

I cannot conclude these few remarks without expressing the hope that British antiquaries will at a future time take great care to ascertain the localities where Cufic coins and silver ornaments have been found in England and Ireland. By such facts we should be enabled to give a still clearer and more detailed account of the remarkable trade between the east and the north of Europe which existed at so early a period, and of the influence which this connection with the Levant had upon the civilization of the north of Europe.

J. J. A. WORSAAE, OF COPENHAGEN.

---

### ON THE CITY OF ANDERIDA, OR ANDREDESCEASTER.

AMONG the numerous questions which have long exercised the ingenuity of antiquaries, one is the site of the ancient city of Anderida, or Andredesceaster, respecting which it is proposed to add another to the many discussions the subject has already experienced. There is, there can be, no expectation of discovering new sources of information, or of throwing absolutely new light upon the matter. All we can hope to accomplish must be to collect the substance of the notices in our old annalists; to make some observations upon the account so obtained; and to conclude with a consideration of the probabilities with regard to those places where the lost Romano-British city is, by their respective advocates, supposed to have stood.

The Saxon Chronicle<sup>a</sup>, and several others of different periods, allude to the fate of Anderida, but merely announcing its utter destruction, they are too concise to serve the present enquiry; therefore, neglecting them, we will produce the copious statement of Henry of Huntingdon. "The kingdom of Sussex begins, which Ella maintained long and most ably; but auxiliaries had joined him from his own country, &c.—Relying therefore upon (his) large forces he besieged Andredescester, a very strong city. The Britons then collected as thick as bees, and beat the besiegers in the day by ambushes,

<sup>a</sup> Gibson's edition, p. 15.

and in the night by assaults. There was no day, there was no night, wherein unfavourable and fresh messengers would not exasperate the minds of the Saxons; but thereby rendered the more ardent, they would beset the city with continual assaults. Always, however, as they assailed, the Britons would press them behind with archers, and with darts thrown with thongs; therefore quitting the walls, the pagans would direct their arms and steps against them. Then the Britons, excelling them in fleetness, would run into the woods; and again come upon them from behind when they moved toward the walls. By this artifice the Saxons were long annoyed, and an immense slaughter of them was made, until they divided the army into two parts, so that, while one part should attack the walls, they might have behind a line of warriors arrayed against the charges of the Britons. But then the citizens, worn down by daily want of food, when they could no longer sustain the weight of the assailants, were all devoured by the edge of the sword, with the women and little ones, so that not even a single one escaped. And because they had suffered such losses there (the Saxons) so (utterly) destroyed the city, that it was never afterwards rebuilt. Only the site, as of a very noble city, is pointed out desolate to those who may pass by<sup>b</sup>."

Such are the words of Henry of Huntingdon, who wrote in the twelfth century. He does not give the precise date of the event, but places it between the fortieth and the forty-seventh years of the coming of the Saxons to England, "adventus Anglorum;" that is, between A.D. 489 and 496. The Saxon Chronicle names the year 490; other authors slightly differing years. Now upon the above detailed description it must be

<sup>b</sup> Regnum Sudsee incipit, quod Ella diu et potentissime tenuit. Venerant autem ei auxiliares a patria sua, &c. Fretus igitur copiis ingentibus obsedit Andredescester, urbem munitissimam. Congregati sunt igitur Britanni quasi apes, et die expugnabant obsidentes insidiis, et nocte incursibus. Nullus dies erat, nulla nox erat, quibus sinistri et recentes nuntii Saxonum animas non acerbarent; inde tamen ardentiores effecti, continuis insultibus urbem infestabant. Semper vero dum assilirent instabant eis Brittones a tergo cum viris sagittariis et amentatis telorum missilibus. Dimissis igitur mœnibus, gressus et arma dirgebant in eos Pagani. Tunc Brittones eis celeritate præstantiores silvas cursu petebant: ten-

