THE METHODS OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH, BEING THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AT THE SHREWSBURY MEETING.

By Sir HENRY H. HOWORTH, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., M.P., F.R.S., F.S.A.*

I should forfeit your good opinion of me if I did not confess to feeling embarrassed by the position in which, by your favour, I find myself. The honour and distinction of filling a chair which has been occupied by so many better men than myself is qualified with every doubt and difficulty. When I look round this room I see before me not only those gifted with greater knowledge than I possess, but who have had greater opportunities, and have not had the work which they love, continually interfered with by manifold cares and duties. You will accept this as my apology for the disintegrated and elementary remarks which I shall impose upon you.

In selecting a subject on which to address you, I have felt it would not be profitable or interesting to merely index the progress of archæology during the last twelve months, nor to condense the county history of Shropshire into a necessarily dry and compressed guide to local antiquities which you must know better than I can know. I have thought it more profitable to devote a little time to considering some of the methods of archæological research, as they have been enlarged and developed in late years, and to condensing some of the more general conclusions that have been reached, and more especially to illustrate them from my own desultory studies.

The Archæological Institute has always been a most catholic mother. In her ample lap she has welcomed every kind of fruit which the cornucopiæ of research has poured out to illustrate the drama of human life. Her aim and object has been, as far as possible, to give a

* Delivered in the Guildhall, Shrewsbury, July 24th, 1894.

picture of the sometimes gay and sometimes gloomy procession which our race has formed as it has tramped along the avenues of time, from the land of mist and cloud to the land of darkness. Every fact, however recorded, whether preserved in words or graven in the universal language in which the ruins of art are enshrined, has been welcome. It has taught the lesson that history means something more than philosophy teaching by examples, it means painting the picture of the past and joining together the broken pieces which have escaped its heavy foot into a mosaic, in which we may see how our fathers lived, as well as what their aims and ideals were. It means teaching how far our ancestors had progressed in making life tolerable and decorating it with sunshine, as well as unriddling the meaning of the terribly tragic chapters in which we read how mighty empires, in which greatness and glory were combined and in which prosperity seemed anchored as firmly as one of the brave oaks of your own county, were levelled to the ground, their people slaughtered and destroyed, their palaces and temples reduced to dust and their fertile fields once more occupied by the pelican and the jackal. It was once the custom to despise some of these lessons. The antiquary was a connoisseur, whose studies were dominated by taste, and not by knowledge. To admire, to study, and to review the masterpieces of Greek art; to do the same with the masterpieces of the Italian Renaissance—these were his aims, Phidias and Michael Angelo his ideals.

It was only when the tide was flowing highest that it was deemed profitable to study it. Hence why the collections and the museums gathered in former centuries are so wanting in historic value. They represent the phases of taste as applied to the arts of other days, and the various measures and standards which the change of taste has created—sometimes inspired by nature alone and sometimes by nature bewigged and powdered. We have advanced from this position. We have learnt that the ebb as well as the flow of the tide is of supreme interest to us. Hence, while we admire and rejoice in some masterpiece like the Hermes of Praxiteles, we are constrained to devote a corresponding study to the rude

bas-reliefs from the temples of Copan and the ruder and more homely products of the old stone men.

We can scarcely realize that hardly a generation has gone by when, at the British Museum, it was the fashion to admit only classical antiquities as worthy of collection, and that the priceless treasures dug up by Faussett and Rolfe were treated as rubbish, unworthy of a place in that sanctuary of the arts, and had to seek a home in a provincial museum. Fifty years ago a man who had devoted his time, his purse, and his knowledge to creating a worthy department of British antiquities, would not have been rewarded with the Order of the Bath, but would have been treated by the students of so-called high art as a barbarian and a philistine, fit only to consort with people like you and me. We have changed all this, but its mischievous results still remain. If we go to the British Museum we shall find the noblest collection of Greek art in the world. Taken altogether, it is quite unapproachable, thanks to the labours, the zeal, and the taste of many good men, and notably of the late and the present curators of that department. But when we turn to Rome—Rome, the mother of modern Europe—Rome, the Britain of old days, the great type of practical good sense in government; the Rome whose roads and bridges, whose colonies and towns, whose laws and municipal institutions were only rivalled by our own, and which ruled the world for a thousand years and more—where are we to look for an adequate picture of the life her citizens led, of the vast colonial dependencies she controlled? We have a few busts and inscriptions. We have a fair collection of so-called Romano-Greek sculpture, and a certain number of domestic utensils and other objects mixed up with and undiscriminated from the remains of Greece. We also have a room devoted to the antiquities of Roman Britain, and then we find the mistress of many legions and the mother of us all treated everywhere as a sort of Cinderella to her more favoured sister Greece, a mere outhouse and barn attached to a Greek palace. Our contention is that there ought to be in our great museum, if not a special department of Roman antiquities, at least special rooms devoted to them worthy of the fame of Rome and of its importance in

human history.[1] For many of us who love art, but also love history, it is quite as important to know what were the surroundings of Tiberius and of Marcus Aurelius, as of Pericles and Alexander the Great. We must also remember that certain forms of art, such as portrait sculpture, silversmiths' work, glass, carvings in coloured marbles and rare stones; &c., reached a higher general level in Roman than in Greek times. The prosaic Romans, like the Dutch, were great patrons of portraiture and of the arts of life. What is true of the neglect of the earlier Rome is much more true of Byzantine Rome, the Rome of the Mosque of St. Sophia, the Rome which inspired St. Mark's at Venice, and the glorious buildings at Ravenna and Spoletro, which shook hands with the East, and by this means wedded fresh ideas to those which were becoming stagnant. Because Gibbon entitled his work the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, we have acquired an entirely mistaken perspective in regard to the part played by Byzantium in the history of art. Byzantium lived, thrived, and flourished for a thousand years after the Goths had taken Rome. Nor are the code of Justinian, the histories of Procopius and Constantine, and the magnificent buildings dating from this time and scattered all over the Ægean, signals of decay and decrepitude, but the reverse; and yet, where are we to look for an adequate collection of objects to illustrate Byzantine art, its rich barbaric sarcophagi, its enamels, silver plate, etc.?

