

## THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE : A RETROSPECT

By JOAN EVANS, D.Litt., D.Lit., V-P.S.A.  
*President of the Institute*

Our Society celebrated its centenary in 1943, when all its records were stored for safety. For this reason our then President, Professor Hamilton Thompson, though he had all the qualifications for writing our history, had not the materials; and his centenary address does not attempt more than an outline of the century of our existence, though in its witty reminiscence it is quite inimitable.

The minute books are now available, and though I have neither the wit nor the historical knowledge of my predecessor, it has seemed to me that the time had come when we might profitably look back. Minute books are, of course, in some measure confidential, yet I do not think I am guilty of any real indiscretion in using those of long-past Councils and committees for an address to the Society concerned.

You will remember that in April 1837 Mr. Pickwick followed the lovelorn Tupman to the Leather Bottel at Chobham in Kent, and there discovered an inscribed stone. He lectured on it to the Club, he had it engraved and presented prints to the Antiquaries, and published a pamphlet containing ninety-six pages of very small print and twenty-seven readings of the inscription. He was elected an honorary member of seventeen native and foreign Societies; heartburnings and jealousies without end were caused by his discovery, and were only exacerbated when the presumptuous and ill-conditioned Blotton wrote a rival pamphlet to prove that the inscription should be read as 'Bill Stumps his mark'.

By 1837, indeed, local archaeology, as against the classical archaeology of Greece and Rome, was coming into fashion; and the spate of discoveries made in consequence of constructing railways did as much to encourage the science of archaeology as it did to foster the sister science of geology. The Society of Antiquaries was then a more entirely London society than it is in fact now—though its official title is still the Society of Antiquaries of London—and was little concerned with small provincial finds. Its main preoccupations at the time, too, lay in the earlier periods, and it did not as yet concern itself with questions of preserving the medieval buildings and monuments that were daily threatened with destruction in an industrial age that admired completeness rather than antiquity.

Consequently it was natural enough that towards the end of 1843 a few people should have had the idea of forming an Archaeological Association to meet needs that were not covered by the Antiquaries. They were not archaeologists by training or profession; indeed, except for four or five men at the British Museum there were then no professional archaeologists in England. All sorts and conditions of men were represented among our founders. T. J. Pettigrew, at whose house the early meetings were held, was a surgeon, born in 1791, who had achieved a measure of fame by vaccinating the Princess Victoria but had not gone so far in his profession as he might have done, because of a tendency to quarrel with his Boards of Management. He became the first Treasurer. Charles Roach Smith was a farmer's son from the Isle of Wight, a manufacturing chemist in a small way in the City. He was far more successful as a collector; his collection of Romano-British antiquities is the core of the British Museum collection. He was

a self-educated egotist of litigious tendencies ; sadly plain to behold, he nourished histrionic ambitions which he satisfied by giving Shakespearean recitations. He was, however, a man of true simplicity of character and touching fidelity in friendship. He became one of the first secretaries. The other—a man of a completely different stamp—was Albert Way, born in 1805 of a good family. The son of a barrister and landowner, he had travelled in Europe and the East, and had learned something of draughtsmanship and archaeology in the field. He was Director of the Society of Antiquaries, and an admirable example of the leisured archaeologist, the learned amateur, of the old school.

Another moving spirit was a young man, Thomas Wright, thirty-three in 1843. He was the son of a poor printer and had been sent by a generous patron as a sizar to Cambridge, where he had taken his degree. Through the influence of Professor Kemble he had become interested in Anglo-Saxon. Now he was exploiting his knowledge of medieval literature by publishing everything he could lay his hands on : a Grub Street medievalist, always in a hurry, always inexact, always full of energy, combining a quite genuine love of the Middle Ages with the necessity of earning his living by writing about them in any fashion that would bring him in a living. He specialized in the secretaryships of the minor learned societies that were everywhere coming into existence : he was Honorary Secretary of the Camden Society on its foundation, Secretary and Treasurer of the Percy Society, and held office of some kind in the Historical Society of Science, the Shakespeare Society and others. With his friend Halliwell Phillips he had been busy editing a monthly magazine called *The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science*, but it had only lasted for just under a year, and had come to an end in June 1842. Mr. Parker, the Oxford bookseller, was another foundation member, who combined a successful business with a real knowledge of both classical and medieval architecture.

