

ARCHAEOLOGIA AELIANA.

I. *A Letter to JAMES LOSH, Esq. one of the Vice-Presidents of the Antiquarian Society, of Newcastle upon Tyne, containing an Inquiry into the Age of the Porch of St. Margaret's Church, York, by J. MACGREGOR, Esq.*

SIR,

IN addressing you, and, through you, a Society, already distinguished for the learning and talents of its Members, I am aware, that an ample apology is due from one, who is, as yet, a stranger in this walk of literature, and, consequently, but ill qualified to do justice to the subject he has undertaken. Having no pretensions, then, to the skill of an Antiquary, it may be proper to state, that I became acquainted with the present, while in pursuit of another, object of study, upon which it promised to throw some light. For this purpose, it was necessary to ascertain its history, and, with this view, the principal works on British Antiquities were consulted, but without effect. I was thus reduced to the necessity of endeavouring to supply this deficiency myself the best way I could, in order to reap the expected and desired advantage. I had not, however, proceeded far in my new labour, until I perceived, that, from a collateral, it claimed to be considered as a primary object of research; in consequence of which it was reserved for a future and more particular consideration, the result of which I have now the honour to lay before you.

Its claims must be considered important indeed, if they be really such as they appear to me—no less than an antiquity of sixteen centuries,

and a pre-eminence in beauty over all the specimens of British Roman art, which have come down to our times.

To vindicate such pretensions was certainly worth any man's while, to whom they appeared well founded. Success would secure to him the merit of having filled up a desideratum in the history of British monuments, and the attempt would, at all events, have the effect of bringing into more prominent notice a beautiful relic of past ages, which has hitherto languished in comparative obscurity.

But I must confess that I had another motive to encourage me in the prosecution of this subject, which was the opportunity it afforded of completing the history of the Signs of the Zodiac, the first part of which I had the honour of submitting to another learned Society, in which you hold an equally distinguished rank.

In discussions like the present, the professed object of investigation frequently derives additional importance, from its furnishing a centre for adapting and connecting scattered fragments of antiquity, which united may diffuse light and order through the most abstruse subjects of ancient history. Accordingly, availing myself of the matter brought forward in the progress of research, I have the satisfaction of having been able to accommodate it to the elucidation of two important points of inquiry at the same time, and thus to give to the following pages all the interest in my power.

In many parts notes are added, where the points under immediate consideration appeared to require further illustration, or suggested matter of consequence, which could neither, with propriety, be introduced into the text, nor omitted altogether.

Upon the whole, I trust the intention will redeem the imperfections of a performance, which, although but a sketch, I am sensible, requires the strongest recommendation to the indulgence of a Society for whose judgment I entertain the highest respect.

Individually, I beg to assure you, that I am, SIR,

With great esteem,

Your very obedient Servant,

J. MACGREGOR.

Newcastle upon Tyne, 1825.

ST. MARGARET'S CHURCH is situated on the north side of Walmgate, in the city of York, behind a line of mean houses, which occupy a space nearly equi-distant between Foss-Bridge and Walmgate-Bar. The ancient porch, attached to this very humble and comparatively modern building, is composed of several retiring arches, which, as they recede, contract in height and span, from about twelve feet in height, and nine in width, (a rough estimate of the size of the exterior semicircle,) to the dimensions of a common door. The arches are supported by corresponding pillars, from whose capitals they spring, which, together with the faces of the arches, are beautifully carved in what is commonly called the Saxon manner.

To save myself the difficulty of a minute description, I beg to refer to an engraving of this porch in Drake's *Antiquities of York*, which is the best representation of it now extant,* although I must not forget to mention, that the signs of the Zodiac, with which the face of the exterior arch is decorated, are, in regard to their position on the porch, reversed in the print, owing, probably, to an error of the engraver.

The *tout ensemble* is very striking; as a specimen of art it is beautiful, and the accompanying air of antiquity, which adds dignity to grace, secures for it unqualified admiration. The most casual glance is sufficient to detect indications of its belonging to a period anterior to the conquest, for both its contour and costume forbid the supposition of its construction in times posterior to the Norman improvement in British architecture.

We are thus enabled, at once, to circumscribe our inquiries within the period of the Roman and Saxon occupation of this country; and to determine to which of these two it belongs, is all that I purpose by the following investigation.

It has been observed by a distinguished writer and antiquary, that it is at all times difficult, in the absence of historical information, to assign, with any certainty, the true dates of buildings of antiquity, or from the

* Since this paper was written, I have seen a good engraving of this porch by Mr. Cave, Engraver, Stone-gate, York. It is taken evidently from Mr. Drake's plate, but much enlarged.

peculiarity of their remains to fix the period of construction. But, in the present instance, this difficulty is much increased, by there being, as will presently appear, no difference in the style of the architecture of these two periods, whereby they may be distinguished; and were it not for some features in the costume, I should have despaired of being able to decide in favour of either.

Before proceeding, however, to the general discussion of the question, it may be proper to show the poverty of the historical notices respecting this monument, in order to justify my having had recourse to the method of intrinsic evidence.

These notices are as follow :

“ The Hospital and parish church of St. Nicholas was ruined in the siege of York, anno 1644, and never rebuilt. It has been a noble structure, as appears by part of the tower yet standing, and its antient porch which is now put up in St. Margaret’s, Walmgate.”*

“ St. Nicholas was of the advowson of the King’s of England, and was visited as such by William Grenefield, chancellor of England, in 1303. Richard II. confirmed all donations to this Hospital.”†

“ Among the religious foundations in York, St. Nicholas is mentioned as an hospital for lepers, to which the empress Maud was a benefactress.”‡

“ There was in or near this city an hospital for leprous persons as antient as the time of Maud the empress, who was a benefactress to it, and is thought to be the same which was afterwards known by the name of St. Nicholas without Waingate Bar, which was of royal foundation. It consisted of a warden and several brothers and sisters, and had lands and rents, 26th Henry VIII. to the yearly amount of £29. 18s. 8d. in toto.”§

In Torr’s *Antiquities of York*, this church is merely mentioned in the list of religious houses which forms the Appendix.

The sum of all this is, that the hospital and parish church of St. Nicholas, from whence the porch of St. Margaret’s was removed, existed

* Drake’s *Antiq. of York*, p. 250.

† Dugdale’s *Monasticon*, p. 165, ed. 1718.

‡ Gough’s *Cambden*, vol. iii. p. 65.

§ Tanner’s *Notitia Monastica*, p. 667, ed. 1744.

in the days of the empress Matilda, and, consequently, in the middle of the twelfth century, if by this personage is meant the daughter of our Henry I. who married Henry V. emperor of Germany, in 1165.*

It is probable we shall never come nearer the date of this church, for the reasons assigned by Somner, who says of parish churches in general, "it is but of very few that I have been able to ascertain either the date or name of the founder, because none of them are much, if at all, anterior to the conquest, before which event, they were for the most part built of wood and destroyed by the Danes. For this reason in some old charters, grants of land are found recorded to churches whose existence cannot be traced beyond this epoch.†

This, in the main, is confirmed by Dugdale in his *History of Warwickshire*, page 301, and in the *Parentalia* it is stated, that "in the time of the Conqueror the street-houses of London were of wood and thatched." But, indeed, until after the great fire, in 1666, wood was the common material of which houses were built in the metropolis.

We gain no assistance from the fact, that it was through the interest of the Dominicans, that so many churches were dedicated to St. Nicholas, who was their favourite tutelar saint, because churches were dedicated to him not only before the arrival of this order in England, in the year 1221, but before the order itself existed. The founder, Dominick de Guzman, a Spanish gentleman, was born anno 1170. The order was first approved in the year 1215, by Innocent III. and confirmed in 1216, by a bull of Honorius III. under the title of Augustine. Now, besides the church at York, there was another dedicated to the same personage in the suburbs of the town of Warwick, either a little before, or immediately after, the conquest, where the Dominicans did not settle before the close of Henry III.'s reign.‡

* Lord Lyttelton, in his *History of Henry II.* vol. ii. p. 456-7, reports that her bounty to pious and charitable institutions exceeded those of any cotemporary king in Christendom, and that she left large sums to lepers and other poor people, as well as to convents and churches, which her son paid honourably.

† *Antiquities of Canterbury*, page 324.

‡ Dugdale's *Antiq. of Warwickshire*.

There were five Popes of the name of Nicholas; the first was elected in the year 858; the second, in 1059; and the third, in 1277; churches, therefore, may have been dedicated to St. Nicholas two centuries before the conquest.

It is evident, however, from the observation of Mr. Drake, "it has been a *noble* structure as appears by part of the tower yet standing," that this church cannot be referred to the Saxon but to the Norman period, because the Saxon churches were mean in appearance compared with those of subsequent times, being built generally within the space of five or six years, with stone roofs, and without towers, or with such as the epithet *noble* could not be applied to in our days. "In the descriptions we have remaining," says Mr. Bentham, "of the most ancient Saxon churches, particularly of St. Andrew's, at Hexham, and St. Peter's, at York, not a word occurs by which it can be inferred, that these, or any other of them, had either cross buildings or high towers raised above the roofs but as far as we can judge, were mostly square, or rather oblong buildings, circular at the east end; in form resembling the *basilicæ*, or courts of justice, in great cities throughout the Roman empire, many of which were converted into christian churches on the first establishment of christianity under Constantine the Great; and new erected churches were constructed on the same plan, from its manifest utility for the reception of large assemblies. Hence *basilica* was used in that and the succeeding ages for *ecclesia*, or church, and continued so even after the form of our churches was changed. St. Peter's, at York, begun by king Edwin in the year 627, is particularly reported by Bede (*Hist. Eccles. lib ii, chap. 14.*) to have been of that form, 'per quadrum cepit ædificare basilicam.'"*

In the *Parentalia* it is also stated, that the cathedral of St. Paul, which was rebuilt by Mauritius, bishop of London, after the great fire in 1083, "was originally built with a semicircular *presbyterium*, or chancel, in the 7th century, after the usual mode of the primitive churches; but, after this event, Mauritius built it in a more modern style, not with

* Bentham's *History of Ely Cathedral*, Introd. sec. 5th.

round (as in the old church) but with *sharp-headed arches*, to make way for which, the semicircular *presbyterium* was taken down.”*

These quotations, as they exhibit the great poverty both of the dimensions and style of the churches built in the Saxon times, appear sufficient to warrant the conclusion, that Mr. Drake's observation can apply to no other than a Norman building, probably a re-edification of that to which the porch originally belonged; many Saxon and Roman door-cases having been preserved, when other parts of the churches were rebuilt.

The date of the church, therefore, which, according to the above data, must be somewhere between the years 1066 and 1165, cannot satisfy us respecting the date of the porch, which is certainly not a Norman work.

To determine this point, therefore, it is evident, that we must, in the absence of historical information, have recourse to the only other means within our power—the intrinsic evidence afforded by the porch itself. This consists of two parts, namely, the general contour of the fabric; and the peculiarity of the costume. But as it is the latter alone which furnishes the discriminating marks, I have selected from it two features as the basis of the argument, which, for the sake of perspicuity, I have divided into three parts. The first of these has reference, in a general way, to the degree of civilization which prevailed in Britain, and more especially to the importance of York, while a Roman province, in order thence to deduce the flourishing state of architecture, and the consequent probability of the existence of such structures during that period; the second embraces the objections to its being a work of the

* Page 172.

Mr. Somner, in his *Antiquities of Canterbury*, p. 516-7—ed. 1640, quotes the authority of a charter of king Edgar to the abbey of Malmesbury, dated 974, for the fact, that most of our monasteries, before the conquest, were of wood. This is well, but the following assertion, by the same author, is clearly refuted by the above remark of Sir Christopher Wren. Somner says, “St. Paul's was rebuilt after the fire of London anno 1087, by bishop Mauricius, upon stone arches for defence of fire, a manner of work before that time unknown to the people of this realm and then brought in by the French. This doubtless is that kind of architecture the continuer of Bede intends where speaking of the Normans' in-come, he saith, ‘videas ubique in villis ecclesias, in vicis et urbibus monasteria edificandi genere consurgere.’”

Saxons; and the third professes to unfold the intrinsic evidence by collateral testimonies derived from the prevailing superstition of the times, and from monuments of this superstition still in existence in this country, though imperfect and very rare.

With regard to the first, we are informed by Cambden,* upon the authority of Cæsar and Strabo, that the Britons, before the arrival of the Romans, had no other towns than woods fortified with a ditch and ramparts; and from the pen of the elegant and discerning Tacitus we learn, that the earliest appearance of regular architecture dates from the time of Agricola. "Cæsar," he relates, "was the discoverer, not the conqueror of the island. He did no more than show it to posterity. The civil wars broke out soon after, and, in that scene of distraction, when the swords of the leading men were drawn against their country, it was natural to lose sight of Britain.

"During the peace that followed, the same neglect continued. Augustus called it the wisdom of his councils, and Tiberius made it a rule of state policy. The invasion meditated by Caligula proved abortive from his caprice, and reserved the grand enterprize for Claudius, who transported into Britain an army composed of regular legions and a great body of auxiliaries. Among the officers was Vespasian. The first officer of Consular rank who commanded in Britain was Aulus Plautius. He was succeeded by Ostorius Scapula; both eminent for their military character. Under their auspices the southern part of Britain took the form of a province, and received a colony of veterans. The next governor was Didius Gallus, who did little more than preserve the acquisitions of his predecessors. Veranius succeeded to the command, but died within the year.

* Gough's *Cambden*, vol. iii. p. 9. This remark, however, can apply only to the interior of the island, because Cæsar himself gives a different account of the condition of the inhabitants of the coast opposite to Gaul. "Ex his omnibus, longe sunt humanissimi, qui Cantium incolunt; quæ regio est maritima omnis: neque multum a Gallica differunt consuetudine."—*De Bell. Gall. v. sec. 14.*

Somner, on the authority of Huntington, states that there were 28 principal British towns in the island. Of these Canterbury was one, and called *Kair Chent*, which in British signified a walled town.—*Antiq. of Canterbury*, p. 8. But this author also reports, with gravity, that this city was founded by Rud-hudibras 900 years B. C.!!

“Suetonius Paulinus was the next in succession, and he pushed on the war in one continued series of prosperity for two years together. In that time he subdued several states; and secured his conquests by a chain of posts and garrisons. He invaded Mona, the retreat of the Druids, and gave a mortal blow to the power of the Britons by the overthrow of their army under Boadicea. From the recal of this officer to the time of Agricola, the Roman commanders were gradually extending the empire of Rome in Britain. Under the latter it was completely subdued, and the Roman power permanently established. He first introduced literature and the arts of civilization, and reconciled them to Roman manners.

“To introduce a system of new and wise regulations was the business of the following winter (the second of Agricola's administration). A fierce and savage people running wild in the woods would be ever addicted to a life of warfare. To wean them from those habits, Agricola held forth the baits of pleasure, encouraging the natives, as well by public assistance, as by warm exhortations, to build *temples, courts of justice, and commodious dwelling houses*. To establish a plan of education and give the sons of the leading chiefs a tincture of letters, was part of his policy. By way of encouragement he praised their talents, and already saw them by the force of their natural genius rising superior to the attainments of the Gauls. The consequence was, that they, who had always disdained the Roman language, began to cultivate its beauties. The Roman apparel was seen without prejudice, and the toga became a fashionable part of dress.

“By degrees the charms of vice gained admission to their hearts; *baths, porticos, and elegant banquets*, grew into vogue, and the new manners, which, in fact, served only to sweeten slavery, were, by the unsuspecting Britons, called the arts of polished humanity.”*

Such is the succinct and interesting communication of this celebrated author respecting the dawn of civilization and the arts among our rude progenitors. To us it is important, as fixing a limit beyond which we need not ascend in our inquiries on the present subject.

* Tacitus' *Life of Agricola*.

That the Britons continued, henceforward, to make progress in the arts, appears from Cambden. "The Romans so civilized the Britons by laws, and polished them by manners, that they were not inferior in way of life and improvement to other provinces. They erected so many buildings and noble works, that their remains strike beholders with the greatest admiration."*

It has been ingeniously shewn,† that the military force of the Romans amounted, in Britain, to 73,000 foot, and 13,000 horse, and that the native Romans, or those born in the island, were, at the conclusion of their empire here, not fewer than half a million. A progressive extension of the Roman colony, during a space of 350 years, could not fail to make a powerful and favourable impression on the natives, converting them from a rude to a polished people, and producing all the consequences that can be imagined to result from the diffusion of civilization among men, and in a country, susceptible of the highest moral and physical improvement.

As it is a point of some importance to ascertain, as nearly as may be, the degree to which "the arts of polished humanity" were then carried, I have endeavoured to convey some idea of this by the following sketch of the civil establishment of the Romans in this country, which, in the absence, more especially, of topographical details, appears the only way by which we can arrive at this information.

"The regions of Britain were divided into six provinces, governed by six Prætors and six Quæstors. The former officer was charged with the whole administration, and the latter was appointed to manage the finances under him. All acknowledged one head within the island, and were subject to the authority of the Proconsul of Britain. The country from the southern sea to the Friths of Forth and Clyde, at the close of the first century, contained a hundred and forty towns differing in degree of civil estimation, and in the nature of their civil constitutions, and distinguished accordingly into four orders of towns, municipal and stipendiary, colonies, and cities invested with Latin privileges. Muni-

* Gough's *Cambden*, vol. i. p. 47.

† Whitaker's *History of Manchester*, vol. i. ch. 6, sec. 4, and vol. ii. p. 198.

cipal, two; colonies, nine; Latin towns, ten; the rest were stipendiary, in which the Britons resided. The Latin towns were those which were raised above the common rank by the communication of the *Jus Latii*, or Latin privilege, which consisted in being exempted from the ordinary jurisdiction of the Prætor, and being governed by one of their own election, where the president, justiciary, and tax-gatherer were Britons. The towns possessed by the Romans themselves were the colonies and municipies. The commencement of the colonies was nearly coeval with the conquests in Britain. Colchester was the first colony, and founded by Claudius. The next in succession were Richborough, London, Gloucester, Bath, Caerleon, Chesterford, Lincoln, and Chester. That colony was esteemed the head-quarters of the legion, where some of the principal cohorts were stationed, the eagle deposited, and the commander was resident. Such was Deva for the 20th Valerian Victorious; Eboracum for the 6th Victorious; Caerleon for the 2d Augustan; and Glevum for the 7th Teuin Claudian. The rest were peopled by the other cohorts of those legions. More than eleven mints, in all probability, were established within the pale of their own government in Britain; two in the municipies; nine in the nine colonies; and some in the legionary stations. Coins minted at Chester, London, York, Colchester, Richborough, Verulam, Lincoln, Gloucester, and Conuvium, have been transmitted to the present times.

