From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

Presidential Address

by H. Gee
1921, Vol. 43, 37-56

© The Society and the Author(s)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

By the Very Rev. Henry Gee, D.D., F.S.A.,

Dean of Gloucester.

LET me begin with a few words of welcome and of general review before I take up the special matter to which I desire to direct your attention this evening. It is a pleasure to us in Gloucester to receive again in this ancient city the members of the Royal Archaeological Institute, and to associate ourselves with them for a few days in the study of some of our local antiquities. I say 'to receive again,' for we remember that this is the third visit of the Institute to Gloucester. To me, if I may venture to speak of my own feelings, the present occasion brings special pleasure as it recalls to me those happy days of security before the war, when it fell to my lot to welcome the Institute in the noble hall of Durham Castle, and to spend a week with them in exploring the records and remains of the great days of the Palatinate of Durham. Some of the friends who were associated in that sunny week of expeditions are present with us to-day, whilst others have left us never to return.

Previous visits of the Institute to this city and neighbourhood were something more than mere picnics. They resulted, to some extent, in producing a real contribution to knowledge, leading, moreover, to questioning and investigation from which has been evolved, in certain instances, something more stable in the way of information than was possessed before. At the least they helped the local historian to discriminate more accurately between knowledge and conjecture than was previously possible, so that to-day we see more clearly than before what still remains to be

ascertained and in what directions our further exploration should be made. The first of these visits was paid in 1860. You must remember that at that time local associations were few in number and, in most cases, of recent origin. One or two had a respectable age attached to them, as, for instance, the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which began its course in 1813. Others had reached maturity like the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society founded in 1839, and the Cambridge Antiquarian Society commenced in 1840. I think that we may date the wider interest taken in local antiquities generally to the formation of the British Archaeological Association in 1843 and of the Royal Archaeological Institute in 1844. By the system of annual congresses which these two societies instituted, visiting year by year some fresh centre of exploration, and drawing into close association and conference many of the best antiquaries of the day, they were able to bring a large amount of expert knowledge to bear upon what had often been the province, the frequently undisputed province, of the local archaeologist. The reports of those congresses carefully collected in annual volumes form, in many cases, a storehouse of information concerning the localities visited. In some places the two societies were able to speak with a voice which commanded attention, and to make an appeal on behalf of buildings or institutions which were threatened with destruction. Here in Gloucester, for instance, the rescue of the interesting little chapel of St. Mary Magdalen's hospital appears to be due very largely, if not entirely, to the intercession of the Archaeological Association at their visit to Gloucester in 1846. It is difficult to restrain in passing the expression of regret that these societies, or some local society, or indeed, any society at all, could not have brought influence to bear upon the city—and, I will add, upon the dean and chapter, in far earlier days—to ensure the preservation of many an interesting feature of old Gloucester which has

been ruthlessly destroyed. Where is Gloucester High Cross, where are the Tolsey, the Booth-hall, the Butter Cross, and above all where are the four gates of the city? What did the city do to preserve these pieces of ancient history? And of what sort of stuff were the dean and chapter of Gloucester made to permit the demolition of King Edward's gate, and to suffer the gradual decay of the west gate of the college, so that to-day it is hopelessly beyond the power of their successors to maintain it, let alone to restore it? And how did they bring themselves to suffer that great blot on the precincts of the cathedral, the desecration of the upper churchyard which adjoins it, that God's Acre which is the resting place of countless citizens of Gloucester who had right of sepulture there from the time of the Norman Conquest, if not before. I still hope, and my colleagues at the cathedral share my hope, to see that bare ugly patch made a place of beauty, such as it ought to be.

Well, it is unfortunate that archaeological societies, whether central or provincial, did not, at an earlier date, bring influence to bear upon the wise preservation of ancient monuments. One thing seems certain that we may directly attribute to the formation of the Association and of the Institute a very considerable spread of interest in ancient survivals. They provoked local patriotism, and they helped forward the study of the wealth of historical remains that exist to-day, despite all vandalism and neglect, in so many parts of our country. I think you will find that these annual visits to different parts of England were a direct stimulus leading to the formation of local antiquarian societies. Thus we get the inception of the Bedfordshire Society in 1844, the Cambrian in 1846, the Norfolk and Norwich in 1846, and the Sussex in the same year. In this particular part of England they came into being a little later, the Wilts society in 1853, the Somerset in 1849, our own Bristol and Gloucestershire society in

1876, though we must never forget that here in Gloucester there was a small meeting which was amalgamated with the Cotteswold Field club about 1850.

