

Notes on the Archaeology of Markshall.

COMMUNICATED BY

RAINBIRD CLARKE.

Despite the fact that in Blomefield's day Markshall contained only one farmhouse, and in 1840 but three cottages more, which to-day, with a few additions, house fifty odd inhabitants,¹ few parishes can exhibit a finer sequence of cultures from the prehistoric age to the present time. Its 549 acres have provided an attractive habitation site, industrial centre and burial ground for successive races. Most of its antiquities have been adequately described individually, and the following notes have mainly been written in view of the erroneous statements on the subject which have been given currency by those in authority during recent years.

The physical configuration of Markshall is dominated by the sand and gravel peninsula known as Chapel Hill, precipitous on the north-west, but sloping gradually on the south-east to the Tas, which flows to its confluence with the Yare beyond the present parish boundary to the north-east. The hill is now crowned by trees and cleft by the Norwich and Ipswich railway line, which bisects the parish. The arable fields surrounding it on all sides are an admixture of sand and boulder-clay

¹ 1931 Census Report.

with gravel, while alluvium prevails along the river margins.¹ The present erratic nature of the eastern boundary of the parish may indicate the course of an older bed of the Tas, but the Arminghall boundary following the crooked drain between the two rivers is modern, as can be seen by comparing Bryant's Map of 1826 (where the boundary follows the course of the Tas to its confluence with the Yare) with the Tithe Award Map of 1838-40.

The earliest artifacts from the parish consist of a few pre-palæolithic flint implements from the field between Chapel Hill and the Yare, but as these may be glacially derived they are not proof of human occupation of the site. The finding of these implements before 1916² led Mr. J. E. Sainty in 1928 to sink a pit in the gravel knoll at the north-east extremity of the parish. Owing to difficulties with water, the excavation had to be abandoned before the lower palæolithic or sub-crag strata could be investigated.³ Before 1881, H. B. Woodward found a small unabraded ovate in the talus of this low gravel cliff, whose surface is about 20 feet O.D.⁴ In September, 1906, Mr. F. N. Haward found in this pit, 9 to 12 inches from the surface, a grey patinated microlith⁵ of Tardenoisian facies of Type D.I.b. iv.⁶

¹ *Geology of the Country round Norwich*, 1881, p. 72, and *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia*, vol. i., 1913, p. 339.

² Now in Norwich Museum. *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. ii., 1916, pp. 220-1.

³ *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. vi., 1929, p. 58.

⁴ $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{3}{8}$ inch thick. Now in Geological Museum, South Kensington. See *Geology of the Country round Norwich*, 1881, p. 145, and *Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists' Transactions*, vol. viii., 1907, p. 395, and letters from H. B. Woodward, 4.xii.1905, and from A. Pringle, 3.vii.1906 (with sketch incorrectly labelled "Lakenham"), in W. G. Clarke MS. 126, Norwich Central Library. A photograph of this gravel terrace (taken 1908) is in Norfolk Photographic Survey, No. 1141, at the same Library.

⁵ Now in Norwich Museum (86.24). *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. iii., 1919, p. 149, and information from F.N.H.

⁶ According to Dr. Grahame Clark's classification of "The Tardenoisian of Horsham," in *Archæological Journal*, vol. xc., 1934, p. 57.

Earlier than 1906, Mr. Haward had discovered a site where flints of "Cissbury" flint-mine type were "roughed-out," in the fields on either side of the railway line on the northern slope of Chapel Hill, just above the river alluvium and below the 50-foot contour. In 1907, quite independently, Mr. H. H. Halls also discovered the site.¹ The implements were of large facies, and among them long scrapers, planes and cones predominated. Pro-tuberant bulbs were common, but facettèd butts rare. A circular depression near the river suggests a ploughed-out "Cissbury" flint pit, and the accumulation of rough flakes around the spot supports the view, though it needs to be confirmed by excavation. Antlers are recorded from the parish.² Implements, including axes, possibly referable to the Neolithic Age, have been picked up on the fields on the east side of the parish.³ The close proximity of the Neolithic flint-mine industry of Campignian tradition and Bronze Age flint types, such as the stemmed and barbed arrowhead,⁴ may be evidence for a continuity of flint exploitation on the site during the Neolithic and Early Metal Ages. The solitary microlith may be of later date and is inadequate to prove human occupation in the Late Mesolithic Age.