“The Roman conquests in Britain were regularly partitioned into dioceses as early as the year 314.* The first bishopricks of the church would naturally be commensurate with the provinces of the state, and the first sees of the bishops fixed at the capitals of the provinces. Three of these provincial bishops appear as subscribers to the Council of Arles, in 314.”†

* Dugdale, in his *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, p. 100, says that Episcopal Sees and Monasteries were not introduced into England before the time of Augustan, when the Benedictine order was established, and became so reputed, that there was scarcely any other in this country before the conquest. Mr. Turner, in his *History of the Anglo Saxons*, says, however, that each of the 115 civitates into which the 17 provinces of Gaul were divided, had a bishop, and every province a superior bishop, answerable to our metropolitan, though not distinguished by the title of archbishop.

† Whitaker's *History of Manchester*, vol. i. ch. 8, and vol. ii. ch. 11, sec. 4.

The rapid growth of civilization under the Romans appears to have been owing in a great measure to their peculiar policy regarding the disposal of their military force. For, different from the practice of modern times, an order to serve in the provinces, was often, to a legion, a decree of expatriation for centuries, and became, indirectly, a powerful mean of confirming the manners and institutions of Italy. The consequences of this regulation or usage Tacitus describes in the following passage: "The natives of the province of Syria had lived in habits of friendship with the legions, and, by intermarriages, had formed family connections. The soldiers, on their part, were naturalized in the country, and the stations to which they were accustomed, were, by long residence, grown as dear to them as their native country."*

This would be precisely the case in Britain, where some of the legions remained upwards of 300 years, particularly after the reign of Antoninus Pius, when the Roman citizenship was extended to every citizen of property and worth. Before this time, none of the natives were permitted to marry into the family of a provincial officer, to purchase territorial property, slaves, or houses.

To the legionary soldiers lands were also assigned, which they had ample time to cultivate, military duty, being, in ordinary, discharged by supplementary legions formed of natives. Hence one great cause of the rapid increase of the Roman population, their condition being, in the main, favourable to domestic happiness. It must be allowed, however, that the wealth and grandeur of Roman-Britain flowed chiefly from the wisdom of their civil policy; for, extensive as their military establishments ultimately became, it is probable, had they confined themselves to these, that we should have had little more than the remains of their walls and forts to remind us of their presence. It is to the transplanting of their civil institutions, arts, and social refinements, and to the care with which they afterwards nourished them, whatever may have been the motives that prompted such policy, that this country was indebted for that early refinement demonstrated by those splendid specimens of art which have from time to time been discovered within

* *Hist. Roman. lib. ii.*

it. But so scanty are the memorials of the fine arts, and so barren the history of this interesting period, that the imperfect picture of Roman-Britain must be made up from fragments of the history of the times immediately succeeding their departure.

“The authentic history,” says Mr. Turner, “for the year 407 is, that the barbarians excited by Gerontius, burst in terror upon Gaul and Britain; that Constantine (created emperor by the British troops in 406, in opposition to Honorius, the legal emperor,) could give no help because his troops were in Spain; that Honorius could send none because Alaric was overpowering Italy; that the Britons thus abandoned, armed themselves, declared their country independent, and drove the barbaric invaders from their cities; that Honorius sent letters to the British states, exhorting them to protect themselves; and that the Romans never recovered possession of the island.*

“After this event the island, as far as it was possessed by the Britons, divided into many independent republics, as appears from the circumstance, that Honorius addressed his letters to the Civitates of Britain. After the year 410, these republics were severally governed by chief magistrates, or decemviri, a senate, subordinate officers called decurions, an inferior senate called curiæ, with other necessary officers. The ecclesiastical concerns were regulated by a bishop in each, whose power sometimes extended into lay concerns.” “The Anglo Saxons must have been materially improved,” continues this author, “in their manners and mental associations by the internal state of Britain at the time of their invasion. They came among a people who, for above three centuries had been the obedient subjects of the Roman government; to whom the peaceful acquisition and enjoyment of regular property had become familiar; who had cultivated the luxuries which create a distaste

* Upon the authority of Bede and Gildas, it is generally said, that the Romans finally quitted Britain in the reign of Honorius, anno 426. But, from a stone, found at Ravenhill-Hall, in Yorkshire, anno 1774, it seems the Romans were in Britain during the reign of Justinian, or between the years 527 and 566, a hundred years after that of Honorius. This stone is represented in Mr. Charlton's *History of Whitby*, and the following is the inscription on it, according to his rendering: “Justinianus Pater Patriæ Vindicianus Mauritanus Africanus Sarmaticus Britannicus Imperator Excellentissimus Romanorum Quater Prætor Maritimum Castrum Effecit Ad Navigantium Opus.”

for war and love of indolent tranquillity; and whose country abounded with those works of art, that distribution of wealth, and those articles of convenience, which a rude mind cannot contemplate without feeling new wants and expecting new comforts; without having its curiosity agitated and its comprehension enlarged. It is true, that the feuds which followed the departure of the Romans had disturbed the prosperity of the island, and the struggles with the Saxons must have spread much devastation. But the monuments and fruits of the preceding civilization, though diminished, were not destroyed. After all the disorders of the period, Gildas still boasts of the island containing twenty-eight cities and some castles, with houses, walls, gates, and towers; and from the ruins of Caerleon, as they continued even to the 12th century, when they were seen by Giraldus, we may form some notion of the improvements of Britain in the 5th and 6th centuries. He says it was elegantly built by the Romans with brick walls. Many vestiges of its ancient splendour are yet remaining; stately palaces, which formerly, with their gilded tiles, displayed the Roman grandeur. It was first built by the Roman nobility,* and adorned with sumptuous edifices, an exceeding high tower, remarkable hot baths, ruins of ancient temples and theatres, encompassed with stately walls, partly yet standing. Subterraneous edifices are yet to be met with, not only within the walls, which are about three miles in circumference, but also in the suburbs, as aqueducts, vaults, hypocausts, and stoves.”†

Mr. Carter, an architect of eminence, states it as his opinion, that the works of the Romans in England rivalled those in Rome itself; and that at Woodchester, in the county of Gloucester, vestiges were discovered of a Roman structure 400 feet in extent, the foundation walls of which have been clearly made out; in several of the principal chambers are

* Caerleon is commonly supposed to be derived from *Caer-Lheion*, the city of legions; but Dugdale, in his *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, page 298, derives it from the name of the British prince Gutheline, by whom it was built, thus, Caer-Guthleon, contracted, Caerleon. But, supposing it to be of British erection, it is evident the Romans were the people to whom it owed its magnificence, for an account of which, see *Polychronicon*, lib. 1, cap. 48.

† *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, book viii. chap. 1.

tesselated pavements, in so rich and fine a taste, that the uprights of the work, he observes, must have been magnificence itself.*

All this is countenanced by the panegyric of Mamertinus, in praise of Dioclesian, Maximianus, and Constantius Chlorus, where it is mentioned that there were many eminent architects at that time in Britain, who were invited by the people of Burgundy to erect and repair their public buildings.†

Such is the glimpse afforded by history of the social organization and refinement of the Romans in Britain. It shows that their system of government was favourable to civil liberty, which, with the domestication of the legions, had the effect of spreading a Roman population over the country, and of gradually incorporating the natives in their extensive community, so that it is probable, had the Romans remained two centuries longer, all distinction between the two people would have been lost. We cannot avoid, therefore, the conviction that their public and private edifices corresponded with the condition of the colony in the latter days of their power, more especially when we consider that all this time a direct and constant intercourse was kept up with Rome, the most luxurious capital then in the world. But not to dwell on the consequences which the above statements render very apparent, I shall only observe here, that they are decisive of the inaccuracy of Gildas, who represents the Britons as being, immediately after the departure of the Romans, in a state of *utter helplessness and barbarism*, and of the superior candour of Stow, who has shown from ancient records, and even from Gildas himself, that the conquest of Britain by the Saxons was owing to the corruption of all classes, and particularly to a waste of military strength, in those contests of ambitious partizans, which occupied the greater part of the interval between the emancipation of the island, and the arrival of the northern bands. So different, indeed, was their real condition from that which the Saxon historian of Glastonbury would lead us to suppose, that we find the natives, notwithstanding these disadvantages, contesting every inch of ground with the invaders, who

* *Antient Architecture of England*, part 1, and note to page 12th.

† See *Speed's History of England*, page 255, folio edition, 1650.

did not, until after the lapse of a century, succeed in *confining* them to Wales, Cornwall, and part of Devonshire. The Britons were then corrupt, and weak from corruption and misrule, but not barbarous.

With regard to York in particular, it appears, from Flaccus Albinus, alias Alcuin, a native of the place, who lived towards the close of the eighth century, that it was built and fortified by the Romans, but Caxton says it was built by Ebrancus, fifth king of the Britons, who called it after his own name, Caer-brank.*

Cambden informs us that it was not a Municipium Britanniae but Colonia.† Like Verulam, however, it soon rose to the rank of a municipium, and to be the chief city of the province of Maxima. The importance of these two Municipia is specially marked by the communication of a privilege which was confined to them, namely, the right of exemption from the imperial statutes, and the liberty of enacting their own laws.‡

Some authors class York as the second city in point of rank, during the Roman dominion in Britain, but the author of the *Polychronicon* asserts that several old writers style it the head of the kingdom.§ Here the bishops of the province resided; here, also, the emperor Septimius Severus had a palace and court of justice,|| where he died, after being four years in the country. Constantius Chlorus, too, who succeeded Dioclesian, made Britain the chief place of his residence, and died in this city, after a reign of two years.¶

* *Polychronicon*, lib. 1, capitulum 48.

† Gough's *Cambden*, vol. iii. page 9.

‡ Whitaker's *History of Manchester*, vol. i. ch. 8, sec. 1st.

§ Among the more modern authors, Archbishop Usher contends for York; Bishop Stillingfleet for London. But the Bishop evidently felt the weakness of his arguments while writing them; they are not written with his usual confidence.—See his *Origines Britannicæ*. Gibbon sides with Usher.—*Decline and Fall*, vol. i, p. 78.

|| Whitaker's *Manchester*, vol. ii. ch. 11, sec. 4th; Gough's *Cambden*, vol. iii. p. 65; and Torr's *Antiquities of York*, page 9.

¶ The long absence of the warlike emperors was very prejudicial to the interests of Rome, and finally annihilated its sovereignty. The emergencies of war were first made the excuse, and until the reign of Dioclesian and Maximian, Rome, in time of peace, was respected as the seat of power and head of the empire. These princes went a step farther, by fixing their *ordinary* residence in the provinces; the former at Nicomedia, the latter at Milan. In consequence, the one acquired, in the space

The sixth legion, conducted into this country by Hadrian, from Germany, was settled here, according to the general opinion, so early as the year 154, which continued to be its head-quarters until the Romans finally quitted the island. It was probably on account of the long residence of this legion in York, that it received both from Ptolemy and Antoninus, the appellation of *Legio Sexta Victrix*, a circumstance which, it seems, procured for some other cities similar titles. Thus, Camalodunum and Glevum are also styled *Gemina Martia*, *Colonia Victricensis* and *Claudia*; we have also *Dena Victrix*, and *Legio Claudia* for Gloucester.

Thus York, from its becoming, at a very early period, the head of the most extensive province in Britain, and afterwards of Britain itself, commands an unreserved acknowledgment of its having possessed a corresponding degree of wealth, population and embellishment. Other less distinguished cities in the island rivalled in magnificence many of the principal cities within the Alps, and therefore it is not likely, that the occasional residence of the Cæsars, and seat of the western empire, would be in a condition less respectable in regard to public establishments civil and religious. In all that was transacted at York, Italy would give the tone, and as there were no examples in architecture but what she furnished, the style of the public and domestic edifices would be imitated from those of the continent, and, moreover, as the Romans were a people who thought it as necessary to introduce their gods as their laws, language, and manners, it is but reasonable to suppose that they would provide in a suitable manner for the ceremonial of their worship, and that, in making such provision, they would be guided by the precedents of Italy. Upon the whole, it is more improbable that there were no temples of elegant workmanship in the capital of Roman Britain, than that it abounded with them. In regard to York, I fear no local demonstration now exists, which I ought to offer at present, but in

of a few years, a degree of magnificence, which might appear to have required the labour of ages, and became inferior only to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in extent or populousness; while the other assumed the splendour of an imperial city, whose houses were numerous and well built, with a circus, theatre, mint, palace, and baths; porticoes adorned with statues, and a double circumference of walls. Such, in short, was its condition, that it did not seem oppressed by the proximity of Rome.

other places ample evidences of such providence have been discovered, with a few examples of which I shall close this part of the subject.

Cambden* states, upon the authority of Spartian (in *Vita Severi*, c. 22,) that there was a temple of Bellona in this city. Upon the conversion of Constantius Chlorus, who is reported to have married a native and christian, the celebrated Helena, we find the christians were instructed to repair decayed *temples*, and to build new ones. Bede informs us,† that Gregory the Great advised Augustine that the temples ought not to be demolished, but only, that the idols should be removed and destroyed, and the temples consecrated to the service of the true God. In the time of Lotharius, King of Kent, anno 670, there were Roman temples standing, in which christian worship was performed. At Canterbury, St. Pancrace's church, within the abbey precinct, and St. Martin's, in which Augustine performed his devotions, are supposed to have been idle temples.‡

Stukely discovered the remains of Roman temples at Cirencester and Chesterford.§ Mr. Carter, in his *Ancient Architecture of England*,|| has given representations of several beautiful fragments of the temple of Minerva, at Bath, discovered a little before he wrote. The accompaniments of an owl and helmet, leave, as he justly observes, no doubt as to the deity to whom it was dedicated. From the representations, too, of the sun and moon found among the ruins of the *ancient* city, and of the head of Diana, encircled by the horns of the moon, it would appear, that temples to these luminaries had also been erected here. And, lastly, a respectable author informs us, that the church of St. Paul, at Rouen, was, originally, a temple of Venus.¶

* Gough's *Cambden*, vol. iii. p. 10.

† *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. ch. 30.

‡ Ethelbert, and his queen Bertha, attended divine service in these churches: the latter was educated a christian, being daughter of Chilperic, king of France.

§ *Itinerarium Curiosum*, p. 63-75.

|| Part i. plates 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th.

¶ *Turner's Tour in Normandy*, page 71.

The Romans first passed into Transalpine Gaul as auxiliaries to the republic of Marseilles, and we find, that Caius Sextius, anno Urbis 629, placed a colony in the neighbourhood of the hot springs of Aix, in Provence, from whom they were denominated Aquæ Sextiæ.—*Ferguson's Roman Republic*, vol. i. See, also, *Livy*, b. lxi. of which there remains only the contents.

Having thus established the probability, at least, of the existence of a structure in accordance with the style of the porch in question, in York, during its occupation by the Romans, I now proceed to state the objections to its being a work of the Saxons.

The northern nations, who conquered England after the Romans, were chiefly composed of Saxons, Jutes, and Angles. Their very early history is still involved in obscurity, authors not being, as yet, agreed respecting their derivation. The common opinion runs, that they were descendants of the Getæ, who originally settled in Germany, sent colonies to the Bosphorus, lake Mæotis, and shores of the Euxine, possessing themselves of Thracia, Dacia, and Mæsia, and who, in after times, assuming the names of the countries they had conquered, were known as Cimmerians, Sarmates, Scythians, Thracians, Dacians, &c. in the east; and as Saxons, Sweves, Angles, &c. in the west.

The most ancient authentic information, which has reached us, places them on the southern part of Jutland, and three small adjacent islands, North-Strandt, Busen, and Heiligland, before the middle of the second century. It appears to have been a particular impulse which determined them to piracy. The emperor Probus, to weaken the barbarous enemies of Rome, had adopted the policy of removing numerous parties of them to very distant stations, and had accordingly posted on the shore of the Black Sea a large body of Franks. These, eager to return to their native country, became the Argonauts of modern times. Having possessed themselves of many ships, they ravaged the various coasts of the Mediterranean, and, sailing into the ocean, arrived in safety at the Rhine. Before this time, the piracies of the Franks and Saxons are not mentioned by imperial writers; but so frequent did they thenceforward become, that, within a few years, it was found necessary to station a powerful fleet at Boulogne, for the protection of the adjacent country. This precaution increased the evil; Carausius, the officer entrusted with the command, having first encouraged the depredations of the pirates, that he might be enriched by recaptures, and having afterwards, when apprehensive of punishment, sought support for his usurpation of the imperial purple, by communicating to the Saxons a more perfect

knowledge of naval tactics. After this, they were fostered by a succession of propitious circumstances, which gradually conducted them to the grand enterprize for which they were destined.*

After the time of Ptolemy, the Saxons are not mentioned again for a century, but, at the æra of the invasion of England, Cambden states, that they were resident in the district of Anglen, in the dutchy of Sleswick, and attributes to them the German cities, Engleheim, the birth-place of Charlemagne; Ingolstadt; Engleburgh; Englerute; and Angleria, in Italy.†

The little band which first arrived under the conduct of Hengist and Horsa, in 449, were Jutes, and three vessels were sufficient for their accommodation during the voyage. A reinforcement, under Ella, arrived, in three more vessels, in 477, Cedric followed, with five ships, in 495, and Ida, with a fleet of forty sail, in 547. Their conversion was first attempted by the monk Augustine, and his coadjutors, in 596, and completed, after the labour of nearly a century, by the submission of the South Saxons to the authority of the church, in 675. Throughout the whole progress of their history, previous to this event, we discover no indications of their ever having been a literary or scientific people. When they were first observed by the Romans, to whom the Goths were known under the name of Germans, they exhibited no symptom of refinement. The perpetual wars in which they were afterwards engaged with this people, in defence of their civil liberty, was unfavourable to the cultivation of letters; and the practice of piracy, to which they became subsequently addicted, and to which the whole nation was devoted, averted the influence of that civilization, which had made great progress in Gaul and Britain, during the decline of the Roman empire in the west, so that, at the period when they became connected with English history, they were, as yet, distinguished for nothing but their ferocity of courage and formidable activity, displaying qualities

* Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, vol. i. 4to. See also, Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 84.

† *Britannia*, Introduction.