By the end of 1843 the Society was duly launched as ' The British Archaeological Association for the Encouragement and Prosecution of Researches into the Arts and Monuments of the Early Middle Ages '. Its President—an impressive figurehead—was Lord Albert Conyngham ; the Chairman of its Committee the rather mediocre sculptor Sir Richard Westmacott, then busy with the pediment of the Royal Exchange. By the end of January the Society had a Printing Committee of eight to run the Journal, which Parker offered to print at his own expense and risk. No definite Editor was appointed, but Mr. Way did most of the work on the first number. He fell ill just before it appeared, and Mr. Wright, another Committee member, took over and brought it out. He continued in fact in office, without formal appointment, and brought out the second number single-handed.

So far, so good ; amity reigned in the Society and the membership was gratifying large. It boasted some 1,200 members, not all subscribing. I expect that many of us would find names familiar in our family history in the list. The printed roll shows the noble and titled members in a separate list, perhaps socially more impressive than we could now show ; the rest appear alphabetically. The Society held fortnightly meetings in London, at which members read short papers and exhibited objects from their collections—and in those days every archaeologist could afford to collect—but the important function was the Summer Meeting, which, we may claim, made it national in intention. The first, held at Canterbury

in 1844, was not only the first held by the Society but also, so far as I have been able to discover, the first ever held in England. It was divided into sections—Primeval, Medieval, Architectural and Historical—each with its President, Vice-President, and Committees. Papers and a conversazione were complemented by expeditions to Heppington, to see the Fausset Collection, to Richborough and Barfreston, by a luncheon given by the President, and by an evening lecture on 'The Mummy'. I take pride in pointing out that one communication was made by a lady—Miss Caroline Halsted—on a commission from Richard III authorizing the collection of alms for roofing a new chapel at Reculver. So many and such long papers were offered that some had to be omitted for want of time. It is not surprising that a medal, by W. J. Taylor, was struck to commemorate so auspicious a meeting.

Alas! trouble lurked in its very success. The *Illustrated London News* offered to report the proceedings of the meeting, and to illustrate the report with engravings by Mr. Fairholt, a popular practitioner in the art who was a great friend of Thomas Wright. Wright, the *de facto* editor, refused to give permission for this report (after it had been advertised) without consulting the *de jure* editor, Way, and persuaded Parker not to issue any separate report on his own account as 'many of the papers were too heavy for the public', and might more suitably appear in *Archaeologia*. He promised a report in the *Archaeological Journal* but only issued what was called 'a meagre skeleton'.

Wright had, in fact, been approached after the Canterbury meeting by an enterprising bookseller who invited him 'to undertake the publication of a work which might be adapted to the drawing-room table, and thus inspire a taste for the study of antiquities on the part of those who had not before engaged in them'. This was to be entitled the *Archaeological Album* and to appear every two months. Wright saved up the Report of the meeting to embellish the first number, complete with his friend Fairholt's engravings, and with no indication that it was not at least semi-official. It was, I think, rather hard on Parker, especially as in September Wright had written to say he could no longer act as Editor gratuitously, and Parker was paying him some £60 a year for his work.

All went well, however, until the convalescent Way returned from Paris in December 1844. A motion had already come before the Central Committee that a notice should be printed on the cover of the next *Archaeological Journal* saying that it was the only publication authorized by the Committee, and thus to protect Parker from the competition of the *Archaeological Album*. This had not been passed. On 28th December, 1844, however, the indignant Way attended a meeting of the Printing Committee and succeeded in getting a similar motion through by a majority of three to two, Roach Smith and Wright dissenting. A circular was thereupon sent out disowning the *Album*, though Wright's name was not mentioned. Though it had been passed only by the Printing Committee it was sent out in the name of the Central Committee. On that technical error our existence as a separate Society depends.

Wright, the Treasurer Pettigrew, and Roach Smith (one of the two Secretaries) promptly issued a rival circular and succeeded in getting a number of members to summon a general meeting of the Association. A considerable number of the members did not recognize the validity of the summons, but some hundred and

sixty attended. The President, Lord Albert Conyngham, attended in the hope of making peace, but his efforts were unavailing. Mr. Pettigrew at that meeting appropriated to his faction the name of the British Archaeological Association and as Treasurer retained the funds.

