

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

**Transactions at Cirencester**

1883-84, Vol. 8, 181-191

© The Society and the Author(s)

# Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society.

---

TRANSACTIONS AT THE  
SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, HELD AT CIRENCESTER, ON  
*Thursday, 8th May, 1884.*

---

THE arrangements for this Meeting were made by a Local Committee consisting of Messrs. CHRISTOPHER BOWLY, T. B. BRAVENDER, WILFRID CRIPPS, F.S.A., ROBERT ELLETT, JOHN MULLINGS, and EDWARD TRINDER, Mr. EDWARD C. SEWELL acting as Secretary. The day was a little dull but fine, and there assembled at the King's Head Hotel, at eleven o'clock, a fairly numerous gathering of members. Among those present, in addition to several ladies, were Sir BROOK KAY, Bart., Sir JOHN MACLEAN, F.S.A., Mr. GRANVILLE BAKER, Mr. K. H. FRYER (Mayor of Gloucester); Messrs. W. C. LUCY, G. F. RIDDIFORD, A. E. SMITH, J. BUSH, J. LATIMER, W. GEORGE, W. C. GRIST, B. M. WHITWELL, T. C. COX, E. C. SEWELL (Local Secretary), J. CREESE, H. ZACHARY, E. HARTLAND, E. CRIPPS, J. B. HALE; the Revs. the Hon. R. STAPLETON, W. BAZELEY, J. M. HALL, S. BARTLEET, T. A. SMITH, E. A. FULLER, F. J. POYNTON, J. EMERIS, T. HOLBOROW, J. W. CALDICOTT, D.D., G. W. PHILLIPS; DR. L. PITCAIRN, &c.

The party proceeded to take a hasty view of the fine parish church. They then inspected the Town Hall, which, under the name of "the Church-house or the Vice," originally formed a portion of the sacred edifice, but was assigned in 1671-2 by Bishop Nicholson, of Gloucester, to the Town, and in the following year was converted into the Town Hall.

The Rev. A. E. Fuller made the following remarks on this structure:— He said that the room where they were now met was commonly called the Town Hall, the upper portion of the porch having been dedicated to public uses by faculty granted by Bishop Nicholson in 1672. In those days instead of one upper floor there were two stories of rooms. The building itself is of the early part of the 16th century, the older porch having been re-built at that date, as witnessed by sundry wills, and the account given by Leland. What the original purpose of these rooms was does not appear, but possibly they may have been used by the gilds connected with the church, there being a way down from this floor by the eastern turret into the church; or again, the upper rooms may have been used by some of the chantry priests. But whatever may have been its use before the suppression of the gilds and chantries, there is no record of

its being put to any regular use afterwards until the reign of Charles II., when, in 1672, "The Vice was made a Towne Hall." The whole building was re-constructed in 1831, when the two upper stories were thrown into one, and the connecting portion between the church-house and the church was also considerably altered, for it will be noticed that as originally built it cannot have blocked up the window over the door of the church. Besides these upper rooms there is on the left side of the porch a "little house" of two rooms, one above another, originally used by the keeper of the clock and chimes. Underneath the building is a large vaulted cellar.

In answer to questions, Mr. Fuller said that the meaning of the name *Vice* was uncertain. It is always so written in the vestry book, never *Parvise*, and the only suggested interpretation of the name is in Bishop Nicholson's faculty, where it is treated as short for *Device*, the idea being that it was so called because of the clever construction, very little light being lost to the church. The carved panel work in front of the platform was formerly the front of the organ gallery erected in the church in 1668. It was removed here at the restoration in 1865-7.

