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The only substantial reminder of the bishop’s palace 18th-century incarnation at Gloucester is the temple-like summer-house (Fig. 1) in the corner of the garden of the present King’s School, which itself occupies the palace built in the early 1860s. The summer-house has often been overlooked and the late David Verey merely described it as a ‘Hut with arms of Bishop Benson (1734–52)’.¹ This paper sets out to address the problem of who designed an 18th-century frontispiece to the palace and the summer-house, and to bring attention to the 18th-century remains still extant. A suggestion that the frontispiece could be the work of William Kent can be rejected on stylistic grounds alone.²

Fig. 1. The summer-house in the garden of the King’s School, Gloucester (photograph 1995 by the author).
The ornate classical façade,\(^3\) which was situated at the south end of the great hall of the bishop’s palace, was probably commissioned during Martin Benson’s episcopate, that is between 1734 and 1752. Canon David Welander assumes that as William Kent’s cathedral choir screen was erected in 1741 the palace frontispiece was added contemporaneously,\(^4\) but the circumstances surrounding its erection appear to be completely undocumented—even its date—and so the two cannot be automatically linked.

The only date we have for Benson’s work on the palace are the remains of painted glass installed by him in 1735, the year of his enthronement. They reveal that he was making alterations and improvements early on. The painted escutcheon, dedicated ‘Martinus Epis. A. D. 1735’ (Fig. 2), was salvaged by the architect Ewan Christian and reset into the plain clear glass windows of the Victorian palace.\(^5\) The fragments, now to be found in the window of the main staircase of the King’s School, are most probably the remains of the glass by William Price the younger of York (1703–65)\(^6\) that Horace Walpole admired: ‘Price has painted a large chapel window for him [presumably Benson], which is scarce inferior for colours, and is a much better picture than any of the old glass.’\(^7\) Price worked on the west and rose windows at Westminster Abbey in 1735 and on windows at Winchester College and New College chapel, Oxford. Mary Yorke, wife of James Yorke, bishop of Gloucester 1779–81, was probably referring to Price’s window in the palace when she wrote on 29 August 1779: ‘The Chaple with the painted window which I am told cost £300 is really elegant’.\(^8\)

Price’s work at Gloucester is richly painted with gold, red, blue, and other hues. The style is an exuberant Baroque, a style we will see again in work associated with Benson. The subject matter is an escutcheon surrounded by florid acanthus foliage symbolising the knight’s torn shroud—here the Baroque is most pronounced. The escutcheon is filled with Benson’s arms which consisted of two crossed keys in the Dexter and three Maltese crosses within a chevron in the Sinister. At the top of the escutcheon is a bishop’s mitre decorated with pearls or diamonds and emanating from beneath it is the knight’s mantle. The mantle entwines a giant key on the right of the mitre and a bishop’s staff on the left. Benson’s 1735 dedication is on a grey coloured illusionistic cartouche below the escutcheon (Fig. 2). The execution is stylised, slick, and sophisticated with technical bravura in the handling of form, light and shadow. The physical process involved the use of an oval of ‘crown’ glass which was painted with stains and enamels and then fired in a kiln. Even in its greatly diminished and debased state one can understand Walpole’s enthusiasm for such work.

Benson, a friend of Lord Burlington and Bishop Berkeley, was a man of cosmopolitan aspirations who wished to up-date the basically medieval bishop’s residence. He was presumably a man of some sophistication as indicated by his patronage of important artists such as Kent and Price. He bequeathed to the library of Gloucester Cathedral a distinguished collection of architectural books\(^9\) formed when he was ‘bear-leading’ young peers on the Grand Tour.\(^10\) At least one book was given to him by Lord Burlington.\(^11\)

Benson was probably responsible for the last great overhaul of the palace prior to its demolition in 1860. According to the Gloucestershire Chronicle on 16 June 1860: ‘It was Bishop Benson who put the place in the state it was in our days—a fact which he published by ornamenting most of the windows with his arms, and those of the see’.

