

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## SOMERSETSHIRE ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

DURING THE YEAR

1919.

---

**T**HE Seventy-First Annual Meeting of the Somersetshire Archæological and Natural History Society was held at Taunton on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, July 29th, 30th and 31st, and was favoured with delightful weather.

A meeting of the Council was held at Taunton Castle at 11.15 a.m.; and was followed at 2.15 p.m. by the Annual General Meeting, which took place in the Council Chamber of the Municipal Buildings (placed at the Society's disposal by the kindness of the Mayor of Taunton).

In the absence of Dr. F. J. Haverfield, the outgoing President, who was conducting a party of antiquaries over the Roman Wall in the north of England, the senior vice-president, the Rt. Hon. HENRY HOBHOUSE presided at the beginning of the meeting and proposed the election of Mr. Henry Balfour, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.Z.S., F.S.A., as President for the ensuing year. Mr. Hobhouse said that the Society was to be congratulated upon having secured such a well known ethnologist and archæologist as Mr. Balfour, in succession to such a distinguished Roman scholar as Dr. Haverfield. For many years Mr. Balfour has filled the important position of Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum in the University of Oxford; he was a past President of the Royal Anthropological Institute and of Section H of the British Association.

Mr. C. TITE seconded, and the motion having been heartily carried, Mr. BALFOUR took the chair as president.

## The Annual Report.

Mr. H. ST. GEORGE GRAY, Assistant-Secretary, read the Annual Report, which was as follows :—

“ In presenting the seventy-first annual report, your Council wishes to state that since the last report 73 new names have been added to the list of members. Losses caused by death and resignation have been 64. The net gain has been nine. The total membership at date is 936 against 927 at the time of the annual meeting last year : the death-roll is larger than usual owing to the great influenza epidemic of last winter.

“ In its report of last year your Council had to announce with much regret the resignation of the Rev. Prebendary E. H. Bates Harbin as one of your Society’s honorary secretaries,—a position he had held for thirteen years. An enumeration of the great services which he had rendered to your Society was then briefly recorded, and a more detailed account of his literary activities was set forth in the obituary notice written by Sir H. Maxwell Lyte, K.C.B., in the last volume of *Proceedings*. The hope was expressed that his valuable assistance would be continued as occasion might require. This hope, however, was not destined to be fulfilled, for after a short illness, Mr. Bates Harbin was called from us by death on September 14th last.

“ Besides Mr. Bates Harbin, your Society has lost three other vice-presidents since the last annual meeting, namely, Sir Thomas Acland, Sir Edward Fry and Mr. Francis Fry.

“ Sir C. Thomas Dyke Acland, Bart., who became a member of your Society in 1880, was President at the Dulverton Meeting in 1900. It will be fresh in your memory that his public-spiritedness and generosity induced him, two years ago, to combine with the National Trust in order to preserve for many generations to come some of the wildest and most beautiful portions of southern and eastern Exmoor.

“ The Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Fry, G.C.B., late Lord Justice of Appeal, who died on October 18th last, at the advanced age of 90 years, became a member in 1881, and was President at the Clevedon Meeting in 1899. In 1903 he wrote an im-

portant paper for your *Proceedings* entitled, 'Somerset or Somersetshire.' He was much interested in botany and wrote a book on British Mosses, and, in combination with his daughter, Agnes, handbooks on the Liverworts and the Mycetozoa.

"Mr. Francis J. Fry, of Cricket St. Thomas, was President at the Chard Meeting in 1903, and he generously contributed to special funds raised for your Society's work. He died on November 4th last at the age of 83 years.

"The tragic death of Dr. J. Wigglesworth, which took place at Porlock on May 16th when collecting notes for his contemplated work on Somerset birds, came as a great shock to many members of your Society and especially to those connected with the Ornithological Section, of which he was President and Recorder. Although he became a member as recently as 1914, he did a large amount of valuable work for your Society, both as a contributor to your *Proceedings* and as the compiler of a catalogue of the stuffed birds preserved in the Great Hall of the Museum, with special notes on those taken in Somerset. It will be most gratifying to your members to know that Dr. Wigglesworth, under the terms of his will, has bequeathed to your Society a large number of his books (including all his botanical works), some stuffed birds and his fine cabinet of British birds' eggs.

"Your Society has also sustained the losses by death (the dates indicate the time of the member's election) of:—Mrs. Arthur Allen (1910), the Rev. Prebendary Beresford (1909), Mr. R. W. Boodle (1898) a well known collector of Somerset books, the Rev. H. Bothamley (1896) at one time Archdeacon of Bath, Major Montgomerie Boyle (1904), the Rev. P. W. Brancker (1908), Mr. Edmund Broderip of Cossington Manor (1877), the Rev. R. A. Cayley (1899), Mr. Willoughby Channell (1913), Major R. S. Clarke (1901), Mrs. Cleland (1910), Dr. H. Costobadie (1914), Mrs. Dobson (1874), Mr. John Dyson (1896), Mr. T. H. Miller (1908), Colonel C. Norman (1895), Mrs. Patton (1904), Miss A. Phelps (1913), Mr. Hugh Poole (1882) undersheriff of Somerset, Mr. J. G. Price (1902), Mr. F. Spencer (1884), Mr. T. N. Sully (1892), and Mr. W. H. Westlake (1876).