The other faction—the Central Committee, complete with the Chairman, Sir Richard Westmacott, one secretary, Albert Way, and a majority of the original Committee—was rather slower off the mark, but no less decisive in its actions. At its next meeting it passed a resolution by ten votes to six that Mr. Wright had behaved improperly and should resign. The President once more tried to make peace and once more failed. In February he resigned and in March was elected President of the rival society : for by now the split was complete and there were two societies, each called the British Archaeological Association.

John Merewether, Dean of Hereford, in his turn tried in a Christian but slightly unwise manner to effect a reconciliation, but found it unexpectedly hard. A letter from him to Pettigrew, dated 14th April, 1845, sums up the situation :

‘ There are two parties claiming the same title and using the same seal, but in direct array against each other. The very title of “ association ” under existing circumstances, is a farce, whilst the epithet “ British ” seems to court the sarcasm of others united in foreign lands in similar pursuits, and to reproach us afresh with being a nation of separatists.’

The whole issue had become personal. One side would not give up Wright, nor the other Way ; and neither Wright nor Way was willing to collaborate with the other. The Way faction—our Society—had not been able, of course, to hold its meetings as before at Mr. Pettigrew’s house, since he belonged to the Wright faction. However, the usual meeting was held on 26th February, 1845, in the theatre of the Society of Civil Engineers. No minutes could be read, for Roach Smith and the minute book were in the rival camp ; but various pictures and books were presented to the Society, a collection of ‘ Chertsey ’ tiles and some brass rubbings were exhibited, and short communications on various churches were read. The stormy atmosphere was recognized by the appointment of a sub-committee to deal with the situation.

This reported on 28th February, 1845. Roach Smith would not answer any letters and would only send vague messages : he refused to give up the minute book, and the Treasurer the funds and accounts. Roach Smith had advertised a special General Meeting for 5th March, and a counter-notice had duly been issued by the sub-committee and a counter-meeting summoned for 6th March. By 12th March it was assumed that Roach Smith, Thomas Wright, Pettigrew and their followers had left the Committee and resigned their offices unless they expressed repentance, as in fact none of them did. Our Society (still calling itself the British Archaeological Association) had collected as impressive a Committee as we have ever had : the Marquess of Northampton, President of the Royal Society, as President, seven Fellows of the Royal Society as members, and a strong representation of the British Museum, the R.I.B.A. and the Antiquaries. A Central Council of President, four Vice-Presidents, two secretaries and a committee of eighteen members usually resident in London, had been set up, of which six were to retire annually and not to be eligible for re-election before a year had elapsed. Life membership was fixed at ten pounds, and the annual subscription

at not less than a pound, though there were a number of corresponding members appointed in the provinces without fee. The report shows donations and subscriptions from some hundred and sixty members, including John Ruskin, Professor Willis of Cambridge (the best medieval archaeologist of his day), Bodley's Librarian, Garter King at Arms, the Head Master of Winchester and other distinguished persons. It duly advertises the *fifth* number of the *Archaeological Journal*: continuity of publication lies with us. The four preceding numbers appeared at the same time as Volume I, with an introduction by Albert Way. The volume, published by Longmans in London, Parker in Oxford, and Deightons in Cambridge, is rather uneven in quality yet a real credit to the Society. It shows a double standard in its quality which suggests that the existence of such a double standard on the original Printing Committee may have helped to foster division. The articles on numismatics, by Roach Smith, and on painted glass by Wright are popular and general; others, on Anglo-Saxon architecture as represented in illuminated manuscripts, Roman London, and the antiquities of Anglesey and the Channel Islands, are of a more scholarly kind. One of the papers that dates least is that by C. H. Hartshorne on Rockingham Castle; he was, however, the despair of the editorial board for he ran them into uncovenanted expenses for plates. A good feature is a section on original documents on the arts and crafts of the Middle Ages; this, however, was due to Thomas Wright and disappeared with him, though it was revived later.

By this time Mr. T. Hudson Turner—whose work on English domestic architecture of the Middle Ages is still a classic—had been appointed Editorial Secretary, with a committee to help him, and a little later the historian S. R. Maitland was appointed Treasurer and the classical archaeologist Charles Newton the second secretary.

Another Committee was set up to deal with the next annual meeting, to be held at Winchester, for which the Marquess of Northampton was appointed Chairman and Lord Ashburton Vice-President. It is interesting to note that after the meeting another Committee decided which of the papers read should be offered to the Antiquaries for *Archaeologia*.

