APPENDIX.

PROCEEDINGS AND PAPERS

FOR THE

SESSIONS 1882-3 to 1885-6.

NOTE.

In the last volume of the old series of the *Journal*, issued in 1885, the Proceedings are brought down to the meeting held on the 13th November, 1872. From that date to the 18th December, 1882, the meetings were held at very irregular intervals, and no summary of the Proceedings, nor any reports of the papers read at such meetings, appear to be now available for publication.

It is, however, only right to add that the accounts of the Society, 1865 to 1882, and for the years 1883, 1884, and 1885, will be found at the end of the last volume of the old series of the *Journal*.

Seven hundred and seventy-five pounds of the Society's money was spent on the purchase of the Derby House property, which now brings in an annual income of about forty pounds.

PROCEEDINGS AND PAPERS,
1883 TO 1886.

SESSION 1882-3.

Monday, 18th December, 1882.

THE opening meeting of the session 1882-3 was held at the Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday, the 18th December, 1882, at eight o'clock.

The Very Rev. Dean Howson delivered a lecture on "The Sibyls in Christian Poetry and Christian Art," illustrated by some ancient glass at Dunham Hall, Cheshire.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole exhibited an antique bronze seal recently discovered in the debris removed from the fine Norman Crypt (on the west exterior side of the present cloisters), now the property of the King's School.

Mr. A. T. Bannister gave a short account of a Roman altar discovered in Chester in 1648 or 1653, and now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Mr. T. Cann Hughes exhibited and described a Roman coin found in Flintshire.

NOTES ON THE ROMAN ALTAR FOUND AT CHESTER IN 1648, BY MR. A. T. BANNISTER.

"There is in the Ashmolean Museum, at Oxford, a Roman altar, 'found at Chester in 1653, in the Forest Street, while digging a cellar at the house of Richard Tyrer, without the Eastgate of the City, about two ells *(ulnas)* beneath the surface.' This is the account of Maittaire *(Mar. Arund.*, in Mar. 45). A MS. quoted by Hearne, however, gives the date as 1648, and says it was found 'at the "Greyhound," in the Forest Street.' Very possibly the earlier date is correct. Maittaire seems to have been misled by the date of a correspondence relating to the altar, which passed in 1653 between Sir William Dugdale and Dr. Langbaine, of Queen's College, Oxford. and between the latter and Selden. But in this correspondence Selden mentions that he has already heard of the discovery 'by 5 or 6 hands;' hence it may well have been really discovered some few years before, as Hearne's MS. says. The altar lay in Richard Tyrer's garden until the year 1675, when Francis Cholmley, Esq., brother of Lord Thomas Cholmley, of Vale Royal, 'at no little expense' had it transferred to Oxford, where it now remains. The altar is a square column of red sandstone, and stands three feet high; its breadth at the top is sixteen inches. On the top it has a hollow, which seems to have held the fire in which the incense was burned. On one of the sides of the column is carved a jug or vase (partially defaced); another side has a laurel wreath; the third an open flower with five petals, resembling a Tudor rose; on the fourth face is the inscription, of which only a few letters can now be deciphered. (There is an engraving of the altar in Hearne's *Chronicon Prioratus de Dunstaple*, Oxford, 1733.) The inscription was worn away, probably with lying in Richard Tyrer's garden so long, even before the altar came to Oxford.

"We are indebted for the correct reading to 'Dominus Johannes Grenehalgh, Scholæ Cestriensis Archididascalus'

(Head Master of the [King's] School, Chester), who carefully transcribed it when the stone was first found. This John Greenhalgh was Master of the King's School during the latter part of the reign of Charles I. and the early years of the Commonwealth. He was ejected from his office for showing favour to the Royalists, and was afterwards Head Master of Witton Grammar School, Northwich, which office he held until his death. He was buried in Great Budworth Church. The inscription is as follows:—

I.O.M. TANARO
T. ELVPIUS GALER.
PRAESENS GUN'A.
PRI. LEG. XX. V.V.
COMMODO ET
LATERANO COS.
V.S.L.M.

That is, expanding: *Jovi optimo maximo Tanaro T. Elupius Galerius, Præsens Gun(t)a, Primipilus Legionis vicesimæ, Valeriæ, Victricis, Commodo et Laterano consulibus, votum solvit libens merito* (or, as Prideaux badly puts it, *liberatus malo).* 'To *Jupiter Tanarus*, Best and Greatest, *T. Elupius Galerius, Præsens Gun(t)a* (?), Chief Centurion of the Victorious 20th, the Valerian Legion, when *Commodus* and *Lateranus* were *Consules*, performed his vow willingly and dutifully.'

"The date of the altar is fixed by the names of the consuls for the year, as 154 A.D., when *Antoninus Pius* was emperor. Several interesting questions are raised by this inscription, which we can only touch briefly upon. First, what is the meaning of *Jupiter Tanarus?* It was a frequent custom among ancient nations, in speaking of a god, to add some attribute, or the place at which he was chiefly worshipped; thus we find Jupiter *Tonans, Capitolinus, Olympius*, &c. But nowhere do we find any mention of Jupiter *Tanarus* except in this inscription. What then does it mean? Now, Camden (*Britannia*, p. 12) says that

the Britons worshipped Jupiter under the name *Tanaris*. We find in *Lucan*, too, a Gaulish (therefore, in all probability, British) god called *Tanaris* or *Taranis*. Dominus Grenehalgh, also (*apud* Humphrey Prideaux), says he learnt by inquiry in Wales that the Welsh *Tanara* = Latin, *Tonitru*. From all this we may fairly conclude (as Selden suggests in a letter to Dr. Langbaine) that Jupiter *Tanarus* is the same as Jupiter *Tonans*. Wright (in *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*) identifies Jupiter *Tanarus* with the Teutonic *Thunar*, the Scandinavian *Thor*, whose name is preserved in our Thursday; and adduces this as a proof of Saxon influence at work in Britain even in very early times. But there is no proof whatever that the Saxons set foot in England until at least two hundred and fifty years after this altar was dedicated; and even then they came as enemies, and it is not likely the Britons would adopt a god from their bitterest foes. *Tanaris* and *Thunar* (modern German *donner*, English *thunder*) seem to me entirely independent attempts to represent by onomatopœia the sound of thunder. It is no proof whatever of intercourse between the two peoples. A Celtic scholar, whose name I unfortunately forget, says somewhere that the true Celtic word for thunder is *tarana*, which agrees with *taranis*, the best reading in the passage of *Lucan* (Ph. i. 446), and would lead to the supposition that *tanarus* is a mistake of the carver for *taranis*.

"Next we have to inquire what is *Præsens Gunta?* Dominus Grenehalgh thinks *gunta* an abbreviation for *gubernator*, and would render it 'resident governor'—*i.e.* of one of the two divisions of Britain. To this Prideaux objects that Galerius was only a *primipilus*, while a governor would be at least a tribune. (The expression *præsens gubernator*, moreover, would be absolutely unparalleled.) Prideaux himself, considering that the letter 'n' was inserted in *præsens* by mistake, and that *gunta* is an abbreviation, would read '*Præses Guinethæ*.' The province of *Guinetha* very nearly corresponds to what is now North

Wales. Pausanius *(Arcadica)* says that this province was frequently invaded by the Brigantes (who inhabited all the north of England). Prideaux considers it likely, therefore, that Galerius, as *Præses* or Lieutenant-Governor of *Guinetha*, may have vowed this altar during an inroad of the *Brigantes*, and paid the vow after successfully repelling them. Maittaire *(Mar. Oxon.* 1732*)* makes *præsens* an abbreviation for *præsentialis*, and adds—'*Præsentiales autem erant satellites imperatori aut Proconsularibus in Provinciis quasi semper præsentes.*' He does not notice *gunta*. Wright makes Galerius a native of Guntia, in Vindelicia (as I believe does Horseley), which is highly improbable, if not impossible, since the Legion had been one hundred years in Britain, and had settled there. On the whole, the explanation of Prideaux seems by far the best.

"The Twentieth Legion: Gruter (*Corpus Inscrip. Roman*, Heid., 1707) gives several inscriptions containing the words LEG XX. VALENS. VICTR.; and in ancient authors we find the Legion called indiscriminately '*valens*' and '*valeria*.' The truth may possibly be as follows:—Several legions were called '*victrix*' (notably the sixth; cf. *Dio. Cass.* 55). To prevent confusion the Twentieth Legion was called '*Valeriana*,' after a certain *Valerius*, who once commanded it. As time passed on, and *Valerius* was forgotten, while the letters 'V.V.' were still suffixed to the title of the Legion, men erroneously began to call it '*Valens Victrix*.' This Legion was originally stationed in Germany (cf. *Tacitus* 'Annals' Bk.). Thence (*circiter* 68 A.D.) it was transferred to Britain, and stationed at Chester (which town Camden considers had been founded only a few years previously) to check the *Ordovices* (North Welsh). (Cf. Camd. *Brit.*, vol. iii., p. 41.) The Legion remained at Chester for about a hundred and fifty years at least, and probably until the Romans finally left the island, A.D. 411.[1]

"Before concluding, I would recommend that the Chester

[1] See a letter on this altar by Mr. Thompson Watkin, and the reply of Mr. Bannister, on pp. 157-161.

Archæological Society should attempt to get this altar restored to Chester. It is at present stowed away in a cellar of the Museum at Oxford, and I have no doubt but that, if application were made in the proper quarters, its recovery might be effected."

A large cartoon drawing of the altar was exhibited by Mr. John Hewitt.

ROMAN COIN FOUND IN FLINTSHIRE.

Mr. Cann Hughes said his father had desired him to express his regret at not being able to be present that evening, but hoped the time might soon come when he would be able to come amongst them again. In the meantime he had sent the following paper, which, with their permission, he would read :—

"My son brought intelligence to me, from Mr. J. D. Siddall, that Mr. Alfred O. Walker, of the Lead Works, had that day shewn him a fine Roman coin, discovered just before in a long disused washing-floor of the Tal-ar-Goch Lead Mine, not far from Prestatyn, in the adjoining county of Flint; and that both the coin and its inscription were in a first-class state. I immediately wrote to our good friend Mr. Walker, appealing to him to lend me the coin for exhibition at this re-opening meeting of the Society as the *very latest* Roman discovery of local interest. Mr. Walker had in the interim mislaid the coin, but it fortunately found its way back to him; and he next day sent it on to me with the following note:—

> Dear Mr. Hughes,—Herewith I send the coin, which, when you have done with it, I shall be much obliged by your placing in the collection of the Chester Archæological Society, with a label, stating that it was found under the ore-dressing floor at the Talargoch Lead Mine, Dyserth, Flintshire. I have always heard that the mine was worked in the time of the Romans, but can give you no authority, nor can I find it mentioned in Pennant's *Tour in Wales*. Try his *Whitford and Holywell*, if you have it.—Yours truly,
>
> ALFRED O. WALKER.

And now a few words as to the coin itself. It is a really fine first brass of Gordian III., who was son of Gordianus Africanus II., and grandson of Gordianus Africanus I., all three of them Emperors successively over Rome A.D. 238 to 244. The obverse of the coin presents the Emperor's head wreathed, and with a boyish, unshaven face, for he was but sixteen years old when, on the massacre of the joint Emperors Balbinus and Pupienus, in A.D. 238, he was raised to the throne of his fathers. As he reigned but six years, having been himself assassinated by the orders of Philip, who succeeded him in A.D. 244, we may put him down as about nineteen when the coin now before you was struck. The inscription on the obverse runs (extended) as follows :—

IMP[ERATOR] GORDIANVS PIVS FEL[IX] AVG[VSTVS].

The reverse shews a female figure, probably the goddess *Pax*, sitting and holding a palm branch in her hand, surrounded with the inscription (extended)—

P[ONTIFEX] M[AXIMVS] T[RIBVNVS] R[OMANI] P[OPVLI] IIII. COS II. P[ATER] P[ATRIÆ].[1]

I myself possess a silver coin of this same Gordian III., dug up from a grave on the north side of St. John's churchyard, Chester, on March 20th, 1874, during the year of my churchwardenship, and given to me on the spot by Mr. John Powell, the then sexton. My specimen has the Emperor's head on the obverse, and on the reverse the legend, 'DIANA LVCIFERA,' 'light' being one of the attributes of that popular goddess. My coin comes from a Chester graveyard, but Mr. Walker's has been reposing for perhaps one thousand six hundred years under a disused ore-dressing floor of the Talargoch Lead Mine, not far from the mouth of the River Dee! How it came there can never absolutely be known, but we may with very good reason conjecture it was part of the hard-earned wage

[1] For a correction of this reading see p. 158.

of a Romanized Briton, who was then a daily toiler, like so many of his successors are now in that self-same valuable mine. However doubtful the fact may have been hitherto as to the Roman origin and character of those ancient workings, this very recent discovery seems to settle it more completely in the affirmative. Mr. Alfred O. Walker's considerate kindness in presenting this genuine relic to the Chester Archæological Society will, I trust, entitle him to-night to that Society's warmest thanks."

Monday, 29th January, 1883.

The second meeting of the Session 1882-3 was held at the Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 29th January, 1883, at eight o'clock.

The Very Rev. Dean Howson gave an explanation of the New Museum scheme.

Mr. J. E. Bailey, F.S.A., read a paper on "Christopher Goodman, Archdeacon of Richmond, Rector of Aldford; a native of Chester, the personal friend and colleague of John Knox."

Letters from Mr. W. Thompson Watkin and Mr. Bannister were read on the Roman altar found at Chester in 1648, and now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, an account of which was given at the meeting in December last.

CHRISTOPHER GOODMAN, ARCHDEACON OF RICHMOND, RECTOR OF ALDFORD; A NATIVE OF CHESTER.[1]

BY J. E. BAILEY, F.S.A.

"If Cheshire gave no martyrs to the cause of the Reformation it offered its confessors. Amongst the Continental exiles in the reign of Queen Mary were two Chester men of note—Christopher Goodman and William Whittingham. It is true that they represented the extreme Calvinist wing of the reformed party, and that they at first

[1] Owing to Mr. Bailey's ill-health, this paper has not had the benefit of his upervision and correction.

regarded the Elizabethan settlement in a very different light from that of Hooker. In course of time, however, they came to recognise the reasonableness and sobriety of its polity; and, no longer holding aloof from it, accepted positions of mark, the one as Archdeacon of Richmond, the other as Dean of Durham. In their exile they were engaged in common literary undertakings, including the preparation of the Genevan Bible; and they were both concerned in a book of dangerous consequence on 'Disobedience to Magistrates,' the arguments of which have been discussed at more than one critical period of our history, particularly at the time of the death of Charles I, In the discussion which then arose Milton took occasion to bestow high praise on Goodman and his associates, saying of them in his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.* 'These were the true Protestant Divines of England, our Fathers in the faith we hold.'

"The events of the career of a man like Christopher Goodman will never be lacking in interest. Ormerod says that he was descended from the Goodmans of Golborne David, in Broxton Hundred, where the family held property. Some of them settled at Chester. Richard Goodman was Sheriff of the city in 1492, and Mayor in 1498 and 1503. Hamnet Goodman was Sheriff in 1505, and William Goodman in 1514. The latter became Mayor in 1532, again in 1536, and once more in 1550, when he served out the time in place of Edmund Gee, who died in that year of the 'sweating sickness,' and was buried in Holy Trinity Church. Ralph Goodman was in 1529 Sheriff, and in 1547 became Mayor, his son Ralph, who had been admitted to the freedom of the city 30 Henry VIII., becoming Sheriff in 1550. Adam Goodman, perhaps an uncle, served the Shrievalty in 1542 as the colleague of Edmund Gee. Only four of the family appear on the extant rolls of the Chester Freemen, viz.:—Ralph Goodman, son of Ralph Goodman, alderman, 30 Henry VIII.; Hugh Goodman, gentleman, 35 Henry VIII.; William Goodman, son of Adam Good-

man, alderman, 2 Elizabeth; Christopher Goodman, gentleman and preacher, 22 Elizabeth. The above William, son of Adam, became Sheriff of the city and succeeded to the Mayoralty in 1579, in which year he died; and he was the last of the name who held a municipal office. The William first named, a merchant, was probably the father of Christopher; his will is dated 1554, and has been printed by the Chetham Society. He mentions four sons,—John, Paul, Adam, and Christopher—and as many daughters. He left considerable property, Christopher's share of which was four pounds. The household seems to have been Catholic, for 'Sir Rauf our priest' has ten shillings. His wife was Margaret, daughter of Sir Wm. Brereton.

"Christopher, who would be born about 1519, if indeed not later, was educated at the school attached to the Abbey of St. Werburgh, at Chester, and was one of the four University students appointed *per fundationem* in 1541, as from the King's School. He was M.A., of Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1544. In 1547 he obtained a senior studentship in Christ Church College, soon after its foundation. In 1551 he was admitted to the reading of the sentences. At Oxford, it is presumed, he was a keen observer of the ecclesiastical changes of the time, and was brought under the influence of the Protestants. The same also may be said of Wm. Whittingham, a boy who five years later followed Goodman from Chester to Oxford at the same colleges, the two becoming associates throughout life. Goodman, who is called M.A., student of Christ Church, was appointed Professor of Divinity about 1548, and held that office until 1553, when a successor of a different faith was appointed.

"On Queen Mary succeeding to the throne, Goodman, with Whittingham and others, who were ardent Protestants, fled to the Continent. He was in England 25th March, 1554 (*Maitland*, p. 102). On November 23rd that year we meet with him at Strasburgh. The correspondence of one of the exiles was directed to be sent to 'Christopher

Goodman, at the house of Marta Doctor Peter Martyr; and he (Goodman) will take care to forward it, whatever it be, to me, at Antwerp. I shall henceforth make use of his assistance in communicating such news as may occur there and which it may be desirable for you (Henry Bullinger) to know.' Goodman termed Martyr his honoured master; and Martyr entertained for Goodman a paternal regard. At Frankfort, Goodman, with John Knox and Whittingham, took part with those of the exiles who on the 'troubles' or dissensions there opposed the use of the liturgy and discipline. Fuller terms them 'furious sticklers' for their views (*Ch. Hist.* fol. ix. 76). It is supposed that Goodman left Frankfort in September, 1555, for Geneva (*Zur. Letters*, iii. 769). *The Troubles at Frankfort* was from the pen of Whittingham (Knox's *Works*, iv. 5), on the subject of the Frankfort Controversy, and deals with his relation to it. His letter to Peter Martyr is dated Geneva, 20th August, 1558 (*Zur.*, iii. 768-771). It is subscribed 'Your disciple, Chr. Goodman.' There is a letter extant (Jewel's *Works*, iv. 1192-3) from Jewel, dated at the house of Peter Martyr, Zurich, 1st June (1557?), to his 'dearest brothers in Christ Mr. Whittingham and Mr. Goodman at Geneva.' Christopher Goodman occurs in the *Livres des Anglois* in the archives of Geneva, with Whittingham, Knox, &c. On the list of those persons received and admitted into the English Church and congregation of Geneva, among those that came there 13th October, 1555, 'to use the benefit of the Church, then newly granted,' were Christopher Goodman, Wm. Whittingham, Anthony Gilby and his family, and others. On 1st November, 1555, when the church was erected, Goodman and Gilby were appointed 'to preach the word of God and mynyster the Sacraments, in the absence of John Knox.' On 16th December, 1556, Knox and Goodman were appointed ministers, Gilby, Whittingham, Wm. Fuller, and another, 'seniors.' In 1557 and 1558, the same ministers were reappointed, Miles Coverdale being one of the

'seniors' in the latter year. Goodman's name occurs as godfather or witness to some of the children of the English colony. Wm. Whittingham was married there on the 15th November, 1556, to Katherine Jaquemayne of Orleaunce in France, he being in the register described as 'of Chester in England' (Burn's *History of Parish Registers*, p. 274). Goodman became acquainted at Geneva with a Scotch nobleman, the Earl of Arran, eldest son of the Duke of Charterhault, who having embraced the reformed faith in France, had to flee that country, and so had escaped to Geneva. On the 1st June, 1558, 'Chr. Goodman, son of William, an Englishman,' was gratuitously admitted a citizen (of Geneva) at his own request (Council-book at Geneva, quoted in *Zurich Letters*, iii. 768; Gorham, p. 418). There is another letter in the *Troubles of Frankfort*, addressed to the English congregations abroad, from the Church at Geneva, dated 15th December, 1558, urging the exiles to unite in religion and ceremonies; and it is signed by Goodman, Knox, Whittingham, Gilby, and others (Strype's *Annals*, II. i. 152).

