

ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MONASTERIES OF KENT IN THE SAXON PERIOD;
IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE RUINED CHURCH WITHIN
THE PRECINCTS OF DOVER CASTLE.

BY ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A., RECTOR AND VICAR OF LYMINGE.

AMONG the few and faint traditions of the monasteries of Kent during the Saxon period, none is more interesting and suggestive than that of the close connection, in origin, in order, and even in endowment, which subsisted between them. Founded as they were by the members of the same family, belonging to the same religious order, and springing from the same impulse of zeal, they present a marked contrast to the foundations of a later age, which discover no such features of early and intimate union. The churches and monasteries which sprang up so rapidly in Kent, three founded by Ethelbert himself, one by his son Eadbald, another by his daughter Ethelburga, two by his great-nieces Eanswith and Sexburga, and others by his remoter descendants, were the exuberant fruits of an early devotion unparalleled perhaps in the history of any country, especially when it is considered that four at least of these foundations were raised on the surrendered sites of the ancient palaces of the Kentish kings. Never was the beautiful maxim of St. Paulinus, on founding the basilica of Nola, more singularly verified than in this instance: "Hæc enim ædificantes in Domino ex adeptu fidei, ædificamur ipsi

a Domino per ejusdem fidei profectum.”¹ Ethelbert, his queen, and their descendants, who carried on with increasing energy this good work, had before them a bright example in one whose life has been strangely overlooked by the historians of the conversion of England. Ingoberga,² the saintly³ (though yet unsainted) mother of Queen Bertha, the afflicted wife of Charibert, had spent the days of her cruel separation from her husband in the practice of every act of Christian piety, and had brought up her only child in the same sentiments and for the same work. In her retirement in some part of Touraine or Maine, but most probably at Le Mans,⁴ she was doubtless preparing the way for that great work of conversion which St. Gregory of Tours was hastening at Rome;⁵ and at her death, in 589, bequeathed a considerable portion of her inheritance to the churches of Tours and Le Mans. “In the fourteenth year of King Childebert,” writes Gregory of Tours, “Queen Ingoberga the widow of Charibert departed this life, a most excellent woman and endued with a most religious character, diligent in watches, prayers, and alms; who, admonished,

¹ Ep. xii. ad Severum.

² Probably a modification of the celebrated Scandinavian name, Ingeborg.

³ It is not easy to determine why the title of Saint was either given or withheld at this early period. The Saxon writers use it apparently rather as a “solemn euphemism,”* than as distinctly separating the “sainted” or “blessed” person from others not so honoured. The dedication of churches to the Saxon saints was the work not of the Saxon but the Norman period.

⁴ Had she lived at Tours itself, she would hardly have been described by St. Gregory of Tours as sending “nuntios ad me usque;” while her special bequest to the church of Le Mans points to this as the place of her retirement (see the ‘Histoire de l’Église Gallicane,’ par le Père Longueval, tom. iii. p. 264 n.).

⁵ Gregory of Tours was the devoted friend of Pope Gregory the Great, whom he visited at Rome in 594. The zeal of Queen Brunehault, the sister-in-law of Ingoberga, in behalf of the conversion of England was so great, as to lead Gregory the Great to acknowledge it in a letter, in which he attributes the work, after God, to her (Ep. ii. 62).

* Cf. Zorn, ‘Opuscula Sacra,’ p. 205. Altona, 1731.

as I believe, by the providence of God, sent all the way to me (*ad me usque nuntios dirigens*) that I might aid her in the plans she was forming for her last will to the remedy of her soul, yet only so as to enable her to put together in writing what she had arranged to do. I went accordingly. I saw there a God-fearing person, who received me kindly, called a notary, and after some consultation with me bequeathed some of her property to the church of Tours and the basilica of St. Martin, and some to the church of Le Mans;¹ and a few months after, overborne by a sudden illness, departed this life, giving freedom to many of her servants, in the seventieth year of her age, leaving an only daughter, who was married to the son of a certain king in Kent.”

This rude contemporary sketch of the mother of Queen Bertha may well prepare us for those signal acts of devotion and self-sacrifice which marked the lives of her descendants on the Kentish throne; while the mournful defection of Charibert, and his successive marriages with Marcovefa and Merofleda, the attendants of Ingoberga, for whose sake he had deserted his lawful wife, present a sad anticipation of the fall of his grandson Eadbald, whose repentance was marked by the refoundation among other churches of that within the castle of Dover,² un-

¹ The church of St. Pierre du Mans belongs to this early period, and the rude and simple features of its foundations and windows (described by De Caumont) may be well compared with those of our earliest ecclesiastical remains.