My object in naming these things is to point a moral. I am afraid the old Adam, if he be not still among us, has left his shadow behind, and there remains much for this great and powerful society to urge and to press. Archæology is the study of history by its monuments, and not a branch of æsthetics. Let us by all means guard our taste and accumulate the highest and the best, but let us also be eclectic and catholic, and realize that the highest and the best of all phases of art are of supreme value; and, further, that what we mean by history is not only the

[1] Since this was written a small and instructive collection of Gallo-Roman bronzes has been put together in a special case, and it is to be hoped that before long each Roman province may have a special corner to itself emphasizing the fact that Rome meant a great deal more than Italy.

history of kings and armies, of great nobles and great philosophers, and of the arts they patronized, but also that of the crowd by whose continuous labour the world has been, and continues to be, subdued, and whose homely and prosaic surroundings have a dramatic interest of their own. If this be one great lesson which the wider horizon of modern archæological study has taught us, another and an equally important one is that of the continuity of art. What Herbert Spencer and Darwin have pressed upon the students of natural history, we antiquaries learnt long before in regard to art, namely, that there are no jerks and jumps in its history, but a continuous flow, and not only a continuous flow, but something more. It was formerly the notion that when art took an apparently new departure and became rejuvenated after a long period of stagnation, it was a spontaneous movement from within. We now know that in almost every case this rejuvenescence was due to contact with some new ideas which came in from the outside. A new graft into the old tree was the real source of the better fruit.

Let me take some examples. When the Mongols, who were then masters of China, conquered Persia, they imported great numbers of Persian workmen, and the result was a complete change in the decoration of Chinese porcelain, bronzes, &c. I believe the knowledge of making blue and white china then first penetrated to the far East, for I know no specimen of it dating from before the time of the Ming dynasty. The subsequent domination of the Chinese in Persia similarly affected the decoration and the shapes of Persian objects. This was again repeated when in the days of Shah Abbas English and Dutch merchants flooded Persia, Southern India, and Egypt with Chinese porcelain. The vases made by the Moors at Majorca and Valencia and perhaps also in Sicily were probably the immediate daughters of the art fabrics of Egypt, and were certainly the mothers of the Italian majolica. The blaze of flowers and ribbons which suddenly broke out this year in the hats and bonnets of English women, without any apparent motive, can be traced to the influence of a famous city on the banks of the Seine, where an explanation of the change is forthcoming. The Japanese are said to have lost their eye for colour and form, because their old art has changed recently

for the worse. They have been, in fact, inoculated with European taste, as they have been flooded with European products. The story is apparently universal. We see the river come out of its mountain fountain and flow down blue and sparkling. Presently we find the colour of its water change to milky white, and realize an explanatton when we trace the new colour to some affluent watering another soil which has come and joined its waters; and sometimes, as in the case of the Rhone after it enters the Lake of Geneva, the milky and the blue streams flow side by side, as the new bonnets and hats of every fantastic shape and colour are mingled with older and more chaste designs on older and more sensible people. The great lesson of all is continuity.

Again, to take another illustration from natural history, a lesson of these later times in archæology has been that of "survival." We find all kinds of archaic survivals—in our speech, in our fairy stories, in our clothes—everywhere in fact, Crystallized boulders of older strata of human life, which have been preserved accidentally in another matrix, and to those who are willing to read their lesson, reflecting unmistakable features of another time. When we see the Italian peasant going on pilgrimages to different altars of Our Lady to be cured of different human ills, are we not reminded of the similar practices in an age when Venus and her shrines were scattered over the same country, and each shrine had its own Venus, just as each altar has its own "Lady" endowed with different healing powers? How curious it is to go to a *kermiss* in some old Dutch town, such as Middleburgh, or Delft, and to see the women with their curiously-shaped lace caps, and to be told that it is still quite possible to distinguish the Roman Catholic families from the Protestant ones, the distinction in the caps having arisen in the fiercer days of the sixteenth century. We may there examine the bags full of curiously-shaped and coloured cakes sold in the booths, and see the roundabouts and rude swing-boats loaded with perfectly sane people, many of them sixty or seventy years old; and then turn to Teniers' great pictures at Amsterdam, and see precisely the same cakes and the same roundabouts figured there! Are not the wooden houses coloured with

red ochre which dot the Christiania fiord the very same that were introduced by the Dutch there in the grand old days of the Norwegian herring-fishing in the seventeenth century? Are not the bull-fights in Spain direct survivals of the exhibitions in the circus, no doubt introduced everywhere by the Romans, Spain having preserved its Roman colour more than any other European community, just as Spain was the most essentially Roman of all the colonies?

Have we not our own fossil customs everywhere? The aldermen and common councillors of London when decked in their state robes might be living in Plantagenet times, and the beef-eaters in the time of Henry VIII. The two ridiculous buttons at the back of our coats, and the bands which barristers wear, are useless relics of once useful garments, the one dating from the time when there was a necessity for buttoning back the flaps of the long coats when George II was king, and the other remains of the long collars of King James the First's time. Are not our judges' wigs directly traceable to the baldness of Louis XIV? These useless things, like the many useless and monstrous and offensive adjectives used by cabmen, and sometimes by schoolboys, are mere survivals of things once useful. The games played by school children in the gutter preserve the ritual of primæval worship and the social customs of primæval times. Hence, as I have always urged, it becomes important and interesting not only to trace the origin of things, but also their final departure. Our dictionary-makers are most diligent hunters of the first usage of words. Would it not be wise if they were also to record the last use of the obsolete words, the dying flicker of a living light? The very fact we are referring to has sometimes perverted archæological reasoning. Because the Shetland islanders still use stone lamps and cups, it does not follow, as some have urged, that a Stone Age in Britain is entirely a mistake. It only means, of course, that in remote corners the very old art has lived on, just as in the names of the old mountains and rivers the language of the earliest inhabitants has frequently been preserved. These touches of poetry in our very prosaic lives are as much relics of an old historical horizon as the fossils which have been found by German geologists in the

far-travelled limestone boulders which strew their country, and which belong to an age not directly represented in the solid strata of the district. The lessons we are discussing are notably prominent in the more recent works on philology, in which loan words and terms foreign to the language have been carefully sifted out, and we have thus been enabled to find not only the origin of many arts and customs, but the stage and culture at which different originally connected races had arrived at the time when they separated. This we can do by comparing their common names for homely or other objects. The same with folk-lore, and the same with the rituals of different religions, all of them being among the most conservative of institutions. This multiplication of avenues by which to approach the thoughts and works of the old men has, no doubt, made our inquiry more complicated and difficult; but it has at the same time made the materials almost inexhaustible, and the possibility of solving problems once deemed insoluble much more hopeful.