The Saxons are not mentioned by Tacitus, but, in the time of Ptolemy, the Anglo-Saxons were recognised as a branch of the great Saxon Confederation, which extended from the Elbe to the Rhine-

the most inauspicious to the improvement of intellectual and moral character. Of their compositions in their pagan state, says Mr. Turner, we know nothing; Tacitus mentions generally of the Germans, that they had ancient songs, and therefore we may believe that the Anglo-Saxons were not without them. But none of these have survived to us. If ever they were committed to writing, it was on wood or stones; indeed the word for book (*boc*) expresses a beech tree, and seems to allude to the matter of which their earliest books were made. The poets of barbarous ages usually confide the little effusions of genius to tradition. They are seldom preserved in writing, till literature becomes a serious study; and therefore we may easily believe, that, if the Anglo-Saxons had alphabetical characters, they were much oftener used for divinations, charms, and funereal inscriptions, than for literary compositions.*

When letters appeared among the nations of the north, is a question still undecided, but, as Tacitus pronounces the alphabet to have been unknown to the Germans, “*literarum secretæ viri pariter ac feminæ ignorant,*” it is probable, their introduction was subsequent to this time. Odin is called, in the Edda, and by Snorro, *Father of Letters, King of Spells*, which favours the opinion, that he introduced the art of writing among the Goths. It is necessary, however, to state, that the learned disagree as to the æra of this celebrated personage, some supposing him to be Sigge, a Scythian prince, who flourished B. C. 70; others, that he was the progenitor of Hengist, in the fifth degree, and figured in the beginning of the fourth century.

It has been urged, in proof of the Saxons' ignorance of letters, previous to their conversion, that the oldest Runic inscriptions on stone commemorate the fortunes of soldiers who had served at Constantinople in the corps of Varangi, and that no specimen of Saxon writing, anterior to their conversion, can be produced. But as we know that, immediately after this latter event, the books written in the Runic character were destroyed, together with the old inscriptions, because these characters had been employed in magic,† the above particulars cannot be

* *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, book vii. ch. 4th.

† It was for this reason that Olphilas invented a new character, and that the Saxon character was

received in evidence on this question. The strongest and most legitimate grounds upon which this fact rests are, the silence of history respecting any literary attainments while they continued in Germany, and the absence there of monuments of art, the most incontrovertible attestations of civilization and refinement.*

Asser, in his life of Alfred, has drawn a melancholy picture of the uncultivated state of the Anglo-Saxons, even at the close of the ninth century. In those days, so much was knowledge undervalued by the great and powerful, that even kings signed with the cross because they were unable to write.† By the wise policy of this prince, most of the nobles, and many of the inferior orders, were put under masters to learn to read and write, and many of his *Earls, Gerefas, and Thegns*, who had been illiterate all their lives, were compelled, under severe penalties, to learn in their mature age, that they might be competent to the discharge of their respective duties. Such was the intellectual condition of the Anglo-Saxons in England, a century after Charlemagne had advanced literature to such a pitch in his empire, that the learned in France and Germany are classed by Muratori with those of Greece, and declared to have been much superior to those of Italy. But the succeeding anarchy had obliterated the labours of Charlemagne, and left Alfred without contemporaneous support, and the civilization of Britain was still more effectually obstructed by torrents of Norman invaders.

High authorities‡ state, that the first rays of literature were shed on the Anglo-Saxons from Ireland, from whence, also, the empire of Charlemagne had been illumined. This singular fact a modern author thus

afterwards invented in England. From the attachment of the common people to them in Sweden, they continued there until the year 1050, when the Roman characters were ordered to be substituted by the Pope. They were finally condemned in the Council of Toulon, anno 1116. The Getæ or Saxons, ascribed their invention to the gods, who were supposed to have communicated the knowledge of them to Fimbul, and Woden was considered the first who applied them to magic.

* Those stupendous remains of architecture still to be seen in some parts of this country, particularly a vast wall erected by Probus, have nothing doubtful in regard either to age or style.—See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. ii. p. 81.

† This seems to have been the original reason, but it continued to be the practice long afterwards, as a token of their conversion.

‡ Bede, Alcuin, and Adelm.

explains.* From the suppression of the western empire, in 476, or at least, from the death of Boethius, in 524, to the close of the eighth century, when Charlemagne employed his utmost efforts for the restoration of learning, a period of nearly 300 years, was an interval of violence and ignorance. In this interval, the rough process was performed, which incorporated the rude tribes of the north with the corrupted nations of the south, and prepared the materials of new combinations of policy; and such a process was inconsistent with the security necessary for the cultivation of letters. But the religion and legislation of the ancient empire contributed to preserve some sparks of learning to relumine succeeding generations. The emperors of the fourth century had encouraged a literary spirit among thier christian subjects, for the defence of their religion against their pagan opponents, and, with this view, had erected libraries for their use. The barbarian conquerors, on the other hand, in general, respected the ministers of religion amidst all the depredations, and the convents became the asylums of the literary treasures of antiquity, and the schools of the middle ages. Ireland appears to have been provided as a geographical asylum for the fugitives of religion and learning, who were driven from the continent by the violence of this disastrous time. Here they enjoyed for a long space that tranquillity which is necessary to the cultivation of letters. At length, Ireland became a scene of northern depredation, the Danes having extended their ravages to it at the end of the eighth century, just when Charlemagne had fully established his government, and the improvement of his dominions demanded that men capable of communicating instruction, should even be forced from their retreat. It was the opinion of Mezeray (*Abrege Chron.* tome i. page 508,) that the driving backwards of the Normans by the French, in the great Saxon war of Charlemagne, begun in 772, gave the impulse to their descents upon the coast of France. It seems, then, to be a reasonable conclusion, that the long series of hostility which subdued and civilized Germany, sent abroad those maritime ravages, who drove from Ireland the teachers of learning and religion to give their assistance in the improvement

* Miller's *Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History*, vol. iii.

of an empire, which has been the foundation of the modern polity of Europe. Iceland, which discharged a similar function, in awakening the literary spirit of the north, appears to have received from Ireland its earliest knowledge of religion and letters." That the Saxons in England were much assisted in their education by Irish ecclesiastics, is equally certain; the Irish monk, Maildulf, who settled at Malmsbury, was skilled in Greek and Latin; and, in the life of St. Dunstan, it is mentioned, that he read the books of some Irishmen, who had settled at Glastonbury. It is true, that mention is made of schools and libraries in England, long before the appearance of the Danes on our shores, and that Canterbury, York, and Bangor, are instanced as seats of learning, anterior to the æra of the sea-kings. But these, such as they were, owed their establishment to churchmen. The school of philosophy at Canterbury, we know from William of Malmsbury, who flourished in the reign of Stephen, was founded by Archbishop Theodosius, who died anno 690; and the Grammar School of York is first mentioned in connection with the name of its most celebrated master, Albert, who was raised to that see in the year 767. This prelate is justly praised as the founder of the library of this city, in which he deposited the books he had collected during his travels abroad.* But seminaries are reported to have existed in the British Isles more than a century before this time, and, in particular, Bede† mentions, that the monastery of Bangor was furnished with learned men before the arrival of St. Augustine. But as this was a Benedictine establishment, (as all the monasteries appear to have been in England before the conquest,) I fear this expression must be measured by the deep ignorance of that dark period, rather than by our notion of learning in the 19th century, because Benedict of Norsia, the founder of this order, was notorious for his contempt of learning, agreeably to which praiseworthy sentiment, he made no provision for education in the rule of his order, the members of which, in imitation of some

* Stow, in his *Chronicle*, page 74, reports from William of Malmsbury, that "Egbert, Archbishop of York, about the year 736, founded a library at York, *replenished with all good books.*" For a good account of the schools and literati of the Anglo-Saxons, see Dr. Lingard's *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, vol. ii.

† Lib. ii. c. ii. quoted by Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicæ*, page 265, ed. 1685.

fraternities in Egypt, were brought up to ignorance, labour, and devotion. It is not until after the time of Charlemagne, who appointed schools for the instruction of youth, both in monasteries and cathedrals, that the followers of St. Benedict are remarked for application to study, a distance of 200 years from the destruction of this monastery, and its supposed famous library, by the grandson of Ida, immediately after the decisive battle, in which he annihilated the power of the Britons, and gave to his countrymen the undisputed sovereignty of England; a victory creditable to the courage of the barbarians, had not Ethelfride steeped his laurels in the blood of 1200 supplicating monks.

At this period, nothing could be expected to emanate from Italy, which was then enveloped in thick darkness, from the miseries inflicted by the continental Goths, and by the Saracens, with whom she waged a domestic war from the year 820, when they first passed from Africa to Sicily, until the beginning of the eleventh century, when the Normans established a new dominion in their room.

So deplorable, indeed, had her condition become, that, a century after Charlemagne, it was stated, in the Synod of Rheims, that, at Rome, scarcely any person possessed so much learning as was necessary for a porter.*

Not a scrap of literature ever came from the shores of the Baltic. The sons of Woden traced the map of the country with the sword, and their martial deeds were recorded in the memories of their Scalds: the fruits of Roman civilization everywhere withered at their approach, and were washed away by the torrents of British blood shed in the battle of Caerleon.

To all this, I am aware, it may be objected, that, in the Anglo-Saxon history, mention is made of their possessing many conveniences and luxuries, which men, recently emerged from a barbarous state, could not have derived from their own invention. But this objection has been

* Miller's *Lectures*, vol. iii. In corroboration of this singular fact, I may be allowed to add, that Mr. Pegge, in his "*Anecdotes of the English Language*," p. 50, states, upon authority, that several bishops signed the acts of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, held in the 7th century, by proxy, from inability to write their names.

successfully met by Mr. Turner, who observes, that they were indebted for these to their conversion to christianity. "When the Gothic nations exchanged their idolatry for the christian faith, hierarchies arose in every converted state, which maintained a close and perpetual intercourse with Rome and with each other. From the letters of our Boniface, of Pope Gregory, and many others, we perceive, that an intercourse of personal civilities, visits, messages, and presents, was constantly taking place; whatever that was rare, curious, or valuable, which one person possessed, he communicated, and not unfrequently gave, to his acquaintance. This is very remarkable in the letters of our Boniface and his friends, of whom some were in England, some in France, some in Germany, and elsewhere. The most cordial phrases of urbanity and affection are usually followed by a present of apparel, the aromatic productions of the east, little articles of furniture and domestic comfort, books, &c. This reciprocity of liberality, and the perpetual visits, which all ranks in the state were in the habit of making to Rome, occasioned a general diffusion of the known conveniences and improved inventions which then appeared."*

To architecture, civil and military, ancient Germany seems to have had as few pretensions, as to literature. Until the time of Charlemagne, the state of society there was a state of infancy. "The ancient Saxons," says Bede,† "have no king, but many chiefs set over their people, who, when war presses, draw lots equally, and whomever the chance points out they all follow as leader, and obey, during the war. The war concluded, all the chiefs become again of equal power."

"That they had some sort of architecture," says Mr. Turner, "before they invaded Britain, cannot be doubted, for they lived in edifices, and worshipped in temples, raised by their own skill. The verb, which they commonly used, when they spoke of building, satisfactorily shows us, that their ancient erections were of wood. So appropriate was the word to building, that, even when they became accustomed to stone edifices, they still retained it. The circles of stones found in Cornwall, Oxfordshire, and Derbyshire, as well as those in Westphalia, Brunswick,

* Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, book viii. ch. 6. † *Hist. Eccles. lib. i. ch. 10.*

and Alsatia, which Keysler mentions, show rather the absence, than the knowledge, of architectural science.”* Montfaucon says, that the Scythians built the temple of their god Mars of vine branches, on the top of which they placed an iron scymitar, the image of this deity.

The temple of the idol Irminsul, which was spacious and magnificent, appears, from the expressions of Adam of Bremen, to have been of wood. The palace of Ingleheim, near Mayence, burnt about the year 813, was of wood. According to Stow,† the first castle in Flanders was built in 793, when this country became an earldom, immediately after the Saxon war of Charlemagne, with whose reign the æra of military architecture properly commences. In Germany, however, it appears, there were not any towns until long after this period, neither he nor any of his successors, before Henry the First, having encouraged them. The first erection of towns, in that country, was the work of the church. “As not only a point of honour, but also a positive canon, required, that bishops should reside in towns, the bishops laboured to form towns for their residence; these were peopled partly by their vassals, partly by freemen, who sought their protection, but principally by artizans and traders. Henry I., anno 919, surrounded with walls the principal villages in Saxony, and the neighbouring provinces. At this period, there was no trace of municipal government in Germany. In the time of Frederick I., emperor of Germany, anno 1152, buildings of stone were so rare, that a cotemporary historian, describing the violences then commonly practised, says, that every man carried steel and flint for setting fire to houses.”‡

The habits and institutions of our Saxon forefathers evidently did not lead them to delight in towns. In England we find, that the country was divided into small hamlet lordships, and that the proprietors lived on their estates. Domesday-Book shows that, at the conquest, the towns of England were small, and their population contemptible, while, at the same time, the country was remarkably populous. The Romans erected, in this country, many works in every province which they

* Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, book xii. ch. 5.

† *Chronicle*, page 72.

‡ *Miller's Lectures*, &c. vol. ii.

conquered. It is hardly possible to suppose that these were all destroyed when they quitted it. Yet, notwithstanding what of these must have presented themselves in every part of the country, we find, in the time of Alfred, that English architecture was equally rude with that on the continent. Asser* informs us, that the walls of the Saxon castles were then of earth, and incompetent for defence against the Danes, in consequence of which, this monarch ordered their fortifications to be repaired and strengthened with brick† and stone buildings, and the royal castle of Norwich is particularly stated to have been so improved by the king himself. But, in truth, although the court of this prince was the resort of learned men of all professions, as well foreigners as his own subjects, there was scarcely an individual in his kingdom who could erect a stone building. Of the elegance and comfort of his palace some notion may be formed from the fact, that hangings and lanthorns were used there from necessity, as defences against the wind, which this ill-constructed fabric admitted freely, to the annoyance of its inhabitants.

It is true, that Giannone has borne testimony to the magnificence of the public works erected at Rome and Ravenna, under the direction of Theodoric, founder of the *Gothic* monarchy in Italy, anno 508. But Muratori assures us, that what he accomplished was with Italian architects; and Maffei, an Italian antiquary, declares, that "it is not to the Goths, but to the Italians themselves, that the Gothic style of architecture is to be attributed." Theodoric is entitled to great praise, not only for what he did, but for what he spared; but it is to Charlemagne that we must ascribe the honour of having restored the splendour of Italy, a glory which he was enabled to acquire by the spoils of the Huns, who had become rich from the plunder of other countries.

Ecclesiastical architecture came to the northern nations, with christianity, from Rome. Clovis, the first christian king of France, is

* *Asserius de Vita Regis Aluredi*, ed. 1603, quoted by Wilkins, *Archæologia*, vol. xii. p. 144.

† I beg to mention here, that in a paper by the Dean of Exeter, read to the Society of Antiquaries in the year 1756, it is stated that the art of making bricks was lost from the time of the Romans until that of Richard II.; upon which authority it seems this opinion still obtains; but if the above passage from Asser be correct, this opinion must be given up, because it is not probable that all the castles were, at this period, repaired from the ruins of Roman works.

reported to have built the church of St. Genevieve, in 507, and many others, afterwards. His son, Childebert, erected, in 559, the church and abbey of St. German de Prez; and Clothaire, that of St. Medard, at Soissons, about the year 564. The churches, in Gaul, before this time, were either the ancient temples which had been consecrated to christian worship, or churches erected by the christians, before the formation of the kingdom of France, under Pharamond, who flourished seventy years before the conversion of Clovis.

The first Saxon churches in England, those of Northumberland, Durham, and Greensted, in Essex, were built of wood. "Bede," says Bentham, "informs us, that the first Saxon churches were built in king Ethelbert's reign, who was converted anno 561.* He enumerates three, one in Canterbury, one in Rochester, and the cathedral of St. Paul, London; but he has left the materials and manner of construction uncertain, and it is not until a century afterwards, with the exception of one church, built by Paulinus, soon after the conversion of Edwin, king of Northumberland, in 627, that he speaks positively to churches of stone, and then, both he and Eddius, a contemporary historian, are careful to inform us, that they were the work of foreign artizans, under the directions of the English prelates, Biscopius and Wilfrid, whose designs were according to the Roman fashion."† This style consisted of piers or round pillars, much stronger than the Tuscan, with rude capitals and bases, and semicircular arches; and some of the most perfect examples are, the White Tower of London, the chapel of St. Crosses, and of Christ Church, Oxford; and such also was the style of the old cathedral of Winchester. These two prelates may be justly considered as the founders of the Saxon architecture in England. Such was their zeal for its improvement, that they repeatedly visited Rome for this purpose, and sometimes in company. It was in Italy alone that in those days architecture could be studied, and Rome was still rich in monuments of art,—for, notwithstanding all she had suffered, there remained to her, in the latter days of paganism, a thousand temples,

* This is a mistake. Ethelbert having been baptized by Augustan, who did not arrive until 596.

† *Introduction to the History of Ely Cathedral*, sec. 5.

sixty of which were situated on the Capitoline hill.* In this extensive field there were two fabrics of peculiar interest; the temple of Peace built by Vespasian, and the basilica of St. Peter of the Vatican. The former is an example of a three-aisled edifice, vaulted with diagonal cross vaults, and was probably the prototype of our cathedrals, as none were built in the form of a cross until the 10th century,† or, at all events, until Rome had been inspected for patterns by the Saxon bishops, although I am aware that another reason is usually assigned.

The basilica of St. Peter of the Vatican, was a beautiful structure, erected by Constantine the Great about the year 324, upon the scite of the circus of Nero, and for whose accommodation the temples of Apollo and Mars were demolished. To the honour of Alaric and Totila, they respected this elegant fabrick, the whole of which formed a cross, and it continued to adorn the capital of the Christian world until the beginning of the 16th century, when, crumbling with age, it was pulled down by order of Julius II. to make way for the gigantic and magnificent structure which he began.

Not content with their personal labours, Biscop and Wilfrid hired workmen to follow them to England; and at Hexham, Rippon, and Weremouth, are still to be seen some specimens of what was then effected. The former has the credit of being the first who introduced, and from France, the art of painting and glazing.‡ The middle of the 7th century may, therefore, be considered as the æra of the Roman Saxon style, an improvement, in Britain, upon the preceding wooden structures of the Saxons, and the more ancient basilicæ of the Romans, whose flat roofs were supported without arches, by ranges of pillars only. An example of this kind of building did certainly appear a little earlier, in the church of St. Paul, London; which was restored by Bishop Melitus in the reign of Ethelbert, with *round arches*, but still retaining the semicircular presbyterium or chancel, agreeably to the mode of the

* Humphry's *Montfaucon*, vol. ii. part 1st.

† I have since learnt that the conventual church of Ramsey, in Huntingdonshire, was the first which was built in the form of a cross. It was begun A. D. 968, and finished in six years afterwards.

