

SAINT AUGUSTINE
OF CANTERBURY



MINIATURES FROM THE C.C.C. M.S., CAMBRIDGE, NO. 286, THE SO-CALLED
ST. AUGUSTINE'S GOSPELS.

Frontispiece.

THE BIRTH OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY

BY SIR HENRY H. HOWORTH
K.C.I.E., HON. D.C.L. (DURHAM), F.R.S., F.S.A., ETC. ETC.
PRESIDENT OF THE ROY. ARCH. INST. AND THE ROY. NUMISMATIC SOCIETY
AUTHOR OF
"SAINT GREGORY THE GREAT" ETC. ETC.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS
MAPS, TABLES AND APPENDICES

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1913

All rights reserved

TO
PROFESSOR WILLIAM BRIGHT
AND
BISHOP BROWNE OF BRISTOL

I WISH to associate the following pages with the names of two English scholars who have done much to illuminate the beginnings of English Church history, and to light my own feet in the dark and unpaved paths across that difficult landscape. I have extolled their works in my Introduction, and I now take off my hat to them in a more formal way. An author's debts can often only be paid by acknowledgment and gratitude.

ERRATA.

Page 34. *For "Christianitas" read "Christianitatis."*

Page 41, footnote. *For "Brown" read "Browne."*

Page 53. *For "Povróπιαι" read "Povróπιαι."*

Page 65, last line but two. *For "though" read "since."*

PREFACE

IN writing a previous work dedicated to the life of Saint Gregory I purposely omitted one of the most dramatic events in his career—namely, the mission he sent to Britain to evangelise these islands. My purpose in writing that work was not to publish a minute and complete monograph of the great Pope. That had already been done in a much larger book by Mr. Dudden,—but to give an account of him such as would enable my readers to understand what manner of man it was who first conceived the notion of sending a Christian mission to the English race; what were the surroundings in which he lived; what was the position he filled in the drama of European politics at the beginning of the seventh century; what was the nature of the administrative changes he effected; how he governed the Church and its possessions; how he dealt with the secular rulers of Europe; what was his mental attitude towards the great theological problems of his day and how he affected the future history of thought, especially of religious thought. To give, in fact, in sufficient detail and with as complete accuracy as I could command, a picture of the Man and the Pope whose scholars and whose friends were the first

missionaries to the English race, and who brought with them what he had taught them. That work I meant to be the foundation-stone for a further volume in which the story of the Pope's English mission should be told as completely as I could tell it. This volume I now offer as a victim to my critics.

I feel, as I have always felt, that these islands are, both geologically and historically, only detached fragments of a much larger country, and that neither their geology nor their history can be understood without a continual reference to the geology and history of the other European lands. Especially is this the case with their religious history. Whatever polemics there may be about the ties of the earlier Church here, generally known as the British Church, there can be no question whatever that the Church of the English was the daughter of Rome. What the missionaries brought with them and planted here was what they had learnt very largely indeed from the lips of the great Pope whose spiritual children they were, for they had been trained in the monastery he had founded, where he had spent much of his leisure, and where his heart was generally to be found when his body was elsewhere.

It is a misfortune that we have next to nothing recorded in regard to the personal views of the missionaries themselves, on religious or secular subjects. Not a scrap of their writings (if any ever existed) has survived. The documents containing the story of their mission, scanty as they are, deal

only with its external aspects. For an account of the Christianity they planted here, its dogmatic leanings, its ritual, and its general policy, we must turn to the voluminous writings of their devoted father and master, Gregory. Hence the necessity for a careful survey of the great Pope's life and works as a preparation for any satisfactory study of the mission. This, as I have said, I made in the previous volume.

The present volume deals with the history of Gregory's venture from its inception to its close on the death of Archbishop Deusdedit, when the Episcopal succession derived from Augustine came to an end, and had to be revived under more promising conditions by Archbishop Theodore. It does not profess to deal with the British or with the Scotic Church. With both of them that mission had slight ties and both of them have an entirely different history, with which I may deal on another occasion.

It is not a very exhilarating story that I have to tell, for, notwithstanding a good deal of romantic writing by soft-hearted and sentimental apologists, the mission was essentially a failure. The conditions were, in fact, difficult and unpromising. The part of England then possessed by the English, instead of being governed by one sovereign or one royal stock, as in Gaul, was broken up into several rival principalities, at continual feud with each other. They had only one common occasional tie, in the person of a specially redoubtable person among the rival princes

who became for a while supreme, and for a while held the hegemony of the whole country, which presently passed to another strong man. This disintegrated condition of the community presented great obstacles to any concerted action on the part of the champions of a new faith. It led to jealousies, and it offered wild souls who preferred the religion of their fathers a ready means of finding a champion, if not at home, in some neighbouring state, to oppose those who surrendered to the new God and the new forms of magic (as they doubtless understood the ritual of the foreigners) of the Italian monks.

I hope I have made it plain in the previous volume that Gregory, although not technically a monk, was a very ideal monk in his heart and aspirations. Religion meant very largely with him a devotion to asceticism and a sacrifice and surrender of this life, in order maybe to purchase another and a happier existence beyond the clouds. He would have liked the whole world to be a monastery and all mankind to be clad in homespun, to abnegate all kinds of æsthetic living, and to devote themselves to penitence and prayer. Hence he forms *the* one heroic figure in the history of monstery. He idealised the monkish life and monkish standards, and he accepted as more or less divinely inspired the mystical thought and the materialised dreams and imaginings which pursue men when they press asceticism to the verge of endurance and starve their bodies and punish them with pain and suffering, until their morbid thought has become

more or less ecstatic and epileptic. His Dialogues prove this most completely.

With this ideal of life, he was the first Churchman of great parts who deliberately placed the monk's rôle and career above that of his secular brethren. Parish priests who had to live a much more trying life in, and continually to associate with, the world, its diseases and its crimes, and to apply such remedies to them as they could with their frail weapons, had, he thought, a humbler sphere. Gregory not only placed the life of a secular priest at a lower ideal level than that of a monk, but he deemed it largely inconsistent with a monk's vocation. He was also responsible for introducing the germs of what became, perhaps, the most pernicious of all innovations on the Christian polity of primitive times—namely, the exemption of monasteries from episcopal supervision and the loosening of their disciplinary regimen.

The fact that the missionaries who came to evangelise the English were monks and not secular clergy, and the consequences that followed, are so important that I must be forgiven for enlarging somewhat on the ideals of the early monks and their methods of attaining them.

The theory underlying the monastic life has some difficulty in justifying itself by an appeal to the New Testament. The institution was not of Christian origin. It had close ties with some forms of Jewish asceticism as practised by the Essenes and other Jewish sects among whom the secluded life had become widely prevalent at the opening of the Christian

era, and it was with one of these sects that Christ's precursor, John the Baptist, probably passed the greater part of his career. But we find nothing resembling monasticism in the teaching of Christ or embodied in His scheme. The central and original idea of a monk's life was not the bettering of the world and the leavening of his fellow-men with higher aspirations, by working among them, and teaching those who were weaker, more ignorant, or more unfortunate than himself how to spend more profitable and joyful lives. Not at all. The monk's chief premiss was, and still is, that this life is unprofitable and utterly wicked and base; that all its joys are delusive; and that every man has as much as he can do, to make sure that when he bids good-bye to the world he shall himself attain to perfect happiness in another home. The helping and bettering of others was to him a very distant vision. What he had to do was to save his own soul, and asceticism, in theory, means the ransom of a soul which is by nature wicked, by means of a lifelong penance and punishment and prayer. According to this theory, a man must cut himself off from the world and from his fellow-men. He should neither consort with them nor even exchange thoughts with them except when literally necessary, but rather devote himself to self-contemplation and introspection. Instead of treating the body as of equal importance and dignity with the soul, with which it is united by a necessarily indissoluble tie as long as life continues, the link was interpreted by the monks as an unholy

alliance between a body ruled by passions and a soul capable of higher things. The only way to eventually release the soul from its degrading bondage was to continually mortify and punish the body, to compel it to resist all its natural cravings and appetites and to deny it everything which could be deemed pleasure or happiness or joy. This, as we have seen, was the express teaching of St. Gregory, the great apostle of the monks. He continually urged upon his disciples the duty of perpetual penance so as to secure a safe haven for themselves in a future life. In order to gain this future, painted by him as one of ineffable happiness, he held that pain, misery, and self-imposed torture were the most fitting apprenticeship and preparation. This was the typical monk's theory of life in the earlier centuries after Christianity, and it was rigidly practised by the lonely hermits and anchorites.

Presently, certain of these hermits found it convenient for various reasons, and notably that of protection against external enemies, to associate themselves in communities living close together. In these they prayed on certain days in the same church and sometimes they fed together in the same room, while their various cells were enclosed by one protecting wall. They, however, kept up the initial idea of rigid seclusion in other respects. Each had his own hut, where he lived and slept and prayed ; the common life being as much restricted as possible, and the solitary and silent one encouraged. These communities were presided over by some autocratic

old member of the body with a reputation for greater sanctity, which often meant a capacity for sustaining life under especially trying conditions. Such communities were to be found all over the Christian East, and are still the models on which the monasteries of the Greek Church are constituted. A Greek *laura* is a mere aggregation of hermits.

This continual struggle against all the instincts and the natural desires of men and women and of the tender promptings of their hearts, was no doubt more easy to maintain among the single anchorites living apart and under the close eye of pupils and devotees than in the enclosed communities, where the *afflatus* and extreme tension had a tendency to relax and the discipline to become affected. Presently, wiser men began to see that the process of continually inventing new forms of self-torture must be restrained if a pretence of sanity was to be kept up, and that they must devise some limitations to fanaticism and some regulation of the life of the community which should not entirely crush all the humanity out of the men who joined it. They proceeded to qualify the stringent extravagance of penance, and of almost continuous prayer and introspection, by some other employment which should be salutary both for the health of the body and the health of the mind ; and otherwise to regulate and systematise the life of the brotherhood. Such a body of regulations was known as a *Rule*, and there were several such put together by the founders of various individual monasteries, or of groups of monasteries.

Among these a very famous one, as we have seen in an earlier volume, was the Rule of St. Benedict. Benedict introduced a great deal of sane human wisdom and good sense into his monasteries, and especially encouraged, among other things, the element of well-regulated labour of the body, to act as a tonic to the continual mental strain which had a tendency to produce hysteria and paralysis of the mind. Under Benedict's Rule again, there grew up a corporate devotion and loyalty among the brethren, first of a monk to his own monastery, and then of each member of a house to those of any other house in the same Order. This family feeling among the monks was fostered by the largely democratic character of the Benedictine constitution. Thus a remedy was found for the strongly individualised and self-centred life practised by the anchorites.

The new departure had excellent results in other ways. As the monasteries increased in size and wealth by the gifts of the pious, their possessions needed more and more skill in management. The establishments became more and more, not merely communities for practising continual asceticism and prayer, but great farms and manufactories where everything necessary for the life and health of the community was studied and practised. Not only was farming pursued with skill and knowledge, but road-making, and draining, and conveying pure water for drinking, and making ponds for stocking fish, and plantations for providing timber and firewood, were all practised in most scientific

fashion. All this involved a condition of things as far removed as can be conceived from the ideals of St. Pachomius and St. Macarius. It led, no doubt, to what the historians of the monks have every right to claim as largely their work—namely, the reclaiming of large parts of the land in Western and Central Europe from waste and desert, and the spreading, by means of the intercommunion between the larger houses, of a knowledge of all the arts of rural life, which was supplemented by schemes for educating the young and ignorant, and the practice of skilled calligraphy for the multiplication of books. This state of things, however, took a long time to grow.

The monks who were sent to convert the rough, heathen English were not men of business and men of the world of the type of their later descendants at Malmesbury or Peterborough or Gloucester, who were accustomed to deal with men and to face difficulties in doing so, but were very simple folk, who had virtually lived like hermits and thought like hermits. Those who have pictured for us the mission of Augustine and his brethren have too often had in their minds not St. Gregory's pupils, but monks like those of St. Albans in the days of its glory, or of Downside in our own day.

Even in later times the useful work done by the monks in civilising the Western World must not allow us to forget that there was another side to the question.

In theory, the life of the monastery was regulated by the Rule of St. Benedict, and in many matters it

was so in practice also. The growth of wealth and the manifold employments and responsibilities of great monasteries must, however, have interfered greatly with discipline and with the ideal monk's life. Especially did it do so as the life in the richer monasteries became more luxurious, more attractive, and indeed far more comfortable, than that in the feudal castles or the lonely manor-houses of the laity. This led to men repairing thither to pass easy lives rather than with rigid ideas of asceticism. Princes and great nobles, princesses and great ladies, flocked to the cloisters, and adopted the outward garb of monks and nuns, but not their spirit, and gave another turn to the life within and without. This was encouraged by the appointment of the abbots in the larger abbeys being in many cases really, though not always formally, controlled by the King. They had become too rich and powerful to be the mere nominees of the monks, and the kings and great nobles began to look on the abbeys as prizes to be given to their relations and supporters. These recruits often came in not as monks, but as useful politicians. According to St. Benedict's Rule, each monastery was an entirely separate institution from every other, and entirely self-governed. This made it more difficult to maintain high standards and good discipline everywhere, and laxity of discipline due to the want of supervision was the eventual cause of monastic decay. Hence the necessity that was found by the great reformers of the Benedictines in later times, such as the founders of the Cistercian and Cluniac Orders, to

affiliate all their houses to the mother-house, and thus to have a system of careful control and an annual conference of all the abbots of the Order, so as to maintain uniformity of practice and of life, instead of each monastery having individual theories of laxity or strictness largely dependent on the character of the abbot for the time being.

The best remedy in such a case was the independent one of episcopal visitation. To this the monks have always had great objections. The ecclesiastical life of the Middle Ages is full of instances of struggles by abbeys to escape from episcopal control and visitation, and of the employment of forgery and chicanery galore, in order to secure their ends. In this struggle the continual tendency of the Holy See was to support the monks, who became in most countries the janissaries of the Pope. For him they fought very largely with the same weapons and by the same sinister acts by which they fought for their own hands. Saint Gregory, great Pope as he was, did infinite harm in this, as in so many instances, by misinterpreting the signs of the future. A monk in heart, as we have seen, he was always ready to foster monkish independence of control.

From his day we may definitely date the beginning of the invasion of the primitive right of bishops and synods to direct the affairs of the Church in all ways, and the gradual substitution of an *imperium in imperio* in every diocese where a monastery existed. Not only did this tend to destroy

the original ideal of church polity and of Christian life as presented in the Bible, but to substitute another ideal for it—that which has borne its richest fruits not among Christians but among the Northern Buddhists of Tibet and the Southern ones of Ceylon and Burma. The monks presently became very largely the authors of a continually changing kaleidoscope of new cults, of new ritual, of new moral theories. They further exalted the condition of celibacy into a special virtue, and were largely responsible for the substitution of devotions to the Virgin (whom they idealised in a morbid way, perhaps natural to secluded celibates) for the primitive worship of the Deity. The monastic theory of surrendering the will and thought of the monk to his abbot was extended presently to lay folk and their priests. By dangerously enlarging the theory of confession, it eventually became the most potent instrument for sapping the virility of the human conscience. Presently again, when the Orders had greatly increased, and had to compete with each other for the good things of life, and for the good will, the help and patronage of the poor and ignorant laity, whose faith in southern climates is so much coloured by its dramatic trappings, they also began to compete in providing more and more highly seasoned food to attract the never-satisfied appetite of the credulous and the ignorant. They accordingly became the great purveyors of miracles, of the cult of relics, of the multiplication of saints, pilgrimages, of images with special virtues,

and of revived pagan forms of magic. In their efforts to do this they defied all the attempts of bishops and clergy to restrain them, until they had overlaid the Christianity of primitive times by a revived paganism which may be best studied in the villages of Southern Italy, of Sicily, of Spain, and of Latin America. Above all things, they became the special bodyguard of the Pope, always ready to fight for the enhancement of his authority and for the corresponding degradation of the episcopate, of which the Pope was theoretically only the senior member. Thus the administrative machinery of Christianity itself became entirely changed. This aspect of monachism has been very much minimised by professed Church historians, whose rôle it is to hide these unattractive and forbidding aspects of the past in a misleading and quite spurious glory, instead of letting men profit by the mistakes of their best-meaning ancestors. No one doubts that in their inception the changes were well meant, but they involved a false analysis of human nature and its frailties, which are always tending to mistake exaggerated emotional tendencies for religion.

In view of all this, it must be kept perpetually in view that Gregory's mission to England was entirely manned by monks. It seems perfectly plain that, with the exception of certain individuals (very few are recorded) who were necessary to serve the altar, none of them were priests, nor in fact in holy orders, but were simply laymen who had taken perpetual vows of poverty, humility, and obedience,

and lived by a Rule. They consorted together in communities in the large towns. There were no parishes, no parish priests ; but the monks used to travel from place to place at stated times and hold baptisms and preachings, while occasionally they would take a priest with them who administered the Holy Sacrament. The only parishes were the dioceses, which were called *parochia*. All this is difficult for us to realise, and more difficult because of the scantiness of our materials ; but it emphasises the fact that the mission of St. Augustine was a monks' mission, and worked from a monastery. It was like the early Spanish missions in South America and the Philippines, and very unlike such missions as those sent out by the Church Missionary Society in charge of one or more secular priests, and having the parochial system in view. The missionaries whom Gregory sent were themselves hardly sympathetic harbingers of good tidings. They had an unfamiliar (quite foreign) physical appearance, olive complexions, black hair, and strange garb. They spoke a foreign tongue, and if some succeeded in learning the native speech, it must have been imperfectly and no doubt they spoke it with a strong accent. If there were interpreters, they were very indifferent conduit pipes between the debased Latin speech of most of the preachers and the understandings of the rude warriors. Under these circumstances, they were probably tempted to gain the favour of their semi-heathen and only half-converted flocks by making compromises with old beliefs, old legends, and old divinities.

They reconsecrated to Christian uses ancient holy wells and sacred trees, while the whole machinery of a more ancient magic was ever readily adapted to the new faith by having new names given to it or being dressed in fresh clothes. The prime difficulty of all, however, was doubtless the temperament of their chief Augustine, an unsympathetic person, with little tact, and pursued by the small thoughts and small issues that act as gadflies on men who live secluded lives, as witness his well-known questions sent to Gregory on difficult matters, some very trivial and some very unclean, and described later on. It thus came about that while the Roman missionaries made little headway, those who went out from Iona and Lindisfarne and represented another allegiance proceeded to the conversion of the greater part of England to the Faith.

It is not easy to say how much of the ritual and practice which was followed by the missionaries was other than that preached at Rome and was derived from that of Gaul. Some of it we know was so derived, and it may well have been thought suitable to their new conditions by the missionaries who had stayed a considerable time there on their way. Nor must we forget that a Gallic mission had already sown some scattered seeds in Britain. It accompanied the French Queen on her way hither, and the new missionaries would probably like to make their practices conform as closely as they could to those which were already familiar to some of the community.

I have tried to make the story as complete as

possible by incorporating a record of every fact accessible to me, and I hope I may have illuminated some dark points and corrected some errors. *Inter alia*, I have thought it right to give a detailed account of the decayed and poor fragments of the sacred buildings positively known to have been put up by the missionaries. They are the only documents remaining on British soil which we can certainly identify with Augustine and his immediate successors, and if they have no artistic merit they are at least genuine. They no doubt represent very much the kind of buildings then being put up in Gaul : shadows of shadows of Roman structures built for the most part with Roman bricks or Roman dressed ashlar, and in the Roman fashion of walling, and they mark the depth to which the architectural art had then sunk. As a background to the picture, I have continually had in view what was passing elsewhere than in these islands, and have given a condensed notice of the history of the Empire, of Spain, and of Francia (as Gaul then began to be called), in all of which lands the dramatic history of the Church was at that time passing through great and far-reaching changes material and moral. These, however apparently far off, had effects on the outermost skirts of Christendom. Among them the most important was the final conquest of Spain by the Visigoths, who had now become orthodox, and the overwhelming of three of the four Eastern patriarchates by the Muhammedans, who also gave the Empire very heavy blows in the latter years of Heraclius and his successors.

The history of the Papacy itself at this time is for the most part uninteresting, and only known in a fragmentary fashion. The most dramatic events, apart from the life of Honorius, are those relating to the Popedom of Martin I., which has been absurdly misinterpreted by most Church historians. Their views I have partially corrected by an appeal to a learned Benedictine who belongs to an Order famous not only for its learning but for its ingenuous treatment of history. Meanwhile, the Western World was sinking into greater intellectual lethargy and decay, and especially in Italy and Gaul. The Church in Spain, so recently converted to orthodoxy, had become a centre and source of movement in which several fine scholars took a part. This vigour was marred by the characteristic Spanish temper of impatience at the existence of intellectual liberty, and the persecution of Jews and heretics. The one unsullied centre and focus of religious life, of missionary enterprise, and of devotion to learning, was Ireland, the last green spot which the sun in his daily journey across the Atlantic suffuses with gold and purple from his exhaustless palette. Alas, that this phase in the history of a gifted and unhappy race, whom fortune has generally treated as a step-daughter, should so soon have passed away! We must never forget, however, that during the period we are dealing with, Columbanus in Gaul and Switzerland and Columba at Iona were holding up for man's guidance, across the fearful waves

that then tormented the Christian world, great lamps whose glow filled all Europe from Iona to Bobbio and St. Gallen.

The three appendices which close the volume deal with matters which, although somewhat remote from the affairs of England, are important enough in the annals of Europe and of the Church at the time we are dealing with, and which needed discussion in view of the latest lights and information about them. I would especially commend the Second Appendix to my readers. In it I have tried to analyse with some pains the difficult question of the position of Pope Honorius in regard to the issue of Papal Infallibility. The historical methods of Baronius, Bellarmine, and Turrecremata are no longer in fashion, and few of their polemical writings have any value for us. Upon no subject did they confuse the judgment of honest folk so much as upon this one, and upon no other have they so much embarrassed the apologists of their Order and of their Faith. I have tried to do justice to a great Pope and an honest man, and to show how his assailants have led their Church to Coventry in their attempts to distort and falsify the clearest light of history. They have done so in support of a paradox whose conditions they cannot or dare not define—namely, that of Papal Infallibility. Perhaps those who are not interested in that issue may be interested in the wider one I have raised in regard to the authority of the so-called Fathers and Doctors of the Church to settle dogmas.

I am not sure that the real gravity of this issue has been hitherto sufficiently appreciated.

The Third Appendix deals with the status and position of the Papal Nuncios at Constantinople, and with the mode of selection of the Popes in the sixth and seventh centuries. The Nuncios were much more important persons than is sometimes suspected, and, as a recent Catholic writer says : "To be sent as *apocrisiarius* to Constantinople was to graduate for the Papacy."

The first Appendix contains a detailed account of the terrible ravages of the plague in the sixth and seventh centuries, and gives a list of its known victims, which proves how terribly the Church must have suffered from the attack ; for we probably only have a tithe of the names of those who were in Orders and died, names which are doubtless limited to the most prominent Churchmen.

Meanwhile, may I crave a kind thought from my readers if I have enabled them even in a small way to see a little farther into the shadows that shroud so much of the history of our country in the seventh century. May I ask that they will be patient when they come across occasional errors of fact or temper or taste, and not expect me to be as immaculate as themselves, nor disdain altogether what has been the result of much labour and thought, because of the wretched flies that may have crept into my pot of ointment while I have been nodding.

30 COLLINGHAM PLACE,
December 1, 1912.

H. H. HOWORTH.

C O N T E N T S

	<small>PAGE</small>
PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	xxxii
THE EMPERORS, POPES, AND THE KINGS OF THE FRANKS AND VISIGOTHS, FROM 595 TO 664	lxxxiii
GENEALOGY OF THE DESCENDANTS OF CHLOTHAIRE II. lxxxiv	
THE ENGLISH ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS, AND THE ABBOTS OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S, FROM 597 TO 664	lxxxv
THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION FROM AUGUSTINE TO DAMIAN	lxxxvi
GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF KENT AND ESSEX	lxxxvii
GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF EAST ANGLIA	lxxxvii
GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF DEIRA	lxxxviii
GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF BERNICIA	lxxxviii
ADDENDA	lxxxix
C H A P.	
I.	1
II.	38
III.	87
IV.	198
V.	240
VI.	318
APPENDIX I.: THE BUBONIC PLAGUE IN THE SIXTH AND SEVENTH CENTURIES	343
APPENDIX II.: POPE HONORIUS AND THE MONO- THELITES	366
APPENDIX III.: THE POPES AND THEIR NUNCIOS AT CONSTANTINOPLE	406

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

MINIATURES FROM THE C.C.C. M.S., CAMBRIDGE, NO. 286, THE SO-CALLED ST. AUGUSTINE'S GOSPELS	<i>Frontispiece</i>
FACING PAGE	
ENGLAND A.D. 597 TO 652	I
THE MARBLE THRONE OF ST. GREGORY	18
THE THREE CHAPELS OF ST. ANDREW, SANTA SILVIA, AND SANTA BARBARA, ORIGINALLY BUILT BY SAINT GREGORY, AND REBUILT IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. (I owe this drawing to my friend, Mrs. E. McClure)	24
THE CHURCH OF SAINT MARTIN AT CANTERBURY, AS IT IS NOW	44
REMAINS OF SAXON WORK AT ST. MARTIN'S, CANTERBURY	46
REMAINS OF THE SAXON CHURCH OF ST. PANCRAS AT CANTERBURY	72
THE SO-CALLED ST. AUGUSTINE'S CHAIR AT THE CATHEDRAL, CANTERBURY	96
GROUND PLANS OF THE SAXON CHURCHES OF ST. MARTIN'S AND OF ST. PANCRAS'S, CANTERBURY; OF THE SAXON CATHEDRAL AT ROCHESTER, AND THE SAXON CHURCH AT LYMINGE	172
THE OLD ALTAR OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S AT CANTERBURY, WITH THE SHRINES OF ÆTHELBERHT, KING OF KENT, AND OF THE EARLY ARCHBISHOPS GROUPED AROUND IT. (From an engraving in the first edition of Dugdale's <i>Monasticon</i>)	186

	FACING PAGE
GROUND PLAN OF THE CHURCH OF PAULINUS AT YORK .	262
THE TWO SIDES OF THE CROSS IN THE CHURCHYARD AT WHALLEY. (Attributed by Bishop Browne and others to Paulinus).	266
THE INSCRIBED CROSS AT HAWKSWELL, NEAR CATTERICK. (Attributed by Hubner, Bishop Browne, and others, to James, the Deacon of Paulinus)	328
THE RELIQUARY OF ST. EANSWITHA AT FOLKESTONE. (I owe this photograph to my friend Sir Martin Conway) .	334

INTRODUCTION

THE authorities for the contents of this volume are largely the same as those for the previous one on St. Gregory which were described in its introduction. They begin with the letters of that Pope, which were of course strictly contemporary and constitute testimony of the best quality. The Pope's correspondence was entered up, as we saw, in a register comprising thirteen and a half volumes, each volume devoted to a single year, the last year being incomplete.¹ The first to use these letters was a learned priest named Nothelm, who became Archbishop of Canterbury, and who made copies of a certain number of them relating to St. Augustine's mission which he sent to Bede to be used in his Church History of England. As I remarked in the previous introduction, it is curious that there should have been any necessity for these copies, for the originals ought to have then been at Canterbury.

It is plain, from a subsequent letter of Bishop Boniface to Archbishop Ecgberht of Canterbury, that only a partial selection of the letters in the papal register (whether relating to Britain or not is not stated) were abstracted by Nothelm, for Boniface

¹ See H. H. Howorth, *Life of Gregory the Great*, xvii-xix.

was able to send some others to his correspondent. As I also pointed out in the previous introduction, the original registers have long ago been destroyed. Fortunately, although a considerable number of the Pope's letters have been lost, a very large proportion of them remain in several collections, about which I have given ample information in my previous introduction. In the present volume, as in the previous one, I have relied upon the edition of Gregory's letters edited by Ewald and Hartmann, which, although by no means perfect, is very much better than any other. I have quoted this edition by the initials of the editors, referring to each letter by the number of the original volume of the register in which it occurs, with the number of the letter as given by E. and H. I have also had continually by my side the excellent translation of a large number of the more interesting letters by Dr. Barmby in the Library of Post-Nicene Fathers, where the letters are illuminated by excellent annotations.

The first of Gregory's letters in which the English are referred to is not contained in Bede. It was written in September 595 by the Pope to Candidus, his agent in Gaul, and instructs him to spend a portion of the papal funds in his hands in the redemption of Anglian slaves.¹

The next letter is dated 23rd July 596. It is not preserved in any of the existing registers,

¹ See *E. and H.* vi. 10; Barmby, vi. 7; *infra*, p. 7.

and was perhaps never entered in them. It is, however, given by Bede, and may have been derived by him from the records at Canterbury. John the Deacon, who quotes it, apparently derived it from Bede. This letter was addressed to St. Augustine's companions (whose hearts had failed them) in order to encourage them.¹ It was taken with him by Augustine on his return from Rome after his visit there,² to cheer the faint-heartedness of his colleagues.

Dated on the same day are a number of commendatory letters to the rulers and bishops of Gaul, recommending Augustine and his companions.³ They are abstracted, and their contents are discussed in the following narrative (pp. 28-35). They are all contained in the extant copies of the papal registers.

In September 597 Gregory wrote a letter to Queen Brunichildis, in which, *inter alia*, he thanked her for her kindness to Augustine and his companions.⁴ In July 598 he wrote to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, reporting to him the success of Augustine's mission.⁵ This and the previous letter are both contained in the extant papal registers.

In July 599 Gregory wrote again to Brunichildis and told her that he was sending a pallium to Syagrius, the Bishop of Autun, to reward him for the zeal he had shown in assisting Augustine and

¹ *Vide infra*, 30.

² It is given by *E. and H.* vi. 502.

³ See *E. and H.* vi. 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 57.

⁴ *E. and H.* viii. 4.

⁵ *E. and H.* viii. 29.

his companions.¹ Of the same date is a letter written directly to Syagrius, in which he makes the same acknowledgment.² None of these letters are in Bede.

In the year 597-98, Augustine, having been consecrated Bishop, sent a mission to Rome to report about the progress of his venture to Gregory. Its head, the presbyter Laurence, also took with him a letter from Augustine to the Pope containing a series of questions on points of practice and ritual in which he had found some difficulty. This mission on its return to England brought back a number of other letters dated 1st June 601. Three were addressed to Queen Brunichildis and her two sons, thanking them for their treatment of Augustine and his companions, and asking for similar favours for Laurence and his party;³ another to Chlothaire II., King of Neustria, also commanding Laurence and his party.⁴ Others, again, were sent to the bishops of Gaul, to whom Gregory introduced the presbyter Laurence and his companions.⁵ These are not in Bede. The Pope further wrote letters to Æthelberht, King of Kent, and his wife Bertha,⁶ and to St. Augustine himself.⁷ These three last letters are contained in Bede. Several of the whole series are dated on the 2nd January, while Nos. 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 44, 50, 51 are dated simply in June. The arrangement of these letters by Ewald and

¹ *E. and H.* ix. 213.

² *Ib.* ix. 222.

³ *Ib.* xi. 47, 48, 49, and 50.

⁴ *Ib.* 51.

⁵ *Ib.* xi. 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 45.

⁶ *Ib.* xi. 35 and 37.

⁷ *Ib.* xi. 36, 39.

Hartmann is not very logical, a fault which is found elsewhere in their excellent work.

Laurence and his companions (almost certainly) took back with them to England another document — namely, Gregory's answers to St. Augustine's letters. These answers have given rise to a fierce polemic, and their authenticity has been questioned or denied by those who have had special reasons for disliking their contents as more or less sophisticating Pope Gregory's orthodoxy. I have discussed the question at length farther on,¹ and have shown what a great weight of authority there is in their favour, including some recent Roman Catholic writers with critical acumen, and I have no doubt myself that the answers in question were the handiwork of the great Pope. These responsions or answers are not contained in the papal registers, but are preserved by Bede. Ewald and Hartmann took their text of them² from Bede. One great difficulty which those people have to face who question the authenticity of the responsions is that, if forged, they must have been forged before the time of Bishop Boniface, who refers to them in a letter written before 741.

After Laurence and Mellitus with their companions had left Rome they were followed by a messenger from the Pope carrying another letter in which he corrected an instruction of his own in regard to the treatment of the heathen temples by the mis-

¹ *Infra*, pp. 100-114.

² xi. 56a.

sionaries. This letter was addressed not to Lawrence but to his companion, Mellitus. It is preserved in the codices labelled R by Ewald, and also by Bede,¹ and is discussed below (p. 128, etc.). It is dated 18th July 601.

This is the last letter in Gregory's correspondence in which he refers to Britain.

Contemporary with Gregory the Pope was Gregory the Bishop of Tours, whose work on the Franks is a priceless record for the history of the Merovingian period in France. It is notable that he should have so little to say about England, showing what a remote and unimportant area it was in his time. He does not refer at all to Augustine's mission; while in his account of the marriage of the Princess Bertha, daughter of King Charibert, he does not give us the name of her husband, *Æthelberht*, nor of any other English ruler. The little he has to tell us about the people beyond the Channel is incorporated in the following pages.

The only other documents of a contemporary date professing to have to do with the English Church are certain charters granting lands and claiming to have been given by the kings of Kent to the new Church, and also certain laws attributed to *Æthelberht*, King of Kent. I say "professing" advisedly, for, with the exception of the laws, I have no doubt that all these documents are sophistications. The charters granting lands were

¹ *H.E.* i. 30.

published by Kemble in his well-known work entitled *Codex Diplomaticus*, and were reprinted in another and enlarged form by my old friend Mr. de Gray Birch. It is a great pity this latter work has not been completed. It also much needs a commentary and annotations, and especially a revised judgment upon the authenticity and contents of the documents. I must now say a few words about those of the charters which come within the period I am dealing with. I will begin with one or two *a priori* arguments.

In the first place, it is exceedingly unlikely that Augustine or the monks who went with him, or belonged to his mission, would have had with them anyone skilled in the production of charters. They were going on what was largely deemed a hopeless venture, and would not be likely to provide for the contingency of drawing up charters. With the second mission under Theodore the case was different. The Church had then been already planted, and we are expressly told that he took with him a person skilled in the art in question. It is quite likely that the Kentish king gave the monks lands, but they would not be of the class called *bocland* (*i.e.* secured by charters), but of the sort called *folcland*, and conveyed in a much more primitive way by what lawyers call *livery of seisin*. Secondly, knowing as we do Bede's care and zeal in treating of the earliest history of the English, and the very competent and learned correspondents and friends he had to help him, it is reasonable to treat all

documents of this early time which profess to deal with the English Church and are not mentioned or quoted by him with suspicion. Quite a number of these exist, and may be roughly put into two classes. First, those which may have been concocted more or less innocently by the custodians of the charters in order to give a more stable and easily proved title to property already theirs. In this class of document we may generally trust the descriptions and boundaries of the lands as reliable, since it was a very difficult matter in the Middle Ages actually to appropriate other people's property in the face of a public inquest, which could always be demanded by the person aggrieved. On the other hand, the terms of the document, the names it contains and also the dates, and more especially the names of the witnesses, are generally entirely sophistications.

A second class of spurious documents is much more dangerous and misleading, and consists of deeds deliberately forged for the purpose of securing not lands but privileges for various abbeys. These privileges generally consist in exemptions from Episcopal control and supervision.

Thomas of Elmham, in his book on St. Augustine's Monastery, gives us a number of documents of both classes. He was treasurer of the abbey in 1407, and there is no reason for attaching any suspicion to himself. He doubtless reports and copies what he saw there. One of the deeds he mentions was in fact already known to Sprott, whose chronicle

extended to 1232, and was thus written a long time before Elmham's day. He makes it the foundation of his account of a synod said to have been held at Canterbury in 605;¹ while another of the documents, which is sealed with a leaden bulla, is copied, with a drawing of the bulla, in the Harleian MS. 686.

It is pretty certain that at the beginning of the thirteenth century there were certain documents and charters at St. Augustine's Abbey purporting to belong to the end of the sixth and the first half of the seventh century, and that they were accepted by the three historians of the abbey—Sprott, Thorne, and Thomas of Elmham—as genuine. There cannot be a doubt that they were all forgeries. The evidence for this is plain, and they have been pronounced to be spurious by all recent scholars, including Kemble, Haddan and Stubbs, and others.

Let us now try and analyse the evidence about these documents. First, the external evidence. On the 29th of August 1168 a fire broke out at St. Augustine's Abbey. It is described by Thorne, the last entry of whose chronicle is dated in 1397, and who tells us that down to the year 1232 his story was chiefly based on that of Thomas Sprott, which is not now extant. Thorne tells us that in this fire many charters perished "*in qua combustione multae codicellae perierunt.*" We not only have evidence, however, of the destruction of the charters at St.

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 56.

Augustine's, but also of others having been forged. In the great struggle that took place between St. Augustine's Abbey and the Archbishop about privileges in the twelfth century, it was contended on the part of the latter that the documents produced by the monks were spurious. Archbishop Richard says in his letter to Pope Alexander III., written about the year 1180 : *Monasteria enim quae hoc beneficium damnatissimae libertatis, sive apostolica auctoritate, sive, quod frequentius est, bullis adulterinis, adepta sunt, plus inquietudinis, plus inobedientiae, plus inopiae incurrerunt : ideoque et multae domus, quae nominatissimae sunt in sanctitate et religione, has immunitates aut nunquam habere voluerunt, aut habitas continuo rejecerunt. Si ergo Malmesburiensis abbas, qui apud nos reputatur arbor sterilis, ficus fatua, et truncus inutilis, ad nos venerit, vel miserit, vitam et opinionem illius in libra justitiae appendatis ; nec illius admittatis privilegia, donec manifeste liqueat, ex collatione scripturae et bullarum, quo tempore, et a quibus patribus sunt indulta. Falsariorum enim praestigiosa malitia ita in episcoporum contumeliam se armavit, ut falsitas in omnium fere monasteriorum exemptione praevaleat, nisi in decisionibus et examinationibus faciendis judex veritatis exactor districtissimus intercedat.*¹ The suspicions here referred to were followed up by a challenge to the Abbot of St. Augustine's to show his *privilegia* in public, and so vindicate the

¹ *Vide* Peter of Blois, ep. lxviii ; Hardwick, *Thomas of Elmham*, xxx, xxxi.

claim he had raised of complete exemption from the Archbishop's jurisdiction. "The challenge was, however, declined once and again amidst the taunts and laughter of the Christ Church monks, who asked exultingly if truth was fond of corners, or if the possessors of a genuine document were likely at such a crisis to shrink from public examination. After a long delay the matter was submitted to the judgment of the Pontiff, who issued a commission empowering certain persons to visit St. Augustine's, to inspect the ancient privileges, and to forward their report to him. Again, however, the inquiry was delayed on account of the invincible tergiversation of the monks."¹

Fresh commissioners were now appointed in the persons of the Bishop of Durham and the Abbot of St. Albans, in whose presence, only the more important of the documents were produced. These consisted of two of the *privilegia* professedly granted by King Æthelbert and one by Augustine (to be afterwards described), while the rest of the documents were carefully concealed. Gervase of Canterbury, a champion of the rival establishment at Christ Church, describes the result of this examination in some graphic phrases: "*Protulerunt*," he says, "*itaque tandem aliquando monachi abbatis schedulas duas, quas sua originalia constanter esse dicebant. Quarum prima vetustissima erat rasa et subscripta, ac si esset emendata, et absque sigillo. Hanc*

¹ See Gervase of Canterbury, *Chron.*, col. 145-48; Hardwick, *Thomas of Elmham*, xxxi and xxxii.

dicebant regis Ethelberti esse privilegium. Alia vero schedula multo erat recentior, de qua bulla plumbea cum iconia episcopi nova valde dependebat. Hanc cartulam sancti Augustini dicebant esse privilegium. In his autem privilegiis, intuentium judicio, haec maxime notanda fuerunt: In prima laudabilis quidem fuit vetustas, sed rasa fuit et inscripta, nec ullius sigilli munimine roborata. In alia vero reprehensione dignum fuit, quod nova extitit ejus littera et bulla cum vetustatis esse deberet annorum quingentorum octoginta, id est a tempore beati Augustini, cuius esse dicebatur. Fuit etiam notatum, immo notorium et notabile, quod bulla ipsius plumbea fuit, cum non soleant Cisalpini praesules vel primates scriptis suis authenticis bullas plumbeas apponere. Modus etiam Latini et forma loquendi a Romano stilo dissona videbantur. Haec duo solummodo privilegia in medium prolatâ sunt, cum alia nonnulla se habuisse monachi jactitarent."¹

It will be seen, therefore, that suspicions existed as long ago as the twelfth century in regard to the documents we are discussing. No wonder that the whole process of the securing of privileges of exemption, and in fact of any advantage, by the monks, was then felt to be steeped in chicanery and falsification, and that no document relating to such privileges can now be accepted as genuine without the closest inspection. The practice was virtually universal,

¹ Gervase, *op. cit.*, col. 1458; Hardwick, *Thomas of Elmham*, pp. xxxii and xxxiii.

and good examples may be found in the wholesale forgeries (now universally admitted to be such) among the early charters of Peterborough, Evesham, Pershore, Chertsey, Malmesbury, etc. etc. The practice of forgery was in fact reduced to a fine art by the monks, and I cannot quote a better proof than the case of Croyland as described by Ingram in the *Archæological Journal* long ago.

By a lucky chance he came upon the whole of the details of the manufacturing and forging of the documents which were afterwards produced as evidence in the struggle between the Abbeys of Croyland and Spalding in the law courts, by which the latter monastery was completely undone.

In regard to the charters from St. Augustine's, we not only know that they were forged, but we can actually recover the name of the forger. This information is contained in a document quoted in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, 1691, vol. ii. preface, p. iv. It is a letter of Ægidius, Bishop of Evreux, written to Pope Alexander, which is sealed with his seal and labelled, “*Ægidii Dei gratia Ebroicensis Episcopi*,” and which is itself endorsed *Contra falsa Privilegia S. Augustini; qualiter per unum monachum falsarium S. Medardi adulterinis privilegiis se munierunt*. I prefer, in order to avoid all question, to quote it in its original Latin.

“*Quam gravis inter Regem Henricum et me servum Vestrae Sanctitatis in initio nostri Episcopatus exorta sit discordia pro reparatione libertatis Ecclesiarum Norman. quae a multis retro tempor-*

ibus conculcateae fuerant; discretionem vestram non credimus ignorare. Illius siquidem persecutionis turbine moti et Parochiae nostrae fines exire compulsi, portum nonnisi in Apostolicae pietatis sinubus invenire potuimus. Quae et quanta nobis solatia foelicis memoriae B. Innocentius Papa contulerit vix mens potest concipere vel lingua proferre. Inter quae hoc unum quia ad modernorum non credimus notitiam pervenisse, vestrae Discretioni, tanquam dignum memoria, praesentis scripti relatione studuimus intimare. Dum B. Innocentius Remis celebraturus Concilium advenisset; me minimum servorum Dei cum fratribus et filiis nostris ex more contigit interesse. Inter caeteros autem, quos nobiscum adduximus, R. in Abbatem B. Audoeni, W. in Abbatem Gemmetensem electi, nec benedicti, Apostolico se conspectui in Abbatum ordine praesentarunt. Quorum electionem, immo dejectionem, dum Apostolicis auribus intimarem, discreto more suo ab eis diligentius inquisivit, si forte aliquibus Privilegiis autenticis munirentur, quorum patrocinio eorum personae vel Ecclesiae a Metropolitanani subjectione comprobarentur immunes. Dum hae Apostolica sollicitudo diligentis scrutaretur instantia; venerabilem vivum G. Catalaunensem Episcopum, quondam Abbatem B. Medardi, ex divino munere contigit affuisse. Qui, dum B. Audoeni Electus circa quaestionem apostolicam haesitaret, nostrae dubitationi finem imposuit, et illius praesumptionis tumorem antiquae recordationis freno compescuit. Ait enim, quod dum in Ecclesia B.

Medardi Abbatis officio fungeretur: quendam Gvernonem nomine ex Monachis suis, in ultimo confessionis articulo se falsarium fuisse confessum, et inter caetera, quae per diversas Ecclesias segmentando conscripserat, Ecclesiam B. Audoeni et Ecclesiam B. Augustini de Cant. adulterinis privilegiis sub Apostolico nomine se munisse, lamentabiliter poenitendo asseruit. Quin et ob mercedem iniqutatis quaedam se pretiosa ornamenta recepisse confessus est, et ad B. Medardi Ecclesiam detulisse. Quo audito B. Innocentius praedictum est sciscitatus Episcopum, si quod de plano interlocutus fuerat, jusjurandi religione firmaret? Quod se facturum vir Dei, religionis et veritatis amator, proposuit. Quo audito Dominus Papa: Eia, inquit, mi frater carissime, indu te ornamentis dignitatis tuae, et praesentibus Electis sub professione canonica manum benedictionis impone: quod ego impetrata licentia aggressus sum. Ipse quod mirabile dictu est, venerabilium patrum conventum ejus adventum expectantium ingredi supersedit; quoad ego secum intraturus, benedictis rite Abbatibus, advenirem. Haec Pater Sanctissime vobis duximus exaranda; exorantes, ut si praedictas Ecclesias contra institutiones patrias aliquid usurpare fuerit comprobatum; vos more solito et debito Ecclesiis singulis suam conservetis in omnibus aequitatem.

“Venerabili Patri ac Domino charissimo Alexandro Dei gratia S. R. E. Summo Pontifici E. eadem gratia Ebroicensis Ecclesiae humilis minister, servus tuae Sanctitatis, obedientiam de-

votam et reverentiam. Quae in schedula scripta sunt, quam vobis cum sigillo nostro Cantuariensis praesentat Ecclesia, ab ore bonae memoriae Hugonis quondam Rothomagensis Ecclesiae Archiepiscopi, patris et patrui mei, accepiums, et sigillo suo signata ad B. Thomam et Ecclesiam Cantuariensem transmissimus; ut veritas recordationis antiquae eorum presumptionem compescat, qui in spiritu erroris et spiritu mendacii indebitam sibi vindicant libertatem. Privilegia autem, quae ex confessione Gaufridi Catalanensis Episcopi in praesentia Sanctae recordationis Innocentii Papae adulterina probata sunt, et praedicto Domino nostro Archiepiscopo redditia, de mandato ejusdem Domini nostri igni comburenda propriis manibus tradidimus. Conseruet Deus personam vestram Ecclesiae suae per tempora longiora incolumem.”¹

These are only samples, and may be compared with the much greater and more far-reaching forging of decretals and Papal Bulls, etc., in the early ninth century, to sustain the increasing and audacious ambition of the Holy See, which decretals were supported by many Popes, and by the most learned Cardinals and Canonists, while most outrageous pretensions were based on them, which are now treated as mere discreditable litter by honest men of all schools and of all faiths. I should hardly have given so much room to these facts but for the extraordinary point of view still maintained in certain quarters by those persons who claim for ecclesiastical documents that they virtually attest

¹ *Op. cit. v., vi.*

themselves without proof and do not need to be stringently verified before they are accepted. Take, for instance, the very latest historian of the Popes, Father Mann,¹ who has exceeded all other recent apologists in the absence of critical intelligence in dealing with historical evidence. In regard to the very documents we are discussing (against which, as we have just seen, the external evidence is complete) he thinks he has established their authority by quoting the uncritical writers of another age. Thus he says: "In their *Monasticon* and *Synodicon* Dugdale and Wilkins have respectfully registered the Catholic title-deeds of Old England. That was to show wisdom and patriotism"!!!

It is fortunate for the cause of historical truth that this has not been the way in which the problem has been approached by all the great critics of another day and of our time. G. Hickes, the most learned of Anglo-Saxon scholars of the seventeenth century, devotes a part of his great Thesaurus to a discussion of spurious documents and the method of testing them. One of the most critical tests he insists on (and he had a very wide experience), is that no genuine English documents before the reign of Charlemagne are dated by the year of the Incarnation, but by Indictions, etc. Thus he says: *Nam prima et secunda chartae istius codicis, quae Æthelberhti I. regis nomine factae sunt, confectae esse dicuntur Anno*

¹ *Op. cit.* i. 402, etc.

ab incarnatione Christi DCV. indictione octava. Verum chartas istas non modo "non liberas a suspicione," ut pro modestia loquitur Spelmannum¹ sed plane falsas, illius argumenta, quibus addi possunt, ostendunt. Quamobrem annum Christi incarnationis ad annum indictionis, ineunti, aut proiecto septimo seculo, chartis accessisse tantum abest, ut constet; ut de eo maximum incertum sit. Verum inito octavo seculo eove haud multum promoto, in designandis chartarum temporibus ad annum indictionis annus dominicae incarnationis frequentius jam tum usitatus accessit, ut in carta Æthelbaldi regis in superioribus . . . citata.²

The acute and able analysis which Hickes applied to testing the legitimacy of Anglo-Saxon documents has been in almost every case accepted by modern critics, and notably his chief touchstone—namely, the method of dating documents. Professor Earle agrees in the main with Hickes, differing only in a small matter. Speaking of the introduction of the method of dating from the Incarnation, he says: "Bede was the first to plant it in Literature, as in his *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. 45, entitled *De Annis Dominicae Incarnationis*, and still more conspicuously in his History, which is chronologically framed upon it. Indeed, this way of reckoning time holds so conspicuous a place in the structure of his History as to suggest that the skeleton of his work was a series of annals arranged upon a scale of years Anno Domini,

¹ *Concil.*, p. 125.

² Hickes, *Diss. Epist.* 80.

like the work of those English chroniclers who must be regarded as his successors in the historical office. . . . The chronological evidence of our early documents, so far as it goes, tends to the same conclusion. . . . If we take a series of eight documents at the highest date where such a series can be formed, with a certainty of their genuineness, they will be of the following years: 679, 692, 697, 732, 734, 736, 746, 759. These documents have been selected as a true representative series of the first quality; and of this series the first five, though all more or less dated, whether by the month, or the regnal year, or the Indiction, or by all these at once, have not the year *Anno Domini*. On the other hand, the last three agree in using the era, and from this time the practice is continuous. In the intervening year, which breaks this series into two parts, falls the death of Bede, A.D. 735, and this coincidence harmonises with the rest of the evidence in associating this great practical improvement with the Anglian historian and chronologist.”¹

Let us now turn to the documents cited by Thomas of Elmham, from the collection of charters at St. Augustine’s. Of these he copies out the one he calls *Carta I.* in facsimile in a cursive hand, and also in what he calls *scriptura moderna*. It professes to be a grant by Æthelberht of a certain piece of land of his own (“*juris mei*,” he says) lying in the

¹ Earle, *Land Charters and Saxon Documents*, Intr. xxxii and xxxiii.

eastern part of Canterbury round about the Church of St. Pancras. This charter is marked as spurious by Kemble,¹ and is so treated by Haddan and Stubbs.² This conclusion follows, *inter alia*, from the fact that it is dated by the Incarnation. Birch adds an attesting clause and the names of several witnesses.³

This document is one of the sophistications which was doubtless meant to supply a genuine deed that had been destroyed. The only part of the charter which is acceptable is that containing the boundaries of the land conveyed, which runs thus: *In oriente ecclesia Sancti Martini; in meridie via of (sic) Burhgat; in occidente et in aquilone Drutingestraete.*

The next deed is marked *Carta II.* by Thomas of Elmham (*op. cit.* 111 and 112), and professes to convey certain lands called Langport from Æthelberht to the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul. This is also given in two forms, in facsimile and in a more recent writing. The charter⁴ is also marked as spurious by Kemble, and, like the previous one, was doubtless concocted to establish a written title in lieu of one dependent on reputation, for the lands it concerns. It is also dated by the Incarnation and attested by the King, by his son Ædbald or Eadbald, by Augustine, whose name occurs between these two, and by a number of witnesses whose names are impossible and quite imaginary—namely, Hamigisil dux, Hocca comes,

¹ Vol. i. 2.

² iii. 53, etc. etc.

³ These are only found in MS. Harl. 358, f. 475. They are apparently corruptly copied from the similar clause in the next charter.

⁴ C.D. vol. i. 3; Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* iii. 53 and 56.

Augemund referendarius, Grapho (*sic*) Comes, Tani-gisil regis optimas Pinca and Geddi. What are names and titles like Grapho and Comes doing in a document of the sixth century?¹ The boundaries doubtless represent those of an estate belonging to the Abbey. They are *In oriente ecclesia sancti Martini*. *Et inde ad orientem be Siwendoune*. *Et sic ad aquilonem be Wycingesmarce*. *Iterumque ad orientem et ad austrum be Burhwaremarce*. *Et sic ad austrum et occidentem be Cyningesmarce*. *Item ad aquilonem et orientem be Cyningesmarce*. *Sicque ad occidentem to Riderescaepe*. *Et ita ad aquilonem to Drutingstraete*. Sprott founds upon this charter an imaginary council of Canterbury, where it was professedly confirmed.² To this Council Elmham also devotes a paragraph. He goes on to say that it met on the 5th of January 605, and was attended by Æthelberht, his wife Bertha, his son Ædbald, and St. Augustine.³

The third charter given by Elmham refers to a grant by Æthelberht of lands at Sturigao, otherwise called Cistelet. This is also given in duplicate,—one in early cursive and the other in later script, and in it the king professes to have had it written out by Augemund. It is professedly witnessed by Augustine, the Archbishop, by Bishops Mellitus and Justus of London and Rochester, by the king's son Ædbald, by Hamigisil, Augemund the referendarius, Counts Hocca and Graphio, and

¹ These witnesses also attest with different words (a quite fantastic process), as *confirmavi*, *subscripsi*, *favi*, *laudavi*, *consensi*, *approbavi*, *benedixi*, *corroboravi*.

² See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 56.

³ *Op. cit.* 110, 111.

Tanigisil, Pinca, Geddi, and Aldhun, *optimates*, quite impossible names, and by many others whose names are not given. Those which are given quite condemn the document. It is marked as spurious by Kemble and Haddan and Stubbs, and is dated in the forty-fifth year of the king's reign, on the 5th of the Ides of January. Dr. Bright refers to it as "the spurious charter of *Æthelberht* marked as third, which," as he says, "uses remarkable language, thus: *Cum consilio . . . Archipraesulis Augustini. Ex suo sancto sanctorum collegio venerabilem virum, secum ab apostolica sede directum. Petrum monachum elegi eisque ut ecclesiasticus ordo exposcit abbatem praeposui.*"¹ The following passage breathes the air of quite a different period: *Quod monasterium aut ecclesiam, nullus episcoporum, nullus successorum meorum regum in aliquo laedere aut inquietare praesumat, nullam omnino subjectionem in ea sibi usurpare audeat, sed Abbas ipse qui ibi fuerit ordinatus, intus et foris cum consilio fratrum, secundum timorem Dei libere eam regat et ordinet,*" etc. There are no boundaries given in this charter, and it looks, from the last clause quoted, as if it had been concocted by the Monk of St. Medard.

The fourth document as numbered by Thomas of Elmham is the so-called bull of Saint Augustine, in which he is alleged to have conferred great privileges on the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of which Elmham says, "*Eja, vere nostra Augstea regia.*" It is also given in two forms in an

¹ Op. cit., *Early English Church History*, 3rd ed., 105, note 1.

early and a late script, together with a drawing of the seal or bulla, which was made of lead. The use of such pendent bullæ at that time having been contested by some, Elmham professes to reply and to quote the example of a foreign bishop who had used one, as was alleged by Philip, Count of Flanders. Elmham says the particular bulla on the document we are discussing contained a representation of the Virgin and Child with a legend round it which could hardly be read (*quae legi poterit, minime apparente*). The foreign example he had quoted contained the figure of an abbot, and was, he urged, apparently the seal of some abbey dedicated to St. Stephen.¹ It was clearly a document of much later date.

This Privilege of Augustine is marked as spurious by Kemble. Bright says of it: "a document called a *bulla* or *privilegium sub bulla plumbea*, professing to come from Augustine and exhorting his successors to ordain the Abbots of this monastery, but not to claim authority over them, and to treat them as colleagues in the Lord's work, is clearly an Augustinian invention." He adds that its language betrays it.²

While the four documents just analysed have been rejected as spurious by all modern scholars, the next one I am turning to, has been generally treated as genuine, notably by Kemble, Professor Earle, and Haddan and Stubbs. I am afraid that, so far as I can see, it must be put in the same category with the rest. It is contained in a

¹ *Op. cit.* 122, 123.

e

² *Op. cit.* 104, note 5.

volume devoted to documents chiefly referring to Rochester, put together by Ernulf, Bishop of that See, and known as the *Textus Roffensis*. Bishop Ernulf had once a better reputation than he has now. As I have shown elsewhere, there are grounds for believing that he was at the back of, and responsible for, the Peterborough forgeries. He was Abbot of Peterborough before he became Bishop, and I have little doubt that he would have had few scruples in regard to manufacturing a document if a title deed was missing or some privilege was to be secured.

The document in question has been said to bear no suspicious contents, and it was certainly spoken of in high terms by the father of Anglo-Saxon studies, namely, Hickes. Earle quotes the latter's very favourable view of it contained in the following words: "*Exstant vero (chartae) quae VII. seculo inito, et deinceps confectae erant, vetustissimae. Scilicet charta Æthelberti I. regis Cantuarorum, omnium antiquissima . . . cuius apographum exstat in "Textus Roffensis," folio 119a, . . . quae omnimodam veritatis speciem p[re]ae se fert.*"¹

The contents of the charter seems to me entirely to condemn it. Thus it is dated the 4th of the Kalends of May, Indiction vii., i.e. 28th April 604, and yet entirely ignores Augustine and refers to his successor as "the Bishop of Canterbury"; but since Augustine did not die till the 26th of May, this seems conclusive in regard to the genuineness of the charter. In addition to this difficulty the

¹ *Diss. Ep.* p. 79.

wording of the charter is singular. In it *Æthelberht* commends his son *Eadbald* to the Catholic faith in an odd phrase: *Ego Æthelberhtus Rex filio meo Eadbaldo admonitionem catholicae fidei optabilem.* It ends with the words: *Hoc cum consilio Laurencii Episcopi et omnium principum meorum, signo sanctae crucis confirmavi, eosque jussi ut tecum idem facerent. Amen.* There are no signatures of the witnesses, who are thus said to have attested it. Again Rochester is called *Hrofibrevis*, which is ridiculous. Its Roman name was *Durobrevis*, while the English called it *Hrofa*, *Hrofeceaster*, or *Rofeceaſter*. And of *Justus* its bishop it is said: *ubi praeesse videtur Justus Episcopus.* “*Ubi praeesse videtur*” could hardly be applied in a Rochester document to the then Bishop of the See. Again, the conveyance is not as usual to the Bishop, but to *St. Andrew* himself. The King is made to say: *tibi, Sancte Andrea, tuaeque ecclesiae . . . trado aliquantulum telluris mei.*

While I have no doubt myself that the charter is spurious, it is pretty certain that the boundaries mentioned in it really describe property once belonging to the church at Rochester. They are set out in the vernacular (which is another suspicious circumstance at this date): *fram Sudgeate west, andlanges wealles, of nordlanan to straete; and swa east fram straete of doddinghyrn nan ongearn bradgeat.*” The letter is given by *Kemble*, and in his work heads the whole list of A.S. charters.¹

¹ See also *Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 52.

I may here add that Dr. Bright says that the Rochester tradition is that *Æthelberht* gave to the church there some land called *Priestfield*, south of the city, and other land towards the east, and quotes *Anglia Sacra*, l. 333.

Another charter connected with King *Æthelberht* professes to convey some land at *Tillingham* to *Mellitus*, Bishop of London. The deed is preserved among the documents at St. Paul's, and was published by Kemble in vol. V. of his great collection, and is there numbered DCCCCLXXXII. It is undated, which is itself a fatal defect. It is No. 9 in Birch's "Cartularium"¹ and is marked as spurious by Kemble, and printed among the questionable and spurious documents by Haddan and Stubbs. It will be noted as significant that in it *Æthelberht*, King of Kent, is the king who proposes to convey the property, while London was in the kingdom of Essex. The witnesses are all impossible names at that time, and include Bishop *Hunfrid*, Bishop *Lothaire* (*Letharius*), *Abban*, *Æthelwald*, and *Æswina*, and the attestation ends with the words *et aliorum multorum*, showing that the deed at St. Paul's cannot at all events be the original. Bishop Browne reminds us that this estate of *Tillingham* is still in the possession of the Dean and Chapter.

The next document we have to deal with is given by *Elmham*,² and was also known to *Thorne*.³ It

¹ See also Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 59.

² Pp. 129 and 131.

³ See col. 1766.

professes to be a bull of Pope Boniface the 4th addressed to King *Æthelberht*, and conferring special privileges on the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul. It is marked as spurious by Kemble. Haddan and Stubbs also expressly treat it as spurious. It is dated the 3rd of the Kalends of March, in the eighth year of the reign of Phocas and the 14th Indiction, *i.e.* the 27th of February 611. In it Boniface professes to control the whole Church, *per universum orbem diffusae curam gerimus*, and to be acting with the authority of St. Peter. He proceeds to grant privileges of exemption quite unknown at that time. He says (*inter alia*), *Unde interdicimus in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi ex auctoritate ipsius beatissimi apostolorum principis Petri, cuius vice huic Romanae praesidemus ecclesiae, ut a praesenti nullus praesulum, nullus saecularium praesumat in dominium hujus ecclesiae aliquo modo sese ingerere, vel quamlibet imperandi potestatem sibi usurpare, vel alicujus inquietudinis molestias inferre, vel aliquam omnino consuetudinem, quamvis levissimam, sibi attribuere, vel etiam, nisi rogatu abbatis aut fratrum, in ea missas facere.* etc. etc.

Certain decrees professing to be those published by a Council at Rome which was attended by Bishop Mellitus are extant. They have been treated, however, as spurious by those who have examined them, and are so called by Haddan and Stubbs.¹ They are derived from a very tainted source,

¹ *Op. cit.* iii. 62-64.

namely, Gratian, chap. xvi., and by him from Ivo, *Decretales*, vii. 22.¹ Dr. Bright calls the decrees "an absurd forgery,"² and he especially refers for proof to the following sentence in which monks are spoken of as being authorised to act as priests : " *Sunt nonnulli fulti nullo dogmate, audacissime quidem zelo magis amaritudinis quam dilectione inflammati, asserentes monachos, quia mundo mortui sunt et Deo vivunt sacerdotalis officii potentia indignos neque poenitentiam neque Christianitatem largiri neque absolvere posse per sacerdotali officio Divinitus injunctam potestatem.*"

We must now turn to another series of notorious forgeries preserved in the *Gesta Pontificum* of William of Malmesbury. "These," say Haddan and Stubbs, "were produced for the first time by Lanfranc in 1072 A.D. at the Council of London, for the purpose of establishing the supremacy of Canterbury over York, then fiercely disputed, and they were confessed by Lanfranc himself at the time to be relics of the fire at Canterbury which four years previously had destroyed both originals and copies of all other documents.³ These letters are not mentioned by the English bishops in their letter to Pope Leo III. in 801 A.D., although they would have been directly to their purpose, and although they do mention in some detail the series of letters in Bede relating to the position of the see of Canterbury. Moreover,

¹ See Mansi, x. 504.

² 113, note 2.

³ See Eadmer, *Hist.*, Nov. 1.

the Malmesbury series of letters and the Bede series, of which the latter are unquestionably genuine, present in several instances pairs of letters from the same Pope to the same Archbishop at the same date and of different tenor. The view maintained in one series of these documents, of the original position of Canterbury relatively to London and York, and of the steps by which that original position was gradually changed, differs irreconcileably from the view in support of which the other and much later series was produced. The letters of this later date represent Canterbury as intended from the time of Justus, if not of Laurentius, nay even by Gregory himself, to be the seat of the primacy of England, including York. Those of earlier date represent it as in the first instance not intended to be the seat of an archiepiscopate at all; and when circumstances had determined this much in its favour in opposition to London,—a step apparently taken formally on the accession of Justus, yet possibly on that of Mellitus,—then as being placed on a level with York and no more,—a step dating with Archbishop Honorius in 634 A.D., while Theodore's conduct first obtained a superiority over York (669 A.D. *sq.*) in point of fact, and it was not until the time of Anselm that a similar superiority was established in point of right.”¹ Plummer, commenting on this issue, says of the Malmesbury letters that “they lie under the gravest suspicion of having been forged. . . . It

¹ *Op. cit.* iii. 65 and 66.

is to be hoped that he (*i.e.* Lanfranc) had nothing to do with their composition." He says that the conclusion of Haddan and Stubbs errs if at all on the side of leniency.¹

The first of these forged Malmesbury letters professes to have been written by Pope Boniface IV. to *Æthelberht*, and to have been sent by Bishop Mellitus in the reign of Archbishop Laurence. Bright calls the letter an Augustinian invention meant to establish the superiority of that community over others.² The following sentence has entirely the sound of a much later age: "*Quae nostra decreta, si quis successorum vestrorum sive regum sive Episcoporum, clericorum sive laicorum irrita facere tentaverit, a principe Apostolorum Petro et a cunctis successoribus suis anathematis vinculo subjaceat*," etc.³ The letter is dated *Anno Dominicae Incarnationis* 615, a mode of dating which, as we have seen, belongs to a much later time, while the date itself cannot be equated with the journey of Mellitus to Rome. Thomas of Elmham, in order to get over the difficulty, invents a second journey of Mellitus to Rome in 615.⁴ Plummer suggests that this statement of Elmham is probably a mere inference from the erroneous date in Malmesbury.⁵ He was not the only person who was mystified by it. Haddan and Stubbs say: "The date of the particular letter with

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 54.

² *Op. cit.* 113, note.

³ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 65.

⁴ *Op. cit.* Tit. iii. 5.

⁵ *Op. cit.* ii. 84.

which we are here concerned is plainly erroneous as it stands in W. Malms. Spelman, from the MS. Annals of Peterborough, has a copy with a different date equally erroneous.¹ He says : *actum sane anno Incarnationis sexcentesimo quarto decimo, imperante Foca Augusto piissimo, anno imperii ejusdem principis octavo. Indictione xiv. tertio die Martiarum, Æthelberti regis regni anno quinquagesimo tertio*, which he would correct into *sexcentesimo decimo* and (with another MS.) 'Indictione xiii.' Ussher, from a MS. in the Cotton Library once belonging to St. Augustine's, gives a like date to that in Spelman except that the Indiction is xiii. and the day is *quarta Kalendarum*, with no month added." Haddan and Stubbs then continue : "The true date, if the letter be genuine, is 610 A.D., eighth year of Phocas, thirteenth Indiction, and the fiftieth year of Ethelbert according to Bede's reckoning, the forty-fifth according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*."² This is, of course, a mere hypothesis of the two writers. It was most misleading of them to put it at the head of the letter in the text, as if it had any real foundation ; and they have misled Mr. Birch, who has also put the letter between the years 610 and 611.

It is well to note that this forgery was quoted in the letter of Pope Alexander II. to Lanfranc as reported by Eadmer. "This," say Haddan and Stubbs, "was after 1072 A.D."—i.e. after the year of the famous Lanfranc forgeries.

¹ S.I. 130 ; W. App. iv. 735.

² Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 66.

It is clear from this analysis that none of the papal letters or of the other documents, domestic or foreign, which profess to secure privileges for English monasteries or to convey lands to them from the death of Pope Gregory to that of Boniface iv. and not contained in Bede are genuine. With Boniface v. we again meet with a document having some claim to authenticity, and of which the best warranty is that it is contained in Bede. I mean the letter which Pope Boniface sent with the pallium to Archbishop Justus. We will pass this by at present, and revert to it when discussing Bede later on. This is not the only letter, however, which has come down to us associated with Pope Boniface v. and Justus. Another one is preserved in the series recorded by William of Malmesbury, which, as we have seen, are now treated as forgeries of the eleventh century prepared for Lanfranc when he was having his polemic in regard to the primacy of Canterbury. This is the special subject of the letter in question. It is marked by Haddan and Stubbs as "questionable." What this word really means with them must be gathered from their discussion of the Malmesbury charters already referred to.¹

Of the letters alleged to have been written by Boniface v. to Justus and to Ædwin and Æthelberga of Northumbria two are cited by Bede, and therefore stand on a different footing to those already quoted. One of the three, however, is not con-

Op. cit. iii. p. 65, note.

tained in Bede. It refers to the privileges and primacy of Canterbury, and is one of the too well-known Malmesbury group. It is marked as questionable by Haddan and Stubbs,¹ and analysed by Plummer,² and must be included in the strictures of these able critics on that collection. I shall have more to say of the other two letters of Boniface v. reported by Bede, farther on.

We next have two grants of land dated in 616 and 618 respectively, professedly made to Archbishop Laurence by Ædbald or Eadbald, son of Æthelberht. They are both marked as spurious by Haddan and Stubbs.³ I have discussed them in the text.⁴

Passing on a few years we have three reputed letters written by Pope Honorius to Archbishop Honorius of Canterbury and to Ædwin, King of Northumbria. Of these again, two occur in Bede, and will be discussed later. The third one does not occur in Bede, but is found among the notorious series contained in William of Malmesbury, and was clearly concocted for the same object—namely, to sustain Lanfranc in his struggle to secure the absolute supremacy of the see of Canterbury. Of this letter Haddan and Stubbs say: “This is the third of the series of letters in William of Malmesbury. This particular letter is directly at variance with the certainly genuine letter just preceding it, written by the same Pope to the same Archbishop, at probably the same date. The establishment of a definite

¹ *Op. cit.* iii. 73 and 74.

³ *Op. cit.* iii. p. 69.

² *Bede*, ii. 191, 192.

⁴ *Infra*, 235.

order between Canterbury and York, and of the downfall of the latter, of which Pope Honorius was certainly ignorant when he wrote either letter, is no doubt the most natural thing in the world for the Pope to do precisely at the time when the see of York had come into being by the previous success of Paulinus; but the establishing of two inconsistent arrangements on the subject at the same time may be fairly set aside as impossible."¹

We will now pass on to other evidences.

For the history of the Popes at this time, which includes some dramatic passages, the main authority is the so-called *Liber Pontificalis*. I discussed this work in the introduction to my previous volume, and took my place alongside of my master Mommsen in the great polemic between him and Duchesne in regard to its date. I am more than ever convinced that Mommsen is substantially right, but I think now that we may fix the date of the work a little more closely. I agree with him that it is quite incredible that in the voluminous works of Pope Gregory not a reference should have been found to this book if it had really then existed. I know of no actual reference to it until we get to the time of Bede, who not only quotes it but does so by name. This is a *terminus ad quem*, therefore. On the other hand, Mommsen has pointed out that there is a passage in the book which seems taken from a work of Gregory. This would be a *terminus a quo*. The date of the book would therefore come

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, p. 86.

between these two extreme dates rather more than a century apart. There is another passage in the *Liber* which has been apparently overlooked, and which seems to me to give us another clue.

In the account of Pope Martin I., when speaking of his tomb at Sta. Maria Maggiore, we read: "*Qui et multa mirabilia operatur usque in hodiernum diem,*"¹ showing that this part of the work was not only not contemporary with, but was written a considerable time after Martin's death. I believe the work was not compiled at all until considerably later than the time of Martin. It seems to me that the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Liber Diurnus* are complementary to each other, and were written about the same time. The *Liber Diurnus* has been shown to have been very probably written towards the end of the seventh century, and it is to the same period I would assign the compilation of the *Liber Pontificalis*. It seems, further, very likely that both were written in the time of Pope Agatho, about whose pontificate there is such a long and detailed notice in the *Liber Pontificalis*, much longer than that of any Pope who preceded him; the only other life which approaches it in length being that of St. Vigilius.

I cannot deal with the question of the Popes' lives and careers without once more animadverting on the nature of the work now being published on them by Father Mann. It is not really a history,

¹ *Op. cit. ed. Mommsen*, p. 184.

but a sustained *apologia* for the Popes' faults and the Popes' mistakes, with a polemical disingenuousness running all through its treatment of the authorities. Its theological rancour is most distasteful to anyone who does not revel in the theories of Innocent III. and his inquisitors.

For the history of Byzantium at this time I have not thought it necessary for my purpose (which is only to supply a sketch of the doings there as a background to my picture) to have recourse to the original authorities. I have relied in regard to it upon the truly admirable edition of Gibbon of my friend Professor Bury, whose new notes are most illuminating and full of evidences of his versatility and manifold learning, and upon his two recent monographs on Byzantine history. For the Merovingian period in Gaul, I have used Gregory of Tours, and have also had constantly by me the second volume, part 1, of the most recent and very excellent history of France edited by M. Lavis (Paris, 1903). For Spain, and especially the doings of its Church, I have chiefly used *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, by Dom H. Leclercq (2nd ed., Paris, 1906), a very fair and learned book. For the sagas about the Anglian slaves I have used the Whitby monk's very crude pamphlet as well as Bede. I have discussed it in my introduction to the previous volume, pp. xlii–xliv, and have nothing to add to what I then said. We will now turn to Bede.

In using Bede, I have naturally quoted from

Mr. Plummer's very ideal edition of his historical works, and also used his catena of notes and illustrations, which contain the results of great and wide reading and good judgment, and are most illuminating. The work must long remain the fountain to which all students of the early English Church will turn as the authoritative edition. In quoting from the first volume, which contains the text, I have given the book and the chapter according to Bede's numeration; when quoting from the second one, which contains the notes, I have given the volume and page. Besides Mr. Plummer's work, I have also had Smith's edition by me. The latter will always remain a fine monument of English scholarship in days when scientific editions were scarce. Its appendices contain discussions on various points and difficulties, several of which are still useful and contain much out-of-the-way learning. There is another edition of Bede which is most useful, not only because its author was a very good Latin scholar, but also because its introduction and notes are full of learning. I refer to the Rev. Joseph Stevenson's translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and minor works in vol. i. part 2 of the *Church Historians of England*.

Bede has in his preface gone into the question of his authorities. I will borrow Mr. Stevenson's excellent version of that part of this preface which deals with his sources for the period dealt with in his great work specially used in this volume. He says: "To the end that I may remove both from yourself and

other readers or hearers of this history all occasion of doubting as to what I have written, I will take care briefly to intimate from what authors I chiefly learned the same.

“My principal authority and assistant in this work (*auctor ante omnes atque adjutor opusculi hujus*) was the most learned and revered Abbot Albinus (he was Abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury), who, educated in the Church of Canterbury by those most venerable and learned men, Archbishop Theodore of blessed memory and the Abbot Adrian, carefully transmitted to me by Nothelm (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), the pious priest (*religiosum presbyterum*) of the Church of London, either in writing or by word of mouth of the same Nothelm, all that he thought worthy of memory that had been done in the province of Kent, or in the adjacent parts, by the disciples of the blessed Pope Gregory, as he had learnt the same either from written records or the traditions of his ancestors. The same Nothelm afterwards going to Rome, having, with the leave of Pope Gregory, who now presides over that Church (*i.e.* Gregory II.), searched into the archives of the Holy Roman See, found there some epistles of the blessed Pope Gregory and other popes; and returning home, by the advice of the aforesaid most reverend Father Albinus, brought them to me, to be inserted in my history. Thus from the beginning of this volume to the time when the English nation received the faith of Christ we have

learnt what we have stated from the writings of our predecessors, and from them gathered matter for our history ; but from that time till the present, what was transacted in the Church of Canterbury, by the disciples of Christ or their successors, and under what kings the same happened, has been conveyed to us by Nothelm, through the care of the said Abbot Albinus. They also partly informed me by what bishops and under what kings the provinces of the East and West Saxons, as also of the East Angles and of the Northumbrians, received the faith of Christ. In short, I was chiefly encouraged in venturing to undertake this work by the persuasions of the same Albinus. . . . But what was done in the Church throughout the different districts of the Northumbrians, from the time when they received the faith of Christ till this present, I received not from any one particular author, but by the faithful testimony of innumerable witnesses, who might well know or remember the same ; in addition to what I had of my own knowledge.”¹

It was to Albinus, above named, that Bede wrote a letter which is affixed to his *Ecclesiastical History*. The last phrases of the dedication are worth recording here for their tender thought : “ *Teque amantissime pater, supplex obsecro, ut pro mea fragilitate cum his qui tecum sunt famulis Christi apud pium Judicem sedulus intercedere memineris* ;

¹ *Op. cit.* ed. Stevenson, vol. i. part ii. pp. 306 and 307. I have inserted the Latin words here as elsewhere when the sense was the least ambiguous.

sed et eos, ad quos eadem nostra opuscula pervenire feceris, hoc idem facere monueris. Bene vale, semper amantissime in Christo pater optime."

The various documents quoted by Bede in regard to the mission of Augustus have been for the most part accepted without dispute, except the one containing the questions of Augustine and the responsions of the Pope above named. Mr. Plummer has shown the great probability that the letter of Boniface to Archbishop Justus has been put together from two separate letters by conflation, and that otherwise it is a genuine document.¹

In regard to the letters quoted by Bede as having been written by Pope Boniface v. to Ædwin and Æthelberga of Northumbria, there is a considerable difficulty. There is no reference in them to any ecclesiastic, whether a bishop or otherwise, and it is especially noteworthy that Paulinus should not be named in them. The letters have previously aroused comment. Thus Stevenson says: "As Pope Boniface v. was buried 25th October 625, this letter (*i.e.* the letter to Ædwin) must have been written before that date. There is, therefore, some little inaccuracy in the order of Bede's narrative at this point, since he places this letter after events which occurred in the previous year."²

Again, Bede tells us Paulinus was consecrated Bishop by Justus on the 21st of January 625, and Ædwin was probably married in June of the same year. On the 20th of April 626 Ædwin's daughter

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 92 and 93.

² *Op. cit.* p. 371, note 1.

was born. *Æ*Edwin was baptized on the 8th of June 626. Now the two letters to *Æ*Edwin and *Æ*thelberga are expressly stated in their text to have been sent by Boniface, who died on 22nd October 625—that is, many months before *Æ*Edwin's conversion, and when there was no reason to think he would be converted, and only four months after the probable date of his marriage. Boniface nevertheless addresses the latter as *Vir gloriosus*. He styles *Æ*thelberga *gloriosa filia Ædelberga*, and also refers to the King of Kent as *gloriosus filius noster Audubaldus*.

Again, Boniface in his letter to *Æ*thelberga says that he had heard with grief that *Æ*Edwin up to that time had delayed to listen to the preachers, and this suggests a difficulty, in that *Æ*thelberga could not have reached York until the end of July, and the tidings of *Æ*Edwin's *delays* could hardly have reached Rome before the end of October, when Boniface was dead. Could "Boniface," says Bright, "in the address, be a scribe's error for Honorius?"¹ To this explanation Mr. Plummer, who does not deny the difficulty, replies that in the letter he speaks of himself as the Pope who had received the news of *Æ*dbald's conversion. "This might be Boniface v., who succeeded in 619, but could hardly be Honorius."²

It would seem, in fact, that there is no escape from the position except by treating the letters as spurious, which is confirmed by the very strange

¹ Bright, 130, note 6.

² Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 97.

language attributed to the Pope when addressing the Queen about her husband. This view is strengthened when we turn to the letter supposed to have been sent by Pope Honorius, the successor of Boniface, to *Æ*dwini. It is addressed to his most excellent and eminent son *Æ*dwini, King of the Angles (*excellentissimo atque praecellentissimo*), and claims to be an answer to a letter from the King asking for certain favours, and telling him he had sent the palls of the two metropolitans (meaning, apparently, he had sent them to *Æ*dwini).

This letter is not dated, nor is it quite easy to find a date for it, nor is it contained in the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede, nor again is its phraseology very comfortable. Nor can we understand how the Pope comes to speak of *Æ*dwini's requests on behalf of his own bishops, *pro vestris sacerdotibus ordinanda sperasti*. *Æ*dwini only had one bishop,—namely, Paulinus,—and there was only one other bishop in England at the time—namely, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who it is difficult to understand could have been in any way *Æ*dwini's bishop. The paragraph about the palls, too, seems to me very suspicious. Why should he mention the two palls when writing to the King? This becomes still more strange when we find him at the same time writing to Archbishop Honorius, then primate of all England, and sending him a pall, but not saying a word about his having sent one to Paulinus, and thus cutting his archdiocese in two and giving one half of it to another without giving

him any notice. The very fact of sending two palls at one time is in itself suspicious. So is the reason he gives for it—not in order to constitute a new metropolitan, but “to the intent that when either of them (he styles both of them metropolitans) shall be called out of this world to his Creator, the other may by this authority of ours substitute another bishop in his place.” The deputing of the power by a Pope of conferring the dignity of a metropolitan upon any one at this time would be most unprecedented and unlikely. A further sign of falsity is the amusing suggestion of the Pope that the recently converted King should spend his days in reading the works of St. Gregory (“*Praedicatoris igitur vestri domini mei apostolicae memoriae Gregorii frequenter lectione occupati*”), when it is quite certain he knew no language save his own Northumbrian speech. I confess that this Northumbrian letter, which consists almost entirely of pious rhetoric, like the Northumbrian letters attributed to Pope Boniface v., has all the signs of being a forgery, and it is curious to me that the suggestion does not seem to have been made before. These letters seem to me to have been concocted in order to establish a claim for the Northern province to have a metropolitan of its own. The sophistication may well have been the handiwork of Paulinus, and the statement that he left his pall to Rochester, as stated by Bede, has the appearance of having been inserted to give further colour to the claim. Anyhow, the internal evidence of the letters entirely condemns them.

This completes our survey of the letters and similar compositions quoted by Bede. There is still another document which he uses. Speaking of King *Æthelberht*, he says that amongst the benefits which his thoughtfulness conferred on his people (*quae genti suae consulendo conferebat*) he drew up for them, in concert with his Witenagemot (*cum consilio sapientium*), judicial decisions (*decreta illi judiciorum*) after the manner of the Romans, which were written in the Anglian language and were extant in his day and remained in force among the people. The first thing laid down in this code is the penalty to be paid by any who steals anything belonging to the Church, to the bishop, or the other orders. He evidently, said Bede, wished to give protection to those whom he had welcomed together with their doctrine (*volens scilicet tutitionem eis, quos et quorum doctrinam suscepere, praestare*;¹ in the A.-S. version, *Da nu gena op dir mid him haefde and gehaldene synd*). These dooms, as they were called, are supposed to be still extant, being preserved for us in the common place-book of Bishop *Ernulf* (1114-24), known as the *Textus Roffensis*. The dooms in question have been thought to be rather an epitome than the full code, and they may well have been written down later than *Æthelberht's* reign, and seem to reflect a time when the status of the Church was better established than in his day. The position given to Churchmen when compared with that of laymen, as

¹ *Bede*, book ii. 5.

measured by their treatment by these laws, is a too attractive one for so early a period.¹

In writing the following pages I have, in addition to the materials supplied by Bede, ransacked the lives of the various persons who come within the limits of my subject and which are contained in the *Acta Sanctorum*. The matter of any value in these lives not in Bede is very slight, and consists first of incidents and stories with local colour and depicting the thought of the times in a picturesque and useful way which are scattered through the, for the most part, very otiose and jejune notices of miracles ; and secondly, of accounts of the translations of the bodies of the saintly men. The authors of most of these lives were very late. Not one at this period is contemporary ; and the best of them, for the picturesque details he gives, was Gocelin. I have also freely used the account of the history of the Abbey of St. Augustine written (as was, I

¹ The late Sir F. Palgrave, a very sane critic of early history, writes thus of these dooms : "They now exist in a single manuscript ; the volume compiled by Ernulphus, Bishop of Rochester, and the opening paragraph or section, containing the penalties imposed upon offenders against the peace of the Church and clergy, seems to correspond in tenor with the recital given by Bede. But it is difficult to believe that the text of an Anglo-Norman manuscript of the twelfth century exhibits an unaltered specimen of the Anglo-Saxon of the time of Ethelbert. The language has evidently been modernised and corrupted by successive transcriptions. Some passages are quite unintelligible, and the boldest critic would hardly venture upon conjectural emendations, for which he can obtain no collateral aid. Neither is there any proof whatever of the integrity of the text. It cannot be asserted, with any degree of confidence, that we have the whole of the law. Destitute of any statutory clause or enactment, it is from the title or rubric alone that we learn the name of the Legislator" (Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 44 and 45).

think, proved by its editor, Hardwick) by Thomas of Elmham, a monk of the abbey, who was its treasurer in 1407. Thomas subsequently became prior of Lenton, in Northamptonshire, was appointed vicar-general to Raymund, Abbot of Clugny for the kingdoms of England and Scotland in 1416, and in 1426 commissary-general in spirituals and temporals for all vacant benefices belonging to the Cluniac order in England, Scotland, and Ireland.¹

His work on St. Augustine's Abbey was planned on a great scale, and only a fragment dealing with the first two hundred years was completed. In this he incorporates the material published by his predecessors Sprott and Thorn, annalists of the abbey, which are very scanty for the period in question. He has given copies of all the charters existing at St. Augustine's when he wrote, and which unfortunately, as we have seen, were nearly all forgeries. He also gives some notices of the successive abbots of the same abbey, which add very little to Bede's account. He supplies us with a certain number of epitaphs, which may in some cases have been composed long after the deaths of the persons commemorated, and he has preserved a very interesting account of the books, ecclesiastical furniture, and relics which, in the opinion of the tenants of the monastery when he wrote, and no doubt for many centuries before, were associated with Augustine and his mission. This information

¹ *Op. cit.* ed. Hardwick, xxii-xxiv.

I have incorporated and criticised. What strikes one in reading his pages is how very little, if any, more knowledge about the mission was possessed by the monks of St. Augustine in the time of Sprott, Thorne, and Elmham than that contained in Bede's immortal work.

It may be noted by my readers that there is hardly a reference in the following book to what was made a fetish by Mr. Freeman and his scholars—namely, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is because, in the period we are dealing with, I look upon it as a worthless authority. We now know it to be a compilation of the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century. So far as I know, it does not contain a single reliable fact or date about St. Augustine and his mission which is not derived from Bede.

Leaving the original authorities and turning to later ones who have used and discussed them in their works, I shall limit my notice to those I have alone found helpful—namely, writers in whose works new or fruitful ideas occur—and shall neglect those conventional authors who have simply followed other conventional ones.

Among the former I must put in the front rank two historians who have done a great deal to illuminate the portion of English Church history dealt with in the following pages. I mean Professor Bright and Bishop Browne of Bristol, whom I have coupled in the dedication to this volume. The former modestly entitled his work *Chapters of Early English Church*

History. It has gone through several editions. I quote from the third. There is not a page in it which is not full of learned research, ingenious suggestion, and sound induction, which have greatly helped me. My old friend Bishop Browne still remains among us. He has filled the rôles of professor, don, bishop, and historian with the same indomitable vigour and energy, and has found time to do many things. His lectures on the early crosses and sculptured stones of Britain did much to put the subject on a scientific basis.

Among the works he has written, those which I have chiefly used here have been two published by the S.P.C.K.—namely, *Augustine and his Companions*, and *The Conversion of the Heptarchy*, in both of which his local and archæological knowledge and his keen insight have greatly helped him and me.

A third work of the same utility and high level was prepared by Canon Mason for the millennium of St. Augustine. It contains excellent and scholarly translations of the documents relating to the latter's mission, printed in juxtaposition with the Latin texts, and with useful notes and also four dissertations full of suggestiveness and value. The first one is written by my most industrious and many-sided friend Professor Oman, and discusses the political outlook in Europe in the year 597 at the time of the mission. The second, by the Editor, refers to the mission of Augustine and his companions in relation to other agencies in the

conversion of England. The third is by one of my oldest friends, also a many-sided person trained in a science which demands a picturesque eye for scenery and geology, Professor M'Kenna Hughes of Cambridge. It deals with the puzzling question of the landing-place of Augustine. The fourth is by the Rev. H. A. Wilson (a most competent authority). It discusses some liturgical questions relating to the mission of St. Augustine.

To these helps I must add the lives in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, of which that of Augustine is by the Rev. G. F. Maclear, D.D., the author of a work published by the S.P.C.K. on the *Conversion of the West*, etc. Those of Archbishops Laurence, Mellitus, Justus and Honorius; of Romanus and Damian Bishops of Rochester, and of Thomas and Berhtgils (or Boniface), Bishops of East Anglia, are by the master-hand of Bishop Stubbs; while Archbishop Deusdedit's is by the Rev. C. Hole. That of Paulinus of York is by a most competent scholar and authority on the history of the Diocese of York, Canon Raine. Other lives in this fine work containing up-to-date information are those of Æthelberht, King of Kent, and his son, King Ædbald, by Professor Bright, already eulogised; Æthelfred and Ædwin, Kings of Northumbria, by Canon Raine; Queen Bertha, wife of Æthelberht, and Æthelberga, wife of Ædwin, by Bishop Stubbs. Bishop Stubbs was also responsible for the lives of Penda, King of Mercia, Redwald, King of East Anglia, and Sabercht, King

of the East Saxons. I have given these names because it would be difficult to match a more competent body of biographers to deal with the lives.

It is a practice which I deprecate to sink the authors of such monographs in the name of the great work in which their contributions are contained, and thus not only to do them an injustice, but to depreciate the value of the borrowed matter, if any.

Turning from the actual biographies to other matters discussed in the following pages. First is the account to be found here of the English ecclesiastical architectural remains still existing, which date from this early period and which I have tried to make fairly complete. In regard to them I have had the help of four friends, one unfortunately dead, who have done much to revolutionise the history of early architecture in this country and to put it on a scientific basis. On this subject those who write with the greatest authority must always place in the first rank our "Father Anchises" Micklethwaite, the architect in charge of Westminster Abbey, who was the first to teach the great lesson which Mr. Freeman was so loath to learn—that the plan of a church is the first element in its analysis; that its history must be found in the inside rather than the outside of the building; and that some technical knowledge of the craft of the builder as well as of the architect is necessary to anyone who professes to describe a building. He swept away many foolish legends

with his berserker's vigorous arm, and he was the founder of the scientific treatment of Anglo-Saxon architectural remains. The result of some of his work in that behalf will be found condensed in the following pages. Those who followed him the other day to his fitting home in the picturesque cloisters of Westminster Abbey, where his requiem was sung by the choir-boys he loved so well, lost a kind, picturesque, masculine-minded friend; and one of his pupils in this inquiry must be allowed to write with a little emotion on an occasion when he is apportioning his various obligations.