"In 1558 two violent books by Knox and Goodman appeared from the Geneva press directed with set purpose against Queen Mary, the Regent of Scotland, and Mary, Queen of England. The maxims of these books were in very questionable taste, and the only extenuation that might be advanced on the part of their authors is that the latter had been exiled from their country by the prosecuting spirit of the Courts of these two Queens. Seldom did two such little books create so much excitement. Knox's book, called *The First Blast*, was a coarse attack on what he called 'the monstrous Regiment of Women;' and Goodman's, containing arguments to the same effect, shewed how superior powers might be disobeyed. The latter argued that it was lawful for one to kill his sovereign if he thought him a tyrant. The purport of the language of the two works was as unmistakable as the advice, on another occasion, when 'to the Lords of Convention 'twas

Claverhouse spoke, there are crowns to be won and heads to be broke!' Goodman's work is now a very scarce little volume. It was prefaced by Whittingham, who vouched for the divinity of it; and it had a rhyming epilogue by Keith, the author of the Old Hundredth in meter. The argument of Goodman's book was peculiarly dangerous at such a time. Its logical results were seen by Archbishop Parker, who speedily met with the book in London, where, as he tells Sir Nicholas Bacon on 1st March the same year, it was spread abroad with Knox's *Blast.* 'If such principles,' says he, 'be spread into men's heads as now they be framed, and referred to the judgment of the subject, of the tenant, and of the servant, to discuss what is tyranny, and to discern whether his Prince, his landlord, his master, is a tyrant, by his own fancy and collection supposed, what Lord of the Council shall ride quietly minded in the streets among desperate beasts? what master shall be sure in his bedchamber?' It was in chapter v. of his treatise that Goodman argued that the government of women was against nature and God's ordinances. Later on he commends Sir Thomas Wyat and his rising: 'O noble Wyat, thou art now with God and those worthy men that died for that enterprise! Happy art thou and they which are placed in your everlasting inheritance, and freed from the miserie of such as were your enimies in so juste and lawful a cause; who liue as yet patrones of idolaters, of theues and murtherers!' It is full of appeals to England, and abounds in *ad captandum* arguments, as where he refers to the horrible slaughter of *thousands* of martyrs. The writer gratefully recognises the comfort which the banished English found in Geneva and elsewhere.

"It was on the 17th November, 1558, that Queen Mary died, and unfortunately the two books remained to testify against her female successor—that masculine princess Elizabeth. She promptly issued her proclamation against books 'filled with heresy, sedition, and treason,' threatening

the possessors of them with execution by martial law. Amongst the Reformers themselves the book was not popular, for the Salic law had only recently been adopted. The French Churches were displeased with the books, and forbade their being exposed for sale. Beza was displeased with the tone of the books. Calvin was rebuffed by Queen Elizabeth for his supposed approval of them, and he explained by letter his relations to her Majesty, adding 'I shall always revere the most serene Queen.' Another exile, Aylmer, afterwards Bishop of London, issued a tract from Strasburg, in 1559, 'against the late blown blast,' lest 'all our side seem to bear with' Knox's views. Knox himself speedily found out that, as he says, 'my first-blown blast hath blown from me all my friends in England.' The Queen would not let him pass through England on his way home (April, 1559), and the two other blasts which he had intended to have blown were never sounded. He says in one sentence that struck me, 'Oh you English ladies, learne here rather to weare Roman hartes than Spanish knaks, rather to helpe your countrey then hinder your husbandes, to make your quene rych for your defense, then your husbands poore for your garish gainesse. If euery one of you would but imploy your ringes and chaines, or the price of your superfluous ruffes, furres, fringes, and such like trinkettes, upon the necessary defense of your countrey, I think you shuld make the quene much richer and habler to mete with your enemies, and your selves much the honester, and readier to withstand satan, which this way goeth about to sift you. Leaue of[f] your pride, and leaue a good example, as the Roman ladies did, to your posteritie, of loue to your countrey, loyaltie to your quene, and honestie towardes God and man.' A Popish writer, Fravin, satirised the books in an *Oration against Protestants*, made at Louvain in 1565; and that work contained the satiric woodcut against Knox and Goodman, of which there is a reproduction in Maitland, pp. 141-2, and in Knox's works, vol. iv. 362.

"Knox arrived in England 2nd May, 1559. Goodman, hardly daring to make his presence known, reveals something of his temper and character. In a letter from 'John Jewel to Peter Martyr, London, 28th April, 1559,' he says: 'I hear that Goodman is in this country, but so that he dare not show his face and appear in public. How much better would it have been to have been wise in time! If he will but acknowledge his error there will be no danger. But as he is a man of irritable temper, and too pertinacious in any thing that he has once undertaken, I am rather afraid that he will not yield.' (*Zurich Letters*, 1st ser., p. 21.) The Latin original is in Jewitt's Letters, iiii. 1206. Goodman, meeting with so little encouragement in England, accompanied Knox's wife and family to Edinburgh, September, 1559; and, by the influence of his friends, he was made minister of Ayr, and remained there during the Scotch troubles. He gives us his own impressions of England as he found it after his five years' life among the exiles. We may conclude that he went to Scotland by way of Oxford and Chester (three days after the Queen Regent had been deposed). He thus writes to Sir William Cecill: 'Constrained by sundry injuries done him in his native country, he has been in Scotland six weeks, when he finds his services, which were rejected at home, everywhere desired and thankfully received. Fears there is not the like thirst for God's Word in England as in Scotland, and thinks it right to tell him of many things in England which wound the heart of the godly, as crosses and candles placed upon the Lord's table, and that in the Queen's chapel, Papists' apparel, pluralities, non-residents, lordly bishops, instead of necessary ministers; saints' days, the wafer-cake, &c. Is sure that God is highly displeased, and threateneth some sure plague to come.' (Thorpe's *Calendar, Scotland*, 1509-1603, vol. i., p. 119.) His opinion evidently was that the hierarchy of England was as corrupt as that of Rome. In the same letter he urged Cecil to abolish all the relics of superstition and idolatry, which, to the grief

and scandal of the godly, were still retained in England; and (alluding probaby to Bonner and Gardiner) 'not to suffer the bloody bishops and known murderers of God's people and your dear brethren to live, upon whom God hath expressly pronounced the sentence of death, for the execution of which he hath committed the sword into your hands, who are now placed in authority.' It was this delay, he declared, this leniency in Cecil (who was happily not animated by the same fiery spirit of persecution which guided the proceedings of Goodman) 'that sticketh most in the hearts of many.' At Scotland he settled, by the influence of his friends, from 1559 to 1565, becoming minister of Ayr in 1559, and subsequently minister of St. Andrew's, nominated by the Lords of the congregation, 19 July, 1560; a member of the first General Assembly, 19 December, 1560; June, 1562; June and December, 1563; June and December, 1564; and June, 1565. Thomas Randall, or Randolph, Queen Elizabeth's agent in Scotland, who had become acquainted with the Earl of Arran at Geneva, writes to Sir R. Sadler and Sir James Croft, 22nd October, 1559, 'For matters of religion [Alex. Gordon], the bishopp of Galloway, Knox, Mr. Goodman, of England, for whose name it may please you to use this (a cipher), for that I shall have occasion to write of him. Therle of Arran brought him to me, and spake of him verie much in the name of the lords of the congregation, tending to this effect, that the quene's majestie should not be offended with the favor that he shall receyve here. He himselfe is readie to doo what service he can. The fourthe in this matier is Ullock. Thies 3 last preached before the lords of the congregation in Edinburgh, and so continew from daye to daye exhorting the peple to folowe the doctrine of Christ, and to seke amitie with such as arre most faithfull' (Sadler's *State Papers*, ii. 48-9).

" Secretary Cecil, writing to Sir R. Sadler and Sir James Croft, from the Court, 31st October, 1559, says:—'I assure

you, I feare much the lack of the *Protestants.* I meane not onely in substance of power, but also of understanding. Of all others Knoxes name, if it be not Goodman's, is most odiose here; and therefore I wish no mention of hym hither' (*Sadler*, ii. 70). John Jewel to Peter Martyr, London, 1st December, 1559:—'The Scots have in their camp the preachers Knox and Goodman, and they call themselves the congregation of Christ? Their next step was to send to the Queen to retire from Leith if she could not be driven from there by force and violence. And from this time they began to treat about an alliance with England' (*ibid.*, p. 60). Vol. v., No. 16, Thomas Randolph to Sir William Cecill:—'Proceedings of the Bishop of Athens [*i.e.*, Alex. Gordon], Mr. Wyllok, Knox and Goodman. . . . Places appointed for Knox, Wyllok and Goodman to preach at' (*ibid.*, i. p. 161). In 1560, after the wars and troubles in Scotland were over and religion established there, Goodman was appointed to be preacher at St. Andrews, when John Knox was appointed at Edinburgh, having returned during those commotions to Ayr (*Annals*, i. 187). Knox's *Hist. Refer.*, ii. 87: 'And suo was Johne Knox appointit to Edinburgh; Christopher Gudman, (quha the maist pairtit of the trubillis had remanit in Ayre), was appointit to Sanctandrois' (see Tytler, iii. 126). In Gorham's *Reformation Gleanings*, p. 418, we have the translation of a letter from Calvin to Goodman, dated Geneva, 23rd April, 1561. Calvin acknowledges the receipt of a letter from Goodman, and refers to a long previous silence between them. We may infer that Goodman had hinted at a return to England. Then is mention made of the death of John Knox's (first) wife: 'I rejoice that he has not been so afflicted by her death as to relax his strenuous exertions for Christ and his Church. It is no common solace that he has you for his faithful and very suitable adjutor. I do not see how you can desert that Province [Scotland] in such destitution. . . . You ought in my judgment to go on with your work.' In the

well-known interview between Knox and Mary, the youthful Queen of Scots, brought about by the wish of the latter, she rallied Knox on his book on the government of women. Knox told her that he had in view most especially 'that wicked Jezebel of England, Mary Tudor'; and was not inclined to continue that subject. She advised him to treat with greater charity those who differed from him in opinion. The real topic they fell to discussing was this little work.

"Meantime, in 1562, Whittingham was made Dean of Durham, whence 'he encouraged Knox and Goodman in setting up Presbytery and sedition in the land of Scotland.' In vol. vii., No. 45, Randolphe to Cecil:—'The Queen of Scots' desire for a perpetual amity between the two countries. . . . Earl of Mar's desire to bring Mr. Goodman with him into England if the interview take place' (*ibid.*, i. 181). Another in vol. vii. 70, Randolphe to Cecil:—'Intended journey of Mr. Knox and Mr. Goodman to visit the churches' (*ibid.*, i. 183). 74, same to same:—'Earnest and veherment preaching, Mr. Knox and Mr. Goodman' (*ibid.*, i. 184). In 1563 his name occurs in the debates of the General Assembly, when Goodman seems to have given an opinion on some point under discussion, and Knox tells us 'thairto he ressavit this check for ansure, *Ne sit peregrinus in aliena Republica.*' Knox records Goodman's rejoinder: 'Albeit I be ane strainger in your pollicey, yit so am I not in the kirk of God; and therefoir the cair thereof does no less appertane to me in Scotland than gif I wer in the myddis of Ingland.' Vol. xi., No. 100, the Earl of Murray to Sir William Cecill:—'Requests his recommendation to the Archbishop of York (Thos. Young) for Mr. Goodman, that he may have licence to preach within his Grace's jurisdiction' (*ibid.*, i. 226). There is one more reference in this Calendar, but it is a misprint and I cannot trace it.

"He afterwards was in England; and when Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland, went against the Popish

rebels, he acquired the friendship of Sir Henry Sidney and the Earl of Leicester. I have mentioned his appointment as Archdeacon of Richmond. He was also, in his own county, rector of Alford—dates not given by *Ormerod*, ii. 760—but Samuel Lloyd, without date, named as his successor. Ormerod says that he was displaced for non-conformity by Bp. Vaughan (i. 117). The date of deprivation is 1597. These appointments, whenever they occurred, imply that Goodman had recanted his more obnoxious opinions. In the year 1571 the Queen was pressing for order and uniformity in the Church, because there were many persons enjoying benefices and places of profit in the Church, and yet did not live in obedience to its rules and injunctions. In this number were Goodman, Whittingham, Lever, and Gilby. Goodman's protestation of his obedience to the Queen took place at 'Lambhith' 23 and 26 April, 1571, before the Archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates. An ecclesiatical commission was appointed the same year (Strype's *Annals*, II. i. 140-1); and Goodman and his old associates were summoned before it. They were under the examination of Archbishop Parker in the beginning of June. 'What was done with them,' says Strype, 'I find not; but that Lever, this year, resigned a prebend, which I think he had in the church of Durham. And Goodman remained in town till August. . . . Goodman was, by the commissioners, demanded to subscribe to a revocation of those articles (in his book); which he yet would not; but desired to go home (viz., to Chester), which they would not permit hitherto' (Parker's *Strype*, ii. 66-67; Parker *Corresp.* [Parker Soc.], p. 381). See Strype's *Annals*, I. i. 184-185, where it is said that Goodman's recantation was made either before the Queen's Privy Council, or her bishops of the Ecclesiastical Commission. There is a copy of the 'recantation of his statements respecting the unlawfulness of women's rule, the right of subjects to banish their rulers, &c.,' in the Baker MSS., v. 441. Another copy of this, or a similar

revocation, is in the Petyt MSS., Inner Temple, described in *II. Rept. Hist. MSS. Com.*, p. 153b. One of the documents in these MSS. is an address to Queen Elizabeth for having written this book; another is a letter addressed to 'your good Lordships,' expressing contrition for things written in the book (see Strype's *Annals*, I. i. 184).

"Having surmounted the obstacles in his way in the southern province, Goodman had yet to meet the heads of the northern province. Grindal, Archbishop of York, writing to Archbishop Parker, mentions some persons whom he had summoned before him, including Whittingham and Goodman, who were under his jurisdiction. The letter is dated from Cawood, 28th Aug., 1571. 'I would gladly see Mr. Goodman's book. I never saw it but once, beyond seas; and then I thought, when I read it, that his arguments were never concludent, but always I found more in the conclusion than in the premises. These articles that your grace hath gathered out of it are very dangerous, and tend to sedition' (*ibid.*; also Parker's *Strype*, ii. 67). Thos. Marbury, of Christ's Coll., Cambridge, in his will proved December, 1571, appoints 'his father-in-law, Mr. Christopher Goodman,' one of his supervisors. Dr. John Aylmer, Bishop of London, writing to Sir Christopher Hatton, says,—'Sir,—I have been an importunate suitor to my Lord of Leicester and you in the behalf of Mr. Doctor Chadderton for his preferment to the Bishoprick of Chester; not so much for my affection to the man, as for the good I know he might do in the Church of God, both for his singular learning as also in respect of his zeal to bridle disordered persons. It may please you therefore at my request to help to dispatch the poor man, and send a governor to that place; which I fear, as an unruly family without a steward, will, by this long delay that hath happened, be hardly drawn to good order. There is in that country one Goodman, who wrote against the government of women, a man not unknown to her majesty; who in this vacation, I doubt will build one way more than the

Bishop shall a good while be able to pull down in that kind of curiosity; I pray God bless you and make you happy in His grace, and in all other prosperity.—From Fulham, the 29th April, 1578. Your honour's most assured to command in Christ,—JOHN LONDON.'

"The subsequent notices of Goodman are few in number. In the records of the corporation of Chester there are some letters dated early in 1581, detailing a scene in one of the churches, where Mr. Aston, son-in-law of Mr. Edward Stanley, of Ewlow, co. Flint, made some unseemly speeches on St. Stephen's Day against Mr. Goodman 'the preacher;' describing also the subsequent violence and misbehaviour of Mr. Aston's mother-in-law, Mrs. Stanley of Ewlow, described as 'in kine vnto our good Lord therle of Derby.' However, a letter, dated 14th February, the same year, announced that apologies and submission had been made to Mr. Goodman, the Mayor, and others; and it is said of the lady that she was ready to conform 'both in going to the church, hearing of divine service and sermon, and in communicating according as a good Christian ought to do.' In 1580 Christopher Goodman was presented with the freedom of this city. There is a letter addressed from Thomas Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, and dated London, 21st November, 1580, in which he desires that 'Mr. Chr. Goodman may be permitted to visit Scotland, where he hath left great testimony of his true service in Christ's church, and wishes to confirm the same with a few sermons before God takes him out of this world. On the 2nd May, 1582, he appears at Chester in an action, Chr. Goodman, dean of Chester, and others, in which it appears they are unable to settle the dispute between the retailers and mere-merchants of Chester. State of the controversy. They are hopeless of bringing the parties to any agreement. In February, 1579, appears a petition by the mere-merchants of Chester to Walsyngham, That the retailers may be restrained from trading to Spain and Portugal as merchants, or else the

mere-merchants may be licensed to deal as retailers. Henry Hardware of the city of Chester, alderman, bequeathed 2nd May, 1582, 'my fyne mourning cloth gowne unto good Mr. Christopher Goodman, the w'ch I pray him to wear for my sake.' I find him in Cheshire—anno 1584—(Chadderton then being Bishop) as a refuser of subscription to the Articles, and a dissuader of others thereto; of whom Archbishop Whitgift complained unto the Lord Treasurer that it was Mr. Goodman—a man that for his perverseness was sufficiently known—and some other evil-disposed persons that instilled these things into men's heads; that is, objections against subscribing to all the Articles of religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer. When Archbishop Whitgift was pressing subscription to the three Articles—which made great heats about this time—Goodman wrote to a certain lord (the Earl of Leicester, I suppose), that the Papists in Cheshire and elsewhere rejoiced at these proceedings of the Archbishop. This the Lord Treasurer communicated to the Archbishop, whose answer was this: 'Goodman was a man for his perverseness sufficiently known, and some other ill-disposed Christians, who instilled these things into his Lordship's head.' In December, 1583, there was a fire at Nantwich, and on March 15th, 1583-84, the mayor and Goodman received subscriptions; and on the 13th November, 1585, there is a brief declaration of the amount of money collected in the several counties throughout the realm for the re-edifying of the town of 'Namptwich,' co. Chester, delivered into the hands of Thomas Aldersey and Tho. Brasse, merchants of London, and to the mayor of Chester, and Mr. Goodman the preacher; including the Queen's most liberal gift of £1,000—amounting in the whole to the sum of £3,224. 6s. 9½d.

