

of the Hebdomadal Council at Oxford 1854 and 1863. The Report which that Commission issued was written mainly by the hand of Dr. Jeune, and was to such extent his own composition. He was made Vice-Chancellor of Oxford in 1858. *The Times* remarks, "In fact there was not a step forward made at Oxford during the twenty years that Dr. Jeune was resident in the University as head of a college, which he did not either propose or support steadily in its earliest, and, therefore, most unpopular stages." He preached, in 1862, a French sermon in Westminster Abbey, on the subject of the International Exhibition. He was appointed Dean of Lincoln in 1864, which he left for the see of Peterborough. The Bishop owed his promotion to a Liberal ministry. He threw himself into the work of his diocese with a zeal which renders insignificant the claims of party. His pastorate made its influence felt in every part of his diocese; whilst as a prelate, and therefore one of the leaders of society, he was a Patron of the Architectural and Archæological Association, and took part in its annual visit to places of interest. It may be said with perfect truth he was a good scholar, a courteous gentleman, and a firm friend; that he was a favourite with a considerable portion of the clergy of his diocese, and regarded with affection and respect by the laity. This vigilant and indefatigable overseer of the diocese, Francis, twenty-fifth Lord Bishop of Peterborough, died at a quarter before eleven o'clock on Friday morning, August 21, 1868, at Whitby, in Yorkshire, and was buried upon the Friday following in the Cathedral yard at Peterborough, at the east end of the Minster.

26. William Connor Magee, D.D., Dean of Cork, was consecrated as Bishop of Peterborough, in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, on Sunday, November 15, 1868, and was installed at Peterborough, on the following Thursday. He was formerly Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, subsequently Assistant Minister of the Octagon Chapel, Bath, and Honorary Canon of Wells; Minister of Quebec Chapel, London; Precentor of Clogher; Dean of Cork; Dean of the Chapel Royal, Dublin; B.A. 1842, M.A. and B.D. 1854. D.D. 1860.

---

*January 30th, 1871.*

THE REV. J. H. HILL, F.S.A., in the chair.

This being the Annual business meeting of the Society, the following Statement of Accounts for the past year was read.



service to local archæology by contributing copies of original documents relating to Leicester Abbey. Transcripts of these documents will appear in this year's Volume of the Associated Societies, and so will be in the hands of all our Members. It is hoped that the "Survey" will be of future use to Mr. Nevinson, Mr. J. Thompson, and of such other of our Members as have been engaged, at intervals, for some years past in making excavations on the site of the ancient Abbey of S. Mary, with the hope of tracing the ground-plan of that once large and, probably, magnificent structure. Those who listened to Mr. Clarke's scholarly discourses upon the Castles of Leicester, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Tamworth, and Tutbury, will not soon forget the genial, happy way in which he pointed out the salient points of each of those ancient buildings. Perhaps, however, the most valuable opinions bearing upon our local antiquities gained during the Congress were those expressed upon that remarkable block of masonry known as the "Jewry Wall." The excavations carried on at intervals during the past four years on the eastern side of the wall, and now completed, greatly assisted in the solution of the question as to its origin. It will be remembered that Dr. Stukeley and Mr. Throsby—in former times, and in later times—Mr. James Thompson, and the late Mr. Henry Goddard, all expressed the belief, backed up with sound reasons, founded upon careful measurements and comparison with similar Roman remains at other Roman stations—that the Jewry Wall formed the western gateway of the ancient Roman city. This opinion was much fortified by the fact that it was found, upon the completion of the excavations, that the masonry never, at any period, extended in an easterly direction—that is, towards the Church of S. Nicholas—but that it extended north and south upon the very line of ground where the ancient Roman wall would be expected to have stood, and which line is marked in various other places by remains of Roman masonry discovered at various times. Such being the carefully formed judgment of local antiquaries, the opinions of Mr. Parker and Mr. Joyce were expected with interest. Mr. Parker—who has had peculiar facilities for the study of Roman antiquities—said decidedly that the portion of the old wall now existing is late Roman work of two periods, the more recent being of the fourth century—the time of Constantine. Mr. Joyce, both when inspecting the wall and also when delivering his address upon Roman Leicester before the Institute, gave his opinion without hesitation that it was the western gate of the city. He afterwards expressed this belief so clearly that your Committee think it well to give here an extract from his letter, which will probably set the question of the origin of the Jewry Wall at rest for the future. Mr. Joyce says:—

