THE

YORKSHIRE

Archæological Journal.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
THE COUNCIL
OF THE
Yorkshire Archæological Society.

PART 100.
(BEING THE FOURTH PART OF VOLUME XXV.)
[ISSUED TO MEMBERS ONLY.]

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY BY
JOHN WHITEHEAD & SON, ALFRED STREET, BOAR LANE, LEEDS.
MCMXX.
The Council of the Society is not responsible for any statements or opinions expressed in the YORKSHIRE ARCHÆOLOGICAL JOURNAL, the Authors of the various Papers being alone responsible for the same.

## CONTENTS OF PART 100.

*(Being the Fourth part of Volume XXV.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Mary's Church, Beverley</th>
<th>John Bilson, F.S.A.</th>
<th>357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Register of York Castle, 1730–1743</td>
<td>William Brown, F.S.A.</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes—V. A Note on Elland Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Cowdray and Easebourne Priory</td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. The British Remains at Hinderwell Beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. The Late Sir William Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preface

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contents

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Illustrations

#### St. Mary's Church, Beverley:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>St. Mary's Church, Beverley, from the South-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Details of South Doorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Details of Arcades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Details of Crypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Details of Arcades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Chancel, North Arcade (between 1867 and 1875) To face 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Chancel, North Arcade, Niche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Chapel on North Side of Chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chapel on North Side of Chancel Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>North Side of Chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Window of Chapel on North Side of Chancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I. Key of Sacristy Vault. II. Window in Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Sacristy, South Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Clearstory Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>West End of Nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>West Doorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Original Turrets from West End of Nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>South Porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Chancel and South Transept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Nave, North Arcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Nave, North Arcade, Minstrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nave Arcades, Stops to Hood-Moulds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Tower, from the South-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>South Porch, Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>St. Mary's Church, Beverley, Ground Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A Note on Elland Church:

| I. | Elland Church, Mouldings of the Chancel Arch |
| II. | Elland Church, c. 1840 |

#### The British Remains at Hinderwell Beacon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>To face 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>To face 443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Illustrations:

- Images and diagrams referenced in the text are listed with their corresponding page numbers and captions.
FIG. 1. ST. MARY'S CHURCH, BEVERLEY, FROM THE SOUTH-WEST.
ST. MARY’S CHURCH, BEVERLEY.

BY JOHN BILSON, F.S.A.

Beverley is distinguished by its possession of two noble churches, which differ as widely in their ecclesiastical history as in their architectural character. In order to appreciate the position of the daughter church, whose architectural history is the subject of this paper, it is necessary to understand something of the constitution of the mother church, the Minster, which is certainly one of the most beautiful churches of its size in our country.

The Minster rose over the tomb and shrine of a famous saint, St. John of Beverley, and was one of the matrices ecclesiae of the great diocese of York—in effect the archbishop’s East Riding cathedral church—and, like its sisters of Ripon and Southwell, was a church of secular canons.¹ The canons, originally seven in number, and afterwards eight, had no separate prebends, but received their stipends out of the common estates administered by the provost. Owing to this peculiarity, the canons were called by the names of the saints to whom the altars in the Minster were dedicated, and not, as in most collegiate churches, by the names of their prebends. Originally, no doubt, the Minster was the only church in a large district, and the prebends were never separated into parishes.² In 1325 the archbishop (Melton), speaking of the church as divided into prebends, with no small cure of souls, some of them very remote from the church, said that no regular vicars had been instituted, except to the prebendary of St. Martin’s altar,³ “The only real parochial vicarage established in the Minster Liberty seems then” (i.e. in 1428) “to have been that of St. Mary’s, the town church of Beverley.”⁴

St. Mary’s then was a chapel attached to the prebendal altar of St. Martin in the Minster.⁵ Although it had long been practically a parish church,⁶ it seems to have been only legally so con-

¹ The constitution of the Minster has been fully and admirably elucidated by the late Arthur Francis Leach in his introductions to the two volumes of the Beverley Chapter Act Book (Surtees Soc. xcviii and cviii).
² Beverley Chapter Act Book, i, lxxvi, lxvii.
³ Ibid. ii, 57.
⁴ Ibid. i, lxxix; ii, 339.
⁵ Frequently so described in the Chapter Act Book (i, 43, 57, 189, 194).
⁶ It is loosely described as a parish church in the Chantry Certificates of 1548 (Yorkshire Chantry Surveys, ii (Surtees Soc. xcvii), 538). A Visitation document of 1442 describes it as ecclesia parochialis, though one of 1409 calls it a chapel (Miscellanea, ii (Surtees Soc. cxxvii), 183, 269).
stituted in the 17th century. Its original position is clearly stated in the earliest document in the Chapter Act Book which deals with St. Mary's. This is an ordinance of 1269 regulating the endowments and duties of the vicar, which was made by commissaries acting for the archbishop, Walter Giffard.\(^1\) After setting out that, as it is not expedient to muzzle the ox which treadeth the corn, so it is necessary that a decent temporal aid be given to the holder of a parochial cure, the ordinance proceeds to fix his emoluments, which amounted in all to 35 marks, 10 marks of which were to be paid out of the prebend of the canon of St. Martin's altar in the Minster. Roger of Rise, chaplain, is admitted as vicar, with cure of souls. He and his successors are personally to serve the parish, as well of the place of the mother church as of the chapel, with a fit number of priests and clerks, and with his priests shall be present in regular habit at processions in the prebendal church on Sundays and other festivals. It is probable that this ordinance was framed upon existing custom, with the view of putting a stop to any irregularities which had hitherto occurred and providing a permanent settlement for the future. It seems to be clear, however, that there had been no canonical ordination of the vicarage before 1269; and, when Roger of Rise died, his successor John of Bridlington was instituted (27 Aug., 1287) 'according to the form canonically ordained as regards the several emoluments of the vicarage which were assigned by the archdeacons of Nottingham and Cleveland, by authority of Walter Giffard of honest memory, archbishop of York, our predecessor.'\(^2\) Archbishop Melton's ordinance of 1325, which has been so frequently cited as the first constitution of the vicarage,\(^3\) was really nothing of the kind, but merely a rearrangement of the emoluments of the vicar.

The duty of being present at the processions in the Minster, which emphasized the dependent position of St. Mary's, was evidently regarded as irksome and frequently shirked, for there are several resolutions of the Chapter insisting on this duty being fulfilled. In 1304 the priests serving in the chapel are warned, under pain of excommunication, to attend the processions in the Minster; otherwise they are to be suspended, and the vicar is ordered so to declare every Sunday and Feast day during mass in the chapel.\(^4\) A similar warning was issued by the Chapter in 1309, the parish priest of St. Nicholas' church being the particular offender on this occasion.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) Beverley Chapter Act Book, i, 194.  
\(^{2}\) Reg. Romyen, ii (Surtees Soc. cxxviii), 357.  
\(^{3}\) G. Poulson, Beverley (1829), 725.  
\(^{4}\) G. Oliver, History and Antiquities of the Town and Minster of Beverley (1829), 127.  
\(^{5}\) Beverley Chapter Act Book, i, lxxxi, 43.  
\(^{6}\) Cf. Archbishop Arundel's statutes of 1391 (Ibid. ii, 268).  
\(^{7}\) Ibid. i, 245.
In 1305 the master of the works of St. Mary’s chapel is warned, under pain of excommunication, not to keep the wax and wax candles and other things coming to the chapel, which are well known to belong to the sacrist of the Minster.1 In 1307 the Chapter ordered that the four clerks ministering in the chapel should be examined in grammar and song, be approved, admitted by, and sworn obedience to the Chapter, like the clerks of the Minster choir, and attend the Minster processions and wear the same habit.2 A similar order was made by the Chapter in 1325.3

If we may judge by the evidence of the wills of the Beverley merchants and craftsmen of the fifteenth century, St. Mary’s seems to have been much more popular with them than was the Minster. It was indeed only natural that they should show a preference for the town church which they could call their own in a manner which was hardly possible with the great Minster, with a Provost and Chapter of its own, invariably drawn from the ranks of the greatest ecclesiastics and state officials of the day,4 and its large staff of clergy,5 and with its crowds of pilgrims flocking to worship at the shrine and tomb of St. John. So they seem to have showered gifts of money, plate, vestments, images, endowments of lights6 and chantries, etc., on St. Mary’s to a much greater extent than they did on the Minster. We shall see that some of these bequests afford valuable indications bearing on the later history of the fabric.

The position of St. Mary’s as the Town Church of Beverley is also indicated by its connexion with the Town Gilds. Mr. Leach says that the distinguishing mark of a separate Craft or Gild was a separate light in one of the churches, a separate castle at the Rogation Procession, and a separate scene or pageant at the Corpus Christi Play.7 On the Monday in Rogation week the shrine of St. John of Beverley was carried from the Minster to St. Mary's church, and on the next day to St. Nicholas Holme. The Craft Gilds first viewed the procession sitting in livery in wooden castles

1 Beverley Chapter Act Book, i, 57.
2 Ibid. i, 180.
3 Ibid. ii, 64.
4 Beverley Town Documents, edited by A. F. Leach (Selden Soc. xiv), Introd. p. xviii.
5 In 1391 the Minster staff, as set out in archbishop Arundel's statutes, numbered 68 (Beverley Chapter Act Book, ii, 265–270). In the Dissolution survey of 1547, the number is 77 (Ibid. 1, xxxv. Yorkshire Chantry Surveys, ii, 524 ff. Cf. Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xxiv, 62).
6 On the Patent Roll of 1329 (3 Edw.iii, pt. i, m. 9) is a confirmation of grants in mortmain for the fabric of St. Mary's church of lands and rents in Beverley, several of which were charged with the maintenance of lights in the church—in the choir before the high altar; before the high altar during the celebration of mass in the choir; before the altar of St. Mary; during the celebration of the mass of St. Mary; on the beam in the choir; upon the beam in the chancel before the high altar; before the cross, etc. (Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1327–1330, p. 405).
in the streets, and on its return rode after it on horseback. The procession and play on Corpus Christi Day were managed by the Corpus Christi Gild, who (according to the order of precedence set out in 1431) headed the procession, followed by the religious gilds of St. Mary and of St. John of Beverley, the aldermen and stewards of twenty craft gilds, and five more religious gilds.1

Of the religious gilds, the Great Gild of St. Mary held its festival on the feast of the Purification, with a pageant, in which were one of the gild clad in comely fashion as a queen, like to the glorious Virgin Mary, having what may seem a son in her arms, and two others clad like Joseph and Simeon, and two as angels carrying a candle-bearer on which were twenty-four thick wax lights. With these and other great lights borne before them and with much music and gladness, the pageant went in procession to St. Mary's church, with all the sisters of the gild following the Virgin, and after all the brethren, each carrying a wax light weighing half-a-pound. There the pageant Virgin offered her son to Simeon at the high altar.2 This gild sustained a chaplain to celebrate divine service daily, for the good health of its brothers and sisters, in the chapel of the Blessed Mary.3

From the ordinances of the Craft Gilds which have been published, it would seem that a much larger number of them had their gild light in St. Mary's church than in any of the other churches in the town. The Goldsmiths had their light of St. Dunstan, and a candle before the image of St. Christopher in the nave (of the Minster?).4 The Butchers had their yearly mass in the church of the Franciscan Friars,5 and the Porters and Crelers in the church of the Dominican Friars.6 The Millers had their light in St. Nicholas' church.7 Eight other craft gilds however are mentioned in the published ordinances as having their gild lights in St. Mary's. The premier gild, that of the Merchants or Mercers, had their light at the altar of the Holy Trinity in the charnel of the chapel of St. Mary.8 The Weavers had their light and yearly mass at St. Mary's.9 The Drapers had their light before the image of St. Michael the Archangel in the church or chapel of the Blessed Mary the Virgin, burning on Sundays and other feast days throughout the year.10

---

1 Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 6, 68. Beverley Town Documents, i-ix, 35.
2 Toulmin Smith's English Gilds (Early English Text Society, 1870), 149. Returns of 1389.
3 East Riding Antiquarian Society's Transactions, v (1897), 46 (Patent Roll, 2 Hen. iv, pt. i, m. 12).
7 Ibid. 103.
8 Ibid. 80 (Cl. 148). Beverley Town Documents, 76.
The Saddlers maintained a light before the image of St. Michael the Archangel on the north side of the high altar. The Barbers maintained yearly honest sergees or a light in the chapel of St. Mary before the image of St. John the Baptist. The Cutlers, Braziers, etc., had their candle before St. Andrew’s image in St. Mary’s. The Tanners had ‘on searge of waxe in the chapell of our Lady Saynt Mary in Beverley, afore the high alter in the north syde of the quier ther, to be brynned upon Sondayes and other festyvall dayes.” The Bowyers and Fletchers were to be charged yearly for ever to find a wax light in the choir of the chapel of B.M.V., to burn before Christ’s Sepulchre from the day of the Passion to Easter, and thence throughout the whole year on Sunday and principal feasts on the candlestick appointed.

The important position which Beverley still held among the English towns of the fourteenth century is indicated by the returns of the levy of the Poll Tax of 1377, which show that in respect of population Beverley ranked as eleventh in the whole of England, the number of persons who paid the tax being 2,663, as against only 1,557 in Hull which is twenty-fourth in the list. This was about the time when, as we shall see, St. Mary’s church began to assume the external proportions with which we are familiar, and the size and stateliness of the church in the fifteenth century is a sufficient indication of the important position which it had come to occupy in the town. The Chantry Certificates of 1548 record that there were 1,800 houseling people in the ‘parish’ of St. Mary, and 2,878 in the nine cures of the nine vicars of the Minster; while the two ‘parishes’ of Hull had only 2,000 between them.

The architectural history of St. Mary’s church presents a striking contrast to that of its mother church. The Minster was erected in what were practically two building campaigns. In the first, more than half the church was built as a single work, of one consistent design, which remains almost unaltered. The remainder of the church was practically one almost continuous work, though its

---

1 Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 100.
5 Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 98.
6 Subsidy Roll of 51 Edw. iii, by John Topham, in Archaeologia, vii, 337-347. The subsidy of ad. (a groat) was levied on every lay person, male and female, of the age of 14 years and upwards, real mendicants only excepted. The ten towns which show a greater number than Beverley are (in order) London, York, Bristol, Plymouth, Coventry, Norwich, Lincoln, Salisbury, Lynn, and Colchester. Newcastle-upon-Tyne (2647) closely followed Beverley, and Canterbury, Oxford, Gloucester, Leicester, Exeter, Northampton, Nottingham, and Southampton are all lower in the list. For a corrected table, see E. Powell, The Rising in East Anglia in 1381, 121.
7 Yorkshire Chantry Surveys, ii, 529, 538.
8 1500 in Holy Trinity, and 500 in St. Mary’s (Ibid. ii, 520, 523).
erection extended over a long period, and was for the most part designed to harmonise with the earlier work, thus giving a strong impression of unity of design.

St. Mary's church is entirely different. Its history, like that of so many of our parish churches, is one of comparatively small beginnings, and of almost constant alteration and enlargement, until only the smallest fragments of the early church remain. Its original plan has been entirely transformed by a succession of changes and alterations, and we cannot understand, far less are we justified in criticizing, what has come down to us, unless we have succeeded in realizing to what extent the builders of each section of the work were controlled and limited by what already existed, to which their new work had to be connected.

The study of so difficult and complicated a church must of course begin with its plan. A wise archaeologist once remarked to me that no one ought to attempt to describe a church until he had made an accurate plan of it. It is owing to the neglect of this excellent rule¹ that most of the descriptions of this church which have hitherto been published fail to give any idea of the way in which the building has grown. They tell us that the church is for the most part a mixture of 'Decorated' and 'Perpendicular,' with some traces of earlier date, which is true enough as far as it goes;² but, however instructive it may be to know that a certain piece of work belongs to a more or less ill-defined 'period,' distinguished by a more or less inappropriate modern name, it does not take us very far in the direction of enabling us to understand how the work of these so-called 'periods' came together in the same building. It is idle to criticize such a church as if it were of one design, instead of what it is, the result of at least a dozen different building campaigns; and it is no small tribute to the skill of the builders of that latest time—the period which some writers have been so fond of stigmatizing as 'debased'—that they succeeded so admirably in giving an air of dignity and unity to a conglomeration of works of so many different periods.

In endeavouring to trace the story of the growth of the building, some parts of the story are so difficult and obscure as to give legiti-

¹ I must plead guilty to having neglected this rule myself, when many years since I published some notes on this church in a pamphlet entitled Two Beverley Churches, which contains many errors, and has fortunately long been out of print.

² The best of the older descriptions of the church is that by the late Charles Brereton, in the Associated Architectural Societies' Reports, viii (1865), 91. Sir Stephen Glyne's description of 1825 (Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xii, 440) gives some useful indications of the then condition of the church, though it is very confused in its mixture of 'Decorated' and 'Perpendicular.'
mate ground for difference of opinion. On such points I do not pretend to do more than offer what appear to me to be the most reasonable explanations, after prolonged study now extending over many years. Much of the evidence of the earlier stages has of course disappeared in the course of successive reconstruction and alteration, and something also has been lost by modern 'restoration,' though fortunately less than is too frequently the case. Where evidence is wanting, one can only resort to conjecture, and leave the reader to form his own opinion of the guesses, after due consideration of the reasons on which they are based.

It will be most convenient to deal with the different stages of the story in their chronological order.

The plan of the church (fig. 26) consists of a chancel of five bays, with north and south aisles, and a sacristy on the north side of the north aisle; transept, of which the northern arm has three bays and a large chapel on its eastern side, and the southern arm has three bays and an aisle on its eastern side; crossing, with central tower; nave of six bays, with north and south aisles; and south porch.

The axis of the church is about 22 degrees north of east and south of west.

The earlier parts of the church, down to and including all the works which I place in the neighbourhood of the year 1300, are built for the most part of oolitic limestone from Newbald; and the later parts, from the second quarter of the fourteenth century onward, of magnesian limestone from the neighbourhood of Tad-

1 The substance of much of this paper was read to the Royal Archaeological Institute when they visited Beverley on July 19, 1896 (Archaeological Journal, lli, 395), after I had made the plan reproduced here as fig. 26.

2 I must acknowledge the assistance which I have received in discussing some difficult points with several expert friends, among whom I should mention the late Sir William St. John Hope and Mr. Temple Moore, and especially Mr. C. R. Peers, who kindly went through the whole story with me more recently.

3 I shall call this the sacristy, in order to avoid confusion with the modern vestry, which is the large chapel on the east side of the north transept.

4 As the dimensions of the church are not generally stated quite correctly, I give the following from actual measurements (internal, within the walls):—total length, 197 ft. 3 ins.; chancel, 72 ft. 2 ins.; nave, 73 ft. long, 21 ft. 3 ins. wide (at its west end); width of south aisle of chancel, 12 ft. 7¾ ins. (at east end); length of transept, 111 ft. 10 ins.; of north arm, 39 ft. 5 ins.—40 ft. 1 in.; of south arm, 39 ft. 2 ins.—39 ft. 9 ins.; width of transept, 22 ft. 10½ ins.; width of east aisle of south transept, 13 ft. 2 ins.; crossing, about 32 ft. square (to outside of piers); nave, 93 ft. 7 in. long, 22 ft. 5½ ins. wide; width of north aisle of nave, 17 ft. 1½ ins.; of south aisle, 16 ft. 2½ ins.; width of nave and aisles, 6 ft. 2½ ins. wide. Owing to the irregular lines of the plan, these dimensions vary to some extent when measured in different places.

5 The axis of the Minster is 16 degrees north of east and south of west.
caster.  

Nothing certain is known as to the time when the chapel of St. Mary was first founded. Some writers\(^3\) have attributed its foundation to archbishop Thurstan (\(1119-1140\)), but I have not been able to find any authority for the statement. It may possibly be based on a vague paragraph in Oliver,\(^4\) with a reference to Leland,\(^5\) which however refers to the time of Athelstan, not of Thurstan. We shall see, however, that the earliest remains which now exist must be attributed to a date not far removed from the closing years of Thurstan's rule.

Whether there was a church on this site before the twelfth century or not, it is certain that the earliest fragments which have survived represent the original plan out of which the existing church has grown.

Of this original church the only visible remains \textit{in situ} are in the chancel. On the south side, under the base of the arcade pier between the first and second bays from the crossing, is the western quoin of the chamfered plinth of a pilaster buttress on the external face of the south wall of the original chancel. The buttress had a projection of \(0\frac{3}{4}\) ins. The plinth stone is \(6\frac{1}{4}\) ins. high, and the chamfer on its upper edge is \(2\frac{3}{4}\) ins. high with a projection of \(2\frac{1}{4}\) ins. Under the west side of the base of the next pier eastward (that between the second and third bays from the crossing) is a fragment of the wall-plinth, and there is a similar fragment under the west side of the base of the pier between the third and fourth bays. On the north side of the chancel, at its western end, there is a short length of the chamfered plinth on the external face of the original wall, which remains between the base of the fourteenth-century respond pier and the projection of the staircase to the tower. These remains on the south side indicate that the original chancel was three bays in length, and that the internal length of this chancel cannot have been less than 46 ft., and may probably have been from 47 ft. to 51 ft.\(^6\) Its width was apparently the same as that of the present chancel—21 ft. 3 ins. within the walls.

---

1. There is a considerable quantity of chalk in the internal work. Repairs and refacing of the earlier work have been done in Tadcaster stone (as in the north transept chapel), but I have not noticed any Tadcaster stone in any work which can be definitely pronounced as original of a date earlier than the second quarter of the fourteenth century.

2. E.g. on the internal faces of the side walls of the south porch.

3. E.g. C. Brereton, \textit{op. cit.} 92.


5. Oliver's reference to Leland's \textit{Itinerary} is wrong. The passage to which he refers is in the \textit{Collectanea}, tom. iii (vol. iv of Hearne's 1774 edition, p. 102), which is reprinted in \textit{Beverley Chapter Act Book}, ii, 350.

When a portion of the upper surface of the masonry foundation of the two eastern piers of the crossing was bared, I found that this foundation extended from each pier towards the centre of the opening of the eastern arch of the crossing, leaving only a width of about 6 ft. in the middle without foundation. The masonry foundation is of Newbald stone, from which we may infer that it is of either twelfth or thirteenth century work, and it may possibly be the foundation of the original twelfth-century tower piers.

