THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN BEFORE A.D. 1000

In Two Volumes, each 5s. net.
With Chronological Table and Index.

Dr. Hastings says:—"It has all the satisfactoriness we associate with Dr. Plummer's work—the scholarship, the conscientiousness, the grace. For popular reading it will supersede all the rest, and it is so clear and so reliable that it could be set for examination."

"Dr. Plummer writes with charm as well as with careful accuracy. We get here history that is reliable, clothed in an attractive dress. We can conceive of no better and more interesting introduction to the study of Church history than the volume before us."—*Record*.

"Dr. Plummer's style is admirably clear, there is enough here to make us look forward to Dr. Plummer's second volume, which will deal with a later, less familiar, but not less momentous, portion of the first millennium."—*Church Family Newspaper*.

LONDON : ROBERT SCOTT

Library of Historic Theology

EDITED BY THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.
DEAN AND CHAPLAIN OF WHITELANDS COLLEGE.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN BEFORE A.D. 1000

LIBRARY OF HISTORIC THEOLOGY

EDITED BY THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.

Dean and Chaplain of Whitelands College.

Each Volume, Demy 8*vo, Cloth, Red Burnished Top,* 5*s. net.*

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. *Vols. I.* and *II.* [*Ready.*
By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D. (formerly Master of University College, Durham).

CHARACTER AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. the HON. EDWARD LYTTELTON, M.A. (Head Master of Eton College). [*Ready.*

THE CREEDS: THEIR HISTORY, NATURE AND USE. [*Ready.*
By the Rev. HAROLD SMITH, M.A. (Lecturer at the London College of Divinity).

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE. [*Ready.*
By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D. (Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford).

MISSIONARY METHODS, ST. PAUL'S OR OURS? [*Ready.*
By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL (Hulsean Prize Essay). [*Ready.*
By the Rev. S. NOWELL ROSTRON, M.A., Late Principal of St. John's Hall, Durham; Vicar of St. Lawrence, Kirkdale).

The following works are in Preparation:—

THE HISTORY AND METHODS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.
By the Rev. Prebendary B. REYNOLDS (Archbishops' Inspector of Training Colleges). [*May,* 1912.

MARRIAGE.
By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A. (Chaplain of the London Diocesan Penitentiary, High-gate). [*September,* 1912

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.
By Professor EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D. [*October,* 1912.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. Professor T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc. (President of the British Association, 1910). [*October,* 1912.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. (formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford). [*October,* 1912.

THE CHURCH AND THE INDIVIDUAL. [*October,* 1912.
By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. (Editor of the *English Church Review*).

POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. [*November,* 1912.
By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A. (Honorary Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society).

MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY. [*January,* 1913.
By the Rev. W. K. FLEMING, M.A., B.D.

THE NATURE OF FAITH AND THE CONDITIONS OF ITS PROSPERITY.
By the Rev. P. N. WAGGETT, M.A. (of the Society of St. John the Evangelist).

THE CHURCH OUTSIDE THE EMPIRE. [*October,* 1913.
By the Rev. C. R. DAVEY BIGGS, D.D. (Rector of S. Philip and S. James, Oxford).

Other Volumes in this Library will be announced from time to time, full particulars may be obtained from the Publisher.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN BEFORE A.D. 1000

BY THE REV.

ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D

LATE MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM
FORMERLY FELLOW AND SENIOR TUTOR
OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

VOL. II

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
MCMXII

CONTENTS

VOL. II.

PAGE

CHAPTER I

The English Missionaries 1

CHAPTER II

The Penitential System and Penitentials . . 77

CHAPTER III

The Revival under Alfred 101

CHAPTER IV

The Revival under Dunstan . . . 126

CHAPTER V

The Danes 171

CHAPTER VI

Summary and Conclusion 214

Chronological Table 245

Index 250

VOLUME II

CHAPTER I

THE ENGLISH MISSIONARIES

IT was pointed out in the first volume (pp. 53, 67, 192) that the conversion of the English led directly to the conversion of other nations. England itself became a missionary centre, sending out its own evangelists, by whose instrumentality, from the seventh to the eleventh centuries, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Iceland were converted to Christianity. This excellent work began as soon as the infant Church of England had set its own house in order.[1] Indeed, Theodore of Tarsus had not

[1] "Hardly had all England received the faith when it began its marvellous work in Germany. The foresight of Gregory was justified by the event; the consequences of S. Augustine's mission went far beyond the spiritual conquest of the English. They spread all over the Teutonic race. The loss of the East which had failed in its mission and allowed the State to interfere with its faith, was more than compensated by the gain of the nation, to whom the future of Europe and the world was entrusted" (J. B. Dalgairns, Preface to Hope's *S. Boniface and the Conversion of Germany*. p. x.).

completed his great achievement of organizing the new-born Church (I., p. 199), when its missions to another and closely kindred nation had begun. And it was this kinship between the Christian English and their heathen brethren on the Continent which greatly facilitated the task of converting the latter. There are still many people who believe that the "gift of Tongues" which was manifested at Pentecost was bestowed upon the Apostles in order to aid them in their work of making disciples of all the nations. There is no trace of their ever making use of a power of speaking foreign languages in their subsequent labours: neither in Acts nor in any of the Epistles is there any mention of the employment of so remarkable and so useful a possession. Whatever may be the relation between the Tongues manifested on the day of Pentecost and the Tongues manifested in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xiv.), it is evident that both gifts were transitory, and that Tongues in the Corinthian Church were not a power of speaking the languages of foreign nations.[1] And in the missionary work of the Apostles no such miraculous power was required. Greek was almost a universal language in the Roman Empire. With Greek and Aramaic, and perhaps a little Latin, Apostles could make themselves understood in most places, either directly or through an interpreter. The English Apostles who

[1] Robertson and Plummer, 1 *Corinthians*, pp. 301–321; Walker, *The Gift of Tongues*, p. 63.

worked for the conversion of Northern Europe were in an equally happy condition as regards language. They were Teutons returning to Teutons (I., pp. 38–40) after an interval of less than three hundred years. No doubt the language which their ancestors had brought from Germany had developed in Britain in a manner somewhat different from the way in which it had continued to develop in Germany; but we may reasonably believe that in the seventh century Englishmen and Germans would quickly be able to understand one another.[1] The great success of the English missionaries on the Continent amounts almost to proof of this hypothesis. And then also, when the frontiers of the Roman Empire were reached, Latin would sometimes come in as a help to mutual understanding. All these English missionaries knew Latin: they worshipped in that language every day

WILFRID

The Englishman who made a beginning with this work was Wilfrid.[2] It has been pointed out (I., p. 126)

[1] Freeman, *Old English History*, p. 137. "Some of the oldest specimens of the languages of continental Germany are the translations made for the use of the German converts" (R. W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, p. 128).

[2] It must always be remembered that Keltic missionaries from Ireland and Scotland were at work on the Continent long before Englishmen, from St. Fridolin (c. 500) onwards. Later, when English and other missionaries were occupying the ground in connexion with Rome, the Irish still continued to come, but as teachers or students rather than missionaries.

that when Archbishop Theodore, without consulting Wilfrid, insisted on dividing Wilfrid's diocese into four, Wilfrid appealed to Rome, and went to Rome to plead his cause in person. There is no evidence that Wilfrid objected to the necessary division, but he naturally objected to its being done over his head; and, as Theodore had already secured the approval of King Egfrid, there was no authority in England to which he could appeal. It was to Rome that England owed its Christianity, and it was Rome that had sent Theodore to take charge of the English Christians. What more reasonable, therefore, than that Wilfrid should apply to Rome for redress? Wilfrid might have submitted under protest; but, if he felt that he ought to appeal, there was no one to whom he could apply for help except the Bishop of Rome. And of course, no one could plead his cause so efficaciously as himself. With bishops at Lindsey, Hexham and York, according to Theodore's new scheme, the diocese of Northumbria would not be neglected. Eddius says that Wilfrid appealed with the approval of his brother bishops (*co-episcopi*), which may mean that bishops in other kingdoms objected to Theodore's measures. In his petition to Rome, Wilfrid says that Theodore acted without the assent of any bishop, which is probably true.[1]

[1] Sir Roger Twysden (*Historical Vindication of the Church of England in the Point of Schism*, 34 f.) shows the bearing of Wilfrid's career on the relations between England and Rome,

Wilfrid set out, with a large retinue, in the latter half of 678, and made for Friesland. Bede seems to think that adverse winds drove him out of his course thither (*flante Favonio pulsus est Frisiam*), but Eddius says that he meant to land there and that the wind favoured him. He was hospitably received by the heathen King Aldgilsus, and spent the winter there preaching to him and his subjects. Much the same results followed as when Augustine preached to Ethelbert of Kent. First the king and his court, and then multitudes of the people, embraced Christianity.

Meanwhile King Egfrid and Wilfrid's foes in England had not been idle. The threat to appeal to Rome had been laughed at, but, when Wilfrid started to make it, attempts were made to stop him. It was assumed that Wilfrid would cross to Neustria,[1] which was the common practice, and hence perhaps arose the idea that Wilfrid was driven by bad weather to land in Friesland. Egfrid got Ebroin, who had made himself tyrant in Neustria, to endeavour to capture

as J. C. Robertson points out (*Hist. of Christ. Church*, Bk. II., ch. iii.). See also Collier, *Eccl. Hist.*, Bk. II., cent. vii., who points out that Cuthbert must have approved of Theodore's action, otherwise he would not have accepted the see of Lindisfarne.

[1] Neustria was the territory between the Schelde and the Loire, and Friesland was, roughly, modern Holland. It included much more than modern Friesland. Its inhabitants were regarded as very barbarous, " living like fish in the water, and holding intercourse with other nations only by sea."

Wilfrid. Through the similarity of name, Ebroin's men caught Winfrid, the expelled Bishop of Mercia, who had succeeded Chad at Lichfield (I., p. 189), instead of Wilfrid. Ebroin then sent to Aldgilsus and tried to bribe him to give up Wilfrid, but Aldgilsus tore up the letter and rejected the bribe with scorn. Independently of Egfrid's incitement, Ebroin was hostile to Wilfrid, because Wilfrid had helped Dagobert II to return from exile in Ireland to his native country, Austrasia, where he was an obstacle to Ebroin's schemes.[1]

Dagobert had been in exile for eighteen years, viz., since the death of his father, Sigebert III, King of the Austrasian Franks from A.D. 632 to 656. He had been spirited away by Grimoald, the powerful Mayor of the Palace, who is of importance in ecclesiastical history as having been the promoter of the law which forbad the holding of episcopal synods without the sanction of the king. He was not, however, unfriendly to the Church.[2] Dagobert was a child

[1] The story is told in detail by C. Platts, *Pioneers of our Faith*, ch. 29 ; see also 32 and 35.

[2] There are several rulers bearing this name in the seventh century who must not be confused with one another. (1) This one, who became Mayor of the Palace in Austrasia in 642. (2) King of the Lombards, 662–672. (3) His grandson, Duke of Benevento, 687–689. (4) Ruler of Bavaria and patron of Corbinian, the first Bishop of Freisingen ; he died in 726. Two of the letters of Desiderius, Bishop of Cahors, are addressed to this Mayor of the Palace, *Domino illustri, totius aulae immoque, regni Rectori, Grimoaldo Majori Domus.*

of three when his father died, and Grimoald, after cutting off the long hair which was the sign of royalty, got Dido, Bishop of Poitiers, to smuggle the child away to Ireland; and he then set up his own son Childebert as king. The nobles, however, refused to accept him, captured Grimoald, and handed him over to Clovis, who put him to death that same year, 656. It was Wulfoald, a subsequent Mayor of the Palace, who asked Wilfrid to get Dagobert back from Ireland and restore him to Austrasia; and Wilfrid accomplished this. Wilfrid perhaps knew how munificent Dagobert's father had been to the Church. But the success of Wulfoald in restoring Dagobert was as short as that of Grimoald in sending him into exile. Ebroin, who for long had been one of the leading men in France, and had in 678 got rid of his great opponent, Leodegar, Bishop of Autun, now vanquished Wulfoald and caused Dagobert to be put to death (679). Wilfrid had doubtless acted for the best; yet it might have been better for the peace of Neustria and Austrasia, if Dagobert had never been restored. Ebroin was now almost supreme in France, and became as tyrannical as he had been before he was checked by Leodegar.[1] But his tri-

[1] It was perhaps because of his resolute opposition to this tyrant, and because of the cruel treatment which he received before he was put to death, that Leodegar was canonized and became one of the most popular saints. The Hofkirche at Lucerne is dedicated to him.

umph, like that of Grimoald and Wulfoald, did not last long. He made himself intolerable, and in 681 he was assassinated by one of the nobles. Ebroin was like Grimoald in strengthening the power of the king (i.e., the power of the mayor) against the clergy, but unlike him in being very hostile to the Church. The clergy supported the nobles in resisting the tyranny of Ebroin, and Ebroin persecuted them and put some of them to death.

