ADDRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE[1]

By PROFESSOR A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, President

I do not intend in this address, nor would it be possible for me in the course of a brief hour, to trace in detail the history of the Royal Archaeological Institute. All that I can do, since the duty of speaking on this occasion has fallen to me, is to say something of the part which it has played in the promotion of archaeological, and I may add from the point of view of my own special interests, historical study, and to commemorate some of those who, at its meetings and in the pages of its journal, have been prominent in furthering its objects.

The Institute was born, not without early difficulties on which I need not dwell, in a day when antiquarian research was regarded mainly as a field outside that occupied by recognised forms of scholarship and as a pursuit for the leisurely dilettante. 'We cannot conceal from ourselves' said Samuel Wilberforce, then dean of Westminster, in an address delivered at the Winchester meeting in 1845, 'that the Antiquary has been commonly conceived to be a harmless creature, patient alike and provocative of jibes; with little pith or point of character, and little earnestness except for trifles'. The golden-tongued orator spoke at length on the nature and value of the study of archaeology. The interests of the audience which he addressed were largely concerned with medieval archaeology, and he was careful to expatiate on the dangers of a too fervent absorption in the relics of a past 'with its wild mixture of true faith and grovelling superstition'. 'Let us only use them'—he referred to what he called 'the ancient hagioscope', 'the intersecting aisles' and 'the lengthened chancels', admiring their beauty but deprecating their purpose—'Let us only use them as examples and incentive, and not feebly and blindly copy them as models'. The year 1845 was a critical year in the history of the English Church, as some of you may remember, and doubtless many of his hearers listened to this advice, conveyed in rhetorical periods of lively imagery, with cordial sympathy. No-one, however, could feel apprehension with regard to the tendencies of a meeting at which Henry Hallam

[1] Delivered 8th December, 1943.

was president of the historical, Dr. Whewell, the famous master of Trinity whose forte was science and his foible omniscience, of the architectural section, and W. R. Hamilton, less well-known but a distinguished antiquary in his day, of the section dealing with early and medieval antiquities. Nor, when Robert Willis, Jacksonian professor of experimental philosophy at Cambridge, held forth at length on the architectural history of Winchester Cathedral, would any trace of grovelling superstition be discovered in a discourse which was a model alike of scientific accuracy and literary skill.

Samuel Wilberforce at any rate was satisfied that the Institute deserved the support of sound Churchmen, for he frequently attended annual meetings when bishop of Oxford, not without difficulty, for at the London meeting of 1866 he attributed his late arrival to the satisfactorily antiquarian condition of the streets of London. For three quarters of an hour he had been on the road from Waterloo station to the Guildhall, the delay being caused by a single cart with six deal boards which, by a judicious twist at intervals, effectually baffled all the ingenuity of his coachman, and kept a whole line of omnibuses and carriages at bay. Again in 1872, the year before his death, when bishop of Winchester, he presided over the historical section at Southampton in an interval between a visit to Guildford, where he had been subpoenaed in an action for libel, and his hasty departure to hold a confirmation at a place unspecified. At these meetings, too, Willis was a constant attendant. Not all his contributions to them were published: of his addresses, for example, at Norwich and Peterborough, there remains nothing, I think, but a bare record, but such papers as those on York Minster and Worcester Cathedral are demonstrations of a method of architectural description which, from the early days of his masterly treatises on Canterbury Cathedral and its monastic buildings, has served as a model for such work, successfully followed by more than one, yet never surpassed.

From 1845 to 1853 special volumes of Proceedings were published in addition to the *Archaeological Journal*. These contained reports of annual meetings followed by papers delivered at them or connected with the places at which they were held. Each of them still has its value for the student of local history and antiquities. Willis's *Architectural History of York Minster* belongs to the volume for 1846, and among their outstanding contents are notes on churches by John Henry Parker and J. L. Petit, papers by Charles Winston on stained glass, by Matthew Holbeche Bloxam on medieval effigies, and elaborately documented accounts of military antiquities

by Charles Henry Hartshorne. The last volume, in 1853, containing a small selection of papers delivered at the meeting at Chichester, was slim compared with its predecessors, and after its appearance the annual volume of Proceedings was abandoned.