The earliest known mention of the classical façade is by Horace Walpole in September 1753 in a letter to Richard Bentley.\(^12\) He wrote of the palace:

The Bishop’s house is pretty, and restored to the Gothic by the last Bishop [i.e. Benson]... The eating room is handsome. As I am a Protestant Goth, I was glad to worship Bishop Hooper’s room, from whence he was led to the stake: but I could have been a Flun, and set fire to the front of the house, which is a small pert portico, like the conveniences at the end of a London garden.
Is 'the front of the house, which is a small pert portico, like the conveniences at the end of a London garden' a derogatory remark towards the façade's ungainly classicism? Also puzzling is 'restored to the Gothic' as Benson's improvements appear to be classical and not Gothic, but Benson did commission the cathedral's Gothic choir screen by William Kent, which was lambasted by Walpole when he wrote that 'Kent... knew no more there than he did anywhere else how to enter into the true Gothic taste'.

Fig. 2. Painted glass of 1735 by William Price in a window in the King's School, Gloucester (photograph 1998 by the author).
A later description comes from Mary Yorke: 'The front I am told is that of a Grecian Temple which seems to me a little inconsistent in Order, with the first room we are to enter, namely a Gothic Hall.' Although writers of the late 18th century and the 19th century described the façade as 'Grecian', it is certainly not Greek-revival in any normal sense of the term. Shire Hall, Gloucester, for example, is strictly Grecian. However Mary Yorke was astute to describe the palace façade as 'a little inconsistent in Order'. She also wrote that

at present there is very little more than a few Pictures of Bishop Benson [and that] the great Hall... is ten feet shorter than your Ladyships long Drawing Room in London, but nearly 30 feet wide well stuccoed, Ceiling very tidy & a fine large Window at one end with Coats of arms of painted Glass.

The reference to a 'stuccoed' ceiling could well be an 18th-century improvement. However in July 1856, with quintessentially Victorian prejudice towards the creations of the 18th century, Ewan Christian (who would rebuild the Palace five years later and so, it could be argued, had an interest in writing the following) reported:

The most remarkable feature in the Building is the Great Hall, called the Abbot's Hall, which, though sadly disfigured by the present theatrical entrance, and its modern internal decoration, is a very noble apartment. Again 'modern' probably refers to 18th-century or 19th-century improvements. Christian also referred to the palace having been 'altered only in detail and architectural decoration, and always for the worse, in modern times'.

The 18th-century façade was a symmetrical classical composition of two storeys with a columned order (cf. Fig. 3). It was c. 30 ft wide and 15 ft deep including the perron (the steps). The central bay was the widest, breaking forward from the other two. The curious feature of the central bay was the double pediment arrangement. A large panelled front door was approached by wide steps with two sets of pedestals on either side. A ground plan for the perron shows the ground-floor portico to have been quite deep with four supporting columns. (Presumably the first-floor pediment was flat against the façade with pilasters, and not projecting like the ground-floor portico.) The portico led into a vestibule which in turn led into the great

Fig. 3. F.S. Waller's 1856 drawing of the south elevation of the bishop's palace at Gloucester showing the mid 18th-century frontispiece demolished in 1860 (Gloucester Diocesan Records, A 13/10, reproduced by permission of the bishop of Gloucester).
hall (Mary Yorke's 'Gothic Hall'). There were small flights of steps between the pedestals on both sides of the portico, but these did not lead anywhere. The pedestals were surmounted by urns with a pineapple motif, and were echoed by their visual counterparts on the parapet. A couple of the pineapple sections appear to have survived as highly weathered ornaments on either side of stone steps leading up to a terrace in the King's School garden on the west side of Christian's Victorian palace (Fig. 4). One abuts the palace and appears to rest on a classical column base (likely to have also come from the palace façade) which is as weathered as the motif itself.

Fig. 4. Pineapple finial in the garden of the King's School, Gloucester (photograph 1998 by the author).