Let us now turn to some of the concrete results which our more powerful analysis has enabled us to compass. In the first place, we have learnt that it is a mistake to confuse art with race. We cannot change our race—that is indelibly stamped upon us by Nature; but art—art of every kind—including language, is not an inheritance from Nature, but is as much acquired as our hats and coats. We learn all our arts. Hence we must be perpetually on our guard against the fallacy that because art has taken a new departure, therefore we are in the presence of a new race.

Archæology is a science which can only be profitably studied on inductive methods. Of this a very notable proof is the discussion on the origin of man, a subject upon which there was much speculation twenty-five years ago. It has not the same living interest for us now. The fact is we realize that materials are wanting at present to enable us to carry the study very far in this direction, and the newly-fledged hopes of a quarter of a century ago have not fructified. The origin of the human race, so far as archæological research goes, is absolutely beyond our ken, and those who are determined

to reach some result in that direction must go to the geologist for their facts and for their arguments. The moral from the archæological vista is this: we can take up the various specialized and elaborated civilisations which men have produced, and trace them up to simpler and less specialized forms. We can separate the tangle created by their mutual influence upon each other, and trace the enormous changes due to the gradual introduction of new ideas and new processes, of new weapons and new tools. We can trace the complicated pedigree until we reach an age when all men used very similar tools, and had very similar arts. The cramping influence of having to use the same often stubborn materials, compelled a monotony of form and of ornament which is in itself bewildering. Eventually we reach a stage where it is most difficult to discriminate among races or their characteristics by their art alone.

For example, the polished stone axes left by the Caribs, those found in some parts of Europe, and those found in some parts of Eastern Asia, are almost indistinguishable. Yet how widely separated these races are in every respect! We may thus be only too easily deceived in supposing that we are getting nearer to the solution of the problem of the origin of man when our goal is the inevitable one, that with his rude tools primitive man in many latitudes was constrained to surround himself with very similar surroundings. A corrective to this is speedily reached when we turn to other fields of research, such as language, mythology, and physical constitution. We can trace back the languages of Egypt, of Babylonia, of India, and China, for a long distance beyond the occurrence of regular annals in those countries—back, in fact, to the Stone Age in each, and similarly with the mythology, and the result is that, instead of apparently reaching a common origin and common elements in them, the gap between them seems to get wider as we go further back, until we have to confess that if there was a common fountain to the various streams, it must have been at a period so remote that we have no materials at present by which to trace them to it. The men who wrote the *Book of the Dead*, those who wrote the *Epic of Sargon the First*, those who wrote the *Vedas*,

and those who wrote the Chinese classics, if they were descended, as we believe, from common parents must have been isolated from each other for a long period in order to become so differentiated at such an early date. These are only mere samples.

If we range further afield we shall find the same lesson meeting us everywhere. It is said that among the Indians of North and South America there are ninety languages spoken which are unintelligible to each other. The same problem meets us in the Caucasus, in Siberia, in Indo-China, and elsewhere. The existence of these languages is a perpetual warning to us to be careful of dogmatizing. How can we explain them except by postulating a long period, during which they have been gradually diverging from each other? We cannot measure this period by any scale or measure. When we compare Icelandic with Norwegian, and remember how long ago it is that Iceland was colonized—when we again compare the Mongol language, still spoken by the Buriats in Mongolia, with the language of the letters of the Mongol khans written to the French kings in the thirteenth century, we shall have a measure of the slowness with which these changes sometimes accrue. If it has taken sixteen centuries to convert Latin into the various Romance languages, how long has it taken for the diversion of the various Aryan forms of speech from one original language, and how much longer to converge the Aryan, Semitic and other families of language upon a common mother? The very question is full of romantic difficulty, assuredly we are a long way from any satisfactory answer to it. The evidence of language and of mythology is supplemented and confirmed by that of the physical features of our race—features which seem to be so conservative and so difficult to alter. If we examine the very earliest human pictures which have been preserved in the tombs of Egypt, we shall find representatives of the various races which then bordered the valley of the Nile, and we shall find that in features and in physique they are undistinguishable from the tribes still occupying the same districts. The Negro, the Nubian, the Coptic fellaheen, the Semitic inhabitants of Palestine and Arabia, are there pictured as we know them now.

The earliest monuments of Babylonia similarly discriminate the various types of men in Mesopotamia. It is so, also, with the early monuments of China, of India, of Mexico, and Peru, and of the borders of the Mediterranean, and this evidence of the monuments is supported by the shapes and contours of the skulls which have been found in the earliest graves, and which show not merely sporadic variation, but variation affecting great classes. All this assuredly requires us to postulate a long period during which fresh changes were incubating and were being carried forward. We have no means of knowing how long this was. We can only very naturally conclude that since so little change has taken place during the last 4,000 years in the languages, the customs and physical features of so many different races, we must go back a long way if we are to explain the differences as they exist.

We have no chronology of any kind for these misty regions. Dates entirely fail us. In Egypt and in Babylonia anything like positive chronological data fails about 2,500 B.C., while, as you know, the Bible dates are, before a certain period, not only based upon those of Babylonia, but they have been preserved in an entirely different shape in the Masoretic, the Samaritan, and the Septuagint versions, and there is no means of rectifying them. All we can say is that the Masoretic numbers, upon which Archbishop Ussher's chronology was based, and which was the basis of the calculation in the margins of our Bibles, are the least trustworthy of all, and can be shown to have been sophisticated and altered.

If I may be pardoned for referring to a work of my own in this behalf, namely, that which I have entitled "The Mammoth and the Flood," I claim to have shown that all the evidence we possess—geological, palæontological, and archæological—converges with singular force upon one conclusion, namely, that at the verge of human history there was a great and wide-spread catastrophe, which overwhelmed a large part of the temperate regions of the earth and which caused great destruction of men and animals. This wide-spread catastrophe has left its mark upon the traditions of many and widely-scattered peoples. It possibly accounts for the isolation of many races in our

own day, notably in districts without great natural frontiers, which isolation is due in all probability to the destruction of intervening links between the various human colonies which survived. It is a remarkable proof of this catastrophe that whereas man is the most elastic of creatures in his capacity for facing and overcoming difficulties, there is, nevertheless, an absolute gap in his history in large areas in Europe unbridged by any remains or by any evidence. How are we to explain this? Once man has occupied the ground he is not likely to abandon it entirely and suddenly. Wherever we find one set of men driving out and superseding another, we have evidence of gradual change (of overlapping). In the hill forts of Dorset we have Roman remains mixed with those of the Britons. In the Kentish cemeteries we have Roman remains mixed with Saxon. In the case before us, however, it is not only human art which shows a gap, but a whole fauna suddenly changes.