At this length of time, the reports of the early annual meetings are themselves archaeological treasures. In these gatherings of sages and *savants*, the accounts of which read something like a series of chapters from a novel by Trollope, the president was usually chosen for the occasion from the local nobility. The mayor and corporation of the city or town selected for the meeting presented the Institute with an address of welcome: a similar address usually came from the local archaeological society. In spite of the seriousness with which each of the sections conducted its business, certain evenings were spent in stately relaxation. We read of the entertainment at the Mansion House at York, 'numerously and brilliantly attended,' and of the selection of Sacred Music performed in the Minster, specially lighted for the evening, for the gratification of members of the Institute. Every arrangement was again made for their gratification at a conversazione next year at the Palace, Norwich, while at Lincoln the year after a 'Banquet' was served in the spacious new hall of the Corn Exchange. In 1862 at Worcester the 23rd day of July was 'agreeably commenced' at 9 a.m. 'with a social and very gratifying mark of the cordial feelings evinced towards the Institute in the "faithful City"' in the shape of a breakfast given by the mayor in the Town Hall. And, though at Peterborough in 1861 the members merely joined the Ordinary at the Great Northern Hotel, this was but for once in a way. Possibly the annals of our society contain no records as stirring as those for the three years from 1870 to 1872. There was the temporary *buffet* erected in the Museum at Leicester, 'provided with a handsome display of refreshments of all kinds which seemed to be greatly enjoyed', while 'an excellent band played a good selection of music, and a most agreeable evening was spent in wandering among the collection of local antiquities'. There was 'the *déjeüner*, on a very handsome scale' given by the Mayor in the Drill Hall at Cardiff, to which upwards of 400 guests sat down, 'considerably increased by private friends invited by his worship'. The name of Sir Bartle Frere was coupled with the toast of the Strangers, and he 'appropriately acknowledged the compliment and concluded by proposing the Ladies'. If the scale of the *déjeuner* at Cardiff was very handsome, that of the *soirée* at Southampton in the following year was very brilliant, and the 600 guests

Bristol, Sir Charles Anderson of Lea in Lincolnshire, Mr. Hallam, Alderman Pountney, Mr. Heywood, M.P., and Mr. Britton, the illustrator of cathedrals. Of the thirteen who thus defied fate, all, I believe, survived the ensuing twelvemonth, though the Principal of Brasenose succumbed to the challenge not long afterwards.

I am tempted, too, to say a word of the meeting at Dorchester in 1865, at which William Barnes gave a reading of his poems in the Dorset dialect. Four years before, unforeseen changes in the arrangements of the Great Eastern railway had brought Lord Talbot from Norfolk late for the opening of the Peterborough meeting. This time the Great Western was responsible for the late arrival of Lord Camden, president of the meeting, accompanied by Mr. Alexander Beresford Hope, whose elaborate witticisms frequently enlivened our gatherings. On this occasion, after dwelling lightly upon the trip which he and the noble Marquis had had the pleasure of taking together, he complimented Dorchester upon the avenues which gird that pleasant town, agreeable substitutes for those boulevards which, said he 'seemed to be a sort of pleasure to obtain which they must endure the risks of sea-sickness'. A year later, it may be noted in this connexion, Lord Talbot expressed his disapproval of the Hausmannisation of Paris. It was Lord Talbot to whose 'kindly and generous disposition', said the Rev. C. W. Bingham, seeing him occupy Judge Jeffreys' chair at Dorchester, 'the odious character' of its earlier occupant 'presented a striking contrast'. At this meeting compliments flowed freely, nowhere so freely as at luncheon at Canford Manor, when Beresford Hope proposed in florid terms the health of their host's mother, Lady Charlotte Schreiber, the editress and translator of the *Mabinogion*. After this luncheon Freeman described Wimborne Minster, and it was also in the course of this meeting that Willis delivered a discourse on the abbey church of Sherborne.

In 1866, after the meeting of the Institute in London, Lord Camden, shortly before his death, obtained the privilege of adding the epithet 'Royal' to its official title.