"Edward Fleetwood, rector of Wigan, writing from Wigan, 7th September, 1587, to the Lord Treasurer, says: 'Concerning my proceedings with the Commission Ecclesiastical I have, according to your honour's discretion,

wholly possessed Mr. Solicitor therewith; and he further required of me and Mr. Goodman a full advertisement of our manifold enormities, which, by mutual conference with all my brethren, I have readily furnished; and against the next week to attend the Bishop and Mr. Solicitor by their appointment. I fear nothing therein, but my Lord of Derby—his discontinuance, lest it breed some inconvenient delays.' In December, 1589, Mr. Goodman appears to have been at dinner at Lord Derby's at New Park. In Robert Parson's *Dolefull Knell of Thomas Bell* (printed at Rome, 1607, 8vo), discussing a safe-conduct which Bell had offered in his *Fresh Larum* for a discussion, he asks:—'Hath Bel forgotten (being one of the two ready to dispute for the catholicke partie), or doth he suppose others remember not, how Goodman of Chester—that old syncantor with his three companions (Hutchins, Bordman, Rogers), vndertook a solemn disputation at Aughton in Lancashire, shewing him selfe most resolut in defence of the Gospel, with al protestation of sincere proceding. The daie being com, and this Caluinian consort expected at the place appointed, they sent word vnto therire opposirs, to repaire vnto them at Lyrpole, not far off, where they were attending them, as a place more commodious: as it was in dede for theire purpose: for whereas Goodman like a sincere Gospeller of Geneva, for lacke of better arguments, had furnished him selfe with a commission, to apprehende his aduersaries: after warde vpon som controversie that fell out betwixt him and the Ordinarie pursuiant, for taking his office out of his hands, it was thought more conuenient to commit the matter to the Mayor of Lyrpole, who was to surprize both the Priests & also the ministers, the better to cloake their own treacherie: whereof a gentleman of good-note and worshippe, M. Holecraft of Cheshire hauing intelligence, who of zeal to the truthe being him selfe a forward Protestant, had procured the meeting, ashamed of his ministers' dealing, and condemning them for such as they were, gave notice for the escaping of that perfidious pitfal. Whether

this be true or no, I appeale to no other than Bel's own conscience, if it be not deade of a Geneva consumption. Not longe since also the like pranke, or not much different, was plaide in Oxfordshire. But God's name be blessed: the Catholicke faith gaineth glorie by such theire disgratious dealing, and Calvinism groweth odious and loseth of her followers.'

"An extract from the 'Chester Assembly Book,' 35th Elizabeth [1592], John Fitton, mayor, reads thus: 'Also at the same assemblie a l're from the gent and others the inhabitants of the parish of ffarneworth in the countie of lanc'r for the admittans of one Robert Hitchmow to be the schole m'r of the free grammer schole there, was Red and considered of Wherevpon It is now fully Agreed by this Assembly, in that by the said l're, as also by the reporte of *m'r Xpofer Goodman, professor of devinitie*, he the same Robt. Hitchmow is comended to be of honest convu'sac'on, & sufficient and meete for that p'pose, both in his Lyvinge, lerninge and educac'on. That he the same Robt. Hitchmow shalbe schole m'r of the said schole, and the rather at their requests is now no'iated and appointed by the Maior and citizens of this Citie to be scholem'r thereof, and haue the yerely wag's appointed for the schole m'r there Accordinge to the fundac'on And now agreed also that this his no'iation & Admittans shall passe vnd'r the Seale of the said Citie, he paiinge the ordenary ffees thereof.'

"The last notice of Goodman I have, is of his lingering for a long time on a sick bed, and receiving visits of his friends at his house. When he lay on his death-bed, it is said, early in the following century, he was visited by that famous man—that man of great learning—Archbishop Ussher. 'As he came [to England] he visited *Mr. Christopher Goodman*, who had been Professor of Divinity in *Oxford*, in *Edward the Sixth's dayes*, then lying on his death-bed at *Chester*, he would be often repeating some grave, wise speeches he heard from him' (Dr. M'c. Barnard's *Life and Death of Abp. Ussher*, 1656, 8vo, p. 42). His will

can yet be seen in the Probate Office here. It is dated 22nd February, 1602-3, with a codicil dated 25th April, 1603, when he would be over eighty years of age, thus having lived to see the son of Mary Queen of Scots come to the throne. He calls himself the unworthy servant of God and minister of His holy word. He wishes to be buried by his wife's corpse in St. Bridget's Church, Chester. He forgets not the poor of the parish; and he leaves £25 to the Corporation to make a fund to provide corn 'to keep down the market and relieve the poor in times of scarcity.' Two young students—one at Oxford, the other at Dublin—share his posthumous bounty. A daughter Catherine is named—the wife of Mr. George Gale, of Tiverton. To his cousin, Mrs. Ellin Fitton, he leaves a great chest with a lock and key, and a little table, 'which my wife's mind was she should have.' To the same lady's husband his copy of *The Book of Martyrs.* Thomas Robinson was to have his '*Musculus upon the Comon Plases.*' His library, made up mostly, as he says, of divinity, he leaves to the order and discretion of his brother John Goodman and his cousin William Aldersey, who were his executors. The codicil bequeathes £50 towards the relief of the distressed citizens of Geneva, 'whereof I am a member;' and to the four maids 'who watche with me,' viz., in his illness, ten shillings apiece. Mr. William Harrison was to have ten shillings to preach his funeral sermon.

"In the transcripts of the registers of St. Bridget's parish, Chester, I find the two entries following: 'Mary Goodman buried 20th June, 1600.' '1603[-4]. Jany. 6th, Christoferus Goodman, Archidiaconus Richmondiæ, celebris verbi regni celestis p'dicator matura ætate naturæ cessit atque hodi hac obi [or ? p'clvbi] quondam baptizatus sepultus fuit.' There is no note of his burial in the Cathedral or St. Oswald's registers, and in the face of the record at St. Bridget's, the claim that he was laid in the Cathedral must be abandoned."

Some discussion, raised by Mr. Morris, ensued as to from

which family of the Goodman's the subject of the paper was descended, there being three families of the name, and Mr. Bailey seemed to be unable to supply a satisfactory answer.

Mr. Hughes said one feature in connection with Goodman appeared to have been overlooked by the lecturer, namely, that he was the first to bring to the city of Chester a supply of drinkable water, by means of pipes, to a tank or reservoir, which existed in the small shop of the lower end of Eastgate Row, by the Cross. In the year 1832, or 1833, there existed a tank, which was said to have been erected under the instructions of Christopher Goodman, and his (the speaker's) father could well remember, when a boy, seeing large pipes made of whole trees—and not lead or other material—taken up from thence, which it was considered had to do with the supply in question. His father said he remembered the tank, if he was not actually in it. Mr. Hughes also pointed out that a family named Goodman lived at Ruthin, which had produced a clergyman of eminence in the Church, who became Bishop of Gloucester. Also among the objects of local antiquarian interest in Chester, there exists in the small museum of the Water Tower a chair, supposed originally to have been the property of Bishop Goodman.

Dean Howson in expressing the gratitude of the meeting to Mr. Bailey for his most excellent paper, said he thought it would lead them to see how much value and interest attached to the King's School, for which many of them had been making some exertions during the last few years. It was extremely interesting to them to note how the history of such an institution intersected with the history of the country; and these points of intersection could only be understood by biographical researches, such as that which had been brought before them. They ought not to forget the fact of such a King's School boy as Goodman, becoming professor of divinity at the University of Oxford; it was a fact of which they might be proud, whether they agreed

with Goodman's sentiments on kings, queens, and women or not.

THE ROMAN ALTAR FOUND AT CHESTER IN 1648.

The Chairman read the following letters:—

"Sir,—The description of a Roman altar found at Chester in 1648 (or 1653), given by Mr. A. T. Bannister,[1] is in the main correct, but there are one or two serious epigraphical errors in it. The abbreviation GALER. in the second line, which Mr. Bannister expands *Galerius*, as one of the names of the dedicator, should be *Galeria*, and is the name of the tribe to which Titus Elupius Præsens belonged. It is in the usual position, the *tribus* being placed between the *nomen* and *cognomen* in inscriptions. Again, the word at the end of the third line is unmistakably GVNTIA, and is the name of the town which was the birthplace of Præsens, *Guntia* in *Vindelicia*, as correctly stated by Mr. Wright. The fact of the legion having been in Britain over one hundred years would not, as Mr. Bannister states, either render it impossible or improbable that Præsens was born at *Guntia*—in fact, the reverse—for the legions were continually recruited from the continent. *Guntia* is also in the proper position in the inscription (following the *cognomen*) for the name of the birthplace. With regard to PRI. in the fourth line, it is certainly not the abbreviation of *Primipilus*, but of *Princeps*. If it had been the former word that was intended, the abbreviation would have been PP. or PRI.PRI. Dr. McCaul (*Brit. Rom. Inscr.*, p. 5) and Professor Hübner, of Berlin (*Corpus Inscr. Latin.*, vol. vii. No. 168), both expand PRI. as *Princeps* in this particular inscription. The latter also objects to ELVPIVS in the second line, on the ground that there is no authority for such a name in Roman epigraphy. He considers that it is a misreading of FLAVIVS. The derivation of *Tanarus* is still a matter of uncertainty. Mr. Roach

[1] See pp. 132-136.

Smith considers it taken from the river named *Tanarus*, in the north of Italy. Mr. Bannister's statement that the Twentieth Legion came to Britain about the year 68 A.D. is particularly erroneous. This legion accompanied Aulus Plautius to our shores in A.D. 43. When Suetonius Paulinus defeated Boadicea in A.D. 61, its vexillarii were engaged in the battle, and it was commanded at that time by the celebrated Agricola, afterwards proprætor of Britain. In the inscription on the coin found at the Talargoch Lead Mine (see pp. 137), the letters TR P. (or as they are given T.R.P.) are expanded as T(*ribunus*) R(*omani*) P(*opuli*). They should be taken in connection with the numerals following them, and read as TR(IBVNITIA) P(OTESTAS) IIII. '(exercising) the Tribunitian power for the fourth time.'—I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

"W. THOMPSON WATKIN."

P.S.—"Dion Cassius, speaking of the legions, questions whether there were two Twentieth Legions before his time, which he seems to think very doubtful; but he expressly informs us that the one then serving in Britain bore the title, *Valeria Victrix*, which has now been generally adopted. The expansion of these words, however, is not 'the Valiant and Victorious,' but 'the Valerian and Victorious.' Again, the letters V S L M do not mean 'performs his vow willingly and dutifully.' That would do for V S L L (*i.e.*, *Votum solvit Laetus Libens*); but we have in this instance only the usual *formula*. Mr. Bannister overlooks the meaning of *Merito*, 'to a deserving object'—the whole reading, 'performs his vow willingly to a deserving object.'"

Mr. Bannister replied as follows: "I must first venture to enter a protest against the tone of Mr. Watkin's letter, which, as I think I shall show, contains additions to, rather than corrections of, my paper read at the last meeting of this Society. When a subject is uncertain, and there are several conjectural interpretations, it seems hardly fair to pronounce *ex cathedrâ* in favour of one particular interpre-

tation, and affirm the others to be 'serious errors.' Surely even Mr. Watkin's reputation as a distinguished antiquary does not necessarily make that interpretation of a difficult passage to which he inclines indisputably correct. So much for the general tone of Mr. Watkin's letter. I will now consider his remarks in detail. First as to the real name of the dedicator of the altar. Mr. Watkin, on the authority of Hübner, would read, "T. Flavius Galeriâ (tribu) Præsens Guntiâ," (*i.e.*, Titus Flavius Præsens, of the Galerian tribe, from Guntia in Vindelicia). Now, I do not wish for a moment to deny that this is a possible interpretation; but I do emphatically deny that it is the *only* possible interpretation; and I will give the reason for my rejection of it. A Roman had usually three names, the nomen (which always ended in *ius*) or Gentile name, marking the gens or family to which he belonged, the cognomen, marking the branch of that family, and the prænomen (what we should call the Christian name). Thus the name Caius Julius Cæsar tells us that the individual Caius belongs to the Cæsarean branch of the great gens Julia. Additional names *(agnomina)* were always placed *after* the cognomen. The insertion of the tribus between the nomen and the cognomen would be anomalous, though, in face of several inscriptions, I will not deny its possibility. Still, I do not by any means feel compelled to accept it. When I first saw the inscription it struck me that T. Elupius Galer exactly answered to the form described above, and I should have so rendered it had I not been overawed by the imposing array of learned men who interpret it Galerius. Greenhalgh (the original describer of the altar), Selden (whom Mr. Watkin will allow to be no mean authority), Gough (the editor of Camden), Prideaux, and Wright, all read 'Galerius,' and I hardly think it a serious error to have followed them. As to Hübner's conjecture of 'Flavius' for 'Elupius,' it may, or it may not, be admissible, but at any rate, I could not have been wrong in applying the canon 'Præstet difficilior lectio.'

Of course, the interpretation of 'Guntâ' depends on our interpretation of the name. If we make Præsens Titus' cognomen (I am compelled to call him Titus, since that is the only word about which there is no dispute) we must read Guntia with Hübner and Professor Ward; if not, we may, with Prideaux and Gale (*Antonini Iter Brit. Comm.*, p. 53) read Præses Guinethæ, or, with Selden, we may give it up. But in the face of these three latter antiquaries we can hardly say that it is '*unmistakably* Guntiâ.' Professor Ward himself (the author of the 'Guntiâ' hypothesis) quotes (in some MS. notes on Horsley in the Bodleian Library) several inscriptions (*e.g.*, *Grüter Corpus*, p. 1063) having the words 'Præses Galliæ;' so why not also 'Præses Guinethæ?'

"With regard to PRI., Mr. Thompson Watkin is somewhat unfair in quoting Dr. McCaul as an authority for rejecting 'Primipilus,' and reading 'Princeps.' Dr. McCaul really says: 'I think it uncertain whether we should regard it as standing for "Primipilus" or "Princeps," of the two I prefer the latter.' Prideaux, Gough, and Greenhalgh all read Primipilus; while Horsley says Primipilus is the usual rendering, though he himself would prefer to read Præ for Præfectus. Selden apparently approves of Dr. Langbaine's 'Principibus.' Considering all this, Mr. Watkin surely goes too far in saying that 'PRI. is *certainly not* the abbreviation of Primipilus, but of Princeps.' The derivation of 'Tanarus,' as Mr. Watkin says, is still (and probably ever will be) a matter of uncertainty; but all the evidence is in favour of the interpretation which I gave. With regard to the date of the arrival in Britain of the Twentieth Legion, I must plead guilty to a mistake; though I would say in extenuation that I followed Prideaux and Camden. (Gough in his edition of the *Britannia* corrects Camden's mistake.) I have now touched on all the questions raised by Mr. Watkin. I must apologise for this lengthy defence; but I was naturally anxious to disprove the charge implicitly contained in Mr. Watkin's letter of having rashly thrust

upon your Society a paper containing 'serious errors,' and I trust I have succeeded. At any rate, I have shown that if I have erred, I have erred in good company."

Monday, 26th February, 1883.

The third meeting of the session 1882-3 was held at the Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 26th February, 1883, at eight o'clock.

Mr. Robert Holland, of Frodsham, read a paper on "Old Sayings, Customs, and Superstitions of a Cheshire Farm."[1]

The Very Rev. Dean Howson made a short communication on Palm Leaves as used for writing.

Mr. J. D. Siddall exhibited a Roman vessel of clay found in the River Trent, on which the Dean made a few remarks.

Special Meeting, Wednesday, March 7th, 1883.

At a meeting of gentlemen interested in reviving the work of the Chester Archæological Society, held at the Deanery, Abbey Square, on Wednesday, March 7th, 1883, at one p.m., the Very Rev. the Dean (Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D.) in the chair, there were present His Grace the Duke of Westminster, K.G.; Dr. Davies-Colley, Dr. Stolterfoth, Mr. Frederick Potts, Mr. Ewen, Mr. Henry Taylor, Mr. E. J. Baillie, Mr. J. D. Siddall, Mr. G. W. Shrubsole, Mr. George Frater, and Mr. T. Cann Hughes.

Letters were read from Colonel Humberstone and Mr. Arthur Potts, regretting their inability to be present.

---

[1] The more important of the old sayings, customs, &c., described in this paper will be found referred to in Mr. Holland's *Cheshire Glossary*, recently printed by the Dialect Society. His paper, as read to the Society, will be found in the *Cheshire Observer* of the same week.

The Dean stated the position of the Society under five heads:—

(*a*) The Accounts.
(*b*) The Subscription.
(*c*) The *Journal.*
(*d*) The Reconstitution of the Council.
(*e*) The State of the New Museum Scheme.

On the motion of the Dean, seconded by Mr. Frederick Potts, it was ordered—

That the accounts presented by the Secretary be audited by the Society's Auditor (Mr. Henry Watson Jones), and that £60 be paid at once to Mr. Hughes, in part discharge of the Society's debt to him.

That the new part of the Proceedings be pushed forward without delay, as a single part, and be issued to members as soon as practicable.

That after the publication of part xii. of the Society's *Journal* (under the joint editorship of the Dean and Mr. Hughes), the Collector be sent round to collect the annual subscriptions for 1883.

On the motion of Dr. Davies-Colley, seconded by Mr. Ewen, it was resolved—

That the officers of the Society be appointed as follows, viz.:—

General Secretary - -	Mr. W. Wynne ffoulkes, M.A.
Archæological Secretary -	Mr. Thomas Hughes, F.S.A.
Historic Secretary - -	Mr. Henry Taylor.
Financial Secretary - -	Mr. George Frater.
Honorary Curator - -	Mr. G. W. Shrubsole, F.G.S.
Assistant Hon. Curator -	Mr. Frank H. Williams.
Honorary Librarian - -	Mr. T. Cann Hughes.
Assistant Hon. Librarian -	Mr. John Hewitt.
Council -	Rev. Canon Gleddowe, M.A.
	Rev. S. Cooper Scott, M.A.
	Rev. C. B. Griffith, M.A.
	Rev. H. Grantham.
	Dr. Stolterfoth.
	Mr. E. J. Baillie.

All the officials being full members of the Society.

On the motion of Mr. T. Cann Hughes, seconded by Mr. G. W. Shrubsole, resolved: That the name of Mr. I. E. Ewen be added to those forming the new Council.

On the motion of his Grace the Duke of Westminster, seconded by the Dean of Chester, it was resolved unanimously—

1. That Mr. Baillie be asked to call a meeting of the Museum Committee, to meet at the Deanery, on Saturday week, at one p.m.

2. That Mr. William Williams be requested to be present, and to state his position relative to the Grosvenor Street site.

3. That the Dean, Dr. Stolterfoth, Mr. Ewen, Mr. Wynne ffoulkes, and Mr. Thomas Cann Hughes be authorised to represent the Archæological Society on the joint Committee.

On the motion of the Dean, seconded by Mr. Ewen, it was resolved—

That a vote of thanks be presented to the Duke of Westminster for his presence at this meeting.

(Signed) J. S. HOWSON, *Chairman.*

Monday, 9th April, 1883.

The fourth meeting of the session 1882-3 was held in the Old Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 9th April, 1883, at eight o'clock.

The Rev. Matthew Henry Lee, M.A., vicar of Hanmer, Flintshire, read a paper entitled "Philip and Matthew Henry: their Lives and Times, considered specially in relation to Cheshire and its Borders."[1]

A few original letters and other MSS. of interest in the

[1] Mr. Lee published in 1882, *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A., of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1696*, which should be referred to by every one interested in the subject of the above paper read to the Society. Mr. Lee's paper read to the Society was afterwards printed as a small pamphlet.

handwriting of the Philip and Matthew Henry, together with their portraits, some of their printed works, &c., were exhibited.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole exhibited a number of Roman antiquities from his private collection, including some recently acquired.