I shall not, however, attempt any review of Archaeological progress in Gloucestershire. That would be unbecoming in one who has so recently come to live in Gloucester, and can not, therefore, lay any claim at present to the requisite knowledge or research for attempting such a task. Such an attempt might be very properly made by some competent person five years hence when we celebrate the jubilee of our organisation. I may, however, be allowed to say something about Gloucester cathedral with which I am directly associated. The visit of the Institute in 1860 formed a real land-mark in the study of the history and architecture of the cathedral. You must remember that at that time the standard descriptions of the building were ill-informed. The local guide-book spoke, for instance, of the Saracenic decoration of the choir canopy, and it seems to have been the fashion, based upon a paper delivered in the cathedral in 1846, to describe the great cylindrical columns of the nave as Saxon. Now it was from the vagueness of guess-work that Professor Willis redeemed the architectural history of the cathedral by his address. He was the first authority to bring to bear upon its elucidation the manuscript History of St. Peter's, to which I shall refer later. Unfortunately his words were not written down, but we have a brief report of what he said; and to that address we may refer the commencement of the scientific study of the building. As you probably know, we owe to his deep knowledge and his balanced judgement similar studies for Canterbury, Winchester, York, Chichester and Worcester. The very imperfect report of what Professor Willis said is still the starting point of what, I think, we may call the scientific study of Gloucester cathedral, remembering that for the first time, so far as I know, a scholar was speaking who was not only a good his-

torian, but also a good architect, and, it may be added, a good engineer—a very rare combination to which he added a wonderful power of luminous exposition. We owe his description of our cathedral directly to the visit of the Institute in 1860.

Thirty years passed by and proved a very fruitful time in archaeological research. It was a time when scholars were free to give themselves up to those lines of study which attracted them, and without all those upsetting social and economic changes which the world-catastrophe of our own period introduced in 1914. New realms of learning were opened up and made accessible. I will merely remind you in passing how the National records were being calendared and made available for reference at the Public Record Office; how the growing stores of printed books and of manuscripts were being placed at the disposal of readers in the British Museum; how local collections of manuscript treasures were inspected and reported on by the Historical Manuscripts Commission; how precious texts dealing with antiquity were being put into print. In fact, the means of knowledge multiplied on every hand. I mention merely one special department which received considerable attention, namely, monastic buildings and the monastic life generally. It was from this source that new light was thrown by degrees upon the cathedrals of the New Foundation—Cathedrals, that is, which had once been the churches of religious houses, but in the reign of Henry VIII, or at some subsequent time, were refounded as establishments of Dean and Canons. The study of monastic literature, and the excavation of monastic sites, gave a new meaning to such a place as Gloucester Cathedral, which became intelligible in a way in which it had never yet been understood. Two prominent members of the Institute were leaders in this branch of research, the late Mr. J. T. Micklethwaite, resident architect of Westminster Abbey, and Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, later known

as Sir William Hope. Mr. Hope, who was not only marvellously adroit in reading from the buildings themselves their story, but was also a real student of documents, came down to Gloucester on more than one occasion, and largely in conference with the late Mr. F. S. Waller produced a plan of the Abbey precincts, and drew up an account of the conventual buildings which carried our knowledge far beyond the point reached by Professor Willis. The account was read by Mr. Hope at the second visit of the Institute to Gloucester which took place in 1890. All the comparative study of Benedictine and other houses which had been in progress since the visit of 1860 was brought to bear upon the history and use of the buildings. No serious student of our Cathedral can afford to neglect Mr. Hope's paper.

In speaking thus of what we owe to scholars outside Gloucestershire, I do not forget our own local antiquaries who have done good work in various ways, Mr. Niblett, Mr. Gambier Parry, Mr. Grimké-Drayton, the late dean Dr. Spence Jones, amongst those who have passed from us, and Mr. St. Clair Baddeley and Canon Bazeley who are still with us and have reached results of permanent value, as the *Transactions* of our local society attest. To-day, however, we in Gloucester are welcoming to our city the Royal Archaeological Institute, and it is, at least, fitting to recall the former visits of the Institute, to remember what fruit they bore, and to express the hope that our united efforts on this occasion may penetrate more deeply still into what is yet unknown or uncertain about local archaeology in general and the history of the Cathedral in particular.