With him I must mention three of his accomplished pupils who have all illuminated the subject of early Anglo-Saxon architecture, all valued friends of mine and gifted with acute insight and knowledge—St. John Hope, C. Peers, and Baldwin Brown. I have freely used and quoted their writings.

In regard to matters of early ritual, I have depended on the master work of Duchesne. In discussing the question of the library of books which Thomas of Elmham associates with St. Augustine's name, and claims that he and his companions brought them to England, I have followed in the footsteps of a not sufficiently appreciated authority, the late Professor Westwood, and of an acknowledged living master, Dr. James of King's College, Cambridge.

I am under obligations to all these scholars and students, and to others from whom I have

learned occasional facts. I take off my hat to them all. Their work has made mine possible.

I may be forgiven for including in my gratitude my patient wife, who has made my life so bright ; my good sons, who have helped me by their advice, as well as in other more onerous ways ; my kind friend the publisher ; his delightful son, John Murray, jun., the heir to many generations of "John" Murrays, who has read through my proofs, and the other members of the ever-patient staff in Albemarle Street. Lastly, the printer, the reader, the compiler of the excellent indices to this and my previous volume, and the skilful persons who made my maps and plates. May we all meet again in Walhalla.

HENRY H. HOWORTH.

THE EMPERORS, POPES, AND THE KINGS OF
THE FRANKS AND VISIGOTHS,
FROM 595 TO 664


	EMPERORS OF BYZANTIUM.	POPES OF ROME.	KINGS OF THE FRANKS.	KINGS OF THE VISIGOTHS.
595	13th year of Maurice. Departure of Augustine from Rome.	5th year of Gregory.	21st year of Childebert, King of Austrasia and Burgundy, and the 11th of Chlothaire II., King of Neustria. Theodebert, King of Austrasia. Theodoric, King of Burgundy.	9th year of Recared.
596	"	"		"
597	"	"	"	"
598	"	"	"	"
599	"	"	"	"
600	"	"	"	"
601	"	"	"	"
602	Phocas.	"	"	Liuva II.
603	"	"	"	Witteric.
604	"	Sabinianus.	"	"
605	"	"	"	"
606	"	Boniface III. (?)	"	"
607	"	Boniface IV.	"	"
608	"	"	"	"
609	"	"	"	Gondemar.
610	"	"	"	
611	"	"	"	Sisebut.
612	"	"	Theodoric unites Austrasia to Burgundy. Chlothaire II., sole King of the Franks.	"
613	"	"	"	"
614	"	"	"	"
615	"	Deusdedit.	"	"
616	"	"	"	"
617	"	"	"	"
618	"	Boniface V	"	"
619	"	"	"	"
620	"	"	"	"
621	"	"	Dagobert I., King of Austrasia.	Recared II. and Suintila.
622	"	"	"	"
623	"	"	"	"
624	"	"	"	"
625	"	Honorius I.	"	"
626	"	"	"	"
627	"	"	Death of Chlothaire II. Dagobert sole King.	"
628	"	"	"	"
629	"	"	"	"
630	"	"	"	"
631	"	"	Sigebert, sub-King of Austrasia.	Sisenand.
632	"	"	"	"
633	"	"	"	"
634	"	"	"	"
635	"	"	"	Chintila.
636	"	"	"	"
637	"	Severinus.	Death of Dagobert I.; Chlovis II. succeeds him in Neustria and Sigebert in Austrasia.	"
638	"	"	"	"
639	"	"	"	"
640	"	John IV.	"	Tulga.

THE EMPERORS, POPES, AND THE KINGS OF THE FRANKS
AND VISIGOTHS—*continued*

	EMPERORS OF CONSTANTI- NOPL.	POPES OF ROME.	KINGS OF THE FRANKS.	KINGS OF THE VISIGOTHS.
641	Constantine III. Constantine IV. Constans II.	John iv. Theodore.	Chlovis II., King of Neustria; Sigebert, King of Austrasia.	Tulga. Chindeswintha.
642	"		"	"
643	"		"	"
644	"		"	"
645	"		"	"
646	"		"	"
647	"		"	"
648	"		"	"
649	"	Martin I.	"	Recceswintha, associated with his father.
650	"		"	Recceswintha
651	"		"	sole King.
652	"		"	"
653	"		"	"
654	"	Eugenius IV.	On Sigebert's death, his brother, Chlovis II., reunited the Frank Kingdom and died the same year.	"
655	"		Chlothaire III., son of Chlovis II.	"
656	"			"
657	"	Vitalian.		"
658	"			"
659	"		"	"
660	"		"	"
661	"		Childeric II. elected King of Austrasia his brother, Chlothaire, only retaining Neus- tria.	"
662	"			"
663	"			"
664 ¹	"			"

¹ End of the mission of St. Augustine.

GENEALOGY OF THE DESCENDANTS OF
CHLOTHAIRE II.




THE ENGLISH ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS, AND
THE ABBOTS OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S,
FROM 597 TO 664

	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	ABBOTS OF SS. PETER AND PAUL (i.e. OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S).	BISHOPS OF ROCHESTER.	BISHOP OF LONDON, ETC. ETC.
597	Augustine landed in England.
598		Petrus.
599	"	"
600	"	"
601	"	"
602	"	"
603	Augustine re- ceived the Pall.	"
604	Laurentius.	"	Justus.	Mellitus.
605		"	"	"
606	"	"	"	"
607	"	Johannes.	"	"
608	"	"	"	"
609	"	"	"	"
610	"	"	"	"
611	"	"	"	"
612	"	"	"	"
613	"	"	"	"
614	"	"	"	"
615	"	"	"	"
616	"	"	"	"
617	"	Rufinius.	"	Mellitus expelled, and London reverted to paganism.
618		"	"	
619	Mellitus.	"	"	
620	"	"	"	
621	"	"	"	
622	"	"	"	
623	"	"	"	
624	Justus.	"	Romanus.	
625	"	Gratiosus.	"	Paulinus.
626	"	"	"	"
627	"	"	"	"
628	"	"	"	"
629	"	"	"	"
630	"	"	"	"
631	"	"	"	"
632	"	"	"	"
633	"	"	"	Paulinus abandons his see.
634		"	"	
635	Honorius.	"	"	
636	"	"	"	
637	"	"	"	
638	"	Death of Gratiosus, followed by a vacancy of two years.	<i>circ. 637</i> Rom- anus drowned. Paulinus (late Bishop of York).	
639	"	Petronius.	"	BISHOPS OF DUNWICH.
640	"	"	"	631 Felix.
641	"	"	"	632 "
642	"	"	"	633 "
643	"	"	"	634 "
644	"	"	"	635 "
645	"	"	"	636 "
646	"	"	Ithamar.	637 "
			"	638 "
			"	639 "
			"	640 "

THE ENGLISH ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS, AND THE
ABBOTS OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S—*continued*


	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	ABBOTS OF SS. PETER AND PAUL (i.e. OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S).	BISHOPS OF ROCHESTER.		BISHOPS OF DUNWICH.
647	Honorius.	Petronius.	Ithamar.	641	Felix.
648	"	"	"	642	"
649	"	"	"	643	"
650	"	"	"	644	"
651	"	"	"	645	"
652	"	"	"	646	"
653	Interregnum.	"	"	647	Thomas.
654	Deusdedit.	Nathanael.	"	648	"
655	"	"	"	649	"
656	"	"	"	650	"
657	"	"	Damian.	651	Berchtgilds or Boniface.
658	"	"	"	652	"
659	"	"	"	653	"
660	"	"	"	654	"
661	"	"	"	655	"
662	"	"	"	656	"
663	"	"	"	657	"
664	Death of Deus- dedit, who probably died of the plague.	"	Death of Dam- ian (?), who probably died of the plague.	658	"
				659	"
				660	"
				661	"
				662	"
				663	"
				664	"
				665	"
				666	"
				667	"
				668	"
				669	Death of Boni- face.

THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION FROM
AUGUSTINE TO DAMIAN¹




¹ This table I owe to Bishop Browne.

GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF KENT AND ESSEX




GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF EAST ANGLIA




* Ecgric, a kinsman of Sigeberht, was put on the throne on the abdication of the latter. He died *sine prole.*

GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF DEIRA



GENEALOGY OF THE KINGS OF BERNICIA



ADDENDA

My attention has been called by Mr. E. G. Gardner to an ambiguity in my description of his edition of the *Dialogues* of Pope Gregory in my former volume. He tells me that he alone is responsible for the notes, Mr. Hill having merely contributed the descriptions of the plates.

Page xlvii, lines 11, etc. By an inadvertence I have attributed the lines in inverted commas to Father Mann himself. They are really quoted by him from Cardinal Pitra. The whole passage taken from Pitra should be read by those who want to study the utterly unscientific way in which that much-trusted Roman Catholic historian treated his authorities,—a more credulous unscientific method it would be difficult to imagine.

Page 21. I have inserted a photograph of this table in my volume on Gregory. It only reached me after the text of that book was written, so that I could not accompany the description with a picture.

Pages 39 and 40. A more careful consideration of the facts has led me to doubt the universal conclusion in regard to the paternity of Queen Bertha which I have adopted in the text, and which is based on the statement of Gregory of Tours. I now think the difficulty of the chronology makes it possible that she was the daughter of Charibert, King of Paris. I am disposed to think now that Gregory of Tours may have been mistaken, and that she was in all probability the daughter of Chlothaire, the second King of Neustria, and therefore sister of Dagobert the First. This explains other things. Thus Thomas of Elmham actually makes her the daughter of Dagobert, and not of Charibert. Again, when Æthelberga, daughter of Bertha, was driven out of Northumberland she sent the royal children to the court of Dagobert to be brought up. Bede says of the princes: “*Misit in Galliam nutriendos regi Daegherecto qui erat amicus illius.*”

Bede, it is true, says *amicus* and not *frater*, but he may have been mistaken in this. The explanation here given also accounts for the number of young princesses from England who took the veil in nunneries in Dagobert's realm.

Page 59. "The Harbour of Richborough is described emphatically as '*statio tranquilla*.'¹ It was that most affected by the Romans; indeed, we never hear of an Emperor, general, or army landing at any other place, and its almost exclusive use seems to have made it a household word at Rome among poets and others."²

Elstob has translated an Anglo-Saxon verse given by Hickes, referring to the traditional season when Augustine's landing took place. It runs thus:—

When rough March begins
Loudly boisterous,
Bearded with grey frost,
With showers of rattling hail
He terrifies the world.
When eleven days are past,
Then did Gregory,
That glorious saint,
In Britain most renowned,
Amidst the Heavenly host
Illustrious shine.³

Page 65. In Mr. E. G. P. Wyatt's interesting *Memoir on St. Gregory, and the Gregorian Music* published by the Plain-Song and Mediæval Music Society, there is a conjectural setting of this litany.⁴

Page 97. The arguments against the chair being Augustine's are, says Stanley: 1st, the use of Purbeck marble in it; and 2nd, the fact that it is made of one stone, while Eadmer says the original was made of several.

Page 128. A dalmatic was a long, sleeved, white tunic, with a purple band (*clavis*) from either side of the neck downwards (Isidore, *Etym.* xix. 22, speaks of it as "*tunica sacerdotalis candida cum clavis ex purpura*"). It was and is a clerical, but not a priestly garment, and could be worn by every clerk in orders when taking part in the service, from a deacon up to a pope, and was so called from having been first used in Dalmatia. It was not

¹ *Amm. Mar.* xxvii. 9. ² T. G. Faussett, *Arch. Journal*, xxxii. 372.

³ Elstob, Appendix to *A.-S. Homily*, p. 26.

⁴ *Vide op. cit.* p. 7.

only used by ecclesiastics, but also, as I have said, by kings and emperors on solemn occasions.

Page 171. This fabulous story about the foundation of Westminster Abbey is told in several mediæval tracts. Some of them were printed by Dugdale in his *Monasticon*, one only having an author's name, namely, Sulcardus, who was a monk of Westminster. As this is dedicated to Abbot Vitalis, who flourished 1076-82, it gives us its date. The tomb of Sulcardus, according to Pits, was in the Abbey in his time, and bore the words, *Sulcardus monachus et chronographus*.¹ The story was incorporated by two such responsible historians as William of Malmesbury and Ralph of Diss, and is also referred to in a famous charter attributed to King Eadgar, which is a measure of the credulity of the times and of the daring flights which the monkish reporters of miracles were willing to take. As it is picturesque, it may interest my readers, being a fair sample of mediæval thought, and I therefore propose to condense it from the various reports in Dugdale. They tell us that the original Abbey was built by King Sabercht of Essex. When the building was finished and the time had come when it was to be consecrated, Mellitus the Bishop went to perform the ceremony, and was encamped in some tents or booths half a mile from the building (*fixis tentoriis a dimidio mileario*). On the evening of the Sunday, when the ceremony was to be performed, a person in the garb of a traveller who was on the other side of the Thames, summoned a fisherman to ferry him over to the church, offering him a reward, and bade him wait in order to take him back. The boatman was struck by the majestic appearance of the traveller. After he had entered the new church he noticed that it became suffused with flaming light, and heard an angelic choir singing partly within and partly without, while the angels were seen ascending and descending a ladder like that of Jacob. Presently the strange visitor returned to the astonished boatman. As they were recrossing the river he bade the fisherman cast out his net, which he did, and thereupon caught a great multitude of fish which almost sank the boat. Among these was a large salmon (*Salmo*), which the traveller picked out, bidding the fisherman present it to Mellitus and to say that St. Peter had sent it to him, while he was to retain all the rest for himself in payment for his services. He further told

¹ See Wright, *Biog. Britt.* ii. 45.

him that he was, in fact, St. Peter ("the heavenly janitor," as one of the tracts call him), and that he had been to consecrate the church, which he had determined to dedicate to himself. He bade him tell all this to Mellitus. In the morning the fisherman went to the Bishop with the salmon, and reported his adventure. The latter was greatly astonished, and on opening the doors of the Basilica he found all the signs of the church having been consecrated. The pavement was inscribed with certain letters *alphabeti inscriptione signatum* (one account says in both Greek and Latin letters); the wall was marked in consecrated oil with a number of crosses in twelve places (*parietem bis senis in locis sanctificatis oleo litum*), while there were also there the remains of twelve half-burnt candles. Assured that the statement of the fisherman was genuine, the Bishop informed the people, who with one voice glorified God. One of the notices says that the fish was called Esiceus, and it adds: *Ab illa itaque usque in hodiernam diem ejus piscatoris progenies Esiciorum decimacionem Deo et sancto Petro, prout audent, conferunt.*¹

Stubbs, in referring to the fabulous account, adds that nothing is known of Westminster till the time of Dunstan. When the Saxon Church there was afterwards amplified by the Confessor, it was natural to look out for an early founder for it, and to attribute it to the first Bishop of London; so when the life of Erkenwald was written, his education was naturally assigned to Mellitus as the Apostle of London. Baronius, whose credulous suggestions have no limit, goes so far as to suggest that the chief business of the alleged visit of Mellitus to Rome was in connection with the consecration of Westminster. Thomas of Elmham has invented a second visit of Mellitus to Rome in connection with the alleged introduction of monks at Christchurch, Canterbury.²

In regard to this earliest known school at Canterbury, we read in the life of St. Fursey, as paraphrased by Bede, how Sigeberht, King of the East Angles, having become a Christian, founded a school and obtained a bishop, Felix, from Kent, and we are told appointed pedagogues and masters for the boys, after the fashion of Canterbury (*eisque paedagogos ac magistros juxta morem Cantuariorum praebente*).³ This Canterbury school thus

¹ Dugdale, *Mon.* ed. 1655, vol. i. 55-58.

² *Op. cit.* ed. Hardwick, 134.

³ Bede, iii. ch. 18.

referred to in 630 can only have been founded by Augustine, as Mr. Plummer suggests.

Page 179. A ghost story was told of St. Augustine's tomb, namely, that on one occasion when its keeper had greatly neglected it, a blaze of light filled all the church. In the midst of it there appeared a boy with a torch in his hand, and with long golden hair about his shoulders. His face was as white as snow, and his eyes like stars. He rebuked the attendant for his neglect, and then withdrew again into his tomb.

As late as the time of James I., a monument used to be shown in the eastern transept of the church at Reculver, claiming, says Stanley, to be the tomb of *Æthelberht*. On it was the inscription—"Here lies Ethelbert, Kentish King whilom." This, says Stanley, may have been *Æthelberht* the Second. Bede's testimony makes it clear that *Æthelberht* the First was buried at Canterbury.

Page 192. As to the ritual introduced by St. Augustine, a few additional words may be said. There can be no doubt that substantially it was that then used at Rome. When Archbishop *Æthelheard* demanded from the prelates at the Council of Clovesho in 798 an exposition of their faith (*ibi sollicito ab eis scrutinio quaesivimus qualiter apud eos fides catholica haberetur et quomodo Christiana religio exerceretur*), they replied unanimously: "*Notum sit paternitati tuae, quia sicut primitus a sancta Romana et apostolica sede, beatissimo Papa Gregorio dirigente, exarata est, ita credimus.*"¹

The Faith they claimed to be the same, but in accordance with his own practice Gregory had conjoined them to qualify the Roman use by those of other Churches, and notably that of Gaul, in cases where they should deem it better—that is, more edifying.

Dr. Bright says of Augustine that he apparently inserted in the liturgy the Gallic *benedictio populi*, and, as he says, the 16th Canon of the Council of Clovesho in 747 seems to imply that there then existed certain other variations in the English Mass book. Again he says: "We infer from a letter of Alcuin to Eanbald II., Archbishop of York in the end of the eighth century, that there were then in use some larger sacramentaries representing 'an old use' which did not entirely agree with the Roman."² As we saw in the former volume, St. Gregory

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 512.

² Alcuin, *Eps.* 171; *Op.* 1-231; Bright, 103 and 104.

apparently made a change in the services of the Canonical Hours, so that the Use on the subject, at his Monastery of St. Andrew's, was different to the standard Benedictine one, and we can hardly doubt that it was Gregory's Rule on the subject that was introduced into England by Augustine. The Canterbury monks apparently, presently adopted the Rule of St. Benedict on the subject. St. Dunstan, however, out of veneration for St. Gregory, ordered the monks to change the course of St. Benedict for that of St. Gregory during Easter week.¹ Lanfranc cared less for the apostle of the Saxons and abolished the custom.²

It was believed in the English Church, according to Haddan and Stubbs, as early as the eighth century, when it is assumed in the answers ascribed to Archbishop Egbert by the Council of Enham in the eleventh century, that Pope Gregory gave the English a rule for the observance of the Ember days. In his Dialogue Egbert says : the English Church kept the first Ember fast "ut noster didascalus beatus Gregorius, in suo Antiphonario et Missali Libro, per pedagogum nostrum beatum Augustinum transmissit ordinatum et rescriptum."³ Such a rule is given by Muratori, but Haddan and Stubbs doubt the authenticity of the injunction in the form there given. It provides for four fasts—spring, summer, autumn, and winter. The first in the first hebdomada of Quadragesima. The second hebdomada after Pentecost. The third in the full hebdomada before the autumnal equinox, and the fourth in the full hebdomada before Christmas. The fast to be always on the sixth day, except from Easter to Pentecost, and when it happens to be a great fast day.⁴

In a letter written by St. Boniface to Pope Zacharias, he reports that a certain layman of great position had reported to him that in the time of Gregory he had given permission for people to marry an uncle's widow, or a cousin's wife, or people in the third degree of consanguinity, and he had himself taken advantage of the licence. Boniface declares that he cannot believe this to be true, since in a Synod of London held in

¹ *Septem horae canonicae a monachis in Ecclesia Dei more canonicorum propter auctoritatem S. Gregorii celebranda sunt* (*Concord. Monach.*, iii. 899).

² Wilk, *Conc. inter Const. Lanfr.*, i. 399, quoted by Lingard, i. 301 note.

³ Haddan and Stubbs, 411 and 412; Plummer, *Bede*, 56 and 57.

⁴ Mansi, x. 446; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 52 and 53.

transmarine Saxony, *i.e.* in England, a country where he was born and brought up, which Church had been founded by the disciples of St. Gregory, *i.e.* Augustine, Laurence, Justus, and Mellitus, it had been affirmed that such marriages involved a very serious wicked incest and a horrible and a damnable wickedness according to Holy Scripture.¹

In a letter from Pope Zacharias to Boniface, he reports that in an English Synod held under Theodore in the country where Augustine, Laurence, Justus, and Honorius (Mellitus is curiously not mentioned) had first preached the faith, it had been declared that Baptism, when only one person of the Trinity was involved, was invalid.²

Gratian, the source of many sophisticated and false documents which passed current in præcritical days (in this case he derived them from *Ivo Decret.* iv. 29), publishes a number of fragments professing to be derived from letters of Augustine, which are false according to Jaffé. They prescribe rules for the use of meat, fish or wine, milk, eggs, and cheese on Sundays by those in "Orders."³

Page 211. Bishop Stubbs, referring to the alleged decrees of this Council of Rome in his article on Mellitus in the *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, says they are most suspicious. They state that they were meant to secure peace for the monks (*de vita monachorum et quiete ordinationis*). Stubbs adds that two versions of the decree are extant, both of which he says are spurious. In them attempts to restrain the monks from undertaking any priestly office are forbidden. Cp. Labbe, *Conc.* v. 619; Mansi, *Conc.* x. 504; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 64 and 65.

It was to Mellitus as Bishop that Æthelberht in a forged charter is made to endow the Church of London with the Manor of Tillingham.⁴

Page 212. Dr. Bright, speaking of the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury, says: "The monastery as it grew in resources, became a conspicuous specimen of monastic exemption from diocesan rule; it was called "the Roman Chapel in England," as being immediately subject to the Pope (see the documents quoted by Elmham).⁵ Eugenius the Third said that

¹ *Eps. of Boniface*, ed. Würdtwein, p. 108; Haddan and Stubbs, pp. 50-51.

² *Epp. Bon.*, ed. Würdtwein, lxxxii.; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 51 and 52.

³ Gratian, *Dist.* iv. Canon vi.

⁴ *Vide ante*, v. 215.

⁵ *ed.* Hardwick, pp. 386, 392, and 404.

the monastery was *Beati Petri juris*, etc., while an earlier Pope, Agatho, forbade any sacerdos (bishop) to exercise authority in the monastery (*praeter sedem apostolicam*), it being specially under the jurisdiction of Rome. Its community carried on a tradition of jealous independence as regards the archbishop, and a sort of standing feud with their neighbours of the metropolitan cathedral, and did not shrink from documentary frauds in support of their programme.¹

Page 213. Thorne says that there was a statue of Æthelberht in the East Chapel (perhaps the apse is meant) of the Church of St. Pancras.² This has, of course, been long since destroyed. There was still to be seen, however, in the fifteenth century in the screen of the church a figure of the sainted King holding a church in his hand.

Page 223. In view of the very slight intercourse between Rome and the Church of Gaul at this time, it will be well to refer to one proof that Arles still obtained thence the recognised metropolitan badge of its Bishop.

In a letter of Theodoric II., King of Burgundy, written on August 23, 613, printed in the *Mon. Germ. Hist.* Epp. 6, p. 455 (*vide*), and written to Boniface the Fourth, he asks for the pallium to be sent to the newly consecrated Archbishop of Arles, named Florian. The Pope commends to the King the care of the Church and of its Patrimony in Gaul, while in a letter written directly to Florian³ he states that he had sent the pallium, speaks of the good reports which had reached him of the Archbishop, and begs him to put down simony, and to live worthily, and he also commends to him the Patrimony of which Candidus still had the care.

Page 231. Sabercht, sometimes called Saba, King of Essex, and patron of Bishop Mellitus according to Stubbs, probably died in the same year as his uncle Æthelberht, *i.e.* 616. We are told that he was buried at Westminster, and when in 1308 his alleged tomb was opened to allow of the transfer of his bones, his right hand and arm are said to have been found covered with flesh and uncorrupted.⁴ As Stubbs says, Sabercht's sons must have been grown up at the time of his conversion, for they continued heathens at the time of his death,

¹ Bright, 113-114 and notes.

² *Op. cit.* 1177.

³ *Ib.* p. 453.
⁴ *Annales Paulini*, p. 140; *Chron. S. Pauli*, ed. Simpson, p. 225.

which took place probably about 616.¹ According to Bede, Sabercht had three sons. Florence of Worcester in his genealogies gives the names of two of them, Saexraed and Saeward.² The third, on very slight grounds, was named Sigeberht by Brompton.³

Page 236. In a life of St. Laurence by Gocelin, which is still unpublished,⁴ are some fabulous tales about a journey he is supposed to have made to Scotland, and a story about the Church at Fordoun into which Queen Margaret was unable to enter.

Bishop Stubbs says that out of 250 churches in England dedicated to St. Laurence, some few may have been dedicated to the Archbishop.⁵ One in the Isle of Thanet may pretty certainly be claimed to have been so.

Page 242. Some relics of St. Mellitus were preserved at St. Paul's in 1298.⁶

Page 243. In regard to the hortatory letter of Boniface here mentioned, Stubbs reminds us that some such letter was referred to by the eight English Bishops who about 805 wrote to Pope Leo the Third, asking for the pall for the Archbishop. In that letter the Pope says of Mellitus and Justus: "*Qui ambo suscepérunt scripta exhortatoria a pontifice Romanae et apostolicae sedis Bonifacio, data sibi ordinandi episcopos auctoritate; cuius auctoritatis ista est forma. Delectissimo fratri Justo Bonifacius.*"

There is preserved in the Canterbury archives an ancient list of palls. Among the recipients of the vestment Mellitus is mentioned, and Gervase of Canterbury and Ralph de Diceto both say that he received a pall. Gervase accounts for the fact by supposing that the Pope sent three palls to St. Augustine, for the three churches of Canterbury, London, and York, and that they were used by the three first archbishops; but, as Stubbs says, the story is based on a mistake, adding that there can be no doubt that neither Laurence nor Mellitus ever received a pall, hence probably why they consecrated no bishops.⁷

Page 257. The Derwent (the White or Clear Water) is a tributary of the Ouse. At Aldby, says Freeman: "There stood a royal house of the Northumbrian kings, the apparent site of which, . . . a mound surrounded by a fosse, still looks down on a picturesque point of the course of the river."⁸

¹ *D.C.B.* iv. 594.

² *M.H.B.* 629.

³ Ed. Twysden, c. 743.

⁴ See Hardy's *Catalogue*, i. 217, 218.

⁵ *D.C.B.* iii. 632.

⁶ See Stubbs, *D.C.B.* iii. 900.

⁷ Stubbs, *D.C.B.* iii. 901.

⁸ Freeman, iii. 355.

Page 259. In the letters attributed to Pope Boniface the Fifth, which I have argued are spurious, there are two sentences which are archaeologically of some interest. He professes to send King *Æ*Edwin as blessings from his protector, St. Peter, a camisia or soldier's shirt¹ ornamented with gold and a camp cloak (*lena*) of Ancyran fashion, while to *Æ*thelberga he sends a silver mirror and a gilt ivory comb.²

Page 262. Taylor, in his *Words and Places*, gives the meaning of the name Goodmundham, as the place (*ham*) of the protection (*mund*) of the Gods, which seems to me very doubtful. It is probably made up, like many similar place names of the same class, from a personal or family name, Godmund and ham. This is also suggested in Murray's *Yorkshire*.

Page 263. In regard to the story of Run, Dr. Bright says it is plainly a Welsh fiction, possibly based on some confusion between Paulinus and Paul Hen, the Welsh founder of Whitland, in which Bede's account of Paulinus is transferred to Run. Urbgen or Urien, the father of Run, had fought against Theodoric forty years before. Two Welsh MSS. of Nennius, appealing to the authority of two Welsh Bishops, read Run . . . *i.e.* Paulinus. Dr. Bright says the equation is to him incredible. It has, however, been favoured by Bishop Browne.³

Page 263. The wooden sanctuary here mentioned, according to Raine,⁴ was carefully preserved and enriched with splendid altars and vessels by Archbishop Albert.⁵ Dr. Bright adds that the remains in the crypt at York Minster, assigned by some to Paulinus, have been attributed by others to Archbishop Albert just named.⁶ The only thing which actually commemorated Paulinus at York Minster was an altar jointly dedicated to him and St. Chad.⁷

Page 269. The only memorial I know of Justus is the name of St. Just, to which the church of Penwith, in remote Cornwall, is dedicated.

Page 319. Sigeberht, who is called *Christianissimus atque docissimus* by Bede⁸ and also *bonus et religiosus*,⁹ became King of East Anglia. He was apparently a stepson and not a son of Redwald. The pedigrees in Florence of Worcester and

¹ Jerome, *Eps.* Ixiv. 2.

² Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 77 and 79; Bright, 131.

³ See Bright, 135, note.

⁴ *Historians of York*, i. 104.

⁵ See Bright, 136, note.

⁶ *Ib.*

⁷ Raine, *D.C.B.* iv. 249.

⁸ *Op. cit.* ii. 15.

⁹ iii. 18.

William of Malmesbury do not make him his son, while they make him a brother of Eorpwald. Florence calls him *frater suus ex parte matris*,¹ and William of Malmesbury says *fratre ejus ex matre*.² In this case he would be Redwald's stepson, and this, perhaps, accounts for his having been driven out of the country by the latter.³ Pits says that Sigeberht corresponded with Desiderius, Bishop of Cahors, and that his letters are preserved at St. Gallen.⁴

Page 327. Bede says the body of Ædwin was afterwards recovered and buried at Whitby.⁵

Page 333. This monastery, of which St. Eansuitha was the Abbess, says Bright, was washed away by the sea in the sixteenth century. In 1885 some workmen employed in the present church found behind the altar a reliquary containing a skull and some bones, which had evidently been hid there at the Reformation. I have given a photograph of it. These relics of the foundress are now preserved in a closed recess on the north side of the sanctuary.⁶ She is still, says Bright, remembered as the local saint.

¹ *F. C. W. Y.* i. 260.

² *W. M.* i. 97.

³ *Inimicitias Redualdi fugiens*—*Bede*, iii. 18.


⁴ *Smith, Bede*, iii. 18.

⁵ iii. 24.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 126, note 2.

ENGLAND

A.D. 597 to 652.



SAINT AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY

CHAPTER I

HAVING surveyed the life and work of Saint Gregory from his birth to his death, as it affected other parts of Europe, we are now in a position to understand rather better the meaning and the results of the most romantic and in many ways far-reaching of his labours, namely, his mission to Britain.

The green island, girdled and buttressed by white cliffs, which lies beyond the turbulent "Channel," had exercised a great fascination over the greatest of the Ancient Romans, Julius Cæsar, and had tempted him to prosecute his most risky and picturesque venture. Six hundred and fifty years later, it similarly fascinated the greatest Roman of the Middle Ages, Gregory, to make another venture, also risky and picturesque, and the fruits of which have been long-lived. To understand that venture we must look at a bigger horizon than bounded the great Pope's vision in his missionary work.

Cæsar's two voyages to Britain were mere transient raids. It was a hundred years later that

2 SAINT AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY

the conquest of the island began, and it went on till the greater part of it was absorbed in the Empire. It presently became one of its richest and most prosperous provinces, and for three centuries and a half it benefited by its laws, its orderly government, and administrative skill. Then it passed again into oblivion. The terrible disasters which overtook Rome, its internal decay, the load of taxation and consequent poverty of the crowd, and the increasing dissipation and luxury of the upper classes, had sapped the Spartan virility of the race, and destroyed the old heroic spirit and fortitude of its citizens. These virtues, which constituted the great prop of the Roman State, had all been replaced by meaner endowments.

Its armies were chiefly recruited by mercenaries, and were wasted in cruel fights between rival claimants for the prizes it still had to offer. Meanwhile the stalwart peoples beyond its borders, who had been kept at bay by the discipline of the Roman soldiery and the skill of its leaders, began to have their day. Those whose relatives when defeated had been ruthlessly slaughtered or made to supply the craving of the debased Roman crowd for bloody and cruel entertainments in the circus, came faster and faster across the sacred boundaries of the state, and, like the insects that thrive on rotten trees, or the wolves that pursue a retreating army, they made the problems of revival or defence almost insoluble. Their memories were reddened with many lurid patches, and their javelins and swords completed

what moral and material decay had begun. When this took place, and those in command were at their wits' ends to meet the ubiquitous attacks, it was natural and necessary to abandon the isolated parts of the Empire where the cost of defence seemed hardly to pay for the benefits secured. Thus it came about that Britain, which had always needed a strong garrison and was now assailed by foes from the west and from the east, from Ireland and from Germany, was at length abandoned, the soldiers withdrawn and the richer and more vigorous among its civilian population who could go, went away to Gaul or Italy. Those who were left were mainly peasants and labourers, or small farmers, and were either driven into the western parts of the island, or reduced to servitude. Meanwhile all the maritime districts from the Solent to the Firth of Forth were occupied by German-speaking and German-thinking folk, who had very few amiable ties with Roman ways. Gaul, though in a less degree, also saw its Roman civilisation jeopardised by tribes with similar endowments. They made access to Britain by Roman travellers and Roman merchants virtually impossible, for they occupied the seaboard of the Channel along its whole length on either side, and thus controlled all the ports of departure and arrival. It required only two or three generations of this paralysis of communication to completely destroy the memory of such a place as Britain among the ruling classes either in the western or the eastern Rome, and it is

not wonderful that it should have passed out of men's memories and that its name should have had no more meaning for them than the half-mythical lands of Thule and Scandia.

How much this was the case may be gathered from the works of such an accomplished and gifted writer as Procopius, who flourished in the busy reign of Justinian, and who tells us only fantastic fables about "Brittia." He says that no one could live in the mist and fog beyond the Roman wall, and speaks of the country as a land whither the ghosts of the departed were ferried by night by unseen boatmen, etc. etc. He clearly had no real knowledge about it.¹

We may gather the same conclusion from the abundant writings of St. Gregory, who had some reason for curiosity. The preparations made for his mission to the Anglians, and the references he makes to them in his letters, show how scanty his knowledge really was until his monks sent him more precise information.

The same causes isolated the Celtic peoples of Wales and of Ireland. It must be remembered that their Christianity was in the main the child of post-Roman times. It was after the legions had left, and when the land was being harried and worried by its foreign foes, that the afflatus for the new faith spread like wildfire among these impressionable folk, and created a great crowd of devotees, anchorites, and monks. Their Christianity

¹ Procopius, *de bell. Vandalico*, lib. i. chap. i.

was orthodox, but its ties were with Gaul and not Italy. Lerins and Tours were its foster-mothers, and Brittany and Western Gaul, with which they kept up a connection, were the only parts of the Continent they knew much about. They clung to traditional ritual usages which had once prevailed widely in Gaul, and which had either not taken root in Italy or had been superseded there. They had little or no intercourse with Rome during the sixth century, and the traditional Primacy of St. Peter's chair was a pious legend with them and no more. They managed their own discipline and were tenacious of their own customs. The Pope, although he knew of the existence of the British Church, seems from his letters to have had no detailed or even partial knowledge of its ways, and perhaps doubted its orthodoxy. The great island and its satellite beyond St. George's Channel were, in fact, as much an unknown land to Gregory as Western China was to the great missionary societies who first sent evangelists there.

There must have been some moving cause to make the overloaded Pope take so much interest and show so much solicitude in Christianising the pagan parts of Britain. It has been suggested, but the notion seems to me very far-fetched, that the idea was first communicated to him by his friend Eulogius, the Patriarch of Alexandria. This view is based on a sentence or two in a letter written by Gregory to the latter in July 598, in which he says that, while the nation of the

6 SAINT AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY

Anglians still continued to worship sticks and stones, he had determined, through the *aid of the prayers of Eulogius*, to send them a monk of his monastery. His actual words are: *Ex vestrae mihi orationis adjutorio placuit*, etc. Later on in the letter, Gregory, having reported the success of the mission, says that he had sent Eulogius the news, to let him know some results of what he was doing "at Alexandria by his acts, and at the end of the world by his prayers" (*quid in mundi finibus agitis orando*).¹

These cryptic sentences are assuredly an unsteady peg to hang such a big conclusion upon, as that it was Eulogius who persuaded Gregory to his famous missionary work.

Another suggestion has been made which seems more plausible. We know from a letter which Gregory wrote to his agent in Gaul, the priest Candidus, in September 595, that he had then heard of the traffic in Anglian boys; doubtless prisoners taken in the fierce wars of the different tribes. In the letter the Pope bids Candidus spend the money he had collected from the patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul in buying clothing for the poor and in redeeming Anglian youths of the age of from seventeen to eighteen, who, he suggests, might profit by being given to God in monasteries. He urges this course since, as the money collected in Gaul could not be spent in Italy (*i.e.* because it was of light weight), it might be profitably spent there. He further told him that

¹ *E. and H.* viii. 29; Barmby, viii. 30.

if he should succeed in getting any of the *ablatae* (*i.e.* arrears of rent), he was to spend them in the same way. Inasmuch as the boys in question would be pagans, the Pope wished a priest to be sent to Rome with them, so that if any were sick and about to die on the way he might baptize them. He thus seems to suggest that except in cases of necessity his agent was not to baptize the boys, but to reserve them for himself, and he bade him lose no time in prosecuting his commission diligently.¹

This notice is particularly interesting, for it shows that when it was written, Gregory was fully aware of the abominable traffic of which the Jews then had the monopoly, and in which the children captured in war were publicly or privately sold to become slaves or for baser purposes. It is clear, also, that he had in contemplation making a certain number of them into monks, probably in order that they should become missionaries ; and further, that he had ordered some of them to be sent to Rome that he might himself baptize them, and it is almost certain that he actually saw and conversed with them.

The extent of the nefarious traffic here named is hardly sufficiently appreciated, and a few references may be profitable. Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*,² tells us that that emperor had passed a law forbidding Jews to have Christian slaves, and ordering them to be freed

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 10 ; Barmby, vi. 7.

² iv. 27.

when they did so. A similar provision is contained in Justinian's Code.¹ Gregory himself refers to Jewish traders in slaves in several of his letters. In one² he forbids Jews holding Christian slaves (*Eis tamen Christiana mancipia habere non liceat*). In another,³ written to the *Prætor* of Sicily, *Liberinus*, he complains of a Jew called *Nasas* who had acquired Christian slaves and devoted them to his own service and use, and ought to have been punished accordingly, and he now bids his agent punish this most wicked of Jews (*quidam sceleratissimus Judeorum*), and compel him to set at liberty, without any equivocation whatever, the Christian slaves he had acquired.

In a third letter,⁴ written to Bishop *Januarius*, Gregory complains that male and female slaves who had fled to the Church from Jewish masters for the sake of the faith (*fidei causa*), had been restored to them or paid for according to their market value; such payments he denounced as causing the poor to suffer by improper spending of money by the patronage of ecclesiastical compassion (*ecclesiasticae pietatis*).

¹ Lib. i. tit. 9, 10: "Judaeus servum Christianum nec comparare debet, nec largitatis aut aliquocunque titulo consequetur. Quod si aliquis Judaeorum . . . non solum mancipii damno multetur, verum etiam capitali sententia puniatur. . . . Ne Christianum mancipium haereticus vel paganus vel Judaeus habeat vel possideat vel circumcidat." Again, in the Visigothic laws of King *Reccared*, xi. 2. 12, we read: "Nulli Judaeo liceat Christianum mancipium comparare nec donatum accipere . . . servus vero vel ancilla, qui contradixerint esse Judaei, ad libertatem perducantur." *E. and H.* vii. 21, note.

² *Ib.* ii. 6.

³ *Ib.* iii. 37.

⁴ *Ib.* iv. 9.

In a fourth¹ the Pope complains that in the city of Luna many Christians were in servitude to Jews, and he bids the bishop have them released, unless they were husbandmen who were tenants of Jews and had become such by conditions of their tenure; which seems an inconsequent exception.

In a fifth² he urges, that if any slave of a Jew, whether Jew or pagan, wished to become a Christian, the Jew was not to be permitted to sell him. In cases where pagans had been brought from foreign parts for sale, the Jew might have three months' grace in which to find a purchaser, who must be a Christian. After that he was not to be permitted to sell him, but he was to be unreservedly released.

In a sixth³ Gregory writes to Candidus, his agent in Gaul, to say that a certain Dominicus had complained to him that four of his brothers were detained by the Jews as slaves at Narbonne.

In a seventh,⁴ written to Fortunatus, Bishop of Naples, Gregory speaks of Christian slaves whom Jews bought from the *territories of Gaul*, and on whose behalf the bishop had acted with solicitude, and he declares that such traffic should be forbidden. The Pope says, however, that he had been embarrassed by the decisions of the secular judges, who had decided the traffic to be legal in the case both of Christians and pagans (*comperimus hanc illis a diversis judicibus reipublicae*

¹ *E. and H.* iv. 21.

² *Ib.* vii. 21.

³ *Ib.* vi. 29.

⁴ *Ib.* ix. 104.

emptionem injungi atque evenire ut inter paganos et Christiani pariter comparentur). It would seem that Jews used to make journeys to Gaul to buy slaves, for whom they had orders. The Pope enjoins that all slaves who were in their hands must be handed over to those who ordered them, or be sold to Christian purchasers, within forty days, or be released. If such slaves should fall sick, the time of their release must be postponed till they were well. If, however, some such slaves should still remain in their hands from the previous year, before the Jews knew of the inhibition, they were to be permitted to sell them to Christian purchasers even if the bishop had taken possession of them.

In the eighth and ninth letters,¹ Gregory, writing to Brunichildis, the Queen of the Franks, and her grandsons, complains that they had allowed Jews to possess Christian slaves in their dominions.

Lastly, we have a letter² in which a "Samarean" (*i.e.* doubtless a Samaritan) had a Christian slave who had been given to him by his Christian master, which the Pope denounces as not only wicked but illegal.

It is therefore quite plain that in the time of Gregory Anglian slaves were being sold in Gaul and in Italy, and that some of them had actually been redeemed by order of the Pope and with the Church's funds, and had been sent on to Rome. It is probably on this foundation that the pretty story to which I will now turn was built.

¹ *E. and H.* ix. 213 and 215.

² *Ib.* viii. 21.

The Whitby Monk tells us it was reported among the faithful that before Gregory became Pope there arrived at Rome certain "of our nation," having fair complexions and flaxen hair (*crinibus candidate albis*). When he heard of this, Gregory desired to see them. Being attracted by the appearance of the boys, he asked of what nation they were, to which they replied they were "*Anguli*" (i.e. Anglians), and he remarked, "*Angeli Dei*" (i.e. angels of God). He then asked what was the name of the king of their nation. They said, "*Aelli*," and he replied, "*Alleluja, laus enim Dei esse debet illuc*" (i.e. Alleluja, the praise of God should be heard there). Lastly, he asked to what tribe they belonged, to which they said, "*Deire*," and he answered, "*De ira Dei confugientes ad fidem*" (they have fled from the wrath of God to the faith).

He thereupon asked Pope Benedict to be allowed to set out hither (*huc* showing that the tract was written in England), for it was a sorry matter that the devil should fill such fine vessels. The Pope gave his consent, whereupon there was a tumult at Rome. The crowd divided into three sections, and waylaid the Pope on his way to St. Peter's Church. The three sections cried out respectively, "*Petrum offendisti; Romam detruxisti; Gregoriam dimisisti*" (Thou hast offended Peter; thou hast destroyed Rome; thou hast sent Gregory away). He accordingly sent messengers to recall the would-be missionary. Before his return, and when he was

three days' journey from the city, Gregory noticed that a locust settled on his book. This he accepted as an omen meaning that he was to stay where he was (*in loco sta*), a rather ingenious pun. He accordingly returned again to Rome.¹

Our author, it will be seen, puts the incident in the reign of Pope Benedict the First, when Gregory was Præfect at Rome, and therefore an officer of the Emperor and was not yet subject to the Pope's authority. This raises our doubts about the matter. Such doubts probably occurred to Paul the Deacon, who, in transferring the story to his own biography, attributes it to the reign of Pope Pelagius. If so, it must relate to an event after Gregory's return from Constantinople. It has been said as a reason for disbelieving the saga, that the habit of punning in the way it occurs in the story, is not found in Gregory's writings, although he was very fond of joking. More than one pun, however, may be found in his letters.

That the story was older than the Whitby Monk's life seems probable. It is hardly likely that Paul the Deacon would have had access to the latter, and the fact that he attributes the event to the reign of Pelagius and not to that of Benedict, while he adds a fourth phrase to those alleged to have been used by the crowd to the Pope, namely, *regnum non tam dimisisti*, points to another source. Bede also tells the story in another fashion, and I cannot agree with Ewald and Hartmann that

¹ *Op. cit. ed. Gasquet*, 13-15.

he derived it from the Whitby Monk and not from an independent tradition. The view that Bede and Thorn, the Canterbury chronicler, both derived the story from an independent source is also urged by Mason.¹ Bede, in telling this story, speaks of it as a tradition (*opinio*) about the blessed Gregory which had been handed down from the ancients. This hardly points to his having been inspired by some one who was, like the Whitby Monk, almost a contemporary. In his hands the tale has considerably grown. The boys have become slaves who were being sold (*vidisse . . . pueros venales*) in the forum or market-place by certain merchants, and who were seen by Gregory while passing, and it was before making his punning allusions that he first learnt that they came from Britain and were pagans.² The Canterbury monk, Thorn, reports a tradition that the boys were three in number.

In a Saxon homily on St. Gregory³ it is said that the merchants who sold the boys were themselves Anglians, which can only mean that it was Englishmen who had disposed of them to the slave-dealers of the period. These variations in the reports seem to make it probable that all the narratives we have, came from some common original, possibly some tradition which existed at Canterbury, which was possibly also the source of some of the miracles as told by the Whitby Monk, Bede, and Paul the Deacon. The one fact

¹ *The Mission of Augustine*, 188.

² *Op. cit.* ii. 1.

³ See Elstob, 11-18.

which remains certain (based as it is on the statement of Gregory himself) is that he knew of the traffic in English slave-boys at this time, and had probably personally encountered some of them.

To return to the motive which moved Gregory to send his mission, the most reasonable is the one he gives himself, when he tells us in a letter to Queen Brunichildis, dated in July 596, that there had gone to him some of the Anglian people who wished to become Christians, but the bishops who were in the vicinity (which has been understood as referring to Gaul) had shown no solicitude for them (*sed sacerdotes qui in vicino sunt pastoralem erga eos sollicitudinem non habere*).¹ Gregory goes on to say that, not wishing to be responsible for their eternal damnation, he had sent Augustine and his companions to learn their wishes and to try and convert them. This is quite explicit and clear.

One curious feature about these notices, which is true of all the occasions on which Gregory refers to the English race, is that he always refers to them as Anglians, and never as Saxons. This confirms the evidence of the story about the Anglian boys, in which they are made to state that their king was called Aelli and their country Deira, and points to the boys thus sold as slaves in Gaul having come from North Britain, and been probably the victims of some war between Northumbria and Kent.

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 57. *Sacerdos* is the usual word employed by Gregory for a bishop.

When Gregory had made up his mind to send a mission to evangelise the Anglians, he also determined that it should consist not of secular priests but of monks, and further, that they should be chosen from his own children—the inmates of his own foundation, St. Andrew's Monastery, on the Caelian Hill.

There are few educated English people who visit Rome who do not pay a visit to the Church of St. Gregorio. On their way thither they for the most part pass under the stately Arch of Constantine, who, in making Christianity the official religion of the State, did so much to encourage its growth and prosperity. Close by the arch stands the Colosseum, with its riven walls, its vast proportions, its massive and grandiose style. There, in the evening, as the wind whistles through the gaps in the walls, we seem to hear echoes of the awful human cries with which dying gladiators and slaughtered martyrs for centuries pierced the skies amidst the plaudits of the cruel, savage, heartless Roman mob that filled the benches. By the same way Gregory when young must have gone well-nigh daily for years as he passed along the Via de San Gregorio, now shaded with trees on either side, until at the farther end he turned up the gentle slope to the left which was known in ancient days as the *Clivus Scauri*, answering to the modern Via de SS. Giovanni e Paolo, where his home was planted on the slopes of the Caelian Hill.

The Caelian Hill was in later Roman times the

favourite residence of some of the wealthier Roman families, and among others of Pope Agapetus (535–537). His father, Gordian, had been the priest of the Church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo on the same slope. Agapetus himself had been an archdeacon before he became Pope; he was a personage of senatorial rank, and had his palace close by the church just named, and near that of the family of his successor Gregory. He was a man of culture and a friend of Cassiodorus, and with him he tried to found a university at Rome, but the times were not propitious. In his palace Agapetus placed a library, and the dedicatory inscription still exists. This house eventually passed into the possession of Gregory, and from him into that of his monastery.¹ Under the present buildings of the monastery are buried vast constructions, including the remains of the library of Agapetus, which was lighted by large windows. These foundations rest on great walls of the early Republic of the kind known as *opus quadratum*.

As we have seen, when Gregory succeeded to the family house in Rome, he dedicated it, with all its appurtenances, to religious uses, and founded on its site a monastery under the patronage of St. Andrew, after whom it was named.

This house where Gregory was born and lived for years, stood right in face of the Palatine Hill, “that *Arx imperii*, covered with its thickly clustering palaces and haunted by strange memories of many

¹ Grisar, *op. cit.* pp. 502, 529.

emperors. Viewed from without, the stately buildings of the Palatine were still magnificent. Valentinian the Third had put them in repair, and the havoc of Goths and Vandals had made but slight impression on their solid structures. Within, however, was one vast desolation—a wilderness of empty courts and closed apartments, choked with rubbish and strewn with the fragments of broken ornaments and statuary. It is true that portions of these buildings were still in use. Theodoric stayed in the Imperial Palace in the year 500; and, after Rome was restored to the Empire, a few officials had their residence there. But a mere corner of the Palatine must have sufficed to house the handful of Imperial agents, and to provide an official Roman residence for the governor of Ravenna. The rest of the buildings, with their halls, baths, galleries, stairways, and innumerable apartments, were abandoned to decay, and in their fading splendour served but to remind men of the brilliant life that had for ever passed away. . . .

"Even now, when on some mild spring morning," continues Mr. Dudden, "we take our stand on the steps of St. Gregorio, and gaze across St. Gregory's Avenue towards the grassy ruins of the Palatine, the spell of antiquity is strong upon us, and the soul is stirred with a wonderful admiration of vanished things. What, then, must have been Gregory's feelings when, in the last years of the classical age, he raised his eyes to the yet abiding mansions of the Cæsars, or rambled through the

ample spaces of the circus, or watched, from some gallery of the Flavian Amphitheatre, the sunshine playing on the bronze of Nero's colossal statue? It cannot be doubted that amid these historic places there was engendered in him that ardent patriotism and pride in the Roman race and name for which throughout his later life he was distinguished."¹

A good deal of rhetoric has been spent in regard to St. Gregory's Monastery as it stands, and the ties between it and our history. The fact is that few such memorable institutions have had so many vicissitudes. Its dedication was changed not unfittingly from St. Andrew to St. Gregory, and it passed presently out of the hands of its original tenants and became the home for a while of certain Greek monks, and in 1573 it was transferred to the monks of Camaldoiese, and became the headquarters of their order.

The cloistered court, or atrium, which forms the main entrance to the church and looks so old, was really only built in 1633 by the architect Soria, and at the instance of Cardinal Scipio Borghesi, while the church itself was largely rebuilt in 1734, under Francesco Ferrari, so that neither the church nor the convent in their present shape and appearance recall in any way the monastic buildings as they existed in the time of St. Gregory. What there is of the old buildings themselves is, as I have said, chiefly underground.

Remains of the church built by Gregory are,

¹ Dudden, *op. cit.* i. 11, 15.



THE MARBLE THRONE OF ST. GREGORY.

To face p. 18.

however, incorporated in the present one, notably its sixteen granite columns, which, like so many others in the churches of Rome, were the spoils of ancient temples or other Roman buildings. Bishop Brown tells us he "found in the steps up to the altar in the north aisle a piece of sculpture which had evidently formed part of one of the sculptured screens of the enclosed choir of the basilica; a remarkably fine example of the imitation of bronze screens, in marble, and of a rare design, and in the garden on the north side, used as the riser of a step, one of the grooved and sculptured marble posts which held the slabs of the choir screens." "These," he adds, "we cannot well doubt, are relics of Gregory's own church as built by himself, evidences of the style in which he built; decorative structure on which his eye, perhaps his hand, has rested."¹

In a small chapel attached to that specially dedicated to St. Gregory, is still a marble throne, or chair (of which I give a figure), alleged with every probability to have been his, and also a recess in which he is said to have slept. The former is described by Bishop Brown. He says of it: "The magnificent white marble throne which is shown in St. Gregory's Church as the chair of Pope Gregory himself, is one of the beautiful thrones of Greek sculpture which were brought to Rome in the time of the Empire, and served as seats for the vestals and other chief personages in the Colosseum and elsewhere, and they have found

¹ *Augustine and His Companions*, 141, 142.

their way to various parts of Rome, but nowhere is there one so fine, I think, as this. Its beauty of sculptured relief is not seen at all, unless you get it removed from its position so as to see the back. The rubbing which they allowed me to take of it shows a very fine piece of symmetrical decoration of the best type, when laid out flat.”¹

In this church, perhaps (no doubt very dear to him in every way), St. Wilfred when in Rome saw on the high altar a beautifully ornamented text of the Gospels which had been presented by the Pope. His biographer tells us it was in the Church of St. Andrew, and he almost certainly meant *this* Church of St. Andrew.

In the atrium of the present church have been inserted a number of tablets also removed from the earlier one, among which are two or three which recall our English troubles of a much later date. One of them may be quoted as an example of quaint pathos. It reads thus: “Here lies Robert Pecham, an English Catholic, who, after the disruption of England and the Church, quitted his country, unable to endure life *there* without the faith; and who, coming to Rome, died, unable to endure life *here* without his country.”

Another monument commemorates Sir Edward Carne of Glamorganshire, D.C.L. of Oxford, who formed with Cranmer and others the Commission that sought an opinion from the foreign Universities in favour of Henry VIII.’s divorce. He was after-

¹ *Augustine and His Companions*, 142.

wards Ambassador to the Emperor Charles the Fifth, by whom he was knighted, and became envoy to the Roman Court, where he died in 1561.

To the left of the staircase leading up to the monastery, three small chapels stand apart on a plot of grass, which, although restored in later times by Cardinal Baronius, have a greater claim than the present church to be closely connected with St. Gregory. One is dedicated to Santa Silvia, Gregory's mother. It contains a very fine modern statue of the Saint. This latter is figured in the frontispiece to the previous work on Gregory. A second chapel was dedicated by Gregory himself to St. Andrew; while the third is dedicated to Santa Barbara, and on the portal is the inscription *Triclinium Pauperum*. In the centre of this chapel is a marble table, 11 feet long and 3 broad, "set on classical supports much resembling in style Pope Gregory's chair." The inscription on it tells us that St. Gregory fed twelve paupers every morning at this table. A pretty legend attaches to the story, namely, that on one occasion Christ Himself in the form of an angel took His seat at the table as the thirteenth guest. For this reason the Pope on Maundy Thursday used to wait on thirteen guests instead of twelve. The inscription on it reads:—

"Bis senos Gregorius hic pascebatur egentes
Angelus et decimus tertius occubuit."¹

¹ *Augustine and His Companions*, 143, note. The table is also figured in the previous volume.

We may be sceptical about the pedigree of some of the things here mentioned which have been associated with Gregory's name, but this will not detract from the fact that wherever we turn in this hallowed corner of the most secluded and silent part of Rome, the great Pope is the genius of the place, nor can we fail to feel a certain glow of sentiment as we mount the stately stairs leading up to the monastery, and remember that it was possibly down these very steps that the monks came as they set out on their English mission.

The Monastery of St. Andrew's and its inmates are mentioned in several of Gregory's letters, and notably in one written in February 601 to the patrician lady, Rusticana, at Constantinople, who had sent some alms to the monastery in question. In this, Gregory tells us of such miracles having been performed there, that it might have been the Apostle Peter who was its abbot. He mentions some which he had heard of from the abbot and prior. Thus, two of the brethren, one old and one young, went out one day to buy something for the use of the monastery, when the elder monk, who had been sent as the guardian of the younger, appropriated some of the money given to him for the purchase. When they in returning had reached the threshold of "the oratory," the thief fell down, having been seized by a demon. When charged by the monks with theft, he denied it. He was again seized, and this was repeated eight times,

when he confessed, and thereupon the devil came to him no more.

On another occasion, on the anniversary of St. Peter, while the brethren were resting at mid-day, one of them became blind, although his eyes were open, uttered loud cries, and trembled. His companions took him up and carried him to the altar of St. Andrew, where they all prayed, when he recovered. He then told them that an old man came to him and set a black dog at him to tear him, and asked him what had induced him to escape from the monastery, and he confessed that that very day it had been his intention to run away.

Another monk also desired to escape. He was very sorely treated by a demon every time he entered the oratory, while he did not molest him when he was outside. He at length confessed to the brethren, who prayed for him for three days, when the demon ceased from molesting him.

On another occasion, two other brethren fled from the monastery. They had previously hinted to the others that they were going down the Appian or Latin Way to make for Jerusalem, but, having gone some distance they turned aside, and, finding some retired crypts near the Flaminian Road, they hid there. When they were missed, some of the monks followed them on horseback by the Metrovian Gate. As their horses reached the crypts where the fugitives were hiding, they stood still, though beaten and urged to proceed. Surprised at this,

their riders searched the crypts, and noticed that the entrance was closed by a heap of stones. Having dismounted and removed them, they found the fugitives, who were much frightened. This "miracle" so acted on them that they were greatly impressed, and returned. Thus, says the Pope, it really proved a great advantage to them to have escaped for a short time from the monastery. Gregory adds that he had sent these stories so that the great lady might know more about the "oratory" on which she had bestowed her alms.¹

They are interesting to us as a sample of the modes of thinking prevailing on some subjects in the very monastery from which Augustine and his brethren set out, and whence, at this time, there seems, further, to have been an epidemic to try and escape. The incident of a number of monks on horseback pursuing runaways along the Appian Way has a very curious local colour.

The monks in question, as we have seen, almost certainly lived under a slightly modified Rule of St. Benedict. Their first abbot, according to John the Deacon, was Hilarion.² He is nowhere mentioned in the works of Gregory. Hilarion, however, is named in the inscription at the monastery recording the famous men who were once monks there, which is a very late record. The Pope, in one of his *Dialogues*,³ refers to a certain Valentio, otherwise unknown, of whom he speaks as "*mihi sicut nости, мео que monasterio praeфuit.*" He may have

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 26; Barmby, xi. 44. ² *Op. cit.* i. 6, 7. ³ iv. 21.



THE THREE CHAPELS OF ST. ANDREW, SANTA SILVIA, AND SANTA BARBARA, ORIGINALLY BUILT BY SAINT
GREGORY, AND REBUILT IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

To face p. 24.

been the same person. According to the same writer, Hilarion was succeeded by Maximian, who held office till 591, *i.e.* the year after Gregory became Pope, when he became Archbishop of Syracuse. He was succeeded, according to one of Gregory's letters, by Candidus, who is styled "the Abbot of the Monastery of St. Andrew the Apostle, situated in this Roman city on the slope of Scaurus (*in clivum Scauri*)."¹ This letter was written in February 598.² He was still abbot in February 601.³

Candidus before he was abbot had been a "bearer of presents,"⁴ and in writing to John, Bishop of Syracuse, to whom he took some presents, the Pope speaks of him as *homo vester*, pointing to his having been a Sicilian.⁵ He also styles him *Defensor*.⁶

While Candidus was Abbot of St. Andrew's, the prior (*praepositus*)⁷ was named Augustine. It was perhaps not his real name, but one he took when he became a monk, and was doubtless adopted from a much greater Augustine, the famous Bishop of Hippo. He was the person selected by Gregory to lead his Anglian mission.

In a letter addressed by the Pope to Syagrius,

¹ *E. and H.* viii. 12.

² *Ib.* xi. 20. He must be distinguished from another Candidus, who, as we have seen, was the protector of the papal patrimony in Gaul.

³ *Lator praesentium*, *i.e.* answering to a modern king's messenger. *Ib.* vii. 9; xi. 20.

⁴ *Ib.* vii. 9.

⁵ *Ib.* iv. 28.

⁶ The word was often written *propositus*, whence our word provost. Plummer's *Bede*, Intr. xxviii, note 5.

Bishop of Autun, in July 599, he specially speaks of Augustine as "formerly *praepositus* of my monastery, now our brother and co-bishop,"¹ while in writing a fatherly letter to the missionary monks he was sending to Britain, he tells them that he puts them under the care of Augustine, their own *praepositus*, who he proceeds to nominate as their abbot.² The rôle of prior or *praepositus* in a monastery was one upon which Pope Gregory set great store, and in one of his letters he says that an abbot's negligence must be remedied by means of a vigilant *praepositus*. He was the abbot's deputy (*secundus ab abbatе praepositi jure*).³ The position was filled at this time at St. Andrew's, as I have just said, by Augustine. According to a doubtful letter of St. Gregory's, he had been a pupil (*alumnus*) of Felix, Bishop of Messina. In it he styles him "consodalis" (i.e. mate or companion).⁴ This, if it is to be trusted, points to his having been, like his abbot, a Sicilian by race, and it was in Sicily that Gregory, as we have seen, had had great estates.⁵ According to another doubtful letter from Pope Vitalian to Archbishop Theodore, he had been *syncellus*, or companion,

¹ *E. and H.* ix. 222; Barmby, ix. 108.

² *E. and H.* vi. 50a.

³ Archbishop Ecgberth's *Dialogues*; Haddan and Stubbs, 406; see Plummer, *Bede*, Intr. xxix, note.

⁴ See Bright, 45, note 6.

⁵ He also had a brother living in Sicily whose name is unknown, but to whom he had commissioned his agent Peter to pay some money, which he had neglected to do (*E. and H.* i. 42; Barmby, i. 44). In another letter he refers to a certain Peter, a baker or miller in the employment of "our brother" (*germani nostri*) (*E. and H.* ix. 200).

in the cell or private room, to Gregory.¹ The same statement is made in a letter from Pope Leo the Third to the Mercian King Kenulf, which is reported by William of Malmesbury.²

It was a new experiment which the Pope was making. This was the first missionary enterprise on a concerted plan, sent out by the head of the Western Church to evangelise a nation. Perhaps it was natural that he should trust its carrying out to the class of men whom he treated as the real depositaries of the Christian ideal, namely, his monks. It is, nevertheless, strange that one so endowed with worldly wisdom should not have realised that the life of monks, secluded from the world and worldly affairs, was hardly the preparation and the training to make them the best capable of dealing with the difficult problems which he entrusted to them, and it is especially notable that he should have put over them a leader who, from what we know of his after career, was little more than a cloistered monk, with little tact and with scant abilities, and that he who was so eminently practical should not have put at the head of his mission some business-like person whose life had been more passed in the open, and who knew the ways of men.

It has also been much remarked upon that, in sending his missionary monks to found a new branch of the Church, Gregory should have neglected to send a bishop with them to perform the necessary duties which bishops were alone deemed capable of

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 116.

² *G.R.* i. par. 89.

performing, or that he did not, in fact, himself consecrate Augustine as a missionary-bishop before sending him on such a distant errand, and thus give him a special prestige. It may be that the generally prudent Pope, who could hardly have foreseen the success that came to him, contemplated a possible failure and treated the venture as more experimental than has been thought. It is more curious that he should not in the first instance have given Augustine and his monks letters of introduction and commendation to the Frankish priests and bishops, nor given them any written instructions.

The travellers set out in the spring of 596.¹ It is pretty certain that they went by sea, setting out from Ostia and making for Lerins, for the land route was long and rough and perilous. It was natural that a body of monks on their unaccustomed journey should have called at the Mecca of Western monasticism, and probably also at this time the most learned centre of theological learning and training anywhere.

The island of Lerins is now known as St. Honorat, from the founder of its famous monastery. At Lerins the missionaries were well pleased with their visit, for we find the Pope afterwards writing to Stephen the Abbot, congratulating him on the report which he had received from Augustine about the regularity and unanimity which prevailed there.²

¹ *Anno xiiii. ejusdem principis* (i.e. of Maurice, that is, during the year from August 595 to August 596); *Bede*, i. 23.

² *E. and H.* vi. 54; *Barmby*, vi. 56.

From Lerins the monks probably went on to Marseilles, and thence to Aix, whose bishop, Protasius, was also well reported upon by Augustine. The latter also spoke favourably of the Patrician Arigius and his treatment of the travellers.¹ At this time, as we have seen, there were two officials with the style of "Patrician" in the kingdom of Burgundy, one with his seat at Arles. The other was Arigius, just named, who lived at Marseilles. At Aix the missionaries were disconcerted by the reports they heard—"the offspring of the tongues of evil-speaking men"—about the dangers of the way and the roughness and cruelty of the people among whom they were going, whose manners and language they did not understand, and who were pictured to them as bloodthirsty savages. Their hearts, in fact, failed them. As Bede plainly puts it, "Struck by a sluggish fear (*timore inertis*), they thought it better to return home than to face the dangers we have named, and, having taken counsel together, they determined to send back Augustine to the Pope with a humble prayer that he would relieve them from so dangerous, laborious, and uncertain a journey." They were clearly not formed of the stuff of which missionary martyrs are made, and they doubtless longed to be back in their delightful seclusion at St. Andrew's Monastery. Augustine accordingly returned to Rome.

The Pope was made of much more masculine materials. He would not hear of their giving up

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 56; *Barmby*, vi. 57.

their enterprise, and wrote them a soothing letter, which was sent back by Augustine. A copy is preserved by Bede, and is addressed "to the servants of our Lord" (*servis Domini nostri*). It afterwards disappeared from the papal registers. It reminded them of the adage that it is better not to begin a work at all rather than to give it up in this fashion. They should not be deterred by the toil of the journey, nor the evil speech of men, but march on with all fervour to fulfil their high calling. God was with them, and the greater their labour, the greater their reward. He, then, constituted their former prior, Augustine, as their abbot (thus giving him greater prestige), bidding them obey him in all things. The Pope concludes with a phrase Mr. Bright describes as really quite Pauline, and in which he expresses the hope that "in the Eternal country he might see the fruit of their labours and share in their reward, as he had wished to share their work, and commends them to the special care of the Almighty." This letter was dated 23rd July 596.¹ It was apparently efficacious, and we do not hear of any more talk of returning. On the same day² Augustine again set out, and this time was fortified with letters of introduction to the Frankish princes and bishops.

In rejoining his friends in Provence, Augustine returned by way of Lerins, and was the bearer of a letter to its abbot, Stephen, in which the Pope congratulated him on the order and unity prevailing

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 50a.

² *Bede*, i. 23.

in his monastery, and which was full of kindly and paternal phrases. It concludes by thanking him for some spoons and plates (*cocleares et circulos*) which Stephen had sent him, and for the things he had also sent for the poor of Rome.¹ These had doubtless been taken by Augustine.

Among the letters of commendation given to Augustine, was one headed “*Gregorius Pelagio de Turnis et Sereno de Massilia, episcopis Gallis a paribus.*” Ewald suggests that a third name once appeared in the heading, namely, that of Ætherius, the Bishop of Lyons,² who would be hardly likely to be left out, and to whom Bede, in fact, says that a letter was sent. Bede, however, makes a mistake in calling him Vergilius. His real name was Ætherius. Turni has generally been identified as Tours. Pelagius was, in fact, the successor of the famous historian, Martin, who had died only a year before, as Bishop of Tours. Tours, on the Loire, was, however, far from Augustine’s route, and it seems difficult to understand how he should have been commended to his care. It is perhaps a proof of the Pope’s slight knowledge of the topography of France.³ The letter says that although among bishops (*sacerdotes*) endowed with that charity that pleases God, religious men require no man’s introduction, yet he takes advantage of a favourable opportunity to commend Augustine, whom he had

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 54; Barmby, vi. 56.

² He was bishop c. 586-602; Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 39, note. *E. and H.* vi. 50.

³ But see *infra*, p. 35.

sent with other servants of God for the good of souls and with God's help. In order that they might be the more ready to help him, he had counselled Augustine to explain the nature of his mission. He also recommended to them the *presbyter*, Candidus, whom he had sent to administer the estates of the poor in the Church in Gaul.¹

From Lerins Augustine went on to Marseilles.

It is not impossible from the number of letters of commendation given to Augustine on his second journey, some of which were far from his direct route, that he was commissioned by the Pope to visit the various dioceses of Gaul on his way through, and to report to him on their condition, etc. etc., and this he seems to have done.

From Marseilles Augustine went on to Aix, where he rejoined his companions, to whom he no doubt read the Pope's letter above named. He took a letter of commendation addressed to its bishop, Protasius, of whom Augustine had reported favourably. In it the Pope asks him to tell Vergilius, his Metropolitan, whom the Pope styles brother and co-bishop (*frater et coepiscopus*), to remit to Rome through him the proceeds of the papal patrimony in Gaul which belonged to the poor and had been detained by the predecessor of Vergilius (*i.e.* by Bishop Licerius), who had looked after the papal patrimony at Arles. This he asks him to do because he, Protasius, had been *vicedominus*, *i.e.* vicar-general, at that time, and knew how matters stood,

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 50; Barmby, vi. 52.

and he further heartily commended Candidus, "their common son," to him.¹

From Aix the missionaries went on to Arles, the capital of Provence, and the stateliest city in Gaul—*Gallula Roma*, it was styled. It was one of the seats of government of the Burgundian kingdom. In his letter to Vergilius, the Archbishop of Arles, who had recently completed the cathedral there and who was Metropolitan of Gaul, the Pope asked for his succour and help for the missionaries and for Candidus, the rector of the "little patrimony of St. Peter." He complains to him that his predecessor, *i.e.* Licerius, had for many years held the patrimony, and had kept the proceeds in his own hands, instead of remitting them, and begs Vergilius to hand them over to Candidus. He concludes with the caustic sentence : "It is detestable that what has been assured by the kings of the nations should be reported to be diverted by the bishops" ("*Nam valde est execrabile, ut quod a regibus gentium servatum est, ab Episcopis dicatur ablatum*").²

The Pope also wrote a letter to Arigius the Patrician, whose reputation he says, Augustine had mentioned to him, asking him to help and succour the travellers, and to do the same for Candidus.³

Leaving Arles, the missionaries proceeded along the Rhone valley, strewn with so many remains of Roman greatness, which were then, no doubt, largely intact, and with so many ancient and prosperous

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 53 ; Barmby, vi. 55.

² *E. and H.* vi. 51 ; Barmby, vi. 53.

³ *E. and H.* vi. 56 ; Barmby, vi. 57.

settlements. They went on to Vienna (the real Vienna as Freeman calls it), the modern Vienne, to whose bishop, Desiderius, the Pope wrote a letter of commendation jointly with Syagrius, the Bishop of Autun.¹ They then went on to Lyons.

They seem, on leaving Lyons, to have gone to Autun, and then to Orleans, to visit Queen Brunichildis and her grandson Theodebert. Gregory had written letters to her, and to her two grandsons. The former letter has been blamed for its obsequious civilities to a merciless woman, but it is very unlikely that Gregory in writing it knew much about the actual internal affairs of her kingdom, which was a long way off, and there had only been a very loose tie between Rome and "the Gauls." Her truculence also only developed in later years when the Pope was dead, and she was now widely known for her political genius, her culture, and, above all, for her devotion to the Empire and to the Church. Her only grave offence at this time was one hardly treated as such by the Franks, namely, her second marriage with her first husband's nephew. In his letter the Pope begins by referring to reports which had reached him of her "Christianity" (*vestrae Christianitas*), and says he does not doubt of her goodness, and speaks of her devotion and zeal for the faith. He goes on to say that there had gone to him some of the Anglian people who wished to become Christians, but the bishops (the word used is *sacerdotes*) who were in the vicinity (by

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 52; *Barmby*, vi. 54.

which no doubt Gaul is meant) had not shown any pastoral solicitude for them (*sacerdotes qui in vicino sunt pastoralem erga eos sollicitudinem non habere*). Not wanting to be responsible for their eternal damnation, he had sent Augustine and his companions to learn the wishes of the Anglians, and with her help to try and convert them. He had instructed them that in order to carry out this view they ought to take with them some priests (*presbyteros ducere*) from the neighbourhood (*e vicino*). He asked her to protect the missionaries and to assist them in the good work, and to provide for their secure journey to the nation of the Anglians. He also commended to her his well-beloved son Candidus, "the rector of the patrimony of the Holy See situated in her country."¹

To the boy princes, Theodoric and Theodebert, he also wrote, repeating the statement about the desire of the Anglians for conversion and the negligence of the bishops in the neighbouring districts to do the work, and asking them to help Augustine and his companions, saying he had charged them to take some priests from the neighbourhood, from whom they might ascertain the disposition of the Anglians, and who should act as interpreters (*cum quibus eorum possint mentes agnoscere et voluntates ammonitione sua*). To them he also commends Candidus, the patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul, and the cause of the poor.²

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 57; Barmby, vi. 59.

² *E. and H.* vi. 49; Barmby, vi. 58.

These letters are especially interesting. In the first place because they show that, in or before the year 596, messengers from the Anglians had approached the Pope in regard to the evangelising of the island, and, secondly, it would seem that the Frankish clergy were not anxious or zealous in converting their cousins beyond the sea, with whom they were probably on bad terms.

One of Gregory's letters was addressed, as we have seen, to the Bishop of Tours, and it is not impossible that, having gone to Orleans, Augustine would proceed down the Loire at least as far as the famous See of St. Martin, in order that he might report upon its condition to his master. Gocelin, writing in the eleventh century,¹ has a legend which is incorrectly given in the *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 37, and which, if founded on some reputable tradition, shows that Augustine actually went into the west of France. According to this story, the travellers arrived at Pont de Sé, in Anjou, wearied and tired. They crossed the Loire, when a rough crowd from Sé, consisting chiefly of women, drove them away with taunts and jeers. One of the women was especially offensive, whereupon Augustine, afraid for his chastity, took up a stick (*batulus*) to stop her. This flew from his hand to a great distance, and as a result a spring gushed out and the crowd ceased their aggressive attitude. A light also rested over the elm tree where the missionaries were reposing. A church was afterwards built on the spot, into which, says Gocelin,

¹ See *Hist. MSS. Com.* iii.

no woman dared to enter, afraid of the saint's displeasure at the insult offered to him by her sex.¹ Such are the naïve stories which in days of easy belief gathered round famous people like Augustine. This one has the special infirmity that we have no earlier authority for it than a writer who wrote five centuries later.

It would seem that the missionaries when they returned from the Loire went to Soissons, where King Chlothaire (whose first cousin had married the King of Kent, to whom they were going) received and treated them well, as was acknowledged by the Pope in a subsequent letter.²

The travellers went very leisurely. This has been quoted against them and interpreted as showing want of zeal, but they were probably following Gregory's instructions. He no doubt wished to have a full report from them as to the state of things in Gaul, and this needed time. It was two years since they had left Rome. They apparently passed the winter of 596 and 597 in Gaul, where they had had what was rather a triumphant procession than a missionary journey, and they were now on the verge of the scene of their later labours. It is a notable fact, as showing how small a place the mission had in the eyes of those not immediately interested, that it is ignored by the continental writers. Neither Isidore of Seville in Spain nor the contemporary French writers mention it.

¹ *Act. Sanct.* vol. xviii. May 26th.

² See *E. and H.* xi. 51; *Barmby*, xi. 61.

CHAPTER II

Now that we have brought the missionaries to within sight of their goal, it will be well to try and realise how matters then stood there. Most of the writers who have described the journey of Augustine have pictured an England at this time full of savagery and exceedingly barbarous. What we know of the archaeology of the pagan Anglo-Saxons shows this to be an entirely mistaken view. The arts were very advanced among them, and they have left us in the pagan cemeteries of Kent examples of their splendid metal work and jewellery as proofs of their skill.

With the exception that they were not Christians, and apparently did not use stone or brick for their buildings, which was also probably the case in the greater part of France, we have no reason of any kind to suppose that they were a whit behind their relations, the Franks and Lombards, in the amenities and surroundings of life. They had no books, that is true, but instead of books they had long memories for poetry, and their "dooms" show they were a law-regulated community and a settled and agricultural people with an elaborate local administration.

Æthelberht, King of Kent, was a great personage

—*rex potentissimus*, Bede calls him. He held the hegemony of the Anglian and Saxon princes, which they defined by the word *Bretwalda*. He was the second Anglo-Saxon sovereign so styled by Bede, *Ælle* of Northumbria having been the first, and he controlled the most cultivated and advanced part of the country. His authority, according to Bede, extended to the Humber, and therefore included the Southern Angles in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, which districts he had apparently taken from the Northumbrians. He would hardly have been permitted to marry a Frankish princess if he had not been a personage with a royal establishment and surroundings. His subsequent conduct shows that he had the taste and tact of a high-bred gentleman. It is preposterous, therefore, for writers to suppose that in going to Britain the missionaries were facing the dangers and inconveniences which have to be faced in entering some utterly savage or barbarous country.

In addition to all this, the Frankish princess who had married *Æthelberht* was herself a Christian and a Catholic, and therefore ready to make the way easy for the Pope's evangelists. Bertha or Bercta, as she was called, was, according to Gregory of Tours, the only daughter of Charibert (the French equivalent of the Saxon *Hereberht* or *Herbert*), King of Paris, who reigned from 561 to 567, and of his wife, *Ingoberga*,¹ and was therefore

¹ *Op. cit.* iv. 26 and ix. 26, 27. As her father died in 567, she must at the latest have been born in or before 568. Her mother *Ingoberga*, according to Gregory of Tours, was seventy in 589. If that state-

a cousin of Chlothaire, the reigning King of Neustria, or Soissons.¹ The words of Gregory of Tours are ambiguous, but seem to imply that, when she married, her husband Æthelberht was not yet king. In one place he says she married a man in Kent,² and in another that she married in Kent the son of a certain king.³ In the headnote of a letter addressed to her by Gregory⁴ she is called Æthelberga, and the Pope seems to have so called her. This may mean that she adopted a new name when joining her husband's family.

When she was married to the pagan Prince Æthelberht, it was stipulated by her parents, according to Bede, that she should be permitted to practise her faith unmolested, and should be accompanied by a certain bishop named Liudhard, as her chaplain and almoner.⁵ His name shows he was a Frank.

He has been called a bishop of Soissons by

ment is reliable, since she could not well have had a child after she was forty, she must have been born before 559. Gregory may well have mistaken the age of the old lady, however, by five years. In that case Bertha may have been born as late as 563, and we may roughly conclude that she was born somewhere between 563 and 568. As her daughter Æthelberga was married to King Edwin of Northumbria in 625, and would probably be born within a year of her mother's marriage with Æthelberht, she would, if then twenty-five years old, have been born in the year 600, or if she was thirty, and we can hardly suppose she was more, then she would be born in 595, and her mother was married to Æthelberht in 594. This is only an induction, but I think it a reasonable one. Hauck, *Real. En.* i. 520, also argues that the marriage was not long before Augustine's mission.

¹ Thomas of Elmham calls her by mistake the daughter of King Dagobert, who discovered (*invenit*) the body of Saint Denis (p. 133).

² *Op. cit.* iv. 26.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ See *E. and H.* xi. 35, note.

⁵ *Ib.* i. 25.

some writers, doubtless on the ground that Soissons was the capital of Bertha's father's kingdom, but no such name as his occurs in the lists of the bishops of Soissons, nor do the authors or compilers of the *Gallia Christiana* name him. At the time we are writing about, Droctigisilus was the Bishop of Soissons.

A more reputable story makes him a bishop of Senlis. The earliest authorities for this notion are, however, very late, namely, the Canterbury chroniclers, Sprott and Thorn, and the authors of the *Gallia Christiana*, who call him Lethardus or Letaldus, and whom they name among the bishops of Senlis. He was said to have come with Bertha as early as 566, and they accordingly mention him after a bishop who subscribed at the Council of Paris in 557. Jacques du Perron, Bishop of Angoulême,¹ and almoner to Queen Henrietta Maria (thus holding a similar post to that of Queen Bertha's chaplain), in drawing a parallel between the two cases of the first Christian Queen of England and her almoner, and the first Romanist Queen after the rupture, says: "Gaul it was which sent to the English their first Christian Queen. The clergy of Gaul it was that sent them their first bishop, her almoner." Montalembert also follows Sprott and Thorn in this matter.

Smith in his edition of *Bede* says that no such name occurs in St. Marthon's account of the

¹ Brown, *The Christian Church in these Islands before Augustine*, p. 13.

bishops of Senlis.¹ The Sacramentary of Senlis, the calendar of commemorations, and the list of bishops are all silent as to any Bishop Lethardus or Liudhard. It would seem, in fact, that he was one of those bishops *in partibus*, or vagrant bishops, who abounded in Gaul 150 years later, and were denounced by more than one council and synod held there.²

As we have seen, it does not appear to be possible to put Bertha's marriage earlier than about 592-593, which would be also the date of her coming to England with her bishop. This would be after her mother's death in 589, and when she doubtless sorely needed a home, for she was an orphan.

It would seem very probable that Liudhard was dead when Augustine arrived, or Bede would have had something to say about him on that occasion, nor would the missionaries have taken immediate possession of his church as they did. It is characteristic of that picturesque reporter of fables, Gocelin, that he makes him attend at St. Martin's Church when the Roman teachers, "superior to him as gold to silver," went there (*ibidem quae Dei sunt agebant*).³ He was buried in St. Martin's. Archbishop Laurence afterwards removed his body into the porticus or chapel of St. Martin in the Church of SS. Peter and Paul, where those of King

¹ *Op. cit.* 61, note 3.

² Hardy, *Catalogue, etc.*, i. 175 and 176; Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 42.

³ *Vit. Maj.* i. 520; Bright, 57, note 1.

Æthelberht and his Queen, Bertha, were also laid.¹

A later legendary life of Liudhard calls him “*praecursor et ianitor venturi Augustini.*”² More than one very late “Life” of St. Liudhard also give an account of his death and of the miracles associated with his name. As Plummer says,³ it is clearly mythical and chronologically impossible. In the additions to Bede’s *Martyrology* his obit is given on the 4th February thus: *Passio S. Liphardi martyris, Cantorbeiae archiepiscopi.* There is no good authority for making him a martyr or an Archbishop of Canterbury. In the first volume of Dugdale’s *Monasticon*, ed. 1655, there is a copy of an ancient drawing of St. Augustine’s Canterbury, which was made after 1325. It was copied for Dugdale in 1652 when it had passed into the library of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. It represents the altar (dedicated in 1325), with a door on each side (marked “north door” and “south door”) leading to the shrines containing the relics in the apse. Above the superaltar, on each side of the figure of Christ, are represented two shrines shaped like churches, on one we read, “Scs. Letard,” and on the other, “Reliqe.”⁴

Let us now turn to the Church of St. Martin, where Liudhard officiated. “Bede tells us that near Canterbury, on the eastern side, there was a

¹ *Thomas of Elmham*, p. 132; *Thorn*, ii. 2.

² *Hardy, Catalogue, etc.*, i. 176.

³ *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 42.

⁴ See also *Bishop Brown, The Christian Church, etc.*, pp. 17, 18.

church dedicated to Saint Martin which had been built in ancient days when the Romans were still in Britain, in which the Queen (*i.e.* Bertha) was accustomed to pray."

This Church of St. Martin, the ruins of which still remain, has been the object of a great deal of discussion. Its dedication to St. Martin, the great Gallic saint, who did not die till about 399 A.D., while the Romans left Britain finally in 407-409, makes it almost certain that if it was actually a Roman building, it had been rededicated by Liudhard in the name of St. Martin. Remains of the church are still to be seen on the east side of Canterbury, outside the walls on a steep slope rising from west to east.

The late Mr. Micklethwaite was the real founder of a scientific history of Saxon methods and designs in church building, and I have the greatest faith in his judgment. Speaking of the buildings in Britain which survive from that period, he says: "The architecture, if it may be called architecture, was a debased imitation of the Italian architecture of the time, which was itself in a very degraded state. The method of building was traditional from Roman times, and there were ruins of Roman buildings in the country which no doubt supplied architectural ideas as well as material for the new churches. In some cases we find better work than in others, and some of the best is among that which we have reason to think the oldest."¹

¹ *Arch. Journ.* liii. p. 294.



THE CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN AT CANTERBURY, AS IT IS NOW.

To face p. 44.

Of these Saxon churches, St. Martin's was the first to be built. Claims have been put in for a Roman origin of the existing nave, but, says "our Father Anchises," just named: "I have not been convinced that any part of the existing fabric is of the Roman time. I do not dispute that Austin found a church there, but I think nothing that is left can go further back than the coming of Queen Bertha and her Christian family who were using it when he came. Even so, it may claim to be the oldest of English churches, not merely by survival, but in fact."¹ Again he says: "All through the controversy I have contended against the claim for the present nave of St. Martin's being Roman. The only argument for it has been the use of pounded brick in the plaster and in the mortar of the western window arches. But that by itself is not enough. All Saxon building was debased Roman, and the use of pounded brick in this instance proves only that there was some one about at the building who either knew by tradition, or had read, or had noticed in some Roman work which, perhaps, he had helped to pull down, that it was used by the Romans; and as there was abundance of broken Roman brick lying at hand, it is not extraordinary that it should have been used here. Mr. Dowker found pounded brick in the *opus signinum* floors at Reculver, which are now admitted to be Saxon, and it has also been found at St. Pancras. The walling

¹ *Arch. Journ.* liii. p. 295.

of the nave at St. Martin's is against its Roman date. It is made up of Roman materials used promiscuously as they came to hand, and tells of a time when there were ruins near, at which the builders might help themselves. This could scarcely have been the case in Kent in Roman times, when it was a settled and peaceful district, but was likely enough after the wars and confusion which accompanied the English conquest."¹ The excavations of Mr. Routledge and Mr. Livett have proved that the present nave is later than the western part of the present chancel, and that the latter was shortened at the west end when the nave was added to it.

"The walls of the eastern part of the present chancel are of the thirteenth century. Those of the western part, which are alone primitive, are entirely built of brick, and nothing like them is known anywhere else, except at the neighbouring Church of St. Pancras, which is built in exactly the same way, and the date of one must be, within a few years, the date of the other."²

Judging from the facts we now know about the church, Mr. Micklethwaite, who has given a ground-plan of it, argues that the original building was a plain oblong chapel, probably not very much more than 30 feet long, while it was 14 feet 6 inches wide. Inside at the east end of the original chancel there is a gap in the wall, which it has been surmised tells of an apse forming the presbytery; and about the

¹ *Arch. Journ.* liii. p. 316.

² *Ib.* 314, 315.



REMAINS OF SAXON WORK AT ST. MARTIN'S, CANTERBURY.

To face p. 46.

middle of the south side is a doorway leading to a little chamber outside (*i.e.* a so-called *porticus*). This was entered by a low, square-headed doorway. The round-headed doorway on the south side of the chancel, though itself of Saxon date, is evidently an insertion in the wall.¹ None of the windows of the earliest church remain, but it is fairly certain they were very narrow and deeply splayed.

Mr. Peers, in his account of the remains of the earliest church, gives some additional details. He tells us that the walls are 2 feet 2 inches thick, with courses of bricks, five to a foot. The opening into the *porticus* or chapel is 3 feet 3 inches wide, with brick jambs straight through the wall and a flat head with a heavy ragstone lintel. The width of this chapel was 4 feet 3 inches, and when intact it was probably square. Into the outer face of the western jamb is built a small piece of a fine-grained oölite, bearing part of a dedicatory inscription, perhaps that of an altar, in good and well-preserved lettering of an early type. It reads thus:—

+ + N HONORE SÆ
ET OMNIVM SÆORVM²

Such are the remains and such the lessons they teach us about this the earliest English Church, which, in fact, dates from an earlier time than Augustine's mission, and was doubtless erected by Liudhard, the chaplain of Queen Bertha, and was

¹ *Arch. Journ.* liii. p. 315 and note 1.

² *Ib.* lviii. pp. 412, etc.

the shrine where she and her household once worshipped. It was in all probability built by Gaulish workmen, and after the debased Roman style then existing in Gaul. We have no evidence that the practice of building in stone or brick had survived as a tradition among the Saxons.

In regard to the rite followed by Liudhard at St. Martin's—that is to say, the rite of the Queen's chapel—it was no doubt the Gallican one, while the Frankish priests who went with Augustine probably knew no other.

Bede does not name Liudhard again, and, as I have said, it is possible he was dead at the time of Augustine's arrival. It is also possible that the messages from England, saying that people there were anxious to be converted,¹ were sent by Queen Bertha herself on the death of her chaplain. If she had had a chaplain or confessor living, there would not have been any occasion to complain of the clergy of the neighbouring districts (by which Gaul and not Wales seems to be meant) for their want of zeal in furthering the cause, nor would there have been a necessity for interpreters to accompany Augustine. We must take it that whatever glimmer of Christian light had been shed by Liudhard's lamp was now nearly, if not quite, extinct.

On the other hand, it is very probable indeed that, like Theodelinda at Pavia, Alchfled, the wife of Peada in Mercia, and Æthelberga, the wife of Edwin of Northumbria, Bertha was a very potent

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 258.

agent in the conversion of her husband and his people. Æthelberht and his nobles had probably been persuaded by the Frankish princess that the new faith was better than the old one, and that it was time the Anglians should renew their intercourse with the civilised world, which had become Christian. It is at all events plain that Æthelberht received the monks cordially and treated them well.