As my old friend, Professor Boyd Dawkins, and others have shown, not a single mammoth or a rhinoceros has ever occurred with the remains of a domesticated animal. Not a scrap of pottery nor a polished implement has occurred with the earlier men. Since there are no traces of a transition, it is clear one set of men and animals did not absorb the other. To myself this sudden hiatus and gap means the occurrence of some sudden and wide-spread catastrophe which desolated a wide area, and destroyed its living creatures in greater numbers, and the re-colonization of the wasted district by a migration from elsewhere. To this great catastrophe the traditions of mankind go back, as do the geological references we can collect. It forms the great divide in early human history.

We must not, however, be misled. Some wild writers have argued as if human beings were quite different in kind before and after the divide. I see no evidence whatever of this. The human skulls found with the remains of extinct animals by Lund in the caverns of Brazil have all the characters of Indian skulls, while those found with the extinct animals in Europe have the characters of European skulls, thus showing that at this period the native races of America and of Europe

had already been differentiated, and it is extremely probable that the so-called palæolithic, or, as I prefer to call them, the antediluvian, men of Europe did not belong to one race, but to several. Those who find certain resemblances to simian skulls in those of antediluvial man overlook the power of drawing shown in the etchings of animals on pieces of bone found in the French caves, which is quite unmatched in after times until we reach a much later period, while the harpoons, the needles, etc., are most skilfully fashioned. Whether the simian origin of man be a fact or not, it is clear we have no evidence in archæology as yet to bridge the gap. If we want a key to the whole position we must turn our backs upon civilized man and explore the fertile fields of ethnography and the multiform types which we find among savage and semi-savage races. Many of these have survived from the time before the great catastrophe which did not in fact affect the tropics. In these latitudes we can find abundant material to study; showing how man with very rude tools has fashioned for himself at least tolerable surroundings. These various tribes of savages are generally ignored when we study history and archæology. No greater mistake could be made. Assuredly they present us with survivals on a great scale by which we can measure and test the phases of human progress in its earlier stages, and some time, perhaps, we may be able to get them all into one pedigree, and to show how a real continuity combines them all. Two lessons of great moment we may learn from them. One is that all these varieties of language, of ornament, of dress, must have taken a very long time to develop; and, secondly, when we come into actual contact with them we are struck by the further fact that they are desperately conservative. The so-called ring money which marks one of the very early chapters of our archæological history still survives in North Eastern Africa. The ornaments and the customs of ancient Egypt may be still found living in the Western Soudan and among the tribes of Ashanti, while, if we turn to Australia and Tasmania, we shall find human arts still in their very infancy, and so far as we know and can judge, the arts of these races have remained unchanged and unaltered since those primitive times, when the

Australians first introduced the dog into Australia, which means, when the extinct Australian animals were still living, while we shall find among the very backward Bushmen and Esquimaux a power of drawing animals, etc., comparable with that of the cave men, and languages remarkable for their structure and capacity.

A third lesson which we learn is that it is quite possible, and in fact an every-day occurrence, for two civilizations which have reached very different stages to co-exist alongside of each other contemporaneously in the same area. The Australian and the Englishman live alongside of each other, as the Lapp and the Norwegian, nay, to come nearer home, as the vagabond gypsy and the sedentary Oxford Professor, and we are led from this fact to the induction which has been too often forgotten or overlooked, that the same thing must always have been. We talk of a Stone Age, of a Bronze Age and of an Iron Age, and these are excellent terms when we apply them to some particular area like Scandinavia, to which they were first applied; but they are misleading when universally used. Many savages are still living, or were quite recently, in the Stone Age, the Shell Age, or the Wooden Age, like the Australians, the Marquesan Islanders, and the Indians of the Amazons, while alongside of them were living the emigrants from Europe, who were not only living in the Iron Age, but had learnt to harness steam to iron, and to multiply human labour tenfold. Not only so, but it is obvious that in such cases there may be a great jump in civilization from a very low to a very high step on the ladder without the necessity or the possibility even of intermediate steps. A Bronze Age or a Copper Age is not at all likely to intervene between the hewers of rude stones or of polished stones in the Pacific and many parts of America and their adoption of iron; and in fact, it may be said that the stage we sometimes associate with palæolithic man (very wrongly, as I think), namely, that in which the Tasmanians and Australians lately lived, may be immediately followed by an Iron Age. I say wrongly, because we cannot argue that the men who lived in our prehistoric caves and were contemporaries of the mammoth, whose portrait they scratched on ivory, were at the same stage of culture as the low type of men discovered in

Tasmania. Diogenes was a philosopher, and not a dog, as he called himself, although he lived in something very like a kennel, and the men who invented and elaborated the Vedanta philosophy, although living with the simplest surroundings, are not to be measured with the untutored and unreclaimed wild hunters of the Kurdish Mountains, among whom the arts of life are at least as much advanced.

Let us now apply this lesson a little more concretely to the complicated story of human progress. If we take our archæological telescope and look back through the avenues of time, we shall reach a period when the great civilizations of the world were still incubating, and when in Europe, in North Africa, and in Asia the many and scattered tribes were living very much as we can see tribes now living in savage countries, some by hunting, some by fishing, and some, no doubt, leading a pastoral life. This stage in Europe and its borders is marked archæologically by what we call palæolithic or antediluvian man. Some have compared him with the Esquimaux, because the Esquimaux, like him, have artistic instincts and can draw well, and because their surroundings are supposed to have been of an Arctic character.

All this is very doubtful, and, in fact, misleading. So far as we know, the cave man of Europe was completely exterminated, as his companions the mammoth and the hairy rhinoceros were, and has left no descendants. His remains are found in the caves, and are cased with stalagmite which effectually separates them from their successors. The immigrants who succeeded them are recognised by their long, narrow skulls, by their employing domesticated animals and cultivated plants, and by their burying their dead in long barrows. Whence they came we cannot positively say, but we may reasonably conjecture it was from some country where the animals and plants just named were indigenous in the wild state. In their graves in Britain no metal objects have been found, no tanged or barbed arrow-heads, while the pottery is of the rudest character, marked by cylindrical shapes.

