

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE FORMATION OF THE  
LONDON AND MIDDLESEX  
ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

By SIR EDWARD BRABROOK, C.B., *President*,

AN ADDRESS.

*Read at the Mansion House, London, December 14th, 1915,  
the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor in the chair.*

---

ON December the 14th, 1855, a meeting was held at Crosby Hall to inaugurate a Society which should be, for "our grand old City of London and our noble metropolitan county," as the chairman of the meeting put it, what the archæological societies that were then being formed in various parts of the kingdom were for their respective counties. It is a striking evidence of the changes which time is continually effecting that the very hall in which the meeting was held has ceased to be in the City. It still remains in the county, having been re-erected at Chelsea.

It is not the fault of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society that Crosby Hall has disappeared from the City of London. We did all we could, in concert with other bodies, to save it for the City; but commercial considerations were treated as paramount, and we failed. Thus it is that the very great-

ness and prosperity which London has enjoyed all through its history militate against the preservation of the relics of that past greatness and prosperity, proud as the citizens of London rightly are of those relics.

We are still more reminded of the mutability of human things when we look back across this interval of sixty years upon the names of those who joined in forming our Society. As far as I know, there is not one person now living of those who attended the inaugural meeting; there certainly is not one left who took an active part in it. Our senior member now is our esteemed Vice-President, Mr. Edward Jackson Barron, who is in his ninetieth year, and became a member in 1859. He is followed by the two sons of one of our founders, Mr. J. R. Daniel-Tyssen, long associated with the manor of Hackney, and by Mr. Frederick Wallen, the architect, who all joined the Society in 1864, in which year Dr. Amherst Daniel-Tyssen published a work on the Church Bells of Sussex, of which he has recently issued a Jubilee Edition.

I became a member in 1865, so that this diamond jubilee is also the fiftieth anniversary of my membership, as yesterday was the fifty-fifth anniversary of my election as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. I have mounted each step of the official ladder of this Society, having become successively member of council, secretary, treasurer, trustee, chairman of council, vice-president, and being now its unworthy president. I have also attained the age spoken of by Ecclesiastes when men have fears of that which is high. At any rate, whatever may be

my sense of my own inefficiency, I cannot but be proud of being, on this auspicious occasion, the representative voice of a Society which has had so interesting a history and so useful a career as the London and Middlesex Archæological Society now looks back upon.

It is not with mere conventional modesty that I appear here in that capacity when I refer to my predecessors in the office of president. That office was first accepted by Lord Londesborough, the President of the British Archæological Association. He was succeeded by Lord Talbot de Malahide, who presided over the Society for many years with much dignity, and with graceful courtesy and cordiality. His successor for a short period was General Augustus Lane Fox Pitt-Rivers, Her Majesty's Inspector of Ancient Monuments, and the ablest explorer of those remains that has ever been known. Finally, we had as President for many years Dr. Edwin Freshfield, whose high position in the City gave him an influence that he always was ready to exert in favour of our Society, and who was deeply interested in its work.

Among the pleasant recollections which this anniversary brings with it are those of the various occasions on which the Society has been accorded the recognition of the Corporation of the City of London. We have always had several of the Aldermen, and on many occasions the Lord Mayor, on our list of Vice-Presidents, and other members and officers of the Corporation on our Councils. We have been received at the Mansion House, as on the present auspicious occasion, and have done our best by our publications to elucidate the

history and antiquities of the City and to illustrate the discoveries of ancient remains made in it.

So also our associations with the City Companies have been agreeable. There is hardly a hall which we have not visited, and where we have not been cordially welcomed. At each we have endeavoured to study the history of the guild and of its more eminent members, and the archæological associations of the treasures it possesses. Our transactions embody much useful information on all these points. I may instance especially the important discovery in relation to the history of London trade guilds made by Mr. J. R. Daniel-Tyssen, in the records of the Commissary Court of the Bishops of London.