2. THE NORMAN BUILDERS OF THE CATHEDRAL.

I now pass on from these words of welcome and remembrance to deal with the special point which has been announced as the main subject of my address to-night. I propose to invite your attention to what we can recover as

to the work of the Norman builders of the Cathedral. I do not refer to their methods of building, to the quarries from which they obtained their materials, or to the workmen whom they employed. I doubt whether we shall ever be able to rewrite that story, but I earnestly trust that we may be able from such evidence as exists to trace a little more in detail than has ever yet been accomplished the various stages through which the great Norman church of St. Peter passed under the hands of the Normans. I have lived for some years under the shadow of another great Norman cathedral where wealth was abundant, and yet progress was slow and extended over more than one generation of Norman builders. Slow progress is characteristic indeed of the Norman work of other English cathedrals, and under the influence of those examples I have constantly felt since I came to Gloucester that the building of the Norman church was a much more protracted process than many who have written about Gloucester have believed. In this connexion I would point out that Gloucester differed from some other great foundations in that it possessed no relics, no great centre of pilgrimage during its Norman period. There was no body of St. Cuthbert brought to it as at Durham, no famous royal burial to attract visitors, and to draw from them generous contributions to the fabric fund. In this respect the advantage lay entirely with the priory of St. Oswald, which was close by and in a real sense a rival. St. Oswald's contained the relics of some important people, and its great treasure was the body of St. Oswald, the head of which lay, indeed, still lies, in the feretory at Durham. Indeed, until the burial of the boy Harold in St. Peter's church in 1168 there was nothing, as far as I know, to attract gifts of money. Consequently we have to look for other sources of income for carrying out extensive building schemes which must have involved vast outlay.

Now there are two lines of evidence to follow up, the one

documentary, and the other architectural, if we are to trace the history of the fabric. Let me say frankly that I am no architect, and that I am not qualified to express an opinion upon the architectural side of our investigation. That is being carefully studied by scholars who are experts, and I hope to read to you presently the tentative conclusions of one who is acknowledged both in England and in France to be in the front rank of architectural students, and has also a right to be heard with attention in this city because he has long been familiar with our buildings, and has recently spent much time in examining them closely on the spot. My own contribution to the investigation is concerned entirely with the documentary side. I have had some dealing in my time with documents, and it seems appropriate that if I am to speak at all I should confine myself to a province of research in which I have had a little experience. My purpose is to take such documentary evidence as exists in order to elucidate the history of the fabric of St. Peter's church from the Norman Conquest down to about the year 1190. I go no farther than that year because, I suppose, the Norman epoch comes to an end thereabouts, and because there was a fire in 1190 which gravely damaged the monastic buildings, succeeded by others in 1222 and 1223 which raise difficulties that lie outside my proper investigation to-day.

What is the documentary evidence available for the years under review, that is to say from the first Norman abbot in 1072 down to my lower limit, 1190? When Professor Willis dealt with the cathedral sixty years ago he said that Gloucester is particularly fortunate in possessing "a complete account of the building in the *Historia* of Abbot Frocester, which gives every particular of the erection of the building, short of the actual building accounts, and thus enables us to date the particular parts of it more accurately than can be done with most other ancient edifices." I shall say more about that *Historia*

presently; but let me remind you of what I have already said—that the years which have run their course since Willis gave his admirable address have been exceedingly fruitful, and that we have available means of knowledge in many directions which are illuminating. In the present instance the fuller sources of information are certainly not as full as we could wish them to be, and I fear that you will be disappointed with the result; but this is quite certain—that Frocester's *Historia* is not by any means the only historical document with which we have to deal. In point of fact the evidence is manifold; and although my examination of it can not be regarded as final, I am going to venture to put before you the various classes of evidence that we possess, and to attempt a slight critical examination of them.