Monday, 29th October, 1883.

The annual general meeting of the Society was held at the Society's Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 29th October, 1883, at which the officers of the Society for the ensuing session were elected, the audited accounts passed, and other formal business transacted.

SESSION 1883-4.

Monday, 12th November, 1883.

THE opening meeting of the session 1883-4 was held at the Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 12th November, 1883, at eight o'clock, His Grace the Duke of Westminster, K.G., presiding.

The Very Rev. Dean Howson delivered a lecture on "The Footprints of the Twentieth Roman Legion," and exhibited several objects illustrative of his lecture.

A Roman water-bottle, discovered in Little St. John Street, and a few recently acquired Roman antiquities of local interest were exhibited.

THE FOOTPRINTS OF THE TWENTIETH ROMAN LEGION, BY THE VERY REV. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., DEAN OF CHESTER.[1]

"This paper on the Twentieth Roman Legion comes before your friendly notice with two purposes in view. It represents the beginning of the new winter session of our Archæological Society, and it is meant to assert the importance of the special Roman interest which belongs to the

[1] Owing to the death of Dean Howson, this paper has not had the benefit of his supervision and correction.

antiquities of Chester. We are all aware, in a general way, of the importance of the prolonged Roman occupation of this position on the Dee. But this subject has never received the attention it deserves, nor have we ever been fully aware of the value of the Roman antiquities which we possess. We have recently received some encouragement in this direction from a visit of two eminent archæologists from Newcastle-on-Tyne—Dr. Collingwood Bruce and Dr. Hodgkin—the latter of whom has since read a paper before the Newcastle Archæological Society, speaking strongly of the treasures we possess in memorials of the Roman time. All this points to the extreme importance of the antiquarian aspect of the Museum, which is soon to be erected in this city. The claims of natural science are certainly very great; but the claims of human history are, in my opinion, greater still. And here I cannot help referring to a humiliating sentence in that part of the collection of Roman inscriptions in Britain which has been put together by the distinguished German scholar, Hübner, where he describes his visit to Chester. He says there that this was the only town of equal size and importance in England which he found destitute of a local museum!

"In this communication I shall limit myself strictly to the military aspect, and indeed to the legionary aspect of Roman antiquities. The separate study of a single Legion is well worthy of patient perseverance, and it furnishes an excellent starting point for the study of a great deal of general history. We may illustrate this by the separate interest of each one of our own regiments; for a regiment is, so to speak, a commonwealth, it is very conscious of itself, it has a continuous history and a reputation to maintain. So it was with each Roman Legion. The very names of our English regiments, 'The Connaught Rangers' for instance, 'The King's Own,' 'The Black Watch,' have a very animated meaning of their own. So have the names of the three great Roman Legions connected with the northern parts of England. The sixth, quartered at

York, was called Victrix; the second, quartered at Lincoln, was called Augusta; while our famous Legion was called Valeria Victrix. We are all familiar, I hope, with the VV which appears after the XX in our local monuments. Once more the badges, both of our own regiments and the Roman, possess a lively interest. In the case of the Roman Legions quartered in Great Britain, the goat and a Pegasus formed the badge of the Second Legion. The Twentieth had for its badge a wild boar; and often it appears delineated with great emphasis,—sometimes with a spear driven through it, as in the antefixes of the roof tiles, found in Chester—sometimes with representations of trees, against which the boar is rushing, to indicate the victory of Roman soldiers over the difficulties of nature, as well as other difficulties. In this comparison, however, of the Roman Legion with the English Regiment—a comparison which, so far as I have used it, is correct—we must beware of a mistake, which would be serious. There is a very great disparity of numbers between the two cases. We know what is meant by an English regiment, and the maximum force to which it amounts, even if it contains two or three battalions. The complement of a Roman Legion was six thousand men with a body of three hundred cavalry attached, and attached to it also was a body of six thousand auxiliaries. Thus when we speak of the Twentieth Legion as quartered here in Chester during three hundred and fifty years, we mean a standing army of from ten thousand to fifteen thousand men, which implies likewise a large number of other persons connected with the commissariat, and other requirements of these troops. The mere statement of this fact is enough to show that the history of such an organised body of men must have had important results on some parts of the general history of this county. There is a collateral subject, which ought to be mentioned by the way, because it is necessary to complete our view of the occupation of our country by Roman troops. Besides the Legionary soldiers, detached

Cohorts, not belonging to any Legion, were employed on service in various parts of the empire. Thus we read in the Acts of the Apostles of the Italic Cohort and the Augustan Cohort, in connection with the life of St. Paul. Such was the case, I apprehend, more or less, in the neighbourhood of the Dee. The best illustration I can give of the meaning of this part of our subject is one which came before me on a recent visit to the Roman wall. We know from the 'Notitia,' which is a kind of directory of the Roman Empire, that along that wall were quartered side by side, Asturians, Tungrians, and Batavians, and we find inscriptions confirming this fact. Now, if we realise the fact, and remember that these various bodies of troops spoke different languages, we begin to see an extraordinary network of policy, as well as an extraordinary proof of military strength. In connection with this collateral topic is another topic full of very curious interest. When I was at the spot where the Asturians were quartered on the Roman wall, there was pointed out to me in the interstices of the masonry a wild flower which it is said that these troops brought with them from Northern Spain. I must confess I doubt the correctness of this as a botanical fact. But the circumstance opens out a view of results, which must certainly have attended the occupation of the Roman Army, namely, the introduction of changes in the horticulture and agriculture of this country. Camden, the famous antiquary of Queen Elizabeth's reign, says that the country people of those parts believed that the Roman soldiers planted certain herbs good for the curing of wounds.

"Our subject then naturally divides itself into three parts. First, the general history of the Legion as a whole; secondly, the traces of separate sections of this Legion as told off in various places for the discharge of important duties; thirdly, the memorials of separate officers and soldiers in this Legion, as found here and there, both in this country and in sundry parts of the Roman Empire. First, in the general collective history of this Legion four

distinct periods are very definitely marked; and in each case the Legion was connected with great campaigns, with arduous work, and eminent men. The earliest notice of the Twentieth Legion is connected about the very beginning of the Christian era with Illyricum. By this geographical term at that time is meant the whole eastern coast of the Adriatic. We trace by inscriptions the presence of the Seventh and Eleventh Legions in the valleys of the Save and the Drave; but it is also clear that the Twentieth was likewise there, under the generalship of Valerius Messalinus, and that it won the honours of a triumph for its general. I imagine that we have here before us the place and the time of the first enrolling of this Legion, and not only so but the origin of its name, Valeria Victrix. The first word being often exhibited in the abbreviated form Val. there has been much controversy as to whether the word was Valens or Valeria. I imagine there cannot be much doubt on the subject. The Valerian gens was a very eminent one, and it is probable that Valerius Messalinus was a very well known general in his day. There was also in the reign of Vespasian another general of the same name who treated the Jews in North Africa with great cruelty. The officer, however, with whom we have to do in connection with the origin of the Twentieth Legion was an earlier member of the same gens or clan.

"Passing from this the next distinct sight we obtain of our Legion is in Lower Germany; that is in the neighbourhood of Bonn and Cologne. The lamentation of Augustus, 'Varus, give me my Legions,' after the terrible defeat of that general in the northern part of central Germany, is a well-known mark of history; and it is probable after that defeat that the Twentieth was brought to the neighbourhood of the Rhine. At all events we know from Tacitus that it was quartered there, that it took part in the mutiny after the death of Augustus, and in the subsequent campaigns of Germanicus. Inscriptions, too, abundantly attest what we find in Tacitus. Now we come

to Claudius and the conquest of Britain. Tacitus is again our chief authority. Claudius was not a great man, but Agricola, who by Vespasian was appointed to the command of this Legion, was one of the greatest men of his day. In the earlier part of the gradual conquest of Britain this Legion had fought well under Suetonius Paulinus. Afterwards, when there was a question whether Vittellius or Vespasian was to be made Emperor, this Legion declared for Vespasian. Thenceforward we have abundant proof of the presence of this Legion, in the north-west of Britain, down to the latest days of the Roman dominion. To mention two well-known geographical authorities, Ptolemy and the Antonine Itinerary exhibit to us this Legion very prominently quartered at Deva, or Chester, and in fact as giving its chief meaning to this city and a fortress on the Dee. The very name Chester is, as we all feel, highly significant of this fact. It is simply 'Castra,' or 'the camp,' without any prefix, as in the cases of Manchester, Colchester, and the like. We must now turn to the period when the Roman occupation of Britain ceased. Here our view of its history becomes somewhat indistinct; but a reasonable conjecture seems to give us some light on the subject. In the 'Notitia' of the Roman Empire which I have named above, no mention is made of the Twentieth Legion in Britain, though other bodies of troops quartered there are very carefully enumerated. Now at this very time, that is, in the early part of the fifth century, the poet Claudian says that a legion was brought from Britain to fight against the Goths. It seems probable that this was the Twentieth Legion. If this was the case, our Chester Roman soldiers may have helped Stilicho in his victory over Alaric at Pollentia. Thus to the end we find this Legion connected with great men and difficult campaigns.

"We may now turn to the consideration of the traces of those detachments of this Legion which were told off at various times to various places for official duty. In speaking of this subject I will avoid the use of technical terms

as much as possible. Sometimes we find the word 'cohort,' which represented a formal subdivision of the Legion. Sometimes we find the term 'centuria,' which denoted a hundred men. What are called centurial stones are very frequent, and they are commonly indicated by a peculiar twisted or angular mark which is supposed to represent a centurion's rod, which was a mark of his authority. At first sight this form of a rod seems very peculiar; but it is to be remembered, as the Latin writers tell us, that this rod was a piece of vine stick, and likely to be crooked. An illustration of this subject will be furnished presently in a stone which belongs to the Dean and Chapter of Chester Cathedral. Another term is Vexillatio or Vexillarii, which seems to denote a body of men, variously selected and told off under a special vexillum or standard for particular local duty. It appears that some Vexillarii of this Legion were with Vitellius in Italy after Nero's death. We find a Vexillatio of the same Legion was engaged in some building work at Ribchester, an important Roman station in Lancashire. But our time being short, and the subject very large, I will limit myself in this part of the paper to the Vexillationes of this Legion, which helped in the building of two very great works, the wall of Hadrian, between Newcastle and Carlisle, and the wall of Antonine, between the Forth and Clyde. When Horsley wrote his *Britannia Romana*, he stated that no inscription bearing the marks of this Roman Legion had been found along the line of the wall between Newcastle and Carlisle. The subsequent investigation which has been carried on so vigorously has brought to light several of such inscriptions, two of them at least with well delineated figures of the boar, to which I have previously invited attention. There is no doubt that detachments of our Legion were engaged in building sections of that great line of fortification. How great a line of fortification it was may be gathered from the fact that it took ten years in building, and required ten thousand men to garrison its whole line.

"One important truth appears from the inscriptions I have named. They help to settle a question which has led to a great deal of controversial writing. Taken along with other evidence, they tend to prove, in my opinion, not only that Hadrian built that wall, but that no one else could have built it. It is a remarkable fact, however, that so far as the evidence of inscriptions guides us, Vexillationes of this Legion were engaged more largely in building parts of the later wall of Antonine, between the Forth and the Clyde, than in connection with the earlier wall of Hadrian. Especially does this seem to have been the case in the western part of the wall of Antonine. There is indeed an inscription preserved in Scotland, in which the following simple letters 'Leg. XX. VV, fecit,' might lead us to suppose that the whole Legion was engaged for a time upon this work. There may have been some circumstances, of which we know nothing, which caused this to be a necessity, thus denuding Deva for a time of a large part of its military force. However this may be, the inscriptions denoting that parts of this line of wall were built by soldiers from Chester are numerous and emphatic. And here I must mention one circumstance which is amusing. In two archæological books relating to this subject, I have seen the boar claimed as a Caledonian boar. Now, I imagine this savage creature belonged originally to Illyricum, if not to Germany, and that he came to Britain across the water. Whether a living boar travelled with the Legion, as a living bear has been known to travel with an English regiment, I am not able to say. A further notice of the relation of the Twentieth Legion to Antonine's Wall will be given at the close of this paper.

"We may now begin to track some of those footsteps of another kind, which in various parts of the Roman world remind us of the historical existence of this great body of Roman troops on the Dee. Such memorials are very numerous, and some of them are very affecting. Near Tarragona there is a monumental inscription erected by a

lady named Manillia Prisca to her excellent husband—'optimo marito,' as she calls him—who seems to have served as centurion in several Legions. Among these Legions the Twentieth is clearly indicated. Near Bath a stone was long ago found, which has given occasion to much debate. Here a soldier of our Legion is described as 'fabriciarius,' which seems to denote a manufacturer of certain parts of Roman armour; and it appears to be indicated in another part of the inscription that there was a college or company of such manufacturers. However this may be, such letters as these, on a Roman stone, open our view into that, which must have been a very busy employment of a large number of men in connection with every important military garrison. Another stone, which appears to me still more interesting, is preserved at Cologne. It tells us of the tomb of a man who is described as 'pequarius,' or cattle keeper of the Legion. I imagine this stone belongs to the early period of the Legion before it came to Britain at all; and this is a circumstance which increases its interest. In the midst of the rough work which had to be done in Germany, it must often have been necessary to drive cattle within the lines of the fortification, in which case cattle keepers would be required. I will conclude with an instance which touched my feelings extremely when I met with it. This is an inscription found in Algeria, not far from Tagaste. I will exhibit it at the close of my paper. It states simply that a man of the Twentieth Legion 'erected a monument over his dearest sister.' The bad grammar and bad spelling in this inscription are charming; and one circumstance gives to the monument a really historical value; it is distinctly stated that this soldier came (we know not on what errand) from the province of Britain.

"I now conclude with the telling of my story. A certain Professor McChesney, who had held the geological chair in the College of Chicago, happened, in 1865, to be the representative of the United States at Newcastle-on-Tyne,

and was in the habit of collecting objects of scientific and historical interest for the Museum of Chicago. While travelling in Scotland he found a certain stone bearing a Roman inscription lying in a farmyard at Hutchinson Hill, near East Kilpatrick, on the line of the Antonine Wall. This stone he purchased and brought to Newcastle, and very politely exhibited it to the Society of Northern Antiquaries, before shipping it to the United States. A report of the meeting reached Glasgow, and naturally Glasgow was very much disturbed. Every effort was made to secure the retaining of the monument in this country. It was urged on Mr. McChesney that the Romans were never in America, and therefore a Roman stone would be out of place there. The Consul replied that as we had many memorials of the Romans in this country, we surely could not grudge the sending of one such memorial to the United States. The force of law was then tried. It was contended that the stone belonged not to the tenant, but to the owner of the property, and that, therefore, Mr. McChesney had not lawfully bought it. But the owner of the property was a gentleman living in Kent, and he declined to interfere. Then a new argument was tried: it was urged that treasures of this kind belonged by right to the Crown. Mr. McChesney replied that when the Elgin marbles in the British Museum were restored to the King of Greece, he might think of the propriety of delivering up this Scotch stone, but not till then. Appeals were still made to the feelings of Mr. McChesney, but at last he cut the matter short by saying the stone was half way across the Atlantic. Now it happens that I can tell the exact date of the final catastrophe of that stone. In the autumn of 1871 I was walking by the side of the falls of Niagara with a young American clergyman, who told me that he had heard that Chicago was burning. I subsequently made enquiries at the Post Office, and found that the rumour was true. The history of that terrible conflagration is probably well remembered

by many in this room. All that I have to say on the present occasion is, that in that conflagration the stone with the ancient Roman inscription was burnt. It happens, however, that a cast of this stone was taken before its departure for America. I have now succeeded in obtaining a reproduction, if I may so call it, of that cast. I here exhibit it in illustration of my paper. After keeping this cast at the Deanery till the new Museum is built, I hope I may be permitted to present it, as a gift for the archæological collection which that Museum will contain."[1]

Several exceedingly interesting and valuable relics of Roman interest, chiefly inscriptions, were displayed in the room during the evening, and were explained and commented on by the Dean and Mr. Shrubsole.

Monday, 3rd December, 1883.

The second meeting of the session 1883-4 was held at the Society's Lecture Room, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 3rd December, at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole read a paper entitled "The City Walls of Chester: Is any portion of them Roman?"

An account of the recent discovery of Roman remains in the Wall near the Northgate was included in this paper.

---

[1] This cast is now in the Society's Museum. It bears the following inscription, referring to the Twentieth Legion :—

	Extended.
IMP . C . T .	= Imperatori Cæsari Tito
AEL . HADR	= Aelio Hadr
IANO . AN	= iano An
TONINO . AVG	= tonino Augusti
PIO . P . P . VEX	= Pio Patri Patriæ Vexillatio
LEG . XX . VV .	= Legionis Vicesimæ Valeriæ Victricis
FEC	= Fecit
P . P . III.	= Per Passus III.

Translated :—"To the Emperor Cæsar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus, the Pious, the Father of his country. A vexillation of the Twentieth Legion, the Valerian, the Victorious, has made three miles" [of the wall].

Monday, 4th February 1884.

The third meeting of the session 1883-4 was held in the Society's Lecture Room, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 4th February, at eight o'clock.

At this meeting the adjourned discussion on Mr. G. W. Shrubsole's paper, entitled "The City Walls of Chester: Is any portion of them Roman?" was continued.

Some Roman and other local antiquities recently presented to the Society's Museum were exhibited.

Monday, 18th February, 1884.

The fourth meeting of the session 1883-4 was held in the Society's Lecture Room, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 18th February, at eight o'clock.

The Very Rev. Dean Howson read a short communication on "Notes of a recent visit to Caerleon-on-Usk."

Mr. F. H. Williams described the recent excavations made in the Deanery Field, Chester.

The City Surveyor (Mr. I. Matthews Jones) described some excavations made on the exterior of the City Walls at the Northgate.

The adjourned discussion on Mr. G. W. Shrubsole's paper entitled "The City Walls of Chester: Is any portion of them Roman?" was resumed.

As will we seen by the above notes of the proceedings, Mr. Shrubsole's paper led to a very animated discussion, which was twice adjourned. As it is impossible to find room for the whole of this important paper[1] (which was a very long one) and the discussion which ensued upon it, Mr. Shrubsole has kindly furnished the Editor with the

---

[1]This paper appeared in full in the *Chester Courant* for December 5th, 1883, some copies of which were reprinted in quarto form, for private circulation only. The discussion which followed the reading of this paper will be found in the *Courant* for the 6th February, and the 20th February, 1884, the latter of which contains Mr. Shrubsole's Reply in full.

following summary of his paper, together with the chief points in his "Reply" to the various criticisms made upon his views, a summary of which, from the full newspaper reports published at the time, will be found in the following pages.

THE CITY WALLS OF CHESTER: IS ANY PART OF THEM ROMAN? BY GEORGE W. SHRUBSOLE, F.G.S.

(*A summary of the original paper read to the Society, December 3rd*, 1883.)

"It is somewhat strange, that one of the most noticeable features in the antiquities of our city, namely, the Walls, which are unique so far as England is concerned, has hitherto received so little attention from the members of this Society. A passing notice, here and there, is all the record that I find in the Society's *Journal*. Indeed, as is often the case, strangers have had more to say respecting their past history than the citizens themselves. While so little has been written respecting them, yet how much might be said! For four hundred years the Walls resounded to the tramp of the Roman soldiery. Then succeeded another four hundred years of desolation, neglect, and decay. Inhabited by no settled people, the place was overrun from time to time by savage hordes of northern tribes—Saxons, Danes, &c.—who seem to have found a peculiar pleasure in the destruction of all traces of Roman civilisation.