dentibusque ad mœnia rursus a tergo aderant. Hac arte Saxones diu fatigati sunt, et innumera strages eorum fiebat, donec in duas partes exercitum dividerunt, ut dum una pars urbem expugnaret, esset eis a tergo contra Brittonum excursus bellatorum acies ordinata. Tunc vero cives diuturna fame contriti, cum jam pondus infestantium perferre nequirent, omnes ore gladii devorati sunt, cum mulieribus et parvulis, ita quod nec unus solus evasit. Et quia tot ibi damna toleraverant extranei, ita urbem destruxerunt, quod nunquam postea reædificata est. Locus tantum quasi nobilissimæ urbis transeuntibus ostenditur desolatus.—Savile's Rer. Angl. Script. post Bed. Frankfort, 1601, p. 312.

remarked, that not a single particular is mentioned affording the smallest clue to the situation of Andredcester, except that the city must have been very closely surrounded by a forest, which we may safely assume to be the great forest of Anderida or Andredesweald; and it is generally admitted to have stood westward from the straits of Dover: but beyond this we know absolutely nothing. Our business therefore must be to examine what assistance the character of Andredescester itself, as learned from the account of it just quoted, will afford in determining its probable position.

The name then indicates that this was, or had been, a Roman settlement, the termination "cester," Latin, castrum, a camp, always implying such a fact. And if it was a permanent Roman station, we may be certain that it possessed marks of Roman occupation, in the existence there of walls constructed with stone and lime. We should also advert to Henry of Huntingdon's observation, that Andredcester was "a very strong city—urbem munitissimam;" which indeed was evinced by the obstinate resistance of the inhabitants opposed to their Saxon invaders. And lastly, that the city was extensive appears an inference equally clear from the statement of the numbers which collected for its defence, as well as for the attack. Therefore, though positive information fails us, we perceive there is reason to believe, that Andredescester was a large and well fortified Roman city; consequently, that the spot where it stood is quite as likely to contain at the present day some signs of Roman domination, as any of those numerous places in this kingdom, wherein undisputed traces remain of Roman ascendancy.

Our next attempt shall be to enquire how far the situation of any of the localities, to which the site of Anderida is conjecturally assigned, will answer to Henry of Huntingdon's description; and especially what vestiges of Roman buildings we can find there. These localities amount to eight; namely, Newenden in Kent, Arundel, East Bourne, Chichester, Hastings, Newhaven, Pevensey, and Seaford, in Sussex. Upon all these places it will be necessary to make some remarks.

1. Camden, it is understood, was the first to pronounce an opinion in favour of Newenden; and his authority upon such questions is justly great. Still his expressions declare only

what is *his opinion*, as he adduces not a tittle of evidence for his assertion<sup>c</sup>, that the monastery, erected in Newenden by Sir Thomas Alberger, (or Fitz-Aucher, according to Dugdale's Monasticon,) temp. Edward I., actually was at or near the site of Andredesceaster. With the entire of the small parish of Newenden, I have been in former days most intimately acquainted: but nowhere, I confidently affirm, is there a single mark of early occupancy, such as we may suppose would be left by a city, like what we are assured Andredcester was. Some inequalities on the surface of the soil may tend to prove that buildings formerly stood there; but I am aware of none, with an exception speedily to be considered, which *could*, from their situation, be any other than dwellings. The parish of Newenden lies upon the extremity of a long ridge or tongue of land, extending eastward from Sandhurst on the west, having the marshes or level meadows along the river Rother to the south, and on the north a narrow valley through which flows a small stream, meeting the Rother at some distance eastward; in which last direction the junction of the two valleys produces a wide expanse of marsh-land. In the north-east corner of the utmost point of the upland, is a spot still bearing the name of "The Castle," or "Castle Toll," comprising a high mound, with vestiges of a moat; of which spot the following is the description in Harris's History of Kent, p. 215. "Castle Toll; this is a raised piece of land, containing, I guess, about eighteen or twenty acres of land; on the east side it hath the remains of a deep ditch and bank, which seems to have gone quite round it. Near this Toll towards the north north-east lies a piece of ground raised much higher than the Toll is; this was encompassed with a double ditch, the tracks of which are still to be seen in some places; and within the line is, I believe, about five or six acres of land; on the south and north sides of the uppermost vallum, very eminent still." (sic.) "When Dr. Plot visited this place in the year 1693, he saith in some manuscript papers of his, which I have the favour to peruse, that they were then very lofty, and he was informed by an ancient and sober countryman, who had often ploughed upon this hill, that both the mounts or tumuli, and the valla, were then at least four foot

