OPENING ADDRESS OF THE ANTIQUARIAN SECTION.[1]

By the Rev. C. R. MANNING, M.A., F.S.A.

I propose, in the few remarks with which I desire to open the Section of Antiquities at this meeting (regreting that a more worthy and competent person has not been called upon to occupy the place of President), to refer to some points of advance which have been made in antiquarian knowledge since the time when the Archæological Institute honoured the city of Norwich and the county of Norfolk with a visit forty-two years ago. It must be, however, in a very restricted sphere that I endeavour to do this; limiting the term "antiquarian knowledge" to matters of almost local interest. I am not about, nor have I the power and learning, to speak of the progress that has been made in the wide fields of Oriental or classical antiquity, of Egypt and Assyria, and the Hittites; or of the investigations of Continental savans; or to take you into the fascinating realms of literature and philology; or even to intrude upon the ground to be occupied to much better purpose at this meeting in the Section of History. But as the Institute approaches towards the year of its jubilee, it may be well to cast a look back and observe a few places where firm ground seems to rise up, and steps of clear progress have been made. It is no disparagement to the memory of the eminent names of those from among us who have passed away, to do this. It was their own object, and the object of all such societies as ours, to accumulate the facts which may elucidate the truth, and it is indeed owing to the researches and persevering study of such men that any satisfactory results have been reached, any long

[1] Read at the Annual Meeting of the Institute, at Norwich, Aug. 6th, 1889.

standing errors dispelled, and any difficulties and problems solved. In fact, there were giants among us here in 1847, with whom we should not venture to compare many of ourselves. The Institute was in the full vigour of its youth, and attracted to itself, as it has continued to do, the best talent of the country in its own line; and the kindred societies, now so numerous, were only beginning to be stirred by the force of its current. In looking at the list of the General Committee of that Norwich Meeting of 1847, I feel awed and impressed by the remembrance of those with whom I had the privilege to associate on that occasion, and in whose society at many meetings in succeeding years so much enjoyment and instruction was found. There appear the names of the then Marquess of Northampton, President of this Section, Bishop Stanley, Dr. Whewell, Professor Willis, Professor Sedgwick, Dr. Guest, Henry Hallam, John Mitchell Kemble, Albert Way, Joseph Hunter, Matthew Holbeche Bloxam, John Henry Parker, and, of more local distinction, Sir John Boileau, Hudson Gurney, Dawson Turner, Henry Harrod, and G. A. Carthew, of whom none are now surviving. These and many subsequent and surviving members of the Royal Archæological Institute, and of its annual committees, have helped to make it what it is, and what it has been; and it is only by having sat at their feet that I can presume to record any brief summary to-day of the advances which in some points we may hope to have made.

In prehistoric antiquities I may almost say that a new science has sprung up within the time to which I refer, and an entire literature has been the result. It is only thirty years since the discoveries by M. Boucher de Perthes in the valley of the Somme (1859), at first doubted and ridiculed, attracted the attention of scientific men, and the existence of flint implements, of vast antiquity, from the drift or river gravels, was accepted as the work of man. Observation of such worked flints had already been made in this part of England by a communication from Mr. Frere, of Roydon, to the Society of Antiquaries, of examples found at Hoxne, in 1797, but the subject lay dormant for half a-century, and I think it was Sir John Lubbock who first classified these implements into

the Palæolithic and Neolithic periods, denoting those fashioned by chipping only, and those that are ground or polished. In 1868 an important Congress was held at Norwich—an International Congress of Prehistoric Archæology, attended by many of the most eminent antiquaries and geologists of Great Britain and the Continent; when our member, Dr. John Evans, F.R.S., now President of the Society of Antiquaries, contributed a highly valuable paper on stone implements, which has since been incorporated in his well-known work on that subject, published in 1872. A corresponding volume of the most interesting and exhaustive character, on bronze implements, was issued by him a few years later. An extensive and accurate knowledge of the stone and bronze period was thus, and by many other works treating on the same subject, made accessible to all, constituting a great advance on the crude and uncertain information of thirty years before. At about the same time, in 1870, an investigation took place in this county which was very helpful to the same class of studies, and has marked an epoch in its pursuit—the exploration of the large collection of pits, known as "Grimes' Graves," in the parish of Weeting, near Brandon, by the skill and energy, and chiefly at the expense, of Canon Greenwell, of Durham. The purpose of these deep excavations, lying side by side on many acres of ground, was fully established, not to be British dwellings, as had been supposed by myself and others, but mines for obtaining a very hard and serviceable class of flints for the manufacture of polished, or Neolithic, implements. It appeared that the method adopted by the ancient miners was to sink a circular shaft in the sand and chalk, gradually narrowing to the average depth of about forty feet, and when the bed of the best flint was reached, to excavate side galleries just large enough for a man to work with his pick, made of the antler of the red deer. I shall never forget the impressive moment, among many pleasant hours spent on that occasion, when one of the low galleries was found blocked by fallen chalk, on removing which were found two picks laid down, their handles towards the mouth of the gallery, as they had been left when the chalk fell in; "a sight (says Canon Greenwell) never to be forgotten; to

