Cheshire was included by the Romans within the province of Flavia Caesaraugusta. It was certainly traversed by several Roman roads, some of which may have partly represented the line of some older British roads or tracks; but although there are still remainings of these roadways here and there, they are not continuous or distinct enough to enable antiquaries to count any decided agreement as to their exact courses. The Antonine "Itinerary" gives us a line of road from Upholland to the station of Deva, which is usually identified with the site of the modern Chester. The exact line of this roadway must to a certain extent depend upon what we imagine to have been the state in the Roman period of the valley, which we have some reason to believe was once part of the estuary of the Dee. The station immediately preceding Deva on the "Itinerary" is called Bovium (10 miles distant), and has been identified with the modern village of Bagby, on the border of Flintshire. The station immediately following Deva is called Manucium (18 miles), which is supposed to be the modern Chester, on the line of road beyond Deva by a station called Corbrid (20 miles), to another called Manucium (18 miles). The site of the station called above we are uncertain as to its exact identity. As to the other stations, the names are only suggestive, and we read the names at Ercallt and Offa. Some of our readers may remember that there is a Humberland mentioned in the "Itinerary" as the next station before Bovium, on the line of road from Upholland to the station called Manucium (19 miles), which we have already identified with the village of Bagby, on the border of Flintshire. The station next beyond Manucium is called Manucium (18 miles), a station of the same name as the station at the modern Manchester. The station next beyond this is called the Warrington station, which is also another Manucium (18 miles), and a station of the same name as the station at the modern Manchester. The station next beyond this is called the Warrington station, which is also another Manucium (18 miles), and a station of the same name as the station at the modern Manchester.

The Geographer of Bittern gives us another station near the city of Chester—Verutum—planted by antiquaries on the Cheshire coast of the Mersey opposite to Warrington. Besides a roadway connecting Deva with Verutum, another is believed to have existed at a later time in the Roman period to have been connected the next station directly with Corbrid. We do not feel, however, that we are treading on insecure ground in mentioning these last lines of road.

Horsley had conjectured that the Romans first permanently established themselves at Deva under Agricola about the year 84. A more recent discovery brought to light brass tablets recording the grant of the freedom of the city of Chester to certain troops serving in Britain in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 58-117), "a portion of which is presumed to have been stationed near Wrexham, where the tablets were found." The Chester inscriptions also are considered to establish that the 20th Legion was stationed there in the reign of Commodus and later under Antoninus Pius, A.D. 150-161, and as late as the joint reign of Diocletian and Maximinus Thrax, A.D. 238-250. "Long time previous to this, a coin of the Emperor Caracalla, A.D. 218-219, recognizes the city as a colony of Rome." Besides the Roman remains, there are three camps attributed to a British origin, but whether these are the result of their struggles with successive invaders is not impossible. They are "Castra Castra, on the site of the Yorkshires; Hadrian's Castle, near Barnard; and Wallsden, in the parish of Drorson; and there may be added a strong but irregular work between the Dee and the Watling Street, near Eccleston." "Of Roman traces on the map of Cheshire," writes Mr. Earsly, in a communication published in the Archaeological Journal, "may be noted the following, which, though they have little of the Latin element in their composition, are yet monuments of the Roman occupation of the district:—Stamford Bridge, near Tarvin, Stretton, Wrexham are all vestiges of a line of Roman road. There is a stone-paved road of the river; the town on the easter or street; and, thirdly, the town by the well or embankment. But the leading Roman feature is the capital city, and the names whereby this city has been designated at different times and by different peoples in our own day it is Chester, a collected modern form of the Saxon Ceeser, as this, again, was an alteration from the Latin Caeser. And not the Saxons only, but the Cambrians, have taken this as the basis of their name for this city. The Welsh at the present day call it Caesarus, Llys Derwyth, Dwyer, or Caer (i.e., Caesarea). Upon the Saxo-Latin name of Cicerom, one or two traditions have been played. It was sometimes known as Lesno Caesareum, which is the Welsh Corwen, the name as Caerinum Legumen. Another variation given by Cogdell, but I know not if ever it had circulation, is West-Chester." This supposed name Mr. Earle considers to have arisen from a misunderstanding of a passage in "The Saxon Chronicles," in which it is said of the town ("Laterutum") to be a fortress ("cause") by the fortresses of (West-) Chester, or a military fortress (Legumen), of which the name of Cheshire and Caestum Legum were a medieval Latin translation. The true old Roman name had been Deva (Antoninus) and Corovina (on a coin of Septimius Severus), and it was in these names were buried in Forrowden, a ford near the Roman station, and during the pre-Roman destruction of Deva, that the modern name took its rise." This description of Deva or Chester has been generally attributed to the efforts of Tiberius or Roman invasions, but Mr. Earle thinks the loss of the original name points to the description of the city as having its seat from the overthrow of the Brito-Roman power by the earlier Teutonic invaders. If so, we must reject altogether the Welsh traditions which give it an intermediate history, and the Saxon traditions which have been supposed to exist for a time after the Roman period, and which conclude that Deva had never been re-established down to the time of the year 891, when, as we read, the Normans invested "o'er the whole city and through the walls they reached a waste fortress in Wirral, called Legumen." The Saxons and Danes did not continue them before they were within the walls of the fortress.