‡ Stow's *Chronicle*, page 74.

primitive churches. But it was the zeal of the prelates just mentioned, for the improvement of the architecture of their native land, that gave the tone to this style, which continued down to the 12th century, and was, as Bede* informs us, allowed by the Saxons themselves to be Roman. All this time, the Saxon laymen took neither interest nor share in these transactions; the bishops were the only architects, and the inferior clergy and monks, the masons. Indeed, it seems they were the only mechanics of those days, at least for the necessities of their own establishments, for it is certain that all the clergy were then taught some trade, which, by the canons, they were obliged to practise at their leisure hours. The twelve hundred monks in the monastery of ancient Bangor were all tradesmen and labourers;† St. Dunstan worked as a blacksmith, and the abbot of Weremouth occasionally held the plough.

Thus, it appears, that the Saxons did not bring with them a knowledge of architecture, and that in Britain, as well as in Germany, the first essays in this science were the work of the church. It appears, also, that the style then introduced, and continued through the remainder of the Saxon period, was purely Roman, having been first taught and practised in England by Roman masters, and that afterwards it was denominated Saxon, only because it prevailed during the dominion of this people in South Britain, and not from any peculiarity in the style itself.—Here we arrive at an intricacy, for, if what are commonly called the Roman and Saxon styles be identical, how, in the absence of dates, shall we be able to discriminate between them? In general I fear this difficulty will be found insurmountable,‡ but, in the present instance, I hope to overcome it through the aid of the intrinsic evidence, and to show satisfactorily that the porch of St. Margaret's was not the design

* *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v., and *Hist. Abb. Wiremouth et Gyrv.* p. 295; quoted by Bentham, *Hist. of Ely Cathedral*, Introd. sec. 5th.

† Bede, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. ch. 2d.

‡ It was the opinion of Sir Christopher Wren (*Parentalia*, p. 296), that the least fragment of a cornice or capital was sufficient to indicate whether it belonged to a Roman or Saxon edifice. And Mr. Wilkins (*Archæologia*, vol. xii. p. 174) has the following remark:—"Thus, it appears likewise, that the respective dates of architecture are distinguishable by peculiar characters also: since it is not only by the great contour of the building, the shape of the arch, or the proportion of the columns and piers

of any Saxon bishop. To the developement of this evidence I now proceed.

It consists of two parts or features of the costume; the first, comprehending the signs of the Zodiac, already mentioned; the second, a specific subject, carved on the arch of the porch.

In a former paper, which professed to explain the nature of the zodiacal figures delineated on the temples of Egypt and India, I offered several reasons in proof of their being, in such situations, mystic, not astronomical, symbols, and feel much satisfaction in having had this opinion confirmed by subsequent researches. This additional evidence will appear in the explication which I am about to offer on the last part of my present subject, in which the history of the signs will be briefly traced among the Romans during the decline of their power, until the subversion of the western empire, when they finally ceased to bear the mystic import, and became the exclusive property of the astronomer.

It is well known that the sun was, in ancient times, the chief and almost only deity among the pagans. Adoration seems to have been originally paid to the natural luminary,* but afterwards images were substituted, which by degrees became almost innumerable. In later times, however, there was one idol of the sun which became pre-eminent among the symbols of this luminary, and engrossed, in the decline of paganism, the universal homage of the heathen world.

This was a humanized emblem of the sun, denominated Mithras, and represented under the figure of a young man crowned with rays. His name has not yet been explained by the most patient mythologists, one believing it to be a Chaldee word signifying "rays of the sun," or a

that their dates are ascertainable, but each little fragment of a moulding, or vestige of enrichment, marks the æra of the structure, and assists the curious investigator in his researches into antiquity." Sir Christopher was a scholar, as well as, perhaps, the greatest architect England ever produced. But notwithstanding, I may with due deference be permitted to ask, how many dates of ancient churches have these gentlemen determined, and why was one left to the conjectures of posterity?

* The worship of the sun, moon, and stars, was at first performed in the open fields. Hence the ancient Greeks, who were Sabeans, gave to the void or space between the earth and firmament the name of temple, and to the objects of their adoration that of *Theo*, which originally signified the mere action of turning or running.

revolution or cycle of that body; another, that it is derived from the Greek word *mio*, to tie, because his cap is bound round his head in the shape of the Persian bonnet; while a third asserts it to be simply the Syriac term for Lord; and a fourth, that it was given to him because the sun is subject to eclipses. The figure itself, however, seems to be intended only as a personification of the eastern gender of the sun, for which the face and phallus were characteristic diminutives and common substitutes.

There is also much uncertainty as to the country which gave birth to this idol. The general opinion derives it from Persia, yet it is strange that this opinion does not stand even on a plausible foundation. That distinguished antiquary Montfaucon observes, in his "Introduction," that "the Persians adored the natural sun at first, afterwards under the figure of a young man, Mithras, which worship extended to Greece, and spread over the whole Roman empire;" but recollecting afterwards, that in the most ancient account of the religion of the Persians, delivered by Herodotus, it is stated that they had no statues, he qualifies what he had said before by intimating, that "it is supposed the worship of Mithras was introduced into that country by foreign merchants."* This latter opinion is very satisfactorily confirmed by the following observations of Mr. Bryant:—"Mithras was a Chaldaic god; adored at Heliopolis, in Egypt, where obelisks were erected to him. He was commonly represented under the character of Osiris and Orus. Stephanus speaks of Mithras as a man and joins him with Phlegyas, and informs us that these were the authors of the Ethiopic rites and worship; for they were by *birth* Ethiopians; which people were the first nation constituted in the world; and the first who enacted laws, and taught men to reverence the gods.

"There was a temple of the god, Sol, in Arcadia. This was an ancient name for Mithras, and Osiris, in the east. Hence the priests of the sun were called Soli and Solimi, in Cilicia; Selli, in Epirus; Salii, at Rome; and described by Virgil thus—

* Humphry's *Montfaucon*, vol. ii. part 2.

“ ‘*Tum Salii ad Cantus incensa altaria circum.*’ ”*

From a passage in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, we may, with probability, infer, that the state religion of Persia was pure Sabaism, even in the third century of the christian æra. In relating the sack of Antioch, by Sapor, King of Persia, in the reign of Valerian, this author mentions, that “the tide of devastation was stopped for a moment, by the resolution of the high priest of *Emesa*, who appeared in his sacerdotal robes at the head of a body of fanatic peasants, armed with slings, and defended his *god* and his property from the sacrilegious hands of the Persians.”†

Both parties were Heliolaters, but the people of Syria had long before become Helio-idolaters, or worshippers of the sun, through the medium of representative images, and consequently obnoxious to the Persians as heretics. That the idol in this temple was Mithras, is placed beyond a doubt, from its having been from Syria that his worship spread through the western empire, and from the circumstance of its symbols, appearing on the coins of Heliogabulus, who was priest of this temple before his elevation to the purple, and afterwards of that which he built on the Capitoline hill to the same god. There seems to be, therefore, no good reason for referring the origin of this modification of the worship of the sun to Persia.

Although the worship of Mithras was common in Greece and Asia, before the Roman commonwealth had reached its zenith, yet no memorial exists from which it can even be inferred, that it was publicly recognized, in Italy, before the Romans engaged in foreign wars, because, until then, there is ample evidence to prove, that they preserved a sincere attachment to the ancient national faith prescribed by the code of Numa, which inculcated the exclusive worship of the gods of their fathers, and veneration for their ancient rites and tenets. The gods of their fathers were the simple and rustic divinities of Etruria and Latium, until the three hundredth and fiftieth year of the city, when a portion

* *Anal. of Ant. Mythol.* vol. iv. p. 313, and vol. i. p. 38.

† Vol. ii. p. 438,—8vo. ed.

of the imposing and elegant mythology which had been embellished by the conceptions of Homer and hand of Phidias was added to the native stock; at which time Livy enumerates, among the principal deities of Rome, Apollo, Latona, Diana, Hercules, Mercury, and Neptune. But these, as yet, received the adorations of the Romans, in the simple capacity of independent rulers of the elements and particular powers of nature, and no others appear to have been associated with them, until a taste for the Grecian philosophy began to prevail, with the exception of Esculapius, in the consulate of Posthumus Megellus and Caius Junius Brutus, and again, anno urbis 462; and of Cybele during the second Punic war.

Ennius, is perhaps the first Roman writer who mentions the *Dii Consentes*, or twelve great gods of the Romans, which he has transmitted to us in the following distich from an old Greek poet.*

*Juno, Vesta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars,
Mercurius, Jovi, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo.*

These, as I have elsewhere shown,† are merely Latin appellations for the twelve great gods of Greece, attributes of the sun, and of which the signs of the zodiac were personifications.

The worship of the sun does not indeed appear to have been established by law in the time of Ennius, but from some prohibitory orders of the Senate, against the solar rites or Egyptian superstitions, as they are called by some authors, it seems to have been clandestinely practised even before this period. Accordingly, we find a decree of the Senate recorded in the 657th year of the city, and consulship of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus and P. Licinius Crassus, forbidding the immolation of man. Now, as human sacrifices were unknown among the Romans until the introduction of the Mithratic mysteries,‡ we have here positive

* This fragment of Ennius has been preserved by Varro *de R. R.*

† *Classical Jour.* Nos. 55-6-7. For an account of these gods, see the notes to the first vol. of *Pausanias' English Translation*, vol. iii. p. 276.

‡ Among other authorities, Photius, in his *Life of Athanasius*, mentions, that there was a Greek temple in Alexandria, in which, in ancient times, the Greeks performed sacred rites to Mithras sacrificing men, women, and children, and auguring from their own viscera. And Socrates and Sozomen

testimony to their private celebration at least, about seventy years after the death of Ennius.

Mr. Gibbon also states, upon authority, that about forty-two years afterwards, the temple of Isis and Serapis was demolished, by order of the Senate, and even by the hands of the Consul himself, and that their worshippers had before been repeatedly banished the city.*

Of the frequent attempts that had been made to introduce foreign superstitions during the better days of the republic, Livy† has furnished ample proof, in a speech which he has recorded of one of the Consuls, who harangued the people on the discovery of the sect of the Bacchanals, a discovery which filled Rome with the utmost horror. "How often," said he, "was it given in charge to the magistrates, in the ages of our fathers and grandfathers, to prohibit the performance of any foreign religious rites; to banish strolling sacrificers and soothsayers from the forum, circus, and the city; to search for and burn books of divination, and to abolish every mode of sacrificing that was not conformable to the Roman practice." As the worship of the sun prevailed at this time among the more polished nations, it is reasonable to suppose, that it was alluded to on this memorable occasion which occurred about 186 years, B. C.

That Serapis was an idol of the sun, is allowed by the most eminent mythologists. The two following inscriptions are from Montfaucon.‡

To Jupiter the Sun the great Serapis, and to the Gods that are worshipped in the same Temple.

To Jupiter the Sun the great Serapis.

In the British Museum also, in the sixth room of Antiquities, No. 95, is a small statue of Jupiter, sitting, having the erect and inverted torch,

report, that, in the reign of Julian and Theodosius, the cave of Mithras, at Alexandria, was opened, and found full of skulls of human victims. Pallas, in Porphyry, also mentions the Mithratic mysteries in connection with the abolition of human sacrifices by the Emperor Hadrian. But this abomination was a common rite in this worship from the earliest times, for the ancient Syrians "caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch," a personification of the sun.

* *Decline and Fall*, vol. i. p. 52.

† Lib. xxx. sec. 16.

‡ Vol. ii. book iii. ch. 1st, and book iv. ch. 6th, Humphrey's Translation.

intimating his two-fold capacity as king of the upper and lower regions, or the summer and winter sun.

The Ennian or Roman Jove, therefore, and the members of his council, the *Dii Consentes*, or *Dii majorum gentium*, were types of the sun and his attributes, adopted from the mythology of Greece, and familiar to the Romans, at the time this poet wrote, as he enumerates them among the deities of his countrymen.

As it will hereafter appear, that these were the *Mythritic* symbols, it follows that Plutarch, who affects to be particular as to the period and people by whom this worship was introduced into Italy, must be mistaken, when he affirms (*Life of Pompey*) that it was brought to Rome first in the time of Pompey, and by the pirates who were subdued by that illustrious commander, who flourished 120 years after Ennius.

Until their interference, in the affairs of Greece and Lower Asia, the Romans may be said to have preserved their primitive religion, and under its influence, their primitive virtue. The innovations previously attempted proceeded from the zeal of fanaticism alone, and though at times partially successful in its appeal to the credulity of the people, was yet effectually within the controul of the laws, whose salutary restraint the Senate, who, throughout the commonwealth, respected the venerable institutions of Numa, occasionally interposed to check the inundation of foreign rites.*

* That the religion of the ancient Greeks and Romans had no connection with their morality; is a misconception founded upon ignorance of their history, and as it has been publicly maintained, in a very recent work, I shall, perhaps, be excused for exposing this error here since it interferes with the view I have taken of the same subject.

In Southey's "*Book of the Church*," the author observes, vol. i. p. 11, that, "Religion had no connection with morality among the Greek and Roman heathens, and this was one main cause of their degeneracy and corruption. Religion consisted with them merely in the observance of certain rites, and the performance of sacrifices; men were left to the schools of philosophy, there to choose their system of morals, and learn a rule of life."

The above remark, he gives upon the authority of Bishop Stillingfleet; the following I give upon that of Polybius, and is so conclusive as to supersede the necessity of further quotation.

In his estimate of the Roman manners, of his own day, compared with those of other cotemporary and ancient people, he thus assigns the cause of the pre-eminent morality of the former:—

"But, among all the useful institutions which demonstrate the superior excellence of the Roman

But after the conquest of the East Rome became the head of a mighty empire, and was incessantly filled with subjects and strangers from every part of the world, who, together with foreign literature, introduced a variety of exotic superstitions to the neglect of the ancient worship. It was then that she became, in the language of her modern historian, "the common temple of her subjects, and that the freedom of the imperial city was bestowed on all the gods of mankind."

The dawn of philosophy and polite literature, at Rome, was coetaneous with the march of her armies into Syria. This was the age of Ennius, of Cato, and of Africanus the elder, who accompanied his brother, Cornelius, commander of the first expedition against the Syro-Macedonian Kings.

The *lovers of wisdom* now began to frequent the schools of Magna Grecia, and Athens, where the teachers, from motives of rivalry, as much as from a spirit of inquiry, were divided into a variety of contending sects. In each school, however, they were alike instructed to

government, the most considerable, perhaps, is the opinion which the people are taught to hold concerning the Gods; and that which other men regard as an object of disgrace, appears, in my judgment, to be the very thing by which this republic is sustained, I mean, superstition, which is impressed with all its terrors, and influences both the private actions of individuals, and the public administration of the State, in a degree that can scarcely be exceeded. To me, it appears, that this contrivance was at first adopted for the sake of the multitude. For if it were possible for a State to be composed of wise men only, there would, perhaps, be no need of any such invention. But as the people universally are fickle, filled with irregular desires, precipitate in their passions, and prone to violence; there is no way left to restrain them, but by the dread of things unseen, and by the pageantry of terrifying fiction. The ancients, therefore, acted with good reason when they inculcated the notions concerning the gods, and the belief of infernal punishments; but much more those of the present age, are to be charged with rashness and absurdity, in endeavouring to extirpate these opinions. For not to mention other effects which flow from such an institution, if, among the Greeks, for example, a single talent be entrusted to those who have the management of any public money, though they give ten written sureties, with as many seals, and twice as many witnesses, they are unable to discharge the trust reposed in them with integrity. But, the Romans, on the other hand, who, in the course of their magistracies, and in embassies, disburse the greatest sums, are prevailed on by the single obligation of an oath, to discharge their duty with strict honesty. And, as in other States, a man is rarely found, whose hands are pure from public robbery; so among the Romans it is no less rare to discover one tainted with this crime." The historian goes on to show the true cause of the degeneracy of morals in great states, from which he predicted, with singular accuracy, the future fate of Rome.—See his *General History*, book vi. conclusion.—Hampton's *Trans.*

reject and condemn the religion of the multitude, to smile at the pious ceremonies of their fathers, and to assert the independent dignity of reason. Men so educated were not disposed to wrangle about new modes of faith or worship, and though they were constrained to yield obedience to the laws by public acts of devotion, yet they approached the most sacred fanes with inward contempt, and even the Pontifex Maximus often ridiculed in private both the objects and system of which he was guardian. With the diffusion of Grecian literature, these atheistical opinions spread among the patricians; and the legions, who had intimately mixed with idolaters of a different cast, completed the downfall of the indigenious superstitions of Italy, by the propagation of the rites of the Syrian Mithras among the commonalty. On the death of Cæsar, the temple of Serapis was restored at the public expense, and under Augustus, his worship had become fashionable at court, as appears from the coins of the British Prince, Cunobeline, who resided in Rome during part of this Emperor's reign, on which, among other Roman devices, may be seen the symbols of this deity.*

But, although this worship was recognized in the wane of the republic, and in the first days of monarchy, and the protection of the law had been yielded to its votaries, by a corrupt and humbled senate, in obedience to the wishes of a prejudiced emperor and clamorous body of citizens, yet there is a circumstance recorded by Tacitus, which shows that it did not generally prevail even so late as the sixty-ninth year of the christian æra, and that the western provinces had not then become infected, since it seems to have been still unknown to the legions who garrisoned Gaul, the banks of the Rhine, and Britain.

In detailing the events of the civil war, which succeeded the death of Otho, this author relates, that on the morning of the engagement, which led to the capture of Cremona, by the army which had declared for Vespasian, "the third legion, according to the custom observed in Syria, paid their adoration to the rising sun." "This eastern form of worship," he continues, "either by chance, or by the contrivance of

* Many of these are engraved in the works of Pegge and Stukely. Fifty are said to have reached our times.

Antonius, gave rise to a sudden report, that Mucianus had arrived, and that the two confederate armies exchanged mutual salutations.”*—Licinius Mucianus and Antonius had each embraced the cause of Vespasian against Vitellius. The former was then at the head of the forces of the east, and governor of Syria, and the latter commanded the troops, who had revolted from Vitellius, in Germany and Gaul. The third legion had, not long before, been removed from the east, as we read of its serving under Mark Anthony against the Parthians (who are described, by Herodian, lib. iv. ch. 15. in the act of worshipping the sun), and under Corbulo against the Armenians. As this legion, therefore, knew what they were about, it was impossible to impose on them, but upon the rest of the army who had not been in Syria; and the attempt of Antonius to gain advantage from this circumstance, or its spontaneous effect in his favour, produced by an erroneous conception of the posture of homage, argues complete ignorance of its import in all the witnesses. Indeed, it does not appear to have become very common, until the civil wars which followed the death of Nero, the last of the line of Cæsar, when the legions were frequently intermixed; the exigencies of the competitors for the purple often bringing suddenly into collision the forces stationed in opposite quarters of the empire.