Almost everything we know that is authentic about Æthelberht we owe to Bede. The additional statements in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are, it seems to me, mere inventions of the author of that late ninth-century compilation. First as to his name. It does not seem to have been sufficiently noticed that the earliest native author who refers to him does not call him Æthelberht at all. This is the anonymous author of the genealogies in Nennius, who wrote in the seventh century. He calls him Ealdberht.¹ This is a perfectly good Anglo-Saxon name, and an *Ealdberht clito* is mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* under the year 722, and is said to have been killed by fire in 725. The genealogies in question are a very good and safe authority. How the statement is to be reconciled with Gregory's letter and with Bede, who both call him Æthelberht, I do not know. Can he have changed his name on his marriage? Æthelberht is essentially the same name as Albert. Did he, on the other hand, adopt the name he is now

¹ *M.H.B.* p. 74.

known by at his baptism? It is a form of name very frequent afterwards in Kent, while it is most unlike those of his reputed ancestors.

The genealogy attached to Nennius calls his father Eormoric.¹ Bede calls him Irminric.² This was a famous name. Hermanric formed a great empire (by uniting the Goths and neighbouring nations), which was destroyed by Attila. He fills a notable place in romance as well as history, and the name of the tribe, the Jutes, which conquered Kent seems to be a dialectical form of Goth. The name of Gothland, an island in the Baltic, is pronounced Yutland in the North.

The father of Eormenric was Ossa,³ the stem-father and originator of the clan of the *Æscings*, from whom the Kentish kings took their family name. We know nothing more about him, nor yet about Eormenric, except that in addition to *Æthelberht* the latter also had a daughter Ricula, who, according to Bede, married the father of *Sabercht* or *Sebert*, the King of the East Saxons.

Æthelberht, according to Bede, died in the year 616, after a reign of fifty-six years. This date is inconsistent with his statement that he died twenty-seven years after his conversion. If the former be reliable, he mounted the throne in 560. In Codex F of the *Chronicle*, and in that alone, which was written in the twelfth century, and is of no authority on such

¹ *M.H.B.* p. 74.

² *Op. cit.* ii. 5. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* calls him Eormenric, *sub ann. 552 et 616*.

³ Nennius, *loc. cit.*

a point, he is said to have been born in 552, which looks incredible, since that would make him only eight years old at his accession. The only event in his reign mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* I believe to be probably fabulous, namely, that in 568 he fought against Ceawlin, King of Wessex, and Cutha, his brother, and was driven into Kent, while two of his Ealdormen, Oslaf and Cnebba, were killed at Wibbandune. Bede speaks of him as *rex Æthelberct in Cantia potentissimus*, which is ambiguous, and may mean either that he was most powerful in Kent, or king in Kent and most powerful. He adds that his authority extended to "the very large river Humber (*usque Humbrae fluminis maximi*), by which the Southern and the Northern Angles were separated from one another." This is supported by other facts—thus, although his nephew Sabercht was under-king of Essex, Æthelberht's interference in the foundation of the See of London shows he was really supreme there. Bede further says that Redwald, who was king in East Anglia, and who was doubtless subordinate to Æthelberht, "became a Christian in Kent," although he relapsed on returning home again, which seems to point to his having also been under the influence of Æthelberht. It is probable that at this time there was no separate kingdom of Mercia, while the Middle Angles, who were the inhabitants of Lincolnshire and its borders, were doubtless also directly subject to the Bretwalda Æthelberht. On the other hand, it is probable that Kent properly so called, which

was bounded on the north by the Thames, then included Surrey, or parts of it.

From the accounts Bede gives of the conference with the British bishops at Aust,¹ it would seem that the meeting was held in a district under the supreme control of *Æthelberht*, which would carry his immediate rule as far west as Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and it would seem that he was, in fact, acknowledged as supreme chief in all eastern, central, and southern England, and as far north as the Humber.

His principal residence and palace was outside the walls of *Durovernum* or *Canterbury* (the *Can-twara-byrig* of the Anglo-Saxons), which Bede calls his metropolis (*metropolis sua*). It still remains ecclesiastically the metropolis of Britain, and a few paragraphs may be opportunely devoted to it.

Mr. T. G. Godfrey Faussett, in his valuable memoir on *Canterbury before Domesday*, of which I gladly avail myself, points out how, in the *Itinerary of Antonine*, *Durovernum* is the last stage on the great Roman road leading from London to the three Kentish harbour fortresses. At *Durovernum* that road divided into three: one gaining the harbour of *Ritupis*, or *Richborough*, in twelve miles; another, *Dubrae*, *i.e.* *Dover*, in fourteen miles; and the third, *Lemanae*, or *Lympne*, in sixteen miles. Of these three ports *Richborough* is by far the most important, and was probably the first to be constructed, since the road to it from *Canterbury*

¹ *Vide infra.*

continues in a straight line. Richborough harbour is the primary origin of Canterbury, which is placed on an important ford on the road leading to it.¹

Durovernum is first mentioned by Ptolemy,² who calls it *Δαρονενον*, and is named by him with *Λονδίνιον* and *'Ροντούνπια* as the three chief cities of the “*Κάντιοι*.”

Its name is written in several ways by the Roman writers, as Durovernum, Durovernia, and Durovernus. As it is not mentioned in the *Notitia*, it would seem that it had no garrison when that work was compiled, and its importance was then doubtless commercial rather than military.

It was a walled town with several gates. The wall and gates are discussed at considerable length by Mr. Faussett in the memoir already mentioned. It was about eight hundred yards long and four hundred yards wide.

On the withdrawal of the Romans, Durovernum was apparently abandoned, and for a long time its ruins remained uninhabited and desolate. Mr. Faussett says that this is pointed at by the fact that it alone among the towns of East Kent lost its name and acquired a new one, namely, Cantwarabyrig; the others, Reculver, Richborough, Dover, and Lympne, all retaining their old ones in a slightly altered form. The best proof that the Saxons did not settle there is the absence of any pagan Saxon cemetery in the city or near it, while they abound in the east of Kent.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 372.

² *Lib. ii. 372.*

“ This view,” says our author, “ is entirely corroborated by the remains of the Roman city. The lower parts of the houses being found in a very well-preserved condition ; and beautiful pavements, all unworn, occasionally coming to light, seem to show a period of almost Pompeian burial, neglect, and over-growth, so that the later restorers of the city noticed nothing of the valuable materials below. Moreover, not a single street is on the site of a Roman street, remains of buildings being under them all, with the exception of Beercart Lane and part of Watling Street, and even here (where must always have remained the great thoroughfare of England, whether through a city or not) the original straight line of the road is so straggled from, as to show that at one period the property flanking the street was of no more value or consideration than the waste of a country roadside.”¹

Mr. Faussett argues that the capital of the earlier Jutish kings was really at Richborough, in favour of which he mentions that its great suburb Ash bears the name of the second king of Kent. It also contains the largest and richest pagan Saxon cemetery ever discovered. Other royal cities he claims were Faversham, where there is another large cemetery called the King’s Field ; while Kingston - under - Barham - Downs probably formed a third. A very rich cemetery was found there, containing, *inter alia*, the wonderful brooch of Bryan Faussett, now at Liverpool, which must

¹ *Op. cit.* 380 and 381.

have been buried with a queen. It seems probable that Reculver was a fourth important settlement.

Another good reason for believing that there was no continuity between the life of the old Roman city and the later English one is, that none of the gates retain their old names. Thus the ground made over by *Æthelberht* to the monks was called, or was near, the Staple Gate, or the Market Gate, from the market close by. That the ground in question should have been thus empty for the newcomers goes not a little to show, says our author, that the Saxon part of the city, at least, must have then been of very recent foundation.¹

The gate in the new piece of wall to the eastward was called Quene Gate, which is first mentioned in a charter of 762, and tradition connects it with Queen Bertha, which conjecture Mr. Faussett is tempted to accept. The Saxon town was the Roman town elongated. Every gate apparently had a market-place outside it. "The Staple" was outside Staple Gate. The charter just mentioned speaks of a house "*quae jam ad Quenegatum urbis Dorovernis in foro [i.e. in the market-place] posita est.*"² From other charters, etc., we learn that Ritherchepe, *i.e.* Rither market, lay between the Dover and Richborough roads, that is, outside the modern Riding Gate and Newingate, and nearly to Burgate. Lastly, outside Worth Gate was the wine market, or Winchepe, which name still lives.³

¹ *Op. cit.* 384 and 385.

² Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* cix; Birch, *Cart.* 192.

³ Faussett, *op. cit.* 386.

The pagan Saxons disliked towns, and especially ruined towns, which they seem to have looked upon as inhabited by demons, and their settlements are almost universally found outside the precincts of the old Roman towns. That this was the case at Canterbury we may be certain from the fact that Bertha's royal chapel, which was doubtless near the palace, was situated outside the walls, and it is probable, since no pagan cemeteries have been found near the city, that it only became a royal residence when *Æthelberht* married the French King's daughter, and probably built for her a more stately residence than his ancestors had lived in. It was about the royal residence that the new settlement of the English was grouped.

Let us turn once more to the missionaries. They reached the English Channel soon after Easter Day, which in 597 fell on 14th April. At this time the principal port of embarkation in Gaul for travellers to Britain was *Quentavic*,¹ the modern *Étaples*, a few miles south of Boulogne, from which, as we are expressly told, Archbishop Theodore set out a few years later. It is interesting to remember that Boulogne and *Thérouanne* were both at this time pagan, having relapsed about 550, while they did not become Christian again till 630, when they were brought back by St. Omer.

The party was a numerous one, and they probably occupied more than one of the trading vessels

¹ i.e., *vicus ad Quantiam*, the town on the *Canche* (Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 203).

(each carrying a single mast and a square-sail, and made in the Roman fashion), which then kept up communication with Britain.

Whatever doubts there may be about the port of embarkation of the missionaries, there can be none as to their place of arrival, which, according to Bede, was in the island of Tanatos (Thanet).¹ He does not specify the exact spot more clearly. The gradual silting of the coast in this part of Kent has greatly altered the general contour of the land and of the channels round the island, which has resulted in many differences of opinion about the exact spot where the landing, so critical for our history, actually took place.

The sluggish Stour, as it is very fitly named, comes down from Canterbury, and presently enters an estuary at a place still called Stourmouth. This estuary divides Thanet from the mainland of Kent. Of it Bede uses the curious phrase that it "pushes both heads into the sea" (*utrumque enim caput protendit in mare*). Part of its waters, in fact, then passed southwards and were called the Wantsum,

¹ Solinus, who flourished about 80 A.D., refers to it in a phrase, "*Adtanatos insula adspiratur freto Gallico, a Britanniae continente aestuario tenui separata, frumentariis campis felix, et glebi uberi, nec tantum sibi, verum et aliis salubris locis: nam quum ipsa nullo serpatur angue, asportata inde terra quoquo gentium inventa sit, angues necat*" (*Polyhistoriae*, chap. xxii.; *M.H.B.* p. x). Isidore (*Hisp.* lib. xiv. chap. vi.; *M.H.B.* p. cii) copies Solinus, and derives the name from *θάραρος*. This early use of its present name shows that Nennius was wrong in the statement that the island was so called by the Saxons. The latter adds that the Britons called it *Ruichim* (chap. xxix.; *M.H.B.* p. 63). Nennius is followed by Asser, who gives the name as *Ruim* (*ib.* 470). It has been suggested that this latter is the origin of the name *Ramsgate*.

and part northwards, and were called the Glenlade or Inlade. The outlets of this channel, which was an ideal anchorage-ground in bad weather, were in Roman times protected on the south by Rutupiae, called Ritupis by Antonine, and Rutubi by Bede,¹ and which Bishop Brown says may have been pronounced Rithubis. Its famous ruins still remain to us in "the mighty walls" of Richborough.² It was situated on a small island, and not on the mainland. On the north the main channel was protected by another fortress, called Regulbium by the Romans, and Racuulfe by Bede, represented by the modern Reculvers, the ancient twin towers of whose church are so conspicuous as we enter the estuary of the Thames. The name of Northmouth still remains near Reculver. The waters of the Stour, however, no longer pass out by their old route, but wind with many convolutions through the low-lying ground and escape into Pegwell Bay. In Bede's time the Wantsum was 3 stadia or furlongs wide, and fordable only at two places. One of them, as Bishop Brown says, was Sarre, at the ford still called St. Nicholas, at Wade.³ The other, south of Minster. The strait is now silted up, but was not completely so at any point till the reign of Henry the Eighth.⁴

Thanet, says Bede, was not large, "measured by the standard of the natives," and accommodated 600 families,⁵ that is to say, it contained 600 hides, a

¹ He says the Anglians called it Reptacestir.

² *Augustine and His Companions*, 28 and 29.

³ *Ad. Vadum.*

⁴ *Twine de reb. Albion.* i. 25.

⁵ *Bede*, i. 25.

hide being the rough estimate of the land needed to support a family. In the Life of St. Mildred the island is called *flos et thalamus regni*.¹

The exact landing-place of Augustine and his party has been discussed with considerable ingenuity and warmth. Bishop Brown suggests with great probability that the fortress of Richborough once gave its name to the whole "harbour," which extended from Sandwich to Ramsgate, and is now in a large measure represented by Pegwell Bay.² This seems a reasonable supposition, especially as Richborough itself was not then on the mainland but on a small island. It was very probably at Richborough, where there were quays and other facilities, that the larger vessels anchored and discharged; and it was at Richborough, which Thorn calls Retesborough, that he makes Augustine and his party land.

As Professor M'Kenna Hughes reminds us, Thorn lived only ten miles off, at Canterbury, and must have been quite at home in Thanet, since he was treasurer of St. Augustine's Abbey, which owned the dues paid in the harbour of Richborough, and which he speaks of as part of Thanet. He was followed by Thomas of Elmham. Thorn says expressly that Augustine and his monks came ashore in the isle of Thanet at a place called Retesborough; adding that "our father Augustine," on stepping ashore, happened to stand on a certain stone, which took the impression of his feet as if it

¹ Hardy, *Catalogue, etc.*, i. 377.

² *Augustine and His Companions*, 30.

had been clay. The stone, he says, was removed and put inside the saint's chapel there, and every year on the day of his burial crowds of people gathered together for devotion and in the hope of recovering their health, saying, "We will worship in the place where his feet stood."¹ I only mention this to show what the tradition about St. Augustine's landing-place was at Canterbury.

In quite modern times it has been conjectured, and the purely arbitrary guess has been converted into an article of faith by many, that Augustine landed at a place called Ebbs Fleet in Thanet. I do not know a single ancient writer who says anything of the kind, and the notion has really arisen in consequence of the landing-place of Augustine having been identified with that of Hengist and Horsa, as reported by Bede and those who followed him. These sea-rovers, however, were entirely different people to the monks. They were wont to avoid "harbours" and to run their boats on beaches in sheltered inlets, while the latter doubtless travelled in trading vessels of considerable size. I know no valid reason whatever for making Augustine land at Ebbs Fleet, except Dean Stanley's imposing rhetoric. It is not improbable that this rhetoric, and the fact that Lord Granville's committee committed themselves to the same opinion, will continue to impose the fable on innocent people. The committee just named erected a commemorative cross about half a mile from the farm still called Ebbs

¹ See Thorn's *Chronicle, X. Scriptores*, col. 1759.

Fleet, near which is a well (known locally as St. Augustine's well). This will continue to delude people into the notion that there is a real foundation for the view.

Let us now proceed. Augustine and his monks, of course, knew no English. They knew Ecclesiastical Latin fairly well, and spoke a rather barbarous jargon in which Latin was changing into Italian, and that was all. Bede tells us they were about (*ferme*) forty in number. He says they had brought with them, on the advice of the Pope, interpreters of Frankish race. These may have lived on the Saxon settlements of Bayeux, and, if so, have known the language; but anyhow, it seems pretty plain that Frankish was understood by the Saxons, doubtless with some difficulty, and as the speech of Yorkshire is understood by the people of London. What follows is, of course, the traditional story as preserved at Canterbury, but it has a most respectable paternity. We are told that the missionaries sent an interpreter to interview *Æthelberht*, and to tell him they had come from Rome with the best of tidings, and promising that in case he and his people were willing "they might without doubt have eternal joy in Heaven and a realm without end in the future, with the living and true God." Having heard him, the King ordered the missionaries to remain in the island where they were, and to be duly provided with necessaries. The fame of the Christian religion, he said, had already reached him, for he had a Christian wife named *Bercta*. In the

accommodating attitude of the King we may no doubt trace the handiwork of his Christian queen. After some days (*post dies*) the King went to the island and summoned Augustine and his monks to a conference in the open air, for he feared that if they entered a house the monks might bring about his destruction by magic and sorcery—*siquid malificae artis habuissent, eum superando deciperent*.¹ Sorcery and magic formed a large element in the religious practices of all the Teutonic tribes, and notably of the pagan English. Bede describes how in a time of great mortality the Northumbrians in the day of St. Cuthbert forsook the sacraments and had recourse to the false remedies of idolatry (*ad erratica idolatriae medicamina concurrebant*), “as if they could have got rid of the plague sent by God by means of their incantations, spells (*fylacteria*), or other devilish arts” (*daemonicae artis arcana*).² In his *Penitential*, Theodore prescribes punishments for women who practised incantations or diabolical divinations.³ A similar enactment was issued by the Synod of Clovesho.⁴ The interview between the monks and Æthelberht, says Green, “doubtless took place on the Downs above Minster, where the eye nowadays catches, miles away over the marshes, the dun towers of Canterbury.” Another

¹ *Bede*, i. 25.

² *Ib.* iv. 27.

³ *Op. cit.* lib. i. chap. xv. par. 4.

⁴ The delinquencies there denounced are: “*inter caetera peccamina, paganas observationes, id est, divinos, sortilegos, auguria, auspicia, fylacteria, incantationes, sive omnes spurcitas impiorum gentiliumque errata*” (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 364).

and more probable view puts it at Richborough, where a cruciform ridge was long after called St. Augustine's Cross.¹ In a map of Thanet given by Thomas of Elmham, there is a representation of the ambit made by a hunted stag belonging to Dompneva, the mother of Saint Mildred, in one day's galloping, and which formed the boundary of the lands presented by the King to her, and was afterwards known as *Dompnevae meta*.² It was probably taken from a much older map. On it a tree is marked in the centre of the island, near the Beacon, with two large crosses near it, which it is suggested by Bishop Brown mark the traditional meeting-place.³

Bede describes how the monks, who were well trained in such effective pageantry, went to the interview, preceded by a silver processional cross, and carrying a painted representation of the Saviour upon a panel; they marched singing litanies "for their own eternal safety and that of their hosts." Gocelin reports a tradition, professing to come from an old man whose grandfather Augustine had baptized, describing the latter as very tall, and as standing head and shoulders above the rest.⁴ In this, says Bright, he resembled St. Columba.⁵ Augustine now proceeded at the King's command to

¹ Bright, *op. cit.* 52, note 3.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 207 and 208.

³ *Augustine and His Companions*, 41.

⁴ *Vit. Aug.* 49. It has been suggested this may have been a mistake for Paulinus.

⁵ Adamnan, *Vit. Columba*, vol. i. 1.

deliver his message to *Æthelberht* and his thanes and ealdormen. According to *Ælfric*, who lived about the year 1000, Augustine told them how the merciful Saviour with His own sufferings redeemed this guilty world, and opened an entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven to faithful men.¹ As Mason² says, these words, which had no doubt to be interpreted, are not mentioned by Bede, and were very probably an invention of *Ælfric*. Bede, however, professes to give the king's reply, in which he is supposed to have said that the traveller's words and promises were pleasant, but inasmuch as they were new and strange he could not assent to them all at once, and leave the faith so long professed by his fathers and the Anglian race; but as they had come a long way to tell him what they deemed to be the truth, and he wished to inquire further, he would take care they were not molested, but rather that they should be hospitably entertained, and their wants provided for, no doubt at his own expense. He accordingly offered them quarters at Canterbury, close to where he lived. Thither they thereupon set out. It has been inferred from Bede's words that they travelled on foot, in procession, singing by the way, but this is most unlikely. To cloistered monks unaccustomed to exercise, a ten miles' walk would have been a wearisome trial. What is more likely is that they went in a cavalcade on horses or mules until they reached the outskirts of the city. One thing must

¹ See *Ælfric, Homilies*, ii. 129; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 11.

² *Op. cit.* p. 38, note 2.

be remembered. When we now think of Benedictine monks, we picture them as wearing black robes—"Black Benedictines" we call them; but it seems pretty clear that at that time they were not so dressed, but were robed in dark-coloured home-spun much after the fashion of the later Franciscans.

On nearing Canterbury it is very likely that they dismounted, sending their sumpter beasts on, and walked in procession. We may be sure it was a striking sight to the English of all classes when they watched these tonsured bare-headed men in hooded brown cloaks, walking two and two singing their litanies, and with the tall figure of their abbot towering above them, and headed by a brother carrying a silver cross as a standard (*crucem pro vexillo ferentes argenteam*), and another carrying a picture of our Saviour painted on a panel (*in tabula depictam*). They had no doubt followed the Roman road from Richborough to Canterbury, to the top of the present St. Martin's Hill, where they had probably dismounted.

Bede reports the words they sang, namely, *Deprecamur te, Domine, in omni misericordia tua, ut auferatur furor tuus et ira tua a civitate ista, et de domo sancta tua, quoniam peccavimus. Alleluja* (We beseech Thee, O Lord, in all Thy mercy that Thy wrath and Thine anger may be turned from this city and Thy Holy House, though we have sinned. Alleluja).¹

This litany and antiphon or anthem is founded

¹ *Bede*, i. ch. 25.

on Daniel ix. 16. The Rev. H. A. Wilson says the words are in close agreement with the Latin Version of that prayer cited by the greater Augustine, and are closer than the version in the Vulgate.¹ It belongs to the Rogation Days.² Bright suggests that Augustine had probably heard it the previous spring when he arrived in Provence, for it was a Gaulish and not a Roman service at this time.³ "It was not until the time of Leo the Third (795-816) that the Rogation litanies were established at Rome.⁴ The earliest sacramentaries of the Gregorian class do not recognise the Rogation Days, while in Gaul they are said to have had their beginning at Vienne, about the year 470. Their general adoption was ordered by the Council of Orleans in 511, and in 567 a council held at Lyons provided that similar litanies should also be used in the week preceding the first Sunday of November.⁵ The particular anthem quoted by Bede occurs in one of the Rogation litanies in use long after at Vienne, and probably in other churches of France. It was probably introduced into England by Augustine, since the Council of Clovesho (747) orders the observance of the Rogation processions,—*secundum morem priorum nostrorum*.⁶

From the height of St. Martin's Hill the

¹ *St. August. Ep. cxi. ad Victorianum*; Mason, *op. cit.* Diss. iv. p. 236.

² See Plummer, ii. 43.

³ *Op. cit.* 55.

⁴ *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne), ii. 12.

⁵ Bruns, *Canones*, ii. 163, 224; Wilson, *op. cit.* p. 236.

⁶ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 368.

monks would look forth on St. Martin's Church, erected on the slopes below them, with the royal palace close by, and on the wood-built suburb of the old city farther down, the Canterbury of *Æthelberht*.¹ Stanley remarks how the view from the present Church of St. Martin thus becomes "one of the most inspiring that can be found in all the world."² English Canterbury, as contrasted with the ruins of Durovernum, was then doubtless a mere collection of modest wooden houses.

Bede, who calls Canterbury the metropolis of his kingdom, tells us that *Æthelberht* gave Augustine and his companions a residence (*mansio*), and promised that he should be duly cared for and have permission to preach.³ Thomas of Elmham calls it Stabelgate, and so it is called in a rhymed notice of Augustine's arrival given by him—

"Mansio signatur, quae Stabelgate notatur
Hac et in urbe datur Dorobernia quae vocitatur."

The name has been misunderstood, and I agree with Mr. Faussett in treating it as connected with "the Staple" or market, which was no doubt held close by. Thorn says it was situated in the parish of St. Alphege, over against King Street on the north, close by an old heathen temple where *Æthelberht* and his men used to worship.⁴ It was not impossibly outside the town, somewhere within the later precincts of St. Augustine's Abbey. A

¹ Bright, *op. cit.* 54.
³ *Op. cit.* i. 25.

² Stanley, 54.
⁴ Thorn, *op. cit.* 1759.

late and quite unreliable writer says that *Æthelberht* gave up his royal residence at Canterbury and went to live at Reculver, which is improbable ; nor would such an honour have escaped Bede, if it had ever occurred.

The travellers now no doubt proceeded to build themselves a suitable home. We have no means of knowing what it was like, but we may be sure it was very different to, and contrasted with, the stately Benedictine houses of later days. It was almost certainly enclosed by a running mound with palings on the top, so as to secure privacy, while the buildings were doubtless of wood and probably thatched, and not unlikely each one of the principal rooms was in a detached building, the whole being homely and not very conspicuous. For a church the monks took over the small building dedicated to St. Martin, where Liudhard had officiated and where there must have been but scanty room for the new community. This they doubtless continued to use till they could build themselves a larger church. In one way their position was unique. They were the only Benedictines who were at this time to be found north of the Alps ; the first swarm of a fertile hive. It should always be remembered that they were missionary monks, and knew nothing of what we understand by parishes. They had come to convert the Anglians as a whole, and had as yet no flock or congregation.

Bede says of them : “ The monks began to follow the apostolical life of the primitive Church, and

with assiduous prayers, vigils, and fasts, preaching the Word of God to whom they could, disregarding the things of this world and receiving from those whom they taught what was necessary for life, living as they taught others to live, and ready to suffer or die for the cause of truth." "What naturally followed?" (*quid mora?*), he says. "Some believed and were baptized, admiring the simplicity of the innocent life and the sweetness of the heavenly doctrine of the monks. In their Church of St. Martin they sang, prayed, said masses, preached and baptized."¹ In regard to their services, we can hardly doubt they were pretty much the same as they had been accustomed to at St. Andrew's Monastery, their old home. Bede² expressly says their singing was *juxta morem Romanorum*.

We must now make a digression. The Church of St. Martin already described is not the only very primitive church at Canterbury of which considerable remains exist. There is another church with claims to almost equal antiquity, and which, according to the very weighty opinion of Mr. Micklethwaite, was built in the same fashion and must be treated as very nearly coeval with

¹ In regard to St. Martin's Church a fabulous legend afterwards arose, that it became the see of a bishop suffragan to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that it remained so till the days of Lanfranc (see *Monasticon*, ed. 1653, i. 26; Hasted's *Kent*, iv. 49). Mr. Plummer declares there is no foundation for the saga, and scoffs at the statement (*Bede*, ii. 43). Haddan and Stubbs trace the story to an inference from a charter of Æthelred, dated 867, in which the Church of St. Martin is mentioned (*op. cit.* iii. 658; *Bede*, i. 26).

² *Op. cit.* ii. 20.

it. This church was dedicated to St. Pancras. Perhaps the most remarkable feature about it is that it is not mentioned by Bede, nor, so far as we know, by any writer until we get to the days of the late Canterbury chroniclers, Sprott and Thorn. Yet the remains are unmistakably there, and show how frequently archæological evidence is of greater value than the written word.

It is not altogether difficult to explain how it was overlooked by Bede and his successors, who had not a close personal acquaintance with Canterbury. The fact is, that it was built in what became the precincts of the great Abbey of St. Augustine. This is especially attested in "several wills of the fifteenth century proved in the Consistory Court at Canterbury, containing bequests to, or directions for burial in the Chapel of St. Pancras. In them it is usually described as within the cemetery of the Monastery of St. Austin, outside the walls of the city of Canterbury." The cemetery was also a favourite place of burial. One of these wills, that of Hamon Bele, dated the 7th November 1492, contains a bequest of £3, 6s. 8d., "*ad reparacionem capelle Sancti Pancracii infra precinctum cimiterii Sancti Augustini ac ad reparacionem Capelle ubi Sanctus Augustinus primo celebravit missam in Anglia dicte Capelle Sancti Pancracii annexe.*"¹

It is clear, therefore, that in Bede's time the small Church of St. Pancras was situated within

¹ W. H. St. John Hope, *Arch. Cant.* xxv. 235-6.

the precincts of the abbey, was no doubt quite overshadowed by the much larger church of the monastery, and would to any casual observer look merely like an unimportant and quite subordinate building forming part of the abbey.

Let us now turn to the Canterbury tradition about the church, as reported by Thorn in his account of St. Augustine. He says: "There was situated on the east of the city, between its walls and the Church of St. Martin, an idol temple where *Æthelberht* used to worship according to the rites of his nation, and in company with his grantees to sacrifice to demons and not to God (*suis demoniis et non Deo sacrificare*). This was duly purgated and purified by Augustine from the pollutions and defilements (*inquinamentis et sordibus*) of "the Gentiles." He also broke the idol, and dedicated the temple (*synagoga*) to St. Pancratius the Martyr, and this was the first church dedicated by St. Augustine."¹ St. Pancras, the boy-martyr, is supposed to have been specially dear to Gregory, the reputed patron and teacher of boys and girls. The family of St. Pancras are said to have owned the part of the Caelian Hill where the Monastery of St. Andrew at Rome was planted, and there is a church dedicated to the Saint, which can be seen from that monastery, so that his name was a familiar one to Augustine. The Church of St. Pancras at Rome is situated on the Janiculum,

¹ Thorn, col. 1760.

just outside the walls. To revert to Thorn. He goes on to say that in his time there still existed in the southern chapel (*porticus*) of this church an altar in which St. Augustine was wont to celebrate Mass, and where previously the image (*simulacrum*) of the King had stood. He further adds that there still remained in his day (*i.e.* about 1397), on the east wall of this chapel, traces of the handiwork of the Devil, who, on seeing St. Augustine perform Mass where he had himself been master, had tried to destroy the building,¹ and had left two deep grooves in the masonry which he had made with his claws. "Those who resort to St. Augustine's Monastery," says Bright, "may see, somewhat eastward of its precincts, an old brick arch which has been supposed to be a relic of this building. Dean Stanley says that, in addition, there was a fragment of one of its walls on a rising ground with St. Martin's Hill behind it. Mr. Micklethwaite was strongly of opinion that it was entirely a Saxon church, and in regard to Thorn's story about the idol temple, which he supposed was its precursor, he says: "Those who argue for its having been a heathen temple must explain the fact of the temple of the heathen god being built after the fashion of a Christian church, and one so satisfactory to the missionaries from Rome, that they made it the model upon which their smaller churches were built."² The site of the church has been recently completely explored by Mr. St. J. Hope

¹ Thorn, col. 1760.

² *Arch. Journ.* liii. 316.



REMAINS OF THE SAXON CHURCH OF ST. PANCRAS AT CANTERBURY.

To face p. 72.

and Canon Routlege, and its remains have also been described in detail by Mr. Peers. The church consisted of a presbytery with an apse forming a chancel about 30 feet 6 inches long and 22 feet wide, opening into a nave 42 feet 7 inches long by 26 feet $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide (which constitutes what the architects call a short nave), by a colonnade of four Roman columns, of which the base and part of the shaft of the southernmost remain *in situ*. Mr. Hope says the diameter of the columns at the base was $16\frac{1}{2}$ inches, which gives a probable height of 11 feet. In the centres of the north, south, and west sides of the nave were doorways leading into small rectangular buildings, that at the west being an entrance porch with two doors; the other two chapels were probably entered from the nave only. These latter were clearly adjuncts of the type called *porticus* by Bede, and the entrance doors from the nave were cut through the walls after the latter were built. Mr. Hope says this necessitated the cutting away of the external buttresses at the same point. All these doors, he adds, run straight through the walls, and have no rebates for doors, which must have been hung from wooden frames wedged into the openings. The thickness of the walls in all parts of the building is 1 foot 10 inches. The walls of the nave, which still remain to the height of about a foot to 1 foot 10 inches, are built of Roman bricks, and laid in regular courses, five courses to a foot, set in a yellow-brown mortar,

and have been plastered inside and out. Courses of herring-bone brick occur in both the north and south walls externally ; the mortar is hard and of good quality. At the north-west and south-west angles were pairs of buttresses of brick, like the nave walls. There were similar buttresses on each side of the west door, and one at each of the eastern angles of the nave. Such buttresses, says Dr. Baldwin Brown, are very rare in pre-Conquest work. They are banded into the walls. All three doorways have plain square jambs, and may have had arched heads, but no proof of this exists. The western doorway as originally set out was 7 feet 9 inches wide, but was altered after the building had been carried up about 3 feet to 6 feet 6 inches. Mr. Hope says that the doorway was further narrowed to 2 feet $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches about 1120, by the insertion within it of another doorway with a stepped sill. There is no evidence as to the windows or the other architectural features of the upper part of the walls.

The central opening from the nave to the presbytery was 9 feet wide, and was spanned by a brick arch, part of which still lies on the floor as it fell. Mr. Hope calculates that, allowing 6 inches for the thickness of the impost, this would give a total height for the central arch of about $15\frac{1}{2}$ feet. On each side of this opening were two narrower ones, which may have had arches or flat lintels. These latter rude openings were blocked up very early in the history of the church, with a wall

1 foot 10 inches wide, of Roman brick in white pebbly mortar. This was doubtless because the central arch showed signs of weakness. The remaining fragment of one of the columns with its base shows they were of good Roman work, and they were doubtless derived from some building in Roman Canterbury. It is the only wrought stone in the building which remains. The presbytery was rebuilt in later times, but fragments of it remain in the present building. Enough of the springing of the early apse is left to show that its form was that of a half-ellipse rather than a half-circle. The apse did not start immediately from the line of the arches, but the chancel walls were carried on for a space of 10 feet in parallel lines; a buttress marked on the exterior where the curve of the apse began. The north chapel (*porticus*) was destroyed in mediaeval times. The walls of the two chapels and the porch were clearly built after those of the nave (though Mr. Peers suggests that they probably formed part of the original design), for the walls of the three chapels are not banded into those of the nave. The southern one is 10 feet 6 inches long, and about 9 feet 4 inches wide internally. The walls are of Roman bricks set in *white* mortar mixed with sea-shells, and with four courses to a foot instead of five. Remains of an altar of much later date are attached to the south wall of the apartment, and is doubtless the one mentioned by Thorn which may have replaced an earlier one. The walls of this chapel were stand-

ing in the eighteenth century. The western chapel was really a porch. Like the others, it was added after the walls of the church had been erected. It is the same size as the southern one. Its north wall, which separated the monks' and lay people's burial-ground, still remains, to the height of 13 feet and more. Its mortar, like that of the south porch and the blocking of the eastern arcade, all early additions to the original plan, is white, and not yellow as are the rest of the nave and its buttresses.

The western door was arched. The arch, according to Mr. Hope, was probably about 11 feet high, and the porch was plastered inside and out; the external plaster being a coating of the mortar used in the building. A small piece of what may have been the original floor, of smooth white plaster 6 inches thick, still remains.¹

The notable thing to remember about this Church of St. Pancras is its resemblance to that of St. Martin, from which it was in all probability copied. It differed from it in its larger size and somewhat more elaborate plan, and notably in the fact that, like many of the early Italian churches, its nave and chancel were separated, not by a single archway, but by a colonnade forming three arches; and by the further fact that there is a presbytery with parallel sides and 10 feet in length between the nave and the apse.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that in the ruins

¹ W. H. St. John Hope, *Arch. Cant.* xxv. 222, etc.; C. R. Peers, *Arch. Journal*, lviii. 408-413; B. Brown, *Arts in Early England*, vol. ii. pp. 122-135.

of the old chapel of St. Pancras we have the remains of a very primitive monument of English Christianity, almost certainly going back to the days of its founder, St. Augustine. This is not all. It is exceedingly probable that some of the things said of St. Martin's Church by Bede really applied to the other church. St. Martin's was a very small building, a good deal smaller than that of St. Pancras, and we may be sure that the forty monks with their dependants would find the former a very inadequate place for their services, and would set about building a new church as soon as may be, and that the Church of St. Pancras was, in fact, the first one built by the Roman missionaries in Britain.

Let us now return to the doings of the missionaries. We read how presently the King, moved by the godly lives of the monks, the Divine message they delivered, the miracles they performed, and probably even more by the gentle suasion of his wife, consented to be baptized. Bede does not say where this took place. Thomas of Elmham, a very inaccurate person, says it was at Christ Church, but that church was as yet unbuilt. It has been generally supposed it was at St. Martin's, but this seems impossible. There would not be room there for such a pageant, nor are there any remains of a baptistery there. It may have been at St. Pancras. Inasmuch as we are told, however, that a large number of his people were baptized in the river Swale,¹ it may be that Æthelberht was also baptized there, and

¹ *Vide infra*, p. 85.

yet it is difficult to believe that one condition of the service as then performed could have taken place in such an open spot in the case of a king, namely, the divesting himself of his clothes in public.

The securing as a convert of the King, who was the first important capture made by the monks, tempts me to a digression in regard to the baptismal service at this time, which was picturesque and interesting.

The ceremony of baptism of adults at the beginning of the seventh century has been much elucidated by Duchesne, who quotes ample authorities for his view. I will give a condensed account of it according to his description, from which it will be seen how very far it had departed from the methods of really primitive times. There were two principal rites, the Roman and the Gallican, and it is difficult to know which of them was followed in the case of *Æthelberht*, but it is very likely that the Roman one was followed. In this the convert first presented himself to the priest, who, after blowing in his face and repeating an exorcism, *Ut exeat et recedat [diabolus]*, marked him on the forehead with the sign of a cross, accompanied by the words, *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*. This was followed by a prayer recited by the priest with his hands extended over the candidate.¹ Salt, which had been previously exorcised,² was then administered by the celebrant, who put a particle of it in the

¹ Its terms are given by Duchesne after the Gelasian Sacramentary Christian Worship, p. 296.

² The exorcism is duly given by Duchesne, *ib.* p. 297.

mouth of the candidate with the words, *Accipe N. sal sapientiae, propitiatus in vitam aeternam.* Then followed another prayer.¹

Having gone through these ceremonies, the candidate was deemed a catechumen, and was admitted to religious assemblies but not to the Eucharistic Liturgy, so-called. The catechumens had a special place assigned them in church, but were dismissed before the beginning of the holy mysteries.

The catechumens or *competentes* being thus initiated, were next prepared by instructions and exercises during the season of Lent in a series of seven meetings called scrutinies, at which certain prayers and rites were employed "in view of the gradual casting out of the evil spirit by forcing him to relinquish his hold over those who were about to pass into the kingdom of Christ."

At the first scrutiny the elect gave in their names, which were inscribed on a register. Then the sexes were separated, the men on the right and the women on the left. The Mass then began. After the Collect and before the Lections a deacon called on them to prostrate themselves in prayer, which they concluded by all saying Amen, always at a signal from the deacon. Each now signed himself with the cross, saying, *In nomine Patris, etc. etc.* One of the clergy now made a cross on the forehead of each male candidate, and imposed his hands on each and pronounced the formula of exorcism.

¹ For its terms, see Duchesne, *ib.* 297.

He then repeated the same thing over the female candidates. The same act was then repeated by two other exorcists (a form is given by Duchesne). The catechumens then again prostrated, prayed, and crossed themselves, while a priest repeated the ceremony of signing the cross and the imposition of hands, and said a short prayer (also given by Duchesne). The Mass was then continued as far as the Gospel, when they were dismissed. Their relations or sponsors took no part in the offering, but the names of the latter were recited in the *Memento*, while those of the elect were included in the *Hanc igitur* with a special recommendation.

The exorcisms were repeated in the same way on the other days of the scrutiny, except the seventh. On the third scrutiny the candidates were especially instructed in the Gospel, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and a summary of the Christian law. This was the fashion at Rome. Elsewhere this initiation was limited to the Creed. The ceremony was known as "The Opening of the Ears." On this day, after the Gradual, four deacons, each one carrying the Gospels, marched from the sacristy to the altar and placed a copy of them on each corner of it. A priest then expounded the nature of the Gospel. The candidates then stood up and listened while a deacon read the first page of St. Matthew's Gospel, on which the priest offered a short commentary. A similar passage was then read from each of the other Evangelists.

After the delivery (*traditio*) of the Gospel came

that of the Creed, preceded and followed by an address from the priest. The Creed employed was the Apostles' Creed, which, as Duchesne says, is properly the Roman symbol, and is the one used by St. Augustine of Hippo in his explanation of the ceremony.

Then followed the delivery of the Lord's Prayer by the priest, who preceded it by a general exhortation, and who accompanied it by a running commentary and concluded with a short address.

The seventh and last scrutiny took place on the vigil of Easter, and according to MSS. of the eighth century, at the hour of Tierce—at an earlier date it was probably in the afternoon. On this occasion the exorcism was not performed by one of the inferior clergy as before, but by the priest himself. The form of the last exorcism is given by Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 303. After this there followed the rite of the Effeta (*Ephphata*). The priest, having moistened his finger with saliva, touched the upper part of the lip (*nares*¹) and the ears of each candidate. This was in imitation of Christ's action in curing the deaf mute. This was done with a recognised formula.²

The candidates then laid aside their garments, and were anointed on the back and breast with exorcised oil. The whole ceremony had a symbolical meaning. The critical moment of the strife with Satan had arrived. Each candidate then

¹ On the meaning of the word as here used, see Duchesne, *ad loc.*

² *Op. cit.* 304.

presented himself to the priest, and went through the process of formal renunciation thus :—

Do you renounce Satan ? I renounce.

And all his works ? I renounce.

And all his pomps ? (*pompis*) I renounce.

Each one then read the text of the Creed (*Redditio Symboli*). This completed the ceremony, and they were then all dismissed by the archdeacon.

In regard to the actual baptism, "the elect" had to be present at the solemn vigil of Easter. The Lections used at that time at the ceremony, which are practically the same in all the Latin rituals, included some of the finest passages in the Old Testament, such as the Creation, the Deluge, the sacrifice of Isaac, the passage of the Red Sea, the vision of Ezekiel, the history of Jonah, the account of the image set up by Nebuchadnezzar ; and from the prophets that in which Isaiah predicts baptism, and extols the vine of the Lord, and those dealing with the covenant of Moses and the institution of the Passover. Each Lection was followed by a prayer. Canticles such as the song of Miriam (*Cantemus Domino*), that of Isaiah (*Vinea facta est*), that in Deuteronomy (*Attende coelum et loquar*), and lastly the psalm, *Sicut cervus desiderat ad fontes*, were interspersed among the Lections.

At the appointed hour all concerned proceeded to the baptistery, where the actual ceremony began by a hortatory prayer. Then the Bishop exorcised the water. The first clause of one of these exorcisms runs thus : *Exorcizo te, creatura aquae, exorcizo te*

*omnis exercitus diaboli, omnis potestas adversaria, omnis umbra daemonum, etc. etc.*¹ Then followed a Eucharistic prayer, in the middle of which the chrism, *i.e.* oil mixed with balsam, was infused into the water, being poured into it crosswise, and then stirred with his hand. A prayer was then recited, imploring the grace of God for those about to enter the consecrated water. All this having been done, the candidates were admitted one by one. Each one, being completely divested of his clothing,² took up his position facing west, and was thrice called upon to renounce the devil and all his pomps and vanities. He then entered the water, where he was required to affirm his belief in God the Father omnipotent, in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, and, thirdly, in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh. He was then thrice immersed.³ On

¹ Duchesne, *op. cit.* 322.

² On this, Duchesne says: In the appendix to Mabillon's *Ordo*, i., one of the lateral chapels of the baptistery is called *ad S. Johannem ad Vestem*. It was probably there that the candidates divested themselves of their garments. As there are two similar chapels, it is possible that they were both used, one for the men and the other for the women. It is scarcely necessary to remark that, in spite of the direction to remove all clothing, precautions were taken so that decency, as it was then understood, should not be offended. The deaconesses had here an important part to play in connection with the baptism of women (*Const. Ap.* III. 15 and 16). It must not be thought, however, that propriety in ancient times was as easily offended as it would be now (Duchesne, 312, note 2).

³ This, as Duchesne says, did not imply that the person baptized was entirely plunged in the water. The water in the font would not reach beyond the middle of an adult. He was placed under one of the openings from which a stream issued, or else the water was taken from the font itself and poured over his head. It is thus baptism is represented in early monuments.

leaving the water, the neophyte was led to the bishop, who made the sign of the cross on his head with chrism, reciting the proper formulary. He then received a white garment, which was handed to him by the bishop. The godfathers and godmothers assisted him in putting on his white robe. The ceremony ended by a special prayer and the imposition of hands. The newly baptized then returned to the church, where the bishop began the Mass, at which he or she partook.¹

The baptismal ceremony here described has much that is imposing and even attractive about it, and was likely to impress a simple and ingenuous people. What will perhaps surprise some who are not so ingenuous is the large part played by exorcism and professional exorcists in the ritual of the Sacrament of Baptism at this time, and the conviction which follows, that devils were then thought to be in possession of material things everywhere, and that before the water or the salt or the oil could be used the unamiable tenants of these objects had to be evicted by charms and magical forms of words, differing little or nothing in essence from those similarly employed by the pagans from whom early Christianity borrowed so much.

Æthelberht was baptized, according to the Canterbury tradition as reported by Thomas of Elmham, on Whitsun Eve, 2nd June 597.² Gocelin rhetorically refers to the famous ceremony as the

¹ Duchesne, *op. cit.* chap. ix.

² *Op. cit.* p. 78.

baptism of *our* Constantine by *our* Sylvester.¹ Dr. Bright aptly mentions the singular fact that on the Sunday morning after Pentecost "the noblest missionary career ever accomplished in Britain came to an end in the distant monastery of Icolmkill,"² *i.e.* the death of St. Columba.

The example of rulers in such matters is very catching, and we read how many began to come together and to abandon the pagan rites and join the Christian community. While the King compelled none to imitate him, he greatly encouraged by his patronage those who did so, for his teachers had taught him that Christ's service ought to be voluntary.³ In this they were following the repeated precept of Gregory. According to the very late author, Gocelin, the Kent men were baptized in the Swale. "If so," says Bright, "it was the passage so-called between Sheppey and the mainland," but Gocelin afterwards mixes up Augustine with Paulinus, many of whose converts were probably baptized in the Yorkshire Swale. Gocelin further adds that the numbers were so great that the baptism was really performed by a vicarious process, the water being passed on by two and two from the original hand of Augustine himself, just like "holy water" is passed on to whole families from "the stoup." This great baptismal harvest was gathered at Christmas, 597-598. Duchesne says it was at Easter that baptism was ordinarily administered,

¹ *Vit. Aug.* ch. xxii.
³ *Bede*, i. 26.

² *Op. cit.* 53.

and that, too, from the earliest times.¹ The vigil of Easter was devoted to this ceremony. If this did not allow sufficient time for probation, or if the neophyte for any reason could not participate in the initiation on that day, it was postponed to a later date in Eastertide. The last day, that of Pentecost, as much on account of its being the last as for its own special solemnity, soon came to be regarded as a second baptismal festival.² In the East the Epiphany, the great festival of the birth of Christ and that of His baptism, appeared to be naturally indicated for the second birth, the regeneration, the baptism of Christians. . . . The example of the East was followed by several Western Churches, and it became gradually the custom to put Christmas and several other festivals on the same footing as the Epiphany in this respect.³

¹ Tertullian, *De Bapt.* 19.

² *Op. cit.* 293.

³ *Ib.*

CHAPTER III

THE baptism of the King and the adherence of so many of his subjects made it plain that the mission had been an abnormal success, and no doubt induced Augustine to secure for himself consecration as bishop, in order that the Church he had founded might be completely organised. Bede makes him go to Arles to be consecrated, and there would be many temptations for him to do so, for its archbishop was the Metropolitan of the Frank realm. He makes the mistake, however, of calling him *Ætherius* instead of *Vergilius*. I am not quite sure that Gregory went to Arles, which was a long way off, and would involve leaving his infant colony a long time without a leader. Gregory, who was in constant correspondence with the Archbishop of Arles, and in fact with most of the bishops of Provence, would in that case hardly have called the consecrating bishops "Bishops of Germany," as he does in his letter to Eulogius. This phrase seems to me to refer to the more distinctly Frankish bishops of Northern Gaul, and probably to those within the kingdom of Soissons, where there then reigned Chlothaire, cousin of Queen Bertha, and that it was there Augustine sought his

consecration. In regard to the service used on occasions of consecration, the important portion was, that, after a prayer on behalf of the candidate, there followed the consecrating prayer beginning *Deus honorum omnium*, which was said by the presiding bishop, generally the Metropolitan, while two other bishops held the open book of the Gospels over the head of the candidate, and all the bishops present placed their hands upon him. Then came the anointing of the hands, with a prayer beginning *Unguantur manus istae de oleo sanctificato et chrismate sanctificationis, sicut unxit Samuel David, in regem et prophetam.*¹

According to Thorn, Augustine was consecrated on Sunday, the 16th of November. It has been argued that this date is wrong, since in 597 the 16th of November was not a Sunday.² From a letter written by Gregory to Queen Brunichildis, it is plain that he was a bishop in September 597, since in it the Pope calls Augustine fellow-bishop.³ As we shall see presently, Augustine was certainly a bishop at Christmas, 597-598.

Bede tells us that upon his return to Britain (after his consecration), Augustine immediately (*continuo*) dispatched the presbyter Laurence (he was doubtless one of Augustine's monks, who had been ordained a priest, and who was his successor at Canterbury) and the monk Peter, who was the first abbot of St. Augustine's, to Rome

¹ Duchesne, 372, 375.

² See Plummer, vol. ii. p. 44, note.

³ *E. and H.* viii. 4.

to inform "the blessed Pontiff Gregory" that the English nation had adopted the Christian faith, and that he had himself been made bishop.¹ We cannot doubt that it was this mission which is referred to in the Pope's letter to Eulogius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, in which he mentions letters which had just arrived telling him of the safety and work of Augustine. This letter was dated July 598. The cheerful phrases of the Pope deserve to be quoted. "While the nation of the Anglians," he says, "placed in a corner of the world, remained up to that time devoted to the worship of stocks and stones, I determined through the aid of your prayers to send to it, God granting, a monk of my monastery for the purpose of preaching, and he having by my leave (*data a me licencia*) been made bishop by the bishops of Germany, has proceeded also with their aid to the end of the world, to the aforesaid nation; and already letters have reached us telling us of his safety and his work, to the effect that he and they who went with him were resplendent with such great miracles among the said people, that they seemed to imitate the powers of the Apostles in the signs which they displayed. Moreover, at the solemnity of the Lord's Nativity, which occurred in this first induction (*quae hac prima inductione transacta est*), more than 10,000 Anglians are reported to have been baptized by the same, our brother and fellow-bishop."²

It was probably at this time that Gregory in-

¹ *Bede*, i. 27.

² *E. and H.* viii. 29; *Barmby*, viii. 30.

serted a passage in his *Magna Moralia* alluding to Augustine's missionary success, and showing how much he had it at heart. He says: "Ecce lingua Britanniae quae nil aliud noverat quam barbarum frendere, jamdudum in Divinis laudibus Hebraeum coepit Alleluja resonare" ("Behold," he says, "the language of Britain, which was only used as barbarous speech, is now used for Divine praises like Hebrew and for chanting Allelujas").¹ This clause must have been added to the book after it was otherwise complete, for the work was written before Gregory became Pope.

It is also an interesting fact that Gregory attributes the performance of miracles to the missionaries, and the phrase clearly points to other miracles than those of wholesale conversion. Bede tells us the King behaved generously to the monks, gave them a residence to live in at Canterbury (*datam sibi mansionem*), and made provision for their needs.² Thorn, on what authority I know not, says the King gave up his royal palace as a residence for the monks, and built himself another at Reculver. This is most doubtful, for it was not the habit of the Teutonic chiefs to plant themselves in the midst of Roman towns such as Durovernum. Augustine is nevertheless said by Bede to have fixed his see in the Royal City (*in regia civitate*).³

It is a rather difficult matter to understand how Augustine accommodated his new position as bishop

¹ *Op. cit.* xxvii. 21; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 14.

² *Op. cit.* i. ch. xxvi.

³ *Op. cit.* i. ch. xxxiii.

to his old one as a monk. It would seem, at all events, that on his new appointment he ceased to be an abbot, and one of his old companions, the above-named Peter, was appointed to his place. It is probable, however, that he continued to live in the monastery, and, so far as we know, he was at this time a bishop without any secular clergy, save the Frankish interpreters he had brought with him. His diocese (*parochia*) was co-extensive with the country over which *Æthelberht* held sway, and all Anglian Christians within those bounds were included in his flock. Nor was it divided into lesser divisions, much less into parishes, nor were there any parish churches. The diocese was worked by his old friends the monks pretty much in the way the friars worked one of their provinces in later days, going about preaching, mostly, if not entirely, in the open air, and in addition holding periodical gatherings for baptizing people. He now probably ordained some of his monks as priests, unless he made use of the Frankish priests who had accompanied him. Otherwise there must have been some difficulty in performing the Mass except at the headquarters of the mission at Canterbury. Anyhow, it is probable that nearly all the converts at first lived in Canterbury or near to it. It must be remembered, again, that the Italian monks were quite ignorant of our tongue, and not apt at learning foreign languages; and that it must have been a tedious process to have the Church's dogmas or the preacher's pathos translated by interpreters little gifted with the arts

of rhetoric, and who no doubt often made sad mistakes.¹

One thing Augustine would probably at once set about providing, namely, a cathedral to become the great centre of work in his vast and unorganised diocese. Let us now try and picture to ourselves what this cathedral was like. Unfortunately no part of the original structure remains. We are told by Bede that Augustine found an old ruined church which was reputed to have been built by Roman Christians, and which he rededicated to St. Saviour and to our God and Lord Jesus Christ (*Sancti Salvatoris Dei et Domini nostri Jesu Christi*).² In this dedication Augustine imitated that of the Lateran Basilica at Rome, which, as Dr. Bright says, he knew so well as Gregory's Cathedral. The latter was then the first in rank of the churches in Rome, perhaps the largest, and the mother church of the city and the world. Thus it is styled in the inscription on either side of the door, "*Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput.*" "Christ Church," the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, still remains, says Bishop Brown, the material first-fruits of Augustine's mission, the outward sign of the dedication of England to Jesus Christ.³

Ælfric, on coming to his archbishopric in 995, was told by the oldest men whom he could consult, that it was hallowed on the Mass-day of

¹ The fact of the service being so largely in an unknown tongue may, however, have specially impressed people addicted to magical formulae.

² *Op. cit.* i. ch. 33.

³ *Op. cit.* 122.

SS. Primus and Felicianus, *i.e.* June 9.¹ Plummer argues the year was 602 or 603.² The remains of this church were so completely uprooted by Lanfranc, when he rebuilt it after 1067, that, as Willis says, it is vain to look to the present building for the slightest remains of the Saxon Cathedral. We have therefore to turn elsewhere if we are to recover its plan or appearance.

Fortunately, we have a description of it as it was before the fire, from the pen of Eadmer, its "Cantor" or Precentor, who had seen it before its destruction, and who accompanied Anselm on his visit to Rome. It is preserved in a tract by Eadmer, entitled *De reliquiis S. Audoeni*, etc. This description was copied and commented upon in Professor Willis' masterly account of the Cathedral of Canterbury. Willis, however, treated the church which Eadmer had seen, and which existed in 1067, as the same church which had been built by Augustine, which with our present lights is not possible. Four hundred and sixty years had passed since Augustine's days, and we cannot doubt that during that time the church had been greatly altered. It will be convenient to condense Eadmer's account as given by Willis, and then to add Micklethwaite's comments from his excellent papers on the history of Saxon architecture in the *Archæological Journal*. Eadmer tells us the Cathedral Church at

¹ See the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, MS. F. (a Canterbury book), *sub an. 995*; and Bright, *op. cit.* 61, note 2.

² *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 63.

Canterbury was arranged in some parts in imitation of the Church of the Blessed Prince of the Apostles, Peter. This statement, Willis says, is amply confirmed by what we know of the old Church of St. Peter's at Rome, of which plans and drawings are preserved in the Vatican.

Mr. Mickletonwaite says that St. Augustine's Cathedral Church was what is called an Italian basilica, a form of church which he thus describes: "The basilican church had a wide nave with an aisle, or in some cases two aisles on each side. At one end of the nave stood the altar, raised upon a platform, beneath which was a vault called the *confessio*. Above the altar was a great arch, and behind it an apse. A space before the altar was enclosed from the rest of the nave to form the choir of the singers, and there were seats against the wall round the apse for the higher clergy, a chair or throne for the bishop being in the middle. . . . Entrance to the *confessio* from the church was arranged in different ways, but the most usual was by two sets of stairs outside the screen of the choir, and when the levels allowed of it there was a window below the altar through which the *confessio* might be seen into from the church. . . . Every church had not all the parts here described. Sometimes the *confessio* was left out, and often the buildings at the other end were curtailed, reduced to a single portico along the front of the church, or omitted altogether."¹

The fashion of having the high altar at the west

¹ *Arch. Journal*, 2nd Series, iii. 297.

end is still followed in St. Peter's and in forty other Roman churches (either ancient or rebuilt), with the same orientation as their ancient predecessors.

The altar was sometimes turned to the east, and sometimes to the west. It was arranged that the celebrating priest should face to the east, and it was held indifferent whether he stood before or behind the altar.¹

Mr. Micklethwaite says the Cathedral at Canterbury had the primitive arrangement of the Bishop's *cathedra* or chair at the extreme west end, and an altar in front of it. This was the plan of the original basilica of St. Peter's at Rome, and, as at St. Peter's, there is little room for doubt that the western altar was once the high altar. The eastern apse with its choir was added, probably in an extension of the building, for the use of the monks, and came to be considered the principal altar through the increased importance of the monks, who gradually made the whole church their own.² The eastern apse was occupied by the presbytery, which was on a higher level than the floor of the church, and extended westwards beyond the apse. Beneath the presbytery was a crypt or *confessio*, the floor of which was lower than the floor of the nave. The entrance to the crypt was in the middle below the presbytery, and on either side of the entrance a flight of steps led up to the presbytery. An altar seems to have stood against the wall of this eastern apse (Micklethwaite calls it a minor altar), and another altar some way in front

¹ Micklethwaite, *op. cit.* 297 and 298.

² *Op. cit.* 296.

of it on the chord of the apse below a wider arch. Below, in front of the presbytery, was the enclosed choir stretching westwards. We have no evidence as to whether the nave in this church had aisles or not, but it probably had, and they probably extended from end to end of the church, and were separated from the nave either by columns or by piers. Like the smaller Roman basilicas, it was doubtless, as Willis says, without transepts. It is pretty certain that it had a porch on the south side, and that this porch was the same described by Eadmer as the one existing at the time of the fire. The porch formed the lowest storey of a tower, and there was a corresponding tower on the opposite or north side. Both projected beyond the main walls of the church. Whether the two towers were part of the original building is doubtful. In regard to the south tower, Eadmer tells us that it had an altar in its midst (*in medio suo*) dedicated to the blessed Pope Gregory. At the south side was the principal door of the church, "as of old," says Eadmer, "by the English so even now it is called 'the Suthdure,' and is often mentioned by the name in the law-books of the ancient kings. For all disputes from the whole kingdom which cannot be legally referred to the King's Court, or to the hundreds, or counties, do in this place receive judgment." Opposite to the tower on the north, says Eadmer, the other tower was built in honour of St. Martin, and had about it cloisters for the use of the monks. "And as the first tower was devoted to legal contentions



THE SO-CALLED ST. AUGUSTINE'S CHAIR AT THE CATHEDRAL, CANTERBURY.

To face p. 96.

and judgments of the world, so in the second the younger brethren were instructed in the knowledge of the offices of the Church for the different seasons, and hours of the day and night.”¹

What “the elevation” of the original Cathedral looked like, we do not know. The episcopal throne (*cathedra pontificalis*), Eadmer tells us, was constructed with handsome workmanship (*decenti opere*), and made of large stones and cement (*ex magnis lapidibus et cemento constructam*), and was contiguous to the outer wall of the church and remote from the Lord’s Table (*Dominica mensa*).² Mr. Micklethwaite says the marble chair still used by the archbishop may be the one which stood in the western apse, but it seems very doubtful if it could have survived the two fires which devastated the choir. He says it is of Italian design, but of English material, and if not Saxon may be the work of that Peter, the Roman citizen, who was working in England about 1280.³

The interior of the church within the two colonnades was divided into two portions, the nave and choir. The choir, says Eadmer, extended westward into the body (*aula*) of the church, and was shut out from the multitude by a proper enclosure. Such a choir was known as the ritual choir, or choir of the singers.

¹ Willis, *Arch. Hist. Cant. Cath.* 9-11. Professor G. Baldwin Brown argues forcibly against the notion that the towers at Canterbury were parts of the original structure. He says they were built over the primitive porches, adding: “It would have been impossible for Romanized Britons or Saxon Christians of the past generation to have planned these flanking towers, which do not belong to the architectural ideas of this time, but lateral porches of entrance would be quite in accordance with early Saxon habits” (*Arts in Early England*, ii. 157).

² Willis, *op. cit.* 12.

³ *Op. cit.* 295-297.

Mr. Micklethwaite holds, as I have said, that the eastern half of the church, including the choir of the singers, or monk's choir, was an after addition, and that Augustine's Cathedral was thus a much more modest building than that described by Eadmer.

After mentioning the building of the cathedral, Bede goes on to say that Augustine "proceeded to build, not far from Canterbury on the eastern side, a monastery which, at his request, King *Æthelberht* constructed from its foundations and endowed with various gifts. He intended its Church of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, to be a burying-place for himself and all succeeding Bishops of Canterbury, as also of the Kings of Kent."¹

Dean Stanley conjectures that the monastery was planted outside the city walls, because Augustine, as Bede says, meant it to be a burial-place for himself and his successors, and according to the traditions of old Rome the dead were always buried outside the walls. This was, no doubt, an excellent reason. A second one was, that the primitive settlement of the monks was already planted on the land where the Churches of St. Martin and St. Pancras were also situated. I shall have more to say about this property of the monks later on. The dedication of the church to St. Peter and St. Paul was not inappropriately changed in later days by Dunstan to that of St. Augustine. The church was not completed at the time of St. Augustine's death, and was consecrated by his successor. The ruins are still known as those

¹ *Bede*, i. 33.

of St. Augustine's. Bede tells us that the first abbot of this monastery was Peter (*i.e.* the same person who was sent as his envoy to the Pope by Augustine). He subsequently went to Gaul on some mission, and was drowned in the inlet called Amfleat (*i.e.* Ambleteuse), where James II. landed in 1689 on his flight from England,¹ and was buried by the natives in an unknown spot a little north of Boulogne. "But the omnipotent God, in order to let it be known what a meritorious person he was, caused a light to appear nightly over his grave. Thereupon the neighbours realised that he was a saint who was buried there, and his body was taken up and buried in the church at Boulogne."² Thomas of Elmham gives his epitaph, and says he was succeeded by John, one of the monks who had come with Augustine.³

Let us now return to Augustine. In his letter to the Pope he had pointed out that although the harvest was plentiful the labourers were few, and he apparently asked him to send him some more recruits for his mission.⁴ He also asked him to give him counsel in regard to certain matters of difficulty which had occurred, which appeared to him to be important.⁵

It has been remarked as curious that there should have been such a long delay in the Pope's answer. The messengers sent from England must have been in Rome for three years, for the letters they took back with them were dated June 601.

¹ Plummer's *Bede*, ii. 64.

² *Bede*, i. ch. 33.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 126.

⁴ Plummer's *Bede*, i. 29.

⁵ *Ib.* i. 27.

No satisfactory explanation of the delay has been given. The fact that he had been tormented with gout, which is given as an excuse in the preface to his answer to Augustine's questions, seems very inadequate, but I know of none better. At length, weary with waiting, the missionaries pleaded that they might be allowed to return, and duly set out.¹ They took with them several new recruits for the mission. Among these Bede mentions four by name—Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Rufinianus. The former three became the first bishops of London, Rochester, and York, and the fourth, abbot of St. Augustine's Monastery at Canterbury. There probably also accompanied the monks some secular priests skilled in teaching music, etc., and suitable for forming the staff of a cathedral. With them the Pope also sent various things needed for public worship and the service of the church—sacred vessels, altar draperies, church ornaments, vestments for bishops and clergy, relics of apostles and martyrs, together with many books (*codices plurimos*).²

When Augustine sent his two messengers to Rome, he entrusted them with a series of questions—"difficult cases" on discipline and in regard to administration—upon which he desired the Pope's counsel and advice. To these Gregory now replied. Some of them deal with the unsavoury details of ceremonial purity and the secrets of married life, which priests have always been prone to pry into and to discuss, and which are not quite profitable

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 56a.

² *Bede*, i. 29.

for celibates or those whom they profess to teach. The Pope answered them all sensibly, and dealt with the more difficult ones according to various precedents chiefly drawn from Levitical enactments of the Old Testament, and did not flinch from using the plain phraseology which the Latin nations habitually indulge in on these matters.

There has been much discussion as to the genuineness of these questions and answers. This has been due largely to their not occurring in the oldest and most reputable of the collections of Gregory's letters (*i.e.* those referred to by Ewald as R. C. & P.), from which their absence can, however, be explained by the fact that in more than one case the Pope's answer savoured of teaching not recognised by the Church.¹ This would lead to their being cancelled from the official record of Gregory's correspondence. Duchesne, in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 94, declares that the document is spurious, although very old, but his reasons are quite inadequate and largely subjective.² The evidence

¹ *Vide infra*, pp. 107-8.

² Two English Roman Catholic scholars of learning and reputation, Abbot Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop, wrote a dissertation which was read at Rome during the Centenary Celebration in 1897 in honour of St. Gregory, but was not printed, and in which they replied to Duchesne. The former scholar published a short account of this in the *Tablet*, for 8th May 1897, p. 738. In it he says: "A writer of great name, and one whose opinion carries great weight, I mean the Abbé Duchesne, at present head of the École Française de Rome, has rejected this document as spurious and assigns it to a later date. His opinion has naturally influenced a number of important persons, who without further inquiry have accepted this verdict upon the strength of the Abbé's words. For my own part, I may say that I think he has not carefully considered the matter, and

in favour of the letters is really very strong; may I say overwhelming.¹ They are given at length by Bede, which is an excellent guarantee of their genuineness, and it seems difficult to understand how they could have been made up, or who else but the wise Pope could have composed such prudent answers at this time, and they were no doubt sent to Augustine with the other documents from Rome by Nothelm. The questions and answers, as has been shown, were accepted as an authority by Pope Zacharias in 743, by St. Boniface in 736,² by Ecgbert of York in 747, and by the Bishop of Cambrai in 826, consequently there is every reason to believe them genuine. In 745, Boniface, Archbishop of Mayence, applied for a copy to Nothelm, who had then become Archbishop of Canterbury, de-

that his conclusion is based upon an inadequate knowledge of the Church in England during the seventh century, and a false notion about the ideas of St. Gregory upon an important matter." The Jesuit, Father Brou, who has written on St. Augustine, takes the same view. Hartmann accepts the letters as genuine (*E. and H.* ii. p. 331, etc.). Mommsen thinks we have not the document in full, but regards it as a set of notes taken down by the priest Laurence at the time. Grisar (S.J., *Civ. Cat.* 1892, ii. 46) treats the letters as genuine, as does Jaffé (*Resgest.*, 1885, 599). A notable piece of evidence in regard to their reputed genuineness is to be found in the fact that it was afterwards found necessary to forge a correspondence between Gregory and Felix of Messina to try and explain away Gregory's pronouncement in regard to the degrees within which lawful marriage was allowed. These forged letters are excluded by Ewald and Hartmann, who do not even name them. That of the Pope is rejected as a forgery by Jaffé, while in regard to Felix he had been succeeded as Bishop of Messina by Donus, in 595 and 596, before Augustine's questions had been even sent (see Barmby, *Epp. of Gregory*, ii. 351 and 353, notes). The suspected letters are given in John the Deacon's Life of the Pope.

¹ *Op. cit.*, Preface, pp. vii and ix, and p. 67, note.

² *Mon. Mogunt.*, 88-94.

claring on the authority of the secretaries (*scrinarii*) that they were not then entered on the papal registers (*Quia in scrinio Romanae ecclesiae, ut adfirmant scrinarii, cum ceteris exemplaribus supra dicti pontificis quaesita non inveniebatur*).¹ This was written in 736.² He therefore wrote to Nothelm to supply him with copies of them. They occur in several early collections of canons which have been collated for Ewald and Hartmann's collection, as well as in Bede. In these collections they are preceded by a short preface not in Bede, which it has been alleged was added afterwards, probably in Italy, and which differs verbally in different copies. Mr. Plummer says he is strongly of opinion that it is a forgery.³ One argument against it is that Gregory never refers to Saxons and Saxonia, but to Angles and Anglia, while the title of the preface reads: "Here begins the Epistle of the Blessed Gregory, Pope of the City of Rome, in exposition of various matters, which he sent into transmarine *Saxony* to Augustine, whom he had himself sent in his own stead to preach." On the other hand, the preface is accepted by Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 18 and 33.

After acknowledging Augustine's letter with the questions (which had been delivered to him by Laurence the priest and Peter the monk), and adding that he had been so afflicted with gout,

¹ *Boniface*, epist. iii. 284.

² Nothelm had returned with the letters somewhere between 715 and 731, so that it was between these dates and 741 that they had disappeared from the registers.

³ *Op. cit.* ii. 45.

and that they had been so anxious to return, that he had not had time to reply at such length as he had wished, he goes categorically through the questions. Augustine's brother-missionaries were monks and not secular clergy, and it seems plain that Saint Gregory meant the English Church to be fashioned on a monkish basis, as his own household had been when he was the Pope's representative at Constantinople. Augustine began his questions by asking how bishops should live with their clergy (*cum suis clericis conversentur*), how the offerings of the faithful were to be divided, and how the bishop should act (*agere*) in the Church. The Pope replied by referring to St. Paul's instructions to Timothy advising him how a bishop should act in such a case. In regard to alms, he said the Holy See delivered an injunction to bishops when they were ordained, that all emoluments should be divided into four parts, one for the bishop and his household (for hospitality and entertainment), a second for the clergy, a third for the poor, and a fourth for maintaining the churches' fabric; but inasmuch as he and his missionaries were regulars, and had to live in common, "they ought to establish in the Anglian Church (*in ecclesia Anglorum*), which was still but newly brought to the faith by the motion of God, that manner of life which our fathers used in the beginning of the infant Church" (*i.e.* to follow the prescription in Acts iv.). They should have no private property, but hold all things in common—that is to say, the provision of a special

portion for the bishop in his case was not needed. The use of the term "Church of the Anglians" (*i.e.* of the English) in this phrase is notable as the first time in which, so far as we know, that Church was distinguished by a special name. A more instructive use of the term occurs in the second answer, where "the Use of the Church of Rome" (*Romanae ecclesiae consuetudinem*) is used in contrast with those of "the Church of the Gauls or any other Church" (*sive in Galliarum sive in qualibet ecclesia aliquid*), and where Gregory goes on to speak again of the Church of the Anglians as still new to the faith, and again, speaks of many Churches and of several Churches. In the fourth answer he again speaks of the Church of the Anglians. In his account of the mission of Bishop Mellitus to Rome, Bede speaks *de necessariis ecclesiae Anglorum* and also of *Anglorum ecclesiis*.¹ Bishop Brown reminds us that in the Act of Supremacy the Church of England was called *Ecclesia Anglicana*, as it was in Magna Charta.²

Secondly, in regard to whether clerics not in Sacred Orders (*i.e.* below the sub-deacons, and including the ostiary, lector, exorcist, and acolyte³) were to be permitted to marry if they could not resist the inclination. Following the steps of Leo the Great, Gregory had laid down that sub-deacons might not marry. Clerks in minor orders who married were, however, clearly expected to live separately from the bishop and his community, and

¹ *Bede*, ii. 4.

² *Augustine and His Companions*, 92.

³ Bright, 64, note.

to have separate stipends. They were to be kept under ecclesiastical rule, and to live good lives, pure from things unlawful, and pay attention to chanting the Psalms. At this time it was usual, as it is now in certain monasteries, to chant the Psalms from memory, without using a book.¹ This was almost essential when so many of the "Hours" were sung, as St. Benedict intended them to be, at night. What was over after satisfying the needs of the Church, was to be given in alms.

Thirdly, in regard to the question as to what "Use" he should follow, since the Use of Rome and that of Gaul were different, though the faith was the same, Gregory replied that Augustine and his fraternity knew the Roman Use in which they had been brought up, but he should be pleased if he would select from that of the Gauls or any other Church what was most suitable and acceptable to God, and introduce into the Church of the Anglians, which was still new to the faith, what he had been able to gather, that was edifying, from other Churches. As he wisely says, "Things are not to be cherished for the sake of places, but places for the sake of things." He concludes his answer thus: "From all the several Churches, therefore, select the things which are pious and religious and right (*quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt*), and gather them as it were into a bundle (*quasi in fasciculum*), and store them in the mind of the English (*apud Anglorum mentes*) to form a Use

¹ Smith, *Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. p. 1747.

(*in consuetudine depone*).” Bright, in reference to this instruction, says: “In Gaul Augustine had evidently noticed the number of Collects in the Mass, the frequent variations of the Preface, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements, the solemn episcopal blessing pronounced after the breaking of the Bread, and before the ‘Peace’ and the Communion. Gregory, who was deeply interested in liturgical questions, and had revived and re-edited the ‘Sacramentary’ of his predecessor Gelasius, and brought the Eucharistic ceremonial to what he considered an elaborate perfection . . . nevertheless advised less eclecticism.”¹ Such eclecticism was very remote from the modern ultramontane theory, and accordingly Duchesne² argues “that no Pope, no one imbued with the Roman spirit, could have given the advice attributed to Gregory in the answer,” and he suggests that the questions and answers were, in fact, invented by Theodore. This view, which he has never withdrawn,³ is, however, purely deductive and subjective, and it seems to me that any one who has carefully studied Gregory’s writings can come to no other conclusion than that the answer is precisely what one would expect from him. It was the inconvenience of the answer, and of that on the marriage of second cousins, etc., which perhaps led to the disappearance of these “Responsiones” from the papal registers, and their

¹ *Op. cit.* 64 and 65.

³ Bright, 65, note 2.

² *Origines, etc.*, 94.

being considered by some ultramontane champions as forgeries. Who could have forged them, and on whose behalf could they have been forged? Augustine's predecessor at St. Martin's, Liudhard, doubtless used the Gallican liturgy. Augustine did not apparently avail himself of the Pope's licence to a great extent. The most notable change was the introduction of Rogation Litanies, which were not in use at Rome at this time, and were used in England from very early times. Some changes crept into the English liturgy afterwards from Gaul, but these doubtless came later. The Roman or Gregorian "cantus" (chant) was also carefully used at Canterbury, and its use became a sign of adherence to the Roman obedience, in opposition to the Celtic customs.¹

Augustine next asked what punishment was to be awarded to those who stole from a church. The Pope replied that the gravity of the offence differed as greatly as, for instance, between those who stole from poverty and those who did not, and that the matter must be left to the good sense of Augustine and his community; but he bade them always temper justice with charity, since the *raison d'être* of earthly punishment was to save a man from a heavier punishment hereafter, and men should be corrected as children by their father. Things stolen from a church must be restored. In any case, the church should be content with restitution, and make no profit out of a theft by receiving

¹ Hunt, *Hist. of the Eng. Church, etc.*, 28.

back more than had been taken. Augustine next asked if two whole brothers might marry two sisters of a family not nearly related to them; which the Pope answered in the affirmative, since nothing contrary to it occurred in Holy Writ. He next asked within what degree of consanguinity it was permissible to marry, and whether a man might marry his stepmother, or his sister-in-law. The Pope pronounced it unlawful for cousins to marry, although it had been allowed by the Roman law, for it had been discovered that such marriages were unfertile, but it was permissible for those in the third and fourth degree of affinity to marry. The opinion of Gregory here given, permitting second cousins to marry, was not apparently generally received by the orthodox, and gave umbrage in some quarters, and it was probably largely because of it, that the answers we are discussing disappeared from the papal registers.

It must be remembered, however, that the Eastern Church permitted these marriages, and Justinian's Code sanctioned them; and, as Mr. Plummer says, as late as 1015 A.D., Gregory's permission was quoted with effect against Gerard, Bishop of Cambrai, who wished to prevent the marriage of Rainer, the second Count of Hainault, with the daughter of Hermann, Count of Verdun.¹ On the other hand, it seems from a canon mentioned by St. Boniface, in a letter to Pope Zacharias in the spring of 742 A.D., that Gregory's

¹ Pertz, vi. 469; Plummer's *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 48.

indulgent interpretation of the rule about consanguineous marriage was not generally followed in England.¹

In regard to marrying a stepmother, the law of the Church was well settled, and Gregory quoted Gen. ii. 24, and Lev. xviii. 7, as decisive ; but the practice was very common with the Teutonic heathens, and, as Mr. Plummer says, Augustine doubtless wished to have his hands strengthened in view of difficulties which presently came, and were then probably looming. In regard, again, to marrying a sister-in-law the Pope was equally emphatic, and mentioned how John the Baptist was put to death for maintaining the Divine law on the subject. "Inasmuch, however," said the judicial Pope, "as many of the Anglians had contracted these marriages before their conversion, they should be admonished to abstain from each other ; but they should not be deprived of the Communion of the Lord's body and blood [*corporis et sanguinis Domini communione*], for doing what they had bound themselves to do before their baptism. Those who had been baptized were different, and if they perpetrated any such thing, they were to be deprived of the Communion of the body and blood of the Lord [mark the words : "*corporis ac sanguinis Domini*

¹ This canon, Boniface claims, had been passed in a Synod, held in London in the time of Gregory's disciples, Augustine, Laurence, Justus, and Mellitus, and he says it was ordained in accordance with Holy Scripture, at that Synod, that such a union and marriage as the Pope was supposed to have sanctioned was a great sin and incest, etc. (*maximum scelus et incestum et horribile flagitium et damnabile piaculum*). Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 50 and 51 ; see also *ib.* 335-36.

communione privandi sunt"]. Two brothers, however, might marry two sisters."

Augustine had asked whether, when a great distance intervened and bishops were not able to assemble easily, a priest might be ordained to a see by a single bishop without the intervention of other bishops. To this the Pope replied that Augustine, being the only bishop among the Anglians, could not help ordaining a bishop without other bishops (*non aliter nisi sine episcopis potes*), "for," he says, "when do bishops come to you from Gaul to attend as witnesses (*testes*) for the ordaining of other bishops?" but he wished him to ordain sufficient bishops in England, so that there should be no obstacle from mere length of the way intervening, to prevent them coming together to an ordination. He urged how exceedingly advantageous the presence of other pastors was, and if possible three or four bishops should assemble and pour forth prayers for the protection of the newly consecrated.

It is clear from this answer (as Bright says) that Gregory thought consecration by one bishop spiritually valid, but irregular. He could hardly have done otherwise, since at Rome, where the earliest tradition seems to have prevailed, it was always the practice for the Pope, when consecrating a bishop, to do so alone without the assistance of others, and this practice of the Bishop of Rome must have been familiar to Augustine. The provision which had been made at the Council of Arles (314), that if possible seven, and at

Nicæa that not less than three bishops should be present, was introduced to guard against disorderly and clandestine consecrations, but its observance was not deemed a *sine qua non* for the conferring of the episcopal character.¹ This older practice apparently also prevailed in the Celtic churches, which were very conservative.² St. Kentigern is said to have been consecrated by a single bishop from Ireland, "*more Britonum et Scottorum tunc temporis.*" In view of this answer, it will be remembered how very positively it was asserted in later times that no consecration was canonical at which at least three bishops did not concur.

Augustine having asked how he should comport himself towards the bishops of the Gauls and the "Britains" (*Galliarum atque Brittaniarum*), the Pope replied that he had given him no authority over the bishops of Gaul. They were subject to the Bishop of Arles, who had been known to receive the pallium from early days, and he bade Augustine if he visited Gaul to act with the Bishop of Arles so that vices among the bishops there, if any, might be corrected, and if any were luke-warm, he might fire them into exertion. He adds that he had written to the Bishop of Arles in the same strain. He was to have no power of judging the bishops of Gaul, for he should not put his sickle into another's corn. As to the

¹ Bright, *op. cit.* 66 and 67.

² See Plummer, *Bede*, ii. p. 49; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 155; Reeve, *Adamnan*, p. 349.

British bishops, he committed them to his care, so that the unlearned might be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, and the perverse corrected by authority.¹

The eighth question was as to whether women could be lawfully baptized when with child. Gregory replied in the affirmative. "Why," he asks, "should not a woman with child be baptized, when it is no sin in God's eyes to be fruitful?"

Then follow some questions and answers relating to intercourse between the sexes.² Those who are curious about such morbid matters may find them, cloaked in friendly Latin, in the original texts of the interrogatories and answers.³ They are excusable only on the ground that the Levitical code of the Jews (which is quoted more than once in Gregory's replies) still survived as a law regulating human conduct. Why these clauses in it should be deemed valid and others be treated as obsolete has never been logically explained. I follow Mr. Dudden in referring to one of

¹ Between the seventh and eighth responses the later editions of St. Gregory's works interpolate a question and answer, not in Bede or the earlier recensions of the letters, and clearly a sophistication. Augustine, in this document, is supposed to ask the Pope to send him some relics of St. Sixtus the Martyr. The Pope is made to send the relics in order to satisfy the people who, under the delusion that St. Sixtus was buried in a certain spot in Kent, used to go there to worship, but no miracles had in fact taken place there, and there was no evidence that the martyr had been buried on the spot. If the relics, he said, were placed there the people would, at all events, have something real to pay their devotions to. See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 33, note.

² A portion of these instructions are quoted by Egbert, Archbishop of York, in his *Penitential*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 423 and 424; Mansi, xii. 451.

³ See *E. and H.* xi. 56a.

Gregory's answers, as proving how sane and sensible he was even in such matters. In this he strongly deprecates the evil custom which some mothers had adopted of entrusting their babies to other women to nurse, and disdaining to suckle them themselves.¹

In regard to Augustine's questions as a whole, Dr. Bright says: "They illustrate his monkish inexperience of pastoral administration, and some of them give the notion of a mind cramped by long seclusion and somewhat helpless when set to act in a wide sphere. His difficulties are small and pedantic ones, and he asks no guidance in the presence of spiritual interests and requirements so vast and so absorbing."

Besides the letters and the answers to Augustine's questions, the returning travellers also carried with them some valuable presents from the Pope for the mission Church.

Thomas of Elmham was a monk of St. Augustine's Monastery. He has, I think, been shown by Mr. C. Hardwicke to have been the author of the *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*. He was treasurer of the Abbey in 1407, and in 1414 left the regular Benedictines to join the more austere order of Cluny. It was probably in that year that the work just cited, as far as he had to do with it, ended. He has also been thought by some to be the author of the famous *Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*.

In the former work,² he enumerates the books

¹ Dudden, *op. cit.* ii. 135.

² *Tit.* ii. ch. 6.

still extant associated traditionally with the names of Gregory and Augustine, which he calls "*primitiae librorum totius ecclesiae Anglicanae*."¹ Some of them are represented in a coloured drawing in the MS. of his book² as placed upon a ledge immediately above the high altar of the church. He describes a number of them in some detail in the text of his work.

The books in question are also referred to in a short paragraph by an earlier writer, namely, William Thorn, whose *Chronica*, which was used by Elmham, ends in 1397. This notice runs as follows: "*Habemus etiam Bibliam Sancti Gregorii et Evangelium ejusdem*," etc.³

There are several extant MSS. which correspond in contents and pedigree with the books named by Elmham, more than one of which may with considerable probability have been sent by the Pope to his missioner. The first work cited by Elmham he calls *Biblia Gregoriana*, and says it was in two volumes, of which the first one had on its first folio *De Capitulis Libri Geneseos*, and the second began with the prologue of Saint Jerome on Isaiah. In these two volumes were inserted several leaves, some of purple and others of rose colour, which showed a wonderful reflection when held up to the light.⁴ Thorn speaks of this Bible a few years earlier as being then in the Library.⁵ In the fifteenth-century catalogue of St. Augustine's

¹ *Op. cit.* ed. Hardwicke, p. 99.
⁴ *Op. cit.* pp. 96 and 97.

² *Ib. xxv.* ⁵ *Chron. col. 1763.*
³ *Chron. col. 1763.*

Library, recently edited by Dr. James, the two first headings are "*Prima pars Bibliæ Sanctis Gregorii*" and "*Secunda pars*," etc.¹ Wanley² says the Bible was still extant in 1604, being mentioned in a petition addressed to James the First. In it we read of this book: "The very original Bible, the selfsame Numero which St. Gregory sent on with our Apostle, St. Augustine, being as yet preserved by God's special providence." Wanley does not seem to have traced the book further, nor is it directly mentioned afterwards.

There is a book, however, in the Royal Collection, numbered I.E. vi., which has every claim to be a fragment of this Bible. In the first place, on a fly-leaf which is about five hundred years old we have an inscription stating that it then belonged to the Monastery of St. Augustine at Canterbury.

Unfortunately, it at present consists of only a mutilated copy of the Gospels, but it very clearly once formed part of a whole Bible, as appears from the numbering of its quaternions, the first of which now appears at the foot of the page containing the tenth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, and is numbered lxxx, while the last page of St. John's Gospel bears the number lxxxviii; and both Professor Westwood and Dr. James agree that it was once a whole Bible, and a very magnificent one. It exactly agrees with Thomas of Elmham's description, in being interspersed with a number of

¹ *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, p. 197.

² *Lib. Vet. Sept. Cat.* 172-173.

purple leaves of vellum. There can be no reasonable doubt that it is a fragment of the very Bible referred to by Thorn and described by Thomas of Elmham. There can be as little doubt that it had nothing to do with Augustine or Gregory. Its text and its illuminations are Anglo-Saxon, and of the purest period of Anglo-Saxon art, dating from perhaps two, or even three, centuries at least after Augustine's time. It is not unnatural that such a sumptuous book should have been attributed to such a source, however, by those who were little skilled in palæography.

Thomas of Elmham next mentions a Psalter, which he calls *Psalterium Augustini*, adding “*quod sibi misit idem Gregorius*.” He describes it in some detail, and gives a list of the hymns, etc., it contains. He also mentions a second Psalter, placed on the table of the High Altar (*supra tabulam magni altaris positum*) which had a silver cover with figures of the four Evangelists on it. He gives a long list of the contents of the book—*inter alia*, the letter of Damasus to Jerome, and the latter's answer, and other interesting entries. Both these Psalters he names among the books sent by Pope Gregory to Augustine. Dr. James, in referring to the Cotton MS. Vesp. A.1, says it is a claimant for the position of one of these two Psalters. It contains Jerome's Roman version of the Psalms, which points to an original connection with Rome. “The version,” says James, “is the one Augustine would have been in the habit of

using. . . . The preliminary matter coincides exactly with that noticed by Elmham as occurring in the second of the two Psalters he describes ; and with that second Psalter, in regard to its matter, we may very confidently identify it, as Westwood did, and as others since his time have done."

Professor Westwood, just named (a very competent authority), made an elaborate examination of this MS., and it seems to me that he established his case in regard to it ; and if so, he proved it to be a monument of very special interest for us. He showed that it consisted of several parts and several dates, and that while considerable portions of it were written and illuminated in England at an early date, other parts were distinctly of Roman origin, and he argues that these latter are all that remain of the original book, which may well have been brought with him by Augustine or sent to him by Gregory. Large parts of it, having become decayed, or discarded because they were not sufficiently attractive, were replaced by others in a more ornate style of native origin. The importance of the book tempts me to give a more detailed account of Westwood's analysis of it.

"The evidence," he says, "upon which this MS. is affirmed to have been sent by Pope Gregory to St. Augustine, is to a certain extent satisfactory." He then quotes the description of it by Thomas of Elmham, with which, as he says, it perfectly agrees, except that, when he wrote, its cover was ornamented with the effigy of Christ and the four

Evangelists. "The text," he continues, "is written throughout in pure Roman uncials, and were it not for the illuminated Anglo-Saxon capitals it could not be distinguished from a Roman MS. Mr. Baber, indeed, in the introduction to the Wickliffe New Testament, says that it is written in the thin light hand of Italian MSS. . . . From the very careful examination which I have made of the MS., I do not hesitate to affirm that a portion of it is Roman, and as old, or older, than the time of Augustine—namely, those leaves which are written in the rustic Roman capitals, with the words indistinct. The same remark may also, perhaps, be applied to the fourth and seven following leaves, written in the more elegant rustic capitals; and I have no hesitation in suggesting that the text of the Psalms is a copy of the original MS., purposely decorated with all the art of the period, and in the spirit of veneration, introduced into the place of the old unornamented Roman MS., which, moreover, might probably have become worn out.¹ This, in substance, was the opinion of that very experienced palæographer Wanley, who, while he could not find what he sought diligently for, namely, the original Psalter of St. Augustine, held that the Cottonian MS. at present occupying us was *a copy* of the Gregorian Psalter (*unde alterum alterius apographum fuisse facile credo*).² Dr. Westwood also partially held this view, but further showed that while Wanley's descrip-

¹ Westwood, *Pal. Sacra*, "Psalter of Augustine," p. 6.

² Wanley, in Hickes' *Thesaurus*, ii. 173.

tion applies to a large part of the MS., that work also contains portions of the original book itself.

Returning to Thomas of Elmham, he tells us that in the Vestiary (*i.e.* answering to the modern vestry) there was a *Textus Evangeliorum*, in the beginning of which the Ten Canons were inserted. It was called the *Textus Sanctae Mildredae*, because a certain rustic in Thanet where the Saint lived having sworn a false oath upon it, had become blind. In the Library, he tells us, was another text of the Gospels, in which the Ten Canons with a prologue were inserted, the latter beginning with the words *Prologus Canonum*.¹ Leland refers in enthusiastic terms to two copies of the Gospels he saw at St. Augustine's, which were doubtless the works last quoted. He says, speaking of "the Gregorian MSS.": "*Ex Latinis autem codicibus majusculis literis Romanis more veterum scriptis, hi etiam nunc extant, incredibilem prae se ferentes antiquitatis majestatem; videlicet duo volumina, quatuor Evangelia complectentia, sed alius quam vulgaris interpretationis.*"²

Dr. Westwood says that Wanley, who searched for and examined the MSS. of this kingdom with so much care, was led to believe that a copy of the Gospels preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (No. 286),³ and another in a similar style of writing in the Bodleian Library,⁴ are the two identical Gregorian volumes described

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 98.