A visit was then made to the ruins of

#### ST. JOHN'S HOSPITAL,

or the Paen, Gloucester Street, and as the trustees have undertaken the task of removing the old cottages by which the remains of this ancient and interesting structure have for so many years been concealed, it well repaid a visit. The work has been for sometime progressing. Most of the arches are now exposed, and a good idea can be formed of the dimensions and appearance of the ancient Hospital. The company having assembled, Mr. Edward Sewell read some notes collected chiefly from Rudder's History of Cirencester, with a view of opening a discussion upon the subject. In these it was stated that the chapel was erected by Hen. I. after the completion of the Abbey, that is from 1132 to 1135. And he added the following interesting particulars relative to the present state of the Hospital:—

From the report of the commissioners appointed by Government for Inquiring into Charities, taken at Cirencester in the year 1829, we find that the sum borrowed by the Trustees in 1793 was £250, with which they built six new cottages. In 1807, the debt being paid, the new cottages were appropriated to the alms-people. According to a minute in the vestry book, dated 23rd November, 1786, the government of St. John's Hospital was by a Decree of the Court of Chancery, made in the 6th year of Charles I., vested in the minister, churchwardens, and overseers of the poor of Cirencester. And in the same minute a resolution of the vestry is recorded, that the then minister, churchwardens, and overseers of the parish should be requested to take possession of all the lands and tenements belonging to the said hospital, and to apply to the executors of one Thomas Bush (who is stated to have surreptitiously obtained in the year 1740 a Grant under the Privy Seal of the Mastership of the same Hospital) for the deeds and writings in their Possession belonging to the said charity, and for an account of all such moneys, if any, received by them and not applied to the purposes thereof.

The dimensions of the pillars and arches, as ascertained, by Mr. Bravender, are as follows :—

	ft.	ins.
Circumference of pillars below capital . . . . .	5	4
Height from present floor to crown of arch . . . . .	13	0
Width between each pillar . . . . .	11	3

Sir JOHN MACLEAN said he would not enter upon the many inaccuracies in Rudder's statement, but it was evident from the remains, of which a part of the arcade still exists, that the erection of the structure was not so early as stated. They had to thank Mr. Sewell for his interesting notes, but they did not require written evidence to assure them that the architecture was Early English, and was to be referred to the latter part of the 12th century—that was to be gathered from the face of the structure itself.

The Rev. E. A. FULLER following, said he quite concurred in the remarks of Sir John Maclean as to the date of the building being later than Hen. I. Rudder's date of the completion of the building of the abbey was entirely erroneous, and the mistake originally arose, he believed, from an error in Leland, aggravated in copying from him. The date of the consecration of the abbey, as given by Benedict Abbas, was 1176, and he proceeded to shew in what manner the error arose. But in truth there was no documentary authority whatever for placing the building of the hospital either before or after the completion of the abbey. It is a question of style of architecture, and that would point to the middle or end of the reign of Hen. II. He added, it was alleged that no mass was celebrated in the hospital till the beginning of the 14th century. In the abbey register, between the dates of 1300 and 1342, there was a deed under which the abbey allowed mass to be said, and it was therein affirmed that was the first time it was permitted. The permission was accompanied by the reservation that the mass at the hospital should commence after the Gospel at the parish church, and that the minister should not take any offerings for himself, but hand them over to the mother church. Another mistake of Leland, in describing the hospital as one of three parish churches in Cirencester, was perpetuated by Rudder. It was no such thing. It was simply the chapel of the hospital.

In passing round the ruins attention was directed to a fragment of incised stone, found in the course of pulling down the cottages. It forms a portion of a mediæval monumental inscription. The reading of it is " . . . low cujus anime propicietur deus amen." The letters "low" would form part of the description of the deceased, either of his name, his place of residence, or of some office held by him.