He found there the rules of four of the London Guilds—the Glovers, the Blacksmiths, the Waterbearers, and the Shearmen or Clothworkers. Of these, the last-mentioned is one of the twelve great Companies: the two first-mentioned are important Companies still in existence, and the Waterbearers' had a hall of its own, but went out of existence when Sir Hugh Myddelton's new river rendered the industry unnecessary. These rules range in date from the year 1354 to the year 1496. They were submitted to the Commissary, who certified that they had been confirmed and authorised by him, and they were thereupon registered in his Court. The object of this registry was explained by one of our members, Mr. Coote, who was very learned in ecclesiastical law, to be that the ecclesiastical court might enforce payment of the quarterages and fines due under the rules by means of a suit *pro læsione fidei*.

Those courts assumed to themselves, much against the will of the civil courts, the right to inflict canonical censures on persons who broke solemn promises.

Early in the history of the Society, a magnificent exhibition of Antiquities was arranged in Ironmongers' Hall, and the catalogue raisonnée of that exhibition was drawn up by a Committee of our members. It fills two finely illustrated quarto volumes, and is frequently referred to as a work of authority. The editor was Mr. George Russell French, an able architect and antiquary. He had a portly presence and a pleasant wit, and was a great student of Shakespeare. He declared that Shakespeare had foreseen the existence of our Society, and he fitted its prominent members with apt quotations. That which he selected for himself was not the least happy:—

“The confident and over-lusty French.”

To our publications we are able to refer with satisfaction. The amount of original research which they embody has earned for them a high reputation, and they have been found of use by many enquirers. The first series of our Transactions is in six volumes, and the third volume of a second series is in progress in annual parts under the editorship of Mr. Bonner. More than once the Council in issuing a volume have had to regret a long and wearisome delay in its publication, arising from circumstances beyond their control, but have been able to express the hope that that delay will not be considered unpardonable, when the varied and interesting

nature of the contents of the volume are taken into consideration.

I have quoted this confession and avoidance because some people might think that nine volumes of Transactions is a small output for sixty years' work. It would be so; but one of the causes that has diminished our issue of the Transactions is our having undertaken other costly publications at the same time. My own private opinion is that the policy of doing so was a mistaken one, and that it would have been better to have devoted all our energies to the perfection of our Transactions, which are really what I may call our staple production.

For many years we held regular monthly meetings in the evening for the reading of papers and the inspection of objects of interest brought for exhibition by our members, and we had in the late Mr. John Edward Price a most able and energetic director for those evening meetings. The proceedings at them were recorded during several years as a separate publication. Any inconvenience that might arise from this has been much mitigated by the insertion in our regular Transactions of several of the more important papers read which had special relation to the history of London and Middlesex. For example, the late Mr. John Green Waller's masterly paper on the Hole-bourne, in which he traced its course from the ponds of Hampstead and Highgate to the Thames at Blackfriars; Mr. William Henry Black's on the Roman sepulchre at Westminster Abbey, and two valuable papers by Mr. John Gough Nichols are contained in the fourth volume of the

Transactions, as well as in the proceedings of the Evening Meetings.

The Society at one time entered upon a somewhat ambitious course. The great work of Lysons on the Environs of London, monument of patient antiquarian research as it is, might well be supplemented by the results of more recent enquiries. The Guildhall Library possesses a fine extra-illustrated or grangerised copy of that work, which gives evidence of this. Why should not the Society create a new Lysons? One of the Council, the Rev. F. C. Cass, rector of Monken Hadley, entered into the plan with zeal and consummate industry and ability. He produced monographs on his own parish of Monken Hadley, and on the neighbouring parishes of East Barnet and South Mimms, which leave nothing to be desired.

These monographs form three well-illustrated quarto volumes, ranging with Lysons' original work and with "Archæologia," and containing pedigrees of all the principal families. With them has ended, at any rate for some time to come, the project of superseding Lysons by a new work of an exhaustive kind for each parish. In truth, it was found that the enterprise was beyond the Society's narrow means, and it and other quarto and octavo publications, though themselves all of great value, have of necessity delayed from time to time the ordinary Transactions.

Among these extra publications are several by Mr. J. E. Price on Roman remains discovered in various parts of London, in quarto: an account of the Marygold at Temple Bar by Mr. F. G. H. Price; a Calendar of

Inquisitiones post Mortem from 1485 to 1603, in three volumes; the Register of Freemen of the City in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, and the Churchwardens' Accounts of Allhallows, London Wall, in octavo; and a reproduction in facsimile of Ogilvy and Morgan's Map of London, 1677, edited by Mr. C. Welch.