² The story, as given by St. Gregory of Tours, is as follows:—“Habebat tunc temporis Ingoberga in servitium suum duas puellas pauperis cujusdam filias, quarum prima vocabatur Marcovefa, religiosam vestem habens, altera vero Merofledis, in quarum amore rex valde detinebatur; erant enim ut diximus artificis lanarii filiae. Æmula ex hoc Ingoberga, quod a rege diligentur, patrem earum secretius operari fecit, futurum ut dum hæc rex cerneret, odio filias ejus haberet, quo operante vocavit regem. Ille autem sperans aliquid novi videre, aspicit hunc eminens fascias regias componentem; quod videns, commotus in irâ reliquit Ingobergam et Merofledam accepit. . . . Post hæc Marcovefam Merofledis scilicet sororem conjugio copulavit. Pro quâ causâ a Sancto Germano Episcopo excommunicatus uterque est” (Gregor. Turon. Hist. Francorum, lib. v. c. 26).

fortunately again a ruin, and probably only just saved from entire demolition. It is memorable that, in the short space of seventy years, no fewer than eight important monasteries were founded by the same family, viz. Christ Church and St. Augustine (598–605), Dover (about 620), Folkestone (630), Lyminge (633), Reculver (669), Minster in Sheppey (about 670), and Minster in Thanet (about 675), in addition to the great foundation of Rochester, whose earliest charter well expresses the care and zeal of the founders for all such “sacred places.”¹

It might well therefore be expected that foundations thus united in origin and connected in all their traditions would stand in relations of close and peculiar intimacy. But there was yet another tie which, though common to all the foundations of the Saxon period, would be still more binding in so small and compact a kingdom as that of Kent. The one Benedictine rule which all these monasteries professed was a bond of union which was unknown to the foundations of a later age. “The new orders,” as a learned writer observes, “were themselves mere attempts to reform the Benedictine order when it had degenerated, and this was the design of the Cluniac rule (1049–1109), the Camaldules (1018–1072), the Carthusians (1084), the Cistercians (1098), and the Præmonstratensians (1120).” But, instead of reforming, they simply divided the original order, for, as he adds, “they had the injurious effect of producing a jealous disunion among the monastic orders, while even in the beginning of the thirteenth century the new orders had become infected with the corruption of the old.”²

To this element of union we may add that of a connection in property and endowment, so singularly illus-

¹ “Nobis est aptum semper inquirere qualiter per loca sanctorum pro animæ remedio . . . aliquid de portione terræ nostræ in subsidiis servorum Dei, devotissimâ voluntate debeamus offerre” (Codex Dipl. cart. 1).

² Wessenberg, Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen des 15ten und 16ten Jahrhunderts, tom. i. p. 347.

trated in the universal legateeship conferred by the will of the Duke Oswulf on the kindred foundations of Christ Church, Dover, Folkestone, and Lyminge, which he enumerates in the order of their foundation and treats with a species of gavelkind equality. It appears that this great Kentish magnate left his entire inheritance, subject to the lives of his wife, Beornthrytha, his son Eardwulf, and his daughter Ealfthrytha, to what he calls "the families" at each of these places. At his death, a certain Æthelwulf contended for his property against Beornthrytha, and neither courts nor synods were able to settle the dispute. A council was at length convened at Canterbury, in which thirty members of the foundations thus endowed—twelve priests and the rest laymen—were sworn as a kind of jury to determine the controversy. This took place in the year 844, and as it is with the single exception of the council of Becancelde, under King Wihtraed, the earliest document we possess in which the monastery of Dover is distinctly mentioned, it has an additional interest on this ground. There are other indications among the Saxon charters of the intimate union between these ancient houses, but the canons of the councils of this period, especially those of Becancelde, Cloveshof, and Chelchyth, throw a still clearer light upon this connection.

A remarkable charter of Ethelbald, King of Mercia, reciting and confirming the council of Cloveshof,¹ shows that the patronage and jurisdiction of the archbishops over all these monasteries formed an important element in this union, and it is notable that the monastery of St. Augustine, the only one which at this early period disturbed the perfect harmony, was also the only one which was exempted from ordinary jurisdiction, being, as a charter of Oswini expresses it, "a Romanâ urbe directus."² The official position of the archbishops as priors

¹ Cod. Dipl. Sax. cart. 87.