There was also found among the rubbish, in clearing out the chapel, another small fragment of sandstone, bearing a few letters in Roman characters. No other similar pieces, which might have formed portions of the inscription, were discovered. This piece was, perhaps, brought in with other old *debris* at the time of the erection of the chapel, to be placed under the floor. The only perfect letters are :—AVGV<sup>s</sup> and the upper part of S following. Having shewn the fragment to the Rev. Prebendary Scarth, he remarks that “the fragment is so small, and the letters so few, that it is extremely difficult to offer a satisfactory reading. He says there appears to him to be indications of the letter E preceding the (·) and the A. (This (·) looks like a hole bored in the sandstone, probably after it was broken, but it is not connected with the inscription). AVGV<sup>s</sup> might stand for AVGVSTV S, AVGVSTINVS or some other similar name of which there have been several found in Britain. And if the mark preceding the initial A be an E the fragment is probably part of a dedicatory or votive offering as : PRO SALVTE AVGVSTI, for the health of the emperor, or the erection of a building, VIRTUTE AVGVSTI by the authority of the emperor, or NVMINE AVGVSTI, the Divinity of the Emperor. We are, however, unable to detect any appearance of the remains of the upper part of the E suggested by Mr. Scarth, and the state of the Stone would rather forbid it. The incision in the midst of the line of writing might well be the middle arm of an E, though it much resembles the horizontal arm of a cross. There are portions of other letters discernible both above and below the line of which we have been treating. (*See fac-simile Plate XI.*)

A move being now made, Sir John Maclean said they must not go away without thanking Mr. Sewell for the interesting notes he had communicated to the meeting, and Mr. Fuller for his valuable remarks thereon ; and inasmuch as neither the President of the Society nor the President of the Council were present, the former being detained in London by his parliamentary duties and the latter being absent from indisposition, he would take the liberty of proposing on behalf of the Society, a cordial vote of thanks to those gentlemen, which was adopted.

A memoir on this Hospital, by the Rev. A. E. Fuller, will be printed in the present volume.

#### THE WEAVERS' HALL

was noticed in returning to the town. Mr. Sewell remarked that King Henry IV. granted to the town a charter for a merchant gild, for the encouragement of trade by the execution of the Statute Merchant. But this charter after a long suit in the Exchequer was decreed to be cancelled.

He observed that possibly the Weavers' Guild dates from the fourteenth century, but all the returns concerning the Cirencester Gilds made in the reign of Richard II. have perished with the exception of that relating to the Trinity Guild, printed in Mr. Fuller's History of Cirencester Church, page 12. At any rate there was here a Guild of Weavers at least as early as the reign of Edward IV. or Richard III., when Sir William Nottingham, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, founded a hall for them, with four habitations for the poorer sort of that fraternity, by the name of St. Thomas' Hospital, and endowed it by his will with a small revenue. King Philip and Queen Mary granted them a charter, which was recited and confirmed by Queen Elizabeth, in the charter of the Weavers' Company, in the 8th year of her reign (1565).

The Charity Commissioners' Report states : " Sir William Nottingham, by his will dated 1st September, 1483, directed his trustees to convey certain property to the persons therein named, for the use, profit, and maintenance of four poor men dwelling in a certain house lately built by him in Cirencester, in a street called Battle Street, and for the use of them who after his decease should dwell in that house, being chosen by the Wardens of the Weavers' Company in Cirencester, and their successors."

There is an ancient stone building in St. Thomas Street, called St. Thomas' Hospital, supposed to be the house originally built for this charity by Sir William Nottingham.

The lands belonging to the Hospital, worth in 1550 £15 8s. 9d. a year, were granted in 1581 to the Earl of Leicester, who re-granted them that same year; and two years later, these lands again changed hands by sale, the £6 18s. 8d. payable to the four alms-folks being charged as reserved rent.