"Without pursuing further the history of the Walls in later times, I may mention that recently the rare opportunity was afforded, of thoroughly investigating the construction of at least fifty yards, of what is reputed to be one of the oldest portions of the Walls. It happened in this way. Early in the spring of 1883, a few yards from the Northgate, on the west side, the pavement and inner face of the wall fell in, and had to be rebuilt. During the progress of the work, an opening was made in the Walls for a gateway.

"The section thus exposed presents several features of interest, showing two distinct periods of construction, an

inner and older wall, and an outer and newer wall. The former was wide-jointed ashlar work, decayed and weather-worn on the front edge, and filled in with loose rubble; the latter was formed of massive stones of all sizes, in good condition, and without mortar. Nor were the two walls bonded together in any way; the arm could readily be passed between them. At a glance the facts might be read. The inner and older wall had become dilapidated and needed repair. Instead of taking it down, massive stones (of which more anon) were piled against it, and by their solidity gave substantial support to the tottering old wall. The massive stones forming the outside portion of the Walls were found on examination to be, with scarcely an exception, of undoubted Roman material. Among them were portions of friezes, bases, cornices, coping stones, and (to place their origin beyond doubt) a Roman inscribed monumental stone.[1] This was an unexpected discovery; for while the North Wall had been spoken of as a unique specimen of high-class Roman masonry, no one had suspected that old materials from Roman buildings and cemeteries had been used in its construction.

"The value of the discovery is, that it affords us some data upon which to form an opinion as to the age of the North Wall, and so assist us in solving the problem, as to whether we have in our existing city Walls any actual Roman work *in situ*. At the onset, I may state, that the question narrows itself down to the North Wall, which is

---

[1] Of these, ten have been deemed worthy a place in the Museum, including the inscribed monumental stone. This is a square block of sandstone of about eighteen inches square. The inscribed face reads—

D M.
M APRO
M F FA.

This is extended as follows: Diis Manibus Marcus Apronius Marci Filius Fabia (tribu). That is, To the Divine Shades Marcus Apronius . . . the Son of Marcus of the tribe Fabia . . . (See a woodcut of this stone on p. 98.)

the only portion having any pretention to the claim. Fragments here and there of an old wall displaying a double-splayed plinth at the base, with nothing else characteristic of Roman work, may be dismissed at once from the discussion, as introducing too novel a feature in Roman castramentation to be seriously entertained.

"Before passing on to consider the features of the wall in detail, I cannot too strongly insist upon the identity in age of the work on both sides of the wall, taking the Northgate as the centre; there is nothing on the east that we have not found on the west. The massive blocks of stone, the moulded cornice so conspicuous on the one side, are both present on the other. In the one the cornice is to the front, in the other turned inside. The work is the same. They are both part and parcel of the same wall. If, then, the portion on the East side of the Northgate is Roman work *in situ*, so also is that on the West. It is all one, and ends here as an outer casing. This reasoning would make the casing of large stones Roman work too. Then arises the question, what would be the age of the inner and older wall? Number two wall can scarcely be older than number one. Mr. Roach Smith, in his *Collectanea Antiqua*,[1] says of the North Wall, 'that it is an example of civic fortification, not exceeded in antiquity by that of any mural remains in this country.' Behind this wall of high antiquity we have now found an older. What then is the age of this older wall? Is it pre-Roman? This problem I leave for solution to believers in the Roman origin of the wall.

"To refute the opinion of the Roman origin of the wall we have only to consider the anomalies presented in its several parts, and composition, and its architecture generally. In considering this question, it should be remembered that in arguing against that view, we are introducing no novel theory. Our view is the concurrent testimony of all

[1] *Collectanea Antiqua*, vol. vi., p. 34.

writers up to 1849, when as the outcome of a walk round the Walls, Mr. C. Roach Smith, F.S.A., published to the archæological world his view that the North Wall was Roman work *in situ*. It is the unsoundness of this modern theory which I now seek to point out.

"Let us now look at a typical portion of the wall on the east side of the Northgate. We are supposed to be looking at a wall which, from its plinth to the cornice, is believed to have been part of the wall which encircled Deva on this side. The anomalies are apparent. The irregular size of the stones, small and large intermixed, the absence of mortar, the plinth, which has a very Edwardian look about it; the whole crowned by a cornice, projecting some eighteen inches, as if to facilitate an escalade. It is an unparalleled example, so far as the walls of Roman castra in England are concerned. To find a similar example, Mr. Roach Smith has to go to Egypt, just as Dr. Brushfield, for an instance of masonry without mortar, refers to the Cloaca Maxima at Rome.[1] These are serious 'novelties' to be introduced as component parts of Roman military architecture.

"Again, if we look at the face of the north-east angle of the same wall, we see there the same massive stones, irregular in size, with earth filling up the vacant spaces. Tier upon tier this rises for the height of nineteen feet, without any bonding element, and is only held together by the solid weight of the big stones, and its ample base. From what I have seen of Roman masonry in the city, observing, as I have done, the profusion of mortar used both in the walls and concrete foundations, I cannot consider a pile of stones, however large, without mortar, and with *earth* filling the interstices, as characteristic Roman work *in situ*, but rather as the work of a much later date, and of another race of builders.

"We will examine some of these 'novelties' more in

[1] *Journal of the Chester Archæological Soc.*, vol. iii., p. 42.

detail. To take one feature of the Walls, the absence of mortar in the work from the foundations for nineteen feet upwards, as in the case of the North Wall, What of it? It is an occurrence unknown in the walls of the castra of England. No similar case can be quoted. In the case of Deva it is inexplicable, with its proximity to the limestone country, with good and direct roads. Nearly twenty feet of walling without mortar, fourteen feet of it for support buried in the soil, which is true of the North Wall. We prefer not to believe, that a wall of this sort would be built at the headquarters of the Twentieth Legion. Examples of their wall building yet remain on and about the Great Wall between England and Scotland. This substitution of earth for mortar, throughout the several courses of the Wall for a distance of four hundred yards, is in itself fatal to any claim for the wall being *Roman work in situ.* Or to take another peculiarity, the supposed secondary use of stones from Roman buildings by Roman builders. This practice is an unheard-of feature in Roman castramentation. There is, however, a similar instance in the case of a part of the London wall. There stones from Roman buildings were found superimposed upon genuine Roman walling. Mr. J. E. Price, F.S.A., who was deputed by the Corporation of London to investigate the circumstance, has stated, and proved, that it was the work of mediæval, not Roman builders.[1]

"Again, to pass over the folly of dismantling a large building for the sake of the stones, with an unlimited supply of rock beneath their feet, bearing in mind the reverence in which the Romans held the memory of the departed, not less sincere than the feelings inspired by Christianity, we cannot fancy them robbing their cemeteries of the monuments to the memory of the leading officers of the Legion, for the purpose of building a wall. It is past belief. Saxons or Normans might have done it.

[1] On a Bastion of London Wall, 1880.

Romans never. Nor do the difficulties end here. To in some measure account for the novel features in the North Wall, Mr. Roach Smith speaks of it, in the quotation we have given, as an example of civic fortification of the highest antiquity. Let us see what this statement involves. Among the stones in the Wall, we have found the monumental stone to Marcus Apronius already referred to, belonging to the second or third century, together with cornices and friezes of classic type, and of like age. Now the Romans invaded Britain in A.D. 43, and Tacitus tells us that Agricola, in 78 or 79, erected fortresses in this locality. According to Mr. Roach Smith, Roman fortifications of the highest antiquity would be prior to this later date, and of the first century. Yet we have seen material of the second or third century in the composition of the Wall. There is a further dilemma. If the North Wall is of the highest antiquity, then it is the oldest wall; now as fragments of temples and sepulchral stones are found in the structure, then these go to show that Deva had massive buildings and other elements of a city, before this first wall was built, thus reversing the well-known Roman plan of procedure, of first securing the position of a castrum by a wall and ditch.

"Again, no good reason can be shown why, in the case of Deva, the usual system of castramentation, that is with small stones, should have been departed from. It is the plan followed in all the adjoining stations built by detachments of the Twentieth Legion. There exists in all Roman constructive works such a uniformity of design and arrangement, that there needs to be good evidence to the contrary forthcoming, before we can credit the idea that the Devan castrum was built unlike any other castra in Britain. That Deva was no exception to the rule, and the wall of the Roman castrum one of the ordinary construction, we have some evidence in the shape of the centurial stones, which appear as witnesses as to the size and character of the stones used in the construction of the

Wall. These stones once occupied a place in the Wall, and indicated the portions built by the men under the several centurions. The centurial stones are only five inches high, and nothing so small is seen in the North Wall. They only weigh a few pounds as against two or three hundredweight. For a stone that was intended to be used as a boundary mark, if not the largest, at least one of average size would be selected. These centurial stones are, therefore, *prima facie* evidence that the Romans constructed a wall here of similar small stones, and seeing that at least one of them was taken out of the modern East Wall, it would seem to point out that the original source of the stone in question was the Roman Wall. This evidence brings the construction of the Devan castrum into harmony with Roman camps in general, and shows that the Wall was just such a one as the unskilled work of the soldiers could accomplish under their several centurions, and obviates the necessity for presupposing any novelty in the style of building the Wall. In Roman mural work the different centuries of the Legion constructed the wall of the castrum of small stones, rudely squared, laid on successive beds of mortar, as may be seen at Segontium (Carnarvon) and at all neighbouring stations. It is evident also that highly-skilled labour was employed upon the buildings within the camp, and perhaps the gates as well.

"Much stress is by some laid upon the fact that the massive stones are of a superior kind, and they hence infer that they have been imported from a distance. This is a mistake. There are a few foreign stones, the white variety to wit, but the majority, and the best stones, on microscopic examination, have been found to be identical with our local stone. This view is further confirmed by the presence of the quartz pebbles, which are characteristic of our local 'pebble beds.' It is to be remembered that the bed of sandstone on which Chester is built is more than three hundred feet in thickness, and the quality varies every few yards. All that can be claimed for the superior stone is,

that much discrimination has been shown in the selection of it. Competent judges inform me, that as good a quality of stone is to be had on the spot as in any of the more distant quarries. All the evidence then is in favour of the stone being local.

"In coming to a decision as to the age of the North Wall, we must not forget that at its western termination, where our excavations were made, it thins out, and does duty as a buttress in protecting an older wall, which has none of the characteristics of a Roman wall, so that we have yet to look for a still older wall, which has not been found. We have seen that the construction of the wall is quite exceptional, that nothing like it is to be found among the Castra in England, while of mediæval work there are several instances of an analogous character, leading to the conclusion that the work is much later than is reputed. It is satisfactory to know that the few scraps of local history we possess, bearing on the subject, point to the same conclusion.

"In answering the question as to whether any part of the existing walls is Roman, I have shown that the idea is too novel to be seriously entertained; that the view of the older writers of the modern age of the Walls is the more correct. Further, I may add, that during thirty years' observation of the structure of them at various points, I have not seen there any Roman work, such as I am familiar with in walls and foundations in various parts of the City of Chester."

In the discussion which followed the reading of Mr. Shrubsole's paper, of which the above is a summary, the Mayor (Mr. Charles Brown) pointed out, that at the meetings of the Archæological Association in Chester in 1849 and of the Archæological Institute in 1856, it was generally conceded that there were portions of the Roman Wall plainly visible. This was especially the case as regards the large stones at the end of Gray Friars and at the Kaleyards. He thought that the "bonding" referred to by Mr. Shrubsole would be unnecessary on account of the size of

the stones. Mr. Harrison, the well-known Cheshire architect, who was familiar with Roman work at Rome and in the East, considered there was evidence of Roman work *in situ*. When his (the mayor's) firm rebuilt their premises they found a number of Roman bricks *in situ*, but he thought that when the Walls of Chester were built they did not need tiles.

Dean Howson said he was well acquainted with the great Roman Wall from the Solway to the Tyne, and he could say in regard to it, both west and east of the well-known Roman station called Chesters, that there was most certainly not the slightest trace of brick ever met with there. He felt very strongly what Mr. Shrubsole had said about the customary tiles in the Roman walls elsewhere, but still it was important to note the above exception. He had also always looked upon the stones in the wall near the Kaleyards and those facing the Roodee as being Roman stones.

Mr. T. Hughes, F.S.A., said that he disagreed entirely with what Mr. Shrubsole had stated about the age of the City Walls. At the Wishing Steps, in forming some drains from Bridgegate to Park Street a few years ago, a large portion of stone-work was uncovered, when some beautifully regular masonry was found, which was then pronounced to be undoubted Roman work *in situ*, and there were no bonding tiles there. In reply to the assertions that the Romans always used tiles, he would direct attention to the remains of the Roman bath in Bridge Street, where the pillars now in the Water Tower Grounds rested on the bare rock. How was it that no tiles were used here when every other Roman bath found in Britain was so constructed? How was it that at Chester these hypocaust pillars were built of stone and not of tiles?

The discussion was then adjourned.

At the adjourned meeting, held on the 4th February, 1884, there was a large attendance of members. The City Surveyor (Mr. I. Matthews Jones) exhibited several

diagrams, sections, &c., of the City Wall, including the cornice near the Northgate. He stated that the wall commenced with batter and ran to a certain height, as shown on the section, 74 feet from the centre of the Northgate, and the cornice full sized commenced at 82 feet from the centre of the Northgate; and the batter wall and the remains of a cornice extended eastward 114 feet 6 inches. Then came a break of 57 feet of vertical wall, popularly known as a Civil War breach, very much weathered but composed of stones with mortar joints, but without the cornice. Then came 138 feet with distinct remains of a cornice, running for 48 feet 4 inches, and including buttresses and a vertical face wall. That brought them to the larger breach made in the upper part of the wall at the time of the Civil War, 158 feet without any distinctive cornice to King Charles' Tower, gradually dying away to a vertical face. Calculations showed that 309 feet altogether of cornice remained, or 103 yards, a very extraordinary length to be brought from anywhere else to be placed in such a position. Then wherever excavations had been made to the foundation as at the Northgate, underneath the breach, at the extreme north-west and at the extreme distance named, near King Charles' Tower, not a vestige of mortar was found in the batter wall. The stones were regular in size and courses, some, so far as could be judged, very large ones, three feet thick; in some cases they were very good on the face, others on the joint parts near the face were decayed and weathered, but those where the earth was newly taken away in excavating were in splendid condition. Mr. Shrubsole had referred to the absence of mortar as tending to prove that the wall was not Roman, but he (the speaker) pointed out that the best acknowledged authorities mentioned that one of the distinctive features of Roman masonry showed that the stones were laid in horizontal courses without cement. In evidence of this there was the gateway of Trèves, built of enormous blocks of sandstone,

three and four feet and others nine feet in length, with a depth varying from three feet. And so skilfully were these stones put together without mortar or cement that they appeared to be supported only by their own weight. With regard to bonding tiles, in all his experience of the City Walls, he had never come across any in position in the walls. They had found no mortar in connection with the so-called Roman work, only on each side near the breach. In reply to a question he stated that so far the moulding of the cornice he had found was all of one pattern. Some was very much more weathered than others.

The Mayor (Mr. C. Brown) stated that the canal now running along on the outside of the wall at the Northgate was constructed in 1770, its original position being assigned further to the north, but the contractor discovered, or was led to imagine, that the old fosse would be available, and he (the Mayor) thought it existed from King Charles' Tower to St. John's Church, but had never yet been excavated.

Mr. W. Thompson Watkin said that his opinion had long been that the cornice and the wall on the top of the rock by the Northgate were not Roman work *in situ*. That they were Roman stones there could be no doubt whatever. He was also of opinion that the features of the wall at the Kaleyards and on the Roodee were distinctly Roman. He thought it was a most unlikely thing for the Romans to place a cornice in the position it now occupies.

Mr. T. Hughes, F.S.A., said he was still inclined to stick to his old beliefs that there were portions of the city Walls still showing Roman work *in situ*. He would ask Mr. Shrubsole to what other period he would assign the building of the wall at the Northgate, establishing it by anything like evidence. That wall had many qualities which belonged exclusively to Roman times. The wall itself, he maintained, was of Roman construction, and had not an atom of mortar in it. It was constructed of stones of a peculiar character, and of decidedly Roman work-

manship, and they must not be deceived because having been covered up during all these centuries, some portions, when uncovered, appeared fresh. He also thought that the plinth, which was found to run along the greater part of the wall wherever excavations had been made, was another distinctive Roman feature. With regard to bonding tiles, he thought it ought to be understood that that was not an exclusively Roman characteristic. There was no attempt at bonding tiles to be met with in any portion of any old buildings that had been met with in Chester, except only at one point in the Castle. At least, he had seen none. He was prepared to say that bonding tiles were absent from the Roman architecture of Chester.

Mr. W. Shone, F.G.S., said that the city surveyor's drawings of the mouldings, the wall, and the plinth, were perfectly accurate, as he had that day carefully examined and compared the wall with the drawings exhibited. He was much puzzled to find that the plinth was composed of such small stones, which were also bevelled on the upper edge, while the stones supposed to be the Roman foundations of the walls opposite the Cathedral, and also by the Roodee, were much larger, and not bevelled, but squared. With regard to the stone of which the wall was built, he proceeded to show by evidence which proved beyond question or doubt, that it was built of the stone from the Bunter Pebble beds, upon which Chester stands, and not from the Lower Keuper sandstone of Runcorn or Manley, from which the characteristic pebbles, so conspicuous in the stones used in the City Walls, were entirely absent. He had further compared the stone of the wall with the stone from the canal cutting below, and these (which he exhibited) were so exactly similar in lithological character as to defy the most practised eye to distinguish the slightest difference between them, either in structure or colour.

Dean Howson said that with regard to the bonding tiles, he imagined the Romans built in different ways, according to circumstances, and that it was a most unlikely thing that a

people like the Romans, who were essentially a building people, should fetter themselves by any conventional rules. He was well acquainted with some part of the Roman wall between the Solway and Carlisle, and there was no trace of any bonding tiles there. He confessed that the argument weighed with him very much that the masonry of which they were talking was found to be very carefully put together, and gave evidence of being the work of very careful builders, so that he was forced to say they must look upon this piece of masonry with very great respect, far more than on a congeries of stones that might have been used to strengthen the work of a mediæval wall. In fact, if the wall in question were not Roman work, he would like to know where they would find it?

The discussion was then again adjourned.

At the adjourned meeting held on the 10th February, 1884, there was again a large attendance of members. The Very Rev. Dean Howson read a short paper, entitled "Notes of a recent visit to Caerleon on Usk." He said the wall at Caerleon, which was a Roman fortress, similar to Deva, was built of small stones without mortar in the interstices, although there was plenty in the middle of the wall. The turns in the fortifications were rounded and not angular. He then referred to the recent excavations in the Dean's Field (at Chester) made by the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, and said that the foundations of the inner wall there exposed were miserably bad, just as the Norman foundations were in the Cathedral, hardly worthy of being called a foundation at all. He then read a letter from Mr. Thompson Watkin, of Liverpool, wherein he expressed the opinion that a portion of the wall east of the Northgate was composed of Roman stones, but that they were not Roman work *in situ*, and also that the lower portion of the wall at the Kaleyards was distinctly Roman. This opinion he strictly adhered to. The absence of bonding tiles, he said, proved nothing, as in many Roman walls, especially at Chichester, there were no traces of tiles.