To the original church also belongs the internal arch of the doorway from the south aisle of the nave to the south porch. The arch, which is semicircular, is decorated on its face and soffit with chevron ornament (fig. 2, i, ii). It was evidently removed from the south wall of the original nave to the wall of the aisle when aisles were added to the nave in the thirteenth century. Some of the masonry

1 In 1893, when the step under the eastern arch was moved a little further eastward, for the re-erection of the rood-screen. It was found that the original floor level here had been about 2 inches above the present floor level.
East Arcade of North Transept: I, Arch; II, Capital; III, Base. East Arcade of South Transept: IV, Arch; V, Capital; VI, Base. From North Transept to North Aisle of Nave: VII, Arch; VIII, Capital of North Pier; IX, Base of ditto. From South Transept to South Aisle of Nave: X, Capital of South Pier; XI, Base of ditto.
of the inner jambs of this doorway is also reused material of the same date as the arch.\(^1\)

The character of the ornament on this arch indicates that this original church was completed about the middle of the twelfth century. The plan of this church would seem to have consisted of an aisleless nave and chancel, with a central tower—a plan on a larger scale but of the same type as that of the well-known church of Ifley, near Oxford. The only other possible plan—a cruciform plan—must, I think, be rejected, because there are reasons for believing that the arms of the transept were later additions to the original plan.

END OF 12TH CENT.  
AND  
EARLY 13TH CENT.  

With the exception of the fragments described above, the earliest masonry to be seen above the floor is that of the inner faces of the walls of the transept, below the windows.\(^2\)

In the north transept, examination of the west and north walls is not easy, because of the organ, but the walling appears to present the same characteristics as that of the west and south walls of the south transept. Here the walling is of Newbald stone, in courses of about 9 to 10 inches high, the stones for the most part being from 11 to 15 inches long.

The arches of the arcades, of three bays, on the east side of each arm of the transept are obviously of much earlier date than the piers which support them, and they present problems which are by no means easy of solution.

The arches on the east side of the north transept are pointed, of two orders, with what is now a hood-mould on the side next the transept (fig. 3, i). The inner order shows a dog-tooth ornament between two filleted rolls, flanked by hollows, those on the transept side being quirked. The outer order on each side has a keeled roll, with a sharp reversed curve on each side of the arris, the roll being flanked by wide hollows and quirked fillets. Beyond the outer order, on the side next the transept, is a moulding 6 inches in depth, which now serves as a hood-mould. This bears a chevron ornament, of two rolls with a fillet between them, and a pellet in the sunk spandrel above. The top of this member is now very roughly weathered, but the weathering does not seem to be original, since the tooling on the weathering is not the same as that on the

---

\(^1\) C. Brereton (op. cit. p2) says that, 'in excavating around the church many fragments of stone mouldings, etc., were met with, the characters of which indicated that they had belonged to a building of the eleventh or twelfth century.

\(^2\) The outer faces of these walls are entirely of the date of the mid fifteenth-century reconstruction. (See also p. 96.) These stones do not seem to have been preserved.
front fillet, and a bit of the flat top is left in places. Nor do the terminations of this hood appear to be original. It is however worked to the arched curve, and is not a horizontal string reused. The conclusion is that this zigzagged hood was not a hood-mould originally, but an arch order, adapted as a hood when the arches were re-set in the fifteenth-century reconstruction. What precisely was then done will be discussed when we come to that stage of the church's story. The character of the detail of arch-orders and 'hood' indicate that the original arcade of which they formed part dated from the latest years of the twelfth century.¹

The arches on the east side of the south transept are pointed, of two orders, with a hood-mould on the side next the transept (fig. 3, iv), and their mouldings indicate a more advanced date than those of the corresponding arches of the north transept. The inner order shows a dog-tooth ornament, set in small hollows between two filleted rolls, flanked by filleted hollows. The outer order has a single rather flat filleted roll, flanked by filleted hollows. The details indicate that the original arcade of which these arches formed part dated from the early years of the thirteenth century. In the southernmost arch, the upper part of each half of the arch is without the dog-tooth on the inner order, and the stones of the upper part of the arch are much longer than those below which have the dog-tooth, showing that the upper part of this arch was reconstructed in the mid fifteenth-century remodelling of the transept. At the north end of the arcade, the inner order springs from a splayed block over the capital of a single wall-shaft on the crossing pier, and the outer orders and hood-mould die into the wall. The alteration of this springing is part of the sixteenth-century reconstruction of the crossing.

I have already suggested the opinion that the original plan of the middle of the twelfth century was not cruciform, and that the arms of the transept were later additions to the original plan. The reasons for this view must now be stated. In the first place, the length of the transept arms is unlikely for the middle of the twelfth century,² though probable enough for the end of that century or later. Then the width of the transept arms (22 ft. 10-11 ins.) is

¹ There is no reason to believe that the arch-orders and 'hood' are not contemporary, or to doubt that they were originally worked for the same arches. The chevron of the 'hood' is of a late type, and might date from anywhere in the second half of the twelfth century.

² Cf. the plan of Newbald church (Yorkshire Archæological Journal, xxvi, 274).
greater than that of the chancel (21 ft. 3 ins.), which is more likely to have occurred if the transept was an addition than if it was part of the original plan. The deviations of axis are also suggestive in this connexion. The axis of the north transept is practically square with that of the chancel, but the axis of the south transept is not. If the axial lines of the north and south arms be produced, they would nearly coincide at the north end of the north transept, but they would be about 1 ft. 9 ins. apart at the south end of the south transept. It follows that the walls of the transept arms do not start from the crossing at points opposite each other. These irregularities are much more likely to have arisen if the transept arms were later additions than if they formed part of the original plan. The difference in date between the arches on the east side of the two arms is also less probable for an original cruciform plan of continuous build.

The conclusion which best suits the facts therefore is that, at the end of the twelfth century, a north transept was added, of three bays, with a narrow eastern aisle, and that this was followed, early in the thirteenth century, by the addition of a corresponding south transept and aisle, as parts of the same scheme of extension, which also included the addition of aisles to the nave.

Some interesting analogies with this plan are afforded by some town churches at no great distance from Beverley. Of these, the most instructive is the plan of St. Augustine’s church, Hedon, which was then a thriving and important port. Of the plan of the earlier church at Hedon we have no certain knowledge, and it is possible that it was not so large as the original St. Mary’s. However this may be, it is certain that the existing church at Hedon was begun towards the close of the twelfth century by the building of so much of the south transept as was possible without interfering with the earlier church; and that it was continued by the building of the north transept, crossing, and aisleless chancel, this being finished by the middle of the thirteenth century. Each arm of the transept had an eastern aisle of two bays, the aisles being about 10 feet in width. The internal length of the transept is 103 feet, and the transept arms and chancel are 21 feet wide.

1 The lines of the axes are marked on the plan (fig. 26), that of the chancel being the axis of the original mid twelfth-century building.

2 The Early History of the Town and Port of Hedon, by J. R. Boyle (1893), 95 ff. The Church of St. Augustine, Hedon, by G. E. Street, in Archaeologia, xlviii, 185.

3 The clearstoried and aisleless nave of five bays was only begun after a considerable interval, and finished about the middle of the fourteenth century (Boyle, op. cit. 114).
Great Grimsby church (St. James'),\(^1\) begun early in the thirteenth century, shows the same plan of aisleless chancel, central tower, and transept with eastern aisle of two bays to each arm.

A later parallel is afforded by Howden church. Here the plan of the rebuilding begun about the middle of the thirteenth century comprised an aisleless chancel,\(^2\) central tower, and transept with eastern aisle of three bays to each arm, the internal length of the transept being \(112\) ft. 6 ins.

The next building campaign may have been undertaken very soon after the completion of the south transept, and doubtless formed part of the same general scheme. It consisted of the substitution of a nave with aisles for the original aisleless nave. That this was an entirely new nave, rather than simply an addition of aisles to the earlier nave, would seem to be indicated by the fact that the axis of the nave does not coincide with that of the chancel. On the west face of the crossing, the axis of the nave is about 8 inches to the north of that of the chancel, and on the inner face of the west wall the deviation to the north is about 18 inches.

The only parts of this thirteenth-century nave which have survived are the respond piers at the east end of each aisle wall, and parts of the arches which spring from them and open from the east ends of the aisles to the north and south transepts respectively; and the outer order of the jambs and arch of the south doorway.

The respond pier at the east end of the south aisle wall consists of a filleted shaft attached to the face of a pilaster, with small hollow chamfers on its angles, flanked by an attached shaft in the angle on each side. The bases (fig. 3, xi) which follow the curve of the shafts, and are not returned around the pilaster, are moulded with the usual deep filleted hollow between a small upper and large lower torus. The capitals of the shafts (fig. 3, x), which have circular abaci, are carved with knobs of conventional foliage.

The respond pier at the east end of the north aisle wall consists of a filleted shaft, flanked by a deep hollow and a smaller shaft on each side, attached to a pilaster, with chamfered angles, projecting 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches from the inner face of the aisle wall. The bases of the group of triple shafts (fig. 3, ix) are moulded like those of the south

---

\(^1\) *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports*, xiv (1878), 152. Grimsby has an aisleled nave of six bays, as at St. Mary's, Beverley.

\(^2\) My reasons for believing that the great aisleless choir of Howden was preceded by a much smaller aisleless choir have been stated in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, xxii, 159. The aisleless nave of Howden, of six bays, was originally intended to have no clerestory.
aisle respond, but with a chamfer below the lower torus, and the group of triple bases stands on a moulded sub-base of semicircular plan embracing the group of three above. The capitals (fig. 3, viii), which have circular abaci, are simply moulded with a profile which is general in the thirteenth-century work in the Minster.

Parts of the outer order (fig. 3, vii), on the west side (towards the aisle) of each of the arches which spring from these respond piers, are of this thirteenth-century work. This order is moulded with two rolls, with dog-tooth between them, flanked by a simple hollow on the face, and by a quirked hollow on the soffit. In the northern arch, the dog-tooth ornament occurs only on the lower ten stones above the northern springing, the remainder being worked with a hollow between the rolls. In the southern arch, only the one stone at the southern springing shows signs of the dog-tooth, which has been cut away. In the northern arch, the quirk on the soffit only occurs on two stones, the lowest and the fourth above the northern springing. In the southern arch, the quirk on the soffit occurs to nearly the lower half of the southern curve of the arch, above which it dies out. We shall see that these arches have probably been twice rebuilt in later times, which accounts for these variations. The simple chamfered hood-mould, rounded on its upper edge, also belongs to the thirteenth-century work.

The capitals of both these respond piers have been raised, and the piers increased in height, when the aisles were altered, as will be described presently. Whether the piers are in situ is a question which is not easily decided. Aisles of this width are not very usual in parish-church plans of the first half of the thirteenth century, and there is some evidence (to be discussed presently) which favours the idea that the original aisles were considerably narrower, and that the later alteration involved the widening of the aisles and the complete rebuilding of the aisle walls.

The twelfth-century inner arch of the south doorway would be moved from its original position in the south wall of the nave to the new doorway in the south aisle wall, when this aisle was built. To this latter date belong the outer jambs and outer order of the arch of the existing south doorway. The jambs have a single detached shaft, with dog-tooth ornament on the outer angle of the nook,¹ and the arch (fig. 2, iii) has a filleted roll separated by deep hollows from a smaller roll on each side, the outer of these having a sharp arris-fillet. The capitals and inner order of jambs and arch

¹The dog-toothed jambs appear to be twelfth-century stones reused, the diagonal tooling showing on one face. The uppermost dog-tooth is worked on the same stone as the capital of the 1300 alteration.
are of the later date of the aisle alteration, which will be discussed in its turn.

The character of this surviving work indicates that the building of the nave and aisles was begun during the second quarter of the thirteenth century, and completed before the middle of the century.

There is no evidence as to the length of the mid twelfth-century nave. It is practically certain, however, that the thirteenth-century nave was six bays in length, and that its dimensions were followed in the sixteenth-century rebuilding; though it may not be absolutely certain that its west end extended quite as far west as the existing west wall.

The plan of the church when this section of the work was finished would thus comprise an aisleless chancel, a crossing with central tower, north and south transepts each with a narrow eastern aisle of three bays, and a nave of six bays with north and south aisles.

There is however another extension, which has left no trace above the floor of the present structure, but seems to be highly probable—the extension of the aisleless chancel eastward to its present length. Such a lengthening of an earlier chancel is of very common occurrence in the story of our parish churches, and, unless we assume that this chancel was lengthened in the course of the thirteenth-century works, it becomes very difficult to explain how the chancel aisles, added as two separate works, were fitted to the then existing chancel.

**C. 1280 to Beginning of 14th Cent.**

The next extension was the building of a large chapel on the east side of the north transept, in place of the earlier narrow eastern aisle, and this was followed by a series of extensive works in other parts of the church. The north transept chapel would appear to have been begun about 1280, and the completion of the other works would extend into the early years of the fourteenth century.

The north transept chapel is built over a crypt, the plan of which is indicated by dotted lines and the lighter hatching on fig. 26. The crypt now measures 23 ft. 6 ins. from east to west, and 21 ft. 8 ins. from north to south. It is vaulted in two bays from east to west, and one-and-a-half bays from north to south, but it was evidently shortened when the north chancel aisle was built, and doubtless when built it extended up to the north wall of the aisleless chancel, with three bays of vaulting from north to south. The vault supports of the crypt as it now exists are an octagonal pier in the middle, semi-octagonal piers on the north, east, and west.
FIG. 4. DETAILS OF CRYPT.

I. Pier on East Wall. II. Central Pier.
walls, and similar half-piers in the north-east and north-west angles. An examination of these supports in detail reveals some very curious features.\(^1\) Fig. 4, i, illustrates the pier on the east wall. This shows that the semi-octagonal pier mentioned above is only two courses in height, and stands on what is evidently the springing of a vault, which is supported by a group of three semi-octagonal shafts, with chamfered bases, and moulded capitals. The support in the middle of the north side has a precisely similar group of lower shafts, but here the semi-octagonal upper pier starts directly from the capital of the lower pier, without the lower vault-springing which is found on the east wall. In the north-east and north-west angles, the lower shaft is semi-octagonal set anglewise, with slightly different detail in the capitals, and here again the upper pier starts directly from the capital of the lower pier. The central octagonal pier, however, has its own base at a higher level than the bases of the lower piers on the side walls (fig. 4, ii).\(^2\) The upper piers have capitals which are moulded to a much larger scale than the delicate mouldings of the capitals of the lower shafts, and the former show some analogy to the moulded capitals of the piers of the south chancel arcade (fig. 5, ii). The vaulting has transverse, diagonal, and ridge ribs, all chamfered, of low segmental curve, and the vault cells are constructed of chalk.

The explanation of the curious arrangement shown on fig. 4 would seem to be that, when the crypt was begun, it was intended to be floored and vaulted at a lower level, but that these levels had to be abandoned in the course of the works, probably because of difficulty with water.\(^3\) The floor-level raised some 3 feet, and the actual vaulting built at a higher level than had at first been intended. The old difficulty was encountered again in the last century, when

---

\(^1\) This examination was much easier when my drawing and notes were made than it is now that the crypt has been divided up to receive the engine which blows the huge organ which now blocks up the north transept. The floor of the crypt, which was then of ashes, has now been concreted. The plan (fig. 26) shows the thickness (4 ft. 8 ins.) of the west wall of the crypt, as measured when the wind-trunk for the organ was cut through it in 1908. The east wall of the earlier aisle was doubtless removed before the crypt was begun. At a distance of 8 ft. 11 ins. westward from the inner (eastern) face of the west wall of the crypt, is the edge of a chalk foundation (also shown on the plan), which is probably a broad sleeper foundation of the arcade piers.

\(^2\) The following are the various levels below the general floor-level of the nave and transept (the floor of the north chancel aisle is 6 inches lower):—Bottom of base of lower piers (intended floor-level of crypt), 8 ft. 1½ ins. Top of capital of lower pier on east wall, 4 ft. 11 ins. Bottom of base of central pier (upper floor-level), 5 ft. 0½ in. Ash floor (before it was concreted for the recent organ works), which I take to be the level left by the nineteenth-century restorers, 6 ft. Top of capitals of upper piers (springing line of actual vault), 5 ins. The soffit of the cell at the ridge of the vault is 3 ft. 5½ ins., and the present floor-level of the chapel over is 5 ft., above the general floor-level of the nave and transept, which last is 36.63 above Ordnance datum.

\(^3\) Cf. Oliver's Beverley, 359, as to trouble in the eighteenth century from this cause.
Pugin inserted a fireplace in the west wall with the intention of using the crypt as a vestry, but this had to be abandoned on account of water.

The crypt has an external doorway in its east wall, and seems originally to have been entered only from the outside. It was in fact only so entered in modern times, until the restoration of the chancel by Sir G. G. Scott, when the present doorway in its south wall and the steps in the chancel aisle were constructed.

The chapel above is 34 ft. 5 ins. in width (north side), and when it extended up to the north wall of the chancel, as originally built, it was 42 ft. 8 ins. in length from north to south. Its north and east walls are not square with each other, but its north wall is practically parallel with the side walls of the original chancel. It is lighted by a pair of two-light windows in its north wall, the jambs and arches of which are moulded with two filleted hollows, and the mullions and inner jambs with a roll flanked by chamfers. The heads of the lights are pointed, with trefoil cusping; and the tracery above consists of the four-sided figure with curved sides which Sharpe called a 'spherical square,' with quatrefoil cusping. In the east wall is a three-light window, the jambs and mullions of which are moulded with filleted hollows, and the tracery shows quatrefoils, the foliations of which form the principal lines, without enclosing circles. The other window in the east wall, which opens into the sacristy, is a later insertion which will be described with the fourteenth-century work in its turn. Below this window is a piscina (of the original build), the sill of which is only 11 inches above the present floor. It is probable that the vault of the crypt below was not built until after the walls had been carried up, and that the height of the vault necessitated a floor-level higher than was intended when the piscina was built in the east wall. The modern floor, too, may be somewhat higher than the original floor. The north end of the chapel finishes with a low-pitched gable, the roof being sixteenth-century work.

The chapel, which is now used as a vestry, is approached from the north aisle of the chancel, through a sixteenth-century doorway in the low south wall which divides the chapel from the aisle, and, in addition to the steps in and within this doorway, there are now five steps across its present length up to the higher level of its floor. It had been enclosed by modern partitions, which were removed.

---

1 Or trifoliated, to follow Professor Willis's definition.
3 The tracery of this window has been entirely renewed.
4 See the drawing (no. vi) of 1866 by Miss Caroline Brereton (Mrs. Hartley) in
by Sir G. G. Scott, when the present doorway was discovered; previously there was a doorway in the western partition, in the middle bay of the transept arcade, and there was also access to the chancel aisle through a modern opening broken through the window in the east wall of the chapel into the sacristy.

The crypt under this chapel was a bone-hole, the ‘charnel’ as it was called in mediaeval times, and this term seems generally to have been used to apply to the whole of this part of the church, rather than merely to the bone-hole or crypt itself. The Merchant or Mercers’ gild, sometimes called the Trinity gild, which was the premier craft gild in Beverley, had its light at the altar of the Holy Trinity in the charnel of the chapel of St. Mary, and maintained a Trinity priest there. The chaplain of the chantry of the Holy Trinity in the charnel was one of the parties to the indenture for the obit of John Ake and his wife in 1417. In his will of 1475 John Mydylton, merchant, left £6 13s. 4d. for the support of the chaplain of the gild of the Holy Trinity in the charnel; and similar bequests to the Trinity gild or its chaplain, or mentions of the Trinity altar in the charnel, occur in the wills of Dionisia Holme (1471), Robert Fisher, mercer (father of John Fisher, bishop of Rochester) (1477), Guy Malyerd, mercer (1486), and Agnes Hildyard (1497), all of whom were buried in St. Mary’s church. In his will of 1471 Henry Holme, who was also buried in St. Mary’s, left 6s. 8d. for the maintenance of the gild of the Blessed Mary the Virgin in the charnel. The connexion of this chapel with the principal religious gild and the principal craft gild of the town may well account for its unusual size.

Supplementing what has been said above of the analogies between the plan of St. Mary’s and that of St. Augustine’s, Hedon, it is worth notice that the latter church already had a chapel of the Virgin built with the chancel (second quarter of thirteenth century) eastward of the earlier eastern aisle of the south transept. At

Illustration of her father’s paper in the *Assor. Arch. Soc.’s Reports*, viii, opp. p. 106. Some of Mrs. Hartley’s original drawings of the church are now in the Beverley Corporation Art Gallery.

1 The illustration of the crypt in Oliver’s *Beverley* (1829), 359, shows a heap of bones on the floor—a survival of its ancient use.

2 There was a ‘charnel’ at the Minster, and in an inquisition of 1428 in the Town Minute Book the altar of St. Martin (to which the chapel of St. Mary was annexed) is described as being in the chapel ‘supra charnellum in cimiterio’ of the Minster (*Beverley Charter Act Book*, ii, 349. *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.*, 13). Part

of this ‘charnel’ still survives in the remains of the undercroft on the south side of the south-west tower, and it appears to have been built at much the same period as the ‘charnel’ of St. Mary’s.


12 *Boyle, op. cit.* 112.
Grimsby, too, a large chapel seems to have been added east of the earlier eastern aisle of the north transept.\(^1\)

The next section of this series of works was the aisle on the east side of the south transept, which would seem to have been undertaken while the north chapel was still in progress, and may be attributed to the last years of the thirteenth or first years of the fourteenth century. The question arises whether this work simply consisted of alteration of the existing aisle, or whether it was an entire reconstruction of a probably narrower aisle. In support of the first suggestion, some irregularities in the jointing of the masonry might be urged as pointing to the conclusion that the windows were inserted in existing walls. On the other hand, the width of the aisle (13 ft. 2 ins.) is more than we should expect in the earlier part of the thirteenth century; the external architectural features are entirely of the later date; and the internal masonry is quite unlike the earlier masonry on the inside of the transept itself, and presents the same characteristics as that of the north chapel, the south chancel aisle, and the upper parts of the nave aisle walls, which must all be placed in this series of almost contemporary works. Again, whereas the windows and other architectural features of the south chancel aisle agree in date with the south arcade of the chancel, the arches of the south transept arcade show quite different characteristics, and it is impossible to place them in the same period as the windows, etc., of this aisle. The most probable conclusion therefore is that the walls of the earlier and narrower aisle were taken down, and that what we see now represents an entire reconstruction.