In June 1929 an R.A.F. aeroplane, at 4000 feet, photographed the north-east corner of the parish. The

¹ *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, 2nd series, part 3, 1908 (Published 1909), p. 96; *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. i., 1912-3, pp. 240-1, 344; and *Grimes' Graves Report*, 1915, p. 30. A photograph of part of this field (1908) is No. 1140 in Norfolk Photographic Survey.

² *Geology of the Country round Norwich*, 1881, p. 138.

³ *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. i., 1913, pp. 339-40; vol. ii., 1916-7, p. 199; vol. iii., 1919-21, pp. 148, 465; vol. v., 1928, p. 311; vol. vi., 1931-2, pp. 249, 385. In Norwich Museum from W. G. Clarke, H. W. Cockrill, and H. H. Halls. Collections from various sites in the parish are horse-shoe, button, and double-ended scrapers, 9 other scrapers, 6 cones, 3 planes, borer, and axe. Fifteen implements formerly in W. G. Clarke Collection are now in Sturge Room, British Museum (R. A. Smith, *Sturge Collection, Britain*, 1931, 126). Other implements are in the possession of F. N. Haward and J. E. Sainty.

P.P.S.E.A., vol. i., 1911, p. 114.

photograph revealed, immediately to the south-west of the gravel knoll referred to, two concentric rings, which appear to indicate a ploughed-out disc-barrow of the Bronze Age, a view confirmed by the numerous circular flint scrapers with characteristic pressure-flaking found on the site. To the south-west of the barrow was a D-shaped enclosure of unknown age and purpose.¹ A previous photograph of July 1928 had revealed two circles, probably ploughed-out tumuli, some 70-100 feet in diameter, in the crops south-west of the coppice called "The Carr."² Inhabitants of the parish allege that seven or eight "circles" were visible in this field (Home Close) when it was last under barley. In August 1933 the Norfolk and Norwich Aero Club took several oblique photographs of the fields south-west of Chapel Hill. These demonstrate the existence of numerous circles and rectangular enclosures. The circles may represent destroyed tumuli, but until they and the other enclosures have been excavated scientifically, it is impossible to dogmatize upon their date or use.³ In the Home Close photograph are several amorphous enclosures bounded by narrow banks and ditches. No satisfactory explanation is forthcoming.

A few fragments of coarse grey pottery found in 1929 on the summit of Chapel Hill by the present

¹ R.A.F. Air-photographs, 1878-9, 18.vi.29, and *Antiquity*, vol. iii., 1929, pp. 258-9, and plate 2. The analogy there suggested between Woodhenge, Arminghall and this site, and the Wiltshire Woodhenge cannot be sustained owing to the rejection of the evidence for circle 1. at the latter site by M. E. Cunington, *Woodhenge*, 1929, 184 (Devizes).

² R.A.F. Air-photograph, 1880, 24.vii.28, at 3000 feet. Also photographed by the Norfolk and Norwich Aero Club, 1933. Reproduced in *Eastern Daily Press*, March 20th, 1934, *The Year's Photography*, 1934-5, plate 51, and *The Norfolk Annual*, 1934, p. 43.

³ *Eastern Daily Press*, August 30th, 1933, September 14th, 1933, and March 24th, 1934. Professor Atkinson regards the site as that of an Iron Age settlement. Air-photographs of similar sites in Oxfordshire appear in *Antiquity*, vol. i., 1927, pp. 469-74, plate 2; vol. vii., 1933, pp. 290-6, plates 4-6; *Antiquaries' Journal*, vol. xiv., 1934, pp. 414-6, plate 58.

writer are most probably to be attributed to Iron Age A, according to Mr. C. F. C. Hawkes, but they are inadequate to prove any extensive occupation of the site. This is only the fifth site in Norfolk from which pottery of this period has been recorded, the others being West Harling, Runcton Holme, Stiffkey, and Tottenhill.