But afterwards, the Mithratic symbols are very common on the coins of the lower empire, particularly on those of Pertinax, Septimius Severus, Heliogabulus, and Constantine the Great. In the third century, this superstition had become general, and the following forms of dedication accordingly very common.

“*Deo Soli Invicto Mithræ.*”—“*Soli Invicto Comiti.*”

In imitation of the Massagetæ, who sacrificed a horse to Mithras, Gallienus, on his return from the east, represented Apollo as a centaur, holding his lyre in his right hand, and a globe in his left, with the inscription, “*Apollini Comiti.*”

Probus, represented him as a charioteer, crowned with sun-beams, the title, “*Soli Invicto.*”

* *Hist.* lib. iii. sec. 24—25.

Constantine, Aurelian, and Crispus, represent him as a naked man, crowned with rays, having a globe in one hand and a whip in the other ; the title, "*Soli Invicto Comiti.*"

At Rome, two altars were found, dedicated to Mithras, by Marcus Aurelius Euprepes, the freedman of the emperor, to whom the god had appeared in a dream.

On the first was inscribed—

*" Numini Invicto Soli Mithræ. M. Aurelius August. Lib. Euprepes
una cum Filiis piis. D. D."*

On the second—

*" M. Aurelius Aug. Lib. Euprepes Soli Invicto Mithræ Aram ex Visu
posuit."*

At Nismes, the following was discovered :—

*" Deo Invicto Mithræ L. Calphurnius Piso Cn. Paulinus Volusius.
D. S. D."*

It thus appears clearly enough, that it was the Mithratic modification of the worship of the sun which prevailed among the Romans ; and as Mithras was but another name for the chief deity of Phœnicia, Egypt, and Greece, it will explain how he came to be frequently represented by the same symbols which were common in the worship of Bel, Osiris, and Apollo.

The prevalence of these rites, through the Roman dominions, during the decline of their empire, appears to be chiefly attributable to the extensive intercourse which arose between Rome and the eastern provinces, after the deposition, by Pompey, of Antiochus *Asiaticus*, the last of the Syro-Macedonian kings, and to the intimate association and family connections formed by the soldiers, officers of state, and some of the emperors, with the inhabitants of Syria, the hot-bed of this superstition.

Septimius Severus, married Julia, daughter of Bassianus, high priest of the sun, at Emesa, who was mother of the emperor Caracalla. Julia

Mæsa, her sister, was married to Julius Avitus, a man of consular rank, by whom she had two daughters, who were the mothers of Heliogabulus and Alex. Severus. Both these were educated in Phœnicia, Mæsa, having, on the death of her son, retired from the angry presence of Macrinus, his successor to her native city Emesa, taking with her her two daughters, then widows, and her two grandsons. By her interest, the son of her daughter Soæmis, was promoted, while a boy, to the office of his grandfather, the duties of which he afterwards continued to discharge, at Rome, where his impiety and folly led him to assume the title of *Elagabal*, or *puissant god*.

Aurelian, too, who filled the throne in the middle of the third century, and who built a magnificent temple to the sun, on the Quirinal hill, in which he placed the images of this luminary which he had plundered from that of Palmyra, was the son of an inferior priestess of Mithras.

Again, Antioch, which, under the Seleucidæ, had risen to such a pitch of wealth, populousness, and refinement, as to yield with reluctance to the majesty of Rome itself, was the permanent residence of the Roman governors, occasionally of the emperors who headed the eastern expeditions, and the head quarters of at least four legions, while, at the same time, it was the grand focus of the Mithratic institutions. The ancient city of Emesa, in whose suburbs one legion was usually quartered, was in its neighbourhood, and Carrhæ, of Mesopotamia, at no great distance; the former celebrated for its splendid temple of the sun, the latter for that of the moon, which was here worshipped under the title of *Deus Lunus*.

It was in the common course of moral agency then, that a worship, which had become the family religion of the prince, and the favourite superstition of the soldiery, at a period when they were the most powerful and intolerant, and whose prominent feature was licentiousness, should recommend itself to a people among whom philosophy and luxury had already undermined every principle of virtue, and by them be gradually diffused through their most distant colonies.*

* In order to show more explicitly, that Mithras was the god adored in Syria, I shall add the

I now come to offer a few proofs of the signs of the Zodiac being symbols of Mithras, and as such, objects of adoration, originally, among the Romans.

In the twenty-first plate of Humphrey's *Montfaucon*, there is a representation of the rape of Proserpine, accompanied by the signs, in separate compartments, and ranged in a straight line. In the thirty second plate, there is a figure of the sun, surrounded with the signs in a manner which forbids the idea of its having any allusion to astronomy. The ninety-sixth plate contains the representation of a broken statue, found at Arles, in 1698, having four coils of a serpent round the body, with three of the signs between each convolution. In the British Museum, in the sixth room of antiquities, No. 65, is a bas-relief representing the goddess Luna, surrounded by the signs. The deity appears seated in an arched niche, on the face of which the signs are sculptured.

following observations, from Mr. Bryant's *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, which, at the same time, prove the identity of this deity with Isis, Cybele, and Ceres, and thus account for the commixture of rites and symbols in the worship of these divinities.

"Asia, *i. e.* land of fire, was a name given originally to Phrygia and part of Lydia only, from the rites of fire established there.

"One of the most ancient cities of Syria, Adesa, called by the Greeks, Edessa, was so named for a similar reason. The sun was here worshipped under the name of Azizus. Both Ceres and Proserpine were called Azazia, and by the Ionians, Azesia. Azaz, and Azizus, is the same as Asis and Isis, made feminine by the Egyptians.

"The Mithyr, of Egypt, was the same with the Da Mater or Demeter of the Greeks, the mother of the gods.

"In the coins of Syria, we find Cybele, with a tower upon her head, sitting on a rock. In her right hand, she holds some ears of corn; near her is the mystic hive and an altar, and over her head is a bird; below her feet is water, in which a person seems ready to sink. There is a coin to this purpose of the empress Julia Severa, which was struck at Antioch, on the Orontes. The same story occurs on the coins of Julia Mæsa, at Edessa, of Severus, at Charræ; of Gordian, at Singara; of Barbia Orbiana, at Side; of Philip, at Nisilus; of Alex. Severus, at Rhesain. The history was undoubtedly taken from the religion of the Syrians and Mesopotamians."—*Vol. i. p. 38; vol. iii. p. 184—245.*

These observations are decisive of Mithras, whose symbols appear unequivocally on the coins of the lower empire, being the masculine type of the sun worshipped at Edessa, and, consequently, that he is of Phœnician descent, and one of the ancient gods of Canaan. After this, it is easy to trace his identity with every other ancient emblem of this luminary.

This monument is, perhaps, not more than two feet in height, but in excellent preservation.*

The temple of Diana, according to Montfaucon, was sometimes ornamented with the signs.

In a paper, by the Reverend John Hodgson, published in the *Archæologia Æliana*, vol. i. part ii. an account is given of a very singular and unequivocal Mithratic monument, which was discovered at the celebrated station of House-Steads, the ancient Borcovicus, thirty miles west of Newcastle upon Tyne. It consists of the figure of the Persian Mithras encircled with the signs. The stone, Mr. Hodgson observes, when perfect, has been four feet high and two feet six inches broad. The upper part has been thinned away. It is at present in several pieces, Libra and Cancer are wanting. I have, myself, seen this monument, and although it is now in a very mutilated state, enough still remains to show that the signs were once complete in number. It is a circumstance worthy of remark, as tending to confirm the nature of this remain, that it was discovered in an artificial cave dedicated to Mithras, because it was a peculiar feature in this modification of the worship of the sun, that its rites were celebrated in caverns, both in Persia, Egypt, and the west.

Montfaucon† reports from Luctatius, the interpreter of Statius, that the Persians were the first who introduced the custom of worshipping the sun in caves. St. Jerome, in his epistle to Læta, mentions the den of Mithras, with its monstrous figures. In Egypt, Belzoni found the signs delineated in some of the ancient tombs; and it was mentioned above, that there was a cave of Mithras at Alexandria.

An intelligent writer, who resided long in India, has the following observation:—"The ancient oracle and place of worship, at Delphos, was a cave, which was called Delphi, an obsolete Greek word, synonymous with *yoni*, in Sanskreet; for it is the opinion of devout Hindus,

* I inquired, at the proper quarter, where this interesting monument was found, but was sorry to learn that this important particular was not known.

† Humphrey's *Montfaucon*, vol. i. part ii.

that caves are symbols of the sacred *yonis*." "This opinion prevailed also in the west; for perforations and clefts in stones and rocks were called *cunni Diaboli*, by the first christians, who always bestowed the appellation of devils on the heathen deities."*

Yoni, it must be noticed, signifies *pudendum muliebris*, and constitutes the second sign or mansion of the lunar zodiac of the Hindus, among whom the worship of Mithras was very common.

These examples are sufficient to show, that, among the Romans, as among other people, especially the Greeks, the zodiacal figures were objects of idolatrous worship, being symbols of the attributes of the sun, the division of whose natural course into twelve parts suggested the partition of his essence into a corresponding number of attributes or qualities, which by the vulgar were esteemed distinct deities. In Greece, however, we find an acknowledgment of the unity of these, in the title *Menotyranus*, which intimates that he was lord of the months as well as of the years.

I have now to mention some of the principal Mithratic monuments which have been discovered in Britain, together with the places where they have been found, in order to show the prevalence of the worship of the sun in this country, during the period of its occupation by the Romans.

Besides the monuments, already mentioned, found at House-Steads, there were two altars discovered there at the same time; and by the same gentleman; one is described as being three feet seven inches high, the other a foot higher, both bearing inscriptions showing their having been dedicated to the sun and Mithras; the former during the joint consulship of Vibius Trebonianus Gallus and his son, C. Vibius Valutianus, A.D. 253.

In Westmorland one, and in Cumberland four, Roman altars were found, inscribed to the god *Belatucadro*, whom Dr. Ward, upon the authority of Selden and Vossius, has shown was the same with Bel, Apollo, or the Sun.† Mr. Cambden mentions that a tablet was

* Wilford on the Sacred Isles of the West—*Asiatic Researches*, vol. vi.

† *Archaeologia*, vol. i. page 309.

found in Trinity church yard, York, on which there was a representation, in bas-relief, of Mithras stabbing the bull. An engraving of this tablet is given in the 62d plate of his *Britannia*. Several similar engravings are also to be found in Montfaucon's *Antiquities*, on some of which two or three of the signs may be recognized, such as the lion, serpent, and scorpion, accompanied with the upright and inverted torch.—Mithras riding on the bull was an emblem of the meridian sun; hence bulls were sacrificed to him, and he is sometimes represented as performing this sacrifice himself, by stabbing the bull in the fore part of the thorax with a short Roman sword. The absurdity of a deity offering sacrifice to himself is characteristic of the Roman people; for, among other instances, Tacitus records that of Sejanus, the freedman of Tiberius, who offered incense to himself after his deification.

In Scotland, at Westerwood Fort, on the wall of Antoninus, Mr. Gordon found a *phallus*, carved in relievo, and in good preservation. Very interesting and curious monuments of this idolatry were also discovered, by Gordon and Pennant, in the north-east of Scotland, chiefly at Baluthern, four miles north of Dundee; at Aberlemni; Forress, in Murray; Aberdeen; Mar; Glamis; and Meiggle, in Angus-shire. They are represented and described by the former author in his *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, and by the latter in his *Tour in Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 167.

But the plates of Gordon appear the most carefully executed, as well as his description the most minute. His representations are exhibited on the plates numbered 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, and 63 of his work published in 1726.

These monuments are large monolithite obelisks, having several of the signs mixed with other devices, rudely carved, on one side, and a large figure of the true cross, as it is termed, on the other. The most remarkable are, 1st. Sweno's stone at Forress, in Murray, which is 23 feet high, and 5 broad, and exhibits several human, and other animal figures, on one side, and the cross, on a large scale, on the other. 2nd. The Maiden Stone, in the county of Mar, twelve miles from Aberdeen: on one side of this stone are carved the figures of a fish, serpent, camel, eagle, and three horsemen; on the reverse, the cross, highly ornamented,

and surmounted by two wild boars. 3rd. King Malcome's stone, at Glamis, on which is represented, a serpent, fish, lion, centaur, two men with battle axes, &c. The cross occurs here on both sides. On the stones at Meiggle similar figures are represented. On No. 6, plates 59 and 60, of Gordon, the caduceus of Mercury is observable. No. 3, plate 60, is the representation of a stone at Glamis remarkable for exhibiting the figure of an elephant in its natural state, unaccoutered. All these are carved in that style which has been remarked as peculiar to the Roman soldiery. Mr. Gordon also informs us, that at Inverkerthing, in Fifeshire, there is a stone 10 feet high, on which several hieroglyphics are carved in low-relief; and that there is another obelisk at Campbelltown, in Argyleshire, which is supposed to have been brought from Icolmkill.

The conjectures respecting the people who raised these stones are almost as various as the antiquaries by whom they have been examined. The terrors impressed by the Danes transferred to that people in the traditions of posterity many a camp and castle, as well as obelisk, erected by the Romans, and seem to have obliterated the remembrance of earlier invaders. Hence it has happened, that some antiquaries have vainly endeavoured to reconcile the appearance of these monuments with events which belong to a later period in the history of Scotland, declaring it to be their opinion, that they were raised in memory of victories obtained over the sea-kings. But no victory was gained over them in Murray; on the contrary, in the reign of Malcome, the Danes, in a great battle, defeated the Scots there: Gordon supposes that Sueno's stone was set up to commemorate the battle of Murtloch, gained over the Danish generals Olavus and Enecus, sent into Scotland by Sueno. But these are the very generals who defeated the Scots in the reign of Malcome.*

Bishop Nicholson, in his *Scots Historical Library*, page 64, concludes, that they are remains of the later incursions of the Danes and other

* It must be allowed that the tradition which connects these stones with events which happened in the time of the Malcomes, is, at first sight, plausible; for, after their successes in Murray, the Danes are said, by some respectable historians, to have been defeated by Malcome II. at Murthlack, in Angus; and Malcome IV. was surnamed the *Maiden*, from having persevered in a life of celibacy.

Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 101.

northern nations; while Hector Boethius, with a bolder imagination, pronounces them Egyptian hieroglyphics, from which country he derives the Scots themselves.* Gordon, apparently ready to take a hint from any quarter, joins issue with Boethius; and, forgetful of his opinion of Sueno's stone, says, page 164, "But taking it for granted that the Scots never came from Egypt, yet this hieroglyphical way of representing facts is uncontrovertedly like the Egyptian fashion, and was without doubt invented to transmit most memorable actions to posterity." To this opinion Pennant also assents, so that, in regard to the number of advocates, it may be considered as hitherto preponderating. This conjecture, as no reason is offered by any of the party in its support, is, by *chance*, a happy one; for these symbols were common in Egypt during the Roman government of that country, together with the hieroglyphical mode of writing, as has been shown by two distinguished modern writers. The signs which may be distinctly made out on the above obelisks are, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Gemini, and Pisces. The other figures, unequivocally Roman, are, the caduceus of Mercury, and the elephant, the image of this animal having been given by Julius Cæsar to the fifth legion, for their standard, as a reward for their having voluntarily combated the elephants, in number thirty, in the army of L. Scipio, at that time the confederate of Juba.

Those, that are presumptively so, are, the wild boar, the horsemen and captives, and cynocephali, which appear on figure 2d, plate 55, because the two former have been found on monuments undoubtedly Roman, as in those represented at Nos. 5 and 6, in Stukeley's plate prefixed to his account of a Roman temple near Graham's Dike, published in 1720; and the latter are familiar objects in the mythology of Egypt, whence they were derived by the Romans.

The appearance of war chariots, too, among these figures, is strong evidence that these stones were erected long before the invasion of the

* In Hollinshed's translation the following are the words of Boethius:—"The Scots, at first, used the rules and manners of the Egyptians from whence they came, and in all their private affairs they did not write with common letters as other nations did, but rather with cyphers and figures of creatures made in the manner of letters, as their epitaphs on tombs and sepulchres remaining among us do hitherto declare."

Danes, as such were not used after the wars of the natives with the forces of Italy.

There are some who imagine, that by possibility these obelisks, or the devices on them, may have been derived from the Phœnicians, or Greeks, who are said to have made early settlements in Britain. But to this it may be replied, that whatever settlements were made by those people, they were confined to the southern shores of the island, being solely for the purposes of traffic, and not with a view to territorial aggrandizement; so that, such a supposition must be treated as a mere flight of imagination. That they were not the work of the Caledonians or natives, is clear, from an expression in Mr. Smith's *Gaelic Antiquities*, where, at page 16, it is said, "in the Gaelic language there is no hint of Roman gods." As, therefore, they were not derived from earlier visitors, nor raised by natives; and as they would form an anomaly in the history of succeeding invaders, it is to the Romans, that common sense as well as sound criticism will refer them, to a people among whom they were familiar, as objects of worship and common design, whose gods were the constant companions of their eagle, and whose common practice was the commemoration of their services in the provinces, by impressions of their national characters.

But let us examine this question more particularly, as it is one of importance and novelty.

Agricola fought his great battle with Galgacus about the year 85 of our æra, in which it would seem, from Horsley,* that all the legions were present, and the general opinion places the scene of this action towards the eastern extremity of the Grampian hills, in whose vicinity many of the stones in question were situated. The impression made at this time, on the Caledonians, was improved by this able general, who immediately formed stations to keep the natives in check, by which means this part of Scotland was preserved to the Romans for a considerable time afterwards. But, upon this expedition, I do not mean to found any conclusion, because, the above learned antiquary asserts, that "we have few inscriptions so ancient as the time of Hadrian,

* *Britannia Romana*, p. 84.

and none now extant in Britain that are undoubtedly older.”* Although, therefore, these monuments cannot be considered as belonging to the class alluded to by Horsley, yet I think it better to draw the proof of my position from later events, both because they are more authentic, and more fertile in materials for the argument. In the reign of Antoninus Pius, Lollius Urbicus commanded the forces in Britain. This active and enterprising officer, is supposed to have penetrated even farther than Agricola himself, into Scotland. He reduced the eastern and north-eastern shore, scaled the hills of Athol and Badenoch, behind which he had driven the natives, and was about to gain the glory of the complete conquest of Britain, when the Caledonians rallying under Creones, attacked and repulsed him. Afterwards, uniting wisdom to valour, they managed to press the Romans with such effect, as, within the space of 30 years, to force them behind the rampart of Antoninus, which this general erected to defend the more southern possessions of Rome; abandoning all to the northward of that boundary, which was denominated the province of *Vespasiana*.