<sup>c</sup> Gibson's edition, p. 258.

lower than when he first knew the place: and therefore no wonder if I found them *much lower yet*, when I visited this place. And the plough and the usual deterrations will in time reduce them to a level." This has been partially effected, and much of what is described above is utterly obliterated, changes having been produced even while I frequented the locality; though sufficient still exists to shew that a fortified place once covered the ground. Now why, it may be asked, should not Andredesceaster have stood here, as Dr. Harris argues that it did? The vicinity might indeed have suited for the peculiar system of warfare, which the Britons are stated to have adopted; although the adjoining upland seems likely to have been less densely wooded, than were the surrounding districts. But the overwhelming difficulty is, that not a particle of Roman masonry is to be found here. When the ramparts, which are now completely levelled, were still distinguishable, as just noticed, about the end of the seventeenth century, they are so mentioned as positively to imply mere earthworks; and the total absence of every thing betokening stone and lime walls was always remarked by myself and others in our numerous visits to the spot. If then this fortification was constructed with sods merely, it may be presumed that no one will contend for its Roman original; and if not Roman, it will not answer to the character of the city we are seeking. Another objection might be found in the situation; which, allowing for every possible alteration in the face of the country, would, formerly even more than now, vastly have resembled that at the bottom of a sack, or of a rat trap: a most unlikely position, it must be acknowledged, for a permanent Roman station.

Those marks of Roman inhabitation, which we fail to discover at the "Castle Toll" of Newenden, are equally wanting, I venture to assert, throughout the entire remainder of the parish. In and about the buildings of Losenham, where Sir Thomas Alberger's priory stood, not a solitary stone, likely to have belonged to that priory, could ever be observed, often as I have looked around for such objects; far less do the premises contain a single portion of the greatly more enduring masonry of the Romans. Indeed, though a native and long a resident of that neighbourhood, I never heard even a rumour of any evidence to prove that an individual Roman, or any thing Roman, had penetrated into that

country, which must, in very early times, have been almost one impervious forest<sup>d</sup>.

2. With regard to Arundel being the site of Andredecester, I am not aware that any claim has been advanced beyond that in a small pamphlet, published in 1843, without any name, but written by Mr. James Puttock<sup>e</sup>. Argument this tract cannot boast, unless we admit as such a far-fetched attempt at deriving the names Anderida and Arundel from the same roots in the British language. The author's expressions are—"the name of this river," the Arun, "I derive, &c.—I conclude," p. 17; "I confidently believe," p. 18; "my impression is," p. 19; "I should think," p. 20; notwithstanding he "flatters himself he has solved the mystery" relating to "the site of Anderida," pref.; and concludes thus, "in short, whoever seeks for Anderida at any other place than Arundel will lose his labour<sup>f</sup>."