"It will be fitting also to mention the Rev. W. Tuckwell,

a member of your Society from 1868 to 1877, who died in February last in his 90th year. He was headmaster of Taunton Grammar School, 1864-1877, and was a keen botanist and student of English literature.

“The deficit on your Society’s General Account at the end of 1917 was £70 7s. 1d.; but, thanks to the twenty-five members who kindly contributed £5 each to a special fund to free the Society from debt last year, there was a balance in hand of £11 8s. 1d. at the end of 1918. In neither case was the whole liability for the cost of the volume for the year then expired, or on the other hand any unpaid subscriptions taken into account. Needless to say the cost of upkeep, printing and taxation has steadily increased since the War began.

“Independently of the General Account, your Society has a small Capital Account (from life membership fees) which, on December 31st last, amounted to £125 0s. 7d. (including a War bond, £100), a Book Fund of £107 11s. 4d. (the interest of which is spent on new books), and a balance in hand on the Woodward Fund of £158 15s. 11d. (which in accordance with the bequest is used as required for special Museum and Library improvements).

“The total expenses attending the issue of Vol. LXIV of the *Proceedings* (for 1918), including printing, illustrations and delivery, have been £177 4s. 1d.<sup>1</sup> Owing to War conditions, the volume had to be further reduced in size, but it is hoped that by degrees the book will attain its former dimensions. The plates illustrating the fourth paper on the ‘Monumental Effigies in Somerset’ have been provided through the kindness of the author, Dr. A. C. Fryer. Thanks are also due to the Rev. Dr. S. J. M. Price, Dr. F. J. Allen and others for their gifts of plates for the last volume. The new volume was indexed by Mr. H. St. George Gray, on the same lines as the previous volumes of the fourth series.

“Your buildings are on the whole in a good state of repair, but a considerable amount of painting will be required before the next annual meeting.

1. Subsequently the sum was reduced to £170 4s. 1d., as £7 was contributed by members of the Council towards the printing of Preb. Bates Harbin’s paper.

“ Mrs. J. G. Loveday has presented to your Society a microscope by Watson and Sons, in memory of her late brother, Mr. Thomas James Savery, to whom it formerly belonged. Although he died at the early age of 31 years, he became a fellow of the Chemical Institute and was a gold medallist in geology.

“ Mr. H. Martin Gibbs has added considerably to his former gifts to your Museum, and since the last annual meeting has presented a number of pewter dishes bearing the marks of Bristol and West-country pewterers, identified by means of Mr. Howard H. Cotterell’s work on the subject published last autumn. Mr. Gibbs has also given to your Museum a collection of elaborately worked weapons, which have not yet been catalogued.

“ Mr. C. Tite last summer added to your collections a large number of Tokens of Somerset and adjoining counties of the XVII, XVIII and XIX Centuries. More recently he has presented twenty-six Saxon and Norman coins minted at Bath, Taunton, Ilchester and Watchet.

“ The Rev. Dr. S. J. M. Price and his sister, Miss Edith Price, have added a number of pieces to the coin collections, including a complete set of the gold and silver coins of the 1887 Jubilee.

“ From Mr. Evan Roberts your Museum has received, through the instrumentality of the Victoria and Albert Museum, a series of seventeen English and French watches and movements of the XVIII and XIX Centuries, including two by Taunton makers.

“ Mr. W. J. Pountney has handed over to the Museum a representative series of shards of delft ware found in his excavations at Wincanton, 1916-17; these are of value in the identification of vessels said to have been made at those potteries.

“ From Mr. F. H. Cridland, of Bournemouth, your Society has received as a deposit on loan, a small bible, dated 1629, with the original binding in raised needlework; the fly-leaf is inscribed with records of the Dyke Acland and Cridland families in the XVIII Century.

“ During the year your Curator has completed the arrangement of the Somerset and Bristol trade tokens of the XVIII

and XIX Centuries; the Museum series and the collections presented by Mr. Martin Gibbs and Mr. C. Tite have been brought together and spaces left for the addition of other types and varieties not yet represented in the collection. The ancient British coins have also been ticketed and arranged, and similar work in connection with the collections of Roman coins found in Somerset has been in progress.

“Your Society has already received considerable help in the classification of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman coins minted in Somerset from Mr. Henry Symonds, F.S.A., who has come to live at Staplegrove. Before his arrival he had listed the silver coins of Charles I in the general collection.

“Included in the Museum work during the year is the completion of the arrangement, cleaning and re-ticketing of your large general series of Somerset birds, a work in which the late Dr. Wiglesworth gave his assistance. Practically the whole of the collections of birds in the Museum are now labelled with all the data available.