Then as to the absence of mortar. In the great Roman wall no mortar was detected, except at the stations. The plinth, as an architectural feature, could not be considered as a test of age. Mr. Shrubsole argued that because of the plinth, the wall at the Kaleyards could not be Roman, but the plinth was visible at many stations, although there were numerous instances of Roman walls without a plinth. The cornice, Mr. Watkin added, began to be fashionable in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, and no doubt the cornice, taken from some temple or other building, was made available at the Northgate.

The Dean then called upon Mr. I. M. Jones, the city surveyor, to furnish the meeting with the result of his observations in regard to recent explorations of the Wall.

Mr. Jones said: "Since the last meeting I have, by the authority of the Improvement Committee and his Worship the Mayor, opened the ground by the low stone wall in the Hoppole Paddock, near the Kaleyards; on the Roodee, by the sallyport steps near Black Friars; and also have further investigated the Walls at the Northgate. I submit drawings showing the excavations and walls found. I confess that I did not expect the good fortune to find at the Kaleyards, at such a depth below the ground, the footings with a bevel plinth and the face stones of the same form and bearing the same character as regards courses and work as at the Northgate Wall. At the Roodee I found the large stones erroneously described as footings, had more than fifteen feet of the same massive masonry underground, the actual footings I have not accurately determined, owing to four or five feet of water being above them, but I have shown them as square on the annexed drawing. By a strange coincidence a batter is again found here of not so great a slope, but within three inches of the same height as the Northgate Wall. I have not found, either at the Northgate or Kaleyards any mortar in the joints or any trace of concrete backing. These facts (not assertions merely) confirm substantially the Roman origin

of the Northgate Wall, and undoubtedly show the building of this Wall contemporary with the Kaleyards and probably with the Roodee. The Romanism of the Kaleyard and Roodee walls heretofore has not been questioned, and it now having been proved that the Kaleyards, Roodee, and Northgate Walls approximate in almost every particular, even to the base, which we know must have been covered with earth for centuries; then with myself Mr. Shrubsole must admit his conversion. If not, then, sir, with your permission (though the onus of proof lies, as it were, on the plaintiff in this discussion) I will be more generous than Mr. Shrubsole and give some authorities and reasons for the faith that is in me.

"As he wished me to look into the cornice question I have done so. The age is uncertain. I have an example of a nearly similar moulding at Hengrave Hall, Suffolk, but only as a part of a joint mould and not as a cornice. But Wright says—'The Walls of Chester, and probably those of other places, were crowned with an ornamental coping, above which, perhaps, rose battlements.' And if our Roman gateway and its surroundings had anything like the ornamentation displayed on the Roman Gateway at Tréves, then Mr. Shrubsole should blame the Emperor Constantine for putting up much more ornamental work than this cornice, to be battered by the enemy. I have already given the length of cornice—the depth is enormous; and with these facts it will still puzzle Mr. Shrubsole's ingenuity to find a place for the same, other than where it is found.

"Then as to Mr. Shrubsole's four standard points, named by him A, B, C, D. Taking A—the absence of bonding tiles—this point he concedes. Then B and C—the absence of mortar in the joints and concrete from the body. As to this, Parker says that 'The Walls of the later kings are of more regular character . . . and simultaneously with these in other districts where the material is a hard stone that will not split . . . we find a different construction . . . and closely fitted together without cement.'

This construction being the easiest and cheapest with these materials, is also continued at all periods, even to our day. Then followed the invention of lime mortar. When men understood its advantages it was used in profusion, and even to excess, and from that time afterwards the body of a Roman wall was almost universally built of concrete, &c. 'In the fourth century,' Parker continues, 'stone walls continued to be used, and these are frequently built of large stones, like the walls of the kings, and they have either mortar (and please note this), or are wedged together with wooden wedges, or clamped with metal.' 'In the arcade of the Aqueduct of Claudius, the large stones are well cut and held together by wooden tenons.' Please also note this—'The buildings of the eleventh century in France and England are generally very massive, and built of large stones where they could be had, with wide joints of mortar, which are generally characteristic of this period.' Wright also says:—'In some parts of the Roman walls in Britain we observe inequalities which seem to have arisen from the accidental deficiency of particular kinds of materials.'

"These extracts prove that Roman work without mortar was done simultaneously in other districts with mortar work, and that anyone knowing anything of the massive construction of the Northgate Wall, where we find single stones more than one ton weight, and it being a wall of one face only, it would not require any body or inner filling of concrete, more especially seeing that, according to Mr. Shone the stones for facing and rubble backing were under the builders' feet. Then what becomes of Mr. Shrubsole's theory in the face of Parker's authority as to wide joints of mortar being characteristic of the eleventh century work? Then again the latest authority on early and imperial Rome, Mr. Hodder M. Westropp, referring to the regular horizontal masonry (which the Northgate Wall illustrates), states that the stones are put together without cement; and lastly, the Roman gateway at Tréves, built by Constantine, should settle the question

so far as the use of mortar is concerned outside Rome. Built of enormous blocks of sandstone, four to five feet in length, some measure eight or nine feet, while their depth varies from two to three feet (see the stones in the Northgate Wall). Wydenbach refers to the skillful way they are joined together without mortar or cement of any kind, &c. You will perhaps remember how the conquerors of the Romans were deceived as to not finding metal clamps in the work. So that we have not to go alone to Rome to do as Rome did or did not do, as Mr. Shrubsole wishes us on the mortar question.

"The last fatal objection made by Mr. Shrubsole recoils on himself—that this is only half a wall—a sham. I have already given a fair idea of the construction, and but few words should be necessary to convince our town's folk that a town of this size, in any but the Roman period, building a wall of this expensive nature from the Northgate to the Kaleyards, would have been overweighed in a financial sense, even we to-day would have felt the tax oppressive. Now as to the local stone and its lasting properties, Wright says—That even where the facings of these walls have been exposed to the air so many centuries, if not injured by the hand of man, they preserve a remarkable freshness of appearance. But whenever they have been buried, when the earth is removed, the masonry appears as fresh as if it had been the work of yesterday. This certainly is the case with the Northgate Wall. The face also of the rock from which the stone has been got shows no sign of wear, and the rock at Handbridge stands, with the sculpture of Minerva thereon, affording a striking contradiction to the assertion that some of our local stone is unequal to the wear of fifteen centuries. The example of the Roman Tower at Dover Castle proves the rounded slope and batter, and at Richmond the bevel of base. As additional proof, Wright says—In some instances the second course was bevelled off into a moulding. The drawings exhibited show the wall of Romulus, the London

Wall, the Kaleyards, the Roodee, and the Northgate Wall; if their similarity on comparison does not convince Mr. Shrubsole, he would even doubt the wall of Romulus, if it could be transferred to the Northgate. Everyone will admit that the subject deserves serious consideration, and I hope, if the Town Council see the propriety of repairing the Walls, to give Mr. Shrubsole the opportunity of examining them more closely than he could possibly have done previous to making his heroic charge against them, and as a result of actual observation I hope yet to hear of his recantation."

Mr. Shrubsole then read a lengthy "Reply to objections," of which he has furnished the following summary:

"In my first communication to the Society on this subject, I stated that some discoveries were made last year, (when a part of the Northgate Wall was under repair) of Roman remains, including a sepulchral slab, which had formed the outer case of a wall, that certainly was not Roman. Occurring as these objects did close by the reputed Roman Wall, it was eminently suggestive of the need for further inquiry into the truth of that belief. Accordingly, I laid my views before the Society, at the same time giving reasons, which seemed strongly to militate against the received opinion, and, therefore, I urged that the question as to whether the east side of the Northgate Wall was Roman work *in situ* should be reconsidered. Knowing how frequently Roman materials were worked up by later builders, I suggested that if Roman work, it was only old material used over again. These were the points prominently brought forward by me for consideration.

"It was then open to any of the members, who believed in the Roman character and origin of the Wall, to have shown that the belief was well founded, and that the appearance and character of the masonry in it was identical in every respect with what is to be seen in all that remains to us of the several Roman castra in Britain. This would

have been a fair comparison, and settled the question. So far from this having been done, not one example is brought forward out of the many castra available. True I am reminded of similar mortarless masonry to be seen at Trèves, and also at Rome and in the Great Wall. These cases, I must insist, are not to the point, for we are discussing the features of Roman castra, and in all fairness the comparison should be drawn from places in England, in which work of this kind is to be seen. It then must be noted that strictly speaking no evidence has been brought forward from existing remains in Britain, which can in the least justify the idea of the anomalous character of the masonry seen in the Northgate Wall as being Roman work. On the other hand, the typical Roman wall, small roughly-squared stones, backed by concrete, is to be found in nearly every castrum in England.

"The Great Wall of Hadrian, seventy miles in length, between the Solway and the Tyne, has been referred to as affording an instance of similar massive masonry to our own wall. Even here some of our friends are under a mistake, for in 1864 the present Bishop of Calcutta read a paper before our Society on the subject of the Roman Wall between the Tyne and Solway. The Bishop, I need scarcely say, was long resident in the vicinity of the wall, and therefore competent to speak about it. The wall itself he describes as a double facing of rough but regular courses of masonry, filled in between with concrete; the stones, about 9 inches by 8 inches, being placed lengthways into the wall. Notice here the mention of mortar or concrete, and stones not a foot square, pigmies in comparison with our giants at the Northgate of 5 feet by 3 feet. There may have been other styles of masonry in different parts of the wall, but I fail to see anything in the Bishop's account of it that militates against the views I have propounded. Indeed, it substantiates what I have insisted upon from the first, that the Romans did use mortar to construct their walls. More than once the contrary opinion has been

expressed during the discussion, and the Great Wall cited as a case in point. Now, in addition to what the Bishop of Calcutta has stated, I am in a position to give this statement as to the non-use of mortar, an emphatic contradiction, since I have it on most competent authority, that of the Rev. Dr. Collingwood Bruce, that the Romans never constructed a wall without the use of mortar; it was used in the building of the Great Wall. There have been instances in which from exposure to atmospheric influences the mortar has been removed from Roman masonry, and the superficial observer in consequence deceived. The application of this rule is fatal, as we shall presently see, to the idea that the wall at the Northgate is of Roman origin.

"It is admitted that, prior to the Christian era, the Romans did in some cases erect structures with stones of cyclopean proportions, and with joints fitting so accurately as to dispense with mortar. This class of work was never applied to the walls of a castrum, and to hint a comparison between work of this kind and our North Wall, with its open joints, and random stones, is to compare things which admit of no comparison. No admitted example of a castrum in England can be found without mortar in its construction.

"Another point to be noticed is that the advocates of the Roman idea failing to get any help or corroboration of their views from existing Roman remains, seek to overwhelm me with the opinions which have been held on this subject during the last fifty years by the fathers of the Archæological Association, men whom I delight to honour, and hold in respect. I believe that had they seen the discoveries which have been made in and on the walls in 1883 and 1884, they would have considerably modified their judgment, and the world would have heard very little of the Roman Walls of Chester.

"This claim for the Wall being Roman, I do not find to be a very old one. The parties in the best position for

judging say least about it. Camden in his day in describing Chester makes no allusion to the Walls being Roman. Randle Higden, in the fourteenth century, tells us of the Roman pavements and inscribed stones to be seen in his day, but says nothing of the Walls being Roman. While the Lysons, who are worthy of some credit, say, 'No part of the Roman Wall of Chester now exists, though the present Wall stands no doubt on the same foundation.' Mr. Brushfield in his paper on Roman Remains in Chester tells us that 'the late Rev. W. H. Massie of respected memory was the first to point out this part of the City Wall as being Roman.' If so the idea is only thirty-five years old. Mr. Roach Smith published his opinion in 1862.

"The position that I take up on this question is this. I once believed as I was told that the Walls were Roman. As time went on I found certain things absent from the Walls, and other things present which, on the supposition that they were Roman, gave rise to doubt and ultimately to conviction that the common opinion was an erroneous one. It has chanced that I have had evidence presented to me which has not been presented to my predecessors, since it has only been available during the past twelve months.

"After disposing of these objections, I consider that we have now arrived at that stage of the inquiry when it is possible for us to come to some definite conclusion as to the Roman, or non-Roman origin of the Wall. Nothing has occurred during this discussion to in the least degree invalidate the opinion I expressed at the first, that there is no precedent in this country of a wall similar in construction and built by the Romans. While there are many instances of a wall identical in character and composition, built as we know both in Saxon and later times. For this among many other reasons I still maintain that the wall in question was not built by the Romans."

Monday, 9th June, 1884.

The fifth meeting of the session 1883-4 was held at the Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 9th June, 1884, at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole described the recent discovery of Roman and mediæval remains discovered on the north side of White Friars, on property belonging to Frederick Bullin, Esq., J.P.[1]

The Very Rev. Dean Howson added some particulars of the Carmelite Friars in Chester, in connection with the probable remains of their church on this spot.

Photographs, plans, sections, and drawings of the masonry and antiquities found were exhibited.

---

[1] Since this paper was read Mr. W. Thompson Watkin has printed a full account of these discoveries in his *Roman Cheshire*, pp. 147 to 152, illustrated with a folding plate giving a ground plan and section of the remains found.

SESSION 1884-5.

Monday, 3rd November, 1884.

THE opening meeting of the session 1884-5 was held in the Society's Rooms (formerly the Albion Hotel), Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 3rd November, 1884, at eight o'clock, the Very Rev. the Dean of Chester in the chair.

Mr. Arthur Baker (architect), long associated, under the late Sir Gilbert Scott, with the restoration of Chester Cathedral, delivered a lecture on "The History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, as represented by its Parish Churches." The lecture was copiously illustrated with drawings of the churches and other ecclesiastical buildings in the diocese, specially prepared from the author's own sketches.

THE PARISH CHURCHES OF THE DIOCESE OF ST. ASAPH, BY MR. ARTHUR BAKER.[1]

Mr. Baker, in the course of a lengthy and very interesting address, copiously illustrated with drawings of the churches and other ecclesiastical buildings of the diocese of St.

[1] Mr. Baker has kindly sent the Hon. Secretaries his paper in full, but it is so very long that they have been obliged to make use of the summary, which appeared in the newspapers.

Asaph, showed that out of two hundred and twenty-five churches in the diocese existing in 1873, one hundred and fourteen were founded prior to the Norman Conquest; one hundred and one of these churches were dedicated to British saints, whilst some of them bore Saxon names. Thirteen he supposed to have been founded directly after the Norman Conquest, and very probably there might have been considerably more; thirty-six were founded by Normans, and nine chapels in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, since which sixty-three new parishes had been formed. Proceeding to point out the advance of architecture in the diocese by means of the drawings referred to, the speaker noticed Valle Crucis Abbey as a fine example of the first transitional period from Norman to Early English. About the middle of the Early English period a great deal of church property was destroyed by Henry III., the cathedral being burned by English soldiers, but in 1296 the rebuilding was completed, and much of the latter work was discovered by Sir Gilbert Scott during the late restoration, particularly two fine lancet windows, a drawing of which the lecturer exhibited. In 1291 a great "taxatio" and list of the churches with their values was taken; and in 1304 the newly-elected canons were required to build suitable houses on their glebes, and the cathedral and churches were put in repair. But the troublous times of Owen Glendower and Henry IV. again resulted in a great destruction of church property, thus accounting for the disappearance of any roofs in the district earlier than the fifteenth century, though there were numerous examples of woodwork of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries still remaining elsewhere. Coming down to the Perpendicular period, the lecturer pointed out several examples, noticing in passing that, while in England, traces of the different styles of architecture were to be found, it was not so in Wales. About this period the style, size, and shape of church windows became adapted for the insertion of stained glass, and its free use in the district

made him think there must have been a manufactory of the kind somewhere in the neighbourhood of St. Asaph. In order to show off this work the larger Perpendicular windows took the place of the smaller and earlier ones.

The lecturer here pointed out by means of drawings many instances and peculiarities of fine timber roofs of the fifteenth century in the diocese, especially hammer-beam and flat roofs, as at Mold and Ruthin, and proceeded to explain how, in his opinion, the recurrence of two aisles and a clerestory in the churches were to be accounted for by a system of enlargement which necessitated the latter. Then, again, in almost every old church, in addition to the beautiful roofs, would be found indications of rood screens both of wood and stone. Many instances of these, of great beauty, were adduced by the lecturer, who also spoke in high terms of the interior of St. Winifred's. From the latter part of Henry VIII. to the end of Elizabeth's reign the principal work of erection of roofs was completed. Passing on, the lecturer reviewed some of the principal events of the Cromwellian era, showing how in 1641, in obedience to orders, images were demolished and altars and superstitious pictures were removed from churches and chapels, and communion tables from the east end of churches; and in 1643 the sale of copes, &c., was ordered, supplemented the following year by an order of Parliament forbidding the use of and ordering the removal of superstitious images. At Meliden Church the font had been found built into a doorway, it was supposed because of such order; and from that time, during the forty years that intervened, till 1686, when a new font was provided, it might be taken that the church was without one. But the destruction of rood lofts and screens was not so complete as to prevent some of them being restored at the restoration of Charles II. Then they came to the whitewashed walls and ceilings and every other abomination of the Georgian period, when numbers of churches were also pulled down and much that was valuable to the antiquary was destroyed.

O, that they could say that this destructive mania had for ever passed away! He took it that buildings that had stood the wear and tear of four centuries were capable of repair, though it might require a considerable amount of faith. Anyone who had seen Meliden Church in its restored condition would bear him out in this, whilst if it had been rebuilt the diocese would have suffered a severe loss. In conclusion the lecturer referred to the necessity for entrusting every work of church restoration to the care of a competent and painstaking architect, who would have sufficient veneration for and know how to treat objects of great antiquarian interest.

In the course of the discussion which followed,

The Mayor (Mr. Charles Brown), alluding to the old and splendid timber roof of Cilcen Church referred to by the lecturer, said there was a tradition that it was brought from Basingwerk Abbey. The stone work certainly appeared of a much later date than the roof.

Mr. Baker could not exactly say how that was, but it would be a curious coincidence if the roof fitted the church. He thought, however, that there were indications of one of the windows at least being earlier than the roof, whilst the font was Norman, and part of the original church. But the roof, which was clearly of the fifteenth century, was one of the most magnificent he ever saw.

The Mayor was understood to say that he had been told by a former rector that the church was built to fit the roof. The stone work was certainly of a very plain character, whilst the roof was very rich.

Rev. Canon Thomas expressed some disappointment at the structure covering the well of Llantrillo, on the sea shore at Colwyn Bay, being described by the lecturer as likely to be of comparatively modern date, he (the speaker) having alluded to it, in his work on the *History of the Diocese of St. Asaph*, as an ancient structure. But of course he stood corrected when the lecturer brought reasons to show that it must be of a much later date. He supple-

mented the lecture with a few interesting remarks in regard to the early church in Wales, and alluding to an observation by Mr. Baker on the paucity or utter absence of stone altars in the diocese, pointed out that in the chapel of the old castle at Hawarden was to be found one bearing the five crosses or "wounds." He said he did not altogether condemn the old whitewash and plaster of the Georgian period, as was the fashion with some people, as he thought they had been in a great measure preservative of much of antiquarian and archæological interest.

Monday, 1st December, 1884.

The second meeting of the session 1884-5 was held in the Society's Rooms (formerly the Albion Hotel), Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 1st December, 1884, at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole read a paper on "Deva: Its Walls and Streets, or Chester in the Time of the Romans."

The fragment of a Roman altar, discovered on the 1st November, 1884, close to the city walls at the east gate, was exhibited and described.

DEVA: ITS WALLS AND STREETS, OR CHESTER IN THE TIME OF THE ROMANS,[1] BY GEORGE W. SHRUBSOLE, F.G.S.