In spite of this assertion, however, the generality perhaps of enquirers will venture to differ from the writer. That a castle existed at Arundel, as Mr. Puttock states, during the Saxon period, is freely acknowledged; for the Domesday description of the place alludes to payments from the "castrum Harundel" in the time of King Edward the Confessor; and that a Roman station of some kind might have stood there is probable, Arundel lying very nearly in a direct line from the Bignor villa to the sea. But actual proof of the existence of any such station depends upon the fact of Roman walls, or remains of them, being traceable in or around the present castle of Arundel; in the absence of which marks, and without positive historical evidence, no claim to have been a Roman

<sup>d</sup> Since these observations were commenced I have seen an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December, 1844, p. 577, by my friend the Rev. Beale Post, who takes the same view of the question as relating to Newenden, and finally draws the same conclusion with myself. Nevertheless I have persevered in my undertaking, because Mr. Post has noticed only two places, Newenden and Pevensey, and because he has adopted a somewhat different line of argument from mine. Upon one particular Mr. Post has, I conceive, fallen into a mistake. He alludes to a farm in the parish of Newenden, bearing a name with, in his opinion, a resemblance to that of Anderida, namely, as there given, Arndred. Hereby he must, I imagine, mean a farm a mile from the

church toward Sandhurst, lying south of the turnpike road; but which, in my time, was always called Heronden or Harnden. This farm however is in the parish of Sandhurst, (my native place); and although great part of the farm on the opposite side of the road is in Newenden, for this I never recollect hearing any other name than Lamberden.

<sup>e</sup> Anderida identified with Arundel, pp. 20. London, H. Hughes, 15, St. Martin's-le-Grand, 1843.

<sup>f</sup> As a friend justly observed after reading the pamphlet, the identification rests upon similar grounds with Fluellin's resemblance between Macedon and Monmouth—

"There is salmons in both."  
Shakespeare's *Henry V.*

city can be admissible. And even allowing a Roman station to have been placed at Arundel, it by no means follows, that it was Anderida; on the contrary, the nature of the locality seems but ill adapted for the sort of warfare by which Henry of Huntingdon tells us the siege and defence were carried on; and most especially the condition of Arundel, when that chronicler wrote, will not agree with his description, because, instead of "lying desolate," it was, and, it is on record, had been for centuries before, in constant occupation. Upon this particular however farther remarks will be made hereafter, applying to Arundel equally with other places. It may be added, that no statement of the possession here of any Roman masonry or ruins is advanced in "The Antiquities of Arundel;" in which work it is expressly observed, p. 2, "the first time we meet with it is in King Alfred's will, 877, in which he gives it to Athelm, his brother's son."

3. The notion of East Bourne having been the site of Andredesceaster is grounded solely, I believe, upon the circumstance, that, A.D. 1712, the vestiges of Roman building were discovered between the church and the sea<sup>b</sup>. Upon this foundation Dr. Tabor<sup>1</sup> raised the hypothesis, that Anderida *must* have stood here. But granting these remains to have been, which appears certain, those of a Roman villa, this, I contend, will by no means prove that a *large fortified Roman town* occupied the immediate vicinity. On the contrary, judging from the usual custom in such cases, the stronger probability seems to be, that the villa would be erected at some little distance at the least, for a quiet retreat from the commotion of the military city. Be this however as it may, beyond these traces of a villa absolutely *no* Roman ruins exist at East Bourne; consequently the true and only safe test in this enquiry fails here, as elsewhere, to throw any light upon the position of the missing Andredescester.

4. Our next subject is Chichester. But as it is now generally considered<sup>k</sup> that the Roman appellation of this city was Regnum, this place may be dismissed without farther observation.

5. Hastings requires scarcely more notice. The situation being among abrupt hills, it seems that space would have

<sup>a</sup> 8vo. London, 1766.

<sup>b</sup> East Bourne, 1787, Appendix.

<sup>1</sup> Philos. Transactions, vol. xxx. pp. 549, 783.

<sup>k</sup> Horsfield's Sussex, vol. i. p. 41, and Gentleman's Magazine, December, 1844, p. 577.



been utterly wanting for those evolutions between the besieging Saxons and the defending Britons at Andredesceaster, which we are assured were actually practised. But the grand difficulty is, that at Hastings there is neither ancient record nor existing vestige of any of those extraordinary structures, which the Romans invariably raised wherever they retained lengthened possession of a country, and which often vie almost with rock itself in durability. So far as my information extends, the strongest advocacy of Hastings as the site of Anderida is comprised in a suggestion of Somner<sup>1</sup>, that such *might* be the case from the addition of "Chester" to the name. Somner's authority for that addition I know not; some no doubt he had, though he adduces none; but certainly it was not the Saxon Chronicle, where Hastings is never styled "Ceaster;" and, as already stated, evidence is still to be produced that a Roman building of any description ever stood on or near the spot.

