

The Presidential Address.

THE PRESIDENT then delivered his address.

He said :

I must first of all express my grateful thanks to the Society for the honour they have conferred upon me in making me their president for the year. It is, I think, some fourteen years or more since I contributed a rather lengthy paper to your *Proceedings* on the subject of some pre-Norman sculptured stones, of which you still have a few in your county. I was living in Cambridge at the time, and could not be present at your meeting. It is therefore specially interesting and pleasant to me to see at last your Society face to face.

In that paper I worked out at some length the early records of artistic work connected with Somerset, and I went into some of the details of St. Aldhelm's care for art, making special mention of the sculptured crosses which those who mourned for his death erected at each place where his body rested for the night on its seven days' journey from Douling, in your county, to his old home at Malmesbury, in North Wilts. If there was at that time any one thing more improbable in my future than another, so far as I could have judged, it was that in this year of grace, 1901, I should have under my care as Bishop some 100,000 souls on the Somerset side of the Avon, and should have in my diocese all those parts of North Wilts through which St. Aldhelm's body passed on its way to the Saxon predecessor of that anxious charge of mine, the Abbey Church of Malmesbury.

This coincidence suggested to me that I should lay before you the steps I have taken towards an identification of the places in Somersetshire and Wiltshire at which the Aldhelm crosses were erected, with some account of the sculptured fragments which remain in the neighbourhood of at least two of the resting places.

Another subject with which I proposed to deal was the puzzling question of how it ever came to pass that Bath and its district was stolen from Mercia and transferred to Wessex, where it met with very unhandsome treatment on the part of Wells. This subject has been most scientifically treated by the Rev. C. S. Taylor, one of yourselves, given to you by us. It would have lent itself to specially-pointed treatment at the hands of the Mercian bishop to whom, of course, Bath and its district ought to belong, in the presence of the West Saxon bishop who represents the hand of the spoilers of a thousand years ago, and has never to my knowledge expressed any desire to make restitution, or any sense of shame in the retention of the spoil.*

The third question with which I had proposed to deal was the difficult matter of the line of separation between the Huiccas, on this western extremity of their southern boundary, and the south-west Britons in the earlier time and the Saxons of Somerset in rather later times. The special point of this investigation is to show that Aust never was on the boundary, and so is out of court as a competitor for the honour of being the place of Augustine's first conference with the Britons.

THE ALFRED JEWEL.

But this is King Alfred's year; and the Somerset folk have quite as much part in Alfred as the North Wilts part of my diocese has. This was borne in upon me so strongly less than two days ago that I changed front completely, and

*The Bishop of Bath and Wells was present as the guest of the Bishop of Bristol.

have hastily gathered up an address on the special link which binds Somerset to the person of Alfred, namely, the jewel found no great distance from Athelney 208 years ago. My remarks will have for their purpose to supplement, and in some respects to differ from, the beautiful and suggestive book on the Alfred jewel recently written for the Clarendon Press by your own Professor Earle, a greatly-honoured name and personality.

I am the more moved to take this subject, because I am unable, by reason of a prolonged absence in Italy, to be present at Winchester in September as the representative of the Society of Antiquaries of London, or of the Wiltshire Society, or of your Society.

You know the jewel well, many of you, and I hope that many of you know the book too; those who do not should lose no time in reading it straight through from one end to the other.

THE INSCRIPTION.

The jewel, as you know, is a small thing of gold and enamel and rock crystal, the shape of an oval battledore with a short handle. It is only two-and-a-half inches long, one-and-a-fifth wide, and half-an-inch thick. The enamelled side shows through a plate of rock crystal the upper part of the body of a man, with long attenuated face, holding in each hand the stem of a floriated sceptre; the two sceptres rest on the shoulders of the figure. The back of the jewel is a plate of gold, with a symmetrical pattern of foliage engraved on it. The handle is the neck and head of a scaly monster, ending in a hollow snout, by which the jewel was firmly attached, no doubt in a vertical position, to some stem; the rivet which fastened it to its stem is still there. I accept Professor Earle's conclusion that the jewel was the ornament of Alfred's helmet;† and with rather less willingness his conclusion that

† There is, however, much to be said in favour of the late Bishop Clifford's view, that it was the head of a pointer sent by Alfred with each copy of his "Pastoral Care."