Missionary work in Friesland was evidently of more immediate interest to Wilfrid than the prosecution of his own cause at Rome, and he did not move onwards until the spring of 679. Even then he did not move quickly. In Austrasia he stayed at the court of Dagobert II, who showed his gratitude to Wilfrid by pressing upon him the bishopric of Strasburg. When Wilfrid declined the offer, he loaded him with gifts, and sent Bishop Deodatus to escort him to the court of Berchtar or Perctarit, King of the Lombards, at Pavia. Here again Ebroin tried to bribe Wilfrid's royal entertainer to surrender him. But the King of the Lombards sent him on safely to Rome. On the return journey he passed through Gaul, and found that Dagobert had been murdered by Ebroin. This and his eagerness to exhibit the Roman decree in his favour (I., p. 128) made him hasten back to England without revisiting his converts in Friesland. But after his release from prison (I., p. 129), he went as a missionary to the South

Saxons, who, in reference to the rest of the island, were almost as foreign as the Frieslanders.[1] Here, instead of his large retinue on the Continent, Wilfrid had only four companions, but he again did good work. King Ethelwalch and his wife were already Christians, but his subjects were heathen savages[2] —so wanting in courage and common sense that they would not venture into deep water to catch fish, and in a time of grievous famine were jumping off the cliffs into the sea rather than endure the pangs of starvation any longer. Wilfrid and his companions taught them to use large nets out at sea, and thus saved them from suicide. After this they became ready hearers; and, as the drought which had caused the famine ended on the day on which a large number of them were baptized, this was regarded as strong evidence of the truth of his teaching. In Friesland Wilfrid's work had been made easier by the fact that the beginning of his preaching was accompanied by a very abundant harvest. One suspects that there was something defective in the Christianity of Ethelwalch. Apparently he had made little or

[1] Florence of Worcester omits the imprisonment and takes Wilfrid direct from Rome to the South Saxons, 679.

[2] The king and queen seem to have made no effort to convert them. A few Irish monks had settled at Bosham, but they do not appear to have accomplished much. The South Saxons remained *gens ignara Dei, simulacris dedita vanis*. By jumping into the sea (they thought) they went direct to Woden.

no effort to convert his subjects until Wilfrid came, and then he forced some of them to abandon idolatry; and when the Isle of Wight was added to his dominions he left the inhabitants there in their original heathenism; for, owing to want of intercourse with the rest of Britain, Wight, like Sussex, remained heathen much longer than other parts of the island. Ethelwalch, however, did give Wilfrid lands and serfs on the peninsular of Selsey, and there Wilfrid built a monastery. He converted the serfs, and at their baptism emancipated them (I., p. 130). When Cædwalla[1] conquered Sussex, slew Ethelwalch, and made himself King of Wessex, he gave Wilfrid a quarter of the Isle of Wight; and here the mission work began again. Wilfrid, however, seems to have left most of the work to his nephew, Bernwini, assisted by a priest named Hiddila. Cædwalla was not yet a Christian, but he was grateful to Wilfrid, who had aided him when he was an exile. It must have been a grievous blow to Wilfrid when Cædwalla put Ethelwalch to death, and perhaps this trouble made him unwilling to stay and work in Cædwalla's dominions. At any rate it was at this time, 686 or 687, that he was reconciled to Theodore and returned

[1] Cædwalla was a turbulent scion of the royal family of the West Saxons who had been for some time in exile. He has no connexion with the British king of the same name who was defeated by Oswald in 634 (I., 96). It is convenient to call the latter Cadwalla.

to work in Northumbria. In 688, Cædwalla repented of his violence in Sussex, Wight and Kent, went on a pilgrimage to Rome, was baptized by Pope Sergius, and died a few days later (April, 689).[1] He was the first of the rulers of English kingdoms to make this journey *ad limina beatorum apostolorum . . . a finibus terrae pio ductus amore* (Bede, *H.E.*, v., 7). Ini, his successor as King of Wessex, did the same thirty-seven years later (725); as also did Offa, King of the East Saxons, in company with Coenred, King of Mercia, in 709.

On two later occasions we find Wilfrid exhibiting his characteristic zeal in the cause of missions. About 692 or 693 he consecrated Suidbert to be bishop of the Frisians, and on his way to prosecute his second appeal in person at Rome he spent some time in Friesland with the missionaries who were carrying on his work there. This was probably in the winter of 703 and 704: in 704 he reached Rome, and there, but for the advice of John VII, he would have ended his days.[2] The Pope urged him to return, and on

[1] Bede (*H.E.* v., 7) gives an epitaph consisting of twenty-four elegiacs in which this pilgrimage to Rome is commemorated. It was written by Benedictus Crispus Archbishop of Milan (d.725). See Gregorovius, *Gesch. der Stadt Rom*, 2[te] Auflage, II., pp. 186, 405. His comments on these pilgrimages of English Kings to Rome are noteworthy, pp. 184–9.

[2] It was to John VI that he had appealed so successfully, but he died January 10, 705, and Wilfrid was present at the election of John VII, March 1, 705. Mr. Platts makes confusion here (pp. 350–2).

the journey back to Britain he was too ill to pay much attention to missions. At Meaux he nearly died, but believed that he had received a revelation that he was to live four years longer. As already mentioned (I., 130), he died in 709, and was buried at his beloved Ripon.

It is remarkable that Wilfrid, at the synod near Easterfield on the border of Yorks and Notts, against which he appealed to Rome, said nothing about his missionary labours, or his educational work, or his activity in the building of churches. In pleading the services which he had rendered to the Church as a reason why he should not resign his bishopric, the points on which he dwells are his opposition to the Keltic usages, his introduction of the Latin chant, and his zeal for monasticism. So little did he understand the proportion of things! It is Wilfrid the missionary that the Church must always honour, whatever estimate may be made of his other achievements.

EGBERT AND WIGBERT

These two, the one a missionary in will, the other a missionary both in will and deed, are sometimes known as Ecgberct and Wictberht, and the former is sometimes known as Saint Egberht. Egbert, at about the age of five and twenty, left his home in Northumbria to go and study in the monasteries in Ireland. At that time this was a common thing

to do. In spite of the good schools which had arisen in Britain, both English and British students rather frequently went to the Scots in Ireland to finish their education. They went, as Bede says, "from one master's cell to another," or as we might say, from one professor's lecture-room to another. "The Scots most willingly received them all, and took care to supply them gratuitously with food, as also to furnish them with books to read and instruction, without making any charge" (Bede, *H.E.*, iii., 27). We know, from Bede alone, of a number of such cases. Chad (I., 123, 126, 168) was there at the same time as Egbert, and Agilbert (I., 119) had been there also. But Egbert's great friend was a young student named Ethelhun, whose brother Ethelwin afterwards came to study in Ireland, and then returned to England to become Bishop of Lindsey, and whose sister Ethelhild became an abbess. Bede says of the two friends that they were youths of great ability and of noble birth. They were studying at the monastery of Rathmelsigi (site uncertain) when the yellow pest swept over England and Ireland in 664. Of course the monastery suffered (I., 120, 166), and most of the inmates either fled or died. The two friends sickened, and one morning Egbert, believing that his end was near, left the infirmary to meditate in solitude on his past life. Feeling that it had been very faulty, he prayed earnestly that he might be allowed to live longer and do better, and vowed that,

if he were spared, he would never return to his native Britain, but would lead a pilgrim's life in much devotion and austerity. He then returned to the infirmary, where he found his friend Ethelhun asleep. But he soon awoke and looked at him and said : "O brother Egbert, what have you done ? I was hoping that we should enter together into life eternal. But I can tell you that what you have asked for will be granted." For he had learned in a vision what his friend had prayed for, and that his prayer was heard. And Ethelhun died the next night.

Egbert lived to be ninety. He wrote to Egfrid, King of the Northumbrians, who had been so hostile to Wilfrid, to urge him not to carry out his plan of invading Ireland, whose people had done him no harm. But Egfrid would not listen, and his army spared neither churches nor monasteries. Next year, 685, against the advice of St. Cuthbert, Egfrid marched against the Picts, was drawn into an ambush and slain, which was regarded as a judgment on him for his disregard of Egbert.[1] Soon after this, Egbert's zeal took a new turn. The pilgrim's life which he

[1] Egfrid was succeeded by his half-brother Aldfrith, who had been set aside, although the elder, as being *nothus*, i.e. the son of a concubine. William of Malmesbury says that Aldfrith went, like Egbert and others, to Ireland, and "enriched his mind with every kind of learning" (*G.R.*, I., 52). Bede says that he went to "the islands of the Scots" (*Vita Cuthb.* 24), which might mean Ireland or Iona. The anonymous *Vita Cuthb.* 24 says definitely Iona.

had vowed should be the life of a missionary. He knew that there were many who had never yet heard the word of God, especially among those who came from the same stock as his own ancestors, as the Frisians, the Danes, the Old Saxons, and others. If this should prove to be impossible, he thought of going to Rome to venerate the thresholds of the blessed Apostles. But the mission-work came first. He chose his companions, men fitted for such an enterprise by learning and courage, and made all necessary preparations with great care.

However, missionary work of this kind was not allowed to Egbert. As St. Paul was forbidden to go into Bithynia to work and was sent to Macedonia instead (Acts xvi. 7–10), so Egbert was commanded to abandon his intention of preaching to the heathen Teutons on the Continent and was sent to instruct the erring followers of Columba in Iona. And, as in the Apostle's case, the means of communication was a vision. There was in the monastery with Egbert a brother who had been at Melrose, when Boisil was provost or prior (*præpositus* or *propositus*) and Eata was abbot. Boisil had died in the pestilence of 664, but during his lifetime he had a great reputation for sanctity and for power to predict the future. Immediately on seeing Cuthbert, he had recognized him as a saint and foretold that he would be a bishop (Bede, *Life of Cuthbert*, 6 ; *H.E.*, iv., 27, 28). When Cuthbert sickened of the plague which was fatal to

Boisil, Boisil assured him that he would recover and told him much about the future. Just as Egbert was nearly ready to start with his fellow-missionaries, this brother, who had lived at Melrose before 664, came to him and said that Boisil had appeared to him in a vision, and had charged him to tell Egbert not to carry out his plan, but to go rather and teach in the monasteries of Columba. Egbert was made uneasy, but he was not convinced. He told the brother not to mention the vision (which might be a delusion) to any one else, and then went on with his preparations for the voyage. A day or two later the brother came to Egbert again and told him that in the previous night, just after matins, Boisil had appeared to him again and rebuked him for not being more emphatic in delivering his message to Egbert: "But go now and tell him that, whether he will or no, he must go to Columba's monasteries, because their ploughs go not right, and it is his duty to bring them back into the right way."[1]

Egbert was no longer able to think that the vision was a delusion, but, like Balaam and Jonah, he still hoped that he might be allowed to have what he had set his heart upon and avoid what he disliked. He again told the brother to say nothing about the vision, and again went on with his final preparations.

[1] This command is remarkable because Egbert had vowed not to return to Britain. Evidently the island of Iona was regarded as no part of the island of Britain.

The vessel which was to take the missionaries was ready, their baggage was on board, and the crew were waiting for a favourable wind, when a storm arose and so damaged the ships that it had to be abandoned. Some of the cargo was ruined, but all that belonged to Egbert and his company was saved. Egbert said with Jonah, " I know that for my sake this tempest is come," and at last abandoned the enterprise.

However, although Egbert was not allowed to go, one of his companions named Wigbert took ship and started for Friesland. He had been in Ireland for years, and was a man of great learning and austerity of life, but his going to Friesland as a missionary in the place of Egbert was not a success. He preached diligently to King Radbod (or Rathbed) and his barbarous subjects; but he reaped so little fruit of his great labours that he returned to Ireland and went on with his life as a hermit. As Bede puts it, " since he could not be profitable to foreigners by bringing them to the faith, he took all the more care to be profitable to his own people by the example of his virtues" (*H.E.*, v., 9).[1]

[1] We may leave it so; but St. Paul's withdrawal from the "opened door" at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13) is not parallel. *He* withdrew and undertook equally strenuous work elsewhere.

Radbod at first had been inclined to accept baptism, but, when he was told that all his pagan ancestors were certainly in hell, he said that he would sooner join them than go to heaven with a handful of beggars. This was during the earlier mission of Wulfram, Bishop of Sens.