Of the serious work which was the result of these meetings, the *Archaeological Journal* is the record, increasing through the sixties and seventies of the last century in the interest and permanent value of its contents. If I may speak in particular of one feature of them at this period, I may remind you of those original documents which, carefully edited by expert scholars and selected with great variety and judgment, appeared in many successive volumes. At this date, as I have already

said, the interests of the Institute were largely concerned with medieval matters and were perhaps—certainly for the taste of the present generation—too heavily weighted on the definitely historical side of archaeology. Such an address as was given at some length by Mr. E. T. Stevens of Salisbury during the Southampton meeting in the Museum at Winchester on Flint Implements was an exceptional feature of the programme. But the proceedings of the Institute in the later sixties and seventies were much controlled by the dominating figure of Freeman. No prominent historian's reputation has been assailed with more severe blows : his dogmatism and his habit, most irritating to his readers, of implying—to say the least of it—that what he told you three times must be true, have met with their natural reward. At the same time his profound sense of the continuity of history, his knowledge of the map of Europe through all its transformations and his conviction of the necessity of such knowledge to the historical student—above all, his skill in relating places and monuments of the past to their historical background with a full understanding of their artistic and architectural value, gave him a well-deserved influence which may well be remembered with gratitude. Among the papers which he read at annual meetings that on 'The place of Carlisle in English History,' a very characteristic specimen of his style, and others afterwards included in his *English Towns and Districts*, have a high place in archaeological literature. It is not difficult to imagine how eloquent he must have been at Chichester in 1853 upon the subject of his hero Earl Godwine, though it was probably not till later that he began to discern Godwine's lineaments in those of his contemporary hero Mr. Gladstone. Thirty years later at Lewes he discoursed on the Early History of Sussex and gave an address at Battle Abbey, in which no doubt he impressed on our members the unpardonable sin of referring to the fight at Senlac as the Battle of Hastings. During the Taunton meeting in 1879, he and John Henry Parker spoke at Wells and his discursiveness was well illustrated at Martock, where the church furnished him with a text for an oration upon the ecclesiastical architecture of Somerset in general. Equally instructive were his remarks outside the south transept doorway of Carlisle Cathedral in 1882, where for the benefit of his large audience he catechised himself searchingly on a number of points leading to the conclusion that the church which they were about to inspect cannot have been anything but a church of Austin Canons. His manner may have been intimidating to doubters, but the lesson was admirably delivered by an accomplished teacher.

Freeman's constant friend and correspondent, William Stubbs, took a less prominent part in our proceedings, but attended meetings and read papers. At Ripon in 1874, close to his native place, he presided over the Historical section, and at Chester in 1886 over the Antiquarian section, a year after he had been consecrated bishop of that see. Closely connected also with the name of Freeman is that of G. T. Clark, many of whose descriptions of castles made before the Institute and printed in the *Journal* are among the series of papers collected in his *Mediaeval Military Architecture*. Clark's theories on the origin of castles in England, supported vigorously by the authority of Freeman, have been disproved by later investigation. But here, as in so many other cases, we have to thank a pioneer who, if in the bold assertion of a mistaken proposition he risked his credit, nevertheless did much towards the systematic study of military antiquities. At Cardiff, face to face with the ruins of Caerphilly and Raglan, Clark was in his element. I am not sure whether, in the following year, he was in the party which, in spite of a warning telegram from the mayor of Newport, I.W., tempted the stormy firth from Southampton to Cowes one wet August morning and was rewarded by a brilliant afternoon at Carisbrooke. On that occasion, however, the speaker was Parker, who had conducted the Institute round the walls of Southampton a few days before. Time would fail to tell of other eminent men who took part in our meetings and proceedings in company with these; but not the least distinguished visitor was Sir Gilbert Scott, then at the height of his reputation, who gave the Institute in 1866 the benefit of his researches into the history of Westminster Abbey and addressed us in Ripon Minster and Hereford Cathedral, recently embellished by a metal screen of his design, at later meetings.