it was designed and wrought before Alfred was King. On the latter point, Professor Earle's argument that if Alfred had been King, the word *cyning* would have been inserted in the inscription, in that or some other form, is, I think, not quite conclusive. The inscription is quite complete, and is "Alfred mec heht gewyrcean"—"Alfred me caused work"—Alfred had me made. Professor Earle's remarks on the philology of this inscription are those of a master, and it would be a mere impertinence on my part to express the conviction they have wrought in me. On a question of palæography I feel it less impossible to hazard a remark. I am surprised that Professor Earle, in dealing with this part of the subject, maintains the silence which seems always to prevail as to the non-existence of the letter *y*, in place of which a little piece of foliage is inserted in the inscription. Those of us who study Bristol and Plymouth china know what disguised numerals mean ; but this, if a *y*, is very highly disguised ; indeed, if we had not conspicuously wanted a *y* there, I venture to say that everyone would have taken the floriation to be a pretty but unusual device for filling up the space of one letter, instead of putting the filled-up gap at the end of the word. And there is another point in the inscription which is passed over without remark—as though it had no meaning whatever—I mean the mark, or dot, between the two halves of the *w*. There is no other example of a dot in the inscription, and this dot is where no dot ought to be. Now there are on the jewel two cases of bind-letters, *me* and *ht*. Is the dotted *w* a bind-letter ? At Chester-le-Street they found one day when I was there an Anglian stone, with a man on horseback, and a name incised which they could not read. I pointed out that it was a mixture of Roman capitals and runes, and it read Eadmund : there was no difficulty in assigning it to the grandson of King Alfred, Athelstan's half-brother, who stopped at Chester-le-Street when riding up to invade Scotland, and made gifts to St. Cuthbert. It so

happens that this dot, if treated as having something to do with a rune, will supply the missing *y*, though not the *y* which philology would require. The two middle strokes of the *w* are the rune for *u*, and the dot or short vertical line is the recognised means of modifying the *u* into a *y*. It is so in the *minden-stin* of Gorm the Old; where Queen Thyra is in runes Thura, but the rune *u* is dotted as on the jewel. Gorm became King of Denmark at the time when Alfred was in Rome as a boy, and did not die till near the end of Athelstan's reign, whence his sobriquet. It is so in our earliest existing piece of English literature, the great runic inscription of the year 670 on the Bewcastle Cross, where Kyng, Kyning, Kyninges, Kynnburug, Kyneswitha, Myrkna, all of them have for their *y* a runic *u*, with a mark inside it. I am well aware, as I have said, that the *y* in *gewyrcean* has a different origin from the *y* in *Kyning*, but at least the coincidence is curious. I confess my folly in pointing it out.

But at the same time I must say that anyone who deals with this inscription cannot safely pass this remarkable dot without a word. If anyone should suggest that its purpose is to occupy a void space, I should reply that such an explanation touches a principle of early lettering to which I have often called attention, but it does not apply here.

THE FIGURE IN ENAMEL.

I cannot go with Professor Earle in his belief that the figure in enamel represents the Pope, with his spiritual and temporal sceptres. That idea does not link itself on to anything that I, at least, know, either of Alfred or of art, but in a matter of this kind no one should commit himself to a sweeping negative. It is, of course, true that the young Alfred was brought into very intimate relations with the Pope, and there can be no doubt that he shared the then universal feeling of all the Courts of Europe with respect to the spiritual head of the Church of the West. But I suspect

that his ideas of the temporal sovereignty of the Bishops of Rome were likely to take their shape from the Imperial domination over the appointment of the Pope, which showed itself in so drastic a form in the case of the Pope and anti-Pope when Alfred was in Rome on the second and more important occasion. Further, there is not the faintest suggestion anywhere of any such feeling as should induce Alfred to regard himself in practice as the soldier of the Pope, fighting the Danes under his auspices. The whole story of his wars goes quite another way ; he was the soldier of Christ. As I have remarked in my essays in the Alfred book of 1899, Asser does not speak of wars between Saxons and Danes, or Angles and Danes ; he speaks throughout of wars between Christians and Pagans. Alfred to him is the champion of Christ. Alfred's wars are against Pagans, not against Danes. As soon as the Dane became Christian, he might remain in the land.