By June 1845 our Society seemed to be sailing in calmer waters. The communications at its meetings were numerous rather than distinguished, but minutes of the meetings could be produced that read quite placidly. In July of that year a three years' lease of rooms in the Haymarket was taken at a cost of £75. It was a happy confirmation of the Society's importance that it was through its Central Committee that Lord Prudhoe in October 1845 offered his collections to the British Museum 'provided there be a room set apart for the reception of these objects and of any national antiquities contributed by other gentlemen'—the beginning of the department of British and Medieval Antiquities. At the same time the York Philosophical Society—who entertained us so kindly last year—wrote to offer a friendly welcome to the Society for the 1846 meeting if it were held in their city: an invitation confirmed by the Lord Mayor, whose successor likewise gave us so hospitable a reception, and duly accepted with Earl FitzWilliam as President.

By the end of the year 1845 over £900 had been received in donations and subscriptions, of which only half had been expended. Just over half of the original

members had remained faithful, and we had some 700 members, a number of whom, as local correspondents, did not pay any subscription. Our first woman subscribing member, a Welsh lady, Miss Jane Williams of Talgarth, was admitted in January 1846. We had elected a number of honorary foreign members, to whom in April 1846 we added the name of Viollet le Duc. By February in that year we had a balance in the bank of just over £625, and were installed in new rooms at 12 Haymarket with Hudson Turner as Resident Secretary at £100 a year.

If our faction of the Society retained the Journal with its original title, it had eventually to admit defeat in the matter of its own name. Two separate societies could not continue to call themselves by the same name, and in February 1846 we adopted the new appellation of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.

The York meeting was organized with a good deal of care. The Resident Secretary was 'empowered to communicate with the London and Birmingham and Midland Counties Railways to obtain information respecting the terms on which they will undertake to convey the members of the Institute to and from York'; but they offered to charge only 1s. 3d. less than the usual fare. The meeting ticket was fixed at £1, which was to cover the York volume. The prospect of the meeting brought in a spate of new members from the district, many of them parsons, and some of them ancestors of people who were kind to us in York last year. Nonetheless the meeting, which was otherwise successful, showed a deficit of nearly £30. This fact, and the minutes in which the Committee express anxiety over the expense of the Winchester volume and over the cost of plates in general, will make the passage of a hundred and three years seem very brief to any Council member of to-day. By an odd coincidence, in 1846 as in 1948, the British Archaeological Association chose Gloucester for their meeting while we were at York. By a coincidence no less odd, in 1847 as in 1949 we chose Norwich to be the next place of meeting after York.

The Norwich meeting was divided into only three sections: medieval, historical and architectural. £5 was paid to the sextons of the Norwich churches to keep them open during the week. Excursions were made to Ely, Walsingham and Castleacre, and the meeting seems just to have paid its way. The Institute however, was in rather low water financially, and then in October 1847 the Secretary had to announce the stoppage of Messrs. Cockburn, their bankers, and the consequent loss of just over £80. A fresh account was opened at Coutts's, and a few months later the Institute made its first investment by putting £50 in the three-and-a-quarter per cents, in the name of Trustees. Newton had resigned from the honorary Secretaryship in February 1847, and Maitland gave up the Treasurership in 1848, Edward Hawkins the numismatist taking over the office. The next year Hudson Turner gave up the Resident Secretaryship for reasons of health, and a Mr. Bowyer Lane was appointed to succeed him. At the end of the year Mr. Parker was relieved of the Journal which was taken over directly by the Society. In September of that year, 1848, one of our best friends, Augustus Wollaston Franks, was elected a member. I am proud to say that I can just remember him, and so bridge more than a century of the Institute's history: he was my father's closest friend, and I was taken to see him when I was a little girl and he an old man, shy and gentle in a fashion that commended itself to a child. He had read Mathematics at

Cambridge, but had been drawn away from them by the fascination of monumental brasses, to become the best medievalist of the later half of the nineteenth century. He began by cataloguing all the brass rubbings in the Institute's possession, a formidable task. In October 1849, E. A. Freeman the historian, was elected, to be for forty-two years an active member. Small, pugnacious and kind-hearted, with endless prejudices and a literary style that strove to be Carlylean and succeeded only in being characteristic, he helped to give the proceedings of the Institute, and particularly the Summer meetings, a savour of their own.