In one respect these long mounds present us with a puzzle. We can hardly doubt that among barbarous races few things are more likely to have been closely studied and more important than the ritual of burial,

and yet we find the practices of burial and of cremation both in vogue. It has been thought that the two practices were, in fact, contemporary from the commencement. In this I cannot agree. In the South of England burial was almost universal among the long barrow men, In Scotland, on the contrary, cremation; but Mr. Anderson has shown that even there burial seems to have preceded burning, and it seems to me that burning the dead body was distinctly an innovation introduced by the men who succeeded those with the long heads, and that originally it was unknown among those men. I think my distinguished friend, Canon Greenwell, our first authority on such a question, would agree in this conclusion. Again, there is another curious distinction, which is apparently a superficial one. When stone was not to be had the bodies were laid in the ground in a more or less crouching attitude and covered in with earth. Otherwise, chambers were built up of boulders or other rough stones, which were approached by long galleries open to the outside, apparently simulating underground dwellings, in which whole families or clans were buried. These, again, were supplanted when the new men with round heads came in by stone boxes or cists closed all round, the introduction of which was, in general, coincident with that of burning, although there was undoubtedly some overlapping. Who, then, were these long-headed men? The early long-headed race of Britain has, according to fair evidence, left its trace in Europe in the long-headed, dark-skinned, black-haired Basques, and in Britain itself they seem to have survived in the Silurians of Glamorganshire (described by the Roman writers) and in the small black-haired people of South Wales and of parts of Ireland. Traces of the Basque language have been said to be found in the Celtic languages, but this particular branch of the field has been hitherto very little explored, nor have the local place-names in those districts where the race may be supposed to have survived. Here, then, we seem to have a clue which points to the men with the long heads having come from the south-west. The Basques have their nearest relations in North Africa, where a race which buried, and did not burn its dead once occupied the country, whose remains are still to be found among

the Berbers and Kabyles of the Atlas range and among the Guanches of the Canary Islands. And these races of the Atlas take us on again to the valley of the Nile, where the early Egyptians are now recognised to have had close relations of blood, etc., with the Libyans and other North African tribes. They were, as you know, almost fanatically devoted to the practice of burial, as contrasted with burning, in disposing of their dead. In this behalf it is curious to remember the distribution of the so-called cromlechs, which are merely chambered tombs of another form. They are found in Syria all round the northern part of Africa, in Spain, in the maritime parts of Gaul, all over Britain, where they have not been displaced by the plough and harrow. They abound in Holland and occur again in Scandinavia, and seem to point to this primitive stock having migrated from west to east in Western Europe along the sea-board. This line of migration leads us eventually to the Nile Valley as a goal, and it seems to some of us that the earliest inhabitants of that valley were first cousins of our long barrow men. There, under favourable conditions of a pure climate and access to the necessary tools and weapons of culture, and perhaps also under the stimulating influence of a mixture of blood which is so often a rejuvenator of ideas, there developed a race which, although unacquainted with metal, produced a wonderful culture—that of the Egyptians of the old Empire.

We have as yet found no traces of a beginning of this culture on the spot, and until quite recently, when Professor Petrie has made some remarkable discoveries at Coptos, which may throw some light on this issue, we seem to have in the monuments of the fourth and fifth dynasty every kind of excellence we associate with Egyptian art fully developed, including its hieroglyphical writing, its strange mythology, etc., and all the while Egypt was still in what the Scandinavian antiquaries describe as the Stone Age. Whether this art was imported with the race which developed it in the Nile valley, or was entirely indigenous, we do not know. It may be that it was the discovery of the ancestors of the tribes who are now represented by the Bishirins, Hadandowahs, and other wild tribes of the eastern Soudan, or by

the Berbers of the Atlas range, who border the Nile valley on either hand, and must have done so for a very long period. One thing seems clear, that for a very considerable period the higher art of the Nile Valley was isolated, and does not seem to have affected that of its neighbours. To us this art is supremely interesting, because we can trace its progress step by step through manifold vicissitudes for 4,000 years. Let me, however, point out that this applies to the higher arts only. I am not aware that it has been sufficiently noticed that when we examine the later stone remains of Sweden and Denmark, in which the forms seem sometimes imitated from metal ones, we cannot possibly doubt that the so-called ripple marking of the delicately-fashioned daggers, the finely serrated edges of the same weapons, and the hatchet-shaped arrowheads found there prove some contact direct or indirect with the men who fashioned flint objects in Egypt precisely in the same way.

I ought not to overlook mentioning here the vast improvement which has taken place in recent years in the arrangement of the British Museum collection of Egyptian antiquities under the vigorous management of Dr. Budge, but much remains to be done. It seems a pity to confuse the ingenuous student by exhibiting Greek and Roman objects from Alexandria in connection with the arts of the old Egyptians, and it would be well also if scientific archæology, as tested and worked out in the admirable diggings of Mr. Petrie, were more closely followed. It is now quite possible to separate objects according to certain great lines of progress in the arts, the key being the only one available, namely, the different stages at which objects occur in the ground. The lesson is particularly interesting and valuable, and it ought to be taught in the Mother of Museums. If the capital and most instructive arrangement which Dr. Budge has applied to the mummies and funereal remains and to the scarabs were applied also to the objects from private life, to the statuettes, &c., it would be a great gain to us all.

Let us now return again to our own country, The long-headed people here were displaced very largely by a race with round heads, who burnt their dead and put their ashes in beautifully constructed urns, and then deposited

them in stone cists or boxes in round or saucer-shaped mounds, and not in long barrows. As we have said, there was considerable overlapping between them and their predecessors, who adopted in some cases their customs, including that of burying in round mounds or barrows. The shape of the skulls of these new men shows us what a profound racial difference there must have been between them and their predecessors. They apparently came from another direction, and with different surroundings.[1] So far as we know, they were the first wave of that migration of tribes from the east which have successively followed each other in Europe, and are represented by the earlier Celts in Central and Southern France and large parts of Spain, and among the Irish or Scottish Gael. Just as their art remains prove the round-headed folk to have mingled with their predecessors, so do we find among these earlier Celts evidences of mixing with their predecessors, the Basques. If we follow our maps eastward, and track the steps of those races who burnt their dead, we shall find them linked step by step, if not by race by a certain relationship in their arts, to the early dwellers in Mesopotamia. In Mesopotamia itself there was a similar development to that we all know so well in the Nile valley. There also we can mount up to a Stone Age of culture. There, however, we seem to have evidence that the culture was not home-grown, but there are reasons for believing that the men who founded the earliest known communities in Chaldea brought with them the arts by which we know them, from the Elamitish mountains to the east, whence they seem to have sent colonies westward into Mesopotamia and eastward into China. This last curious and most interesting induction is one of the most important discoveries of recent years. We owe it largely to the labours of the late M. Terrien de la Couperie, and to those of the Rev. C. J. Ball, who ought to write a monograph on the subject. It enables us to link the culture of the furthest east to that of the west, and it also enables us