For the early years which followed the Conquest we have, of course, the Norman chroniclers proper such as Orderic, and William of Jumiéges, who help us to the general framework, but contribute no special facts about Gloucester in particular. When we reach the more peaceful days of Henry I we reap the first-fruits of the historical studies which were then being undertaken in great monastic houses refounded by the Normans in England, at Winchester, Worcester, Peterborough, Malmesbury and elsewhere. In particular there are the continuations of the so-called Anglo-Saxon Chronicle known generally as the Worcester and Peterborough Chronicles, or by the letters D and E. There is also the further Worcester Chronicle called by the name of Florence, and its continuation which Sir Henry Howorth has convincingly taught us to attribute to John of Worcester. Of special value is the work of William of Malmesbury, who was a real historian, and had some special knowledge of Gloucestershire. He died about 1125. All these chroniclers have some facts to give about St. Peter's, Gloucester, and supply us with some links in the history of its buildings. They were largely Benedictine

and may be presumed to have had some kind of first-hand knowledge of a sister-abbey which was growing up under royal patronage at Gloucester, which is not far from Worcester and Malmesbury, at all events.

St. Peter's is not known to have had a chronicler of its own in its early days. Our earliest local information is in the shape of a few 12th century charters and grants which find a place in the ten majestic volumes of deeds and charters which were bound for us by the munificence of Mr. Niblett of Haresfield. Unfortunately they give us no details as to the buildings, but they must be mentloned as a highly important constituent element in our *apparatus criticus*. The first surviving abbey document that we possess, apart from these charters, is that noble manuscript known as the Gloucester Cartulary which is amongst the Exchequer documents at the Public Record Office. It was compiled long after the Norman period, at the end of the 13th century and probably by Abbot Gamages, or, as I should like to think, by one of the learned monks of Gloucester who were in his time frequenting the University of Oxford. The Cartulary is mainly a collection of early deeds, charters, royal confirmations and so forth, which are of prime importance as regards the progress and possessions of the monastery. These documents, as set out in the Cartulary, range right back from about 1300 to the time of William the Conqueror, and, whilst they incorporate, perhaps, some forgeries, are in the main, no doubt, copied from the actual grants themselves. For our purpose they possess some value in that they introduce definite reference here and there to the buildings, or the conditions, or some historical circumstances connected with the monastery. The Cartulary was printed by Mr. Hart in the Rolls Series in 1863-7.

In the next place, and a century later than the Cartulary are the extremely valuable registers drawn up by Abbot Frocester, specially the *Historia* which was made

generally accessible by Mr. Hart in 1863. It is the document to which Willis referred. It was put together about the year 1400 by our first mitred abbot. It is obvious that it is a compilation made from many authorities. I have been trying to dissect the book, and my tentative analysis seems to point to, at least, four different sources. First, as Mr. Hart indicated, it presupposes some, at all events, of the early chroniclers of whom I spoke, and occasionally it quotes their actual words. Next it makes use of original charters, some of which we can trace in the Cartulary. In the third place it quotes various obit rolls and other records compiled in St. Peter's itself, with a clipping here and there from some Gloucester or other Benedictine annalist, but no early continuous local history, which, if it ever existed, was burnt, I presume, in the fire of 1122 or the later conflagration of 1300. Finally, it weaves in various monastic traditions such as would be handed on from mouth to mouth for the benefit of visitors. These traditions grow in fulness as we reach the time of the compiler.

From what I have said it will, I think, be clear that the materials for reconstituting the documentary history of St. Peter's church, and, of the monastic buildings generally are fragmentary and incidental. A history of the estates could be compiled, but a full account of the buildings is impossible. All that can be achieved, so far as records go, is a vague outline of the story of the fabric, helped out by the comparative study of similar institutions elsewhere. Let us now see what this line of research will yield. At the Norman Conquest, then, the Benedictine Abbey of St. Peter was forty-four years old, though it occupied a site which has a shadowy history long before that. I will only trouble you with one fact about the pre-Norman buildings—that Aldred, bishop of Worcester, began a church here which he dedicated to St. Peter in 1058. William of Malmesbury is very emphatic as to the mere inception of the church by Aldred, and there is no evidence that Aldred