look, after a lapse, it may be of three thousand years, upon a piece of work unfinished, with the tools of the workmen still lying where they had been left so many centuries ago." The day's work over, the men had laid down each his pick ready for the next day's work; meanwhile the roof had fallen in, and they were not removed until thus unearthed by the explorers of the nineteenth century. Beyond this satisfactory advance, and the opening of some tumuli, and the finding occasionally of coins and pottery and articles of personal use, there is little to record; and our knowledge of the British period in East Anglia is still but dim. We have no lofty hills on which defensive works of that age are to be looked for, and, from the absence of stone, there are no megalithic monuments or cromlechs (now no longer miscalled "Druidical"). A vague tradition of a stone circle having existed at Gorleston has no corroborative evidence to support it. There seems room for enquiry as to the depopulation of the Celtic inhabitants of these districts. Traces of them occur apparently in the names of some natural features, as the rivers, otherwise the record outside of the historians is a blank. Were the Iceni a purely British stock, or had they already a mixture of Teutonic or Northern elements? Considering that this part of Britain would be one of the first to be reached by the invader from the Continent, on his westward march, may the scarcity of the signs of a previous population be owing to the very early date at which they were dispossessed? An opinion is held by some, Mr. Walter Rye among the number, that there was a Danish invasion and settlement in Norfolk previous to the Roman Conquest; founded on the large number of instances in which place-names have Danish or Norse terminations. Even if these are not so many as Mr. Rye supposes—for I am not willing to accept "ham" as a corruption of "holm,"—still it certainly seems incredible that the historical invasion of Danes and their subjugation of the country in the ninth century, would give time enough for the entire obliteration of the Saxon place-names, which must have been in use before over half a county and in Lincolnshire, &c., where the Danish or Norwegian names prevail now. Earlier pre-Roman settlements of long con-

tinuance would solve this difficulty. It may, however, be thought that this is a question more properly belonging to the Historical Section.

I should come now, in the order of subjects, to the Roman period in Britain. The advance here, in general knowledge, is considerable. Many volumes and essays and contributions to periodicals have seen the light, helping forward the more exact knowledge of the Roman occupation; such as Dr. Bruce's "Roman Wall," Mr. Coote's "Romans of Britain," and Mr. Scarth's "Roman Britain;" and from these alone the ordinary student may obtain a fair knowledge of the subject. A valuable dictionary of Roman coins, by the late Mr. Stevenson, of this city, has also been recently published. But as far as our own locality is concerned I am not able to report any very important accession of information within the limit of time that I am treating of. Not much exploration has taken place in our local camps, but some considerable finds of Roman coins, as at Baconsthorpe, and of pottery, bronze ornaments, &c., have been recorded, and additions have thus been made to the cabinets of collectors, and are available for comparison. Some remarkable wells or shafts, of considerable depth, constructed of wood, and square in shape, were found in making the railway at Ashill, and have been described by the late Mr. Thomas Barton. They contained pottery in regular layers, and do not appear to have been merely for waste and refuse. Similar contrivances have been found on the cliff at Felixstowe, in Kent, and elsewhere. The subject of Roman roads and other early trackways will, I believe, be brought before this meeting, in a separate paper, by Mr. Beloe. It may be worth mentioning that where the great road from Suffolk and Essex enters Norfolk at Scole, the original blocks of paving-stone were recently seen in the river Waveney, when the stream was being cleared of the accumulation of soil and weeds. It is to be hoped that no agricultural operations will be allowed to obliterate ancient landmarks of this class, and that antiquities found will be treated with care. The labourer's pick, or spade, has only too often instantly demolished anything suspected of being a "pot of money." There is so much educational interest connected with the Roman

period in Britain, as illustrated by coins and existing remains, that schoolmasters and teachers would do well to acquaint themselves more with it, and infuse a spirit of inquiry into it, and even of the joys of the collector, among their scholars. I will not, however, pursue this branch of my summary of progress further, partly because I have no competent knowledge of it, and also because it is to form the theme of a contribution in the able hands of Mr. G. E. Fox.