6, 7. The cases of Newhaven and Seaford may be discussed together, their claims to the honour in question, as reported in Horsfield's *Sussex*, vol. i. pp. 51 to 54, resting entirely upon manuscript observations by Mr. Elliott, Mr. Hayley, and Mr. Charles Verral. In these observations, however, I find merely conjectural supposition beyond the statements that Roman camps are yet visible in the neighbourhood of those two places, and that "an extensive Roman cemetery has been discovered on the farm of Sutton" adjoining Seaford<sup>m</sup>. But *camps*, surrounded by earthworks, like those just alluded to<sup>n</sup>, are totally distinct things from cities encircled by stone walls; and it will hardly be denied, that the latter must have been the condition of Andredesceaster. Respecting the Roman remains, I repeat what has been said with regard to East Bourne; that the utmost such remains can demonstrate is, that some Roman settlement existed at no great distance, not, in the absence of other proof, that such settlement was a considerable city like Anderida. At both Newhaven and Seaford, as well as at every other spot, omitting Chichester, hitherto noticed in this discussion, there is wanting the conclusive testimony supplied by masonry of indisputable, or even probable, Roman origin, such as that

<sup>1</sup> Roman Ports and Forts in Kent, p. 105.

<sup>m</sup> Ut supra, p. 52.

<sup>n</sup> The camp near Seaford I have never

inspected: that at Newhaven I have seen, and deem the fact very doubtful whether it really is Roman.



wonderful people were accustomed to construct for the defence of their permanent stations.

8. We have now, lastly, to examine the title of Pevensey to the honour in question. And here we discover clear evidence of a Roman settlement, and that of no mean importance. It is well known, that the Romans deemed an essential ingredient in the composition of really good mortar to be pounded pottery, or tiles; which is specially mentioned by one of their authors, Vitruvius, in his book upon architecture<sup>o</sup>. This admixture necessarily imparted a very perceptible red tint to the mortar; and inasmuch as no other people are recorded, or even conjectured, at any period, to have adopted the same system, wherever this red mortar is observed, it may be regarded a sure proof of the workmanship being Roman; although the absence of that colour in the mortar is not conclusive to the contrary, because sometimes the pounded pottery is wanting in erections, undoubtedly, I believe, of Roman construction. At Pevensey however this red mortar is most conspicuous throughout the entire original portion of the walls, namely, those enclosing the great court; wherefore we may safely pronounce this indisputably a Roman fortress. The present appearance of the exterior range of walls and towers, which are yet perfect, evinces the former strength of those defences, especially against such uncivilized assailants as the ancient Britons or Saxons. And the interior area, comprising altogether nearly ten acres<sup>p</sup>, would suffice to contain such an amount of population, as we may imagine, from the old Chronicler's description, had congregated within Andredcester just previous to its final overthrow. That Henry of Huntingdon in saying, as above, that "the Britons collected as thick as bees," did not mean that the whole number assembled within the walls of the city, is clear from his account immediately following of the assaults and stratagems enacted by those without, and which could not have proved so successful as they did unless very strongly supported.

<sup>o</sup> Si autem fluviatricæ aut marinæ duæ arenæ in unam calcis conjiciantur: ita enim erit justa ratio mixtionis temperaturæ. Etiam in fluviatrica aut marina si quis testam tusam et succretam ex tertia parte adjecerit, efficiet materiæ temperaturam ad usum meliorem.—Vitruvius Pollio de Architecturâ, lib. ii. c. 5.