The windows of this south transept aisle, two on the east and one on the south, are of three lights, with chamfered jambs of two orders both externally and internally, and chamfered mullions. Their arches are filled with what has been called 'intersecting tracery.'\(^2\) in which the mullions are continued through the window-head by arcs of the same radius as the outer arch, which intersect one another, and are continued to the outer arch.\(^3\) In these windows, the tracery is not cusped.

The addition of an aisle on the south side of the chancel (hitherto aisleless) must have been nearly contemporary with the transept

\(^1\) Associated Architectural Societies' Reports, xiv, 153.

\(^2\) E. Sharpe, Decorated Window Tracery in England, 81.

\(^3\) This type is not infrequent in twolight openings in earlier thirteenth-century work in England, as in the choir triforium of Whitby and Rievaulx, and in the transept triforium of York Minster. It is so frequent in the thirteenth-century Gothic of Normandy that modern French archaeologists call it 'remplage normand' (Saint-Étienne, Caen, choir triforium; Bayeux, choir triforium; Coutances, central tower, etc.).
aisle, though an examination of the masonry of the angle between them on the inside seems to indicate that the east wall of the transept aisle was built first, and that the south wall of the chancel aisle was built up to it. The wall of the latter is thicker (2 ft. 8 ins.) than that of the transept aisle (2 ft. 2 ins.), and the chancel aisle is rather narrower. The windows of the chancel aisle are similar to those of the transept aisle, but both the heads of the lights and the tracery openings are cusped,¹ and there are some other small points of difference. As a result of the greater thickness of the wall, the outer chamfers on the jambs are wider. The fillets on the mullions and tracery are narrower. The window arches are segmental, struck from centres a little below the springing line; this results from the fact that the windows are about a foot wider, and, the height from the window springing to the cornice being fixed by the transept aisle, the window arches were so struck to accommodate the greater width to the same height. The plinths and sill-strings are the same, but the lower chamfered plinth of the chancel aisle does not occur in the transept aisle. The buttresses of both transept aisle and chancel aisle are finished with gabled heads, but the buttresses of the transept aisle² have more projection than those of the chancel aisle, and, whereas the former have two weatherings, the latter have only one.

The four bays of the chancel aisle are spaced equally between the buttresses from the eastern face of the wall of the transept aisle, the eastern side of the eastern buttress being in line with the external face of the east wall of the chancel aisle. The piers of the south chancel arcade however do not centre with the buttresses, which indicates that, as usual, the walls of the aisle would be set out and built before the south wall of the chancel itself was interfered with. The irregular spacing of the five bays of the arcade is more difficult to explain. The first, third, and fourth bays (from the crossing) are practically of equal width, but the second and fifth (eastern) bays are about 16–18 inches wider. It is possible that there may have been something in the spacing of the roof principals of the (then existing) chancel which caused this irregularity, though nothing of the kind seems to have affected the later north arcade, where however the spacing of the bays was governed

¹ In the east window of the chancel aisle, the heads of the lights are not cusped, but the stonework has been renewed, and the cusps may have been removed. In the windows of the aisles of the nave and south aisle of the chancel, the cusping is soft-fi-cusping. So also to the inside of the two north windows of the north transept chapel, though on the outside of these two windows we find chamfer-cusping (see Sharpe’s Decorated Window Tracery, 34).
² Except the south buttress next the south-east angle of the chancel aisle, which projects less than either, and has only one weathering.
by the east wall of the north chapel. However this may be, we must, I think, assume that the south aisle was added to a chancel of the present length, the roof of which remained unaltered, and this points to the thirteenth-century lengthening of the twelfth-century chancel which I have suggested above.

The south arcade of the chancel, of five bays, has piers which consist of four half-shafts, filleted, separated by filleted hollows. At the west end the respond pier starts from a 3 feet length of wall, which is partly of the date of the arcade, and partly of the later rebuilding. At the east end the half-pier comes directly against the east wall. The capitals and bases of the piers are simply moulded. The arches are of two orders, with hood-mould on both sides (details illustrated on fig. 5, i, ii, and iii). The hood-moulds are of the date of the arcade, but the spandrels were altered when the clearstory was added in the fifteenth century. Several of the characteristic heads which form the terminations of the hood-moulds are of the date of the arcade. The character of the details indicates that the arcade cannot well be dated later than about 1310. The master of the works appears to have been Gilbert Humbercolt,1

The chief motive for adding aisles such as this was to provide room for additional altars, and the piscina for the altar at the east end of this aisle is under the easternmost window in the south wall. In the south-east angle is a corbel, probably for an image. In later times, at any rate, this aisle was the chapel of St. Katharine, for Gent2 records that the life and sufferings of the saint were 'curiously painted on the Ceiling of the South Isle of the Chancel,' and he gives a detailed description of the paintings in the 'fourteen square divisions.'3

The other section of this series of works which remains to be considered is the alteration of the aisles of the nave. All the architectural characteristics of these aisles agree so closely with those of the south chancel aisle that these two sections of the works must be pronounced to be nearly contemporary, and, as their date must

1 'Gilbertus dictus Humbercolt, magister operis capellæ (Beatae Mariæ) was the master of the works mentioned on page 359 supra (Beverley Chapter Act Book, i, 57), 4 March, 1305. Gilbert de Humbercolt is mentioned in the confirmation of grants for the fabric of St. Mary's on the Patent Roll of 1329 (p.359, note 6, supra), as well as Geoffrey, son of Gilbert Humbercolt of Beverley (Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1327-1339, pp. 408-9).


3 The ceiling of the aisle is divided into fourteen panels (seven in the length by two in the width), although all traces of the paintings described by Gent have disappeared.
be somewhere around 1300, it will be simplest to refer to them as the 1300 works.

The question arises whether the nave aisles as we see them now represent merely an alteration and raising of the aisles which formed part of the reconstruction of the nave which was finished about the middle of the thirteenth century, or whether the aisles have been completely rebuilt. I have already remarked that the aisles are considerably wider than is usual in parish-church plans of the first half of the thirteenth century, and instances of the widening about this time of earlier narrow aisles are very common. It is worth notice that the south chancel aisle is some 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) feet narrower than the south aisle of the nave, which seems less likely to have been the case if the nave aisles were already of their present width when the south aisle was added to the chancel. The probability, confirmed by some indications in the masonry to be noticed presently, is that the existing aisles represent a complete rebuilding of the 1300 date, replacing narrower and lower aisles with lean-to roofs which had been so built some half-century earlier. It will therefore be assumed in the following description that this is what happened.

Some points in the spacing of the bays of the nave arcades and aisle walls deserve attention (see plan, fig. 26). The piers of the existing arcades are opposite each other, and we may assume that they reproduce the positions of the piers of the thirteenth-century nave. But, while the buttresses of the south aisle wall centre truly\(^1\) with the arcade piers, the buttresses of the north aisle do not, and are in fact from 2 ft. 4 ins. to 3 ft. to the west of the centre lines of the piers. The reason is obvious. The aisle bays were set out from the external faces of the transept walls, the widths corresponding on the two sides, north and south. The buttresses of the south aisle, doubtless set out first, were properly centred with the arcade piers. As a result however of the deviation in the axes of the transept arms which has been noticed above, the point where the external face of the aisle wall starts from the external face of the transept wall is 2 ft. 4 ins. further to the west on the north side than on the south, and this initial divergence is slightly increased in each bay, so that the buttress to the east of the north door is set on a centre line 3 feet to the west of the axis of the corresponding pier of the arcade.\(^2\) It was doubtless to correct this divergence to some

---

\(^1\)This is true to within an extreme variation of less than 3 inches, taken at right angles to the axis of the nave.

\(^2\)See the explanation of a somewhat analogous divergence in the nave of the Minster, in the Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland, iv, p. lxv. It is worth notice that in both cases an attempt was made to rectify the error when the point was reached where a cross line could be got through the doorways.
extent that the doorway bay in the north aisle wall was made 11 inches narrower than the adjoining bay eastward.

We know nothing of the length of the original nave, but the narrow westernmost bay of the north aisle, and the lengths of main wall which continue the western respond piers of the nave arcades up to the west wall, may perhaps indicate an extension westward of the original length. On the north side however the plinth and sill-string extend up to the later buttress at the north-west angle of the aisle, and the window in the narrow western bay is an insertion in the 1300 wall; while on the south side the sill-string is continued between the south porch and the buttress at the south-west angle of the aisle, though the plinth is of fifteenth-century date. It is certain therefore that at the time of the 1300 alterations the nave extended as far west as it does now.

The external facing of both north and south aisle walls is certainly entirely of the 1300 date. There is a lower chamfered plinth, and the buttresses have gabled heads and a single weathering all as in the south chancel aisle. The windows of three lights, five in the north aisle, and three in the south, have double chamfered jambs, chamfered mullions with the narrower fillet, cusped intersecting tracery, and segmental arches, all as in the windows of the south chancel aisle, and the walls are of the same thickness—so following the chancel aisle in all the points in which it differs in detail from the east aisle of the south transept.

An examination of the internal facing of the aisle walls reveals a marked difference between the lower and upper parts, the latter showing the courses of irregular depth and rather long stones which is characteristic of the other sections of the 1300 works. Between the respond piers at their eastern ends and the doorways the lower 4 1/2 feet or so in height, and between the north doorway and the north-west angle the lower 6 feet or so, are walled in more regular masonry, in courses generally from 8 to 10 inches in height, the stones

1 Brereton (op. cit. 96) records that, some ten or twelve years before he wrote his paper (in 1865), the north walls (sic) of the nave had become so much out of the perpendicular that they were obliged to be shored up; they were then substantially rebuilt from the base to the parapet, the old materials being used as much as possible. The second and third buttresses east of the north doorway project more than the others, and I take this to be an alteration made in this nineteenth-century rebuilding. The set-in of the external face of the north aisle wall above the window-springings may also result from this rebuilding. The north aisle has not the battlemented parapet which was a late addition to the other aisle walls.

2 The windows in the two bays of the south aisle next the transept, and the window in the western bay of the north aisle, are later insertions.

3 The lowest three courses above the floor in each aisle wall are a renewal of Sir G. G. Scott's restoration, probably replacing stones decayed by damp (cf. Brereton, op. cit. 96). Many of the stones in the upper part are chalk, and renewals of facing stones tend to make conclusions from the character of the masonry the more difficult.
being from 11 to 13 inches and more in length—not unlike the earlier walling already noticed in the south transept, and undoubtedly of earlier date than the facing above.\(^1\) This might be taken to indicate that the earlier aisle walls were only raised and refaced externally in the 1300 period, but there are some other indications which militate against this view. The respond piers at the east end of the aisle walls are not bonded to this lower walling, as we might expect them to be if they were originally built with them. In the inner jambs of the north doorway, one of the beds on the east side, and several of the beds on the west side range with the beds of the lower walling. The most probable conclusion therefore is that earlier stones were reused for the internal facing of the lower parts of the 1300 aisle walls. Under the easternmost window in the north wall are two arched monumental recesses of unequal height, of the 1300 work.

The north doorway, the jambs of which have two attached filleted shafts with caps and bases, is of the 1300 work, but has been extensively renewed.

In the south doorway we have already noticed the work of two different dates, the mid twelfth-century inner arch, and the mid thirteenth-century outer order of the jambs and arch on the side next the porch. The inner order of the jambs and arch on this side (fig. 2, iii), and the capitals of both orders of the jambs belong to the 1300 work, when the whole was probably rebuilt, reusing the earlier work. It we accept the theory of a complete rebuilding and widening of the aisles, the twelfth-century arch must have been moved twice, and the mid thirteenth-century jambs and arch-order must have been moved from the wall of the narrower south aisle.

The respond piers at the east end of the aisle walls have evidently been increased in height, and their capitals refixed at a higher level. The original lower arches would suit the assumed lean-to roofs of the narrower aisles, which preceded the present nearly flat roofs. The mid thirteenth-century outer order of these arches on their western side has already been described. The inner order and the outer order on the side next the transept are of the 1300 date, and their profiles are very similar to those of the south chancel arcade (cf. fig. 3, vii, and fig. 5, i). These arches were again rebuilt, in part at any rate, in the early sixteenth-century reconstruction.

All the work of this 1300 period is simple and quiet in character,

---

\(^1\) If we may fairly regard the diagonal axing of some of the stones as original (as seems probable), they must be stones from the walls of the twelfth century nave, reused when the aisles were added, and again when they were widened.
but quite undistinguished compared with the very remarkable work which next followed it.

The next extension, and practically the last so far as the ground plan of the church is concerned, was the building of the aisle or chapel on the north side of the chancel, with the adjoining sacristy, and the whole north arcade of the chancel. These works were probably commenced about 1330, and finished before the Black Death of 1349.

The whole of this work is of the highest merit, and, although on a small scale, it must rank among the finest architectural achievements of its time. The second quarter of the fourteenth century was indeed a period of notable architectural activity in Beverley.\(^1\) The beautiful nave of the Minster was being rebuilt; the altar-screen was in course of construction in 1334; and its completion was closely followed by the erection of the lovely tomb of Eleanor Percy, which is still persistently miscalled the Percy shrine. The north chapel of St. Mary's can more than hold its own, even when compared with the excellent contemporary work in the greater church. It is worth remark too that it is the only considerable part of St. Mary's church which can be regarded as an architectural conception complete in itself. The church, as we now see it, is the result of a long succession of alterations and enlargements, and, although its general character is largely due to the fifteenth-century builders, their work was controlled to a very great extent by pre-existing conditions. The north chapel on the contrary was an entirely new work, and is as complete as it is beautiful.

This north aisle or chapel was added to the whole free length of the north side of the chancel, from the east wall of the north transept chapel to the east end of what I have assumed to be a thirteenth-century extension of the mid twelfth-century chancel. The sacristy on its north side occupies the angle between the north transept chapel and the new chapel, and forms part of the same work. The arcade opening from the chancel into the new chapel was extended westward to the crossing, which involved the shortening (on the south) of the transept chapel and the crypt beneath, and the opening out of the west end of the new chapel by an arch in the east wall of the transept chapel.

The arcade which opens from the chancel into the chapel is of three equal bays, the width of which was determined by the position of the east wall of the transept chapel, now represented by a much

\(^1\) Cf. Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xxiv, 221.
FIG. 6. CHANCEL, NORTH ARCADE (BETWEEN 1867 AND 1875).
larger pier against the back of which abuts the arch by which the west end of the chancel chapel opens to the aisle to the west. As these three eastern bays of the arcade were not set out on the precise line of the north side of the chancel, the two western bays between the larger pier and the crossing, which were evidently built after the chapel had been set out and at least begun,¹ are not in the same line as the eastern bays, but are slightly skewed to the south westward (see the plan, fig. 26). These two western bays are about 18 inches wider (centre to centre) than the three eastern bays, but their details are almost identical (see fig. 6).²

The piers of the arcade are based on the same motive as those of the south arcade—four filleted half-shafts separated by hollows³—but, as throughout this work, the details are more refined and of much higher quality.⁴ The capitals are moulded, the lower part following the circular plan of the shafts, and the abacus and hollow moulding below it having a semi-octagonal plan (fig. 5, v). In the bases the upper mouldings follow the circular plan of the shafts, and the lower have a semi-octagonal plan (fig. 5, vi). The arches, the soffit curve of which in the three eastern bays is slightly more sharply pointed than equilateral, are of two orders, admirably profiled⁵ (fig. 5, iv). At their springings, the mouldings die away into semi-octagonal blocks rising vertically from the capitals. The spandrels between the arches are divided vertically by moulded ribs,⁶ stopping at the top into the string-course below the clearstory, and at the bottom continuing below the hood-moulds which die away into them, to terminations of sculptured angels.⁷ In the spandrels, on each side of the vertical rib, is a sunk circle, trefoiled, each lobe of the trefoil being again trefoiled, and all three (circle and each trefoil) are ornamented with little knobs, pointed and of octagonal plan, which are profusely used in this work, and are called by Mr. Brereton the 'Beverley stud-moulding'⁸ (fig. 7). In the string-course above the arcade, below the clearstory, the hollow moulding is ornamented with

1 In order to leave the western part of the chancel in use as long as possible.

2 The photograph from which fig. 6 is reproduced was taken after Sir G. G. Scott’s restoration of 1864-7, and before his refitting of the chancel in 1875-6. See also engraving in Rickman (1848 edn.), 156.

3 Only one of the piers, the first eastward of the crossing, has the complete plan of four half-shafts. The other piers have part of the same plan (to the respond piers), or are reinforced at the back to receive the springing of the chapel vault (see plan, fig. 26).

4 The second bay from the east is very completely illustrated in Details of Gothic Architecture, by J. K. Colling (London, 1852–6), vol. i, ‘Decorated,’ pls. 4 and 5.

5 The profiles of the eastern arch differ slightly from those of the other two, as may be seen by comparing the details of the latter in Colling with the former illustrated in the A. A. Sketch Book (cited below).

6 F in Colling’s pls. 4 and 5.

7 At the east end the hood-mould stops against a large crouching figure.

8 C. Brereton, op. cit. 109, and pl. xi. See details in Colling’s pl. 5.
similar 'studs.'\(^1\) In these three bays, the outer order next the chapel is profiled with a simple 'wave'-'moulding, and serves as the wall-arch for the vault.

The two western bays of the arcade, which continue the arcade between the chancel and chapel westward to the crossing, are treated in precisely the same manner, with some slight modifications of detail\(^2\); but, these bays being wider than the three eastern bays, their arches are more obtusely pointed. At the west end the respond-pier starts from a wall some 5 feet in length from the tower pier, which retains, on the side next the aisle, a fragment of the original mid twelfth-century wall and plinth.

The large pier which divides the three eastern from the two western bays of the arcade consists of two respond piers in the line of the arcade, and of a respond pier on the back, which receives the arch across the west end of the chapel,\(^3\) against which the vaulting of the chapel finishes, which was opened through the east wall of the transept chapel. The back respond has a plan towards the west which is much more than that of the half-pier. The two responds on the line of the arcade are also more than half-piers on the side next the chancel, where the main filleted shafts are complete, and are each flanked with a large hollow up to a flat face, 8 inches wide, which runs up past the capitals of the arcade piers to a sculptured capital at the foot of the niche which crowns this pier of junction. This niche\(^4\) (fig. 7) is a most beautiful and refined composition, a real gem of its time, which may be compared, not to its disadvantage, with the delicate niches at the back of the altar-screen\(^5\) in the Minster.\(^6\) The sides of the niche have double pilasters, starting from angel corbels, plain in their lower part where the hood-mould of the arcade arch dies into them, and panelled above an annulet which it springs on the north side are detailed in a similar manner to the main arcade, but the capitals of the north respond have foliage carved on the bell.

\(^1\) E in Colling’s pls. 4 and 5.
\(^2\) Compare the arch-mouldings of the western bays illustrated in E. Sharpe, The Mouldings of the six periods of British Architecture (London, 1871), pl. 49, with those of two of the eastern bays illustrated in Colling’s pl. 5. The hood-mould on the side next the chancel is different, and the filleted roll on the soffit of the inner order is wider in the eastern bays than in the western. The outer order on the side next the aisle is moulded similarly to the outer order next the chancel, but the profile is not the same. The hood-mould on the aisle side has the same profile as that on the chancel side of the eastern bays. The termination of the hood-mould over the pier between the two western bays is illustrated in Colling’s Details, ii. 40.

\(^3\) This arch and the respond pier from

\(^4\) This niche is excellently illustrated in detail in Colling’s Details of Gothic Architecture, vol. i, 'Decorated,' pls. 10 and 11.


\(^6\) The details of contemporary work of this period in the Minster and in St. Mary’s seem to me to indicate that, as perhaps we might expect, two different master-masons were employed at the two churches. The same remark, I believe, holds good for the late fourteenth and early fifteenth-century work in the two churches, for the tracery of the windows of St. Mary’s does not show the same handling as in the Minster.
FIG. 7. CHANCEL, NORTH ARCADE, NICHE.
which surrounds them just above the hood-mould. The jamb within the pilaster is ornamented with the ‘stud.’ The canopy of the niche consists of three gablets, one on the front, and one on each canted side, beautifully traceryed within the gable-mould, which has foliaged crockets and finial; between each of the gablets is a little pinnacle, now broken away, starting from a head at the springing of the gable. The soffit of the canopy has a dainty little ribbed and cusped vault. From the top of the canopy rises a tall pinnacle shaft, on plan four sides of a hexagon, panelled, with delicate traceryed head within the gablets which finish each side, the gable-mould having foliaged crockets and finial; while between the gablets the angles are carried up as small pinnacles, now broken away. The flanking pilasters mentioned above have their panels finished with traceryed heads at the same level, within gablets springing from heads, crocketed and finialed, and from these rise their crocketted and finialed spirelets which terminate them. The flanking pilasters are connected with the central shaft, just below the gablets, by tiny cusped and crocketed ‘flying-butresses.’ From the gablets of the central shaft rises its spire-termination, crocketed on the angles, and finished with a foliaged finial against the string-course which runs above the arcade, below the clearstory stage. This lovely creation was doubtless designed for a statue of the Virgin,\(^1\) which may be that mentioned in the will of Elias Casse, dyer and burgess of Beverley, 1501, who was to be buried ‘in insula australi, coram imagine B.M.V. ibidem.’\(^2\)

At the back of this large pier is a smaller but very charming niche\(^3\) designed on similar lines. It masks what would otherwise have been an awkward corner formed by the eastern springing of the arcade arch (eastern of the two western bays) and the southern springing of the arch which divides the chapel from the aisle which continues it westward, and it is delightfully contrived for its purpose.

The aisle or chapel (fig. 8) to the north of the three eastern bays of the arcade is some 4 feet wider than the earlier south aisle of the chancel, and its three bays extend to a length of only about 38 feet. Yet within these modest dimensions the unnamed Beverley

---

\(^1\) The crook for securing the image is shown in Colling’s pl. 11.

\(^2\) Reg. Test. vi, 12. Test. Ebor. iv, 199. There was however an image of the Virgin in the nave. In her will of 1471, Dionisia Holme bequeathed ‘j zonam cerec’, argentum ornatum et deauratum, imagine B.M.V. in navi eccles. praedictae existenti (Reg. Test. iv, 37. Test. Ebor. iii, 182); and, in his will of 1479, Thomas Dieson, weaver of Beverley, bequeathed ‘ad ymaginem dulcissimae Virginiis in navi eccl. zonam meam serico rubio, harnesitam cum argento.’ (Reg. Test. v, 145. Test. Ebor. iii, 192n.). In 1487 Cecilia Malyerd (wife of the mercer to be mentioned presently) left a pair of gilt beads to the image of the Virgin (Reg. Test. v, 317. Test. Ebor. iv, 16n.).