² Cart. 36.

of Christ Church, while it tended in the days of Archbishop Dunstan to absorb the lesser and more distant houses into the principal and central foundation, appears at the earliest period to have rather contributed to their union and correspondence. There are traces of a transference and interchange of property among them in many of the earliest charters, arising out of this connection; while, from several of the canons of Cloveshof, the regular clergy living in these monasteries appear to have at least taken a part in the cure of souls and in a kind of missionary work in outlying districts. Thus the eighth canon enjoins the priests to give obedience and assistance to the abbots and abbesses in admonishing, rebuking, exhorting those under them; the second canon having already urged the same duties in regard to their monastic conversation; while the twenty-eighth canon, which prohibits any one from "establishing a larger society (*congregationem*) than he is able to support," can only point to those kind of missionary sodalities through which the larger and richer monasteries assisted in the evangelization of a country as yet but partially Christian. The community of labour, of interest, of franchises, and in some cases even of endowment, which we have here indicated, gave to the Saxon monastic system a unity of character which is altogether lost in the rival orders and conflicting interests of the monasteries of a later age, during which the religious orders maintained a double warfare, the one a kind of civil war between themselves, the other a contest in which they were united against the secular clergy. The results of these fatal divisions were marked in the degeneracy of the monastic system in the opening of the thirteenth century, described so vividly by Cardinal Jacobus à Vitriaco.¹

¹ Jac. à Vitriaco, *Hist. Occidentalis Ecclesiæ*, c. i.-iii. He describes the monks of that day as "inobedientes, murmurantes, invicem detrahentes, . . . immundi et incontinentes."

But interesting as this connection will appear to be in a religious and social point of view, it is no less interesting from the light which it throws on questions of an archæological nature. Structures founded nearly at the same period, by members of the same family, and at a very short distance from one another, might well be expected to possess a great degree of mutual resemblance. And when the historical connection between them is taken into account, and the probable model which the founders had before them in the churches of Normandy, of Maine, and of Touraine, not only through the intercourse and alliances of the royal families of Kent with those of France, but from the education of the earliest converts of rank in the religious houses of the latter country, so significantly mentioned by Bede,¹ we shall be led to compare the few fragments of a primitive architecture which still remain to us, not only with one another, but with that earlier Continental standard to which they may all alike be referred.

For it must be borne in mind that there still exist in France several churches, principally in the district here indicated, whose antiquity mounts up to the fifth and sixth centuries, and which stand in the same relation to the churches of our earliest period as the churches of the later Romano-Byzantine type do to our churches of the Anglo-Norman period. Such are the churches of St. Jean, at Poitiers, of St. Samson-sur-Rille, of St. Eusebius, near Saumur, of Savenières, near Angers, of St. Martin, at Angers, of St. Pierre, at Le Mans, of St. Jean de Saumur, and the Basse Œuvre, at Beauvais. These have been fully described by M. de Caumont in his admirable 'Cours d'Antiquités Monumentales' (pt. iv. pp. 82-103). The comparison of these early monuments with the earliest churches of our own country, especially as regards the masonry and cements employed in them,

¹ Bed. Hist. lib. iii. c. 8.

would tend greatly to illustrate a subject still sufficiently obscure.

In the case of the Kentish monasteries but few of these venerable fragments remain; the original fabrics of Canterbury having passed away before the dawn of a higher art, while that of Folkestone perished by the inroads of the sea at a still earlier period. Portions of the early foundation at Reculver still remain, and have been too fully and ably investigated by Mr. Roach Smith to permit us to venture upon ground so well occupied. Our remarks shall be therefore principally directed to the comparison of the features of the work of a brother and sister, viz. the ruined church within the precinct of Dover Castle, and the chancel and south wall of the church of Lyminge, the undoubted relics of the original foundation of 633.

The documentary evidence in the case of Lyminge is so full and unbroken, carried on as it is from the year of the foundation up to the time of Archbishop Lanfranc in a succession of fourteen charters, and by a number of historians, including Florence of Worcester, Goscellinus, Alured of Beverly, Hugo Candidus, Thorn, and others, as to render it unnecessary to reproduce it here.¹ The materials which we possess for the history of the church at Dover are however much scantier, and will take but a short time to recapitulate.