As a matter of experience in ecclesiastical art, we are very familiar with the two sceptres carried by our Lord when shown in His glory. On one great cross after another in Ireland there is the Crucifixion on one side, and on the other side the Lord seated in glory, with a sceptre on each shoulder. Professor Earle gives the representation of the Temple in the Book of Kells, which I see he still calls a seventh century MS., though its label was corrected to "eighth century" some years ago. In this is a full-face representation of our Lord, of the Irish type, with the two sceptres. I shall continue to take the jewel to be Alfred's badge as the soldier of Christ, notwithstanding the absence of a nimbus.

Professor Earle omits to note one of the marked features of the twin sceptres. They are in one piece, not in two, as in the Book of Kells and on the Irish crosses. And they are so drawn as to give the idea of a strong spring at the place where the two stems meet, as though their shape when not in use would be that of a pair of tongs with a spring

instead of a hinge and handle, and as if some little force were required to keep the two members wide apart, so that one may rest on each shoulder. I would suggest a reference to the two very remarkable crosses at Sandbach, in Cheshire, one of them the largest in the kingdom, both of them wonderful records of the Anglian art. On each of them there are two figures by the side of our Lord, the dexter figure with a book, the sinister with a large key, presumably St. Paul and St. Peter, certainly St. Peter on the left side. In each case the key is two keys, their stems joined at the extremities, "a pair of keys," just as we see and speak of "a pair of tongs." If these keys were opened like a pair of tongs, they could be held like sceptres on the two shoulders, and the wards would lie symmetrically like little square flags where the head of the sceptre would naturally be.

THE DEVICE AT THE BACK.

As regards the symmetrical and very pretty foliaginous device engraved on the plate of gold at the back of the jewel, I cannot go with Professor Earle in seeing that the stem of the plant, growing out of the very usual cup or sheath, is a sword piercing a heart. To those of us who have for many years closely studied this kind of ornamentation, there is nothing unusual or specially allegorical about the pattern. Even if the cup had been a heart, there are plenty of examples of a heart-shaped boss on the stem of foliage, like the pear-shaped bosses on Renaissance candlesticks. The heart boss is found quite clear and precise on the little portable altar found on St. Cuthbert's breast, and also, even still more clear, on the end of Frithestan's stole, to which we must now turn. Professor Earle does not make use of this apt illustration of the Alfred jewel.

The stole of Bishop Frithestan, of Winchester, was given to the body of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street by Athelstan, Alfred's favourite grandson. It was worked at Winchester

between the years 905 and 916, by order of Ælflæd, the Queen of Alfred's son and successor Edward. It has the Latin form of Alfred's own inscription, "Ælflæd fieri precepit." Ælflæd caused to be made, the Latin passive taking the place of the Saxon active. It is a wonderful piece of work, woven in flat gold wire, with self-edged openings for the insertion of tapestry-work figures of prophets and letters of inscriptions. It was made, as itself declares, for the pious Bishop Frithestan. Ælflæd died in 916, and Frithestan became Bishop in 905, so we have the date sure.

Now, not only does Ælflæd's stole carry on her father-in-law's inscription, only spoiled by its ecclesiastical purpose which turned it into Latin, but I suggest a more important connection still. Professor Earle finds the type of the face of the figure on the jewel in Irish art. But it is in outline long and rather emaciated, and the faces in the Book of Kells are plump and well liking. I find just the right length and thinness of face in the prophets on Ælflæd's stole, and I venture to suggest that Alfred's artists and Ælflæd's went to the same Byzantine source for the faces of their figures. Inasmuch as the Irish art was not improbably Byzantine in origin, Professor Earle's remarks about the eyes of the figure on the jewel may well be in point, for the treatment of eyes on sculpture and in parchment in the earliest times in these islands followed rather closely accepted types, while other parts varied. The specially close relationship between Alfred's jewel and the Winchester stole of the next generation of his family will be found not only in the shape of the face but also, and very pointedly, in the outline of the hair.

ROMANCE OF ECCLESIASTICAL ART.

There is another and more remarkable parallel to the inscription on the Alfred jewel, to which also Professor Earle does not refer. Indeed, I suppose that very few of us are aware of it. I delivered a lecture on the subject in Cambridge

when I was Disney Professor there, and as the whole of the story makes a very interesting romance of ecclesiastical art, I will take this opportunity of setting the facts before you in brief. I am far from sure that it has not something to do with these parts, as you will see in the end.