² See Preface to *Thomas of Elmham*, xxvi.

³ This was presented by Archbishop Parker.

⁴ *Auct. D.* ii. 14; *Bod.* 857.

above; not only because they are two of the oldest Latin MSS., written in pure Roman uncials that exist in this country, but also because they contain Anglo-Saxon entries, now a thousand years old, which connect them with the Monastery of St. Augustine itself. Dr. Westwood describes them at some length.

In regard to the *Corpus Christi* Gospels here named, Dr. James says the book may be possibly identical with the text of "St. Mildred" in Elmham's notice. "The date of it," he says, "is now generally fixed as the seventh century, and though it can hardly have belonged to Augustine, there is nothing to prevent us from supposing it to have been brought to England by some such person as Abbot Hadrian." Dr. James quotes a notable statement by Thorn, 1770, in which he mentions a privilege of the abbey copied out in the Gospel book of Hadrian, "*transcriptum in textu Adriani.*"¹

In regard to the Bodleian MS., *Auct. D. ii. 14*, Dr. James says it was presented by Sir Robert Cotton in 1603, and is written in uncials. He says of it that it contains on the last leaf a list of Anglo-Saxon books belonging to an abbey and in possession of various members of it. Among them is one named Baldwin (*Bealdevine*) Abbas. No Baldwin, he adds, was ever Abbot of St. Augustine's, but there was a Baldwin who died Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, in 1098, and Mr. Macray has suggested, with great probability, that he may be the person

¹ *Op. cit. lxvii, note.*

here meant. Baldwin of Bury came from the Abbey of St. Denis, and may perhaps have brought this, which is a foreign book, with him.¹

Lastly, there is a fragment of a Gospel book in the British Museum, Otho C.5, containing Matthew and Mark, which is very like a *Corpus Christi* MS., numbered 197, containing Luke and John. "It has often been conjectured that the two originally formed a single volume, but there seem to be some doubts about it. That the latter came from Canterbury is attested by a note emanating from Archbishop Parker: 'Bishop Tanner asserts, we know not on what authority, that it was a portion of the Gospels of St. Felix, the Apostle of East Anglia, otherwise called the *Red Book of Eye.*'"²

It would seem that, of these various books, the only two which have a strong probability behind them attesting a pedigree in whole or in part reaching back to St. Augustine, are the so-called Augustine's Psalter, Cott. Vesp. A.1,³ and the

¹ *Op. cit.* lxviii and lxix.

² *Ib.* lxviii.

³ The following is a list of the contents of this very interesting volume, as given by Thomas of Elmham, and it shows how early in the history of the English Church a very fair choice of books and materials for studying the Psalter had reached it. He says it had on its cover an image of Christ and others of the four Evangelists, wrought in silver, and continues: "In . . . primo folio incipit, 'Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata.' In tertio folio incipit, 'Epistola Damasi papae ad Ieronymum' et in fine Versus ejusdem Damasi; ac deinde 'Epistola Ieronymi ad "Damasum" cum Hieronymi versibus. Deinde in quarto folio, 'De origine Psalmorum' in cuius fine distinguit Psalterium in quinque libros. . . . In quinto folio ejusdem Psalterii sequitur expositio de Alleluja secundum Hebraeos, Chaldaeos, Syros et Latinos. Item interpretatio 'Gloriae' apud Chaldaeos. Item interpretatio Psalmi cxviii. per singulas literas. In sexto folio sequitur quando psalli vel legi debeat, quomodo Hieronymus scribit;

Corpus Christi Gospels, but they all form a very interesting group, some of which may well be treated as dating within a half-century, or little more, of the great mission.

Elmham mentions three other books which were reputed in his time to be gifts from St. Gregory to Augustine, all of which were put upon a shelf or table on the high altar: one containing an account of the conflict of the Apostles Peter and Paul with Simon Magus, together with lives and passions of some of the Apostles. It had a cover in silver upon it, with a representation of Christ standing erect and blessing with His right hand. A second one, with the passions of the Saints, also with a silver-gilt cover with a representation of "the Majesty," studded round with crystals and beryls. Thirdly, one containing expositions on certain Gospels and Epistles. Its cover had a great beryl in the centre with many crystal stones all about it.

Dr. James says of these three books: "No attempt has ever been made, so far as I know, to show that any of them still exist, and I have no suggestion to offer on the point."¹ Their magnificent bindings would make them welcome plunder, and it may well be they were all three destroyed. In regard to the sacred vessels, etc., which Gregory

item, 'Ordo Psalmorum per A, B, C, D.' In septimo folio de literis Hebraeis, quae in Psalterio scribuntur. In octavo folio, 'Interpretatio Psalmorum' usque ad folium undecimum ubi incipit 'Textus Psalterii,' cum imagine Samuelis sacerdotis, et in fine ejusdem Psalterii sunt Hymni de matutinis, de vesperis, et de Dominico die" (*op. cit. tit. par. 6.*).

¹ *Op. cit. lxvii.*

is supposed to have sent to Augustine, Elmham tells us they had all disappeared in his day. He says that some reported they were hidden during the period of the Danish invasions, and had not since been found. Others said that they had been employed in the payment of the ransom of Richard the First when he was imprisoned by the Duke of Austria. Others, again, held that when Egelsinus the Abbot fled to Denmark (*Dacia*) in 1071 for fear of William the Conqueror, who confiscated the Abbey with all its contents, and placed a monk named Scotlandus over it, these precious objects, with many other things, were hidden away secretly, and their whereabouts was lost.¹

Thorn refers to certain old copes (*quasdam capas veteres*), etc., which had been sent by Gregory to St. Augustine as still extant in his time. Of these, according to Elmham, six copes and a chasuble remained when he wrote. All were of silk. One was of sapphire or azure colour, with borders of gold, adorned in front, in the upper part, with stones. Two were of purple, in other respects like that just mentioned. Three were also of purple silk, interwoven in parts with golden and milk-coloured silk threads (*aurei ac lactei coloris*), while in another part they were snow-white. The chasuble was purple, adorned in the upper part, behind, with gold and precious stones. He points out that the number of copes corresponded with the number

¹ *Op. cit.* ed. Hardwicke, 101.

of those who, it was claimed, had brought them—Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Rufinianus, together with Laurence the priest and Peter the abbot. It need not be said that no trace of these vestments now remains.

Thomas of Elmham also refers to the gifts sent by the Pope to King *Æthelberht*.¹ He derived this information from a spurious charter of *Æthelberht*. We are told by him that the King deposited some of these gifts in the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul (St. Augustine's), and Mr. Plummer says very rightly that the tradition may be true, though the charter is spurious. They include a silver dish (*missurium*), a golden flagon (*scapton*), a saddle and bridle decorated with gold and gems, a silver *speculum* or looking-glass, a military jacket entirely made of silk (*armilcaisia oloserica*), and an embroidered shirt.²

Thomas of Elmham enumerates the relics extant in his time at St. Augustine's Abbey which were claimed to have been given by Gregory to Augustine, and were preserved in the vestry. These were a double cross (*crux geminata sive duplicata*), which he says was called *bifurcata* by T. Sprott and others—it was made of Christ's Rood (*de ligno Dominico*); part of the seamless tunic (*de tunica inconsutili*), some of the hair of Saint Mary (*beatae Mariae*), of the rod of Aaron, and relics of the apostles and martyrs, etc.³ By

¹ *Op. cit. tit. ii. 11.*

³ *Op. cit. 9.*

² Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 57.

far the most precious gift, however, sent by the Pope was a pall, which symbolised and was meant to convey a Metropolitan jurisdiction to the recently consecrated Bishop of the English. A few supplementary remarks to those made on the pall in the life of St. Gregory¹ will not be out of place.

Pall, or pallium, simply means cloak, and as such Tertullian recommends it as more convenient than the toga.² “A rich form of it became part of the Imperial attire, and was granted by Emperors as a mark of honour to Patriarchs and others—thus Valentinian gave a pallium of white wool to the Bishop of Ravenna. Later the Popes began (originally in the Emperor’s name or by his desire) to allow the use of the pall to certain bishops, especially to those who represented the Apostolic See, to some Metropolitans, or to other prelates of influence and distinction. In Gregory’s time it was thus variously granted, his references show that it was sometimes rich and heavy with ornament; it was not to be worn except at Mass. It did not become a necessary badge of the Metropolitan dignity till later.”¹ It was in fact at first given as a distinction conferring precedence rather than special jurisdiction. Originally a cloak, it ultimately lost this shape and became a symbolical vestment rather than a garment, consisting of a long band passing round the shoulders, with its pendant ends hanging down behind and before, so that the front and back views of it are like the letter Y. It was orna-

¹ *Vide Gregory the Great*, p. 47.

² Bright, 68 and 69.

² *de Pallio*, iii. 5.

mented with a number of purple crosses (now fixed at four), and was and is composed of the wool of lambs reared in the Convent of St. Agnese in Rome for the purpose. When made, the palls were placed for a night on the tomb of St. Peter, and then kept until required. The Popes presently established the principle that the possession of the pallium was necessary to the exercise of Metropolitan functions, none of which could be performed till it was received, and Gregory himself seems certainly to have treated the reception of the pallium as necessary to enable Augustine to consecrate bishops—*qualiter episcopos in Britannia constituere debuisset* are his words. In later times the Popes insisted on the archbishops visiting Rome to receive their palliums, as they insisted on their right to confirm the appointment of Metropolitans, and thus exacted submission to themselves as the price of their confirmation.”¹ Neither of the two immediate successors of Augustine, Laurentius or Mellitus, received the pall, which probably accounts for their not having consecrated any suffragans.² In addition to the pallium, as we have seen, Gregory also sent all such things as were necessary for the services of the church, including (1) sacred vessels (*vasa sacra*). These no doubt meant silver chalices and patens, such as he sent to Venantius, Bishop of Luna (*calicem argenteum unum habentem uncias vi., patenam argenteam habentem libras ii.*).³ (2) Altar

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 49 and 50.

² Plummer, ii. 79.

³ *E. and H.* viii. 5.

clothes (*vestimenta altarium*). Gregory of Tours, vii. 22, speaks of the altar and the oblations being covered with a silken vestment (*pallio serico*), and in the letter just quoted, written by Gregory to Venantius, he speaks of sending him two *sindones*, i.e. linen cloths used for covering the loaves offered by the faithful for the Sacrament, and an altar cloth (*coopertorium super altare*). (3) Church furniture (*ornamenta ecclesiarum*), doubtless including candlesticks, ewers, etc. etc.; and (4) vestments for priests and clerics. In July 599 Gregory sent some dalmatics to Aregius, Bishop of Gap, for the use of his deacon and archdeacon.¹

Let us now return from our long digression, to the travellers who were returning to England to recruit and reinforce the English mission.

It would seem that, after they had been a while on their way, they were overtaken by a messenger from the Pope, bearing a supplementary letter for Mellitus the Abbot. In this letter he gives some additional counsel as to how Augustine was to deal with heathen temples. The Pope says he had been in great suspense since the departure of the travellers from not having heard of the success of their journey. He bids Mellitus when he reached Augustine tell him he had long been considering about the Anglians, and proceeds to modify one of his injunctions to King Æthelberht contained in the letter² he had sent him. He said he was now of opinion that the

¹ *E. and H.* ix. 219.

² *Vide infra*, p. 135.

idol temples should not be destroyed, but only the idols in them broken. "Rather," he says, "let blessed water be prepared and sprinkled on the temples, and let them build altars and put relics of the saints in them ; since if they were solidly built they would be most useful, and it would be merely converting the houses of demons to the service of God. It would be well that the people should, in fact, continue to worship where they had been accustomed,¹ and inasmuch as it had been further customary for the pagans to sacrifice oxen at their services, it would be well in this matter also not to break abruptly with old traditions ; but on the occasions of the dedication of the churches, or the nativity of the martyrs, when their relics were exposed, to build booths of boughs about the church, and there to hold religious festivals where animals might be slain to the praise of God for their own eating ; for,"

¹ This wise injunction of the Pope probably accounts for so many of the older country churches having been planted on sites which were probably those where heathen worship had previously prevailed. This adaptation was of much older date than St. Gregory. Let me quote an apt note from Dr. Bright : "The Irish believed that St. Patrick, finding three pillar stones which were connected with Irish paganism, did not overthrow them, but inscribed on them the names Jesus, Soter, Salvator" (Stokes, *Tripl. Life*, i. 107). A Pictish well, reputed to have baneful powers, was said to have been made holy by Columba's blessing and touch (*Adamnan Vit.* col. ii. 11). One of the boldest acts ever done on this principle is recorded of St. Barbatus of Benevento, who melted down a golden image of a viper which the half-heathen inhabitants had venerated, and made a paten and chalice out of it (see Bar. Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, Feb. 19 ; Bright, *op. cit.* 81, note). May I add that at Dol, and other places in Brittany, the menhirs and dolmens are frequently sanctified by being marked with a cross, while the presence of yew trees in so many churchyards is another form of survival.

says the wise Pope, "it is not well to make people of an obstinate turn grow better by leaps, but rather by slow steps, as the Israelites were taught in the wilderness. Thus the victims formerly dedicated to demons may be offered to God." This he urges Mellitus to press upon Augustine, and he concludes with the hope that God would keep him safe.¹

Similar feasts to those here referred to by the Pope, with quite a pagan flavour, and traceable to the same survival of pagan fashions, were no doubt the Whitsun and Church ales, and the May games; and thus, too, it came about, as Bede says,² "people now call the Paschal time after the goddess Eostre." Thus Yule, the midwinter feast, was turned into a synonym of Christmas, and the midsummer festival of Balder became the holiday of the eve and day of St. John the Baptist.³ Bede⁴ distinctly approves of the conversion of the lustrations of the Lupercalia into the Candlemas ceremonies of the month of February.⁵ In Syria the cultus of the sun-god "*Hλιος*" was converted into that of the prophet '*Hλίας*', and Welsh saints named Mabon are possibly only the Celtic Apollo Maponos in a Christian garb.⁶ Similarly, we have "pagan superstitions linked to Christian holy tides, as the eves of St. John the Baptist and All Saints."

The so-called rushbearings, well known in my

¹ *Bede*, i. 30.

² *De Temp. Ratione*, 15.

³ Bright, *op. cit.* 82, note 2.

⁴ *De Temp. Ratione*, c. 12.

⁵ See Plummer, *Bede*, ii. p. 60.

⁶ Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, 302; Plummer, *Bede*, ii. p. 60.

memory in the North, are another example of these commemoration feasts. It was formerly the custom to bring fresh rushes at the feast of the dedication of the church with which to strew the floors, and the supplying of bundles of rushes for this purpose is mentioned in many church accounts. They were used to keep the churches cool in summer and warm in winter and dry at all times, and for a pleasant smell, and were similarly used in private houses. Bridges, in his history of Northampton, speaking of the parish of Middleton Chendent, says it was the custom to strew the church in summer with hay gathered from six or seven swathes in Ashmeadow, which was grown for the purpose, the rector finding the straw. At Norwich Cathedral the sweet-scented flag (*Acorus Calamus*) was used for the purpose. Its roots when bruised gave out a powerful and fragrant odour like that of myrtle.

The festival was especially cultivated in my old town of Rochdale, and is described in some detail in a letter from a native of the town inserted in Hone's *Year-Book*, pp. 1105-6. "Many years before," he says, "the rushes were carried down to the church on men's shoulders in bundles, some plain and some decked with ribands, garlands, etc. At the churchyard they were dried, and the floor of the church was then strewn with them. This was before the floor was boarded. They were used to keep the feet warm from the clay or stone floors. This old fashion presently gave way to a more elaborate display, in which the rushes

were carried in a cart, and were cut transversely and laid down so as to form a long pyramid, and the cut surface of the rushes was then decorated with carnations and other flowers, in devices and surmounted by bunches of oak, a person riding at the top. The cart was sometimes drawn by horses and sometimes by young men numbering twenty or thirty couples, adorned with ribands, tinsel, etc., preceded by a man with horse bells and playing the part of a comedian. Then followed a band of music or a set of morris dancers, followed by young women carrying garlands, then a banner of silk of various colours joined by narrow riband fretted, the whole profusely covered on both sides with roses, stars, etc., of tinsel. The whole procession was flanked by men with long cart-whips which they continually cracked."

Let us now revert again to Mellitus and his companions.

On their return the Pope entrusted them, *inter alia*, with certain commendatory letters which were dated in June 601. Among them was one written to Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, whom he asked to succour the travellers; "and since," he adds, "it often happens that those who are placed at a distance learn first from others of things that require amendment" (*i.e.* "Strangers often see most of the game"), "if he should perchance intimate to your Fraternity any faults in priests and others, do you in concert with him inquire into them with all subtle investigation (*suptili cuncta investigatione*),

and do you both show yourselves so strict and solicitous against things that offend God and provoke Him to wrath, that for the amendment of others both vengeance may strike the guilty and false report not afflict the innocent. God keep you safe, most reverend brother."¹ The Pope still seems to think that Canterbury and Arles were sufficiently near to each other for the two archbishops to take counsel together at times.

A second letter was sent to Desiderius of Vienne. In this letter he specially mentions Laurence the priest and Mellitus the abbot, whom he says he had sent to his most reverend brother and co-bishop Augustine as fellow-workers.² To Ætherius, Archbishop of Lyons, he wrote a similar letter, asking him to assist the missionaries.³ He sent another commendation to Aregius, the Bishop of Gap.⁴

With these individual letters to the more influential prelates, the Pope also wrote a circular letter addressed to several bishops, namely, Menas of Toulon, Serenus of Marseilles, Lupus of Châlons-sur-Saône (Cabellorum), Agilfus of Metz, Simplicius of Paris, Licinius of Angers, and Melantius of Rouen, in which he tells them that such a multitude of the Anglians were being converted that Augustine had informed him that he had not sufficient men to do the work, and

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 45; Barmby, xi. 68.

² *E. and H.* xi. 34; Barmby, xi. 54.

³ *E. and H.* xi. 40; Barmby, xi. 56.

⁴ *E. and H.* xi. 42; Barmby, xi. 57.

that he, the Pope, had accordingly sent him a few more monks, with Laurence the priest and Mellitus the abbot, and asking them to aid the travellers on their way.¹

Of the same date we have two letters, addressed to the boy-kings Theodoric of Austrasia and Theodebert of Burgundy. In these letters Gregory acknowledges the kind services formerly rendered by them to Augustine and his fellow-travellers, as had been reported to him by certain monks who had visited him from England, *i.e.* Laurence and his companions, and asks them to extend the same favours to the same monks on their return.² A similar letter, dated 22nd June of the same year, was written to Queen Brunichildis, in which we have the same fulsome compliments as before. She is further told that the miracles hitherto wrought in the conversion of the Anglians must be already known to her, and asking her to aid the new missionaries now on their way.³

We also have a letter of the same date addressed to Chlothaire II., King of Neustria, who resided at Soissons, and was now about eighteen years old. In this the Pope acknowledges his kindness to Augustine and his companions, and commends Laurence and Mellitus and their companions to him.⁴ Armed with these various letters, the new recruits for the English

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 41; Barmby, xi. 58.

² *E. and H.* xi. 47 and 50; Barmby, xi. 59 and 60.

³ *E. and H.* xi. 48; Barmby, xi. 62.

⁴ *E. and H.* xi. 51; Barmby, xi. 61.

mission made their way across France, and reached England.

Thither they also took letters sent by the Pope; among them was one addressed to King Æthelberht himself, whom he calls Adilbertus—surely a romantic document, the first one in which a Pope addressed an English sovereign. In this letter, which is dated 22nd June 601, Gregory addresses the King as “Glorious Son” (*glorioso fili*) and “Your Glory” (*vestra gloria*), and tells him to keep the Grace which had been given him by God (*eam quam accepisti divinitus gratiam sollicita mente custodi*), and how he had been set over the nation of the Angles in order that benefits might be conferred on the nation subject to him. He bade him make haste to extend the Faith among the people subject to him, to put down the worship of idols, to overturn their temples, and to build up his subjects in the Faith by exhortation, terror, enticement, correction, and example. He reminded him of Constantine, when he recalled the Roman world from the worship of idols, and subjected it with himself to Christ, and of the fame he thereby acquired; and he similarly urged him to infuse into the kings and peoples subject to him the knowledge of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that he might surpass the ancient kings of his race in renown and deserts. He then went on to commend to him “Augustine the Bishop,” as learned in monastic rule (*in monasterii regula edocitus*), full of knowledge of Holy Scripture, and endowed

with good works, and bade him listen to and follow his admonitions. He reminded him that the end of the present world was at hand, and that of the saints about to begin—as witnessed by terrors in the air, terrors from heaven, contrary seasons, wars, famine, pestilence, and earthquakes in divers places; and that though the end would not come in their days, it would come later. He must not therefore be disturbed by such portents, which were meant to make us more zealous in good works. He promised to write to him presently at greater length after the more perfected conversion of his nation.

He finishes by saying that he was sending him some small presents, which he must accept with the benediction of St. Peter, and he invokes Almighty God to guard and perfect him in grace, to extend his life, and eventually to receive him into His heavenly congregation.¹

In another letter, addressed to Queen Ethelberga (*i.e.* Bertha or Bercta), written in the same month, the Pope mentions that Laurence the priest and Peter the monk had reported how she had shown great kindness toward his most reverend brother and fellow-bishop, Augustine, and succoured him in his work, and he blesses Almighty God for having reserved the conversion of the Anglians to be her reward. He compares her very aptly to the Empress Helena, who had kindled the fire of faith in the heart of Constantine. He then adds,

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 37; *Barmby*, xi. 66.

rather enigmatically, that it should have been her duty for a long time past to incline the heart of her husband by her good influence and excellent prudence as a good Christian, to have predisposed him to follow the faith (which she cherished) for the good of his kingdom and his own soul, to the end that the joys of heaven might be the reward of his and the nation's conversion. This should have been neither slow of accomplishment nor difficult. He adds that now was a suitable time, and she should begin to make reparation for wasted years, and bids her strengthen his mind, by continual exhortation, in the love of God (*mentem . . . in dilectione Christianae . . . roborate*), and kindle his heart for the fullest conversion of his nation. Her good deeds, he tells her, were known not only at Rome and in divers places, but had even come to the ear of the Most Serene Emperor at Constantinople. He ends by commending Augustine and his companions to her care, and, as in the case of the King, with wishing her temporal and heavenly blessings. He addresses her as "Your Glory" (*vestra gloria*).¹

From some of the phrases in this letter it has been not reasonably argued that Æthelberht's conversion had only been nominal and perfunctory. Dr. Barmby would explain it by supposing that the letter has been dated too late, and that the King had not been converted at all when it was written; but as it mentions Laurence and Peter, Augustine's

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 35; Barmby, xi. 29.

envoys, and also calls Augustine a bishop, this is hardly possible, and Ewald and Hartmann certainly date the letter in 601. The Pope probably refers to Bertha's lack of zeal in the days before Augustine's arrival.

With these letters to the King and Queen of Kent, Gregory sent others to Augustine himself. In one of them, dated the 1st of June 601, and which is very rhetorical, and full of scriptural quotations, the Pope begins by apostrophising the Saviour, "through whose love we seek in Britain for brethren whom we knew not, and by whose gift we find those whom without knowing them we sought." It goes on to speak of the joy that sprang up in the heart of all the faithful at Rome when the Anglians by the grace of God and the labours of the Fraternity had been converted to the *True Faith*. As Christ had chosen unlettered men for His disciples, so He now deigned to work mighty works (miracles) among the Anglians by weak men. But while there was ground for joy, there was ground also for fear of undue elation ; for while God had displayed great miracles through his (*i.e.* Augustine's) love for the nation which He had willed to be chosen, he must beware of presumption, lest while exalted in honour outwardly he should at the same time fall inwardly into vainglory. This maxim he presses home by some apt Bible passages. Because he had received even the gift of doing miracles, Augustine must never forget what he was, and must treat the honour as granted not for himself, but for the sake

of those he had been sent to save.¹ While it was true that the apostles, when reporting their success to their Master, said that even the devils were subject to them in His name,² he bade them not rejoice in this, but because their names were written in heaven.³ Gregory's statement in this letter, that Augustine had wrought miracles, is very characteristic. The only miracle distinctly mentioned by Bede was the healing of a blind man (ii. 2),⁴ but he (ii. 1) implies that others of the mission also wrought miracles. This is expressly stated by Gocelin,⁵ who needs a very small excuse for amplifying a story or legend. In another letter to Augustine, dated 22nd June 601, the Pope sends instructions to him how he wishes him to organise his great charge. "Inasmuch," he says, "as the new Church of the Angles has been brought to the grace of Almighty God through His bountifulness and thy labours, we grant thee the use of the pallium (for the solemnisation of Mass only), and so that thou mayest ordain bishops in twelve places to be subject to thy jurisdiction, with the view and intention that a Bishop of London should be always elected in future by his own synod, and receive the pallium from the Holy and Apostolical See." To the city of York (Eburacam) the Pope desired Augustine to send as bishop some one whom he might judge fit to be ordained, so that, if that city and the neighbouring districts (*cum finitimiis locis*) should receive

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 36; Barmby, xi. 28.

² Luke x. 17.

³ Luke x. 20.

⁴ *Vide infra*, p. 162.

⁵ *Vit. Aug.* 20.

the Word of God, he also might ordain twelve bishops, and so enjoy the dignity of a Metropolitan. To the Bishop of York also, if his own life should be prolonged and God willed, he proposed to send the pallium. "Nevertheless," continues Gregory, "he is to be subjected to the control of thy Fraternity, but after thy death let him be over the bishops whom he shall have ordained, so that he shall not in any wise be subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London." As between the Bishops of London and York, he who was first ordained was to be deemed the senior, but he enjoined that they should arrange matters which might have to be done in zeal for Christ, with a common counsel, and with concordant action. They should be of one mind, and work without disagreement with one another.

He provided, lastly, that all the bishops whom either he or the Bishop of York should ordain should be subject to him (Augustine) during his life, as well as all the "sacerdotes" of Britain,¹ "so that," as he says, "they may learn the form of right belief and good living from the tongue and life of thy holiness." The letter is dated in the nineteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Mauricius Tiberius, the eighteenth year after the consulship of the same lord, and on the 10th of the kalends of July, Indiction 4 (*i.e.* 22nd June 601).²

¹ Up to this point Gregory had designated bishops in his letters by the word "episcopi." He now applies the term "sacerdotes" to those of the Britons. Apparently he was not quite certain of the status of the bishops in the British Church.

² See *Bede*, i. 29; *E. and H.* xi. 39; *Barmby*, xi. 65.

This very interesting and important letter, which had most far-reaching consequences, shows the prudence and wisdom of the great Pope. He never contemplated planting a Metropolitan See in an obscure village in Kent which by accident happened to be the residence and capital of the Kentish King, but in the midst of the largest and most important city in southern England, London, where it ought, in fact, to have been; while he intended that a second Metropolitan should be placed in the great city on the Ouse, York. During Augustine's life his dominion over the whole Christian colony which he had founded was not to be disturbed, but after his death each province was to be independent, and the precedence of the two Metropolitans was to be governed by the seniority of their ordination. It is interesting also to notice that the Pope provided (in addition to the regular Provincial Synods, for which he makes no special provision) for a General Council of the English Church to be held as required. As Professor Bright again says: "He contemplates, with a sanguine hopefulness as to the probable extent of the missionary successes, the foundation of twelve dioceses to be subject to Augustine as Metropolitan, so that the Bishop of London, meaning evidently the successor of St. Augustine, might in future be always consecrated by his own synod of suffragans, over whom he was to preside as Archbishop."¹ In a well-known letter, written in 798 by Coenwulf, King of Mercia, to Pope

¹ *Op. cit.* 75.

Leo the Third, the former reminds the Pope that Gregory intended London to be the Metropolitan See, but because Augustine died and was buried at Canterbury it seemed good to the Witan or General Council (*visum est cunctis gentis nostrae sapientibus*) that the "Metropolitan honour" should abide there.¹

In regard to these regulations, which gave rise to bitter feuds and litigation in later times between the Sees of Canterbury, London, and York, Dean Stanley has some interesting remarks. He recalls the fact that the dioceses in England are so much larger than abroad, where there is generally a Bishop's See in every large town, and a bishop is rather like an incumbent of a large parish than a bishop. This peculiar feature in England arose from Gregory's order to divide the country into twenty-four bishoprics. Britain was to him an unknown island. Probably he thought it might be about the size of Sicily or Sardinia, and that twenty-four bishops would suffice. Hence the great size of the English bishoprics. Eventually there were twelve in the Archdiocese of Canterbury, but only four in that of York.

The concluding paragraph of the letter we are discussing, in which, in addition to the bishops Gregory had constituted for the English, he also puts "all the bishops of Britain" (*omnes Britanniae sacerdotes*) under Augustine, was hardly tactful.

Among the famous questions put by St.

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 522; Bright, *op. cit.* 106, note 4.

Augustine to the Pope, the eighth one dealt with the way he was to treat the British bishops. The Pope knew from his correspondence with Columban that on certain matters of discipline and practice the Celts differed from the standards recognised at Rome, and he no doubt wished that they should be induced to conform, since very often small differences of ritual and practice are more conspicuous and cause more friction than larger differences on more important matters. The Pope made a great difference in his advice to Augustine in regard to the Frankish and British bishops respectively. While he bids him treat the former as having full authority, and tells him that he must beware of encroaching on their rights, he continues, "as for all the bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care, that the unlearned may be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, and the perverse corrected by authority."¹ This was a very large "order." It was one which his messenger and representative had not the necessary gifts to make palatable and acceptable to an obstinate, proud, conservative race, which had lately steered its own fortunes independently, and whose dealings with Rome had been too sporadic and few for a long time, to make such a course acceptable, unless it was presented in a very gentle and attractive way. This claim of supremacy Augustine, with the aid of Æthelberht, now proceeded to try and enforce, but with very scant success due largely

¹ *Bede*, i. ch. 27; *Resp.* 7.

to his tactlessness and arrogance. Haddan says: "There is little or no evidence that the Celtic Church was in antagonism to either the Roman or any other Church before Augustine made it so. It had been simply severed by distance and by a broad barrier of heathenism" (and may I add of Arianism) "from any practical communication with other Churches, and had developed accordingly after its own inward powers." It had remained largely as it was, while Rome had grown. By leaving Caerleon alone when he provided for the foundation of the sees of London and York, Gregory showed that he did not wish to interfere with the Church of Wales beyond making the Bishop of London (where he had intended that the southern archbishop should have his see) its Metropolitan, as he may have been before the Romans left the island. If Augustine had followed the policy of his master and teacher Gregory, instead of insisting so much on an acceptance of the Roman rite, there would probably have been no prolonged and bitter feeling. As we can see from the letters of Columban to Gregory, there was no ill-feeling towards the patriarchal jurisdiction of Rome as such among the Celts. It was to Augustine as Archbishop and not to Gregory as Pope that the Welsh took exception.

The greatest of the Celtic monk-theologians had no hesitation in speaking to the Pope in very deferential terms. In his letter to Gregory, Columban, who was an Irish monk living at the monastery he had founded at Luxeuil, in the Vosges

mountains in Burgundy, doubtless represents the point of view taken by the Celts generally of the Pope's jurisdiction. He calls him "Holy Lord and Father in Christ," and "Holy Pope," and says: "It does not befit my place or rank to suggest anything in the way of discussion to thy great authority, nor that my Western letters should ridiculously solicit thee, who sittest legitimately on the seat of the Apostle and Keybearer, Peter"; but he adds: "Consider not so much worthless me, in this matter as many masters, both departed and now living." He specially refers to St. Jerome, and bids him take heed not to create a dissonance between himself and that great man, "lest we should be on all sides in a strait as to whether we should agree with thee or with him," and he bids him further beware of creating the scandal of diversity. "For," he says, "I frankly acknowledge to thee that any one who goes against the authority of Saint Jerome will be one to be repudiated as a heretic among the Churches of the West, since they accommodate their faith in all respects unhesitatingly to him with regard to the Divine Scriptures."¹ Dr. Barmby says very truly that in this letter, as also in a subsequent one written to Pope Boniface iv. on the same subject, "though addressing the Bishop of Rome in language of the utmost deference and recognising his high position, he shows no disposition to submit unreservedly to his authority."²

¹ See Barmby's *Epistles of Gregory*, ix. 127.

² *Ib.* vol. ii. p. 282, note.

There were several matters in which the Celtic Churches followed another “Use” than the Roman one, and the want of conformity was no doubt a grave inconvenience in view of the common enemy, the surrounding pagans ; and it was natural that the Pope and his missionary should wish to bring the two usages into agreement if possible. The matters which were deemed serious were, in fact, three.

The first one had regard to the time of celebrating the great Paschal festival which commemorates the Resurrection of the Saviour. This festival, it was universally agreed, should be preceded by a fast, and the fast and festival together formed the Christian Passover, and corresponded with the Passover of the Jews.

The Jewish rule was to kill their Passover on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, entirely irrespective of what day of the week it was, and certain Christians, especially the Church of Ephesus and its daughters, therefore held that this fourteenth day was obligatory, and were known as Quartodecimans in consequence. Inasmuch as Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week, it was held by the rest of the Christian world that the Feast of the Resurrection ought to be always on a Sunday, irrespective of its being any particular day of the month, and so it was decided by the Council of Nicæa. According to Constantine’s letter written after the Nicene Council (the decree of which on the subject is lost), that famous synod also decided that under no circum-

stances should the Christian Easter Day coincide with the Jewish Passover. This excluded the fourteenth of the month as a possible Easter Day under all circumstances.

As Dr. Bright says, it was ordained (at Nicæa) that Easter Sunday should always and everywhere be a Sunday *following* the Equinox, which would imply that it should similarly follow and never coincide with the fourteenth day of the Paschal month. . . . According to the orthodox reckoning, the fifteenth was the first day of the month which could legitimately be an Easter Sunday ; this method, starting at the fifteenth and going on to the twenty-first as limits, kept clear of the Jewish day. In case the fourteenth day of the Paschal month happened to be a Sunday, the Easter celebration was deferred to the following Sunday, *i.e.* the 21st.

The Celtic Churches had a practice of their own, which they no doubt inherited from early times, and which had been used at Rome a century and a half before. They have been unwittingly styled Quartodecimans, as if they followed the practice of the Jews and of their imitators at Ephesus.

In the first place, their Easter Day was always on a Sunday, like that of the Roman Church, while the Jews and Quartodecimans always held it on the fourteenth, whether that day was a Sunday or not. On the other hand, the latter had no scruples about holding their feast at the same time as the Jews held their Passover, and when the first full

moon after the Equinox happened on a Sunday, they made that Easter Day.

The calculation of the proper time for keeping the Easter feast was complicated, therefore, by two elements which were not present to the Jews in settling their Passover. It must be on a Sunday, and it must be after the fourteenth of the month. In addition to this, it must conform to the earlier rite in that it was to be held in the third week of the first month. The first month for Paschal purposes was the first in which the full moon fell after the Vernal Equinox. There was considerable difficulty in calculating the right day. This arose from accommodating the lunar year to the solar year, in view of the periodical vicissitudes in the motion of the two luminaries in question. The first point was to ascertain how often and when, a full moon recurred on the same day of the month, and a series of cycles was invented in order to discover this. Hippolytus made such a cycle of sixteen years, which became famous and was inscribed on the marble chair on which his statue was placed;¹ Dionysius of Alexandria adopted a cycle of eight years, and Anatolius of Laodicæa one of nineteen. It was the principle of all three that Easter must follow the Equinox. At Alexandria the Equinox was dated on 21st March, and at Rome on 18th March, "and it thus happened," says Bright, "that between A.D. 325 and 343 the Roman Easter fell six times on a different day from the Alexandrian." In 343

¹ Bright, 87, note 4.

the Sardican Council attempted a settlement which was not in effect observed. Two successive bishops of Alexandria, Theophilus and Cyril, framed Paschal tables based on the nineteen years' cycle; and although Rome for some time used the cycle of eighty-four years,¹ which had superseded that of sixteen, and was a little improved by Sulpicius Severus, it has been conjectured, says Hefele, that Pope Hilary adopted the better scheme which had been framed by Victorius of Aquitaine, an abbot at Rome in 456-7. Finally, in 527, one still more accurate and completely in accordance with Alexandrian calculations was proposed by Dionysius Exiguus, and accepted by Rome and Italy.² On the other hand, the Victorian cycle long held its ground in Gaul, and the old cycle of eighty-four years was retained by the British and Irish Churches.³

A second matter in which there was divergence between the Celtic and Roman usage was in regard to the tonsure. It was an early practice in the Church for ecclesiastics to cut their hair short, it being deemed more ascetic, and some ancient ascetics shaved the head altogether. The custom was supposed to be carrying out the injunction in 1 Cor. xi. 14. The practice gradually grew of making the tonsure of the hair more regular and systematic, and it took the form of carefully shaving the back of the head and leaving a circle

¹ Bright, 88; Hefele, *Councils*, i. 328.

² Hefele, i. 330.

³ Bright, 88 and 89.

or crown of hair all round. This fashion prevailed in Italy and Gaul. Among the Celts the tonsure had taken another form. They cut off the whole of the back hair from ear to ear, leaving a semi-circle of hair on the front of the head, while the back of the head was bare and bald. This practice seems to have been as old as the time of Patrick, who was called the Tailcend or Shaven-headed.¹ This tonsure, according to Dr. Bright, is represented on the head of St. Mummolinus of Noyon, who had been a monk at St. Columban's monastery of Luxeuil.² It is a memorable fact that Gregory of Tours tells us the Saxons of the district of Bayeux used both the same tonsure and ecclesiastical vestments as the people of Britanny.³

There was a third matter in which the Celts differed from the Roman usage, doubtless following a more primitive custom, namely, in regard to baptism. Bede does not tell us what the Celtic peculiarity was, nor can we do more than conjecture.

As is well known, a primitive method of performing the sacrament of baptism was to employ a single immersion only, and not three, as was practised at Rome. The former method was in vogue in Spain, and the correspondence of Gregory with his friend Leander, the Archbishop of Seville,

¹ See Todd's *St. Patrick*, 411; Stokes, *Tripartite Life*, i. p. clxxxiv.

² Bright, *op. cit.* 92, note 6; Mabillon, *Ann. Bened.* i. 529.

³ *Op. cit.* x. 9.

shows that he allowed the practice under the conditions prevailing in Spain.¹ "The early Gallican books leave the practice open, in the Breton diocese of St. Malo single immersion was still retained as late as the seventeenth century";² and it was distinctly said to be the custom of the Celtic Churches. The practice being so widespread, it would seem improbable that the Roman party should have made it a cause of sharp dissension at Augustine's conference.

While it has, indeed, been supposed by some that the objections of Augustine were directed to this difficulty, others have thought that it was to the omission of chrism in baptism by the Irish, which was alleged to be their practice by Lanfranc in a letter to the Irish King Tirlagh. Wilson says that the use of chrism in baptism is clearly directed in the Gallican books and in the Stowe Missal. Others, again, argued that it was the absence of confirmation. In support of this view, St. Bernard of Clairvaux is quoted as saying that the Irish at the time of St. Malachi's reforms neglected the rite of confirmation.³ It may be noted, says Wilson, that the Gallican books contain no directions that the baptized person should forthwith be confirmed. "But," he says, "the direction is not always found, even in Roman books; and its fulfilment would depend on the presence of the bishop."⁴

¹ See Howorth, *Life of Saint Gregory the Great*, p. 136.

² Mason, *The Mission of Augustus*, diss. by Wilson, 249.

³ St. Bernard, *Vita Malachiae*, c. 3.

⁴ *Op. cit.* 249 and 250.

It has, again, been surmised that Augustine's objection was not in regard to an omission but of an addition, and is to be found in the usage of washing the feet of the newly baptized after the unction with chrism. This custom seems to have been usual in the Gallican rite, and is recognised in the Stowe Missal. It was not in use at Rome. In Spain it was prohibited by the Council of Elvira, in 305. Mr. Wilson says of this view, which was supported by Dr. Rock and Mr. Warren, that it is unlikely that a custom commonly received in Gaul would have been treated by Augustine as a thing intolerable in Britain. He himself suggests that the invalidity of the British rite was perhaps due to the fact that it would seem not to have included an invocation of the Trinity. At all events, in a letter of Pope Zacharias to St. Boniface,¹ it is asserted that a decree had been made in an English synod (apparently referred by the writer to the time of Augustine) declaring the nullity of baptism "without the invocation of the Trinity."²

Augustine was not unreasonable in wishing, if possible, to secure uniformity in these matters, even if the British Church did preserve a more primitive usage, which is probable.

Let us now turn to the famous conferences. Bede tells us that, with the help (*adjutorio usus*) of King Æthelberht, Augustine summoned a confer-

¹ Jaffé, *Mon. Maguntiana*, p. 185.

² Wilson, *op. cit.* 251; see also Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 51 and 52.

ence of the bishops and¹ doctors from the nearest provinces of the Britons to a conference. Palgrave interpreted the words *adjutorio usus* as implying a good deal. He says: "Who called the prelates together? did they not obey a Saxon king? If we give credit to Bede, we must admit that they were subjected to Ethelbert of Kent, the Bretwalda, by whose authority the synod was summoned."² Mr. Plummer similarly argues that "Ethelbert's supremacy would seem to have extended, not only over the Saxon kingdom, but over the Britons also."³

The date of the conference is discussed by Haddan and Stubbs. They say it is fixed to a later year than 601, by the receipt of "the responsions" of Augustine which determined the latter's position relatively to the British bishops. As they were received late in 601,⁴ this makes it pretty certain that it took place sometime in 602 or 603, a view concurred in by Plummer.⁵

Bede does not tell us the names of the British bishops or doctors, nor have we any means of knowing what they were, save quite late unreliable legends. It has only been realised in recent years that bishops, such as we know them—that is, diocesan bishops—were at this time as unknown among the Celts as were parochial clergy. There were, in fact, neither dioceses nor parishes at this time among the Britons and the Irish. The Church

¹ In Bede *sive=et.*

² *Eng. Com.* p. 454.

³ *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 73.

⁴ *Op. cit.* iii. 40.

⁵ *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 73.

was entirely organised on a monastic plan, and the large monasteries, each of them the centre of light to a separate community or tribe, took the place of the modern dioceses. Of these the abbots were the heads. Each large monastery had a bishop, but he was not the head of the community, but only the senior ecclesiastical personage whose presence and whose help was necessary for the performance of certain ecclesiastical functions ; and it is virtually certain that the seven bishops referred to by Bede were men of this stamp, and in no sense diocesan bishops. The opposite view, which has led in much later times to various attempts to locate the bishops in question in certain sees, and to identify the latter with sees still existing, is futile. The sources of these conjectures are to be found among the very suspicious documents known as the Iolo MSS. (143 and 548), which belong to quite a late date, and are full of mistakes, guesses, and sophistications. The statements in them have been sifted with acumen by my friend, Mr. Willis Bund, and I will abstract what he says :—

“ The list in the Iolo MSS. which gives seven bishops—1, Hereford ; 2, Llandaff ; 3, Padarn ; 4, Bangor ; 5, St. Asaph ; 6, Wig ; 7, Morganwg—is obviously the guess of some Welsh antiquary of much later date. That a bishop’s see existed at Hereford in 601 is opposed to all historical evidence—the Saxon See of Hereford having been carved out of Mercia, and not out of Wales. At this time

the so-called Bishop of Llandaff was Dubricius, who died in 612;¹ but although we have tolerably copious lives of Dubricius and of his successor, Teilo, there is no mention of the so-called conference. At this time it is doubtful if there was a Bishop of Padarn, as Cynog the bishop had become Bishop of St. Davids. Bangor is said to have been founded by Deniol, who died in 584;² but no record of any bishop at this time exists, and it is probable the Bishop of Bangor has been confounded with the Abbot of Bangor-Iscoed. The existence of St. Asaph as a bishopric at this date is most doubtful. It is true the alleged founder, St. Kentigern, was alive; he died in 612; but his connection with it, and his placing St. Asa there on his return from Scotland, are monastic legends of the twelfth century. It is also most doubtful if any such see as Wig ever existed, and the same remark applies to Morganwg.³ Apart from these difficulties, it would seem, as Mr. Willis Bund says, that the first conference was essentially a South Wales gathering, that the main purpose of the second one was to consult the North Wales men, and that the supposed intervention of bishops from North Wales at the first conference was an invention of a later date. If there were seven bishops only at the second conference, it is unlikely that there were so many at the first one.³

¹ *Ann. Camb.* and *Liber Land.* 81.

² *Ann. Camb.* *an. cit.*

³ Willis Bund, *The Celtic Church of Wales*, 246-248.

Bede distinctly implies that the bishops and doctors in question were not drawn from all Wales. He describes them as having come from "*proximae Brettonum provinciae*," suggesting that they came from South Wales only, and when the conference was adjourned it was in order that they might secure a more complete representation "*ut secundo synodus pluribus adventibus fieret*"; and then goes on to say that seven bishops attended and many learned men, and especially the Abbot of Bangor (*Bancornaburg*), Dinoot.¹ The special mention of this abbot points him out as the real head of the British Church, and also points very much to the conclusion I have mentioned, that the Welsh Church at this time was based on a monastic, and not an episcopal, organisation.

Let us now turn to the conference, and first as to its place of meeting. Bede says it was near the province of the Britons, in a place which "is still called in the Anglian speech 'Augustinae Ac' (or Augustine's Oak)," and was on the frontiers of the Hwiccians and the West Saxons."

The shade of a great umbrageous tree was a natural rendezvous, and equally a protection against fierce sunlight and rain. Palgrave picturesquely says: "The oak of Guernica, yet flourishing in verdant age, saw the States of Biscay assemble under its branches for more than a thousand years . . . and very many of the trysting-places of the English

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. ch. 2.

Courts were marked in like manner by the oak, the beech, or the elm, the living monuments of Nature, surviving through many a generation of the human race.”¹

Augustine’s Oak has been traditionally identified with Aust, or Aust Cliff, on the Severn near the Bristol Channel, which seems not improbable. Aust, say Haddan and Stubbs, derived its name from a ford, *Trajectus Augusti*. It is called *Æt Austin* in a charter of 691–692.² At Aust there is a well-known ford, where Edward the Elder afterwards had an interview with Leolinn, Prince of Wales.³

On the other hand, Plummer says: “Mr. Moberley kindly sends me the following note: ‘Perhaps the spot called The Oak in Down Ampney, near Cricklade. This would be on the border line of the Hwiccias and Wessex, about a mile north of the Thames at the north-east corner of the Hwiccias, at the nearest point to Kent from which Augustine came. A well close by has the reputation of curing sore eyes, which recalls Augustine’s miracle in which sore eyes were cured.’”⁴

Bishop Brown argues in favour of the same place. He says: “Every man would like to know if possible where it was that the tall, gaunt, self-satisfied man from Italy met the thick-set, self-satisfied men from Wales.” Following the statement of Bede, that

¹ *Eng. Com.* 139.

² *K.C.D.* xxxii.

³ Stevenson, *Bede*, i. 99, note.

⁴ Plummer’s *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 74.

the conference was held under the shade of the wide-spreading branches of a big oak, he adds picturesquely: "Time after time we have illustrations of the fact in our early history that a great conspicuous tree, not of any great height perhaps, but spreading its thick-leaved branches far and wide, was recognised as a regular trysting-place." He interprets Bede's words that the meeting took place on the border of the Hwiccians and the West Saxons, as meaning that it took place somewhere on the eastern border of Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and Warwickshire, and, drawing a line from Swindon in Wessex to Cirencester in Gloucestershire, he fixes on the point where the line cuts the county boundary at Cricklade on the Thames and not the Severn as the place where the conference really met. I cannot myself think it probable that the suspicious and jealous British bishops would hear of such a gathering taking place in the midst of their enemy's country, rather than on some neutral spot on the frontier of both peoples; nor can I rid myself of the very probable etymology generally accepted as explaining the name *Aust*. It is, further, pretty certain that the relative position of the Hwiccians and West Saxons was then very different to what it afterwards became.

Wherever the meeting took place, it was a memorable event. According to Bede, Augustine began by trying to persuade the Welshmen by friendly admonitions "to hold Catholic peace with

himself and to undertake in conjunction with him the work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen for the Lord's sake."¹

We may rest assured that the case for the Celtic bishops and monks was stated with learning and ingenuity, for they were at this time an accomplished class, and probably quite as learned as the Italian monks. In regard to the difference about Easter, we know pretty well what their case was, for it was argued by one of their number, St. Columban, in a letter written to Pope Gregory himself. In this he urged, first, that when Easter was put off till the 21st or 22nd of the month, it was putting it off to a time of preponderating darkness (*i.e.* the moon had then entered her last quarter). This argument, he said, had been urged in a canon of St. Anatolius (Bishop of Laodicea in 269), whose work had been approved by St. Jerome.² He urged, again, that the seven days of the Lord's Passover, during which it could alone be eaten, were according to the Law to be numbered from the 14th of the moon to the 20th. "For a moon on its 21st or 22nd day is out of the dominion of light, as having risen at that time after midnight, and when darkness overcomes light." It was impious, he said, thus to keep the solemnity of light, and he asks the Pope why he keeps a dark Easter, and denounces the error in this matter which Victorius (*i.e.* Victorius of Aquitaine,

¹ *Bede*, ii. ch. 2.

² "This Paschal Canon is now admitted to have been a forgery, and perhaps designed to support the Celtic rule" (Bright, 91).

who lived in the middle of the fifth century) had introduced into Gaul, who calculated a cycle that was accepted by Pope Leo, and indeed until that of Dionysius Exiguus was introduced in 527.

If the Pope in the matter was content with the authority of his predecessors, and especially of Pope Leo, let him remember that, according to Eccles. ix. 4, a living dog is worth more than a dead lion, and a living saint (*i.e.* Gregory himself) might correct what had not been corrected by another who came before him; and he bids him remember that "our masters and the Irish ancients, who were philosophers and most wise computationists in constructing calculations, held Victorius as rather worthy of ridicule and as not carrying authority." In regard to the argument that we ought not to keep the Passover with the Jews, as Pope Victor had urged, none of the Easterns accepted the view. He held there was no warrant in Scripture for such a statement, and the Jews, having no Temple outside Jerusalem, could not be said to keep the Passover as prescribed, anywhere. Besides, the Jews did not fix the 14th day of the moon for the feast, but God Himself had chosen it as the day for the passage of the Red Sea, and if God intended Christians not to keep the Passover with the Jews, He would have enjoined on the latter a fast of nine days, so that the beginning of our solemnity should not exceed the end of theirs. By extending the fast to the 21st or 22nd, it was adding, at the

instance of men, two days to the period fixed by God at seven days.¹

What the details of the long dispute referred to by Bede as having taken place between Augustine and the British bishops were we do not know. Neither the prayers and exhortations nor the reproaches of Augustine and his companions availed with the Welshmen, and, as Bede says, "they preferred their own traditions to those of all the Churches which were in agreement with each other in Christ."

We cannot altogether wonder at the attitude adopted by the Celtic monks and bishops towards the Roman mission. As Haddan says : "Augustine had no right to demand that the representative of the invaders, barely established in the land, and still almost wholly heathens, the insecure occupant of a petty mission should step at once into the position of even the British Archbishop of London or York . . . or that the missionary bishop of an invading tribe, whose permanent occupation of the island must have been far from a recognised fact in the minds of the British, and whose countrymen at the very time were ravaging and destroying the British soil on both sides of the river where the conference was held, should claim the admission of his primacy from British bishops. These were neither of them very self-evident conclusions either from Church law or from common sense. The Britons might well think that a turn of fortune

¹ See Barmby's *Letters of Gregory*, vol. ii. p. 282, etc.

would speedily bring a British monarch back to London again. . . . Why should the Church surrender hopes which the State still maintained?"¹

It is at all events clear that the first discussion at Augustine's Oak was not very fruitful.

St. Augustine ended it by offering to appeal to God for a Divine sign instructing them what tradition they should follow, and by what path men were to hasten to enter His Kingdom. He proposed that some afflicted man should be produced, that each party should pray for his recovery, and that the side whose prayer was answered was to be deemed to be in the right. His opponents having consented, though unwillingly, a blind man of *Anglian race* (mark that) was brought forward. At the prayer of the British priests no answer was forthcoming, whereas, when Augustine fell on his knees and prayed, the blind man was cured. The British are said to have admitted the cogency of the test and its result, and that Augustine's teaching was right, but they said they could not abandon their ancient practice without consulting their people; and they asked that a second synod might be summoned, when a larger number might be present.² We must always remember that this version of what happened comes from an avowed enemy of the Britons.

"The miracle here reported," says Dr. Bright, "looks like an interpolation in the narrative, and it would seem as if the delegates to the second

¹ Haddan's *Remains*, 315 and 316.

² *Bede*, lib. ii. ch. 2.

conference, on both sides, ignored it."¹ Hook treats it as a Canterbury tale.

To this second conference, which it has been generally considered was held at the same place, although we have no definite statement on the subject, there went, according to Bede, seven British bishops and many learned men, mainly from their most noble monastery (*plures viri doctissimi, maxime de nobilissimo eorum monasterio*), which in the language of the Anglians was called Bancornaburg (a contraction of Bancorwarenaburg, *i.e.* the people of the burgh of Bancor²), over which the Abbot Dinoot is then said to have presided. Dinoot, according to Rhys, is the Welsh equivalent of the Latin Donatus.³

Those who attended this second conference, went on their way thither to consult a holy and discreet man, who led the life of an anchorite, and who was versed in their traditions, and conferred with him as to whether or not they ought to abandon their own practice at the instance of Augustine. He told them that if Augustine was a man of God they ought to follow him. "How are we to know?" they said. He thereupon quoted the passage, "Bear My yoke and learn from Me, who am humble of heart." "If Augustine, therefore, is gentle and humble, make sure he carries Christ's yoke; but if he is proud, it shows he is not from God, and we must disregard him." "How are we to test this?" asked they.

¹ See Bright, 94.

² Celtic Britain, 310.

² Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 75.

“Let the Prior of the Abbey and his followers approach him. If he rises from his seat and goes to meet you, then is he a humble man. If not, but treats you all contemptuously, then is he a proud one ; and as you are the more numerous, you in turn can show your contempt.” They followed his counsel. Augustine remained seated.

The story, as told by Bede, reads naïvely, and is probably founded on a good tradition. At all events, the effect was that the Britons were angry (*mox in iram conversi sunt*), and noticing his pride began to contradict everything he said.¹ As Dr. Bright says : “Even according to Bede’s own showing they clearly did not deem themselves bound to accept the exhortations of a bishop sent from Rome, and thus far a representative of Rome, *as such*. They treated the question as open—Shall we adopt his ways or shall we not ?”²

Augustine now addressed them, and apparently surrendering minor points like the tonsure, in which the Britons differed from the Universal Church (*immo universalis ecclesiae contraria geritis*), he said he would be content if they would concede three : 1. The time of the Paschal feast ; 2. in regard to baptism, that they would conform to the practice of the Roman and Apostolic Church (*juxta morem sanctae Romanae et apostolicae ecclesiae compleatis*) ; and 3. that they would join with them in preaching the word to the heathen Anglians. To these they would not consent, nor would they accept

¹ *Bede*, ii. 2.

² *Op. cit.* 95.

Augustine for an archbishop, arguing that if he received them sitting he would hold them in further contempt if they began to obey him. It must be said that, apart from his haughty attitude, reason and good sense seem to have been largely on the side of the Roman missionary in the matter, and that his opponents showed as little conciliation in their attitude as he did. On receiving their unyielding reply, Augustine adopted a minatory attitude. "If you are unwilling to accept peace with brethren, you will have to accept war from enemies; and if you will not preach the way of life to the nation of the Anglians, from their hands you will suffer the punishment of death." This statement, doubtless made by Augustine in a moment of haste, has been interpreted as a deliberate prophecy which brought about its own fulfilment, and has involved him in a good deal of obloquy. It has been suggested by many polemical writers that he actually inspired the massacre of the Bangor monks, which happened some years later, and this seems to have been the theory in Wales, for Geoffrey of Monmouth says that *Æthelfrid, King of Northumbria, who slaughtered the monks, was incited to do so by Æthelberht (Edelbertus Edel-fridum instimulavit)*.¹

Bishop Browne reports a Welsh tradition that Cadvan (who was a king in Wales at this time), when he was told that the Romans had customs which differed from those of the Britons, but held

¹ Geoffrey of Monmouth, viii. 4.

the same faith, remarked that if the Cymry believed all that the Romans believed, it was as strong a reason for Rome obeying them as for them obeying Rome.

In regard to the responsibility of Augustine for the massacre at Bangor, nothing is plainer than that *Æthelfrid*'s savage campaign against the Britons was inspired by the fact that they had given shelter to his rival, King *Ædwin*, who was probably housed and cherished by the monks of Bangor, and not directly by any prophecy of Augustine. He was a ruthless heathen, and not very likely to be affected in his opinion by Christian priests. It nevertheless remains the fact that Bede expresses no shame or remorse either in regard to the ill-timed prophecy or to its cruel fulfilment, and seems to exult in it as an exercise of Divine judgment (*Quod ita per omnia, ut praedixerat, divino agente judicio patratum est*).¹ It will be noted that here, as a few lines further on, where Bede speaks of Augustine's *praesagium*, he treats what the latter said as a prophecy.

Mr. Haddan contrasts the results of Augustine's proud bearing and tactlessness with those of the cordial conduct of St. Eligius towards Columban, which eventually led to the ending of the controversy as it existed on the other side of the Channel, in the gradual absorption of obnoxious or singular customs there. "A plate," he says, "in Mabillon gives us both the Latin and Celtic

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. ch. ii.

tonsures, as worn respectively in the seventh century by two loving coadjutors in the missionary work of the north-east of France at that time.”¹

Dr. Hunt has some shrewd comments on these transactions. “While,” he says, “Bede’s story of the consultation with the hermit represents a genuine tradition, Augustine’s lack of courtesy would scarcely have had much weight with the Britons had they not already determined on the course which they adopted. Their rejection of Augustine certainly involved a renunciation of the authority of the Roman See, but that result was merely incidental; nothing so far as we know was said about it, and the past history of the British Church, specially in connection with the date of Easter, shows no reason for believing that obedience to Rome would, in itself, have been distasteful to them. They were strongly attached to their traditions. . . . It was race hatred that kept the Britons from preaching the Gospel to the English, and exaggerated their feelings with regard to ecclesiastical usages which were in their eyes hallowed by a sentiment of nationality, specially keen and sensitive among a depressed and conquered people. It is not too much to say that they rejected Augustine at least as much because he came to them as Archbishop of the English, as because he demanded that they should conform to the Roman usages in the computation of Easter and in the ritual of baptism.”²

¹ *Op. cit.* 314.

² Hunt, *op. cit.* 37.

In regard to their objection to sharing in the evangelisation of the Anglians, it is at all events singular, as has been remarked, that while the Scots (*i.e.* Irish) were *par excellence* the missionaries of nearly all Europe north of the Alps, and in particular of all Saxon England north of the Thames, hardly a Cumbrian, British, Cornish, or Armorican missionary to any non-Celtic nation is mentioned anywhere.¹ As regards the Britons the last sentence is an exaggeration. As Plummer says, Nynian is a notable exception, and there are others.² So much for Augustine's negotiations with the British clergy. That wonderful dealer in fables, Gocelin, tells us that on his return home Augustine passed through Dorsetshire, where the peasants threw fishes' tails at him and his companions, and were punished by having tails attached to themselves and their descendants ever after.³

These events doubtless took place after the return of Augustine's embassy to the Pope already named. Bede tells us that in the year 604, Augustine, whom he here styles "Archbishop of Britain," ordained two bishops. At this ordination he acted alone. The Pope had in his instructions to him given his countenance to this otherwise irregular proceeding on the ground of its being a case of necessity, there being no assistant bishops available. The regulation was, in fact, of no moment in regard to

¹ See Haddan and Stubbs, i. 154.

² *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 76; see also Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, 172 and 173.

³ Hardy's *Catalogue*, i. 193.

the validity of the ordination, and had only been introduced to prevent scandals and favouritism, etc., by securing the adhesion of the other prelates of the province. The Pope, who in such a matter was a bishop and nothing more, and who doubtless followed the primitive practice, has always ordained other bishops without assistants.

The two bishops thus ordained were Mellitus and Justus, both of them among the new recruits. Mellitus is referred to in more than one of Gregory's letters, where he is called "the abbot," by which he apparently means the Abbot of St. Andrew's on the Caelian Hill. In one of these letters,¹ in which he couples him with Laurence the priest, Gregory calls him "*dilectissimus et communis filius.*"

Mellitus was appointed missionary bishop to the East Saxons, who, says Bede, "were separated from Kent by the Thames and were contiguous to the Eastern Sea." They apparently extended westwards to the Chilterns, and their territory thus included a portion at least of modern Hertfordshire.

Their capital (metropolis) was the city of London (Lundenwic as it is called in the *A.-S. Chronicle*). The fact of London being their capital shows that the kingdom of the East Saxons also included Middlesex. It was situated on the north bank of the Thames, and was the emporium of many peoples coming by sea and land.² Saberct (? Sigeberht), the son of Æthelberht's sister Ricula, was then their king.

¹ *E. and H.* xi. 41.

² *Bede*, ii. 3.

He was subject to the overlordship of *Æthelberht* (*quamvis sub potestate positus ejusdem Aedilbercti*). "As soon," says Bede, "as that province received the word of truth by the preaching of Mellitus, *Ædilberht* built the church of St. Paul the Apostle, where he and his successors might have their Episcopal See." It will be noted as a proof of his authority that it was *Æthelberht* and not *Saberct* who founded the church in London, which was certainly in the latter's kingdom.

What the original church of St. Paul's was like, we have no means of any kind of knowing; not a trace of it exists, nor have we any account of it. The church is said, in a legendary story, to have been founded on a site once occupied by a Roman camp, and where a temple of Diana had stood.¹ Camden refers to a structure called "Diana's Chambers," and to "the ox heads digged up there." An altar of Diana was in fact discovered near the spot not many years ago.

It is curious that this church should be always referred to from its patron saint, while the other great churches are named from the towns where they are situated, as York, Canterbury, and Rochester.

It became the largest church in England, as St. Paul's outside the Walls was the largest in Rome till the later St. Peter's was built.

The church was built, according to tradition, about 609, and was dedicated to St. Paul; being the

¹ See Dugdale, 1st ed., *St. Paul's*, 28; and Milman, *Annals*, 5.

first church dedicated in England either to him or St. Peter. According to the *Statutes of St. Paul's*, ii. 52, the *festum Sancti Adelberti* was a festival of the first class at St. Paul's.¹ It was afterwards believed that Saberct founded the Monastery of St. Peter's, in Thorney Island, in "the great marsh" then formed by the Thames as it bent south-westward, and which became known as the West Minster. Thorn ascribes its foundation to a citizen of London at the suggestion of *Æthelberht*,² but the story rests on no sound basis. Bright says the traditional tomb of Saberct is to the south of the altar in the present church at Westminster.³

While Mellitus was ordained as bishop of the East Saxons, Justus was similarly ordained Bishop of Dorubrevis, or Rochester. He had possibly been a monk of St. Andrew's.⁴

"The fortress of the Kent men (*Castellum Cantuariorum*)," says Bede,⁵ "was called Hrofaescaestir, from one named Hrof, who was formerly its chief man (*a primario quondam illius, qui dicebatur Hrof*), and was situated twenty-four miles to the west of Durovernum." A place with a similar name, Hrofesbreta, also situated on the Medway, is mentioned in a charter.⁶ Harpsfeld says that in his time there was still a family in Kent called Hrof.

¹ Bright, *op. cit.* 100, note 3.

² *X. Scriptores*, 1768.

³ *Op. cit.* 100 and 101, notes.

⁴ It may be mentioned, however, that a presbyter called Justus signed the acts of a Roman Synod of the 5th July 595 as priest of the Church of St. Nereus and Achilleus (*E. and H.* v. 57a), and that, on 5th October 600, Gratius was priest of that church (*ib.* xi. 15).

⁵ *Op. cit.* ii. 3.

⁶ *K.C.D.* iii. 386; Birch, i. 364.

Bede gives its Latin name as Dorubrevis. It is apparently named in the Peutingerian Table as Roiti, being then doubtless a military station protecting the Medway. William of Malmesbury¹ describes Rofa, as he calls it, as a town planted on a very narrow site (*situ nimium angustum*), but on a height (*in edito locatum*) washed by a most boisterous river, and inaccessible to an enemy except with great danger, and yet, as Plummer says, it was sacked by Ethelred of Mercia in 676.²


It was doubtless the second in importance of Æthelberht's towns, and commanded the Medway. It was there that Augustine fixed a new see, to which he appointed Justus. The church was dedicated to St. Andrew, doubtless in remembrance of the mother church of so many of the missionaries, on the Caelian Hill.

It has been argued, but I think gratuitously, that the two bishops in Kent point to there having once been two kingdoms of Kent. Of this I know no real evidence. It was, in fact, the fashion of the times, especially in Gaul, to place a bishop in every considerable town.


The foundations of the eastern part of the church built by Æthelberht at Rochester have been recently recovered in excavations made there by Mr. Livett, and described by him and Mr. Hope in vols. xvii. and xxiii. of the *Archæologia Cantiana*. The walls that remain are not higher than 20 inches. They are formed of irregular masonry, with sandstone

¹ *Gest. Pont.* i. 33.


² Vol. ii. p. 80.




THE BLACK LINES REPRESENT
THE GROUND PLAN OF THE
SAXON CHURCH OF ST.
MARTIN AT CANTERBURY.



GROUND PLAN OF ST. PANCRAS'S
CHURCH AT CANTERBURY.



GROUND PLAN OF THE SAXON
CATHEDRAL AT ROCHESTER.



GROUND PLAN OF THE SAXON
CHURCH AT LYMINGE.

quoins and wide mortar joints, the mortar being hard, made of sand with a few shells and a little charcoal, with traces of herring-bone work. The thickness of the walls is 2 feet 4 inches, with a foundation course of tufa and ragstone on concrete full of small pebbles, and blocks of rag-stone. The apse, like that of St. Pancras, was semi-elliptical in outline, and was, like that in St. Martin's, directly in contact with the east of the nave, and separated from it in all probability by a triple arcade, as in the former of the two churches just mentioned. The western part of the nave is now covered by the west front of Rochester Cathedral, and could not be explored. The nave measured 42 feet by 28 feet 6 inches.

We are nowhere told how Augustine constituted the cathedral administrative staff of the two sees of London and Rochester, any more than we are in regard to his own cathedral at Christ Church, Canterbury, but it is pretty certain that it was formed on a monastic basis.

One of Augustine's alleged protégés, whom he is reported to have baptized, was Saint Livinus, known as the Apostle of Brabant, who was murdered 12th November, A.D. 656.¹

Augustine was now nearing the term of his life. His last recorded act was a most uncanonical one. He had ordained two bishops, either of whom might well expect to succeed him as Metropolitan. For some reason or other he had other views, and

¹ Hardy, *Catalogue*, i. 255.

was determined that his successor should be one whom he had not yet raised to the episcopate, namely, one of the companions whom he had originally brought with him, and who is referred to in Gregory's letters as Laurence the priest. Whether he was a monk as well, we do not know. A Laurence who was a "deacon of the Holy See" (*qui primus fuerat in ordine diaconii sedis apostolicae*), and was superseded by Honoratus in September 591, is mentioned in one of Gregory's letters.¹ Another, or perhaps the same Laurence, is called a most illustrious man (*vir clarissimus*), and acted as a papal messenger.² When the first missionaries set out with Augustine they took with them as priest, Laurence, whom we are now considering, and it was he who was sent to Rome to report Augustine's success to the Pope and to bring back recruits for the mission. In Gregory's letters he is named before Mellitus.

It was this Laurence whom Augustine had selected as his successor. He was, however, apparently afraid that his wish might not be carried out, and so, in spite of the Canon Law, he determined to ordain him to his own see and as his successor during his own lifetime, "fearing," in the words of Bede, "lest the Church should be left without a chief pastor amidst difficult and rude surroundings." This did not show much confidence in his two fellow-bishops. Bede, who, no doubt, knew well that the proceeding was irregular,

¹ *E. and H.* ii. 1.

² *Ibid.* ix. 63 and 130.

quotes as a precedent the case of St. Peter himself, who, he says, similarly consecrated St. Clement,¹ a statement which is most doubtful.² A better precedent would have been that of St. Athanasius, who consecrated his friend and successor, Peter, five days before his own death.³ A Roman synod in 465 forbade bishops to nominate their successors (*ne successores suos designent*).⁴ The law of the Church was, also, plain on the subject. Although it was quite regular for a bishop to have assistant bishops (*chorepiscopi*, as they were called), the ancient canons, and notably canon 8 of the Council of Nicæa, seemed to forbid the consecration of a bishop as coadjutor and *future successor* by the actual occupant of a see. A similar prohibition was embodied in a canon of the Council of Antioch in 341.

Gregory of Tours mentions how Felix, Bishop of Nantes, who was grievously ill, summoned the neighbouring bishops, and implored them to confirm the appointment of his nephew, whom he had selected as his successor, which they did. The young man was still a layman, and went to Gregory to ask him first to give him the tonsure and then to go on with him to Nantes and there consecrate him as bishop in the place of himself. Gregory replied that it was contrary to the Canons for any one to be appointed bishop unless he had regularly

¹ *Bede*, ii. 4.

² See Plummer, *ib.* vol. ii. 82, who discusses the question.

³ See *Chron. Acephalum*, quoted by Bright, 106, note 3.

⁴ Dudden, ii. 145, note.

passed through the several ecclesiastical grades. He bade him return whither he had come, and ask those who had elected him to have him tonsured, and after he had worked assiduously as a priest for some time he might then hope to become a bishop. Meanwhile, his uncle Felix recovered, and the matter was postponed, and eventually his relative Nonnichius became bishop.¹ In the next century, the request of St. Boniface to be allowed to consecrate his own successor in his own lifetime was refused by Pope Zacharias as being against all ecclesiastical rules and the institutes of the Fathers.²

The consecration of Laurence as his successor by St. Augustine had at least one notable effect which has been overlooked. It was clearly the intention of the Pope that the arrangement made when Augustine came to England, by which Canterbury was made the seat of the Metropolitan of the realm, was only meant to be temporary, and that Gregory had in view the restoration of London, which was the most important city in the kingdom, and had once in all probability been the seat of the Metropolitan, to its old position. The raising of Laurence, who was only a priest, to be Archbishop of Canterbury while the See of London was still held by Mellitus, instead of promoting the latter, confirmed the original arrangement and clearly made it very difficult, if not impossible, to make the change later on. In a letter afterwards written

¹ *Gregory of Tours*, vi. 15.

² *Mon. Mog.* p. 119; *Dudden*, ii. 145, note 3.

by Kenulf, King of Mercia, to Pope Leo the Third, he states that Gregory's intention to make London the Metropolitan city was frustrated by the fact of Augustine's burial at Canterbury, whereupon it seemed good to the Witan (*cunctis gentis nostrae sapientibus*) that "the Metropolitan Honour" should remain there.¹ This seems a far-fetched reason, for which a more cogent cause was the one just named.

The date of Augustine's death is not *certainly* known. On his tomb it was recorded, according to Bede,² that he died on the 7th of the kalends of June, *i.e.* 26th May. He does not, however, mention the year. This date is also given in the Martyrology,³ and is there stated in this fashion, "*Depositio S. Augustini primi Anglorum episcopi.*" In the *A.-S. Chronicle* the date is only given in the late MS. F., which puts it, as Mr. Plummer says, at the impossible year 614. This may be a mistake for 604, but Thorn says that some placed it in 613.⁴ Florence of Worcester and the *Chronicon S. Crucis* put it in 604. Thorn and Thomas of Elmham both give it in 605. Haddan and Stubbs accept 604 as the date, while Dr. Bright made it 605. It is probable that 604 was the year, the same year which saw the death of Pope Gregory.

Augustine's name is still to be found in the Calendar of the English Church.

At the Council of Clovesho in 747,⁵ it was

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 522.

² *Op. cit.* ii. 3.

³ Bede *Opera*, iv. 72.

⁴ Plummer, vol. ii. p. 81.

⁵ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 368.

decreed that the 26th May, the obit of St. Augustine, "who first brought the faith to the Anglian people," should be always invoked in the litanies (*in Laetaniae Cantatione*) after that of St. Gregory, and his feast be observed as a holiday (*feriatus*). Their names, we are told, had long been honoured together in a Mass read every Saturday at an altar in the monastic Church of SS. Peter and Paul. It was on Augustine's Mass-day in 946 that Saint Edmund was said to have been murdered. In the fourteenth century devotion to our Saint seems to have waned, and in 1356 Innocent the Sixth renewed the celebration of his festival as a holiday of obligation, making it a double. A duplex or double meant that when the festival of a saint coincided with a great festival of the Church, his special service in the Missal was always used instead of that otherwise appointed for the day in the Calendar; and lastly, by a brief dated 28th July 1882, the Pope ordered St. Augustine's day to be celebrated by the whole Church.¹

Bede tells us that on his death Augustine's body was buried outside and near the Church of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, which was still incomplete and unconsecrated. As soon, however, as it was consecrated it was taken inside and decently reburied in the northern *porticus* or chapel—where the bodies of the subsequent

¹ In the margins of some MSS. of Bede are inserted certain lections specially selected to be read on St. Augustine's day in the Refectory, and taken from Bede's life of him (see Plummer's *Bede*, i. pp. 425-427).

archbishops have been interred except two, namely, Theodore and Brightwald, who were laid in the church itself, because the *porticus* would hold no more. In this chapel was an altar dedicated to the blessed Pope Gregory, "where every Saturday memorial Masses were solemnly celebrated by a priest of the place."

Bede reports Augustine's epitaph in the following words: "*Hic requiescit dominus Augustinus Doruvernensis archiepiscopus primus, qui olim huc a beato Gregorio Romanae urbis pontifice directus, et a Deo operatione miraculorum suffultus, Aedelberctum regem ac gentem illius ab idolorum cultu ad Christi fidem perduxit, et completis in pace diebus officii sui, defunctus est vii. Kalendas Junias, eodem rege regnante*";¹ which is thus neatly translated by Mr. Mason: "Here rests the Lord Augustine, first Archbishop of Canterbury, who being sent hither by the blessed Gregory, Bishop of the City of Rome, and supported by God with the working of miracles, brought King Æthelberht and his people from the worship of idols to the faith of Christ, and, having fulfilled in peace the days of his ministry, died 26th May in the reign of the same King."

The account given by Gocelin of the subsequent translation and the miracles of St. Augustine is more than usually interesting.² He describes

¹ *Bede*, ii. 3.

² The narrative seems to be transposed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and part ii. ought apparently to be part i. At all events, the story really begins with the first chapter of part ii. (*Act. Sanct.*, 26th May).

how the church of the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul, whose foundations were laid by Augustine, was largely rebuilt in his own time, and says that preparations for the reconstruction were first made by Abbot Ailmer, who became Bishop of Shireburn in 1022. He solemnly took away the arches and columns (*arcus et columnas*) of the shrine, which had been built over the bodies of the saints "with Roman elegance."¹ With these he decorated the cloister of the monastery. This looks rather more like the spoliation of the monument than a rebuilding of it. He was succeeded by Abbot Ælstan, who transferred the remains of St. Mildred to St. Augustine's. He visited Rome, where the Emperor Henry happened to be, who received him very honourably, and begged, but begged in vain, that he would send him, what he deemed very precious, the slightest fragment, even a hair or a pinch of dust (*extremum pulvisculum*) of the Archbishop; but he declared that he dared not dispose of anything of the kind.² He was in turn succeeded, in 1047, as abbot by Wulfric, who was skilled in secular and ecclesiastical learning. His great ambition was to rebuild the church of the monastery, but he dared not, without much higher authority, touch a monument so venerable and so crowded with saints. Pope Leo the Ninth happened to be then at Rheims for the dedication of the church there, and Wulfric was sent to greet him by King Edward the Con-

¹ *Act. Sanct.*, 26th May, vol. vi. p. 428.

² *Ib.* p. 429.

fessor. From him he obtained permission to rebuild the church. Thereupon he proceeded to demolish it (*a fronte diruit*). He transferred the tomb of St. Mildred, which was erected before the principal altar of the Apostles, into the Chapel of Saint Augustine, and then pulled down the western part of the Chapel (*oratorii*) of the Virgin (which had been built by King Eadbald),¹ with its appurtenant side chapels (*cum porticibus*), while he purged the cemetery of the brethren, which was between the two churches, all which space he added to the area of the new church. Of this he built the walls, the columns, and the arches. This interference with her chapel, we are told, aroused the indignation of the Virgin, and she struck the unfortunate abbot with an illness from which he died shortly after. The date is uncertain, but the Bollandists put it in 1060.²

Wulfric was succeeded as abbot by Egelsin. He was apparently displaced at the Conquest by Scollandus or Scotlandus (whose tomb was discovered by Mr. St. John Hope in recent excavations). He was anxious to continue the work of reconstruction, but feared the fate of his predecessor unless he had a due sanction. This was given him by Pope Alexander, and included permission entirely to pull down the old building and to remove the various bodies of the saints lying there.

He thereupon demolished those parts of the

¹ *Vide infra*, p. 234.

² Gocelin, *loc. cit.*

Chapel of the Virgin which Wulfric had left standing, and also cleared away the new buildings which had been erected by the latter, and which were doubtless thought to be not fine enough—a good proof of the larger views on such matters which came in with the Conquest.

He then removed to a temporary resting-place the very notable and large series of the remains of kings (including those of *Æthelberht*), archbishops, and saints who had been buried there, and which are enumerated by Gocelin, with details about each. When describing the removal of St. Letardus (*i.e.* Liudhard), he mentions a number of miracles which were connected with his relics, none of which present any features of permanent interest.

This closes the second part of Gocelin's narrative, and in order to pursue the story we have to turn to the first part. He there tells us how the new presbytery with its chapels occupied a much larger space than the old, including the site of the Chapel of the Virgin already named. This part of the building having been more or less completed, Abbot Scotlandus died, and was succeeded by Abbot Wido, who proceeded to pull down the west end of the older church, including the nave, where the tomb of St. Augustine lay. Before doing so, he asked the consent of King William, who gave it, on condition that the transport of the precious remains was done with due solemnity and with a suitable attendance of

bishops and abbots. The King said he would have been present himself, but for the fact that he was about to set out for the Scottish War. The governor or master mason (*monasteriarcha*), impatient at the slowness with which the work of demolition and the removal of the saints was proceeding, brought a powerful ram, and overthrew that part of the structure where some of the saints lay. "There was no excuse for his carelessness," says Gocelin, "except his good intention." Before the crash he rescued the sweet-smelling relics of St. Hadrian the Confessor and St. Mildred the Virgin of Christ which lay there. Meanwhile a great mass of stones, beams, portions of the roof and of the leading (*tam moles lapidum, trabium tectorumque, plumbatorum*) fell down and covered several of the monuments, including that of St. Augustine, but did not, apparently, do them much injury. When the mass of débris was taken away, the saints' bodies which were there were removed. There still remained the south wall, where St. Augustine and Archbishop Deusdedit lay. This also was battered, and at length it broke in a huge solid piece, and, as it were, leaped over the resting-place of St. Augustine and fell towards the south,¹ which was, as usual, deemed a miracle. The violent disruption of the old building apparently laid bare the tombs of several saints, and as there was a danger of their being exposed to the elements

¹ Gocelin, *op. cit.* 409 and 410.

the workmen built a shed (*tugurium*) of boards (*assiculis*), and one or two of the brethren kept vigil there for nine weeks. Gocelin reports how during the temporary absence of these watchers a candle which had been placed on the tomb of St. Augustine fell; fortunately, and of course miraculously, its rich coverings (*linteis aut palleis*), were not injured. The tombs were made of fragile material and of bricks (*fractiles et lateriliae*) (these last doubtless from some Roman building), and, what was deemed miraculous, the angels and the figure of the Saviour represented in glory between them, which stood on Augustine's tomb, were found unbroken and intact.

The time had now arrived when it was necessary to remove St. Augustine's remains. We are told that there was present the famous Bishop of Rochester, Gundulf. He marched with the abbot and the brethren, singing hymns, and ordered them to open the tomb, but every one was afraid to begin. The bishop, armed, we are told, with prayer and devotion, determined to set them an example, and struck the first blow (*ictum in tumbos fronta dedit*). Thereupon a certain Plither, described as *dictator* of the church (? master workman), proceeded to pull down the altar of Augustine, and when he had razed it to the ground there was disclosed a slab of white Parian marble. It had doubtless been originally taken from some Roman building. This he raised slightly, when there came from beneath

a scented vapour (*erumpens vapor nardifluus*). He then gently let it down again, as it was not his duty to disturb the contents of the tomb thus discovered. By order of the abbots the monks removed the stone, when a rush of sweet scent seemed to come from the lips and breast of the Saint.

They then produced some candles and went in, and, "behold, the first founder (*institutor primicerius*) of Christianity in Britain was disclosed," after he had lain there five hundred years and survived many rough times. The remains lay draped in chasuble, alb, and stole, with Augustine's staff (*baculus*), sandals, and other pontifical garniture (*ceterisque Pontificalibus instrumentis*). The monks now collected the remains and placed them in a chest vested with rich cloth (*linteala et palliata*), and ornamented with gold and precious stones. Among the dust even bits of the flesh were found intact. "They then moved the body, which shed a sweet odour over the whole city and even over the whole of Kent"—a statement which must be accepted allegorically, and it was placed before the altar of the Apostles until a suitable final resting-place could be found for it. A few days later they proceeded with the building of the nave, and the first of the great columns on the north side was placed on the spot where St. Augustine's body formerly lay. Gocelin tells us the ground in which the bodies had been deposited was covered with red tiles (*lateres punicei*) with a polished texture, and was reeking with saffron-coloured nard oil (*crocea*

nardo firmantes). These were taken up and laid down at the altar of St. Gregory in the new church.¹ Many tried to secure some relics of the Saint for their churches, but they got not a single hair, but some fragments of the tiles and some of the earth in which the body lay were secured by the churches at Bortinga (?) and Ramsey. Gocelin was an eye-witness of what he here relates.

We have now to turn to Thorn, who, although he lived a long time after, had, as we shall see, a contemporary document as a witness of what he states. According to him, Abbot Wido, who succeeded in 1087, separated the remains into two portions. The greater part of them he placed in a stone coffin or tomb, and to prevent them being molested he built it secretly into the north wall of the church, only a few monks knowing its whereabouts. In order, however, that the faithful might have some of the Saint's remains to cherish and revere, he placed a few small bones (*quibusdam assiculis*) of the Saint and a portion of his ashes in a coffer (*vasculum*) of lead, and enclosed them in a stone tomb (*lapidum feretrum*) or shrine. On the top of this tomb, in a small leaden case enclosed in a silver shrine, were placed some fragments of the Saint's flesh and some of the earth moistened with his blood.

In 1168, the Church of St. Augustine was burnt, when the above-named shrine was injured.

¹ *Op. cit.* 416, etc.



THE OLD ALTAR OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S AT CANTERBURY, WITH THE SHRINES OF AETHELBERHT, KING OF KENT, AND OF THE EARLY ARCHBISHOPS GROUPED AROUND IT.

To face p. 186.

On the 27th of April 1221, the monks determined to discover where their predecessor had secretly buried the Saint. They had a hole broken into the north wall close to the altar of St. Augustine, and there found his stone monument, beautifully decorated with iron and lead (*ferro et plumbo peroptime sigillata*), and inscribed—

“ Inclitus Anglorum Praesul pius et decus altum
Hic Augustinus requiescit corpore Sanctus.”

The Abbot, Hugh, was at the time absent in France. On his return the tomb was opened in the presence of many other abbots and magnates, when inside it, besides the Saint's remains, there was also found a leaden tablet inscribed with an account of what Wido had done with the remains as above described. We further read that close beside St. Augustine's remains when replaced there were also put some relics in the silver shrine, including hair of the Virgin Mary, a piece of the seamless coat of the Saviour, of the column at which He was flagellated, etc. etc.

Abbot Hugh enriched the shrine with gold, silver, and precious stones, “as now seen,” adds Thorn.

It is interesting to read that in 1526, at the very verge of the Reformation, and before Augustine's monastery and tomb were destroyed, Henry, Cardinal of York (*i.e.* Wolsey), presented King John the Third of Portugal with some relics of St. Augustine, namely, the chin bone, three teeth, and the *os notabilis*, in exchange for some remains of other saints. We are further told that in 1628

these relics were taken by the Portuguese Bishop Luzane to Belgium, and placed in a silver shrine in the Church of St. Salvator at Antwerp, belonging to the Cistercians.¹

Gocelin enumerates a great many miracles which were reputed to have been the handiwork of Augustine's intervention or of his remains. Most of them are of the usual very homely kind, but some are interesting for the local colour they afford, and may be appropriately reported here. He tells us that, *inter alia*, in the reign of William the First some English merchants sent fifteen ships (which are described as having one mast and one sail) to Caen to bring stone for the building of the King's palace at Westminster. The person employed in the business (apparently the owner of the ships), called Vitalis, a friend of Abbot Scotland, was persuaded to present a shipload of the stones for the building of the new church of the abbey. A great storm having come on, fourteen of the ships foundered, with their crews and their burdens. The only one which escaped was the one destined for the Abbey of St. Augustine. The stones were used for bases, columns, capitals, and architraves (*epistylia*). This ship, after great dangers, and, as Gocelin says, by the solicitude of the Saint, reached a safe anchorage at Brembre (*i.e.* Bramber, in Sussex).

In another narrative, we have a miracle reported about a senior monk of the Abbey of St. Augustine

¹ *Act. Sanct.*, *lib. cit.* pp. 897 and 898.

who was sent to "the town of Mark (*ad Marchiam villam*), near Boulogne in Flandres," which we are told was rich in stone (*in lapides foecunda*). With him were sent a number of workmen, who secured a large quantity of stone for the monastery.

In another story we read of three men from Kent, whose names Gocelin gives, who were metal workers, or what we should call tinkers, and were in the habit of travelling about the country buying from gold and silversmiths, moneymen, and other metal workers (*metallorum fusores*) the scoriæ, ashes, scourings, and other waste products of their craft, which they melted together into large lumps, and then pounded and washed, and thus recovered the remains of the precious metals they contained. Happening to be at Bath (which Gocelin describes as being "all built of stone, it being so abundant there"), and requiring a big stone to do this pounding, they removed one from the King's highway, for which they were prosecuted. Two of them, who were old, were allowed to pay a ransom of twenty solidi of silver, but the younger one, who was strong, was tortured. They bound his legs in the stocks, and put irons on his legs and arms. When, however, he made an appeal to St. Augustine, his own Kentish Saint, his bonds fell off and he was released.

In another story we read of certain English nobles who at the Norman Conquest went to Constantinople, where one of them secured the command of an army. He married and built a

church dedicated to St. Augustine and St. Nicholas, which was frequented by the English exiles.

Again, Egelwi, Abbot of Athelney (Ethelinge), having gone to Rome, was prevented returning for six weeks by violent storms, and, having eaten up his food and spent his money and sold his horses and clothes, was reduced to great want. He thereupon made a vow to St. Augustine that if he ever again viewed with safety the tower of his church at home, he would build one in his own monastery in honour of the Saint, which he eventually did.

It will now be well to try and measure somewhat the work actually done by Augustine. It has been both exalted and minimised by writers writing with a polemical purpose, and who have not tried to weigh his opportunities and his difficulties. When he died he had succeeded, by the help of Queen Bertha, in converting the King of Kent and overlord of the greater part of Britain to the Christian faith. He had also secured a considerable number of people of note who could be influenced by the King, and perhaps of others who began to have longings for a closer tie with the communities of Western Europe. This could only be secured by joining the common faith, which made them in a sense one commonwealth.

On the other hand, we cannot doubt that a large number of *Æthelberht's* own people clung to their own faith and to the gods which their fathers had worshipped. Some of them would do so furtively, and some of them would move away to more

congenial lands like that south of the Weald, especially to Sussex, which remained pagan for a considerable time later. What recruits were secured for the faith were much too quickly converted to realise fully what they were about, and retained no doubt a large portion of their old superstitions, and especially their belief in magic, which under another name was shared by the Church. The missionaries made it easy to conform to the change, by adopting old festivals and retaining old rites and customs, but the Christianity of the new converts was largely nominal. The God's name was changed and certain forms of ritual were introduced, but otherwise the essentials were for a long time after this much the same as before.

In addition to this, Augustine had consecrated two bishops to two sees other than his own, and had appointed his own successor. The bishop of one of these sees (namely Rochester) was largely a suffragan of his own. The other was planted in London, the great emporium of English trade, a place where, as after events showed, Christianity made very little way for some time, and the bishop of which, Mellitus, although nominally bishop of the country north of the Thames and east of the Chilterns, called Essex, had probably little influence outside the Court circle of King Saberct (Sigeberht), *Æthelberht's* nephew and protégé.

Besides these human foundations of his Church, Augustine had built or partly built five churches, all of which lived on, and four of them have continued

to exist on the same spots where he founded them, certainly with numerous alterations and rebuildings, but with a continuous life for thirteen hundred years. He or one of his immediate successors doubtless founded the first English school in his realms, as well as the singing school at Canterbury, which both became famous in later days.