To return to the façade—there are Roman Doric columns or pilasters at ground-floor level supporting a full entablature. The first-floor order is Ionic. The ground-floor entablature with its triglyph frieze strongly defines the half way division of the façade. Another peculiar feature employed here are the *œil-de-boeuf* windows on the first floor against the plainly rusticated wall. Their juxtaposition with the more conventional ground floor sash windows is not altogether successful.

The ground-floor pediment tympanum is filled with sculpture according to the only known illustration of the frontispiece. This is a technical drawing by F. S. Waller, the cathedral architect in the later 19th century, and labelled 'Entrance Front South Elevation' (Fig. 3). The drawing is too generalised for us to be precisely sure of the design. There appears to be a central escutcheon possibly with a bishop's mitre signifying the building's occupant. On either side are cornucopia or floral motifs. The first-floor parapet pediment is plainer and of a slightly lower pitch. Placed along the parapet and pediment are urns. The pedimental arrangement has an urn
on both sides on the acroterion (the plinths jutting out of the pediment) and one on the pediment’s apex. Behind the top pediment is a pyramidal shaped roof surmounted by a ball finial, again awkward as a composition but perhaps unavoidable as the roof belonged to the medieval abbot's hall (the great hall) situated behind the façade. The architect responsible for the frontispiece may have added a pediment to the tall private chapel window to the right of the façade behind the buttress. The window below the pediment has Gothic glazing. It is not altogether clear what improvements Benson carried out to the interior of the palace. "There were drawing and dining rooms as fine as plaster, paper, and paint could make them" might be a reference to 18th- or 19th-century improvements. We know that Benson somewhat vainly filled the windows of the palace ‘with coats of arms of painted Glass, chiefly Bishop Benson’s Arms, which appear twenty times about the House’.18

The obvious comparison with the bishop’s palace façade would be the east front of the nearby church of St. John the Baptist built by Edward and Thomas Woodward of Chipping Campden in 1732–4 (Fig. 5).19 The two buildings have the following in common: both façades are three bays wide and two storeys high. The parapet compositions are virtually the same—a central pediment without tympanum sculpture. The pediments are ‘broken’ (a slight recession) along the base and on the forty five degree slopes. Both have an acroterion on either side of those slopes. The parapets are very similar with urns on the pediments and marking the ends of the façade—the parapet spacing and rhythm is the same. They share similar proportions with a

Fig. 5. The church of St. John the Baptist from the east as illustrated in T.D. Fosbrooke, An Original History of the City of Gloucester (1819), plate facing p. 158.
large central bay and smaller outer bays. Both buildings have a small pitched roof, perhaps medieval, behind the parapet pediment. The coupling of Ionic pilasters for the central motif—i.e. the church’s Venetian window and the palace’s pedimented porch—is similar. The central feature is raised in either case. Oeil-de-boeuf windows are employed at first-floor level in the outer bays above the doors or windows. Both buildings have a triglyph frieze though in different positions. In between the triglyphs on the palace entablature and on a carved wooden reredos inside St. John’s church there are decorative motifs. Their depiction in Waller’s drawing is too small to be certain of their subject matter.

St. John’s church and the palace façade are coincidentally 18th-century remodellings or refrontings of medieval buildings. The relationship between the classical façade and the medieval palace is incongruous, looking more like an appliqué frontispiece than an organic part of the building or, as the *Gloucestershire Chronicle* put it, ‘stuck on like a new patch on an old garment’. 20 The church and the palace are theatrical compositions busy with motifs and loaded parapets. The palace façade indicates an unworliday grasp of the classical language not usually associated with William Kent. It reveals the tendency of architect-masons such as the Woodwards to overload and overcrowd a façade with compositional devices. To compare it once more to the façade of St. John it is worth bearing in mind what Goodhart-Rendel thought of the east end of the church: ‘very Cotswoldy and making unintelligent use of the Orders’. 21 Sir Howard Colvin wrote of St. John’s church that the ‘result was a handsome but rather unsophisticated classical building’. 22 Both comments could well be applied to the palace façade. The Woodwards also remodelled or rebuilt the medieval church of St. Swithin, Worcester, in 1734/5, and Alcester church, Warwickshire. Church rebuilding appears to have been a speciality of theirs. Interestingly they carried out repairs to the bishop’s palace at Mathern in Monmouthshire. 23