Some of you, no doubt, have seen in the treasury of the church of Ste. Gudule, in Brussels, the great reliquary in the form of a cross, which is said to contain the two largest portions of the true cross in existence. Erasmus, who knew the Low Countries only too well, declared in his notes on the whited sepulchres of St. Matthew xxiii, 27, that there were enough portions of the true cross, if they were collected, to freight a large ship. There is also, in this Ste. Gudule reliquary, one of the nails of the Cross, which the visitor can see through a piece of glass. The cross has at its centre a crown of thorns, and on the arms and head and stem a number of the emblems of the Passion. There is no inscription, and there is nothing really old about the reliquary.

In 1891, Dr. Logéman, the Professor of English philology at Ghent, became possessed of a manuscript which described an inscription of a curious character on this cross, in a language which the writer of the MS. had not understood. It was sufficiently like Flemish to tempt him into some very quaint interpretations; but it was not Flemish. No such inscription, nor, as I have said, any inscription at all, could be seen upon the cross as it stood in the treasury, examine it as you would. At this point it would be well to relate what is known of the history and provenance of the cross from which this remarkable inscription had so completely disappeared. It will eventually give us an interesting clue.

The reliquary was given to the church of Ste. Gudule by the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, by their will; it had been one of the ornaments of their chapel in Brussels since 1605. The Archduke died in 1621, and the Archduchess, who was a daughter of Philip II of Spain, and had the

Netherlands for her dowry, ruled alone after the death of her husband till her own death in 1633, when their will took effect, and the reliquary came to Ste. Gudule. It had come to the Archdukes—I wish we still retained that royal use in England, and spoke of the Princes of Wales and the Dukes of Cornwall, *principes* and *duces*, not *principem* and *principissam*, *ducem* and *ducissam*—it had come to them from Cologne, to which place it had been carried by the Bishop of Haarlem, when he fled from the reformers in 1573. It had reached the Low Countries long before, when Egbert, Archbishop of Treves, gave it to the Abbey of Egmond. This Egbert, whose name is suspiciously English, indeed there is scarcely any not-English Egbert before 1100, is said to have been a son of Theodoric II, Count of Holland. This reigning Count, Dietrich or Thierry, ruled Holland from 963 to 988. He was allied to English families, and his son Egbert is said to have exploited this insular connection. He invited his English friends and relatives to visit him at Treves, and when he got them there he spoiled them of their goods, and made them send over as ransoms a number of other precious things for the adornment of his chapel. We will remember that date, 963 to 988, to which we seem to have traced the cross.

At the time of the French Revolution the cross was plundered of its jewels, and broken in two pieces. In the same year, 1793, it was restored, covered on the front with copper, and attested and sealed by the Papal Nuncio. This copper covering, with the emblems of the Passion, is the front of the cross as we have seen it. Dr. Logeman interested the Dean of Brussels in the investigation which the manuscript had set going, and as the Dean of Brussels is usually a person of importance at Rome he was enabled to break the Nuncio's seals and remove the copper covering. There stood revealed a singularly graceful and beautiful Anglo-Saxon cross, with plates of embossed silver, the Agnus Dei in the

remarkable attitude found before the Norman Conquest in England, the symbols of the Evangelists, an inscription across the arms of the cross, and a long inscription running completely round the silver plates on the edge of the cross, from the bottom at one side, round the arms and head, and down to the bottom on the other side, all in Anglo-Saxon. Across the arms, in beautifully dainty lettering, is the inscription *Drahmal me worhte* (Drahmal wrought me) : who Drahmal was we do not know ; the name does not occur elsewhere. The inscriptions on the edges are—to turn them into modern English—“ Rood is my name. Once I bare the Rich King, trembling, blood-bedabbled. This rood Æthelmær caused work, and Adelwold, his brother, to the glory of Christ for the soul of Ælfric their brother.”

SURPRISING COINCIDENCE.