As regards the settlement in Britain, after the departure of the Roman garrisons, of the Saxon and other tribes from the northern part of the Continent, especially as to their systems of land tenure and village communities, the effects of which prevail down to our own day, a large and interesting field has been explored, Before 1847 the works of Lappenburg and other foreign authors had brought the subject more to the front; and afterwards those of Von Maurer, Kemble, Sir Henry Main, and others were more especially devoted to it; and, later still, Mr. Gomme and Mr. Seebohm have very fully investigated it. There is still much to be done; and the publication of early records, now so eagerly pursued, and the examination of existing tenures and customs, will, no doubt, eventually clear up much of its uncertainty and difficulty.

I may here mention the valuable service that has been rendered towards staying the destruction of ancient monuments, by the appointment of an inspector under the Act of Parliament, in the person of General Pitt-Rivers; and we may be assured that his aid will not be invoked in vain if occasion should arise for its exercise. The Society of Antiquaries has also issued a forcible appeal to lords of manors and the custodians of court rolls and other documents, to urge their careful preservation; and suggesting that when no longer needed, they might well be deposited in some public department, or in the library of some society. For the purposes of future progress it is also recommended that the large-scale ordnance maps be procured by the local societies, and that all antiquities existing or found in their respective counties be noted down upon them.

One very important branch of antiquities has made a

decided advance in precision in our time—the earthworks of our ancient castles, and the purposes of the stone buildings placed within them. The better knowledge of this subject is due to Messrs. Viollet le Duc, in France, and our accomplished member, Mr. G. T. Clark, whose admirable *vivâ voce* descriptions of the castles which this institute has visited from time to time have instructed and delighted his audiences for so many years, and whose absence at this meeting, from advancing age, is deeply to be regretted. No one who had the advantage of hearing him at Arundel, Caerphilly, Dover, Kenilworth, Framlingham, Lincoln, Ludlow, Lewes, Pevensey, York and many other places, and where I was not present, can fail to be grateful, or to lament that the author of "Mediæval Military Architecture" will not be with us to-morrow at Castleacre. Much confusion prevailed in the ideas, even of recent antiquaries, on this subject. Almost all earthworks that were not rectangular were supposed to be British. The British or Celtic earthworks which we know of in hilly districts, as in Wiltshire and Somerset, and the marches of Wales, are fortified hill-tops, suited to the protection of a large body or tribe of people; and I see no reason to suppose that there is a single example of an earthwork of that period in East Anglia. Norwich and Colchester (or Lexden), were, no doubt, occupied by Britons at one time, but there is nothing in the existing remains that can be supposed to be unaltered. The term "castle" is so associated in the modern mind with a building of stone, that persons in general have a difficulty in realising that the castles of pre-Norman date were conical earthen mounds, with their surrounding inclosures chiefly of horseshoe shape, surmounted by a *wooden* dwelling, and defended by timber palisades. The castles of our English or pre-Norman forefathers were not tribal fortresses, but fortified *domestic* dwellings, suited for the long residence of a chief lord and his family and retinue, who held a little court, and dispensed justice and hospitality, with no unfrequent recourse to his "gallows hill" for the unfortunate thief or manslayer. Such an earthen or wooden castle became the "caput" of an honour, under the manorial system, and wherever such was the case, we shall find the remains of the

conical mound and basecourts of an English castle. We do not look for such mounds at a Roman camp that never became an English castle, as at Caister by Norwich, nor within the moats of a fortified manor-house of Plantagenet days, as at Caister by Yarmouth, but at places like Castleacre which were first Roman, then English, then Norman, we find the earth and stone works of all three periods combined. The largest and finest conical mounds in Norfolk are those of Norwich and Thetford; their great size is due to the importance of their ancient owners. They were both the seats, not of ordinary lords of an honour or manor, but of the kings of the East Angles. Norwich was probably constructed by Uffa in 575, on the site, possibly, of a British stronghold; it was certainly the castle of King Anna in 642. Thetford, one of the largest mounds in the kingdom, and which I regret that the Institute does not visit, was probably also the work of Uffa. It is remarkable as never having had Norman stone buildings erected upon it, for the simple reason that it was not the seat of a great family after the Norman conquest, and there had been no East Anglian kings for many years to occupy it. The mound has been supposed to be Danish, from the same ignorance of the term "castle." Although Thetford was burnt by the Danes in 870 and 1004, they were the wooden buildings that were destroyed, while the earthworks are much older. The absurdity of considering these conical mounds as British will be evident by observing that their pointed tops could only hold a few persons at a time, and would be no refuge for a tribe. In fact, their bare summits were not exposed as they are now, but extensively covered and overhung by timber halls and chambers. When the Norman Conquest took place, and English lords were dispossessed, stone castles, in the Norman fashion, began to prevail, and were very frequently placed upon or within the earlier earthworks. But that the mounds themselves are not Norman is evident from the fact that a newly-erected mound would not bear the weight of a stone castle. Besides Norwich and Thetford, Norfolk has castles with the conical mound at Castleacre, Mileham, Horsford, Middleton, and Wormegay; and Suffolk has them at Bungay, Clare, Eye, Framlingham, and