The following is the meaning of Vitruvius, as rendered by Mr. Hartshorne, in

his paper on Portchester Castle, p. 22, in the Proceedings of the Archæological Institute at Winchester, 1845: "If the cement be made of river or sea sand, the proportions should be two parts of sand and one of lime; and if to this there shall be thrown in for the third part broken and sifted tiles, it will greatly ameliorate the quality of the cement."

<sup>p</sup> Chronicles of Pevensey, p. 41.

That the walls of Pevensey existed, and in a ruined condition, at the landing of the duke of Normandy, seems sufficiently certain from the evidence now to be adduced. It is indeed stated by Mr. Lethieullier in his "Description of the Tapestry remaining in the Cathedral of Bayeux," that "Harold, who had been crowned king, was not ignorant that the duke would infallibly come with an army to support his right to the throne; and therefore *fortified Pevensey*," &c. The authority for this assertion I know not, but admitting it to be indefeasible, it cannot signify that Harold then erected the whole of the now standing walls, because, in the first place, he had no time for a work of such magnitude and admirable construction, as we behold it to be; and secondly, as already shewn, internal proof still survives that the masonry is Roman. So again, though a Chronicle of Battle Abbey<sup>a</sup> informs us, that the duke of Normandy landed "near the castle called Pevenesel<sup>r</sup>," this expression, considering what ground we have for believing the anterior origin of the fortress, can only imply, as it would seem, that the "castrum Pevenesel" was in being when William landed there. But, beyond this negative reasoning, the walls even now shew marks of repairs and additions belonging to what, with regard to architecture, is styled the Norman period. One of the towers has been heightened<sup>s</sup>, where the distinction between the Roman and the later mortar is clearly visible, beside that the upper portion exhibits a window with a semicircular head, or of Norman shape. There are also several places where the walls have been patched, one in particular, apparently an extensive injury, where the new work is "herring-bone;" but in all these cases the composition of the mortar manifestly indicates a date subsequent to the original erection, and my observations tend to the conclusion that a majority, if not all, of these repairs, are coeval with the addition to the tower just referred to. Whether they were effected by Harold, or by his rival William, is immaterial: the difference of time could be very trifling; and at the period in question the intercourse between England and

<sup>a</sup> From A.D. 1066 to 1176, compiled by an unknown monk of that establishment, and recently printed by the Anglia Christiana Society, from a manuscript in the British Museum.

<sup>r</sup> 1066. Dux ergo cum incredibili exer-

citu, divino comitante favore, navigationem aggressus, prospere tandem prope castrum Pevenesel dictum applicuit.—Chronicon Monasterii de Bello.

<sup>s</sup> Chronicles of Pevensey, p. 43.

Normandy was so frequent, that a great similarity with regard to architecture would be likely to prevail in both countries, more especially in the parts most contiguous to each other. There is farther evidence that the walls of Pevensey were in ruins at the Norman invasion, in the facts that there is no record of Pevensey castle as a defensible fortress at the time, nor of any opposition offered to the invading army from thence, though it is expressly declared to have disembarked on the neighbouring shore.

Against the notion now contended for, that Pevensey represents Andredesceaster, there are two objections, which we must endeavour to obviate. And first with regard to the modern name; which certainly bears no resemblance to that which we would appropriate to the vicinity. *Wheresoever* the ancient city stood, it is clear, that both name and remembrance are most completely lost. Nor need this circumstance greatly surprise us, when we recollect the utter and long-continued desolation which is stated to have overwhelmed the place. Our supposition, that the old walls now called Pevensey are those which encircled Andredesceaster, is by no means contradicted by the fact it involves, that when, in process of time, the *adjoining* valuable, though possibly quite deserted, land was taken possession of, as undoubtedly it would be, the new occupant must have imposed a new appellation, even though all memory of the old one might not have vanished. And that such was really the case seems the meaning of Henry of Huntingdon's expression, "*locus tamen ostenditur desolatus; the site is pointed out desolate:*" as if the situation of the ruined city was known and noticed, long after the present town of Pevensey is recorded to have existed under that title. The name Pevensey is considered, perhaps correctly, to be of Saxon origin, and if so, it *must* have been attributed after the destruction of Anderida; in confirmation of which idea it may be mentioned, that the earliest occurrence of the name, which I have been able to discover, is in the Saxon Chronicle at the year 1046<sup>t</sup>; only twenty years, be it observed, before the arrival of the Normans. It is however the opinion of Archbishop Usher, as quoted by Somner<sup>u</sup>, that Pevensey is the "Caer Pensavelcoit" of the