It is worth comparing the façade of the palace at Gloucester with an attributed example of the Woodwards’ domestic work such as Bedfont House, Chipping Campden, dating from the early 18th century. 24 Although there are few similarities in terms of architectural motifs, the scale and general massing can be compared—both façades are squat, and again share the Woodwards’ penchant for cramming features together in an almost stifling manner. Both façades are three bays wide and two storeys high (although Bedfont has a discreet attic). Both their central bays are especially wide in comparison to the narrow outer bays, and both are on raised bases. The façades have oeil-de-boeuf windows although Bedfont’s are less obvious and are elliptically shaped and positioned on either side of the main façade.

The palace façade can also be compared with the front elevations of Foxcote House, Warwickshire (Fig. 6), and of the ruthlessly restored Radbrooke Manor, Warwickshire, both attributed to the Woodwards according to Colvin’s *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects*. All three have a central section wider than their outer bays and with a first-floor pediment with a broken entablature along its base. Each has an acroterion jutting out of the sides of the pediment and on its apex sporting urns or finials. Again the spacing or rhythm of the parapet urns is very similar. All three have deep entablatures with triglyphs, though that of the bishop’s palace is on the ground floor. All three buildings are basically in three sections with five urns or finials along the parapet. Nikolaus Pevsner suggested that Foxcote’s outer bays were perhaps later additions. 25 If all three are by the Woodwards, as well as Bedfont House, the central section of the curved screen at Honnington Hall, Warwickshire (attributed), St. John’s church, Gloucester, and St. Swithin’s church, Worcester, it would reveal that, with the exception of Bedfont House, the Woodwards stuck with a repetitive tripartite arrangement featuring a central pediment and parapet with five urns or finials.

Although Colvin has expressed doubts over attributing the bishop’s palace frontispiece to the Woodwards, the argument he made in his paper entitled ‘Bell–Guttae and the Woodwards of Chipping Campden’ 26 parallels mine:
It is, however, the churches that support the attribution of Foxcote to the Woodwards. For the Doric frontispieces which adorn the east ends of St John's at Gloucester and St Swithin's at Worcester are essentially the same as those which emphasise the centres of Foxcote and Radbrooke. They are the same bold Doric order supporting a pediment with a single break back. The fenestration is naturally different, but the basic architectural formula is identical... It is, therefore, possible to confirm Mr Harris's attribution of Foxcote to the Woodwards and to add to it that of Radbrooke and presumably also of the screen walls at Honnington.

In 1860 the Gloucester Journal reported that: "The work of removing the old Episcopal Palace in this city is going rapidly forward, the whole of the building being now down except the Abbot's Hall and Picture Gallery, which will be incorporated in the new building". In 1865 the same newspaper reported with the benefit of hindsight that:

The Episcopal palace at Gloucester was an old rambling edifice, with the exception of a noble entrance-hall, totally unsuited to the requirements of an Episcopal palace in the present day. The reception-rooms were dingy in appearance, and destitute of comfort. The whole building was badly ventilated; the grounds were damp, unwholesome, and ill-drained. In the winter months, fogs rose from the low parts of the city and the neighbouring Severn, enveloping the episcopal residence in mist and a damp, chilling atmosphere. There was, however, this advantage in its favour—the bishop was close to the cathedral. A walk through a covered passage communicating with the cloisters enabled him to extend the daily services without personal trouble or loss of time."