Now here we have two—or rather three—examples of the persistence of a form. The work of art itself speaks. It was so in the earliest sacred song of the English race which has come down to us, two hundred years before Alfred, three hundred years before the end of the reign of the father of Archbishop Egbert, of Treves, the great sacred song of which there are stanzas in runes on the cross at Ruthwell, in Dumfriesshire, erected about 680 ; it was so with Alfred’s jewel ; it is so with Drahmal’s cross. That is the first point. Next, the cross of Drahmal has exactly the words on it which are found on the Ruthwell cross, “ I bare the rich King,” the cross thus telling of the Crucifixion, and “ with blood bedabbled.” That same great sacred song is found in the Vercelli MS. of Anglo-Saxon poems, a MS. of the tenth century, at much greater length than on the Ruthwell cross. In this MS. the poem is in the dialect of Wessex, not of Northumbria. Drahmal got his inscription from the Wessex MS., not from the Ruthwell cross, for while the words “ I bare the rich King ” and “ with blood bedabbled ” are common

to the Ruthwell cross, the Vercelli MS., and Drahma's cross, the assertion of Drahma's that it trembled under its burden is not given in that form on the Ruthwell cross, but the Vercelli MS. makes the cross say "that I trembling saw." That is the second point. It is the third point that links us on to the Alfred jewel. "Drahmal me worked," "Rood is my name." "This rood Æthelmær caused work." Here we have the "me," and the "caused work," and the order, of the jewel, "Ælfred me caused work."

The jewel has *Alfred mec heht gewyrcan*. When a hundred years had elapsed, *mec* had become *me*, and *gewyrcan* *wyrcan*. This leads us to the question of the date of Drahma's cross.

Remember the dates we said we would remember, 963 to 988. The only instance in English history in which the names found on Drahma's Cross, Æthelmær, Adelwold, and Ælfric, are brought near together, occurs in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the years 982, 983, 984. That is a surprising coincidence, of which, however, it is possible to make too much. They are not described in the Chronicle as brothers, but no student of the Chronicle will be disturbed by that omission. In the Chronicle, Ælfric survived Æthelmær and Æthelwold, while Drahma's Cross was made by order of Æthelmær and Adelwold for Ælfric's soul. But in the Isle of Man about that time people were setting up crosses for their own soul and the soul of a relative, and it is not at all necessary to take it that Ælfric was dead. Indeed it is very easy to imagine circumstances under which two brothers might cause a costly work to be produced for the safety of the soul of a brother for whom they were anxious. This would be specially likely to be so, if one of them was a Churchman of much piety and the other a layman of great position who knew the dangers of the times, while the brother for whose soul the costly work was wrought was perhaps a good deal younger than they, and was a man likely soon to be set in the midst of many and great dangers. This exactly

describes the three men whose names occur in the Chronicle. In 982 Dorsetshire was ravaged by Vikings, London was burned, and Æthelmær, Alderman of Hampshire, died, and was buried in the new monastery at Winchester. In 983 Ælfhere, Alderman of Mercia, died, and Ælfric succeeded to the same aldermanship. In 984 died Æthelwold, the benevolent Bishop of Winchester, father of monks. In 985 Ælfric was driven from the country. The abstract guess that Ælfric might be a young brother, for whom the two older men were anxious, has received since I wrote it a curious confirmation. I find that he was called in Saxon "Ælfric child," and in Latin *cognomento puer*.

Thus I think that in working out our parallel with the inscription on the jewel, we have done something to claim for Wessex that beautiful Drahmal Cross, and Drahmal the artist himself. I think that Bishop Æthelwold and Alderman Æthelmær, both living in Winchester, arranged the design, and had it worked out by the head of the Winchester school of artists in gold and silver, a man after King Alfred's own heart, Drahmal. Bound up with the validity of that claim, is the inter-communionship of governorships between Mercia and Wessex, that most puzzling topographical question, a few years after the date at which our distinguished member, the Reverend C. S. Taylor, has, I think, shown that Bath and its district passed over finally from my jurisdiction to that of Dr. Kennion here present.

I may add that Dr. Logeman sent over to me in 1891 his original photographs of the whole of the Drahmal Cross, and most kindly allowed me to cause work lantern slides from them. As I am to give several lectures on early art in Bristol next autumn and winter, there will no doubt be an opportunity of showing these slides.

I may also perhaps be allowed to lighten the course of a heavy address by telling you of two of the quaint translations made by the author of the MS., on which the whole discovery

turned. The word "bedabbled" is in Anglian and Saxon alike "bestemed." This the ingenious person took to be two Flemish words, *beste med*, and he translated it *optima virgo*. "Blode" he felt sure meant blood, as in fact it does. "Wyrican" is spelled of course with the Saxon *wen*, and looks like "Pyrican." He knew the connection between *l* and *r*, and between a Pelican and blood, and he translated it Pelicanus.