\(^3\) Illustrated in Colling’s Details, i, ‘Decorated,’ pl. 1. Cf. Breton, op. cit. 107, and pl. vii.
master achieved what may safely be pronounced to be one of the masterpieces of English Gothic art. Its plan (fig. 26) is well worth careful study. The principle of suppressing the wall, and concentrating the supports of the vault in pier and buttress, which is characteristic of developed Gothic vaulted construction, is here very completely realized. The south side next the chancel and the west end of course consist entirely of pier and arch, but the same principle is carried out at the east end and on the north side, as well as in the adjoining sacristy. So at the north-east angle the plan shows only the solid angle turret and the window jambs, while the supports on the north side consist only of the pier and the deep buttress behind it; and the window openings fill the whole space enclosed by pier and vault. At the angle between the chapel and the sacristy, where the thrusts of vault and window-arch largely neutralize each other, we see only a pier of minimum thickness. The construction is logical to an extent which is by no means common in English parish churches, and it is carried out with a beauty of detail which is equally remarkable.

The plan of the arcade piers is skilfully adapted to their functions. A pier of the normal four-shafted plan would not have sufficed to resist the thrust of the vault of the chapel. Accordingly, in place of the fourth shaft towards the chapel, the plan shows an elongation of the pier northward by a kind of buttress-projection, finished with a filleted attached shaft flanked on each side by a filleted hollow. This gives the pier a length of 4 ft. 5 ins. from north to south, instead of the normal 2 ft. 8½ ins., and provides an adequate abutment for the vault. The large pier between the three eastern and two western bays has a repetition of half the elongated pier (plus the whole of the filleted shaft), which with the three responds described above gives this pier a bulk which is sufficient to resist the thrusts of the western arch and western vault-springing of the chapel, which are not here neutralized by any vault-thrust from the west. The filleted shaft at the back of the elongated piers has a capital to receive the vault-springing, and similar smaller capitals rise from the extreme fillet of the flanking hollows,¹ the function of which will be explained presently. At the back of the easternmost pier these capitals are moulded, while those to the westernmost pier and western respond are sculptured with a convex band of foliage.

The three bays of the vault of the chapel (fig. 9)² have moulded transverse, diagonal, and wall ribs, a single tierceron between each

¹The bases are similarly planned.
²The eastern part of the chapel is illustrated by four sheets of measured drawings by Mr. C. de Gruchy, in the Architectural Association Sketch Book, 3rd ser. vol. iv, pls. 6–9. The section
FIG. 8. CHAPEL, ON NORTH SIDE OF CHANCEL.
transverse and diagonal rib, and between each diagonal and wall rib, and horizontal ridge ribs in each direction continued to the wall ribs.\textsuperscript{1} The main intersections of the diagonal and ridge ribs have large foliaged bosses, and there are similar smaller bosses at the intersections of the transverse and ridge ribs, and of the tiercerons and ridge rib, as well as at the apex of the longitudinal rib on the south side, where the ridge rib stops at the longitudinal rib and is not continued to the arcade arch. There is also a small boss at the intersection of the ridge rib with the apex of the transverse rib within the main arch at the west end of the chapel; but there are no bosses at the intersection of ridge rib and wall rib on the north side, nor on the east end. The cells of the vault are plastered.

The springings of the vault-ribs at the back of the two arcade piers and at the western respond, on the south side of the chapel, afford an interesting example of the kind of penetration which at a later date became common in the ‘Flamboyant’ manner in France.\textsuperscript{2} The wall or longitudinal rib on this south side (figs. 8 and 9) is some distance behind the arcade arch, thus leaving a strip of barrel-vault 1 foot wide between the rib and the outer order of the arch. On the capital of the filleted shaft on the back of the pier, the transverse rib, the tierceron on each side of it, and the longitudinal rib, form a group in common at their springing. The diagonal rib, however, springs from the flanking capital, and intersects the longitudinal rib on its way to its springing from this capital. The tierceron between the diagonal and longitudinal ribs springs from further back still, dying away into the plain face beyond the flank-
ing capital; consequently it also intersects the longitudinal rib (see plan, fig. 26). At the points of intersection the longitudinal rib is in front of the diagonal rib and tierceron, and its central fillet is continuous, as also is its whole middle roll except where it is intersected by the middle filleted roll of the lower length of the diagonal rib (fig. 9). The ribs are moulded with refined profiles, the transverse and diagonal ribs being both deeper and thicker than the tiercerons and ridge ribs. The longitudinal rib on the south side is again less in depth, and on its side next the arcade arch is only moulded, beyond the filleted roll, with a wide shallow hollow. The transverse rib within the main arch at the west end is treated in the same manner. As the strip of barrel-vault between the longitudinal rib on the south side and the inner order of the arcade arch is set behind the flat face at the side of the pier, it does not complete itself to the general springing-line, but springs at an angle from the continuation of the flat face some distance above the general springing-line.

The springings of the vault on the north and east sides of the chapel are arranged quite differently. Here the ribs are continued, without capitals, down to bases immediately above the floor. The complete piers on the north side, between the first and second and between the second and third bays from the east, are semicircular on plan and about 1 foot in diameter, and as these two piers each receive nine ribs—a transverse rib, two diagonals, four tiercerons, and two wall ribs—they are composed of the fillets and a small section of the soffit-roll of these nine ribs. The pier on the west side of the third bay, which receives a transverse rib, one diagonal, two tiercerons, and one wall rib, is rather more than a quadrant of a circle on plan, and is similarly composed of five fillets, etc. The pier at the north-east angle of the chapel, which receives one diagonal rib, two tiercerons, and two wall ribs, is a quadrant of a circle on plan, composed of five fillets, etc. The pier at the south-east angle is a quadrant of a circle on plan, set in the break formed by the east wall and the projecting flat face of the eastern respond pier of the arcade, and, as it receives one diagonal rib, two tiercerons, the eastern wall rib, and the southern longitudinal rib, it is similarly composed of four fillets, the fillet and southern side of the longitudinal rib dying into the flat face of the respond pier.

The plans of these piers, which result from the setting-out of the ribs, prove that the vault must have been worked out in detail before the walls rose above the floor level. So also must the pene-

---

1 See these profiles in detail in A. A. Sketch Book, iv, pl. 9.
FIG. 9. CHAPEL ON NORTH SIDE OF CHANCEL, VAULT.
trations on the south side have been worked out in detail from the first, for the plan of the bases on the flanking hollows of the piers is repeated above in the capitals which receive the diagonal ribs of the vault.

The ribs of the vault (as measured from the middle bay) are set out to the following curves. The transverse rib (north to south) is a pointed arch struck from centres which divide the span into three very nearly equal parts. The wall rib (north side) and the longitudinal rib (south side) are a little lower than equilateral pointed arches. The diagonal ribs are some 2 inches lower than a true semicircle. The ridge ribs are practically horizontal. As the diagonal ribs spring from further within the piers on the south side (except at the south-east angle) than on the north, the two halves of these ribs do not lie in precisely the same vertical plane.

I have already remarked on the care which the master took in planning his piers to resist the thrust of the vault. The same care and skill is exhibited in the construction of the springings of the vault. These, as usual, are in single stones with horizontal beds, and the lowest horizontal bed is continued horizontally through the springings of the window arches on the north and east sides of the chapel, and the lowest two horizontal beds are continued horizontally through the springings of the arcade arches on the south side. The springings of the arcade arches from the large pier between the three eastern and two western bays, and both springings of the main transverse arch across the west end of the chapel, also have two horizontal beds, the upper of which is not at the same level as the second horizontal bed of the vault-springer. The

1 Mr. de Gruchy's drawings in the A. A. Sketch Book, iv, pls. 6 and 7, show the plan and section of the vault in detail, but, as they do not show the projections of the rib-curves, they may be supplemented by the following dimensions of span and height, measured from the middle bay. The width of the bay from centre to centre (east to west) is 12 ft. 6½ ins. The clear width between the piers (north to south) is 14 ft. 5⅛ ins. The spans of the ribs are—transverse 14 ft. 4¾ ins.; diagonal 19 ft. 3 ins.; and wall rib (north) 11 ft. 5⅛ ins.—the height of all being 9 ft. 5⅛ ins. The longitudinal rib (south) has a span of 11 ft. 9½ ins. and a height of 9 ft. 6¾ ins. All these dimensions are taken within the fillet of the soffit-roll, and to the fillet of the ridge rib where the apex of the rib-curve is covered by a boss. The heights are measured from the top of the capitals on the south side, though the bed-joint at the springing of the arch is about ⅛ inch higher. The height from the floor to the springing-line is 11 ft. 6¾ ins.

2 This remark does not apply to the diagonal rib from the south-east angle to the first pier (from the east) on the north side, the two halves of which do lie in the same vertical plane.

3 Not counting the bed at the springing-line. Over the piers on the south side of the chapel, this last is about ⅓ in. above the top of the abacuses.

4 Colling's pl. 1, which shows radiating joints, is inaccurate in this respect. In Mr. de Gruchy's pl. 6 too the jointing is not quite accurately indicated, for he shows three horizontal beds as continued through the springing of the arcade arch, instead of only two.

5 In the two western bays of the arcade, where there is no vault behind, there is one horizontal bed in the arch-springing over the middle pier, and two in that over the western respond.
springings of the ribs of the vault are constructed in *tas de charge* for a height of four courses above the springing-line, the upper bed of the top course radiating to receive the ribs which are in separate stones above this level. The real arched construction of the ribs thus only begins at a point which is considerably above the mid-height of the arch curve itself, and the actual span of the real arched construction is nearly one-fourth less than the span at the springing-line. The thrusts of the vault were so successfully dealt with that the piers on the north and south are now only a quarter-of-an inch out of plumb in their height from base to capital or springing-line. This description applies to the springings of all the ribs except on the south side, where the ribs interpenetrate in the manner shown in figs. 8 and 9. The transverse rib and the tierceron on each side of it are in separate stones above the fourth course, but the longitudinal and diagonal ribs and the tierceron between them spring as separate stones from a fifth course in *tas de charge*, on which part of the penetration of the tierceron and longitudinal rib is worked.

The solid springers of the ribs on the south side, and the interpenetrations of the ribs which, it will be noticed, come within them, were worked before the stones were set. The curves of the transverse rib and of the tierceron on each side of it were set out to rather too long a radius, with the result that the curve is broken to some extent at the top of the *tas de charge*. The curves of the other ribs are more nearly true. There are some slight irregularities in the line of the longitudinal ridge rib which arise from the method of setting-out. At the west end of the chapel, the springing of the main arch is further in on the south than on the north, in relation to the vault, and this throws the apex of the arch a little out of centre. These small irregularities are not perceptible without minute examination, and they are only mentioned here to show that they arose quite naturally out of the conditions, and not from any conscious aiming at irregularity.

The windows of the chapel fill the whole space between the piers

---

1 On the north side (two piers) the fourth springer is jointed in the hollow on the west side of the soffit-roll of the transverse rib.
2 This remark applies to the transverse rib. The spans of the other ribs are of course correspondingly reduced. This corbel-construction (*tas de charge*) of the springings of mediaeval vaults considerably lessened their thrust, and counteracted the tendency of the rib stones to slide on their beds and crush (see Viollet le Duc, *Dictionnaire*, articles *Tas de charge* in vol. ix, and *Construction* in vol. iv).
3 Plumbed on the first piers, north and south, from the east end.
4 See the plan of the vault in Mr. de Gruchy's pl. 6.
5 It may be noted here that the oblique profiles of the ribs were truly set out on the horizontal beds of the *tas de charge*, so as to give the ribs their normal profile down to the springing. The Beverley master did not adopt the rough-and-ready method described by Professor Willis in his paper on the *Vaults of the Middle Ages*, p. 13 (*Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, 1842).
FIG. IO. NORTH SIDE OF CHANCEL.
FIG. II. WINDOW OF CHAPEL ON NORTH SIDE OF CHANCEL.
Fig. 12. I, Key of Sacristy Vault; II, Window in Tower.
and the wall ribs of the vault, and their outer and inner jambs are continued down to the external plinth and internal bench-table respectively, between which and the sills the enclosing wall is only of the thickness of the sills.\(^1\) The shafts on the jambs, both externally and internally, have capitals and bases, and internally the front moulding of the mullions is continued down below the sill to bases on the bench-table. The windows are filled with excellent flowing tracery, and their details have the same high quality and refinement which are characteristic of the whole work.

The east window\(^2\) is of four lights, and the main lines of its tracery are formed by two ogees, each including the arches of two lights, which are continued to enclose a large centre-piece filled with flowing forms. A detail worth notice is the ogee form of the middle cusping\(^3\) in the heads of the lights and in three of the figures within the centre piece. The piscina beneath the southernmost light has a slightly ogled arch, trefoil cusped, and its bowl is semi-octagonal on the bust of a figure as corbel.

The two windows in the easternmost and middle bays on the north side (figs. 10 and 11) are of three lights, and here the main lines of the tracery are formed by two ogees, each of which includes the arches of one of the side lights and the middle light, which intersect to form a small centre-piece filled with flowing forms.\(^4\)

The angle between the western bay on the north side of the chapel and the north transept chapel is occupied by the small building which I have called the sacristy, which is of the same build and character as the chancel chapel itself. The sacristy measures internally (excluding the window recesses) 12 ft. 6\(\frac{1}{2}\)–8 ins. from east to west, by 9 ft. 9 ins. from north to south. It is covered by a vault of the same plan as that of a bay of the chapel, with tiercerons and ridge ribs in both directions, and the cells are plastered. There are small bosses at the intersections of the ridge ribs and tiercerons, and a large boss at the intersection of the diagonal and ridge ribs (fig. 12, i). The latter is sculptured with two angels holding a napkin in which is the naked figure of a soul with hands folded in prayer.\(^5\) At the north-west, north-east, and south-east angles, the ribs of the vault

---

\(^1\) See the section in Mr. de Gruchy’s pl. 7.

\(^2\) The east window is illustrated in detail in Colling’s *Details of Gothic Architecture*, i, ‘Decorated,’ pls. 8 and 9, and in Mr. de Gruchy’s pls. 7 and 9.

\(^3\) See Sharpe’s *Decorated Window Tracery*; early examples, Holy Trinity, Hull (pl. 29), and Wells Chapter-house (pl. 39); developed examples, Heckington (pls. 38 and 39), and Seaford (pls. 40, 41, and 57). Also in the canopy of the Percy tomb in the Minster.

\(^4\) These windows are illustrated in Sharpe’s *Decorated Window Tracery*, pl. 43; and in Rickman (1848 edn.), 147.

\(^5\) Compare the representation on the finial of the ogee hood-mould on the south side of the Percy tomb in the Minster (Architectural Review, iii, 257). E. S. Prior and A. Gardner, *Medieval Figure-Sculpture in England* (Cambridge, 1912), p. 333, fig. 379).
are continued, without capitals, down to bases immediately above the floor, by piers of quadrant plan, precisely like that at the north-east angle of the chapel. At the south-west angle the ribs die into a plain pier of quadrant plan. In the south wall is a piscina, the bowl of which has disappeared; the opening is finished with a crocketed ogee under a crocketed gable springing from flanking pinnacles which have been destroyed and renewed only in block. The north window (fig. 10) of three lights is like the windows in the eastern and middle bays on the north side of the chapel. The east window has only two lights, the heads of which are ogées continued to enclose a centre-piece containing three flowing forms; and the middle cusping of the heads of the lights has the ogee form already noticed in the east window of the chapel. The upper part of the tracery of this window contains some small fragments of old glass. Part of the side light of this window, as of the adjoining window of the chapel, is intercepted by the pier in the internal angle between them. The south and west sides of the sacristy are filled with windows opening into the chancel chapel and north transept chapel respectively, and so both are unglazed. The tracery of the west window, of three lights, is of the type commonly known as 'reticulated,' and the middle cusping of the three ogee-ovals has the ogee form already noticed. The south window is of four lights, and the main lines of its tracery are formed by two ogées, each including the ogee arches of two lights, which are continued to enclose a large centre-piece (fig. 13). The tracery of these two windows is chamfered in two orders, not moulded as in the other windows, and the cusping of the heads of the lights has three foils, instead of five. The jambs and arches on both sides of the west window have two wave-moulds. The tracery of the south window is simply included within the wall ribs of the chapel and sacristy vaults. The enclosing wall between the chapel and sacristy, below the sill of the south window, contains a doorway which, on the chapel side, has shafted jambs and ogee-moulded arch and hood-mould. Of the two sculptured stops from which the hood-mould springs, that on the east is a rabbit with a pilgrim's scrip.

A staircase at the south-east corner of the chapel gives access

---

1 See the plan, fig. 26.
2 This west window is illustrated in detail in Colling's *Details of Gothic Architecture*, i, 'Decorated,' pl. 6.
3 This south window, with the doorway below, and a bay of the south arcade of the chancel, is illustrated in Rickman (1848 edn.), opp. p. 157: and the window (less correctly) and doorway in Sharpe's *Decorated Window Tracery*, pl. 44.
4 Illustrated in detail in Colling's *Details*, i, 'Decorated,' pl. 2.
5 The doorway from the staircase to the upper room is described and illustrated in the *Archaeological Journal*, v, 73. The top of the staircase is finished with a pretty little vault (of the later work) of eight pointed ribs which die into the walls and newel.
FIG. 13. SACRISTY, SOUTH WINDOW.

F. H. Crossley, phot.
to a low upper story, which comprises a large room over the chapel, and a small room over the sacristy. The larger room is lighted from the east by a pointed arched window of three lights; over the pointed arched heads of the side lights, the mullions are continued to the main arch in curves of the same radius as that of the arch curve, and the space between is filled with flowing forms continuing the ogee head of the middle light. The other windows of this upper story, two on the north side of the larger room, and one on the east and one on the north of the smaller room, are each of two lights, with square heads and hood-moulds returned down to the springing of the cusped ogeed heads of the lights. The roof of the larger room, which is now nearly flat, must originally have been a ridged roof of the pitch indicated by the existing east gable. This gable-end is flanked at the north-east angle by a buttress of octagonal plan, which is carried up as a turret with crocketted spirelet. The other buttresses, of which that at the north-east angle of the sacristy is set anglewise, are finished with gabled heads. Between them, on the north side of the chapel, and on the east and north sides of the sacristy, runs a parapet (fig. 10), which is panelled with quatrefoils (without bounding circles), and both the quatrefoils and the moulding which frames them are enriched with the 'stud' ornament which has been noticed in other parts of the work of this date.

This north chapel of the chancel seems to have been the chapel of St. Michael. In 1421 Thomas Frost, of Beverley, willed his body to be buried in the chapel of the Virgin at Beverley, in the north aisle, before St. Michael’s altar, near Thomas Frost his late uncle. In 1477 Walter Froste, son and heir of Thomas Froste, late of Beverley, willed his body to be buried ‘in capella B.M.V. Beverlacii, juxta sepulturam Thomae Froste, patris mei.’ In 1496 Thomas Froste, of Beverley, willed his body to be buried in the church or chapel of the Blessed Virgin at Beverley, in St. Michael’s aisle near his father’s tomb. In 1486 Guy Malyerd, mercer of Beverley, willed his body ‘to be beryd in the chirch or chapell of oure Lady, before the alter of Seynt Michaell th’ Archangell in the north ile,’ and in 1487 his wife Cecilia willed her body to be buried in the church B.M.V. in the aisle of St. Michael the Archangel, near the tomb of her husband. The Saddlers’ gild (1441) maintained a wax light before the image of St. Michael the Archangel in the

1 These rooms now contain a collection of some interest, including the surviving portions of the inscription to be noticed presently.
2 The parapet is illustrated in detail in Colling’s Details, i, ‘Decorated,’ pl. 22.
5 Reg. Test. v, 486. Test. Ebor. iii, 238n.
church or chapel of B.M.V. of Beverley, on the north side of the high altar.¹

This chapel has been called 'the Londoners' chapel,' but the only ground for this name seems to be the fact that in 1686 certain London citizens, 'who have of late years kept Beverley mart,' gave presents to the church.² Either the chapel or the sacristy is still constantly called 'the Flemings' chapel,' and we are gravely told that the chapel 'may have been built by Flemish workmen,'³ apparently because the window tracery is supposed to bear some resemblance to the Flemish 'Flamboyant.' It is high time that a name which suggests such a historical blunder was dropped. The introduction of the Flamboyant manner in Flanders was either an importation from France or part of the same movement, and the Flamboyant manner did not become general in France until after English masons had abandoned flowing forms for perpendicular lines in their window tracery.⁴ Even if we entertained the wildly improbable idea that Flemish masons were employed in Beverley in the fourteenth century, it would be ridiculous to suppose that they could build in a manner there which had not yet been introduced into their own country. As a matter of fact the design of the chapel is purely English, and of the best.

What I have called the sacristy was probably the vestry for St. Michael's chapel. The rooms in the upper story, which are generally called 'the priests' rooms,' are not likely to have been used as living-rooms, for they have no fireplace. They were probably used as the treasury of the church.

The works on the north side of the chancel were continued across the lower part of the east end of the chancel itself. This east end is flanked by large turrets of polygonal plan, of which the northern, which contains a staircase, is considerably larger than the southern. The base-course of the north chapel is continued across the east end of the chancel and around the turret projections, being stepped up on the north-east side of the north turret, and the lower part of the east wall and of the turrets forms part of the same work. The northern turret is bonded to the east wall of the chapel, but the jambs of the east window of the chancel are not bonded to either of the turrets. On the south-east face of the northern turret there is a slight change in the plan of the turret faces immediately above the string-course at the level of the transom of the east window. It is probable that this earlier work in the turrets extends up to the

¹ Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 100.
² Poulson's Beveriae, 748 and note 3.
³ Bell's Guide to Beverley Minster, 133.
⁴ See M. Enlart's paper, Origine anglaise du style flamboyant, quoted above.
Fig. 14. CLEARSTORY WINDOWS.

I. Nave, south side. II. Chancel, south side. III. South Transept, east side.
string-course at the level of the springing of the arch of the east window, this string on the northern turret marking the level of the springing of the east gable of the north chapel. It is difficult to say precisely what the earlier builder intended to make of the east end of the chancel, but it is possible that he proposed a narrower east window under the high-pitched gable of the chancel,1 which would doubtless then be without a clearstory. Whatever the intention may have been, it would seem that its realization was prevented by the Black Death of 1349 and its recurrence in succeeding years,2 and it was not until half-a-century later that the work was resumed under different conditions.