In the production of some of these the Society has had liberal pecuniary aid from individual members.

I must not forget that there is in the Guildhall Library a permanent record of the Society's work in the form of an armorial window representing the minor companies of the City. When the Library was in course of building, it occurred to the Council that such a window would be a suitable embellishment and would have an educational value, and the Companies upon being appealed to willingly collaborated in the scheme. I have formed a strong opinion that heraldic devices, governed as they are by the strict laws of blazonry, devised for the very purpose of harmonious balance and brilliant effect, afford the most beautiful and appropriate adornment of a fine building, and I think I may point to that window as an instance.

Nor must I omit to mention the friendly relations we have held with other Societies. For some years we shared rooms with the Surrey Archæological Society, and held joint meetings. With the Essex Archæological Society a pleasant interchange of amenities took place about forty-five years ago, when the Honorary Secretaries of each Society were made Honorary Members of the other. With the British Archæological Asso-



ciation we held recently a joint congress, and the two Societies were received by the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House. Our area of operations has been extended to include the whole county of London.

While we can congratulate ourselves upon our sixty years' work, we must confess that we might have done more if we had had ampler means. Thanks to the vigilant care of Colonel Pearson, C.B., the Chairman of the Council, and Mr. Deputy Pitman, J.P., the Treasurer, our financial position is sound; but we ought to have many more members and a larger income, and it is to be hoped that one result of the present celebration will be to induce many of the right sort to join us.

I turn now to the principal subject to which I wish to draw attention, viz., the progress of archæological science generally during the last sixty years, and in doing so I must ask leave to repeat in other words much of what I said in a previous address to the Society.

At the beginning of that period and during many previous years, a deplorable course of destruction, under the name of "restoration," had been pursued with respect to a vast number of the ancient churches of the country. On the 1st May, 1855, the Council of the Society of Antiquaries adopted a memorandum on the subject in which it was stated that the destruction of the character of ancient monuments which was taking place under the pretence of restoration was a pernicious practice and an increasing evil.

They feared that unless strong and immediate measures were taken to remedy it, the monumental records of England would before long cease to exist as

truthful records of the past. They were convinced that the indiscreet zeal for restoration had inflicted more injury on these monuments than time and neglect together had caused. Time and neglect may impair and in time destroy, but do not add to a building nor pervert the truthfulness of monuments. Restoration may produce an imitation of an ancient work of art, but it falsifies the original, which can no longer be an example of the art of the period to which it belonged. The more exact the imitation, the more it is misleading. A monument restored is frequently a monument destroyed.

They thought that, if the public at large really knew how imperfectly the principles and practice of ancient art were understood, and how very few of the so-called restorations had any just pretensions to fidelity, and if the public could appreciate the rash presumption of those who in general recommended and undertook such work, much less would be heard of money being lavishly spent in thus perpetrating irreparable mischief; and they strongly urged that, except where restoration is called for in churches by the requirements of Divine Service, or in other cases of manifest public utility, no restoration should ever be attempted, otherwise than in the sense of preservation from further injuries by time or negligence, and contended that anything beyond this would be untrue in art, unjustifiable in taste, destructive in practice, and wholly opposed to the judgment of the best archæologists.

This vigorous protest had some effect in modifying the unholy zeal of the restorers; but the evil was too deep-seated to be wholly remedied by it, for many things

have been done in churches since 1855 that cannot be defended. Some progress, however, has been made; and all archæologists are united in deploring the mischief that has been done in the past, and deprecating any attempt to do the like in the few churches that still remain unrestored. The restorers now announce their designs with bated breath, and humbly whisper that it is only repair that they are engaged in, not restoration.

We have, therefore, now arrived at entire unanimity on the question that destructive restoration ought not to take place. No one holds the contrary doctrine. No one thinks, as the restoring architects used at one time openly to declare, that it is for them to clear away everything that has been done in a church since some particular date, and to re-create that which they fancy was the church at the date in question. Though all are agreed, however, that this ought not to be, it is still done sometimes. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings has prevented much mischief, but there are still cases in which it cannot interfere, or in which its interference has not the desired result.