A Finance Committee was established in February 1849, and in the next month it was decided to move to better rooms on the first floor of 26 Suffolk Street, with a library enterprisingly lit by gas. Lord Northampton died at the end of 1850, and Lord Talbot de Malahide was elected President in his stead. In August 1850 the Central Committee of the Institute considered a resolution adopted by the rival British Archaeological Association on the expediency of amalgamating the two societies. They did not go very far in meeting them, but inserted advertisements in the *Athenaeum*, *Literary Gazette* and *Notes and Queries* stating that the Institute was willing to admit members of the Association as members without entrance fee. Thomas Wright then entered the lists with two disobliging letters in the *Literary Gazette* and the matter of amalgamation went no further, though after 1851 the two societies exchanged publications and were on a friendlier footing.

In that year a lot of time was spent in consideration of a proposed archaeological annexe to the 1851 Exhibition, to be held in Buckingham House in the Strand, which eventually fell through because of the difficulty of guaranteeing it against loss. A committee to help advise on the Manchester Exhibition of 1857 had no financial responsibility and seems to have worked well.

There is not a great deal to record in the fifties. Winter session succeeded winter session and summer meeting summer meeting, usually enlivened by special temporary exhibitions of portable antiquities. In 1853 the Institute's own collection of antiquities, which had become inconveniently large, was transferred to the new department of British and Medieval Antiquities at the British Museum ; in 1861 most of its casts and miscellanea were similarly disposed of by gift, and the rest sold.

The sixties were times of prosperity for the Institute as for England. Every summer a special exhibition was held in London in June to illustrate the history of some particular art : in 1862 enamels and niello, in 1863 sculpture in ivory. It illustrates the changed values of works of art that these exhibitions were chiefly drawn from members' own collections. In 1862 Mr. Way resigned the secretaryship (though he retained the editorship) and took the opportunity for making a general survey of the position, which he found reasonably satisfactory : in that year the Institute had an income of nearly £1,400, of which it spent all but about £80. The Worcester meeting that year made a profit of £210 ; the Dorchester meeting of 1865 £207. The summer meeting of 1866 was held in London, and produced a record profit of some £340. The handsome profits from provincial meetings were often due in some measure to generous contributions from the Town Council of the place. After 1866 printed notices of the subjects of papers to be read at the meetings were sent to members.

In 1863 the Institute moved to rooms at 1 Burlington Gardens. Lord Lyttelton was elected President and in 1864 the Prince of Wales became Patron of the Institute, as the Prince Consort had been before him. In that year Edward Hawkins resigned from the Treasurership after a tenure of twenty years. In 1866 our member Lord Campden (who died just afterwards) obtained for the Institute the privilege of adding 'Royal' to its title.

One of the activities of the Institute at this time was to do what it could, alone or with other societies, to preserve monuments, castles, gates, churches and early sites that were threatened by the stupidity of ignorant men. In 1866 the Committee even protested to the Italian Government against the threatened destruction of the Monastery of Monte Cassino : a protest that now reads a little ironically. In 1867 they also protested very sensibly against the proposed transfer of the Plantagenet effigies from Fontevault to England, a protest that brought them into friendly touch with the Société française d'Archéologie, our sister society in France.

By the end of the sixties, however, the Institute was no longer quite so flourishing. By 1868 the number of members had fallen to 650 and was dropping : the finances were precariously balanced. The Committee ascribed the drop to the growth of local societies ; to the errors of not funding the life compositions and entrance fees, and not pressing members in arrears for their subscription ; to the diminished value of money ; and to the low original subscription of a guinea. They suggested raising it to two guineas, and funding the composition fees. After the Lancaster meeting—which made a profit of £110—the Finance Committee proposed that all subscriptions should be raised to £2, but the Central Committee watered down the proposal in various ways and finally only *invited* additional subscriptions. (Eighty years have passed and we have just done exactly the same thing.)