The company then proceeded to the place called

#### THE BULL RING, OR AMPHITHEATRE.

This is situated at a place called "The Querns," which latter consists of mounds of *debris* and hollows, resembling the results of ancient quarrying, probably the site of the quarries whence the Romans obtained the stone for building the town. On the north side of these "tumps" is what is believed to have been a Roman Amphitheatre. The first historian who noticed it was Rudder, in 1779, who suggested this as its origin. It is of an Elliptical form, measuring in its longer axis about 200 feet, and in its shorter about 130 feet, having an entrance at each end. "Round it," as described by Rudder, "is a mound, or wall, of earth thrown up to about the height of 20 feet, sloped on the inside with so much exactness as to manifest the hand of care and design; and I am of opinion that there were original rows of seats or steps, one below the other, from top to bottom, but time has much defaced them," and Rudder mentions a third "strait approach, about 30 inches wide, on the north side, between two stone walls, which were designed to keep up the high bank of earth on each side." It was visited in 1868 by the Members of the British Archæological Association when an animated discussion arose whether it was, or was not, a Roman Amphitheatre. The Rev. Prebendary Scarth, a valued member of our Society, who has made Roman Remains his study for many years, gave several reasons for answering the question in the affirmative, as did also the late Rev. J. G. Joyce; but other members of the Association desired to withhold their opinions until excavations should have been made, to the execution of which the late Earl Bathurst, upon whose estate it is situated, with ready courtesy kindly consented. We believe, however, that this examination has not yet been carried out. A plan of the ground is given in the Journal of the British Archæological Association for March, 1869, and there is a view of it in "Illustrations of Remains of Roman Art in Cirencester," by Professor Buckman and Mr. C. H. Newmarch, 1850. On returning the party visited the Corinium Museum, in which are deposited some fine tessellated pavements and other valuable Roman remains discovered in the town and neighbourhood. Returning to the King's Head Hotel an excellent lunch was provided, which was partaken of by about thirty ladies and gentlemen. Sir John Maclean was requested to preside. As soon as lunch was finished the company started on

## THE CARRIAGE EXCURSION,

which proved a very enjoyable trip, although perhaps not very rich in material for archaeological research.

## SIDDINGTON

was the first place visited, and the interesting and restored church of St. Peter was the object to which attention was chiefly directed. The Rector, the Rev. the Hon. J. Gifford, had written expressing his regret at being unable to be present. He supposed that the attention of the company would doubtless be directed to the peculiar shape of the Norman font, and also to the fine south porch. The tympanum over the south door contained a representation of our Lord, with St. Peter, the patron saint, on the right hand, and on the left hand a figure apparently making an offering to the Saviour, and Mr. Gifford desired to have from the members of the Society some explanation of the latter figure. The members carefully examined the work referred to, but were unable to afford the information which the Rector sought. The north aisle is called the Langley aisle, after the family of the Langleys of Siddington. This manor had been held by the family of Musard from the Conquest, and was purchased of the heirs of Hascult Musard as early as the reign of Henry III. by Geoffry de Langley, who died seized on 2nd Edward I., leaving Walter his son and heir, aged 30 years and more (Inq. p.m. 2nd Edward I.) From this date the manor continued in the family and name of Langley, with remarkable variations of descent, which are briefly traced by Fosbroke in his History of Gloucestershire (Vol. II., pp. 482-3), until 21st Henry VII., when it fell to female heirs, and was subjected to a partition, but the representatives of the coheirs continued to hold it until 5th James I., when it was alienated. The Langleys doubtless built the aisle, probably the whole of the present church; and the monogram of one of the members of the family was to be seen on the apex of one of the arches. A quaint story was related—the painted glass from one of the windows was removed from the church and placed in a window of the parish church at Cirencester. This was done by order of the lord of the manor, one of the Earls Bathurst, and the glazier on being remonstrated with in the course of his work in removing the glass, was said to have made the irreverent reply “The lord is on my side, I do not fear what man doeth unto me.” There was a second church in the parish, dedicated to St. Mary, now destroyed, and Mr. Gifford considers its site to be near his residence, a number of stones of Norman work which had evidently belonged to it had been found in his garden.

The Rev. W. BAZELEY drew attention to the peculiar shape of the font, and threw out the suggestion that it appeared to be an imitation in stone of a leaden font. There were two leaden fonts of that shape near Chepstow. He only made the suggestion, observing that our ancestors did strange things sometimes.