With the completion of this extension, the church in the middle of the fourteenth century had practically assumed its present ground-plan, but its general appearance externally must have been very different from that which is familiar to us. The four arms of the cross would then doubtless have high-pitched roofs and gables,3 for the tall clearstories which give the church such distinction were not yet built. The need for better lighting of the central spans was a sufficient motive for the clearstory additions, which take a prominent part in the story of the later works which remains to be told.

No building seems to have been done during the thirty years following the Black Death, and it was not until the last quarter of the fourteenth century—probably about 1380—that the next work was begun by the addition of the clearstory to the nave and the building of a new west front, completed in the earlier years of the fifteenth century.

Following the explanation set out above of the earlier story of the nave, it would seem that the clearstory was added to arcades which dated from the first half of the thirteenth century. The clearstory has, as we shall see presently, been entirely rebuilt, but, as this was done almost entirely with the old materials, its description may most fitly find its place here, in the order of its original build.

The clearstory4 (fig. 1) has seven windows on each side, over the arcades of six bays, the westernmost window on each side coming

---

1 On the inside the projection of the staircase is finished with a chamfered angle a little south of the northern jamb of the actual east window. The late Mr. Temple Moore suggested to me that this chamfered angle might possibly have been intended to be carried up as the internal jamb of the narrower east window which may then have been proposed.

2 At the Minster, the interruption caused by the Black Death is clearly recognizable in the north aisle of the nave, near the north porch.

3 Cf. the nave of Cottingham, and the nave and transept of Patrington.

4 For elevation and details of the clearstory, see Colling's Details, i, 'Perpendicular,' pls. 7 and 8.
over the length of wall behind the western respond piers of the arcades.\(^1\) The facts that the clearstory stage was built over earlier arcades, and rebuilt more than a century later over new arcades, doubtless account for some slight irregularities of spacing; in the three western bays on the north side, the windows are a little to the east of the centres of the arcade arches, though they seem to be central between the tie-beams of the roof; on the south side the windows appear to be central with the arcade arches; but a little to the west of the centres between the tie-beams, especially in the western bays. The windows (fig. 14, i) are of three lights, and their tracery shows some survival of flowing lines in the ogee heads of the lights and of the smaller tracery lights above—more so than in the clearstory windows of the chancel and transept (fig. 14, ii, iii). The jambs, both externally and internally, have a wide chamfer and hollow, and the mullions have two chamfers, the outer straight, and the inner hollow. Internally the jambs are continued downward below the sills to the clearstory string at a considerably lower level (fig. 20), thus giving the whole clearstory stage internally a height of nearly one-half the total height of the wall. The recessed face between the upper and lower sills of each window is divided into three panels by mullions continuing the lines of the window mullions above. On the south side the tracered heads of the panels are formed by two cusped ogees; on the north side the tracered heads are unsymmetrical, consisting of one complete ogee and two incomplete ogees enclosing a blank shield.\(^2\) The terminations of the internal hood-moulds of the windows appear for the most part to belong to the original build; those to the two westernmost windows on the south side display the emblems of the four evangelists, and those eastward on this side are angels bearing the instruments of the Passion; on the north side the subjects vary, one (to the middle window) being an excellent representation of a king. Some of these terminations however are of obviously later character, and date from the sixteenth-century reconstruction.\(^3\) Externally the clearstory walls are crowned by battlemented parapets, with pinnacles set anglewise springing from corbels at the cornice level.\(^4\) On the south side, below the pinnacles, there are gabled heads and corbels, which look like a flat version of canopied niches, though

---

\(^1\) Colling's *Details*, i, 'Perpendicular,' pl. 8.

\(^2\) Ibid. pl. 7.

\(^3\) On the south side, the extreme easternmost; on the north side, the western side of the middle bay and of the bay west of it, and both sides of the westernmost window.

\(^4\) Colling's *Details*, i, 'Perpendicular,' pl. 8. Mr. Brereton speaks of these pinnacles as having been taken down in the middle of the last century *(op. cit. 96).*
FIG. 15. WEST END OF NAVE.
FIG. 16. WEST DOORWAY.

F. H. Crossley, phot.
there is no trace on the corbels of any seating for a figure; these do not occur on the north side.

The west end of the nave itself (fig. 15)—the ends of the aisles are of later date—is a fine composition, richly treated. It is flanked by large turrets of polygonal plan, repeating the motive which had already been adopted for the east end of the chancel, and, as there, the northern turret, which contains the staircase rising from the floor, is larger than the southern. The turrets are divided into three unequal stages by string-courses, below which are traceries, heads on each face. Between the turrets, the lower stage contains the doorway, which is very elaborately treated (fig. 16). Each jamb has two pairs of shafts, with leaf capitals and battlemented abaci. Between these pairs of shafts is a band of tracery, which develops into leafage around the arch. The hollows are decorated with a profusion of small ornaments, and the outer and inner orders of the arch have pendant cusping. The hood-mould stops on busts against the pinnacles of the niches which flank the doorway, the canopies of which have disappeared. Internally the doorway is flanked on either side by a niche; the corbel of the southern niche has been renewed.

Above the doorway, the whole width between the turrets is filled by the great west window (fig. 15), the tracery of which has been renewed. The window is of seven lights, divided mid-height by a battlemented transom, below which the heads of the lower lights are arched and cusped. Of the six mullions, four—the two middle and the two extreme ones—are main mullions, with capitals and bases both externally and internally, like the jambs; the two minor mullions have no capitals nor bases. The main mullions are continued to form the principal divisions of the tracery by curves of the same radius as the main arch—thus reproducing a motive which has already been noticed in work of a century earlier. The acutely pointed arched forms over the middle and extreme lights are filled with tracery which is similar to that in the corresponding parts

\[1\] The doorway is illustrated in detail in Colling's *Details*, i. 'Perpendicular,' pls. 3, 4, and 5.

\[2\] The doorway presents some points of similarity to the west doorway of the Minster.

\[3\] As it has been suggested that this doorway ought to undergo the process miscalled 'restoration,' what Mr. Brereton tells us (op. cit. 94) of Scott's attitude is worth notice. Scott is not generally considered to have been too conservative in matters of this kind, but he evidently shrank from a renewal which would have left us a mechanical copy like the transept doorways. Mr. Brereton remarks too (as can still be seen) that the lower parts which had been renewed twenty years before he wrote were already in a worse state of decay than some of the old work which had not been touched. It is earnestly to be hoped that the doorway will escape renewal until public opinion is sufficiently instructed to make such so-called 'restoration' impossible.
of the east window of the Minster, and there are also some minor points of similarity in the rest of the tracery. The tracery over the two pairs of lights between these main divisions, included between two battlemented transoms, has the heads of the four narrow tracery lights formed by straight lines, giving triangular heads to the lights, and lozenge-shaped spandrels over them—rather an unusual detail. The lights of the tracery above are also divided by battlemented transoms. Below the window internally runs a gallery, with an open quatrefoiled parapet, with battlemented coping, which Mr. Brereton tells us had been reconstructed a few years before he wrote. Above the window externally, the wall-face is panelled, below the open battlemented parapet which follows the very slight slope of the nave roof. In the niche of the pinnacle in the centre is a standing figure of the Virgin and Child, a modern renewal.

The upper stages of the great turrets consist of a solid panelled lower stage; an open middle stage subdivided by a cusped transom, and surmounted by a cornice; above which is a tall open traceried parapet with a battlemented coping. Mr. Brereton records that 'the restoration and partial rebuilding of these turrets, with the parapets, &c.,' were done under the direction of the late Welby Pugin, at an expense of upwards of £600. As a matter of fact, however, these upper stages of both turrets were entirely rebuilt in new masonry, for the originals still exist in and near Beverley (fig. 17). The whole of the northern turret down to the bottom of the solid panelled stage (fig. 17, i) is in the garden of Mr. Timothy Thompson's house at Woodmansey—the house formerly inhabited by Mr. Gillyat Sumner, who doubtless acquired the masonry when the turret was taken down. Of the southern turret, the open middle stage (fig. 17, ii) is in the garden of Mr. George Pape's house, No. 11, Butcher Row, Beverley; and the solid panelled stage, surmounted by the cornice and parapet (fig. 17, iii), is in the garden of Register House, Beverley. These remains afford an instructive illustration of what was meant by 'restoration' in the middle of the last century.6

3 Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, 1812–1852. His work on this church was begun in 1844.
4 On July 2, 1851, it was ordered that 'the two lantern towers, the stonework of the old west window, and the oak woodwork taken from the chancel' be sold by auction, and the foreman was directed to set out the stonework of the west window in lots in the churchyard.
5 For this collector, see J. R. Boyle's Hedon, p. viii (also Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 1).
6 Another striking local illustration may be mentioned here. When the nave of Holy Trinity church, Hull, was restored, the tracery of two of the west windows was removed to Brough, where it lay for some years before it was removed to Brantinghamthorpe, and given to Mr. W. H. Todd, who set it up in the garden of his house, Birkholme, Hedon, where it now is.
FIG. 17. ORIGINAL TURRETS FROM WEST END OF NAVE,
FIG. 18. SOUTH PORCH.
With regard to the dates which I have suggested for this work on the nave, I have only met with two documentary indications. In 1400, Thomas Swanland, William Mallard, and Thomas Coldbeck, churchwardens of St. Mary's church, caused to be unloaded on the Beck bank a ship of William Skinner with great stones for the use of the chapel aforesaid, against the orders and ancient statutes. The date of the completion of the work would seem to be indicated by a bequest in the will of William Melburne, merchant, 1411, of as many Flanders tiles as would pave the north aisle of the chapel of the Virgin from the west end 'usque les langcetels.'

As the building of the south porch was a continuation of these works on the nave, it will be convenient to describe it here, though its erection may quite possibly have been contemporary with, or even later than, the works on the chancel to be described presently.

The south porch (fig. 18) is a large and dignified structure of two bays in length. In each bay on each side is a pair of graceful windows of two lights, and the spandrels between their arches and the cornice are ornamented with blank tracery. The cornice is surmounted by a battlemented parapet, at a little lower level than that of the south aisle, and on the south end of the porch the parapet is continued over the low-pitched gable. The buttress between the two bays on each side, and the two buttresses which flank each of the southern angles, have tall square pinnacle shafts set anglewise, which spring from the buttress weatherings, and are finished with crocketted spirelets. The doorway, which has been extensively renewed, has two shafts on each jamb, between which is a wide hollow continued round the arch, with large paterae and heads in it. Pendant trefoil cusping below the hood-mould follows the curve of the arch. The hood-mould, which springs from the sides of the pinnacle shafts which flank the doorway, is crocketted and of ogee form rising to a finial below the apex of the gable cornice, with a tracered spandrel between the hood-mould and the arch.

The doorway is flanked on each side by a canopied niche, set between the pinnacle shaft and buttress. The vault of the porch is a later insertion, to be described presently. On the wall above the inner doorway is the double canopy of a niche, not of course in its

1 Beverley Town Documents, 23.
2 Fabrice chori capelle B.M. in Bever-laco xxv. Ad pavidocem borialis insule dicte capelle tantas tegulas Flan-dresques quante sufficient ab occidente fine ejusdem insule usque les langcetels. (Reg. Bowet, i, 349. The Fabric Rolls of

York Minster (Surtees Soc. xxxv). 66n.)

3 For a measured drawing of the south end of the porch, see Architectural Association Sketch Book, 3rd ser., vol. ii, pl. i.

4 Compare the west doorways of the Minster.

5 C. Brereton, op. cit., pl. 8.
original position, which appears to be earlier than the porch itself, dating from the later fourteenth century.

The completion of the clearstory and west end of the nave seems to have been followed immediately by the addition of a similar clearstory to the chancel (figs. 19 and 23). The windows (fig. 14, ii), of three lights, are very similar to those of the nave clearstory, but, instead of the pair of ogeses over the two pairs of narrow tracery lights of the nave, the perpendicular lines of the mullions are continued up to the arch—the more advanced character indicating a slightly later date. The jamb mouldings are the same in both clearstories. Internally the jambs are continued downward below the sills to the clearstory string at a considerably lower level, as in the nave. The mullions are continued down to the lower sill, each of the three lights of the recessed face between the two sills being subdivided by a minor mullion, with cinquefoiled arched heads to the six blank lights of the panelling, under the battlemented upper sill. On the south side, vertical moulded ribs, from the clearstory string to the intersections of the hood-moulds of the arcade, and circles containing cusped trefoils (without the 'stud' enrichment), were inserted in imitation of the earlier work of the north arcade. As the piers of the north and south arcades of the chancel are not opposite to one another, some considerable adjustment of the spacing of the clearstory windows was necessary to bring them within the bay spacing of the tie-beams of the roof. On the south side the windows are approximately central with the arcade arches, though set a little to the east of the latter. On the north side the windows are necessarily placed considerably to the west of the centres of the arcade arches. In describing the north arcade of the chancel, it was pointed out that the two western bays were not exactly in the same line as the three eastern bays. This bend disappears in the clearstory, which was built in a straight line, by setting its wall-face behind the arcade face at each end, and in front of it in the middle. Externally the clearstory walls are crowned by battlemented parapets, without pinnacles.

The addition of the clearstory to the chancel necessitated the carrying up of the east end to the new roof, and all this east end (fig. 19), above the work which has already been described as having been built by the middle of the fourteenth century, forms part of the same building campaign as the clearstory. The east window, which is of this later work, fills the whole width between the turrets. Its jambs, both externally and internally, have a large hollow within a wave moulding, and, as this latter occurs in the upper
FIG. 19. CHANCEL AND SOUTH TRANSIPT.
window in the east end of the north chapel, its presence here may be a survival from the earlier work. The window is of five lights, divided mid-height by a transom, below which the heads of the lower lights are ogee-arched, cusped, with traceried spandrels. Unlike the west window of the nave, the mullions and jambs have no capitals. All the mullions are of the same size, and are continued to form the principal divisions of the tracery by curves of the same radius as the main arch, but here (again unlike the west window) the mullions themselves are carried up vertically of their full profile to the main arch. The acutely pointed arched forms over the middle and extreme lights contain a quatrefoiled circle over the cusped heads of the lights, and over the heads of the intermediate lights are three tiers of narrow tracery lights. The hood-mould inside stops on heads of a king and of a queen with a wimple. The window rises to the full height of the east wall, which is crowned externally by a battlemented parapet following the low pitch of the roof, and in the niche in the middle is a seated figure of the Virgin and Child. The two turrets which flank the gable are finished with crocketted spirelets.

The roof of the chancel, which is only very slightly ridged, is divided into five bays by moulded tie-beams which are cambered to follow the slight slope of the roof, and these, with the moulded ridge-beam, form ten main panels, each of which is subdivided into four panels by moulded ribs. The panels are bounded by similar moulded ribs next the side walls, which have no stone cornice, though there is a stone cornice on the east wall. The intersections of the tie-beams and ridge have large bosses, with similar half-bosses at the wall ends of the tie-beams. The ribs of the smaller panels have bosses at each central intersection, and also where the ends of these ribs finish against the sides of the tie-beams and ridge and against the walls. Of the large bosses along the ridge, that at the east wall has an angel bearing a scroll inscribed *Ies napmathus*; that on the easternmost tie-beam (over the altar) has a crowned angel bearing a crown; the second has a king and a bishop—St. John and Athelstan—with the legend *Als trō nǐk K thē*; the third and fourth have angels bearing shields; and against the tower wall is a hooded figure with uplifted hands. On the ends of the tie-beams next the walls, one of the bosses has an eagle with scroll inscribed *S. Johannes*; and among the others are a double-headed eagle and two griffins addorsed. The smaller bosses are ornamented with foliage, animals, an angel, a head of Christ with a cruciform nimbus, and, against the tower wall (south), two crossed fishes.
There is some reason to believe that the raising of the chancel closely followed the work on the nave, and that it may have been completed some time before 1445, the date which appears on one of the painted panels of the ceiling. The beginning of the work may be indicated by the bequest of 20s. to 'the fabric of the choir' in William Melburne's will of 1411, and another reference to it is probably to be seen in the indenture of 1417 for the obit of John and Elen Ake, which mentions a payment of 20l. to the churchwardens to the use of the fabric or new work of the chapel of St. Mary.

The forty panels of the chancel ceiling contain painted representations of the kings of England, the last of the series (Henry VI) being dated 1445. The paintings were restored in 1863, and, in order to form some opinion as to the authenticity of what we see now, it will be well to examine the record of what was then done.

Mr. Brereton, who was a careful first-hand observer, wrote in 1865 of the chancel ceiling thus:

"To the present Vicar and Churchwardens, however, the credit is due of having begun, and achieved its restoration. In Mr. W. Padget they fortunately met with a man who was competent to undertake and complete the work. Accurate tracings of every panel were taken by him, and notes respecting the colouring appended. After the woodwork was carefully and substantially repaired, the outline cartoons were transferred to their respective panels, and coloured faithfully after the originals."

A different account is given in the report of the Yorkshire Architectural Society for 1862. After a protest against the way in which 'improvements' were being carried out in the Minster, the report continues thus:

"It must be confessed that the inhabitants of St. Martin's and St. John's have some reason to dread professional architects; when they see what has been done at St. Mary's, in the same town, under the auspices of Mr. Broderick (sic). The fine old roof of the chancel, painted in forty panels of rich blue and gold, in the year 1445, and adorned with the effigies of the kings of England, down to the reigning monarch, King Henry the Sixth, has been ruthlessly demolished. Some of the Members of this Society were anxious to inspect it, and take notes of it, but no word of warning was spoken. However, good taste has not altogether fled from that town, and the Churchwardens have taken

---

1 See page 401, note 2, supra.
3 In the following references each panel is distinguished by a number and letter (or letters). The numbers run from west to east (1 to 10). The four rows are distinguished as north (N), north-centre (NC), south-centre (SC), and south (S).
4 C. Brereton, p. clix.
5 Associated Architectural Societies' Reports, vi (1862), p. cxiv.
6 Mr. Cuthbert Broderick, then of Hull; architect of the Leeds Town Hall, 1853-1858; and of the Hull Town Hall (now taken down), 1862-6.
counsel of Mr. G. Gilbert Scott. The panels are to be reproduced, as faithfully as circumstances will allow, from his own drawings, by Mr. W. Padgit (sic), Junior, of Beverley."

The statement that the roof was 'ruthlessly demolished' is certainly erroneous, unless it is to be understood as only describing repainting, and there is probably here some confusion with the roof of the north transept which was taken down in 1861. On Sept. 23, 1862, Mr. Cuthbert Brodrick reported to the churchwardens that the main timbers and woodwork generally of the chancel roof were in a very good state of preservation, and would require very little repair previous to being resealed, and it was on his recommendation that Mr. William Padgett junior was requested 'to take a copy of the painted figures and inscriptions,' and to give an estimate for repainting them under the directions of the architect. Mr. Brodrick's connexion with the works at St. Mary's seems to have ceased about the end of this year, and in January, 1863, Mr. (afterwards Sir) George Gilbert Scott¹ was asked to come to Beverley to inspect the tracings taken of the chancel roof, and to give his opinion as to the painting and restoration of the figures. The work was in hand in May, 1863, when Mr. Padgett stated that 'the painting of the stars suggested by Mr. Scott, the architect,' would cost about £20 extra, making the whole £120. Mr. Padgett finished the repainting in the following September.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Brereton's account accurately represents what was done, and that there was no considerable renewal of woodwork.² Nor can there be any doubt that William Padgett reproduced the faded paintings as accurately as he was able. The possibility of error in the reproduction of the inscriptions is not thereby eliminated, and must be borne in mind in endeavouring to account for the difficulties which some of the inscriptions present; indeed there are two cases where it is certain that a letter has been altered,³ doubtless in Padgett's repainting.

Unfortunately there does not appear to be any trustworthy transcript of the inscriptions before they were repainted. They were printed by Gent,⁴ in four columns as in the ceiling (the top of his page being the east), but his fourth column is reversed, reading

¹ This seems to have been the beginning of Mr. G. G. Scott's connexion with the works on St. Mary's church, Beverley. He was then engaged on the restoration of St. Mary's church, Hull.
² Alderman James E. Elwell tells me that he saw Mr. Padgett doing the work from the scaffold, and conversed with him about it, and he believes that there was little or no renewal of woodwork. His recollection agrees with Mr. Brereton's record of the repainting.
³ In the first word of the inscription in panel 7, N, what is now n should be b. In panel 8, N, πιθ should be πιθ (opera).
⁴ Gent's Ripon, 82.
from west (top) to east (bottom). On the preceding page is a small woodcut of the William I panel (10, S C), but the inscription does not agree with that printed in his table, and neither agrees with the inscription as it now exists. In panel 6, N, which really represents Edward the Martyr (975–978), the word 'quartus' is inserted, and the panel made to represent Edward IV.¹ The adjoining panel, 7, N, which has an exceptional inscription, is made to refer to Richard I, while the real Richard I panel, 8, S, which comes in its proper place in the ceiling, is attributed to an Edward. The next panel 8, N, which gives the date of the work, is printed by Gent with the common-form ending, though it is absolutely certain that this inscription could not have been invented by any restorer. Clearly therefore no reliance can be placed on Gent. Poulson² simply copies Gent, with some additional errors of his own.