This charming story about Egbert and Wigbert illustrates a variety of things, chief of which is the intense missionary zeal of English Christians in that age, especially with regard to the heathen descendants of their own ancestors in the North of Germany and the adjoining countries. We may feel pretty sure that Wigbert was an Englishman; he was at any rate a stranger (*peregrinus*) in Ireland; and Egbert is likely to have selected Englishmen (if only on account of the language) to accompany him to Friesland. We may regard the projected mission as mainly, if not exclusively, English. And Egbert's attitude towards the reported warnings of the holy prophet Boisil is very interesting. First he doubts whether they really come from him. Then he doubts whether they are a divine command which must be obeyed; and nothing but the destruction of the ship which was to have carried him convinced him that his sphere of work must be something very different from that which he had planned. Does this mean simply that he was bent on having his own way; that he had a longing for mission work among the heathen, and he was determined to gratify it? Or does it mean that he could not bring himself to believe that God really thought it more important that he should put Columba's disciples right about certain details of the Christian life, than that he should go and teach those who knew no Christianity at all? For that is what Boisil's charge to him seemed to

imply. The Keltic Church of Iona, as has been repeatedly pointed out in the first volume (see index), differed from the rest of Christendom in certain usages, one of which certainly was of some importance, viz., the time of keeping Easter; and it is these differences of usage which are alluded to in the metaphor of their ploughs not going in the right way. One can sympathize with a man who believed, as Egbert may have believed, that to produce uniformity in such matters was a work of less pressing need than that of winning pagans from idolatry to the worship of the true God. Nevertheless, there is also the possibility that Egbert was much better fitted for the one work than for the other, or that he was more needed in the British Isles than in the mission-field on the Continent. But it looks as if the authority from whom Bede got the story thought that the conversion of the Scots from their heretical customs was of more moment than the conversion of the Frisians from paganism; and perhaps Bede himself may have had some sympathy with that view, for there is nothing in his way of reproducing the narrative to indicate any hesitation or lack of approval, except that he keeps a firm hold on the story of the missions to the heathen.

Another interesting point is the tempest and its effects. It is those that were going to convey the missionaries who suffer loss; their ship and part of their cargo is ruined: but the property of the mission-

aries is saved. The narrator seems to imply that this is all as it should be, for no regret is expressed for the calamity to the innocent mariners The idea perhaps is that the baggage of those who were undertaking holy work was under special protection. Egbert, like Jonah, is sufficiently chastened by being made to undertake an unwelcome duty.

But the detail which is likely to have most charm for the modern reader is the touching friendship between the two young representatives at Rathmelsigi of Northumbrian nobility, Egbert and Ethelhun. It is like, and it is unlike, the affection between David and Jonathan. The likeness needs no pointing out; but there is just this difference. In the case of the Hebrew friends, it is the survivor who laments, in many beautiful verses, the death of his slain companion. The friend is taken and he is left to live on without him. Might they not have lived on together? Such laments have been common from David's time to Tennyson's, and they will continue as long as death has power. But in the case of these two English students in Ireland, it is the one that dies who laments, in a few plaintive words, that his friend is not dying with him. Might they not have gone out of the world together? Yes, they might, *but* for the friend's own ill-advised action. If he had not prayed to be spared, God would have taken both of them into eternal life together.

> And love would last as pure and whole
> As when he loved me here in Time,
> And at the spiritual prime
> Rewaken with the dawning soul.
>
> *In Memoriam*, xlii.

WILLIBRORD THE APOSTLE OF THE FRISIANS

The enthusiasm of Egbert for missions to the heathen on the Continent was by no means quenched, either by his own disappointment in being forbidden to go, or by the ill-success of his companion Wigbert.

On the contrary, it would be hardly an exaggeration to say that he continued to supply the driving power of the movement, or at any rate the largest amount of it. In 690 he sent out Willibrord (or Wilbrod) to do the work which he had so longed to do himself. This gives us an approximate date for what has just been recorded. Egbert's projected mission and Wigbert's unfruitful mission must be placed earlier than 690, for that is the known date of Willibrord's arrival in Friesland, and Willibrord did not leave Ireland until after the unsuccessful Wigbert had returned thither.[1] Indirectly, if not directly, it was owing to Egbert's influence that after the departure of Willibrord for Frisia two English priests, who had long been resident in Ireland, went out on a mission

[1] Florence of Worcester places the departure of Willibrord and his arrival in Frisia under the year 692, and some modern writers have followed him. But contemporary evidence is decisive for 690. *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iv., pp. 63, 65.

to the Old Saxons. As they both had the same name, they were distinguished, according to the common custom in that age, by the colour of their hair, the one being called Hewald the Black, and the other Hewald the White. They were kindly received by a steward, who promised to send them to the chief who was his master, according to their request. But their daily celebration of the Eucharist on a portable altar which they had brought with them, and their frequent psalm-singing, convinced the neighbouring savages that the strangers' religion was very different from their own. Fearing that their chief might be converted, and that their own religion would then be in peril, they determined to slay the new-comers. Hewald the White was quickly despatched with the sword, but the Black one was torn limb from limb; and then both corpses were thrown into the Rhine. The chief, enraged that strangers who wished to see him and had been entertained by his steward should have been killed in his territory, put the murderers to death and destroyed their village. Here was a tragic end to another English mission, but not so grievous as the retirement of Wigbert. *Semen est sanguis Christianorum.*[1]

The twelve men sent by Egbert to Frisia had a very different fate.[2] Their leader, Willibrord, was then

[1] Tert., *Apol.*, 50.

[2] Bede (v. 10) gives twelve as the number, of course in imitation of the Apostles. Thirteen was a common number,

about thirty-two years of age. Like Egbert he was a Northumbrian, and from infancy he had been dedicated by his parents to a religious life in the monastery of Ripon.[1] Here he had been brought up, and had had Wilfrid as one of his instructors. When he was about twenty, he had gone to finish his education in Ireland ; and it was after twelve years of study and discipline there that Egbert sent him out to Frisia. It was not wonderful that a man trained first by Wilfrid and then by Egbert should have a zeal for mission work, and should prove a successful missionary. He landed at the mouth of the Rhine, and at first had only a cold reception. He went to Utrecht, where the pagan Radbod and his court were not more ready to listen to him than they had been to listen to Wigbert a few years before. The Frisians themselves were not friendly. So Willibrord went further inland, to the court of Pippin II, who had recently conquered Radbod in battle, and had made himself virtually duke of the Frisians as well as duke of the Franks. Pippin II is often called Pippin of Heristal,

the leader being what Christ was to the Twelve. Columba, Columban and Eloquius had twelve companions.

[1] At the time of his conception, his mother, like the mother of Thomas Becket, is said to have had a vision of the moon entering her mouth. Similar stories are told of several Irish saints (C. Plummer, *Vitæ Sanctorum Hiberniæ*, I., p. clviii.). It was the new moon, increasing till it was full, that she saw ; and this was supposed to mean that her child should disperse the darkness of error.

but the correctness of the title is doubtful. He had been Mayor of the Palace and real sovereign since 688. He was an enthusiastic friend of the Church, as were other members of his house. The unfriendliness of Radbod to Willibrord and his party may have recommended them to Pippin. He certainly gave them a warm welcome and threw himself heartily into the work of converting the numerous heathen in those regions. Radbod was driven out, and then it was seen that it was his influence which had made the Frisians hostile to the missionaries. As soon as he was gone, numbers of them came and were instructed and baptized. This once more shows how often, in the conversion of the heathen tribes, Christianity spread from above rather than below (I., p. 70). The removal of a hostile chief was a gain; the support of a Christian prince was an enormous gain. The adherence and help of Pippin II ensured the success of Willibrord's mission, so far as man's efforts could secure it.

It was probably about 692 (when Willibrord saw his way to establishing a permanent mission) that he went to Rome to consult Pope Sergius and obtain his approval of what was being done. And it was about the same time that Suidbert, another of the twelve missionaries,[1] went to Britain to be conse-

[1] He also was an Englishman who had studied in Ireland. He is said to have been abbot of a monastery at Dacre in Cumberland.

crated bishop. By this time Wilfrid had again been expelled from Northumbria, and Suidbert went to him in Mercia, obtained consecration from him, and at once returned to the Frisians. It is possible that Willibrord did not take the step of sending Suidbert, until he himself had returned from Rome; and we may place the consecration of Suidbert in 693. It is a little unlikely that both of these leaders were absent from the mission at the same time. Suidbert could not go to Canterbury for consecration, for Theodore had died in September 690, and his successor Berhtwald had gone to Lyons in 692 for consecration, and did not return till the end of August, 693. Suidbert's see was fixed at Dorostadium on the Rhine, and he devoted himself to the conversion of the Boructuari or Bructeri, a tribe between the Ems and the Lippe. Somewhat later, Plectrude, the wife of Pippin, got him to give to Suidbert the island of Kaiserswerth,[1] in the Rhine, a few miles below Düsseldorf. Here he built a monastery and ended his days. The monastery became famous, but the present church is of later date. Relics of St. Suidbert are still shown there. Oddly enough, there was a Bishop of Utrecht in the tenth century who bore the same name as the hostile chief Radbod, and a sermon by him in praise of Suidbert is extant.

[1] Sometimes called Verden. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, III., p. 433.

Willibrord returned from Rome with the Pope's approval and a large number of relics, with which to give dignity to the churches which were being erected in place of temples. Of course there was much opposition, but the missionaries made steady progress in the destruction of idolatry. Willibrord went to Heligoland and destroyed a famous shrine of the god Fasite, challenging the god to punish him for doing so. Nothing happened that could be interpreted as the god's vengeance upon the missionary, and the influence of Willibrord over the Frisians was proportionately increased. Another attempt to win Radbod over to Christianity failed, and Willibrord went on to the Danes. Their king was equally intractable, but Willibrord brought back with him thirty Danish boys, whom he proposed to train up as Christians and then send them back as missionaries.[1] Gregory the Great had tried a similar policy (I., p. 57, 58), but in neither case do we know how far it succeeded.

In 695 or 696, Pippin II urged Willibrord to go back to Rome to be consecrated Archbishop of the Frisians by Sergius. We have seen what an advantage it was to Theodore of Tarsus to have been consecrated by the Bishop of Rome himself as Archbishop of Canterbury (I., p. 124; cf. p. 52), and Pippin was

[1] St. Sebaldus (Sigwald), the patron saint of Nuremberg, is said to have been one of these thirty boys.

no doubt aware that a similar advantage was well worth securing for the new see of Utrecht.[1] Willibrord himself must have been conscious of it. On St. Cecilia's Day (November 22), and in the church of St. Cecilia in Trastevere, the Apostle of the Frisians was consecrated.[2] The Pope gave him the name of Clement, but it never displaced his original name. Willibrord stayed only a fortnight in Rome, and then hastened back to Utrecht, where he continued his mission-work in his huge diocese and built a number of churches. He also founded monasteries, one of which became celebrated. This was Echternach or Epternach in Luxemburg, not far from Trèves, where Irmina, daughter of Dagobert, was abbess of a nunnery, and she joined with Willibrord in founding Echternach. He was believed to have arrested a pestilence which was raging in her nunnery, and in gratitude she gave him a large grant of land. Pippin and Plectrude became large benefactors,[3] as did Charles Martel afterwards. Charles Martel

[1] It is not of much moment whether Wiltaburg (Wiltenburg) or Utrecht was the place first chosen as the see. The two places, if they are distinct, were close together, and either name seems to have been used for both (Bede, *H.E.*, v., 11).

[2] Alcuin places the consecration in St. Peter's; but Bede (*H.E.*, v., 12) is more likely to be right. Florence of Worcester gives the day, but not the place.

[3] The charter in which they take the monastery under their protection is given in *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, IV., p. 683; a similar document is given p. 689. For Charles Martel see p. 699.

asked Willibrord to baptize his son, afterwards Pippin III or Pippin le Bref, and Willibrord is said to have predicted that the child would do great things in after years.

Willibrord lived to be over eighty, and he spent the last years of his life in seclusion at Echternach. When Wilfrid and Acca passed through Frisia on their way to Rome for Wilfrid's second appeal, they visited Willibrord, and Wilfrid could then see how the work which he had begun thirteen years before had developed. Thirteen years later, 716, there was war with Radbod, during which the Christians suffered much. Boniface (see below) came to the support of Willibrord; but they could not induce Radbod to allow the Gospel to be preached in his dominions, and it was not until after Radbod's death in 719 that the work went forward.

Willibrord died in 738 or 739. He had been an indefatigable worker and had accomplished a great deal; but he had made mistakes, and after his death the results of those mistakes became evident, when Widikind almost extinguished Christianity long before the end of the century. Utrecht was a bad choice for the chief see; it was not sufficiently central. Willibrord's frequent retirements to Echternach during the latter part of his life were prejudicial to the laying of solid foundations. But the chief mistake of all was relying too much on the secular arm. The immense advantage of gaining the support of

Pippin II at the outset led Willibrord to trust too much to the ruling powers; all the more so, when the goodwill of Pippin was followed by the goodwill of Charles Martel. The Church in Frisia never learnt to walk alone, and Charles Martel took care to keep power in his own hands.