“Your Library has been enriched, owing to the generosity of some of your members, by seventy-eight historical and liturgical volumes from the library of the late Canon Scott Holmes.

“As already reported, your Library will be further enlarged by a portion of the library of the late Dr. Wiglesworth, including all his botanical books.

“To Mr. Martin Gibbs your Society is further indebted for the gift of several books, including art journals, and works by Hannah More.

“Mr. C. H. Spencer Perceval has presented some interesting volumes, including Buck’s ‘Antiquities of England and Wales,’ in three large volumes, 1774.

“From the Rev. F. W. Weaver, F.S.A., has been received his library copy of ‘Somerset Incumbents,’ which he edited in 1889, together with a considerable amount of additional information in the form of letters and loose manuscript sheets. Further entries have been made in the Society’s interleaved copy of ‘Somerset Incumbents,’ and your Council is anxious to hear of somebody willing to undertake the collation of the memoranda preserved with the copy which Mr. Weaver has

presented, and the additions and corrections to the part having reference to the Archdeaconry of Wells, compiled and recently given to your Society by the Rev. Prebendary Daniel. Your Council has been informed by Sir H. Maxwell Lyte, K.C.B., that in the Literary Search Room of the Public Record Office there is a series of Institution Books from 1720 to 1838, which give the name of the incumbent, the date of institution, and the name of the patron. The diocese of Bath and Wells is in Series C, Vol. I, which is arranged under parishes alphabetically.

“In the manuscript department there have been several additions, including a transcript, in the original language, of the Athelney Cartulary, which served as a basis of the English version issued in Vol. XIV of the Somerset Record Society’s publications (presented through the instrumentality of Sir H. Maxwell Lyte); and a number of Somerset deeds and documents, and court rolls of Banwell and Westbury (Mendip), presented by Mr. Arthur W. Marks, who from time to time has added considerably to your collection of manuscripts.

“The deeds and documents relating to Gray’s Almshouses, Taunton, XVII to XIX Centuries, have been placed on deposit at Taunton Castle by the charity’s trustees (*per* Mr. H. B. Sheppard).

“It will be gratifying to members to know that your Society has over two thousand Somerset parchment deeds in its possession (independently of those forming part of the Serel collection of manuscripts). All these, embracing over 250 parishes, have been sorted this year by Mr. H. Symonds, who has been cordially thanked by your Council. Deeds of other localities have been eliminated, and they will in due course be disposed of to institutions in the counties to which they refer. Since this sorting the deeds have been bundled and docketed, and an alphabetical list of parishes prepared, so that they are now available for reference. A card-catalogue of the deeds is contemplated, and a further report will be made perhaps at the next annual meeting.

“Some time has been given up to the re-arrangement of certain parts of the Library, which now consists of about 21 000 volumes; and for the purposes of further re-arrange-

ment and cleaning the Library (not the Museum) will be closed for a fortnight from August 10th. The hope has been expressed that a card-catalogue of the Library, giving authors and subjects, may be prepared, if means can be found to carry the project into effect.

“Your Council is still considering the desirability of producing an Index to the first sixty volumes of your Society’s *Proceedings*, but, although the necessity is keenly felt, the total cost of such a work at the present time would be beyond the means of the Society, unless a large proportion of your members promised subscriptions of a guinea each.

“During the year Mr. H. B. Walters, F.S.A., of the British Museum, has been carrying on researches with regard to the Church Bells of Somerset and their makers, and it is hoped that the results will be published by your Society.

“For obvious reasons, archæological excavations have been suspended for nearly five years past; and the proposed work of the Somerset Earthworks Committee has been in abeyance from its formation at the Bath Meeting in 1914. It is hoped that circumstances will soon permit of active work being undertaken on ancient sites in which Somerset is very rich. Few of these earthworks have been systematically explored, and much of the archæological history of our county still lies buried within their ramparts. It is also hoped that the excavations at Glastonbury Abbey will be continued at an early date.

“In your recent annual reports much has been said of the progressive and careful work of your Natural History Sections. The herbarium has been added to greatly, thanks chiefly to the energies of the Rev. E. S. Marshall, Mr. H. S. Thompson and Dr. W. Watson in the field, and of Mr. T. W. Cowan in connection with the mounting of the specimens. The Ornithological Section has increased its membership, and the bird and egg collections in your Museum have greatly benefitted owing to the general activity of members of the section. The Entomological Section is also fully alive, and its field meetings received little check during the War.

“Your Museum was visited by 7313 persons last year, including 1120 visits from members. In 1917 the total number



of visitors was 5891, when there were 1125 visits from members. During the first six months of the current year there have been 3816 visitors, an increase of 37 per cent. as compared with the corresponding period of last year.

“In accordance with Rule II one-third of the elected members of the Council retire annually by rotation, but are eligible for re-election. Those retiring at this meeting are the Rev. A. J. Hook, the Rev. Dr. S. J. M. Price, Mr. H. B. Sheppard and Dr. W. B. Winckworth; all of them except the last-named are willing to act again. The vacancy has been filled, subject to the approval of this meeting, by the inclusion of the Rev. G. W. Saunders, already a local secretary for Martock.”