The Gloucestershire Chronicle reported in 1860:

many I daresay, have peered over the high dead wall and through the screen of green trees in Palace yard, wondering to see a Grecian portico of the modern classical style amidst so many
relies of Gothic architecture... Since the Palace has been gutted and dismantled, I have once or twice obtained the keys, and wandered through the barbarous old edifice... A classical front, stuck on like a new patch on an old garment; rooms dark and dismal, the bedrooms mere black holes; and though there were drawing and dining rooms as fine as plaster, paper, and paint could make them, they contrasted oddly with those apartments which retained some of their native condition, such as the Abbot’s parlour.29

Despite the new façade and some interior alterations to the palace the garden adjacent to it appears to have been left undeveloped until after Benson’s episcopate. The summer-house is first recorded on Arthur Causton’s 1843 map of Gloucester, but judging it stylistically it could have been built a century earlier. It has been suggested that it is the re-erected portico of the palace, but this can be discounted for two reasons.30 First, the summer-house is marked on the 1843 map, and the palace was not demolished until 1860.31 Second, the summer-house physically does not relate to Waller’s drawing mentioned earlier. By the later 18th century the area in which the summer-house now stands had become ‘The Bishop’s Garden’ and was divided into four quarters bounded on one side by Half Street (now St. Mary’s Street) and on another by College Wall (now Pitt Street).32 By 1805 the area was developed into a series of semi-formal paths radiating off a central axis.33 The same garden layout appears on a map of c. 1828,34 which appears to be merely a copy of the 1805 map.

The semi-formal garden was apparently replaced with a more informal greensward in the 1830s or the early 1840s. This is an unusual date for a more informal garden because during that period formality was being reintroduced into garden layout with the late Regency or early Victorian preference for a parterre. Presumably the summer-house was moved at this time from elsewhere in the cathedral precincts. If it had been built in the 1830 or 1840s it would have been an extraordinary anachronism in a somewhat anachronistic garden. It is more likely to be roughly contemporaneous with the bishop’s palace façade. The summer-house is clearly on the 1851 Board of Health map where it is indicated by the letters ‘S. H’.35 It is in the far northwest corner of the garden surrounded by trees off the circuit path. The trees surrounding the building have since been felled but the summer-house remains in the same position.

The summer-house is a small building, though with much presence. It is open to the elements. Two columns and brick walls on three sides support a decorated entablature and pediment. It is in good repair, but has been recently coarsely restored. The pediment tympanum (Fig. 7) is filled with an escutcheon of Benson’s arms. On either side are elaborate cornucopias curling up to the escutcheon. Near the cornucopia tails are flowers bound to horns with bows. The fruit oozing out of the horns and indicating fecundity includes pomegranates, grapes and pears and is placed asymmetrically on either side of the escutcheon. Michael Wilson, the author of a monograph on William Kent, has suggested the design of the escutcheon and cornucopia is reminiscent of Rococo silverwork.36 The colour and texture of the tympanum sculpture are different to the rest of the structure’s stonework—perhaps it is a facsimile of the original.

The summer-house tympanum sculpture appears to relate to the monument to Benson erected on his order in the cathedral on his death in 1752 (Fig. 8).37 The date could possibly help us date the summer-house. The sculptor of Benson’s memorial is not known though it might be the work of the carpenter William Roberts, who built and may have designed the Tolsey in Gloucester in 1750–1,38 with a tympanum sculpture of the city arms and insignia in a similar exuberant Rococo style.39 The Tolsey sculpture and the cathedral memorial are contemporary. They both have a central escutcheon, draped fabric towards the top, and florid foliage (possibly palm leaf) towards the bottom.

The summer-house tympanum sculpture and the cathedral memorial both share a Rococo-style escutcheon with Benson’s armorial bearings depicting a bishop’s mitre and a couple of
crossed keys. The style of the memorial is a late Baroque/Rococo hybrid typical of 1752—this description can be applied to the tympanum sculpture bearing in mind Wilson’s Rococo suggestion. Benson’s memorial was of some grandeur, but its impact has been reduced by its removal from the north aisle to the east end of the south tribune gallery c. 1860. On removal it presumably lost some of its Rococo flourishes on either side of the shield and, more noticeably, the bishop’s staff emanating from his mitre and the base with elaborate feet incorporating putti. Above the putti is a large undulating shield carved from a veined marble of a colour similar to Red Leicester cheese with an inscription to Benson within. The rest of the memorial is carved in white marble, which is currently soiled. The escutcheon with crossed torches and ribbons depicted above the memorial earlier has been repositioned below it (Figs. 8–9). In terms of direct comparison the summer-house tympanum and the memorial escutcheon are closest in their Rococo surrouns. The general exuberance of both tympanum and memorial have much in common suggesting the same artist or designer. The Woodwards and William Roberts can be reasonably considered as candidates for the architect of the summer-house.