In the meantime old members were passing away to whom we owe much. In March, 1873, died Albert Way, the leading spirit of the Institute in its earliest days, a scholar and antiquary whose most permanent gift to a later age is probably his edition of the medieval Latin dictionary known as *Promptorium Parvulorum*. In 1875 we lost Professor Willis, whose work stands the test of time well and has been a source of inspiration to many followers. The death of Mr. Burtt, for many years an indefatigable secretary to the Institute, followed in 1877. In 1883 came that of Lord Talbot de Malahide, and in 1884 that of John Henry Parker. But there was no lack of good material in their place. In 1878 the Antiquarian section at Northampton had as its president Mr. (afterwards Sir) John Evans, and it

was about this time that the Architectural section was strengthened by the coming of J. T. Micklethwaite, whose paper on the Growth of English Parish Churches, read at Lincoln in 1880, had a far-reaching influence upon ecclesiological study. In 1879 the first of those numerous papers in the *Journal* in which year after year Bunnell Lewis, professor of Latin at Queen's College, Cork, described the Roman antiquities of cities on the European continent dealt with Antiquities in South-Western France. In 1882 came one on Tarragona, in 1883 on Constantinople, in 1884 one on Reims, in 1885 on Langres and Besançon, and so on, with few lapses of a volume, until the paper on Baden in Aargau and Bregenz which appeared in 1907, the year before his death. It is interesting to notice that in 1887, in the same volume of the *Journal* with Lewis's paper on the Antiquities of Saintes, Freeman produced an illuminating paper on Toulouse and Narbonne, while a posthumous paper appeared on the church of Sainte-Radégonde, near Tours, by J. L. Petit, a former member of the Institute whose architectural drawings had from time to time illustrated his contributions to the *Journal*. And in 1888 Freeman, with a paper on Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, again accompanied Lewis, whose work this time was on Touraine and the Central Pyrenees.

As president of the Institute, Lord Talbot was succeeded by Lord Percy, who later, as sixth duke of Northumberland, maintained his historical and antiquarian interests with zeal and with great advantage to the societies of which he was a member and patron. He was elected president at the Lewes meeting in 1883, a meeting remarkable in more than one way. It was there that William Henry St. John Hope first appeared before the Institute, being then engaged with 'intelligent energy', as the official report of the meeting puts it, upon the excavation of Lewes priory. He had already made his reputation as an archaeologist in his native county of Derby, and in Kent, but at Lewes he became known to a wider audience which welcomed with appreciation the unusual range of his interests, the accuracy and thoroughness of his knowledge and the clearness with which he conveyed it. He at once took his place among the leaders of our society. For a time he edited the *Journal*, infusing into it new life and vigour: as Assistant Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries, he strengthened the links that bound us, and still bind us, in close alliance with that body. Year after year, he was a principal figure at our summer meetings, bringing forth from the treasure-house of a rare and accurate memory things new and old, and there were only two or three of these from which he was absent. He thus became

a guide to a whole generation of antiquaries who followed readily in his footsteps, and of his constant kindness and readiness to lay his knowledge at the service of others none can speak with greater confidence than myself.

Hope's papers on the priories of Lewes and Repton were features of the *Journal* for 1884 which showed that a worthy successor had arisen to Robert Willis, working in the same scientific spirit and setting forth his results with a logical clearness that allowed no concession to conjecture. In that same year he began his work on the foundation of the Premonstratensian abbey at Alnwick. Here the Institute came in August from Newcastle, where they met under the presidency of Lord Percy's father, the duke of Northumberland. I need hardly remind you of the high place which Newcastle occupies in the annals of English archaeology. Mandell Creighton, then rector of Embleton on the Northumbrian coast, presided over the Historical section, James Raine the younger, to whose work on historical documents and infallible capacity for selecting those of exceptional interest for publication the North of England owes so much, presided over the Antiquarian section. It is to Raine, for example, that we owe two documents printed in early volumes of the *Journal* which contain vivid details of two cases of sorcery brought before the ecclesiastical court of York in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, both of exceptional value to social historians. Other well-known scholars, such as Dr. Greenwell, perhaps, as Hope used to say, the best all-round antiquary of his day—and it was a long day—and Thomas Hodgkin, were present at the meeting. And we should not forget one who, little known outside his own district, did within its limits work of sterling worth, wielding a lively pen and not afraid to produce theories which, if not always convincing, were argued with a wealth of sound knowledge and could seldom be dismissed as groundless. The series of articles in our *Journal* upon churches of Austin Canons and their plan, by J. F. Hodgson, vicar of Witton-le-Wear, may not wholly succeed in laying down a rule unhampered by exceptions, but its author was a sound and accurate observer, and these papers are a most useful source of reference on the subject of plans of monastic churches in general.