"Of the early history of Deva little is known. It will be admitted on all hands that the situation of Deva was one in every way suitable for the purpose of a Roman Camp. A level plot of not unkindly soil, a mile or two in extent, with good natural drainage, a tidal river on two sides, and the rest enclosed by a forest, affording both fuel and animal food in abundance, would seem of all places the one that

---

[1] Mr. Shrubsole has kindly furnished this abstract of his original paper.

we should have expected to have been occupied. Such a place was Deva prior to the coming of the Romans. The Romans were not slow to discover the value of the position as a military post; while across the river the mineral resources of the country of the Ceangi in North Wales such as coal, lime, and lead, may have further influenced their decision in making Deva a legionary station. From its position it would be essentially the key to the possession of Britannia Secunda, at the same time holding the road to the far north.

"The first Devan Camp, we may be sure, was very limited in extent, and simple in its construction. At this stage of its existence it would be square, and made up of a wide trench, the earth dug out from which formed at the side a rampart, further protected by brushwood or stakes planted on the top. In time, as the advantages of the position were realised, it was determined to make Deva a permanent legionary station—a depot to furnish the men and arms, to conquer and hold the north and north-western provinces, for Imperial Rome. When this took place, the temporary camp would soon give way to one of a more solid character. The fosse might indeed remain, but in front of the rampart of earth would arise a solid stone wall, ten or fifteen feet in height, with towers, or forts, or gates as required. The streets became an ample paved way, both in and outside of the camp. Inside, the streets intersected it at right angles, dividing it into four unequal quarters, which in turn were divided and subdivided. That Deva was a Roman station is a matter of history. That it became in time encircled with a stone wall is, I think, equally certain, for apart from the circumstances to which I have referred, we read in Saxon times of the existence of a wall, which originally could only have been the work of Roman hands. Then again we have the evidence of the five centurial stones from the wall itself—a record of work done, which could only refer to the wall of the Roman castra.

"In speaking of Deva as a Roman station we scarcely do

it justice. It was more, both as to size and importance, than a mere station. It was the fortified camp of one of the four Roman Legions then in Britain, the Twentieth, the Valerian and Victorious Legion. A military fortress of the first importance, it, with Eboracum (York), the capital of the province, served to consolidate the Roman power in this part of Britain. While admirably placed for keeping watch and guard upon North Wales, it equally served as a point from which to advance against the northern tribes. It was from Deva that Agricola marched against them with the Second as well as the Twentieth Legion, taking the direction of the line of stations along the north-west side of the province up to the great wall, along which at various stations we find, on inscribed stones and tiles, the record of their doings. If any proof is required of the Roman origin of the present Walls of Chester, we have it in the shape, position, and dimensions of the present circumvallation: all these details, within certain restrictions, are essentially Roman. The present streets of Chester run mainly in an east and west, and north and south direction, and are a survival from Roman times. The *via militaris*, as we shall see, passed through the camp very much on the line of the present main thoroughfare of Boughton and Foregate Street. The *porta principalis* was on the site of the present Eastgate, and the *via principalis* the Eastgate Street and Bridge Street of to-day. The striking parallelism, which we shall show to exist between the Roman streets of Deva and the City Walls of Chester, is of so marked a character, as to indicate clearly the Roman origin of the latter.

"It will help us in working out the limits of the Roman camp and its encircling wall, if we first of all get the direction of the *via militaris* in and out of Chester. These Roman roads, we know quite well, ran in tolerably straight lines from one point to another. Such being the fact, it comes to this, that if in a stretch of reputed Roman road, we find at distant points certain portions all tending in the same direction, and we draw a straight line between these

points, we get the Roman road restored. These Roman roads, we may remark, were paved ways some 25 feet broad, and raised some 3 feet above the surrounding ground. We recently, in the month of September last, broke through some 600 yards of the Roman street on the Eccleston Road, on the occasion of laying water pipes. We may take it that the presence of the Roman road under the present Eccleston Road is established beyond doubt. Now if we turn to the ordnance map we notice that the road now, with one slight deviation, is in a very good north and south line, and further that it is pointing to the old ford (Aldford), near the Iron Bridge. We leave this spot for the present, and take our station in Upper Northgate Street, a mile distant, which was the road out of Deva, on the line of the present Parkgate Road, to the Roman colony at Meols, the remains of which have been so well cared for, at the hands of the late Canon Hume. With the map before us, and having in view the Roman road through Handbridge, we draw a line between it and where we have found the Roman street in Upper Northgate Street. This line is the north and south street, which passed through Deva, across the Dee, and along the Eccleston Road to Eaton, and from there branching in one direction to Uriconium (Wroxeter), and in the other for North Wales and Segontium (Carnarvon). We will take the width of the street as 80 feet in its passage through the camp. The course it took was as follows. After leaving the Northgate, it rapidly encroached on the west side of the street, until half way down it left the present roadway, and passed some yards inside the present Town Hall and Market, the Town Hall steps being the centre of the Roman street, thence behind Shoemakers' Row, the churchyard of St. Peter's Church, the whole of which it included. Bridge Street from the Cross to St. Michael's Church is almost identical with the Roman street, with the exception, on the west side of some 15 feet between the Cross and Commonhall Street. In Lower Bridge Street,

to Castle Street, it is 40 feet west of the roadway. From this point the present roadway turns sharply to the east, and is the Norman approach to the bridge. The Roman street is continued through Shipgate Street and Skinner's Lane, and is very nearly in a line with the angle of the wall of the county gaol, where we come to the fords (the ground on either side gently sloping to the river), and across Greenway Street to the Eccleston Road. In corroboration of the above being the Roman street, I may mention that Upper Northgate Street, Bridge Street, and (for a certain distance) the Eccleston Road, a distance in all of some two miles, are none of them, after allowing for 80 feet of roadway, more than 20 feet out of the line of the Roman road which we have sketched. Now in the vicinity of the fords we have both a scarped rock surface, and a wall built up of rock. If this front be carefully examined, it will be found that the rock has been excavated down to a low level for 25 yards, and is now built up with sandstone, and the point where it is so built up coincides with the line of the Roman street. I may also mention as being further corroborative, that nearly all the Roman altars found in Chester have been met with on the margin of what I have regarded as the street, or the one to be mentioned shortly. This is just the prominent place in which we should expect them to have been set up. We have found altars in Eastgate Street, Bridge Street, Foregate Street, Northgate Street, and Watergate Street. They have all, without exception, been found by the side of one or other of the Roman ways. The Roman paved street as well as the line of buildings have been found at many points in the direction indicated, which I need not now stay to particularise.

"I think that we may regard the north and south road through Deva as fairly established. The other road will not be difficult to trace, since we know that the rule generally was to follow the cardinal points, and therefore we shall find it to intersect the other road at a right angle, in an east and west direction. We are further guided by the

line of the last few miles of the Tarvin Road, without doubt a branch of the Northern Watling Street. The direction of this street at this point is identical with the one through the city. The bend of the river at Boughton Church interfered with its course, and necessitated its divergence at Boughton, but in Foregate Street we have its course again indicated. Now, how does the present Eastgate Street agree with the Roman street? The south side is found to be very true to the old lines, while on the north side at either end the encroachment is as much as 20 or 30 feet. It is Watergate Street that suffers most by the comparison. Both sides of it, near the Cross, encroach some 20 or 30 feet upon the Roman way. We have now by the help of the Roman streets outside Deva restored the leading ways through the Castra. Having thus ascertained from existing data the course of the streets, we shall have no difficulty in tracing the lines of the camp wall, since I think we may act upon the principle that the streets and walls would be arranged on parallel lines, in accordance with the well-known Roman custom. A very cursory glance at a plan of the present walls is strikingly suggestive of the existence of old lines of fortifications with modern extensions. Nor is it difficult to separate the one from the other. In one we see a definite plan, which in the other is conspicuously absent.

"With the plan of the camp before us, and its streets marked out, we take in at once the idea of the square camp of Roman Deva, and what is very much to the point, find that no part of the present Walls is more than 50 feet out of a line drawn through them, parallel with the streets, while to a considerable extent they occupy what we believe to be the original lines. The distance between this restored east and west wall is 1,930 feet. Having straightened the north wall, we proceed to run a line 1,930 feet distant to obtain the square of the camp. The result is as follows. It commences with the curve at the Newgate, of which the Wall is a continuation, at a point some few

feet only from the Newgate, thence through the north side of St. Michael's Church to St. Martin's Church, and ending at a spot 20 feet north of the Black Friars' steps leading to the Roodee. We first found the streets of Deva, and then the streets have given us the walls. With regard to three sides of the walls, the east, north, and west, we need have no shadow of doubt as to their identification. The south wall, it is admitted, is in a different position, and yet there is corroborative evidence in favour of its taking the direction I have mentioned. It is singular that the present curve in the east wall near Mr. Storrar's house should agree with the line of the square. This round corner at the south-east angle is similar to the north-east angle, and both are strongly indicative of Roman fortifications, and of the existence originally of a Roman tower on the spot, as in the case of Eboracum. Then, again, the existing walls beyond the square camp are crooked, irregular, and unshapely, and evidently the production of a much later time. Further, a strong reason for believing that the south wall of Deva did not extend beyond this point is, that some years ago evidence came to light, that near the Black Friars there was in or about Roman times an inlet of the river, which ran in the direction midway between the Militia Barracks and St. Bridget's Rectory. In cutting the intercepting sewer in 1876, the bed of this stream was seen extending for 100 yards. This naturally enough determined the boundaries of the southern wall of Deva.

"We will now start from the Newgate and survey the east side. Taken as a whole, it is the nearest of the three walls to the original lines. At either extremity the line is nearly correct, and at no point of divergence does it exceed 12 or 14 feet, and often only a few feet. The principal departure is from near the Eastgate to the Cathedral Churchyard. We pass round the north-east angle, and examine the north wall. Here, too, the first part of this side is tolerably true to the original lines until we come to the Northgate, and from this point to Morgan's Mount the

present wall runs at least 20 feet in advance, while from Morgan's Mount to the north-west angle it is the like distance inside of the Roman Wall. At the Water Tower corner we find that the mediæval builders have extended the walls outwards nearly 40 feet. The silting up of the river rendered it desirable to push forward the fortification, and determined the construction of the additional outwork. Now we proceed with the west side of the Wall which, soon after leaving the Water Tower, recovers its normal character, and is well on the Roman foundation, and the same may be said of the ending near Black Friars. It is worthy of note here that the large stones on the Roodee, which, on account of their size, are presumed to be part of the Roman wall, are 40 feet outside the Roman castra, and altogether out of the direction of either line of wall.

"We have now gone over three sides of the Walls, and indicated what I believe to have been the original lines of the castra. I know of no circumstance to militate against this view. On the contrary, there is much to support it. For instance, outside of the wall there should have been a fosse, if of Roman origin, and a fosse has been found. On the western side the camp was protected by the river and needed no fosse, while on the north and east front the former existence of it has from time to time come to light. The fact so far strengthens the case that no reasonable doubt need be entertained that we have ascertained the course followed by the Roman wall of Deva over three sides of its course. Of the fourth, the south wall I admit that we have no trace of either wall or fosse, and, singularly enough, it is the same with York. It has been stated that the fosse of the south wall was discovered in 1848, but such was not the case, and I hope to show that what was found has not the least claim to be regarded as the fosse. The facts are as follows: During the sewering of the city in 1848 in St. John Street, Pepper Street, and Grosvenor Street, a trench was found cut in rock. It was seven feet wide at the top, rapidly sloping to three feet. Then appeared a

floor of stout timber. By probing, no rock was found at a depth of 17 feet. The narrowness, the depth of the cutting, and above all the timber floor, altogether exclude the idea of its being the fosse; while the space beneath the floor, filled with debris of Roman age, clearly indicates a drain, and the wider opening suggests facility in its making. It was really an intercepting sewer cut in the rock to drain the east and south area of the camp, on which sides we know there were two buildings of large size.

"I will now call attention to the similarity between the Devan camp, and the camp as described by the Roman writer Polybius. They were both square in form, and virtually identical in size, the latter having a diameter of 2,077 feet, and the former of 1,930 feet. It will be observed that in the latter also the *via Principalis* is not in the centre of the square, but on one side, dividing into thirds, one-third on one side, two-thirds on the other. So it was in the Devan camp. Eastgate Street is part of the line of the *via Principalis*, and divided the city in much the same way. But the Devan camp was not in every respect absolutely a reproduction of the typical Roman one, indeed, it could not be, for it contemplated for the *via Principalis* a wide open space through the camp. In our case there could be no through communication in a line with Eastgate Street, owing to the Westgate terminating with half a mile of the river in front. Some modification was needful, and the *via Principalis* followed the main line of traffic from Eastgate Street, through Bridge Street, to the Fords across the Dee. It will be noticed in the camp, as described by Polybius, that the smaller division, the upper camp, is set apart for the official residences, and contained the Prætorium, Quæstorium, and Forum, &c., extended in line with the Prætorium in the centre. This arrangement was not possible in our case. What was done under the circumstances is best shown by what we have found as relics. The only place in the city in which we have found the remains of public buildings has been on either side of

Bridge Street. There, of late years, we have found the remains *in situ* of two or more public buildings, each 100 feet long. Bases, columns, capitals, friezes, mouldings, cornices, have all come to light to witness to the former existence of buildings of noble proportions on the site. The character of these buildings has for long been a puzzle. If we take Polybius as our guide the mystery is at an end. The erections found in Bridge Street would be the Prætorium, the residence of the general and his staff; the Quæstorium, or Public Revenue Office, the Forum, or Market, as well as the seat of justice. These are some of the public buildings essential to the head quarter's camp of a Roman Legion. We have been accustomed for years to regard St. Peter's Church as on the site of the Roman Prætorium. There is no evidence to support this from anything that has been found. According to Polybius, the Prætorium was in the smaller and upper division of the camp. St. Peter's Church is on the wrong side of the *via Principalis*. Some years ago a considerable number of Roman coins were found in Bridge Street, on the site of these buildings. It was the largest find of which we have any record. Could this have been any part of the Roman Treasury on the site of the Quæstorium? We are now able for the first time to name the several gates of the Castra. The gate in the rear of the Prætorium, or south gate, will be the Porta Prætoria, and the Northgate the Porta Decumana, and the Eastgate the Porta Principalis.

"This sketch of Deva would be incomplete without some notice of the appearance of the walls and their fortifications. It is true that we have no fragment of the wall remaining, to which we can point in illustration, yet we have material to guide us, including undoubted stones from the original wall. These will give us a general idea of the size of the stones. Then we may fall back upon York, as the counter part of our Castra, for other details, and avail ourselves of the well-known similarity of Roman masonry. In this

way the restoration will not be wholly imaginary on our part. The material of the wall was our own local red sandstone. This point has been ascertained beyond dispute. It was built of small rudely-shaped stones, set in mortar, but open jointed. In height the wall was some ten or fifteen feet, and in width about six feet, sufficient to allow two soldiers to walk abreast. The fosse we know was of unusual depth, and this leads me to think that on that account the wall was not so high as usual. On the top of the wall there would be the breastwork three or four feet in height. In the depth of the wall there would be two layers of four or five courses of bonding tiles. The strength of it was mainly due to the concrete interior, which filled up the space of five feet between the single layer of stone on the outer and inner face of the wall. The effect being with the aid of the bonding courses to consolidate the whole into a rigid mass, firm as a rock. As a rule we find that this interior filling of the wall is often more durable than the outside stone: for at York, Manchester, Leicester, and many other places there are parts of the old wall of which nothing remains but the interior core of concrete. This does not hold good in Chester, for the concrete formed of sandstone fragments is an inferior article. The mortar is good, but the sandstone has, in many instances, lost its cohesiveness, and may be crushed between the fingers. This is the reason why we have none of the Roman wall visible to-day. They seem to have been aware of the nature of the stone. Hence in important foundations, such as that of the Southern Gate (*Porta Prætoria*), which we found quite recently covering an area of 14 feet under the steps of St. Michael's Church, the concrete was composed of small boulder stones bedded in the usual mortar. It was so unyielding that it was not possible to procure a specimen of it for the Museum.

"This explanation will go far towards accounting for the fact, that there is no Roman work *in situ* to be seen above ground in the Walls. As to the claim of the City

Wall between the Phœnix Tower and the Northgate to be so considered, Dr. Brushfield tells us that Mr. Massie was the first to point out that it was Roman. This is not forty years ago. I have good reasons for believing the work to be of Edwardian age. There only remain the large stones on the Roodee to be considered. There is really no case here to answer; the stones in question are no part of a wall. A few big stones placed terrace fashion on a sloping clay bank do not constitute a wall. They are supplementary to the real wall, which has always been on the top of the bank. Their purpose has been to keep the clay bank from slipping, and bringing down the Wall from above. The age of the stones is not two hundred years older than the enclosure of the Roodee, as shown upon some of the stones being undercut as by the action of sand and water, and now buried beneath a foot or two of soil. The supposed Roman stones at the Kaleyards proved to be, when excavated, alongside the base of an Edwardian wall, out of the perpendicular (the top having most likely fallen over), the base was allowed to remain, and a new wall built some feet inside of the old.

"A recent visit to York has shown me that there are several striking parallels between that city and Chester worth noting. Both were originally Roman fortresses of the first magnitude, each capable of holding one-fourth of the Roman soldiers in Britain. Both were built about the same date, and for a like purpose; each was the headquarters of a Roman Legion; the dimensions and form of both camps were much the same; both were built on the banks of a tidal river; both have a south wall not as yet traced. Both possessed a mediæval wall, which has survived to the present time. In both the lines of the Roman wall have been used in part for the modern fortification. Indeed, so strong is the resemblance that I feel we ought to regard them as (what they really are) twin fortresses, constructed much upon the same plan, and, not

unlikely, owing much to the engineering skill and constructive genius of Agricola. York is fortunate in having not only large fragments of the original Wall in good preservation, but towers and turrets as well. An examination of the Wall at York has convinced me that its preservation is due to the superiority of limestone as a building stone over sandstone. I have found no Roman concrete in Chester to compare for hardness and solidity with that to be seen in York, owing, of course, to the use of the sandstone in the former case.

"Again, I think that we may learn something as to how the Walls of Deva were protected, or armed. At York we have towers projecting from the angles of the Walls, and furnished with loopholes, to effectually command the Walls on either side. Similar towers, I have no doubt, were existent in Deva, while the gates were similarly protected, and smaller towers were present at intermediate points. The earthen ramparts, which backed up on the inner side the outer stone wall, are not so well seen in Chester as in York. In our case the six or eight feet of earth has long since been covered over with a like amount of soil, and the surrounding ground has, from a variety of causes common to an enclosed inhabited spot, been raised in time to the same level, so that now in Chester, Roman roads and remains are found at depths varying from 8 to 14 feet. It may be interesting to give some of these recently ascertained depths. At White Friars, under the Lady Chapel, and Eastgate, 9 feet, the King's School yard 10 feet, Dean's field 12 feet, Genio Sancto Centuriae Altar 13 feet. In this sketch of the walls of Deva, it must be understood that while I have taken the latest extension of the circumvallation by the Romans for elucidation, I am not forgetting that there is evidence of a much earlier camp in which each gate stood in the centre of its own line of wall. This I leave for the present."

Monday, 5th January, 1885.

The third meeting of the session 1884-5 was held in the Society's Rooms (formerly the Albion Hotel), Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 5th January, 1885, at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. Thompson Watkin read a paper on "Facts Connected with the Roman Occupation of Cheshire."[1]

This lecture was illustrated by the exhibition of some of the Roman altars and inscriptions from the Society's Museum, and by the exhibition of Roman remains collected by Mr. G. W. Shrubsole, and found in Chester.