However this may have been, the surrounding country seems to have been for a long time, independent, or under the domination of the British princes of Gwynedd, through one line of invasion after another advanced and receded again over its tracts. Thus King of the Northumbrian Bernicia, is said, in the year 607, to have massacred the towns of Bagby, and then defeated the British King of Powis, but to have been himself defeated by some other British princess near Chester; and the district was not again subjected to the Saxons till about the year 898, when Egbert is said to have conquered it. We doubt much, however, whether its final subjection under the Roman power must not be referred to a considerably later period.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE ORIGIN OF CIVILIZATION.

[THE DEBATE ON THE "SPECTATOR."]

Earsly,—In your issue of August 28 you have the honour to notice some remarks which I offered on Sir John Lubbock's paper at the recent meeting of the British Association; but, owing to the imperfect manner in which the proceedings were reported, you have entirely misunderstood what I really said. I beg, therefore, that you will allow me to state what are the opinions I hold on this point, and which I then expounded.

You represent me as saying:—"Suppose that a European colony were entirely isolated from their race, then I believe that there is a moral certainty that in the course of centuries they would lose a considerable amount of degradation, and hardly be recognized as the descendants of a civilized people," and you then go on to argue (and, I think, very justly) that under such circumstances progress is, at least, as probable as degeneration. But the supposition which I made was a different one. It was the isolation of a very small European community in a country very ill-adapted for civilization and progress—a country, like Australia, with no indigenous animals capable of domestication, and without corns, or roots, or fruits adapted for cultivation—a country without native iron, and with such an unpropitious climate as to necessitate frequent migrations and a perpetual struggle to support life. Under such conditions I maintained that degradation to comparative savagery would be inevitable, just as under analogous circumstances would the preservation of cultivated plants or domesticated animals supplant the native species, and so approaching that of their wild allies. I argued, therefore, for degradation under extremely unfavourable conditions, not as the result of mere isolation; and, during the long period that man has been upon the earth, such unfavourable conditions must frequently have occurred, it appears to me more philosophically to admit that some of the lower races may owe their present state of barbarism to a partial degradation, than to maintain that they necessarily represent an original low condition, above which they can in no wise have arisen.

Again, you quote me as having found among savages "a most delicate sense of right and wrong," and as deducing from this fact
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a theory—that they are degenerate persons, who have retained amidst their degeneracy a principle of moral nature. Allow me to say that I never expressed nor do I hold any such theory. My object was simply to show that, treating the question as a scientific one, to be determined solely by facts, and not by feelings, there is really no such clear evidence of progress in morals as there is of progress in intellect. Children, modern savages, and prehistoric man alike exhibit deficiency of intellectual power, but we do not find an equal constant deficiency in moral feeling. Intellect, no doubt, rests upon morality by determining the more remote effects of our actions, and by logically extending the sphere of our sympathies; but a moral sense certainly exists in savages, which, within a limited sphere of action, seems as powerful an incentive to regulate the most civilized races. Morality is an essential part of man’s nature, which can only be fully developed by that true civilization towards which we have as yet hardly taken the first steps. The great mass of the people in civilized countries derive benefit from modern science and its marvellous practical applications, just as we do the savages who receive the products of Manchester Bourse and Birmingham workshops. Owing to their geographical position, the former derive rather more benefit, but as to knowing and understanding anything of the wonderful results of modern science, the creation of the civilization which surrounds them, they are as absolutely ignorant as the Salomis or the negroes. Exposed as they are to the enormously increased temptations to vice with which civilization surrounds them, how can we wonder if their moral nature often remains as imperfect and undeveloped as it does in savages?—I am, Sir, &c.,

ALFRED B. WALLACE.

THE IRISH CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

SIR,—In your number of the 6th you say of Cardinal Collin’s death that the Government should surrender the whole of the estate of three-fourths of Ireland to his hands, that the main point is, what does the Catholic Church think of it? Will you permit an Irish Protestant Liberal to make two remarks on this subject which an Englishman may very well overlook? In the first place, you will never get at the opinion of the Irish Roman Catholic on such a subject, in any regular systematic way. The vast majority of them are too ignorant to form any opinion at all on such a question, except that in all such matters the priests are their natural leaders. The chief fact of Irish politics, as any one can see, is the alliance between the priests and the peasants; but the objects of the two are quite different. The priests aim at a change in the tenure of land, the peasants aim at securing that they shall not be evicted from their own lands. But by the terms of the alliance, each of these two adopt the “cry” of the other; the peasants join in demands about education, of the true bearing of which they neither know nor care anything; the priests join in the demand for land-right, which they care nothing about; but they may care much for it as a means of evicting the peasants. That small minority of the Roman Catholics who are really Liberals prefer mixed education to denominationalism; but though they include the most enlightened and best educated among the members of their Church, they are, for the most part, utterly cowed by the coalition I have described, and with rare exceptions their opinions find no expression. This state of things may be difficult for Englishmen to understand, but it must be remembered that in consequence of the unfortunate religious history of Ireland Ultramontanism has been till now, and is still, the national idea, though everywhere else it is the anti-national one. There is thus no educated by Roman Catholics of which Parliament can be guided.