<sup>t</sup> Gibson's edition, p. 160.

<sup>u</sup> Roman Ports and Forts, &c. p. 104.

Britons ; and Mr. M. A. Lower<sup>x</sup> alludes to the name being used in A.D. 792, and 1042.

The second difficulty in the question arises from the present denuded condition of the adjacent country, whereas Andredecester must have been closely surrounded by wood. But though Pevensey Level now consists solely of rich grazing land, why might it not, nearly twelve centuries ago, have been a wide swampy forest? The like alteration, it is admitted, has happened with respect to the fen districts of Cambridgeshire and the contiguous counties ; neither are we absolutely without evidence, that the state of the low lands in this division of the kingdom may also once have been similar. The late Mr. E. J. Curties, M.P. for the county, has related in the Gentleman's Magazine<sup>y</sup>, his noticing on the sea shore upon the eastern side of the Level the stumps of various kinds of trees now common in our woods, some of them four or five feet high, with the roots yet firmly imbedded in the earth ; plainly the remains of an ancient forest. Whether the same may be the case in Pevensey Level I am ignorant, but in some at least of the low lands eastward, on the borders of the streams, it was recently, and I have no doubt is now, not very unusual to disinter logs or timber from beneath the surface of what is now bare grass.

Before concluding this portion of our discussion we may notice Dr. Tabor's objection, in the papers already alluded to, against Pevensey being Anderida, from the fact of *so much* old wall yet existing there. His idea must be, that such large and still perfect remains are inconsistent with the accounts delivered to us of the utter destruction of the city. But clearly this argument is inconclusive, because any entry within the fortification, which enabled the besiegers to accomplish the slaughter of the inhabitants, would sufficiently answer the description of the Chronicles, without requiring all the walls to be absolutely levelled with the ground ; which last feat indeed, especially considering that the construction was *Roman*, would be such a serious undertaking to the Saxon army, that we may safely imagine they would rest contented with having obtained possession of the city, without attempting farther injury to the "too, too solid" walls. On this particular, it may have been perceived already, I am completely at issue with Dr.

<sup>x</sup> Chronicles of Pevensey, pp. 10, 11.

<sup>y</sup> Horsfield's Sussex, vol. i. p. 427.

Tabor, and, far from deeming the extent of the ruins at Pevensey a reason for seeking Andredesceaster elsewhere, I regard that very circumstance as strongly in favour of the identity of the two places. Moreover, I contend, that the statement of the consequences of the demolition of the Romano-British city by the Saxons, is actually applicable to Pevensey, almost alone of all the spots which have been named as the site of Anderida. The quotation given above from Henry of Huntingdon, concludes, it will be remembered, by saying, "The Saxons so utterly destroyed the city, that it was never afterwards rebuilt. Only the site, as of a very noble city, is pointed out desolate to those who may pass by." If we use these words to test the condition, when they were written, of the several places whose claims we have been reviewing, we shall find the castle of Arundel mentioned in Domesday Book as existing "in the time of King Edward" the Confessor, and there can be no doubt of the situation being occupied and inhabited from that time to this; at Hastings the castle was erected, if not by William I., at least by an early Anglo-Norman sovereign, and a still earlier date will probably be granted to the town. Seaford was a port, maintaining intercourse with those of the Netherlands previous to the Norman invasion<sup>z</sup>. Of the early state of East Bourne and Newhaven, the only evidence I can offer is, that the church of the latter was indisputably Norman; but the want in those localities, already urged, of any vestiges of Roman military masonry, is enough to exclude them from the category: the same might be said of Newenden, but we have also the testimony of Domesday Book, that the place was then of such importance as to possess a valuable market, although, if that was held where the present church and village stand, it was at a considerable distance from the intrenchments, supposed to have been those of Andredesceaster, which spot certainly is uninhabited to this day. However, of all the situations, where, with reasonable probability, we might seek for the desolated British city, the Chronicler's account seems best, if not solely, applicable to Pevensey. It is admitted, as above, that the surviving ruins shew marks of Norman repairs; these however were comparatively slight