Haughley. Buckenham and Castle Rising have large surrounding earthworks, but no mound, and this circumstance may be accounted for by the fact that these are two castles of the great D'Albini family, erected after the Norman Conquest, when the mound was no longer a necessary feature. There are some very remarkable earthworks, without a mound, or any later stone buildings, and where there was no chief seat of a lordship, at Warham, near the sea, on the north coast of Norfolk, only a few miles from Binham, but which the Institute had not arranged to visit. They are supposed to be Danish, and they certainly appear to belong to a class distinct from the common type; and, possibly, the great works at Castle Rising may have a similar origin, and be earlier than the Norman buildings within them. Our advance in the knowledge of these structures is thus considerable and satisfactory, and further information of particular local examples may be found in the pages of Mr. Harrod, or the papers of the Norfolk and Norwich Society.

Of church architecture before the Norman Conquest there are very numerous remains in Norfolk, and the subject was treated of at the meeting in 1847 by a veteran member of our local society, Mr. Gunn, who is, happily, still with us. The examples at Great Dunham and Weyborne are well known, and several have been noticed since, as Framingham Earl and Houghton-on-the-Hill. I have ascribed the date of these churches, mostly small, and much altered in later times, to about the year 1020, and not earlier. After the dreaded millennium, the year A.D. 1000, had passed, and the world still remained, activity in church building made rapid progress, and we are told that an order was made by Cnut, after his conversion, that the churches (no doubt generally wooden) which he and his father Sweyn had burnt, should be rebuilt of stone and lime. I believe that a very large proportion of the small Norman churches in our villages have walls really of pre-Norman date. The double-splayed circular window is very often found when the extremely thick walls are scraped, fitted with a circular wooden frame in the wall, from which cords or canvas was strung through eyelet holes, instead of glass. Pieces

of "long and short" work remain at angles, as at Houghton and Scole; the flints in the masonry are very uniform in size and regular in course, especially at the bottom of the walls; while the upper part of the nave walls are often found reduced in thickness, to accommodate later windows and roofs, so as to give a sloping appearance inside. I think also that, except where there were central towers, almost every small church of early date had its round tower at the west end, owing to the scarcity of building stone in these districts; and that wherever there is now *no* round tower it is only because a wealthy patron or merchant has rebuilt it in the prevailing style of his own day. Our knowledge on these points is thus much improved, and the crude notions held formerly about Saxon and Norman architecture are quite exploded. I remember Bishop Stanley, at the meeting of 1847, referring to the sage opinion, actually held by some, that these round towers were once antediluvian wells, from which the earth, by geological convulsions, had been denuded, and left them exposed, to be turned into bell towers! This is not much worse than the mental calibre of a writer, within the present century, who undertakes to describe a fine fourteenth century church in these terms:—"It was so the custom to unite different orders of architecture, that it is almost presumption to pronounce in which order this building should be classed. The low doors and lofty windows of *Danish* construction; the *acute* forms of *Saxon* architecture in the arches of the windows; and the numerous *Saracenic* buttresses, cause no hesitation on the whole, in pronouncing it to be a *Gothic* building!"

Having come to the Norman period in my glance at the past, I must mention the very conclusive evidence made known through the pages of our local society in 1877, as to the meaning of the name and the birthplace of the first bishop of Norwich and founder of the Cathedral, Herbert de Lozinga. He was not so termed because, as old writers said, he was a liar and a flatterer; nor because he came from Oxford, nor Orford, nor Hoxne, nor Lothingland. His father was Robert Lozinga, or Lotharingius, who came from Lotharingia, or Lorraine, and Herbert was born at Exmes, in the Pagus Oximensis, in Nor-

mandy. Proofs of this are fully stated by Mr. E. M. Beloe, of King's Lynn, in the Norfolk Society's eighth volume. There were many Lotharingians in England, brought over by the Norman kings, in the eleventh century, and another Bishop, Robert, Bishop of Hereford, was named Lozinga.

