Newton in 1511, on the death of Charles Lyce.

1512. In 1512 Richard Bond was presented on the death of Roger Cawhill.

1528. The Abbot granted the next presentation to Edward ap Hoel, of London.

**Rectors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustine Pylsworth</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Thomas Rivet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In looking through the Gloucester Registers I found this note:

"Queen Elizabeth. A bond for induding Augustine Pylsworth in Wotton-under-Edge." But I do not find his name among Wotton-under-Edge vicars, though in 1571 this baptism is registered:—

1571. Margaret, d. of Augustine Pylsworth.


2 Rudder has printed in his History of Gloucestershire, Appendix No. xxiv., a Charter of Confirmation, by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, of gifts to Priory of St. Leonards Stanley, of which the Advowson of Ozleworth was a portion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Pilsworth</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Thomas Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gwynn, A.M.</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Gabriel Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Bennet</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Timothy Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hill</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Clissold, Curate</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Clutterbuck</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mayo</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Lewis Clutterbuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Clutterbuck</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Lewis Clutterbuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matthew Blagdon Hale was consecrated Bishop of Brisbane, and on his retirement was presented to the vicarage of Oselworth, by Mr. James Clutterbuck, but on his arrival in England he declined to accept it.
Isaac Walton, present Rector . 1855 . . . James Clutterbuck

Sir Henry Barkly said he must take exception to two points in the valuable paper read by Mr. Perkins as to this church. First, to his supposition that it was built by the Knights' Templars; second, that the right of presentation to it had passed from the Abbey of St. Peter, Gloucester, to the Abbey of Kingswood. As regards the former, I still consider that there is not the slightest ground for such a conjecture. A church was certainly in existence at Oselworth early in the 12th century, for it was one of those conferred by Roger de Berkely (11), who died in 1130, on his Priory of Stanley St. Leonard's.

The arch above the door into the nave is so plain in style and rude in workmanship that it seems to me that it might well have formed part of the building, though I observe that Mr. Pettit referred the hexagonal tower to the "latest Norman" or "transition" period in consequence of one of the arches supporting it being pointed.

As regards the second question, I find that such conflicting evidence is in existence that it is not in the least surprising that Mr. Perkins should have come to a different conclusion from that which I entertain. I think, however, that a closer examination will confirm my view, e.g., In 1143 Archbishop Theobald confirmed the donation of the Church of Oselworth to St. Leonard's.—Dugdale's Monasticon.

In 1146 Roger de Berkeley (iii.) transferred Oselworth Church with the Priory of St. Leonard's to St. Peter's Abbey.—Cartulary of Gloucester.

In 1207 Robert de Rochford sued Roger de Berkeley v., in order to compel him to obtain an exchange of the advowson of the Church of Oselworth "quam amasit versus Abbobtem de Glouc." (anmisit, evidently here meaning "relinquished freely"). Roger denied that he had given Oselworth to Robert, but is prepared to warrant the Charter which he gave to Thomas de Rochford (Robert's brother) of the Manor of Oselton.¹ Robert withdraws, sine die, by leave of the Court.—Abbr. Placit. S Joh. Iot. 1 in dorso

¹ Is it possible that this was Caldecote?
THE CHURCH OF OSELWORTH.

No doubt it was about this time that Roger de Berkeley (v.) executed the confirmation of Oselworth Church to St. Peter's, "as given by his father and his ancestors."—Cart. DXXXVIII.

In 1242 the Rochfords and De la Beres having given to Kingswood Abbey all the lands Roger de Berkeley had given them at Oselworth, the monks there laid claim to the advowson of the church also, but John de Berkeley of Dursley came forward at the call of the Abbot of St. Peter's, Gloucester, to warrant that it had been given to this Abbey by his ancestors, and confirmed by his grandfather Roger.—Vide the Berkeleys of Dursley in 13th and 14th centuries, p. 7.

In 1272 Henry de Berkeley Lord of Dursley, received eighty marks from the Abbey of Kingswood for confirmation of the Manor of Oselworth, but this, as Smyth explains two pages earlier, was really the Manor of Caldecote (now reported to be in Newington parish), "which that abbey held and called a manor, or the Manor of Oselworth."—Berkeley MSS. Maclean's edn., Vol. III. Hundred of Berkeley, pp. 306-308.