It is probably through confusion with his contemporary Willibald that writings have been attributed to Willibrord; but there is a note on an ancient MS. of the martyrology of Jerome which is thought to be in his handwriting. The lines at the end of his epitaph sum up his character thus:—

> Vir virtute potens, divino plenus amore,
> Ore sagax, et mente vigil, et fervidus actis.[1]

Among the other companions of Willibrord who were sent out by Egbert from Ireland, was Adalbert (Ethelbert or Albert). He is said to have been a son of St. Oswald, King of Deira, and may easily have been his grandson, son of Edilwald or Oidilwald, who for a short time was King of Deira after Oswald's death.[2] Statements about him are not very trustworthy, but we may believe that he was sent by the Council of Utrecht in 702 to work at Egmond in North Holland, where he died in 705. The abbey

[1] *Hist. Lit. de France*, IV., p. 64.

[2] Smith and Wace (*Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, I., 32) make the Northumbrian prince a different person from the disciple of Egbert, but both are missionaries in Holland.

erected in memory of him at Egmond was destroyed by the Spaniards in 1573, but the 25th of June continued to be remembered there as the day of his death.

Another companion of Willibrord, according to Alcuin, was Wiro, from the diocese of York. He is said to have gone with Plechelin to Rome, and to have been consecrated with him by the Pope for work among the Frisians. On their return, Pippin assigned the district near the junction of the Rura with the Meuse as the sphere of their labours. The evidence for this is not strong, but there is nothing improbable in it.

Willibrord's common title as "the Apostle of the Frisians" is true in the sense that he probably did more than any other worker in that field towards the conversion of the nation and towards the permanent settlement of the Christian Church amongst them; but, as we have seen, he was not the first to preach the Gospel in Friesland, nor did he confine his missionary labours to that country. He had worked among the Franks and had received much help from Frankish rulers, and it is possible that this fact was at first an impediment to his success in Friesland. Any one who seemed to be an emissary of the Franks would be likely to be looked upon with suspicion by the Frisians, just as a missionary from the British Christians would have been regarded with suspicion or contempt by the heathen English (I., p. 52). With

this limitation, the title of "Apostle of the Frisians" gives Willibrord an honour that is his due.

BONIFACE THE APOSTLE OF GERMANY

Great as were the labours and the achievements of Wilfrid and Willibrord and their companions in the mission-field of Northern Europe, those of their later contemporary and successor, Boniface, far exceeded them. "It is no exaggeration to say, that since the days of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, no missionary of the Gospel has been more eminent in labours, in perils, in self-devotion, and in that tenacity yet elasticity of purpose, which never loses sight of its aim, even while compelled to approach it by some other route than that which it proposed to itself originally." [1] He was born at Crediton in Devonshire, and was of noble birth: that much is certain. The tradition that he was of royal birth, which was preserved in an inscription in the Cathedral at Mainz, may be correct, and if so it probably refers to some family connexion with one of the sub-kings in Wessex. Irish writers have claimed Boniface as an Irishman, but this claim is disproved, not only by older authorities, but also by the indisputable evidence of his own letters and of letters to him. The exact date of his birth is unknown, and various years

[1] I. Gregory Smith, *Boniface*, in *The Fathers for English Readers*, pp. 105 f.

from 670 to 695 have been suggested; but the true date must be in or near 680, and not later than 683. He was ordained priest before he started for Friesland about 716, and he was over thirty at the time of his ordination; and in 722 he rejected Willibrord's proposal that he should succeed him in the see of Utrecht on the ground that he was not fifty years of age. That makes any date earlier than 673 impossible; and the refusal rather implies that he was considerably under fifty at the time. His original name was Winfrid, but it has almost been forgotten in the name which he made famous after he was formally admitted as a monk at Nutscelle or Nursling in Hampshire.[1] It is sometimes said that the name Boniface was given him by Gregory II, when he consecrated him bishop; but he was certainly called Boniface before that, and it is probable that he himself adopted the name when he took the monastic vows at Nutscelle. We have seen that the name of Clement, which Pope Sergius I gave to Willibrord at his consecration, was quickly forgotten. Winfrid was educated at a monastery in or near Exeter, and wished then to take the vows, but his parents would not consent until he was older, and then only unwillingly. It is likely enough that the resignation of the Kingdom of Wessex by Cædwalla and his pil-

[1] All trace of the monastery is lost: it was probably destroyed by the Danes. Some regard Netley as the place.

grimage to Rome in 688, and the departure of Willibrord and his companions for Friesland in 690, had something to do with the aspirations of the young Winfrid and with the gradual yielding of his parents.

Boniface, as we may now call him, soon became distinguished at Nutscelle both for his knowledge of Scripture and for his powers as a preacher. It was in 705 that Aldhelm became Bishop of the new see of Sherborne, when the diocese of Wessex was divided (I., p. 190), and he and Bishop Daniel of Winchester did an immense deal for education in Wessex. Monastic schools became common, and Boniface was just the man to profit by them. He must also have shown that he was a capable man of affairs, for the abbots of Wessex recommended him to King Ini as a proper person to be sent to confer with Berhtwald, Archbishop of Canterbury, on some confidential matter which apparently could not be committed to paper. It is conjectured that it was some question connected with the new see of Selsey, which was instituted in 711. It would be about this time or a little later that Boniface was ordained priest. He was summoned to attend at councils of clergy, was marked out for preferment, and had a distinguished career in the English Church before him.

But this was not the kind of career that satisfied him. He was a born missionary and yearned for the work of converting the heathen. There was not much work of this kind to be done in Britain ; even

Sussex and the Isle of Wight, which had been the last strongholds of paganism, had surrendered and accepted the Gospel. But in the old country, whence Boniface's forefathers had come, there were whole tribes that were still heathen, and their dark condition seemed to him to be a perpetual cry, " Come over and help us." There was the example of Willibrord to inspire him, and he determined to follow it. He convinced Abbot Winbert that he ought to go, and two other monks were allowed to accompany him. It was probably in the spring of 716 that they crossed from London to Dorstat near Utrecht and began to work.[1]

They were not happy in their opportunity. Pippin II, who had been a firm friend of earlier missionaries and of the Church, had died in 714. His grandson Theoduald was only a child, and his widow Plectrude was not equal to the demands of such troubled times. Pippin's son Charles, afterwards known as Martel, the offspring of a concubine, had made himself Mayor of the Palace in Austrasia, and was at this time engaged in war with Radbod, the heathen ruler of the heathen Frisians. Radbod was destroying the churches and monasteries which the Franks had planted in Friesland, was restoring the temples and the old idolatrous worship, and was persecuting the

[1] The mission is sometimes placed in 704, but so early a date is most improbable.

Christians, including Willibrord and his clergy. Boniface came to Willibrord's assistance, but Radbod was away when the missionaries reached Utrecht. On his return, Radbod granted Boniface an interview, but would not allow him to preach. Boniface lingered for some months, learning what he could about the country, and returned before winter to Nutscelle. Thus ended the first missionary enterprise of Boniface. As regards visible results it was a complete failure; but it seems to have intensified rather than extinguished his missionary zeal.

Soon after his return to Nutscelle, Winbert, the abbot of his monastery, died, and the other monks wished to elect Boniface in his place. To some men this might have seemed a call to work in England, but Boniface was convinced that he had received an earlier call, and he succeeded in convincing Bishop Daniel of Winchester, before whom the matter was laid, that he ought to return to their heathen kinsmen on the Continent. But it was agreed that, before doing so, it would be wise to go to Rome and get the approval of the head of the Western Church[1] for an endeavour

[1] "Mediæval Christianity required for its preservation a strong central power and legal discipline. It is doubtful whether in those barbarous times, and amid almost constant civil wars, the independent and scattered labours of the anti-Roman missionaries could have survived and made as strong an impression upon the German nation as a consolidated Christianity with a common centre of unity and authority" (P. Schaff, *Mediæval Christianity*, I., p. 99).

to spread the faith in Germany. Such approval was, if not indispensable, in the highest degree expedient. Rome was the one constant authority in Europe. The East was in confusion, through internal controversies and external assaults from the Saracens. Northern Europe was also in confusion, through frequent struggles between rival factions within most of the countries, and frequent warfare between one country and another—warfare which was sometimes made more bitter by being accentuated through differences of religion. In such circumstances, it was only common sense to secure the support of the ancient see, to which all Western Christians looked up with respect. Daniel supplied Boniface with two letters, a private one to commend him to the Pope, and a public one commending him to all persons in authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, whom he might visit in his long and perilous journey. Both letters attained their object. He went slowly through France, where he was joined by other pilgrims to Rome, was well treated by the Lombards, who were not always so gracious to strangers, and received a hearty welcome from Gregory II. It was in Rome that he formed his friendship with Eadburga, or Heaburga, or Bugga, daughter of a King of Wessex. After retiring into a monastery and becoming abbess of Minster in Thanet, she had gone on pilgrimage to Rome. She and Boniface corresponded afterwards, and a portion of the correspondence survives.

Boniface had various interviews with the Pope, who entirely approved of the proposal to offer the Gospel to the barbarous tribes of Germany, and gave him ample powers for prosecuting the work.[1] In 718 or 719 Boniface set out, armed with this general sanction and well supplied with relics for the enrichment of the churches which he hoped to build. He also took with him a document in which Gregory commended him to all bishops and all orders of Christians, especially to Charles Martel, whose powers as Mayor of the Palace in Austrasia gave him large opportunities of being useful to a missionary in the North of Europe. In 717 he had captured Cologne and made himself ruler of the Eastern Franks; and in 718 he defeated the Neustrians at Soissons, and thus became master of the whole of the Frankish Empire, a position which he retained for the remainder of his life. For a considerable period the Frankish Empire became the chief stronghold of Christendom, threatened as it was by the Saracens, the Saxons, and the Frisians. It is said that in return for these benefits Gregory "exacted an oath of allegiance to the Roman see." This is possibly confusion with what took place when Boniface returned to Rome to be consecrated bishop.[2] But, in any case, it is

[1] The French Benedictines think that this amounted to making him Legate. Perhaps Boniface himself thought so.

[2] Or the charge which Gregory gave to Boniface in writing, to be obedient to the Roman see and to refer to it for instructions, may have been mistaken for an oath taken by Boniface.

not likely that there was much exaction in the matter. Boniface would take such an oath willingly enough. Unity of authority was indispensable for the prosperity of missionary work and for the establishment of a permanent Church ; and in the existing condition of Europe there was little chance of such unity apart from the Roman see. The fact that Boniface had applied to Rome for sanction and assistance shows what his mind on that subject was. At Pavia, Boniface was hospitably welcomed by Liutprand, the greatest of the Lombard Kings, and thence crossed the Alps into Bavaria.

Bavaria had been partly converted early in the fourth century, but, owing to ignorance and neglect and the inrush of Asian invaders, religion was in strange confusion. When, about 650, Emmeramnus gave up his see, which was probably Poitiers, and visited Ratisbon, on his way to preach the Gospel in Pannonia, he found so many heathen, that he was persuaded to remain and work there.[1] He did this all the more readily because the surviving Christianity had become so mingled with paganism that there were priests who used the same chalice for the Eucharist and for pouring libations to heathen gods.[2] Rupert, Bishop of Worms and afterwards of Salzburg, has

[1] *Hist. Lit. de la France*, III., p. 448.

[2] Bede says that Redwald, King of the East Angles, had two altars, one for Christian worship, and one for the worship of demons (*H.E.*, ii., 15).

been called the Apostle of Bavaria. *He* also visited Ratisbon and was induced to remain for a time, but he passed on and established himself at Juvavum,[1] afterwards Salzburg. He is said to have been an Irishman, and his restlessness confirms this. It is possible that he had recently died, when Boniface entered Bavaria, but some writers place his death much earlier. Corbinian of Chartres had been at Rome shortly before Boniface, and Gregory II had insisted on his becoming a bishop to work in Bavaria, where he incurred the hostility of Duke Grimoald, whom he rebuked for having married his brother's widow.[2] Eventually, Corbinian settled in Bavaria and became the first Bishop of Freisingen.

There was plenty of work to be done in Bavaria among pagans and Christians who were still half pagan in ideas and customs; but it did not attract Boniface, who soon passed on into Thuringia, where the Saxons were probably more absolutely heathen than the inhabitants of Bavaria. But he did not remain there long. In 719 his old opponent Radbod died, and it was probably the news of this event that determined him to return to Friesland and renew

[1] Juvavum or Juvaria was destroyed in the fifth century by the Heruli, but was rebuilt in the seventh. It was also called Iopia.

[2] Compare the case of St. Kilian, who is said to have made Gosbert, Duke of Franconia, put away Geila, his brother's widow. Geila then caused Kilian to be put to death. The story is suspiciously like that of Herodias and the Baptist.

his efforts there. His experiences in Bavaria and Thuringia may also have shown him the difficulties of missionary work, and that it would be wise to place himself under the guidance of those who knew more about it than he did. He went down the Rhine to Utrecht, and for three years worked as the assistant of Willibrord and his companions. The success was great, and churches and monasteries once more took the place of temples. In 722, the aged Willibrord wished Boniface to take his place as Bishop of Utrecht; but Boniface pleaded that he was too young, being not yet fifty, and otherwise unfit. Moreover, the Pope had charged him to undertake other work, viz., the conversion of the inhabitants of Old Saxony, who were "of one blood and bone" with himself. Perhaps he had already lingered too long with Willibrord. And he went off to labour in Hessia.

