

From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

Gloucestershire and the Norman Conquest

by D. Douglas
1957, Vol. 76, 5-20

© The Society and the Author(s)

GLOUCESTERSHIRE AND THE NORMAN CONQUEST

Presidential Address

by PROFESSOR DAVID DOUGLAS, M.A., F.B.A.

9 March 1957

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I must begin my address to you this afternoon by expressing my deep sense of the honour you did me by electing me to be your President, and I hope you will not think I am making too poor a return for your kindness if I select to-day for your consideration, an historical, and not an archaeological, subject. I wish to speak of the critical events which overtook England in the latter half of the 11th century—of that long process which is usually described under the title of 'The Norman Conquest.' But I want to discuss those well-known happenings, not from the general point of view, and still less in relation to modern controversies concerning them, but rather from the standpoint of an inhabitant of 11th-century Gloucestershire. How would such a man have been affected by this crisis? What part might *he* have played in it? And what would *he* have thought of those topics which are so familiar to all of us: Stamford Bridge and Hastings, Edward the Confessor and Earl Harold, William the Conqueror and Domesday Book? Do these seem to you very trivial questions? If so, I can only plead that, in my judgment, such efforts of critical imagination are essential if the past is vested with actuality. Moreover, it has been a source of pride to me that among my predecessors in this Society was the great historian of the Norman Conquest—Edward Augustus Freeman. Can I do better this afternoon than attempt, however haltingly, to follow in his footsteps—even though on occasion my conclusions may be different from his?

I do not need to elaborate to this audience the crisis with which England was faced in the latter half of the 11th century.

At that time it was uncertain whether England would degenerate into a chaos of warring principalities, or achieve a new unity under a strong monarchy. It was, likewise, uncertain whether her fortunes for the remainder of the Middle Ages would be linked up with the Scandinavian north or with Latin Europe. It was also uncertain whether her culture would develop on the vernacular lines upon which it had hitherto progressed, or whether it would become part and parcel of the Latin civilization of western Europe. It is in relation to these problems that the Norman Conquest has been termed the most important event in English history between the Conversion and the Reformation. In 1042 when Edward the Confessor came to the English throne, all was in doubt. By 1100 an emphatic answer had been given to all these questions. In giving that answer Gloucestershire played her individual part, and the Norman Conquest entailed consequences to Gloucestershire which endure to-day.

It was characteristic of 19th-century scholarship, of which Freeman was such a notable example, to treat this epoch-making process from a national standpoint—and to visualize the dominant theme in these events as a conflict between 'English' and 'Normans'. Yet such ideas are alien to the time. It is true that the previous political growth of England had been remarkable. It is true, also, that the royal dynasty represented in Edward the Confessor, strong in its traditional prestige, enjoyed great respect throughout England. Finally, there are traces in the mid-11th century of a common feeling which might have developed into a national consciousness. Such things are difficult to assess, but it is at all events significant that a nearly contemporary life of Edward the Confessor can speak of conflicts between the provinces of England as being *quasi bellum civile*—like civil war—perhaps the first time in English history for such a phrase to be used in such a context. It is, of course, easy to make too much of such utterances. But they do indicate that among some representative men in England about 1050, there were, at any rate, some who felt that a conflict between north and south—between the men of Gloucestershire and the

men of Yorkshire for example—was something more disastrous—more hateful—than a war with men from overseas.

Yet when all this has been said—and it needs to be said—I am quite sure that our Gloucestershire man did not view the politics of the age from anything like the standpoint of some later national historians. No interpretation of these events—or of their enduring consequences—can be adequate which does not appreciate the provincial differences then existing in the Old English state, or the intense local loyalties which these inspired. The social structure of 11th century England was marked by cleavages separating one district from another, Northumbria from Kent, East Anglia from the western Midlands, and above all was the abiding difference between the Danelaw and the rest of England. For anyone living in our shire in the 11th century this must have seemed almost the most important factor in secular politics. Looking out from Gloucestershire, northward and eastward, our friend would have been conscious that a large part of England regarded itself almost as a separate land, a large area, moreover, which included all of Lincolnshire, much of Yorkshire, the northern Midlands and East Anglia. Here was a wide region vividly conscious of its Scandinavian inheritance, populated by a peasantry which often bore names denoting their Scandinavian ancestry, and always impatient of control by Kings reigning in the south.