But we must not delay over individual meetings, and of the Salisbury meeting in 1887 I need say only that addresses were given by General Pitt-Rivers and by Bishop John Wordsworth, one of the scholarly prelates who have afforded us substantial help from time to time, while the cathedral was described, from material left by Willis, by Precentor Venables of Lincoln.

If old friends were taken away from our ranks, Bloxam and Beresford Hope in 1888 and Freeman himself in 1892, there were new accessions. Francis Haverfield became a frequent contributor to the *Journal*; John Willis Clark appeared from time to time at our meetings. His aid was invaluable at the Cambridge meeting of 1892, where Mandell Creighton, now bishop of Peterborough, again addressed the Historical section. That meeting, as I have heard from one who professed to be the only survivor of the ordeal, was remarkable for an evening discourse by a high authority on a most interesting, though technical subject, which lasted for four hours. The company, states the report, separated at a late hour. Not since the party returning from Wells had heard the Bristol chimes at midnight had the Institute achieved such a record, and the paper itself as printed, though an exhaustive treatise on its theme from which great profit can be derived, is almost sternly devoid of those lively sallies of wit which might have made the hours pass like a waking dream.

At Cambridge Lord Dillon was elected president of the Institute in succession to Lord Percy and presided at the meeting in London the following year. Here the Comte de Marsy, director of the *Societe française d'archéologie*, was a guest; Horace Round spoke on the Mayoralty of London; and there was one day with a very full programme, when Archbishop Benson conducted the party round Lambeth Palace in the morning, and, this over, they met at Westminster Abbey, where J. T. Micklethwaite was their cicerone. One noteworthy circumstance of this meeting was the loan of the royal coronation robes by Queen Victoria and their exhibition by Dr. Wickham Legg with the assistance of a dressmakers' dummy. Round, who at this meeting had treated a subject on which he was an undisputed authority, contributed a paper to the next volume of the *Journal* on Armorial Bearings.

Lord Dillon could not be present at Shrewsbury in 1894 and his place was taken by Sir Henry Howorth with an address on the Methods of Archaeological Research. Here it was, too, among the local antiquaries who took part in descriptions, the Institute as a body made the acquaintance of one who is still one of its vice-presidents, the present Dean of Norwich. For we are now coming near what, from the point of view of three-score-and-ten years, I may call modern times. And in 1895 at the Scarborough meeting we made contact, as the phrase now is, with John Bilson, whose exact architectural science and severely logical mind, impatient of inaccuracy and working straight to its point with unerring precision, were of immense

advantage to us for some twenty years. His descriptions of the Minster and St. Mary's at Beverley and of the remarkable church at Lastingham were a foretaste, not only of many such elaborate demonstrations, but of casual comments on addresses by others which unfailingly added something to the subject in hand. His active life-work is over, but he is still with us and those of you who have known him will remember him to-day with grateful respect.[1]

His paper upon the recently discovered eastern apses of the Norman church at Durham opened the *Journal* for 1896. Ever since Hope had taken over the editorship for a short time in 1884, papers of a monographic and authoritative type had become frequent in its contents. Such papers as those by Hope and that devoted ecclesiologist, Thomas McAll Fallow, upon Chalices provided a new foundation for the orderly study of their subject. I have spoken of J. F. Hodgson's Churches of Austin Canons, Hope's papers on the shields of arms of Cambridge colleges and English municipal heraldry, with their clear and sightly drawings, belong to the opening of a new era in armorial science. In the volume which contained Bilson's paper on Durham, the predecessor of more devoted to that great church of which the last appeared in the *Journal* for 1922, was published also a paper by Micklethwaite modestly called 'Something about Saxon Church Building,' which, with a later supplement, was the first endeavour to put the problematic history of pre-Conquest architecture in England upon a basis which should form the foundation of systematic study.