The Rev. Dr. S. J. M. PRICE, Chairman of Council, in moving the adoption of the Report, said that a serious difficulty was developing in the matter of providing room for the additions to the County Museum. The Museum existed for the preservation of Somerset objects, but there were from time to time gifts offered which the Society felt they could not rightly refuse to accept, because of their educational value and their relation to local objects. They could not leave the Report without thanking the many quiet workers who assisted the Society in various ways, and above all they had to thank Mr. Gray for his manifold activities.

The Rev. Prebendary J. HAMLET seconded and observed that the position of the Society was very satisfactory. Although they had not reached Mr. Gray's ideal of a thousand members, they were well over 900, and the number was steadily increasing.

The report was unanimously adopted.

### **finances.**

Capt. R. C. BOYLE, joint Hon. Treasurer, presented the Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year 1918, and proposed its adoption.

Mr. SEBASTIAN EVANS seconded, and the adoption of the accounts was then carried.



**WOODWARD FUND, 1918.**

				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.	
To Transfer to General Account, for Maps, etc.	...	...	...	17	16	4	By Balance from 1917	...	...	...	172	14	2	
„ Balance	...	...	...	158	15	11	„ Interest for Year	...	...	...	3	18	1	
				<u>£176</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>					<u>£176</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>	
								„ Balance of Fund to 1918	...	...	...	158	15	11

**CAPITAL ACCOUNT (LIFE MEMBERSHIP FEES).**

				£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.	
To Transfer to Current Account	...	...	...	0	2	0	By Balance from 1917—Deposit at Bank	...	8	10	3			
„ Balance—5% War Bond	...	...	...	95	2	9	„ „ „ „ £100 5% War Bond	...	95	2	9	103	13	0
„ „ On Deposit at Bank	...	...	...	29	15	10	„ Bank Interest	...	...	...	...	0	7	7
				124	18	7	„ Life Membership Fees	...	...	...	...	21	0	0
				<u>£125</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>					<u>£125</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	

**BOOK FUND.**

By Balance from 1917 (New Zealand 4% Incribed Stock) ... £107 11 4

**GENERAL STATEMENT.**

				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.					£	s.	d.
To Deposit at Parr's Bank (Woodward Fund)	...	...	...	158	15	11	By Balance, Woodward Fund	...	...	...	...	158	15	11		
„ „ „ „ (Capital Account)	...	...	...	29	15	10	„ Capital Account	...	...	...	...	124	18	7		
				188	11	9	„ Book Fund	...	...	...	...	107	11	4		
„ Balance on Current Account	...	...	...	11	8	1	„ Balance on Current Account	...	...	...	...	11	8	1		
				199	19	10					<u>£402</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>			
„ New Zealand 4% Stock at cost	...	...	...	107	11	4					<u>£402</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>			
„ 5% War Loan Bond (£100)	...	...	...	95	2	9					<u>£402</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>			
				<u>£402</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>					<u>£402</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>			

Audited and found correct, February 1st, 1919.

A. C. MOLE & CO., *Incorporated Accountants, Taunton.*

## Election of New Members and Officers.

Mr. H. ST. GEORGE GRAY, Assistant Secretary, read the names of 73 new members, who had been provisionally elected by the Council since the last annual meeting.

The Rev. D. J. PRING proposed, and Mr. T. G. SIMMONDS seconded, that the election of the new members should be confirmed. The latter thought that an increase in the number of local secretaries would be the means of obtaining more members. The motion was carried.

Mr. A. E. HUDD, F.S.A., proposed, and Mr. T. W. COWAN, F.L.S., seconded the re-election of the officers of the Society, including three of the four outgoing members of the Council, viz., the Rev. Dr. Price, the Rev. A. J. Hook, and Mr. H. Byard Sheppard; also the election of Dr. Haverfield as a Vice-President of the Society; the Rev. G. W. Saunders as a member of Council (to fill the vacancy mentioned in the Annual Report); and Mr. Henry Symonds, F.S.A., and Mr. R. C. Hope, F.S.A., as local Secretaries for Taunton and Burnham respectively.

## Somerset Record Society.

The following report, which had been received from Sir HENRY MAXWELL LYTE, K.C.B., was read:—

The Society has not published anything since the summer of 1918, when an abstract of the Register of Bishop Stafford was issued in two volumes. Arrangements have, however, been made for the printing of Sir H. Maxwell Lyte's collection of Records illustrative of the history of the Honour of Dunster. This will probably be followed by a volume of Records of Quarter Sessions in the reign of Charles II. It is unfortunately necessary to say clearly that an increase in the number of subscribing members is not only desirable, as stated last year, but absolutely necessary if the Society is to continue its work. The cost of printing a volume being now nearly double what it was before the war, and the reserve fund of the Society being almost exhausted, the present income will not suffice

for the production of yearly volumes of reasonable size. At a time when record societies are being started in Oxfordshire and Warwickshire, it would be lamentable if the Somerset Record Society, founded thirty-two years ago, should come to an end for want of local support. The Rev. A. J. Hook, Vicar of Hambridge, Taunton, who has succeeded the late Prebendary Bates Harbin as Honorary Secretary, will be pleased to receive applications for membership.