The supporting entablature on the summer-house has various mouldings including egg and dart, and an attractive pulvinated frieze with a bay-leaf motif. The front elevation frieze has a blank centre panel. The same can be said for the summer-house’s right hand side elevation. Oddly there is no bay leaf motif on the left-hand side elevation. The columns, delicately executed in the Ionic order, are very worn but still have the remains of fluting, and both are cabled (when the flute is filled in convexly) towards the bottom of the column.
Fig. 8. The monument to Bishop Benson in Gloucester Cathedral as illustrated in T.D. Fosbrooke, *An Original History of the City of Gloucester* (1819), plate facing p. 137.
Fig. 9. The monument to Bishop Benson in Gloucester Cathedral (photograph 1998 by the author).

The cathedral architect wrote (1996) of the summer-house:

The stonework to the gable is supported on a T-shaped piece of steel, which is very unusual much before that date. The walls are brick, and are less than 9" thick, producing a very complicated construction with the inner leaf bricks set on edge. The whole was reconstructed 5 or 10 years ago when the boundary wall to the King’s School garden had to be rebuilt following collapse."
THE 18th CENTURY BISHOP’S PALACE AT GLOUCESTER

It could be that the summer-house and the bishop’s palace are connected in the following way. Perhaps at the time of the palace’s demolition in 1860 the sculpture in the tympanum of the ground-floor pediment of Benson’s frontispiece was inserted into the summer-house’s pediment. This is merely conjecture, but a comparison of the tympana reveals a shared florid Rococo quality with a central escutcheon incorporating a bishop’s mitre. History has not been kind to Benson’s ungainly classical frontispiece but it has looked more favourably on his decision to commission William Price’s splendid painted glass.
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Notes


2. According to David Welander, The History, Art and Architecture of Gloucester Cathedral (Stroud, 1991), pp. 409–11: ‘When Benson approached Kent he wanted him first of all to carry out improvements at the bishop’s palace, and in particular to design a new portico in the Palladian style...'. This imposing entrance to the palace formed a courtyard on the south side of the house since it was from this direction, through Palace Yard (Miller’s Green), that carriages approached the house'. Welander also writes (ibid. p. 409) that there ‘are no references in the Chapter Act Books or the Treasurers’ Accounts to this work so presumably the bishop obtained the tacit and informal agreement of the dean and prebendaries and met the total cost of the work himself’. According to T.H. Cocke, ‘Bishop Benson and his Restoration of Gloucester Cathedral, 1735–52’, British Archaeol. Association Conference Trans. 9 (1985), pp. 130–2: ‘Kent carried out other work in the Cathedral for Benson, as well as making alterations for him in the Bishop’s Palace’. Cocke also notes that plans and elevations of the old palace are illustrated in W.H. St.J.Hope, ‘Notes on the Benedictine Abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester’, Archael. Jnl. 54 (1897), plate opposite p. 110 and writes: ‘The contributions of Benson and Kent appear to have been a palladian frontispiece to the hall and internal alterations in the principal apartments’. There is no written evidence of Kent doing any other work for Benson aside from the cathedral’s Gothic choir screen of 1741.

3. Sir Howard Colvin has suggested that the 18th-century façade is stylistically neither Baroque nor Palladian (correspondence 2 Aug. 1998). However it might be seen as a hybrid incorporating in an unscholarly manner aspects of the Baroque and Palladianism.