<sup>z</sup> M. Alford, *Annal. Eccl. Angl. Sax.*, tom. ii. p. 394; and *Acta Sanctorum, Mens. Julii*, p. 612.

works, the remains of the keep belonging to a far later period. There are also sufficient records of the castle being occupied as a fortress, when it must necessarily have been the residence of those to whom the custody of it was intrusted; but it is especially to be remarked, first, that the interior of the Roman walls shews no signs of other buildings attached to or within them, with the exception of the now ruined keep; and secondly, that the town of Pevensey, properly so called, though immediately *adjoining*, is *entirely distinct from the spot which we would assume to be Andredescester*; so that the name Pevensey was bestowed, *not on the ancient British city, but upon a separate spot*. Still farther it may be noticed, as a *possible* corroboration of Henry of Huntingdon's statement, that the earliest portion of Pevensey church, as now standing, is in style Early English; consequently, that it was not erected till about the time of, if not subsequent to, that writer's death; and there is such a strong resemblance between some arch-mouldings of the church, and others among the ruins of the keep, that I should assign the construction of both buildings to the same period.

Before concluding this dissertation I would adduce some support to my views from *authority*. And first Somner, in opposition to Camden's theory, decidedly inclines to Pevensey as the probable site of Anderida<sup>a</sup>, though he does not express a positive opinion. Private information enables me to produce also the observation upon this subject of one, whose reputation stands deservedly high in such matters. The late Henry Petrie, Esq., Keeper of the Records in the Tower, repeatedly mentioned, that he could satisfactorily recognise every Roman station, from Burgh castle on the confines of Norfolk and Suffolk round the coast southward and westward to Portchester in Hampshire, applying to each station both the ancient and the modern name, *with only a single exception in each case*; the identity of Andredescester having never been determined, nor any Roman appellation appropriated to the indisputable Roman ruins existing at Pevensey. From these considerations therefore the impression upon Mr. Petrie's mind was, that Pevensey is, and Pevensey alone can be, the site of the long-lost Romano-British city.

This discussion has necessarily been lengthened by the desire not to pass unnoticed whatever bearing upon the ques-

<sup>a</sup> Roman Ports and Forts in Kent, p. 105.

tion appeared to require attention. In closing the remarks offered I do not presume to alter in my favour the old Latin sentence, and say, "*Est nostro tantas componere lites.*" Whenever, as in this instance, the decision can only be between different degrees of probability, the opportunity must ever subsist of reopening the debate. As the enquiry was commenced with no previously cherished theory or bias, so the wish and endeavour throughout have been to examine and to state every thing fairly and impartially on all sides; and if the result shall be deemed to have gathered any additional weight into the scale of truth, the writer's purpose will be fulfilled, and his labours amply recompensed. To one particular of the above line of argument much importance is confidently attributed; which is, that no spot can possess any good claim, independent of authentic records, to have been a Roman city, unless exhibiting clear evidence of walls, or vestiges of walls, such as the Romans would have erected for its defence. Reasoning from this kind of testimony alone has effected my own conviction; otherwise I might have felt most disposed to assert the credit of my native county of Kent, supported as I should have been by the concurrent opinion of one of our earliest and most celebrated antiquaries.

ARTHUR HUSSEY.