Boniface seems to have formed a definite plan of campaign for the conversion of "the old country." This was to surround it with a chain of Christian centres, and gradually drive in the frontiers of heathenism. Hence his preference for work in Friesland, Hessia, and Thuringia, rather than in Bavaria or any country which did not border on the Saxons. It was on his way from Friesland to Hessia that he fell in with the young Gregory at a convent near Trèves. Gregory was a grandson of Adela, the abbess of the convent, who was a daughter of Dagobert II. He was fascinated by Boniface, insisted on going with him, although

he was barely fifteen, remained with him for years, and when Boniface became Bishop of Mainz in 743 was made abbot and administrator of Utrecht. His devotion to Boniface gave him a great interest in Englishmen, among whom he had many disciples, including two English lads whom he brought from Rome ; and his colleague as administrator of Utrecht was an Englishman named Alubert. At a place not easy to identify, two nominally Christian brothers called Detdic and Dierolf, who were still half pagan, gave Boniface land for the foundation of a monastery, where he planted numerous disciples ; and with this as a centre he made a large number of converts.

Boniface was still only a priest, and he had no bishop over him. He was acting under the direction of Gregory II, who had no knowledge of his action. He sent therefore a report to Rome, and asked for further instructions. Gregory sent a very sympathetic reply and expressed a wish to see him. This for Boniface was a command, and in 723 he paid his second visit to the holy see. Gregory questioned him as to his belief, and then told him that he must accept the office of a bishop for the better prosecution of his work. At the same time, he bound him by a solemn oath at the tomb of St. Peter to be always obedient to the Pope, and to oppose all bishops who should act contrary to the holy see. Since the fifth century, an oath of this kind had been taken by bishops in Italy within the patriarchate of Rome,

but it seems to have been a new thing to require it from a missionary bishop who was to work outside. Gregory again gave him a special commendation to Charles Martel, in the track of whose victorious army Boniface had been working.[1] And in his new position as *episcopus regionarius*, that is, as a bishop without a see, he went to Charles Martel's court, for, as he wrote to his old friend, Bishop Daniel of Winchester, "without the protection of the prince of the Franks, whose word inspires universal fear and respect, I could neither govern the people, nor defend priests, deacons, monks, and the handmaids of God, nor prevent pagan and sacrilegious rites in Germany." There is a letter in which Charles formally takes Boniface under his protection; and the Pope afterwards attributes the wonderful successes of Boniface to the help which he received from Charles. Charles was well aware of the support which bishops might give to the establishment of his kingdom, but he was very jealous of their having power which could be used in opposition to his plans. He deposed more than one. At the court of Charles the clergy were in many cases such evil men that Boniface found it difficult to regard intercourse with them as consistent with his oath of allegiance to Rome, especially when they tried to induce Charles Martel to refuse

[1] It is possible that this commendation was given only once. If so, it was more probably given at this second visit to Rome. *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, IV., pp. 91 f.

to help him. But Charles gave him a very ample letter of protection and commendation, and this proved to be of great service. He now had the express support of the two chief rulers in the West, the Pope of Rome and the King of the Franks.

When Boniface returned to Hessia he found many difficulties awaiting him. There was the common experience that some converts had, either openly or secretly, relapsed into heathenism; others had retained customs which were distinctly pagan, or so closely associated with paganism as to be perilous. The missionaries who had been in the field before him had come mostly from the Keltic Church in Ireland or Iona, in which diocesan bishops were unknown (I., pp. 106 f., 173), and jurisdiction was commonly in the hands of presbyters.[1] Consequently these missionaries and their disciples had no idea of episcopal authority, and respected neither Boniface nor the Pope as having any jurisdiction over them. Besides these evils, Boniface often in his letter laments the presence of preachers who are "adulterers and fornicators," which in some cases may mean that they were men of abandoned life—temptations in the mission-field are frequent and strong—but in other cases may mean no more than that they were clergy

[1] Such missionaries seem to have been commonly known as *Peregrini*. Streams of them were constantly coming to the Continent, latterly, more as students than as missionaries.

who did not recognize the necessity for celibacy and refused to become monks.

In these various difficulties Boniface by no means always applied to Rome for advice and instruction; and in one of the letters of instructions which he did get from Rome, he was told that, if a pestilence broke out in a monastery, it would be folly to leave it, "for no one can escape God's hand." That might well make him doubt whether Popes were always wise. He kept up a close correspondence with friends in England, especially with Cuthbert of Canterbury and Daniel of Winchester, and he applied to them for books as well as for advice and sympathy. There is a letter of his to Egbert, Archbishop of York, thanking him for the books which he has sent, and asking for more by the Venerable Bede, especially his commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon. In this letter he asks how he should deal with a priest who had fallen into grievous sin, had done penance, and had then continued to minister. Ought he to be allowed to minister? Boniface has no one to put in his place, and converts ought not to be left without a minister. And from England he got more than books and letters, for not a few men and women came out to help him. Over and over again, in this casual way, we come upon evidence of a strong, missionary spirit in the newly organized English Church. The advice which he received from Bishop Daniel is of an interesting character: "Do not begin by ques-

tioning the genealogies of their gods. Accept their assertion that some of their gods were begotten just as men are, and then point out that beings, born like men, are men rather than gods. Had this world a beginning, like some of their gods? Then who created it? And where did the gods dwell before the universe existed. If the universe had no beginning, who governed it before the gods were born? From whom, and when, and where, was the first god generated? If there are so many gods, how can one be sure that one is not offending a more powerful god by worshipping a less powerful one? If the gods possess all things, what good do sacrifices do? Can gods be propitiated by things which they do not want, and which the sacrificers keep for themselves? If they are omnipotent, why do they not punish the Christians, who overthrow their images? Why do Christians possess the fertile regions, while the worshippers of idols have only the frost-bound regions? These and similar reasonings you should bring before them, not so as to insult or irritate them, but with mildness and moderation. And you should sometimes compare their superstitions with Christian doctrines, so that they may be ashamed rather than provoked, and be led to confess they have been holding foolish fables."

These arguments are a curious mixture, and some of them might be urged against Christianity. The temper of them is more important than the substance,

and the substance shows that they are addressed to a thoughtful race, as the Teutons have always been. Nowhere are threats suggested as a means of influence, still less is actual force; and there is no evidence of Boniface having ever used force or called in the secular arm to enforce his preaching.[1] To what extent he employed the arguments suggested by Bishop Daniel we do not know; but his chief argument seems to have been that of overthrowing idolatrous objects, and showing that the gods never prevented or punished these insults. The hewing down of the great oak of Thor or Donar—the Donner-eiche—and the building of an oratory with the timber, is the most famous instance of this,[2] but several others are recorded, and the result was a great increase in the number of converts. The work of conversion was similar to that which had been so successful in England: monasteries were planted in various places, and each monastery became a missionary centre (I., p. 161). But the pagans in the old country seem to have been less easily converted than those in England. In their great ancestral forests they clung with traditional reverence to the beliefs and customs with which many

[1] After the death of Boniface, Charlemagne did use force, and compelled the Saxons to embrace Christianity; and Pope Hadrian I wrote to him in approval of this policy.

[2] This took place at Geismar. There are several Geismars, but the one near Fritzlar is believed to be the place. "This practical sermon was the death and burial of German mythology" (P. Schaff).

spots had been for centuries associated. The success of Boniface is all the more remarkable: he had a genius, both for winning and for retaining men, for convincing and for organizing them.

The new Pope, Gregory III (731–741), showed his appreciation of Boniface's services to the Church very soon after his own election.[1] In 732 he sent Boniface the pall of a Metropolitan and gave him authority to found bishoprics in Germany. It is now that the oath of strict obedience to the Roman see which Boniface took when he was consecrated *episcopus regionarius* becomes historically important. A similar oath was required from all the bishops of the sees founded by Boniface, and a direct consequence of this was the dependence of the Churches of Germany upon the Roman see. Gregory III continued the policy of Gregory II in this matter, as in most things. Some of the directions which he gave to Boniface seem to be very rigid. Marriages within the seventh degree are forbidden. No food offered to an idol is to be eaten. Persons baptized by priests who have eaten such food are to be re-baptized! Eating horse-flesh is to be strictly forbidden. This last regulation

[1] He was a Syrian, and is said to have been forced into the pontifical throne by the Roman people, while he was attending the funeral of Gregory II. He was the last Pope whose election was confirmed by the Exarch before he was consecrated. Later Popes were consecrated without waiting for imperial confirmation.

was probably made because horse-flesh was so often used in heathen sacrifices. Gregory also forbad consecration by a single bishop; every consecrating bishop must be assisted by at least two others (I., pp. 121, 123, 187). It is strong evidence of the progress which Boniface's mission had made in Germany, that Gregory III ruled that a synod ought to be held twice a year as a safeguard against heretics, "especially British heretics coming into those parts." It has been thought that this has special reference to Virgilius, an Irish missionary, a geometer, whose ideas were in advance of his age, and had been condemned by Boniface as heretical.[1] Married bishops, priests and deacons were to live with their wives as if unmarried.

Boniface made the monastery which he had founded at Fritzlar his headquarters (*c.* 733), and at first was abbot of it himself. But he was so often absent that discipline suffered; and it is noteworthy that he sent to *England* for a suitable man. He invited Wigbert, a Glastonbury monk, to come and be abbot; and it is further evidence of the missionary spirit which still glowed in England that Wigbert, although an elderly man, came at once, to the great delight of Boniface. Wigbert writes back to Glastonbury that

[1] I. Gregory Smith, *Boniface*, p. 45. The reference is problematical. A more probable reference is, members of the British Church, who still held to the Keltic Easter and Keltic form of the tonsure.

God has given him a prosperous journey across the sea and through the perils of this world, and grants success to the work, although it is dangerous and laborious in all things, in hunger, thirst, cold, and the incursions of the heathen.

In 738 Boniface paid his third and last visit to Rome, this time accompanied by a large number of disciples. In spite of the great victory of Charles Martel over the Saracens at Tours in October 732, fighting between him and the Saracens in France still continued, and the Church in France was in a miserable condition. The successes of Boniface in Germany were therefore all the more welcome, and he received a hearty reception at Rome. For some reason (perhaps because the Pope wanted him as an adviser) he remained for a year in or near Rome. He was made Legate to the holy see, and the bishops in Bavaria and Germany were charged to receive him with due honour and accept from him the order of the Church of Rome.[1]

It was not till the autumn of 739 that Boniface set out to return to Germany. He was invited by Duke Odilo to come to Bavaria, and was urged to remain some time. The Church there was in great confusion, with only one bishop, Vivilus, whose see was at Passau. Corbinian of Freisingen had died in 730, and had no successor. Boniface made Erim-

[1] This may have been a renewal of legatine authority, or a formal confirmation of an earlier informal commission.

bert, brother of Corbinian, his successor; Rupert, Bishop of Salzburg, had died in 718, and had no successor, and Boniface caused that see to be filled. A bishop was also placed at Ratisbon, where Emmeramnus had worked long before. These four sees have continued to exist down to the present time. In Bavaria he had the same difficulties as those which confronted him in Germany. He had to deal with heathen, Christians that were still deeply tainted with heathenism, clergy of evil life, and Keltic missionaries from Ireland, who acted as free lances and resented episcopal jurisdiction. But the organization of four regular dioceses did much to mitigate the evils.

Charles Martel died October 22, 741, and Gregory III died November 28 in the same year. It is probable that both events were a gain to Boniface. The death of the Emperor, Leo III, "the Isaurian," June 18, 741, would not greatly affect him. Charles left his dominions to his sons, and they were more disposed towards peace than their father had been; moreover, the struggle with the Saracens had ceased to be acute. The elder son, Carloman, resigned his position and retired to a monastery in Rome, leaving his brother Pippin le Bref sole ruler; and in 751 Pippin, with the sanction of Pope Zacharias, deposed Childeric, the last of the Merovingians, and assumed formally the supreme power which he and his father had long held.[1] It is said that Carloman had known

[1] *Annales Francorum Fuldenses*, an. MDDLI. Annals

little Christianity till he came in contact with Boniface, and that it was under the influence of Boniface that he adopted the monastic life. It is also said that Boniface, like the Pope, approved of the deposition of Childeric, and even that he crowned Pippin III. Zacharias made Boniface Legate in France as well as in Germany and Bavaria, and, as Boniface had great influence with the sons of Charles Martel, this meant a great increase in the power of the Popes.[1] Pippin was quite ready to support Boniface in the work of reforming the Church in France. The French clergy, like the Keltic, had maintained their independence of Rome more completely than the clergy of England and Germany, and one result of their independence had been a great deal of licence. Most of the bishoprics were held by laymen or immoral clergy. In 742, at the request of Carloman, Boniface had held a synod for the reformation of the Frankish Church—the first synod that had been held in Austrasia for nearly a century—and this synod was quickly followed by others[2] At one of these, Gewilieb,

attributed to Einhard give the reply of Zacharias as *melius esse eum regem, apud quem summa potestatis consisteret.*

[1] *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France,* IV., p. 94, 97. Respecting Carloman's resignation, see the extracts from Einhard, V., pp. 90, 197.