In the Roman Age the proximity of the town at Caistor naturally pre-supposes that some extensive traces of human habitation, burial, or industry might be discovered in the area. The wish has been father to the thought, and some learned antiquaries have lavished ink and imagination in depicting the last rites of the Roman soldier at the gaunt cemetery on Chapel Hill, and on the mob of humanity chaffering their wares on a quay about 300 yards north-west of "The Carr" on the west bank of the Tas. The date of both "cemetery" and "quay" will be discussed in connection with the parish church. Suffice it here to say that there is no evidence for a Roman date for either. At present a pottery kiln is the sole relic which can be attributed to that period. A letter from Mr. Charles Layton of Norwich, dated May 12th, 1822, announced this discovery to the Society of Antiquaries.¹ Owing to the finding of a cemetery which he, in error, regarded as Roman, on a steep hill (White's Hill)² overhanging the Tas, opposite the north-west corner of

¹ Read 16.v.1822. *Archæologia*, vol. xxii., 1829, pp. 412-4, and plate XXXVI, *Arch. Jour.*, vol. xlv., 1889, pp. 343, 355. Re-published in A. Brongniart, *Traité des Arts céramiques ou des Poteries*, Paris, 1st ed., 1844, vol. i., p. 449, and Atlas, plate XXV.; *Norfolk Archæology*, vol. vi., 1864, p. 155; H. Godwin, *English Archæologist's Handbook*, 1867, p. 61; R. Fitch, *An Account of Caister Camp*, 1868, p. v.; *Victoria County History of Norfolk*, vol. i., 1901, opp. p. 292; and *Cambridge Antiquarian Society's Communications*, vol. xvii., 1913, pp. 28-9. Also in Add. MSS. 23,027, f. 91 (Dawson Turner).

² On Tithe Award Map, c. 1838-40.

Caistor town wall,¹ Layton started digging early in 1822. He excavated 120 square yards and uncovered a cemetery undoubtedly of Anglian character. In the course of this work, he dug into a Roman pottery kiln. Though a portion was destroyed, Layton drew a plan and section of the structure with fragments of pots still *in situ*. As the present location of this pottery is unknown, it is impossible to date closely the period of activity of the kiln, and consequently to explain its relationship to the three pottery kilns² which operated in the early 2nd century inside the subsequent walled area at Caistor, and to the kiln found in 1931 east of the walled area.³ The Markshall kiln owes its position to the suitable boulder-clay in the neighbourhood.⁴

On November 9th, 1815, the Society of Antiquaries was informed that four urns had lately been dug up near the top of a natural elevation in the parish, at a distance of two or three furlongs north-west from the "Great Camp at Castor," by labourers engaged in making a fence in preparation for tree planting. Similar urns had "been taken up in very great numbers in the course of the last six months."⁵ Twenty urns at least were found in 1815,⁶ and others in 1818 and 1820. Attracted by these finds, Layton excavated and found more urns "in regular rows," some containing bronze

¹ Kiln marked on O.S. 6-in., 75, north-east, and site is known on R.A.F. Air-photograph 3111, 18.vi.29, at 4000 feet.

² *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xxii., 1932, p. 33-46.

³ Information from Surgeon-Commander F. R. Mann.

⁴ *Geology of the Country round Norwich*, 1881, p. 104.

⁵ *Arch.*, vol. xviii., 1817, p. 436 and plate XVIII; vol. xxii., 1829, p. 412; vol. xxiii., 1830, p. 366. The four urns in the plate are also shown in Dawson Turner Add. MSS. 23,035, f. 127, dated 1816. (The reference to Add. MSS. 23,055, f. 111, in *V.C.H.* vol. i., 1901, p. 292, is incorrect.) See also A. Brongniart, *Traité des Arts céramiques ou des Poteries*, Paris, 1st ed., 1844, Atlas, plate LVII., f. II.; R. Fitch, *An Account of Caister Camp*, 1868, pp. v.-vi.; and a *Handbook of the Prehistoric Archaeology of Britain*, 1932, p. 64.

⁶ *Proc. Arch. Inst.*, Norwich vol., 1847, p. xxix.

tweezers, besides a glass goblet, which may indicate an admixture of inhumation in this otherwise predominantly cremation cemetery. From this Anglian cemetery come the four urns, bronze tweezers,¹ and an iron ring from a bucket, given to Norwich Museum in 1825, 1826, 1838, and 1847.² The accession books give no additional information. An urn dated 1820 is now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.³ The "elevation," or, rather, twin elevations, referred to are marked as tumuli on a map of 1838,⁴ but they seem to be of natural origin. There are traces of digging on the northern one.