In 1306 having thus acquired the whole Parish of Oselworth, the Monks of Kingswood renewed their endeavours to get the church, and it appears from an Inquisition in 35th Edw. I. that their Abbot purchased of the Abbot of Gloucester one acre of land in Bagpath with the advowson of the Churches of Oselworth and West Newington, by way of exchange for £10 rent in Haseldean and Culberton, given by the Abbot of Kingswood to Gloucester, and that the said churches were held by John (ii.), son of William de Berkeley, then in ward to the King.—Ibid.

Either, however, John refused to assist on coming of age or the arrangement fell through from some other cause, for

In 1357 Oselworth Church is included in the list of the churches belonging to St. Peter's Abbey at that date (Cartulary Vol. III. p. 31), and this is confirmed by the presentations cited by Mr. Perkins, as well as by Rudder, who expressly states that

In 1510 (2 Hen. VIII) the patronage of Oselworth was vested in that abbey.
It does not, however, appear among its possessions at the Dissolution.

Upon leaving the church the party walked across the grounds of the mansion, known as The Court House, and resuming their places in the brakes, proceeded down the valley, through rich meadows and closely wooded lanes, to Kingswood Abbey, Mr. Perkins still acting as guide, to visit the remains of the old abbey founded by William Berkeley, of Dursley, in 1139, passing on the way Wortley Chapel, on which Mr. Perkins had read some notes on the Tuesday evening, and to which he directed attention in passing.

KINGSWOOD ABBEY.

All that now remains of this ancient abbey are the entrance gateway and the external walls, extending east and west on either side, now forming the fronts of ranges of labourers' cottages, as stated by Mr. Perkins in the paper he read at Dursley on Tuesday evening, in which he gave a history of the Abbey.

Vol. XI. 0
Over one of the cottage windows on the eastern side of the gateway is inserted a small escutcheon of arms. It would appear to be thus charged: Per fess, in chief harry wavy of four, and in base chequy (but without a closer inspection by means of a ladder we are unable to speak with certainty), over all a sword in pale point upward. We do not know of any such arms. Beneath this is carved on stone in Arabic figures the date 1123. Some of those present thought this was a contemporary date, and Sir John Maclean's attention being called to it, he pointed out that Arabic numerals were unknown in England at the date stated, were not used until centuries later, and then in form, he said, they were unlike those on the wall. He said the only example known to him of the use of Arabic numerals in England, except in manuscript, is an escutcheon on the church door at Rendcombe, in this county. In that case the figures are doubtful with the exception of the last three, which are pronounced to be certainly 417, and it is supposed that the year 1417 is indicated. Arabic numerals, however, he said, were used in writing at a much earlier date. The earliest known to him, personally, are to be found in an account at Exeter College, Oxford, sparsely used with Roman characters, in the 14th century. He added that the forms of the figures at those early dates are very unlike those now in use. Those under the escutcheon on the wall appeared to him to be of the 17th century, certainly not earlier, and the shape of the shield and its ornamentation are of the same date; and he desired the company to take notice that the fictitious date is not on the same stone as the shield, but on a piece of stone of a different character.

Turning to the Great Gateway, Sir John called attention to the details of the structure. Alluding to Mr. Perkin's description of it in his paper, he said he was disposed to agree with Mr. Perkins in thinking that the upper story, in its present condition, was probably later than the lower story, and suggested that, possibly, the upper part had been taken down when the rest of the abbey was destroyed and afterwards rebuilt, the old materials being used. He considered that the whole was of a later date than that attributed to it by Mr. Perkins. He did not think that any portion of it was earlier than the end of the 15th century, if so old. Directing attention to the details of the niche and the pinnacles, he requested those present to recall to their minds the niches and pinnacles of the church porch at Dursley, which resembled these so closely as almost to lead to the conclusion that they