[1] If it were possible it would be a gain to separate the art remains of the long-headed and round-headed men which are shown heterogeneously in the Prehistoric room in the British Museum, and to have a special guide book to this most instructive and excellent collection.

to conclude that the arts are not the peculiar heritage of any one race, for here we seem to be compelled to admit that the foundation of the culture which we call Aryan or Indo-European is really to be traced to the now despised Turkish and Finnish races. It was a race very nearly akin to Turks and Finns which certainly invented the cuneiform writing, and apparently developed the earliest religious system in Chaldea. From this race it was directly learnt by the Semitic races, whose original home was Arabia, and whose enterprise and vigour distributed it far and wide. One thing we must remember, that so far as our present evidence goes the arts of Babylonia were as different from those of the Nile valley as were the language, the mythology, and the appearance of the people.

These Semitic peoples founded the successive kingdoms of Babylonia and Assyria, but it was the Phœnicians who were chiefly instrumental in multiplying and distributing the wares which the older men of Mesopotamia had made. They were to be found trading and trafficking everywhere from far off Britain to far off Thule, and still further to that land of mist and snow where the Griffons were supposed to guard the gold deposits of Siberia. Their settlements and trading posts were to be found all over the Mediterranean. These same Phœnicians were also great metallurgists, and if not the discoverers of bronze, which added so much to the resources of the early craftsmen, they were, so far as we know, the great distributors of the knowledge of making it.

Let us revert once more to northern Europe, and notably to our own country. It was during its occupation by round-headed people that the use of bronze was first introduced here. Gold was apparently their own discovery, in the stone age, but making bronze, I believe, was an imported art, and had nothing to do with the introduction of a new race. The bronze workers, as we know from the numerous hoards which have occurred and also from the numerous moulds which have been found, were travelling tinkers and metallurgists, such as the metal-workers of Finland still are, and as the mediæval goldsmiths in Scotland were. The weapons,

ornaments, and tools of the so-called bronze age are of the same type, differing in slight details only, from one end of Europe to the other, and showing that the art was spread over a wide area occupied by many races. It seems to have spread from the Mediterranean lands perhaps by the agency of those traders who took Baltic amber to Greece and Italy, and who in the first instance were probably the Phœnicians. While in the main the shapes and mode of making the bronze objects are the same, it is curious that this bronze culture should have advanced to very different stages of style and elaboration in different areas. In Spain it advanced only to a small degree, as we may learn from the explorations of my friends the Brothers Siret. In England and France considerably further. In Scandinavia and Hungary further still, and I would suggest as an explanation that the reason is that in Spain and the western countries bronze was displaced by iron at an earlier date. Thus, while in Scandinavia we have no reason to suppose that iron was used until about the Christian era, in Britain it must have been used several centuries earlier. Thus the later and more developed bronze culture of Denmark and Hungary corresponded to and was synchronous with the earlier use of iron in Britain and probably also in Gaul and Spain, and hence it represents a later and more developed art. Similarly the use of stone continued much later in Denmark, where the finest boat-shaped polished stone axes, the daggers, &c., are evidently modelled on metal originals whose scarcity led to such copies. In later times when bronze became so very common in the Baltic, we must postulate the existence of a much larger trade than is generally conceived of as possible in those days and the frequent representation of large boats in the stone carvings of this age in Scania and Denmark is noteworthy. As I have said, the introduction of bronze was the introduction of a new art and not a new race, and it is a great mistake for people to talk of the bronze folk as if they were something different to the men who used stone.

The next art revolution in these latitudes did, however, mean the importation of a new stock. This was coincident with the introduction of iron. This problem, as it

presents itself in Britain, is one of the great puzzles of early archæology, for it means a great deal more than the mere introduction of iron for cutting weapons and tools—it means the introduction of an entirely new style of ornament, a style of ornament apparently quite *sui generis*, consisting of the most graceful scrolls, known as trumpet scrolls, of endless variety and taste.

Alongside of this we have the most wonderful skill in metallurgy. Nothing can exceed the delicate manipulation with which the old artificers fashioned the objects of manifold shape, and of entirely new designs—horse trappings, shields, helmets, sword and dagger sheaths, spoons, mirrors, etc., and the dexterous way in which they ornamented them with enamel, which they were, apparently, the first to discover and to apply. These objects have occurred in the greatest numbers in Great Britain, and in Ireland; but they have also been found in Belgium, in Eastern France, and in certain parts of Switzerland, such as at La Tène, etc., and it would seem, therefore, that they reached us by some migration down the Rhine. One important fact about this art is, that we know its relative date. We know that it was living when the Romans conquered Britain. The remains of the early Roman conquerors are found mixed with objects of this date in the hill forts of Dorsetshire, *e.g.*, Hod Hill, etc., and the descriptions of the Britons by Cæsar apply to this charioteering people. Not only so, but it survived the Roman Conquest in that part of these islands untouched by the Romans—namely, in Ireland. The art of Ireland, until it was displaced and sophisticated by the Norsemen, was a mere development and growth of this art, and it is found abundantly displayed in the ornaments illustrated by Westwood in his work on Irish MSS. How long it had flourished here before the Roman Conquest, and at what date it displaced the art of the Bronze people we do not know. As I have said, this same art is found in the Rhine valley and in Switzerland; it is not found in Denmark and Germany, where the objects of the iron age have an entirely different origin and different history. Nor again, is it found in western France, nor in Spain, and the only avenue, therefore, by which it can have

reached Britain is that suggested by my very acute friend, Mr. Arthur Evans, namely, the valley of the Rhine. In his original and suggestive memoir on the subject he traces this art to Switzerland. There it seems to have incubated and developed itself in contact with the art of the Etruscans, with which at some points it has some analogy. As a whole, however, its inspiration is not Etruscan, but it goes back further to that primitive Mediterranean art which, for lack of a better name, we call Mykenean—the art of the Homeric poems. It is in the Mykenean objects that we find the same scrolls and the same dexterous manipulation of metal, and the use also of enamel. The distinction, of course, is that in Crete and the Aegean islands, where this primitive art of the Eastern Mediterranean chiefly grew, it was applied to bronze tools and weapons, and not to iron ones, On its way to Britain this art was met by the introduction of iron. We do not find the iron itself decorated with its peculiar patterns; the dagger blades, etc., were apparently plain, the only exception are the backs of the mirrors, but it continued to be applied to the sword sheaths, the shields, helmets, mirrors, etc., all of which continued to be made of bronze. The introduction of iron merely displaced the kind of metal and did not affect the art.