[2] These synods seem to have been Frankish assemblies rather than ecclesiastical councils. Laymen took part in them, and their decrees were published in the names of Carloman and Pippin. *Recueil des Hist.,* IV., p. 110.

Bishop of Mainz, was deposed for indulging in unclerical sports and for homicide, neither of which offences seem to have scandalized his people. Boniface summoned him before the council, and the council requested Boniface to take the bishopric himself, which he did, with the title of Archbishop of Mainz. Boniface tells Zacharias that a certain nobleman declares that Gregory III had given him leave to marry his uncle's widow, who was also the wife of his cousin, the cousin being still alive, but deserted by her. Of course a union of that kind cannot be allowed; and in the synod of London, in "Saxony beyond the sea," it had been condemned as incestuous.[1] The question of marriage within the prohibited degrees was a frequent one. Pagans who had been accustomed to keep within the limits of their tribe or their family saw little use in Christian regulations on the subject; and certainly the prohibition of marriages between fourth, and even seventh cousins, and between godparents to the same child, did not seem to be reasonable. These councils issued regulations respecting heathen practices, which are always such a difficulty in missionary work. Converts secretly continued the customs of their ancestors, some of which would be innocent but for their connexion with paganism. Not only divination, and the use

[1] See also the complaints of Boniface in the letter quoted *Recueil des Hist.*, IV., p. 94.

of amulets, and sacrifices of all kinds, whether to spirits or to saints, were forbidden, but even "need-fire," i.e., procuring fire by friction, because of its association with idolatry.

About this time[1] Boniface founded the famous abbey of Fulda, aided by Sturmi, a Bavarian noble, who had been educated by him. The rule was in the main Benedictine, but more severe than that of Monte Cassino. Boniface made Sturmi abbot and often came to the monastery for rest. About the same time also he did for Germany what he had done for Bavaria by adding four bishoprics, Würzburg, Eichstadt, Erfurt and Buraburg or Bierberg, over which he placed men whom he knew and could trust, Burchard, Willibald, Adelhar and Albinus. The see of the last was afterwards moved to Paderborn.

A Neustrian synod was held at Soissons in 744, and Boniface brought before it the conduct of two of his troublesome opponents, Adelbert (or Eldebert), and Clement. The former is said to have been a new Simon Magus, claiming supernatural powers and professing great sanctity. He said that he had a letter which had been sent to him from heaven. He told people not to go to church, but to come to his ministrations in the fields. Saints and martyrs were not of much account, and it was folly to dedicate churches to them. The oratories which he set up

[1] Florence of Worcester places it in 744.

he dedicated to himself, and he distributed clippings from his hair and nails as relics. This may have been in derision of prevalent ecclesiastical customs. The same may be said of his praying to angels to whom he gave grotesque names, as Sabuoc and Simiel. When people came to him to confess, he said that he knew all their sins already, and that they might go home and be certain that they were forgiven.

Adelbert was a Frankish bishop, and his eccentricities were exhibited chiefly in Austrasia, on the borders of which this council was held. Clement was a Scot from Ireland, a very independent missionary bishop, with a great contempt for episcopal jurisdiction or any ecclesiastical authority. The Latin Fathers were of no account with him. He taught that by Christ's descent into Hades the souls of unbelievers as well as believers were set free, and that the Jewish levirate law proved that marriage with a brother's widow was lawful. Such marriages were not uncommon among the Teutonic nations, as the cause of St. Kilian's martyrdom shows. And it was expected that a son would marry his *father's* widow. See p. 39 n.

The synod at Soissons condemned both Adelbert and Clement, but neither this condemnation nor a subsequent one seems to have put an end to their activity, and they were then condemned by a synod at Rome. Adelbert was to be put to penance, and if he resisted, was to be anathematized; Clement

was to be anathematized at once. Two years later, however, they are still active, and perhaps were too popular to be severely punished otherwise than by excommunication. An anonymous writer says that Adelbert was imprisoned at Fulda, escaped, and was murdered. The Benedictine editors say that Carloman and Pippin put both of them in prison, and that they probably died there.[1] They have been claimed as anticipating the teaching of the Reformers, but there is not much resemblance. Adelbert rather anticipates the eccentricities of some of the Anabaptists. In one thing he agreed with Boniface, viz. as to the evils which attended pilgrimages, and he advised people not to take part in such things.

A more interesting teacher, who came into collision with Boniface, is the Virgilius mentioned above. His Irish name was Fergal or Ferghil, which in Latin became Virgilius. He came to the court of Childeric III about 744, and was well received by Pippin, then Mayor of the Palace. A year or two later Pippin commended him to Odilo, Duke of Bavaria, who set him over the monastery of Salzburg, where as abbot he continued the Keltic custom of holding the jurisdiction, while he had an Irish bishop named Dobda or Dubhda to ordain for him and perform other episcopal functions (I., pp. 107, 173).[2] In this matter he

[1] *Hist Lit. de la France*, IV., p. 83.

[2] The evidence is not clear, but this is a possible explanation.

and the Duke possibly acted in concert. The Duke did not wish his dominions to come under the control of the powerful kings of France, and Virgilius did not wish his see to come under the control of the powerful Archbishops of Mainz; but in the end the Frankish influence prevailed. Virgilius first came into collision with Boniface over a direction from the latter that persons that had been baptized by a priest who made grammatical nonsense of the words of administration, were to be re-baptized. This priest said, *Baptizo te in nomine Patria et Filia et Spiritus Sancti* (or *Spiritua Sancta*). Virgilius and another priest named Sidonius appealed to Pope Zacharias, who said that he was disturbed and astonished at such a charge, and ordered Boniface, if it was true, never to give such a direction again, but to hold to the traditions of the Church. Mispronunciation of Latin did not make the sacrament invalid. Then Virgil published a treatise in which he argued that the earth was a globe, and that there were antipodes, with inhabitants, and another sun and moon, on the other side of it. This gave a handle to a charge of heresy, for it might imply that these inhabitants were not descended from Adam and were free from original sin; and, when Virgilius was nominated as Bishop of Salzburg, Boniface objected on account of this doctrine of antipodes. The Pope, as

Dobda was known as "the Greek," which points to Irish learning, unless this surname arose through misapprehension of his full name, Dobdagreus.

when Virgilius complained of Boniface, hoped that the charge was not true ; but, if Virgilius did teach that there were antipodes, he must be brought before a council and excommunicated. Virgilius probably showed that his speculations did not question either the unity of the human race or the universality of original sin. The speculations are indication of Irish training. Martianus Capella was much studied in Ireland, and he has this hypothesis of antipodes. Virgilius must have been able to free the hypothesis from heretical inferences; for it is certain that, after the death of Boniface in 755, he was consecrated Bishop of Salzburg, and that he was canonized by Gregory IX in 1233.

The papal condemnation of Virgilius is similar to that of Galileo nine centuries later. Dr. Newman thinks that Pope Zacharias escaped condemning as heretical what is scientifically true. "When the glorious St. Boniface, Apostle of Germany, great in sanctity, though not in knowledge, complained to the Holy See that St. Virgilius taught the existence of Antipodes, the Holy See apparently evaded the question, not indeed siding with the Irish philosopher, which would have been going out of its place, but passing over, in a matter not revealed, a philosophical opinion."[1] But the Pope quite clearly states that, if Virgilius holds the perverse doctrine, which dishon-

[1] *Lectures on University Subjects*, p. 280.

ours God and imperils his own soul, that there are other men on the other side of the earth, he is to be cast out of the Church; but he has sent a letter to Virgil telling him to present himself and be examined. The Pope writes to Boniface: *De perversa autem doctrina ejus, qui contra Deum et animam suam locutus est, si clarificatum fuerit eum confiteri, quod alius mundus et alii homines sub terra sint, seu sol et luna, nunc habito concilio ab ecclesia expelle.* Mrs. Hope would have us believe that there were three Virgils, one who *falsely* accused Boniface of an error about re-baptism; one who was condemned by Zacharias for some perverse doctrine which probably had nothing to do with antipodes; and a third who was the canonized Bishop of Salzburg.[1]

Pope Zacharias had died March 14, 752, and in 753 Boniface wrote to his successor Stephen, asking to be confirmed in his office of Legate; he apologized for having been so late in making this application; but he had been occupied in restoring more than thirty churches which had been destroyed by the heathen. In another letter to Stephen, Boniface complains that Hildegar, Archbishop of Cologne, claims authority over the see of Utrecht, which is not really in his diocese. The Pope decided for the independence of Utrecht, and Pippin then assigned Utrecht to Boniface in addition to the Archbishopric of Mainz.[2]

[1] *S. Boniface and the Conversion of Germany*, pp. 198–202.

[2] It is unlikely that Boniface ever held the see of Utrecht,

In 753, Hildegar accompanied Pippin in a campaign against the Saxons and was killed by them, June 28.[1] As in the case of our own King Edward, who was cruelly assassinated some two hundred years later, the violent death of Hildegar was accounted a martyrdom, and he is spoken of later as a saint or a martyr. There is also a touching letter to an abbot, about whose name and monastery various guesses have been made, asking for his prayers and proposing to exchange a list of persons, both living and dead, for whom intercessions on both sides might be made.

It was perhaps about this time that Boniface dedicated the monastery in the diocese of Freisingen which had been erected by Alto, an Irish missionary. Alto had come to Bavaria some ten years earlier, and had lived as a hermit in a forest between Munich and Augsburg. Pippin heard of him, urged him to found a monastery, and granted him a site. When all was ready, Boniface came for the consecration of the Church. In memory of the founder, it was called Alto-Münster, which became corrupted into Alt-Münster. The founder showed a more liberal spirit than the consecrator. Boniface wished that all women should be excluded from the convent-church; but Alto begged that it might be a parish church,

either after he had resigned Mainz or in conjunction with it. As Papal Legate he may have directed the affairs of the see during an interval.

[1] *Recueil des Hist.*, V., pp. 220, 316, 326, 336, 359, 362, 375.

open to every one; the men of the neighbourhood would often be unable to come, but the women would always be at home, and could come and pray for the men and for themselves. Boniface agreed, but he would allow no women inside the convent, even to get water from the well. One might have expected that the man who had been a hermit would in this matter have been the more rigorous of the two. On the other hand, Boniface had had the larger experience of the corruptions that were possible in monasteries. He had said that, as regards purity of life, heathen Saxons and Wends were better than Christians. The damning evidence of the Penitentials is pointed out below (p. 90).

Boniface was now seventy years of age, or more. Ever since his third visit to Rome in 738 he had been engaged in reforming and reorganizing the Churches in Bavaria, Neustria, Austrasia, and those parts of Germany in which the Gospel had been planted. He had had comparatively little time for what he regarded as the work to which he had been divinely called—the work of converting the heathen. Perhaps he was weary of the ceaseless contention with unsatisfactory bishops and clergy, and with laymen who had become possessed of ecclesiastical lands and offices, of endeavouring to bring the Keltic missionaries under the authority of bishops and the Roman see, and of promoting discipline by the establishment of monasticism. The numerous councils must have

made a considerable demand upon his time, tact, and temper. In or about 754, he obtained Pippin's consent to his resignation of the see of Mainz and the appointment of Lull or Lullus as his successor. He had made this application some time before through Fulrad, Pippin's head chaplain, and at the same time had asked for Pippin's protection for the clergy and converts on the frontiers of heathendom.[1] Lullus was an Englishman who had been educated at Malmesbury, and had been induced to come to Germany by missionary zeal and the fame of Boniface, to whom he is said to have been related. Boniface sent him to Rome in 751 to consult Pope Zachary confidentially on various matters. From the Pope's written reply (November 4, 751) we learn some of these, one of them being: How often, and where, should there be crossings in the canon of the Mass? Before leaving Mainz, Boniface specially commended his English fellow-workers to the care of Lullus, and he then took him with him through Thuringia and introduced him to his converts there. He exhorted Lullus to finish the buildings at Fulda, where it was his wish to be buried. Any septuagenarian, whether he knows it or not, has received "notice to quit" (Ps. xc. 10); and Boniface seems to have had a presentiment that his end was near, when for the third and last time he set out for "the old country," the home of his forefathers, to convert the heathen who were still

[1] The letter is given in *Recueil des Hist.*, V., p. 483.

numerous in Friesland. One of the few books which he took with him was the *De Bono Mortis* of St. Ambrose, which he kept in the folds of his Benedictine habit; he also took with him an altar-cloth, which was to be his shroud. This was kept in a box with his other books.