Horsley† and Gordon‡ are of opinion, that the Romans had no settled stations beyond the River Tay, and that the *Vallum Barbaricum*, as it is sometimes termed, or the rampart which stretched across the isthmus, between the Forth and Clyde, was, by that people, considered the limit northward. But, besides the above positive testimony, that they occupied the province of *Vespasiana*, at least the eastern half of it, for upwards of thirty years, Mr. Whitaker, who, on more than one occasion, has displayed greater depth of research than either of these gentlemen, informs us, that the British nations beyond the rampart of Antoninus were sixteen in number, of which six were reduced by the Romans, and ten remained unconquered.|| And from the Itinerary of Richard Corinensis, which forms the appendix to his *History of Manchester*, the following appear to have been the principal stations, in Scotland:—Falkirk; Peebles; Dunbarton; Stirling; Kinkel, upon Erne; Perth; Dunkeld; Brumchester, on Tay Frith; Brechin; Eshlie, on North Esk; Aberdeen; Fyvie; Nairn; Inverness; and

* *Britannia Romana*, p. 81.

† *Britannia Romana*, p. 65.

‡ *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, p. 187.

|| *Hist. of the Antiquities of Manchester*, vol. ii. p. 201.

Brumchester, near Blair. Now, as to three of these stations the *Jus Latii* was extended; namely, to Inverness, Perth, and Dunbarton (all within the province of *Vespasiana*), it appears they were towns of considerable importance, municipal, and within the pale of Roman judicature, consequently, integral portions of the empire, and, therefore, as permanent as the Roman government, in that quarter of the island. This proves, that the Romans not only had military stations, but that they were domiciliated for some time beyond the Tay. But this is going, perhaps, farther than necessary, for all that is requisite, is, merely to establish the probability, that they were in that district under such circumstances as would produce sepulchral monuments. Now, we know, that after the province of *Vespasiana* was formally abandoned, that of *Valentia* was retained for upwards of seventy years afterwards, until *Septimius Severus* fixed the limit of the empire, in Britain, by his famous wall, which extended from the River Tyne to the Solway Frith; and, that along the whole line of the *Vallum Barbaricum*, or wall of *Antoninus*, the Roman population was very dense, from the number of considerable towns which were situated in the line of country which it occupied, such as, Falkirk, Dunblane, Stirling, Paisley, Dunbarton, Glasgow, &c. Thus established on the confines of *Caledonia*, it is not too much to suppose that frequent occasions would offer, either for the gratification of cupidity, or the exercise of vengeance, on the hostile tribes of the north; and, it is certain, that in such excursions, the intrepidity of their opponents would give ample occasion for the erection of monumental pillars. But, further, sixty years after the time of *Septimius Severus*, a war of considerable duration was prosecuted against the Scots and Picts, by *Constantius Chlorus*, and after his death, by his son *Constantine*, who was twice in Britain. The impression made, at this time, may be gathered from *Speed*, who says, "they subdued the Britons, that were more remote, and inhabitants of those islands, that witness the setting sun."* At a still later period, the Romans again established themselves on the borders of *Caledonia*, for, in the reign of *Theodosius I.* the province of *Valentia* was reconquered, apparently by

* *History of England*, p. 259,—from *Eusebius' Life of Constantine*.

Stilicho, who then commanded the forces of the west, and whose victories over the Scots and Picts are celebrated by Claudian, though without specifying the year.

But, as the transactions of this general, in Scotland, have not been minutely detailed, I forbear to examine the reasonableness of the supposition, which would derive these monuments from them, because, in my own opinion, the probability of their Roman origin is sufficiently accounted for, by the knowledge of the previous integration, with the empire, of the country in which they were found; although, as it could be done without prolixity, I deemed it but justice to the subject, to adduce every circumstance in which a probability might be supposed to reside.

The nature of these monuments seems to be placed beyond all doubt, by some later discoveries, mentioned by Mr. Gordon, in his work, page 87, "On digging up," he states, "a small tumulus, near the castle of Glamis, in Strathmore, an urn was lately discovered, with great quantities of Roman medals of silver; one, a silver coin of Galba. At the Silver Burn, near Aberdeen, many more Roman medals were found, several of which I saw in the hands of some gentlemen there. Further north, in the country of the Boyne, several Roman coins were dug up, twenty-seven of which were then in the possession of the earl of Findlater. Four of these were medals of Antoninus Pius, one of Faustina, one of Otho, in silver, the rest of different emperors." He further informs us, that the medals and coins, found north of the Tay, were all procured from sepulchral monuments, and that no vestiges of Roman encampments, no altars with inscriptions, or military instruments, are to be found beyond this river. Here, it is to be observed, that none of the coins specified are of later date than the reign of Antoninus, and, therefore, none which can be referred to a period subsequent to the abandonment of Vespasiana. It is remarkable, too, as Mr. Pennant observes, that such stones are not only unknown in Ireland, but limited to the eastern side of north Britain. Thus, then, if we commence at Theodosia or Dunbarton, not far from which is Campbellton, where one of these stones is stated to have stood, and proceed along the wall

of Antoninus to its eastern extremity, we come to Inverkeithing,* on the north side of the Queen's Ferry, where another of these stones was found; next, turning northwards through Fifeshire, we arrive at Victoria, or Perth, on the banks of the Tay, twenty miles west of Dundee, and about half that distance of Meiggle, Glamis, and Coupar in Angusshire, where more were discovered; then, continuing northwards from Dundee, or, in a north-easterly direction from Perth, we arrive at Aberdeen, in whose neighbourhood the rest are placed. If from hence we still proceed northwards, we come to Ptoroton, or Inverness; from whence, drawing a straight line, almost directly southwards, through Brumchester, or Blair, to Victoria, we shall have described pretty nearly the boundary of the Roman possessions in *Vespasiana*, within which, both the obelisks and other sepulchral memorials, mentioned by Mr. Gordon, were discovered; a coincidence equally remarkable and satisfactory.

But here I must anticipate an objection, which those who follow the opinion of Mr. Horsley will urge, who denies that the 5th legion was in Britain; because, if this opinion holds, it will deprive my argument of all the weight which depends on the image of the elephant being a Roman emblem. This opinion was adopted and maintained by this distinguished antiquary upon the ground that he could not discover any memorial to substantiate the fact; contending that, during the second, third, and fourth centuries, the 2d, 6th, and 20th legions *only* were in Britain.† Mr. Gordon, however, who preceded him by several years in this walk of literature, had, in his *Itinerary*, page 56, presented the world with an engraving of a stone which he found at Grot-Hill-Fort, near the town of Crow-hill, upon the wall of Antoninus, inscribed thus > [LEGV] <. "From the letters," he says, "two angular borders appear on each side of the stone so close and plain that it leaves no room

* Stukeley makes Abercorn the eastern termination, but it is supposed to have extended to the Queen's Ferry, although it cannot now be traced so far, the east end having been long imperfect from the removal of the material into new buildings, chiefly during the times when the Scottish kings occasionally held their court at Linlithgo, and Calender Castle.

† Camden says that these were all that were in Britain during the reign of Severus.—*Gough's Camden*, p. 44.

to doubt of its being read *Legio Quinta* ; nor is there any space whatsoever for another letter to have been put in." Against this Horsley enters a strong protest, alleging that it ought to be read *Legio Victrix*.* But among the three legions which he himself allows to have been then in Britain, and to have continued until the last, there was another so entitled, namely, the 20th, or *Valens Victrix*. According to his own account, also, both these legions were employed in building this wall ; † therefore, his reading would reduce this stone to the condition of an equivocal monument ; and if so, it is, so far as I know, at least, the only equivocal monument in our island. There are some unintelligible from the nature of the subject which they commemorate ; others from the defacings of time ; but none perfect, I believe, of ambiguous import. Besides, it appears, that in regard to the amount of the military force of the Romans in Britain, the author of the *Britannia Romana* was not very well informed ; and, therefore, to remove so much of the objection as depends on his limitation of the number of legions, I shall have recourse to the exposition of Mr. Whitaker, who places this particular in a very luminous point of view. " It is supposed," he observes, " by Mr. Horsley, that the Roman garrisons in Britain during the second, third, and fourth centuries, amounted to only three legions, the 6th Victorious, 20th Valerian, and 2nd Augustan, and their auxiliaries.— And with this supposition the *History* of Dio, Ptolemy's *Geography*, and Antonine's *Itinerary* seem all to concur ; as they all mention these to be resident in the island. This number, as appears from the complement of a single legion during the very same ages, which was 6100 foot, and 726 horse ; and from the stated proportion of the auxiliary to the legionary troops, which was equal in the infantry and double in the cavalry, must have contained about 36,000 foot, and 6500 horse. Such would be the greatest amount of them, even if every corps had its just complement of men. And we can have little doubt but among a nation which was so numerous, and in a country only in part subdued, the legions and their auxiliaries were constantly supplied with fresh recruits, and maintained in their full force. But, even this considered, three are

* *Britannia Romana*, page 86.

† *Ibidem*, p. 77.

insufficient for the purpose of garrisoning the island. And the long list, which the two Itineraries give us of the stations in Britain, shows them to be so. That presents us with 140 or 150 fortresses, even after the Romans had retired to the wall of Antoninus, and abandoned the stations that extended from the friths to Inverness. Those were all of them designed to be, and were actually, garrisoned by the Romans; as otherwise they would not have been constructed at first, nor recited in the Itineraries afterwards. And I have shown each of them to have been attended with various castellets, which would require garrisons nearly equal to the complement of the principal station. But it would be evidently ridiculous to distribute a body of 43,000 men into 140 principal forts; as such a scheme would allot only about 307 for a station and its subordinate chesters. The garrison of every station in the Itinerary, with its appendages, except five or six that were merely constructed *ad Fines*, could not have been less than 400 effective men. A greater number would have been requisite for most, and a smaller could not be sufficient for any. And even in this disposition, the total amount of troops requisite for 140 garrisons would be 56,000 men. This is apparently the smallest number that we can suppose resided in the kingdom. But a much greater was resident in it; as, during the dispersion of the rest, some more considerable bodies would be kept together, the more effectually to overawe the conquered Britons within the walls, and the unconquered without. And such actually appear together; one large corps being quartered at York, another at Chester, and a third at Caerleon, in Monmouthshire. This being the case, there were necessarily more than three legions in the island. The positive testimony of Josephus assures us, that there were four during the reign of Vespasian. And the accounts of Richard, and the discovered inscriptions of the Romans, prove that there were more afterwards. Several bricks have been discovered at Caer-Rhun, on the ancient Conovium, in Wales, which clearly exhibited the name of the 10th legion. And the fact is very particularly authenticated, having the united attestation of the Rev. Mr. Brickdale, and Dr. Gale, each (as far as appears) unknown to the other, and both concurring in the same testimony. Hence the 10th legion

appears to have been quartered among the Ordovices, and at the station of Conovium. And it remained there a long time; because the name of a neighbouring hill, Mynyah Caer-Lheion, or the mountain of the city of the legion, shows the town to have obtained the same name among the neighbouring Britons that Deva, the seat of the 6th legion for three centuries, acquired on one side, and Isca Silurum, the residence of the 2d for as long a period, still retains on the other. To this we may add the 7th or Claudian, which was settled at Gloucester in the reign of Claudius, and from the length of whose residence the town was denominated Legio Claudia. Thus have we found five legions resident for a long time in Britain, two additional to the number supposed by Mr. Horsley, and seemingly fixed by Ptolemy, Dio, and Antoninus. But the legionary lists in these authors are very defective. That of Dio, which is the fullest, mentions only thirty-one in the whole; that of Antoninus only twenty-six; and Ptolemy's only seventeen. And as the two last of them appear particularly defective upon a collation merely with the first, so is this expressly declared to be the list of such legions only as consisted of Roman citizens. The many that were composed of volunteers from the subject nations, and which were very distinct from the bodies of auxiliaries supplied by the national authority of each, as the 5th of the Gauls, the 10th of the Batavians, and the twelve others that are recited in the following catalogue."—(See vol. i. p. 261.)—
“All of these are professedly omitted by Dio. The authentic records of inscriptions demonstrate the number of both to have been fifty or sixty at least. And the suggestions of common sense, still more authentic than they, evince the necessity of as many (independently of the national auxiliaries) to secure the extended dominions of the Roman empire. The express number of the legions appears indeed, from Dio, to have been only twenty-three or twenty-five from the reign of Augustus to that of Alexander Severus; and from inscriptions, I think, never to have exceeded thirty-six afterwards. And this has been generally supposed by our antiquaries, to be absolutely the whole of the Roman legions. But as several of these were bodies of foreign volunteers, so each of the others, except, perhaps, the 8th, 11th, 14th, and 30th had

several extraordinary brigades of citizens or foreigners belonging to them; every one of which had equally the complement and denomination of a legion, and were distinguished from each other and the original brigade by some additional title. And this was sometimes derived from the name of the emperor under whom they had been originally raised, or by whom they had been particularly favoured, but was generally assumed from the kingdoms of their first or longest residence. Hence in Dio's catalogue of purely Roman legions, we find so many of them distinguished by the denominations of Gallic, Cyrenean, Scythian, Egyptian, Macedonian, &c. And the 10th Twin legion, being long stationed in Germany, and the 2d Augustan, being longer settled in Britain, appear under the particular denomination of the 10th Germanic and the 2d Britannic legions, in Ptolemy and the Notitia. But the original and additional battalions can seldom be distinguished from each other by their names. And yet they may by the catalogue of Dio. Thus the 7th legion had the several brigades which were called the 7th Claudian, and the 7th Galban legions, both consisting of Romans, and, therefore, specified by Dio; and the 7th Twin, 7th Twin Claudian, and 7th Twin Antonian, all three composed of foreigners, and therefore omitted by him. And the 10th had the 10th Fretan, and 10th Twin, two enumerated battalions of Romans; and the 10th Antonian Augustan, and the 10th Batavian, two unnoticed ones of foreigners. The 10th legion is mentioned by Dio, and placed by him in Judea; and Josephus had previously fixed it at Jerusalem. And the brigade intended by both appears, from the Notitia, to have been equally denominated the 10th Fretan. It was settled in Judea by Titus; and there it continued to the period of the Notitia. But the legion which was stationed in Wales, and which appears, from the above mentioned inscription, to have been certainly a battalion of the 10th, appears pretty clearly, from a coin which was discovered in that country, and inscribed with the following name, to have been the 10th Antonian Augustan.

“ And many of the legionary brigades were denominated *Gemellæ*, or Twins; because they were compounded of two, and had a double complement of men. Such was one of the 10th, of the 13th, and

14th. And such, as appears above, were three of the five in the 7th. One of these, the Twin Claudian legion, was that which was stationed at Gloucester. The troops, then, which the Romans maintained in the island, were five legions, one of them being double, and all having their attendant auxiliaries; or about 73,000 foot, and 13,000 horse. And the head-quarters of another, the 20th, were in all probability fixed at Chester, by order of Agricola, at the termination of his war, as it certainly resided there within seventy years afterwards.

“We have also the positive authority of Malmsbury, perhaps the vehicle of tradition, but probably the copier of history, that one or more of the Julian legions, those commanded by Julius Agricola, were actually settled at Chester; and the better and more express attestation of Richard, that Chester was constructed by the soldiers of the 20th.”*

This statement is clear and precise, and consistent with the nature and extent of the Roman government in Britain, and a strong contrast to the superficial manner in which this important question has been disposed of by the author of the *Britannia Romana*. It is true, we gather from it no direct proof of the 5th legion's being in Britain, but it contains the certainty that the military establishment of Britain comprised two more than this author chooses to allow, and the probability that in the course of three centuries others may have belonged to it, whose records may still be undiscovered, or have perished in the lapse of time.

But, besides the latitude in regard to the amount of the forces in Britain, we know from history that sudden emergencies often produced a rapid and indiscriminate shifting of the legions, a memorable instance of which happened in that eventful period which succeeded the death of Nero. In the civil war between Vitellius and Vespasian, the former was reinforced with the flower of the British army, and he had sent also into Spain and Gaul for succours. The 5th and 15th legions, which were disposed in the wings of the army, were supported by the vexillaries of three British legions, apparently of the 9th, 2nd, and 20th, which formed the centre, as their numbers correspond to three of the four brought over by Claudius. Pannonia and Mæsia were drained of their contingent

* *History of the Antiquities of Manchester*, vol. i. ch. 6, sec. 4.

of troops, and Mucianus was hastening from the East to the same scene of action. This political tempest agitated the whole empire, and so disturbed what may be considered the quarter-master-general's arrangements, at least, for the western provinces, as to render it impossible for historians to have taken distinct notice of the particular changes which then occurred.* Other succeeding commotions, no doubt, were, to a certain extent, followed by similar results, so that it appears bold to presume, that no part of a legion, which was indisputably quartered in the neighbouring provinces of Germany, ever served in Britain, especially since we know, that it was not uncommon for the legions to have detachments in different provinces; for example, the 10th had three; the 12th, five; and the 22d, six cohorts, in Gaul and Germany.†

The following discovery, however, in conjunction with the above reasons, I conceive to be completely decisive of this question. About the year 1793, a Roman urn was discovered, in a barrow, 196 feet in circumference, near Hopton, in Derbyshire. On the stone which covered this urn was inscribed, "*Gellius Præfectus Cohortis Tertix Legionis Quintæ Britannicæ.*"‡

This shows that this legion was not only in Britain, but distinguished, as a British legion, by the title Britannica.

It ought not, at the same time, to be forgotten, that the legions did occasionally carve the insignia of their standards on the works which they erected. In Mr. Carter's *Ancient Architecture of England*, part first, plate fourth, is exhibited a representation of the standard of the 2d Augustan legion, consisting of a pegasus and sea-goat, which were taken out of the Roman wall, near Newcastle. And number 3, in the plate prefixed to Stukeley's *Description of a Roman Temple*, is another representation of the same standard, found in Scotland. It is

* This is eminently exemplified, in M. Crevier's *History of the Roman Emperors*, who, in relating the same events, upon other authorities, states, that there was only one legion drawn from Britain upon this occasion; and that the 5th and 15th, had, at the same time, been removed from Mæsia and Pannonia to assist at the siege of Jerusalem.

† *History of the Antiquities of Manchester*, vol. i. ch. 8, sec. 1st.

‡ *Archæologia*, vol. xii. plate 2d.

not likely, that a national custom would be exemplified in the practice of one legion only.