To revert for a sentence or two, the people who developed and used this later Celtic art also used coins. The coins have been traced partially to the early coinage of Marseilles and Carthage, and partially to the coinage of Philip of Macedon, large quantities of whose gold staters were probably taken back by the Gauls after their invasion of Greece. The gradual sophistication of these Greek models has been traced and followed out by Sir John Evans, with his unfailing ingenuity and acumen. On another side we seem to have evidence that Druidism, which differed from the old polytheistic religion of the Gauls and Germans (which was related to the religions of Rome and Greece), was imported from the far east, and having apparently reached Thrace, was carried back with them by the Gauls who invaded Greece, and who thus acquired the notions of metempsychosis, etc. I am not at all sure that the old notion of Godfrey Higgins, which has not had many adherents lately, is not true, that Druidism

was largely the outcome of the teaching of the Buddhist monks, who, as we know, penetrated into Persia and Syria, as they spread the ideas and the artistic instincts of India all over the further east from Japan to Java. But to return to Europe. The art I have been describing has been styled Neo-Celtic by Sir A. Wollaston Franks, who has done so much to illustrate it. He has made a magnificent collection of objects to illustrate it that deserve a special room to themselves, for they are possibly the most precious objects of pure archæological interest in the British museum. They deserve also to have a special memoir devoted to them by the first of English antiquaries. This art was imported by a new wave of population, to which the name Belgic has been given, and whose original home was apparently in Switzerland and South Germany. The race is now best represented by the Welsh and Bretons, but we must not forget that it also had large colonies in Ireland, where Neo-Celtic art became predominant, and where it outlived the Roman domination elsewhere. In Great Britain, as on the Continent, this art was displaced, as the art of so much of the world was, by that of the Romans—itself a daughter of Greece. In regard to Greek art I should like to iterate a conclusion which I have pressed for before, namely that as we understand it, the art of the architect, the sculptor, the vase painter, etc., it ought to be dated from the foundation of Naucratis. This was the real terminus *a quo* from which Doric architecture, itself a daughter of Egypt, started. The so-called Apollo statues, the very earliest really artistic products of the Greek sculptors, were mere copies in pose and form of the Egyptian statues of Psammetichus, and it is probable that the art decoration of metallic objects, bowls, &c., which so largely affected the potters was also largely affected by Egyptian and Phœnico-Egyptian models. It was the contact with Egypt through Crete, and with Assyria through Cyprus, which converted the so-called Mykenean or Aegean or Pelasgian art into the art we call Greek.

Secondly, while preaching the doctrine of continuity we must not forget that it was Alexander's campaigns in the east which first planted the more important arts in India. Stone architecture there was the daughter of

Bactrian. The casting of bronze figures was probably an art derived from the Greeks, while the earliest statues from Afghanistan and from the early Buddhist buildings are mere shadows of Greek work. The Buddhists took up the ideas thus planted, and spread them over Tibet, China, Japan, far and wide in the Indian Archipelago. Similarly Parthian art is only debased Seleucidan. It is not my purpose to discuss such a well-known subject as Roman art. I would only point out to you how the newer school of archæology has shown that Roman art was very largely the art of the Roman provinces, and not so much Italian. Alexandria was a great centre of silversmiths and other artistic metal work; Treves and Cologne and Lyons and Clermont of pottery, of glass, and also of metal work, Spain perhaps of cutlery; and there can be no doubt that Greece, both continental and insular, continued to be under the Roman domination a fertile mother of sculpture, architecture, etc.

Rome was the great assimilator and distributor of these various provincial wares, as her language became the *lingua franca* of half the known world, her laws embodied and displaced other forms of jurisprudence, her generous Pantheon welcomed the foreign gods, and her military system mixed and mingled the natives of very different countries and climates. I would like to say by the way how necessary it is that we should have a complete survey of Roman Britain such as has been begun so well at Silchester, and how much some of us long again to see the spade put into our own Uriconium.

When the Roman capital was removed to Byzantium new and fresh ideas were apparently developed, or perhaps old ones which had been localized there were distributed in all directions. In one direction the Sassanians drank at the well, and it is not possible now to say whether the embroideries, the damasks, the silver bowls, etc., which we associate with this eastern people were Byzantine or not. In another direction the art of Byzantium spread all over the Teutonic world. The art we call Teutonic is really Byzantine. The tribes which were planted on the various frontiers of the Empire and were largely in its service and its pay were all directly indebted to Byzantium for their art. Hence

why we find the same art with slight local differences among the Goths of the Crimea, the Lombards in Italy, the Burgundians in Austria and Switzerland, the Alemanni on the Rhine, the Merovingians in Gaul, the Angles and Saxons in Britain, the Visigoths in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, and the earlier Scandinavians in Denmark and Scandinavia. The cloissonée jewellery, the interlaced dragon patterns, etc., all of which have such a common likeness, have an equally common likeness with the work which we can trace to the Queen of the Bosphorus, where the capitals of the pillars in the early churches might have been designed by Scandinavians. As Lindenschmidt was never tired of preaching, there is no Teutonic art. The art of the Teutonic tribes who founded the modern States of Europe was in reality the art of Byzantium, and this was so in later times also. The art of the Carlovingian Empire and of the later Anglo-Saxons was the art of the exarchate of Ravenna, just as the art of south-eastern Europe, as preserved in the churches of Kief, was the direct daughter of Constantinople. The enamels, the bronze-works, the ivories, the illuminations in the books, the jewellery, etc., are all directly traceable to the same opulent mother.