The Rt. Hon. HENRY HOBHOUSE, in support of the report, said that the Society had produced thirty-two extremely valuable and well bound volumes, which contained records, hitherto unpublished, bearing on ecclesiastical, historical, legal and other questions connected with the county. The society had only about ninety subscribers, and its income would be insufficient to produce a volume a year unless more funds and more members were forthcoming.

### **Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries.**

Mr. HENRY SYMONDS, F.S.A., reported on the continued publication of *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*. He said that the magazine had suffered during the war, and only three parts yearly instead of four had been published recently. He appealed for greater support and more subscribers.

### **The Presidential Address.**

The President, Mr. HENRY BALFOUR, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.S.A., then delivered his address, which was as follows :—

On entering upon the office of President of the Somersetshire Archæological and Natural History Society, one of the most vigorous and enterprising of County scientific associations, I feel that my first duty is to express my cordial thanks to the Society for the compliment which has been paid to me in inviting me to occupy the chair. This invitation was a very unexpected one, and the more gratifying to me since by no stretch of imagination can I discover that I have any claim

upon the County. I must rank as "imported goods," made elsewhere; but, apparently the Society upholds the principles of free-trade in the matter of presidents, and amongst the duties imposed upon me "import duty" is not included. My energies will, however, be *taxed* to the full in following my distinguished predecessor, Professor Haverfield, who not only belongs to Somersetshire, but also knows every inch of it, and has studied exhaustively and with illuminating results many scores of archæological acres (perhaps I ought to use the Roman equivalent *jugera*).

Such links as I have with the County are mainly of a personal nature. For many years I was a colleague in Oxford of that great anthropologist Sir E. B. Tylor, who although not a Somersetshire man by birth, became in a dual sense *wedded* to the County and adopted it as his second home. Then, I feel that to some extent there is a balance on the credit side in my account with Taunton, since, many years ago, when a new Curator was appointed to take charge of the Museum, it was my own assistant, Mr. H. St. G. Gray, who was taken to fill the post, and those of you who realize the work which he has done in the Museum, for county archæology and for the Society, will realize also that while I rejoiced at Taunton's gain, I deplored my own loss of a valued assistant and made the sacrifice grudgingly.

Failing an adequate experience of Somersetshire, such as would warrant my addressing you upon matters relating to the County, I shall ask you just to cross the county border for the subject of my address, and to turn to Rushmore and Cranborne Chase, on the border of Wilts and Dorset, the home of a very great archæologist and ethnologist, whose life-work will provide me with a worthy theme.

Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, who was born in 1827 and died in 1900, was in every way a remarkable personality, who has left his mark for all time on the record of archæological and ethnological research, as a great pioneer, whose name must remain a prominent landmark in the history of progress in these linked sciences.

Once his interest in a subject was aroused, he was not satisfied till he had probed deeply into its hidden mysteries and

done his utmost to solve the problems which presented themselves. Many of his methods and suggestions have been adopted so thoroughly as to become part of the ordinary machinery of research to-day, and have been promoted to the ranks of *obvious* routine. But we must not forget that in the middle of last century, at the time when his scientific interest was aroused and became active, the conditions under which both archæological and ethnologicál research were conducted, were still relatively crude and undeveloped. Scientific method in research was in many respects still in its infancy, and the results were unsubstantial, uncoordinated and often unconvincing, for want of efficient guiding principles and close attention to detail.

Interest in archæological problems had long since been aroused, and many keen and often brilliant researchers were in the field, while the bitter controversy over the question of the antiquity of Man was gradually dying out, the opponents of a very high antiquity gradually yielding ground, as the weight of geological evidence steadily forced them from their entrenched positions.

The time was ripe for the intervention of such a penetrating genius as Colonel Lane Fox, who entered the lists with the training of a soldier, who could bring new weapons into use for attack upon old-time prejudices, and who could offer new suggestions calculated to stimulate afresh scientific enquiry, with the help of improved methods and the promulgation of new ideas.

The brief time at my disposal will not admit of my dealing otherwise than cursorily with his archæological work. He has left a noteworthy record of his principal achievements in this field, in the magnificent series of volumes on his excavations in Cranborne Chase, published at his own expense and distributed with great generosity, and also in numerous papers contributed to scientific periodicals.

He ranged widely both in time and space, his researches covering periods from the early Stone-age down to Romano-British and even later times, and extending from the British Isles to Egypt and beyond. As a matter of County interest, I may remind you that some of his excavations were conducted

in Somersetshire. In 1877, in conjunction with Professor Rolleston, he excavated some round-barrows at Sigwell, and in 1883 he investigated the Pen Pits in the s.e. of the County.