First, we have the mention of the monastery in the larger copy of the 'Acts of the Council of Becanceld,' already referred to. This is the earliest mention of it with which I am acquainted, and belongs to the year 694. The next in order of time appears to be the charter confirming the bequest of the Duke Oswulf, which is dated as late as 844. Now between these dates the alleged transfer of the foundation from the castle to the church

¹ These authorities are given more fully in my 'Historical Sketch of the Church of Lyminge,' recently published.

of St. Martin's, by King Wihtraed, is supposed to have taken place, a transfer for which we have no earlier authority than an extract from a chronicle of the monastery of Dover, made by Leland, and written not earlier than the reign of Henry I.

“Of the King Eadbald,” it runs, “the son of Ethelbert, who after baptism returned to his idols and exiled the bishops and priests, much may be found in the life of St. Mildred, and how he was recalled to the faith by St. Laurence, who enjoined him, for the remission of his sins, to dedicate churches as he had before destroyed them, and to cherish the clergy whom he had before persecuted. That he appointed an order of canons in the castle can be clearly gathered from the fact that, according to ancient tradition, the canons resided in the castle for a hundred years and more. Reckon how you will, that was the period which elapsed from the time of King Wihtraed, who transferred the canons to the church of St. Martin, in the town of Dover. And inasmuch as this king (Eadbald) reigned long after the penance imposed on him, it is sufficiently credible that among others he dedicated and endowed his chapel in the castle.”

We may observe, first, that the Mildred whose history is here referred to must be that earlier Mildred for whose sake Ethelburga, the sister of Eadbald, is said by her monastic biographers to have founded the nunnery of Lyminge, and not the second Mildred, the foundress of the nunnery of Minster, in Thanet, who was not born till about thirty years after the death of Eadbald, and whose life had not the slightest bearing on the circumstances here related. The profound silence of the Saxon historians respecting the earlier Mildred, the niece of Ethelburga, which led afterwards to the confusion between the two, and to the long controversy between the monasteries of St. Gregory and St. Augustine on the subject of their relics, arose, without doubt, from the same delicacy which has suppressed all mention of the second wife of Ethelbert. The ill-omened marriage of

this princess with her stepson, Eadbald, is believed (as Mr. Coxe observes in a note to Roger de Wendover¹) to have led to the withdrawal of her name from history; and the singular silence which is observed regarding the Mildred who is described as the niece of Ethelburga, can only be accounted for on the ground that she was the daughter of Eadbald, by a marriage which caused so much scandal and affliction to the infant Church of Kent.

Our next observation arises out of the mention of the institution of canons by King Wihtraed. Here we cannot but detect an anachronism, which however may be readily rectified by supposing that the son of Wihtraed, and not that king himself, was the founder of this college. For the institution of canons regular by Chrodegangus, Bishop of Metz, took place, as is well known, not earlier than A.D. 765; and this new rule consisted in placing them under the same roof and subjecting them to a monastic discipline. It is probable that Wihtraed restored the church of St. Martin's, and thus fitted it for the transfer of these canons to it by his immediate successors, whose correspondence with St. Boniface must have made them acquainted with the new institute of Chrodegangus.

The "hundred years and more," during which the canons are said to have remained within the precinct of the castle, sufficiently agree with the period that would be thus assigned them, while the necessity for occupying the entire precinct as a place of military defence might well account for the removal of a religious foundation beyond its walls.

We proceed to consider next the penance imposed on Eadbald by St. Laurence, viz. the restoration of the churches which had been destroyed and dismantled during the idolatrous portion of his reign. And this

¹ Tom. i. p. 113.