The religious houses of England, the arrangement of their buildings, their statutes, rules, and ritual, according to their orders, of monks, nuns, friars, or canons, regular and secular, lead to a most interesting subject of enquiry, and much progress has been made in it. We all know Professor Willis's labours. The late eminent architect, Mr. Edmund Sharpe, one of our members, was foremost in the investigation of the plans of Cistercian houses; and the foundations and structural peculiarities of many important buildings have since been carefully examined, with most instructive results. The ignorance shown in many otherwise valuable topographical works of older antiquaries on these points, has almost entirely passed away, and no local historian can expect to gain a hearing if he is behindhand in such information. We hope that one good effect of our present meeting will be the excavation and fuller understanding of the ruins of the Cluniac Priory at Castleacre, under the very able hands of Mr. St. John Hope. Where some of these buildings are what have been termed "double churches," *i.e.*, both conventual and parochial, the arrangement is also now much better understood. The celebrated Arundel case, so well explained in the journal of the Institute by Mr. E. A. Freeman, and in many of his *vivâ voce* addresses, as at Dunster, have made the public familiar with the true state of the case. There are several examples of this in Norfolk; and also where the parishioners were allowed to retain the use of the nave at the Reformation, which has consequently been preserved, while the choir and other buildings, granted to a private owner, have been left to go to ruin, as at Binham, Weybourn, and Wymondham.

The fine parochial churches, and domestic buildings also, that abound in Norfolk, of the fifteenth century or later, are owing to the wealth of this district, when it was the chief manufacturing county of England. Noble patrons and rich merchants vied with each other in

rebuilding their parish churches and halls; and on the north coast harbours were open which are now closed and silted up, where trade with the Continent flourished, and caused such beautiful structures as we shall see at Cley and Blakeney, Sall and Cawston, to be built. In the absence of stone quarries, the flints of the chalk or gravel were turned to admirable account, and wood was profusely used in the screens for which the county is famous, enriched by paintings, probably in many cases the work of English artists, and that are not unworthy of the schools of the Van Eyks and Albert Durer. The better knowledge which prevails now of the arrangement and contents of parish churches, and of the services and ritual for which they were adapted, is a hopefnl pledge of more intelligent restoration, when needed, and of the more careful preservation and protection of every ancient feature, and of even the smallest link in its history of the past. Mural paintings have been found on the walls of very many churches, and are now either jealously preserved, or have had proper drawings made of them. Some are early and of much interest, as those in the Cathedral, treasured and explained by Dean Goulburn; some are interesting witnesses to the religious sentiments and prevailing cultus of the people at the time to which they belong, and some are consecration crosses and tasteful ornaments. Greater attention is now paid, and better superintendence on the part of archdeacons, clergy, and churchwardens, to church goods, as the parish registers, so valuable for the pedigrees of families that have attained higher position, whether in this country or in America and elsewhere, several of which have been printed *in extenso*; the churchwardens' accounts and other ancient writings; and the Church plate.

In this last subject great advance in our knowledge has been made. The valuable labours of the late Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Chaffers, and Mr. Wilfrid Cripps, C.B., and more recently by Mr. St. John Hope and Mr. Fallow have recorded almost all the ancient plate remaining in England, and have contributed to great accuracy in classifying and dating them. Old wills and inventories show that there must have been an immense store of exquisite plate in the country before it was sacrificed to

the zeal of the Reformation, the rapacity of the Tudors and their favourites, and, later, to the exigencies of the civil wars. Our loss in these, and a thousand other classes of ecclesiastical and personal use, is incalculable. There are some well-known examples of pre-Reformation chalices in England, numbering about 40, but not one has been found in Norfolk. Of patens of the same age, there are about double this number, and of these there have been noticed in Norfolk, by the help of the archdeacons, as many as thirty-three, which have all been photographed for the Norfolk and Norwich Society. It is difficult to account for the large proportion of these patens remaining in Norfolk, especially as only one is known to exist in Suffolk. Edward VI.'s Commission of January, 1553, was issued for the seizure of all Church goods not absolutely required for service, except one chalice and paten for each parish, or two for large populations. Probably the existing patens are those which were then allowed to remain, and the reason that there are so few early ones among them, but that they nearly all date shortly before or after 1500, may be that the Commissioners took care to leave the most recent and least valuable ones. After Mary's reign, and as soon as Bishop Parkhurst came to the see, further changes took place, and the "profane chalices" of Archbishop Parker's Visitation Articles were melted down, and the "decent Communion cuppe," with its cover, took their place. Hence we find a very large number of such cups and patens, mostly of Norwich make, in the diocese, and almost all of the years 1564 to 1570. A great many more have disappeared since through the carelessness of parochial authorities, or have been injudiciously exchanged for more fashionable articles. The improved attention given to the subject will, it is hoped, prevent further loss and illegal sales.