## SOUTH CERNEY

was the next place visited, and the interesting church of All Hallows was inspected under the guidance of the vicar, the Rev. W. E. Hadow. The features most admired were the handsome and almost unique south porch, with an almost equally interesting doorway in the north wall; a very beautiful piscina, with elegant decorations, and the whole building

was viewed with much interest. In the south aisle, before the "restoration," there was an old chantry chapel, and the piscina still remains. The low square tower was formerly surmounted by a spire, but about 25 years ago some three or four of the courses were displaced by lightning, and the people (the vicar being then non-resident), being seized with panic, had the whole spire taken down and the stones thrown under the wall of the churchyard, where they still remain waiting funds necessary to replace them. The parish registers date from 1583. An interesting tomb in the churchyard was inspected, and the three old manor houses were pointed out. At the date of the Domesday Survey Walter de Gloucester held one manor in South Cerney, and it is probable that on the death of his five grandsons, sons of Milo Fitz Walter Earl of Hereford, s.p., the manor became partitioned between their three sisters and coheirs, thus forming three manors, and hence the three manor houses. An old ivy-clad tower in the garden of Mr. Snell was glanced at, chiefly for the reason that it was locally known as "The Chapel," but grave doubts were expressed as to whether it had any pretensions to antiquity. The Rev. W. Bazeley said it was stated that in 1139 King Stephen took the castle of South Cerney, which Milo had erected for the purpose of the insurrection against him, and in the same year Milo was recorded to have re-possessed himself of the fortress, which was supposed to have formed one of a chain of forts between Cricklade and Malmesbury. No trace of the stronghold now remained, and its site is unknown.

A pleasant drive brought the party to

#### ASHTON KEYNES,

where the substantial and well kept church was visited, as well as the moated farm house close by. The three crosses in the village were also noticed, and then the party proceeded to

#### CRICKLADE.

Time would not admit of more than a very hasty inspection of the handsome parish church of St. Sampson, its many interesting features being hastily noticed. A cross in the churchyard was just glanced at, and the visit intended to be made to the old church of St. Mary was necessarily abandoned, the horses' heads were turned homewards, Cirencester being reached a little before 6.30.

#### THE EVENING MEETING

took place in the King's Head Hotel Assembly Room, when Sir John Maclean presided.

A paper was read by Mr. T. B. Bravender *On Recent Roman "Finds" in Cirencester*, which will be printed in this volume, upon the conclusion of which the chairman invited remarks thereon from the members. Responding to this invitation,

Mr. SEWELL, referring to Mr. Bravender's statement, that no portion of an earthenware lamp had been found, observed that he had one that had been discovered near Price's Row in the Watermoor Road.

Mr. BRAVENDER said that was the only one he had heard of.

In the course of a short conversational discussion, the chairman enquired if any of the potters' marks and the coins that Mr. Bravender had mentioned as having found were rare or unique.

Mr. BRAVENDER replied that some of the potters' marks were previously unknown. Professor Church was endeavouring to find some information upon them, and there were some marks that he had been unable to discover.

The CHAIRMAN said he should like to have a correct copy of the rare or unique marks in order that they might be published in the Transactions of the Society.

Mr. BRAVENDER said he should be happy to let Sir John Maclean have the pieces themselves in order that they might be illustrated.

In reply to an enquiry by the chairman relative to the coins, Mr. Bravender said some of the coins were also very rare, and he promised to lend these to Sir John in order that he might have them examined by an expert, and such of them published as were worth it.

The CHAIRMAN also alluded to the Tokens. He supposed that they were tradesmen's tokens. They were very interesting objects, and those of them hitherto unknown should be published. He thought a collection of all Gloucestershire tokens should be made for the County Society's Museum. It was a small museum at present, but it could be made to grow by contributions of interesting objects, and he would suggest that if no better use could be found for the objects mentioned they should be sent to the secretaries for preservation in the museum of the Society.

Mr. SEWELL said they had an excellent receptacle in the Corinium Museum.

Mr. BRAVENDER said he had some duplicates to which the Society was welcome.

Mr. SEWELL referred to the paved Roman road exposed in Gloucester Street, about three feet below the surface, during the recent drainage works. He said the road was very perfect, and there were grooves in the pavement made by the wheels of the vehicles passing over it. The grooves were two inches deep, and some of the stones from the road, showing the grooves, were deposited in Earl Bathurst's Park, near the Museum.