5. According to Verey, Gloucestershire, vol. ii, p. 223: ‘a quantity of c16–18 heraldic glass was put back in the Dec-style windows of the house’ (i.e. the new palace built by Christian in 1861). The Gloucester
Journal for 8 Feb. 1862 reported that the 'whole of these old buildings were levelled to the ground, except some portion of the great hall, known as the Abbot's Hall... the carvings of the old palace will be used where most suitable, the old painted medallions of the old windows will be cleaned and reused in the new windows, and all the old linen-fold panelling and other work of any interest will be incorporated in the new building'. An inspection of the Victorian palace (i.e. the King's School) in 1998 could not locate anything pre-Victorian save for the painted glass and part of a buttress (?) medieval in the cellar.

6. Alan Brooks, an authority on stained glass, believes (correspondence 9 Sept. 1998) that it is 'very probable that this heraldic glass is by William Price—it seems close to other work of his I have seen'. Others have advised that the stylistic influence for Price's work at Gloucester appears to be Bohemian.

7. W.S. Lewis (ed.), Selected Letters of Horace Walpole (New Haven and London, 1973), p. 51. Walpole wrote of Price in his Anecdotes of Painting (4th edn., London, 1796, pp. 28–9): 'Windows at Queen's, New-college and Maudlin by William Price, the son, now living, whose colours are fine, whose drawing good, and whose taste in ornaments and mosaic is far superior to any of his predecessors, is equal to the antique, to the good Italian masters, and only surpassed by his own singular modesty'. In a note Walpole added: 'It may be not unwelcome to the curious reader to see some anecdotes of the revival of the taste for painted glass in England. Price, as I have said, was the only painter in that style for many years in England'. The only clue we have of the subject matter of Price's chapel window is from Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers (London, 1904), p. 159, which includes among Price's commissions 'Gloucester, the Bishop's Palace: A window, the “Resurrection”'.


9. They include Italian and French publications and John Vardy, Some Designs of Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. Wm. Kent (1744). The latter appears to be the most relevant to Benson's alterations as it includes a plate (no. 49) of Kent's 1741 Gothic choir screen dedicated to Benson with his armorial shield. Several of the publications are signed in ink, presumably in Benson's hand: 'M. Benson'.

10. Cocke, 'Bishop Benson and Gloucester Cathedral', pp. 130–2. 'Bear-leading' is a form of chaperoning.

11. Information from John Harris.


13. Ibid.


15. Church of England Record Centre, South Bermondsey, London: Ecclesiastical Commissioners' file no. 10279. Six years earlier John Clarke in The Architectural History of Gloucester (Gloucester, 1850), p. 85, had described the bishop's palace as having been 'much altered in appearance by frequent white-washings, and the erection of a screen or front of the Roman Doric order, but its general plan does not seem to have been much disturbed. The gables, in most places, retain their original form, and on the north side, their barge boards, decorated with tracery and foliage, have been left'.


17. GloS. Chron. 16 June 1860.


24. Ibid. p. 1079.


27. GloC. Jnl. 23 June 1860.


30. Correspondence (26 Jan. 1996) from the chapter steward incorporating the views of the cathedral librarian and architect. There are black and white prints of the summer-house taken by Robert Patterson in 1954: Glos. R.O., D 3867/IV/40-4 T.C-AM.B.


34. Ibid. (c. 1828).

35. Plan of Gloucester, surveyed by O.S. Dept. for the Gloucester board of health, 1851; photocopy in Glos. R.O., PC 1086/1.

36. Correspondence (29 April 1996).

37. T.D. Fosbrooke, *An Original History of the City of Gloucester* (1819), p. 137, in which it is described as a handsome marble monument on the north side of the great west door.

38. *V.C.H. Glos.* 4, p. 249 and n.: the Tolsey was demolished in the mid 1890s.


41. Correspondence (26 Jan. 1996) from the chapter steward incorporating the views of the cathedral librarian and architect. The structure measures 8 ft 1 in in depth, 13 ft 5 in in height, and 9 ft 2 in in width. The columns are 7 ft 4 in in height.
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