1 Since the meeting we have looked a little further into the question of the introduction of the Arabic characters of notation now almost exclusively used. Considering their superiority over the Roman system, it seems amazing that they were not generally adopted earlier. Sir Francis Palgrave, about 40 years ago, brought under notice the use of one Arabic character with Roman numerals as early as 1252. It was the representative of the figure 3. In 1850 the late Mr. Joseph Hunter, of the Public Record Office, laid before the Archaeological Institute a warrant from Hugh le Despenser to certain Italian merchants to pay £40, the receipt of money being indorsed in Arabic characters. This was in 1225. The indorsement was not in the same hand-writing, nor was it written by an Englishman, but it shows that Arabic numerals were sometimes used in England in the beginning of the 14th century in matters of business. The date of the document at Oxford, mentioned in the text, is 1373. In the 15th century examples are more frequently found, but, strange to say, the Arabic system of arithmetical notation, notwithstanding its manifest advantages, did not come into general use until the latter end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century, and even now, as everyone knows, it has not entirely superseded the simple though clumsy Roman system.

2 Mr. Pope does not concur in this. He thinks that the whole was built at the same time.
had been built at the same time and by the same man. It was elicited from an aged man present that he remembered a somewhat similar gateway half way up the street, now removed, and a large building at a place called Cam's hole, on the north side, near the water, within the abbey precincts. This is also removed. 1

The site of the old abbey, about a mile distant across the fields, is now a farm-house. It has a two-light window of ancient date, but all the rest is modern.

Some few of the members visited the church close by, built in the reign of George I., and is as poor and ugly as could be conceived even at that period.

The next place visited was

Wotton-under-Edge,

where lunch had been provided at the Swan Hotel. The President took the Chair.

After lunch the party visited the fine, though sadly mutilated, Parish Church, under the guidance of the Vicar, the Rev. H. Sewell, who read a paper thereon, which will be printed post; and Mr. Perkins made some remarks on the fine Brasses of Sir Thomas Berkeley, Lord Berkeley, the 4th of his name, and the tenth of his line, who died in 1417, and of the Lady Margaret his wife, sole daughter and heir of Gerard Warren, Lord de Lisle, by Alice daughter and heir of Henry Lord Tyes. Lady Berkeley died 20th March, 1392-3. A good description of these brasses is given by Mr. Cecil T. Davis in his "Brasses in Gloucestershire," and they have been illustrated in various works. There is also a magnificent slab, now broken into three pieces, which form the matrix of a very handsome cross which commemorated Richard de Wotton, Rector of the parish, circa 1320.

Leaving the church, the party, under the guidance of Mr. Perkins, visited several places of interest in the town, and returning to the churchyard, a photographer was found there exercising his art, when Col. Forbes proposed that the whole party should be photographed. This was generally assented to, and the party was grouped for the purpose in front of the west door of the church, when the President, with quiet humour, remarked that the group consisted of "Barclay Perkins & Co.

Some members having partaken of afternoon tea, kindly offered by Mrs. Thomas at Lisle House, close to the church, the party proceeded to rejoin their carriages, and, on the way, at the invitation of Mr. Perkins, some of members visited his interesting old Jacobean House, panelled throughout with oak. The party then broke up, having enjoyed beautiful weather throughout the whole time of the meeting.

1 Sir Robt. Atkyns, in his History of Glouce., p. 438, says of this place: "The gatehouse is still to be seen, and a considerable part of the abbey is yet standing, but divided into several tenements. There is carved, and still remaining, over the kitchen chimney of the abbey, a tiger, a hart, an ostrich, a mermaid, an ass, and a swan, the first letters of which creatures spell Thomas, the name of the Lord Berkeley, who was a considerable benefactor and patron to that foundation." Lysons adds: "this was probably Thomas Lord Berkeley, who died 35th Edw. III., and was a great benefactor to many religious houses, as the building, from the style of the architecture, appears to have been erected at that time." The Thomas Lord Berkeley who died 31th Ed. III. (not 35th), was the third Lord Berkeley of that name, but we do not find that he was in any way a benefactor to Kingswood Abbey, though his relict, the Lady Katherine, before her death, gave the abbey a yearly pension of six marks, and when she died many rich gifts, and endowed the house with fair possessions of her own purchase, which were confirmed by her husband's grandchild. (Berkeley MSS., Vol. I., p. 347). We are sorry to add that the remains mentioned by Atkyns are now not to be found.