His output was immense, but although the actual facts brought to light during his excavations added enormously to the store of archæological material and filled many gaps in the archæological record, of still greater significance were the *methods* which he adopted in the pursuit of his investigations. He realized that scientific excavation involved more than the mere exhuming of specimens, collecting the more striking examples, and labelling them in a general way as found on such and such a site. His earlier excavations had been conducted in a methodical manner and ever with increasing care and attention to detail, but when in 1880 Colonel Lane Fox succeeded to the Rivers property and assumed the name Pitt Rivers—becoming the owner of Cranborne Chase, an estate teeming with pre- and proto-historic remains—a fresh stimulus was given to his archæological investigations, and, what is very important, he now had ample means at his disposal, enabling him to prosecute his work in a manner satisfactory to himself. No pains and no expense were spared to render fully effective his record of finds. Accurate and complete surveys were made and all sections were carefully plotted out. Every specimen discovered, however trivial and unimportant it might appear at first sight, was kept and labelled; its exact position was noted, and it was measured where necessary and photographed or drawn by a highly qualified artist. His methodical procedure may well be taken as a model by other archæologists. Even to-day much of the excavation work which is conducted by so-called enthusiasts lacks scientific accuracy and attention to matters of detail. Surveys are scamped and the object too often is the mere annexation of specimens to gratify a collector's greed. In this way, many of the most interesting sites have been destroyed and the finds removed without any real benefit to the science. I do not think that I am exaggerating when I say that most of the sites excavated by General Pitt Rivers in Cranborne Chase could be accurately reconstructed from his surveys, and that the specimens could be replaced in almost their exact original



position. This is a real test of good excavation work, since it implies that every detail has been considered and recorded.

It may be urged that Pitt Rivers was a rich man who could well afford to be very thorough, whereas most archæologists are not so favourably situated as regards finance. True enough ; but I would urge that it is better to do a *little* systematically and thoroughly than a *lot* in a haphazard manner. Excavation work should be restricted to those who have a knowledge of and appreciate the value of the strictly scientific method. A careful study of the publications of General Pitt Rivers would go far towards equipping field investigators with a knowledge of what is essential to the proper conduct of their researches. A definite course of training, followed by tests of efficiency, seems to be required before a person should be authorized to undertake the exploration of important sites of national interest. A clumsily excavated site is spoilt for ever, and the lessons which might have been learnt from it are irretrievably lost. Thanks to the precepts and the example of General Pitt Rivers, the enthusiastic site-spoiler now-a-days has no excuse.

Now let me turn to a brief consideration of another branch of the General's activities—his ethnological work, and more particularly his doctrine of continuous sequence in the very gradual evolution of the various arts, industries and appliances of Man.

It is interesting to recall that his attraction to the study of both ethnology and archæology resulted directly from his employment as an officer in the Army (Grenadier Guards). During some part of his career as an army officer, he was engaged in investigations for the improvement of the service musket, which at that time was still the time-honoured smooth-bore Tower musket, familiarly known as "Brown Bess." For this, eventually, the Minié rifle was substituted. But the progressive changes whereby this revolution was effected were very gradual, each fresh stage being but a very slight advance upon the one immediately preceding it. Colonel Lane Fox, being behind the scenes and able to observe *all* the successive variations through which new and important forms were arrived at, noted how very slight each new modification was,

and how the process of gradual advancement, by successive minute variations, was practically a process of evolution, rather than one of progression by sudden jumps. He also observed that most of the actual stages disappeared again almost at once and were rapidly forgotten, as new ideas suggested themselves.

By the general public what was known as a "new invention" was regarded as a kind of new creation, the spontaneous product of a sudden brain-wave, a "brain-explosion," one might almost term it. But to him who follows in detail the progress of the inventor, each new type, which is a sufficiently marked improvement to warrant its adoption for a time, is really the cumulative result of a continuous series of small successive variations, very few of which are heard of by the public at large. It is clear that the term "invention" must be used not in its popular sense, but in its original significance, as something reached by a process of gradual change (*in venio*, I arrive at).

Acting upon his observations, Colonel Lane Fox collected a small series of fire-arms to illustrate the evolution of the more specialized types from the more primitive. This was the nucleus of the great collections which he later on amassed; for, assuming that the developmental phenomena associated with the improvement of fire-arms must apply equally to other appliances, industries and arts, he proceeded at once, in 1851, to make a wider application of his theory, and laid the foundation of the ethnological and archæological collection with which his name will ever be associated.

Here, again, he was a pioneer, this general doctrine of evolution in the material arts being a new one. It revolutionized the current ideas, but, unlike many heterodox movements, it met with ready acceptance and was hailed as a valuable theme for future researches into the history of human progress.

He collected vigorously and enthusiastically, and his collection rapidly outgrew the capacity of his private house. Transferred in 1864 to the Bethnal Green Museum, and, again, in 1878 to the South Kensington Museum, it was, about the year 1880, offered to the Nation with certain very natural reservations, but for various reasons it was not accepted.