introduces the interesting inquiry, whether any of the Christian edifices of the Roman period might have survived in a sufficiently uninjured state to become the subjects of this work of restoration. Now Bede,¹ in his description of the calm which succeeded the persecution of Diocletian, says that the Christians, who during this time of danger had hidden themselves in woods and deserts and caves, came forth again into daylight and “restored the churches which had been levelled to the ground, and founded and built up the basilicæ of the holy martyrs.” And there is good reason to believe, from the significant fact that two at least of these Roman fabrics were existing in Canterbury before the conversion of Ethelbert, viz. St. Martin’s and Christ Church, that the Saxons did not needlessly destroy these sacred buildings, but rather appropriated them for other uses. For the latter building is said to have been “recovered” by St. Augustine, and consecrated by him, while in the former the actual performance of the rites of Christianity seems never to have been suspended. Among the churches which Bede describes as restored after the great persecution must have been this at Dover, in all probability one of the earliest and most important seats of Christian worship in Britain. In conformity to this view we find that St. Augustine received license from Ethelbert, immediately on his conversion, to “restore” as well as to build churches.² And it will be obvious to all who consider the far greater strength and stability of Roman work, that the restored churches would be likely to survive those which were thus built from the foundation. It appears to me that the materials of the ruined church at Dover, and the character of the masonry, separate it at once from the Saxon and Norman periods, between which the theories of archæologists have hitherto chiefly oscillated. Sufficient attention does not seem to have

¹ Lib. i. c. 8.

² Bede, lib. i. c. 26.

been given to these two elements for forming a practical and solid judgment on the question, while an undue importance has been attached to architectural features, whose transitions are so gradual as to make it difficult to assign the limits of the periods to which they belong.

The criterion of the Roman mortars is thus given by Vicat in his learned work 'On Cements:'—"In general, all their mortars which are exposed to the air are alike. We recognize them by the presence of coarse sand mixed with gravel. The lumps of lime in it are sometimes so multiplied that it is impossible to attribute them to defective manipulation. The extinction by immersion, as applied to a very rich lime, can alone account for it."¹ "The Roman hydraulic mortars," he observes further, "are very remarkable, and differ from ours essentially. They are composed, with few exceptions,² of pure lime, mixed in large proportions with the fragments of bricks coarsely pounded. Thus they resemble a breccia of which lime is the matrix." Now, though they varied their work according to the materials of the country,—for Vitruvius writes: "I do not know what ought to be the materials for walls, because we do not everywhere meet with such as are most desirable, but we make use of such as we can find,"³—it is clear that the predominance of lime of the purest character is the distinctive feature of Roman as opposed to Saxon work, in which sand is the predominant ingredient. On the other hand, we find in Norman work an imitation of the Roman mixtures: as in the church of St. Alban's, where even the red concrete is occasionally imitated, as it is also in the Norman arch of the south entrance of the

¹ Vicat, translated by Captain Smith, p. 119.

² These exceptions are not rare, at least in England. In the double foundation at Lyminge, as well as in the remains at Dover, both the red and white concretes are employed: the former apparently being chiefly limited to buildings in which bricks are used in the structure itself; the latter where undressed stone is the material. . . . ³ Lib. i. c. 5.

ruined church at West Hythe. And as we proceed along the Middle Ages we find so constant an approximation to the earliest mortars, that Vicat mentions the curious fact, that a bridge at Cahors, built in 1400, is in every respect similar to that of an ancient (Roman) theatre, the ruins of which are to be found in the same town (Ap. p. 225).

On the other hand, the Saxon mortar presents all the characteristics of the most irregular structure and of the rudest manipulation. That at Lyminge is composed of the yellow sand of the neighbourhood; which has separated itself from the lime so as to give the appearance of lumps of lime imbedded in sand, and is combined with fragments of chalk, Roman brick, and charcoal. Nor is the masonry less distinctive. Courses of irregular herringbone work, with bonding-courses of Roman bricks and flat stones intervening, sometimes varied with a course of remarkably large stones or masses of Roman concrete used as a single block, present a marked contrast to the walls at Dover, which exhibit sufficient regularity for that kind of Roman work which is designed to be faced with concrete.

Putting together these early specimens, the admitted foundations of a brother and sister, at very nearly the same period, and within a few miles of one another, we shall be led to the conclusion that while one is a Saxon work built upon a Roman foundation, the other is a Saxon restoration of a Roman work which had never been actually destroyed. The massive blocks of Roman brick, with which several of the walls in their upper portion are quoined, point clearly to such a work of restoration; while a fragment of a Roman wall, recently discovered in the field adjoining the churchyard at Lyminge, resembles the masonry at Dover so closely as to corroborate the view which has been here taken.