That Society recently took the opportunity of urging its views upon the Archbishops of Canterbury and York by a deputation which they kindly asked me to join. The reception which their Graces gave to the deputation was cordial. Since then, a Report has been issued of a committee whom they had called in to advise them. That Report was very much to the effect that the present system of granting faculties by the Chancellors of Dioceses was the best that can be devised. We do not think so. We think, in fact, that the method of issuing Faculties is a weak point in the present system.

Another weak point is the extent to which the legal requirement that nothing should be done to an ecclesiastical building without a faculty is neglected. We cannot but think that more effective measures might be adopted to enforce against incumbents—who hold only a life interest in their cures, and ought not to be allowed to prejudice future generations—the requirements of the law in this respect; and we think also that no faculty should be granted until the Chancellor has been satisfied by independent expert advice that it is not open to objection on archæological grounds.

The satisfactory result of all this discussion is the development of public opinion in favour of the preservation of ancient monuments, both ecclesiastical and civil. When one looks back to the years during which Lord Avebury (then Sir John Lubbock) had to fight for his Ancient Monuments Bill against the opposition of property owners and the indifference of the public, and the many concessions he had to make before he could get any Bill passed at all, we cannot but rejoice at the progress which is indicated by the present condition of things.

In this respect, indeed, we can congratulate the nation. General Pitt-Rivers, the first Inspector of Ancient Monuments, with all his consuming zeal and masterly ability, found himself hampered by the limitations of the Act, and could do but little. After his death several years of inaction supervened. Now we have a Department of the Office of Works established, with Mr. Peers, the Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries, at its head as Chief Inspector, and other inspectors and a com-

petent staff to assist him, and the protection of Ancient Monuments is their daily work as a recognised branch of the activities of the State.

The thing that emerges from all this is the growing interest taken by the public in relics of antiquity; but I do not mean to assert that no such interest existed before the year 1855. The two rival penny illustrated magazines which were started in 1832—one (the “Penny Magazine”) by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge; the other (the “Saturday Magazine”) by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge—did much to awaken and stimulate it.

I possess a complete set of the last-mentioned, the twenty-fifth volume of which contains a brief general Index, and I frequently avail myself of it to consult the excellent archæological articles which the magazine contains, and which cannot but have had much influence in interesting its readers in the subject.

I am not overlooking the great works of Lysons and Colt Hoare and the monumental County Histories, some of which date to the eighteenth century, but they appealed to another class of readers.

What I venture to assert is that there has been for many years past not only a growing interest in objects of antiquity, but also a growing knowledge of their importance and value spread among all classes of the community. An old house is not now looked upon as a nuisance, to be swept away and its place occupied by one in more modern taste. The public is learning more and more to understand and appreciate the ideas

that are expressed in the buildings and decorations of old time. Necessity sometimes requires the destruction of an old house, but it is always done under protest, and after every effort to save it has been exhausted.

It is not merely because our taste in art is better educated that we have learned to appreciate old things; the love of antiquity is a mental and moral quality as well as an æsthetic one. Who can visit Westminster Abbey and view the mystery of its lofty roof, like interlaced boughs of forest trees, the monuments of the kings, the group of apsidal chapels, the elaborate decoration of the chapel of the Order of the Bath, the graves of statesmen and other great men, of Livingstone and Darwin, the peace of the cloisters—especially the little cloister—the ancient chapel of the Pyx, the monastic buildings leading up to the School Hall, Ashburnham House, with its beautiful staircase, the Deanery and Dean's Yard, the Jerusalem Chamber and the Abbot's Dining Hall, without being inspired with fine thoughts and deep emotions?

We have only to contrast with this the depth of infamy that the enemies of our King and Country have incurred by their treatment of the ancient buildings in Belgium and France that have come into their temporary possession by their lawless invasion of those countries. First, the University and Library of Louvain, of which not a single book or manuscript was saved, but absolute destruction was effected by the use of chemicals. Then the Cathedral and Cloth Hall of Ypres, magnificent not only as specimens of Gothic architecture, but as monuments of a closed page of his-

tory. Arras Cathedral, also, and worst of all, perhaps, the unique grandeur of the Cathedral of Rheims, all sacrificed to a brutal savagery that prides itself on rivaling that of the Huns.