Common action by men from these parts and men in the south and west was always difficult, for their aspirations were always different. To the men of Gloucestershire, invaders from Scandinavia were in truth 'foreigners,' but to men in the north they might appear as kinsmen or as friends. The army of Harold Hardrada was later to be widely welcomed in Holderness, and if we can trust a later Saga, a Norwegian notable flying from the rout of Stamford Bridge found little difficulty in making himself understood by the inhabitants of south Yorkshire. A few years later the Rising of the North was planned with Danish help, and the Scandinavian raiders could always count on local support. They were wont, says a Norman writer,

to take refuge with the peasantry and to join in the feasts of the country people on their farms. Between such a temper and that prevailing in 11th-century Gloucestershire there could be little in common. And so it was. During the critical years 1066 the men of the Danelaw were for the most part ready to receive Harold Hardrada of Norway as King of England. They had only a distant interest in that other Harold—the Earl of Wessex, who had then been overlord of Gloucestershire for many years, and who a few months previously had seized the throne of England for himself.

Here, then, was one dominant reason for a Gloucestershire man looking at the events of this age from a local standpoint. Yet another was to be found in the fact that during the twenty years preceding the Norman Conquest the politics of England had been dominated by the rivalries of the three great earldoms: Northumbria under the house of Siward, Mercia under that of Leofric, and Wessex under the house of Godwine. The very existence of these earldoms, and the separatist policy pursued by their holders, powerfully counteracted those sentiments of national consciousness which we have noted. For these men consistently acted in rivalry towards each other, and for their own aggrandizement. Nor, in times of reverse, were they reluctant to appeal for help from overseas. Earl Godwine, when exiled, came back by force with assistance from Flanders. Harold at the same time attacked England with the aid of Irish pirate crews. A little later Ælfgar, son of Leofric, forced his way back from exile with the assistance of Griffith, King of North Wales. And in 1066, Tosti, son of Godwine, allied himself with Malcolm, King of Scotland. Throughout the reign of Edward the Confessor, the chief task of the King of England was to try to impose his unifying authority over these desperate divisions, and as is well known he strove to do so by building up a Norman party within the country, and with the further aim of ensuring a Norman succession after his death.

In this confused and critical situation the position of Gloucestershire was unique. It was part of the earldom of Wessex, and therefore directly, and immediately, involved in

the particularist policy of the great Wessex Earls, Godwine and Harold. At the same time, it was a frontier region of the earldom, and Gloucester itself was on the border between Wessex and Mercia. For this reason every shift of power between Wessex and Mercia, every new allocation of territory to one or other of the rival houses, sharply affected the shire. Again, Gloucestershire faced Wales, and was thus influenced by each successive Welsh incursion into English affairs. Nor was this all. Ecclesiastically also, Gloucestershire was specially placed. The shire was part of the diocese of Worcester, and Worcester was in Mercia, not in Wessex. Moreover, the bishops of Worcester during these years, Aldred and Wulfstan, were very remarkable men, whose influence was pervasive as far south as Bristol, where, as you will remember, Wulfstan came to remonstrate with the men of my city for their zeal as slave traders. Finally, these ecclesiastical arrangements brought Gloucestershire into direct contact not only with Mercia, but also with Northumbria. There was, throughout this period, a close connexion between the sees of Worcester and York. Aldred was promoted from Worcester to York in 1062, and for a short time held both sees in plurality. And it is even probable that the west-country version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle—MS 'D'—was during these years being compiled in the northern province.

For all these reasons, Gloucester became a pivotal point in the politics of the age, and a most frequent place of critical assemblies. There, was held in 1043 the critical council which marked the beginning of the Confessor's constructive efforts at kingship. It was at Gloucester, too, that King Edward in 1051 started to mobilize his forces at the beginning of Earl Godwine's revolt. It was probably to Gloucester that in 1063 Earl Harold brought the head of Griffith of Wales to lay the same at the feet of his King as a grisly token of victory. Gloucester had, in fact, become one of the essential centres of English political affairs, and it is not surprising, therefore, that, after the Norman Conquest, King William made it a practice to hold there his Christmas court. At many of these courts

the most important decisions were taken, until at last it was at Gloucester that at Christmas 1085 there occurred that famous 'deep speech' which eventually resulted in the compilation of the Domesday Survey.