We may observe, in conclusion, that if the building

be not of Roman origin, it must either be Saxon or Norman, for no one, it is to be presumed, will suggest even the possibility of a later date. Against the former supposition, the materials of the fabric are, as it appears to me, a clear and conclusive evidence; against the latter supposition the entire history of the building is arrayed. Nor does the form of the cross, which the ground-plan of this church exhibits, in any degree detract from the probability of the high antiquity we have ventured to ascribe to it. For the basilica of St. Paul-without-the-walls, of Rome, developed this feature as early as the fourth century; while that built by St. Namatius of Auvergne, in the year 475, is described by St. Gregory of Tours¹ as perfectly cruciform: “Totum ædificium in modum crucis habetur expositum.”

I have offered these observations rather as materials for the judgment of those who are far more competent than myself to pronounce authoritatively on such a subject, than as an exposition of my own views. My principal object has been to draw attention to a connection between these early institutions so close and intimate as to contribute an important element in the discussion, and towards the settlement of a question of general as well as local interest.

Since writing the above, I have, with the other members of the Association, had the pleasure of hearing the interesting and picturesque address delivered by Mr. Puckle within the walls of the building here referred to. In this (which will, I believe, be presented to the reader of this volume in a more permanent form), the Roman origin of the wall is entirely disallowed, and the most ancient portions of it assigned to King Eadbald, the Saxon founder or (as I have ventured to allege) restorer of the church. But the grounds upon which

¹ Lib. ii. c. 16.

this judgment was based, do not appear to me to have such strength and solidity as to induce me to surrender the position I have here taken. The assertion that the bricks are Saxon, and not Roman, resting mainly upon the ground that the method of their fabrication is different, cannot be sustained, inasmuch as those specimens in the lower portion of the building which we are able to compare with bricks of undoubted Roman manufacture resemble them in every particular; while the presence of Saxon bricks in the upper portions of the structure, if capable of proof, would consist well with the theory of restoration here asserted. The allegation that the lines or scoriations to be found on the bricks of the Pharos are a criterion of Roman manufacture is altogether erroneous, inasmuch as very few bricks of this kind occur in undoubted Roman buildings either in France or England. In the abbey of St. Alban's, built almost wholly of the bricks from the ruins of Verulam, one or two of these bricks are noted as a rare and peculiar instance among the thousands that are uncovered in that vast structure.¹ They are not said to be found at Richborough, Lymne, or Reculver, though fragments of inscribed bricks have sometimes occurred at these places; nor do they appear in the Roman work at Lyminge. So little are they known in France, that De Caumont does not mention them in his elaborate work, though he specially notes the presence of grains of quartzose sand as a criterion of bricks of Roman manufacture.² Nor is the absence of tufa from the building in question sufficient to set aside its claim to a Roman origin, for tufa is not always found in Roman work, and is said to have been used even in buildings of a much later period. Nor yet, again, are those architectural features, alleged to be distinctively Saxon, to be too much relied on in

¹ See Buckler's 'Abbey of St. Alban's.'

² 'Cours d'Antiquités,' tom. ii. p. 184, *note*.

this instance. For it is to be borne in mind that such features, unless taken in combination with other peculiarities,—masonry, mortars, etc.,—may as probably belong to the last stages of the decay of Roman art in Britain, as to the first period of Saxon building, which would necessarily be the imitation of the latest instances of Roman work. The remarkable architectural details at Reculver, described by Mr. Roach Smith, would indicate how nearly the features of Roman architecture in its decadence approached those of the earliest recognized period of Saxon building. A truer criterion still remains which, however difficult to apply in more recent structures, is of clear application when the question lies, as it must here lie, between Roman and Saxon work alone. This is the mortar, in which the predominance of lime or sand marks clearly the Roman or Saxon periods.¹

The Roman cements were of two kinds, that with the white matrix and that with the red, and the elements of both are analyzed with great care, in the case of the principal Roman buildings in France, by M. Vicat.² Both are found in the Roman Pharos; and the mortar in a large portion of the ruined church so closely resembles the former kind of concrete, as strongly to confirm the view that at least the core of the building is Roman, to however late a portion of that epoch it may be assigned.

¹ 'Antiquities of Richborough, etc.,' by Mr. Roach Smith, p. 256.

² 'On Cements,' App. p. 254.

[In explanation of the preceding observations, we regret to announce that Mr. Puckle, from a pressure of laborious professional occupation, has been unable to complete the promised paper to which they refer, in time for publication in this Volume, and that, instead of enriching our 'Archæologia' with it, he has now determined upon publishing it in an independent work of his own,—a determination which was not made known to us till these pages were printed, and it was too late to alter them.]