It is true that the prime instigator of these atrocities has said that his own heart bleeds over them. I am far from accusing him of insincerity; but I wish that his emotion had gone the length of preventing them. The fact that he did not do so, and that his people rejoice in the evil that has been done, is evidence that no culture of the intellect is of much avail unless it is accompanied by reverence for the past. The Kaiser's own respect for antiquity has taken a curious form. At Saalburg, the great Roman fortress of Artaunum, he has shown himself to be the most audacious of "restorers."

The Roman buildings here were of great extent, and had been carefully explored for several years. Mr. F. G. Hilton Price communicated a very clear and full account of them to the Society of Antiquaries on March 20th, 1890 (Proc. S.A. xiii. 110). Since then the Kaiser has rebuilded them, with a view to give his subjects an object lesson in Roman strategy, and to show them what a Roman fortress of the first class would have been like. The motive is indeed excellent, but the work itself would, I fear, fall under the censures pronounced by the Society of Antiquaries in 1855 on the work of the imitative restorer.

I hope that, in saying this, I am not disparaging the one good action of a misspent life.

In explorations of ancient remains, both in the

manner of conducting them, and the means of recording them, there has been a marked advance during the last sixty years. It is due in the main to the example set by General Pitt-Rivers, who under his previous description as Colonel Lane Fox, had acquired a high reputation for precision in observation and acuteness in reasoning out the significance of the things observed. The change of name with its quaint combination of the names of the two great rivals of a past generation— Fox and Pitt—was due to his inheriting the Rivers estates in the year 1880 under the will of his great-uncle, the second Lord Rivers. On these estates there were a considerable number of antiquities, extending over a large area of what was formerly Cranborne Chase. "I had," he says, "an ample harvest before me, and with the particular tastes that I had cultivated, it almost seemed as if some unseen hand had trained me up to be the possessor of such a property, which, up to within a short time of my inheriting it, I had but little reason to expect."

He organised a staff of assistants, and devoted the remainder of his life to the complete exploration of the district. The results are set forth in four stout quarto volumes, describing respectively the Romano-British Village on Woodcuts Common, and the Romano-British antiquities in Rushmore Park; the Barrows near Rushmore, the Romano-British Village at Rotherley, Winklebury Camp, and the Anglo-Saxon Cemetery on Winklebury Hill; Bokerley and Wansdyke; the South Lodge Camp at Rushmore Park, Handley Hill Entrenchments, the Stone and Bronze Age Barrows



and Camp at Handley, Dorset, Martin Down Camp, and other remains.

These volumes were privately printed, and were generously presented by the author to working archæologists. They are a model for all explorers, containing very accurate accounts of the precise position in which every object was discovered, its form and size, measurements and indices of the skulls and other important portions of every human skeleton, and many figures, plans and maps.

The able assistants General Pitt-Rivers engaged and trained in his methods of working have since themselves achieved distinction in the same field: both Mr. St. George Gray and Mr. Reader having made extensive researches and published accounts of them.

Another important and prolonged exploration is that undertaken by the Society of Antiquaries into the Roman town of Calleva, the remains of which are situated at Silchester. This occupied the close attention of Mr. (now Sir William) St. John Hope, Mr. Mill Stephenson and others for seventeen summers, and each year the results were reported to the Society in the form of a paper in "Archæologia." It is much to be desired that a collected volume of these results should be separately prepared and issued.

I need not refer at length to other work of the kind which has been undertaken and partially carried into effect, but the further prosecution of which has had to be suspended in consequence of the war, such as the excavations at Old Sarum and at Wroxeter, for my object is fulfilled in having shown that during recent

years there has been a great increase of activity in this work, and also a great increase of scientific precision and accuracy in the manner of carrying it out, both of them elements of the utmost importance in every archæological enquiry.

There has thus been progress both in scientific archæology and in popular archæology. The first is due mainly to the labours of individuals; the second in a large degree to the influence of associations. The visits made to places of interest by the Royal Archæological Institute, the British Archæological Association, and the County Societies, including our own, have been followed by visits from local Antiquarian Societies, University Extension classes and other bodies under expert guidance. Even picture postcards have helped to spread among the multitude some knowledge of the beauties of our old architecture. I thank your Lordship, on behalf of the Society, for the encouragement your presence at this meeting gives us to a continuance in well-doing.