The Rev. H. A. Wilson has discussed with learning and ingenuity the liturgical questions which arise out of the mission of Augustine. At this time there was a considerable difference between the Roman rite and that of Gaul. As he says, the most marked difference was that "the Roman canon of the Mass, with the exception of a few minor clauses, which vary on certain days, was fixed and unchanging. In the Gallican rite, on the other hand, only a few sections of the corresponding portion of the Mass were fixed: the prayers which were grouped about these fixed portions, and with them made up the whole of the consecration prayer, varied from day to day."¹ Augustine had received the Pope's permission to make such selections from the different rites as he should think most appropriate to the local circumstances. We can hardly doubt that he would be tempted to continue as far as he could the traditions of the little Church introduced by Liudhard and his companions, which were practised in the Queen's Chapel, and were doubtless entirely Gallican, since any material change would cause suspicion among those already

¹ *Mason's Mission of Augustine*, Appendix IV. p. 242, note.

converted. "These doubts would not be lessened if, as seems likely, the Franks who had come with the missionaries to England as interpreters were accustomed to the Gallican rite. St. Augustine would have to face the question whether it was desirable to allow a diversity which might lead to division and disunion within the royal household, and among the growing body of English Christians."¹ It is most likely that the basis of his service books was that of the Roman usage which Augustine had been accustomed to at St. Andrew's. We read in the 13th Canon of the Council of Clovesho that the English Church had adopted the model of the Roman Canon of the Mass which it had received from the Roman Church, and probably with Gregory's not very important alterations. In the principal functions, such as the observance of the hours of prayer, in the order of the Mass, in the ceremonial with which Augustine administered the rite of baptism to his first converts, he would naturally follow the usage of his own time. That the Roman style of Church music was maintained at Canterbury appears from Bede,² where it is recorded of James the Deacon that he "instructed many persons in chanting" (*juxta morem Romanorum sive Cantuariorum*).³ On the other hand, it is plain that in some things Augustine adopted the Gallican rite: thus in the use of certain litanies on the three days before Ascension Day known as

¹ Mason's *Mission of Augustine*, Appendix IV. pp. 241 and 242.

² *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 20.

³ *Ib.* 238.

Rogation Days. These were not known at Rome until the time of Leo the Third (795–816). Meanwhile they had long been known in Gaul. They are said to have had their beginning at Vienne about the year 470, and their general adoption was ordered by the Council of Orleans in 511, while in 567 a Council at Lyons provided that similar litanies should also be used in the week preceding the first Sunday in November. It is very probable that Augustine and his companions had heard and taken part in them during their long delay in Gaul, and had adopted them in part or whole. The anthem which Bede tells us the monks sang as they marched to Canterbury, occurs in one of the Rogation Litanies in use long after at Vienne and probably in other churches in France, and it may well be that the Gallican custom of Rogation processions which were established in England as an ancient usage at a time when it was still unrecognised at Rome was first brought into England by the Roman mission.¹ The Council of Clovesho in 747 orders the observance of the Rogation processions according to the method of "our predecessors" (*secundum morem priorum nostrorum*).²

It would seem further, as Bishop Brown says, that in the early days of its history the Church of the Anglians had a certain number of rites which it probably derived from the British Church. Whether they were adopted by Augustine or at some

¹ Wilson, *op. cit.* 236 and 237.

² See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils, etc.*, iii. 368.

later time we do not quite know. Among these he enumerates a rite which Gildas says was peculiar to the British Church, namely, that of anointing the hands at ordination. The lessons, too, used at ordination were different both from the Gallican and from the Roman use. In the early Anglo-Saxon Church this anointing the hands of deacons, priests, and bishops was retained; hence it seems probable that other rites at ordination in the early Anglo-Saxon Church, which we cannot trace to any other source, were British. Such were the prayer at giving the stole to deacons, the delivering of the Gospel to deacons, and the investing of the priests with the stole.¹

Leaving these matters of routine and of simple accommodation which Augustine probably faced with prudence and discretion, and turning to things of greater moment which were better tests of his real capacity and power, we meet at once with the infirmities attending the lack of experience of men and things due to his conventional training, his want of mental grasp, and smallness of vision. This was notably the case in his treatment of the British Church and in some of his questions to Gregory on matters of difficulty.

In regard to these matters I may quote a measured judgment of him by an English scholar of considerable perspicuity. "If any man," says the late Haddan, "ever had greatness thrust upon him with which, Malvolio-like, he did not quite know

¹ *The Church in these Islands before Augustine*, 149 and 150.

how to deal, that man was Augustine of Canterbury. The Pope and his missionary remind us of nothing more forcibly than of some Arnold or Moberly, trying, by mingled rebukes, advice, and warnings, to get a timid, awkward boy to act his part properly in the semi-independent sphere of prefect or monitor. Scarcely able to tear himself from the side of the truly great man on whom he leaned, shrinking back from exaggerated difficulties the moment he found himself alone, delaying on the threshold of his enterprise an unreasonable time; strangely ignorant, at the end of this delay, of the true position of the Celtic Churches already in the land to which he was sent, and still needing interpreters to enable him to preach to his future flock; asking, with solemnity, the simplest of questions, such as a novice might have settled without troubling the Pope, a thousand miles off, about the matter; catching too readily at immediate and worldly aids to success, and when success came unduly elated; ignoring altogether the pioneers whom he found at work before him, and sensitively proud and unconciliatory towards supposed rivals —Augustine has one claim to our respect, that of a blameless and self-denying Christian life.”¹

It is certainly a notable thing, and measures his reputation among his contemporaries, that nothing remains of what he wrote save the questions he sent to Gregory, which so well define the real stature of the man. Not a letter or a homily or any other docu-

¹ *Remains*, 303.

ment from his hand was preserved either at Rome or Canterbury. The Pope's replies to his letters were kept in both places, but of the first Bishop of the English race we have nothing. What a contrast to another Missionary Bishop who learnt his work in England and went a few years later to evangelise Germany—Boniface!

The best that can be said of Augustine is that he was a commonplace man, with good motives and high standards, set to do a work much beyond his capacity, and for which he had had a very indifferent training. The Church he planted was a plant with a feeble constitution from the first, and it needed a more vigorous personage, who was also a greater scholar and a bigger man, to set it going again on a more promising journey. He presently came, and his name was Theodore.

CHAPTER IV

THE END OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S MISSION

SAINT LAURENCE

As we have seen, St. Gregory and St. Augustine probably died in the same year. Before we complete the picture of Augustine's mission, it will be well to survey the political events elsewhere during the next few years, and also the lives and characters of Gregory's immediate successors. We have seen how the half-savage, cruel, dissipated, and incapable Phocas obtained the throne of the Eastern Empire. His reign brought gloom to the great city on the Bosphorus, and disgrace and disaster to the Empire. Continually pursued by secret fears of plots and assassination, and of the resuscitation of the family of Maurice, he laid a heavy hand on all he suspected of favouring it. He especially pursued the widow and daughters of his predecessor. In Gibbon's sonorous phrases, "A matron who commanded the respect and pity of mankind, the daughter, wife, and mother of Emperors, was tortured like the vilest malefactor, to force a confession of her designs and associates; and the

Empress Constantina, with her three innocent daughters, was beheaded at Chalcedon on the same ground which had been stained with the blood of her husband and her five sons."¹ Meanwhile, every kind of ingenious torture and cruelty was applied to endless victims elsewhere, and, again quoting Gibbon, "the Hippodrome was polluted with heads and limbs and mangled bodies." Phocas made the wives of the great citizens the victims of his lust. He displaced the really able commanders in the army whom he suspected of similar treasons to that he himself had dealt out to Maurice. He replaced them by relatives and flatterers. Among his victims was the finest soldier of the time, who was alone fitted to cope with the powerful Persians, Narses, who, having been deprived of his command and resented it by rebellion, was burnt to death at Constantinople.

While this was the condition of things at home, the affairs of the Empire, especially in the far East, again became greatly troubled. The Persian ruler Chosroes professed to be horrified at the murder of Maurice and his family. Phocas, according to Theophylactus,² had sent him as trophies the heads of the murdered Emperor and his sons. Chosroes invaded the Empire. In order to increase the armies in the further East an expensive peace was purchased from the Avars, but the Roman generals Germanus and Leontius were both badly defeated. The Persians, incited by their Magi, captured the

¹ *Op. cit.* ed. Bury, v. 65.

² Lib. viii. ch. 15.

fortresses of Mardin, Daras, Amida, and Edessa, and carried off vast plunder and innumerable prisoners to Persia. "In 608 the danger was brought nearer to the careless inhabitants of the capital; for, having occupied Armenia and Cappadocia, Paphlagonia and Galatia, the army of the fire worshippers advanced to the Bosphorus, showing mercy in the march to neither age nor sex, and encamped at Chalcedon, opposite to Constantinople, and thus," says the historian, "there was tyranny both inside and outside the city. . . . In Syria there was always a spirit of disaffection towards the orthodox Byzantine government, for Syria was full of Jews as well as of heretics of various kinds. . . . Phocas conceived the ill-timed idea of constraining all the Jews to become Christians. The consequence was a great revolt of the Hebrews in Antioch; Christians were massacred, and a cruel and indecent punishment was inflicted on the Patriarch Anastasius. Bonosus, Count of the East, now cast out all the Jews in the city."¹

In Egypt and the Province of Africa, the granaries of the Empire, riots and outbreaks took place, and for two years Heraclius, the Exarch of the latter province, "refused all tribute and obedience to the Centurion who disgraced the throne of Constantinople."² Meanwhile these disturbances interfered with the grain supplies at the capital, where a famine ensued.

¹ Bury, *Hist. Later Roman Empire*, ii. 199 and 200.

² Gibbon, v. 66.

In Italy alone, things were more cheerful and Phocas more popular. A peace was made with the Lombards, which lasted some years, while at Rome the Exarch of Ravenna erected in 608 in the Forum a white Corinthian pillar, with his statue on the top of it, to the honour of the Tyrant, on the site of the famous equestrian figure of Domitian apostrophised by Statius.¹ Readers of Byron will remember his reference to the "nameless column with the buried base."² The base of this column was actually uncovered in 1813, and on it was found an inscription in which the monument is declared to have been erected to the Emperor "*pro innumerabilibus pietatis ejus beneficiis et pro quiete libertate.*"³ Towards the Popes Phocas was very complacent, no doubt to emphasise his dislike of the Patriarch Cyriacus, who had protected the family of Maurice. The unpopularity of Phocas presently brought its Nemesis. On the invitation of some of the grandees at Constantinople, the Exarch of Africa, Heraclius, a person of high character, sent his son with a flotilla to the capital. A naval engagement was fought there on the 4th of October 1610. Phocas was defeated, pursued, and executed, together with his chief supporters, their bodies were burnt, and on the next day the younger "Heraclius was proclaimed Augustus by the Senate and the people, and crowned by the Patriarch Sergius."⁴

¹ *Silv. I.* v. 66; *Gregorovius I.* 319 and 330, note 12. A picture of it is given in my previous volume on St. Gregory.

² *Childe Harold*, Canto IV. cx.

³ See *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vi. 251.

⁴ Bury, *op. cit.* 206.

Let us now turn from the Emperor to the Pope. St. Gregory was immediately succeeded by Sabinianus, a native of Volterra in Tuscany, whose father was called Bonus. He is mentioned in several of Gregory's letters, in which he speaks of him as his dearest son (*dilectissimus filius*), as his deacon, as a bearer of presents (*lator praesentium*), etc., and as acting the Pope's agent in various capacities. Presently we find him filling the most responsible position of all, namely, that of Nuncio at Constantinople, which Gregory had himself occupied. Lastly, it would appear that he was appointed Bishop of Jadera in Dalmatia.¹

It would seem that on the death of Gregory he became his successor, having doubtless ingratiated himself while resident at Constantinople with the all-powerful Phocas, as he probably had ingratiated himself also with the Exarch of Ravenna. It would fit in with his having been Bishop of Jadera that he was not elected Pope until five months after Gregory's death, namely, on the 13th of September 604. At the time of his election there seems to have been a grievous famine in Italy,² and the new Pope, finding it difficult to meet the situation, seems to have blamed the unmeasured alms which Gregory had dispensed and his often inconsiderate charity, and he aroused the anger of the crowd against Gregory's memory, as I have already related in my Life of Pope

¹ For more details about Sabinianus, see Appendix III.

² *Paul, Diac.* iv. ch. 9.

Gregory. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*,¹ he insisted on selling the corn to the people at what they deemed an exorbitant rate instead of giving it to them, and the fickle crowd turned once more with loving thoughts to the memory of their late Pope, while the latter's successor, who only reigned for a short time, and died on 22nd February 606, had to be taken to his burial furtively, in order to escape the angry crowd. This is generally the fate of the successors of spendthrift rulers. Onuphrius Panvinus attributes to him the introduction of the practice of ringing bells at the Canonical Hours, and at the celebration of the Eucharist.²

There is considerable difficulty about the chronology and the lives of the two immediate successors of Pope Sabinianus, and I am constrained to think that two Popes have in fact been created out of one person. In the first place, it is strange that both should have been called Boniface, which was an uncommon name. It must be remembered that the practice had not yet begun of Popes adopting titular names on their accession, and at this time they were styled by their real names. Secondly, while it is curious that out of so many hundreds of available "clerks" two of the same name should have been distinguished enough to be successively designated as Pope, it is still more odd that both of them should have had a father called John. Again, what we read of the first of

¹ *Vit. Sabiniani.*

² Barmby, *Dict. Chr. Biography*, iv. 574.

the two, who is generally known as Boniface the Third, is very slight, and it comes virtually from one source only, and that a not too satisfactory one, namely, the *Liber Pontificalis*. Thus, although he is said in that document to have been a Roman, he is given the name of John Cataudioces, which, as Gregorovius says, points to his having been of Eastern origin and not a Roman.¹

Again, he is said to have held a Synod in St. Peter's attended by seventy-two bishops and thirty-three Roman presbyters and deacons. The number of bishops here given, points to its having been a council of importance, and a good deal more than a mere synod of his metropolitan province. This being so, it is very strange that no record exists of it anywhere else, and that none of its acts are extant. The only thing recorded of this synod by the author of the *Liber Pontificalis* is a prohibition under anathema of the appointment of any bishop to a see until at least three days after the death of his predecessor. This reads very curiously, considering that Augustine had just before appointed Laurence as his successor during his own lifetime, and it has the look of a much later date. Again, Boniface the Third, although he only reigned eight months and twenty-two days, is said to have consecrated twenty-one bishops, which seems an excessive number when we compare it with what was done by other Popes who reigned much longer. It seems to me that, in every way we

¹ *Op. cit.* It. ed. i. 420.

look at it, grave doubts arise as to such a person as Boniface the Third having existed, and that his name has been interpolated, as others have, into the long list of Popes. A reason for this interpolation may be found, I think, in the only other act of his reign recorded in the work just cited, and which has a very suspicious look. This entry has been seriously doubted, and, if spurious, needed to be attributed to some Pope otherwise not well known and whose acts were not otherwise recorded. We are, in fact, told that Phocas the Emperor conferred on him the right to use the style of *Œcumene* or Universal Bishop. This is a most improbable and in fact incredible statement, considering how bitterly and persistently Pope Gregory, who only died two years before, repudiated any such title as utterly reprehensible. If it had had any basis we should assuredly have had the fact mentioned by some other more or less contemporary writer, and it would at once have been adopted by other Popes, while, as Gieseler says, the first occasion on which it is recorded as having been used by a Pope was much later, namely, about 682-85, when it occurs in the *Liber Diurnus*.¹

I venture therefore, with some confidence, to urge that Boniface the Third was a myth, and that there was only one Pope Boniface at this time, namely, the one usually called Boniface the Fourth, who, in my view, immediately succeeded Sabinianus, and who had previously been a

¹ See Gieseler, Eng. tr. i. p. 344, note.

considerable personage and a protégé of Pope Gregory.

A Boniface occurs several times in Gregory's letters.¹ On the death of Sabinianus, Boniface was appointed his successor as Pope, doubtless by the influence of Phocas, who must have known him well, for, like his predecessors, he had filled the office of Papal Nuncio at the Imperial Court.

Boniface was a Marsian from Valeria, and the son of a doctor named John.² His name is closely connected with the history of the famous ancient Temple of all the Gods, known as the Pantheon, which was first mentioned under the name Pantheum in a document of the reign of Nero.³ At the time we are dealing with it had doubtless been vacant and shut up for a good many years.

Few people who have visited that marvellous triumph of the architect's skill realise that it is not merely the only building of anything like the same age which has remained intact, but that it has (save for a limited interval) been continuously occupied for nineteen hundred years. It was built by Agrippa, the cherished companion of the Emperor Augustus, who afterwards erected its splendid vestibule and covered both the cupola and the roof of the temple with shining bronze, which was carried away in part by the Emperor Constans II. when he visited Rome in 668, while the rest was melted by Pope Urban the Eighth,

¹ See Appendix III.

² *Liber Pont. Vit., Boniface IV.*

³ *Gregorovius I.* 435, note.

whose name of Barberini tempted a wit to make, perhaps, the most famous of all pasquinades on the subject of the vandalism, "*Quod non fecerunt Barbari, fecerunt Barberini.*" It is first mentioned, as I said, under its present name (Pantheon) in a document of the year 59 A.D., of the time of Nero, and is also referred to by Pliny and Dion Cassius. The latter tells us how among the other gods whose statues were worshipped there was the deified Julius Cæsar—the one mortal who had secured a place in the gathering of the great deities, and notably of Jupiter Ultor, and Cybele, the mother of the gods, of Mars and Venus.¹

On the conversion of the Emperors to the Christian faith the old temples were shut up and the statues of the gods were probably removed, while for two hundred years the buildings were mostly closed, and among them no doubt the Pantheon.

We read in the *Liber Pontificalis* that Pope Boniface asked the Emperor Phocas to give him the Pantheon, and having secured it he determined to rededicate it to the Virgin and Martyrs (*Maria ad Martyres*).² A ring of altars took the

¹ *Gregorovius I.* 422.

² *Paul, Diac.* iv. ch. 37. Dr. Bright, referring to similar instances of rededication, says: "It had already been carried out as to a temple at Novara in the early part of the sixth century (see *Ennodius, Dictio 2*, and *Carm. ii. 11*)—

'Perdidit antiquum quis religione sacellum,
Numinibus pulsis quod bene numen habet?'

So also in the case of the circular temple of Romulus, son of Maxentius (on the northern side of the Roman Forum), dedicated in 527 by Felix the Third or Fourth to SS. Cosmas and Damian" (*op. cit.* p. 79, note 2).

place of the pedestals where the gods had stood. At the new dedication, the Pope summoned the clergy, and they walked in solemn procession bearing the cross, sang psalms and litanies, and in the vivid imagination of the Romans, the demons and devils who previously possessed the building, and were represented by the dispossessed gods, fled away discomfited, as the choir sang *Gloria in excelsis*, while the Pope aspersed the building with holy water.¹ It is said that twenty-eight cart-loads of relics, doubtless brought from the Catacombs, were conveyed to the church at its dedication, while the magnificent services which then took place were the origin of the famous festival of All Souls.²

We will now return again to England and its Archbishop, Laurence. We have seen how he was consecrated as his successor by Augustine. He was in priest's orders, and was the latter's confidential friend, and had been selected by him to convey to the Pope the account of his doings in Britain. Bede tells us that he vigorously strengthened the foundations of the Church he had seen so firmly laid, by his exhortations and his pious activity, and this not only with the English, but also the British and the Scottish tribes inhabiting Ireland, among whom, as among the Britons, "were many things unchurchlike, especially in regard to the celebration of Easter." In conjunction with his fellow-bishops he sent the Scots

¹ Gregorovius I. 422.

² Smith, *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* i. 329.

a hortatory letter, bidding them keep the unity of peace and of Catholic observance with the Church of Christ in other parts of the world. The letter is headed :—

“ To our dear brethren, the Lords Bishops and Abbots throughout the land of the Scots ” [that is, of course, the Irish Scots]. “ Laurence, Mellitus, and Justus, Bishops, servants of God’s servants :

“ Having been sent by the Apostolic See to preach to the heathen tribes in these Western regions, according to the usage of that See all over the world, we have been permitted to make an entrance into this island of Britain. Before we knew these parts, we, supposing that they walked according to the custom of the Universal Church, held in great reverence for their sanctity both the Britons and the Scots ; but when we came to know the Britons, we thought that the Scots must be better than they. Through Bishop Dagan, however, who came to this island, and through the Abbot Columban, who came to Gaul, we have learnt that the Scots are not at all different in their ways from the Britons. For when Bishop Dagan came to us, he not only refused to eat with us, but refused to eat at all in the same lodging where we ate.”¹

This Dagan has been identified, says Plummer, with Bishop Dagan of Inbher Daeile (now Ennereilly, County Wicklow), whose death is given by the Four Masters and the *Chron. Scot.* in the year 639, and who is commemorated on September 13, in the

¹ *Bede*, ii. 4.

Felire and *Martyrology of Donegal*, and also on 12th March, which Colgan thought was the day of his translation.¹ Bishop Brown reminds us that in the Stowe Missal is a very ancient list of saints to be commemorated, and in it Dagan's name occurs next but one to those of Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus. He further remarks that the work was a *Scotic* (*i.e.* an Irish) work, and the list a *Scotic* list, which shows an unexpected friendliness to the English prelates. It is noteworthy, however, that the name of Augustine is omitted from the altar list.²

Laurence and his fellow-bishops also sent a joint letter to the British bishops suitable to their degree (*suo gradui condignas*) to confirm them in the Catholic unity, but, as Bede says, "how much good these proceedings did, present circumstances show."³

Gocelin also tells us that an Irish archbishop, by name Terenanus, was attracted to England by the fame of Laurentius, and was by him converted to the true computation of Easter. Terenanus was identified by Ware with an Archbishop of Armagh named MacLaisre.⁴

About the year 610, Bishop Mellitus is said to have gone to Rome to confer with Pope Boniface about the affairs of the English Church, and Bede says he took part in a synod held at Rome for better regulating the monastic life. Bede turns

¹ Plummer's *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 83, note.

² *Augustine and His Companions*, p. 155.

³ *Op. cit.* ii. 4.

⁴ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 62.

aside to remind us how, as we have seen, it was this Pope Boniface who obtained a grant of the Pantheon at Rome from the Emperor Phocas, and dedicated it as a Christian church to the Virgin and all Martyrs.¹

The synod in question, according to him, was held on 27th February 610, and he adds that the English bishop was present at it, "in order to add the weight of the subscription of Mellitus to whatever was canonically decreed," and to bring the decrees back to Britain to be delivered to the English Churches for their observance, together with letters addressed by the aforesaid Pontiff to Laurence the Archbishop, beloved of God and the clergy in general, and also to King *Æthelberht* and the English people.² There are some serious difficulties about this statement of Bede. It is a very extraordinary fact that no such Council is mentioned anywhere else, and Labb   relies for his account of it on Bede's statement alone. Not a word about it is said in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which, as we have seen, mentions a synod alleged to have been held by Boniface the Third, who was probably a myth, and who is said to have died in 607. I cannot avoid the conclusion that Bede's statements on the subject of this Council, and on the visit of Mellitus to Rome, are not to be relied upon, and were perhaps interpolations. It will be noted as ominous of this fact that the letter Bede refers to as having been written by the Pope to Laurentius is not given by him and is

¹ *Bede*, ii. 4.

² *Ib.*

no longer extant, while that said to have been written to *Æthelberht* is also lost, and has been replaced by a forged one in the series of forgeries preserved by William of Malmesbury and meant to sustain the claims of Canterbury against those of York.¹ A second letter from the same Pope to *Æthelberht*, dated 27th February 611, and preserved by Thomas of Elmham, is also forged.² Both the letter to *Æthelberht* given by Malmesbury and the alleged acts of the Synod of Rome in 610, which last occur in two recensions, are described by Haddan and Stubbs as spurious.³ In addition, may I add, that if Mellitus had visited Rome at this time, when he was a bishop with a young and difficult see to manage, it must have been on some very critical business, and it is strange that he did not return with a pall for Laurence, so as firmly to establish the latter's metropolitan rank. It was in the same year that the tyrant Phocas died, and was succeeded as Emperor by Heraclius.

As we have seen, the Abbey Church of St. Peter and Paul at Canterbury was not completed at the death of Augustine, and was consecrated by Archbishop Laurence.⁴ Thomas of Elmham says it was dedicated in 613.⁵ We have no means of knowing what this church was like, for it was apparently destroyed in the rebuilding of the eleventh century, as graphically described by Gocelin in his account of the translation of St. Augustine's remains as

¹ Plummer's *Bede*, ii. p. 84.

² Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 67.

³ iii. 62-65.

⁴ *Bede*, ii. 3.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 131.

above given.¹ It was doubtless a simple basilica. Aethelberht, King of Kent, died on the 24th February 616.² Bede says that Aethelberht's death took place in the twenty-first year after the sending of Augustine, which, Mr. Mason says, can only be made correct by counting from the first setting out of the missionaries.³ He was buried in the *porticus* or transeptal chapel of St. Martin, in the Church of the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul, afterwards known as St. Augustine's, where his wife Queen Bertha and her chaplain Liudhard were also buried.⁴ Thomas of Elmham thus reports his epitaph :—

“Rex Aethelbertus hic clauditur in poliandro.
Fana pians certus Christo meat absque meandro.”

In later times he was held to be a saint, and in the plan of St. Augustine's Monastery previously mentioned there is represented a shrine above the high altar inscribed *Scs Ethelbertus*. In 1325 his name was added to those of SS. Peter and Paul and St. Augustine in the dedication of the high altar.⁵ Among the other benefits, says Bede, which Aethelberht's thoughtfulness conferred on his people, he drew up for them, in concert with his Witenagemot, or Great Council of the Wise, a code of judicial decisions after the manner of the Romans (*decreta judiciorum juxta exempla Romanorum*), which are still extant in the English language. The code commences with the penalties to be inflicted on those who did injury to Church

¹ *Ante*, p. 179, etc.

² *Bede*, ii. 5.

³ *Op. cit.* 109, note.

⁴ *Bede*, ii. 5.

⁵ Brown, *The Christian Church, etc.*, 17 and 18.

property or to that of Church dignitaries, bishops, priests, and deacons. In regard to Church property it was enacted that the reparation was to be twelve times the value. In that of a bishop elevenfold, in that of a priest ninefold, of a deacon sixfold, while of clerks (*clericī*) (by whom those in the lesser orders are doubtless meant) threefold. The breach of Church frith, *Cyric frith* (i.e. the peace or privilege of the Church) was charged twofold, while *Maethelfrith* (i.e. the peace of the people's assembly, *volksversammlungsfrieden*) was similarly assessed.¹

It is plain from Bede's statements that Æthelberht gave the new church considerable property. The old deeds and documents of the Canterbury churches were, however, largely, if not entirely, destroyed by fire—those at St. Augustine's by the fire in 1087, when we are expressly told that the charters of the Abbey were destroyed.

Charters, professing to be grants of lands from Æthelberht to the Abbey of St. Augustine, are preserved by Thomas of Elmham, as well as a grant of privileges from St. Augustine to the same foundation, and known from its seal as the *Bulla Plumbea*. These four documents are now universally held to be spurious. I have discussed them in the "Introduction." The three former may, however, possibly in part preserve the sub-

¹ F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, i. p. 3. The word "doom" was the primitive name for law among the Anglo-Saxons, and was displaced later by the Scandinavian *laga* (i.e. law) (Plummer, ii. p. 87).

stance of the contents of documents burnt at the fire ; of this we have no evidence. What is chiefly valuable in them is the description of the boundaries of those parts of the Abbey property, which probably formed its oldest possession. The *Bulla Plumbea* is no doubt entirely a sophistication dating from much later times, when the practice of forging documents in support of monastic privileges had become common.

Another grant professes to convey the Manor of Tillingham from Æthelberht to Bishop Mellitus and the Monastery of St. Paul's at London.¹ This is also spurious. I have discussed it in the Introduction. Bishop Brown tells us that the Manor of Tillingham, mentioned in the document, still belongs to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, showing that even where the charter is false the reference to the grant of the particular lands may have a real foundation.

There remains a fifth charter,² which has been generally treated as genuine, and which professes to convey certain lands at Rochester from King Æthelberht to Justus, Bishop of Rochester, and the Church of St. Andrew, with the approval of all his *grandeis* and of Bishop Laurence. This document seems to me to be also a clear forgery.³ Its only statement of any value is inserted in Anglo-Saxon, and describes the boundaries conveyed, and runs thus : “*fram Suthgeate west, andlanges wealles,*

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. pp. 59 and 60.

² *Ib.* pp. 52 and 53.

³ *Vide* Introduction.

*oth northlanan to straete; and swa east fram straete
oth doddinghyrrnan ongean bradgeat.*"

Æthelberht was duly registered among the saints, and at least one miracle was attributed to him.¹ His name-day was the 24th of February, under which lives of him are entered in the *Acta Sanctorum*. His remains, as we have seen, were translated to the new Church of St. Augustine's when the other kings and saints were moved, and a notice of the translation occurs in the *Acta Sanct.* vi. 439, 24th May, headed "*Translatio et Laus S. Ethelberti, primi Anglorum Regis Christiani.*"

In the picture of the *sacrarium* at St. Augustine's given by Dugdale, above referred to,² the relics of Æthelberht, as I have said, are put in the place of honour immediately above the altar, and their receptacle is inscribed *Scs Ethelbertus*.

The death of Æthelberht in 616 was nearly coincident with great changes in the distribution of political power on the Continent. Let us first turn to the Empire and its ruler.

We have seen how the tyrant Phocas was dethroned and succeeded by Heraclius. Heraclius was one of the remarkable men by whose character and genius the Empire of Byzantium was several times lifted for a short interval out of the slough of decay to which it had a continual tendency to revert, and who gave it a very considerable new life. Professor Bury has explained how it was that the earlier years of his reign showed little proof of the vigour and power he

¹ See Hardy's *Catalogue*, i. 584.

² *Ante*, p. 213.

possessed, and how this was due to lack of money and of soldiers, and to the intrigues of a dissipated aristocracy at home. Meanwhile, the Persians, under their famous ruler Chosroes, continued their merciless campaign. They invaded Syria and captured Damascus in 613 or 614. Palestine was then invaded and Jerusalem taken, the Patriarch being carried off into captivity, and the Cross, "the Wood" as it was called, was taken off to Persia. After the surrender of the city there was an outbreak of the Christian citizens and a massacre of the Persians. This was terribly revenged, and we are told that the Jews, whose hatred had been aroused to boiling-point by the cruelty they had suffered, ransomed 90,000 Christian prisoners and then slaughtered them.

Egypt was next conquered, and, as elsewhere, the path of the Persians was smoothed by the bitter rivalries of the Christian sects, Monophysites, Jacobites, and Melchites (the Royal party), against each other and against the Jews.

After their capture of Egypt the Persians entered Asia Minor and advanced to Chalcedon, where an attempt at securing peace was made by Heraclius and the Persian general Shahan, which so exasperated the latter's master that he had him flayed alive. Heraclius began to despair, and especially was he embarrassed by the moral rottenness and the want of patriotism of the population of the capital, where, to add to other troubles, the capture of Jerusalem had caused a famine which was followed by a pestilence. He actually con-

templated moving the capital to Carthage, but was dissuaded by another personage who at this time showed marked ability, courage, and good sense, his friend the Patriarch Sergius. The latter aroused a widespread religious fervour among the Christians, who had been specially moved by the capture of what they deemed the most precious relic in the world, the Holy Rood. Meanwhile, the clergy offered Heraclius a larger loan with which to prosecute what had become a religious war, and the gold and silver plate of the Church were melted and converted into coin to help the cause. The public fervour was increased by the almost incredible insolence of the letters of Chosroes, who spoke of the Empire and its ruler in most contemptuous terms.

Things being now ready for what was in effect a great crusade, Heraclius secured his flank by making a very useful if humiliating peace with the Avars. Meanwhile the Persians, leaving Chalcedon, made an assault on Constantinople itself, but were utterly beaten, with the loss of four thousand men and their ships. It was on the day after Easter, in 622, that Heraclius sailed from Constantinople. Dr. Bury says that George of Pisidia delivered an oration in which he foretold that he would redden his black leggings in Persian blood, and the army was accompanied by a famous image of the Virgin which, it was said, had not been made with hands. It is no part of my purpose to detail the magnificent series of victorious campaigns in which Heraclius justified his reputation, during which he had to

face the treachery of the Avar Khan, who took advantage of his necessities to try and capture Constantinople. This was in 626. Every obstacle gave way before his pertinacity, skill, and resourcefulness. Chosroes, retaining his indomitable obstinacy and cruelty to the end, was at length captured and starved to death at the instance of his eldest son Siroes, whom he had displaced in favour of the son of his young and favourite wife Shirin, who with all her children were executed.

By the terms of peace all the Roman provinces were restored, as were all Roman captives, together with what the crowd probably thought the crown of their good fortune, namely, the Holy Rood. "The victor sent to the Imperial Court," says Dr. Bury, "a song of exultation over the fall of 'Chosroes Iscariot,' the blasphemer who had gone to burn for ever in the flames of hell."¹ The people of the capital went out to meet the returning hero with taper processions and myrtle branches, and he was received by Sergius in the Church of St. Sophia, where "the true Cross" was solemnly uplifted, and the ceremony followed the pattern of the ancient triumphs in the capital.

Once more and for the last time the old frontiers of Rome were stretched out eastwards to their farthest limit, while the great and pompous Persian Empire, which had threatened it so long, was humbled in the dust. Heraclius adopted a new policy elsewhere which had far-reaching effects.

¹ Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, ii. 207-245.

In order to meet the continual danger of attacks from the ruthless Avars, he invited the Slavonians (Servians and Croats) to cross the Danube and to plant themselves in the Balkan lands, to act as a cushion between the Empire and their sleepless enemy.

The Emperor was not content to meet and thwart and defeat the external enemies of the Empire, he tried also very strenuously to restore its internal peace, which was continually threatened by feuds. Christendom was then divided, as on many other occasions, by differences mainly depending on very abstruse metaphysical issues, which were all the more dangerous and exciting from the fact of their absolute divorce from questions of morality or conduct or worship. Most of them arose out of the great difficulty of reconciling the complete Unity of the Divine and human natures of Christ, with the continued separate existence of two persons, a problem which naturally taxed all the resources of dialectical casuistry to solve. Sergius the Patriarch of Constantinople discovered a formula by which it was hoped the contending sects might be united, and in which, while allowing the existence of two persons in the God-man Christ, he claimed that there was only one will directing his activities. This view was accepted by the Monophysites and other similar sects, who abounded in Egypt and Africa, and was also accepted by three of the other Patriarchs, including the Pope of Rome.

The only one who stood out was the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

The opportunity was eagerly seized by Heraclius, who, like probably all the more prudent and foreseeing politicians and theologians of the time, was anxious to repair the riven garment of the Church, and under his patronage and by his sanction a pronouncement was published forbidding in future the teaching of a double will in Christ, and affirming His possession of a single will only. This view was called Monothelism, and the pronouncement was called an *Ecthesis*. It led, after the death of Heraclius, as we shall see presently, to some grave consequences.

While Heraclius thus applied what proved an ephemeral remedy to the most important schism in the Church, he continued the merciless campaign of his predecessor against the Jews. It is difficult in our day to appreciate the merits of the quarrel. It was not entirely religious fanaticism, although that had much to do with it on either side. To the civil authorities there was a further question. The Jews had greatly increased in numbers, wealth, and importance, in Greece, Africa, Spain, Georgia, and Arabia ; and with this increase in their weight and power, and the ever-present signs of decay in the affairs of the Empire, there had revived among them a very strong determination "to restore the throne of David" under their long-expected Messiah. They were also aggressive and continually causing riots. On the other hand, we

have had in our day evidences in the Russian "pogroms" of the unmitigated and ruthless cruelty with which Jews can be treated and were treated by the fanatical Christians of the 20th century. While Heraclius held rule there were massacres of Jews in Palestine and at Edessa, and the survivors fled to Arabia. Compulsory baptism was forced upon them, while the Emperor induced the Visigothic King Sisibut, with whom he made a treaty, to follow his example. The wealth of the Jews also excited the rapacity of the mob. They were the great money-lenders, slave-dealers, brothel-keepers, and generally the purveyors of what was unsavoury, and were accused of pursuing any occupation in which money was to be made. On the other hand, we have an account of a famous Jew of Tiberias named Benjamin, who was reputed to have been a persecutor of the Christians, and who consented at the request of Heraclius to be baptized. He honoured Heraclius and his retinue with a princely entertainment on their way to Jerusalem in 629. This type of recreant occurs too frequently in the history of "the chosen race."

So much for the history of the Empire at this time. The death of *Æthelberht* was also nearly coincident with a great change in the distribution of political power in Gaul. As we have seen, Chlothaire, the King of Neustria, had been often defeated by his aunt Brunichildis, acting as the real ruler of the two nations of Burgundy and Austrasia in the name and on behalf of her grandsons,

Theoderic and Theodebert, and his realm had been reduced to small proportions. She herself became more ambitious and exacting as she became older. In her dealings with the turbulent and ruthless chieftains whose ambitions and truculence would have reduced the State to anarchy she never flinched, and she got rid of one after another—*inter alia*, she put to death the patrician Egila, and banished Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, to an island in the Mediterranean and is reported to have secured his death; while she appointed Protadius as Mayor of the Palace, the most dignified office under the Crown. He was a Gallo-Roman, who levied the taxes with great rigour.

Meanwhile, the two boy kings quarrelled about their rights to certain border districts, notably that of Alsace, a name which now appears for the first time, and which was claimed by Theodebert of Austrasia, or rather by the great chiefs who dominated him, and who were much more independent than those of Burgundy. A war ensued, and two fierce battles took place at Toul and Tolbiac, in both of which Theodebert was defeated. He was captured, taken to Chalons-sur-Saône, and there put to death by his brother, who himself died a few months later of a sudden disease which men attributed to “the Providence that avenges fratricide.”

The grandes of Austrasia were determined no longer to support the yoke of their terrible mistress, and headed by Arnulf, Bishop of Metz, and Pepin, ancestor of the Carlovingians, they made an alliance

with Chlothaire of Neustria. In the battle which followed, the Burgundians abandoned her. She was captured, and suffered gross indignity. They put the aged Queen on a camel and made sport of her for the army, tortured her for three days, and then, tying her by a leg and arm to a horse's tail, dragged her along at a furious gallop till she was reduced to a shapeless mass. This was in 613. Thus did Chlothaire revenge his infamous mother and his own bitter reverses. Thus also passed away the greatest Queen the world had seen for a long time, and certainly the greatest personage of this time save Pope Gregory and Heraclius the Emperor. I will sum up the verdict of the gifted scholars who have combined under M. Lavisson to write the latest history of France.

They speak of her as the most remarkable figure of this terrible epoch. Pure in her private life, and incapable of inciting her grandsons to debauchery in order to retain control of them (as has been imputed to her), she had the qualities of a man of affairs and a politician. She was determined to maintain the rights of the Crown against the aristocracy, and claimed the right to appoint the officials and to demand their allegiance. She tried hard to keep alive the old Roman method of taxation, and redistributed the taxes in the towns so as to relieve the poor and make the rich pay their due share. She demanded military service from all who owed it. She dispensed an even justice to all, and attempted to stop the custom of

continual division of property in favour of the succession of the eldest son. She carried her dominance into her dealings with the Church. She increased the endowment of bishoprics, and built a number of new monasteries, as St. Vincent de Laon, St. Martin of Autun, and perhaps St. Martin near Metz ; and as we have seen, she carried on an important correspondence with Pope Gregory, who pressed on her the reform in discipline of the Church in Gaul. Meanwhile, she insisted on the rights of the State to control the monasteries. When Columban complained that the royal officers had entered his Abbey of Luxeuil, he was sent into exile at Besançon, and when he returned he was again seized and sent to Nantes, with the intention of transporting him to Ireland. He went back, however, to Burgundy, and eventually evangelised the Alemannians round the Lake of Constance.

Brunichildis, like other great rulers, loved to build, and tradition attributes to her the erection of several castles, but some at all events which bear her name, as those at Cahors and Vaudemont in Lorraine, go back to Roman times. She also encouraged commerce, and took care of the great royal roads, "*dans certain pays*," say our authors, "*en nomme encore cellesci chaussées de Brunehaut ou chaussées de la Reine.*" All her life she set before herself a great ideal, and was not like the other Merovingians, who were barbarians, and pursued by caprice and passion. She wished, while maintaining the principle of absolutism, to combine

with it order and good administration.¹ With the destruction of Brunichildis and her grandsons, the empire of Chlovis was once more united under one ruler, namely, Chlothaire the Second, to whose reign we shall return presently.

Let us now devote a few sentences to Spain.

Originally the Visigothic monarchy had been an elective one, but the last two or three occupants of the throne, including Reccared, had filled it by reason of their royal lineage. This was apparently not entirely popular, and Reccared's son, Liuva the Second, having been murdered, Witteric, a leading noble supported by the aristocracy, and apparently also by a considerable number of people who still sympathised with Arianism, mounted the throne. Witteric, who reigned from 603 to 610, was eventually murdered. He kept up a continual struggle against the imperial possessions in the Peninsula, and succeeded in ousting the Byzantines from Sagontia on the Guadalete. He was succeeded by Gunthimar, whose short reign of two years, 910-912, produced no notable events. Gunthimar was succeeded by Sisebut, who virtually evicted the Greeks. At his accession they still held on to two strips of country, a small piece in what is the modern Portuguese province of Algarve, including Ossonoba, and a much larger strip along the coast from near Cadiz to Cartagena, of varying extent inland. He conquered these districts, which included Malaga and Assidonia, the bishops of which

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. 148 and 149.

appear for the first time at a Gothic council, at Seville in A.D. 618, two years after the peace by which the conquests of Sisebut were assured to him.¹ There only remained for a few years longer a shadowy foothold of the Greeks in the little Algarvian strip. This conquest made it more easy for close ties to be drawn presently between the Church in Italy and in Spain, which had been hampered by the difficulty of shaping a policy welcome to both Byzantines and Visigoths. Sisebut was the first of the Gothic kings who became famous for his unflinching orthodoxy and fiery zeal. He grievously persecuted the Jews in his dominions, and, in spite of the protests of Isidore, the Archbishop of Toledo, he compelled large numbers of them, against their will and conscience, to become Christians. He also passed laws preventing Jews from possessing Christian slaves, a practice also forbidden by the Imperial Code. He reigned till 621. Spain was at this time in the full bloom of her regenerated Church life, after the long struggle with Arianism, and was really a much more vigorous and intellectual centre of theological learning and of culture than Italy. This was largely due to a wonderful family of three brothers and one sister, the children of a native of Cartagena in Spain, named Severianus, apparently related to the great Gothic King Theodoric. Their names were Leander, Isidore, Fulgentius, and Florentina, and all four were styled saints, which was a quite

¹ Smith, *Dict. Christ. Biog.* iv. 703.

unique distinction. We have spoken before of Leander, the Archbishop of Seville and the close friend of St. Gregory, the real author of the reconciliation with the Arians, and a very notable scholar. He, *inter alia*, wrote for his sister, who became a nun, a Manual or Rule on the Institution of virgins and urging contempt for the world. He was succeeded as Archbishop of Seville by his brother Isidore, the famous and most industrious historian, annalist, and compiler, and the generous protester against the persecution and forcible conversion of the Jews, which had been stirred into fresh life by the impetus given to orthodoxy in the recent conversion from Arianism. It will be instructive to contrast the wealth of authors consulted by Isidore in his works, and apparently contained in his own archiepiscopal library at Seville, of which he says,

“Sunt hic plura sacra, sunt et mundalia plura,”

with the extreme poverty in such materials used by Gregory, already commented upon. These included, in the field of theology, the works of Tertullian, Cyprian, the pseudo Clement (*Recognitiones*), Lactantius, Victorinus, Athanasius, Hilary of Poictiers, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Cassian, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, and Gregory the Great; in philosophy, Aristotle, Plato, and Porphyry (at second hand after Boethius); in science, Aratus, Hyginus, Solinus, Pliny, etc.; in antiquities, Varro and Macrobius;

in grammar and rhetoric, Cicero, Quintilian, Priscian, Donatus, Servius, Victorinus, Velius Longus, Charisius, etc. ; in oratory, Demosthenes (the Olynthiacs) and Cicero ; in law, Gaius, Ulpian, Paul, the Theodosian Code, etc. ; in medicine, Cælius Aurelianus ; in history, Sallust, Livy, Suetonius, Justin, Julius Africanus, Hegesippus, Eusebius, Orosius, etc. ; in poetry, Atta, Cinna, Dracontius, Horace, Juvenal, Juvencus, Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Nævius (under the name of Ennius), Ovid, Persius, Plautus, Pomponius, Proba Falconia, Terence, and Virgil ; in architecture, Vitruvius, etc. These are samples only. What will be noted is the paucity of the references to Greek books.¹

In addition to the remarkable family just named, I ought to mention another Spanish scholar and theologian who was famous at this time, namely, John, Abbot of Biclaro, and afterwards Bishop of Gerona. He was a champion of orthodoxy, and wrote a chronicle dealing with the reigns of Leovigild and Reccared, Kings of the Visigoths. He was born in 540, went to Constantinople in 558, where he stayed till 578, and then returned to Spain. His chronicle is a work of the first authority for the conversion of the Spanish Arians and for the history of the Council of Toledo, at which he was present. I have enlarged somewhat on the history of Spain at this time, because it was in marked contrast with that of Italy and France,

¹ Dom. H. Leclercq, *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, 2nd ed. 324 and 325.

which were both sinking lower and lower in culture and in character. It was in fact with Ireland, the brightest home of Christianity in Western Europe.

Let us now return again to Britain.

King *Æ*thelberht's death caused a great vacancy. To use Thomas Fuller's quaint words, "it appeared as if much of Christianity was buried in his grave." Not Christianity only, for with his death "the hegemony" over the English race held by Kent passed elsewhere, namely, to East Anglia. It is, in fact, very probable that it had done so at his baptism, for we may believe that that act of submission to the foreign faith and the foreign priests would be mightily distasteful to the rough and sturdy pagans who dominated the rest of the land.

"On the death of *Æ*thelberht," says Bede, "when his son Eadbald had assumed the helm of government, it proved a great disaster to the still tender growth of the Church there. Eadbald not only refused to accept the faith of Christ,¹ but polluted himself with such wickedness as was not so much as named among the Gentiles, and married his father's widow."² In this latter offence against Church law, Eadbald was following an old custom of his race, and it is quite probable that Bercta was then an elderly woman. His example in abandoning Christianity was followed (probably gladly) by many of his subjects. Bede tells us the apostate King became

¹ Bede's words are *recipere noluerat*, which, as Mr. Plummer says, imply that he remained a heathen more or less during his father's lifetime (Plummer's *Bede*, ii. p. 88).

² *Bede*, ii. 5.

the victim of an often-recurring insanity, and that he also suffered from the attacks of an unclean spirit—a statement we must of course take with many grains of salt. It was a very usual way of creating terror in the minds of their people for priests to ascribe the misfortunes of their enemies to the wickedness or madness of the princes whom they disliked.

The same movement took place in Essex, only in a more aggressive form. There the Christian King Saberct, who died about the same time as his uncle, *Æthelberht*, left as his heirs three sons, who had meanwhile remained heathens, and who also began to cultivate once more the idols which they had professedly abandoned. Bede tells a story which shows that at that time the unbaptized were sometimes allowed to be present at the sacrament. He says that when they saw their bishop (*i.e.* the Bishop of London) giving the Eucharist to the people, they asked why they also should not have some of the fine bread which he used to give to their father “Saba,” as they were wont to call him, and which they still distributed in church. He replied that if, like their father, they would consent to be baptized they should also partake of the bread, but if they continued to despise the Giver of life they could not possibly receive the bread of life. They refused to go to the font, the need for which they said they did not feel, but they declared they would insist upon eating the bread notwithstanding, and as the bishop (*i.e.* Mellitus) still resisted them, they bade him leave their province; he and his

and in fact turned him out. The story points to the ancient discipline forbidding the presence of the unbaptized at the Eucharist.

When Bishop Mellitus left London, he repaired to Kent to take counsel with his brother bishops there, Laurence and Justus, and they all three decided it was better worth while (*satius*) definitely to leave a country where they had been so ill used and to return to their native land (*i.e.* to Italy). Bishop Browne quotes this fact as a proof that their mission had been really a failure. Mellitus and Justus were the first to set out, and withdrew to Gaul to await events. "The Kings who had driven from them the heralds of the faith" (*i.e.* the Kings of Essex), says Bede, "did not practise the worship of devils very long. They went out to fight against the Gewissians (*i.e.* the West Saxons), and fell, together with their army, but their people still remained obdurate in their idolatry." From the years 616 to 654 the East Saxons continued to repudiate Christianity. It was doubtless largely this attitude which prevented Gregory's original plan of making London the ecclesiastical capital of England from being carried out.

Laurence was on the point of setting out to join Mellitus and Justus. We are told he ordered his bed to be made that very night in the Church of the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul. After uttering many prayers and shedding many tears he lay down and went to sleep, but St. Peter appeared to him in the middle of the night, and

proceeded to scourge him and to demand why he was thus forsaking his flock in the midst of wolves, and reminded him how he himself had suffered bonds, blows, imprisonments, and death itself, for the sake of Christ's little ones. Laurence thereupon, as soon as it was daylight, rose up and went to the King, and drawing aside his garment showed him the result of the castigation he had received. Eadbald was much surprised, and asked who had ventured to inflict these stripes on such a man ; and when he heard that it was for the King's own salvation he had endured the blows at the hands of the Apostle, he was greatly alarmed, denounced his own worship of idols and unlawful marriage, was duly baptized, and proceeded to favour the interests of the Church in every way he could.¹

The story about the scourging of Laurence by St. Peter is referred to by Alcuin in his letter of remonstrance to Bishop Æthelheard : “ *olim sanctissimus ejusdem sedis pontifex Laurentius velle legitur ; qui tamen apostolica auctoritate castigatus, ab incepto resipuit consilio.* ”² It also engrosses two lines in Laurence's epitaph, as given by Thomas of Elmham :—

“ *Hic sacra, Laurenti, sunt signa tui monumenti
Tu quoque jucundus pater, antistesque secundus
Pro populo Christi scapulas dorsumque dedisti
Artibus hinc laceris multa vibice mederis.* ”³

Dr. Hook⁴ and Mr. J. R. Green⁵ explain the story

¹ *Bede*, ii. 6.

² *Mon. Alc.* 367 ; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 519.

³ *Elmham*, 149. ⁴ i. 89. ⁵ *Making of England*, 247.

as having arisen from a dream, but a dream would not have left marks of scourging on the bishop's back. Churton¹ suggests that the stripes were self-inflicted in compunction, by the archbishop; but this does not explain the positive statement made to the King. We are safer in attributing the event to a pious fraud meant to frighten the ruler into penitence, which is the view adopted by Haddan² and Hardwick.³ Similar stories were told of St. Jerome, Bishop Natalius, and St. Columba.⁴ One thing is very plain, the attitude adopted by the three bishops was not an heroic one.

King Eadbald on his conversion recalled Bishops Mellitus and Justus from Gaul, and they came back a year after their self-imposed exile. It would be interesting to know where they had meanwhile been. Justus returned to Rochester, but the people of London refused to receive Mellitus, preferring to remain pagans. It is clear that Eadbald did not possess the same authority there as Æthelberht had done, and Mellitus probably took up his residence at Canterbury. Eadbald's conversion was complete, and he worked to strengthen the faith.⁵ He built a church dedicated to the Holy Mother of God (*sanctae Dei genetricis*), in the precincts of the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul (*i.e.* St. Augustine's), which was afterwards consecrated by Archbishop Mellitus.

This church we have already referred to in

¹ *Early Eng. Church*, 53 and 54.

² *Remains*, 309.

⁴ See Bright, *op. cit.* 118.

³ *Chr. Ch. Mid. Ages*, p. 9.

⁵ *Bede*, ii. 6.

reporting the rebuilding of St. Augustine's Abbey Church, and the translation of the relics of St. Augustine. It was largely pulled down in order to make room for the presbytery of the new building. According to Thorne, a part of it was incorporated in the latter as the "Church in the Crypts."

A second church, which was dedicated to St. Peter, is said to have been built by Eadbald at Folkestone.¹

Two spurious deeds are extant professing to convey lands from Eadbald to the Church. One of them, preserved by Thomas of Elmham,² professes to convey thirty plough lands at "Nortburne" to the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul, and to be witnessed by Archbishop Laurence, Bishops Mellitus and Justus, by the King's wife (*copula*) *Aemma* [sic], daughter of the King of the Franks, and by the King's sons Egberht (who, in the body of the deed, is called Egfrid) and Ercumberht, etc. The second deed, preserved at Lambeth, professes to convey a property called Adesham to Christ Church Cathedral. It is unattested. The latter is dated in 616, the former in 618.³ Nothing in these deeds is genuine except "the parcels," which no doubt describe property in possession of the abbey at a later time.

Archbishop Laurence, who is styled *dilectus archiepiscopus* by the Pope,⁴ died on the 2nd of February 619, and was buried on the same day

¹ "Vit. Sanct. Eanswithæ," Hardy, *Catalogue*, i. 228 and 229.

² *Op. cit.* 144-146.

³ Haddan and Stubbs, 69 and 70.

⁴ *Bede*, ii. ch. 4.

beside his predecessor Augustine in the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul.¹ From Bede ii. 7 it would seem that he added to the churches at Canterbury a “*martyrium*,” *i.e.* a church or shrine dedicated to martyrs, on the south side of the Cathedral, in honour of the Four Crowned Brothers (*Quatuor Coronati*), *i.e.* Severus, Severianus, Victorinus, and Carpophorus, who were martyred in the reign of Diocletian. A well-known church dedicated to them existed near the Caelian Hill in the time of Gregory the First, and was rebuilt in 626 by Pope Honorius.² It is still one of the most curious and interesting churches in Rome.

St. Laurence was buried where so many other archbishops were to be afterwards laid, and was deemed a saint. His relics were preserved in a casket, and placed in the eastern apse of the same church after it was rebuilt, and on the left of those of St. Augustine, as appears from the plan in Dugdale, already mentioned. A number of miracles of the usually otiose character are reported by Gocelin and in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda*³ of St. Laurence both before and after his death.

Before turning to his successor, let us in a few words record the scanty doings of the Popes at this time. We have seen how Boniface the Fourth converted the Pantheon into a Christian church. This is the one notable fact recorded of him. It

¹ *Bede*, ii. 7. ² *Bede*, ii. 7; Bright, *op. cit.* 124 and note 1.

³ Thomas of Elmham attributes to him the appointment of two Abbots of St. Augustine's, namely, John and Rufinianus, *op. cit.* 12 and 148.

is well to remember that we are expressly told he had to ask the Emperor for a gift of the Pantheon before he reconsecrated it, showing that the latter and not the Pope was still the actual owner of the old State property at Rome. Boniface died on the 7th of May 615,¹ and on his tomb the fact just mentioned is made his chief title to fame. It reads thus:—

“Gregorio quartus, jacet hic Bonifacius almus.
 Hujus qui sedis fuit aequus rector et aedis
 Tempore, qui Focae cernens templum fore Romae.
 Delubra cunctorum fuerunt quae Daemoniorum
 Hoc expurgavit, sanctis cunctisque dicavit.”²

The inscription is still preserved in the vaults of the Vatican.

The *Liber Pontificalis* adds that “he converted his house into a monastery,” showing that his heart, like that of St. Gregory, was with the monks. The same authority says that in his time Rome was afflicted with famine, pestilence, and inundations.

He was succeeded six months later by Deusdedit, son of Stephen, a subdeacon and a Roman. The long interval which at this time separated the death of a Pope from the accession of his successor was due no doubt to the necessity of securing the Emperor’s *imprimatur*. The *Liber Pontificalis* says of him that he greatly cherished the clergy, and restored the priests (*sacerdotes*) and clerks to their former position, which has been interpreted as meaning that he reversed the policy of Boniface

¹ *Gregorovius I.* 425.

² *Ib.* 436, note 15.

the Fourth, who had favoured the monks at the expense of the secular clergy.

A similar phrase, "*Hic ecclesia de clero implevit*," is used in the same work of Sabinianus. Deusdedit died on the 8th of November 618,¹ probably of the plague (*clades in populo percussio scabearum*). In his time Eleutherius had been appointed Exarch of Ravenna in the place of John, who had been murdered. He visited Rome, was received in state by the Pope, and then went on to Naples, where he put down a rebellion, and then returned to Ravenna, while great peace reigned in Italy.² Deusdedit was succeeded by another Neapolitan, Boniface the Fifth, who was not consecrated till December 619.³ It was about this time that the Emperors transferred to the Exarchs of Ravenna the right of confirming the appointment of the Bishops of Rome.⁴ According to the Jesuit Garnerio, the editor of the *Liber Diurnus*, the second form of the decree, styled *Decretum de electione pontificis*, was first used at the election of Boniface the Fifth. The electing body is described in the words *Clerus, optimates, et milites seu cives*.⁵

In the *Liber Pontificalis* we are told that Boniface provided that wills were to be interpreted (*i.e.* doubtless by the Ecclesiastical courts) in accordance with the Imperial Code, that no one should be dragged (*trahatur*) from a church (*i.e.*

¹ *Lib. Pont.*, *sub voce* "Deusdedit"; *Gregorovius I.* 426.

² *Liber Pontificalis*, chap. lxx.

³ *Ib.*; and Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 90, note.

⁴ *Gregorovius I.* 427.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 436, note 21.

one who had sought asylum there), that acolytes were not to presume to move the relics of saints (this was to be done by priests alone), and that in the Lateran Baptistry, acolytes were not to take the place of subdeacons as assistants to the deacon in baptisms. Boniface completed the cemetery of St. Nicomedes and consecrated it. The same work speaks of the gentleness of Boniface towards everybody, and that he was devoted to the clergy (*clerus*), *i.e.* he probably cherished them rather than the monks. During his Papacy, Eleutherius the Exarch attempted to displace the Emperor and to mount the throne. He went to Rome and was there killed by the soldiery from Ravenna at the castle of Luciolis, and his head was sent to Constantinople. On his death on the 25th October 625, Boniface was buried at St. Peter's.¹ His epitaph is given by De Rossi.² He was succeeded by Honorius.

¹ *Liber Pontificalis*, Boniface v.

² *Inscript. Christ.* ii. 128.

CHAPTER V

ST. MELLITUS

ON the death of St. Laurence he was followed as archbishop by Mellitus, who, as we have seen, had been Bishop of London, but who was now without a see. It is noteworthy that Bede distinctly calls Mellitus archbishop.¹ Justus still continued Bishop of Rochester. Bede tells us that during their occupation of the two Kentish sees they received a letter of exhortation from Pope Boniface. Mr. Plummer has very plausibly suggested that this letter, or a portion of it, is extant but not intact, and that it has in fact been joined on to another letter written later to Justus, by a scribe who turned over two leaves of a MS. This is supported by the fact that while in the earlier part we have the plural pronouns *vos* and *vester*, in the latter we have the singular ones *tu* and *tuus*, and that the earlier part of the letter was meant to include Mellitus. I think this view is very probable. The part of the letter which Mr. Plummer thinks formed part of the exhortation of Boniface is largely rhetorical, congratulating the bishops in

¹ ii. 6 and 7.

their zeal, and encouraging them. He mentions in it, however, that he had received a letter from King Adulwald¹ (i.e. Eadbald), in which the King had praised their efforts, and he bids them work for the conversion not only of the people subject to him but also of the neighbouring tribes.²

Bede tells us that, although he suffered from the gout, the steps of his mind were sound (*Erat autem Mellitus . . . podagra gravatus sed mentis gressibus sanis*). He reports a story of him, namely, that “the city of Canterbury having on one occasion been set on fire, and being in danger of destruction, no amount of water seeming to quench the flames, which extended to the Bishop’s residence. Trusting in the help of God, he had himself carried to meet them as they assailed with special vigour the Chapel of the Four Crowned Ones already named. Then by prayer the bishop began to drive back the danger which the hands of the whole and strong had not been able to cope with. Presently the wind, which had blown the fire over the city, changed its course and blew southwards, and eventually lulled and became quite calm.”³

During his tenure of the see Mellitus consecrated a chapel dedicated to “the Holy Mother of God,” which had been built by King Eadbald within the precincts of the Monastery of St. Peter and St.

¹ This name is, in fact, a different one entirely to Eadbald, although doubtless meant for the latter. The mistake perhaps arose from the fact that the King of the Lombards at this time was called Adulwald or Ethelwald.

² Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 72 and 73.

³ *Bede*, ii. 7.

Paul¹ (*vide supra*, p. 234). Bede tells us Mellitus died on the 24th of April 624. He speaks of him as naturally of noble birth, but nobler by the loftiness of his soul. Gocelin in his life of him describes certain miracles as performed at his tomb which are specially connected with the cure of the gout from which he suffered so much. When the relics in the old church were translated in 1087, the bones of St. Mellitus were placed on the right of those of St. Augustine in the apse of the new church. It does not appear that Mellitus ever received the pall, which was apparently also the case with Laurentius, and it is equally remarkable that neither of them ordained any bishops, which that fact may explain. When Mellitus died, only one Roman bishop in fact remained in Britain, namely, Justus. The epitaph of Mellitus is given by Thomas of Elmham as follows:—

“Summus pontificum, flos tertius, et mel apricum
 Hac titulis clara redoles, Mellite, sub ara,
 Laudibus aeternis te praedicat urbs Dorobernis
 Cui semel ardenti restas virtute potenti.”

ST. JUSTUS

On the death of Mellitus, Justus succeeded him as archbishop. This was some time after April 624. Bede tells us he received a letter from Pope Boniface authorising him to consecrate bishops, which is addressed *Dilectissimo fratri Justo.*² As Mr. Plummer has suggested, Bede's

¹ *Bede*, ii. 6.

² *Ib.* ii. 8.

transcript of the letter is mixed up with that of another one, above recited. The latter part of the document, as he gives it, alone relates to Justus as archbishop. He writes to say that the bearer of the presents also took with him a pall which he authorised him to use at the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, and then only, and also giving him authority to ordain bishops when need required, so that Christ's Gospel, having many preachers, might be spread abroad among all the nations which were as yet unconverted; and he bade him keep with uncorrupt sincerity of mind what the Holy See had conferred on him, and to remember what was symbolised by what he wore on his shoulders (*tam praecipuum indumentum humeris tuis barlandum suscepereis*).¹

An edition of this letter given by William of Malmesbury is a sophistication, and forms one of a series of forgeries reported by him which were concocted to sustain the claims of the See of Canterbury in its famous controversy with that of York.²

Having received this letter, Justus proceeded to consecrate (alone, be it noted) a new bishop to the See of Rochester which he had himself vacated.³ This was Romanus, doubtless one of the contingent

¹ *Bede*, ii. 8.

² See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 73-75; Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. 91 and 92.

³ Dr. Bright points out the close dependence of the See of Rochester on Canterbury, the successors of Justus being especially expected to do work for the successors of Augustine (*op. cit.* 102). Until the year 1148 the bishops of Rochester were appointed by the Archbishop. The Bishop of Rochester is the cross-bearer of the Province (*op. cit.* 102 and note 1).

of recruits to the mission, who had accompanied him from Rome. He was afterwards sent by Justus on a mission to Pope Honorius.¹ The latter had succeeded Boniface the Fifth at the end of the year 625.² We do not know what the object of this mission was. Bede tells us Romanus was drowned while on the way, "in the Italian Sea," showing that he must have travelled by water across the Gulf of Genoa.

Let us now turn to another part of England.

"East Anglia at this time included the modern counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, together with at least that part of Cambridgeshire which lies to the east of the Great Dyke (the Devil's Dyke) at Newmarket. The parishes in this corner of Cambridgeshire were in the East Anglian diocese till fifty or sixty years ago, when the Archdeaconry of Sudbury was transferred to the See of Ely. . . . The fen country up to Peterborough, although probably reckoned with East Anglia at some period of time, formed a principality of Fen-men (*Gyrvas*), which would count with Mercia or with East Anglia according to the political circumstances of the time."³ Bede says that Ely was in East Anglia,⁴ and, as Dr. Brown says, inasmuch as Medehamstead (now Peterborough) was in the land of the Gyrvii,⁵ it is very probable that Grantacherster or Cambridge was so also.

It was in this secluded district, which was

¹ *Bede*, ii. 20.

² *Lib. Pont.*, sub nom. "Honorius"; *Gregorovius I.* 426.

³ Bishop Browne, *Conv. of the Heptarchy*, 68-69.

⁴ iv. 17.

⁵ *Ib.* iv. 6.

almost an island (for the marshes separated it from the rest of England), that a special swarm of Anglian invaders had settled. They were known to their neighbours as East Anglians, in contrast with those of the race who lived west of the Marshes. Thomas of Elmham describes them as the most strenuous of the German race, and says they were named Stout-heris (*i.e.* bold lords) by their neighbours. He says that "according to a saying they were wont to put their children of tender age on the roofs of their houses so as to test the quality of their nerve and agility."¹ They had a native race of kings whose family stock was known as that of the Uffings, with a reputed ancestor called Uffa, who is called Wuffa by Nennius. The latter calls him the son of Guecha or Vecta, "who was the first who reigned in Britain over the East Angles." He makes him the father of Tidil, and Tidil the father of Eeni.² Bede says that Vuffa was the ancestor of the Vuffings, whose son was Tytil, whose son was Redwald.³ Redwald is not mentioned by Nennius. Florence of Worcester, in his genealogy of the East Anglian kings, conflates the two stories, and says that Eeni and Redwald were brothers. Bede makes Redwald the fourth Bretwalda, and adds that he began to secure the hegemony for his people even during the reign of Æthelberht (*Redwald qui etiam vivente Ædilbercto eidem suae genti ducatum præbebatur, obtinuit*).⁴ Flor-

¹ *Op. cit.* 140.

² *Lib. ii. ch. xv.*

³ *M.H.B.* p. 74.

⁴ *Ib. ii. 5.*

ence of Worcester states (doubtless it was an inference) that he became master of all the Anglians and Saxons south of the Humber.¹ His capital has been located in more than one place. Bishop Browne suggests that it was probably at Rendlesham in Suffolk, a little to the south-east of Woodbridge. Exning, near Newmarket, is also mentioned somewhat later as a royal seat, while Framlingham is named as an East Anglian royal vill. Bede tells us that, having paid a visit to Kent in the time of Æthelberht, Redwald was initiated into the Christian sacraments (*sacramentis Christianae fidei inbutus est*), but in vain, since on his return home he was seduced from the faith by his wife and certain perverse "doctors" (*perversis doctoribus*), thus becoming worse than before—for, after the manner of the ancient Samaritans, he combined the worship of Christ with that of the gods whom he previously worshipped, and in the same shrine and altar (*in eodem fano et altare*) at which he offered the sacrifice of Christ he had a small altar (*arula*) where he offered victims to the demons. Bede says that Aldwulf, who reigned over the province in his time, asserted that this shrine was still existing in his youth, and that he had seen it.²

There seems reason to believe that Paulinus may have gone to East Anglia when Redwald returned there after his visit to Æthelberht, and that he may have done some missionary work there.³ This would explain Bede's silence about the doings of a

¹ *M.H.B.* 636.

² *Bede*, ii. 15.

³ *Vide infra.*

man so famous to the Northumbrians, in the days before he undertook his northern mission. Paulinus may have met King *Æ*edwin about this time. The latter, as we shall see presently, had been driven out of his kingdom of Deira by his brother-in-law, *Æ*thelfrid, the King of Bernicia, and had taken shelter with Redwald. Moved by the gifts and threats of *Æ*thelfrid, Redwald determined to assassinate his guest, but was turned away from that purpose by his Queen, who urged upon him that nothing would be baser than to sell his plighted promise to his young guest for money. He consequently not only sent back *Æ*thelfrid's messengers, but collected his own forces and marched against the latter, and fought a great fight against him on the borders of the Mercians on the eastern bank of the river Idle (*amnis qui vocatur Idlae*). This was probably at Idleton, near Retford.¹ In the fight *Æ*thelfrid was defeated and killed. "As we infer," says Bright, "from a calculation of Bede, this was before the 11th April 617."² In this battle we are told by the latter that Redwald's son Raegenhere was killed. This is the last mention we have of Redwald. It was perhaps the great victory on the Idle which secured for East Anglia the hegemony of England.

In regard to Redwald's double cult of the new Christian faith and that of his old gods, Bright quotes some other apt examples from other places, *e.g.* the ruler of Pomerania, who set up a pagan altar within a church; Hakon, son of Harold

¹ Pearson, *Hist. Eng.* i. 127.

² See *Bede*, ii. 12; Bright, 123.

Fairhair of Norway, who, while signing the cross over his cup, told his people that it meant the hammer of Thor, etc.¹ On the death of Redwald, the date of which we do not know, he was succeeded by his son Eorpwald.

Let us now turn to the Angles of Northumbria. It would seem that at the beginning of their history the whole maritime district from the Humber to the Lammermuirs was occupied by one race, speaking the same dialect and having the same religion and customs. This race was sharply divided by its strongly marked dialect and vowel sounds from that occupying Mercia further south, which had probably been affected by contact with the Romans and Britons. At a later day it was itself divided in twain by a dialectic difference whose origin and cause it is not difficult to trace. Yorkshire was overrun and largely settled and occupied by the Scandinavians. At the time when Domesday Book was compiled, almost all its gentry and landowners were Danes. On the other hand, Durham, Northumberland, and the Lothians were apparently quite free from Danish settlements, and there can be little doubt that what is known as the Yorkshire dialect was the primitive dialect of all Northumbria sophisticated and altered by the Danish speech.

Before the Danish conquest the people of all Northumbria apparently spoke one language, which is preserved in its greatest purity in Northumberland.

¹ *Op. cit.* 120 and notes.

How this race came there, is a great puzzle. We are nowhere definitely told, and it would seem probable that it had been there some time when the Northumbrian history introduces us to any very definite knowledge about the district.

In our earliest notices, Northumbria was divided into two sections, separated by the river Tees or perhaps the Tyne, and respectively called Baernicia and Deira by the Anglians, and perhaps corresponding to earlier Celtic divisions called Brenneich¹ and Deivr. The former stretched from the Tees or Tyne to the Lammermuir Hills, and the latter (roughly corresponding to Yorkshire) lay between the Tees and the Humber.

Bede puts the foundation of Bernicia in 547² and following Nennius he makes Ida, who is given a fabulous pedigree by the latter, its founder. He was the traditional builder of Bamborough Castle, which became the capital of the kingdom, and was succeeded by several sons one after the other. One of these latter, called *Æthelric*, had a son called *Æthelfrid*, who became the ruler of Bernicia in 592. Bede describes him as "a Saul in harassing his enemies," and adds that "no English leader conquered more British land either driving out the Britons or reducing them to slavery."³ In the genealogies attached to Nennius he is called *Ælfret* or *Edlferd Flesaur*, or the ravager.⁴

¹ According to Rhys's *Celtic Britain*, p. 113, a form of Brigantia.

² *Op. cit.* v. 24.

³ *Ib. i.* 34.

⁴ *M.H.B.* 74.

In the year 603 he was attacked by Aidan, King of the Scots of Argyll, whom he defeated at Dagestan, now called Dawston, at the head of Liddesdale.¹

Meanwhile *Ælla*, or *Ælle*, son of *Uffa*, or *Yffi*, had been reigning over Deira. Bede in the short chronicle annexed to his history says that *Ælle* and *Æthelfrith* were Kings of Northumbria during Augustine's mission in Kent.² As we have seen, it was probably some of the captives made in a war between *Ælle* and *Æthelberht* of Kent who gave rise to the tale about Gregory and the Anglian boys above reported.

It was about a year after the battle of Dagestan, *i.e.* in 604, the year in which Gregory and Augustine died, that *Ælla*, King of Deira, also died. His daughter *Acha* had been married to *Æthelfrid*. This did not prevent the latter from immediately attacking *Ædwin*, the son and successor of *Ælla*, and appropriating his kingdom. This is expressly said in Nennius to have been twelve years after his own accession to the throne of Bernicia, *i.e.* in 604.

As *Ædwin* was only forty-eight years old when he was killed in 633, he must have been born in 585, and been about nineteen years old when he was driven from the throne. According to Bede, his brother-in-law pursued him with relentless and bitter animosity from one place to

¹ See Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, i. 177.

² *M.H.B.* 96.

another, through many kingdoms and countries and for many years.¹ At length he sought shelter among the Britons, apparently at Chester. The life of St. Oswald says he was brought up by Cadvan the Welsh King, with his son Cadwallon, and it was probably because of the shelter and kindness shown to him by the monks of the great monastery of Bangor y Yscoed close by, that Æthelfrid in 613² utterly destroyed that foundation and killed all its monks. Ædwin escaped, and seems to have made his way to East Anglia, whose King, Redwald, was perhaps related to him, both having an Uffa for an ancestor, who may have been the same man. Redwald gave him shelter. Æthelfrid was not long in pursuing him thither, and sent Redwald much money to try and bribe him to assassinate his guest, but he would not consent. He sent a second and a third time, offering still larger bribes, and threatening war if he did not comply. At length, either tempted by the money or frightened by the menaces, or still more by the news he had no doubt heard of Æthelfrid's terrible campaign at Chester and his defeat of the Scottish King, he promised either to kill him or to hand him over to the envoys. A friend, says Bede, who had heard of Redwald's determination, went into Ædwin's chamber in the first hour of the night and offered to conduct him where neither Redwald nor

¹ *Bede*, ii. 12.

² *Ann. Camb.*, *ad an.*; *Annals of Ulster*, *ad an.*; *Lloyd, History of Wales*, i. 179, note 68.

Æthelfrid could do him any harm. While thanking him for his kind offices, Ædwin said he could not do this, since he had a pact with the King by which the latter had undertaken to defend him, and if he was to die he would rather do it by Redwald's own hand than by that of a meaner man. Besides, whither was one to fly to, who had for so many years been a vagabond trying to escape with his life?

On the departure of his friend, Ædwin sat on a stone in front of the palace, cogitating what he was to do, whereupon, according to Bede, he had a vision in which he saw a man in a strange dress and of a weird appearance, who asked him what reward he would give him if he found him an escape from his present position, and if he secured his becoming a mighty king greater than all his forefathers. He further asked him if by chance he came to his father's throne in this way, and if a man came to him promising him a new life and a new law better than any he or his fathers had known, he would believe and obey him? Ædwin promised that he would. The apparition then gave him a sign by which the occasion should be remembered, namely, by putting his hand on his head in some peculiar way (perhaps making the sign of the cross is meant), and disappeared. The apparition was afterwards, according to the legend, recognised by Ædwin as that of Paulinus.¹ Soon after, the same friend came to him and said the King had changed his mind, and had been

¹ *Vide infra*, p. 258.

persuaded by the Queen that it would be a shocking thing to betray his guest for gold, and had made up his mind rather to fight *Æthelfrid*. He therefore collected an army and marched against the latter. He did not give him time to collect his forces, but, as we have seen, attacked him on the eastern bank of the river Idle, a tributary of the Trent in Nottinghamshire,¹ and defeated and killed him, but he lost his own son Raegenhere in the struggle.² The battle was fought about the year 617.

The result of this fight was very important. *Æthelfrid* had been a mighty king and conqueror, and *Ædwin* was now put on the throne, and secured not only his paternal dominions of Deira, but also Bernicia, and drove out *Æthelfrid*'s sons, with a large following of nobles (*nobilium*).³ They took shelter among the Scots or Picts (*Scottos sive Pictos*), and there they were taught the faith and were baptized (*ad doctrinam Scottorum cathecizati et baptismatis sunt gratia recreati*).

Ædwin's further career of conquest began early; apparently in the very first year of his reign, he attacked a British principality called Elmet, which still existed in the West Riding of Yorkshire and possibly dominated over Lancashire and its borders. Of this principality Leeds (*Loidis*) was the principal town.

By this conquest *Ædwin* extended the kingdom of Deira to the English Pennines, and enclosed

¹ *Vide ante.*

² *Bede*, ii. 12.

³ *Ib.* iii. 1.

the West Riding within his dominions. It is not improbable that at the same time he also became master of Lancashire, and thus ruled northern England from sea to sea.

He seems now to have turned his attention to his northern neighbours, among whom the sons of *Æthelfrid* had taken refuge, and proceeded to conquer the district between the Firth of Forth and the Lammermuirs, which we call the Lothians. There he planted a settlement under the great rock so closely associated with the name of Arthur. This fortified post, to which he gave its name of *Ædwinburgh*, became in later days the capital of Scotland.

Having thus punished his northern neighbours, and perhaps compelled them to give up the shelter which they had offered to the sons of *Æthelfrid*, he seems to have begun a long and a terrible warfare against the Britons of Wales. Of this we have no details in the English chronicles, but the Welsh poems preserve some grim memories of it. The war was apparently carried on against Cadvan, the King of North Wales, and his son Cadwallon.

Ædwin pushed his conquests out into the west, and even as far as the two islands of Menavia, *i.e.* the Isle of Man and Anglesea. Nennius expressly says he conquered the Menavias (in the plural). Bede tells us that the southern Menavia, *i.e.* Anglesea, was more fruitful and richer than the more northern one, and was

occupied by 960 families, while the northern one, *i.e.* the Isle of Man, only contained 300.¹

In the Cambrian Annals we have a short pregnant entry under the year 629, where we read that Cadwallon was besieged in the island of Glannauc (*i.e.* Priestholm, near Anglesea). This shows the stress to which he was then driven. Ædwin had now become the most powerful ruler whom the Anglians had produced, and his imperial authority probably extended from the Forth to the Thames, or rather to the English Channel, for he was apparently acknowledged as overlord by all England except perhaps Kent. Such was his fame and his firm grip of authority that Bede tells us it had become proverbial that a woman with a newborn babe could safely traverse the land from sea to sea without molestation. As a proof of his benevolence it is told of him that in many places where there were springs of water near the highways he put up stakes, to which he fastened brazen cups, that travellers might refresh themselves and that no one dared remove them. Bede tells us further that he was wont to have a standard carried before him, not only in war-time, but also when he rode with his officers through the towns and villages, which was called by the Romans *tufa*, and by the English *thuuf*.² The *tufa* is mentioned by Vegetius among the military standards,³ and was formed of a *tuft* of feathers—"une Tuffe de plumes," as it

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. 9.

² *Op. cit.* iii. cap. 5.

³ *Bede*, ii. 16.

is called in a charter of Gervase of Clifton to Robert de Bevercotes in the time of Richard II.¹

While *Æ*Edwin was a fugitive he married Quenburga, the daughter of Cearl, whom Bede calls a King of Mercia. Of this Cearl we have no independent mention, and it would in fact seem that there was no kingdom of Mercia at this time, and that that kingdom was first founded by Penda. It is more probable that he was a king or chief of Wessex, which would account for the conduct of the Wessex King, Cwichelm, to be presently mentioned. By Quenburga *Æ*Edwin had two sons, namely, Osfrid and Eadfrid.²

Now that he had become a mighty potentate, *Æ*Edwin was anxious to ally himself with the blood of *Æ*thelberht, which had been, as we have seen, strengthened by a graft from the famous royal line of the Frankish Kings. It is possible that his former wife was still living, we do not know, but we now find him making advances to Eadbald, the son of *Æ*thelberht, for the hand of his sister *Æ*thelberga.

Eadbald replied that it was not lawful to give a Christian maiden in marriage to a man who knew not the true God. Upon which *Æ*Edwin said that she and those she brought with her should be free to worship in any fashion they pleased, and that he himself would become a Christian if he found on due examination that that religion was worthier than his own.

¹ *M.H.B.* 168, note *c.*

² *Bede*, ii. 14.

Thereupon, the Princess was duly sent, with her attendants. With them went Paulinus, who was consecrated a bishop on 21st July 625, by Justus, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Christianity, as we have seen, was at this moment limited among the Anglo-Saxons to the Kentish subjects of Eadbald, and to such a sophisticated form of that faith as was partially followed in East Anglia. In setting out on his journey Paulinus was like Augustine, a veritable missionary bishop. We are told that Cwichelm, the King of Wessex, now sent one of his men called Eomer with a poisoned dagger to assassinate Ædwin. The King was spending the Easter feast of 626 at his royal villa on the river Derwent. This has been identified as Aldby.¹ The messenger had an interview with the King, during which he struck at Ædwin with his dagger, but Lilla, the King's thane (not having his shield with him), intervened his own body, and the blow was so determined that the blade went right through him and wounded Ædwin. The men who were standing round thereupon slew Eomer.²

The same night Æthelberga bore her husband a daughter, who was named Eanfleda. The King duly thanked his gods in the presence of Paulinus, and the latter offered his to Christ, and assured Ædwin that the child had been born in answer to his own prayers. He was greatly pleased at this, and promised that if he returned successfully from his war against the West Saxons he would become

¹ *M.H.B.* 158.

² *Bede*, ii. 9.

a Christian, and in token of his sincerity he permitted him to baptize the child, who thus became the first-fruits of his mission among the Northumbrians. At the same time eleven other families were also baptized. This was on the 8th June 626.¹

Ædwin, having recovered from his wound, marched against the West Saxons and destroyed or received the submission of all who had conspired against him.² The statement in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (which in this portion, in so far as it is of any value, was apparently entirely dependent upon Bede) that he slew five of their kings, seems absolutely without foundation.

On his return home, Ædwin was indisposed to carry out his promise to Paulinus to become a Christian, without further consideration (*inconsulte*), although he gave up his idols. He conferred much with the bishop, and also with those among his chieftains whom he considered to be most wise, and asked them what they thought should be done. He no doubt feared (and as it proved had good reason to fear) that the revenge of the pagan party, which had been powerful enough to deprive Æthelberht of Kent of his great supremacy, and to transfer it for a while to Redwald of East Anglia, might undo him also.

One day, according to Bede's story, Paulinus entered his room and, putting his hand on his head (which was the sign which the apparition had

¹ *Bede*, ii. 9.

² *Ib.*

given him in his distress when at Redwald's court), reminded him of the promise which he had then made to him. Ædwin, says Bede, "like a man of great natural sagacity often sat alone for a long time together in silence, holding many a conversation with himself in the depth of his heart, considering what he ought to do and what religion he should observe."¹

At this point, and before he reports Ædwin's conversion, Bede inserts two letters from the Pope to Ædwin and his wife respectively, which he attributes to Pope Boniface the Fifth. I have discussed these letters in the Introduction, where I have argued that they are very suspicious.

Ædwin having discussed his position with Paulinus, determined, before finally committing himself, again to debate the matter with the princes, his friends, and his counsellors (*amicis et consiliariis suis*), so that if their view coincided with his own they might all be baptized together. Paulinus approved of this, and a Witenagemote, or great council of his kingdom, was accordingly summoned. At this the King asked every one individually what he thought of this new teaching.

The first to speak was Coifi (a name which Kemble says was equivalent to Cœfig or Cefig, *i.e.* the bold or active one), the head priest (*Primus pontificum*) of the old pagan religion, who had apparently been previously approached. He bade the King decide for himself, for as far as he was

¹ *Bede*, ii. 9.

concerned he had come to the conclusion that the faith he had hitherto professed had neither virtue nor profit in it. "None of your people," he said—or as the Anglo-Saxon version has it, "None of your thanes" (*thegna*)—"has been more faithful to the old gods than myself, yet there are many among them who have received greater gifts and dignities than I have, and have also had greater luck in their plans and their gains. If the old gods had any real power, they would have favoured me, their most devoted worshipper." "If you therefore, on a due examination, find the new things now preached are better and stronger, let us all adopt them without delay."

The speech of Coifi was followed by that of one of the King's ealdormen (*alius optimatum regis*), who spoke in a more serious and elevated mood. He said that "man's life here, in comparison with the time beyond, of which we know nothing, is as if we were sitting in the winter-time at supper with your ealdormen and thanes (*cum ducibus ac ministris tuis*) at a fire in the middle of the hall by which it is warmed, while outside were storms of wintry rain and snow, and a sparrow were to enter and fly quickly through the house, in at one door and out at the other. While it was inside it would be untouched by the wintry storm, but when that moment of calm had run out, it would pass again from winter into winter, and you would lose sight of it. So this life is a short interlude; of what follows it, and of what went before, we know

nothing. If this new teaching, therefore, has brought any sure knowledge to us, we would do well to follow it." This beautiful simile shows that the great council meeting took place in winter. The rest of the King's hereditary chieftains (*ceteri majores natu*) and his counsellors now followed (and by God's instigation) in the same strain.

Coifi again intervening, now suggested that they would like to hear Paulinus. When they had done so, Coifi said: "I have long felt that what we have worshipped has been nothing at all (*nihil esse, quod colebamus*), and the more I have sought for the truth in it, the less I have found it. I now acknowledge that in the new teaching shines the truth, which can give us the gifts of life and health and everlasting happiness. I propose, therefore, that we ban and burn the temples and altars which we have consecrated to no profit."

Thereupon the King gave permission to Paulinus openly to preach the Gospel, and himself renounced idolatry. When he asked Coifi who should first profane the altars and shrines with their enclosures (*cum septis, i.e.* the frith-geard or heath-tun of the Angles), he answered: "I in my folly cherished them, and who but myself when enlightened by God's wisdom should undo them." So he girded himself with a sword, and mounting the King's charger (*et ascendens emissarium regis*) proceeded to the idols. The multitude thought him mad. When he drew near the temple he cast his lance

at it, and thus desecrated it, and bade his companions destroy and fire the fane and all its sacred hedges (*fanum cum omnibus septis suis*). Dr. G. F. Maclear remarks that this action must have looked like that of a madman to his people, for as a priest he could not bear arms, or ride, except on a mare.¹

The place which was afterwards shown as the site of the idol temple, says Bede, was not far from York, towards the east and beyond the Derwent, and "is called Godmunddingaham"² (now Godmanham, *i.e.* the enclosure of the gods, near Market Weighton).³ Smith says it was situated near the Roman Delgovitia, which Camden derives from the British Delgwe, meaning statues of the gods. In regard to the whole incident, Bede adds, quoting Vergil, that the chief priest "destroyed the altars which he had himself consecrated" (*destruxit eas quas ipse sacraverat, aras*).


We are next told that the King with all his nobles (*cum cunctis gentis suae nobilibus*), and a great crowd of people were baptized on Easter Day, 12th April 627. This ceremony took place at York, in the wooden church dedicated to the Apostle Peter, which Ædwin had built hastily when he was a catechumen under instruction for baptism (*cum cathecizaretur*). This (no doubt) very rude structure was the first-recorded church on the site of York Minster. Bede tells us that a

¹ *The English*, p. 52.

² *Bede*, ii. 13.

³ Bishop Browne, *op. cit.* 181, and note 1.

YORK MINSTER



GROUND PLAN OF THE CHURCH OF PAULINUS AT YORK.

To face p. 262.

certain Abbot of Peartaneu (Parteney, near Spilsby, in Lincolnshire ; it was a cell of Bardney and afterwards absorbed by the latter) reported that a man of great veracity, called Deda, told him that he had talked with an aged man who was baptized by Paulinus in the river Trent in the presence of King Ædwin.

It is a curious fact, for which we have no adequate explanation, that Nennius and the Cambrian Annals say that Ædwin was converted by Run map Urbgen, *i.e.* Run, the son of Urien, who continued to baptize his people, the Ambrones, for forty days. By Ambrones the people on the river Umber (*i.e.* the Northumbrians) are perhaps meant. How the name Run came to be substituted for Paulinus I do not know. It is not difficult, however, to convert Paulinus into Paul i hen, and thus make a Welshman of him, as was in fact done.

Ædwin made plans under the direction of Paulinus for the building of a stone church, "a larger and more august basilica of stone" (*curavit docente eodem Paulino, majorem ipso in loco et augustiorem de lapide fabricare basilicam*), upon the same spot, in the midst of which he enclosed his earlier chapel. The foundations having been laid, he began to build a four-sided (*per quadrum*) basilica, but before they had reached their full height, the King, says Bede, "was wickedly slain, and left the work to be finished by his successor Oswald." It was subsequently burnt in 1069.

Mr. Micklethwaite tells us that "the works at York Minster, which followed on the burning of the quire in 1829, brought to light evidence of the earlier buildings on the site. In the western part of the quire, below everything else, there was found a remarkable foundation of concrete and timber. It did not belong to the present building, nor to the Norman one that preceded it, but to something older; and when the plan of it is laid down by itself, it appears plainly to show the foundation of a basilican church with a transept like that at Peterborough. The foundation of the presbytery is wanting, and was probably removed in the course of the building of the present quire, and I suspect something is also wanting at the west, where the central tower of the church is now, and that the building went on further, far enough to make the nave equal the transept in length. The width of the transept was about 30 feet, and that between the aisle walls about 68 feet. If the ancient walling which remains visible at the sides of the site of the nave be the substructure of the arcades of the first church, the middle span was about 30 feet, but, if they be later, it may have been a little more. The continuation of the foundation all across, in line with the western wall of the transept, seems to point to the substitution of an arcade for the 'triumpnal' arch in that place."¹ Bishop Browne quotes Canon Raine as writing of the present crypt: "In another peculiar place is the actual

¹ *Arch. Journ.* 1896, pp. 305-306.

site, if I mistake not, of the font in which *Æ*dwina became a Christian.”¹

Paulinus continued for six years after the King’s baptism to preach the Word in the province with the consent and goodwill of *Æ*dwina and without a break—that is to say, till the end of *Æ*dwina’s reign.

Among those who, according to Bede, at this time “believed and were baptized, being pre-ordained to eternal life,” were Osfrid and Eadfrid, *Æ*dwina’s sons whom he had had by Quenburga, the daughter of King Cearl. Subsequently the children he had by *Æ*thelberga, namely, *Æ*edilhun and *Æ*edilthryd, and another son named Wuscfrea, were also baptized. Of these latter the two former died when young (*albati adhuc rapti sunt*) and were buried at York.² So great was the fervour for the faith, that on one occasion when Paulinus went with the King and Queen to the royal vill (*in villam regiam*), which was called Adgefrin, *i.e.* Ad Gefrin, now called Yeverin, in Glendale,³ he spent six-and-thirty days from morning till night in catechising and in baptizing in the river Glen (*in fluvio Gleni*). This is now called the Beaumont water, a tributary of the Till.⁴ The vill just named was, according to Bede, laid waste in later times and replaced by another at Maelmin.⁵

¹ *Alcuin of York*, p. 81, by Bishop Browne.