In the Squire Manuscripts at Norwich Castle Museum is a crudely executed drawing of a small bronze vase or ewer on three legs, with two handles, found here in an urn in 1831.⁵ This probably comes from the Anglian cemetery, but in the absence of the vessel it is impossible to be certain. From Chapel Hill in 1857 came a rough gold imitation of a "Third Brass" of Helena, possibly struck in Gaul, according to Sir John Evans, who referred it to the 5th or 6th century.⁶ A large bead of opaline vitreous paste was found in Chapel Hill before 1847, but its present location is unknown.⁷

Markshall had a church at the Domesday Inquest, but the date of its construction is undetermined, and

¹ J. Akerman, *Pagan Saxondom*, 1855, p. 43.

² *Catalogue of Antiquities*, Norwich Castle Museum, 1910, p. 51, and 1855 ed. The two urns, dated 656. 1847, are apparently identical with those in bottom row of plate XVIII., *Arch.*, vol. xviii.

³ Mr. E. T. Leeds informs the present writer that this has been incorrectly published as coming from Markshall, Essex, in *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.*, vol. xix., 1929, p. 253. It is there illustrated in plate IV.

⁴ First edition 1-inch Ordnance Survey.

⁵ Merely on the evidence of the drawing, Mr. T. D. Kendrick guesses that the vessel might be "either Coptic or, more probably, a Teutonic miniature copy of a Coptic vessel."

⁶ Figured in *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1st series, vol. xx., 1859, pp. 43-8, and *Proc.*, 19.xi.1857, pp. 33-4, and *V.C.H.*, vol. i., 1901, pp. 292-3. Reprinted in R. Fitch, *An Account of Caister Camp*, 1868, pp. viii-xi.

⁷ *Proc. Arch. Inst.*, Norwich vol., 1847, p. xxvi.

the extant sketches of its fabric are inadequate to enable the period of its architecture to be decided. The site of the church has been the source of much confusion, which may best be dispersed by relating its causes. In 1881-2, when the parish was surveyed in preparation for the first 6-inch to one mile Ordnance Survey Map, the only ruin above ground was a fragment of masonry north-west of "The Carr."¹ This consisted of a rectangular structure, apparently extending east and west and ending eastwards in a hexagonal "bay." The east wall of the bay of faced flint with brick quoins, stands about 3 feet high, and is 8 feet long. Owing, however, to the fact that an ash tree grows inside the "bay," the walling of which has parted under the strain, it is impossible to determine the thickness of the wall. The south wall is 7 feet 6 inches long and 1 foot 6 inches thick, and the bay may be of similar dimensions. The north wall is nowhere visible, but rubble on the surface may indicate its position. The south-east face of the "bay" is 4 feet long, while the east face at the end of the south wall is 2 feet 2 inches long. The westward extent of the building cannot be determined without excavation. There seemed no objection to the identification of this structure with the ruins of the parish church, especially as the Ordnance Survey accepted it, till in 1906, the Rev. H. J. D. Astley, at the instigation of Mr. Walter Rye, asserted that this ruin was the remains of a Roman quay. At the same time he published² a photograph of a sketch made by Tom Martin in 1737. Unfortunately, misreading Martin's notes in the light of his conviction that the ruin was of Roman origin, he advanced the untenable thesis that the

¹ Sheet 75, north-east, published 1885.

² *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, 2nd series, 1906, pp. 39-45. Also photograph of east side of bay.

site of the church was on the gravel bluff 370 yards to the north, despite the fact that no traces of a building were to be seen. Strange to relate, the Ordnance Survey accepted Dr. Astley's conclusions, and "Markshall Church" and "Roman Landing Place" have remained on the 6-inch map at the sites indicated by him, through the editions published in 1908, 1919, and 1929. More recent writers, relying on the joint testimony of the Ordnance Survey and Dr. Astley, have perpetuated the same idea.¹ Yet attractive as is the suggestion, it cannot be accepted. There is a striking absence of masonry from the gravel knoll. Gravel digging, besides the excavations of Mr. Sainty referred to above, have completely exposed the whole area to a considerable depth without revealing foundations of any sort. The brick and flint structure is certainly not of Roman date. No quay would have been erected one mile below the town at Caistor and on the opposite bank of the river. Neither the method of construction nor the bulk of the material are Roman. The bricks are obviously mediæval in date, though a few may have been stolen from Caistor. Are we then to revert to the pre-1906 theory and regard this structure as the remains of the parish church, an identification strengthened by its plan and construction? Unfortunately the evidence to the contrary is too strong to be gainsaid.