Finally, the collection was offered to Oxford University in 1882, and was, after long discussion as to ways and means, accepted in 1884. A special building was erected, and in 1886 the arrangement of the series in their new home was commenced by myself, acting under the general direction of Professor H. N. Moseley, professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy, in whose charge the Pitt Rivers collection was placed. Since Professor Moseley's death in 1891, the whole responsibility has devolved upon me, and in spite of very serious difficulties arising from a too limited space and a still more limited financial support, I have found the work of following up the Pitt Rivers school of ethnological study fascinating and absorbing to a degree. An extensive and unique museum has grown up around the original nucleus of the Pitt Rivers collection, and the specimens are now, probably, four or five times as numerous as they were in 1886.

The principles upon which General Pitt Rivers worked were mainly these. His aim was to illustrate, either actually or hypothetically, the origin, development and continuity of the material arts and of the various appliances used by Man; and to show the successive variations whereby progress has been effected.

By bringing together the archæological and ethnological material, he sought to make each elucidate the other. From the archæological record a chronological sequence could be derived. But many are the gaps in the archæological record, and these he sought to fill from evidence derived from a study of the *recent* primitive and barbaric peoples. The culture of modern Stone-age Man he regarded as a more or less direct survival from that of ancient Stone-age Man, and he argued that much which is obscure in the culture of prehistoric times, may be elucidated by observation of the practices and equipment of the recent primitive peoples, the *unrisen* races, as they have been happily called. Among these, various degrees of retarded or stagnating progress may be observed; as, for instance, a palæolithic culture phase among the recently-extinct Tasmaniâns; a proto-neolithic status among the Australians; a neolithic culture throughout the islands of the South Pacific and in parts of South America, and so on.

Arguing from the known to the unknown, these modern survivals of early cultures have been used, as far as possible, to complete the picture of the life and industries of Prehistoric Man. From the combined material derived from ancient and modern times series were created to show, tentatively at any rate, how the more developed types of appliances were arrived at by successive slight improvements from their simple and generalized prototypes.

Incidentally, these typological series serve to demonstrate the *geographical distribution* of particular arts, industries and appliances, a matter which is becoming recognized as increasingly important, as affording valuable clues to the intricate problems of racial dispersal and migration routes, and as supplying evidence of culture-contact between various peoples not necessarily related to one another.

The line followed by Pitt Rivers in the systematic arrangement of his ethnological and archæological series, was nearly akin to that adopted by zoologists in classifying the Animal Kingdom. The objects of human manufacture were classified, as it were, into families, genera, species and varieties, in accordance with their apparent affinities; and just as the fleshless fossil types of animals may be reincarnated through a study of the structure of their nearest living allies, so, too, may obscure elements in the culture of the past be explained and realized with the help of modern survivals.

In studying the development of human arts, it must not be supposed that progress was effected by a simple process of what is known as "end-on" evolution, the successive morphological changes following one another in simple unilinear series. The process is far more complex, in most instances at any rate. Probably, at the time when Pitt Rivers was making his researches, the belief in "end-on" evolution was dominating biological investigations, and he seems, very naturally at that time, to have followed the prevailing doctrine very largely, in applying his evolutionary ideas to human culture-products. He does not appear sufficiently to have realized that, in the main, progress in culture is brought about by changes due to hybridization, so to speak, of ideas, or to the grafting of one idea upon another and thus arriving at a new variant.

If we endeavour to visualize in diagrammatic form the phenomena of progressive changes in human artefacts, we can do so to a great extent with the help of two simple and obvious similes.

On the one hand, in studying, for instance, the many varieties within a connected group of appliances, whose ancestry may be traced back to a common origin, we may call to mind the diagram of a *tree*, whose stem represents the prototype; whose larger limbs symbolize the early division into a few, still generalized, modifications of that prototype, adapted to more special uses; and whose smaller branches and twigs represent the later and still later subdivisions into species and varieties, all derived ultimately from the same source, but tending more and more to vary from the prototype, as the special modifications were evolved and adapted to fulfil special requirements. The generalized parent form gives rise to successive generations of increasingly divergent and specialized offspring.

On the other hand, in tracing the phylogenetic history of some particular appliance, in use, perhaps, to-day, we may usefully keep in mind the diagram of a typical *river-system*, composed of an apparent main-stream, which is fed and whose course is deflected at frequent intervals by inflowing tributaries, each of which is itself swelled by smaller rivulets, and so on, the whole river-system being a complexus of influences, using this term in its literal sense. This is clearly an apt simile to take for the developmental history of an appliance or other product of human activity. We may follow what seems to be the main stream of its evolution, though doubts may from time to time arise as to which *is* the main-stream (just as the actual source of a river may be, and often is, a debatable matter), but we must recognize that the development of our appliance has been constantly affected and deflected by tributary influences. In other words, ideas traceable to different sources are constantly influencing one another and, by combination, are producing new results, in which the attributes of both factors may often be clearly discerned.