The Gloucestershire man through whose eyes I am trying to look at the drama of the Norman Conquest must, therefore, through these years have found himself subject to many conflicting loyalties. Personally, I fancy that he would have regarded himself as, in the first instance, bound to the Earls of Wessex, Godwine, and then Godwine's greater son Harold. He would have followed their policies, and been deeply concerned with the vicissitudes of their power. Between 1042 and 1046, for instance, Gloucestershire was placed not directly under Godwine but under his son Sweyn, who then ruled over the whole region from the Worcestershire border down to Porlock. But in 1046 this man, the most reprobate member of a violent house, outraged the conscience even of that callous age, by abducting the abbess of Leominster, and had to fly the country. Henceforth, Gloucestershire came under Godwine's direct control, and shared intimately in the mighty earl's bid for supreme power.

Throughout all these years it must be remembered that the King was striving to consolidate his position over his overmighty magnates, and trying at the same time to build up a royal party in the country, with its nucleus in a group of Norman notables whom he had intruded into high places in Church and State. To this policy Godwine was irrevocably opposed, and when, in 1051, a Norman was made Archbishop of Canterbury, and a promise of succession was given to the Norman Duke, the great Earl determined on armed rebellion, and the crisis of the reign ensued. Its setting, moreover, was in Gloucestershire, and we are abundantly fortunate in that we have a graphic contemporary account of one of the most colourful episodes which ever took place in this, our shire. I am going to quote to you a passage from that account which is contained in MS. 'D' of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:—

Then Earl Godwine—began to gather his people from all over his earldom, and Earl Sweyn his son did the same over all his, and Harold his other son over all his. And they all assembled at Langtree (*i.e.* Beverstone).—King Edward was then residing at Gloucester. He sent for Earl Leofric, and to the north for Earl Siward and asked for their retainers. And they came to him at first with a small force, but afterwards when they had understood how things were in the south, they sent north throughout all their earldoms, and had a great army called out for the help of their liege lord—and they all came to Gloucester to the help of the king.

It was a great moment in the history of Gloucestershire, and it reflected accurately what were the essential factors in the history of the Norman Conquest. For a man of our shire the situation was at best difficult. He had a loyalty to his Earl—and perhaps our friend may have been in that great host encamped near Tetbury. On the other hand, Edward the Confessor was his King, and though he cannot have felt much in common with the men from the Danish north when they were flocking to Gloucester, he may well have thought that there lay his ultimate allegiance. Something of this dilemma appears even in the archaic phraseology of the Chronicle which at this point rises to dramatic power. The magnates at Gloucester we are told felt themselves so much bound to the King's support that:—

They were willing to attack the army of Godwine if the King had wished them to do so. But some of them thought it would be a great piece of folly if they joined battle because in the two hosts there was most of what was noblest in England.

or as another contemporary writer put it:—

It was hateful to almost all of them to fight against men of their own race because there was little else that was worth anything on either side apart from Englishmen.

Such sentiments, at this date, are, I think, wholly remarkable—and the moderation which they inspired was effective. In 1051 only the twenty short Cotswold miles which divide Gloucester from Tetbury separated England from a bloody civil war. But it was averted, and Godwine and his sons were forced without a battle to go into exile.

If the conditions prevailing at the close of 1051 had been allowed to continue, it is even possible that the change in the royal dynasty might, in due course, have been peacefully achieved, for about this time King Edward in his triumph formally nominated Duke William of Normandy as his heir. But the royal victory was speedily followed by a reaction. Godwine and his sons in 1052 effected their return by force, and had the King at their mercy. The Norman party was suppressed, and the family of Godwine became supreme in England. Moreover, in 1053, with the death of Godwine, the leadership of this house passed to his son Harold. From then on until 1066 this family was to remain the most powerful force in English politics. Soon indeed the issue was to be made even clearer. In 1057 there came to England from his exile in Hungary another Edward who might by reason of heredity have been considered the next in line of succession to the throne. Shortly after landing he died in mysterious circumstances, and Earl Harold who was already the most powerful man in England must from this time forward have begun to think of the succession for himself. Across the sea, Duke William who claimed already to have had the promise of the King was biding his time. Thus all the large issues confronting England became at last crystallized into the personal rivalry of two remarkable men.