To those, who, notwithstanding what has been said, may still be disposed to imagine, that the image of the elephant, on one of the stones, at Glamis, has some connection with the *order* of the elephant, of Denmark, I would beg leave to observe, that in 1464 Christian I. established a monastic society with the badge of an elephant, which appears to have suggested to Frederick II. the idea of founding such an order of knighthood, which he gave away for the first time, in 1580. As the earliest of these dates is subsequent to the latest invasion or descent of the Danes on Scotland, it destroys the last presumption in favour of the Danish origin of this emblem.†

But it must be confessed, that a difficulty, apparently a formidable one, still opposes itself to the conclusion, that these obelisks are Roman. I allude to the seemingly anomalous conjunction of christian and pagan symbols, presented by the appearance of the cross on these monuments. In explanation, it will be necessary to advert, in the first place, to the authentic æra of the introduction of christianity into this country.

Some rest satisfied, that this most important blessing flowed immediately from the compassion or policy of Gregory the Great,* who, in the year 596, appointed the monk Augustine, with Paulinus and Melitus, as his principal associates, to this charitable mission. But, we are assured, that the first consequence of their arrival was, a dispute with the members of the British church, respecting the prerogative of the bishop of Rome. This sagacious and wily pontiff perceived the growing importance of Britain, and was unwilling to delay the opportunity of establishing within it his temporal authority, by proclaiming and arguing his divine right of supremacy over the christian world. At all times the first step in this scheme of ambition was, to effect the recognition of the supreme authority of the see of Rome in ecclesiastical government. But, startled at this new and presumptuous doctrine, the

* Mr. Ledwich, in his "*Antiquities of Ireland*," p. 78, says, that bishop Lawrence, in Bede, mentions, that he and Austin were sent by Gregory, as if the gospel had never been heard before in Britain.

† The standard of Hungar and Hubba was a *raven*.

British prelates deputed to confer with the monks, warmly remonstrated, and opposed with firmness, such arrogant pretensions. Failing in argument, the archmissionary paid court to the Saxon king, Ethelbert, who accepted baptism and became a pious catholic, walking daily arm in arm with his spouse Bertha, to the church of St. Martin, to listen to the sermons of St. Augustine on the tenets of the Roman church. The Britons, obnoxious on more accounts than one, were gradually put to the sword, until their civil and religious liberty was finally extinguished.*

It is evident, then, that these were not the first christians who came to Britain, and that Augustine was the apostle, not of the British but of the Saxon nation, whose conversion may very properly be dated from this event.

In a former part of this paper, it was stated, upon authority, that this island was partitioned into dioceses so early as the year 314, or eight years after the accession of Constantine the Great, when christianity was established by law throughout the Roman empire. Its introduction into Britain must, therefore, date higher than this period.

Bede says (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. ch. 4.), that the British king, Lucius, was baptized about A. D. 164.

Usher agrees to this, while others reject this passage of the Saxon historian as spurious, upon the flimsy pretext, that the history of the church in times immediately succeeding, is very obscure.

In escaping from this hard passage, Rapin, in his *History of England*,† remarks, that from the supposed conversion of Lucius, to the Dioclesian persecution, or, during eighty years, the ecclesiastical history of Britain is entirely unknown, although, in that persecution, it furnished many martyrs. Mr. Bentham also, in the introduction to his *History*

* Bede, lib. ii. ch. 2, reports, that Augustine threatened the British clergy with extermination, by the Saxon sword, for their resolution of non-conformity. Mr. Ledwich cites, in the above mentioned work, p. 94, authorities for the fact, that Ethelbert, at the instigation of the same monk, put to death the seven bishops who first resisted his claims. And Spotswood, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, fol. p. 12. ascribes to his religious enmity the slaughter of the twelve hundred monks of Bangor.

† Book i.

of *Ely Cathedral*,* observes, as it were by the way, that “little is found in history concerning the state of the British church, in the times immediately succeeding, possibly the records of those times might be destroyed in the Dioclesian persecution; for nothing material occurs concerning the christians in Britain, till the beginning of the fourth century, the last year of that emperor’s reign, when we find they had their share in it.” Their share seems to have been considerable, since a thousand suffered martyrdom, in Litchfield alone. So much, says Speed,† did this town then suffer, that it still bears for its arms, a field, charged with many martyrs.

From this sad account, we learn, that christianity had made considerable progress, in Britain, before the time of Constantine the Great, as this persecution commenced ten years before Dioclesian resigned. For the growth and extension of christianity, in this dark period, we perceive an adequate cause in the long peace of a hundred years enjoyed by the church, from the persecution of Domitian, in the year 92, to the edict of Severus, in the year 204; neither Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Verus, nor M. Aurelius, having publicly noticed the christians, or made their religion a matter either of conscience or state policy. In many places, it is true, they sometimes suffered during this period, from civil commotions, the violence of provincial governors, and even from their own imprudence; but, throughout, there was no *edict* for persecution, and, upon the whole, it was a period of comparative rest to the church, in which much seed was brought to maturity.

From this we are better prepared to receive the testimony of Fordun (*Scotichron*, lib. iii.) and of Hector Boethius (lib. vi. p. 89),‡ who report the introduction of christianity into Scotland in the reign of Severus, upon an application of King Donald to Pope Victor, for missionaries to preach the gospel to his subjects; nor, against such authority, do I think it reasonable to treat this particular of Scottish history as a fable, merely because Bede, St. Jerome, and Marianus Scotus are silent on the subject, unless their testimony be essentially necessary to the whole history of

* Page 3.

† Page 255.

‡ Quoted by Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicæ*, ch. ii. p. 52.

the Scottish church anterior to the times in which they respectively flourished. Marianus, however, happens to mention the mission of Palladius, the first bishop of Scotland, who, according to the *Ulster Annals*, arrived there in the year 431, or two centuries after the reign of Donald; therefore Cardinal Baronius* chose, for the honour of his church no doubt, to laugh at Fordun and Boethius, and pronounce Palladius the first who promulgated christianity in North Britain. Unfortunately, however, for this dignitary and his followers, it is an indisputable fact, that many christians retired from England, during the Dioclesian persecution, into Scotland, where they would not fail to make known the faith they so highly valued, and where, it is certain, they did establish a system of church government similar to that which prevailed in South Britain, an ample detail of which may be seen in the history of the Culdees, members of the primitive church of Scotland.

Since, then, there is no positive proof to oppose to the statement of Fordun and Boethius, their declaration must hold good against a negative argument, more especially as they are authors of respectability, particularly the latter, who was principal of the college of Aberdeen in the reign of James V., and of whose learning and integrity both Buchanan and Erasmus speak in the highest terms, notwithstanding the aspersions of some English writers. The fair inference, therefore, from the fact related by the above historians, and which they profess to have collected from ancient annals, is, that if Donald solicited assistance from the bishop of Rome for the propagation of christianity in his dominions in the beginning of the third century, he must previously have heard of it, have listened to its preachers, and been convinced of the truth of its doctrine, and, therefore, that it must have reached Scotland in the 2d century, and if so, that it was originally introduced by the Roman soldiers, who were the only foreigners known to the Scots for the first five centuries after the christian æra.

This, however, implies a very early planting of christianity in South Britain, from whence the Roman garrisons in Scotland were always furnished with troops.

* See Spotswood's *Church History of Scotland*.

That it was known here in, or near, the times of the apostles, Usher, Stowe, Speed, and Stillingfleet have shown from several authorities.—The latter, in particular, quotes Eusebius and Theodoret to this effect,* and states, upon the authority of Gildas, the father of British history, who flourished nearly two centuries before the Saxon historian, Bede, that this event happened after the triumph of Claudius Cæsar over the Britons, and before the middle of Nero's reign, *i. e.* between A.D. 44 and 61, during which Britain was reduced to a Roman province, and a communication opened between the two countries. Now, as Gildas acknowledges that, from the scarcity of domestic monuments, he was compelled to have recourse to foreign writers for information on this subject, the fact of this early introduction rests, fortunately, upon the testimony of unprejudiced and impartial men, and therefore the more entitled to credit. Rejecting then, the legendary tales of the preaching of Joseph of Arimathea, of Simon Zelotes, and of St. Paul, in Britain, yet whence arises this unanimity of opinion among the ancient historians of England and Scotland, and some of the ancient fathers of the church, as to the general fact, unless from a concurrence of more remote history and tradition; a basis perhaps as solid as any upon which we build our belief of the general subjects of ancient history. It would thus seem that the introduction of christianity into Britain is to be referred to Roman emigrants who fled from the persecution of Nero, and its prevalence during the first centuries, to its adoption and propagation by the Roman colonists and soldiers, throughout the whole line of their conquests northward in the island. Some have wasted much time in attempting to determine the year and the individual who first conveyed it hither; but it is hopeless to glean such particulars from the scanty records which have survived the several persecutions of ancient British literature. The edict of Dioclesian was as hostile to the works as to the religion of the Christians, and many records of those early times were buried in the ruins of the British churches; Ethelfrid burnt the library of the monastery of Bangor in which there must have been some interesting memorials of the transactions of the ancient Britons; and Edward I.

* *Origines Britannicæ*, ch. i. p. 36—7.

destroyed the monuments of the Scottish nation.* From the time of Bede to the conquest, a space of three hundred and thirty years, there was not an historian in the kingdom; and much of what had been gathered by the clergy in the middle ages, perished at the dissolution of religious houses in the sixteenth century, so that it is now vain to hope to obtain a knowledge of the precise time or mode of its introduction. What of this sort has been raked up and exhibited by some modern authors has been disproved as monkish fables unworthy of attention or remark, and the unimportance of the question itself is likely to screen it from further discussion, at least in the present day. Assuming, therefore, in the mean time, the reign of Nero as the æra of the introduction of christianity into Britain, we shall have, from thence to the reign of Antoninus Pius, a space of eighty-eight years, in which it was making progress among all classes of Roman subjects, and, therefore, a high degree of probability that it obtained in the army of Lollius Urbicus, his lieutenant. Thenceforward it seems to have spread, with more or less interruption among both the Romanized Britons and natives, until,

* Spotswood thus enumerates the more prominent consequences of the invasion of the English monarch:—"He carried the principal nobility captive; abolished the ancient laws; imposed the English ecclesiastical rites; destroyed the ancient monuments, both Roman and native; burned the public registers, and the famous library of Restennoth; and carried off the marble chair, the palladium of the national independence."—*History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 50. From the perverse zeal of the Romish clergy, too, before the establishment of the Saxon schools, it appears that the early history of Britain suffered as severe a loss as from the barbarous fury of heathen and christian tyrants. On this subject I quote the following passage from Ledwich's *Antiquities of Ireland*, page 353:—

"'From the time of St. Augustine,' says Rous, (*Hist. Reg. Ang.* p. 68, 72—3), 'the Bishops of Rome interdicted schools and teaching in England, on account of the heresies constantly springing up there, and this continued to the time of Alfred.' Gregory I. discouraged profane the more to advance sacred learning, and with this intent burnt the Palatine library and works of Livy. Gregory followed Arnobius, whose work against gentile superstition clearly inculcated the corruption of christianity by heathen writers. The learned Bruker, in his *Critical History of Philosophy*, against Bayle and Barbaryrac, shows Gregory's conduct to be highly probable, if not certain. These facts are recorded by zealous Romanists. Hence the liberal and ingenious were necessarily driven to Ireland to acquire the rudiments of knowledge, as papal injunctions had no force there. And hence the superiority of the British and Irish clergy in all their disputes with their antagonists about baptism, Easter, &c.; a superiority which so severely galled the Romish party that Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, even against the spirit of his religion and the order of his superiors, was forced to set up schools and promote the study of letters."

under Constantine, it became the established religion of the country.— Thus, it appears, that the figure of the cross cannot be considered an objection to the Roman origin of these obelisks, if the objection be grounded solely on the supposition that the Roman soldiers were exclusively heathens when the Roman armies were in Scotland.*

But, further, this apparent incongruity is explained by the practice of some of the earliest professors of christianity, especially those known under the generic term of Gnostics, a class of heretics, who profanely mixed the doctrines of the gospel with the tenets of the oriental philosophy and religion. This pseudo-christianity was conspicuous in the schools of Alexandria and Greece, where the true religion seems, for the most part, to have been received from motives which would have admitted, with equal readiness, any new pagan superstition, and where its pure doctrines were submitted to the test of philosophical conceits; the leaders of this sect being theoretical, not practical, christians, adopting many of the rites and doctrines of christianity without surrendering those of the heathen worship. The Gnostics arose mostly in the second century; their success was rapid and extensive; they covered Asia and Egypt, established themselves in Rome, and spread over France and Spain. At this period they were the most wealthy and distinguished of the christian name; but, after an existence of about two centuries, they were suppressed by the superior ascendant of the reigning power.†

They sprung from the sect of the new Platonists, who, neglecting the whole compass of moral, natural, and mathematical science, attempted to explain the secrets of the invisible world, imagined that they possessed the power of disengaging the soul from the body, claimed a familiar intercourse with spirits and dæmons; and, by a very singular revolution, converted the study of philosophy into that of magic.‡ Among the Gnostics, the Basilidians are stigmatized by the early fathers as pre-eminent for the blasphemous worship of Christ and idols, and

* Tertullian assures us, that in the time of Septimius Severus the christians “filled the armies, senate, and cities of the empire.” Many of Alexander Severus’ household officers, too, professed the true faith; and in the time of Maximian, the Theban legion was entirely composed of christians.— From the death of Antoninus to the accession of Sep. Severus, there was a space of only 33 years.

† Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 286.

‡ Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 165.

some of their talismans are curiously illustrative of the justness of the charge. On some old seals, Harpocrates and Serapis are represented on one side, with the invocation, *Conserve me*, on the reverse. Others have a lion's head, near which are the figures of the sun and moon, and several birds, who were supposed to be the angels who presided over these luminaries and the planets. The same deity is seen, also, seated on an ass, with the title, *strong and invincible*, which they applied to Jehova. Upon this subject, Montfaucon speaks plainly.* “It is certain,” he observes, “that the pseudo-christians worshipped the sun, under the two names of Abraxas and Mithras, and that they believed Jesus to be the same with the physical sun. The letters, composing the word, Abraxas, according to the supputation of the Greeks, make the number 365. They are placed as follows, ABRAXAS, and reckon severally, 1, 2, 100, 1, 60, 1, 200. The word, MITHRAS, contains only 360, but if read, MEITHRAS, 365.” To the same purpose he also quotes Hadrian's letter to Servianus the consul, in which is this remarkable expression,—“The worshippers of Serapis are christians, and some of the sectaries of that deity, call themselves bishops of Jesus Christ.” But the simultaneous worship of Christ and idols, and the practice of magical rites, were not confined to the polite philosophers of the east, they were alike common to all barbarian converts. Procopius† complains, that the Franks, after their conversion, continued to observe many rites of their former superstition. Bede‡ mentions, that some of the Saxons had, after the manner of the Samaritans of old, in the same temple, an altar dedicated to Christ, and another to idols. From Buchanan, we learn, that the same was the case in Scotland; and from St. Audeon's *Life of St. Eloi*, bishop of Noyon,§ we become acquainted with the fact, that, even so late as the seventh century, the ancient heathen deities were commonly worshipped in France.

Among some, even of the Jewish proselytes, there prevailed, in the first century, a community of worship. The first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem were all circumcised jews; and the congregation over which

* Humphrey's Translation, vol. ii. part ii.

‡ *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. ch. 15.

† *Gothic.* lib. ii. ch. 25.

§ Cited by Mr. Ledwich, *Antiq. of Ireland.*

they presided, united the law of Moses with the doctrine of Christ. Are we to wonder, then, that the Roman soldiers, who were every day witnesses of such a practice, not among the rude and unlettered provincials only, but even in the very centre of philosophical refinement and of christianity, in the Syrian cities of Damascus, Berea, and Antioch, and in those of Asia, mentioned by St. John as the primitive seats of the faith, should follow an example, unfortunately, so general and so highly recommended? That they did so, there is positive evidence in the instance of Alexander Severus, who placed in his domestic chapel, the statues of Abraham, of Orpheus, of Apollonius, and of Christ.* Thus, the union of these symbols, though awfully incompatible, was yet conformable to the practice of many of the first *professors* of christianity, a practice which arose from their impiously considering divine revelation as a species of natural religion, and thence inferring a connection between the author of our holy faith and the gross object of their base idolatry.

In the second place, this anomaly is explained by some upon the supposition, that the figure of the cross was added afterwards, in times posterior to the universal acceptance by the Scottish nation of the christian faith. In those days there was no covered temple, and the converts assembled stately at such places as possessed some remarkable object well known to the inhabitants of certain districts of the country; for, as yet, it was not divided into parishes or dioceses, Malcolm III. being the first who set limits to the jurisdiction of the bishops, who, together with the inferior clergy, were hitherto itinerant preachers. The remarkable objects, which fixed the place of congregation, were, the circle of stones, old fort, tower, or obelisk, whose purity was renewed, and whose future sanctity was confirmed by consecration with the sign or badge of the new faith.

Thus, in no point of view is there to be discovered a solid objection to the Roman origin of these curious and singular remains.

Having thus mentioned some of the principal Mithratic monuments, which have been found in our island, I have next to show the

* Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 450.

correspondence between the places where they were discovered and the stations of the sixth legion in its progress through Britain, *from the east*, until its final settlement at York.

From a passage in *Tacitus*,* part of which was given above, it appears, that this legion was in Syria, in the reign of Nero. How long before it may not be material to enquire. The consecutive part of the passage is to the following effect:—"Commutations, about the same time, broke out in Dacia; and, since the legions were withdrawn from Mœsia, there remained no force to hold the people in subjection. They had the policy, however, to watch, in silence, the first movements of civil discord among the Romans. Seeing, at length, that Italy was in a blaze, they seized their opportunity, and stormed the winter quarters of the cohorts and cavalry. Having made themselves masters of both banks of the Danube, they were preparing to raze to the ground the camp of the legions, when Mucianus, apprised of the victory at Cremona, sent the *sixth legion* to check the invasions of the enemy. The good fortune, that had often favoured the Roman arms, brought Mucianus, with the forces of the *east*, to quell the insurrection," &c.