In the seventies our affairs continued in a rather *diminuendo* fashion. Mr. Way had finally resigned from active work, and died in 1874. The Institute had moved to rooms at 16 New Burlington Street. The chief innovations were a special day excursion to Guildford in June 1871—the first of our spring expeditions, which we have just repeated—and the use of postcards—a new invention—to inform members of the Annual Meeting. The summer meetings prospered, though there was a slight contretemps in 1873 when it was found that the Earl of Devon, who was to take a prominent part in the Exeter meeting, had been President of the body which had wished to remove the roodscreen from Exeter Cathedral : a piece of vandalism against which the Institute had rightly protested. However the Devon meeting passed off peacefully enough. In 1877 the Institute presented addresses to Dr. and Mrs. Schliemann on being made Honorary Members ; and passed a resolution against the pulping of records by the Public Record Office. All was peaceable and chatty : I have rarely read a set of minutes in which the phrase 'a conversation then arose' more frequently occurs. Mr. Hartshorne became Secretary and Editor in 1876, with Mr. Brailsford to help him as assistant secretary and librarian ; space was made in the library by selling the Society's brass rubbings to Franks for presentation to the Society of Antiquaries, and the question of amalgamation with the British Archaeological Association again arose. The Institute's *ad hoc* sub-committee, however, voted against it.

By 1877 the Institute was overdrawn at the Bank, and Hartshorne undertook

all the secretarial work. At the end of 1878 the Institute had only 534 members ; in the next year the £200 stock that represented its investments had to be sold to meet its debt to the Bank.

In the eighties the Institute continued its work with little change. A sub-committee on the Annual meetings, set up in 1880, reported that they were attended by too many people of whom too few were really antiquaries. They complained of the numbers of local tradesmen, newspaper correspondents and children ; of the rush for carriages and meals ; of the want of obedience to the Director of Excursions and of a lack of decorum when visiting private houses. It was recommended that attendance should be limited to members and their immediate friends ; that no free tickets should be issued, though the clergy of the neighbourhood should be let in at a special rate. Nine years later the problems of organization had still not been solved. A committee of that year recommended that the excursions should be led by a conductor accompanied by a bugler, aided by a steward of transport, a steward of tickets and a whipper-in, ' who should endeavour to induce persons disposed to linger on the site to join the rest of the party '. All these were to work under the President and Secretary, who were responsible to the Council. All the excursion officers were to have badges of office and to be empowered to nominate people to help them. At the same time the clergy of churches visited were invited to send in notes on their buildings to be printed in leaflets and distributed at the meetings : leaflets that are the beginnings of our summer programmes. Not unfamiliar troubles confronted the organizers. At Lewes in 1883, for example, General Pitt-Rivers was President of the antiquarian section and Professor Freeman of the historical : neither was exactly of a pacific temperament. Freeman made a handsome offer to conduct the members of the Institute over the site of the Battle of Hastings provided that sufficient time—namely the whole day—was allowed for the purpose. The offer was accepted ; but it may well have been with mixed feelings.

The protests of the Institute were still made, if not always effectually, against such things as Grimthorpe's calamitous ' restorations ' at St. Albans and the proposed demolition of Ashburnham House, Westminster. I take pleasure in the latter protest, made in 1880, for it shows how early the Institute included Renaissance buildings within its scope.

In 1882 our Society moved to rooms in Oxford Mansions. In the next year Hartshorne resigned his offices and Mr. W. St. John Hope was appointed Editor, with a seat on the Council, and Mr. Gosselin secretary. That year the President, Lord Talbot de Malahide, died. Strong feelings were expressed that the office should be held by a Peer, but Sir John Lubbock (who became a peer soon afterwards) was nonetheless invited to take office. He refused, and Lord Percy was finally elected. The new social view was, however, reflected in the decision taken in 1884 that the old distinction in the list of members between Mr. and Esquire should be abolished. In 1892 it was so difficult to find a suitable nobleman to preside at a Cambridge meeting that the President of the Institute, Lord Percy, held the office ; this was the beginning of the practice by which the President of the Institute presides over the summer meeting. Lord Dillon, the next President, presided without a question over the London summer meeting of 1893.

In 1884 the Institute became incorporated under the Companies Act of 1867

as an Association not trading for profit; this is still its legal status. In the following year W. St. John Hope was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Antiquaries, and Hartshorne once more took over the editorship. At the end of 1891, Wednesday became our regular meeting day.

By 1892 the Institute was once more in financial difficulties. There was a drop in the membership to 314, and meeting profits, donations, and the sale of publications were also down. Hartshorne and Gosselin resigned and the whole position of the Institute was reviewed. It was resolved that the Editorship should be honorary, that the rooms should be given up and an office taken for the Secretary at 20 Hanover Square. The Library was lent to University College. Amalgamation with the British Archaeological Association (also in an insecure position) was considered both in 1892 and in 1896, but inexplicably fell through; I fancy our Committee quite wrongly thought that the Association was moribund. It is worth noting that in 1897 a national photographic record and survey was proposed and a representative appointed to the Committee. It was, however, some forty years before action was taken in the matter.