In this rivalry the men of Gloucestershire after the events of 1051 were deeply concerned, and the shire found itself even more deeply committed when immediately after the death of the Confessor, on 5 January 1066, Earl Harold seized the throne for himself. The events of the next nine months are part of the history of England and of Europe, but it must be noted that the power of Harold was always dependent on his own earldom of Wessex. In Gloucestershire he could be accepted as King without undue misgiving: he was an overlord of long standing, and a familiar figure in the shire. In the north, however, he was in many respects an alien, and it is significant that before he could there be formally accepted as King, he had to pay a special visit to York where his cause was pleaded

by our own bishop Wulfstan. Harold, in short, could never be regarded as, in the full sense, a national king. He came to the throne by means of a *coup d'état*, and he relied on the support of a particular province of which Gloucestershire formed an important part. He could never count on effective resistance from north of the Trent, and when on the eve of Hastings he called for reinforcements from the Midlands few were forthcoming. He fought and died, at the last, appropriately, under the flag of Wessex.

It is not known how many men from Gloucestershire fought under King Harold at Hastings, but the shire like the rest of England was soon to be affected by the Norman triumph. Yet even here it is important to note the significance of provincial differences, and the absence of any true national feeling in the struggle. Even as there had been a King's party at Gloucester against Earl Godwine in 1051, so now when King William marched against Exeter in 1068 there were already English soldiers in his army, and respected English prelates such as Aldred and Wulfstan, almost from the start, supported the new King as the legitimate heir to the Confessor. It was as a result of the Exeter campaign that Gloucestershire was formally subjected, and at Gloucester itself a castle was set up. This, of course, entailed some destruction, but it was less here than in some other places, and there is no suggestion that the city had to be taken by storm, or even siege. By 1070 the shire may be said to have accepted the new order.

What did this imply? For the bulk of the people—the free and semi-free peasantry in the scattered manors of the shire—I fancy there was at first very little change. The Domesday Survey of Gloucestershire, which records peasant conditions in 1065 and 1086, does not suggest any very widespread, or steep, depression of the peasantry during these twenty years, though the change of masters, and a more strict interpretation of manorial rights, must often have entailed individual hardship. The lot of the Gloucestershire peasant—always bleak at this time—was, I think, not much worse at the close of the 11th century than it was in 1050.

It was among the higher ranks of society that the Norman Conquest entailed something like a revolution in the shire. The Old English nobility—the smaller landed gentry—received a lethal blow in 1066. This thegnly class had suffered terribly in the three great battles of 1066—Fulford, Stamford Bridge and Hastings—and in the local campaigns of the next four years. The survivors either went into exile, or, if they remained, they found themselves in a society to whose sanctions, and to whose military modes, they could not adapt themselves. They were at the mercy of the new nobility which arrived to supplant them—and they succumbed. The change was catastrophic, and there is little danger of exaggerating its magnitude. Such modifications as may be discovered are always interesting, and Gloucestershire can supply two of them. The descent of the medieval lords of Berkeley from the Englishman, Robert, son of Harding, son of Eadnoth, may surely now be regarded as unchallengeable, and there is a respectable tradition which asserts that Robert d'Oilli, who in 1086 held Turkdean, Wick Rissington, and Naunton, married a daughter of Wigod of Wallingford. But such instances of any continuity are very rare, and it is always dangerous to assume the authenticity of any noble pedigree which purports to derive from any individual in pre-Conquest England. Certainly, in Gloucestershire, the tenurial revolution which occurred in the shire was thorough and complete, and within twenty years of the battle of Hastings it had been accomplished. Among the secular tenants-in-chief separately recorded in the Gloucestershire Domesday there is no Old English name to be found.

The most spectacular result of the Norman Conquest in Gloucestershire was thus to establish, as the dominant interest in the shire, members of perhaps the most notable secular aristocracy produced in western Europe during the Middle Ages. The list of the tenants-in-chief in the Gloucestershire Domesday includes many of the greatest Norman names. Here, for instance, is represented Montgomery in the person of Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury, husband of the notorious Mabel of Bellême, and the only man ever to give his name to a shire of England

or Wales. Here also is to be found Hugh, Earl of Chester, son of Richard *vicomte* of the Avranchin. Here, again, is represented the great Norman family of Tosny—the earliest Norman family to receive a territorial appellation descendible in the manner of a surname. Such figures are common in Domesday Book as landowners in England, and in this respect, Gloucestershire shared in a process that affected the whole country.