In two successive years the Institute supplemented its meetings by short voyages. The Canterbury meeting in 1896, at which Hope described the cathedral church and its precincts, was followed by a two-days excursion to Calais and Boulogne, while a similar excursion to Jersey followed the meeting at Dorchester in 1897. At Dorchester full attention was properly given to prehistoric remains under the guidance of Pitt-Rivers and Boyd Dawkins, and Howorth gave an address on Old and New Methods of Writing History. This was the last summer meeting held during the presidency of Lord Dillon, who was succeeded at Lancaster in 1898 by Sir Henry Howorth. Of Howorth's presidency, which lasted for twenty-five years, many of us have memories. The width of his interests was remarkable: no speaker came before the Institute to whose address he was not ready to add comment and illustration, often diverging from the main current into channels which he

[1] Since this address was delivered, Dr. Bilson has died. A notice of him will be found later in the present volume.

traversed with a skill that earned him from some of his constant hearers the sobriquet of Prince Henry the Navigator. With his ready fluency and fertile memory there went a cheerful geniality of disposition. His attitude to the Institute was intimate and paternal—even, as time went on, proprietary: he took a personal interest in each individual member and made him feel at home, and, when he died, a few days before the opening of the meeting at Norwich in 1923, the loss was felt even by those who in his later years were alive to the risks of a tenure of office prolonged indefinitely. The drawing of him by Mr. Miller, an old member of the Institute, which precedes the obituary notice of Sir Henry in the *Journal*, vividly recalls his characteristic expression, the earnest intentness with which he listened to what others had to say, while inwardly he was setting in order the analogies, parallels and illustrations which occurred to him as material for commentary on the discourse in progress. And, if his references were sometimes more ready than exact—I have heard him refer to *Monumenta Franciscana* as *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* and the names Ruthwell and Rushworth were with him interchangeable—he is not the only eminent person who has made such errors in moments of fertile reminiscence.

New names came into prominence at the close of the nineties, filling gaps in our ranks. Harold Brakspear's first account of Lacock Abbey was given to the *Journal* in 1900, and in subsequent years his admirable ground-plans of buildings lent to reports of meetings an increased value. As years went on, such plans in his hands and those of others became an indispensable accompaniment of our programmes. At the Ipswich meeting in 1899 W. H. Knowles, the Newcastle architect, acted as secretary, and in 1900 at Dublin and some subsequent meetings the secretary was Charles Peers, whose first noteworthy contribution to archaeological literature was his paper on Saxon Churches of the St. Pancras type in the *Journal* for 1901.

My object in this address is to recall things that are in danger of being forgotten, and, as I approach our own day and living persons, I must be brief. Under Howorth's presidency the meetings pursued a tranquil and useful course. Municipalities and local societies still welcomed us hospitably, though I do not think that there ever was a repetition of the enthusiasm manifested at Exeter in 1873, when the streets were hung with flags by the mayor's order to celebrate our arrival. Once more in 1902 the dangers of the Solent were braved in a visit from Southampton to the Isle of Wight. Hope's papers in the *Journal*, as well as his many addresses at meetings, maintained

their quality and authoritative excellence: I need mention only one which is not so well known as his detailed descriptions of monastic remains and other monuments, his highly judicial survey of the question of the origin of English fortresses and castles, a good example of his command of the literary material to be called into evidence. It was in 1904 that the first of his papers on the working of alabaster in England appeared, a topic which, with ample illustration, has been pursued in the *Journal* by other zealous lovers of medieval art, including a French antiquary, the Comte Paul Biver, who, with other most interesting and fully illustrated papers, produced one on examples of English alabaster tables in France. His name reminds us of the distinguished French archaeologists who from time to time have honoured our meetings, the Comte Robert de Lasteyrie, Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, Camille Enlart, whose conclusions on the English origin of French Flamboyant art were printed in our *Journal*, and of our own reception in France at the meeting at Rouen in 1938.

Such series of articles in the *Journal* as Dr. Fryer's careful papers on Fonts and Mr. G. C. Druce's researches into mythical and legendary zoology deserve a passing mention. At a meeting in 1905 a paper on the hotly debated subject of Low Side windows was followed by considerable discussion of their controverted uses, in which Hope spoke at some length on the side of commonsense and the theory which to-day has become generally accepted on a problem of which perhaps too much has been made.