The representations of the kings are arranged with their heads towards the ridge, so that the panels in each half of the ceiling are read from the opposite side of the chancel. They are painted on a light ground, powdered lozengewise with a star-like ornament. All are represented as standing on a mound, and all are crowned, the heads being turned alternately eastward and westward, though a few are full-face. The costumes and their colours vary, but nearly all have an ermine tippet; the greater number have a long mantle, and the colours most generally used are crimson and blue, in many cases counterchanged for the colour of the mantle and its lining or the robe beneath. In the pre-Conquest series, five³ are represented in full armour, while in two others⁴ the armoured legs only show. Of the post-Conquest kings, only William the Conqueror (10, S C) and Henry V⁵ (9, N) appear in full armour, and Richard II (10, N C) is represented with legs in armour and a hart on his mantle. All the pre-Conquest kings are represented with a sword or a sceptre (none with both), most frequently in the right hand. Of the fifteen post-Conquest kings, four⁶ are represented with a sword only, three⁷ with a sceptre only, and eight⁸ with both sword and sceptre. Each panel has a scroll of nearly semicircular

¹ This accounts for the erroneous statement in some of the guide-books that the ceiling dates from the time of Edward IV (J. J. Sheahan in Green’s Handbook to Beverley, new edn., p. 38. C. Hatt in the Beverley guide in Bell’s series, p. 131). The table in Sheahan dates from after the repainting.
² Beverley, 740, n. 2.
³ 1, N; 2, N C; 3, N (Athelstan).
⁴ 3, N C; and 4, N.
⁵ Henry V had visited Beverley after the battle of Agincourt, which was fought on Oct. 25, the day of the Translation of St. John of Beverley (Poulson’s Beverley, 185. Passi Eboracenses, 91).
⁶ Stephen (7, S C); Henry II (7, S); John (9, S); and Edward I (7, N C).
⁷ Henry I (8, S C); Edward II (8, N C); and Richard II (10, N C).
⁸ William I (10, S C); William II (9, S C); Richard I (8, S); Henry III (10, S); Edward III (9, N C); Henry IV (10, N); Henry V (9, N); and Henry VI (8, N).
form, curved in opposite directions in alternate panels, so as to pass behind the head and shoulders or legs alternately, and the ends of the scrolls are turned over. The inscriptions on the scrolls, which are printed as they now appear at the end of this paper, record in each case the name of the king, the length of his reign, and the place of his burial—\textit{not always correctly}. The latest king of the series, Henry VI (8, N), has a longer inscription, which records that he had reigned 23 years at the time of this work, and was still reigning, viz.: A.D. 1445. The adjoining panel 7, N, the sixteenth of the eastern group, which remained over when the fifteen post-Conquest kings had been placed, contains a representation of St. Edmund of East Anglia, with a sceptre in his right hand, and three arrows in his left hand, and the inscription reads—\textit{Ave Rex gentis anglorum, miles regis angelorum}—which are the first two lines of an antiphon for the day of St. Edmund, king and martyr, in the York Breviary.\footnote{1} Three of the pre-Conquest kings are called \textit{saints} in the inscriptions—Edmund of East Anglia (6, S C), 855–870; Edgar (4, N), 959–975, who was reverenced as a saint at Glastonbury; and Edward the Confessor (5, S C).

With regard to the order of the representations,\footnote{2} the post-Conquest kings, which fill fifteen of the sixteen easternmost panels (four in length from the east end, and four in the width of the chancel), are arranged in an orderly and regular manner. They begin with the Conqueror at the east end of the south central row (10, S C), continuing in this row to Stephen (7, S C), then turning to the south row from Henry II (7, S) to Henry III (10, S); thence to the north central row from Edward I (7, N C) to Richard II (10, N C), and to the north row from Henry IV (10, N) to Henry VI (8, N). The arrangement of the twenty-four westernmost panels (1–6) is however so odd, as compared with the eastern group, that it suggests that the latter was done first, as was natural, and that the pre-Conquest series was filled in afterwards, with a change of scheme between 6 and 5. It is difficult to see what principle dictated the choice of subjects in 6. 6, N is evidently Edward the Martyr (975–8), appropriately placed next to St. Edmund, but he was buried at Shaftesbury, not at Winchester. 6, N C is Ethelred the Redeless (979–1016), who was buried at St. Paul’s, not at Wimborne, which was the burial-place of Ethelred I, Alfred’s brother. ‘Knoudus’ (6, S) must be Canute, but the length of his reign is wrong, and he

\footnote{1} The word used is uniformly \textit{facel}, except in one case—John (9, S)—where the word is \textit{sepeliur}.

\footnote{2} \textit{The York Breviary}, ii (Surtees Soc. lxxvi), 702.
was buried at Winchester, not at London. 6, S C is St. Edmund of East Anglia (855-870), but again the length of reign is wrong. If the original intention was to place Edmund Ironside (1016) here, the four kings in 6 would be in chronological order from north to south, and the pointless repetition of St. Edmund would have been avoided. The four kings in the next transverse row, Harold I (5, N), Hardecanute (5, N C), Edward the Confessor (5, S C), and Harold II (5, S), are in chronological order from north to south, and fill the gap between Canute and the Conquest. The transverse order is maintained in the next two rows (3 and 4), but from south to north. The eight kings in these two rows are in chronological order, from Ethelred I, 866-871, to Edgar, 959-975 (4, N), though the lengths of their reigns are not always correctly stated, and some of the burial-places are wrong. Alfred was buried at Winchester, not at London, and Edred also at Winchester, not at Canterbury. I assume here that ‘Acbelardus’ in 3, S ought to read ‘Ethelredus’ or ‘Aethelredus.’ Four kings from south to north would have filled the next row (2) as far as Egbert, but Ethelbald and Ethelbert are omitted, though Ethelwulf is in his proper place (2, N C). It would seem however that they wished to start the whole series with Egbert, if, as is probable, the ‘Eglarus’ of 1, N should be read ‘Egbertus,’ though the regnal years are wrong. The repetition of Canute in 2, N may have been due to a desire to fill the vacant panel between Egbert and Athelstan with some important monarch whose activity in church matters was well known in the north of England, though both the regnal years and burial-place are wrong. ‘Segebardus’ (1, N C) is apparently one of the five Sigebarts or Seberts, possibly the East Anglian king who died fighting against Penda about 637. The four remaining kings are legendary. Brutus (2, S), Locrine (1, S), the son of Brutus, and Eboracus or Ebraucus (1, S C), the sixth king of Britain, derive ultimately from Geoffrey of Monmouth; and ‘Ludbracus’ (2, S C) would appear to be Lud. The arrangement of these western panels is altogether curious and irregular.

The painting of the chancel ceiling had not been finished many years when preparations were made for further building operations of importance. The nave and chancel had already been transformed by the addition of their tall clear-stories, and it now remained to treat the transept

1 A suggestion by Mr. Hamilton Thompson. 2 For Canute in connexion with Durham, see *Rites of Durham* (Surtees Soc. cvii), 137.
in the same fashion. The date of the inception of the work is fixed by bequests in the wills of two Beverley citizens. In 1451 Richard Patryngton, merchant, of Beverley, bequeathed 'x libras argenti' ad facturam sive constructionem de lez crosse yles ejusdem ecclesiae de novo construendas,' on condition that the work be commenced or finished within three years after his death, failing which the money was to be distributed among the poor.¹ In 1453 Thomas White, 'pannarius,' of Beverley, bequeathed £6 'ad fabricaturam sive constructuram de lez crosseylez ejusdem B.M. de novo construendis.'² In _The Fabric Rolls of York Minster_, an entry in a roll which the editor dated as probably of 1456 records the sale of 'xxviii doliorum' of stone to the churchwardens of St. Mary's, Beverley.³

The reconstruction of the transept involved no change in its plan, and indeed, as we have seen, the lower parts of the original walls still remain, although they have been entirely refaced on the outside. Above the level of the sills of the lower windows, however, everything was reconstructed in both arms of the transept in this mid fifteenth-century campaign.

The three arches on the east side of the north transept, which date from the latter part of the twelfth century, have been described above. They now spring from piers which belong to the mid fifteenth-century reconstruction.⁴ The plan of the pier consists of four attached shafts separated by four filleted hollows, and the moulded capitals are semi-octagonal on plan over each shaft for their full height above the bell. The southern respond pier shows the usual half-pier plan, but at the north end of the arcade there is no respond pier, and the incomplete northern half of the arch springs directly from the wall, the width of the northern bay being considerably less than that of the two other bays. This cannot have been the original arrangement. It will be seen from the plan (fig. 26) that the bay-spacing of the arcade does not correspond with that of the crypt to the east of it, which as we have seen was originally of three bays from north to south. The bay-spacing of the crypt need not necessarily have followed the bay-spacing of the arcades of a century earlier, but one would expect closer correspondence between them, and this would have existed if we assume that the arcade was originally divided into three equal bays (possibly of slightly less width than the present central bay). On this assumption, the original piers would be further south than the existing piers, and the suggested shifting of the arcade to the north may be con-

nected with some possible alteration of the north-east crossing pier which required more space at the south end of the arcade. The most probable date that can be suggested for such an alteration would seem to be this mid fifteenth-century reconstruction. The raking joint above the southern respond, which goes through the wall, may either be connected with this reconstruction, or with the reconstruction after the fall of 1520.

It is very difficult to say precisely what has happened to this arcade, but the most probable conclusion is that, in the course of this mid fifteenth-century reconstruction, the arches and the wall over them were taken down, and reset on the new piers, with the old material for the most part. If the present zigzagged 'hood' was (as already suggested) originally the outer order of the arch, the original wall must have been thicker than the present wall, which must therefore have been rebuilt. The arch orders are badly fitted, and the curves are distorted—results which do not appear to be altogether due to settlement, but rather to the way in which they were reset, possibly to slightly different curves and spans from the original ones. Up to some two courses above the apex of the arches, the masonry of the spandrels on the western face shows a considerable proportion of stones of the comparatively square shape which has been noticed as characteristic of the late twelfth and early thirteenth-century walling, and the same thing can be seen to a less extent on the eastern face. The upper courses on the western face are thinner, with stones of irregular length. The course beneath the clearstory string tapers, the greater depth being towards the north and the less towards the south, which indicates that the top of the wall was out of level when the clearstory came to be built. This might be taken as indicating an interval between the clearstory and the wall below it, but it is very difficult to suggest any hypothesis which is more probable than a mid fifteenth-century resetting.

The three arches on the east side of the south transept have already been described and attributed to the early part of the thirteenth century. They now spring from piers which belong to the mid fifteenth-century reconstruction, the details of which are similar to those of the corresponding piers in the north transept.¹ It has already been observed that the upper part of the southernmost arch and the springing of the northernmost date from the mid fifteenth-century reconstruction. Many of the stones in the walling of the

¹ A photograph by Mr. F. H. Crossley of the base of one of the south transept piers is reproduced in F. Bond, *An introduction to English Church Architecture* (Oxford, 1913), 554.
spandrels seem to be of the early thirteenth-century date of the arches, but some are thinner and longer, and there are three thinner courses below the clearstory string. The probability is that here too the arches and the wall over them were taken down and reset on the new piers, reusing the old material. It may be noted that the height of the piers, from the floor to the top of the capitals, is some 2 feet more than in the north transept, where the piers are of much the same height as those of the chancel arcades.

On the outside, the end walls of the transept arms and their western walls were entirely refaced. The lower windows in the western walls are of three lights, and their tracery has more of the perpendicular and horizontal motive than that of any of the windows hitherto described. There is less of this in the three-light clearstory windows (fig. 14, iii), where the tracery is very similar to that of the nave clearstory windows; the long lights have the same ogee heads, with horizontal transom above them, but in the two pairs of tracery lights the ogee heads are replaced by stiffer curves of the radius of the window arch. Both the upper and lower windows have jambs moulded with an outer hollow, with a fillet between it and a wide casement. The internal hood-moulds of the clearstory windows stop on angels holding shields. The lower windows have no internal hood-moulds. On the east side of each transept arm, the clearstory is crowned by a battlemented parapet, with pinnacles springing from corbels (fig. 19), as in the nave clearstory. On the west side, and at the angles of the gable-ends, pinnacle shafts set anglewise stand on the weatherings of the buttresses.

The north end of the north transept and the south end of the south transept are each pierced by a doorway in the middle of the wall. The two doorways, which have been extensively renewed, are of practically the same design, and very similar to the outer doorway of the south porch. They have the same wide hollows with large paterae to the jambs and arch, pendant cusping to the arch below a crocketted ogee hood-mould, with traceried spandrel, and flanking pinnacle shafts. The rolls of the jambs however are here without capitals. The doorway of the south transept retains one leaf (the western) of its original oak doors, which is panelled with three mullions and elaborate tracery; the tracery over the side 'lights' repeats a motive in the west window of the nave of nearly half a century earlier—an instance of the imitation by the craftsman in wood of mason's motives of earlier date.

The north window of the north transept has four wide lights, with a cusped transom. The middle mullion is thicker than the
side mullions, and it is continued by curves of the same radius as the window-arch to form the main lines of the tracery, which is divided up into small lights of late character. The jambs and arch are moulded with a chamfer and hollow, as in the clearstory of the nave. The low pitched gable is crowned by a battlemented parapet.

The south window of the south transept has jambs, arch, and hood of the same profile, and is four lights in width, with a thicker middle mullion, the lights being of about the same width as those of the north transept window. The window therefore forms part of the mid fifteenth-century reconstruction of the transept. The tracery however is flowing, very thin in character, which, if it were original, would be a century earlier than the jambs, etc., though it lacks the strength of the original work of the second quarter of the fourteenth century on the opposite side of the church. In his notes of 1846, Mr. J. H. Parker describes this window as having ‘Decorated tracery, but Perpendicular jambs and hoodmolds.’ Apparently the tracery must be due to some ‘restoration’ of considerably earlier date than Pugin’s time. The flying buttresses to the south end of the transept were added by the Pugins, to counteract settlement caused by burials.

Although there is no positive evidence to confirm the conjecture, it is very probable that this reconstruction of the transept would include the alteration and raising of the then existing central tower, and it is not unlikely that these alterations may have had something to do with the disaster of 1520.

A note may be added here with reference to the levels at the several doorways of the church. Taking the floor level of the nave as our datum, the threshold of the doorway of the north aisle (early fourteenth century) is 7 inches above, and of the doorway at the north end of the transept (mid fifteenth century) 8 inches above, which indicates that the ground on the north side of the church must still have been at a low level. At the west doorway of the nave (late fourteenth century) and at the doorway at the south end of the transept (mid fifteenth century) the difference is 22 to 23 inches,

1 Archaeological Institute, York vol. of 1846, p. 37. In his description of 1825, Sir Stephen Glynne calls it ‘a good Decorated window,’ but he also speaks of the north window of the north transept as ‘Decorated’ (Yorkshire Archæological Journal, xii, 450).

2 For the condition of the south transept in the eighteenth century, see Gent’s Répon, 81.

3 Mr. Brereton says that these flying buttresses were ‘designed and executed by the Pugins, father and son’ (op. cit. 90). A note by Mr. A. C. Bickley says that they were added in 1853 by E. Welby Pugin (The Gentleman’s Magazine Library, ed. G. L. Gomme; Architectural Antiquities, part i (1890), 371), who continued the work on the church after his father’s death in 1852. An engraving in Allen’s Yorkshire (1831), iii, 272, shows the south end of the transept before the flying buttresses were added.
while the floor of the south porch (early fifteenth century) is as much as 3 feet 1 inch above the nave floor, and approximates to the present levels of the street to the south and west of the church.

The insertion of two three-light windows in the two easternmost bays of the south aisle of the nave was nearly contemporary with the reconstruction of the transept. The tracery of these two windows is of the same pattern as that of the lower windows on the west side of the transept, but the aisle windows are less in height, the arches more obtuse, and the mullions thinner.

The addition of battlemented parapets to parts of the church which had not been reconstructed would appear to date from the fifteenth century, possibly following the reconstruction of the transept, unless they date from after the fall of 1520. These include the south aisles of the chancel and nave, the east aisle of the south transept, and the north gable of the chapel on the east side of the north transept—the last probably dating, with the roof, from after the fall of 1520.

The reconstruction of the west ends of the north and south aisles of the nave might, from the late character of the work, be attributed to the period following the fall of 1520, but for the facts that there is no indication that the damage extended so far to the west, and that there appears to be documentary evidence for placing these works in the last years of the fifteenth century. In his will of 1498, Robert Dacres, weaver, of Beverley, bequeathed 16li. 'fabricae et facturae de lee north yle infra dictam ecclesiam,' with a proviso for the disposal of this sum if the work were not begun within one year after his death.1 In her will of 1499–1500, his widow, Agnes Dacres, bequeathed 4li. 'ad aedificationem insulae borialis.'2 The west end of each aisle has a three-light window with a four-centred arch (figs. 1 and 15), and, although the tracery of the two windows differs, their mouldings are so nearly alike that they must be of nearly the same date. The buttresses at the outer angles of each aisle are surmounted by a group of three pinnacles, and at the angle of the north aisle the buttresses are richly panelled. The wall in each case is crowned by a parapet following the slope of the aisle roof, with open flowing tracery and battlemented coping. The three-light window in the westernmost bay of the north wall of the north aisle is an insertion of the same date in the earlier wall, the earlier plinth and sill string still remaining up to the north-west buttress.

---

We come now to a catastrophe which necessitated the rebuilding of a considerable part of the church. The record of this disaster was preserved by an inscription carved in oak which had been reused in one of two canopied pews at the east ends of the aisles of the nave. These pews were removed in the course of the restoration of the middle of the last century, and the parts of the inscription which have survived are now preserved in the room over the north chancel aisle. The inscription, almost complete, was printed by Poulson, and in Mr. Brereton's paper. The following reproduces Mr. Brereton's version, as regards the parts now missing—the parts within brackets—or partially illegible. The parts which can still be clearly read are underlined, and those parts where the lettering has been partially destroyed and has only left traces of the lettering recorded by Mr. Brereton are distinguished by a dotted underlining.

[Pray God have marce of the sawllys of the men and wyomen and]

| lechedryn whos bodys was flayn at | the saulyn of thys schere
which | [town this saul was the] | xxix day of aperel in the yere of
our lord a 11 ye and xx and for | at the saulys of thayn the whyth
haws bryn | *** | ys *** lehal be god benefactors and helpers | [of
the sayd schere] | up a gapyn and for al crysian sawllys the whyth god
wol[d have prayed for and] | for the law [lys of Sr] Recherd Rockysbe
knycyt and bryn Jone his wyfe whych gave two hundred pounds to
the building of thys schere and for the sawllys of Willm Hall cooper
and his wyfe]

The parts of the inscription which remain are let into four lengths of rail, of two different sizes and section, two of each, the first two being of the larger section. In these two, the rail is 4 inches by 4 inches, chamfered on all edges. The first piece is 2 feet 1 inch

---

1 Oliver says at the south-east end of the nave (Beverley, 352). Cf. Beverlæc, 740.
2 C. Brereton, op. cit. 102. In a note Mr. Brereton says that these pews are put aside in expectation that not only may this inscription be preserved, but that other portions of the old carved oak may come into use at a future stage of the restoration. This expectation was not realized, but some of the oak fragments are preserved at the east end of the chancel.
3 These rooms contain many fragments of interest, for the preservation of many of which the credit is due to Mr. Edward Bunnington, who has now been verger for many years past.
4 Beverlæc, 735. Oliver, 352, prints what is doubtless a less correct version.
6 This word is broken, and it is not possible to say whether it is whych, as Poulson and Brereton print it, or whyth, as it certainly is in the other part of the inscription which remains.
7 Sic. Poulson prints asterisks for an omission after this word.
8 Probably schere, as in the earlier part of the inscription which remains.
9 What remains here does not look the remains of a p.
10 Only the first stroke of the u remains.
11 The capitals are printed here as in Mr. Brereton's version, but there are no capital letters in those parts of the inscription which remain.
long, the ends of the chamfers are mitred, and there is a long tenon at one end and a mortice at the other end. The second piece is 1 foot 9\(\frac{3}{4}\) inches long, but is cut square at each end, with a mortice at one end. The lettering in these two lengths is cut in a strip 2\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches by \(\frac{3}{8}\) inch, let into the full length of the rails. In the first piece, which includes the words *scheldryn whos bodys was fayyn at*, there is a plain inch or so at each end of the lettering, showing that this is a complete strip. This is not so in the second piece, which may not be a complete length; it includes the words _the faulyng of thys fchere whyth (or whych)._ The third and fourth lengths are only 4 inches by 2 inches, not chamfered, but with a band of ornament cut in the rail below the lettering, which is cut in strips 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches by \(\frac{3}{8}\) inch let into the rails. The third piece is 5 feet 4\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches long, with a tenon at each end; the lettering begins _xxix day_, and ends *haws bryn*, but there is a makeshift joint in the strip between _for_ and _al_, the second length beginning with a plain piece (before _al_) in which is a pin hole. The fourth piece is also 5 feet 4\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches long, with a tenon at each end, but here again the lettered strips have been altered. The lettering begins with what Poulson and Brereton read as _up a gayn_, and continues on one strip as far as _god wol_, where it is jointed up to another strip which begins _ys . . . fchal_ and ends at _helppers_; here the second strip is jointed to a third short strip on which are only the words _for the faw . . ._ (with only the first stroke of the _w_ remaining). It would seem that the strips in these two lengths of rail must have been taken out and let in again after the woodwork was removed from the pew in the mid nineteenth-century restoration. The first two pieces may have been the rails of a screen originally, but it is difficult to see how they were combined with the third and fourth pieces of different pattern and smaller lettering.

The year of the fall was read by Poulson and Brereton as _1513_, but, although the concluding numerals have been broken, they are quite certainly _xx_, and not _xiii_, and the correct reading is _1520_. The 29th April, _1520_, was the third Sunday after Easter.

Sir Richard Rokeby, whose gift of £200 towards the cost of the rebuilding is recorded in the inscription, was a younger son of John Rokeby of Sandal, and brother of the archbishop of Dublin.\(^1\) His name appears on the Commission of the Peace for the East Riding from the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII\(^2\); for Middlesex and Surrey in _1518\(^3\)_; for Essex and Surrey in _1520\(^4\)_; and for Surrey in

---

\(^1\) _Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire_, ed. J. W. Clay, ii, 27.  
\(^2\) _Cal. State Papers, Domestic_, 1509–

1514, 455, 954, 1550, 1735, 5605.  
\(^3\) _Ibid._ 1515–1518, 4435, 4437.  
\(^4\) _Ibid._ 1519–1523, 1081.
1522. In 1517 a licence was granted to him 'to keep and shoot with cross-bows and hand guns, having an income of £200 a year.' In 1518 he had a grant of the lease of a manor called Burton Feldis alias Burton Leez, York. He seems to have been knighted and to have removed to London by 1519, when we find his name in a list of Commissioners to search for suspected persons from Temple Bar to Charing Cross, being associated in this district with another Yorkshireman, Sir Robert Constable. In 1520 and 1521 he appears as comptroller of the household of cardinal Wolsey. In 1522 a lease of the lordship of Rise was granted to him and Richard Crake, described as both of Beverley. In September, 1522, among the payments for the army against the Scots (when the duke of Albany was threatening to invade the north of England) appears one of £66 13s. 4d. to Sir Richard Rokeby 'on a prest for the conduct of my lord Cardinal's soldiers.' He was at Beverley in this year on the same business, when he is described as captain of hired men going towards Scotland, and as one of the King's commissioners for the musters in the Westwood. He died on April 27, 1523, and was buried in the Savoy Chapel. In his will of April 22, 1523, he bequeathed 'towarde the belding of the churche or chapell of our Lady in Beverley two hundred poundes, wherof I have delivered a certeyn sume of money to the use of the said church in partie of payment of the said two hundred poundes, as in the church bookes there more playnly doth appere.'