² *Bede*, ii. 14.

³ Plummer, ii. pp. 104 and 105.

⁴ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. p. 105.

⁵ Smith, in a note to Bede, and following Camden, col. 1097, ed. 1753, identifies this with Millfield, near Wooler. Mindrum, higher

In Deira (roughly Yorkshire) Paulinus also had a marked success. We are told he used to baptize in the river Swale, which flows past the village of Cataractam (*i.e.* Catterick, called Cetrehtan in the Anglo-Saxon version), for, as Bede says, the Church was then only in its infancy and they had not been able to build oratories (*i.e.* chapels) or baptisteries (*oratoria vel baptisteria*).

At Campodonum,¹ where there was a royal vill, he built a basilica which was probably made of wood² and was afterwards burnt, as was the whole place, by the heathens who slew King *Æ*dwini. Its altar, however, which was of stone, escaped the fire, and, when Bede wrote, was still preserved in the monastery of the abbot and priest Thrydwulf, in Elmet Wood.³ Bishop Browne tells us that Paulinus "left his mark on Northumbria. 'Pallinsburn,' in the north of Northumberland, still commemorates him. It used to be said that an inscription on a cross at Dewsbury recorded his preaching there."⁴

up the Glen, on the borders of Northumberland and Roxburgh, has also been suggested, while Mr. C. J. Bates suggests Kirk Newton, where there is a church dedicated to St. Gregory. See Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 105.

¹ It is called Donafeld in the Anglo-Saxon version, a name possibly still surviving in Doncaster; perhaps Slack, near Huddersfield (Plummer, ii. 105). It has also been identified with Tanfield, near Ripon (see Smith's *Bede*).

² In the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede the word here used for "built" is *getimbran*, showing how general was the use of wooden buildings at this time.

³ *Bede*, ii. 14.

⁴ Bright, 138, note 1. Camden mentions this cross, and says it was inscribed "*Hic Paulinus praedicavit*" (*Britt.* col. 709). A successor to it, according to Whitaker, was accidentally destroyed in 1812 (Loidis and Elmete, 299).



THE TWO SIDES OF THE CROSS IN THE CHURCHYARD AT WHALLEY.

To face p. 266.

In the time of Edward the Second the boundary of some land near Easingwold is described as extending '*usque ad cruces Paulini*' (i.e. as far as the crosses of Paulinus), while Brafferton, near Easingwold, is, by local tradition, made a baptizing and preaching place of Paulinus.¹ A cross of Paulinus again, is still shown at Whalley, in Lancashire, one of three remarkable Anglian shafts remaining in that most interesting churchyard, and the one of all the early shafts still preserved among us which most suits by its style that very early ascription."²

"Paulinus," says Bede, "also preached the Word in the province of Lindissi, which was situated south of the Humber, and reached to the sea"³ (i.e. the later Lincolnshire); it then probably formed a part of Northumbria). He further tells us that Blaecca, whom he calls the *præfect* of the city (*civitatis*) of Lindocolina (i.e. Lincoln), with his family were converted. Florence of Worcester professes to give his pedigree up to Woden, and says that his ancestor was given Thong Castle, with all Lincolnshire, by Hengist. In that city he built a stone church of beautiful workmanship (*operis egregii de lapide*), the roof of which, he says, has been brought down (*dejecto*) either by long neglect or by the hands of enemies, but the walls are still standing, and every year some miracles of healing are displayed on the spot for the benefit of those who seek the faith. It was in this church, according to

¹ Murray's *Yorkshire*, 230.

² Browne, *Augustine and his Companions*, 183.

³ *Bede*, ii. 16.

Bede, that on the death of Justus, *circ.* 630, Honorius was consecrated archbishop in his stead.¹ Mr. Mason says in a note that it now goes by the name of St. Paul's, which is short for St. Paulinus.

Bede says, in regard to the conversion of the province, that he was told a story by a very truthful (*veracissimus*) presbyter, a man called Deda. He was abbot of the Monastery of Parteney. He reported that he had been informed by an elderly man (*quendam seniorem*) that he had been baptized in the middle of the day by Bishop Paulinus (in the presence of King *Æ*dw in, and with him a multitude of people) in the river Trent (*Treenta*), near a city (*juxta civitatem*) which was called, in the language of the Angles, *Tiouul-fingacaestir*.² In the Anglo-Saxon version it is called Teolfinga ceastre. I agree with Mr. Plummer that the name has nothing to do with that of Torksey, with which it has been equated, and which is called Turcesig in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in 873. There is good reason to believe it was at or near Farndon, where the old ford across the Trent was placed.

Dr. Bright tells us that Southwell in Nottinghamshire has always claimed Paulinus as its founder.³ The old man mentioned by Deda, who had been baptized by Paulinus and therefore knew him well, described him as of tall stature, somewhat bent, with

¹ *Bede*, ii. 16.

² *Ib.* ii. 16.

³ P. 141, note. He argues that the tradition arose from the fact that, from Saxon times, St. Mary's of Southwell was subject to St. Peter's of York.

black hair, spare face, and a very thin hooked nose ; looking at the same time venerable and fierce (*venerabilis simul et terribilis aspectu*). He had with him as his assistant James, a deacon, and a man both indefatigable and noble (*industrium ac nobilem*) in Christ and in the Church.

Bede says that Archbishop Justus died on the 10th November.¹ He does not state the year, which was probably 630.²

Before we deal with the next archbishop and his career, it will be convenient to make a survey of the progress of events in other parts of the Christian world at this time.

I brought down the reign of Heraclius to the point where by his vigour and genius he had trampled on the power of the Persians and restored the Eastern limits of the Empire to their farthest stretch as in the days of Justinian, and I have also referred to his temporary success in allaying the great feuds which then rent the Church, or at least the Eastern portion of it. I must now turn to a very different story, namely, that of his disastrous later life. No more tragical contrast exists in history, nor one more inexplicable. That one who had shown such skill, resource, and energy should have almost suddenly lost his initiative and power

¹ *Bede*, ii. 18.

² The *Anglo-Saxon Chr.*, MS. E, a twelfth century Peterborough document and a poor authority, puts it in 627, but this date does not occur in the Canterbury copies of the *Chronicle*, MSS. A and F. Smith, in his edition of *Bede*, argues that it was about 630, which is probably right.

of will and allowed his mind to become entangled in the metaphysical struggles of priests and monks to the exclusion of all care and solicitude for his country and people, and permitted a new and a very long-lived enemy of the Empire to overwhelm one-half of it so effectually that it passed completely out of his control, is indeed a puzzle.

The enemy in question came from Arabia and its borders, and were known very widely as Saracens, and in race, physique, and temperament greatly resembled the Jews.¹ A great prophet arose among this race, who seized (as prophets sometimes do) the imagination and the peculiar instincts of the Arabs, and produced not only a new departure, but a new religion in which a great deal was directly adopted from the Jews: not merely the patriarchal story and various legends which were mingled with others from the desert, but the great cardinal feature which united Jews and themselves, namely, the worship of one God who divided his authority with no other being and would tolerate no rivals under any form or name. Muhammed modified considerably but not entirely, and then incorporated, the ethical teaching of the later Jews. Having bound his followers together in

¹ The name Saracen, of doubtful etymology, was, so far as we know, first applied among the classical writers by Ammianus Marcellinus, who, writing in the second half of the fourth century, applies it to certain tribes of plundering Arabs on the Roman frontier. It was afterwards used as a generic name for the predatory Arabs.

a very powerful leash, as the children and servants of Allah (their form of Jehovah), he bade them fight the battle of their one and only God with merciless persistence against all idolaters, and against the Christians, whose belief in a Triune deity could not, in Muhammedan eyes, be disentangled from a worship of three gods. In the name of Allah he promised them great rewards not only in this world, but in the next, where those who died or suffered for their faith would live such Sybaritic lives in heaven as the desert children had never dreamed of.

This was not all. It seems plain to me that Muhammed not only derived a large part of his sacred book from the Bible of the Jews, but that the large number of Jews, many of them fugitives, who then lived in Arabia and its borders, and who had been very harshly treated by the Emperor and the officials of the Church, did a great deal to incite the Arab race, already on fire with the eloquent appeal made to their hearts and their passions by their prophet. They also helped in a great many ways to keep alive the undying and unquenchable heroism and furore of the descendants of Ishmael. The latter were further incited and inspirited by their priests, whose rôle may be compared with that of the children of St. Dominic in the terrible campaigns against the Albigenses. It is, further, pretty certain that both the Jews and their own Fakirs and Kadhis would present in most attractive shape the prize that was within their reach if they behaved

like men. They urged them, no doubt, to hit the weary giant whose heart was at Constantinople some heavy blows, where his limbs were most paralysed by the internecine religious feuds of the orthodox and the heterodox among the Christians. They further, doubtless, offered as a bait a rich booty of gold and silver, silks and spices, with which the provinces of old Rome still teemed, which must have been very inviting to warriors whose lives had been so hard and whose fare had been so scant. This is all clear, but it would hardly have availed against the disciplined forces which sent the great Chosroes to his grave, if it had not been for the mental and moral paralysis which overtook Heraclius in his later days.

Muhammed, having secured the adhesion of a large number of his countrymen in Arabia, wrote in 628 to the Emperor, to the King of Persia, and to the King of Abyssinia urging them to adopt the Faith. The King of Abyssinia accepted the invitation in an enthusiastic and humble letter. Chosroes, transported with fury, characteristically ordered the Governor of Yemen to send him the insolent Arab in chains. Heraclius said neither yes nor no, but sent presents to Muhammed in acknowledgment of his communication.¹ In 632 Muhammed died, and was succeeded as khalif (*i.e.* successor) by Abubekr, who at once planned with Omar an attack on Persia and on "New" Rome. Khalid ("the sword of God") was sent into Irak against the former, and four

¹ Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire*, ii. 261-2.

other generals were sent into Syria, who quickly captured Bostra and Gaza; and presently a Roman army was defeated on the banks of the Yermuk, which falls into the sea of Tiberias. This battle decided the fate of Damascus, which fell in 635. Emessa or Hims and Heliopolis or Baalbek were taken a year later, whereupon Heraclius, who was either at Edessa or Antioch, abandoned Syria and fled to Chalcedon. Abubekr had died soon after the fight at Yermuk, and had been succeeded as khalif by Omar. Tiberias, Chalcis, Bercea, Epiphania, and Larissa successively fell, while Edessa agreed to pay tribute. Antioch, the seat of one of the five patriarchs, was next taken. As Mr. Bury says, there can be no doubt that the rapid conquest of Syria was facilitated by the apostasy of Christians as well as the treachery of Jews. In 637 Jerusalem, the seat of a second patriarchate, also fell after a siege of two years. Omar was conducted round the city by the obsequious patriarch Sophronius, and a mosque was built on the site of Solomon's temple. A desperate but futile attempt was made to recover Syria, but the Roman army was utterly beaten, and for some centuries it remained in the hands of the Muhammedans. The conquest of Syria was speedily followed by that of Mesopotamia. Edessa, Constantina, and Daras were captured in 639. A year earlier, the Persian Empire had been laid in the dust by the defeat of its armies at Cadesia after a four days' fight.

Shortly after, its capital Ctesiphon was taken and sacked. Presently ‘the battle of Nehavend, ‘the victory of victories,’ stamped out for ever the dynasty of the Sassanids, which had lasted somewhat more than four hundred years, 226–641.’¹

Egypt was the next to fall. If, says Mr. Bury, a foreign invader was welcome to some in Syria, still more was he welcome in Egypt. The native Copts, who were Jacobites, hated the Greeks, who were Melkites, and this element was made use of by Amru, the Arab general, to effect his conquest, which was rapidly carried through; its capital, the mighty and famous city of Alexandria, falling on December 641, and being replaced as the seat of government by Fostat, afterwards called Cairo. Heraclius himself died on the 11th of February of the same year.

The political and economical effect of these conquests, by which some of the richest provinces in the Empire passed into other hands, must have been appalling. Not less appalling must they have been in their effect upon the whole public conscience and sense of pride and of self-respect of the Christian world. It was doubtless due to three causes—the paralysis in the character and will of the Emperor; the animosities of the various Christian sects against each other, and of all of them against the Jews, which were vigorously returned; and lastly, the fact that the men from the desert were strong men with a strong faith in themselves

¹ Bury, *op. cit.* 269.

and their religion, while the subjects of the Empire were as weak in morals as they were physically. Mr. Bury has quoted a graphic sentence in which the Imperial governor of Egypt who surrendered his trust, Mukankas, justified his act to the Emperor. "It is true," he said, "that the enemy are not nearly so numerous as we, but one Mussulman is equivalent to a hundred of our men. Of the enjoyments of the earth they desire only simple clothing and simple food, and yearn for the death of martyrs because it leads them to paradise, while we cling to life and its joys, and fear death."¹

In addition to the results here named, the conquests of the Arabs had a far-reaching if not quite immediate effect upon the Papacy. Up to this time the Pope, if generally acknowledged as the senior administrative-officer of the Church, was so rather in regard to precedence than dominance. He shared his position as Patriarch with four others, three of whom had titles as old as his own, and each of whom had a jurisdiction within his province as independent as his own. One of them, who presided at Alexandria, governed a Church which had been famous for its learning and for the number of theologians it had produced. It was in these respects far more famous than Rome. The relative positions of the three Patriarchs just named were now to be entirely altered. They became more or less insignificant personages, with great titles, but with very scant

¹ *Op. cit.* 270.

power and influence. Their people and they themselves became the subjects of Muhammedan rulers instead of being under the ægis of the orthodox Emperors. They became poor and more or less illiterate ; their schools decayed, their theological influence shrank and disappeared. The result of all this was the great enhancement of the prestige of the two Patriarchs who remained, the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople, and especially of the Pope who, living in the Old Rome and far away from New Rome, was not so much dominated by the Emperor and his courtiers as his brother-Patriarch of Constantinople, while the adherence of the Lombard and Spanish Arians to orthodoxy and the initiation of a new missionary church in Britain added greatly to the extent of the territory which acknowledged him as its head. This enhancement in his position, however, was not immediately forthcoming, but came presently.¹

¹ If we try to realise the desolation and misery caused, and the terrible sufferings and bloodshed which resulted in later years in half the Eastern Empire by its conquest by the Muhammedans, we shall indeed wonder that a Christian priest, the latest historian of the Popes, should write the following blasphemous comment on it : "The Catholic historian may well be excused in seeing the hand of God in the fact of three out of the four Patriarchs becoming at this period subject to the Saracen. With an ambitious patriarch of Constantinople, a mere puppet in the hands of emperors often worthless and tyrannical, and with the other three patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem also subject to their sway, one cannot help feeling that, short of this calamitous subjugation of Christian bishops to Moslem Caliphs, nothing could have checked the growing pretensions of the Byzantine emperors and patriarchs in the ecclesiastical and spiritual orders, or have prevented the bishop of Constantinople from becoming Universal Patriarch in fact as well as in name. . . . In a word, as a direct result of the Moslem conquests, which can only be described as an 'act of God,' the power and

The Emperor Heraclius died in February 641, leaving the Empire in sore straits. He left two sons, the elder of whom had been his colleague, and a younger one, Heraclonas, by a second wife, Martina, whose influence and counsel possibly explain the changed character of the old Emperor. She at once began an intrigue in favour of her son, and was supported by Pyrrhus the Patriarch and by the Monothelites. Constantine, the eldest son of Heraclius, was, according to a doubtful statement of Zonaras (a very late authority), an opponent of that view. The latter was successful in the struggle and mounted the throne, but died after a reign of only three months and a half, and it was suspected he had been poisoned by Martina. The issue now lay between Heraclonas and Heraclius the son of Constantine, but after a few months the party of the latter prevailed, and he mounted the throne in September 642, at the age of eleven,

importance of the Oriental patriarchs has gone on decreasing from age to age since that period, till now their names are scarcely known" (Mann, *Hist. of the Popes*, i. 302). What would St. Gregory have had to say to one of his priests who should write thus of his own co-patriarchs, whom he treated as equals and wrote to so deferentially and kindly. The notion of attributing the fearful consequences to Christ's flock in half the Christian world which ensued from the Moslem conquest, to the act of God, is in itself a shameless statement. It takes us back to the views of another kind of God than ours (a kind of Avatar of Shiva) who was supposed to delight in the savagery perpetrated by the agents of Innocent the Third against the Albigenses, by the authors of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or still more keenly by the blood-bath filled by the Latin Crusaders at Constantinople when the latter were on their way to rescue Jerusalem from the Saracens. To excuse the Almighty's action as having had in view merely the prevention of one of the Church's Patriarchs rather than another becoming dominant in the Church is the *ne plus ultra* of bigoted wickedness, and makes us blush for our century.

and took the name of Constans, or more probably Constantine. He is generally referred to as Constans the Second. His stepmother and her son, Heraclonas, were banished; the former had her tongue cut out, and the latter his nose slit, which shows that they were suspected of foul play towards Constantine. Their supporter, the patriarch Pyrrhus, fled.

Let us now turn from the Empire to the Papacy. We have brought down its story to the death of Boniface the Fifth on the 25th October 625. A few days later his successor was duly nominated. This short interval has been explained by the historians of the Church as probably due to the fact that Isaac the Exarch was present at Rome at the time to give the necessary sanction to the election on behalf of the Empire. The new Pope was called Honorius, and belonged to a noble stock—his father, Petronius, having been styled consul, which at this time would seem to have been used as a title of honour. The Romans, in electing a person of this quality, probably thought they were reverting to the great days of Pope Gregory. He was clearly a person of very different quality to the Popes who intervened between Pope Gregory and himself, and deserves a larger notice. He is described by a contemporary (Jonas, in his life of St. Bertulf of Bobbio) who had met him at Rome, as *sagax animo, vigens consilio, doctrina clarens, dulcedine et humilitate pollens*.¹ The more official record

¹ Migne, *P.L.* vol. lxxxvii. p. 1063.

of his reign in the *Liber Pontificalis* says he did many good things (*multa bona fecit*), *inter alia*, that he instructed his clergy (*erudivit clerros*). These phrases are again reflected in his epitaph, which shows the reputation he had among his contemporaries.¹

His principal intervention in politics was on behalf of the late Lombard King Adelwald, who had been deposed and superseded by Ariald, and he reproved certain bishops beyond the Po for taking the part of the usurper. In other letters he is found trying to settle a schism which had arisen at Aquileia, appointing a new Patriarch there instead of Fortunatus, who was apparently a supporter of the Three Chapters, and protesting against the interference of the President of Sardinia with clerical discipline in that island; nominating a notary and a general to Naples and making business-like arrangements for the administering of the papal lands, etc.; among other things he forbade the use of the pallium in the streets or in processions.²

¹ This epitaph is worth recording, for he was a much-slandered man:—

“Sed bonus antistes dux plebis Honorius almus
 Reddidit ecclesiis membra revulsa piis
 Doctrinis monitisque suis de facibus hostis
 Abstulit exactis jam peritura modis
 At tuus argento praesul construxit opimo
 Ornavitque fores, Petre beate tibi.
 Tu modo coelorum qua propter, janitor almae
 Fac tranquillam tui tempora cuncta greges.”

Rossi, *Inscript. Christ.* ii. 1a, p. 78.

² Labbe, ed. 1885, vol. i. pp. 224-226.

In January 638 there was held the sixth council of Toledo, attended by all the bishops subject to the Visigoths and presided over by the four Metropolitans of Spain. At this council a cruel edict was passed supplementing a recent law which had been passed, expelling all Jews from Spain. By this new edict it was provided that every king on mounting the throne was to take an oath suppressing all Jews and putting in force against them all current ordinances on pain of anathema and maranatha before God.

At the same council a letter was read from Pope Honorius exhorting the bishops to be more zealous for the faith and in putting down the wicked.¹ This letter of the Pope was replied to by Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa, and there runs through the latter's phrases a sarcastic vein which is remarkable, and perhaps marks some resentment at the intervention of Honorius. It begins by saying that the Pope would be fulfilling the obligations of "the chair given him by God" in the very best way, when, with holy solicitude for all the Churches, and with shining light of doctrine, "he provided protection for the Church and punished those who divided the Lord's tunic with the sword of the word." It then goes on to say that the bishops of Spain, at the instigation of "their King" Chintila, the Pope's most clement son, were about to assemble together when the Pope's exhortation that they should do so reached them. They thought the language used

¹ Jaffé, 2038.

in the papal "decree" was rather hard upon them, as they had indeed not been altogether inactive in the cause of their duty. They therefore thought it right to let the Pope see what they had accomplished, by sending him the decrees of their synods, so that "his eminent apostleship" (*Apostolatus vestri apex*) might judge for himself. This they did with the veneration which they owed to the Apostolic See. They knew that no deceit of the serpent could make any impression on the Rock of Peter, resting, as it did, on "the stability of Jesus Christ," and hence they were sure that that could not be true which false and silly rumours had set going, namely, that "by the decrees" (*oraculis*) of the venerable Roman Prince (*Romani Principis*) it had been permitted to baptized Jews to return to the superstitions of their religion.¹ By the bearers of this letter Chintila the King forwarded a covering (*pallium*) for the altar of St. Peter, on which was worked an inscription in the terms following :—

"Discipulis cunctis Domini praelatus amore,
Dignus apostolico primus honore coli
Sancte, tuis, Petre meritis haec munera supplex
Chintila rex offert, Pande salutis opem.²

¹ This letter is a very remarkable proof of the attitude adopted by the Spanish Church towards the Pope in the early seventh century, which was so entirely contrary to what has been argued by some aggressive champions of its claims in recent years. An attitude less consistent with a belief in either the supremacy of the Pope or his infallibility, at least as regards Spain, can hardly be conceived. We shall see presently how it was matched by the Church in France.

² Mann, *op. cit.* i. 327, 329; Florez, *Espana Sagrada*, xxx. p. 348; De Rossi, *Inscript.* ii. 254; Grisar, *Analecta*, i. 87.

A more far-reaching result was attained by a letter written by Honorius in the year 630 to the Scots (*genti Scottorum*), described as "a small community living at the ends of the earth," urging that they should not think themselves wiser than the ancient and modern churches of Christ throughout the world, and maintain a computation of Easter contrary to that sanctioned by the pontifical synods of the whole world (*neve contra paschales computos, et decreta synodalium totius orbis pontificum*).¹

In consequence of this letter a Synod was summoned at Magh Lene, near Rahan, in the King's County, at which it was decided that the Fathers there assembled "should go as children to learn the wish of their parent," *i.e.* Rome. Thither they sent deputies accordingly, who, on their return, pointed out how the Roman practice in regard to Easter was followed everywhere.² Whereupon the Scots of the south of Ireland, on the admonition of the Bishop (*antistitis*) of the Apostolic See, adopted the canonical method of keeping Easter.³

The most dramatic event in the reign of Pope Honorius which has made his name so famous ever since, was the part he took in the Monothelite controversy which has caused so much difficulty and trouble to the champions of infallibility. The question is too intricate to be discussed here, and I have remitted it to the Appendix.

¹ *Bede*, ii. 19.

³ *Bede*, iii. 3.

² Migne, *P.L.* vol. lxxxvii, p. 969.

Meanwhile I will devote a few paragraphs to another side of the Pope's career, in which he was very active and did much for the restoration of the churches in Rome, and the undoing of the terribly ruinous condition of the city, thus emulating the policy and doings of Popes Damasus and Symmachus. The *Liber Pontificalis* contains a long list of his munificent acts in this regard which must have made a considerable drain on the resources of the Papal Exchequer. These I propose to enumerate. He restored the church furniture at St. Peter's and covered the *confessio* or tomb of the Apostle there with fine silver weighing 187 lbs. He covered with plates of silver, weighing 975 lbs., the great central door of St. Peter's known as the *janua regia major* or *mediana*, and in later times *argentea*. This was doubtless worked in relief, and must have been a precious object. The dedicatory poem, which is extant, speaks of the figures of St. Peter and St. Paul as occupying the centre, and says they were surrounded with plates of gold decorated with gems, while a purple veil hung in front which, when drawn aside, disclosed the mosaics inside. It was destroyed and appropriated by the Saracens in 846. An inscription in which it is referred to, styles the Pope *Dux plebis*, and tells us he put an end to the Istrian schism in regard to the Three Chapters.¹ Honorius also presented two great candelabra (*cereostati*), each weighing 272 lbs., to

¹ Gregorovius, i. 428, etc. ; De Rossi, *Ins. Chr.* ii. 1a, p. 78.

the same shrine. He further covered the roof of St. Peter's with gilt bronze plates. These were removed from Hadrian's temple of Venus and Rome, which was that Emperor's finest building and the greatest temple in ancient Rome. These were presented to the Pope by the Emperor Heraclius. At the same time sixteen great beams were also placed in St. Peter's. He further decorated with silver plates the *confessio* in the shrine or chapel of St. Andrew, which had been built by Pope Symmachus near St. Peter's, and he similarly adorned the church of St. Apollinaris near the *Porticus Palmata* of the basilica of St. Peter. St. Apollinaris of Antioch, the alleged disciple of St. Peter, filled the place at Ravenna which St. Peter did at Rome, and was the patron saint of the city. The addition of the saint to the Roman calendar by the Pope in this latter instance was doubtless meant to conciliate the Exarch and the Archbishop of Ravenna, to whose see Apollinaris, it was said, had been appointed by St. Peter. Honorius further decided that every Sunday a *laetania* or procession should proceed from this church to that of St. Peter.

In the Forum, at or near the *Tria Fata*, Honorius built the basilica of St. Hadrian, dedicated to a martyr of Nicomedia, who died in 302. Lanciani considers that it was once the "aula" of the Roman Senate (the Curia), transformed into a Christian basilica.¹ This

¹ Gregorovius, p. 437, note 28.

was the second church built in the Forum, the first one having been that of SS. Cosmas and Damian.

Gregorovius has a graphic passage in regard to this church. He says: "A fire had destroyed the Curia in the time of Carinus; the palace had, however, been rebuilt by Diocletian, and to it belonged the *Secritarium Secretus*, restored in 412 by Epiphanius, the City Prefect. This imposing pile of buildings still endured in its main outlines, and every Roman was familiar with their history and significance. The ancient Hall of Council was known in the mouths of the people as the Curia or Senatus. Here round the Altar of Victory had been fought the latest struggle between the old and new religions, and here, under the Gothic rule, the remnant of the most revered institution of the Empire had assembled in parliament. The historic halls had, however, remained empty and forsaken for more than fifty years, and successive plunderings had robbed them of their costly decorations." Hadrian's basilica "arose in one of the chambers of the Curia, and the sole fragment of the ancient palace exists in the church dedicated to the Eastern saint."¹

Honorius further restored the church of the Four Crowned Saints on the Cælian, which had existed as a titular church in the time of Gregory the Great. "The building of Honorius has unfortunately disappeared in successive alterations.

¹ Gregorovius, *op. cit.* i. ch. iv. 3.

The mediæval fortress-like walls, however, still remain, and in conjunction with the ruins of the Aqua Claudia and the massive circular church of St. Stephen, impart a striking character to the Cælian hill."¹ Honorius also rebuilt the church of St. Severinus, whose ruins were discovered in 1883, a mile and a half from Tivoli, and restored the cemetery of SS. Marcellinus and Peter in the Via Laricana.

St. Lucia *in Silice*, on the Carinae, says the same author, was so called from a street paved with polygonal blocks of basalt. It derived its name of *in Silice* from the fact that it was made on the site of the ancient Clivus Suburranus, where was situated the temple of Juno Lucina. It was also called Orphea, from the old fountain "Lacus Orphei" mentioned by Martial² close by. It was rebuilt by Honorius. He also built the church of St. Cyriacus the martyr, seven miles from Rome, on the Ostian Way, where the saint with his companions, Largus, Smaragdus, etc., were burnt. Fragments of it alone remain.

Honorius also rebuilt from its foundations the famous basilica of St. Agnes, the child martyr, whose story is so naive and beautiful. This church was built on the family estate of the Saint outside the Porta Nomentana, three miles from Rome, and, Gregorovius says, it still remains essentially a work of this Pope, and the finest memorial of his reign. It is situated far below the level of the

¹ Gregorovius, *op. cit.* i. p. 431.

² i. 431 and 432, note 32.

ground, and a descent of forty-seven steps leads to the entrance. "The basilica though small is of graceful proportions, and does honour to the architecture of the period. It possesses two rows of columns with Roman arches, one over the other, the higher forming an upper church. The beautiful workmanship and the material of Phrygian marble prove the columns to be the remains of some ancient building." According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Pope decorated the tomb of the saint with silver weighing 252 lbs., and over it he placed a ciborium or tabernacle of gilt bronze of great size, and added three dishes (*gavatas*) of gold, each weighing a pound. This tabernacle has disappeared, but the mosaics in the tribune still exist, and are figured by De Rossi in his great work. They form a memorial to the Pope and a witness to the decline of art. "The figures represented are but three, and notwithstanding the absence of individuality and life possess a certain naive grace. In the middle stands St. Agnes crowned with the nimbus, an attenuated figure of Byzantine character, her face devoid of light and shade, and her limbs draped in a richly embroidered Oriental mantle. The hand of God the Father stretches forth to place the crown on her head; at her feet lies the sword of the executioner; flames are represented at each side. On the right, Honorius presents her with a model of the basilica; on the left stands another bishop, either Symmachus or Sylvester, holding a book. Each Pope wears a

chestnut-brown *planeta* or chasuble and a white pallium, while their shaven heads are uncrowned by any halo. The heads of the two Popes are modern." Below the mosaics are some ancient verses, "among the best of their period," says Gregorovius, and more artistic than the picture which they extol. Some of my readers may like to have a specimen of not ungraceful seventh-century Latin. It runs thus:—

"Aurea concisis surgit pictura metallis,
 Et complexa simul clauditur ipsa dies.
 Fontibus e niveis credas aurora subire
 Correptas nubes, roribus arva rigans.
 Vel qualem inter sidera lucem proferet Irim.
 Purpureusque pavo ipse colore nitens,
 Qui potuit noctis, vel lucis reddere finem
 Martyrum e bustis hinc reppulit ille chaos.
 Sursum versa nutu, quod cunctis cernitur uno.
 Praesul Honorius haec vota dicata dedit,
 Vestibus et factis signantur illius ora,
 Lucet et aspectu lucida corde gerens."¹

The *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to Honorius the restoration of the church of St. Pancras, the boy martyr who was a contemporary of St. Agnes and who became so popular. One of the gates of Rome, the Aurelian or Janiculan gate, was renamed after him, and it was the fashion among the Romans to pledge their most solemn oaths at the grave of St. Pancras. I have mentioned how one of the earliest churches erected by St. Augustine in England was dedicated to him. "Honorius found the old basilica of St. Pancras at Rome in a state of

¹ Gregorovius, i. 432.

decay, and restored it in 638. An inscription at the foot of the mosaic sets forth the particulars of its erection. The mosaic, however, has been destroyed, and in the later transformation of the church the outlines of the earlier building have irretrievably perished."¹ The *Liber Pontificalis* tells us the Pope decorated the tomb of the saint with silver weighing 120 lbs., and also gave the church a silver ciborium weighing 187 lbs., with 5 silver arches (*arcii*), each weighing 15 lbs., and three golden candlesticks, each weighing a pound, etc. etc.

Honorius also founded a monastery in his own house near the Lateran, in honour of the Apostles Andrew and Bartholomew, which bore his name, and which he endowed with lands and other gifts.² In the same work we are told that he built some mills near the city walls close to the aqueduct of Trajan, which carried water from the Sabbatine lake to the city. Gregorovius adds that this confirms the supposition that Belisarius had restored the aqueduct of Trajan.

While this lordly list of buildings in and near Rome prove how active Honorius was in adorning the ruined city, he was also busy elsewhere ; thus the *Liber Pontificalis* tells us he ordained 13 priests, 11 deacons, and 81 bishops.

He died on the 12th October 638, and was buried at St. Peter's.

On the death of Pope Honorius he was suc-

¹ Gregorovius, *loc. cit.*

² *Liber Pontificalis*, lxxii.

ceeded after a considerable interval by Severinus, a Roman, the son of Labienus or Abienus. Severinus, according to Jaffé, was consecrated on 28th May 640. It has been argued that the lapse of a year and a half which occurred between the death of Honorius and the consecration of his successor was due to the latter's hesitation in accepting the *Ecthesis* which had been put together and adopted by the Eastern Church as an eirenicon with the Monophysites and others. Of this I can find no direct evidence.

The very short career of Severinus was an exceedingly troubled one. During the vacancy of the see, Maurice, commander of the troops at Rome, who had no money with which to pay his clamorous and turbulent soldiery, determined to plunder the *vestiarium* of the Lateran Palace, containing the various treasures presented by the faithful, the funds put aside for rescuing prisoners and relieving the poor, and, as was believed, large hoards accumulated by Honorius, whose profuse expenditure on buildings lent colour to the story. Maurice made furious appeals to the soldiers and the mob to seize and divide these treasures. The papal officials and servants defended their charge for three days, when Maurice by the advice of the magistrates put the Imperial seal on the treasures and invited the Exarch Isaac to go and take possession of them. Isaac went, drove the principal clergy (*primates ecclesiae*) out of the city, and then proceeded for eight days to plunder

the famous palace. Of the proceeds he kept a part for himself, sent a third to the Emperor, and gave the rest to the troops. He professed to have gone to Rome to sanction the appointment of Severinus, who was at once consecrated, but died two months and six days later.

The *Liber Pontificalis*, from which these facts are gleaned, tells us that that Pope restored the mosaics on the apse of St. Peter's which had decayed. He favoured the clergy and increased their stipends. He was pious, gentle, and a lover of the poor. The *Liber Diurnus*, without giving any details, merely names him among the opponents of the Monothelites; while the *Libellus Synodicus*, which has been quoted in the same behalf, was not written till the end of the ninth century. A much greater authority, the *Liber Pontificalis*, says nothing about it. He was buried at St. Peter's.

Severinus was succeeded as Pope by John, a native of Dalmatia, whose father was called Venantius, styled Scholasticus. Bede quotes a letter of John written after his election but before his consecration (*cum adhuc esset electus in pontificatum*) to the Scots in regard to the time of keeping Easter, and to Pelagianism, and in which he is styled *Johannes diaconus et in Dei nomine electus*.¹ The future Pope, who was still a deacon, writes conjointly with Hilary the Archipresbyter, John the Primicerius, and John the Consiliarius, the holders of which offices acted as viceregents during

¹ *Bede*, ii. 19.

the interregnum between one Pope and another. John was ordained 25th December 640. We are told he sent large sums by Martin the Abbot to distribute among the people of Dalmatia and Istria who had suffered in the recent attacks of the Slavs. He added a fourth oratory (dedicated to the martyrs Venantius, Anastasius, Maurus, etc.) to the Lateran Baptistry, for which relics were sent from Dalmatia and Istria. Venantius had been a bishop and was the national saint of Dalmatia. "The still existing mosaics of the time of John the Fourth," says Gregorovius, "in the coarseness of their style betray how far painting had fallen from the traditions of antiquity. . . . In this oratory the apocalyptic representations of the four Evangelists are enclosed in square frames on the triumphal arch; at each side stand four saints; in the tribune is a rough half-length portrait of Christ, between two angels and surrounded by clouds, His right hand raised. Below is a series of nine figures. The Virgin, in dark blue draperies, in the middle, with her arms uplifted in prayer, after the manner of the paintings in the Catacombs. Peter and Paul stand one on each side, the latter holding a book instead of the sword with which later art has endowed him; Peter bears not only the two keys, but also the pilgrim staff with the cross, like the aged Baptist beside him. The bishops Venantius and Domnios follow; on the left, the builder of the oratory carries the model of a church. On the right, another figure, probably

Pope Theodore, who finished the building, completes the series. Three couplets are written in one line underneath."¹ Pope John presented his oratory with two arches (*arcii*), each weighing 15 lbs. ; and many silver dishes, etc. It will be noted that in the *Liber Pontificalis* not a word is said about his having taken any steps in regard to the Ecthesis issued by the Emperor, or in summoning a synod to denounce it, as was afterwards reported. No Acts of such a synod exist, and the statement depends on Theophanes (758-817) who wrote more than a century later, and whose account of the events at this time are described as inaccurate by Father Mann himself, who quotes him in regard to the synod. The date itself is eight years wrong. The fact that it is not mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which is careful in referring to such meetings, seems to prove that no such synod was ever held. The letters that John is alleged to have written on the subject to Heraclius and Constantine are not extant, and their existence depends on the most suspicious authority of Maximus, whose career, as we shall see, was a very sinister one, notwithstanding that he is numbered among the saints, and who is hardly likely to have had access to them even if they existed, for he was a *persona ingratissima* at Constantinople.

John the Fourth was buried at St. Peter's on the 14th October 642.

Theodore, who succeeded him, was a Greek, and the son of Theodore, a bishop of Jerusalem.

¹ Gregórovius, i. 442 and 446, note 6.

The appointment of a Greek, and the son of a Greek bishop, as Pope at this time is very curious. It is no less curious that he should have been accepted for the post by the Emperor, since he was strongly opposed to the Imperial Edict known as the *Ecthesis*, and was a close friend of Sophronius and Maximus, the two aggressive opponents of Monothelism. Perhaps his views had hitherto been discreetly concealed. He was a lover of the poor, says the *Liber Pontificalis*, kindly towards everybody and very charitable. In his time Maurice, who had commanded the troops at Rome, and had incited them to sack the city, as we have seen, rebelled against the patrician Isaac, who was then Exarch of Ravenna, collected troops from all sides and made them swear that none of them would in future obey Isaac. The latter sent Donus, the *Magister militum*, and his *sacellarius* or treasurer, to Rome with an army, whereupon all the judges and the soldiers who had sworn allegiance to Maurice deserted him and joined Donus. Maurice fled, but was seized and sent to Ravenna, and there decapitated, and his head was exhibited on a stake. Isaac soon after died, and Theodore the patrician was appointed Exarch in his place.

The Patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, had apparently been implicated in the murder of Constantine,¹ and had in consequence been expelled from the city. Although he had not been deposed canonically, Paul, a strong Monothelite

¹ Theophanes, *ad an. 621.*

and supporter of the *Ecthesis*, was appointed in his place. Meanwhile Pyrrhus, doubtless with the object of getting assistance in order to recover his Patriarchate from the Latin Church, which under the teaching of Maximus opposed Monothelism, abandoned his former attitude and became "orthodox" in the sense in which Pope Theodore interpreted orthodoxy. Pyrrhus went to Rome, where he was effusively welcomed and given a seat at the services near the altar by the Pope, who had previously denounced him and had even pressed the Emperor to take canonical proceedings against him. Thence he went to Ravenna, where this "Vicar of Bray" found it convenient to abjure his recent alleged conversion which had brought him the patronage of the Pope and once more affirmed his belief in "a single will." According to Theophanes (a very orthodox person who suffered greatly for the faith, but who lived a hundred and fifty years after these events), the fierce Pope excommunicated his recent friend in a way which was practised in the East and was therefore familiar to Theodore. Standing by St. Peter's tomb, he dropped a portion of "Christ's blood" from the chalice into the ink, with which he wrote a sentence of excommunication and deposition against Pyrrhus and his associates. This shocking adjunct to the pronouncement of anathema was known to Theodore's countrymen the Greeks.

Pyrrhus returned to Constantinople, and even-

tually on the death of Paul was restored to his Patriarchate.

Meanwhile the fight about the single will continued, and the Christian world was divided into two sections—the Greeks (who were skilled as controversialists), for the most part under the leadership of Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Sergius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, supported the single will; while the Latins both in Africa and Italy took the other side, which was vigorously championed by the Pope, who had probably been a disciple of Sophronius, the former Patriarch of Jerusalem, for he came from there. His policy we can hardly doubt was emphasised by the growing jealousies between the bishops of Old Rome and New Rome. To the appeal of Theodore, Paul replied, affirming his complete adherence to the notion of a single will, adding (what was doubtless very distasteful to the Pope) a reminder not only of the views of the Fathers, but more especially of those of his predecessor Honorius, and Theodore went to the length of excommunicating his brother Patriarch in regard to an issue upon which there never had been an authoritative decision, and on which his own predecessor Honorius agreed with Paul.

Meanwhile the Emperor Constans made a fresh effort to pacify the Christian world, which was being torn in twain by an abstract issue which very few people could even understand. Apparently at the instance of Paul, the *Ecthesis*, which was still hung on the public buildings at Constantinople,

was withdrawn, and in its place a fresh pronouncement was issued known as the Type, probably composed by Paul, in which a perfectly neutral attitude was taken. In this document it was ordered that no one should speak either of one will or of two, or of one energy or of two. The whole matter was remitted to oblivion, and the condition of things which existed before the feud was to be maintained as it would have been if no dispute had arisen.¹ In case of a bishop or clerk, disobedience to the Edict was to be punished by deposition, of a monk by excommunication, of a public officer in civil or military service by loss of office, in that of a private person of obscure position by corporal punishment and banishment for life.² As Professor Bury tersely says: "The Type deemed the one doctrine at least as good as the other, while the bigoted orthodox adherents deemed the Laodicean injunction of neutrality no less to be reprobated than a heretical injunction of Monothelism."

Among his works at Rome Theodore built the Church of St. Valentinus on the Via Flaminia, near the Milvian bridge, to which he gave many gifts. It is now destroyed. He also built the oratory of St. Sebastian in the Lateran Palace, and that of St. Euplus the Martyr, outside the Ostian Gate, near the pyramid of Cestius, probably afterwards transformed into the church of St. Salvatore. He further removed the bodies of the

¹ Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire*, ii. 293.

² Mansi, x. 1029 and 1031.

martyrs Primus and Felicianus, who had been buried in the Via Numentana, and placed them in the church of Stephen the Proto-Martyr. To this he also made presents—*inter alia*, three gold *gavatas* or dishes, a silver panel or table to be placed before the “confessio,” and two silver arches (*arcii*). He died on the 31st of May 649, and was buried at St. Peter’s.

Theodore was succeeded as Pope by Martin from Todi (Tudertina), in Umbria, a very strong opponent of Monothelism, who has become famous from the heroic tenacity with which he maintained his views. It is as difficult to understand how Martin came to have his appointment confirmed as it is to explain the same thing in the case of Theodore, unless the authorities were indifferent to their religious views so long as they obeyed the laws of the state. Muratori’s explanation is a dangerous one, namely, that Martin was, in fact, consecrated on Sunday, 5th July 649, without the Imperial confirmation. This is supported by the accusations of the Greeks that he secured the Episcopate *irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum subfuisset*.

There can be no doubt whatever that at this time the Emperor’s consent and confirmation were necessary to the validity and legality of a Pope’s election. This very important fact has been forgotten by the champions of Martin. There was another reason why the Imperial authorities should resent the doings of the Pope and his chief adviser

Maximus, generally styled St. Maximus. I will describe it in the words of a quite recent Roman Catholic historian of the Church in Africa, Dom H. Leclercq, who, speaking of Maximus, quotes M. Diehl as follows : " Parmi les paroles en effet que prononçait le moine, quelques-unes étaient singulièrement graves : non seulement il déclarait nettement aux familiers du prince qui gouvernait à Byzance, que protéger ou même tolérer l'hérésie était un scandale véritable et une offense à Dieu ; mais il lui arrivait de dire que, tant que régneraient Héraclius et sa race, le seigneur demeurerait hostile à l'empire romain,¹ et on l'accusait d'user de son influence pour détourner de leur devoir d'obéissance les fonctionnaires publics. En tout cas, il entretenait en Afrique le mécontentement qu'avait crée le conflit religieux, et il exaspérait les tendances déjà trop manifestes à résister au despotisme impérial."² In plain words, Maximus preached and taught treason against the Empire.

This was emphasised by the wording of the addresses sent to the Emperor by the provincial synods of Africa, of whose terms Dom Leclercq says : " Assurement rien n'était plus légitime, mais rien aussi n'était plus imprudent." The result was that in 646 the Exarch of Africa, the Patrician Gregory, under the inspiration of these theologians, raised the standard of rebellion. " On sait," remarks the same writer, " que Grégoire était intimement lié à l'abbé Maxime, fort populaire à ce titre dans les Eglises

¹ See Migne, *P.G.* xc. col. 111.

² *Op. cit.* ii. 303 and 304.

Africaines et dans le peuple à ce titre dans les Églises Africaines et dans le peuple et assez bien vu par le pape,¹ qui aurait, a't on dit, fait mander a l'exarque qu'il pouvait en sûreté de conscience se soulever contre *le basileus*; Dieu lui même approuvant la révolte et lui assurant le succès. L'Abbé Maxime, qui dut être pressenti sur cette grave décision, fit un rêve d'une clarté qui ne laissait rien a désirer. Il vit des chœurs d'anges planant dans le ciel du côté de l'Orient et du Côté de l'Occident; les premiers criaient 'Victoire à Constantin Auguste,' les autres repondaient 'Victoire à Grégoire Auguste,' mais les premiers se fatiguerent et bientôt on n'entendit plus que les voix qui acclamaient le patrice."²

Can it be wondered that these two "saints," one an irregularly elected Pope who had no legal status, and the other a fanatical monk, who had no authority whatever to define dogmas, who had openly and daringly preached and encouraged treason, should, like the leaders of the Pilgrimage of Grace, or the rebels and traitors who tried to pose as martyrs and saints in Queen Elizabeth's reign, have been visited with dire punishment by the civil authorities.

The Pope, without waiting for an indispensable legal sanction (which was needed if he was to act *de jure*), and apparently under the advice of Maximus, who was then at Rome, called a synod of 105 bishops at the Lateran, over all the five regular sittings of which he presided. The first sitting was

¹ Migne, *P.G.* xc. col. 111.

² *Op. cit.* p. 207.

held on 5th October 649. This synod was a purely local Latin synod, and attended by only Italian bishops, and by those from the islands, with a few from Africa. There were also present many presbyters and other clergy. At this synod five prelates were condemned by name as Monothelites, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, three of whom were dead, one of whom, Paul, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had written to Pope Theodore to say he followed the doctrine of Honorius, and yet Honorius was not apparently mentioned at this Roman synod, where the silence imposed by the Type was so much denounced. Why was not Martin's predecessor named, and why were the rest alone anathematised? Not only were the Monothelite prelates anathematised, but the two pronouncements of the Emperors, the *Ecthesis* and the *Typos*, were styled impious and declared inoperative, notwithstanding that the latter contained no decision on doctrine, but only insisted that the burning question on which there had been no authoritative pronouncement should not be publicly discussed. The Pope in signing the Acts of the synod, which was afterwards known as the First Lateran, claimed no dominating voice, and styled himself, "I, Martin, by the grace of God, Bishop of the Holy and Apostolic Church of Rome." After the Council, however, he went on to nominate Bishop John of Philadelphia as his vicar in the East, and to supervise the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch, where he had no conceivable right to inter-

vene, for no General Council had deposed their legal heads. What would Pope Gregory the Great have said to such a piece of audacity? At the Council, and in subsequent letters sent to various churches, it was urged (doubtless in order to conciliate the Emperor), that he had been deceived and cajoled by the Exarch Paul. This statement Constans speedily corrected. When he heard what had happened, and that a Pope whose appointment had not received the Imperial sanction had summoned a synod without his knowledge and approval, at which an Imperial Edict had been spoken of in opprobrious terms and denounced, he at once acted. He sent the Chamberlain Olympius to replace the dead Exarch at Ravenna, with orders to cause all the clergy and "proprietors" to sign the Type and to seize the Pope. We do not know what really happened in consequence, but Olympius failed to carry out the Imperial orders, and was afterwards charged with making himself a treasonable accomplice of the Pope. He took his army away to Sicily to oppose the Saracens there, and was killed. His place as Exarch was taken by another type of man, namely, Theodore, styled Calliopas, who entered Rome with Theodore the Chamberlain and an army on 15th June 653. He informed the clergy who gathered round the Pope, that the latter had been illegally appointed, that he was not fit to be Pope, and that another would be appointed in his place. After some resistance Martin agreed to leave Rome, and asked that some of his clergy

might accompany him. A few days later he was hurried away in a boat to Portus, and thence to Misenum. Eventually, after a tedious voyage, he reached Constantinople on the 17th September 654, and after three months' imprisonment he was brought before the *Præfect* Troilus to be tried.

Here, again, it was not his views on religion that were charged against him, but his political intrigues. He wished to protest against the "Type" being sent to Rome, but was reminded by the judge that it was not religion, but treason, for which he was being tried. "We, too," he added, "are Romans and Christians, and orthodox." The proceedings were conducted by the *sacellarius*, or Count of the sacred patrimony. The Emperor was sitting in an adjoining room whence the latter came out and said, "Thou hast fought against the Emperor, what hast thou to hope? Thou hast abandoned God, and He has abandoned thee."¹ It is said that his life was spared at the instance of his old opponent Paul, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and on the 26th March 655 he was exiled to Cherson in the Crimea, and there he died on 6th September 655, and was buried in the Church of the Virgin at Blacharnae, near Cherson, now called Eupatoria. He was afterwards deemed a saint and martyr, his name-day being the 12th November. His relics are said to have been deposited in the Church of SS. Sylvester and Martin of Tours.

Two monks named Theodosius and Theodorus,

¹ Bury, *Hist. Later. Rom. Emp.* ii. 295.

writing about 668, describe having seen the tomb of St. Martin at Blacharnæ, and having been told by one of his companions of the many miracles performed there. They were given some relics of him among them,—one of the *campagi* or papal slippers which I described in the previous volume on St. Gregory.¹ In a letter of Pope Gregory the Second (Labbe, vi.), mention is made of the miracles of healing performed at his tomb.²

It has served the purpose of later partisans to try and divert the issue to another conclusion, but the facts are quite plain. As to the story told about his cruel treatment by Calliopas and his soldiers, it rests almost entirely on the letters of the Pope himself, which in such a case are not safe evidence, and of Anastasius, who wrote a long time after. It will be well to confront them with a much more neutral document. This is how the *Liber Pontificalis*, which is otherwise very full about St. Martin, describes his latter days: *Deinde directus est ab imperatore Theodorus exarchus, qui cognomento Caliopas, cum Theodorum imperiale cubicularium, qui et Pellurius dicebatur, cum jussiones. Et tollentes sanctissimum Martinum Papam de Ecclesia Salvatoris, qui et Constantiana appellatur, perduxerunt Constantinopolim; et nec sic eis adquievit. Deinde directus est sepius dictus sanctissimus vir in exilio (in loco), qui dicitur Cersona, et ibidem, ut deo placuit (vitam finivit) in pace Christi Confessor (et sepultus in basilica Sanctae*

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 58.

² Mann, *History of the Popes*, i. 403.

*Mariae semper virginis.) Qui et multa mirabilia
operator usque in hodiernum diem.¹*

A few supplementary words are necessary about another matter which has been largely overlooked.

In all this story one thing is perfectly plain, and in regard to it the contemporary documents are clear. The Pope was tried and deposed, not for his religious views, but for usurping the Papacy without getting the confirmation of the Emperor, and on the charge, true or false, of having intrigued against the Crown.

In one of his letters Martin complains of the treatment he had received from the Roman clergy after his condemnation, which makes it very probable that they had complied with the order of Calliopas, and had actually deposed the Pope on the ground of his irregular appointment. Martin dilates in his letter on the want of thought and compassion among his old friends, who seemed not to care whether he was dead or alive, and wonders most of all at the conduct of the clergy of "the Most Holy Church of St. Peter" for their utter neglect of him. He then proceeds to invoke the intercession of St. Peter to strengthen the faith, and especially, he adds, *the pastor who is said now to preside over them*. This was no doubt Eugenius the Fourth, who occurs after him in the list of Popes. Martin had some time previously entered a protest against another being put in his place, which, he says, "had never yet been done, and I

¹ *Op. cit., sub voce "Martinus I."*

hope will never be done, since in the absence of the Pontiff, the archdeacon, the arch-presbyter, and the primicerius represent him." There can be no doubt whatever that the quite irregularly elected Martin (styled saint and martyr) was superseded as Pope in his own lifetime by Eugenius, who must have been duly elected by the clergy and people of Rome and confirmed by the Emperor. Would this have happened if he had been an innocent saint and martyr?

It thus came about that for more than a year there were two Popes living, one of them who had been deposed by the Emperor, largely on account of his irregular election, and the other who had been nominated by the same Emperor in his place. Both of them were elected, and both consecrated, and both are treated not only as legitimate Popes, but also as saints. This is assuredly a very awkward condition of things. If Martin was not legally and canonically deposed by the joint action of the Emperor and the Roman clergy, then his successor was not canonically or legally elected, and was no Pope at all. If he was legally and canonically deposed, because he had never been a true Pope, then all the acts of his papacy, including the decrees of his Roman synod, are invalid and void. The fact of Martin's death occurring after Eugenius had sat on the papal throne for some time would not cure the irregularity of the latter's original election, and of his having been up to that time an illegitimate Pope. The

question has become a serious and important one, since all the real Popes have been pronounced to be infallible. Were either of the two Popes, Martin and his successor, legitimate and real Popes?

When the synod was ended, Martin wrote letters to various bishops in the Western world informing them of its decisions. Among the letters the only ones which immediately interest us are those written to the Frankish bishops.

In his letter to Amandus, Bishop of Maestrich, in Austrasia, known as St. Amandus, the Pope calls his own synod *concilium generale*, which was an entire misnomer, since it was only a local provincial synod. It also failed in an essential factor of a true council at that time in that it had not been summoned by the Emperor. The bishop had written to Martin complaining of the difficulties of his position and the vices of his clergy, and asking to be allowed to retire; he also asked for some relics from Rome and some books from the Pope's library. The Pope in his reply encouraged him to remain where he was, and to continue his efforts to maintain discipline, and he also sent him the Acts, etc., of the Roman synod; bade him summon a synod of his own for the acceptance of its decrees, and asked him to persuade the Austrasian King "to nominate bishops who might first go to Rome, and thence pass on as a legation from the Pope to the Emperor, carrying with them the assent of their Church to the Lateran decrees." Martin sent him some relics, but in regard to the books he wanted, he said the library at

Rome was already exhausted and there was no time to make copies.¹ We are also told by St. Audoenus (St. Ouen) of Rouen in his life of St. Eligius of Noyon that the Acts of Martin's Roman Council had also been sent to Chlovis the Second, King of Neustria and Burgundy.

We must now say a few words about the state of Gaul at this time. We have seen how in 613 Chlothaire the Second reunited the Frankish realm. He was then thirty years of age, and was master of the whole of Gaul from the Pyrenees to the Rhine, while the land beyond as far as the Elbe was tributary. On the 10th October 614, a Council attended by seventy-nine bishops met at Paris, where certain important Acts were passed, which were approved by the King with some notable alterations. It had been proposed to enact that the freedom of the election of bishops from either durance or bribery as a condition of their legitimacy should be affirmed, but this clause was struck out, and in substitution it was declared that if a person selected for a bishopric was worthy he was to be consecrated by order of the King, while if any of the courtiers were selected it must be because of his personal merits or his learning.² The authority of the ecclesiastical courts was extended. The King undertook not to protect any clerk against his bishop, and to respect the wills of private persons in favour of the Church. After this Synod, things in Gaul

¹ *Ep. ii., D. of C. B.* iii. 853.

² *Hist. de France*, Lavisse, ii. 155 and 221.

improved somewhat. It will be noted that in the Acts of this Paris Council there is not the slightest reference to Rome. The King was everywhere.

Meanwhile, the external political unity of the State really disguised differences incapable of lasting solidarity. There were three great communities united under Chlothaire—Austrasia, Burgundy, and “Neuster,” as it was then called (it was presently known as Neustria). Over each of these Chlothaire placed a great officer of State called a Mayor of the Palace or Major Domo. Landri superintended Neustria, Radon Austrasia, and Warnachar Burgundy. Meanwhile, Aquitaine was a common prey of the rest, and was ready to revolt.¹

Of the three great divisions Austrasia was the most restive and difficult to govern. It had had a sovereign of its own since 561. In 623 Chlothaire sent his young son, Dagobert, to rule the country from the Ardennes to “the Faucilles,” but neither the prince nor his people were satisfied with this truncated territory, and in 626 Chlothaire was obliged to reconstitute the ancient Austrasia in all its former extent, including Champagne. In the name of Dagobert two remarkable men exercised jurisdiction—one of them, Pepin, who succeeded Radon; and secondly, Arnulf, the Bishop of Metz. While still a layman the latter married, and his son Chlodoald succeeded him in his bishopric. It was in 612 that Arnulf, being then a layman, went through all the gamut of the ecclesiastical orders

¹ *Ib.* ii. 156.

in one day, and thus slipped into the See of Metz. It was Pepin and Arnulf who, as we saw, combined together and destroyed Queen Brunichildis. In 627 Arnulf retired into a monastery. He died in 641 and was styled a Saint. His place was taken as joint-councillor of Dagobert by Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne. Arnulf's second son, Ansegisil (who later (when the legend of Troy was revived) was styled Anchises), married a daughter of Pepin. She was called in later times Begga, and from them sprang the Carlovingian royal house of France.

In Burgundy, after some disturbances, Chlothaire granted the not very tractable people an assembly distinct from the Neustrians and Austrasians. In 627 Warnachar, the Mayor of the Palace, died. His son Godin tried to usurp the position and to treat it as hereditary, but the King had him put to death; whereupon the Burgundians declared that they needed no more Mayors of the Palace, but preferred to be ruled directly by the King. Chlothaire died on the 18th October 629, and was succeeded by his son Dagobert the First, to whom we shall revert presently.¹

The state of the Church in Gaul was getting worse daily. There was no external control and no discipline, and when the great Church appointments were not sold by the kings they were without scruple used as prizes to reward the counts and other grandees, who made use of them as sources of power and of income and little else. The popular

¹ *Hist. de France*, ii. 157, 158.

election, instead of curing matters, only gave greater influence to the power of the purse. Thus in 629 the people of Cahors elected a powerful courtier named Didier as their bishop. He was the brother of the late bishop, who had been assassinated. He himself had been Governor of Marseilles and Treasurer of the Palace. Dagobert excused himself for making this appointment on the ground that it was necessary to get such a powerful person away from the Court. He nevertheless continued his intrigues. Arnulf, the Mayor of the Palace (as we have seen), became Bishop of Metz. Bonitus, Bishop of Clermont, had been an official of a Count of Marseilles; Bodegisl, Bishop of Mans, was formerly a Mayor of the Palace. It will be seen that in this fashion the Episcopate had become very largely laicised, and its members had not the qualifications of training, character, or learning suitable for such an office, while there was no general control, discipline, or superintendence such as Pope Gregory had tried to introduce.¹ It is perfectly plain that the Church in France had become disintegrated and secularised, and had sunk to a terribly low level, both morally and mentally. The Pope was a mere distant figure-head, having no appreciable influence there, except perhaps at Arles, to whose bishops, the ancient Vicars of the Papacy in Gaul, we still read of occasional and sporadic missions, while it is pretty certain that the Patrimony of St. Peter, which was limited to the valley of the Rhone, still remained intact.

¹ *Ib.* ii. 221.

In Spain things were drifting in another direction. There was no lack of zeal. In fact, zeal was red-hot and fiery there, and the Bishops had become very largely the arbiters of the country's fortunes. Meanwhile, the persecution of the Jews was pursued with characteristic cruelty, and the crushing of men's minds into one level type of orthodoxy based upon dogmas outside the teaching of the Bible and beyond human power to decide, apart from the inspired Book, became the rule. Thus early did Spain assume the rôle which it has pursued throughout its history, and which in much later times produced the Dominicans and the Jesuits, with their aims and methods, and which made schism in the eyes of the Church the one unpardonable crime.

We carried the story of the Visigothic Kings down to the death of Sisebut in 621.¹ He was the first Visigothic sovereign who was also a man of letters, and it proved an almost unique accomplishment among his class. His correspondence with Cæsarius, the governor of the Byzantine possessions in the peninsula, is extant. On both sides it is marked by exaggerated subtleties and a florid style. He also wrote a life of St. Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, compiled two laws, a letter written to the King and Queen of the Lombards containing a refutation of Arianism, a letter written to Eusebius, Bishop of Tarragona, condemning certain disorders, a second to Cecilius, Bishop

¹ *Ante*, p. 227.

of Mentesa, who had retired to a monastery, and who was ordered by the King to resume his episcopal functions, and lastly a letter to the Monk Theudila. He is credited with having been humane, and he even conceded to the Jews one year's respite during which they must accept the faith or depart. By some he was said to have died by poison, and by others as the result of the ignorance of his doctors. He was succeeded momentarily by his infant son, who died in a few months, when the line of hereditary rulers again ceased for a while, and the pernicious system (in practice) of an elective monarchy was again introduced.

Suinthila, a relation of Sisebut's, alleged to have been the son of Reccared the First, now occupied the throne. He began by putting down a revolt of the Cantabrians and Basques, destroyed the last slight foothold of the Emperors in Algarve, and was the first Visigoth who ruled over the whole of Spain. He tried in 625 once more to re-establish the hereditary principle by associating his young son Ricimer, a boy of seven, as ruler with himself. He was much thwarted by his brother Geila, who in 631 joined the disloyal governor of Septimania, Sisenand, who with a number of other nobles and a body of Frankish troops had risen in rebellion and seized Saragossa. Thereupon Suinthila (who thus proved his weak character) retired into private life, and Sisenand succeeded him. In payment of the Frankish contingent sent him by King Dagobert,

he presented the latter with a wonderful golden cup weighing 500 pounds, which had been given by the Roman general *Ætius* to Thorismond. The rare object was viewed as a talisman. The bearers of it were pursued by the Goths, who resented parting with the precious object, and the cup was recovered, and a ransom of 200,000 golden solidi, equivalent to £72,000, was paid for it.¹

In order better to secure his position, Sisenand allied himself closely with the clergy. Thus he summoned a so-called Universal, but really a National, Council at Toledo in 633, attended by sixty-two bishops and presided over by St. Isidore, which has already occupied us. To the bishops there, Sisenand was most complacent. He prostrated himself before them, and begged them in tears to crave God's pity for him. Thereupon a process was instituted against Suinthila, accusing him of rapine and other unnamed crimes. He was deprived of his crown and all his property save that given him by the condescension of Sisenand. His real crime was having placed his own infant son on the throne, and thus turned away from the old Visigothic rule of electing their ruler. Suinthila and his property were not the only sacrifices offered by the obsequious prelates to their patron. At the Council they proceeded to declare that whoever should break his oath of allegiance to Sisenand (a usurper!!), or should do him any

¹ It will be remembered that the crown of Suinthila was one of the precious objects found at Guarazar, and is now preserved at Madrid.

harm or despoil him of his power, should be deemed anathema before God and the angels, and be driven from the Church. They then addressed him in what was more seemly language, and conjured him and his successors to rule with justice and piety, and prayed that in capital cases he should not pass sentence until after the voice of the people had been given and the judges had passed judgment. They further declared those rulers who were cruel and tyrannical to be anathema. They lastly enacted that not only Suinthila but all his relatives should in future be excluded from the throne. The Council then proceeded to promulgate a symbol of the faith, to provide for a uniform "Use" in chanting the Psalms, in the Mass, and in the services of Matins and Vespers for all Spain and for the Spanish outpost of Gallia Narbonensis; and decreed that every individual priest, deacon, clerk, or laic who had grievances should bring them before the annual synod of the province where he lived, which was to meet on the 18th May of each year, at one hour before sunset, under the Metropolitan. After the opening of such a synod the Metropolitan Archdeacon was to read out the names of the complainants in order. To their grievances the Fathers were to listen and then pass judgment, whereupon the royal delegate (*executor regis*) was to see it carried out. These were very salutary regulations, and show a good sense which we could hardly have expected at that time.

At the same Council a considerable number of

canons were passed. Among these were laws enjoining on priests the duty of chastity, on bishops that of keeping watch over the civil tribunals so as to prevent injustice, and regulating the form of the tonsure, and the punishment of clerics who violated and robbed tombs. All free clerics were to be relieved from the payment of dues and charges. A provision was introduced to protect monks (who, it was said, were worked like slaves by the bishops), and to hinder the latter from preventing priests from entering monasteries if they were so disposed; while recreant monks who escaped and got married were to be sought out and made to respect their vows. In future no Jew was to be forced to become a Christian. Those, however, who had been constrained to change their faith and had received the sacraments were to remain Christians, while those who had lapsed after becoming Christians and persuaded others to be circumcised were to be forcibly restored. If the newly circumcised were the children of such recreants they were to be separated from their parents, and if they were slaves they were to be set at liberty. This was only a more general application of the general and cruel law which took away the children of Jews and had them brought up in monasteries. The property of recreant Jews was taken away from them and made over to their children. All Jews were excluded from the public service; they were forbidden to hold Christian slaves, and if by chance a Jew had married a

Christian he was not permitted to convert her or to separate from her.¹

Sisenand died directly after the meeting of the Council, on the 30th June 636.²

He was succeeded by his brother Chintila. One of his first acts was to summon a fresh Council. This met in 640. The provinces of Seville and Braga were not represented there. It was chiefly occupied in providing safeguards for the throne and establishing the royal authority—a process thus commented on by the learned author of an admirable recent account of Christian Spain, M. Leclercq, to whom I have been much indebted in my summary of the doings in that country. He says: “Voici donc un type achevé de Concile politique. Il est impossible d’associer plus étroitement l’Eglise à l’Etat; nous verrons dans trois quarts de siècle les fruits de cette politique lorsque devant l’invasion arabe l’Eglise partagera les destinées de l’Etat.”³ We have referred in an earlier page to a later Council held under the auspices of Chintila, and to the remarkable correspondence which passed between its leaders and Pope Honorius as a proof of the very slight place the authority of Rome had in Spain at this time.⁴

¹ Leclercq, *op. cit.* 298-308.

² *Ib.* 312.

³ *Ib.* 310.

⁴ *Ante*, pp. 280-281.

CHAPTER VI

ST. HONORIUS

LET us now return to England. Archbishop Justus was succeeded by Honorius about the year 630-631.¹ He is described by Bede as a man of lofty erudition in things of the Church.

One of the most imposing functions performed by Paulinus, who was now the only Roman bishop left in England, was the consecration of Honorius as successor to Justus, early in A.D. 631. This ceremony was performed at Lincoln,² where Paulinus had built a church of stone which had become unroofed in Bede's time. Its beams were then exposed, but, according to Bede, miracles were continually occurring there. It was in this church that the consecration took place.

Meanwhile, it will be well to note what was going on in East Anglia.

On the death of King Redwald he was succeeded by his son Eorpwald, who was persuaded by Ædwin of Northumbria to leave off idolatrous superstitions (*relictis idolorum superstitionibus*) and to adopt the faith and sacraments of Christ. This

¹ *Vide ante*, p. 269.

² *Bede*, ii. 18.

must have been after 627, when *Æ*Edwin was himself baptized. Eorpwald soon after received the faith. According to the very doubtful authority of the *English Chronicle* and Florence of Worcester he was baptized in 632.¹ He was killed by a heathen named Ricberct, and for three years the province remained under error (*in errore versata est*) until Sigeberht, his half brother, succeeded him.² Sigeberht, says Bede, was a man in every way most Christian and most learned, who during his brother's life had received the faith and the sacraments while an exile in Gaul, and who from the outset of his reign took steps to impart them to his whole province. This was probably in the earlier part of the reign of Dagobert the First, when that ruler spent a considerable time in Burgundy reforming the administration and making easier the lot of the poorer classes.³ It was probably in Burgundy that Sigeberht had been living. Perhaps he was tempted to go there by the fact that it was the centre of activity of the famous Irishman, St. Columban. The episcopal cities of France had at this time famous schools. We have noticed how the zeal of Desiderius of Vienne in teaching the classical authors was rebuked by St. Gregory. St. Germanus praises St. Modoald,

¹ The date is, in fact, altogether doubtful. Dr. Bright says that by tracing back twenty-two years before the year 653, in which Honorius died, we reach 631 at the latest for the coming of Felix (which followed the accession of Sigeberht), and must go back some three years further for Eorpwald's baptism and death, which Haddan and Stubbs place in 628 (iii. 89). See Bright, p. 141, note 4.

² *Bede*, ii. 15.

³ See *Fredegar*, ch. 58.

Bishop of Treves, for teaching boys the liberal arts (*qui sagacis ingenii cerneret puerum, liberalibus literis erudivit*). The Abbot Frodobertus lauds the zeal of the Bishop of Troyes (*apud urbem Trecassinam Pontificis Ragnesili scholis parentum studeo mancipatur*). Leodegar, Bishop of Autun, was taught by Dido of Poictou all the studies which men were wont to learn at the time, and was fully equipped (*ad plene in omnibus disciplinae lima est politus*). Praejectus, Bishop of Clermont (Arvernensis), was taught letters in the school of another bishop.¹ Guizot speaks highly of the episcopal schools which flourished at this time at Poitiers, Paris, Le Mans, Bourges, Clermont, Vienne, Chalons, Arles, and Gap, which he says superseded the great civil schools.² It would have been very interesting if we could have recovered some details about the methods and processes of this teaching and of the actual proficiency of Sigeberht, the first of English princes to be educated in at all a high sense, and to know whether he was in orders, or merely a princely lay scholar. Florence of Worcester says that when in Gaul, Sigeberht made friends with Bishop Felix, and that on Eorpwald's death they came to England together.³ In the life of Felix mentioned in Hardy's *Catalogue*, i. 234, he is made to baptize Sigeberht when in Gaul. Bede's story, however, implies that they came to England separately, although it was

¹ Smith's *Bede*, 723.

² *Civil. in Fr.* Lect. 16; Bright, 142, note 2.

³ *M.H.B.* p. 529.

probably on Sigeberht's invitation that Felix was induced to make the journey.

Felix, according to Bede, came from Burgundy where he had been ordained (perhaps only as a priest). He may have been a protégé of Columban. On his arrival in England he went to see Archbishop Honorius, and asked his permission to go and preach "the Word of Life" among the East Anglians. In one of the lives of Felix quoted by Hardy,¹ Honorius is made to ordain him as bishop. This was probably in 631.² He fixed his episcopal see at Dumnoc, now Dunwich.

Dr. Bright, speaking of it, says: "Under the Conqueror, Dunwich, though it had long ceased to be an episcopal city, still had 236 burgesses and 100 poor; and it was prosperous under Henry III. Spelman heard that it was reported to have once had fifty churches. When Camden published his *Britannia*³ in 1607, it lay 'in solitude and desolation,' the greater part being submerged by the effect of the sea on the soft cliff on which it stood. One local tradition places the first preaching of Felix at Seham."⁴ A few walls of the old town alone remain.

At Dunwich, Felix, according to Bede (who refers to the happy omen of his name, *sui nominis sacramentum*), presided over the province for seventeen years, and was no doubt greatly helped by

¹ *Cat. Brit. Hist.* i. 234-35.

² See the date discussed, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 89, note.

³ i. 448.

⁴ Bright, 143, note 1.

Sigeberht, who is said by the same author to have used great zeal after he became king in propagating the faith.¹ He says of the mission of Felix that "he delivered all the province from long-standing unrighteousness and infelicity, and as a pious cultivator of the spiritual field he found abundant fruit in a believing people."² He had apparently been trained entirely in Gaul, and his services and his ritual at Dunwich were doubtless taken from those of Gaul. They probably did not follow the Roman pattern as much as it was followed at Canterbury, although it must be understood that Felix was in no way a detached bishop, but had been sent by Honorius, and no doubt treated the latter as his Metropolitan. Bede³ tells us Felix had a great regard for St. Aidan.

At this time another foreign missionary also settled in East Anglia. This was the Irish monk Furseus, who had, however, nothing to do directly with Augustine's mission.⁴ He founded a monastery at Cnobheresburg (now called Burgh Castle, in Suffolk). Bede says that Anna, King of East Anglia, and the nobility there embellished it with stately buildings and gifts.⁵

Returning to Sigeberht, Bede tells us that, desiring to imitate the good system he had seen in Gaul, he founded a school for the instruction of boys in letters (*in qua pueri literis erudirentur*), in which work he was helped by Bishop Felix, whom

¹ *Bede*, ii. 15.

² *Ib.*

³ *Ib.* iii. 25.

⁴ *Ib.* iii. 19.

⁵ *Ib.*

he distinctly says he had received from Kent (*de Cantia acceperat*), and who supplied him with masters and teachers after the Kentish pattern (*pedagogos ac magistros juxta morem Cantuariorum praebente*, *i.e.* who had been trained at Canterbury).¹ This school, we can hardly doubt, was attached to the Cathedral Church of Felix at Dunwich. It will be remembered that in the long and strenuous fight between Oxford and Cambridge as to the respective antiquity of the two Universities this school of Felix has been quoted on behalf of Cambridge, which is certainly more reasonable than an appeal to King Alfred as the founder of Oxford.

Sigeberht after reigning for some years determined to retire from the world, being the first among the Anglo-Saxon princes to become a recluse. He entered a monastery which he had himself founded (*quod sibi fecerat*) and received the tonsure. When the ruthless Mercian ruler Penda invaded East Anglia, Sigeberht was withdrawn from his monastery and put at the head of their forces by the leaders of his old people, who found it impossible, however, to make head against the Mercian chief. Sigeberht refused to be armed, and went into the fight with a wand in his hand. He was killed, together with his relative (*cognato suo*—perhaps, says Plummer, his brother-in-law) Ecgric, who had succeeded to his power when he withdrew from the world.²

According to Thomas of Ely, in his *Vit.*

¹ *Bede*, iii. 18,

² *Ib.* iii. 18.

Aedeldritae, Sigeberht's monastery was situated in Bedrichswurde, afterwards called Edmundsbury, and now Bury St. Edmunds.¹ No part of this early building now remains at Bury. Ecgric was succeeded by Anna, the son of Eni, Redwald's brother. It was during Anna's reign that Kenwalch, King of Wessex, was driven from the throne by the Mercian ruler Penda, whose sister he had divorced. He took refuge in East Anglia with Anna, with whom he spent three years, and there he accepted the faith.² The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* MSS. A and F say this was in 646. Florence of Worcester says he was baptized by Felix, which is not improbable. The Annals of Ely add that Anna was his godfather (which is also not unlikely), and say that he helped to restore him to his kingdom, and that it was this which drew on him the vengeance of Penda, which, as Mr. Plummer says,³ is probably an inference from Bede. Anna was killed by Penda.⁴ The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* MSS. A, B, and C date his death in 654. He was more famous as the father of four saintly daughters than for his own acts. Bede styles him a good man, and happy in a good and pious offspring (*vir bonus et bona ac sancta sobole felix*).⁵ As I have said, he left four daughters, all of them styled saint—1, Sexburga, wife of Erconberht, King of Kent; 2, Æthelberga, who became the Abbess of Brie, in Gaul (*in Brigenti monasterio*); 3, Ætheldritha, Queen of Northumbria, and after-

¹ See Smith's *Bede*, p. 121, note 28.

² *Bede*, iii. 7.

³ *Ib.* ii. p. 143.

⁴ *Ib.* iii. ch. 18.

⁵ *Ib.* iii. 7 and 18.

wards Abbess of Ely; and 4, Withburga, a nun in the same monastery.¹ Anna was succeeded by his brother Æthelhere.

St. Felix, as he was afterwards called, held his see for seventeen years,² and according to Mr. Plummer must have died in 647 (as stated by Florence of Worcester³) or in 648. Capgrave, *Ang. Sac.* i. 403, puts his obit on 8th March. He was buried first at Dunwich, thence he was translated to Seham, near Ely (now Soham)—“a town,” says William of Malmesbury, “planted near the marsh which in former times had to be traversed by a dangerous route in a boat, but can now be gone over on foot.” The church there was destroyed by the Danes, but Malmesbury adds that remains of it still survived, and among them was found the body of St. Felix, which was removed to Ramsey Abbey.⁴

Several places still claim his memory, such as Felixstowe, south-east of Ipswich, in Suffolk, and Feliskirk, near Thirsk, in Yorkshire. On the death of Felix, Archbishop Honorius consecrated Thomas his deacon (*diaconum ejus*) to the see. He was a native of the Province of the Gyrwas (*Provincia Gyrwiorum*). In the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede the words are translated by “Gyrwa maegdh,” the kindred of the Gyrwas. The *Liber Eliensis* describes the Gyrwas as “all the Southern Angles living in the great marsh in which is situated the

¹ Florence of Worcester, Appendix, *M.H.B.* 636.

² *Bede*, ii. 15, iii. 20.

³ *M.H.B.* p. 530.

⁴ William of Malmesbury, *Gest. Pont.* pp. 147 and 348. *Lib. El.* pp. 21 and 22. Plummer, vol. ii. p. 174.

Isle of Ely."¹ Thomas died five years later, probably in 652 or 653, whereupon Honorius consecrated Berctgils, whose name in religion was Boniface, and who was a Kentish man, in his place.²

Let us now turn to Northumbria.

"When," says Bede, "Ædwin had reigned gloriously over Anglians and Britons alike for seventeen years, during six of which he had been a Christian, Caedwalla, King of the Britons, in alliance with Penda, a very vigorous man of the royal family of Mercia, and a pagan, rebelled against him." A fierce battle took place at Haethfelth (probably Hatfield Chase, near Doncaster), and Ædwin was there killed. This fateful battle was fought on the 12th October 633,³ when Ædwin was forty-eight years old. His son Osfrid and his whole army were either killed or scattered. His other son, Eadfrid, who fled for refuge to Penda, was put to death by him in spite of his oath to the contrary.⁴ We may be certain that the upheaval which led to this catastrophe was largely caused by the dislike of many of his people to Ædwin's change of faith, and to the fact that a very large number of them had remained pagans. Mr. Green has well expressed the actual results of this rapid change of religion,

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, vol. ii. p. 174.

² *Bede*, iii. 20.

³ The Chronicle attached to Nennius dates the battle in 630, and Tighernac in 631. Tighernac, however, dates Anglian events two or three years before Bede (Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 243, note 25).

⁴ *Bede*, ii. 20.

perhaps intensified by the indecency with which the Archpriest Coifi had treated his late gods. He says : "Easily as it was brought about in Aedwin's court, the religious revolution gave a shock to the power which he had built up in Britain at large. Though Paulinus preached among the Cheviots as on the Swale, it was only in Deira that the Northumbrians really followed the bidding of their King. If Aedwin reared anew a church at York, no church or altar rose in Bernicia from the Forth to the Tees."¹ In addition to the cause here assigned for the increase in Aedwin's enemies, we may also conjecture that Caedwalla's fierce and cruel devastation of Northumbria had been inspired by the merciless way he had been driven hither and thither, and also by the British clergy, who could not have forgotten the slaughter of the monks at Bangor, and the ruthlessness of Aethelfred. On the other hand, the exiled family of Aethelfred may also have had a hand in the matter.

King Aedwin's head was taken to York, and was afterwards removed to the Church of St. Peter there, the church he had himself begun, and which was completed by St. Oswald. It was placed in the Chapel (*in porticu*) of "St. Gregory the Pope, from whose disciples he had received the Word of Life."²

Things in Northumbria now went hard with the Christians, who were cruelly trampled upon, and Aedwin's immediate successors relapsed into pagan-

¹ Green, *The Making of England*, 264.

² Bede, ii. 20.


ism. "All was lost," says Bishop Browne. "A day's preaching had converted hundreds. A day's defeat swept the whole thing away. Christianity in the North was gone."¹ This is not quite accurate. When Paulinus abandoned his flock and his great mission in Northumbria, he left behind him his faithful deacon James, "a man," says Bede, "who was both an ecclesiastic and a saint," and who for a long time after, remained in the Church, and plucked much prey from the old enemy (*antiquo hosti*) by teaching and baptizing. "The village," says Bede, "where he chiefly worked, situated near Catterick (*juxta Cataractam*), still bears his name."² Bishop Browne says the place is now called Aikbar or Akebar, of which name, he argues, the first syllable represents Jacobus, and not Oak, as has been thought by some.³ The cross of St. James is still to be seen at Hawkswell, five miles from Catterick.⁴ Bishop Browne says of it: "The shaft is about four feet high above ground, and it is covered with simple but unusual interlacing patterns, cut in relief, and of the type so well known to those who have studied the curious and beautiful remains of Anglian art in the north of England." The commencement of the spring of the cross-head can be seen at the upper part of the shaft. There is on the front of the shaft a small rectangular panel with raised border, and Hübner gives as the inscription on it, *Haec est crux sci Gacobi*. A figure of

¹ *Augustine and his Companions*, 186.

² *Op. cit.* ii. 20.

³ *Conv. of the Heptarchy*, pp. 218-222.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 215 f.



THE INSCRIBED CROSS AT HAWKSWELL, NEAR CATTERICK.

To face p. 328.

the cross is given by Bishop Browne. Near it is St. Andrew's Church, dedicated to the patron of Paulinus' monastery at Rome. Bede says that, being highly skilled in the art of singing in church, when peace was afterwards restored in the province, and the number of believers grew, he became the master of the ecclesiastical chanting after the fashion of the Romans and Kentish men (*Qui quoniam cantandi in ecclesia erat peritissimus, . . . etiam magister ecclesiasticae cantionis juxta morem Romanorum sive Cantuariorum multis coepit existere*); "and being old and full of days, as the Scriptures say, he followed the way of his fathers."¹ Bede says in another place that he survived to his own day.² The latter, a famous Northumbrian himself, probably exaggerates the influence of James, who, however excellent, can only have shed a very local and small light "amidst the encircling gloom" in Northumbria at the time.

The terrible desolation of Northumbria after Ædwin's death left little temptation to Paulinus to remain behind, for he was apparently not made of the same stuff as martyrs are made; and, perhaps, as has been suggested, he felt some obligation to see the Queen, whose chaplain he had been, escorted to a place of safety. This might excuse his making a journey to Kent, but hardly justified his complete and final abandonment of his missionary Church and of the converts he had made. He accordingly set out by sea for Kent, taking

¹ *Bede*, ii. 20.

² *Ib.* ii. 16.

with him his protégé, Queen *Æthelberga*, whom he had originally escorted to Northumbria. Bede says they were very honourably received by Archbishop Honorius (*ab Honorio archiepiscopo*) and by King Eadbald,¹ who was of course her half-brother.

When *Ædwin*'s widow, *Æthelberga*, returned to her old Kentish home, she, according to Thomas of Elmham, founded the Monastery of Lyminge, in Kent, in the town of the same name. The place of her burial is still marked by a wooden tablet on the south wall of the church there, and her name of endearment is still perpetuated in a neighbouring common called Tatta's lea, while "St. *Æthelberga*'s Well is situated to the east of the church."² This was the first nunnery recorded to have been founded among the Saxons or Anglians. It was probably based on the type of those in Gaul, for she was a friend of King Dagobert's.³

My friend Mr. Peers has given a graphic account of the vicissitudes of the early church at Lyminge, which I will take the liberty of quoting. After reporting how *Æthelberga* received a gift of the royal vill of Lyminge from her brother, the Kentish King, and how she died in 647 in the monastery she had founded there, and was there interred, as was also presently her great-great-niece St. Mildred, he proceeds: "The monastery was raided by the

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. 20.

³ *Vide infra*, p. 333.

² Bright, 149.

Danes, but, as at Rochester, the church can only have been partially destroyed, for in 1085 Lanfranc, requiring relics for his new foundation in Canterbury, St. Gregory's, caused the bodies of the two saints to be translated from the north *porticus* of Lyminge Church to the Church of St. Gregory, and thereby started the great and long-lived squabble between the monks of St. Augustine's at Canterbury and the canons of St. Gregory's as to which house possessed the authentic relics of St. Mildred, the details of which may be read in the polemical tract of Gocelin, monk of St. Augustine's, entitled 'Contra inanes beatae Mildrethae usurpatores,' written about 1098.¹ Gocelin, who seems to have been present at the removal of the relics, speaks of Æthelberga's tomb as still existing: '*eminentius monumentum . . . in aquilonali porticu ad australem parietem ecclesiae arcu involutum*'; and again, speaking of Æthelberga says: '*Cujus in limingis eminentius et augustius creditur monumentum.*' The position of the tomb, in an arched recess in the north *porticus*, against or near the south wall of the church, is not clear, unless the north porch and the south wall are understood as belonging to two different buildings. This would, at Lyminge, fit the case very well, as the present church is built just to the north of the old foundation, so that a north *porticus* of the older church could very well abut on the south wall of the later one. Canon Jenkins claims to have discovered the site of both grave and *porticus* in the north wall

¹ Cott. MS., Br. Mus., Vesp. B. xx. f. 260.

of the apse, just to the east of the triple arcade, but the evidence is inconclusive, and points rather to a later interment.”¹

In regard to the remains of St. Æthelberga’s church, Mr. Micklethwaite says its foundations are situated in the present churchyard south of the existing church, and show that it was of the same form as that of St. Pancras at Canterbury, but smaller, and was without any porches or external chapels. It had an arcade of three instead of a single sanctuary arch.² Mr. Peers adds that there is nothing left of the church but the lowest foundations of the walls, which are 1 foot 10 inches thick, of Roman materials, with good evidence of a triple arcade. No trace of the *porticus* remains in which St. Æthelberga and St. Mildred lay, and which seems to have been standing at the end of the eleventh century. Traces of Roman buildings abound on the site, and a Roman foundation underlies the western end of the nave.³

Meanwhile, Bass, a King’s thane, conducted another party, which included Ædwin’s daughter Eanfleda and his son Vuscfrean, together with Yffi, his grandson, the son of Osfrid, to Kent. Æthelberga presently had misgivings as to the intentions of Eadbald and Oswald towards these dangerous young people. The mention of Oswald is specially ominous. He had interests in the north which the existence of the young princes threatened. She accordingly sent them to be brought up in

¹ *Arch. Journ.*, 1901, p. 407.

² *Ib.*, 1896, pp. 313 and 314.

³ *Ib.*, 1901, pp. 419 and 420.

France, to King Dagobert, who, says Bede, was a friend of hers. There they all died in infancy and were honourably buried in the church. There is a sinister sound about this part of the narrative. When he went to Kent, Bass also took with him the precious vessels, including a great golden cross and a golden chalice which Aedwin had given for the service of the church, and which Bede says were still preserved at Canterbury in his day.¹

At this time there was a vacancy in the see of Rochester. Its bishop, Romanus, who had been sent on an embassy to Rome by the archbishop (perhaps in order to secure himself a pallium), was drowned in the Mediterranean. Whereupon, at the invitation of Honorius the archbishop (*antistes*) and of King Eadbald, Paulinus (who was at the time without a see) took charge of his church.²

After his return to the faith, Eadbald, the Kentish King, apparently proved himself a zealous churchman. For example, we are told in the life of his daughter, St. Eanswitha, that he built a church at Folkestone dedicated to St. Peter. Eanswitha refused to marry and became a nun and abbess of a nunnery there, which was also probably founded by her father.³ We have seen how he built the small Church of the Virgin, in the precincts of St. Augustine's Abbey, which was consecrated by Archbishop Mellitus. It

¹ *Bede*, ii. 20.

² *Ib.*

³ See Hardy, *Catalogue*, i. pp. 228 and 229.

is probable that he granted lands and benefactions to the Church, but the charters associated with his name are forgeries.¹

Thomas of Elmham tells us that Gratirosus, the fourth abbot of the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury, died in 638, and was succeeded after an interval of two years by Petronius, a Roman.²

King Eadbald died in the year 640. He was succeeded by his son Earconberht. Bede makes him the only son of Eadbald. A second son, Eormenred, is mentioned in an interpolated passage in Codex A of the *Chronicle*, *sub an.* 640. The notice perhaps came from Florence of Worcester.³ Eormenred apparently died before his father, and, by his wife Oslava, left two sons and four daughters.⁴ Earconberht, according to Bede, was the first of the English Kings who insisted on the pagan idols being forsaken and destroyed throughout his kingdom. He also caused the forty days of Lent to be observed, and issued instructions that any one who failed to obey these orders was to be visited with condign punishment.⁵

Paulinus remained Bishop of Rochester until his death, which took place on the 6th of the ides of October (*i.e.* 10th October) 644, having been bishop nineteen years, two months, and twenty-one days. In this calculation Bede includes the whole

¹ See Introduction.

² *Op. cit.* 175.

³ See *M.H.B.* 627 and 635.

⁴ Florence of Worcester, *M.H.B.* 635.

⁵ *Bede*, iii. 8.



THE RELIQUARY OF ST. EANSWITHA AT FOLKESTONE.

To face p. 334.

length of his episcopate. Of these years eight were spent at York and eleven at Rochester.¹ In the Life of St. Gregory by the Whitby Monk, we are told the soul of Paulinus was seen on his death to fly to heaven in the form of a white swan.² He was buried in the sacristy (*in secretario*) of St. Andrew's Cathedral.³ He is said to have left the cope which the Pope had sent him to that church.⁴ In Bishop Gundulf's days the old church was destroyed and rebuilt by Lanfranc, when his bones were put in a casket (*in scrinio*) and transferred to the new building. This translation took place on the 4th of the ides of January, which was a day solemnly kept at Rochester.⁵

In his place Archbishop Honorius ordained Ithamar, who, says Bede, was sprung from the people of Kent, and was distinguished in life and learning.⁶ He was apparently the first Englishman to be made a bishop, and retained his old English name.

Archbishop Honorius himself died on the last day of September (1st kalends of October), 653.⁷ Elmham gives his epitaph:—

“Quintus honor memori versu memoraris, Honori,
Digne sepultura, quam non teret ulla litura.
Ardet in obscuro tua lux vibramine puro:
Haec scelus omne premit, fugat umbras, nubila demit.”⁸

¹ See Smith's *Bede*, iii. 14, note 13.

² *Op. cit.* par. 17.

³ *Bede*, iii. 14.

⁴ *Ib.* ii. 20.

⁵ Smith, *op. cit.* note 14.

⁶ *Bede*, iii. 14.

⁷ *Ib.* iii. 20. His life is given in the *Acta Sanct.* vii. 698-711.

⁸ *Op. cit.* 183.