A most active period was that from 1908 to 1914. At the Durham meeting in 1908 John Bilson expounded his conclusions upon the date of the cathedral vaulting, which were then not readily accepted by M. Lefèvre-Pontalis but gradually won recognition among French archaeologists. Bilson also was author of the masterly paper on Cistercian architecture in England, which was the chief but not the only notable feature of a volume of the *Journal* in 1909. Other papers of architectural interest were those of the late F. E. Howard, too soon lost to us, on Fan Vaulting and Medieval Wooden Roofs; while a mass of material with regard to the arrangements of Northamptonshire churches in the middle ages, collected by Robert Meyricke Serjeantson, rector of St. Peters, Northampton, and another Northamptonshire clergyman, Henry Isham Longden, filled a large space in the *Journal* for 1913. The same period also was marked by a couple of two-day meetings in the springs of 1911 and 1913, one to Westminster Abbey and the other to Windsor, where Hope, then lately knighted, acted

as guide to the castle. In 1913, further, at one of the ordinary meetings in London was exhibited the embalmed head said to be that of Oliver Cromwell—a unique occurrence in our annals.

But the outbreak of war, just after the end of the Derby meeting in 1914, curtailed our activities for the time being and our recovery was gradual. There were circumstances which made revival slow and from 1920 to 1922 our summer meetings were held in close co-operation with those of local societies at Devizes, Gloucester and Ripon. During this period we had the advantage of Mr. B. H. Cunnington's help as meeting secretary, which was of special assistance to us on our visits to prehistoric sites. It was a period of transition. Hope had gone ; Brakspear's services were still available ; Aymer Vallance was still ready to give us the advantage of his highly specialized knowledge of church furniture and fittings. On the same side came an important accession to our numbers in the person of Gordon McNeil Rushforth, with his fastidious scholarship and intimate acquaintance with medieval iconography and stained glass. These and others were with us at Winchester in 1924, when, under the presidency of Sir William Boyd Dawkins, the Institute, after a period marked by severe losses, had successfully recovered its strength.

Of more recent times I shall say nothing, save that in Boyd Dawkins's successor, Sir Charles Oman, we had a president who was—and is—a historian of comprehensive interests and wide learning with full appreciation of the part which archaeology and topography can play in historical study, always prepared in his presidential addresses to furnish our meetings, as Freeman in time past had done, with the general historical setting in which their details assumed perspective. Of others who have taken prominent parts in our meetings, alike in London and further afield, I feel that their virtues may be left to future commemoration and will spare their blushes. Their names, however, will be in all your minds. There is, however, one feature of our work on which I must dwell in conclusion. During the years since the last war, we have followed the tendency of public taste to pay increasing attention to the culture and monuments of early and prehistoric ages. At our annual meetings, which in recent years have included visits to Ireland and Normandy and two to Scotland, such monuments have taken a prominent place in our programmes. In the *Journal* also we have seen the publication of works of general importance to the history of early civilisation, Dr. Grundy's long series of elucidations of early English

land-charters, the serial issue of the late Hadrian Allcroft's *The Circle and the Cross*, into which the observation and reading of a lifetime were devoted to the scholarly demonstration of a most ingenious and original theory, and the monograph of Messrs. Hawkes and Dunning on *The Belgae in Britain*. If this side of our subject has of late years received special notice, medieval antiquities have by no means been forgotten. It was in 1928 that the late dean of Wells and our old friend John Bilson combined to furnish reasons for re-reading the history of the nave of Wells Cathedral and assigning to it a more gradual progress than had hitherto been accepted—a work of first-class importance to the architectural historian; and since then younger scholars, with an impartial zest for antiquity in all its aspects, have contributed much valuable material, founded on a sound historical basis, to the literature of monastic, military and domestic architecture. The effulgence of our early days may have lost its full brightness: the clouds of glory which we trailed to our early banquets and conversazioni and in our triumphal progress through flag-bedizened Exeter may have lost their splendour in the light of common day. But, if we are not as young as we were, I think that we may claim to have gained in wisdom and experience advantages which will be of immense assistance to us in facing the difficulties that surround us and all societies like ours in these critical times. And, though we are now entering upon our second century, I may make the further claim that we are as yet free from the reproach which usually is attached to second childhood, while from our survey of the past we may gain strength and hope for the future.