Some further documentary evidences of the fall may be mentioned here. In the accounts of the Governors of Beverley for 1520 there is a record of a payment of 8s. 7d. to a goldsmith for the exchange of a chalice belonging to Kelk's Chantry, which was broken when St. Mary's church fell, and another entry records that four tops of oaks from Westwood were given to the fabric of St. Mary's. In 1522, 3s. 6d. was spent by the twelve Governors at Robert Welle's house with the master mason (latomo) of St. Mary's church. In the Great Gild Book of Beverley, a document of 1522 (8 Dec.) records a grant by Peter Crawe, draper, of 20 marks 'toward the newe beyldyng of Saynt Mary Chirche in Beverley now beyng in rewyne,' Sir Richard Rokeby being one of the witnesses. In his will of 1525, Robert Halitreholme, rector of Biddenham, Bedfordshire, a

1 Cal. State Papers, Domestic, 1519-1523, 2415.
2 Ibid. 1515-1518, 3239.
3 Ibid. 1515-1518, 3097.
4 Ibid. 1519-1523, 365.
5 Ibid. 1519-1523, 652, 1142.
6 Ibid. 1519-1523, 2016.
7 Ibid. 1519-1523, 2545.
9 North Country Wills (Surtees Soc. cxvii), 110.
11 Ibid. 174.
12 Ibid. 52. Beverley Town Documents, 63.
native of Beverley, bequeathed 20s. to the repair (reparationi) of the church of St. Mary, Beverley.\(^1\) In the Governors' accounts for 1547, there is an entry of a payment of £30 by the churchwardens of St. Mary's, which Mr. Leach suggests was probably in repayment of money advanced for rebuilding the church,\(^2\) and in 1545 there is a record of a similar payment of £40.\(^3\)

Neither the inscription nor the other references to the catastrophe tell us what part of the church it was that fell, and we are left to form our conclusion from an examination of the structure itself. Here however the evidence is perfectly clear. It was the tower that fell, injuring the nave. There is nothing very surprising in the failure of the central tower of a church which had undergone so many alterations. The tower was originally built in the twelfth century, with (if my reading is correct) only its east and west walls pierced by arches; the addition of the transept arms involved the piercing of the north and south walls; the abutting walls of the nave and chancel were replaced by arcades; the abutting west walls of the transept were pierced by the arches opening from the transept to the aisles of the nave; and, finally, there is every probability that, when the transept was reconstructed and raised, the upper part of the tower was reconstructed and raised, and that the much altered piers eventually proved to be insufficient to support their load. If we examine the ends of the clearstories of the chancel and transept next the tower, we can easily recognise where the work of the rebuilt tower joins the earlier work of the clearstories.\(^4\) There are no such indications at the east end of the clearstory of the nave, and the irregularities in the masonry of this clearstory indicate that it has been entirely rebuilt up to the west end, where the junction of the older work with the rebuilt clearstory can be detected just east of the western turrets. The nave arcades date entirely from after the fall, including the western respond piers, beyond which the junction is clearly to be seen, and the eastern and western responds of the south arcade bear the date 1524. From the fact that both the north and south clearstory walls of the nave were rebuilt for the most part with the old materials, it would seem to be probable that the tower collapsed towards the nave, rather than

---


\(^2\) Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 175.

\(^3\) Ibid. 176.

\(^4\) The line of junction is marked by a straight joint on both sides of the chancel and on the east side of the south transept.

On the west side of the north transept, the rebuilding included the south jamb of the southernmost window of the clearstory, and the masonry above up to the line of the southern springing of the hood-mould of this window. On the west side of the south transept, the original window jamb and some masonry beyond it remain.
that it fell over it, and that the collapse so dislocated and injured the thirteenth-century arcades as to necessitate a complete rebuilding up to the west end.

The nave arcades (fig. 20),¹ as built after the fall, have piers of the same plan as the piers of the arcades on the east side of the transept—four attached shafts separated by four filleted hollows, and they stand on tall well-moulded bases. The piers are higher than those of the transept or chancel arcades. The capitals of the nave arcade piers and of the tower arches show a difference which serves to distinguish the work built after the fall of 1520 from the mid fifteenth-century work in the transept. In the piers of the transept arcades, the mouldings of the capitals are entirely of semi-octagonal plan over each shaft above the bell.² In the piers of the nave arcades and tower, the abaci only follow the semi-octagonal plan, and the moulding over the bell is of circular plan (fig. 21). The arches of the nave arcades are moulded with a deep hollow between two double ogees (fig. 5, vii). The hood-moulds on the sides next the nave show a characteristically late section.³ On the side next the south aisle,⁴ the hood-moulds show a simpler section—weathering, fillet, and hollow. On the side next the north aisle the hood-moulds are simply double-chamfered (fig. 5, vii), and, as some of the stones which are shorter than others are of Newbald stone,⁵ this early section⁶ would seem to indicate the reuse of old material from the thirteenth-century arcades. Most of the arch-stones in the north arcade and a few in the south arcade are much smaller than the others, and appear to be stones from the thirteenth-century arcades, reused and recut. The spandrels between the hood-moulds and the clearstory string are entirely filled with traceried panelling, the central figure being a quatrefoil within a circle, with trefoil cusping to each lobe of the quatrefoil around a blank shield in the middle (fig. 20).

The stops to the hood-moulds of the north arcade are sculptured with the busts of little figures of men or women bearing scrolls, on which are inscriptions recording gifts towards the rebuilding of this part of the nave. The inscriptions are in English on the side next the nave, and in Latin, of similar purport, next the aisle. The two

---

¹ Illustrated in detail in Colling's *Details of Gothic Architecture*, vol. i, 'Perpendicular,' pls. 6 and 8.
² The capital of the shaft of the respond pier at the north end of the south transept arcade, which is part of the tower rebuilding after 1520, has the circular moulding above the bell.
³ See Colling's pl. 6. Also Sharpe's *Mouldings*, pl. 60, where they are erroneously attributed to c. 1400.
⁴ There are no hood-moulds to the back of the arches of the transept arcades.
⁵ There are many stones of chalk in the nave arcades.
⁶ The hood-mould of the early thirteenth-century south arcade of the nave of Hessle church shows the same section.
FIG. 20. NAVE, NORTH ARCADE.

F. H. Crossley, phot.
FIG. 21. NAVE, NORTH ARCADE, MINSTRELS.
westernmost piers and the western respond (two pillars and a half) were given by John Crosley and his wife; the next two piers by the good wives of Beverley; and the easternmost pier by the minstrels. On the east side of this pier are corbels with characteristic sixteenth-century leafage and moulded capitals, on which stand five little figures of minstrels with their instruments (fig. 21), which have been carefully described elsewhere. The ordinances of the company or fraternity of minstrels in Beverley of 1555 are printed in Poulson, and there are numerous references to the minstrels or waits in the Corporation documents.

The inscriptions on the stops to the hood-moulds read as follows (the piers are here numbered from the west, the western respond being 1, and the two sides are distinguished by S, south side next the nave, and N, north side next the aisle).

1, S. XLAY
2, S. AND HYS WYF
   FE MADE THES
3, S. TO PYLLORS
   AND A HALFFE
3, N. ORATE PRO
   ANIMABVS
2, N. IOHIS CROSL
   AY MERCATORIS
1, N. ET IOHANNE
   VXORIS EIVS
4, S. THYS TO PYLLO
   RS MADE GVD
5, S. WYFFYS GOD
   REWARD THAYM
5, N. (OR)ATE P(RO)
   (AN)MAB(VS)
4, N. ISTARVM
   (BON)ARVM M(VLIERVM)
6, S. THYS PYLLOR
   MADE THE
   MEYNSTYRLS
6, N. ORATE PRO
   ANIMABVS
   HISTERIORVM

1 John Crosley is mentioned in the accounts of 1519–20 (Hist. MSS. Com. Rep., 171).
5 Fig. 22, i.
6 The letters within brackets have been defaced.
The stops to the hood-moulds of the south arcade are also sculptured with busts, but only two of them bear inscriptions. These are over the eastern respond next the nave (7, N), and over the western respond next the aisle (1, S), both of which show the date 1524. On the side next the aisle, two represent the demi-virgin issuing from clouds, of the Mercers’ gild (4, S, and 7, S), and two others represent a jester (3, S, and 6, S). On the side next the nave are an official with a square cap (7, N), a civil dignitary with a flat cap (6, N), a king (5, N), a cardinal¹ (4, N), an archbishop (3, N), a civil dignitary (2, N), and a merchant or official (1, N), illustrated in fig. 22, ii. There are indications that these stops have been painted.

The crossing piers were rebuilt (as may be seen from the plan) of very substantial bulk, evidently from a desire to avoid any recurrence of the disaster. Each pier consists of a large attached shaft, flanked by a wide hollow, a smaller shaft, and an ogee. The bases and the capitals of the three shafts (which are separate) are moulded very similarly to those of the nave arcades. The two principal orders of the crossing arches, separated by a hollow, are moulded with large ogees, and the hood-moulds are similar to those of the nave arcades. In each internal angle of the crossing is an attached shaft, with a capital at the level of the capitals under the crossing arches. From the capitals of the angle shafts rise triple shafts, with capitals and bases, from which spring very flat four-centred wall-arches, with carved spandrels, under the cornice below the wood ceiling. The stair in the north-east pier is now entered from the north chancel aisle, and has also a doorway to the chancel, now blocked. Another doorway above gave access to the rood loft.

The tower (figs. 1, 19, and 23), as rebuilt after the fall of 1520, broad and low, is in excellent relation to the church which it fitsly crowns. The stage immediately above the roofs is lighted by a circular traceried window in each face (fig. 12, ii). The taller belfry stage above has a single traceried window of four lights in each face. The buttresses, well graduated in three stages, finish below the cornice of the parapet, which is battlemented and panelled. From the cornice rise the pinnacles, one at each angle, and three on each face, those at the sides being rather lower than the angle and middle pinnacles.

The completion of the rebuilding of the nave was followed by the provision of a new font (fig. 24),² which stands at the west end of the north aisle of the nave. The font is of Derbyshire marble,

¹ A cardinal is also represented on the stop over the eastern respond of the north arcade, on the side next the nave, and on the side next the aisle is a queen.
² Engraved in Beverlac, 741, and in Oliver’s Beverley, 161.
FIG. 22. NAIVE ARCADES, STOPS TO HOOD-MOULD.
FIG. 23. TOWER, FROM THE SOUTH-EAST.
Fig. 24. Font.

F. H. Crossley, phot.
and is richly ornamented. The bowl is octagonal, with the faces slightly hollow, 3 feet 10½ inches in diameter, and 3 feet 8 inches high from the upper step to the top of the bowl. The plinth has two bands of tracery, and the shaft and corbel are also panelled with tracery. The bowl has a small square shaft on each angle, and each face has a crocketed ogee, with a finial rising through the inscription band, and some rather crude cusping within the ogee. The inscription running around the top of the bowl is in well-cut raised letters, beginning on the east face, and reads thus:¹

Pray for || the soules | of Myllmon leryffacx | draper & | his : wyvis
| which in | the thyss | font | of | his | pper | coftes the | v | day. | of |
| marcie v | gere of | our lord | Mvdx

Another inscription below, in the spandrels above the ogees, has been so defaced as to be almost altogether illegible, except a few words—(saint) autyn (north-west face), church to hab (south-east face). On the corbel of the bowl are shields, one of which (north face) bears a merchant’s mark composed of a cross with a W across its long lower arm; another (north-east face) bears what seems to be a rebus—an animal, possibly a bear, tied to a letter which may be p.²

William Leryffax, the Beverley draper who gave this font on March 10, 1530, made a will³ on Dec. 22 of the same year, which is a very human document. He wishes ‘to be buried in the church of our Blissid Lady in Beverlay, nygh unto the grave of Robert Leryffax, my father, if it please Almyghty God yt I depart from this world in Beverlay; and, ellys, I will it be buried in the next holy ground, where it shall please Almyghty God to call me from this wretched world.’ After bequests to his mother and his wife, he provides that—

“If Robert, my son, dye ... my supervisores shall sell the for-
said house ..., & by a cope of velwet and a westment of the same,
with two tunicles, two copies to stand in the qwhere w³ an ymage of
gold of Sanct John of Beverlay of yche one of thame, and litill ymages
of Sanct George in gold, and iiiij lettris of gold of yche one of thame,
W and L, R and an L, yff the money will mount so fer; or, els, so fer
as the money will goo; iff the money will mount farther, it is my will
to have other two copies for ij clerkes to stand in of some other thyng
nere unto the same colour; and, iff ony thyng remayn, I will that the

¹ In the inscription as here printed, the single lines indicate the angles, and the double lines the finials. The name has often been misread as Peryffaxe, and the day of the month omitted, but the v is on the finial itself.

² The font at Goodmanham was evidently an imitation of the St. Mary’s font (see illustrations in F. Bond, Fonts and Font Covers (Oxford, 1908), 112, 121.

said supervisores doo bestow it in such thynges as y" shall thynke moste necessary for the maynteneyng of the service of Almyghty God. I gyve unto my Lord, Thomas Prior of Watton, a woman's gowne of tawny damaske without sleves to his owen use, and to doo with as he will. To my Lord, Richard abbot of Meuxe, a kirtill of tawny sattyn to his use, besechyn thame boith that thay wil be gud lordez with Robert, my son, yf it please thame to have his witword and porcion in keping, that y" may know how it is spendid in his bringing uppe, for I holy putt hym and it to thar ordering and off Maister Robert Waid, and in no way that he be in his mother' keping."

The vaulting of the south porch (fig. 25) appears from its character to date from after the disaster of 1520. The vaulting shafts in the middle of each side wall and in the four angles have obviously been inserted in the earlier walls. The vault is divided into two bays by a transverse rib of four-centred arched form, the upper part of the curve being very straight above the quick curve of the lower part. The vault is divided longitudinally by a ridge rib which is straight from end to end; and each half of the vault is divided by a longitudinal rib which is slightly arched from the transverse rib to the end walls. The diagonal ribs intersect on these longitudinal ribs—not on the ridge rib as in vaults of an earlier type—and they are continued beyond these intersections to the ridge rib; consequently two of the diagonal ribs cross the whole two bays from angle to angle of the porch. There are wall ribs at the north and south ends, but there are no wall ribs to the lateral lunettes on the east and west walls. A minor ridge rib runs level from a boss at the apex of each of these lunettes to the intersection of the diagonal ribs, and from this intersection to the ridge rib there is a lierne or half transverse rib. There are carved bosses at all the intersections of the ribs. The cells of the vault are plastered.

A minor work which also appears to date from after 1520 is the doorway in the screen wall between the chapel on the east side of the north transept (now the vestry) and the western part of the north aisle of the chancel. Previous to the restorations of the middle of the nineteenth century, this vestry was partitioned off from the transept and from the chancel aisle,¹ and this doorway was opened out when the partitions were removed. The doorway has delicately moulded jambs and a low four-centred arch, with quatrefoil spandrels, under the coping of the wall.

The roof and ceiling of the chancel have already been described in their place. The ceilings of the aisles are generally simply panelled with moulded ribs. The roof of the nave was

¹ Beverlac, 739.
of course reconstructed after the disaster of 1520, and the roofs of the north transept and of the chapel on its east side appear to be of the same time.  

The roof of the nave, though of similar low pitch to that of the chancel, is not constructed in precisely the same manner. In the chancel the tie-beams are cambered to follow the slight slope of the roof. In the roof of the nave, the tie-beams are also cambered, but not to the extent of the slope of the roof, to which the tops of the tie-beams are made up, and the tie-beams are panelled with tracery both on their sides and underside, and have a main boss in the centre of each beam. Each bay of the ceiling is divided into eighteen panels (three in the length of the bay, and six in the width of the nave) by the moulded ridge, purlins, and ribs. There are carved bosses, smaller than those on the tie-beams, at each intersection of ridge, purlins, and ribs, and where the purlins rest upon the tie-beams (twenty bosses in each bay), but there are no bosses next the side walls, where the roof springs from a stone cornice. The sculptures on the bosses form an interesting series, which includes (on the second tie-beam from the crossing) St. John and Athelstan with the usual legend, the evangelistic symbols, and (in several cases) the monogram of the Virgin.

The roof of the north transept, which has been much restored, is similar to that of the nave, with the addition of wall-posts and struts with angels, which may have been added when the roof was restored. The bosses on the middle of the tie-beams bear the evangelistic symbols with the names on scrolls, and other bosses have the monogram of the Virgin. From the southern tie-beam to the crossing the ceiling is coved.

The roof of the south transept has also been very much restored, if not entirely renewed. The ribs are flatter, and the angles of the panels are cusped.

1 The woodwork of the church deserves much more thorough description (with illustration) than I am able to give it here, or than (except the screens) it has hitherto received.


3 The roof of the south transept was ' restored ' in 1861. As however Mr. Cuthbert Brodrick was only appointed architect at the same meeting at which tenders for the work were accepted, his share of the work cannot have amounted to more than supervision of work which had already been decided upon when he was appointed. The roof of the north transept was taken down in 1861, and reconstructed under Mr. Brodrick's direction, and from his drawings and specification. As the cost of the carpenter's work on the roof of the south transept was £145, and on the north transept £87 (including the taking down), it appears to be more than probable that the roof of the south transept was a new roof.

4 Gent (Ripon, 81) describes some paintings and inscriptions which seem to refer to the south transept, but his descriptions are not always easy to follow, and sometimes inaccurate. He ingeni-ously transforms the W. Hal carpenter of the north transept chapel ceiling into ' William Penter.'
The roof of the large chapel on the east side of the north transept, which includes the western bays of the north chancel aisle, is similar to that of the nave, and was evidently constructed in the same period, after the fall of 1520. It is divided into three bays by the tie-beams, and there is a corresponding beam against the north wall. Each bay is divided by moulded ribs into eight panels in the width from east to west, and from north to south the north bay has two panels, and the other two bays three panels each. The bosses in the middle of the tie-beams and northern wall-beam bear the evangelistic symbols. On the bosses at the ends of the ribs next the walls and southern tie-beam are the words of the Angelic Salutation, but they are incomplete and misplaced, possibly when the vestry partitions were removed and the roof was restored in 1866.¹

The words which now remain (one word or half-word on each boss) are: on the wall-beam on the north, Ecce ancilla tuā fīād michī [ἐκκε] [ἀνκέλλα] [τοῦ] [μή] [κῆ]; on the east side, grācia plīna [τῆς] [τοῦ] [Β] [ῆρα]; on the southern tie-beam, mulieri [μολι] [βε] [τα] [ε] [το] [μ] [ε] [τ] [ο] [ς]; while on the west side one boss has [θν]. On the tracered sides of the tie-beams are the monograms [τ] [ς] and [ψ] and the monogram of the Virgin, generally crowned. Among the various subjects on the bosses at the intersections of the ribs are angels, the emblems of the Passion, the pelican in her piety, the Sacred Face, monograms, a miller and his horse, a fox preaching to geese, etc. On the south side of the southern tie-beam is the following inscription: Magn[es] In thy lyvyng loue [God] a bown all thyng and ever [²]

Thynke at the begynnyng quhat schall comowe off the endynge

The southern tie-beam is some little distance from the arched north wall of the chancel, and the intervening space is ceiled with a cove, divided by ribs into small panels, two in the depth of the cove, and fifteen in the length, with a half-panel next the canted side of the tower stair. On the bosses at the intersections of the ribs along the middle of the cove is the following inscription:

W hal car p en ter m ad th ys go w fc

followed on the last three bosses by a square, an axe, and compasses.

¹ Mr. Brereton (1865) speaks of this roof as being in a dilapidated state (op. cit. 105). The beams and woodwork were repaired and the roof reloaded in 1866, under Mr. Scott. Mr. Padgett was directed (May 18, 1866) to take a copy of the inscriptions, and a particular account of the various bosses noting their situation so that they may be again put up in their proper places. The ceiling was repainted by Mr. Padgett, who, in addition to the repainting of the chancel ceiling, also repainted the ceilings of the south transept (1861), the north transept, under Mr. Cuthbert Brodrick (1862), the tower and south aisle of the chancel (1863), and the nave and aisles, under Mr. Scott (1865).

² Here is the eagle of St. John.
The stalls, which occupy the two western bays of the chancel, may with probability be attributed to the second quarter of the fifteenth century, after the addition of the clearstory to the chancel. They had been removed, at some period and for some reason unknown, to the eastern bays of the north and south aisles of the chancel, where they remained until they were moved back into the chancel by Sir G. G. Scott in his later restoration of 1875–6. The stalls are arranged in a single row of twelve on each side, with two returned stalls on each side. There are alleys through the fronts opposite the fifth and tenth stalls from the east. The fronts of the desks are panelled with tracery heads, with buttresses between each pair of panels. The desk tops are 2 feet 3 inches above the raised floor, and 13–14 inches wide; they are housed into ends with poppy heads, with a buttress on the outer edge. The outer faces of the two eastern ends and of the two ends to the returned stalls are panelled with tracery. The stall divisions have little angels on the elbows, on a shaft below on the front of each division. The misericords, most of which are original, show an interesting series of sculptures which deserve adequate description and illustration. The costumes of the figures, and the bassinets of two armed figures (north side, 9th and 11th from east), help to indicate the date of the work.

The backs of the stalls, next the aisles, have panelling of later dates than the stalls themselves. On the south side, the panels have cusped and crocketed ogees springing between buttresses with pinnacles, with tracery above the ogees, under a cornice carved with a band of running foliage. It is possible that the date of this panelling may be indicated by the will of Guy Malyerd of 1486, which contains a bequest to the kyrk-werk of oure Lady aforesaid xxx squared trees and half c waynescotes, to the reparaciones of the stalles of the said chirch. On the north side, the panelling is of still later date, doubtless after the disaster of 1520, and the panels have carved heads of good character and late type.