Monday, 2nd February, 1885.

The fourth meeting of the session was held at the Society's Rooms, in Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 2nd February, 1885, at eight o'clock.

Mr. Robert Holland, of Frodsham, read a paper entitled "Cheshire Idioms, Metaphors, and Proverbs."[2]

Mr. Ewen exhibited a number of specimens of ancient lace from his own and other collections, and made a short communication on the antiquity and history of this valuable art.

Monday, 2nd March, 1885.

The fifth meeting of the session 1884-5 was held at the Society's Rooms (formerly the Albion Hotel), Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 2nd March, 1885, at eight o'clock.

---

[1] The principal facts here referred to will be found in Mr. Thompson Watkin's *Roman Cheshire*, published since this paper was read.

[2] The most important of these Cheshire Idioms, Proverbs, &c., will be found in Mr. Holland's *Cheshire Glossary*, recently published by the Dialect Society.

The Very Rev. Dean Howson delivered a short lecture entitled "Notes on the Old Chapter Books of Chester Cathedral."

The Rev. G. Preston, M.A., read a letter addressed by him to Mr. G. W. Shrubsole on "the Agreement of the lines of the present streets of Chester, with the Viæ of an original Roman camp, and the probable direction of the southern agger."

NOTES ON THE OLD CHAPTER BOOKS OF CHESTER CATHEDRAL, BY THE VERY REV. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., DEAN OF CHESTER.[1]

The Very Rev. the Dean began by referring to the former neglect of documents and books in the Cathedral, and stated that when Dr. Coplestone came here as Dean, and began various reforms, which were very much needed, he found the books in closed cases, shut out from fresh air, and some volumes of great value were found eaten into utter ruin. Within the memory of some now living, boys at the King's School had opportunities—and used those opportunities—for cutting pictures with their penknives out of some of the books. So, with the documents of our Cathedral, I found them some years ago in dust and confusion; and a duty which ought to be discharged as soon as possible is the careful examination of them and the placing of them in order. As to the Chapter books, which I wish to bring to your notice, it was on this wise that I became aware of their existence. In an open box containing various business papers, apparently of little value, I one day accidentally caught sight of a fragment of writing of the seventeenth century. My curiosity was excited, and on tenderly taking out the paper on which this writing appeared I found that it was part of an old

[1] Unfortunately the death of Dean Howson has prevented this lecture being revised by him. It is therefore printed from the report in the *Chester Chronicle* of March 7th, 1885.

Chapter book hanging together in shreds. A second book of the same kind, and in a similar condition, was found presently afterwards, and both were confided to the skilful and affectionate care of Mr. T. Hughes, F.S.A., and here they are, carefully bound, and with every page safely preserved and arranged. Both these books are fragments. Some parts of them are irretrievably lost. But, besides this, it is evident that at some period the Chapter minutes of our Cathedral were kept with great care, at other times very carelessly.

The period of time over which the earlier of these books ranges is from 1648 to 1673. The second begins in 1694 and ends in 1747. One of the first things that one meets with in these pages is an indication of the vast extent of this diocese, even when separated by King Henry VIII. from the mother diocese of Lichfield. The Dean proceeded to quote a minute of January 28th, 1661, in which, amongst other matters, it was ordered "that the yearly rent of twenty pounds per annum, payable from Sir William Stanley, Baronet, bee payed yearly for the supply of all fast festival and extraordinary sermons, and that in due tyme some able and orthodox person be pitched on for that employment, and to bee made also vicar of St. Oswald's at the next vacancy." We find "It is also ordered that there be no Hollyday lecture hereafter maintained at the charge of the Chapter, but bee supplyed as anciently by the constant lecturer by the ancient constitutions allowed, notwithstanding any act made by the Chapter formerly to ye contrary, and Mr. Trafford is to bee paid for every sermon hee hath preached on Hollydays since Midsummer last 10s. for every sermon or otherwise according to my Lord Bishop's direction." This is also signed Henrie Bridgeman. The whole question of the "lecturer" in Chester Cathedral is a very curious one. He is not a statutable officer, and yet he was for several years a recognised personage. Next we have a record January 5, 1662, stating "That the copye of an answeare to the

Rt. Rev. Father in God the Ld. Bp. of London touching the redemption of prisoners in Aldgiers he fayr transcribed and returned to his Lordship with our name subscribed." The subject of the appointment of sub-deans and receivers and of the nomination of scholars for the King's School by the Dean having been touched upon, the lecturer proceeded to give a quotation of an amusing character. In September, 1707, it is ordered, "Whereas complaint hath been made that Edmund White, organist of this Church, being intrusted to instruct a young gentlewoman of antient and right worthy family in musick, endeavoured to engage her affections by kissing, courting, and the like dalliance unknown to her parents, and motioned a match with her, which particulars when sounded he could not deny, only frivolously pretended the motion of marriage was in jest. We, therefore, abhorring attempts to steal children from their parents as much as to rob parents of their most vallued treasure, doe according to the statute 'de corrigendo' depose the said Edmund White from that place of organist, and also from being master of the choristers, and we doe declare that the station or office of organist and master of the choristers to be actually voyd. L. Fogg, Dean." Now here this raises some very interesting questions. I refer to the office of "organist." This office does not really appear in the statutes, but then it is to be remembered that the organ was an instrument which only gradually grew into its present magnificent proportions.

The lay clerks used to be named "conducts." The following passage exemplifies the severity of discipline which was sometimes applied to them: "Nov. 28, 1711. Forasmuch as Mr. Samuel Webb, one of the laie clerks or conducts of this church, hath been heretofore admonished concerning some misdemeanour, from which he is not yet reclaimed or hath returned to his duty, wherefore we decree and order that the said Mr. Webb be for the present discharged from ye said place of conduct or any other place

in this church that he layeth claim to, yet reserving to ourselves the liberty of restoring him to ye said place of conduct, when he shall regularly behave himself and conform to such orders as shall be made for his due and more regular behaviour. And that in the meantime he doe not presume to sit in the stall that he was accustomed to sit in, or wear his surplice, but that he constantly attend ye service of the church in some other visible place.—L. Fogg, Dean."

The association of the name of St. Oswald with the south transept was also touched upon. It would be a mistake to say that the transept ever was St. Oswald's Church in the strict sense of the word. The power of holding service there during the intervals of Cathedral service was the limit of the right of the parishioners, and there was a minute dated June 20th, 1672, which he read, in which it was recorded that John Deane, butcher, sexton of the parish of St. Oswald's, begged pardon on his bended knees of the dean and chapter for having broken ground for a grave in the Church of St. Werburgh, otherwise sometime called by the name of St. Oswald, without their leave. On December 3rd, 1708, there was a note of the petition of the parishioners of St. Oswald to the dean and chapter for a gallery, and on September 6th of the following year the dean and chapter gave their consent. The lecturer then proceeded to sketch the lives of the various deans in office during the period mentioned. He concluded with a brief defence of the antiquarian against current cavils in which he said: "Some persons, who have a distaste for all intellectual pursuits, and think themselves wise in consequence, are apt to smile at antiquarians as dealers in small trifles, and as enthusiasts for worthless relics. But such criticisms are not according to the true relation of things. Gold mines are not to be discovered by the men staring with a vacant mind at the surface of the ground, and without any trouble being taken to dig. A local archæological society has, in truth, a very great dignity and a very great claim on public

attention, because it is a conscientious, useful, and loyal servant to one of the mistresses of the sciences, to the study of history."

THE ROMAN STREETS OF CHESTER.

The Rev. G. Preston, M.A., read a communication he had addressed to Mr. Shrubsole on the subject of the correspondence of the principal streets of Chester with the "viæ" of a Roman camp. After comparing his view of the matter with Mr. Shrubsole's, with the aid of drawings on the blackboard, he said: "After some thought I have come to the conclusion that my original idea was the right one, that the—

1. Eastgate stands where stood the Porta Prætoria.
2. Watergate stands where stood the Porta Decumana.
3. Northgate stands where stood the Porta Principalis Dextra.
4. The Prætorium was near (a little east of) the Market Cross.
5. Northgate Street and the upper part of Lower Bridge Street run where ran the Principia or via Principalis.
6. Eastgate Street runs where ran the short road from the Porta Prætoria to the Prætorium itself.
7. Watergate Street runs where ran the road from the Porta Decumana to the Prætorium.
8. Weaver Street and Trinity Street run where ran the via Quintana.

"And I will even venture on the hazardous course of giving reasons for my conclusions, because the theory, if sound, should be able to stand criticism. I have been led to my opinion chiefly by the remarkable, indeed most striking, similarity between these streets of Chester and the ways in a Roman camp. Let anyone take a map of Chester and a plan of a Roman camp, such as may be found in a dictionary of Roman antiquities, and place them side by side in the manner I have indicated, and

then compare the corresponding relative positions; they will be found to agree, street with 'via' almost exactly. I attach the greatest importance to the idea that the present streets follow the lines of the ways in a Roman camp, because, as thoroughfares in constant use for centuries, they would not be likely to be built over, rights of way being always jealously guarded amongst the Romans as amongst ourselves. Buildings may disappear, but roads and streets (unless after a general conflagration) do not. Indeed, the curious antiquary might find some interest in tracing the correspondence of King Street, Princess Street, and the whole of the other streets and passages opening southwards on the south sides of Northgate Street and Bridge Street, to the passages on the Porta Decumana side of the via Principalis in a Roman camp. This would go no little way towards explaining the marvellous number of passages, bye-ways, alleys, and shuts in Chester. Has anyone ever seen any other place with more or with so many?" Having discussed the question pretty thoroughly, Mr. Preston concluded—"And now having tried to solve one question, may I start two fresh ones? First. Why in Chester, which is so much of a Roman city, are there so many *gables* to be seen in the streets, when we know that in Rome these were only allowed in *temples*, or occasionally in the houses of pre-eminent Romans, on whom was bestowed the privilege of having a '*fastigium*' (gable) as a sort of divine honour? I may mention that when in Rome, some years ago, I noticed few or no gables in the streets except in the case of *churches*, nearly all of which had gables facing the street. Second. Next, where was the Amphitheatre? I have no more doubt that the Roman officers and men, who liked fun with their fighting and fighting with their fun, had an Amphitheatre near at hand, than I doubt that British officers get up horse races, wherever they are posted for any length of time. Where was it? It must have been in either the north or the north-east or the east side outside the walls. Could it have been in Boughton?"

Mr. Shrubsole, being called upon to reply, said that at that late hour he would not speak at any length. Indeed, he agreed generally with what Mr. Preston had said as to the arrangement of a typical Roman camp. In his paper on "Deva," &c., one of his objects had been to show, from what had been *found* here, how and why this ordinary disposition of a camp had been departed from, and to that he still adhered.

Wednesday, 5th August, 1885.

A joint excursion of the Archæological and Natural Science Societies took place on Wednesday, the 5th August, 1885, to visit the Roman road recently found at Edisbury and Delamere.[1]

Mr. Edward Kirk, of Manchester, to whose perseverance the re-discovery of this Roman road is due, was the leader of the party.

---

[1] A full account of this road, with a map, plans, and sections, will be found in Mr. Thompson Watkin's *Roman Cheshire*, pp. 26 to 46.

SESSION 1885-6.

Monday, 14th December, 1885.

THE opening meeting of the session 1885-6 was held at the Society's Rooms, Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 14th December, 1885, at eight o'clock.

Mr. Edward Kirk, of Manchester, read a paper on "The Roman Roads in Delamere Forest and the Neighbourhood."[1] This paper was illustrated by specially prepared maps, photographs, and diagrams of the roads and sites explored by Mr. Kirk.

Mr. G. W. Shrubsole exhibited and described certain Roman remains in lead and bronze from Bridge Street and Vicar's Cross, and Samian ware and cinerary urns from the Roman Cemetery at Handbridge, &c.

Monday, 25th January, 1886.

The second meeting of the session 1885-6 was held in the Society's Rooms (formerly the Albion Hotel), Lower Bridge Street, on Monday evening, the 25th January, 1886, at eight o'clock.

[1] See Mr. Thompson Watkin's *Roman Cheshire*, pp. 26 to 46. Mr. Kirk's paper appeared in full in the *Chester Courant* for December 16th, 1885. Another paper on this subject is also printed in the *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, vol. iii., pp. 111-133, 1885, illustrated by a plan of the Roman Roads and an enlarged Section.

Mr. James Hall, of Willaston, near Nantwich, read a paper entitled "Place Names in Nantwich Hundred."[1] The principal places referred to in this paper were pointed out on a large skeleton cartoon map, specially prepared for the purpose.

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETINGS.

It seems desirable that the following copies of the Minutes of the meetings of the Council of the Society, held on the following and subsequent dates, should here be printed:—

Council Meeting, Friday, 18th December, 1885.

Present: Dr. Stolterfoth, M.A., in the chair; the Rev. H. Grantham, Mr. A. Lamont, Mr. G. W. Shrubsole, and the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Thos. Hughes, F.S.A.

The Hon. Secretary reported the death of the Very Rev. the Dean of Chester, John Saul Howson, D.D., one of the Presidents of the Society, and asked the pleasure of the Council as to the Society being officially represented at the funeral to-morrow, Saturday, December 19th, in the Cloister Green of the Cathedral.

Whereupon it was unanimously agreed that Messrs. I. E. Ewen (Archæological Secretary), Henry Taylor (Historic Secretary), G. W. Shrubsole (Curator), and Mr. Lamont should be appointed a deputation to represent this Society at the funeral—the Chairman, the General Secretary, and other members of the Council having been summoned to attend in other public or official capacities.

Other business had been set down for discussion, but in view of the circumstance of the late Dean's lamented removal and of the painful ceremony of the morrow, it was

[1] Mr. Hall's paper, which appeared in the local papers shortly after the date of the meeting, is somewhat too long and too discursive to be here printed.

determined to proceed no further but to adjourn this Council meeting to the earliest convenient day in the new year.

Council Meeting, 6th January, 1886.

At a meeting of the Council held this day at the old Albion Rooms, Lower Bridge Street. Present: Dr. Stolterfoth, M.A., in the chair; Dr. Davies-Colley, Messrs. Baillie, Lamont, Shrubsole, and Thomas Hughes (Hon. Secretary).

The minutes of the last meeting were read by the Secretary and letters from the Rev. C. B. Griffith, Messrs. H. Taylor, and G. Frater.

The Council had met on this occasion mainly to pass a vote of condolence with the family of the late Very Rev. Dean Howson. The Secretary submitted, and the Council approved, the following letter of sympathy addressed to the relatives of the Society's late lamented President:—

> To the Rev. George John Howson, M.A., Edmund Whytehead Howson, Esq., M.A., the Rev. Francis James Howson, M.A., and the Misses Howson, sons and daughters of the late Very Rev. John Saul Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester.
>
> We, the Council of the Chester Architectural, Archæological, and Historic Society in Council assembled, respectfully tender to you as a family our earnest sympathy and condolence on your recent double bereavement.
>
> The death of Dean Howson is a severe public loss to this city, to which, by long association, he had become so warmly, nay even reverently, attached. The Cathedral,—to the restoration and adornment of which, he had consecrated the later years of his most valuable life, literally wearing himself out in its service,—is a standing monument and evidence of his active and devoted loyalty to both the Church at large and to our city in particular.
>
> But it is as one of the leading Presidents of our own Society that we, as a Council, would desire especially to speak of our much lamented colleague. From the day of his

first coming to Chester as Dean,—though Archæology, as he was fond of confessing, had not previously occupied his mind to any great extent,—he was not long resident among us without finding those pursuits, so dear to our Society, gradually acquiring a firm hold upon his respect and regard.

The late Dean was one of the most regular attendants at our antiquarian gatherings, seldom absent from either our Council or ordinary meetings; and whether it was in his position as chairman, genially supporting the readers of papers before the Society, or himself an able and enthusiastic lecturer, or sharing freely in our sometimes animated debates, he never failed to make his influence felt or his conclusions treated, other than with the respect all acknowledged he deserved.

We cannot, therefore, but feel that, while the great loss to his family (accentuated as that has been in so solemn a degree by that of his faithful partner through life—your excellent mother) can never be replaced, we of the Council, who in common with our fellow members, have worked along with him in the fields of local archæology and history, have lost a friend, who was ever ready with his countenance and advice in the directing of our researches and studies to some useful and practical end.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

HENRY STOLTERFOTH, *Chairman.*

Council Meeting, 24th February, 1886.

Present: Dr. Stolterfoth, M.A., in the chair; Messrs. Henry Taylor, Baillie, Lamont, Shrubsole, and T. Cann Hughes (Assistant Secretary).

The Secretary announced that he had received the following letter from the Rev. George J. Howson in reply to the vote of condolence with the family of Dr. Howson passed at the last meeting.

Overton Rectory, Rhuabon, January 13th, 1886.

Gentlemen,—On behalf of my brothers and sisters and myself, allow me to thank you most cordially for the

beautifully worded address of condolence, which you have been good enough to send us. I well know the intense interest which my father had in the Society which you represent. The objects were very very dear to him, and constantly when I used to go to see him during this long last illness of his, I found him busy with something connected with it.

When at Bournemouth, I heard him in the middle of some of the distressing wanderings of his thought say, "Tell Freeman and Chester I take no credit," referring, doubtless, to the proposed meeting to be held in Chester this year and to Professor Freeman, who is, I believe, to be the chairman of one of the sectional meetings to be held in connection with archæology.

Again thanking you very much,

I am, yours very faithfully,

GEORGE J. HOWSON.

Council Meeting, 5th June, 1886.

Present: His Honour Judge Wynne Ffoulkes (in the chair), His Grace the Duke of Westminster, the Very Rev. the Dean of Chester, the Venerable Archdeacon Barber, Rev. H. Grantham, Dr. Stolterfoth, Messrs. I. E. Ewen, A. Lamont, G. W. Shrubsole, H. Taylor, and T. Cann Hughes.

Resolved that a circular be sent to the members calling their attention to the approaching visit of the Royal Archæological Institute from Tuesday, August 10th, to Tuesday, 17th August, 1886, and to explain the advantages open to members only on that occasion.

Council Meeting, June 21st, 1886.

Present: His Honour Judge Wynne Ffoulkes (in the chair), the Very Rev. the Dean, the Venerable Archdeacon Barber, the Rev. H. Grantham, Dr. Stolterfoth, Messrs. Lamont, Baillie, H. Taylor, I. E. Ewen, Shrubsole, and T. Cann Hughes (Hon. Sec.)

The Secretary read the report of a sub-committee of the Council appointed to consider the constitution of the Society and of the Museum fixtures.

The Council adopted the rules framed by the sub-committee with slight modifications.

The Council deputed the same sub-committee to draw up, engross, and present an address of welcome to the Royal Archæological Institute on their approaching visit to the city.

General Meeting, 7th September, 1886.

A general meeting of the members of the Society was held at the Grosvenor Museum, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Chester, chairman. The meeting proceeded to discuss the recommendations of the Council as to the proposed alterations in the title of the Society, and of the rules for its constitution and government, and to elect the Council and Officers for the ensuing Session 1886-7.

These Rules, which were subsequently revised and altered, will be found on the following pages, together with the list of Members made up to May 30th, 1887. The list of the Council and Officers of the Society will be found at the commencement of this volume.

Resolved that the rules be printed and circulated among the members of the Society.

Resolved that the best thanks of the Society be given to the Chairman and Directors of the Chester United Gas Co., the monthly Board of the Chester General Infirmary, and to the family of the late Dean Howson for their handsome donations to the Society's Museum and Library.

Resolved that the General Secretary be instructed to write to the above, acknowledging the gifts with the thanks of the Society.