carried his work very far. The Abbot Wulstan in the difficult days that followed the Conquest went on pilgrimage, and died in a foreign land in 1072. The monks were either dispersed or were few in number. Malmesbury speaks of them as "not more than three." The Conqueror in that same year, bestowed the office of abbot on one of his Norman clergy, Serlo of Mont St. Michel, who was a Benedictine monk, and a friend of other Normans who came into prominence in England. The abbey, as it was, Malmesbury calls an *exile donum*, a poverty-stricken gift, when it came into the hands of Serlo. The new abbot was at all events fortunate in his friends. Lands and possessions began to be made over to the monastery. Various important persons were generous. The Conqueror did not forget Serlo, bestowing on him the manor of Barnwood, and Serlo knew how to beg. Ethelwy, abbot of Evesham, appointed by William to be governor of Worcestershire, Gloucestershire and neighbouring counties, was a kindly patron and bestowed frequent help of all sorts—*multimoda frequenter ei sua impendit levamina*—before his death in 1077, says the Evesham Chronicle. Domesday shows that various estates had been acquired by 1087. It is natural to suppose that Serlo would do some building; but it is agreed that the abbot did not begin his new church until 1089, when he had already been seventeen years in office. It is impossible to say whether he would or could have been contented with the church as he found it, but we seem to have a reason supplied for the commencement of the church in that year. Tucked away in a charter of 1088 we find a sentence which runs: "in this year by reason of civil war between the nobles of England, Gloucester was destroyed and the church of St. Peter." It was indeed the year in which the whole district was in violent commotion, and, although we have no other record of fire and sword at Gloucester in 1088, the words of the charter fit in

very well with what Florence of Worcester tells us of the general situation when he says "William d'Eu invaded the county of Gloucester, pillaged the regal vill of Berkeley, and wrought huge woe all through with sword and fire." Florence further asserts that at the same time Robert of Normandy made a special attack on Worcestershire, threatening vengeance on the church and monastery of Worcester, which was only foiled by the brave show of Wulfstan the bishop.

At all events Serlo laid the foundation of his church in 1089, and further gifts of land were made during the remainder of the reign of Rufus. The dedication took place in 1100 and many gifts were bestowed at that time. But what was dedicated? We can not believe that much more than the choir was complete at that time. The analogy of other great churches would lead us to such a conclusion, and we have no proof of special wealth or other advantages, so far as Serlo was concerned, to make us think that Gloucester was an exception to the general rule. But the establishment generally was growing. As we pass into the more peaceful reign of Henry I there is proof of the goodwill of the new king and the increasing patronage of Norman nobles and others. In 1101 King Henry bestowed from his demesne lands the manor of Maisemore, which the charter specially tells us was given for the sustentation of the monks. As I say, the monastery was growing.

But a terrible disaster is said to have overtaken the monastery in 1102, when a fire burnt down the church and the city. So says Florence of Worcester, but I venture to think that this fire is doubtful. There is no word of it in the continuation of the A.S.C., nor in William of Malmesbury. The fact seems to rest entirely upon the evidence of Florence; and we may well argue that so pathetic a circumstance as the more or less total destruction of Serlo's work in his lifetime would surely have been noticed by his

great admirer William of Malmesbury, had such a tragedy occurred. Serlo died in 1104. William says he found only three monks in 1072, and a charter of 1215 says that he left sixty,[1] a number magnified by the much-later *Historia* into one hundred.

Whether the fire of 1102 is historical or not, we reach in 1122 what must have been a great catastrophe. As Dr. Freeman once said in a lecture delivered in Gloucester, allusions to monastic fires are frequently very perplexing to interpret. They are so numerous and they record such wholesale destruction that we have to choose between accepting them at their face value, and discounting them by the evidence of the buildings themselves. A conflagration which took place in 1122 is not only supported by the contemporary evidence of John of Worcester, but in the Peterborough Chronicle it is described with such a particularity of detail as to compel credence. The chronicle just named tells us that "in the Lent-tide . . . the town of Gloucester was burnt whilst the monks were singing their mass and the deacon had begun the gospel *praeteriens Jesus*. Then came the fire upwards to the tower (or up towards the tower) and burned all the monastery and all the treasures that were therewithin except a few books and three mass-robes. That was on March 8 . . . On the night of July 25 there was a great earthquake over all Somersetshire and Gloucestershire." Let me just say in passing that the special gospel was in the Benedictine liturgy appointed for Mid-lent Sunday which, in 1122, fell on March 5th. Allow something for exaggeration, and something for the fact that a Peterborough monk is describing what took place 110 miles off at Gloucester, and we must still admit that very serious damage was done. But si monumentum quaeris circumspice. Go into the nave of the Cathedral and mark for yourselves the ocular proof of the fire in the evident traces of serious burning

[1] Cart ii, 40.

which the massive columns still show where they have not been refaced. And look at the western wall of the chapter house, which bears distinct traces of fire and seems to have belonged to a building which was older than the present room. It may well have been that the earthquake in July completed the ruin begun in March. The monk counted the books and mass-vestments as the most important salvage: I wonder whether we may add the famous Gloucester candlestick which had been presented by Abbot Peter a very few years before the fire! It is now, as you know, in the South Kensington museum.