As regards other contents of churches, and especially sepulchral monuments in brass or stone, Mr. Herbert Haines's "Manual of Monumental Brasses" had not been published in 1847, and from that and many other volumes and papers on the subject, our knowledge of costume, armour, and ecclesiastical vestments has much improved, and the public taste in memorials of the dead shows an influence for the better in every churchyard and cemetery.

Truer principles guide the architect, the artist, and the sculptor in wood, stone, or metal, in every department of design, and this advance is greatly owing to the study of ancient examples, begun by Pugin and Carter, and the Cambridge Camden Society, and carried on by the London and provincial bodies that have sprung into existence all over the country. Each locality has been industriously worked to reveal its archæological treasures, its MS. evidences searched among the public records, in the British Museum, or the Probate Offices, and many papers of great value have been enabled to be published, not only at the local expense, but also by the more extended resources, and with the wider publicity of the venerable Society of Antiquaries of London, the British Archæological Association, and our own Archæological Institute.

The county of Norfolk has been more fortunate than many in the literary productions that have contributed to illustrate it, in various departments, in recent years; and it is very gratifying to be able to record such works as the following, that, with many others, have enriched our libraries, and have become indispensable for reference. Besides the volumes issued by the local society, and its other occasional publication, of the "Screens of Norfolk," the "Gates of Norwich," and their edition of Husenbeth's "Emblems of Saints," and a first volume of "Norfolk Records," I may mention in *Topography*, Mr. Walter Rye's valuable "Index to Norfolk Topography," published by the Index Society, on a plan which might be usefully supplemented by a companion volume, recording not only the more public sources of information, but such as might be supplied from private and MS. authority, and from personal observation. In *Local History*, Carthew's "Hundred of Launditch" and "History of Bradenham;" Palmer's "Perlustration of Great Yarmouth;" Mr. Rye's "History of Norfolk," and his "Antiquarian Miscellany;" Mason's unfinished history of the county; Dr. Jessopp's "Visitations of Religious Houses," published by the Camden Society; and several parochial histories, such as Mr. Blyth's "Fincham," Mr. Eller's "West Winch," and others. In *Etymology*, Mr. Munford's "Local Names of Norfolk." In *Church Architecture* and appliances, Dean Goulburn's "Ancient Sculptures of Norwich Cathedral;"

L'Estrange's "Church Bells of Norfolk" (to which may be added Dr. Raven's forthcoming "Bells of Suffolk"); Willins' "Quaint old Norwich," Mr. Mark Knights' "Highways and Byeways," &c. In *Heraldry*, the Rev. Edmund Farrer's excellent "Church Heraldry of Norfolk," in course of publication; Mr. Rye's "Three Norfolk Armories," and Mr. Elvin's valuable recent work on the subject. In *Genealogy* and *Family History*, Mr. Rye's "Feet of Fines for Norfolk," Harvey's "Visitation of Norfolk of 1563," edited, with large additions, by the late Mr. Dashwood and Mr. Carthew, and still in continuation by General W. E. G. Lytton Bulwer; Dr. Jessopp's Memoirs of the Walpoles and the Norths, and several privately-printed family memorials.

In bringing my "Points of Local and General Archæological Progress"—incomplete as they are—to a conclusion, I must not omit to mention the beneficial influence which such societies as we represent have exercised in preventing the destruction of antiquities and historical remains, and staying the hand of the ignorant "restorer," or the ruthless speculator. The local society of this county has happily been the means, with the help of higher authorities, of saving, by timely protests, the Tolhouse of Great Yarmouth, and the choir of the Black Friars of Norwich, and prevented the invasion of the Cathedral precincts by a railway. Perhaps nothing shows the force of the progress that has been made in the true spirit of the archæologist more than the hearty and intelligent support which the newspaper press has so readily given on these occasions, and in fully reporting the proceedings of meetings.