As the sixth legion was despatched on the spur of the moment, and before other forces could be collected, it would seem to have been at head-quarters or in the immediate neighbourhood, in Syria, where the third had learnt the worship of the sun, and not farther to the eastward, or in Judea under Titus, to whom his father Vespasian had just committed the conduct of the siege of Jerusalem. Upon the termination of the civil war between Vitellius and Vespasian, the legions, who had fought at Cremona, were dispersed by Mucianus into several provinces, and it seems he was in the more haste to do this, from the attachment of several to Antonius Primus and Varus, his rivals in the emperor's favour. Accordingly, the seventh was sent into winter quarters, in Italy; the third was sent back to Syria; and the rebellion of Civilis (a German), who was at that time endeavouring to erect the provinces of Gaul and Germany into an independent kingdom, was made a pretext for marching the *sixth*, and *eighth*, into Germany. We hear no more

* *Hist. lib. iii. sec. 16.*

of the sixth legion until its arrival in Britain, under the command of Hadrian, about the year 121. Their first service in this country appears to have been in Scotland and the north of England, particularly in the erection of the walls and other works.

“The legions,” says Horsley, “which continued long in Britain, were jointly employed in carrying on the works in this island, they jointly built the wall in Scotland, and those in the north of England. The legions and legionary cohorts seem to have been the only soldiers, who were employed usually in erecting forts and fences, and among all the inscriptions found upon the Roman wall in Scotland, there is but one, at most, that mentions any auxiliary cohort as having a hand in the work. Several inscriptions, in Northumberland and Cumberland, show the *sixth* legion to have been at *Stanwicks, Cambeck-Fort, Burdoswald, Little Chesters, and House-Steads*. In the former part of Antoninus’ reign they were in Scotland, and had their share in building the wall there. After their return from Scotland, and about the middle of Antoninus’ reign, they were settled at York; for Ptolemy places them there, where, it would seem, they continued to the last, as its head-quarters, from whence some cohorts were occasionally sent out.”* Gordon presents us with additional testimony to the fact of their having worked upon the wall of Antoninus in the following inscription, which was dug out of this wall, and presented to the University of Glasgow in the year 1695.†

“*Imperatori Cæsari Tito Ælio Hadriano Antonino Augusto, Patri Patriæ Vexillatio - Sextæ Victricis perfecit Opus Valli per Passus Quatuor Mille Centum Quadraginta Unum.*”

The same author informs us, that there are many inscriptions to Hadrian in the north of Scotland, and that some stones with inscriptions have been found, showing that the *sixth* legion lay near *Craw-Hill Town*, upon this wall.

In Stukeley’s account of a Roman temple, mentioned above, there are two inscriptions, which show, that this legion made, at one time,

* *Britannia Romana*, p. 77—79.

† *Itinerar. Septentrionale*, p. 62.

four miles, a hundred and forty-one paces, of this wall; at another, three miles, six hundred and sixty-six paces, additional. It is proper to observe also, that it was in the line of this wall that the Roman temple, mentioned and described by this author, and commonly called Arthur's Oven, stood, which, from the description, appears to have resembled so closely the old circular temple of Vesta, mentioned by Plutarch in his life of Numa, and the ancient round temple of the sun in Thrace, noticed by Macrobius (*Saturn*, i. 18), in the centre of whose dome there was an aperture to admit the light, that there seems scarcely room to doubt of its having been a chapel dedicated to the worship of the same divinity. We have the authority of Mr. Horsley, also, for the fact, that this legion worked likewise upon the wall of Severus.*

Upon the whole of these facts I have to observe, in the first place, that the progress of the sixth legion has been distinctly traced from Syria, northward, through Spain and Germany to Britain; and in Britain, through the several stations in which the above mentioned Mithratic monuments were found; first, to the wall of Antoninus, where Arthur's Oven stood, and where Gordon found the phallic symbol; then, along the wall of Severus which crosses Northumberland and Cumberland, where the several monuments described in the *Archaeologia Aeliana*, and the altars dedicated to the god Belatucadro were discovered; and, lastly, to York, where the Taurine Tablet was dug up, and where also stood a temple of Bellona,† a personification of the sun, according to

* *Britannia Romana*, p. 79.

† Bellōna is the Latin appellation for Enyo of the Greeks, the sister or wife of Mars. Hence she was esteemed by the Romans, originally, as the goddess of war. It appears they had adopted her very early, while they yet retained the worship of the ancient divinities of the country, for, in the speech of Decius Mus, when he devoted himself to the gods for the safety of his country, during a battle with the Latins in the year 337 B.C., she is called upon by name, together with Janus, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, the Lares, and the gods *Novensiles* and *Indigites* (Livy, viii. 9.). The same author mentions an appeal to her as Bellona the *Victorious*, in a battle fought about the year 296 B. C. (lib. x. 19.). During the commonwealth, while the simplicity of ancient worship continued, it seems she was known and adored as the arbitress of battles only, since we find the worship of Cybele, who is the same divinity, introduced from Pessinus in Phrygia, by order of the Sibylline books, 120 years after the earliest of the above dates.

That Cybele and Bellona are the same deity, and types of the sun, might be easily proved from a comparison of their rites, symbols, and character of their priests, but the trouble and space which this

Mr. Bryant, who derives the name from Bel and On, two eastern terms for this luminary. Considering the distance of time, this must be esteemed a very extraordinary agreement between history and monumental records.

Secondly, from Gordon's information that many stones, with inscriptions to Hadrian, were found in the north of Scotland, it would seem, (as this emperor was especially commemorated in Britain by the sixth legion,) that this legion was in Vespasiana, probably occupying, in part, the chain of stations mentioned by Whitaker as extending from the Friths to Inverness; certainly, in the army of Lollius Urbicus, during his war with the Caledonians, and, therefore, in all probability, had a share in raising the obelisks found in that province.

Thirdly, as we find that this legion assisted in building the stone wall of Severus, in the beginning of the 3rd century, we must allow that it composed part of the army which this emperor conducted against the Scots and Picts; and as his campaigns in the north occupied the three or four last years of his life, it follows that it was not *permanently* settled

would occupy, are saved by the following passage from the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, where the moon is introduced as addressing the metamorphosed author thus:—"Behold, Lucius, moved with thy supplications, I am present; I, who am Nature, the parent of all things, queen of the elements, first progenitor of ages, the highest of divinities, queen of departed spirits, first of celestials, and the uniform appearance of gods and goddesses, who rule, by my nod, the luminous heights of the heavens, the salubrious breezes of the sea, and the silences of the infernal regions, and whose divinity, in itself but one, is venerated by all the earth, according to a multiform shape, various rites, and different appellations. Hence the primitive Phrygians call me Pessinuntica, the mother of the gods; the native Athenians, Cecropian Minerva; the floating Cyprians, Paphian Venus; the Cretans, Dictynnian Diana; the three-tongued Sicilians, Stygian Proserpine; and the inhabitants of Eleusis, the ancient goddess Ceres. Some, again, have invoked me as Juno, others as Hecate, others as BELLONA, and others as Rhamnusia; and those who are enlightened by the rays of the rising sun, the Ethiopians, Arrians, and Egyptians, powerful in ancient learning, who reverence my divinity with ceremonies perfectly proper, call me by a true appellation, Queen Isis."

Nothing can be more satisfactory of the identity of Isis, Cybele, and Bellona, and, as the same deity was of both genders, of these with Mithras or the Sun. At a time, then, when the worship of the sun prevailed universally among the Romans, when all distinction of deity had merged in this one gross object of idolatry, the temple of Bellona, at York, in the time of Severus, must have been a temple in honour of this deity, the Lord of Day. And as the porch of St. Margaret's has been proved to have belonged to one of this description, there exists the greatest degree of probability, especially from the representation of this emperor, which it still bears, as will be mentioned hereafter, that it is actually part of that very temple.—How much does this discovery enhance its interest and our respect!

at York till about fifty years after the time assigned by the author of the *Britannia Romana*. Hence we obtain a period, that will admit of its domestication in the neighbourhood of the walls, and consequently account, satisfactorily, for the construction of those durable places of worship, and sacred monuments, which have from time to time been discovered in their vicinity.

In conclusion of this part of the intrinsic evidence, I have only to mention, that a few instances occur, both in this country and on the continent, where a single sign, or small groups of two or three, are to be seen scattered among the ornaments of some churches, baptismal fonts, and sepulchral monuments, of the Saxon and middle ages. Iffley church, near Oxford, and that of Montevilliers, in Normandy, where the pillars are ornamented with clusters of Sagittaries, are the most striking examples at present within my recollection in regard to the signs. But other Roman devices, or grotesques, as they are now termed, are to be met with on the friezes of the north and south parts of Adderbury church, Oxfordshire, and on the undercroft of the French church at Canterbury, supposed by some to have been part of a Roman temple sacred to Isis. They have also been noticed on the frieze of the pulpit of the church of St. Laurence, without the walls of Rome; and on the door-way in the west front of Kenilworth church, near Coventry. Most of these are, unquestionably, immemorial fabrics, erected, at least in part, either by Roman heathens, or by the earliest Saxon christians, who imitated for the sole purpose of decoration, the mythological figures of their predecessors. That this was the case is evident from the capricious disposal of some of the signs, singly, or in small groups, among the other sculptures, and from the singular fact that on no church, *originally* christian, is the whole number of the signs to be seen, either in consecutive order, or dispersed among the mouldings; of which any one may easily satisfy himself, by an inspection of such churches themselves, or the engravings of them in architectural works.

This partial use, and whimsical arrangement, are obvious in every existing instance; and prove that embellishment alone was the point in view, and that their astronomical and mythological import was as little

apprehended by the Saxon prelates, as by the Scots and Picts. Before their days their countrymen on the continent had subverted the Western empire, and with it the ancient religious institutions of Italy, which were slowly expiring before the light of the gospel. In Britain, the same salutary service was performed about the same time, and the remains of an impure and cruel idolatry, the peculiar disgrace of mankind from the flood to the time when the Goths emerged from their native forests to vindicate the honour of God and of human nature, were eradicated for ever in the savage work of extermination.

Those, who shudder at the accounts of the blood which they shed, and the desolation they occasioned, ought to reflect on the high purpose to which they were destined, that, like the Hebrews of old, they were the avengers of nations defiled with blood and wallowing in pollution, practising the identical abominations for which the aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan were “spued out” by the land itself—agents in the hand of divine Providence, to root out, within the sphere of their action, a moral poison, which had contaminated the whole earth, and thus to prepare the way more effectually for the establishment of a pure system of religion and morals, and of constitutions of civil polity more consistent with the dignity of man.

It was then that the worship of the sun was extinguished throughout the greater part of Europe and eastern coast of Africa, all memorial of it being swept away in the flood of northern invasion. What escaped the Goths, Vandals, and Saxons, was met by the Northmen or Danes, who continued the work of destruction, until the final triumph of christianity in the west by their own acknowledgment of its influence.

In the mean time, another people were appointed to fulfil the same purpose in the east, and the Saracens, with an impetuosity surpassing that of the Goths, and with an enthusiasm which they did not feel, dissolved the ancient systems that still lingered among the nations composing the eastern empire, which, together with Arabia, Persia, and the greater part of Hindoostan, they thoroughly cleansed from the mire of this most offensive superstition.

The original import of the signs, as objects of idolatrous worship,

perished in this general dissolution of the civil and religious systems of antiquity. On the revival of learning in Europe, they were again introduced to notice, as marks or *signs* of the several divisions of the zodiac; to which purpose, agreeably to the creed of the times, they had very appropriately been applied by the Greek astronomers, from whose works they were copied both by Arabian and European writers on this science, and who, ignorant of their genuine signification, simply followed them in this inoffensive application of these figures. It does not appear, that any of the Greek authors alluded to has explained whence they derived these figures, or hinted at their mystic character; since it is still a matter of much difficulty to trace their derivation, even with the assistance of elaborate treatises on ancient mythology, owing chiefly to the endless transformations to which all the heathen deities were subjected in classic times, which confused to perplexity the simple theogonies of the heroic ages.

I now come to the second part of the intrinsic evidence, which will detain us but a moment as it requires no comment. It is included in Mr. Carter's description of a monument brought from the wall of Severus by Sir Robert Cotton, and now in Trinity College, Cambridge. It is a basso-relievo, with the inscription "*Numinibus Augustorum Cohors III. Gallorum Equitum Fecit.*"

Of this monument, Mr. Carter says, "We may notice, that the octagonal wreath, in the centre, has four different ornaments, each of which is repeated; these varieties consist of quiloche, the laurel-leaf, with and without berries, and the oak-leaf; each division is tied with a riband.

"On each side of the tablet are shields, above which are heads; that on the left presents at once three faces, one front and two profiles; below them are snakes twisted into the ornamental true lover's knot. In the arched recess on the left, is a winged victory, with the usual symbols, the palm-branch, laurel wreath, and globe under one foot; in the compartment below, is a stork, &c.; in the nich on the right is a statue, *in the full warlike dress of the Romans*. In the compartment below the last figure, is another representation of a stork, with a vase,

&c. *This subject is likewise carved on the arch of the grand porch of St. Margaret's church, York; which porch was originally brought from a building of a very remote date, and, from its general design, nearly of Roman workmanship. Horsley supposed the emperors commemorated in the inscription to be Severus and Caracalla.*"*

This is positive testimony, of great importance even if it stood alone, but its additional evidence discloses so entirely the value of the preceding observations on the nature and derivation of the signs on ancient British monuments, as to raise the whole argument to a demonstration that this porch is not *nearly* (an unmeaning term as applied by Mr. Carter) but absolutely of Roman workmanship, and originally designed as part of a temple of Mithras, or the Sun, whose worship anciently constituted the established religion of this celebrated city.

For the preservation of this interesting monument to our times, I can only plead the good fortune which favoured others until lately, and some even to the present day; such as the heathen chapel of Ethelbert; the Pharos, in Dover Castle; the temple of Janus, at Leicester; the amphitheatre, at Dorchester; Richborough Castle; Worth-gate, at Canterbury; and New-Port-gate, at Lincoln.

York is said to have had a large share in the disasters, which befel the country immediately after the departure of the Romans, and were we to believe implicitly all that is related upon this head, no argument whatever could satisfy us that any monument, now within it, belongs to a period so distant as that which I have assigned to the one in question. I shall endeavour to remove this oblique objection; by one or two observations on a passage to this effect, in the *Britannia* of Camden, which I have purposely selected as that of the greatest weight.

"At the conclusion of the Scotch and Saxon wars," says this author, "little more than the shadow of the former greatness of York remained, and so completely were the buildings destroyed, that Paulinus, in 627, could not find in the whole city a church wherein to baptize king Edwin, in consequence of which, according to Bede, he was obliged to construct one of wattles for the purpose."

* *Ancient Architecture of England*, part i.

But this assertion is refuted, first, by Mr. Bentham, who observes, that Bede's wooden oratory was built on the spur of the occasion, a mere temporary expedient; and, that the Saxons, at the time of their conversion, must have learnt the art of building stone edifices with columns and arches, because they had many instances of such kind of buildings before them, in the churches and other public edifices, erected by the Romans. "For, notwithstanding," he adds, "the havock, that had been made of the christian churches, by the Picts and Scots, and by the Saxons themselves, some of them were then in being. Bede mentions two in Canterbury, besides which, it is likely, there were others of the same age, in different parts of the kingdom, which were then repaired and restored to their former use."*

Secondly, by the rescript of Gregory the Great, who interposed in behalf of the pagan temples, and by the rite of consecration appeased and reconciled the converted Saxons to their use.

Thirdly, by a passage in *Doomsday-Book*, quoted by Camden himself,† which states, that "in the Confessor's time, there were in this city, six scyræ or divisions, besides the archbishops. One is laid waste for castles. In the other five were 1418 houses inhabited, and in the archbishop's, 200."

Lastly, by Caxton, who states, in his *Polychronicon*, that before York was destroyed by William the Conqueror, "it seemed as fair as the city of Rome from the beauty and magnificence of the buildings."

Whence, then, did York derive this magnificence which it exhibited in the beginning of the eleventh century? According to Bede and Camden, it must have proceeded from the efforts of the Saxons or Danes, for they allow nothing to have descended to so late a period from the Romans. But we have seen, that, for nearly two hundred years after their arrival, the Saxons were rude and unlettered barbarians, strangers to the arts, and enemies to civilization; and that, after their conversion, they were, as a nation, alike ignorant and regardless of civil architecture, being, for the most part, dispersed in small village communities, in preference to the more extended associations of large towns. The

* *Introd. to the History of Ely Cathedral*, sec. 5th.

† *Britannia*, vol. iii.

unsettled state of the country during the Danish dynasty, which may be said to have been a period of continued civil war between two barbarous people, will not allow us to suppose, that the arts of civil life were then carried to any measure of extent in England, or arose to any degree above the wants and capacities of savage freebooters. The appearance of York at the conquest, therefore, must be ascribed to the superior taste and refinement of its more ancient, powerful, and civilized inhabitants, with whose institutions and moral condition it alone corresponded. Thus, there is no reason for believing in so complete a demolition of public edifices in the year 627, as Bede has represented, but rather, that many continued to adorn it throughout the Saxon period of English history. It appears that in the year 1070, the Conqueror visited this city, with great severity, as a punishment for the treachery of the inhabitants, who had, but a short time before, made a voluntary surrender of it to the Normans. The historians of this transaction represent William as at this time the equal of Cambyses, in the madness of his fury, *totally destroying all the noble remains of antiquity which still continued to adorn it*; and the parallel between the Norman and the Persian seems continued into the description of the remote consequences, for it is asserted, that the city and adjacent country lay desolate for forty years afterwards. Such, however, are the warm but vague expressions of monkish historians, who record every capture of this city in nearly similar terms. It is enough for the present purpose, that, after this storm, the porch emerges from the mist of antiquity as the hallowed adjunct of a christian church, which, though of humble note, is yet deserving of especial remembrance for the shelter it afforded, for centuries, to this beautiful memorial of the first age of the arts in Britain. In the year 1644, the period of its first notice, by history, it escaped more imminent danger than in 1070, from the cannon of the parliamentary army, which played against the quarter of the town where it then stood, and demolished the edifice to which it belonged. After this event, we trace it to St. Margaret's church, to which it still continues attached, but under circumstances which excite deep regret, as it is there exposed to certain destruction, not so much

from the slow operation of time and weather, as from the distressing accidents which occasionally arise from the gambols of the rabble youth who frequently play around and within it, proofs of which I have witnessed with sorrow.

Upon the whole, if the above arguments are well founded, it follows that the citizens of York possess within their walls, a very beautiful remain of an ancient temple of the Sun, a unique in Britain, perhaps in Europe, and a monument which would, it seems, be highly prized in France, where, even single figures of the signs are carefully laid up in museums. Should its future preservation ever become an object worthy of particular consideration, I beg leave to suggest the minster as its most proper asylum, for, as a consecrated relic, and specimen of art, it will reflect neither on the piety nor taste of those, who may be disposed to vote it a place among the glories of that wondrous pile.