I ought in fairness to say that a linguistic expert whom I consulted was of opinion that the language of the inscription is of date later than 980, perhaps forty or fifty years later, perhaps even more. But while I am always most grateful to experts for their opinion, I do not allow it to overwhelm facts. Besides, I have recently had five furnaces and grates put into my house for cooking my dinner and warming the water for my bath instead of two, by an expert; and another expert has not only heated my wine-cellar, but also diverted a flood of water and mud into the room where my candidates for "orders" are examined. So I am at present, as the American trader, dying to secure an expert, would say, "rather off experts."

You will, I am sure, heartily join with me in one concluding remark, that we felicitate the University of Oxford, which at present possesses this noble Somerset property of ours, on having found so admirable an exponent of its interest and its charms as Professor Earle has proved himself to be. Speaking to Somerset people, I need scarcely remark that they had, of course, to come to Somerset to have it thoroughly well done.

The Bishop of BATH and WELLS, in proposing a vote of thanks to the president for his address, said he sincerely hoped that he might be able to retain in his diocese that most beautiful city of the West—Bath—and while he quite appreciated the longing desire that Bath might have to be ruled over by the Bishop of Bristol, and the equally longing desire that the Bishop of Bristol had to rule over Bath, he still hoped there might be enough Bath men to say, "We

will not have such a spoliation, even by one of the most attractive Bishops in the land." He felt thankful that while it had pleased God in His Providence that they should lose from the Bench of English Bishops such great historians as Bishop Stubbs and Bishop Creighton in one year, they should still be able to number among them such a profound historian as the Bishop of Bristol. He thought the whole question of Alfred's connection with Somerset ought to have been more recognised than it was by the committee which was formed by the Lord Mayor of London and the Mayor of Winchester. He was exceedingly surprised that there was not on that committee any representative of Somerset or of their society. They knew—who would doubt it, being a Somersetshire man?—that the cakes were burnt at Athelney, and they liked to think, too, that Guthrum was really baptised in Somerset, as they sometimes almost dared to think that the Ethandune of victory might have been their Edington. With these facts and possibilities in their minds, and certainly recognising that it was in Somerset that Alfred was able to gather round him that army with which he won his famous victory—that could not be gainsaid even by a representative of Wiltshire—he really thought that this Society and the county of Somerset had a grievance in not being properly represented on the committee to which he had referred.

Alderman THATCHER seconded the resolution.

Bishop BROWNLOW supported and, referring to King Alfred's Jewel, said that the figures represented on it were similar to some found on Irish illuminated manuscripts, and they must remember that in the days of King Alfred, Ireland was the University of Northern Europe.

Canon HOLMES also supported the vote of thanks by a few remarks. He said that they were deeply indebted to the Bishop for his address, which was an extremely valuable one, and of great historical importance.

The vote of thanks was carried with acclamation.

Mr. W. R. BARKER offered the Society a warm welcome on behalf of the Museum Committee. He referred to the discovery of a Roman villa at Brislington.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE, F.S.A., presented to the Museum an old quart bronze measure, of which the following is a description :—

The Measure is of Bronze, 6·5 in. in height, 4·5 in. in diameter at the top, and 4·25 in. at the bottom; internal diameter, 3·85. The sides are straight, with reinforcing rings of 12in. in thickness at top and bottom. There is a large curved handle on one side, and in the upper edge a double cut for showing when the measure is accurately full. The capacity is a very accurate quart measure. The weight is 6 lbs. and $\frac{1}{3}$ of an ounce. In front are the Arms of Bristol, finely engraved with Mantlings. Over them is the date, 1777, with a diamond enclosed within double incised lines and the initials M.H.Q.S. (Mansion House, Queen Square). The whole of the engraving is of later date than the measure itself. Several Government stamps appear on the upper edge. The measure was probably looted at the time of the Bristol riots in 1832, when the Mansion House was burnt down.

Mr. BARKER gladly accepted the measure on behalf of the Museum Committee, and thanked Colonel Bramble.

Lieut.-Colonel BRAMBLE mentioned that with regard to the Winchester celebration, the Somerset Archæological Society were not quite ignored by the Council. They had not been asked by the latter to appoint any representative, but the Committee did them the favour to send and ask them for a list of their members in order that they might be applied to for subscriptions.

This concluded the business proceedings.

After luncheon at the Royal Hotel, Bristol, the members and visitors in the afternoon inspected several places of interest in the city.