Mr. BRAVENDER remarked that the paved roads had the same grooved appearance in Pompeii.

Dr. CALDICOTT suggested that as Cirencester was so rich a neighbourhood for remains, all "finds" of interest should be communicated to the Society, in order that they might be published in the Transactions, and thus attract the attention of archaeological students.

The thanks of the Society having been accorded to Mr. BRAVENDER,

Mr. E. C. SEWELL followed with a paper on *Cirencester during the Civil War in 1642-44*, which was listened to with much interest. After some introductory remarks on the previous state of political affairs, he referred to the appointment by the King of George Lord Chandos as Lord Lieutenant of Gloucestershire, stating that how, upon his Lordship's visit to Cirencester to execute his commission of array on behalf of the King, he and his unarmed attendants were attacked by the towns-folk, and barely escaped with their lives. The insurgents expecting that this gross insult to the King's representative would not be endured by the Royalists placed the town in a state

of defence and garrisoned Sudeley Castle. This, to a great extent, interfered with the means of obtaining supplies for the Royal forces in the western districts, and in January, 1642, the Marquis of Hertford, with a large army, threatened the town, and summoned it to surrender upon the promise of a free pardon for all their past offences. This summons, with great professions of loyalty, was refused by the towns-people, but the general withdrew his forces without molesting them further.

On 21st January, 1642, Prince Rupert marched from Oxford with the greater portion of the King's army with the primary object of relieving Colonel Hastings, who was besieged in his own house at Ashby de la Zouch, but learning that that officer had beaten off his assailants the Prince determined to proceed to Cirencester to punish the rebels there. On the 2nd February he made an attack on the town. Rudder, who was at that time chaplain to Prince Rupert and present with the army, gives a very detailed and graphic account of the attack, which Mr. Sewell read to the meeting. Among the Officers serving under the Prince was Lord Carnarvon. The town was taken by storm, with a loss to the rebels, according to Rudder, of about 300 men, and many were made prisoners. It is alleged that the prisoners were treated with much barbarity. That a great amount of suffering must be endured by prisoners in such circumstances would be unavoidable, but it is to be hoped that no wanton cruelty was exercised on this occasion. Among the notable men who were slain in the conflict, Mr. Sewell says, was one Hodgkinson Pain, a wealthy clothier, who fell with the colours in his hand, and was buried on the 5th February, 1642, as recorded in the parish register; and on a small brass plate in the south aisle of the church the following quaint epitaph is inscribed:—

“Here lyeth buried y<sup>e</sup> Body of Hodgkinson Pain, Clothier, who died y<sup>e</sup>  
3<sup>rd</sup> of Feb. 1642.”

“The Poores Supplye his life and calling grac't  
'till warre's made rent and Pain from poore displac't  
But what made poore unfortunate Paine blest  
by warre they lost their Paine yet found no rest  
Hee losing quiet by Warre yet gained ease  
by it Paine's life begun, and paine did cease :  
And from the troubles here him God did sever  
by death to life, by Warre to peace for ever.”

The capture of Cirencester caused the greatest terror and consternation among the malcontents of the West of England. Sudeley and Berkeley Castles were evacuated by their Parliamentary garrisons. Tewkesbury and Malmesbury submitted, and the King's authority was acknowledged throughout the district. Gloucester only stubbornly held out. Even the inhabitants of Cirencester appealed to the King's mercy, which was graciously accorded to them on the condition that they demeaned “themselves with that duty and obedience to his Majesty's just and necessary commands as the condition of the present time and his Majesty's necessities require.” Prince Maurice was left governor. The town remained in the King's hands until after the battle of Newbury, when it was again taken by the Parliamentarians. After this the town played a less conspicuous part in this internecine conflict, but the following entries of burials in the parish registers shew that skirmishes occurred as late as

December, 1644

The 11<sup>th</sup> day—Mathew Woodcock, a Lieutenant of the King's slain

The 22<sup>nd</sup> day—A Captain's Sonne, no name knowne

The 25<sup>th</sup> day—Mr. Thomas Lea, Chaplain of Coll. Hodgkinson's Regiment

The 30<sup>th</sup> day—Lieutenant Colonel Guddridge.