"There is no room to question the fact, in my judgment, of the Jewry Wall having been the western gate of the ancient city. No archæologist, with the map of Leicester in his hand, and the traces of Roman work marked upon it, will hesitate to decide that this mason work formed part of the city wall, and in it are two arches close together, the openings of which were about 14 feet high by 9 feet wide. If it be admitted, as it was by common consent of all present, that the probable site of the Roman forum was identified by means of the pillars, whose position with regard to the intersection of the principal ways was pointed out by myself, we have the clearest evidence that the direct line of communication between this forum and the great Fosse-road on the west must pass straight through those arches, indicating, almost to certainty, that openings so close together, and of such a size in the city wall, could be no other than one of the town gates. The depth of Roman wall below the sills of the arches attracted some observation, and appeared to be the only ground on which any hesitation was expressed as to assigning this use. An

excavation was made, at my request, before the Institute assembled, by which solid wall was traced to a depth of 16 feet below the present street level. The explanation of this was given by me to an eminent local archaeologist (Mr. Thompson) at the time; but owing to pressure of other matters, was accidentally omitted from my address. As it is interesting in its bearing on such works generally, and as it appears to me to dispose of any further controversy about this subject in particular, I ask the favour of space enough to state it now. If this structure be a city gate in a city wall it could not well be constructed other than it is; and were this depth of masonry below the gate sills absent, there would be great reason to doubt that it could be a gateway to a fortified town. The reason is obvious enough when explained. A fortified town was encircled generally by a fosse, as fortifications still are. The depth of the fosse varied with the necessities of the defence. Approaching such a walled city from the outside you must cross the ditch to enter any gate, and in crossing it you would have before you the town wall, built so as to form a facing to the fosse down to the very bottom, unless there was natural rock. In the language of fortifications the wall would be the revetment of the fosse, surmounted by a rampart. A causeway or a drawbridge gave access to the gate. It will be quite obvious that the sills of the gateways, though on the same level as the streets of the Roman city, would show on the outside as much solid wall beneath them as would reach downward into the bottom of the fosse, and we opened this wall on the inside to a depth of ten feet below the sills. It is, in truth, this very circumstance which, when taken in connection with its position, determines beyond reasonable doubt that this double arch was the gateway of a fortified city."

The Committee record with much satisfaction the care shown by the municipal authorities to preserve the historical interest attaching to our ancient buildings in Leicester by placing upon each during the past year a bronze plate, with an historical description in each case.

The volume of the Associated Societies, placed in the hands of our Members last year, contained some interesting and valuable papers.

Your Committee has again to apologize for the non-appearance, at its proper time, of the yearly "part" of our own local transactions. This delay is owing entirely to the dilatoriness of the printers, and is as annoying to your Committee as it may be disappointing to you. Part I. of Volume III. is, however, now in course of being printed, and expedition is promised. It will contain a full account of the Melton Congress, under the presidency of Bishop Jeune, and will include several papers of local and general interest.

Your Committee begs to urge upon all Members of the Society, and especially upon those who have recently joined it, the desirability of keeping up the interest of the bi-monthly meetings. This can be done not only by attending personally, but also by always contributing some article or articles for exhibition, and by reading memoirs upon them. It can further be done by bringing before the notice of the Society (by the reading of papers or otherwise) subjects connected with the particular objects for which the Society is formed.

In consequence of the visit of the Royal Archaeological Institute to Leicester last year, the Annual General Meeting and Excursion of the Members of this Society did not take place.

The Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton, and the Warwickshire Society, have each more than once expressed a wish for a joint summer meeting with our Society. It is hoped arrangements will be made for a *re-union* of that kind during the coming summer.