In Gloucestershire, three of these secular tenants, however, perhaps deserve particular note. Two of them, Walter and Drogo, are described as the sons of Pons, and this Pons can perhaps be identified as the Pons who attested in Normandy a grant to the ducal abbey of Fécamp which was made by the Duke (as it says) 'just before he went to England' and which was to take effect only if God grant him the victory. Even more remarkable is the presence in the Gloucestershire Survey of Roger of Beaumont—the man after whom the present Beaumont-le-Roger is named. For this Roger had been active in Norman politics as early as 1034; he was too old to fight at Hastings where he was represented by his son Robert who became in due course one of the greatest landowners in Norman England. Roger, then, must have been of great age in 1086 when he was lord of Dorsington, and his recorded presence there in that year is of the highest interest. It also points to a general conclusion of historical criticism which is sometimes ignored. The tenants-in-chief in Domesday Book are too often, by genealogists and historians, regarded as a homogeneous and contemporary group. Now, I have found elsewhere a Domesday tenant-in-chief who was the *grandson* of a man who fought at Hastings. Here, by contrast, with Roger of Beaumont, is a patriarch who had been active in Normandy before the death of Cnut, and who already in 1066 had been considered too old to take an active part in warfare. It is a salutary caution, and may perhaps be regarded as the most notable contribution which the village of Dorsington has made to general Domesday criticism.

The endowment of this highly competitive aristocracy out

of the spoils of conquest could not be made without some violence, and undoubtedly there were some pure robbers among its members. Gloucestershire was particularly unfortunate as having for its sheriff (along with Worcestershire) one of the most notorious of these—the ill-famed Urse of Abbetôt, who was denounced for his rapacities, particularly at the expense of the Church, and notably for his robbery of the churches of Worcester, Pershore and Evesham. Nor did Gloucestershire wholly escape his attentions for the inhabitants of Old Sodbury, we are told, had good reason to rue his lordship.

Yet when all has been said about the rapacity of individual members of the new Norman nobility, I think the most notable feature of their establishment was the ordered manner in which it was accomplished. Partly this was due to the overriding authority of a King who was probably the greatest constructive statesman of his age—a conqueror who always sought to be regarded as a conservative, who proclaimed himself the true heir of the Confessor, and who consistently strove to respect—and to make others respect—the system of private relationships which had existed in England before his time. The great pleas of the reign with their perpetual appeal to earlier customs are striking testimony of this, and the strong hand of the Conqueror was never far removed during the tenurial revolution which followed his coming to England.

Some praise must, however, also be given in this matter to the members of the new aristocracy themselves, many of whom were men of high responsibility and outstanding capacity. They are so often depicted as if they were mere lawless brigands that their positive achievement is often forgotten. The cause of English unity, the feudal settlement of England, owed much to the activities of those great Norman families which now appear for the first time in England. There was, of course, always a danger of rebellion, for all political systems when they are operative display a balance, or tension, which is very real. But it was none the less essential to the survival of the small aristocracy recently established in a conquered country that they should co-operate with their King, and, by and large, they

did so. A survey of the tenants-in-chief in the Gloucestershire Domesday, and a contemplation of their careers might even suggest that the dominant theme of Anglo-Norman history is to be found not so much in an opposition between Crown and Baronage, as in the reorganization of England upon a feudal plan by an exceedingly able group of men with the King at their head.

The most important secular supporter of the Norman expedition of 1066—William fitz Osbern—does not of course figure in Domesday Book, since he died at the battle of Cassel in 1071. Nevertheless, as Earl of Hereford, and important in the western shires, he must in his time have held much land in Gloucestershire, for several men who belonged to his personal entourage were richly endowed with lands in the shire, and his brother, Osbern, bishop of Exeter, was in 1086 established at Titherington. Moreover, the two Norman abbeys which William fitz Osbern had previously founded in Normandy received estates in the shire; the abbey of Cormeilles holding land at Newent, and the abbey of Lyre at Duntisbourne. It was, in fact part of the essential pride of these Norman nobles to be considered as patrons of the Church, and it is significant that the great Montgomery foundation at Troarn should in 1086 be recorded as lord of Horsley.