But it was among the Arabs that the seeds of Byzantine art flourished and thrived the most. The Arabs themselves in regard to art were always a sterile race. Like their own sands, they do not seem to have had the instinct for art, but they had the instinct of government, and at Baghdad, at Cairo, and at Granada they founded communities which are as famous as any in the world's history. They had the Semitic instinct, too, for making money, and, having made it, for spending it freely as munificent patrons; but they initiated nothing. When we speak of Arab art we mean the art of Byzantium, which had a curious renaissance of its own under the impulse of fresh ideas gathered together from every wind of heaven by the enterprise of those Arab traders, who crossed all the known seas from China to the Straits of Gibraltar. Cæsarea, Antioch, Damascus, and Alexandria (the mother of Cairo), were Byzantine cities, with flourishing arts, before the Arabs annexed them, and, so far as we know, the arts of Damascus and of Cairo were the

daughters of Byzantine art. The mosques of St. Sophia and of Omar were Christian churches before they became the models for the stately buildings of the later Khalifs. Embroidery, pottery, and glass and metal working, including damascenery and bronze casting, all passed from Byzantine craftsmen to those employed by the Arabs, who were for the most part not Arabs but Syrians, Copts, or Moors. The chief development they received was in response to the injunctions of the Prophet against the making of graven images and of painted representations, which compelled those employed by the Arabs to devote their energies to developing conventional ornamentation and so-called arabesque work; while their contact with the Chinese and the Hindoos enabled them in pottery, and probably also in bronze work, etc., to supplement the lessons they learnt nearer home with fresh lessons from the farthest East.[1] Then came a curious phase. As is often the case in the modest life of our homes, the daughter, having outgrown her mother's teaching, returned some of the lessons and became in turn the fruitful mother of new ideas and of a new inspiration. From Egypt and from Syria art workmen found their way to Venice, Pisa, Palermo, and other Italian towns, and started men along new roads by presenting them with new models. The glass, the brass work, and the pottery of Venice, when Venice headed the renaissance of the industrial arts, were all the children of Eastern workmen imported by the rich Republic. Another wave of Mohammedan art influence passed through North Africa into Southern Spain and its islands, and only quite recently the riddle of the origin of that famous converted mosque, the Cathedral of Cordova, has been solved by the proof that it is really copied from the mosque at Kairwan in Morocco. In the Moorish towns, and in the islands of *Majorca*, &c. the lustred wares known as Majolica had, if not their origin, their great development, and thence they were transplanted to Italy. The fine tiles which the Moors made were widely imitated, and called azulejos by the

[1] This view has recently been strongly urged by Mr. Wallis in his splendid illustrated description of the unequalled treasures of the Mohammedan art possessed by my friend, Mr. Godman.

Spaniards, and thence also came the astrolabes, the clocks, and other inventions which Arab science had produced.

One feature in the panorama we have hastily traced is obvious, namely, that it has been the nations and peoples with great mercantile enterprise who have not only been rich enough to patronize, but who have also been in contact with fresh ideas, who have given Art its new departure. The Flemings at Bruges and the Hanse traders all over the Baltic accumulated and developed ideas which they picked up at Novgorod and in the far-off districts of Perm, &c. On the other hand the Venetians and the Genoese had their factories all over the Black Sea and among the isles of Greece. They shook hands there with the caravan traders from China and from the fur countries of Siberia, and there they supplied each other with objects suitable to their taste and needs. The Mongols were masters of the greater part of the Asiatic world. Their ruthless conquests drove the artificers of Persia into India and into Egypt, and in either country a great rejuvenescence of the arts took place at the same time in the same style, and it is a most curious piece of history as well as interesting in art to compare the tombs of the Khalifs at Cairo with those of the Pathan sultans at Delhi. Then the Mongols themselves became civilized and settled, and these artificers crowded back and brought new ideas with them, and at Tebriz and Sultania erected buildings and decorated them in a manner previously unattained. Not only so, but great masses of workmen were transported eastward and westward under the control of the same exacting masters, and thus the designs on Chinese porcelain—the phœnixes and dragons, etc.—invaded Persia, and similarly the Chinese learnt how to make what we call blue and white porcelain, which they did not know until this time.

To take one more illustration. We cannot wander about the glorious ruins of your county—such ruins as Wenlock Priory—without being reminded of a sermon in every stone. We realize how much we owe to Gregory and to Augustine, who planted Christianity here, as well as to Benedict and St. Bernard, and their indomitable disciples and scholars, who reared aloft high standards of

purity, and simplicity, of work and of duty in a community which was disintegrating under the influence of a barbarous soldiery, and of brutal and uneducated manners. We are further reminded, as we can almost hear the jingling spurs and iron-encased feet of the knights trampling down the aisles, that it was the romantic enterprise of the crusading nobles, prelates, and monks which brought back the genius of Gothic architecture to Europe, and the taste for poetry, for sentiment, and for art, which they had learnt from the Saracens, followers of Saladin. It was very largely their handiwork that flooded Western Europe with the new ideas which blossomed in the magnificent forms of our minsters, and the equally fresh and novel ideas which Froissart and Chaucer and Malory enshrined in immortal verse and prose; and if we turn over the medal and look on the other side we shall find a reflex influence of the crusades upon the East.

I do not propose to carry this disintegrated story further. My purpose and object have been to press home as a universal factor of human progress the element of continuity which we all concede in regard to particular cases, and also to press home the lesson that we cannot do justice to our subject if we limit our horizon, as we are apt to do, to our parish, our county, or our island. These are only outlying pieces of much larger areas, and the true way of studying and of profiting by the study of art is not only to be catholic, but to be continually conscious of its interdependence and continuity. Lastly, one lesson let us carry away with us, lest we forget the humility which becomes the students of the venerable past. If it be true that we are the heirs of all the ages, it is true also that the memory of much of our inheritance is blighted and sophisticated. It is not exhilarating to our vanity and self-respect to think that human progress is not a continual growth—that men reach levels very often which those who come after cannot emulate. The men who built the Parthenon, no less than the unknown architects of so many of our great minsters, the artificers who manufactured the lovely embroideries, the matchless tiles, the radiant decorations of the Alhambra, and the Taj at Agra, have left no heirs, and we are mere scholars sitting at their feet. Our strength is not great enough to carry the

lamps which they carried in so many ways. Every generation of men, it may be, has its triumphs, yet it is not altogether reassuring to think that in the great meeting in the happy hunting grounds, beyond the screen of night, it will not be the nineteenth century which will occupy the foreground. Homer will still lead the procession of the poets, Socrates of the moral philosophers, Phidias of the sculptors, Raphael of the painters, and not only so, but we shall have to give place to many unknown and unchronicled masters of their craft in the days of old. When that day comes I know not what I shall say to the archæological giants, whose disciple alone I can claim to be, for my presumption in addressing you in this incoherent fashion, save to remind them that if the men of Shropshire have not all the gifts of their forefathers, they still command the virtues of patience and long-suffering, of urbanity and kindness; and I may be allowed to conclude with the hope that the sun may continue to shine brightly on your homes.—*Floreat Salopia!*