Time does not permit me to enlarge upon these views, which are the natural outcome of an application of the doc-

trines of General Pitt Rivers, whose views were largely founded upon a study of comparative morphology as applied to the material arts.

Another problem upon which he sought to throw light, was that involved in the vexed question of the monogenesis or polygenesis of particular human products—whether, that is, similar objects having similar uses and occurring, perhaps, in widely separated regions, *must*, none the less, be regarded as having a common parentage; or whether they should be considered as having been arrived at *independently*, in response to similar requirements; whether they are exotic or indigenous to the regions in which they are found.

It has been urged, and I think with good reason, that under like stimuli the human mind will often achieve like results, and that thus certain almost identical inventions *may* be arrived at independently, just as “convergent types” have arisen in the animal world. It is well to bear this problem in mind, although one must admit that it is probably unsolvable, since, of late, a school of anthropologists has arisen seeking to maintain that independent origin of similar results in human culture is not to be conceived. I may quote the confident statement made by a well-known anthropologist.<sup>1</sup> He writes, “As to the possibility of any invention originating wholly independently in more than one centre, the facts of history no less than the common experience of mankind are fatal to any such hypothesis.” This is a risky axiom to lay down, however desirable it may be to further a particular theory. It can neither be proved nor finally disproved, and so dogmatic an assertion should have no place in scientific literature unless backed by positive evidence. From many talks with General Pitt Rivers, I am convinced that he would have been the first to condemn the unwarranted dictating of so untrustworthy an axiom.

In Oxford the influence and effect of the labours of General Pitt Rivers have been far-reaching. Not only did the University through his generosity become possessed of the pioneer nucleus of a museum which is unique of its kind, but this possession stimulated the inauguration of the teaching of

1. *Man*, 1915, p. 163.

Anthropology in Oxford. A lectureship (Readership) was established as a direct result, and to it was appointed a great anthropological pioneer, Edward Burnett Tylor, who was later on made Professor. He gave regular courses of lectures in the University, and although he played no part in the internal administration of the Pitt Rivers Museum, which was outside his official sphere, he always took great interest in it and was a generous donor of specimens.

A natural outcome of the interest aroused in anthropological study was the establishment by the University of a Diploma in the subject. This has attracted many students who have been taught upon broad lines, the syllabus covering a very wide field. Many of these students have since travelled extensively with their minds attuned to scientific anthropological study, and they have done excellent research-work in the field. Others have been appointed to museum staffs or hold teaching and research posts, and are applying their Oxford training in many parts of the World.

The effect of the teaching of Pitt Rivers may be observed in museums both in this country and abroad, in the increasing tendency to introduce systematic typological series. The interest taken in such synoptic series is a fitting tribute to the man who initiated the system.

I have given but a hasty and very incomplete survey of the work of and the influence exerted by General Pitt Rivers. The subject is not one which can adequately be condensed into a discourse of half-an-hour or so. He has left his own record of diligent and broad-minded research, and the example afforded by his enthusiasm, characteristically tempered with caution, should have the effect both of stimulating and of restraining the work not only of this generation but of generations to come.

Colonel E. ST. C. PEMBERTON proposed a vote of thanks to the President for his able address, to which they had listened with close interest. They welcomed his remarks on excavation work, and hoped the fruitful field of Somerset would yield many more treasures of knowledge when it was possible to revive the systematic work which had been discontinued during the period of the war.

Mr. C. TITE seconded, and the vote of thanks was heartily carried.

The PRESIDENT, returning thanks, said he had for some years taken a great interest in the growth of the Somerset County Museum, and he well remembered when it presented a very different appearance from that which is seen to-day. Its development during the last decade or two was very striking, and had been the result of patient labour.

### Nunney Castle.

The Rt. Hon. HENRY HOBHOUSE said that the Council that morning had recommended that the following resolution should be submitted to the Annual Meeting that afternoon:—

“The Council having learnt that, owing to the growth of trees and other causes, the disintegration of Nunney Castle is proceeding rapidly, the owner and H.M. Inspector of Ancient Monuments should have their attention drawn to the matter.”

Mr. Hobhouse added that the building was scheduled under the Ancient Monuments Act four years ago, but nothing had been done during the war to preserve it from further decay.

The resolution was adopted, and directions given to forward copies to the owner and the Inspector of Ancient Monuments.

### “Proceedings” for Louvain Library.

The Rev. Dr. S. J. M. PRICE said the Council had before them that morning a suggestion that the Society might like to make a gift of books towards the formation of the new library of the University of Louvain, and with the approval of the Annual Meeting the Council proposed to send as complete a set as possible of the *Proceedings* of their own Society. Apart from human tragedy, he thought that one of the greatest tragedies of the war was the destruction by the Germans of the world-famous library of the University of Louvain.

The Council's proposal was unanimously agreed to.



*Second Day's Proceedings.*

XXXV

At the conclusion of the meeting the Mayor of Taunton was thanked for the use of the Council Chamber; and subsequently several members visited the Society's Museum and Library.