1 Oliver's Beverley, 357. Brereton, op. cit. 108. The stalls in the north aisle of the chancel are shown in Greenwood's engraving in Poulson's Beverley, opp. p. 737; in Sharpe's Decorated Windows Tracery, pl. 44; and in the photograph of the chancel, taken between 1867 and 1875, reproduced as fig. 6 above.

2 The stalls are illustrated by a photograph in Howard and Crossley's English Church Woodwork, 170, and by careful measured drawings by Mr. C. de Gruchy in the Architectural Association Sketch Book, 3rd ser. vol. vii, pls. 9, 10, and 11.

3 A list of the subjects is given by Mr. J. E. Morris, 'Little Guide' to the East Riding (Methuen, 1906), 97.


5 The panelling on the south side is illustrated in English Church Woodwork, 170, and that on both south and north sides in A.A.S.B. (as above), pl. 9.
screens. The screen work in the church has been very fully described by Mr. Aymer Vallance in a recent volume of this Journal,\textsuperscript{1} and can therefore be dealt with very summarily here.

The screens which Sir G. G. Scott\textsuperscript{2} erected to enclose the chancel in the third bay of the north and south arcades incorporate and were designed for some lengths of the original heads,\textsuperscript{3} which would appear to belong to the parclosest constructed on the completion of the north arcade, just before the middle of the fourteenth century. These heads are each cut out of a single plank, and show two differing patterns of flowing tracery. A similar piece is preserved in the room over the north chancel aisle.

The western side of the rood-screen, in a maimed condition, stood between the eastern piers of the crossing until it was taken down about 1875.\textsuperscript{4} In order to fit it within the insufficient width between the crossing piers, about half of the width of each extreme bay (of the three) had been destroyed, and the vaulted cove and loft had disappeared. When a movement was started for its replacement, chiefly on the initiative of the late Dr. William Stephenson, most of what remained of the screen lay in the crypt beneath the north transept chapel. The western side of the screen was replaced, under the writer's direction, in 1893. In order to avoid interference with the modern choir stalls under the crossing, the screen had to be placed as far east (as close to the piers) as the width of the three complete bays would permit, but it is not certain that this was its precise original position. Nor is it certain that the screen did not extend further to the north and south; indeed the north face of the post at the present north end has an ogee moulding\textsuperscript{5} which proves that there must have been more of it beyond this post. The western side of the screen, as re-erected,\textsuperscript{6} consists of three wide bays, of six lights each, and, with the exception of some minor replacements and the completion of the missing parts of the two end bays, all this part of the screen is the original work. The vaulted cove and cornice are entirely new and conjectural. The length of cornice fixed on the east side of the screen is not, of course, in its original position, and was only placed there to ensure its preservation. The screen was originally double, and the loft cannot have been less than 14 feet wide, at the sides at any rate.

\textsuperscript{1} Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xxiv, 174–175.
\textsuperscript{2} The roodos and screens in the second bay (from the east) were the work of his son, Mr. J. Oldrid Scott, in 1881.
\textsuperscript{3} Y.A.J. xxiv, 122, and pls. vii and viii. English Church Woodwork, 25.
\textsuperscript{4} Mr. Vallance relates why it was not replaced.
\textsuperscript{5} On the south side of the southern post, this moulding is not original.
\textsuperscript{6} See my drawing in The Builder of March 24, 1894, and the photograph in Y.A.J. xxiv, 118 (pl. vi).
backs of the doorposts show the stile mouldings and grooves for the divisions which enclosed the central passage, and at the east end of the chancel are preserved two pairs of posts which belonged to this eastern part of the screen. Two of these posts are similar to those which divide the bays of the western part of the screen. In the two other posts, the shafts are attached to a quasi-butress, with embattled cornice and base, and its two sides panelled with tracery, and the level of the base shows that it must have been fitted on the top of the back of the returned choir stalls. My plan, which Mr. Vallance reproduced, shows the general arrangement, but further consideration has convinced me that these posts, AA and BB, cannot have stood where this plan shows them. The bevelled backs of the four posts, and especially the directions of the tenons on the tops of the posts, indicate a plan for the eastern opening canted inward (westward), though, as Mr. Vallance truly says, it is not at all clear what the precise plan was.

With regard to Mr. Vallance’s remarks as to the date of the screen, he notices as an unusual feature the setting back of the folding doors some 3 or 4 inches to the east of the corresponding face of the side bays, but he does not mention the fact that the inner frame of the doorway, carved with a narrow trail, is an addition covering a hollow moulding on the inner side of the back shaft. As the crooks are clumsily let into these back shafts just below the neckings, and the foliage of the capitals has been cut away to allow the bands to pass, the present hanging of the doors can hardly be original.

At the east end of the chancel are preserved some fragments of screen-work, two of which, of three lights, seem to belong to the screen in the southern bay of the north transept arcade (west end of north chancel aisle) which is shown in Miss Caroline Brereton’s drawing of 1866, but no longer exists. There are also two wider pieces of tracery, of six lights, one of which is simply cut out of half-inch board, without moulding, and must be comparatively modern; the other cannot well have formed part of the rood-screen, for it is much thinner than the tracery indicated by what remains on the back of the doorposts, and on the detached posts which belonged to the eastern part of the screen. Two lengths of canopy

---

1 See detail plan of this post in Y.A.J. xxiv, 118.
2 Y.A.J. xxiv, 117. Compare the original arrangement of the rood-screen and stair and loft doors at Holy Trinity, Hull (Y.A.J. xxiv, 149–152).
3 Y.A.J. xxiv, 114.
4 See detail plan, Y.A.J. xxiv, 118.
5 C. Brereton, op. cit. pl. vi. Y.A.J. xxiv, 123.
work, now at the east end of the chancel, and of sixteenth or seventeenth-century date, may probably have come from the pews at the east ends of the aisles of the nave, mentioned above.\(^1\)

The chantries in this church of which certificates were returned in 1548 were three in number. The most valuable was Kelk’s chantry, at the altar of St. Thomas the Martyr\(^2\); the ordinance of 1425, under which the Twelve Keepers were trustees, provided for two chaplains who were to have stalls in choir next the stalls of the chanplian of the chantry of St. Katharine and the chanplian of the brotherhood of the Holy Trinity, or, by assignment of the vicar and churchwardens, to one of them a stall in the south part of the choir.\(^3\) Of the chantry of St. Nicholas,\(^4\) admissions of chaplains are recorded in 1448 and 1452,\(^5\) but there seems to be nothing to indicate the position in the church of the altars of St. Thomas and St. Nicholas. The ‘chantry of Nicholas of Rise’ is mentioned in 1449.\(^6\) The chantry of St. Katharine\(^7\) was probably at the altar in the south aisle of the chancel.\(^8\)

The altar of the Holy Trinity in the charnel and its connexion with the Mercers’ gild, and the altar of St. Michael in the north chapel of the chancel, have already been mentioned above. The chapel of St. Cuthbert in the south part of the church is mentioned in the wills of John Coppynadle, 1477,\(^9\) and of his son Stephen, 1485.\(^10\)

The Easter sepulchre, doubtless a moveable piece of furniture, is mentioned in the ordinances (1413) of the Bowers and Fletchers,\(^11\) and in the will of Cecilie Lepnyngton, widow (1526),\(^12\) in which she bequeaths ‘to the said kirke my best oversee bed called the Baptest os an ornament to the sepulcre of oure Saviour Criste Jhesu at the fest of Ester’;\(^13\) she also gave ‘to the altar of our Blissid Ladie ... a silver salt, to make of it a chales to belong to the forsaid altar.’\(^14\)

---

\(^{1}\) See a water-colour drawing (looking east) by Miss Caroline Brereton (Mrs. Hartley) of 1852, and another water-colour drawing of the nave looking west, both in the Beverley Corporation Art Gallery.

\(^{2}\) *Yorkshire Chantry Surveys*, ii, 539.

\(^{3}\) *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.*, 150, 159 (see also index for other references).

\(^{4}\) *Yorkshire Chantry Surveys*, ii, 538, 544.


\(^{6}\) Ibid. 163. Poulsone states that this chantry was founded in 2 Hen. V. (*Beverlæc*, 728, n. 3).

\(^{7}\) *Yorkshire Chantry Surveys*, ii, 539, 544.

\(^{8}\) P. 380 supra.


\(^{11}\) *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.*, 98.


\(^{13}\) In the will of Agnes Constable of Withernwick (1521) is—Item do et lego Beatae Mariae de Beverlaco my best gowne’ (*Reg. Test. ix*, 225. *Test. Ebor. v*, 137).

\(^{14}\) For the church goods in 1552, see *Inventories of Church Goods* (Surtees Soc. xvii), 58. For the existing plate, see *Yorkshire Church Plate*, i, 221.
The original slab of the high altar is said to remain beneath the present modern altar. At the east end of the chancel stands the eighteenth-century communion table, which has a black marble top, 5 feet 7 inches by 3 feet 3 inches, on wrought iron supports.

In the paving of the church, several slabs of Pre-Reformation date still remain, some of which have had brasses, but all have been reaved, and only the indents remain. In the following list of the principal slabs, the numbers refer to the corresponding numbers on the plan (fig. 26). It must be remembered that, in those slabs which have had brasses, the indents only are described.

1. Chancel, north side. 9 ft. 1 in. long, partly under stalls, visible width 3 ft. 11 ins. Single figure (priest?) with scroll around head. Shaft and pinnacle on each side, cusped canopy, two shields, and marginal inscription.

2. Chancel, south side. 9 ft. 1 in. by 4 ft. 5½ ins. Two figures, of man (civilian) and woman, four shields, and marginal inscription.


4. Chancel (west of last). 7 ft. 1 in. by 3 ft. 2 ins. Plate and quatrefoil angles.

5. North aisle of chancel. 8 ft. 10 ins. by 4 ft. 4 ins. Two figures, of man and woman. Two shields below. Marginal inscription, with quatrefoil angles.

6. North aisle of chancel. 8 ft. 5 ins. by 4 ft. 7 ins. Figures of two knights. Two shields below. Marginal inscription, with quatrefoil angles.

7. South aisle of chancel, western bay. 5 ft. 10 ins. by 4 ft. Long plate. Four quatrefoils.

8. South aisle of chancel, western bay. 7 ft. 11½ ins. by 3 ft. 8½ ins. Long plate, with shield under. Quatrefoil angles (no marginal plate).

9. South aisle of chancel, western bay. 7 ft. 4 ins. by 3 ft. 6½ ins. Two small figures, above a long plate with shield under. Quatrefoil angles (no marginal plate).

10. North transept. Present size 6 ft. 1½ ins. by 3 ft. 7½ ins., but has been cut down and reused in eighteenth century. Two figures (merchants?). Marginal inscription.

11. South transept. 8 ft. 8½ ins. by 3 ft. 8½ ins. Figure of priest, shield each side, under triple canopy, crocketted, with four pinnacles, two of them on side shafts. Marginal inscription.

12. South aisle of nave, eastern bay. 6 ft. 5½ ins. by 3 ft. 8 ins. (visible, partly under pew). Incised inscription in black letter (illegible).

13. Nave, eastern bay. 5 ft. 8 ins. by 2 ft. 11½ ins. Cross, of three incised lines, with floriated ends, and base mouldings represented in perspective. Two letters, R and B, one on each side of the stem of the cross. Marginal inscription with incised letters, within quatrefoil angles, thus:

Pray for ye soule | of Robarte Burton tanner whiche dyed ye xx day of | julii a dni meccc | xxxv° and for ye sole of Kateryne his wife and ye chyldre

There are also three slabs with indents in the central alley of the nave, which are not shown on the plan.

Of the later memorials in the floor of the church, mention need only be made here of that of Sir Edward Barnard, 1686, in the south aisle of the chancel, which has an oval bronze plate bearing his arms.¹ The most important wall-monuments are three to members of the Warton family, Ionic columned structures of almost identical design. Two of these are in the western bay of the south aisle of the nave, one on each side; on the south, Sir Ralph Warton, d. 1700 (no. 15 on the plan); on the north, Charles Warton, d. 1714 (no. 16). The third is between the windows of the east aisle of the south transept—Ralph Warton, d. 1709 (no. 14). The two earlier ones were formerly in the south aisle of the chancel.² On the outside of the south aisle of the chancel, on the westernmost buttress, is the well-known tablet of 1689 in memory of two Danish soldiers.³

The inscriptions on the bells, then six in number, were recorded by Mr. W. Consitt Boulter in an early volume of this Journal.⁴ Two of the bells bore inscriptions in Lombardic capitals—(no. 3)⁵ ● FVIT GRÆ BENEDICTVS ET NOMINE, and (no. 4) ● VT TVBA SIC SONITV DOMINI CONDIVO COHORTES 1599, PD RC RS WI RT. No. 6 was evidently the ‘great bell’ which is recorded as having been cast by Samuel Smith, of York, in 1700.⁶ No. 2 had ● S ● S widely spaced within a band, below which was a shield

¹ Beverlac, 756. Oliver's Beverley, 354. ² Gent's Ripon, 87. Oliver's Beverley, 354. Gent describes Charles Warton’s monument (1714) as being ‘in the south Isle, near the west end.’ Cf. Beverlac, 757. Gent’s Ripon contains a considerable number of inscriptions from St. Mary's church and churchyard (pp. 86–88).

³ Gent's Ripon, 88. Oliver's Beverley, 238. Photograph in the Beverley guide in Bell’s series, ii, 126.

⁴ Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, ii, 222.

⁵ The numbers are Mr. Boulter’s, of the then ring of six.

⁶ Beverlac, 752.
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bearing two crowns in chief and a bell-founder’s mark between a letter r on the dexter and a bell on the sinister.\(^1\) The two other bells were dated 1631 (no. 5) and 1760 (no. 1). Two more bells were added, and no. 1 was recast, in 1888, making a ring of eight. The oak frame bore the date 1744, the names of the vicar and four wardens, and ‘Ja\(^8\) Harrison of Barrow in Lincolnshire Bellhang.’\(^2\) In 1900 the bells were recast and increased to a ring of ten, hung in a steel frame. The crowns of two of the bells (nos. 2 and 4), the fourth and seventh of the ring of eight, are preserved in the room over the north aisle of the chancel.

RESTORATIONS. Some notes of the works of restoration of the last century have been incidentally given above, and these may be completed by the following further notes.\(^3\)

Before the commencement of the general restoration in 1844, the churchwardens employed their own master-mason, etc., in works of repair and renewal. Mr. William Comins, ‘who had been bred up in the cathedral works at York,’ and executed the west face of the altar-screen in Beverley Minster in 1825–6,\(^4\) was so employed at St. Mary’s. When it was decided in 1830 ‘that a proportion of the revenue of the church property should in future be applied to the repair and restoration of the fabric,’ and the first stone of these repairs was laid at the west side of the south porch on June 23, 1830, Mr. Comins was present and is described as architect.

Oliver states that ‘the church enjoys the convenience of roomy and substantial galleries,’ and gives the dates of their erection and re-erection.\(^5\) At the archdeacon’s visitation of June 20, 1844, the churchwardens were ordered to report to the archdeacon within three months on the state of the galleries in the church. On the following day, the churchwardens decided to call in Mr. Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, and to apply for a faculty for such alterations and improvements as he might advise. Pugin submitted a comprehensive report, dated Sept. 25, 1844, on which a faculty was granted on Nov. 16, 1844. His works, which were carried out by Myers, were, I believe, almost entirely confined to the exterior of the church, and were still in hand when he died in 1852; after which they were continued for a short time by his son, Edward Welby

\(^1\) This is the shield illustrated in the lower right-hand corner of the plate opposite page 68, in vol. ii of the Yorkshire Archaeological Journal; also in Y.A.F. xvi, 82, pl. iii, no. 18.

\(^2\) The inscription is preserved in the room over the north chancel aisle.

\(^3\) I have to acknowledge the kindness of Mr. F. G. Hobson, the clerk to the churchwardens, in giving me facilities for ascertaining the facts here recorded.

\(^4\) Beverley, 681–2.

Pugin. In 1859 E. W. Pugin submitted a plan for the repewing of the church, which was not carried out because of its cost, and his connexion with the church ceased. The walls of the nave were cleaned and scraped in 1857, and those of the chancel in 1862–3. In 1861 the roof of the south transept was ‘restored’ (or renewed). 1 In 1861–2 the roof of the north transept was taken down and restored by Mr. Cuthbert Brodrick. The restoration of the chancel was then contemplated, for on Dec. 9, 1862, it was ordered that ‘such of the monuments or tablets as are fixed on the pillars in the chancel, and interfere with the restoration thereof, be removed by the stonemason to such places as the vicar and churchwardens shall direct.’ Mr. (afterwards Sir) George Gilbert Scott was first consulted by the churchwardens early in 1863, and in 1864 he began his general restoration of the church. His plans for refitting the church were approved on Feb. 22, 1864, and the tender for the nave fittings was accepted on Aug. 9, 1864. The works were practically completed by the end of 1867, though some minor works were carried out after that date, but the refitting of the chancel was postponed, and was only done by Sir G. G. Scott in 1875–6. The reredos was added after his death, by his son, Mr. John Oldrid Scott, in 1881.

I have to express my sincere thanks to two members of our Society who have so kindly contributed the photographic illustrations for this paper. Mr. Fred H. Crossley, of Chester, most generously placed at my disposal all his fine photographs of the church, and from these a selection has been made of the twenty-one here reproduced. The Society is indebted to Mr. Crossley for continuing his admirable contributions to the illustration of the Journal. Mr. J. V. Saunders, of Hull, has very kindly taken specially for me the photographs reproduced in Fig. 14, ii and iii, and Fig. 17, i, ii, and iii.

1 See p. 423, note 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>1, N</th>
<th>2, N</th>
<th>3, N</th>
<th>4, N</th>
<th>5, N</th>
<th>6, N</th>
<th>7, N</th>
<th>8, N</th>
<th>9, N</th>
<th>10, N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'EGLARUS'</td>
<td>CANUTE</td>
<td>ATELSTAN</td>
<td>EDGAR</td>
<td>HAROLD</td>
<td>EDWARD</td>
<td>ST. EDMUND</td>
<td>HENRY VI</td>
<td>HENRY V</td>
<td>HENRY IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, NC</td>
<td>2, NC</td>
<td>3, NC</td>
<td>4, NC</td>
<td>5, NC</td>
<td>6, NC</td>
<td>7, NC</td>
<td>8, NC</td>
<td>9, NC</td>
<td>10, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'SEGERARDUS'</td>
<td>ETHELWULF</td>
<td>EDWARD</td>
<td>EDWY 'HARDENIUS'</td>
<td>ETHELRED</td>
<td>EDWARD I</td>
<td>EDWARD II</td>
<td>EDWARD III</td>
<td>RICHARD II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, SC</td>
<td>2, SC</td>
<td>3, SC</td>
<td>4, SC</td>
<td>5, SC</td>
<td>6, SC</td>
<td>7, SC</td>
<td>8, SC</td>
<td>9, SC</td>
<td>10, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGEANUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>1, S</th>
<th>2, S</th>
<th>3, S</th>
<th>4, S</th>
<th>5, S</th>
<th>6, S</th>
<th>7, S</th>
<th>8, S</th>
<th>9, S</th>
<th>10, S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOBBS</td>
<td>HAROLD II</td>
<td>ST. EDMUND</td>
<td>FM. sc</td>
<td>HENRY II</td>
<td>AM. sc</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>HENRY III</td>
<td>HENRY I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERENCE PLAN OF CHANCEL CEILING
APPENDIX.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE CHANCEL CEILING.

For the purpose of reference, the panels are numbered and lettered as indicated on the reference plan on page 433. The numbers run from west to east (1 to 10). The four rows are distinguished as north (N), north-centre (NC), south-centre (SC), and south (S).

The inscriptions are printed here as they now appear in the ceiling, and in the chronological order suggested in the text.

The vertical rule indicates where the inscription is intercepted by the head or legs of the figure.

1, S. Brutus.


1, S. Locrine.


1, SC. Eboracus or Ebraucus.


2, SC. Lud ?¹


1, NC. Sigebert.


1, N. Egbert ? (802–839).


2, NC. Ethelwulf (839–858).²


6, SC. St. Edmund (855–870).


7, N. St. Edmund (855–870).³


3, SC. Alfred (871–901).⁴


¹ The initial letter of Rex is missing in the existing inscription.
Buried at Winchester, not at York.
² There appears to be some error of repainting the first word Aec, as the initial letter is missing, and the second letter is now n (with a contraction-mark over it), instead of b.
³ Buried at Winchester, not at London.
3. NC. Edward the Elder (901–924).


4. SC. Edred (946–955).\(^1\)

4. NC. Edwy (955–959).

4. N. Edgar (959–975).

6. N. Edward the Martyr (975–978).\(^2\)

6. NC. Ethelred the Redeless (979–1016).\(^3\)

2. N. Canute (1016–1035).\(^4\)

6. S. Canute (1016–1035).\(^4\)

5. N. Harold I (1035–1040).

5. NC. Hardecanute (1040–1042).\(^5\)

5. SC. Edward the Confessor (1042–1066).

5. S. Harold II 1066).


---

\(^1\) Buried at Winchester, not at Canterbury.
\(^2\) Buried at Shaftesbury, not at Winchester.
\(^3\) Buried at St. Paul's, not at Winchester.
\(^4\) Buried at Winchester, not at Durham nor London.
\(^5\) Probably originally written Hardecnundus.
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9, SC.  William II (1087-1100).

8, SC.  Henry I (1100-1135).

7, SC.  Stephen (1135-1154).

7, S.  Henry II (1154-1189).
  Rex : henricus : regnabit : xveb : anis : apb : | 
  sount : evezed : iacet.

8, S.  Richard I (1189-1199).

9, S.  John (1199-1216).

10, S.  Henry III (1216-1272).

7, NC.  Edward I (1272-1307).

8, NC.  Edward II (1307-1327).

9, NC.  Edward III (1327-1377).

10, NC.  Richard II (1377-1399).

10, N.  Henry IV (1399-1423).

9, N.  Henry V (1413-1422).

8, N.  Henry VI (1422).  1445.¹
  Rex : henricus : | fextus :

¹ As this inscription is longer that the others, there is an additional horizontal scroll (above the usual curved scroll) on which the first three words are written. The word which now appears as apís clearly should be apís (operis).

Note.—The contraction-marks in the inscriptions as printed above follow as nearly as practicable what are now painted on the ceiling, but several of them are wrong or misplaced.