In 1675, Ogilby published his road book indicating the chief landmarks visible from the main roads. On leaving Norwich by the "Hartford Bridges" for Ipswich, the traveller rode along an open way as far as the 39th

¹ e.g., C. J. W. Messent, *The Ruined Churches of Norfolk*, 1931, p. 26. "Its site is on a large mound well raised above the marshes, about ½-mile south-east of Hartford Bridges. It is only reached by traversing a foot path for about a mile in a northerly direction from Markshall Farm. Only the foundations in the ground now exist, and these are completely covered with grass." These bearings are contradictory.

milestone at Dunston. On his left, midway between this road and Caistor, and some distance to the north, was to be seen a lofty hill (shown by hachures) surmounted by a roofless, towerless edifice bearing the cross and labelled "Merkshall." Can this be other than Chapel Hill and Markshall Church?

The next witness is "Honest Tom Martin."¹ In view of Dr. Astley's amazing version, it may be well to transcribe Martin's field notes accompanying the sketch made at the time of his visit. "May 27, 1737. Markshall. Humbleyard Chapell on an eminence by the Harford Bridge River shewing cross Lakenham Chu(rch) on the other side of the river N.E. No steeple—nave 8 yards long same broad—chancel 10 yards long (?) 5 yards broad—roofless—churchyard down not a house near only one farm $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile south—Castor river between." Astley read "Chu" as mill, (?) 5 yards as 8, $\frac{1}{4}$ as $\frac{1}{3}$, and "between" as behind. An examination of the manuscript indicates that the "5" was written hurriedly. It is unlike any other numeral employed by Martin, but 5 is the most likely reading. " $\frac{1}{3}$ " of a mile is impossible. Martin, who was obviously estimating the distance by eye, wrote $\frac{1}{2}$ and then altered it to $\frac{1}{4}$, the truth probably lying between the two. Chapel Hill again is the only eminence in the area. It is visible from Lakenham Churchyard, across the Yare to the north-east. Both the gravel knoll and the ruin are over $\frac{1}{2}$ a mile north of Markshall Farm, while Chapel Hill is between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ a mile, though the bearing is west of north.

Blomefield provides the next testimony,² though whether he depended on Martin or did a completely

¹ *MSS. Church Notes*, vol. 3, Norwich Central Public Library.

² Blomefield, 4to vol. iii., p. 32; 8vo vol. v., 1806, pp. 46-9.

independent survey himself is uncertain. After describing Keswick Church, he writes: "More on the same side of the river, on a promontory bounded on the South-east by the river Taüs, are seen the ruins of another church, properly enough called 'Merkeshall.'" The church is dedicated to St. Edmund King and Martyr. It "never had a steeple only a nave and chancel." The former was 10 yards by 8 and the latter 10 yards by 6. "The only house in the parish stands about 2 furlongs south of it; the ruins are still perceptible at some distance."

The final evidence comes from the *Norfolk Chronicle*.¹ In excavating a cutting for the Norwich and Ipswich railway through Chapel Hill, the navvies dug up seven human skeletons, the skulls of two of them being damaged. (The usual legend of a battle is here interpolated.) The foundations of a building "probably a chapel or some religious house" were removed. A stone coffin, broken into two, in which were fragments of human bones, but no skull, was found on April 13th in the presence of the newspaper correspondent. "Some pieces of 'Roman' pottery were . . . discovered, but no coins nor any other antiquities." The coffin is probably to be identified with the fragments of the head and foot of a mediæval stone coffin now lying on the rockery in the grounds of Caistor Hall, and with the "stone cist" marked on the Ordnance Map, together with Roman coins, and bearing the date 1845. This must be an error, unless digging took place on the site before the railway work began in March, 1847.² The pieces of "Roman" pottery may be of Iron Age or mediæval date. Nothing is known of the coins marked on the Ordnance Survey Map.

¹ April 17th, 1847. Reprinted in *Norfolk News*, April 24th.

² Fossils are recorded in 1842. (*Geology of Country round Norwich*, 1881.)