The fire brings us to the last third of the reign of Henry I. On the front page of the Cartulary we have an undated charter of that king which bestows the Fulbrook upon the monks, giving them complete control of this little stream and, as the *Historia* interprets the grant, permitting them to turn it and dispose it at their pleasure. You may regard it as an assumption to assign the document to some year after 1122, for it may belong to an earlier date; but it must be referred to some year, and I would just point out how suitable the privilege would be after the fire, when it may safely be said that the monastery was concerned in large plans of reconstruction and was very probably laying out afresh the whole scheme of the monastic buildings. This, however, I may point out as a matter not to be questioned that in the years which followed 1122 generous gifts were made to the monastery, and privileges were bestowed upon it, far more in number and in value than those given in the decade before the fire. This profusion of endowment fits in very well with the needs of a time when their glorious church and its adjacent buildings had been badly injured, and required much generosity if they were to be restored and carried to a worthy completion.

From the last years of Henry I our evidence has chiefly to do with grants of land which have been summarised by Miss Rose Graham in the *Victoria County History*.

Notwithstanding the multiplication of gifts there is some sign of financial difficulty, and if large building operations were in progress such embarrassment receives explanation. But the actual references to the fabric, so far as I have traced them, appear to be very few. We have an allusion to the chapel of St. Edmund and St. Edward in 1168, when on the northern side of the choir a boy called Harold was buried, his cult, perhaps, requiring its adaptation and embellishment. In the account of his funeral, which is given with great detail and seems to be contemporary, there is reference to the 'larger bells' of the church, but we are not told whether they were in a central Norman tower or in one of the western towers. But a very few years later than this, we get the last reference, within my limits, to the buildings, in an interesting story preserved by Giraldus Cambrensis. The context seems to suggest that the event recorded took place between 1174 and 1179. Pontifical High Mass was being sung by Bishop Roger of Worcester at the high altar. Just as the consecration was being performed, a massive and lofty tower at the west end suddenly collapsed, owing to a faulty foundation. The great church was thronged with people. Consternation seized the congregation, and they, with the monks present, rushed out panic-stricken, seeking for safety, since they thought that the entire building was on the point of falling in ruin. Providentially the large number of worshippers had massed themselves as near as they could to the choir, in order to receive the bishop's blessing. When the noise and the dust had cleared away it was discovered that no one was hurt, whilst the bishop, all through, maintained his place and continued the office. The fall of this western tower receives confirmation from the 12th century abbot's chapel now in the deanery, where half, at least, of the last bay closely adjoining the former south-west tower of the church has been carried away, and, as it may be presumed, in consequence of this accident.

At present I have nothing more to add to this chronological survey of documentary allusions to the Norman St. Peter's church. They are not full, and, very often, they are not explicit. They seem to suggest that Serlo inherited a poverty-stricken abbey, and, so far as the church went, he had to begin a new church. His work may have been largely injured even in his life-time. The building, probably, went on slowly, and after 1122 Abbot Godemon had virtually to begin all over again, and the construction of the Norman work was continued, as means were forthcoming, during the years that followed.

3. ARCHITECTURAL EVIDENCE.

Now let us turn to the architectural evidence and see how far it accords with the documentary side of the investigation. I may say that Mr. Bilson, who is known to many of you, proposes to give the result of his special study of Gloucester to the *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Institute.* I am not sure how soon it will appear in print, but meanwhile he has summarised his present views in a paper which he has kindly lent to me. I proceed to set before you an abstract of what he has communicated, premising that I had already written what I have now read to you before reading his pages, although I have for some time been conversant with his general conclusions. Mr. Bilson then thinks that in 1100 when the formal dedication took place the whole eastern arm of the church was complete together with its ambulatory and chapels, the crypt beneath and part of the crossing and transepts. The mention of the crypt raises an important question, for one theory that has been stoutly maintained is that Serlo utilised the crypt of Aldred's church. Mr. Bilson says that this theory is contradicted by all the evidence. He calls attention to the conclusion of Professor Willis that "the crypt was planned to receive the existing superstructure and no other." He further quotes a paper by