Lord Dillon resigned in 1898 on being elected President of the Antiquaries, and Sir Henry Howarth—not a nobleman—was elected in his stead. In 1900 it was decided, in view of the financial situation to dispose of the library: a step which I confess I view with shame and regret. A considerable number of books was honourably given to the Antiquaries, and in return our members were—and are—admitted to the privileges of their library. The rest was sold for over £500. The minutes for 12th December, 1902, have a section headed 'The late library'. As a consequence of all the retrenchments it was possible in 1902 to invest £1,000. Nonetheless in 1903, when there were only 227 subscribing members, there was a financial crisis which led to the resignation of the editor and the creation of an executive committee. The profits on the summer meetings were small—usually about £20 or £30—membership crept up slowly to 302 in 1909 and in that year the room at 20 Hanover Square was given up, meetings being held, as now, in the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries. The Secretary had some accommodation first in the apartments of the Society for Roman Studies, and later in those of the Hellenic Society. In 1909, forty years ago, we begin to meet our friends of to-day; Mr. Leonard Woolley and Mr. Hamilton Thompson were among the young men elected members in that year.

The war years naturally saw a suspension of most of our activities and a great delay in printing the *Journal*. Membership, however, did not drop very seriously: we had 380 members in 1914 and 343 in 1922. A paper by Miss Abrams on Bruges misericords printed in the *Journal* for 1915 is the first communication by a woman to be published: the first of many.

Sir Henry Howarth died in 1923, and was succeeded for three years by Sir William Boyd Dawkins. The reign of his successor, Sir Charles Oman, brings the history of the Institute down to where the memory of most of us begins.

The history of the last twenty years need not be told here; a brief history of landmarks will suffice. In 1928 the offices of Editor and Secretary were once more separated, with Mr. W. H. Godfrey as secretary and Dr. Mortimer Wheeler as editor; Miss Rose Graham was elected to the Council as our first woman member, and Mr. Christopher Hawkes and Mr. Cyril Fox were elected to the Society. In

the next year Colonel Barwick Browne was elected Meetings Secretary. In 1931 Mr. Hawkes took over the Secretaryship with Miss Thalassa Cruso to help him. In 1938 the Institute for the first time had a meeting abroad, at Rouen, that was a great success. The history of the last decade is familiar to you ; the distinguished presidencies of Professor Hamilton Thompson and Sir Alfred Clapham are fresh in all our minds. You know as well as I do what we owe to them and their officers, and to the steady and courageous policy that kept the Institute's meetings going whatever strange weapons fell from the skies. That I read you this paper in this room is proof that the definition of our relation to the Society of Antiquaries as laid down in March 1844 still holds good : that we should be ' wholly independent of the said Society, yet wholly subsidiary to its efforts and the extension thereof '. The number of people who are at once Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries and members of the Institute is of happy augury for the continuance of our friendly relations.

Such, then, is our history : modest enough, but with an English quality of endurance and perseverance about it. We still have the same subscription as we had in 1843 ; I do not know for how much longer it can be maintained. We still pursue the same policy of winter meetings for communications and a summer meeting for seeing buildings and sites. We have become, I think, a more learned body with the years, but there is still plenty of room for the amateur in our ranks, though I fancy I may be the last amateur, as I am the first woman, to have the honour to be your President. We are, I know, a much more friendly body—though I touch wood as I say it ; but it is not merely the increased cost of printing that keeps us from hurling vituperative pamphlets at each other's heads. If Professor Hawkes, our Editor, were to wish to publish an *Archaeological Album* in monthly parts, it would not split the Society ; we know better than they did a hundred years ago how much more remains to be discovered, and how much even of existing knowledge remains to be published. We are not yet amalgamated with the British Archaeological Association, but I hope it is not vain to anticipate that one day we may be. We have so many members in common that a fusion would hold no shocks for either society ; my sister President, Dr. Rose Graham, was the first woman to be elected to the Council of our Institute. The success of the new Prehistoric Society may gradually lessen our duties in that field and may leave us and the British Archaeological Association identical in scope and interest.

We are still hard up, still active, and still all profoundly convinced that archaeology is the most delightful study in the world. Except for the first, I hope my successor may be able to say the same in a hundred and six years time.