A general confirmation of this comes from a letter of July 26th, 1847, written by Hudson Gurney of Keswick.¹ "For those visiting Caistor," he writes, "the best position for seeing the whole course of the estuary of the Yare, was from a spot in Merkeshall hills, where the old church of Merkeshall stood, but since covered by the plantations of the late Mr. Dashwood; as far, however, as I can judge from a distance, I think the works of the newly projected railroad, will have reopened the view."

The evidence for the site of the church may now be summarized. The gravel bluff at the north-east extremity of the parish cannot be the site, for its position does not agree remotely with the distances given by Martin or Blomefield, while no building materials or foundations have been found or shown in the recent air-photographs. The brick and flint structure cannot be identified with Markshall Church, for its dimensions do not tally with either of the measurements given; no bay is shown in Martin's sketch; its site is not on an eminence, it cannot be seen from the Ipswich road, and its situation, abutting on marshland liable to floods, is unsuitable for a church. Finally, on Chapel Hill, a site significant in name, and corresponding in every particular to the descriptions of Ogilby, Martin, and Blomefield, save that it is north-west and not north of Markshall Farm, a mediæval ecclesiastical structure surrounded by its oval graveyard, has actually been discovered.

It will be noted that the hill is "Chapel" Hill and that Martin calls the edifice a "Chapell." This is accounted for by the fact that in 1525 William Paston presented William Woodward Priest "not as formerly to a rectory, but to a free-chapel; by means of which, at

¹ *Proc. Arch. Inst.*, Norwich vol., 1847, p. 8.

the Dissolution, it was demolished, the glebe and profits seized."¹ It does not appear that the demolition was at all thorough, for Martin's sketch shows the lower part of the windows as existing in 1737. However, incumbents were presented till the church was desecrated in 1695, and the living consolidated with that of Caistor St. Edmunds.

The secular antiquities of the parish in the Christian period are few in number. A gold ring with a Norman-French inscription,² found in the railway cutting, was exhibited to the Norfolk and Norwich Archæological Society on December 7th, 1848. In 1933 the present writer found in the field immediately east of Chapel Hill a large buff-coloured rim of unglazed ware dated to the 12th or 13th century by Mr. Hawkes. The field containing the disc-barrow is called Monks on the Tithe Award Map. The name may be derived from the fact that the advowson was settled on Thos. Moyne in 1349, on Thos. Moigne or Monk in 1408. In 1451 John Yelverton was lord of Monk's Manor or Lumnour Hall in this parish. Is it possible that the brick and flint structure is connected with the house of this manor? In Blomefield's day the whole village as well as the church was dilapidated. The present farmhouse had then lately been built by a member of the Pettus family. The barn by Markshall Lane,³ west of the railway, bears a tablet with the date 1824 and the initials H. D.—Henry Dashwood of Caistor.

The archæological richness of Markshall in post-glacial times, at least, is due primarily to its innate geological and geographical facilities for human habitation, especially to its excellent natural drainage and to its adequate

¹ Blomefield, vol. v., 1806, p. 48.

² Now in Norwich Museum. See *Norfolk Archæology*, vol. ii., 1849, p. 407.

³ Bryant's Map of 1826.

water supply, while its flint and clay and the fertility of its fields have led to its economic exploitation. Among the major archæological periods apparently only the Upper Palæolithic Age, the Late Bronze Age, and Iron Age B are unrepresented. Of these, the absence of Late Bronze Age remains is perhaps the most surprising in view of the concentration of population in the Norwich region in that period.¹

I am deeply indebted to those who have placed information at my disposal or allowed me to incorporate the results of their criticisms. In particular I would mention Miss G. V. Barnard, the Rev. J. W. Corbould-Warren, M.A., Surgeon-Commander F. R. Mann, and Messrs. O. G. S. Crawford, F.S.A., H. H. Halls, F. N. Haward, C. F. C. Hawkes, F.S.A., G. Hayward, F.L.A., T. D. Kendrick, F.S.A., E. A. Kent, F.S.A., E. T. Leeds, F.S.A., F. Leney, H. F. Low, A. A. Rice, and J. E. Sainty, B.Sc.

¹ *P.P.S.E.A.*, vol. vii., 1933, p. 156, and plate IV. "Distribution of Objects of the Late Bronze Period."