After taking leave of Lullus, Boniface went to Utrecht, which he placed under the care of his old disciple Gregory, who had been devoted to him since his boyhood and was now an abbot in Utrecht. Thence, with a coadjutor bishop named Eoban or Doban, he set out for his last mission to the heathen in Friesland, taking with him a small company of clergy and attendants; and his first work was among those who had already embraced Christianity. Early in June 755, the company encamped at Dockum, on a stream now called Boren, which was the boundary between East and West Friesland.[1] Boniface had arranged that a large number of recent converts should assemble there next day, which was Whitsun eve, to receive the rite of Confirmation. But before these converts arrived a hostile body of pagans surrounded the camp, to avenge the desertion of their ancestral gods by sacrificing the missionaries to them. The younger members of the mission and some of the

[1] Several chronicles place the martyrdom of Boniface in 754, and one places it in 753, but 755 is right. See the extract from the *Life of St. Boniface* by Willibald in *Recueil des Hist.*, V., pp. 424 f.; also p. 367.

converts who had arrived would have defended themselves and Boniface, but he entreated them not to meet violence with violence. "Fear not them that can kill the body but cannot harm the soul. Do not in this short hour lose the fruit of a long life of conflict. Accept this sudden peril of death for the sake of Him who suffered for us, that you may reign with Him for all eternity." The pagans massacred the whole company—Boniface (it is said) being the last to be slain. They then broke open the chests of the mission, which contained, not valuables, as they had hoped, but only books and provisions. They got drunk with the wine, to which they were not accustomed, and then fought with one another over the scanty spoil. Pippin thereupon invaded Frisia and punished the guilty tribe. The body of Boniface was carefully preserved by Christians. Utrecht and Mainz both wished to have it; but Lullus, who at first was inclined to yield to the people of Mainz, at last insisted that the saint's own directions must be respected, and the body was buried at Fulda, to which for ages it attracted pilgrims, who were a great source of wealth to the abbey.[1]

It was mentioned above that among Boniface's rather numerous correspondents in England was

[1] The life of Sturmi, the first abbot, by Eigil, the fourth abbot (818–822), gives some account of Fulda. See the story of Pippin's treatment of Sturmi, banishing him and then restoring him, in *Recueil des Hist.*, V., pp. 428 f.

Cuthbert, who was Archbishop of Canterbury, 740–758. One of the most interesting of Boniface's letters is addressed to him. He tells him of the synods which he had held, and enlarges on the responsibilities of a bishop, and he then goes on to mention the disparaging remarks which are sometimes made as to the condition of the English Church. He thinks that it would be a good thing if nuns and other women were not allowed to make such frequent pilgrimages to Rome, in which many perish and few remain pure; and writes of other grievous scandals of which he had heard. It has been thought by some that it was in consequence of this letter that Archbishop Cuthbert held the synod at Clovesho in 747, the result of which was to bring the English Church more into conformity with Rome. It has been shown, however, by Haddan and Stubbs, that this is reversing what actually took place. The letter of Boniface did not bring about the council of Clovesho, but Cuthbert's report to Boniface of what had been done at the council elicited this letter from Boniface, who wished to show that in holding councils for purposes of reform he had been following Cuthbert's example.[1] Boniface begins by thanking Cuthbert for the information which he has received from him. When Cuthbert heard of the martyrdom of Boniface, he wrote a long letter to Lullus, saying that such a death was a glory to Christendom, and that the English Church, in a

[1] *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents,* III., p. 383.

general synod, had resolved to commemorate the martyrdom annually. It is remarkable that a dispute over the body of Cuthbert, even more unseemly than the one over the body of Boniface, took place at Canterbury after the archbishop's death in October 758. In order to secure burial according to his wishes in Christ Church, Cuthbert instructed his clergy to let no one know of his death, until he was safely in his grave. The rage of the monks who were thus outwitted, and the triumph of the clerks who had thus outwitted them, were all the more scandalous, because the chief object was to secure the offerings which were made at archbishops' graves.[1]

Boniface was "the Apostle of Germany" much in the same sense that Willibrord was "the Apostle of the Frisians." He was not the first to preach the Gospel in the various localities in which he worked, but he did far more than any other missionary in giving Christianity a permanent home in Germany and in organizing a German Church. He acted in the first instance as a missionary of the English Church, to which, all through his career, he frequently turned for sympathy, counsel and help. But from the time of his first visit to Rome he was

[1] The greed of the monks was a serious hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. Alcuin says: "Had the easy yoke of Christ, with His light burden, been preached to the stubborn Saxons, with as much earnestness as the payment of tithes and legal satisfaction for very small faults were exacted, perhaps they would not have abhorred the sacrament of baptism."

much more the servant of the Roman than of the English Church ; not that the two interests were antagonistic, but that they were not always co-incident. This devotion to Rome was thoroughly intelligible, and it was also thoroughly intelligent. It was natural that he should be impressed by the greatness of the Roman see, and that he should desire to show his gratitude for the support which Pope after Pope gave him in his work of converting the heathen and consolidating the Churches in Germany and elsewhere, And it was also a very wise course to pursue. Everywhere, whether from ecclesiastical or civil powers, he was glad to secure support, and no support was of such value to him as that of the Church of Rome. At home in England, he had seen how enormously the Church had progressed after it had been organized by Theodore in accordance with Roman rather than Scottish traditions ; and, on the continent, he had seen how Wilfrid and Willibrord had worked on similar lines. His own experience had taught him that the free-lance system, or want of system, exhibited by the Irish missionaries, was productive of much evil ; and it would have been useless to have held up before them and their converts either his own personal authority or that of the English Church from which he had come. He had found out, as we do, that one of the chief hindrances to the success of missions is dissension among the missionaries. Heathen cannot be converted by preachers who contradict one another, and

unity of some kind is necessary for success. The prestige of the Roman Empire was not extinct, and in a subtle way a good deal of it had been transferred to the Roman Church. And, what was far better than prestige, it was recognized that the influence of Rome, if sometimes selfish, was commonly on the side of the welfare of Europe.

It is quite true that Boniface's attachment to Rome was one of the most powerful forces in his activity, and it is probable enough that in some cases it was excessive, and led him to adopt measures which were unwise, or even unfair. The French Benedictines admit that he sometimes expresses his devotion to the holy see in terms which are not quite befitting in one who holds the office of a bishop.[1] But to say with Mosheim that "the honour and majesty of the Roman pontiff were quite as much his care as the glory of Christ and His religion—or even more so," or with Schröckh that he was "a missionary of the papacy rather than of Christianity," is a monstrous exaggeration. The devotion of Boniface to Rome was not that of an unscrupulous schemer, but of an affectionate son. He was no Guicciardini, giving (for his own selfish ends) unscrupulous support to a papal system which he knew to be bad; he was an

[1] *Hist. Lit. de la France*, IV., p. 106. Schaff speaks of his "servile Romanism" in dealing with Scotch-Irish missionaries, but admits that it was organized against unorganized Catholicism.

enthusiastic missionary, giving conscientious support to a system which he believed to be essential to the success of missionary work; and we may forgive him if he sometimes went to extremes in promoting the interests of that system. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance of his doing so was when he supported Pope Zacharias in sanctioning the deposition of Childeric III, the first instance of a Pope interfering with the allegiance of subjects and authorizing the removal of one king and the setting up of another. Yet he was no blind and servile henchman of Rome, unable to see faults in its action, or not caring to notice them. He protests when he has reason to believe that Rome grants dispensations for marriages which are incestuous. He complains when pagan customs are tolerated at Rome, the report of which are a hindrance to his own work among the heathen; and he seems to believe that it is possible that the Pope has given to bishops and priests, who have been deposed for misconduct, licence to resume their religious functions, for he tells Pope Zacharias that there are guilty people who say that they have received such licence. There is also some reason for believing that he had complained of the fees (exacted perhaps by officials rather than by the Popes) which were paid by Metropolitans when they received palls from Rome. And it is said that he resisted Pope Stephen with regard to the consecration of a Bishop of Metz; see below. All these facts show that Boniface had

the courage to maintain his independence when the system which he supported seemed to be in fault.

Boniface has been compared with his contemporary, Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, whom Pope Stephen, in gratitude for his services in rescuing him from the Lombards, made Archbishop and Legate. Both were great reformers and organizers of the Church within their jurisdiction. But Chrodegang was primarily an ecclesiastical statesman, and a missionary not at all. Boniface was primarily a missionary; even his reforming and organizing were subordinate to that; and he was a politician, not by choice, but of necessity, because he had so often to depend upon the support of kings, and mayors, and dukes. Both recognized the necessity of acting in union with Rome and of sustaining the authority of Rome. Both were Teutons ministering to Teutons; but, in order to minister effectually, they loyally worked under the system which had proved its superior efficiency, although it was not Teutonic (whether English or Frankish), but Latin.[1]

The zeal of Boniface for education is conspicuous in his work. The monasteries which he planted were schools of instruction, especially for promoting a knowledge of the Scriptures. His desire for books from England has been noticed. On his last missionary journey he took books with him. And capable and

[1] Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, I., pp. 500 f.

masterful as he was, he was quite content to leave much to be done by others, who were to be taught, as he had been taught, by experience, and who thus became able to water what he had planted, and to plant where he could not be. Consequently, his success was not a superficial or transitory success. "Whatever Boniface did was done thoroughly. Xavier in Southern India, one of the most devoted of missionaries, made converts by thousands, but the impression made was not lasting; the converts baptized in crowds, without adequate preparation, fell away quickly from their too hasty profession. But the work of Boniface was permanent, because it was done thoroughly, and with singleness of heart. Ever ardent, ever longing for fresh enterprise, he yet remembered that the work in hand must be done before attempting anything new; he was plodding, persevering, tenacious." [1]

With regard to the miracles attributed to Boniface and other missionaries, what has been said already (I., pp. 77–84) may suffice. They have not been mentioned in this sketch of their careers, for all that is mentioned here can be quite well understood without them. Many of them will be found in Mrs. Hope's book on St. Boniface, and Father Dalgairns

[1] I. G. Smith, *Boniface*, pp. 70 f. In this attractive little volume will be found instructive specimens of the letters of Boniface, and an extract from one of his sermons, translated into English. Schaff (pp. 96–98) gives Sermon 15 in English: it reminds converts of their baptismal vows.

explains why, in editing her work, he has not thought it necessary to exclude them. They are good illustrations of what was regarded as not only credible, but natural and almost necessary, in the lives of those who had a reputation for exceptional piety. But there is no evidence that Boniface ever attempted to gain converts by deceiving the heathen with false miracles. Claiming events that were an advantage to his work as marks of divine favour, and events which injured the pagans as judgments on idolaters, is one thing: working sham miracles is quite another. Boniface was never guilty of any such "pious fraud." Indeed, one of his biographers says that he wrought no miracles, and treats this as a strange defect, which needs to be explained. If he was not seen to cure men's bodies, we must remember the many invisible cures of souls which he effected.

LIBUINUS THE PATRON OF DEVENTER

It seems like an anti-climax to continue the account of English missionaries to the Continent after the death of Boniface. Mention has frequently been made of the devoted men and women who came over from "Saxony beyond the sea" to aid Willibrord and Boniface in the work of converting their heathen kinsmen in Friesland, Saxony and elsewhere. But the fire of missionary zeal in England did not at once die down, when the magic of the personal presence of these two great leaders had ceased to exist; and the

ecclesiastical and dramatic interest of the career of Libuinus is too considerable to be omitted.

He was born in England of Saxon parents and was educated as a monk. His original name was Liafwin or Liefurin, which was Latinized into Libuinus or Livinus, and this causes danger of confusion with St. Livinus of Ghent. The latter is a somewhat legendary person, who has been thought to be a mere double of Libuinus of Deventer ; but there seems to be no reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of the *Vita S. Libuini* by Hucbald of St. Amand, of which Hugh Cressy has given a full translation in his *Church History of Britanny or England*, 1668. Libuinus came to Utrecht where he was heartily welcomed by Gregory, the disciple of Boniface, who sent him to labour on the Yssel, where he made many converts among the Frisians and built several churches. Then the heathen made inroads, burnt one of his churches, and killed some of his converts. Then came his great opportunity, of which, against the advice of his friends, he decided to make use. The Saxon pagans were about to hold their national assembly at Marklo on the Weser, and Libuinus determined to attend it and confront them. He might convince them ; and, if he failed and they put him to death, his martyrdom would bear fruit. So he put on his priestly robes, took a book of the Gospels in his hand, and presented himself. They listened while he spoke to them of the true God and of the folly and wickedness of idolatry ;

but, when he went on to say that, unless they submitted to Christ and were baptized, a powerful king, who was not far off, would come and sweep them all away, they became exasperated, and it was with some difficulty that an old chief named Buto calmed them, and at last induced the assembly to grant leave to Libuinus to preach wherever he pleased. Libuinus returned in safety and spent the rest of his life in making full use of this permission. But hostility to him did not cease. The heathen still persecuted him and on one occasion burnt his church at Deventer. The date, neither of his birth, nor of his death, seems to be known.