In the second place, the Roman Catholic have no right to call themselves the people of Ireland. They are the majority of the people, but the State is the natural protector of minorities; and if the Roman Catholic demand for exclusive schools is granted, the Protestants in those parts where they are few and poor, will be left without the means of education for their children. I am, Sir, &c.,

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.
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MRS. STOUE AND LORD BYRON.

SIR,—In reference to the charge made by Mrs. Stone against the character of Lord Byron, would it not be well to remember the following words of Sir Thomas Browne? They are quoted by the Rev. Charles W. Giswald in his memoir of Edgar Allan Poe, in

reflections on a horrible crime of which that poet was accused. Its archaism is somewhat perplexing, but it is, in my humble opinion, an admirable passage, and well worthy of careful reflection, as showing how dangerous and, indeed, how criminal a thing it is to dismiss a man simply because he is different from the mass of men, or to ignore his individuality.

"Verities whose truths we fear and heartily wish there were no truth in—these relations honest men use to deprecate. For some men are heterodox, and such, as others may or may not present the same name or parents, present no distinction in their history. We desire no record of revolution; such should be accounted new. They omit of their ascendency as they fall from their purity; for man must not revile with their forefathers, and falsely sometimes they divide a sin in society. In things of this nature, so many according to his standards, is each variety of thing therein which these must never meet a Panglossian, nor remain anyregister but that of hell."

I am, Sir, &c.,

W. J. L.

RAILWAY INVESTMENTS.

SIR,—In your article of the 28th ult., on railway investments, you say that the London and North-Western pays only 6% on its £210 stock. This is a mistake. The last dividend was at the rate of only 5%, but the case before that was at 6%, making an average of the two of 6%, and this is the real test of value, as the first half of the year is never so good as the second. The London and North-Western consequently pays, not 4% per cent, as you think, but over 6% on the price of the stock, which is about 1.7— I am, Sir, &c.,

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Old Forge, Dumfriess, county Ayrshire, September 4, 1869.

COMPELLING EDUCATION.

SIR,—In your short notice about compulsory education in last week’s number, you say that all that is necessary is "to make all payment of wages a child illegal, unless the child spends 180 days of every year at school." I hope you will allow me to point out that this does not teach a case which from these years you will experience a raged school I know to be rather a common mode, when the parents take the children away from school to assist them (the parents) at home, a case not involving the question of wages at all. This, I fear, nothing but a fine will reach. I am, Sir, &c.

ARThUR HUGH CLOUGH.

Mrs. Clough has done wisely in giving her husband’s remains so frankly to the world, and all understanding readers will thank her sincerely for the true taste, perfect simplicity, and quiet literary skill with which she has edited them. These two volumes, as they now stand, contain as adequate a picture of the singular, but large, simple, and beautful nature of the Oxford poet as one can imagine; and it is one which no one can study without much delight and some pain, without much profit and perhaps some loss, without feeling the high exaltation of true poetry and the keen pleasure caused by the delightfulness of true scholarship, as every one, and without feeling the great and again the small losses of those "blank misgivings of a creature moving about in works not realized," which are scattered so liberally through these fine poems of buoyant ardour, disappointed longings, and speculative purpose, and through these singular letters and reviews of delightful tenderness and rough self-analysis. The new material now for the first time published, and many of them for the first time printed, are of the highest interest in the compilation they give us to Sir Clough’s intellectual autobiography. And some one of them will add greatly to his fame—especially the strong and wonderful prose written at Naples in 1840, in which Mr. Clough starts from the presently opposite point of view to Katie’s Easter hymn, and instead of singing,—

"Oh, day of joy! shall hearts be free, / No mortal rapier shall them pierce? /"

pours out the despair with which the poet infests from the multitude of servile beats not set free from either guilt or necessity, that "Christ is not risen." This poem will live, we believe, for ever in English literature, as the most burning and the most beautiful lesson which an ardent love of Christ, various and enhanced and elevated at the spectacle of an utterly Christian world calling itself Christian, and the despair of intellectual utterance suggested by this spectacle, ever produced. To our readers, this singular poem, short though it be, is not unlikely to be recognized as one of the greatest poems for