January, 1645

The 6<sup>th</sup> day—A Quartermaster, that was hanged

As in 1642 the first opposition in the county to the constituted authorities occurred at Cirencester, so, in 1688, was the first blood shed on account of the revolution. Rudder states in his History of Cirencester that this occurred when Lord Lovelace, being on his march to join the Prince of Orange, with a party of horse, was attacked by a Captain Lorange, of the County Militia, at the instigation of the Duke of Beaufort, "who was very zealously attached to King James." Capt. Lorange was the proprietor of an estate called Haynes, near Tewkesbury, and though both he and his son were slain in the fight, his men overpowered Lord Lovelace and carried him prisoner to Gloucester jail, having slain some unfortunate gentlemen at the same time. Capt. Lorange selected the town as a particularly suitable place to attack the Prince's party, knowing that the greater part of the inhabitants were implicit followers in the Beaufort train, and had imbued the Court principles of indefeasible right and non-resistance—a remarkable change of opinion within a short time.

Mr. Sewell's paper, of which a brief abstract is here given, contained a very clear and detailed narrative of the connection of Cirencester with the events of the unhappy civil war during the period referred to.

On the conclusion of Mr. Sewell's remarks, the chairman, invited a discussion on the subject. He said there were probably many old documents of great interest in the family archives of the county bearing on the period referred to, which were at present quite unknown, but which might be made available, and he said he would ask his friend Mr. Gael, who he was glad to see in the room, and than whom no one would be likely to possess better information, did he know anything upon that point?

Mr. S. H. GAEL, who had joined the party at the Evening Meeting, said he did not at present recollect any such treasures as the chairman had referred to. The great house now owned by Lord Bathurst was at the period indicated in the possession of the Poole family. He did not know who the present representatives of the Poole family are, and he never heard that Lord Bathurst had any documents of the kind. The Howe family had a great many papers for they took a very conspicuous part in the times referred to; and the Spring MSS. probably also contained interesting documents, but they were taken away in bulk, and had not been examined. It was exceedingly difficult to find out these things, and if anything did transpire he thought it would be partly by accident. There were no doubt a great many documents in the possession of the Benetts of Wiltshire.

Mr. SEWELL said he thought these had been published in the Pyt House Papers.

Mr. GAEL added that he could never make out what became of Sir Robert Atkyns's papers, for he must have had a great store, and his great

house was at Saperton, contiguous to Cirencester. He had never heard that Lord Sherborne had any such documents, but the Dutton family must have taken a prominent part in the proceedings of that district. He hoped that the fact that these things were being enquired after would lead to their being discovered. Now that Mr. Sewell had kindly undertaken that particular epoch of the history of Cirencester, he trusted there would not be wanting among their Cirencester friends some gentlemen who would follow up the enquiry in the subsequent stages. There must be in that town and neighbourhood a great many treasures connected with the Howe family and also the Master family. Cirencester was also the scene of a great political confederation of singular importance at the revolution of 1688, and interesting information could be furnished as to that. There was hardly anything more interesting than the operations of Jack Howe in that town, and as he flourished well into the 18th century no difficulty should be experienced in obtaining information.

A short conversation followed, and Mr. Sewell was heartily thanked by the chairman for his interesting paper.

Dr. CALDICOTT moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Sewell for the able manner in which he had organised and carried out the meeting, which was carried by acclamation.

Mr. SEWELL acknowledged the compliment, and said their old town had very great interest in his eyes, and if they could show strangers the various objects of interest it contained he thought it was their bounden duty to do so.

The proceedings closed with a vote of thanks to Sir John Maclean for presiding.

---