DEUSDEDIT

On the death of Honorius the see was vacant for a year and a half, when Deusdedit, a native of Wessex, whose real name, according to Elmham,¹ was Frithonas,² and who was probably a monk, was elected in his place. He possibly took his name in religion from Pope Deusdedit. Ithamar came from Rochester to consecrate him, which was again an instance of a single bishop, and one too who had not received the pall, consecrating another. He was ordained on 26th March, or perhaps 12th December 654,³ and was the first archbishop of English birth. He ruled the diocese for nine years, four months, and two days.⁴ During his episcopate he consecrated Damian as Bishop of Rochester, as the successor to Ithamar, on the death of the latter. Damian came from Sussex. We do not know when he died, but it was probably some time before Deusdedit, for, according to Bede,⁵ the see of Rochester had long been vacant through the death of Damian on the arrival of Theodore at Canterbury. Bede tells us that in the year of the eclipse and

¹ Pp. 192 and 193.

² Elmham says: “*patria lingua primitus Fritonas vocabatur; sed propter dona gratuita, quae suis meritis multiplicibus consonabant, nomen ejus Saxonum nec immerito in nomen gratificum est conversum*” (*op. cit.* 192).

³ See Plummer, vol. ii. p. 175. During the same year, according to Thomas of Elmham, Petronius, the fifth abbot of SS. Peter and Paul's Monastery at Canterbury, died. He adds that his burial-place was not known (*op. cit.* 183). He was succeeded by Nathanael, one of the monks who had come with Mellitus and Justus (*ib.* 184).

⁴ *Bede*, iii. 20,

⁵ iv. 2,

of the plague which followed close upon it (14th July, A.D. 664), Deusdedit also died at this time.¹ Thomas of Elmham gives his epitaph:—

“Alme Deusdedit, cui sexta vocatio cedit,
Signas hunc lapidem, lapidi signatus eidem.
Prōdit ab hac urna virtute salus diuturna,
Qua melioratur quicunque dolore gravatur.”

Earconberht, King of Kent, died on the same day. It is very probable they both in fact died of the plague, to which, as a most potent factor in the annals of the sixth and seventh century, both religious and secular, I propose to devote a somewhat detailed account in the first Appendix.

On the death of Archbishop Deusdedit, on the 14th of July 664, there was apparently a great difficulty in filling his place. Bede says the see became vacant for a considerable time.² The accounts of what followed are not quite consistent. In his history of the abbots, which is the earlier and more trustworthy work, Bede tells us that Ecgberht, King of Kent, sent out of the kingdom a man named Wighard, who had been elected to the office of bishop. He was a person who had been sufficiently instructed in every kind of ecclesiastical institution (*omni aecclesiastica institutione sufficienter edocitus*) by the Roman disciples of the blessed Pope Gregory in Kent.³ It was Ecgberht's desire that Wighard should be ordained at Rome as his own bishop, so that,

¹ *Op. cit.* 193.

² *H.E.* iv. 1.

³ Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, par. 3.

possessing a bishop of his own nation and language, "he himself and the people who were subject to him, might become the more perfectly instructed in the words and mysteries of the faith, inasmuch as they would then receive them not through the medium of an interpreter, but from the tongue and the hands of a kinsman and a fellow-countryman." In all this, not a word is said of Northumbria. The whole question is treated as a Kentish question, and was decided by the Kentish King to meet his own needs and convenience. The notice is interesting as showing how irksome the ministrations of the foreign monks who did not know English (or, if they did, knew it very badly) had become, and how anxious the King was to have an English archbishop who could speak to him and his people in their own tongue, who was English in his ways and instincts, and who was very learned in matters of ecclesiastical discipline (*vir in ecclesiasticis disciplinis doctissimus*).¹ Wighard was the bearer of some lordly gifts for the Pope, including not a few gold and silver vessels (*vasis*). On arriving at Rome, where Vitalian was then Pope, he had an interview with the latter, and reported the object of his mission; but most unfortunately, he soon after, with the majority of those who had gone with him, perished of the plague.

With the death of Deusdedit passed away the

¹ Bede, *H.E.* iv. 1.

last Archbishop of Canterbury who belonged to the mission of St. Augustine and who could trace his Orders to that evangelist. It is a very remarkable thing that this "succession" should have been permitted to die out. It could not be because of any increased stringency in the rule about ordination by a single bishop, since there was still a bishop in East Anglia (who however, died soon after), who might have concurred with Deusdedit. It cannot have been that Deusdedit, not having received a pall, did not feel competent to consecrate a bishop, since he had already consecrated Damian to the see of Rochester.¹ Whatever the reason, there can be no doubt that his death marks a distinct gap in the history of the English Church, and with it that Church had to make a fresh start.

It was my purpose in writing these pages to try and bring together, as far as my materials and my limited gifts enabled me, a connected picture of the first attempt to evangelise England, and especially to keep in view the fact that as Britain is only a detached fragment of Europe geographically, its history and the changes and movements that have taken place among its people can only be understood by continual reference to the political and religious movements that have meanwhile occurred elsewhere.

I began by drawing a detailed, and I hope fairly adequate, picture of the great Pope who was the initiator of the movement, of the changes he made in the administration, and, above all, of the theology

¹ *Bede*, iv. 20.

he taught, which have since so largely dominated the Holy See and its satellites. To this I devoted a previous volume. I have tried in this volume continually to remember that Augustine the Missionary was what Gregory the Pope, his master, had made him, and that in view of the scantiness of materials which have been preserved in regard to the domestic doings of the missionaries we may turn confidently to the almost excessive materials supplied by the writings of Gregory to beacon our feet and illuminate our minds as to the kind of religion Augustine brought and taught.

The enterprise Gregory had so much at heart and which he so much cherished might perhaps have had a more successful issue if more worldly wisdom had been shown in the selection of his agents. Here again, however, we must realise how few materials were available, and how, of these, the men who were willing to face the dangers and difficulties of the task were only to be found among those who had said a final good-bye to the world and its attractions and who were not men of the world, but, in the language of the time, were saints. On the other hand, things might have been different if England had been a united kingdom under one ruler, or ruled by one family, instead of (as it was) a disintegrated body made up of several fragments with a different origin and with very small common interests. It was presently the work of the Church to create and foster this unity and with it a common patriotism. Meanwhile the missionary

cause suffered greatly from the perpetual strife and the divergent ambitions of the various tribes and their several chiefs.

The actual work of the mission has been well summed up by Dr. Mason. He says: "The Augustinian line of bishops had died out. Gregory's sanguine vision of two metropolitans with twelve suffragans apiece was very far from being realised. Eleven bishops in all owed their consecration directly or indirectly to Augustine. The first six of these were Italians, who either came with Augustine or joined him in 601 — Laurence, Mellitus, Justus, Romanus, Paulinus, and Honorius." All of these except Romanus are claimed as alumni of St. Andrew's Monastery in the inscription inscribed on the façade of the existing church. They occur with others, including Paulinus the Evangelist of Northumbria, and Peter the Abbot of Canterbury, and the whole list is headed: "From this monastery there set out," etc. (*Ex hoc monasterio prodierunt*). "The other five were Englishmen—Deusdedit, Ithamar, Damian, Thomas, and Boniface, who occupied the sees of Canterbury, Rochester, and Dunwich. Boniface of Dunwich was the last. He died in the year that Theodore reached England. In him that succession became extinct. No sacred Orders now existing can be traced up to Augustine. If the episcopal succession is the framework of the structure of the Church, the foundation of the present Church of England begins with Theodore of Tarsus. Again, only a small

part of England, it will have been seen, directly owes its Christianity to the missionaries sent by Gregory. Canterbury was the one and only centre in which the work begun by them had had an uninterrupted and continuous history. Even at Rochester, within the kingdom of Kent itself, there was a short break. London, so far as any visible result was concerned, wholly repudiated their operations. Their magnificent successes in Northumbria were to a great extent swept away. East Anglia alone (out of Kent) retained ecclesiastical connection with them from the time of its first acceptance of the Gospel ; but so far as we can see they would hardly have evangelised East Anglia but for their timely reinforcement by the Burgundian bishop, Felix. The first Christianising of Wessex was accomplished without the least reference to the chair of Augustine, indeed almost in defiance of it. . . . Nevertheless, the history of the Church of England begins with Augustine and centres round his see of Canterbury.”¹

Having thus traced the thread of the history of the English Church down to where it broke in twain, I have reached a fitting halting-place. I hope I may be able in a third volume to describe how the broken thread was again pieced, and how under happier conditions and stronger men the Church's second start proved more fruitful and more lasting.

¹ Mason, *The Mission of St. Augustine*, pp. 202-203.

APPENDIX I

THE BUBONIC PLAGUE IN THE SIXTH AND SEVENTH CENTURIES

THERE is no more dismal episode in the world's history, nor yet one the effects of which have been so inadequately appreciated, as the desolating and widespread epidemic which depopulated Europe in the first half of the seventh century. There have been many and terrible plagues which have decimated the world at times, and notably the Black Death in the fourteenth century, but I know of none in which the effects were so awful in selecting for destruction in such large numbers, those men who were the very salt of the human family. This kind of material was not too abundant in the sixth and early seventh centuries, and the corresponding loss and penalty were terrible. The particular epidemic to which I refer was known to the Latin writers as the *Lues inguinaria*, i.e. the bubonic plague. It apparently broke out in special paroxysms and was then comparatively dormant for a while. In describing the plague and its effects, I cannot do better than adopt one of those magnificent pieces of condensed rhetoric in which

Gibbon has so often baffled imitation, and in which the craft of the historian is presented in its most ideal form. “Æthiopia and Egypt,” he says, “have been stigmatised in every age as the original source and seminary of the plague. In a damp, hot, stagnating air, this African fever is generated from the putrefaction of animal substances, and especially from the swarms of locusts, not less destructive to mankind in their death than in their lives. The fatal disease, which depopulated the earth in the time of Justinian and his successors, first appeared in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, between the Serbonian bog and the eastern channel of the Nile. From thence, tracing as it were a double path, it spread to the East, over Syria, Persia, and the Indies, and penetrated to the West, along the coast of Africa, and over the continent of Europe. In the spring of the second year, Constantinople, during three or four months, was visited by the pestilence; and Procopius, who observed its progress and symptoms with the eyes of a physician, has emulated the skill and diligence of Thucydides in the description of the plague of Athens. The infection was sometimes announced by the visions of a distempered fancy, and the victim despaired as soon as he had heard the menace and felt the stroke of an invisible spectre. But the greater number, in their beds, in the streets, in their usual occupation, were surprised by a slight fever; so slight, indeed, that neither the pulse nor the colour of the patient gave any

signs of the approaching danger. The same the next, or the succeeding day ; it was declared by the swelling of the glands, particularly those of the groin" (whence its name of *lues inguinaria*), "of the armpits, and under the ear ; and, when these buboes or tumours were opened, they were found to contain a *coal*, or black substance, of the size of a lentil. If they came to a just swelling and suppuration, the patient was saved by this kind and natural discharge of the morbid humour. But, if they continued hard and dry, a mortification quickly ensued, and the fifth day was commonly the term of his life. The fever was often accompanied with lethargy or delirium ; the bodies of the sick were covered with black pustules or carbuncles, the symptoms of immediate death ; and in the constitutions too feeble to produce an eruption, the vomiting of blood was followed by a mortification of the bowels. To pregnant women the plague was generally mortal ; yet one infant was drawn alive from his dead mother, and three mothers survived the loss of their infected foetus. Youth was the most perilous season, and the female sex was less susceptible than the male ; but every rank and profession was attacked with indiscriminate rage, and many of those who escaped were deprived of the use of their speech, without being secure from a return of the disorder. The physicians of Constantinople were zealous and skilful, but their art was baffled by the various symptoms and pertinacious vehemence of the

disease; the same remedies were productive of contrary effects, and the event capriciously disappointed their prognostics of death or recovery. The order of funerals and the right of sepulchres were confounded; those who were left without friends or servants lay unburied in the streets or in their desolate houses; and a magistrate was authorised to collect the promiscuous heaps of dead bodies, to transport them by land or water, and to inter them in deep pits beyond the precincts of the city. Their own danger and the prospect of public distress awakened some remorse in the minds of the most vicious of mankind; the confidence of health again revived their passions and habits; but philosophy must disdain the observation of Procopius that the lives of such men were guarded by the peculiar favour of fortune or providence. He forgot, or perhaps he secretly recollects, that the plague had touched the person of Justinian himself; but the abstemious diet of the Emperor may suggest, as in the case of Socrates, a more rational and honourable cause for his recovery. During his sickness the public consternation was expressed in the habits of the citizens; and their idleness and despondence occasioned a general scarcity in the capital of the East.

“Contagion is the inseparable symptom of the plague; which, by mutual respiration, is transfused from the infected persons to the lungs and stomach of those who approach them. While philosophers believe and tremble, it is singular that the existence

of a real danger should have been denied by a people most prone to vain and imaginary terrors. Yet the fellow-citizens of Procopius were satisfied, by some short and partial experience, that the infection could not be gained by the closest conversation; and this persuasion might support the assiduity of friends or physicians in the care of the sick, whom inhuman prudence would have condemned to solitude and despair. But the fatal security, like the predestination of the Turks, must have aided the progress of the contagion, and those salutary precautions to which Europe is indebted for her safety were unknown to the government of Justinian. No restraints were imposed on the free and frequent intercourse of the Roman provinces; from Persia to France, the nations were mingled and infected by wars and emigrations; and the pestilential odour which lurks for years in a bale of cotton was imported, by the abuse of trade, into the most distant regions. The mode of its propagation is explained by the remark of Procopius himself, that it always spread from the seacoast to the inland country; the most sequestered islands and mountains were successively visited; the places which had escaped the fury of its first passage were alone exposed to the contagion of the ensuing year. The winds might diffuse that subtle venom; but, unless the atmosphere be previously disposed for its reception, the plague would soon expire in the cold or temperate climates of the earth. Such was the universal

corruption of the air, that the pestilence which burst forth in the fifteenth year of Justinian was not checked or alleviated by any difference of the seasons. In time, its first malignity was abated and dispersed ; the disease alternately languished and revived ; but it was not till the end of a calamitous period of fifty-two years that mankind recovered their health or the air resumed its pure and salubrious quality. No facts have been preserved to sustain an account, or even a conjecture, of the numbers that perished in this extraordinary mortality. I only find that, during three months, five, and at length ten, thousand persons died each day at Constantinople ; that many cities of the East were left vacant ; and that in several districts of Italy the harvest and the vintage withered on the ground. The triple scourge of war, pestilence, and famine afflicted the subjects of Justinian, and his reign is disgraced by a visible decrease of the human species which has never been repaired in some of the fairest countries of the globe.”¹

“The plague,” says Dr. Bury, “seems to have appeared in Egypt in 541. Before the end of the year it was probably carried to Constantinople, for Theophanes says that it broke out in October, A.D. 541, but it did not begin to rage till the following year, A.D. 542, the year of the third invasion of Chosroes.” Bury doubts the statement of Gibbon that it penetrated into the west “along the

¹ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. Bury, iv. 436-440.

coast of Africa." It must have reached Africa from Constantinople, and the desert west of Cyrenaica, the modern Tripolis, was an effectual barrier against the invasion; and Corippus distinctly says the Moors escaped it. The malady spread in Africa in A.D. 543.¹

The same author attributes the lassitude and change of character which overtook Justinian in his later days to the results of his own attack of the plague. "He was touched," he says, "with dispiritedness or with the malady of the Middle Age."² As Bury says, its presence in Persia caused Chosroes to retire prematurely from his campaign in 542, a few months before it reached Constantinople, where it raged for four months. "Procopius was especially impressed with the universality of the scourge; it did not assail any particular race or class of men, nor prevail in any particular region, nor at any particular season of the year. Summer or winter, north or south, Greek or Arabian, washed or unwashed—of these distinctions the plague took no account; it pervaded the whole world. A man might climb to the top of a hill, it was there; or retire to the depth of a cavern, it was there also. If it passed by a spot, it was sure to return to it again." The frivolous and the wicked seemed to escape the most readily. In the words of Procopius: "This pestilence, whether by chance or providential design, strictly spared the

¹ *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. Bury, iv. 436 and 437, note 128.

² *The Later Roman Empire*, i. 358.

most wicked." "The plague," continues Mr. Bury, speaking of the years 542 and 543, "aggravated the disastrous condition of the people, which had suffered from the pressure of taxation. It produced a stagnation of trade and a cessation of work. All customary occupations were broken off, and the market-places were empty, save of corpse-bearers. The consequence was that Constantinople, always richly supplied, was in a state of famine, and bread was a great luxury.

"In 558 there was another outbreak of the pestilential scourge in the East; it lurked and lingered in Europe long after the first grand visitation. In the last years of Justinian it produced a desolation in Liguria which was graphically described by Paul, the historian of the Lombards. 'Videres,' he writes, 'saeculum in antiquum redactum silentium,'—the country seemed plunged in a primeval silence."¹

It was equally fatal elsewhere. An outbreak of the bubonic plague occurred in the year 600 in the army of the Great Khan of the Avars, who lost seven sons in one day, and compelled the heart-broken chief to raise the siege of Constantinople and to withdraw.²

It is no wonder that the Greek historians of those times, who still mingled philosophy with their narratives, were baffled by trying to find an explanation which should justify to their readers

¹ *The Later Roman Empire*, i. 402 and 403.

² *Ib.* ii. 139, *Theophanes ad an.*

the terrible and apparently arbitrary destruction of human life in this dread visitation, which looked so much more like the operations of an aimless fate than of the tender Father of mankind Procopius and Agathias, one a determinist and the other a champion of free will, and both men of remarkable faith, tried their hand and found no better solution than in attributing the scourge to the punishment of a wicked race by a wrathful God.

We have seen in a former volume what a terrible visitation of the plague there was at the end of the sixth century in Italy, when Pope Pelagius died of it and the city was desolated, while it was one of the glories of St. Gregory's reign as Pope to design measures for its mitigation.

In his *Dialogues* Gregory gives a bizarre account of a boy called Theodore, to illustrate his theory that the soul, while still in the body, receives punishment both for its own good and the benefit of others. He says that Theodore was a very unruly boy, and with his brother, entered St. Gregory's Monastery on the Caelian Hill, where he was very unwilling to hear any talk about spiritual matters, and would scoff or swear or protest against the notion that he would ever adopt a spiritual life. When the plague came, and the greater part of the city was grievously stricken, Theodore himself lay sick, and being at the point of death all the monks repaired to his chamber to pray for the happy departure of his soul, which could not apparently be far off, since half his body was

dead and only a little life remained in his breast. Thereupon he cried out and tried to interrupt their devotions, bidding them depart, since he said he was being devoured by a dragon and their presence prevented him from dispatching him. "He hath already swallowed my head in his mouth: why should they prevent him having his way if it was his fate to eventually devour me?" The monks at these fearful words bade him sign himself with the cross. He declared he would do this willingly if he could, but he could not, as he was so loaded with the dragon's scales. Thereupon the monks all fell on their knees and piteously prayed God to deliver the boy, who mercifully heard them, for he presently declared that the dragon had fled, and asked them to pray for forgiveness of his sins, declaring that he was ready to adopt a better life. He thus turned to God with his whole heart.¹

A few words must be added in regard to the effects of the plague farther west. Gregory of Tours, in describing the career of St. Gall, refers to its devastations in Gaul, especially in the diocese of Arles. He tells us how, by the prayers of the Saint, the city of Auvergne escaped the malady, and adds that the poor people in his diocese were conscious of a special protection, since they noticed that the houses and churches there were marked with a *Tau*.²

Some years later, namely, in 571, the pest broke out with especial virulence in the same district. There was such a mortality, says

¹ *Op. cit.* lib. iv. ch. xxxvii.

² *Op. cit.* iv. ch. v.

Gregory, that it was impossible to count the multitudes who perished. There were not sufficient coffins in which to place the dead, and they were buried ten or more in a single hole. On one Sunday three hundred corpses were to be found in the basilica of St. Peter. "Death came very suddenly," says our author. "There arose in the armpit or the groin a sore in the form of a serpent, and within two or three days the victim died, after losing his senses. Thus perished the priest Cato, who, while others fled, remained faithfully to tend the sick. The bishop Catinus, who had wandered hither and thither to escape the malady, and who returning to the city, caught it, and died on the Sunday of the Passion. Tetradius, his cousin, died at the same time. Lyons, Bourges, Chalon, and Dijon were grievously depopulated during the attack."¹

In 580 the pest took another form all over Gaul, namely, that of a most deadly dysentery, a violent fever with vomitings of a nauseous kind, with pains in the kidneys, while the heads and necks of the victims turned yellow and even green in colour (!). The peasants fancied that their hearts were covered with boils (*Rusticiores vero corales hoc pusulas nominabant*). Some found a cure in profuse blood-letting, in which the blood seemed corrupted, while others had recourse to potions made by the herb doctors. The disease began in August and especially attacked infants. Among others who were attacked were King Chilperic and his two sons, and

¹ *Op. cit.* iv. 31.

even the fierce and cruel Fredegondis, his wife, was moved into some semblance of tenderness by the appalling malady, and persuaded her husband to burn the registers of the tax-collectors. One of her two sons died. Another victim of the disease was Austréchildis, the shameless wife of King Gontran, "who, in dying," says Gregory, "decreed that people should weep for others beside herself, and made her husband promise to put her doctors to death." Another prominent victim was Nantin, Count of Angoulême.¹

A little later another outbreak took the form of a kind of smallpox at Senlis, while Nantes was desolated by the true plague itself. Among the victims of the former was Felix, Bishop of Nantes, the details of whose illness are given by Gregory of Tours.²

Lastly, somewhat later, we read of the renewal of the plague at Narbonne after a surcease of three years, and of its causing a terrible mortality there. The famous city of Albi also suffered grievously.³

Let us now turn to the great islands beyond the English Channel which so immediately concern us, and first to Ireland, where our documents are most abundant. In the Annals of Ulster we read under the year 544 of the first mortality, which is called *blefed*, in which Mobi Clarainech died. The *Chron. Scot.* dates this in 541, and tells us the victim was called Bercan. Under the year 548 we read in the Ulster Annals of a great mortality, in which Finnio Macc-U-Telduibh, Colam descendant

¹ *Op. cit.* v. 35-39.

² *Ib.* vi. 14 and 15.

³ *Ib.* ch. xxxiii.

of Craumthanán, Mac Tail of Cill Cuilind, Sinchell, son of Cenandan, Abbot of Cill'achaídh of Druim-fota and Colum of Inisceltra, died.¹ In the year 553 we read: "The distemper, which is called the *Samthrose*" (it is glossed by *scabiem*, and no doubt the word means a skin disease). In 555² we read: "A great mortality in this year, i.e. the *cron-conaill*, i.e. the *buidhe chonaill*." *Cron*, says Dr. Hennessy, means saffron-coloured, and *buidhe*, yellow; *connaill* is the same as the word *connall* (glossed by *stipulam*).³

In the year 663 (660 in the *Chron. Scotorum*) we read in the Annals of Ulster: "A pestilence reached Ireland on the kalends of August. . . . The mortality raged at first in Magh Itho of Fothart." In the Annals of the Four Masters we read under the same year: "Baetan Mac-Ua-Cormaic, Abbot of Cluain mic Nois, died. Comdhan Maccutheanne; Bearach, Abbot of Beannchair; Cearnach Sotal, son of Diarmaid, son of Aedh Slaine, died, together with the aforesaid persons, of a mortality which arose in Ireland, on the Calends of the August of this year in Magh Itha, in Fotharta."

In 664 the Ulster Annals again speak of a great mortality. "Diarmait, son of Aedh Slaine, and Blathmac (his brother), two kings of Erin, and Maelbresail, son of Maelduin, died of the Buidhe chonaill, Ultan, the son of Cunga, Abbot of Cluain Iraird, died. The falling asleep of Feichen of Fabhar

¹ *Chron. Scot.* puts it in 551. ² The *Chron. Scot.* puts it in 554.

³ See Annals of Ulster, vol. i. p. 55, note 5.

(i.e. St. Ferchin, Abbot of Fobhar), that is, from the same distemper, and of Aileran (or Eeran) the Wise, and Cronan, son of Silne. Cu cen mathair, son of Cathal, King of Munster, died, Blathmac of Tethba, Oengus Uladh, Manchan of Liath, and bishops and abbots, and other persons innumerable died. Colman Cas, Abbot of Cluain mic Nois, and Cummeni, Abbot of Cluain mic Nois, slept."

The *Chron. Scotorum*, which dates these deaths wrongly in 661, adds to the names just given Ronan, son of Berach, Maeldoid, son of Finghin.

In 665 there is a long obituary in the Ulster Annals, and, although the cause of death is not actually given, we can hardly doubt it was the plague. It includes Ailill Flannessa, son of Domnall, son of Aedh, son of Ainmire; Maelcaich, son of Scannal of the Cruithni; and Maelduin, son of Scannal, King of Cinal Coirpi; also Eochaid Iarlaithi, King of the Cruithni; Dubhinnrecht, son of Dunchad, King of Ui Briuin-Ai; and Cellach, son of Guaire; while the same author says that "Guaire Aidhne also died, according to another book" (his death had been reported in 662).¹ The Four Masters add the additional name of Baeithin, Abbot of Beannchair or Bangor. In 666 the Annals of Ulster repeat that there was a mortality in Ireland. The *Chron. Scot.*, which wrongly puts this in 663, states that four Abbots of Bennchair Uladh (i.e. of Bangor in Ulster) died of this plague, namely, Berach, Cumine, Colum, and Aedhan. The Four

¹ The same deaths are reported in the *Chron. Scot.* in 662.

Masters date it in 666. In 667 the Ulster Annals again refer to a great mortality, *i.e.* the Buidhe chonaill, adding, "Fergus, son of Muccid, died, Diarmaid and Blathmace, the two Kings of Ireland, and Feichin of Fobhar, and many others died, *i.e.* of the Buidhe chonaill, according to another book."¹

In 682² we read in the Ulster Annals, "the beginning of the mortality of children in the month of October." In the year 683³ there is in the same Annals the entry, "Mortality of the Children" (*mortalitas parvolorum*). Neither of these facts is mentioned in the Annals of the Four Masters. They have a reference, however, in 684 to a mortality among animals in general throughout the whole world for the space of three years, so that there escaped not one out of a thousand of any kind of animals. This is not mentioned in the Ulster Annals nor the *Chron. Scot.*

Turning from Ireland to the Welsh records, we first read of the plague in 547, when we are told there was a great mortality in which Mailcun, King of Gwenedota, or North Wales died (*pausat*). In 682 we read there was a great mortality in Britain, in which "Catgualart, son of Catguolaum," died.⁴

Adamnan, in his life of St. Columba, has an interesting reference to the plague. He says that in his time it twice devastated the greater part of the world. "I will be silent," he says, "in regard

¹ These names had already been mentioned in these Annals in previous years; see Reeve's *Adamnan*, p. 182.

² 679 in the *Chron. Scot.*

³ 680 in *Chron. Scot.*

⁴ *An. Cambr., M.H.B.*, pp. 831 and 833.

to other regions, such as Italy and the city of Rome, the provinces of Cis-Alpine Gaul" (by which he means Gaul north of the Alps), "and Spain." He then says that the islands of Britain, that is to say, Scotia and Britannia (mark the order of the names), were twice devastated by the dire pestilence, except two peoples, namely, those of the Picts and Scots, between whom the dorsal mountains of Britain passed, who were protected against it, he says, by his own prayers and those of his patron (*i.e.* of St. Columba). He claims that not a single one of the nobles (*comites*) of the Picts and Scots nor of their people were attacked by the plague.¹ It especially wasted Northumbria, once after King Ecgfrid's war, and the other time two years later.

Turning to England, Bede tells us how on the 3rd of May in the year 664 (which fixes the date) there was an eclipse of the sun. In the same year a sudden pestilence first depopulated the southern coasts of Britain, and then extended into Northumbria, and for a long time ravaged that country far and near, and destroyed a great multitude of men. Among others, he says, there died Tuda, the Bishop of the Northumbrians, who was buried in the monastery called Paegnalaech (probably Finchale, near Durham). The same pestilence, he says, did no less harm in Ireland. Many of the nobility and of the middle class of the English nation were in Ireland at that time. In the days of Bishops Finan and Colman they

¹ *Lib. Col.* ii. ch. xlvi.

had forsaken their native island and retired thither either for the sake of divine studies or a more continent life, and some of them presently devoted themselves faithfully to the monastic life, others chose to apply themselves to study, going about from one master's cell to another. The Scots (*i.e.* the Scots of Ireland) willingly received them all, and took care to supply them gratuitously with daily food and with books to read, and taught them without charge. Among them were Aedilhun and Ecgberht, two youths of great capacity of the English nobility, the former of whom was brother to Aediluini, who after studying in Ireland returned to England and became Bishop of the Lindissi. The two young men just named were in the monastery called Rathmelsige, by the Scots afterwards known as Mellifont, and having lost all their companions, who were either cut off by the pestilence or dispersed in other places, both fell sick of the same disease and were grievously afflicted. Ecgberht recovered, but Aedilhun died.¹ Another and more famous victim was Bishop Cedd, who died while on a visit to the monastery of Laestingaeu (*i.e.* Lastingham, near Whitby in Yorkshire), and was buried first in the open air, but presently in a stone church in the same monastery. The terrors of the plague seem to have been especially severe among the East Saxons, many of whom, we are told, once more relapsed from Christianity, and with their King, Sigheri, became apostates and restored the

¹ *Bede*, iii. ch. xxvii.

old idols and gods. It is pretty certain, although Bede does not expressly say so, that Earconberht the King of Kent, and Archbishop Deusdedit, who died on the same day, namely, the 14th of July 664, also perished from the plague. Mr. Plummer suggests that Bishop Damian of Rochester, who died at the end of the same year, was also carried off by the same visitation. Florence of Worcester¹ declares that Bosil, Abbot of Mailros, died of the plague (*lethali morbo pressus*). It is possible that the East Anglian King *Æthelwald*, who also died in 664, also perished from it. Some years later St. Chad died of the plague on 2nd March 672,² and during St. Cuthbert's residence on Farne Island (676-84) nearly all the Lindisfarne community was swept off by it.³ St. Aetheldrytha died of it in 679 or 680, and it was reported that she had prophesied that this would be so and also foretold the number of her companions who would also die.⁴ As we have seen, Cadwaladar died in 682.⁵

The mortality was especially terrible in the monasteries, where the inmates were congregated together under bad sanitary and other arrangements. We have seen how this was the case at Lindisfarne and Lastingham. So it was at Selsey; thus Bede says that, about the time when the South Saxons embraced the faith, a grievous mortality ran through many provinces of Britain, which by the divine dispensation reached to the aforesaid

¹ *M.H.B.* 532.

² Florence of Worcester, *ib.* 533.

³ *Vit. Cuth.*, ch. xxvii.

⁴ *Bede*, iv. 19.

⁵ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. 195.

monastery, then governed by Eoppa, and many, as well of those who had come thither with the bishop (*i.e.* Wilfred), as also of those of the South Saxons who had been lately called to the faith, were in many places snatched out of this world. The brethren, in consequence, thought fit to keep a fast of three days, and humbly to implore the divine mercy. Bede mentions how at that time there was in the monastery a little boy of Saxon race lately called to the faith, who had been seized with the same disorder and had long kept his bed. On the second day of the said fasting, the boy was left alone in the place where he lay sick, when St. Peter and St. Paul (Bede calls them the "Princes of the Apostles") appeared to him and bade him not fear death, and told him that that very day after receiving the viaticum he should be conducted to heaven by themselves, and be thus freed from sickness. He was further told that his prayers for the sick brethren had been heard, and no one would thenceforth die of the plague, either in the monastery or in its adjacent possessions, but that all their people who were ill of the distemper should be restored to health, except himself, who was to be carried at once to heaven as a reward for his services. This good fortune, they said, had been due to the personal intercession of St. Oswald, who had been killed in battle this very day, and was then in heaven, and they were all bidden to communicate in the heavenly sacrifice, to cease from fasting, and to refresh themselves with food. The boy

summoned a priest and told him what had happened, and described the heavenly visitors to him. One of them, he said, was shorn like a clerk, while the other had a long beard. The brethren then ordered dinner, provided that Masses should be said, and that all should communicate as usual, and caused "a portion of the sacrifice of the Lord's oblation" to be carried to the sick boy. Soon after, and on the same day, the boy died. No one else except himself at that time suffered, and from that time we are told the day of the nativity of that king and soldier of Christ (*i.e.* of King Oswald) began to be yearly honoured with Masses, not only in that monastery but in many other places.¹

So also at Wearmouth, where Bede may have been an eye-witness of what occurred. He tells us how, after Benedict Biscop's return from his sixth visit to Rome, he found troubles awaiting him—among other things, the venerable presbyter, Eosterwini (whom at his departure he had appointed abbot), and a large number of the brethren had died from the pestilence which was then everywhere raging.

In the anonymous History of the Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow we are told that when the plague attacked the latter monastery all who could read or preach or recite the antiphons and responses were swept away, except Abbot Ceolred himself and one little lad nourished and taught by him,

¹ *Bede*, iv. 14.

“who is now a priest of the same monastery, says our author. . . . And the abbot, sad at heart because of this revelation, ordained that, contrary to their former rite, they should, except at vespers and matins, recite their psalms without antiphons. And when this had been done, with many tears and lamentations on his part, for the space of a week, he could not bear it any longer, but decreed that the psalms, with their antiphons, should be restored according to the order of the regular course. By means of himself and the aforesaid boy, he carried out, with no little labour, that which he had decreed, until he had either trained himself, or procured from elsewhere, men able to take part in the divine service.”¹ It has been reasonably thought that the boy here referred to was none other than Bede himself.

At Barking was a double monastery comprising a house of monks and another of nuns. It would seem that the nuns had their own cemetery. When the plague attacked the part of the house where the men lived, and they were “daily hurried away to meet their God,” the Mother of the women’s house began to inquire among the sisters in what part of the nunnery they would have their bodies buried if they died of the pestilence, and where a special burying-place for those infected was to be placed. The nuns being uncertain about it, a special sign from heaven was afforded them in the form of a divine light which moved along to

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, ii. p. 393.

the place where it had been determined by the higher powers that the new cemetery should be planted.¹

"At this time there was in the monastery," according to Bede, a boy about three years old named *Æsica*, who was brought up by the nuns. Having been seized by the plague, when at the last gasp he called by name upon one of the consecrated virgins as if she had been present, namely, "Eadgyd, Eadgyd, Eadgyd!" and then died. The virgin in question was thereupon immediately seized with the distemper, and died the same day.

At the same time, another of the nuns, being ill of the same disease, cried out to her attendants to put out the candle that lighted her, saying she saw the house full of light while the candle itself was quite dark. They heeded not what she said. She then declared that a man of God had visited her in a vision, and told her that at the break of day she should depart to Eternal Light, which came about, for she died next morning.²

I have enlarged at greater length than some may deem reasonable on the details of the awful visitations of pestilence which marked the sixth and seventh centuries, and which destroyed so many of the men and women among the classes most indispensable in maintaining the life of man at an ideal standard and especially of those in Holy Orders and the tenants of the Monasteries. We cannot realise the terrible void that must thus

¹ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. ch. vii.

² *Ib.* ch. viii.

have been created, nor wonder that it took centuries to reman the armies of civilization in Europe with adequate and competent administrators, and to battle successfully with all the nether forces which had meanwhile been let loose. It is for this reason that I have converged attention upon the results of the plague as an element in shaping the course of the succeeding centuries.

APPENDIX II

POPE HONORIUS AND THE MONOTHELITES

THE history of the origin of Dogmas and of their development is one of the most intricate inquiries which the historian of Christianity has to face. The theory which underlies what is known as the Rule of Faith has been subject to many vicissitudes. Nothing is more difficult than to answer the question—What ought a Christian man to believe? and why? For a long time it was possible to reply that a Christian man should hold what is taught by the Church. So long as the Church was unbroken and held together by a common nexus of opinions and of ritual this view was sustainable. Presently, however, came a time when for various reasons the authority of the Church was denied and repudiated by large bodies of the most intellectually powerful of Christians. They denied the validity of an appeal to it as the final arbiter of Christian truth, and professed to go behind the Church to the Bible. They claimed that in this book we have the written Word of God directly inspired by Him, and further claimed that its interpretation did not need the help of the Church,

but was within the reach and compass of any godly man. I am not concerned with the validity of this claim. I am only concerned with the new issue which it raised, which compelled the Church to justify itself, a condition which had hitherto been unnecessary, since everybody had bowed without questioning to its authority. Not only was it driven to defend its authority which had been questioned, but it was further constrained to define with greater precision what was the basis upon which it proposed to stand, and to justify its claim to prescribe for mankind what they must believe if they were to be the champions of Truth.

Put on its defence the Church declared that its authority was based on two sources, namely, the Bible and Tradition, and not on one alone, namely, the Bible, as those whom it looked upon as its rebellious children held. It claimed, in fact, that the Bible only contained a tittle of the wisdom and knowledge which Christ and His apostles had published, and that much the larger part of this knowledge had been preserved and handed down, not in the written book, but by a continuous tradition going back to its original fountain source.

In order to ascertain what the traditional view was on any subject in dispute a method was devised which was also reasonable. The bishops of the various Sees of different parts of the Christian world were summoned to a Council. Each one was supposed to be a Trustee for the Faith and to be able to report what had been taught in his diocese.

Mr. Percival has put very clearly and usefully what was the theory underlying these conciliar decisions. The question the Fathers considered was not what they supposed Holy Scripture might mean, nor what they from *a priori* arguments thought would be consistent with the mind of God, but something entirely different, to wit, what they had received from their fathers. "They understood their position to be that of witnesses, not of exegetes. They recognised but one duty resting upon them in this respect—to hand down to other faithful men that good thing the Church had received according to the command of God. The first requirement was not learning but honesty. The question they were called upon to answer was not, What do I think probable, or even certain, from Holy Scripture? but, What have I been taught? What has been entrusted to me to hand down to others? When the time came, in the Fourth Council, to examine the Tome of Pope St. Leo, the question was not whether it could be proved to the satisfaction of the assembled Fathers from Holy Scripture, but whether it was the traditional faith of the Church. It was not the doctrine of Leo in the fifth century, but the doctrine of Peter in the first, and of the Church since then, that they desired to believe and to teach,"¹ and so, when they had studied the Tome they cried out: "This is the faith of the Fathers! This is the faith of the Apostles! . . . Peter hath thus spoken by

¹ Percival, the seven œcuménical councils, Hist. Note to the First œcum. Council,

Leo! The Apostles thus taught! Cyril thus taught," etc. "This is clearly set forth," adds Mr. Percival,¹ "by Pope Vigilius as follows: No one can doubt that our fathers believed that they should receive with veneration the letter of blessed Leo if they declared it to agree with the doctrines of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Councils, as also with those of blessed Cyril, set forth in the first of Ephesus. *And if that letter of so great a Pontiff needed to be approved by those comparisons, how can the letter to Maris the Persian, which especially rejects the First Council of Ephesus and declares to be heretical the expressed doctrines of the blessed Cyril, be believed to have been called orthodox by those same Fathers, condemning as it does those writings by comparison with which, as we have said, the doctrine of so great a Pontiff deserved to be commended?*"²

This expresses in clear language what had in substance been said long before by Vincent of Lerins, who died about 450 A.D., and whose famous work, the *Commonitorium*, is one of the most important ecclesiastical classics. In this he tells us that an appeal to Tradition as a source of Divine truth would not have been necessary had not all the leading heretics claimed the support of Holy Scripture.³ In defining what a genuine Tradition implies, he says, it must have been believed everywhere, always, and by all (*quod ubique, quod*

¹ See Migne, lxix. col. 162. Percival, *loc. cit.*

² *Vigilius Const. pro. dam. Trium Capitulorum.*

³ Chaps. I and II.

semper, quod ab omnibus creditus est). In other words, we must follow *Universitas, Antiquitas, Consensio*, understanding by the last the agreement of all, or almost all, bishops and doctors.¹

It would have been well, perhaps, if the establishment and preservation of dogmas had continued to be thus based (as the primitive theory required) upon the Bible or upon Tradition, in each case receiving its ultimate warrant from the inspired teaching of the Saviour and His apostles.

Unfortunately this method of dogmatic teaching did not suffice for those who eventually shaped the Church's theology. The Greeks, who so largely fathered the latter, were a good deal more than mere theologians—they were keen philosophers steeped in the theories which had been pursued along different lines by their acute-minded predecessors, the Sophists and their allies. They were too much imbued with the practice of investigating the inner nature of things, of causes, and ends, to be content with the simple dogmas of primitive belief. They proceeded to sift and analyse these with extraordinary dexterity, not by a process of safe and sound induction, but by a very unsafe and dangerous deductive method. The process really began with St. Paul, who was a Greek in mind and thought, and not a Jew. The method was in essence what is known as Scholasticism, viz. the application of logic and reasoning to the simple factors of primitive

¹ Chap. II., see Cazenove, *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, iv. 1154.

Faith, and thus building up out of them a huge scheme of reasoned theology. It has been repeatedly urged that Scholasticism started in the twelfth century with Anselm and others. This seems to me an entire mistake. It no doubt received a great impetus from them, and a still greater impetus when Aristotle's works were in large part recovered, and when those who used them found themselves in possession of a much more powerful weapon for ratiocination. In essence, however, this later Scholasticism was the same as the process followed in embryo by St. Paul. Once dogma became the child of dialectics, instead of being the product of Faith, every kind of danger was introduced into the discussion. Zeno and his scholars had taught men to use dialectics in a most subtle fashion to sustain almost any conclusion, and if there had been a free play of discussion the whole of the Christian Faith would have been dissolved into chaos by the Dialecticians. What happened was perhaps even worse than chaos. A certain number of men with strong wills and aggressive pens and tongues, and endowed also with considerable gifts, who became known in early times as Fathers or "Fathers of the Church," and who were succeeded by others in later times known as Doctors, were accepted as the final Arbiters of the Faith. They had no real authority of any kind except that which comes from learning, character, or skill in argument. These last attributes in an age which was getting very barren in such qualities, secured for them and

their opinions very considerable influence. So much so that they came to be looked upon as in a measure inspired, and the results of their metaphysical skill came to be treated as Divine truths. Men were even led to treat their opinions and to quote them as having equal potency and authority with the contents of the Bible, the Creeds, and the pronouncements of Councils. In a later age the *obiter dicta* and opinions of these Fathers and Doctors were collected by the so-called Masters of the Sentences, and ranged alongside of quotations from the Bible as the common material on which the great scheme of Theology was based; both being treated as having virtually co-ordinate authority. No definite distinction was made, for instance, between a pronouncement by Thomas Aquinas and a statement by an Evangelist.

The theologians did not claim that the great mass of these pronouncements were directly drawn from the Bible, but only that they were consequential, and followed as inevitable corollaries from the simpler truths enshrined in Holy Writ or handed down by tradition. This was in many cases an unjustifiable pretension, for they were of no more real weight and authority than other and contradictory deductions which could be and were derived from the same premises by rival Fathers and Doctors. They were of no more warrant again than the equally honest, and in many cases equally irrational, views of others who differed from them and whom they with great complacency styled heretics.

That their views eventually prevailed was due very largely to accident, to persistent iteration, to the use of illegitimate methods of pressure or corruption, or to the overwhelming votes of ignorant and prejudiced men, always at the mercy of the most fanatical advocates, and always frightened at the word heresy. No one has ever defined what a Father of the Church is, or what right or claim he has to define dogmas beyond that which is possessed by any educated man with trained reasoning powers. Nevertheless we find that during the earlier centuries of Christianity a few subtle-minded people succeeded in imposing on the world without any authority a crowd of propositions, most of them purely verbal and incapable of being pictured in the mind, which have been forced on the Church by an active and aggressive section of it, a section which has arrogated to itself the sole claim to orthodoxy. Let us now turn from this rather abstract preface (which is necessary to understand the problem), to one more concrete, and try and analyse a particular instance of what I mean.

The incarnation of Christ is professedly one of those mysteries which, as Occam, the great English schoolman who destroyed Scholasticism, showed long ago, can only be apprehended by Faith, and cannot be explained by any reasoning process. The Bible statements about it are simple enough. They tell us that God became incarnate, in a virgin who was made pregnant by the Holy Ghost. That statement cannot be made the sub-

ject-matter of deductive reasoning, because its elements are entirely outside all analogies. No amount of dialectic skill can carry the question further than the original statement of it in Holy Writ. The Union of God and man ; of the unconditioned, the infinite, the omnipresent, the immortal, the all-powerful, the all-knowing, with the conditioned, the finite, the local, the mortal, the frail, the ignorant, etc., in one person is not *thinkable*. Directly we begin to try and think or write about it, we begin to condition the unconditioned, to define the indefinable. It may be possible to accept the simple words as a phrase or a definition, untranslatable to our minds, and to give our assent to them by Faith without pretending to form a mental picture of what they mean, but further we cannot go, for we cannot transcend our own thought.

It has been the object of Scholasticism in this, as in other cases, to try and pierce this solid wall which girdles our thought about and limits our human horizon in such issues, and to try and transcend both thought and consciousness, and to take us into a transcendental metaphysical world. It has further been the continual effort of the orthodox, as they call themselves, to insist upon all men *with their lips*, declaring that they accept one alleged deduction from some particular dogmatic definition rather than another. They have gone further, and have demanded from the orthodox that they shall suppress every alternative pronouncement

under penalty of fire and sword, and have put to death with cruel torture myriads of men and women in the process. The attempt has not only entirely failed in producing uniformity of opinion, but we are not a whit nearer a solution of these everlasting paradoxes as a consequence of the gigantic mass of sophistry which is known as Scholasticism. No bridge has been found anywhere to traverse the gulf between infinity and what is finite, between what has conditions and what has none. No interpreter has succeeded in really translating into rational thought ideas and conditions which *ex hypothesi* cannot be comprehended by reason. The notion that any legitimate solution is feasible betrays, in fact, a stupendous ignorance of the very elements of thought and consciousness.

Let us see what really happened in the case we are discussing. Instead of leaving the mystery as it appears in the Bible, and merely affirming the Incarnation as an ineffable and unthinkable union of the Divine and human, the ever restless and unsatisfied minds of the Greeks proceeded to refine, discriminate, and build up a quite fantastic superstructure, fantastic because unwarranted by the possibilities of any legitimate logical process. Thus a number of theories contradictory or inconsistent with each other arose, all of them being attempts to transcend human experience, and none of which, whether dubbed orthodox or heterodox, had the slightest claim to be pronounced true or false. No human tribunal being competent to try the issue.

Among these transcendental puzzles, perhaps the one that caused the greatest heat and the most wideworld consequences was the question of the real nature of the God-man Christ.

The Nestorians had maintained that in Christ there were two distinct hypostases or persons (as the Latins translated the evasive term), one human and the other Divine, which were both perfect. This view was pronounced to be heretical by the Fathers who dominated the Council of Ephesus in 431, as more or less involving two Christs, two Sons of God, etc. At the other extreme, another set of writers insisted that the parentage of Christ involved similar conditions to those of man, and that the natures of the father and mother were merged in the offspring, and did not continue to exist as separate or separable entities in Him. Such was the view of one of the most powerful sects, hence named Monophysites. The view was repudiated by the section which eventually dominated the position, and which was treated as orthodox. This latter section maintained the unthinkable position that the God-man, although he was "one" in essence, comprised two separate and separable persons, one human, and partaking of all the qualities of a *perfect* man (that is to say, of such a man as never existed in all time: for the definition of man implies a man subject to frailty, error, sin, and other limitations), and a perfect God bound by no limitations and undefinable. These two persons were supposed to coexist in the God-man without one interfering or trenching on

the other, and yet without friction or diversity of thought or purpose.

In either case the opinion was really quite immaterial for simple men, who could not even understand the problem, since there was no authority under heaven which could finally decide a metaphysical issue like this, based, as so many others are based, on purely transcendental arguments entirely beyond the reach of legitimate dialectics.

Both theories were equally unthinkable, and neither of them had the slightest moral purpose or interest. The feud between the Orthodox, as they called themselves, and the Monophysites was the more bitter and furious because it was about a mere metaphysical and not a real issue, one too which the crowd could not even comprehend and which the champions on each side found the greatest difficulty in expressing in rational language. What was really fought about was a form of words emptied of any comprehensible meaning and which thus became a real shibboleth. On both sides there was the same infirmity, namely, an attempt to define a mystery which could not be comprehended by reason, and which, as presented by the Scriptures, appealed to faith only and not to logic. All that can be said about it is, that if (which is not the case) the analogy of human nature is of any value whatever, in the settlement of such a problem, the Monophysites had much the best of the argument since they did appeal to human

experience. The case on the other side was sustained by quite illegitimate and sophistical arguments, in which the validity of the deduction was entirely destroyed by being based on purely arbitrary and unverified postulates.

While the furious combatants on each side fought most fiercely about their empty shibboleths, which could not be translated into thought, the Empire was being sapped by the hatred and feud which was thereby engendered among its subjects, and presently, as we have seen, the feud was the main cause of the collapse which took place when half the Christian world was destroyed by the Muhammedans.

It is not wonderful that the Emperor Heraclius, who at that time was in the full strength of his mental and bodily vigour, should have been very anxious to piece the rent in the community which was undoing his Empire and to bring the Orthodox and the Monophysites, who were very numerous, into one fold. His friend Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, also a man of far-seeing views, was of the same mind with himself. The latter presently informed his master that his own predecessor, Mennas, in one of his writings had put forward a formula which he thought might be accepted by the Monophysites as a reasonable and acceptable compromise. This formula, while conceding two natures in Christ, postulated a single operative will, *θέλημα*, which he called a divine-human energy, *μία ἐνέργεια δ' ἀνθρακή*. It

seemed to him, as it surely seems to any person who will analyze the problem, that in regard to the will it is impossible to understand how Christ can have two wills, a Divine will and a human will, working with complete independence, and each with complete potency. The very essence of a will is that it shall be free. To postulate the existence of two free wills in one person, where neither shall be constrained and dominated by the other, is to postulate an unworkable machine as the operative part of thought and conviction. Even those who pressed the view allowed that the two wills must always act in unison and never conflict with one another, a concession which really made their contention a mere verbal one, as so many dogmatic pronouncements in fact are.¹

¹ This may be illustrated by a paragraph from the Definition of Faith made at the Council of Constantinople in 680, where we read: "We declare that in Him" (*i.e.* in Christ) "are two natural wills, . . . and these two natural wills are not contrary one to the other (God forbid!), as the impious heretics assert, but His human will follows, and that not as resisting and reluctant, but rather as subject to His Divine and Omnipotent Will." Can verbal distinctions without real meaning go further?

It will not be uninteresting to quote another passage on this subject from a very modern writer, who has great authority among English Roman Catholics, namely, Mr. Luke Rivington, to show what a quagmire of mere meaningless verbiage can be imposed upon us as genuine psychology by an able man who sees theological questions through a smoked glass. He says: "Further, there is in our Lord's human nature what is sometimes called *the will of the reason* and *the will of the senses*, but between the two there is not, and there cannot be, contrariety. In the Agony the will of the senses expressed itself, but was incapable of disobedience, for it was not wounded by the fall, and it was the will of the Eternal Word. There was no triumph of one over the other, for there was no rebellion, no faintest wish that it might be otherwise. In a word, the operation of

Having framed the formula, the Patriarch Sergius communicated it to the other Patriarchs and to the heads of the so-called Monophysite schism, and those associated with them. It met with a very satisfactory welcome, and it looked as if Monothelism, as it was called, was going to bring peace and goodwill to the fighting sects.

It was accepted by Severus the champion of the Monophysites, and by the Jacobite Patriarch Anastasius. While among the orthodox, Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, who became Patriarch of Alexandria, and the Patriarch of Antioch, both concurred. The action of the Pope was more significant and more far-reaching. His view of the position was contained in two very friendly and sympathetic letters written to Sergius.

These letters of Honorius were apparently not known at Rome, or the copies of them, if any, had been lost. They were only published to the world by the Council of Constantinople in 680, a Council specially called to settle the differences on the subject of Monothelism, and entirely manœuvred so as to secure its adhesion to the Roman view, and where, therefore, it would be the interest of those who

the human will (with its two departments) is distinct from the operation of the divine in the same Person of the Word, but while distinct, incapable of contrariety." What is this? Is it philosophy? is it theology? is it capable of being thought? Is this stuff really accepted in Roman seminaries as part of the Divine Wisdom imparted to simple men by Christ and His apostles, or merely a handful of cobwebs from a disordered brain trying to give form to a nightmare, and imposed on simple men without any authority under heaven, by a private and lay member of a Church which repudiates all exercise of private judgment as pernicious in those outside its fold?

controlled the Council to keep the letters of Honorius dark if possible.

The genuineness of the letters has been questioned by some Roman Catholic apologists of obscure reputation, such as Gravina, Coster, Stapleton, Wiggers, Bartoli, and Ughi, but this is no longer the case. Thus Father Mann in the latest history of the Popes, says: "Contrary to the opinion of some Catholic writers, the letters are here allowed to be genuine and incorrupt. . . . This is in accordance with nearly all the best Catholic writers." He then quotes Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, v. p. 56 *seq.*, p. 191 of the English translation.¹ He might also have quoted Pennachi's monograph entitled, *De Honorii I. Romani Pontificis, causa in Concilio VI.*, or, still more effectively, the Jesuit Grisar's *Analecta*.

Döllinger, writing on the same side, also makes an effective reply. "Seeing," he says, "that the letters of Honorius were laid before the Council,² examined and condemned *in the presence of the papal legates* (who at any rate must have known their contents), it was found necessary to abandon this method of getting out of the difficulty." Even if they had been forged, a supreme difficulty would still remain. It has been overlooked by the champions of Papal Infallibility that the Pope did not stand alone in the matter. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility was quite unknown at the beginning of the seventh century, and at that date the pro-

¹ See Mann, *op. cit.* i. p. 337.

² *i.e.* the Council of 680.

nouncement of one Patriarch was as good and as authoritative as that of another, and Honorius in his action really stood alongside of his three brother Patriarchs who had co-ordinate jurisdiction and authority with himself. We must therefore very largely extend the area of forgery if we are to include them. The fact is, the suggestion of forgery in this case is based on no single fact or reason except the supposed necessity of saving the face of an infallible Pope.

The original copies of these letters in Latin, says Hefele, are no longer extant, but we still possess the Greek translation which was read at the sixth œcumenical Council, was then compared by a Roman delegate with the Latin originals still extant in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople and found to be correct. From the Greek translation two old Latin versions were made, which are printed in Mansi and Hardouin. Of these, the first was doubtless prepared by the Roman Librarian Anastasius.¹

In his letter the Pope makes a sharp distinction between what the Greeks called *θέλημα* and *ἐνέργεια*, (translated *operatio* by the Latins), *i.e.* the will and its operative and resultant action. It has been urged that he did not quite understand the subtlety of the distinction as defined by the Greeks. This seems to me very improbable. There were plenty of Greeks at Rome at this time who could help him even if he had not been the scholar he was. In his letters Honorius disputed the formula of

¹ Hefele, *Councils*, Eng. ed. v. 28.

Sergius in one respect, and declared that he held it not to be correct to say there were only one or two, or any specified number of ways by which the decision of the will could be put into operation, but many ways (*πολυτρόπως*), and he therefore deemed it idle to discuss that subject and advised that discussion on it should cease. The words of the Latin translation are worth quoting as they stand. *Utrum autem propter opera divinitatis et humanitatis, una, an geminae operationes debeant derivatae dici vel intelligi, ad nos ista pertinere non debent, relinquentes ea grammaticis, qui solent parvulis exquisita derivando nomina venditare. Nos enim non unam operationem vel duas Dominum Jesum Christum, ejusque sanctum Spiritum, sacris litteris percepimus, sed multiformiter cognovimus operatum.*"

So much for the *operations* of the will, now for the will itself, *θέλημα*, which was the real issue ; that upon which the subsequent trouble arose, namely, as to the unity or duality of Christ's "will." Upon this the language of Honorius is as precise and explicit as it can well be. I will give it both in its Greek and Latin form : *ὅθεν καὶ ἐν θέλημα ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* ; in Latin, *unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*¹ (i.e. whence also, *we confess one Will of our Lord Jesus Christ*). Nothing can be plainer.

Not only so, but he made an express reply to those who quoted the two critical texts relied upon by the other side, namely, "I came not to do mine

¹ *Ib. 29.*

own will, but the will of him that sent me," and "Not my will, but thine be done," which he declared should be taken in a figurative sense only, and that Christ meant the two phrases merely as an exhortation to us to submit our wills to the divine will, which was apparently the very argument used by the Monophysite Severus in the same behalf. Others have urged that the Fathers at the Council misunderstood the meaning of Honorius when they condemned him as a heretic. This is treating the one hundred and seventy-four members of the Synod who signed its Acts and who were all Bishops with very scant courtesy. They condemned the letters of Honorius after examining them, and ordered them to be burnt. Apart from this, the very words of Honorius in regard to the single will, which I have quoted above, are as plain and clear as they can be made, and the majority of those who have discussed these passages, especially those who are more directly responsible for the pronouncement on Papal Infallibility, have overlooked what the declaration of the Pope really meant. It will be remembered that up to this date there had been no official or authoritative pronouncement on the subject of Monothelism, the particular issues had not been raised and decided by any authoritative body. There were certain *obiter dicta* of individual scholars, but so far as I know there had been no definite pronouncement as to what was or was not the orthodox view. The Pope seems to say this in another clause of

his letter, thus, *Non opertet ad dogmata haec ecclesiastica retorquere, quae neque synodales apices super hoc examinantes, neque auctoritates canonicae visae sunt explanasse, ut unam vel duas energias aliquis praesumat Christi Dei praedicare, quas neque evangelicae vel apostolicae literae, neque synodalis examinatio super his habita, visae sunt terminasse, nisi fortassis, sicut praefati sumus, quidam aliqua balbutiendo docuerunt, condiscendentes ad informandas mentes, atque intelligentias parvulorum, quae ad ecclesiastica dogmata trahi non debent, quae unusquisque in sensu suo abundans, videtur secundum propriam sententiam explicare.*¹

It would seem, therefore, that Pope Honorius, together with the other Patriarchs, were the first authoritative persons who defined the orthodox position on the subject of Monothelism *v.* Duothelism; and further, that if we accept his own plain and unqualified language as it stands, we must admit that he, with the other Patriarchs, accepted Monothelism as the orthodox faith. This, as we shall see, was also the opinion of his immediate successors on the Papal throne and of the Church both East and West. A more powerful Court to decide such a question it would be impossible to conceive, except the decision of a general Council, and it certainly committed the Church most completely to Monothelism. From such a decision, it seems to me, the champions of Papal infallibility cannot appeal without rebelling against the Vatican Council.

¹ Migne, *P.L.* xxxvii. 474.

Meanwhile, precisely in accordance with the views of Honorius as set out in his first letter to Sergius, the latter drew up a pronouncement which was called an Ecthesis, in which it was forbidden to discuss the question of a single or a double "energy" or operation; while in regard to the "Will of Christ" it was declared to be a single one only. This Ecthesis was officially issued in the name of the Emperor and was confirmed by a Synod assembled under Sergius at the end of 638.¹ Soon after which both Sergius and Honorius died.

While all the patriarchs were united as champions of Monothelism and their decision was confirmed by a Synod at Constantinople, a sharp opponent to it arose in the person of the monk Sophronios. The fact that Sophronios and another monk named Maximus were the great protagonists of the opposition to Monothelism seems to show that, as Milman long ago suggested, the movement was in substance a Monkish one, and that the result was the first great victory gained by the Regulars over the Seculars. This meant a victory of monks who were not in Orders and merely laymen under vows, against a Pope, against all the Patriarchs, and against a general Synod of the Church, a position that is positively ridiculous when we remember that they in fact succeeded in forcing their unauthorised view upon the Church. Sophronios aroused the fanaticism of the crowd by raising the popular cry that the proposed peace was to be purchased by

¹ Mansi, x. 1000.

a complete surrender to the hated Monophysites, by arousing jealousies of the Constantinople Church among the Latins, and by raising the cry of heresy, which in Italy at that time was easily believed, since the Latin Church was then sunk in torpor and ignorance. The forces of the secular power and the influence of three of the Greek patriarchs quietened Sophronios for a while and misled the Emperor, who appointed him Patriarch of Jerusalem. He thereupon began his furious campaign afresh.

In previous pages I have described what happened at Rome after the death of Honorius. He was succeeded successively by Severinus and John the 4th, neither of whom apparently took part in the disputes about Monothelism, the contrary opinion being, so far as we can see, based on a mistake.¹ John was in turn succeeded by a Greek named Theodore, whose father had been Bishop of Jerusalem, and who was himself a friend and adherent of Sophronios and had perhaps been a monk. He was attached to the latter's views on Monothelism.

Meanwhile the Emperor Constans the 2nd, succeeded to the throne of Constantinople, and apparently at the instance of his Patriarch Paul, withdrew *the Ecthesis* which had been issued under the ægis of Heraclius and substituted for it another document called *the Type*.² Theodore died in 649. Thereupon it would appear that the bishops and priests at Rome who had been worked upon by

¹ *Vide ante*, pp. 290-293.

² *Ante*, pp. 206, 207.

the monks and who were opposed to Monothelism proceeded to elect Martin, a famous champion of the two wills (that is, of a heresy, according to the only decision of the Church at the time). He was consecrated without the Emperor's consent having been obtained to his election, and was thus *de jure* not a Pope at all.¹

Martin proceeded to summon a provincial Council at Rome, to which he gave the name of "General," but which was in reality only an Italian provincial Council, and did this without the knowledge of the Emperor, to whom the right alone belonged of summoning every legitimate Council. At this quite irregular Latin synod, which met on the 5th of October 649, the Monothelite prelates Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus patriarch of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, patriarchs of Constantinople, were condemned and anathematised as supporters of Monothelism, while the Imperial edicts, the Ecthesis and the Type, were styled impious and declared inoperative. The result of all this quite arbitrary action was that the election of Martin as Pope was declared void on the ground of its irregularity, not by the Emperor only, but by the Roman clergy, who deposed him and elected his successor. This clearly made all the acts of his reign, including those of his Roman synod, also void. Martin was removed to Cherson, and a fresh Pope, Eugenius the 4th, was elected in his place by the bishops and clergy of Rome, and he was duly con-

¹ *Vide ante*, pp. 298, 299.

secrated after his election had been confirmed by the Emperor.¹

It is a noteworthy fact that the Patriarch Paul in writing to Martin's predecessor, Theodore, justifying his adhesion to Monothelism, stated that "he had followed the doctrine of Honorius," who was in fact as much committed to that opinion as any of the four Eastern prelates who had been anathematised by the Synod of Rome. The name of Honorius does not appear, however, among those denounced at the latter synod. Probably the fact of Honorius having already compromised the position was not known there, and perhaps if it had been the Roman Synod would not have been held.

Let us now pass on a few years. Milman suggests that by the exertions of the Eastern Monks a considerable change had recently taken place in the view of the Eastern Church on Monothelism.

The Emperor Constantine Pogonatos (663-685) seems to have been as anxious to reunite the broken fragments of the Church as his predecessor Heraclius. If he was to do so, however, it was necessary that he should conciliate the Latin Church, which after the conquests of the Muhammedans had become relatively much more important, and where the monks were all-powerful. He found the Church of Constantinople, which had become most Erastian, very complacent, and ready to turn its back on the views it had maintained when the Ecthesis and the Type were issued.

¹ *Vide ante*, pp. 300-306.

On the 7th of November 680, Constantine caused to be summoned at Constantinople what is known as the 6th *Œ*cumenical Council, which was attended by nearly three hundred bishops, of whom 174 signed its Acts. At this Council, which was presided over in person by the Emperor, all the five patriarchs were represented. The representatives of Pope Agatho were seated on the left of the Emperor. The Pope himself was summoned to the Council as "the most holy and blessed archbishop of Old Rome and *œ*cumenical Pope," and the Patriarch of Constantinople as "the most holy and blessed Archbishop of Constantinople and *œ*cumenical Patriarch."

In his letter to the Emperor, Agatho enumerates the delegates whom he had sent to the Constantinopolitan Council. These he styles "our fellow-servants, Abundantius, John, and John; our most reverend brother bishops, Theodore and George; our most beloved sons and presbyters, with our most beloved son John, a deacon, Constantine a sub-deacon of this holy spiritual mother, the Apostolic See, as well as Theodore the presbyter legate of the holy Church of Ravenna, and the religious servants of God, the monks.¹ Mark this phrase: What legitimate place had Monks at a Council according to the traditions of the Church? The Pope was therefore well represented at the Council. His legates and representatives signed its acts and took them back with them to Rome.

¹ Percival, *op. cit.* 329.

The four representatives of the Pope signed themselves "John, an humble deacon of the holy Roman Church, and holding the place of the Most holy Agatho, œcumenical Pope of the City of Rome;" "John, by the mercy of God, bishop of the City of Thessalonica, and legate of the Apostolic See of Rome;" "John, the unworthy bishop of Portus, legate of the whole Council of the Holy Apostolic See of Rome;" "Stephen, by the mercy of God, bishop of Corinth, and legate of the Apostolic See of Old Rome."

The Council began with the reading of a letter from the Pope in answer to the Emperor's invitation (*sacra*), reciting that during the previous forty-six years certain novelties contrary to the orthodox faith had been introduced by those who at various times had been bishops of the Imperial city, namely, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, by Cyrus at one time Archbishop of Alexandria, and by Theodore Bishop of Pharan, against which novelties he, Agatho, had persistently prayed; he begged that those who shared these views in the most Holy Church of Constantinople might explain what was their source.

It will be noted that the Pope's representatives do not here name Honorius, another proof that the existence of the letters of that Pope were not then known at Rome. To the letter of Pope Agatho the Monothelites present protested that they had brought forward no new method of speech, but had taught what they had received from the Holy

Œcumical Synods, as well from the archbishops of "this Imperial city," to wit, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, *as also from Honorius* who was Pope of Old Rome, and from Cyrus who was Pope of Alexandria, that is to say, in reference to the Divine Will and its operation, and so we believe and so we preach, and we are ready to stand by and defend this faith.¹ The mention of Honorius in this protest was probably a revelation and a great surprise to the Papal delegates.

At the fourth session of the Council a letter from Pope Agatho addressed to the Emperor, and to Heraclius, and Tiberius Augustus, setting out at considerable length the case of those who held the doctrine of two Wills, and appending a *catena* of passages from the Greek Fathers was read.²

Then followed a similar letter addressed to the same three high personages from Pope Agatho and a synod of 125 bishops which had met at Rome, which claimed to represent the views of the Lombards, Slavs, Franks, French (*sic*) Goths, and Britons, and further claimed that these views represented the traditional faith as set forth in the Council presided over by St. Martin, the forlorn character of which I have already described.³

After the reading of these letters the Emperor asked George, Archbishop of Constantinople, and

¹ Labbe and Cossart, *Con.* vi. col. 609, etc.

² A more extraordinary specimen of inept logic, sophistical use of irrelevant analogies, and mere puerilities than this letter it would be difficult to find.

³ Percival, *op. cit.* 340-41.

Macarius, Archbishop of Antioch, and their suffragans, to say if they accepted the views set out by Agatho and by his Synod. The former on behalf of himself and his bishops, except only Theodore of Miletus (who handed in his assent at the tenth session), declared that they accepted the Pope's letter and its contents ; an excellent example of the utterly Erastian character of the Church of Constantinople at this time, for it really meant entirely reversing the previous decision of the Church. On the other hand Macarius, the Patriarch of Antioch, replied, "I do not say that there are two wills or two operations in the dispensation of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, but one will and one theandric operation."

At the thirteenth session of the Council, sentence was pronounced against the Monothelites. In the document containing this sentence the Fathers at the Council declared that they had reconsidered the letters of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople ; Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis ; *Honorius, sometime Pope of Old Rome, as well as the letter of the latter to the same Sergius*, and declared that these documents were quite foreign to the apostolic dogmas ! to the declarations of the Holy Councils ! and to all the accepted Fathers ! and that they followed the false teachings of the heretics. They further pronounced that the names of those whose doctrines they execrated must also be thrust forth from the Holy Church of God. Then follow the names of

Sergius, Cyrus of Alexandria, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople and Theodore of Pharan, who had all been rejected by Pope Agatho because they were opposed to the orthodox faith and upon whom they pronounced anathema. The document then continues, *and with these we define that these shall be expelled from the holy Church of God, and anathematised Honorius, who was sometime Pope of Old Rome, because of what we found written by him to Sergius, that in all respects he followed his view and confirmed his impious doctrines, etc. etc.*¹

This was followed by the acclamations of the Fathers, in which, after greeting the Emperor in fulsome phrases, together with Agatho the Pope, George, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Theophanes of Antioch, the Council, and the Senate, they pronounced anathema against Theodore of Pharan the heretic, Sergius the heretic, Cyrus the heretic, *Honorius the heretic*, etc. etc.²

Then followed the definition of the Faith, which was made at the eighteenth session, in the midst of which occurs a denunciation of the personages previously declared to be heretics, and, *inter alia*, the Fathers declare “how the author of evil, who in the beginning availed himself of the aid of the serpent, . . . had found suitable instruments for working out his will.” Then comes a list of the leaders of the Monothelites who had been thus misled by the Devil; in which we read: “And moreover Honorius, who was Pope of the Elder Rome.”³

¹ Percival, *op. cit.* 342-43.

² *Ib.* 343.

³ *Ib.* 344.

There then follows the so-called *Prophonicus*, or Report of the Council to the Emperor, with a recapitulation of the Faith and a denunciation of various heretics, including the leaders of the Monothelites. "We cast out of the Church," says the document, "and rightly subject to anathema all superfluous novelties as well as their inventors, that is to say, Theodore of Pharan, etc. etc." Then follows the sentence, "And with them Honorius, who was the ruler (*πρόεδρον*) of Rome, since he followed them in these things." Then follows a letter from the Council addressed to Pope Agatho, telling him how, by the help of the Emperor Constantine, the Fathers there had overthrown the error of impiety, etc. etc., and had slain with anathema as lapsed concerning the faith and as sinners certain persons . . . in accordance with the sentence already given concerning them in the Pope's letter, . . . "their names," they add, "are these: Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter," etc. etc.¹

Lastly, followed the Imperial decree proclaiming the finding of the Council, which was posted up in the third atrium of the great Church near the Dicymbala. In this decree the Council speaks of "the unholy priests who infected the Church and falsely governed it," and mentions the Monothelite leaders by name, among them "Honorius, the Pope of Old Rome, the confirmor of heresy who contradicted himself." It then proceeds to

¹ Percival, *op. cit.* 349.

anathematise the originator (*i.e.* Sergius) and “these patrons” of the new heresy. Among them “Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome, who in everything agreed with them, went with them and strengthened the heresy”: *τὸν κατὰ πάντα τούτοις συναιρέτην καὶ σύνδρομον καὶ βεβαιωτὴν τῆς αἵρεσεως.*¹

These extracts are conclusive, and no amount of casuistry or chicanery can undo their effect. The only way of destroying it would be, in fact, to declare them forgeries. This course was actually adopted by some of the most famous Roman controversialists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who were once deemed almost invincible, and who are now seldom quoted by any serious student, since their pitiful and disingenuous controversial quibbles, mistakes, and deliberate perversions of the truth, in the supposed cause of the Church, have made their names a byword. As Friedrichs (himself, a great scholar), with very different views of historical verity, says: “This one fact—that a great Council, universally received afterwards without hesitation throughout the Church, and presided over by Papal legates, pronounced the dogmatic decision of a Pope heretical, and anathematised him by name as a heretic—is a proof clear as the sun at noonday that the notion of any peculiar enlightenment or inerrancy of the Popes was then utterly unknown to the whole Church. The only resource of the defenders of Papal Infallibility since Torquemada and Bellarmine” (including,

¹ Percival, *op. cit.* 352, 353

may I add, Baronius), "has been to attack the Acts of the Council as spurious, and to maintain that they are a wholesale forgery of the Greeks. The Jesuits clung tenaciously to this notion till the middle of the last century (*i.e.* the eighteenth century). Since, it has had to be abandoned."¹

The immediate successor of Pope Agatho was Leo the Second, who is described in the *Liber Pontificalis*, as *Vir eloquentissimus in divinis scripturis sufficienter instructus, Graeca Latinaque lingua eruditus*, etc. etc.²

"He being Pope at the time received the decree (*suscepit sanctam*) of the Sixth Council, above cited, which he most carefully translated into Latin (*quam et studiosissime in Latino translatavit*), and in which were condemned Cyrus, Sergius,

¹ Janus, pp. 74, 75. I may here quote a passage from the same work, which puts the similar case of Pope Vigilius and the Three Chapters in a particularly vivid way, and which I overlooked when discussing the question in my previous volume on Pope Gregory. Speaking of the attitude of that Pope towards the writings of Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas, which were held to be Nestorian, the author says : "He first pronounced them orthodox in 546, then condemned them the next year, and then again reversed this sentence in deference to the western bishops, and then came into conflict with the Fifth General Council, which excommunicated him. Finally, he submitted to the judgment of the Council, declaring that he had unfortunately been a tool in the hands of Satan," who labours for the destruction of the Church, and had thus been divided from his colleagues ; but God had now enlightened him (see his letter to the Patriarch Eutychius ; cf. De Marca, *Dissert.*, Paris, 1669, p. 45). Thus he thrice contradicted himself : first he anathematised those who condemned the Three Chapters as erroneous ; then he anathematised those who held them to be orthodox, as he had himself just held them to be ; soon after he condemned the condemnation of the Three Chapters ; and, lastly, the Emperor and Council triumphed again over the fickle Pope (Janus, pp. 72, 73).

² *L. P., ad. nom. Leo II.*

Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus," etc. etc. If the name of Honorius was not present in the decree of the Council sent to Rome and translated by the Pope, how comes it to be in the *Liber Pontificalis*?

This is by no means all. Leo confirmed the decrees of the Council and expressly anathematised Honorius. His words are: "*Anathematizamus . . . necnon et Honorius, qui hanc apostolicam Ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est, et omnes, qui in suo errore defuncti sunt.*"¹ If the name of Honorius was inserted in the Acts of the Council by a fraud, how came Leo the Second, who not only was represented at the same Council by several of his own deputies, and himself received and translated its Acts, to join in anathematising him?

Leo went even further. As Milman says: "The impeccability of the Bishop of Rome was not as yet an article of the Roman creed." He hastened to advertise the heresy of Honorius. To the Bishops of Spain he wrote of him, "*qui flammarum haeretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam autoritatem incipientem extinxit sed negligendo confovit.*"²

To the King of Spain he wrote: "*et una cum eis Honorius Romanus qui immaculatam apostolicae traditionis regulam quam a praedecessoribus suis accepit maculari consensit.*"³

¹ See Percival, *op. cit.* 352.

³ *Ib.* 1252.

² Labbe, p. 1146.

Not only so, but in 692, only twelve years after the meeting of the Sixth Council, another Council was held at Trullo, commonly called the Quinisext Council. In the first Canon of this Council there is a confirmation of the finding of the Sixth Council on the question of the Monothelites, in which it describes the sentence on them and their views as just, and this for their having adulterated the true doctrine. Here again "Honorius of Rome" is named among those anathematised.

Well may Mr. Percival, a singularly fair historian, who is generally found leaning to the side of Orthodoxy, say : "With such an array of proof no conservative historian, it would seem, can question the fact that Honorius, the Pope of Rome, was condemned and anathematised as a heretic by the 6th *Œcumene* Council." ¹ Again he says : "The groundlessness, not to say absurdity, of Baronius's view has been often exposed by those of his own communion ; a brief but sufficient summary of the refutation will be found in Hefele who, while taking a very halting and unsatisfactory position himself, yet is perfectly clear that Baronius's contention is utterly indefensible." ²

Even if Baronius had been right as to the Council, he still had to account for Leo the 2nd (also an infallible Pope) having on a most solemn occasion joined in anathematising his predecessor as a heretic. Not only so. We can go still further.

¹ Percival, *ib.* 352.

² Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, v. p. 190, *et seq.*

In the *Liber Diurnus*, which contains drafts of different ecclesiastical documents to be used on various occasions, there is a form of the Papal Oath taken by every Pope down to the eleventh century in the shape probably prescribed by Gregory the 2nd. This oath smites with eternal anathema the originators of the New heresy, Sergius, etc., “*together with Honorius, because he assisted the base statements of the heretics.*”¹

Lastly, in the lesson for the feast of St. Leo the 2nd in the Roman Breviary, the name of Pope Honorius used to occur among those excommunicated by the Sixth Synod. It has since been erased. On this erasure Bossuet (perhaps the greatest of French Catholic Bishops), remarks : “They suppress as far as they can, the *Liber Diurnus* : they have erased this from the Roman Breviary. Have they therefore hidden it? Truth breaks out from all sides, and these things become so much the more evident as they are the more studiously put out of sight.”²

The question that has to be faced, then, and which was never faced by the Vatican Council, is not so much the condemnation and anathematisation of a Pope, viz. Honorius, as a heretic, by a Council, but by the voice of the whole Church, Greek, and Latin, until the Jesuits and their scholars invented the theory of Papal Infallibility in the 16th century, and afterwards forced it as a Dogma on

¹ *Una cum Honorio, qui fraudis eorum assertionibus fomentum impedit, op. cit. ed. Sickel, p. 100.*

² Bossuet, *Def. Cler. Gal.*, vii. ch. 26.

the Vatican Council. Proving thereby once more how much they despise all history which has not passed through their sophisticating crucibles.

This action of the whole Church, and especially of the whole Latin Church in the matter, completely sweeps away the contentions of other apologists who accept the Acts of the 6th Council as genuine and as not interpolated, but question their validity on various grounds. *Ex. gr.* Pennachi, the most rational of all the Roman apologists, in his *de Honorii I. Romani Pontificalis, causa in Concilio vi.*, argues quite arbitrarily and without a shadow of proof and even of probability, that the 6th Council ceased to be oecumenical and had become only a synod of a number of Orientals before it took action against the Monothelites. I need hardly say that no one has been found to follow Pennachi's lead in this fantastic contention.

Those who try by comparing phrases, and especially confronting the two letters of Honorius, to soften the effect of a strong, clear pronouncement in one letter by a rather softer phrase in the other, and hence console themselves with the notion that the Pope did not mean what he actually said, forget what their attitude means. It means that in this matter a certain number of individuals, Jesuits or secular priests, driven from every other refuge, have at last found shelter in setting up their own *obiter dicta*, their own arguments, and their own conclusions against the positive decision of a Council and of a Pope, who had before them

all the evidence now available and perhaps still more, and yet joined in unanimously pronouncing the teaching of the letters to be heretical and worthy of anathema. This is an appeal to Private Judgment with a vengeance, and is a crutch which we should have thought the Society of Jesus would be the very last to employ. To question the fallibility or the heresy of a Pope, which have been affirmed by a Council and supported by later Popes, ought surely to be itself heresy, if there is any sense or meaning in the decrees of the Vatican Council.

The last refuge of those who have upheld a hopeless fight has been to declare that the pronouncements of Honorius were only his private opinions and were not delivered *ex cathedra*. If this was so, what possible pronouncement can be deemed *ex cathedra*? When has a pronouncement been made on a more solemn occasion than when made on the invitation of the great Patriarch of the East with the purpose of agreeing on a formula, a *modus vivendi*, with the most numerous and formidable of then existing heretics. The more influential, recent controversialists on the Roman side have seen this, and have seen how the contention in question practically cancels the finding of the Vatican Council. Thus Pennachi says distinctly that the letters of Honorius were, strictly speaking, Papal decrees, set forth *auctoritate apostolica*, and therefore irreformable.¹

In this behalf it is instructive to turn to the

¹ Percival, *op. cit.* 351.

statements of the Jesuit Grisar. Grisar admits completely the genuineness of the Pope's first letter to Sergius. He then proceeds to discuss that part of it dealing with two natures. He admits definitely that the Pope, in regard to it, was speaking *ex cathedra*, because he fulfilled the conditions demanded by the Vatican Council for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. The pronouncement in question made by that Council was *quum omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungere pro supraem sua apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendum definit.*¹ Grisar thus applies this decision to the letter of Honorius. (*In quando alle due nature, per una definizione ex cathedra, perche pone la condizione ex cathedra.*²) He limits his argument, however, to that part of the Pope's letter dealing with "the operative part of the Will," about which there is no contention.

He does not apparently refer directly to the Pope's decision in regard to the single will which was made in the same letter and in the same clear way, and of which I have quoted the *ipsissima verba*, but his argument implies that if one part was *ex cathedra*, so also must the other have been. They are both contained in the same document, and no distinction is made between their potency by the Pope. There is no escape from this position. We are driven then to the conclusion that Pope Honorius, when issuing a pronouncement on the Faith, in which he defined what was then a new

¹ Sess. iv. Chap. 4.

² *Analecta*, vol. i. 398, 399.

dogma, was speaking *ex cathedra*, and in his character as the mouthpiece of the Church. If what he said was heretical, then it follows that an Infallible Pope can be guilty of heresy. If, on the other hand, as Pennachi argues, the Pope's letters were orthodox and the Council was in error in condemning him, then an Ecumenical Council and a whole catena of infallible Popes have been heretical themselves in pronouncing Honorius' view heretical. Lastly, whether heretical or not heretical, the mere condemnation under anathema of an Infallible Pope, speaking *ex cathedra* by either a Council or by other Infallible Popes, is a *reductio ad absurdum* of Papal Infallibility.

There still remains another matter, however. If the contention of Pennachi and Grisar be right, that Pope Honorius was speaking *ex cathedra* when defining Monothelism as the true orthodox faith, and that in doing so he pronounced an irreversible decision on the subject, then a very important Council and a great many Popes have themselves been tainted with serious heresy in declaring Honorius a heretic, and in adopting as "the Faith" what he denounced as heresy. It is for the champions of Infallibility to unfasten this Gordian knot. To a Protestant it would seem plain that, whether the Pope was heretical or not, his decision in the matter was the only one consistent with sound sense and which did not involve a contradiction or absurdity. It is strange, indeed, under these circumstances to find Father Mann closing

his account of Pope Honorius with this phrase, "With whatever degree of guilt he incurred from his action with regard to his letter to Sergius, Honorius went to meet his Maker on October 638." I am afraid the Infallible Pope will fare very badly if he has to depend on the prayers of Father Mann.

APPENDIX III

THE POPES AND THEIR NUNCIOS AT CONSTANTINOPLE

THE connection and intercourse between the Popes and the Civil Rulers of Italy in the sixth and seventh centuries, which had a potent effect on European history, has still to be adequately elucidated. During a considerable part of this period Italy was dominated by the Goths, who were Arians and who had a Church and bishops of their own, and the position of the Popes was a difficult and unenviable one. While they were not much interfered with in their administrative work, so long as they did not themselves interfere with politics, the Gothic kings meddled considerably in the selection of the new Popes and largely dominated their election. Simony prevailed to a scandalous extent, as did intrigues of a discreditable kind, and the quality and endowments of the candidates became of secondary importance in their chances of being elected, compared with their skill in corrupting the officials of the foreign kings and in their powers of chicane. The consequence was a great deterioration in their quality. Some notes on this question

will certainly not be impertinent to our subject ; my remarks can only be limited.

I will begin with the death of Felix the 4th in October 530. This was followed by the election of two Popes. Boniface the 2nd, who was of Gothic parentage and who when elected was duly consecrated in the Basilica of Julius (Jaffé, *Regesta*). At the same time a rival party elected and consecrated a rival Pope named Dioscorus, who was probably a Greek, in the Basilica of Constantine. Dioscorus died a few weeks later, and thereupon Boniface anathematised his dead rival for simony.¹ He further compelled all his clergy to subscribe the decree containing the anathemas.

Boniface then summoned a synod at St. Peter's and caused a resolution to be passed (*fecit constitutum*), which was written down and signed by the clergy, by which, contrary to the Canons, he secured the nomination of his own successor, and proceeded to nominate the deacon Vigilius. (Vigilius is also styled Archdeacon in the *Lib. Pont.*, *sub voce*, Silverius). Grisar names him among the *apocrisiarii*.² A subsequent synod annulled this resolution and appointment as uncanonical. Boniface acknowledged his error and publicly burnt his own decree.³ He died in October 532.

He was succeeded by John the 2nd. "The

¹ Cassiodorus, Var. 9, ep. 5.

² *Op. cit.* par. 542.

³ *Liber Pont.*, *sub voce*, Bon. II.

canvassings and contests," says Dr. Barmby, "usual at this period on the vacancy of the See . . . were such on this occasion as to delay the election for eleven weeks. Church funds had been expended on bribery, and even sacred vessels had been publicly sold for the purpose."¹ John died on 27th May 535 A.D.

He was succeeded by Agapetus, the son of Gordian a priest, who was then an old man. He began by reversing the decree of Boniface about Dioscorus, which he caused to be burnt in the midst of the assembled congregation.² He was a protégé of the Gothic King Theodahatus, and was employed by him as an envoy to Constantinople, to try and appease Justinian. While there he persuaded the latter to depose the Patriarch Anthemius, suspected of being a Monophysite and who was supported by the Empress Theodosia.

The visit of Agapetus to Constantinople and his long residence there, no doubt had a considerable effect on the ties of the Pope with the Empire, which were thenceforth much closer, and we are expressly told that on leaving the capital in 536 he left behind him Pelagius, who subsequently became Pope, as his Nuncio, or, as he was otherwise called in Greek, his *apocrisiarius* (in Latin, *responsalis*), and this was apparently the beginning of the appointment of a regular agent by the Popes at the Imperial Court.³

¹ *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iii. 390.

² *Lib. Pont.*, *sub voce*, Agap.

³ Grisar suggests that the appointment of such an agent was first made by Pope Leo the Great when, in the middle of the fifth

Meanwhile, in the absence of Agapetus, Belisarius captured Rome, which had long been in the hands of the Goths. Agapetus died on the 21st of April 536.

Thereupon a subdeacon called Silverius, a son of Pope Hormisdas, was elected in his place. The election of Silverius, says Dr. Barmby, was not a free one on the part of the Roman Church, but forced upon it by the Gothic King Theodahatus, who at that time had possession of the city, and this not without simony on the part of Silverius. The *Lib. Pont.* says distinctly : “ *Hic levatus est a tyranno Theodato sine deliberatione decreti. Qui Theodatus, corruptus pecuniae datum, talem timorem indixit clero, ut qui non consentiret in hujus ordinationem, gladio puniretur. Quod quidem sacerdotes non susscripserunt in eum secundum morem anticum, vel decretum confirmaverunt ante ordinationem.* ” The author of that work goes on to say that after his ordination, thus effected by force and intimidation (Grisar might have added by simony also), “ the presbyters assented to it for the sake of the Church.”

Presently, Belisarius, on the 10th of December 536, entered Rome again in the name of Justinian, while Theodahatus was assassinated and succeeded by his general Vitiges.

Meanwhile Vigilius, whom we have already mentioned, was sent for by the Empress Theodora. She promised to secure the See of Rome for him century, he sent Julianus, Bishop of Cos, as his agent to report to him what was done at Constantinople. This appointment, however, was apparently an individual act of his. (Grisar, It. tr., ed. ii. vol. i. pars. 237 and 542.)

through Belisarius if he would adhere to Monothelism. Belisarius, it was further said, had also been bribed by Vigilius. Silverius was now accused of a traitorous correspondence with the new Gothic King Vitiges. He was disrobed, his pall was removed, and he was dressed as a monk and banished to Pontus, and Vigilius was forthwith elected and ordained in his stead by order of Belisarius.

Presently Silverius died of famine (*deficiens mortuus est*). This was on the 20th of June 538 A.D., a year after his deposition. It is perfectly clear that he had not been canonically deposed, and there can be no doubt that he remained the lawful Pope until his death. On the other hand, the appointment of Vigilius was entirely illegal and invalid, inasmuch as there is no evidence of his having been re-elected, so that it would seem his Papacy was entirely irregular and void, as were the acts of his reign, and that he ought to be treated as an Anti-Pope. "Never," says Dr. Barmby, "was there a time in which the dignity of the great Roman See suffered so much as this; a time when such things as have been related could be done through the machinations of two women such as Theodora and Antonina. Imperial domination from Constantinople proved in fact no good exchange for the more immediate authority of the Gothic kings of Italy, who though themselves Arians had generally treated the Catholic Church with respect and fairness."¹

¹ *D.C.B.* iv. 673.

On the death of Silverius, Vigilius sent secret letters to Anthemius, Theodosius, and Severus, in which he adhered to the Monophysite cause, and added a confession of his faith in which he condemned the Tome of Pope Leo, while the orthodox doctrine of two natures in Christ was enunciated. In another letter he maligned Paul of Samosata, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret. Pagi has completely proved this, although he holds that the See of Rome had not been compromised, since Vigilius was not *the true Pope* at the time of writing. When he became so, Pagi does not show.

I do not propose to continue much further the story of this Anti-Pope, who, as I showed in the previous Appendix, was continually reversing what he had previously affirmed, compromising the Holy See, and raising insuperable difficulties for those champions of infallibility who still claim him as a real Pope. Two things, however, seem plain. When Vigilius was a free man and not under durance we find him affirming in his famous *Constitutum*, which was signed by seventeen other Latin Bishops and by other clerics, including Pelagius, who became his successor, "that it was not lawful to subvert anything constituted by the Holy Council of Chalcedon."¹ This represents undoubtedly the Catholic faith and practice in early times in regard to Conciliar decisions. Those who came after, and notably St. Gregory, who per-

¹ *Concil.* ix. 103.

mitted the Church to be dragooned into assenting to the reversal of a Conciliar decision at the beck of a lay emperor and then supplied sophistical arguments to support their conduct, were sorry advocates of Truth. Secondly, we must remember what Vigilius, then a Pope and admitted into the lists as a legitimate Pope by the champions of orthodoxy, declared when free from durance, and writing as he thought with the support of and the signatures of seventeen bishops including that of his successor as Pope. He then said that he had always been of one opinion and had only apparently differed in consequence of the machinations of the devil, who had deceived him. His desire had always been to ascertain the Truth, and he need not be ashamed of acknowledging former errors, since so distinguished a theologian and Latin scholar as St. Augustine had corrected his own writings and retracted his own words. This is a brave confession, but it is fatal to the claim of infallibility in the case of one Pope at all events. He then proceeded to anathematise the opinions he had held when under constraint—that is, the opinions which Pelagius the 2nd, and Gregory, and other Popes fought for, and to declare them null and void. There is no answer to this indictment, for the attempt to make out the *Constitutum* to have been a forgery has utterly failed. Vigilius died either late in 554 or early in 555.