The establishment of Norman abbeys as landowners in England was of course only a minor part of the ecclesiastical consequences of the Norman Conquest. Far more important, so far as Gloucestershire was concerned, was the fact that the same aristocracy which was established in the lay fiefs came rapidly to control the great ecclesiastical foundations of England. Thus in Domesday a large part of Gloucestershire was held under the King by ancient English churches, such as York, Hereford, Malmesbury, Glastonbury, Winchcombe, Gloucester, Evesham and Pershore, but the continuity which this suggests was in some sense illusory since all, or nearly all, of these great foundations had by 1086, passed under the control of Norman, or at least of continental prelates. These men were for the most part hard-working ecclesiastics, who conscientiously discharged

the duties of their office. They were not, for the most part, distinguished for personal sanctity, but they were hard-headed men of affairs, often notable patrons of the arts, and very frequently great builders. Typical among them was Serlo, who became abbot of St. Peter's, Gloucester in 1072. It is said that when he took office, he found only two monks and six novices in the house, but under his rule the numbers of monks grew, the discipline in the monastery was tightened, and its revenues more than doubled. And before his death in 1104 the great building which was eventually to grow by successive stages into the magnificent cathedral we know to-day was already begun.

Such men were responsible for carrying out, under their great archbishop, Lanfranc, the reforms in the Church which came over to England with the Normans, and many of you know, far better than I do, how notably the revivification which they promoted was reflected in stone—not only in our own cathedral, but in so many of the parish churches of our shire. In all this, indeed, Gloucestershire shared to the full, but neither her contribution to the Norman ecclesiastical settlement, nor the benefits she received therefrom, were peculiar to herself. Except in one respect. I have spoken of the Normanization of the prelaty after 1066. Of the 21 abbots who took part in the Council of London in 1075, only 13 were Saxon, and of these only three remained in office at the death of the Conqueror. And by 1080 there was only one bishop of English birth left in England. Only one—but that one was our own Bishop Wulfstan, who continued, respected by everyone in his see, until his death in 1095. In his long life he bridged over the greatest crisis in English medieval history, and he made his own personal and enduring contribution to two social orders which were in many respects so markedly different.

In conclusion, one further effect of the Norman Conquest upon Gloucestershire deserves to be noted. I stressed, at the beginning of this address, the importance of the provincial differences which existed in England in 1042. I would close by noting how these differences were by 1100 being submerged in a new conception of political unity imposed on England by its

new rulers. Nowhere could this fundamental process be better appreciated than in the contemplation of one of those Christmas courts which the Conqueror held so regularly in the city of Gloucester. Sitting in state at Gloucester, the King found himself surrounded by a small group of important magnates who held land not only in our shire but all over England, and by a group of prelates who controlled all the greatest offices in the Church. With them he had 'deep speech' about every part of his kingdom, and through them he came to impose a uniform government over all his realm. Gloucestershire was being made year by year, ever more consciously, an integral part of a politically united England.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I must ask your pardon for having harped so long upon a well-worn theme. All I have tried to do is to re-tell a familiar story in a new way. But perhaps the attempt may have prompted in you—as it has in me—one general reflection. It is this. How completely arbitrary is the current distinction sometimes made between 'general' and 'local' history! The general historian if his work is to be given reality must always take account of the particular manifestations of the historical process with which he is concerned. The local historian and archaeologist can only make his work of general value if he constantly remembers that it is part of a larger whole. Some such realization has in fact lain at the basis of much of the greatest historical work which has been produced in England, and in particular of that bequeathed to us by the great English scholars of the 17th and 18th centuries. So may I end by quoting to you from one of them? Sir Thomas Brown had very much to say about general history, but in some ways his most characteristic book was devoted to a local investigation of pottery—a work which resulted in perhaps the most remarkable historical monograph in the English language. In *Hydriotaphia* he was primarily concerned with his urns, but he could salute the 'Ancient of Days' as 'the Antiquaries' truest object', and conclude:—

'Tis opportune to look back upon old Times, and contemplate our Forefathers. Great examples grow thin, and are to be fetched from the

passed world. Simplicity flies away, and Iniquity comes at long strides upon us. We have enough to do to make up our selves from present and passed Times, and the whole stage of things scarce serveth for our instruction.'

That challenge, Ladies and Gentlemen, is, I venture to suggest, as apposite to-day as when it was first written. And in the light of such instruction, how meaningless appear those distinctions (still sometimes made) between 'professional' and 'amateur' historians, between 'general' and 'local' history! The exploration of the past admits no such divisions, and in very truth we have all of us in this enterprise 'enough to do.' From our interests, and in our studies, we have surely, all of us been made aware how ineluctably the history of England is imprinted on her countryside, and how firmly the growth of England has been rooted in her soil.