Mr. F. S. Waller in the first volume of the *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* to the same effect. In fact the developed ambulatory plan of the eastern area and its crypt takes its proper place in the sequence from St. Augustine's, Canterbury (begun between 1070 and 1073), Winchester (begun in 1079), being more developed than either of these, whilst it presents points of analogy with Worcester (begun in 1084). The volute capitals which crown most of the columns in the central part of the crypt are the normal type of capital in use in Normandy in the second half of the eleventh century, and are not found in England before the Norman Conquest.

In the choir we see Serlo's undisputed work. There are here three bays as at Worcester, against four at Winchester and Norwich. Gloucester has a ground story arcade and triforium arcade of approximately similar height, as in the nave of St. Etienne Caen and the transept of Winchester. The short cylindrical piers of both arcades have the convex capital which is characteristic of Gloucester, Malvern, Tewkesbury and Pershore, and was doubtless designed to receive painted decoration. The cylindrical piers of the triforium stage have attached shafts to their cardinal faces, and at the back the shaft is continued up to the head of the transverse arch under the vault. The triforium story which really forms an upper aisle giving access to the upper radiating chapels and transept chapels, is more splendidly developed than in any other church of the Anglo-Norman Romanesque. The half-barrel vault must have been designed to abut the clerestory of a vault over the principal span. But above the triforium-story in choir and transept Serlo's work breaks off. Later builders destroyed it, and we have to conjecture what his clerestory was like. Mr. Bilson thinks that we may recover the original design by a study of Tewkesbury. He suggests that in the choir of both churches there were four stories,

namely, the two arcades of ground-story and triforium, above these a stage of small openings into the space between the head of the triforium vault and the lean-to roof which covered it, and above all a clerestory. If so, we have here in Serlo's work, and at Tewkesbury, an Anglo-Norman anticipation of the four-storied elevation that in the second half of the next century is seen at Noyon, Laon, the south transept of Soissons, and originally in Notre Dame, Paris.

Passing to the N. transept, its east side belongs to the first stage of the work before the dedication of 1100. It is characterised by unmoulded arches, and simple cushion capitals, with plain chamfered abaci. Above the triforium and along the north and west walls of the N. transept the work has been altered by later builders. In the S. transept the northern bay of its east side belongs to Serlo's work, but the S. bay has been much altered by Thoky. The gable-end seems to suggest the completion of this part of the transept about 1150. The eastern crossing piers, which are really sections of walls some fourteen feet in length with a thickness of more than six feet, were part of the first work, and possibly some part of the western piers were also built then.

So far of Serlo's work. After the dedication in 1100 the buildings on the east side of the cloister were in progress. The inner parlour or slype adjoining the northern transept, with its wall-arcade and simple barrel-vault, is of this date, and so is the western wall of the chapter-house. This wall shows traces of fire, doubtless that of 1122, which the parlour escaped, thanks to the protection of its vault. The rest of the chapter-house is of much later date. Turning to the nave: this seems to have been proceeded with after 1100. The design of the internal elevation was greatly changed by the substitution of the very lofty arcade for the low arcade of the choir. Its motive was probably due to the abandonment of the great triforium-story of the

choir, and the substitution of the usual three-story design for the four stories of the choir and east side of the transepts. Additional height was gained by the fall in the floor-levels, and the nave-arcade does not rise so high as the triforium-arcade of the choir. This gave height for a more considerable triforium stage (although relatively small) than the little triforium openings of the nave at Tewkesbury which simply reproduce the motive of the upper triforium of the transept, and doubtless originally of the choir. The fire of 1122 would appear to have had its origin near the crossing, as the Peterborough Chronicle suggests, when it says "then came the fire up towards the tower." It probably spread along the eastern range of the cloister-buildings, as witness the reddened stones in the west wall of the chapter-house. The reddened stones in the lower parts of the nave piers probably resulted from burning scaffolding. The damage caused by the fall of a burning roof would have been much more serious, as was shown by the Selby Abbey fire.