He was succeeded by Pelagius the 1st, who had been appointed by Pope Agapetus when about

to leave Constantinople in 536 A.D. as his *apocrisiarius* there, this being apparently the first occasion on which the office was definitely created.

He was a man of very considerable abilities. These he had used during his long residence as Nuncio at Constantinople, with dexterity and address, in his diplomatic struggles with the heads of the Greek Church and with slight scruples. He was very subservient to the Empress Theodora, and acted in her interest on several occasions, while he attached himself to the fortunes of her protégé, Pope Vigilius, whose wavering attitude on the question of "the Three Chapters" he followed with considerable agility and without compromising himself too much.

Justinian, having recovered Italy for the Empire, issued his famous Pragmatic Sanction, by which the administration of the country was revised and many much-needed reforms and remedies were introduced. Among other things, he was determined to have a dominant influence in the selection and approval of the Pope and the control of his policy. The Pope was too powerful a person (now that the Arian rulers had been displaced), to be allowed a free hand at Rome, and from this time the confirmation of his election by the Emperor was exacted as a condition of his legality.

Mr. Holmes describes graphically what followed on the death of Vigilius. He says: "The Emperor judged sagaciously that the vacant Popedom was an allurement which would dissipate the most assured theological convictions; and he determined

to test its potency on the man who above all others was best fitted for the Papal seat. When an intimation was conveyed to the redoubtable champion of Chalcedon, Pelagius, that the pontificate was the prize of his recantation, the weapons with which he had so long defended 'the Three Chapters' escaped from his nerveless grasp, and while he accepted the tiara of the West with one hand, he signed, with the other, a convention that his faith was assimilated in all respects to that of the princely donor. The report of his defection preceded him to Rome, and on his arrival there the influence of Narses scarcely availed to induce the ecclesiastics of sufficient rank to perform the ceremony of his consecration. He had covenanted with Justinian to enforce the decrees of the Fifth General Council in the West, with the authority which attached to the occupant of St. Peter's chair; but the hostility of the Roman Bishops was so positive that he was obliged to shelter himself behind ambiguous utterances and pronouncements as to his unfaltering allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon."¹ Erastianism in the very highest quarters in the Church could hardly go further than this.

"The appointment," says Dr. Barmby, "was not welcome to the Romans themselves, and there was even a difficulty in getting prelates to consecrate him. Two only in the end officiated, John of Perusia and Bonus of Ferentinum, assisted by

¹ *The Age of Justinian and Theodora*, ii. 686.

Andrew, a presbyter of Ostia, in place of the bishop of that See, whose peculiar privilege it generally was to ordain the Popes.¹ His dubious attitude on the subject of the Three Chapters led to Pelagius being accused of heresy not only in Italy but in Gaul, where King Childebert challenged his orthodoxy. He died in the year 560.²

“On his death,” in the words of Milman, “Rome waited in obsequious submission the permission of the Emperor to inaugurate her new Pope, John the 3rd.” His obscure reign lasted for over twelve years, when he was succeeded by Benedict, the early patron of St. Gregory, whose short reign of four years was marked by the invasion and the terrible ravages of the Lombards. The appalling condition of things is marked by a notable sentence in the *Liber Pontificalis*, where we read of his successor, Pelagius the 2nd, who occupied the Papal Chair in 580, *Hic ordinatur absque iussione principis, eo quod Langubardi obsederent civitatem Romanam*, which shows what a remarkable anomaly such an election was thought to be.

It might be partly to excuse this informality, as well as to seek help against the Lombards, that, as Dr. Barmby says, Pelagius sent a deputation to the Emperor Tiberius. This was headed by Gregory, afterwards Pope, whom Pelagius had appointed his *apocrisiarius*. Pelagius, like the other Popes of this period, suffered from having to defend a

¹ *Lib. Pont.*, sub. voce, Pelagius I.

² *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iv. 296.

position in regard to the Three Chapters which had been compromised by his predecessor Vigilius, and it was fortunate for him he had such a skilful advocate as Gregory, who returned to Rome, as we saw in a previous volume, in 585, and became the Pope's Secretary there.

On the return of Gregory to Rome his place as *apocrisiarius* was apparently taken by Laurence the Archdeacon. Pelagius the 2nd died of the plague in January 590.

In an earlier volume we have seen how he was succeeded as Pope by Gregory, who probably owed that position to the favourable impression he had created at Constantinople during his long residence there. In one of his letters, written in September 591, he speaks of the deposition of Laurence, who, he says, had been a Deacon of the Apostolic See, *in ordine diaconii sedis apostolicae*, on account of his pride and evil acts, on which the Pope preferred to keep silence (*propter superbiam et mala sua quae tacenda duximus*). Honoratus was elected in the Golden Basilica (now called the Lateran),¹ in his place, in the presence of all the priests, deacons, notaries, subdeacons, and clerks. Honoratus was apparently succeeded by Sabinianus, or Savinianus, whom we find at Constantinople acting as Nuncio in September 594. He afterwards became Pope.² We must say a few words about him, as his earlier career has been overlooked by the historians of the Popes.

¹ *E. and H.* ii. letter i.

² *Ante*, 202.

He first appears in a letter from Gregory to John the patriarch of Constantinople, written in July 593.

In this letter, after discussing several matters, he continues: "But I need not speak at length by letter about these things, since I have sent my most beloved son, the deacon Sabinianus, as my representative in ecclesiastical matters (*pro responsis Ecclesiasticis*) to the threshold of our Lords, and he will speak to you more particularly about everything."¹ In a letter of the same date sent to Priscus, styled the Patrician of the East, about some business, he bids him communicate with Sabinianus the Deacon, whom he there calls bearer of presents (*lator presentium*).² In another letter, dated August 593, written to the physician Theodorus at Constantinople, he commends "his son the deacon Sabinianus."³

In September and October 594, Gregory writes to Sabinianus the Deacon at Constantinople, about Maximus ("prævaricator" at Salona).⁴

On 1st June 595, the Pope encloses a letter which he had written to the Patriarch John bidding him deliver it. In the covering note he freely discusses the latter's pride and temper.⁵ In this letter written to the Patriarch he reminds him how he had frequently expostulated by previous *responsales* (and did so again now by their common son Sabinianus), on his assumption of the title œcuménical.⁶ On the same day he writes to the

¹ *E. and H.* iii. 52; Barmby, iii. 58.

² *E. and H.* iii. 51.

³ *Ib.* iii. 64.

⁴ *Ib.* v. 6.

⁵ *Ib.* v. 45.

⁶ *Ib.* v. 44.

Empress Constantina to tell her he had heard of her good works from his *responsalis*, the deacon Sabinianus.

In the same month Gregory writes to the Emperor Maurice about various matters, and *inter alia* says that he had indicated in full to his *responsalis* Sabinianus what had happened in Rome, and asking Maurice to judge the matter about which he was writing as indicated in the petition sent through the latter.¹ In a subsequent letter written directly to Sabinianus also in regard to the pretensions of John the Faster, he tells him he is not to communicate (*procedere*) with him. Dr. Barmby says the word *procedere* was especially used for approaching the altar for celebration. This letter was written in July 595.²

In July 596, writing to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, he says that some time before, he had sent a letter to Sabinianus the Deacon, his agent (*responsa ecclesiae*) in the Royal City, to be forwarded to him (Eulogius), to which he had received no reply.³ This letter is curious, as showing that it was usual to communicate with Alexandria by way of Constantinople.

In June 597, Gregory acknowledges a letter which he had received from Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch, through their "common son" the Deacon Sabinianus.⁴

In the same month he writes to Eulogius and

¹ *E. and H.* v. 37.

² *E.d.* v. 45.

³ *Ib.* vi. 58.

⁴ *Ib.* vii. 24.

Anastasius, just named, and concludes the letter with the words, "I received the letters of Your Holiness on the arrival here of our common son the Deacon Sabinianus; but as their bearer is already prepared for departure, and cannot be detained, I will reply when the deacon, my *responsalis*, comes."¹

In June 597, writing to "the Patricia" Theoctista and to Andrew, he acknowledges the receipt of thirty pounds of gold which they had sent for the redemption of slaves and the relief of the poor.² Of the same date we have another letter from Gregory to the Physician Theodore, in which he says that his beloved son, the Deacon Sabinianus, on his return to him had brought no letter from Theodore, although he had taken to him what had been sent for the poor. On this lapse he pays his correspondent a neat compliment, saying he knew the reason for it. It was that he would not speak by letters to a man who had by a good deed already made his address directly to Almighty God.³

In November 597, Gregory writes to Amos, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, about a certain Peter, an acolyte, whom he had placed under the Deacon Sabinianus, his ecclesiastical representative (*responsa ecclesiastica facienti*) in the Royal City, and who had fled and had resorted to his church, and bidding him send him back.⁴ This is the last occasion

¹ *Ed.* vii. 31.

² *Ib.* vii. 25; Barmby, vii. 28.

³ *E. and H.* vii. 23.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. 6.

on which we find Sabinianus occupying the very influential post of *apocrisiarius*.

From a letter of Gregory written to him at a later time, it is clear that he was deposed for some fault which the Pope refers to in the phrase *ob culpam praeteriti excessus*. Gregory commends him for the alacrity with which he had submitted to the rebuke, as appeared from the letters he had written to himself. He continues, "I trust in the compassion of Almighty God that His Grace will so protect thee that, having been thus also absolved from other sins, thou mayest rejoice in having wholesomely obeyed."¹ It would be interesting to know what the fault of Sabinianus had been, for he afterwards became Pope. His attitude towards the memory and reputation of Gregory, after he had succeeded him, shows that the latter's treatment of him, although submitted to, had rankled. He was succeeded as *apocrisiarius* by Anatolius.

Sabinian had been already superseded when the letter to Amos, just cited, was written, for in another letter, dated in June 597, and addressed to Narses, Gregory says: "I beg your most sweet Charity to frequently visit my most beloved son Anatolius, whom I have sent to represent the Church (*ad facienda responsa ecclesiae*) in the Royal City, so that after the toils he endures in secular causes he may find rest with you in the Word of God, and wipe away the sweat of this his earthly toil, as it were, with a white napkin. Commend

¹ *E. and H.* viii. 24; Barmby, viii. 24.

him to all who are known to you, though I am sure that, if he is perfectly known, he needs no commendation. Yet do you show with regard to him how much you love the holy apostle Peter, and me."¹ In letters dated July 599, Anatolius is addressed as Deacon at Constantinople, and as Deacon and *apocrisiarius* at Constantinople respectively.² Anatolius still held the post in February 601,³ but he seems to have been dead in January 602, for in a letter of that date addressed to the subdeacon John of Ravenna, Gregory speaks of him as Anatolius of most blessed memory.⁴ He was succeeded by Boniface, of whom we shall have more to say presently.

As we have seen, Anatolius had already been appointed *apocrisiarius* in June 597, which implies that Sabinianus had relinquished the post some months before. It is almost certain that he was, in fact, the same person as the Sabinianus, Bishop of Jadera, who appears in that character for the first time in April of the same year, and who was then mixed up with a certain Maximus the Deacon. The latter had had dealings with Sabinianus as *apocrisiarius*, as we previously saw,⁵ and Gregory addresses him in various letters as *frater et coepiscopus noster*, *frater vestra*, *dilectissime frater* and *frater carissime*. In a letter written in June 598, and addressed to him as Bishop of Jadera, and already referred to, Gregory says

¹ *E. and H.* vii. 27; Barmby, vii. 30.

² *E. and H.* ix. 187, 188, and 189.

³ *Ib.* xi. 29.

⁴ *Ib.* xii. 6.

⁵ *Ib.* vii. 17.

that he had instructed Anatolius to assist him in every way.¹ The sentence is an interesting one. “*Dilectissimo autem filio nostro Anatolio diacono jam et prius et nunc iterum omnia suptiliter indicavimus hortantes ut, quicquid ad utilitatem ac quietem caritatis vestrae vel filiorum vestrorum pertinet, creatoris nostri auxilio suffragante augere stricte ac studiose festinet.*” This mention of his children may explain the supersession of Sabinianus after Gregory’s death. This is the last time we read of Sabinianus as Bishop of Jadera. In July 599 we have two letters to a Sabinianus (in one he is called Savinus). He is styled in both Bishop of Callipolis (*i.e.* Callipoli in Calabria), and it would, in fact, seem that he was translated to that See.² He does not occur again in Gregory’s letters.

On the death of Gregory he became his successor, having ingratiated himself while resident at Constantinople with the all-powerful Emperor Phocas, as he probably had ingratiated himself also with the Exarch of Ravenna. It would fit in with his having been Bishop of Jadera and Callipolis that he was not elected until five months after Gregory’s death, namely, on the 13th of September 604. I have in a previous page related the history of Sabinianus as Pope. As *apocrisiarius* he was superseded, as I have said, by Anatolius, and Anatolius by Boniface.

Boniface occurs several times in Gregory’s letters. Thus, a letter to Anastasius, Patriarch

¹ *E. and H.* viii. 24.

² *Ed.* ix. 205 and 206.

of Antioch, written in February 591,¹ was sent, together with some "keys of St. Peter," by Boniface, who is there styled *lator* (i.e. messenger) and *defensor*. The Pope says he had further entrusted him with some confidential and private messages for the Patriarch. A second letter of the same date was sent to the Archbishop Anastasius of Corinth by Boniface, in which he is again styled *lator* and *defensor*. In it Gregory informs him of his own election to the Papacy.² From a letter dated July 591, it seems that Boniface had been sent on business to Corsica, and in its first sentence Gregory says his son Boniface the deacon (*Filius meus Bonifatius diaconus*) had brought him some news from the island.³ In April 593, Boniface, who was its bearer, is mentioned in a letter written jointly to the Abbot of Palermo and to the Notary and Rector of the Papal Patrimony there, in which he is styled *praesentium lator Bonifatius vir clarissimus*.⁴

From a letter dated September 593, and written by Gregory to the Archbishop of Milan, it would appear that Boniface had been sent there and had received some private message from the latter to convey to the Pope. In it, Gregory calls Boniface "My most beloved son, the Deacon Boniface" (*Dilectissimus filius meus Bonifatius diaconus*).⁵ In a letter written in April 596 to Castor the Notary, he refers to *filius noster diaconus Bonifatius*. In it he bids him take heed to the letter Boniface

¹ *E. and H.* i. 25.

² *Ib.* i. 26.

³ *Ib.* i. 50.

⁴ *Ib.* iii. 27.

⁵ *Ib.* iv. 2.

had written him in conjunction with the Magnificent man the chartulary Maurentius¹ (*quod tibi filius noster diaconus Bonifatius et vir magnificus Maurentius chartularius scriptis sollicite attende*).

In March 598 Gregory writes a letter to Boniface on the privileges of the *Defensores* or Guardians, and especially of the seven Regionary Defensors, of whom Boniface himself was the head or *primicerius*, a post which, it would appear, the Pope now definitely establishes. This letter is addressed *Bonifatio primo defensori*.²

In a letter written in February 599, mention is made in the title of Boniface, Defensor.³ In August 601, Gregory writes to Boniface, who was then Defensor of Corsica, chiding him for having permitted the Churches of Aleria and Ajaccio to be so long without bishops. He bids him also see to it that erring priests were tried and punished by the bishop or by himself, and adds that they were not to be held in custody by laymen (*a laicis teneantur*).⁴

It is plain from these notices that Boniface was greatly employed and trusted by the Pope, and we now find him promoting him to a much more important post, namely, that of *apocrisiarius*, or nuncio, at Constantinople. Anatolius, the previous holder of the office, was already dead in January 602, for in a letter of that date the Pope speaks of his *dilectissime memoriae*.⁵ On the death of Anatolius

¹ *E. and H.* vi. 31.

² *Ib.* viii. 16; Barmby, viii. 13.

³ *E. and H.* ix. 110.

⁴ *Ib.* xi. 58; Barmby, xi. 77.

⁵ *E. and H.* xii. 6.

there seems to have been a long delay in the appointment of his successor. The Pope, in a letter to Phocas written in July 603, explains the reason why. He says : "The reason your Serenity has not had a deacon of the Apostolic See resident at the Court, according to ancient custom, is that all the ministers of this our Church shrank and fled with fear from times of such oppression and hardship" (*i.e.* those of the Emperor Maurice); "it was not possible to impose on any of them the duty of going to the Royal City to remain at the Court. But now that they have learnt that your clemency, by the ordering of God's grace, has attained to the summit of Empire, those who had before greatly feared to go there, hasten even of themselves, to your feet, moved thereto by joy. But seeing that some of them are so weak from old age as to be hardly able to bear the toil, and some are deeply engaged in ecclesiastical cares, I have sent the bearer of these presents, who was the first of all our guardians (*defensores*), had been long known to me for his diligence, and approved in life, faith, and character, and I have judged him fit to be sent to the feet of your Piety. I have accordingly, by God's permission, made him a deacon, and have been at pains to send him to you with all speed, that he may be able, when a convenient time is found, to inform your Clemency of all that is being done in these parts. To him I beg your Serenity to deign to incline your pious ears, that you may find it in your power to have pity on us all, the more speedily,

as you learn the more truly from his account what our affliction is." He then goes on to say how they had for thirty-five years been sorely oppressed by the Lombards.¹

In a letter of the same date, addressed to Cyriacus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, he commends to him "our most beloved common son, the Deacon Boniface."² In another letter to Eulogius of Alexandria, Gregory says he had heard from his *responsalis*, who was then living in the Royal City, that Eulogius had become blind, and writes to console him accordingly.³

In September 603, Gregory writes to Vitalis the Defensor, telling him to go to Sardinia, where the people were being harassed, and saying he had sent word to his dear son Boniface the Deacon, to bring the case before the authorities of the Court at Constantinople.⁴

In November 603, Gregory writes to Boniface the Deacon at Constantinople, sending him letters of complaint which had reached him from the Bishop of Ancyra in regard to the efforts of the Bishop of Euria in Epirus to subject his see to his jurisdiction, and bidding him lay the matter before the Emperor, whom he styles "His Piety."⁵

This is the last of Gregory's letters to Boniface that is extant, and was written only a few months

¹ *E. and H.* xiii. 41; Barmby, xiii. 38.

² *E. and H.* xiii. 43; Barmby, xiii. 43.

³ *E. and H.* xiii. 45; Barmby, xiii. 42.

⁴ *E. and H.* xiv. 2; Barmby, xiv. 21.

⁵ *E. and H.* xiv. 8; Barmby, xiv. 13.

before the great Pope's death, at which date he doubtless still held the post of nuncio. On the death of Sabinianus, Boniface was appointed his successor as Pope, doubtless by the influence of Phocas, who must have known him well.

I N D E X

Abubekr, Khalif, 272, 273.
 Abyssinia, King of, 272.
Acta Sanctorum, lxxv, 37 n., 179
 n., 180 n., 188 n., 216, 335 n.
 Adamnan, *Vit. Columbae*, 63,
 112 n., 129 n., 357 n., 358 n.
 Adrian, Abbot, lxviii.
 Adulwald, 241. *See also* Eadbald.
 Ædbald. *See* Eadbald.
 Ædilhun, 265.
 Ædilthryd, 265.
 Ædwin, King of Deira, letter to him
 from Boniface v., lxii, lxxi,
 lxxii; sheltered by the
 monks of Bangor, 166, 251;
 driven from his kingdom by
 his brother-in-law Æthelfrid,
 247, 250; shelters with Red-
 wald, who refuses to give
 him up, 247, 251; Bede's
 story of Redwald's deter-
 mination to give him up and
 of a friend who offers to con-
 duct him to safety, 251; and of
 an apparition which he after-
 wards recognised as Paulinus,
 252; after the death of Æthel-
 frid, he unites Northumbria
 under his sceptre, extends
 his kingdom to the English
 Pennines, 253, and possibly
 from sea to sea; gives its
 name to Edinburgh, conquers
 North Wales with Anglesea
 and the Isle of Man, 254; the
 extent of his kingdom, his
 firm and just rule, 255;
 marries Æthelberht, and
 promises to accept Chris-
 tianity, 256; Cwichelm, King
 of Wessex, employs Eomer
 to assassinate him, 257, xcvi;

overcomes the West Saxons,
 and still further delays
 accepting Christianity, 258;
 Paulinus reminds him of his
 vision, he consults his coun-
 sellors before deciding, 259-
 261; gifts sent to him from
 Boniface v., xcvi; Coifi de-
 stroys the idol temples, 262,
 xcvi; Ædwin baptised with
 all his nobles and a great
 crowd of people, 262; he
 commences to build a stone
 church at York, 263; slain by
 Caedwalla and Penda at
 Haethfelth, 326; his head
 taken to York and buried in
 St. Peter's there, 327; his
 body recovered and buried
 at Whitby, xcix.
 Ælfret. *See* Æthelfrid.
 Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury,
 92.
 Ælfric, *Homilies*, 64.
 Ælla, King of Deira, 250.
 Ælstan, Abbot of St. Augustine's,
 Canterbury, 180.
 Æthelberga, lxii, lxx, lxxi, 256,
 xcviii, 330, 331.
 Æthelberht, King of Kent,
 Gregory's letter to him, xxxiv,
 xxxvi, lv, lxxiv; held the
 hegemony of the Anglian and
 Saxon princes, extent of his
 authority, was married to a
 Frankish princess, 39; possi-
 bly before he came to the
 throne, 40; buried in SS.
 Peter and Paul, 43; called
 Ealdberht in Nennius, 49;
 did he adopt the name Æthel-
 berht at his baptism? his gene-

alogy and different names in various authorities, 50; the inconsistency of the dates given for his life, 50, 51; a fabulous battle in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 51; the extent of his kingdom, 51, 52; its capital, 52-56; interviewed by the interpreters from Augustine, orders the missionaries to remain in Thanet, and promises them his protection, 61; summons Augustine and his monks to a conference, 62; commands Augustine to deliver his message, his reply, he offers the mission quarters in Canterbury, 64; gives them a house in St. Agelgate, 67, 90; said to have given up his own house to the mission and to have gone to live at Reculver, 68; baptized at Canterbury, uncertain at what church, 77; builds and endows the monastery, 98, 214; Gregory's letter to him, brought from Rome by Augustine's missionaries, 135; his supremacy seems to have extended over the British as well as the Saxons, 153; builds St. Paul's, 170; the church he built at Rochester, 172, 173; a doubtful letter to him from Pope Boniface, 211, 212; date of his death, buried in St. Augustine's Abbey Church, xciii, 213; removal of his body at the rebuilding of St. Augustine's Abbey, 182, 216; held to be a saint, 213, 216; his shrine above the high altar, 213; his dooms, lxxiv, 213, 214; at his death, or perhaps conversion, the hegemony passed from Kent to East Anglia, he was succeeded by his son Ædbald or Eadbald, 230.

Æthelberht, King, *Dooms of*, lxxiv, 213, 214.

Æthelfrid, King of Bernicia, his campaign against the Welsh, who were sheltering his brother-in-law, Ædwin, King

of Deira, 165-166, 247, 251; attacks Ædwin and wrests Deira from him, 250, and pursues him, 250, 251; tries to get Redwald to kill or deliver up Ædwin to him, 247, 251; in a battle which follows is killed by Redwald, 247, 253; Bede's description of him, 249; defeats Aidan, King of Scots, 250.

Æthelheard, Bishop, 233.

Ætherius, Bishop of Lyons, 31, 87, 133.

Agapetus, Pope, 16, 408, 409.

Agatho, Pope, 390-397.

Age of Justinian. See Holmes (G. W.).

Agilfus, Bishop of Metz, 133.

Aidan, King of the Scots of Argyll, 250.

Ailmor, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, afterwards Bishop of Shireburn, 180.

Aix, 29, 32.

Aix, Bishop of. See Protasius.

Albinus, Abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul, Canterbury, lxvii, lxviii, lxix.

Alcuin, *Epistles*, xciii n.

Alcuin, *Monumenta Alcuinana*, 233.

Aldwulf, King of East Anglia, 246.

Alexander, Pope, 181.

Amandus, St., Bishop of Maestrich, 307.

Amianus Marcellinus, xc.

Anatolius, Nuncio at Constantinople, 422.

Anatolius, St., Bishop of Laodicea, 159.

Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover. See James (Dr.).

Angers, Bishop of. See Licinius.

Anglia Sacra. See Wharton, Henry.

Anglians, Church of the, first use of the phrase, 105.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, lxxvii, 49, 50, 51, 93 n., 169, 177, 258, 268, 269 n., 324, 334.

Anna, King of East Anglia, endows a monastery at Burgh Castle, 322; succeeds Ecgric,

killed by Penda, his four saintly daughters, 324; succeeded by Æthelhere, 325.

Annales Cambriae, 155 n., 251 n.

Annales Paulini, xcii n.

Annals of the Bodleian Library.
See Macray.

Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral.
See Milman (Dean).

Annals of Ulster, 251 n., 354-357.

Antioch, Council of, 175.

Archæologia Cantiana, 70 n., 76, 172-173.

Archæological Journal, xc n., 44, 45, 46, 47, 72, 73-76, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 264, 330, 331, 332 n.

Aregius, Bishop of Gap, 128, 133.

Aregius, Patrician of Burgundy, 29, 33.

Arles, 33, 87, xcvi.

Arles, Archbishop of. See Vergilius, Licerius.

Arles, Council of, III.

Armagh, Bishop of. See Teran-anus.

Arnulf, Bishop of Metz, 223, 309, 310, 311.

Asser, 57 n.

Arts in Early England. See Brown (J. B.).

Augustine, St., Archbishop of Canterbury, on his consecration as Bishop, sends a letter to the Pope, xxxiv; Prior of St. Andrew's Monastery, and selected by Gregory to lead his Anglian mission, 25; said, in a doubtful letter, to have been a pupil of Felix, Bishop of Messina, 26, and to have been cell-companion to Gregory; not the type of man likely to be a successful leader, 27; sets out, probably from Ostia, by sea to Lerins, reports to Gregory on the monastery there, 28; to Marseilles and Aix, returns to Rome on account of difficulties, 29; returns the same day with letters of introduction to Frankish princes and bishops, 30; probably com-missioned to visit the various churches of Gaul and report to the Pope, rejoins his companions at Aix, 32; thence to Arles, 33; Vienne, Lyons, Autun, and Orleans, 34; legends of him in the west of France, 35; two years occupied in visiting the churches of Gaul, 37; reaches the English Channel, probable port of embarkation, 56; place of landing, 59, xc; reasons for rejecting the Ebbs Fleet conjecture, 60; brought interpreters from Gaul, sends one of them to Æthelberht to tell him the glad tidings, he promises protection, 61; summoned to confer with the king, 62; traditional description of his personal appearance, 63; commanded to deliver his message, Bede's account of the king's reply, quarters at Canterbury are offered, 64; the progress thither, 64-67; secures consecration as bishop, according to Bede, at Arles, but the Pope speaks of "Bishops of Germany," 87; the date of his consecration, on his return to Britain sends Laurence and Peter to Rome to tell the Pope that the English had accepted the faith, and that he had been made bishop, xxxiv, 88; ceased to be abbot, but probably still lived in the monastery, his diocese co-extensive with Æthelberht's kingdom, 91; his letter to the Pope unanswered for three years, 99; the delay unexplained, his letters had contained a series of difficult cases to which the Pope now replies, 100; notwithstanding doubts of some writers, this correspondence maintained to be genuine, 101; the arguments stated, 102, 103; the questions stated, with Gregory's

responses, 104-114; one of the questions in some versions evidently interpolated, 113 n.; the books which Gregory sent to him, 115; the sacred vessels, 124; the vestments, 124, 126, 127, xc; the relics, 125; further injunctions from the Pope with regard to heathen temples, 128-130; to beware of presumption, 138; to erect a Metropolitan See of London, 139; and of York, subject to London, that the bishops of the British Church are to be subject to him, 140, 142; twelve dioceses to be formed, subject to Augustine during his life, and afterwards to London, 141; his position with regard to the British bishops, 142-144; with the help of Æthelberht summons the British bishops to a conference, 152; begins by trying to persuade them to conform, 158, 159; the details of discussion not known, 161; the conference not very fruitful, story of a miracle wrought by him considered an interpolation, 162; calls a second conference, offends the British bishops by his haughty attitude, he does not press the matter of the tonsure, 164; tells the British bishops if they will not preach to the Anglians they will suffer death at their hands, so is thought by some to have inspired the massacre of Bangor, 165; he ordains two bishops, 168—Mellitus to the East Saxons, 169; Justus to the See of Rochester, 171; baptizes St. Livinius, his last recorded act an uncanonical one, he passes over the two bishops he had ordained, 173; and appoints Laurence the priest as his successor, and ordains him to the See of Canterbury whilst he him-

self still filled it, 174; the year of his death not certainly known, 177; devotions to him, his burial-place, 178, 179, xciii; his epitaph, 179; Gocelin's account of his translation, 179-186; the remains separated into two portions by Abbot Wido and buried in different parts of the abbey, 186; Gocelin's account of his miracles, 188-190; the results of his labours, 190-192; ritual introduced by him, 192, xciii-xciv; an estimate of his character, 195-197; his death probably the same year as Gregory's, 198.

Augustine and his Companions.

See Browne (Bishop).

Augustine's fellow-missionaries: but little record of their personal views, none of their writings have survived, viii; very simple folk, xvi; all monks, xx, 104; naturally unsympathetic to the natives, xxi; their success compared with that of the missions from Iona and Lindisfarne, doubtful how much of their ritual was derived from that of Gaul, xxii; all chosen from the monks of St. Andrew's Monastery at Rome, 15; none amongst them who knew the ways of the world, 27; fearful of the dangers of the way, send Augustine back to the Pope asking to be relieved of the journey, 29; the Pope's letter to them, 30; rejoined by Augustine at Aix, 32; two years spent in France on the way to Britain, 37; they reach the English Channel, probable port of embarkation, a numerous party, 56; their landing-place, 59; reasons for rejecting the Ebbs Fleet conjecture, 60; knew no English, had Frankish interpreters with them, were about forty in number, ordered by Æthelberht to remain in

Thanet, and are promised protection, 61 ; summoned to confer with the King, 62 ; Bede's description of the procession, 63 ; quarters offered to them at Canterbury, 64 ; their progress thither, 64-67 ; their dress, 65 ; their processional litany and anthem, 65, 66, xc ; *Æthelberht* gives them a house in St. Petergate, 67, 90 ; they proceed to build the monastery, and take over the Church of St. Martin, 68 ; probably some of the monks ordained priests, 91 ; two of their number sent to Rome with a letter from Augustine to the Pope, where they remained three years, 99 ; they return with several new recruits and various articles for use in the service of the Church, 100, 114 ; overtaken by a messenger from the Pope with a further letter for *Mellitus*, 128 ; commendatory letters given by the Pope to the messengers of Augustine for the bishops of Gaul, 132-133 ; to the Kings of Austrasia, Burgundy, and Neustria, and to Queen Brunichildis, 134 ; to King *Æthelberht*, 135 ; and Queen Bertha, 136, 137.

Augustine, St., of Hippo, *Epistles*, 66 n.

Augustine's Oak, 157, 162.

Aust Cliff, on the Severn, 157, 158.

Autun, Bishop of. *See* *Syagrius*.

Avars, the, 199, 218, 219, 220.

Baber, H. H., in *Introduction to Wickliffe's New Testament*, 119.

Bangor, massacre at, 166, 327.

Baptism, the Service described, 78-86 ; differences between the usages of the British Church and Rome, 150-152.

Baring-Gould, S., *Lives of the Saints*, 129 n.

Barmby, Dr. J., *Epistles of Gregory*, xxxii, 6 n., 7 n., 24 n., 25 n., 26 n., 28 n., 29 n., 31 n., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 35 n., 37 n., 102 n., 133 n., 134 n., 137, 139 n., 140 n., 145, 161, 419 n., 420 n., 421 n., 424 n., 426 n.

Barmby, in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 203 n., 408, 414, 415 n.

Baronius, Cardinal, 21.

Bede, the Venerable, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, lviii, lix, lx, lxii, lxvi, lxvii-lxxiv, xcii, xciii n., xcix n., 12, 13, 28 n., 29, 30 n., 40, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 85 n., 87, 88, 90, 98, 99, 102, 105, 113 n., 130, 139, 140 n., 153, 156, 158, 159 n., 161, 162 n., 163, 166, 168, 169 n., 170, 171, 174, 175 n., 177, 178, 179, 193, 208, 209 n., 210, 211 n., 212 n., 213, 230, 231, 232, 233 n., 234 n., 235 n., 236, 240, 241, 242 n., 243 n., 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251 n., 253 n., 254, 255, 256, 257, 258 n., 259 n., 262, 265 n., 266 n., 267 n., 268, 269, 282, 291, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323 n., 326, 327 n., 328, 329, 330, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 359 n., 360 n., 362 n., 364 n.

Bede, the Venerable, *De Temp. Ratione*, 130 n.

Bede, the Venerable, *Historia Abbatum*, 337 n.

Bede's Writings, edited by C. Plummer, lx n., lxvii, lxx, lxxi, xciv n., 26 n., 31 n., 42 n., 43, 56 n., 66 n., 69 n., 88 n., 93, 99 n., 100 n., 103, 109, 110, 112 n., 125, 127 n., 130 n., 153, 157 n., 163 n., 172, 175 n., 177 n., 209, 210, 212 n., 214 n., 230 n., 238 n., 240, 242, 243 n., 244 n., 265 n., 266 n., 323, 324, 325, 326 n., 336, 360 n., 363 n.

Bede's Writings, edited by Smith, lxiii, xciv n., 41, 42 n., 265 n., 266 n., 269 n., 320 n., 324 n.

Bede's Writings, edited by Rev. Jos. Stevenson, lxvii, lxix, lxx, 157.

Belisarius, 409, 410.

Benedict I., Pope, 11, 12.

Benedict, St., rule of, xv, xvi, xvii, 24.

Benjamin, a Jew of Tiberias, 222.

Bercta. *See* Bertha.

Berctgils. *See* Boniface, Bishop of Dunwich.

Bernard, St., of Clairvaux, *Vita Malachiae*, 151.

Bertha, wife of Ethelberht, King of Kent, xxxiv, xxxvi; a daughter of Charibert, King of Paris, 39, lxxxix; called Ethelberga by the Pope, accompanied to Britain by her Christian chaplain, 40; the probable date of her marriage, 42; buried in SS. Peter and Paul, 43; she possibly sent the message to Rome that her people were anxious to be converted, 48; her influence on Ethelberht evident in his reception of the mission, 62; the Pope's letter to her brought by Augustine's missionaries, 136, 137.

Birch, W. de G., *Cartularium Saxonicum*, lvi, 171 n.

Bishop, Mr. Edmund, 101 n.

Bishops, consecration of, 88; Gregory's responsion upon, 111.

Boniface, Bishop of Dunwich, 326.

Boniface II., Pope, 407, 408.

Boniface III., Nuncio at Constantinople, 204; doubts as to his identity with Boniface IV., 203; what is said of him is very little and all from one source: said to have consecrated twenty-one bishops in eight months, 204; reasons for the interpolation of his name, 205.

Boniface IV., Pope, Columban's letter to him, 145; was he the successor of Sabinianus? 203-205; a protégé of Pope Gregory who had been Papal Nuncio at Imperial Court, 206; asks Phocas to give him the Pantheon, and dedicates it to Christian worship, 206-208, 211, 236, 237; doubtful letters from him to Lawrence and Æthelberht, 211; his death and epitaph, 237, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427.

Boniface V., Pope, his letters to Justus and to Ædwin and Æthelberga, lxii, lxx, lxxi, xcvi; the successor of Deusdedit, his legislation and acts, 237, 238, 239; his death and burial, 239; his letter to Mellitus and Justus, 240, 242.

Boniface, St., xxxi, 102, 152, 176.

Boniface, St., *Epistles*, xciv n., 103 n., 109, 110 n.

Books sent by Gregory to Augustine, 100, 114-123.

Bossuet, J. B., *Defensio Declarationis Conventus Cleri Gallican*, 400 n.

Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa, 280.

Bridges, John, History of Northampton, 131.

Bright, Dr. W., *Early English Church History*, lli, llii, lv, lvii, lxxvii, xciii, xcvi n., xcviin n., xcix, 26 n., 30, 42 n., 63 n., 67 n., 72, 85, 92 n., 105 n., 107, 111, 112, 114, 126 n., 129 n., 130 n., 141, 147, 148 n., 149 n., 150 n., 159 n., 162, 163 n., 171, 175 n., 177, 207 n., 234 n., 236 n., 243 n., 247 n., 248 n., 266 n., 268, 319 n., 320, 321.

Brightwald, Archbishop of Canterbury, 179.

Britain, under Roman rule, 1, 2; assailed by foes from Ireland and Germany, 3; Procopius, fables about, 4; state of civilisation in Augustine's time, 38.

British bishops — committed by Gregory to Augustine's care, 113; want of tact on the Pope's part, 142; differences in discipline between the Celtic Church and Rome,

the perverse to be corrected by authority : reasons why this attitude did not succeed, 143 ; not originally antagonistic to Rome, 145 ; wherein their "Use" differed from Rome, 146-152 ; in the time of celebrating Easter, 146, 149, 159 ; in regard to the tonsure, 149, 150 ; in the sacrament of baptism, 150-152 ; summoned to a conference with Augustine, 153 ; the date, names of the bishops unknown, they were not diocesan bishops, 153, but the senior ecclesiastical personage in each monastic community; the contrary view based on late documents and mere conjecture, 154 ; the first conference representative of South Wales only, the second of the whole Church in Wales, 155 ; the place of meeting, 156-158 ; not strange that native Church should object to supremacy of a mission sent to their invaders, 161 ; the first conference at Augustine's Oak not very fruitful, an appeal to God for a sign, each party prays for the recovery of a blind man, the miracle appears to be an interpolation, 162 ; called to a second conference, they seek the advice of a hermit, who advises them to follow Augustine if he is humble, 163 ; they decline to alter the time of Easter, or their service of baptism, and will not preach to the Anglians, 164 ; Augustine's minatory attitude to them, 165 ; the underlying reasons for their decision, 167.

Brompton, Joannes, *Chronicon*, xvii n.

Brou, Father, 102 n.

Brown, Prof. G. Baldwin, *Arts in Early England*, 74, 76 n., 97 n.

Browne, G. F., Bishop of Bristol, *Alcuin of York*, 264, 265 n.

Browne, G. F., Bishop of Bristol, *Augustine and his Companions*, lvi, lxxvii, lxxviii, 58 n., 59 n., 63 n., 92, 105, 157, 165 210, 215, 232, 267 n., 328.

Browne, G. F., Bishop of Bristol, *The Christian Church in these Islands before the Coming of Augustine*, 41 n., 43 n., 194, 195 n., 213.

Browne, G. F., Bishop of Bristol, *Conversion of the Heptarchy*, lxxviii, 224 n., 246, 262, 328.

Brunichildis, Queen of the Franks, xxxiii, xxxiv, 10, 14, 34, 88, 134, 222, 223-226, 310.

Bruns, *Canones*, 66 n.

Bubonic plague in sixth and seventh centuries, 343-365 ; its effect described by Gibbon, 344-348 ; by Prof. Bury, 348-350 ; in the East, 350 ; in Italy, 351 ; in Gaul, 352, 353, 354 ; in Ireland, 354-357 ; in Wales, 357 ; in Scotland, 358 ; in England, 358-364.

Bund, Willis, *The Celtic Church in Wales*, 154, 155 n.

Bury, Prof. J., *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 200 n., 201 n., 218, 219, 272 n., 273, 274, 275, 297, 303, 349.

Byron, Lord, *Childe Harold*, 201 n.

Byzantium, authorities for history of, lxvi.

Byzantium. *See under* Maurice, Phocas, Heraclitus, Constantine III. and IV., and Constantine II.

Cabellorum. *See* Châlons-sur-Saône.

Cadvan, a king in Wales, 165.

Caedwalla, King of the Britons, 326, 327.

Cæsar's voyages to Britain and their results, 1, 2, 3.

Cambrai, Bishop of. *See* Gerard.

Camden, W., *Britannia*, 266 n., 321.

Candidus, Abbot of St. Andrews, 25.

Candidus, protector of the papal patrimony in Gaul, xxxii, 6, 25, 32, 33, 35.

Canterbury, the palace of $\text{\textæ}thelberht$ was just outside its walls, the division of the Roman road from London to the three Kentish harbour fortresses, 52 ; first mentioned by Ptolemy, a walled town, ruined and abandoned on the withdrawal of the Romans, 53 ; Roman remains, 54 ; the gates and markets, 55 ; quarters there assigned to the mission by $\text{\textæ}thelberht$, 64, 67 ; not intended to remain a Metropolitan See after the death of Augustine, 129, 141, 142 ; the prayers of Mellitus stay a conflagration here, 241.

Canterbury, Archbishops of. *See* Augustine, Laurence, Mellitus, Justus, Honorius, Deusdedit, Theodore, Brightwald, Nothelm, Ecgbert.

Canterbury, Chapel of the Four Crowned Ones, 236.

Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral, 77 ; its dedication, 92 ; no remains of it existing, described by Eadmer, 93, 96, xc ; Mr. Micklithwaite's description of the plan, 94-96 ; the elevation, 97, 98.

Canterbury, Church of "the Holy Mother of God," 181, 234.

Canterbury, St. Augustine's Monastery and Abbey, xxxviii, xxxix ; an early drawing of altar, 43 ; $\text{\textæ}thelberht$ endows the monastery, 98 ; Pope Gregory's gift to, 100, 114-126, lxxxix ; the church burnt and Augustine's shrine injured, 186. *See also* SS. Peter and Paul.

Canterbury, St. Martin's Church, St. Liudhard's legendary connection with, 42 ; its ruins still to be seen, 44 ; earliest existing Saxon church, no portion of the Roman building remaining, 45 ; the nave and chancel, ground plan, 46 ; details, dates earlier than Augustine's mission, and doubtless erected by Liudhard, 47 ; taken over by the mission, 68 ; wrongly said to have been the see of a bishop suffragan to the Archbishop, 69 n. ; generally supposed $\text{\textæ}thelberht$ was baptized here, 77.

Canterbury, St. Martin's Hill, the missionaries first view their future home from, 65-66, 67.

Canterbury, St. Pancras, almost as old as St. Martin's, 46, 69 ; though not mentioned before the writings of Sprott and Thorne, 70 ; how Bede came to overlook it, 70, 71 ; said by Thorne to have been originally an idol temple, 71 ; legendary handiwork of the Devil ; pagan origin of the church doubted by Micklithwaite, 72 ; description of its remains, 72-76 ; resembles St. Martin's, but larger, 77 ; probably many of the things said of St. Martin's by Bede really apply to St. Pancras, the first church built by the Roman missionaries in Britain, $\text{\textæ}thelberht$ possibly baptized here, 77.

Canterbury, SS. Peter and Paul, the body of Liudhard removed from St. Martin's, 42 ; intended for burying-place of Bishops of Canterbury and Kings of Kent, 98 ; its dedication changed by Dunstan to St. Augustine, the names of St. Gregory and St. Augustine long honoured in a Mass every Saturday, 178 ; the burial-place of St. Augustine, 179, xciii ; rebuilding of under Abbots Ailmer, $\text{\textæ}lstan$, 180 ; Wulfric, 180-181 ; Egelsin, 181 ; Scotlandus, 181-182 ; Wido, 182-186 ; not completed at Augustine's death,

and consecrated by Laurence, what it was like unknown, 212; exempt from diocesan rule, xcv; burial-place of Æthelberht, 213; his statue there, xcvi; there St. Laurence was scourged by St. Peter, 232-233; burial place of St. Laurence, 236. *See also* St. Augustine's.

Canterbury, Stablegate (=Staple-gate), 67.

Canterbury before Domesday. *See* Fausnett (T. G.).

Capgrave, *Nova Legenda*, 236.

Carne, Sir Edward, tablet to, in S. Gregorio, 20.

Carthage, 218.

Cartularium Saxonicum. *See* Birch (W. de G.).

Cassiodorus, *Variae Epistolae*, 407 n.

Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain. *See* Hardy (Sir T. D.).

Cearl, King of Mercia (? Wessex), 256.

Celtic Church in Wales. *See* Bund (W.).

Celtic Scotland. *See* Skene (W. F.).

Chalcedon, 200, 217.

Châlons-sur-Saône, Bishop of. *See* Lupus.

Charibert, King of Paris, 39.

Charters granting land to the Church in Augustine's time to be treated with suspicion, xxxvi, 214, 215; proof of the forgery of most of them, xxxvii-lxiv.

Chintila, King of the Visigoths, 281, 317.

Chlothaire II., King of Neustria, xxxiv, 37, 40, 134, 222, 224, 308, 309, 310.

Chlovis II., King of Neustria and Burgundy, 308.

Chosroes, Shah of Persia, his invasion of the Empire, 199; his army advances to the Bosphorus, 200; invades Syria and Palestine and captures Damascus and Jerusalem, captures Egypt, enters Asia Minor and advances to Chalcedon, 217; his insolent letter to Heraclius, assaults Constantinople and is beaten, 218; captured and starved to death, 219; Muhammed's letter to him and his reply, 272.

Christian Church in these Islands before the Coming of Augustine. *See* Browne (Bishop).

Christian Church in the Middle Ages. *See* Hardwick (C.).

Chronicon Acephalum, 175 n.

Chronicon S. Crucis, 177.

Chron. S. Pauli, xcvi n.

Chronicon Scotorum, 209, 355-357.

Churton, E., *Early English Church*, 234.

Civilisation in Europe. *See* Guizot.

Clovesho, Council of, xciii, 62, 177, 193, 194.

Codex Diplomaticus. *See* Kemble.

Coenwulf, King of Mercia, his letter to Pope Leo III., 141.

Coifi, 259, 260, 261, 327.

Cologne, Bishop of. *See* Cunibert.

Columba, xxiv.

Columban, xxiv, 166, 319; his letter to Gregory, 144, 145, 159-161; to Boniface IV., 145; sent into exile by Queen Brunichildis, 225.

Constans II., Emperor of Byzantium, 277, 278, 302, 387.

Constantina, Empress, 199.

Constantine, eldest son of Heraclius, 277.

Constantine Pogonatos, Emperor, 389-396.

Constantinople, 200, 201, 218, 219.

Constantinople, Council of, 379 n., 381 n.

Constantinople, Papal Nuncios at, 406-427.

Constantinople, St. Sophia, 219.

Conversion of the Heptarchy. *See* Browne (Bishop).

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, 201 n.

Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne, 310.

Cwichelme, King of Wessex, 257.

Dagan, Bishop, 209.

Dagobert I., King of Austrasia, afterwards King of the Franks, 309, 310, 311, 319, 330, 333.

Damian, Bishop of Rochester, consecrated to the See by Deusdedit on the death of Ithamar, date of his death unknown, 336.

X. *Scriptores.* *See* Twysden (Sir Roger).

De Rossi, *Inscript. Christ.*, 239, 279 n., 281 n., 283 n., 287.

Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, 34, 133, 223, 319.

Deusdedit, Archbishop of Canterbury, 183; succeeds on the death of Honorius, consecrated by Ithamar, consecrated Damian to Rochester on the death of Ithamar, 336; his death from the plague, the See vacant for some time, 337; the last Archbishop of Canterbury who could trace his orders to Augustine, 339.

Deusdedit, Pope, succeeded Boniface IV., restored the priests to the position that the monks had held under Gregory and Boniface, 237, 238; dies and is succeeded by Boniface V., 238.

Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, 106 n.

Dictionary of Christian Biography, lxxix, xcvi n., xcviij n., xcviij n., 203 n., 308 n., 370 n., 408 n., 410 n., 414, 415 n.

Dinoot, Abbot of Bangor, 156, 163.

Dioscorus, Pope, 407, 408.

Dogmas, history of the origin and development of, 366-373.

Dorubrevis. *See* Rochester.

Dover, 52, 53.

Down Ampney, near Cricklade, 157.

Droctigisilus, Bishop of Soissons, 41.

Dubrae. *See* Dover.

Duchesne, L., *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 78 n., 79 n., 81, 83 n., 84 n., 85, 86 n., 88 n., 101, 107.

Dudden, Rev. F. Homes, *Gregory the Great*, vii, 17, 18 n., 113, 114 n., 175 n., 176 n.

Dugdale, Sir W., *Monasticon*, xcii n., 43, 69 n., 170 n., 216, 236.

Dunnoc. *See* Dunwich.

Dunwich, 321, 325.

Dunwich, Bishop of. *See* Boniface (Thomas).

Durovernum, Durovernia, Durovernus. *See* Canterbury.

Eadbald, King of Kent, succeeds his father Æthelberht, refuses to accept Christianity, marries his father's widow Bercta, 230; forsakes idolatry and is baptized, 233; recalls Mellitus and Justus from Gaul, 234; builds the church of "the Holy Mother of God" at Canterbury, 181, 234, 333; and St. Peter's at Folkestone, 235, 333; his letter to Boniface V., 241; Ædwin asks him for his sister Æthelberga in marriage, 256; on Ædwin's death he gives her the royal vill of Lyminge, 330; is mistrusted by Æthelberga, 332; his death and successor, 334.

Eadfrid, 256, 265, 326.

Eadmer, *De reliquiis S. Audoeni*, lxi, 93, 96, 97, 98.

Ealdberht, 49; *see also* Æthelberht.

Eanfleda, 257, 332.

Eanswitha, 333, xcix.

Earconberht, King of Kent, succeeds his father Eadbald, 334; his death, probably from the plague, 337.

Earle, J., *Handbook to the Land Charters and other Saxon Documents*, xlviij, xlii n., liii, liv.

Early English Church. *See* Churton.

Early English Church History. *See* Bright (Dr.).

East-Anglian Kingdom, extent of, 244-245; genealogy of its

kings, 245 ; its history in the time of Augustine's mission, 246-248.

Easter, methods of computing date in British Church differed from Roman, 146, 147 ; the various cycles in use to determine it, 148, 149 ; the Scots conform to the Roman practice, 282.

Ebbs Fleet, 60.

Ecgbercht, King of Kent, sends Wigward to Rome for ordination as Archbishop of Canterbury, 337.

Ecgbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, xxxi.

Ecgbert, *Dialogues*, 26 n.

Ecgbert, *Penitential*, 113 n.

Ecgbert of York, 102.

Egfric, King of East Anglia, succeeds Sebert on his return to a monastery, and is killed with him, 323.

Ecthesis, the, 294, 295, 296, 301, 386, 387, 388, 389.

Edlferd Flesaur. *See* Æthelfrid.

Edward the Confessor, 180.

Eeni, King of East Anglia, 245.

Egelsin, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 181.

Egelwin, Abbot of Athelney, 190.

Egila, 223.

Eleutherius, Exarch of Ravenna, 238, 239.

Eligius, St., 166.

Elmham, Thomas of, a monk of St. Augustine's monastery, the author of *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, treasurer of the Abbey 1407-1414, Prior of Lenton, lxxv ; left the Benedictines to join the order of Cluny, thought to have written *Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*, 114 ; his list of the books sent by Gregory to Augustine, 115-123 ; the sacred vessels and copes, 124 ; the relics, and the gifts sent to Æthelberht, 125.

Elmham, Thomas of, *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, xxxviii, xxxix, 1, lii, liii n., lxxv, lxxvi, lxxxix, 43 n., 59, 63, 67, 77, 84, 99, 114 n., 115 n., 177, 212, 214, 233, 235, 236 n., 242, 245, 330, 334, 335, 336.

Elistob, E., *An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory*, xc n., 13 n.

Elvira, Council of, 152.

Ely, Thomas of, *Vita S. Aedel-dritae*, 323.

English, *The*. *See* Maclear (Dr.).

English Commonwealth. *See* Palgrave (Sir F.).

Eomer, 257.

Eormenred, 334.

Eormenric, Irminric, or Eozmoric, the father of Æthelberht, 50.

Eorpwald, King of East Anglia, succeeds his father, Redwald, 248, 318 ; persuaded to Christianity by Ædwin of Northumbria, 318 ; dies a violent death, 319.

Ernulf, Bishop, *Textus Roffensis*, liv, lxxiv.

Étaples (Quentavic), Augustine's probable port of embarkation, 56.

Ethelberga. *See* Bertha.

Ethelred, King of Mercia, 172.

Eugenius IV., Pope, succeeds Martin I. on his deposition, 305, 306, 388 ; was his election legitimate whilst Martin lived ? 307.

Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, xxxiii, 5, 87, 89.

Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 7.

Ewald, P., and Hartmann, L. M., *Gregory's Letters*, xxxi, xxxii n., xxxiii n., xxxiv n., xxxv, xxxvi, 6 n., 7 n., 8 n., 9 n., 10 n., 12 n., 24 n., 25 n., 26 n., 28 n., 29 n., 30 n., 31 n., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 35 n., 37 n., 40 n., 88 n., 89 n., 100 n., 101, 102 n., 103, 103 n., 127 n., 128 n., 133 n., 134 n., 137 n., 138, 139 n., 140 n., 169 n., 171 n., 174 n., 416 n., 417 n., 418 n., 419 n., 420 n., 421 n., 422 n., 423 n., 424 n., 426 n.

Faussett, T. G., in *Archæological Journal*, lxxxvi.

Faussett, T. G., *Canterbury before Domesday*, 52, 53, 54, 55, 67.

Faversham, 54.

Fellire, 210.

Felix, Bishop of Dunwich, came from Gaul to Britain, either with Sebert or at his invitation, 320, 321; ordained bishop by Honorius, 321; probably used the Gaulish ritual, 322; assisted Sebert in founding a school at Dunwich, 322-323; his death, burial, and translation, 325.

Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, xcix, 177, 245, 246, 324, 325 n., 334 n., 360 n.

Florentina, St., 227, 228.

Florez, *Espana Sagrada*, 281 n.

Four Ancient Books of Wales. See Skene (W. F.).

Fredegar, 319 n.

Freeman, A. E., xcvi n.

Fulgentius, St., 227.

Fuller, Thomas, 230.

Fursius, 322.

Gallia Christiana, 41.

Gap, Bishop of. See Arigius.

Gasquet, Abbot, in the *Tablet*, 101 n.

Gaul, the Church in, xxvi, xxvii; authorities for history of Mérovingian period in, lxii; its Roman civilisation jeopardised, 3; ceases to be passable from Rome to Britain, 3; the foster-mother of the Church in Wales and Ireland, 5; civil war in, 222-224; state of the Church in early seventh century, 308-311.

Geoffrey of Monmouth, 165.

George of Pisidia, 218.

George, Patriarch of Constantinople, 392.

Gerard, Bishop of Cambrai, 102, 109.

Germanus, Roman general, 199.

Gerona, Bishop of. See John.

Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, xli n., xlii n.

Gesta Pontificum. See William of Malmesbury.

Gibbon, E., *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, edited by Prof. J. Bury, lxvi, 198, 199 n., 200, 344-349.

Giesler, 205.

Glenlade, or Inlade, 58.

Gocelin, *Vita Major S. Augustini Anglorum Apostoli*, 36, 42, 63, 84, 85 n., 139, 168, 179-186, 188, 210, 212, 242.

Gratian, *Decretales*, lviii.

Gratian, *Dist.* xciv n.

Gratiosus, Abbot of SS. Peter and Paul, Canterbury, 334.

Green, J. R., *The Making of England*, 233 n., 326, 327 n.

Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, 201 n., 204, 206, 207 n., 237 n., 238 n., 244 n., 283 n., 284 n., 285 n., 286 n., 288 n., 289, 293 n.

Gregory, Exarch of Africa, 299.

Gregory I., Pope, St., not technically a monk, but essentially one, x; fosters monkish independence of control, xviii; his letters, xxxi-xxxvi; questions of his orthodoxy, xxxi; meaning and results of his mission to Britain, 1; his scanty knowledge of Britain, 4; the cause of his solicitude for Britain, his letter to Eulogius, 5, 6; his letters to Candidus, xxxii, 6, 7, 9; to Bishop Januarius, 8; to Bishop Fortunatus, 9; to Queen Brunichildis, 10; the Monk of Whitby's story of St. Gregory and the Anglian slaves, 11-13; the motive that moved him to send his mission, his letter to Queen Brunichildis, he never refers to Saxons, only Anglians, 14; founds St. Andrew's Monastery, 16; his chair, feeds twelve paupers every morning, lxxxix, 21; mention of the monastery in his letter to Rusticiiana, and of miracles there, 22-24; selects Augus-

tine to lead his Anglian mission, 25 ; his letters to Syagrius, and to the companions of Augustine, a doubtful letter, 26 ; strange that one so business-like should not have included in the mission someone used to affairs and no bishop, 27 ; his letter to Stephen, Abbot of Lerins, 28-30 ; will not hear of Augustine relinquishing the mission, 29 ; sends Augustine back with a letter to his companions, constituting him abbot, 30 ; his letter to the Bishops of Tours and Marseilles, 31 ; his letter to Protasius, 32 ; his letters to Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, and to Arigius, 33 ; his letter to Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, and Syagrius, Bishop of Autun, and to Queen Brunichildis, 34 ; to Queen Brunichildis, 88 ; his letter to Eulogius telling him of Augustine's success, 89 ; delays three years in answering Gregory's letter, 99 ; sends several recruits to the mission, books and articles for the service of the church, 100, 114 ; and replies to Augustine's questions, 100 ; notwithstanding doubts of some writers, this correspondence maintained to be genuine, 101 ; the arguments stated, 102, 103 ; the questions stated, with Gregory's responses, 104-114 ; an interpolated question and response, 113 n. ; the books he sent to Augustine, 115-123 ; the sacred vessels, 124 ; the vestments, xc, 124, 126, 127 ; the relics, his gifts to Æthelberht, 125 ; his letter to Venantius, 127, 128 ; his letter to Mellitus, with messages for Augustine and Æthelberht, 128-130 ; his letters to the various bishops in Gaul, asking succour for

Laurence and Mellitus on their return to Britain, 132, 133 ; also to Theodoric, Theodebert, and Queen Brunichildis, and to Chlothaire II., King of Neustria, 134 ; to Æthelberht, 135 ; and to Queen Ethelberga (Bertha), 136, 137 ; his letters to Augustine, 138-143 ; intended that London should be the Metropolitan See after Augustine's day, 139-142 ; his correspondence with Leander, Bishop of Seville, on the sacrament of baptism, 150 ; his intention to make London the Archiepiscopal See frustrated by the ordination of Laurence to Canterbury to succeed Augustine, 176 ; died the same year as Augustine, 177, 198 ; further letters of, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423

Gregory's Letters. See Ewald and Hartmann.

Gregory the Great. See Howorth (Sir Henry).

Gregory the Great. See Dudden (Rev. F. Homes).

Gregory I., Pope, *Dialogues*, 351, 352 n.

Gregory I., Pope, *Epistles*. See Barmby.

Gregory I., Pope, *Magna Moralia*, 90.

Gregory, Bishop of Tours, *History of the Franks*, xxxvi, lxvi, 39, 40, 128, 150, 175, 176 n., 352 n., 353 n., 354 n.

Grisar, H., *History of Rome and the Popes*, 16, 407, 408 n.

Grisar, H., in *Civiltà Cattolica*, 102 n.

Grisar, H., *Analecta*, 281 n., 403 n.

Guecha, King of East Anglia, 245.

Guizot, F. P. G., *Civilisation in Europe*, 320 n.

Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, 184.

Haddan, A. W., *Remains*, 161, 162 n., 166, 195, 196 n., 234.

Haddan, A. W., and Stubbs, W., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain*, xxxix, l, li, liii, lv n., lvi n., lvii, lviii, lix n., lxi, lxi, lxiii, lxiv, xciii n., xciv n., xcvi n., xcviia n., 26 n., 27 n., 62 n., 64 n., 66 n., 69 n., 90 n., 103, 110 n., 112 n., 113 n., 125 n., 152 n., 153, 157, 168 n., 177 n., 194 n., 211 n., 212, 215 n., 233 n., 235 n., 241, 321 n.

Handbook to Land Charters and other Saxon Documents. See Earle (J.).

Hardwick, Chas., *Thomas of Elmham*, xl n., xli n., xlii, lxxv, xcii, xcvi n., 115 n., 124 n.

Hardwick, Chas., *Christian Church in the Middle Ages*, 234.

Hardy, Sir T. D., *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain, etc.*, xcvi n., 42 n., 43 n., 59 n., 168 n., 173 n., 216 n., 235 n., 320, 321 n., 333 n.

Harpsfield, N., *Historia Angliana Ecclesiastica*, 171.

Hasted, E., *Kent*, 69 n.

Hauck, A., *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 40 n.

Heathen feasts, their conversion into Christian festivals, 130-132.

Heathen temples, the Pope's counsels to Augustine how to deal with them, 128-130.

Hefele, C. J. von, *History of the Councils*, 149, 381, 382 n., 383 n., 399 n.

Henry, Emperor, 180.

Heraclius, Exarch of Africa, afterwards Emperor of Byzantium, 200; refuses obedience to Constantinople, 200; defeats Phocas and is proclaimed Augustus, 201; his character and genius, 216, 217; his attempt to secure peace with the Persians at Chalcedon,

217; contemplates moving the capital to Carthage, aided by a loan from the Church starts a great crusade, 218; and defeats the Persians, and returns in triumph, 219; his efforts for internal peace, 220-222; the deterioration of his genius, 269-270; loses one-half of his empire to the Saracens, 270; Muhammed's letter to him, and the presents he sends in return, 272; his death, 277; his attitude towards the Monophysites, 378.

Heraclius, grandson of Heraclius the Emperor. See Constans II.

Heraclonas, 277, 278.

Hickes, Geo., *Diss. Ep.*, 1.

Hilarion, first Abbot of St. Andrew's, 24.

Historia Angliana Ecclesiastica. See Harpsfield (N.).

Historical MSS. Commission, 36 n.

History of the English Church. See Hunt (W.).

History of the Franks. See Gregory, Bishop of Tours.

History of the Later Roman Empire. See Bury (Prof. J.).

History of Rome and the Popes. See Grisar (H.).

Hole, Rev. C., in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, lxxix.

Holmes, G. W., *The Age of Justinian and Theodora*, 413, 414 n.

Holy Rood, captured by the Persians, 217, 218; restored by Heraclius, 219.

Hone, W., *Year Book*, 131.

Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, lix, lxviii; succeeds Justus, 268, 318; succeeds by Paulinus, 318; he ordains Felix as Bishop of Dunwich, and sends him as missionary to East Anglia, 321, 322; at Felix's death consecrates his deacon Thomas to the see, 325; and at his death ordains Berctgils in his place, 326;

sends Romanus, Bishop of Rochester, on an embassy to the Pope, invites Paulinus to become Bishop of Rochester, 333; on the death of Paulinus ordains Ithamar in his place, his death and epitaph, 335.

Honorius, Pope, xxiv, lxxi; his letters to Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, lxiii, lxxii; succeeds Boniface v., 239, 278; of a noble family, 278; his wise acts, his epitaph, 279; his letter to the Council of Toledo, 280, 317; the reply from Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa, 280, 281; his letter to the Scots of Ireland, his part in the Monothelite controversy, 282; his munificence in restoring the churches, 283, and in church building, 284-288; founds a monastery in his house near the Lateran, his death, 289; his letters to Sergius on the Monophysite schism, 380-404.

Hook, Dr. W. F., *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, 233.

Hope, W. H. St. J., *Archæologia Cantiana*, 70 n., 72-76, 172-173.

Howorth, Sir Henry H., *St. Gregory the Great*, vii, xxxi, lxxxix, 126, 151, 304.

Hrofaescaester. *See* Rochester.

Hugh, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 187.

Hughes, Prof. M'Kenna, in *The Mission of Augustine*, lxxxix, 59.

Hunt, W., *History of the English Church*, 108 n., 167 n.

Ingoberga, 39.

Inlade. *See* Glenlade.

Inscript. Christ. *See* De Rossi.

Interpreters, 61.

Iolo MSS., 154.

Ireland, Church in, 4; derived from Gaul, little or no intercourse with Rome in sixth century, 5.

Irminric. *See* Eormenric.

Isaac, Exarch of Ravenna, 278, 290, 294.

Isidore, St., Archbishop of Seville, 227, 228, 314.

Isidore, Hispalensis episcopi, *Opera*, 57 n.

Ithamar, Bishop of Rochester, succeeds Paulinus, probably the first Englishman made a bishop, 335.

Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 102 n., 280, 290.

Jaffé, *Mon. Maguntiana*, 152 n.

James the Deacon, 193, 328, 329.

James, Dr. M. R., *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, 116, 117, 121.

Janus, 397 n.

Jerome, *Eps.*, xcvi n.

Jerusalem, taken by the Persians, the Patriarch carried into captivity, massacres there, 217.

Jews, constrained to become Christians by Phocas, they revolt, 200; ransom Christians from the Persians to slaughter them, 217; Heraclius' treatment of them, their wealth and power, naturally aggressive, 221; massacred in Palestine and at Edessa, compulsorily baptized in Spain, 222; persecuted in Spain under Sisebut, 227; expelled from Spain, 280.

John, Abbot of Biclaro, afterwards Bishop of Gerona, 229.

John, Abbot of St. Augustine's, 99, 236 n.

John the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory*, 24, 102 n.

John, Exarch of Ravenna, 238.

John II., Pope, 407, 408.

John III., King of Portugal, 187.

John IV., Pope, succeeds Severinus, between his election and consecration writes a letter to the Scots, 291; adds an oratory to the Lateran Baptistery, 292; his death and burial, 293; took

no part in the disputes about Monothelism, 387.

Jonas, *Life of St. Bertulf of Bobbio*. *See* Migne.

Justinian's *Code*, 8, 109.

Justus, first Bishop of Rochester, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury lxii, lxx, lxxi; one of the recruits to the mission sent in response to Augustine's letter to the Pope, 100, 125; ordained Bishop, 169; of Rochester, 171; signs joint letter to the Scots, 208-209; and to the British bishops, 210; on the relapse of Kent and East Anglia to idolatry, withdraws with Mellitus to Gaul, 232; recalled by Eadbald on his conversion, returns to Rochester, 234; a letter to him from Boniface v., 240, 242, 243, xcvi; on the death of Mellitus he was the only remaining Roman bishop in Britain, and succeeds him as Archbishop, 242; he consecrates Romanus Bishop of Rochester, 243; sends him on a mission to Pope Honorius, 244; probable date of his death, 268, 269; dedication to, xcvi.

K.C.D. (i.e. *Kem. Cod. Dip.*), 157 n., 171 n.

Kemble, J. M., *Codex Diplomaticus*, xxxvii, 1, lli, llii, lv, 55 n.

Kenulf, King of Mercia, 177.

Kenwalch or Coinwalch, King of Wessex, 324.

Kingston-under-Barham-Downs, 54.

Labbe, P., *Councils*, 279, 392 n., 398 n.

Laodicea, Bishop of. *See* Anatolius, St.

Lateran, First Synod of, 300, 301.

Laurence, Nuncio at Constantinople, 416.

Laurence the presbyter, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, sent by Augustine on a mission to Rome, xxxiv; brings back letters from the Pope, xxxv; sent by Augustine to Rome to tell the Pope that the English had adopted the faith and that he had been made Bishop, 88, 103, 208; never received the pall, so appointed no suffragans, 127; ordained by Augustine to the See of Canterbury, 174; this made it difficult to transfer the Archiepiscopal See to London, 176; had done much to strengthen the foundations of the Church, 208; his letter to the Scots, 208, 209; and to the British Bishops, 210; a doubtful letter to him from Pope Boniface, 211; on the point of withdrawing from his charge, spends the night in St. Augustine's Church, where St. Peter appears to him, 232, and scourges him; he shows the marks to Eadbald, who forsakes idolatry, his epitaph, 233; his death, 235; and burial, 236; fabulous tales of him, few churches dedicated to him, xcvi.

Lavisse, E., *Histoire de France*, lxii, 224, 226 n., 308 n., 309 n., 310 n., 311 n.

Leander, St., Archbishop of Seville, 150, 227, 228.

Leclercq, Dom H., *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, lxvi, 229 n., 299 n., 317.

Leland, J., 120.

Lemanaë. *See* Lympne.

Leo II., Pope, 397, 399, 400.

Leo III., Pope, 27, 177.

Leo IX., Pope, 180.

Leontius, Roman general, 199.

Lerins (St. Honorat), 28, 29, 30, 32.

Letaldus. *See* Liudhard.

Lethardus. *See* Liudhard.

Libellus Synodicus, 291.

Liber Diurnus, lxv, 205, 238, 291, 399, 400.

Liber Eliensis, 324, 325.

Liber Land, 155.

Liber Pontificalis, lxiv, lxv, 66 n., 102 n., 203, 204, 206 n., 207, 237, 238, 239, 244 n., 279, 283, 287, 288, 289, 291, 293, 294, 304, 305 n., 397, 398, 407, 408, 415.

Licerius, Archbishop of Arles, 32.

Licinius, Bishop of Angers, 133.

Liebermann, F., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 214 n.

Lilla, thane to King *Æ* Edwin, 257.

Liudhard (Lethardus or Letal-dus), Chaplain to Queen Bertha, called Bishop of Soissons, 40; but more likely of Senlis, 41; probably a bishop *in partibus*, seems to have died before Augustine's arrival, Gocelin's mention of him, 42; other legends of him, 43; no doubt he built St. Martin's Church, 47; he used the Gallican rite, 48, 108; his translation at the rebuilding of St. Augustine's Abbey, 182.

Liuva II., King of the Visigoths, 226.

Livett, in *Archæologia Cantiana*, 172.

Livinus, St., the Apostle of Brabant, 173.

Lloyd, J. E., *History of Wales*, 251 n.

London, bishopric of, intended to be Metropolitan after Augustine's death, in place of Canterbury, 139, 141, 142; and to include the Welsh dioceses, 144; Mellitus ordained Bishop of, 169; Laurence's ordination to the See of Canterbury prevented the removal of the Archiepiscopal See to London, 176.

London, Bishop of. *See* Mellitus.

London, St. Paul's Cathedral, built by *Æ*thelberht, not a trace of this building existing, said to have been founded on the site of a temple of Diana, always referred to its patron saint and not as other cathedrals to the city, 170.

Luna, Bishop of. *See* Venantius.

Lupus, Bishop of Châlons-sur-Saône, 133.

Lyminge, the first nunnery amongst Saxons or Anglians founded here, 330; Saxon church at, 331, 332.

Lympne, 52, 53.

Lyons, Bishop of. *See* *Æ*therius.

Lyons, Council of, 194.

Mabillon, J., *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, 150, 166, 167 n.

Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, 393.

Maclean, Rev. C. F., in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, lxxix.

Maclear, Dr. G. F., *The English*, 262.

Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, 121.

Maestrich, Bishop of. *See* Amandas, St.

Magh Lene, Synod of, 282.

Mann, Father, H. K., *Lives of the Popes of the Early Middle Ages*, xlvi, lxv, lxxxix, 276 n., 277 n., 281 n., 304 n., 381 n.

Mansi, lviii n., xciv n., xcvi, 113 n., 297 n., 386 n.

Marriage, degrees of consanguinity in which permissible, 109, III.

Marseilles, 29, 32.

Marseilles, Bishop of. *See* Serenus.

Martin, Bishop of Tours, 31.

Martin I., Pope, xxiv, lxv; succeeds Theodore, was he consecrated without Imperial confirmation? 298; calls the first Lateran Council, 300, 301, 388, 404; a fresh Pope appointed in his place, 302, 388; he is tried for political intrigues and sent into exile, his death, 303; his deposition discussed, 304-308; his letter to Amandus, Bishop of Maestrich, 307, 308.

Martyrology of Donegal, 210.

Mason, A. J., Canon, *The Mission of Augustine to England*, lxxviii, 13, 64, 66 n., 179, 192 n., 193 n., 194 n., 213, 268, 341, 342.

Maurice, Emperor, 198, 199, 201.

Maximian, Abbot of St. Andrew's, 25.

Maximus, St., 299, 300.

Melantius, Bishop of Rouen, 133.

Mellitus, first Bishop of London, xxxv, xxxvi; one of the recruits of the mission sent in response to Augustine's letter to the Pope, afterwards Bishop of London, 100, 125; never received the pall, so consecrated no suffragans, 127, xcvi; Gregory's letter to him, 128-130; ordained Bishop of the East Saxons, whose metropolis was London 169; had probably little influence outside King Saberct's Court, 191; joins in the letter of Laurencius to the Scots, 208-209; and to the British bishops, said to have gone to Rome to confer with Pope Boniface, 210; but doubtful, 211, 212; is banished for refusing the Eucharist to the unbaptized kings, 231; withdraws to Gaul, 232; recalled by Eadbald on his conversion, but rejected by the people of London, probably lived after at Canterbury, where he consecrated the church Eadbald had built, 234, 241; Boniface IV.'s letter to him, 240, 241; his prayers stay a fire at Canterbury, his death, miracles at his tomb, never received the pall, his epitaph, 242, xcii; relics of him, xcvi; legend connecting him with the foundation of Westminster Abbey, xci.

Menas, Bishop of Toulon, 133.

Metz, Bishop of. *See* Agilfus, Arnulf.

Micklethwaite, Mr., lxxx, 69.

Micklethwaite, Mr., in *Archæological Journal*, 44, 45, 72, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 264, 332.

Migne, J. P., *Patrologia*, Latin series, 278 n., 282 n., 369 n.

Migne, J. P., *Patrologia*, Greek series, 299 n.

Mildred, St., 330, 331.

Milman, H. H., Dean, *Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral*, 170 n.

Minster, 62.

Mission of St. Augustine to England. *See* Hughes (Prof.), Mason (Canon), Oman (Prof.), and Wilson (Rev. H. A.).

Mommesen, Th., 102 n.

Monasticism, not of Christian origin, xi; its central idea, xii, xiii; the evolution of the monastery from the hermitage, xiii; regulation of the life of the community, xiv; the Benedictine Rule, xv; the varied labour in monastic life, xv, xvi; the independence of each monastery leads to laxity of discipline in some, xvii; the best remedy episcopal visitation, always objected to by the monks, xviii; this tended to destroy the ideal of church polity, xix; the monastic theory of the surrender of the will of the monk to his abbot spreads to the laity, xix.

Monk of Whitby, the, lxvi, 11-13, 335.

Monothelism, 220, 221, 277, 290, 294, 296, 297, 301, 366-405.

Montalembert, C. F. R., *Monks of the West*, 41.

Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, xcvi.

Monumenta Historica Britannicæ, xcvi n., 49 n., 50 n., 57 n., 245 n., 246 n., 249 n., 250 n., 256 n., 257 n., 320 n., 325 n., 334 n.

Muhammed, his letters to Heraclius, Chosroes, and the King of Abyssinia, his death, 272.

Muhammedanism, derived largely from the Jewish religion, 270; the rewards it promised to its followers, its war against the Empire encouraged by the Jews, 271-272; its conquests in Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, 273; and Egypt, the political and economical effect of its conquests, 274; its effect upon the Papacy, 275-276;

Father Mann's remarks on this effect, 276 n., 277 n.
 Murray's *Yorkshire*, 267 n.

Narses, 199.

Nathanael, Abbot of SS. Peter and Paul, Canterbury, 336 n.

Nennius, 49, 50, 57 n., 245, 249, 263, 326 n.

Nicæa, Council of, 112, 146, 147, 175.

Northumbria, its inhabitants and extent, its dialects, 248; two divisions, Baernicia and Deira, its early rulers, 249.

Nothelm, Archbishop of Canterbury, xxxi, lxviii, 102.

Nova Legenda. *See* Capgrave.

Œcumical Council (6th), 390-404.

Olympius, Exarch of Ravenna, 302.

Oman, Prof. C. W. C., in *The Mission of Augustine*, lxxvii.

Omar, Khalif, 273.

Onuphrius Panvinus, 203.

Origines du Culte Chrétien. *See* Duchesne.

Orleans, Council of, 194.

Osfrid, 256, 265, 326, 332.

Oswald, 332.

Palgrave, Sir Francis, *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*, lxxv n., 153, 156, 157 n.

Pall or pallium, the, 126-127, 139.

Paris, Bishop of. *See* Simplicius, 133.

Paul the Deacon, 12, 13, 202 n., 207 n.

Paul, Exarch of Ravenna, 294, 296, 302.

Paulinus, Bishop of York, lxvi, lxvii, lxix; one of the recruits to the mission sent in response to Augustine's letter to the Pope, 100, 125; probably accompanied Redwald to East Anglia on the King's return from a visit to Æthelberht, 246; appears to Ædwin in a vision, 251; consecrated bishop by Justus and accom-panies Æthelberga to the Court of Ædwin, 257; baptizes Eanfleda, Ædwin's daughter, and eleven families, 258; he reminds Ædwin of his vision, who consults his counsellors before embracing Christianity, 259-261; confused by some writers with Run, 263, xcvi; continues preaching in Northumbria with great success during Ædwin's reign, 265, 266, 327; churches he built, and crosses commemorating his preaching, 266-268; consecrates Honorius Archbishop of Canterbury, 318; leaves Northumbria at Ædwin's death and accompanies the Queen back to Kent, 329; at the death of Romanus is appointed to the see of Rochester, 333; his death, 334; burial and translation, 335.

Pearson, C. H., *History of England during the Early and Middle Ages*, 247 n.

Pecham, Robert, tablet to, in S. Gregorio, 20.

Peers, C. R., in *Archæological Journal*, 47, 73-76, 330, 331, 332 n.

Pelagius, Bishop of Tours, 31, 36.

Pelagius I., Nuncio at Constantinople, afterwards Pope, 12, 408, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416.

Penda, King of Mercia, his invasion of East Anglia, 323, 326; and of Wessex, 324.

Pepin, 223, 309, 310.

Percival, H. R., *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 368 n., 369 n., 390 n., 392 n., 394 n., 395 n., 396 n., 398 n., 399 n., 402 n.

Persia. *See* Chosroes.

Pertz, 109 n.

Peter of Blois, xl n., xli.

Peter the monk, afterwards first abbot of St. Augustine's, sent to Rome by Augustine to inform the Pope of the adoption of the faith by the English, 88, 103; first abbot

of St. Augustine's, went on a mission to Gaul and was drowned, buried at Boulogne, 99.

Petronius, Abbot of SS. Peter and Paul, Canterbury, 334, 336 n.

Phocas, Emperor of Byzantium, his cruelties, 198, 199; constrains the Jews to become Christians, 200; a monument erected at Rome in his honour, his complacency towards the Popes, he is defeated by Heraclius and executed, 201; said to have conferred on the Pope the title of Universal Bishop, 205; gives the Pantheon to Boniface IV. for Christian worship, 207.

Pitra, Cardinal, lxxxix.

Plague. *See* Bubonic Plague.

Plummer, C. *See* Bede, edited by.

Pont de Sé, 36.

Procopius, his fantastic fables about Britain, 4.

Protadius, Mayor of the Palace under Queen Brunichildis, 223.

Protasius, Bishop of Aix, 29.

Ptolemy, 53.

Pyrrhus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 294-295.

Quartodecimans, 146, 147.

Quenburga, 256, 265.

Quentavic. *See* Etaples.

Racuulfe. *See* Reculvers.

Raegenhere, 247, 253.

Raine, Canon, in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, lxxix, xciiii n.

Raine, *Historians of York*, xciii.

Ravenna, Exarch of, 201, 202.

Reccared, King of the Visigoths, 226.

Reculver, xciii, 53, 55, 58, 68, 90.

Redwald, King of East Anglia, said to have been converted to Christianity in Kent, 51; the fourth Bretwalda, 245; extent of his kingdom, place of his capital, he combined Christian worship with idol-

try, visits Æthelberht and may have taken Paulinus back with him, 246; shelters Ædwin, King of Deira, refuses to betray him to Æthelfrid, 247, 251; whom he marches against, defeats and kills, 247, 253; date of his death unknown, 248; Bede's account of his treatment of Ædwin, 250-252; at his death, Eorpwald succeeds, 318.

Regulbium. *See* Reculver.

Relics sent by Gregory to Augustine, 125.

Reptacestir. *See* Richborough.

Retesborough. *See* Richborough.

Rhys, Sir John, *Celtic Britain*, 130 n., 163, 249 n.

Richborough, 52, 53, 54, 58; the probable landing-place of St. Augustine, 59, xc; probable place of conference with Æthelberht, 63.

Ritupis. *See* Richborough.

Rivington, Luke, 379 n.

Rochester, Justus ordained bishop, 171; the various names by which it has been called, sacked by Ethelred of Mercia, 172; the church that Æthelberht built there, 172-173; Romanus consecrated bishop, 243.

Rochester, Bishop of. *See* Justus, Gundulf, Romanus, Paulinus, Damian, Theodore.

Rochester Cathedral, Justus ordained bishop, 171; remains of the original building built by Æthelberht, 172-173; unknown how staff was constituted, 173; its close dependence on Canterbury, 243.

Rofa. *See* Rochester.

Roiti. *See* Rochester.

Romanus, Bishop of Rochester, 243; sent by Justus on a mission to Pope Honorius, and drowned on the way, 244, 333.

Rome, Caelian Hill, the, 15.

Rome, Palatine, the, 17.

Rome, Pantheon, 206-208.
 Rome, Phocas' Monument, 201.
 Rome, St. Andrew's Monastery, afterwards St. Gregory's, 15, 16, 17-27, 29, 69, 71, 169, 172, 193; chapel of St. Andrew, 21, 23; chapel of S. Barbara, 21; chapel of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, 16; chapel of S. Silvia, 21.
 Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae*, 279 n.
 Rouen, Bishop of. *See* Melantius.
 Routlege, Canon, in *Archeologia Cantiana*, 73-76.
 Rufinianus, afterwards abbot of St. Augustine's, one of the recruits to the mission sent in response to Augustine's letter to the Pope, 100, 125, 236 n.
 Rusticiana, a lady in Constantinople, Gregory's letter to, 22-24.
 Rutupiae. *See* Richborough.
 Sabercht. *See* Sebert.
 Sabinianus, Pope, 202, 422; his rule, 202-203; favours the priests rather than the monks, 238; successively Nuncio at Constantinople, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420; Bishop of Jadera, 421, 422; and Callipolis, 422.
 Sacred vessels sent by Gregory to Augustine, 100, 123-124, 127.
 Saracens. *See* Muhammedanism.
 Saragossa, Bishop of. *See* Braulio.
 Sardican Council, 149.
 Scotlandus, or Scollandus, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 181-182, 188.
 Sebert or Sabercht, King of the East Saxons 50, 51, 169; said to have built monastery of St. Peter's on Thorney Island, his tomb in the present abbey, 171; at his death, leaves his three sons as his heirs, 231, 236; who fell together in battle, 232.
 Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, 31, 133.
 Sergius, Patriarch of Constanti- nople, 201, 218, 220, 378, 380, 393.
 Severianus, 227.
 Severinus, Pope, succeeds Honorius, his career short and troubled, 290; his character and death, 291; took no part in the disputes about Monothelism, 387.
 Seville, Archbishops of. *See* Leander, Isidore.
 Seville, Archiepiscopal library, 228, 229.
 Shahan, Persian general, 117.
 Sigeberht of East Anglia succeeds his brother Eorpwald, a learned and Christian man, received the faith in Gaul, 319; his pedigree, xcix; brings Felix to England, 321; founds a school at Dunwich, 322, 323; retires from the world and enters a monastery, is withdrawn from the monastery to lead his people against Penda's invasion and is killed, 323.
 Silverius, Pope, 409, 410, 411.
 Simplicius, Bishop of Paris, 133.
 Sisenand, King of the Visigoths, 313, 314, 317.
 Sisibut, King of the Visigoths, 222, 226, 227, 312.
 Skene, W. F., *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, 250 n.
 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, 326 n.
 Slave traffic, xxxii, 6-10.
 Slavonians, 220.
 Soissons, 37.
 Soissons, Bishop of. *See* Droctigisilus.
 Solinus, *Polyhistoriae*, 57 n.
 Sorcery, 62.
 Spain, the Church in, xxvii, xxviii; authorities for history of, lxii; the state of, during Augustine's time, 226-230; in the time of his early successors, 312-317.
 Spelman, Sir Henry, *Concilia*, xlvi.
 Spelman, Sir Henry, *Archæologus*, lxi.
 Sprott, Thomas, *Chronica*, xxxix li, lxxvi, 41, 70, 125.

Stanley, A. P., Dean, *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*, 60, 67, 72, 98.

Statius, *Silv.*, 201 n.

Statutes of St. Paul's, 171.

Stokes, *Tripartite Life*, 129 n., 150 n.

Stour, river, 57, 58.

Stourmouth, 57.

Stubbs, Bishop W., in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, lxxix, xcvi, xcvi n.

Suinthila, King of the Visigoths, 313, 314, 315.

Swale, river, 77.

Syagrius, Bishop of Autun, xxxiii, xxxiv, 25, 26, 34.

Tablet, the, Abbot Gasquet in, 101 n.

Terenanus, Archbishop of Armagh, 210.

Tertullian, *De Bapt.*, 86 n.

Tertullian, *De Pallio*, 126 n.

Textus Roffensis. *See* Ernulf, Bishop.

Thanet, Island of, place of Augustine's landing, many differences of opinion as to exact spot, 57; other names in early writers, 57 n.; the missionaries at first ordered by Æthelberht to remain there, 61.

Theodebert, King of Burgundy, 34, 35, 134, 223.

Theodora, Empress, 409, 413.

Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, lxiv, 179, 197, 336.

Theodore, Archbishop, *Penitential*, 62.

Theodore (Calliopas), Exarch of Ravenna, 294, 302.

Theodore, Pope, succeeds John IV., his parentage, 293; events of his reign, 294; his opposition to Monothelism, 294, 387; the churches he built, 297; his death, 298.

Theodoric, King of Austrasia, 17, 35, 134, 223.

Theodosia, Empress, 408.

Theophanes, *Historia*, 294 n., 350 n.

Thomas, Bishop of Dunwich, 325, 326.

Thorne, William, *Chronica*, xxxix, lvi, lxxvi, xcvi n., 13, 41, 43 n., 59, 60 n., 67, 70, 71, 72, 90, 115, 117, 124, 171, 177, 186, 187, 235.

Tidil. *See* Tytil.

Tighernac, 326 n.

Tytil. *See* Tytil.

Todd, J. H., *St. Patrick*, 150 n.

Toledo, Council of, 280, 314-317.

Tonsure, the, the divergence between the British use and the Roman, 149; in conference with the British bishops Augustine concedes the question of, 164; a plate in Mabillon illustrating the difference, 166.

Toulon, Bishop of. *See* Menas.

Tours, 31.

Tours, Bishop of. *See* Gregory, Martin, Pelagius.

Twine, T., *De Rebus Albion.*, 58 n.

Twysden, Sir Roger, *Historiae Anglicanae, Scriptores X.*, 171.

Typus, the, 297, 301, 302, 303, 386, 387, 388, 389.

Tytil, King of East Anglia, 245.

Uffa, King of East Anglia, 245.

Valentinian III., 17.

Valentio, Abbot of St. Andrew's, 24.

Vatican Council, 403.

Vecta. *See* Guecha.

Venantius, Bishop of Luna, 127.

Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, 32, 33, 87, 112, 132.

Vestments sent by Gregory to Augustine, 100, 124, 126-127, xc.

Vienne, Bishop of. *See* Desiderius.

Vigilius, Pope, 407, 409, 410, 411, 412.

Vigilius, Pope, *Const. pro. dam.*, 369 n.

Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, 369.

Vita Sancti Cuthberti, 360 n.

Vitalian, Pope, 26, 338.
 Vuffa. *See* Uffa.
 Vuscfrean, 332.

Wales, Church in, 4 ; derived from Gaul, little or no intercourse with Rome in sixth century, 5.

Wanley, H., *Librorum Vet. Sept. Catalogue*, 116, 120.

Wanley, H., in Hickes' *Thesaurus*, 119.

Wantsum, 57, 58.

Westminster, Monastery of St. Peter's, said to have been built by Sebert, his tomb there, 171, xci.

Westwood, Prof., *Palaeographia Sacra*, "Psalter of Augustine," 116, 118, 119, 121.

Wharton, Henry, *Anglia Sacra*, xliv, xlvi n., 36, 325.

Whitaker, T. D., *Loidis and Elmote*, 266 n.

Wido, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 182-186.

Wighard, elected to succeed Deusdedit as Archbishop, goes to Rome for consecration, 337 ; and dies there of the plague, 338.

Wilfred, St., 20.

Wilk, *Conc. inter Const. Lanfr.*, xciv n.

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, lviii, lx, xcix, 27, 172, 212, 243, 325 n.

William the Conqueror, 182.

Willis, Prof. R., *Architectural History of Cathedral of Canterbury*, 93, 94, 96, 97 n.

Wilson, Rev. H. A., in *The Mission of Augustine*, lxxix, 66 n., 151, 152, 192-194.

Witteric, King of the Visigoths, 226.

Wolsey, Cardinal, 187.

Wright, *Biog. Brit.*, xci n.

Wuffa. *See* Uffa.

Wulfric, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 180-181.

Wuscfrean, 265.

Wyatt, E. G. P., *Memoir on St. Gregory and the Gregorian Music*, xc.

Yffi, 332.

York, created a Metropolitan
 See, 139 ; intended to govern twelve dioceses, 140.

York, Bishop of. *See* Paulinus.

York Minster, the first church (wooden) on its site, 262 ; the first stone church commenced by Ædwin and finished by Oswald, 263 ; its remains discovered, 264.

Zacharias, Pope, 102, 109, 152, 176.