The king, with whose vengeance Libuinus threatened the Saxons, was Charlemagne ; and it was he who, in a very different spirit, and with methods very different from those of Boniface and Libuinus, completed the conversion of the Saxons.[1] Whenever Charlemagne went on a distant expedition, the Saxons gave

[1] For the warm approbation which Pope Hadrian I sent to Charlemagne respecting his treatment of the Saxons, see the letters quoted in *Recueil des Hist.*, V., especially p. 568. For the wholesale baptism of uninstructed Saxons, see pp. 203, 319, 342, 376 ; for the baptism of Widikind, pp. 239, 319, 345, 364, 377, 451, 620.

Alcuin, in a letter which is quoted by William of Malmesbury (I., 90), put the matter very succinctly thus : "The Old Saxons and all the nations of the Frisians were converted to the faith of Christ through the exertions of King Charles, who *urged some with threats and tempted others with rewards.*" See W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World* (Bampton Lectures, 1909), pp. 145–149.

trouble. When he had defeated them, multitudes professed Christianity and accepted baptism. Then, when he had withdrawn, they returned to their old idolatry, for they had never been taught what Christianity meant. The Saxon chief Widikind could always find followers in his conflict with this worthless substitute for the ancestral religion. When Charlemagne returned, he fled, and when Charlemagne retired, he came back. At last he surrendered in 785, and accepted baptism, with Charlemagne as his godfather. He may have been a genuine convert, or he may have accepted baptism merely as an admission that he was beaten. It is said to have been a Saxon doctrine that Thor was the god of strength and was always on the side of the stronger. Thor, therefore, had decided against Widikind.

Charlemagne's legislation for Saxony, *Capitula de partibus Saxoniæ*, issued that year, was far more rigorous than the rest of his legislation, and in some respects was disastrous. It was perhaps the result of great exasperation, or it may have been promulgated merely as a temporary expedient. It was somewhat modified twelve years later. It was reasonable enough to make it a capital offence to burn churches, to murder clergy, or to offer human sacrifices. But it was monstrous to make it a capital offence to refuse baptism or deride Christianity by eating meat in Lent. Genuine Christians are not formed by such means. In short, Christian baptism

was degraded into being little more than an acknowledgment of submission to the King of the Franks: but those who have made the Holy Communion a test of loyalty to the King of England must remember that enormity when they condemn the policy of Charlemagne. As to the fruits of that policy, what Montalembert says of the conversion of the Franks under pressure from Clovis or Chlodwig, the son of Childeric, is true enough of the Saxons under the still greater pressure of Charlemagne. Clovis gave the word to his soldiers and subjects, whom he had led to victory. Charlemagne gave the word to his vanquished enemies, to whom disobedience meant death. Loyalty to a successful leader was the motive in the one case; dread of a detested conqueror was the motive in the other. Yet even Clovis could not make such a conversion real; and still less could Charlemagne with his more violent methods do so. "The Franks," says Montalembert, "were sad Christians. While they made profession of the Catholic faith, they violated without scruple all its precepts, and even the simplest laws of humanity, sometimes in outbursts of fury, sometimes by cold-blooded cruelties. It is difficult to believe that, in embracing Christianity, they gave up a single pagan vice or adopted a single Christian virtue."

But the great Teuton monarch, who compelled the Saxons to be either baptized or slaughtered, was neither an Englishman nor a missionary; and his

work lies outside the scope of this chapter. It is, however, not impossible that his attempts to destroy heathenism on the Continent had some connexion with the attempts, which began about this time, to destroy Christianity in England. To a large extent he checked the career of paganism on land; and paganism at once found a new career for itself on the sea. England and Ireland were overrun by the Danes.

CHAPTER II

THE PENITENTIAL SYSTEM AND PENITENTIALS

THERE has been a good deal of difference of opinion as to whether the Penitential System which was introduced by the Roman and Scottish missions did much good. It certainly did a good deal of harm, and if we confine our attention to the Penitential Books, or Penitentials, as they are commonly called, we may say that the harm far exceeded the good, whether we regard their effect on the clergy who used them, or the laity who were treated in accordance with the regulations laid down in them.

The penitential system as a whole was an attempt to lay upon the rough selfish world something of the monastic discipline which had come to be regarded as the ideal life; and of course some modifications had to be made in the discipline when it was applied to lay persons living in the world. In two respects at least it did good. It taught and

enforced the wholesome doctrine that sin was a pollution to the sinner, and that wrongdoing was an injury, not only to the persons wronged, but also to the wrongdoer himself. No doubt this had been taught, not only in the first ages of the Christian Church, but before the birth of Christianity, and by both Jews and Gentiles. But the penitential system drove this idea home, and emphasized the fact that personal purity and rectitude were things to be desired for a man's own well-being, as well as for the safety of those among whom he lived; and thus the moral sense of society was made more alert, and was raised to a higher level. The system also did a great service to society in changing the point of view from which offences were to be judged. Every great injury to the person had its customary penalty, according to a rate which eventually became embodied in laws; and this penalty was called the *wer*, which being of the nature of a pecuniary fine was commonly spoken of as the *wergild.* But, whereas the *wergild* of the State was on a scale which rated offences according to the rank of the person wronged, the penitential system of the Church rated offences according to the rank of the wrongdoer. The one made an offence committed *against* a person of high rank worse than an offence committed against a person of low rank. The other treated an offence committed *by* a person of high rank as worse than one committed by

a person of low rank. The difference from a moral point of view was great, aud wholly to the advantage of society. The principle that *noblesse oblige*, that the nobleman is under stronger obligation to behave well than the serf, and the priest than the layman, was wholesome doctrine: and it was no less wholesome doctrine that to kill a serf was just as much murder as to kill an aetheling or a king.

One can hardly avoid, in this connexion, talking of Anglo-Saxon *laws*; but it must be remembered that we know very little about such things, and it is unwise to make more than tentative statements on the subject. It is convenient to talk of Ini's laws or Alfred's laws, and such language easily leads one to think of a code drawn up under the one king or the other. But we probably make a considerable mistake if we assume that any such code ever existed. The "dooms" that have come down to us are isolated regulations; attempts to put down in black and white some of the more important customs which had become established, and which often require a knowledge of customs that were not written down, in order to make the written "dooms" intelligible. That is just the knowledge which, with our present materials, it seems to be impossible to obtain. Nevertheless, enough is known to enable us to compare the civil customs or laws of the State with the penitential system of the Church, and to see that the moral

influence of the latter was in some respects superior to the moral influence of the former.

Wergild and compurgation seem always to have gone together; the higher the *wergild*, the greater the value of that person's oath in court. Every man's life had its value, and every man's word had its value, when he swore to alleged facts in a trial. The oath of the twelfhynd man was worth twice that of the sixhynd man, and six times that of the twyhynd man. The *wergild* of the twyhynd, or simple free man, was 200 shillings, and this seems to have been the unit of calculation. The estimates for the higher ranks, whether in the State or in the Church, were multiples of that; viz., twice, or four times, or six times, 200 shillings. The slave had no *wergild*, and his word went for nothing in a court of justice: he could no more give legal testimony than an ox or an ass. He was simply his master's chattel. Injuries done to him were treated as done to his master, just as injuries done to the master's cattle were treated; and the master was responsible for all injuries done by his slave, just as he was responsible for what his cattle did.

Yet even in this civil legislation or traditional custom we can trace the influence of the Church. Church property was regarded as God's property, and theft of it was punished more severely than theft from a king. The word of a bishop, like the

word of a king, was indisputable, even without an oath. A priest could clear himself from an accusation by denying the truth of it before the altar and saying *veritatem dico in Christo, non mentior* (Rom. ix. 1). A layman had to swear, and bring others to swear, that he was innocent. It is stated that a slave who was made by his master to work on Sunday could claim his freedom. Such a law is obviously of ecclesiastical origin, and it must have secured to the slave one day of rest in the week. No master would risk losing his slave for the sake of a few hours' work. But it is probable that these customs were not the same in all kingdoms, or at all periods. Nevertheless, we may assume that similar principles prevailed in almost all cases: and the difference between estimating the gravity of a crime by the rank of the person who commits it, rather than by the rank of the person who suffers from it, is very great indeed; and this change of view may be attributed to the penitential system, which made the penance of a priest heavier than that of a deacon, and the penance of a deacon or subdeacon heavier than that of a layman. Nevertheless, at its best, such a system had obvious perils, which might easily be realized. It seemed to imply, by its carefully graduated penalties for particular sins, that by the performance of the penance the sin was *ipso facto* cancelled as if it had never been committed, just as

a debt is cancelled by the payment of what has been owed: and it might easily be understood to insinuate that the sin might be committed, if you were prepared to perform the penance which was prescribed for it. Modifications were gradually introduced into the system, partly of necessity, and partly through the ingenious casuistry of penitents or of indulgent confessors, which turned these possibilities into disastrous facts.

When a flagrant sinner had delayed repentance until he was on his deathbed, it was futile to tell him that he must undergo penitential fasts for many years. He was allowed to commute these for works of mercy by donations to churches and monasteries, helping the poor, freeing his own slaves, and redeeming those of other masters, building bridges, and the like. This kind of indulgence was required often, and at last was reduced to a system, with a fixed price for every period of fasting that was commuted, the price being graduated according to the rank or wealth of the penitent. Then it was pleaded that, if this commutation was allowed to all those who were supposed to be dying, some of whom eventually recovered, it ought to be allowed to all sick persons, who were, by the fact of their sickness, precluded from undergoing a long period of fasting. And then it was argued that all whose constitutions or daily employments rendered a prolonged diet of bread and water

perilous to health might claim the same right of commutation. When this concession had been made, it was obvious that the Church was favouring the rich, while being as stern as ever to the poor. The rich man might commit some scandalous crime, and quickly be reconciled to the Church by payment of the sum which was equivalent to the years of penitential discipline which his sin had incurred; while the poor man, in similar circumstances, would have to undergo the penance or be excommunicated. This rendered it necessary that some kind of commutation, other than a money payment, should be invented. If, therefore, the penitent was too poor to pay a silver penny for every day of fasting that his sin had incurred, he might recite fifty psalms instead of paying; and if he was too illiterate to recite fifty psalms, he might say the Lord's Prayer fifty times. But, supposing he was so ignorant as to be unable to say the Lord's Prayer, or had to work so hard for his living that he could not find time for reciting so many psalms or prayers daily, what was he to do? Then he might get some one else to do it for him, of course remunerating his substitute so far as he was able. Supposing that he found a good-natured substitute who did not require to be remunerated, he got off scot free. In this way it was possible for a man to commit a grievous sin, and yet enjoy the full privileges of communion, without having done any-

thing to prove, either to himself or to others, that he was penitent. He could tell himself and others that he had done all that the Church required.

Such cases were not only possible, they actually occurred, and evidently they were not rare. At an early date the Council of Clovesho found it necessary to proclaim that no one must think that psalm-singing will free people from the obligation to practise other good works, or that sins can be cancelled by the fasts and prayers of other persons. It also told the clergy to remind their flocks that alms and prayers, although certainly useful, are designed to be only auxiliaries of fasting, and not substitutes for it. The bishops, however, seem hardly to have been in earnest about the matter. The indulgences and commutations and substitutions which they condemned were, little by little, sanctioned, first by silence, and then by formal permission.

When this system of counting the austerities and devotions of other people as penance for one's own sins had become recognized and accurately graduated according to a known rule, it developed to an extent which is hardly credible, and which in any sphere other than that of the solemn work of reclaiming sinners and freeing them from their sins would seem to be grotesque and absurd. In order to be safe from the suspicion of exaggerating for controversial purposes, it will be well to take the

description of the process from a Roman Catholic writer of great learning and fairness. The case is that of a wealthy thegn who had committed a crime for which the established penance would be a rigorous fast for a year. "At his summons, his friends and dependants assembled at his castle: they also [i.e., as well as the thegn himself] assumed the garb of penitence: their food was confined to bread, herbs, and water, and these austerities were continued till the aggregate amount of their fasts equalled the number specified by the canons. Thus, with the assistance of one hundred and twenty associates, an opulent sinner might, in the space of three days, discharge the penance of a whole year" (Lingard, *The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,* I., p. 339). It was stipulated that the sinner must do a fraction of the penance himself; and he was admonished that the experiment of getting other people to do the greater part for him was a doubtful one, and that he must sanctify the experiment by true contrition. But such admonitions were not likely to have much effect, when the practice of vicarious penance had been not only allowed but regulated in detail. Lingard states that he has found no instance of it later than the reign of Edgar;[1] but of course that

[1] The reason for making the reign of Edgar a limit may be the occurrence of this passage at the conclusion of the chapter "Of powerful Men" in Edgar's canons (Thorpe, 414,

does not prove that the custom came to an end then. In history generally, and especially in ages in which historians are not found and chroniclers are few, it is things which are of frequent occurrence that are not recorded. One may conjecture that an arrangement which was so much in accordance with the wishes of the powerful and wealthy would not easily die out of itself or be put down by ecclesiastical authority. It would be interesting to know whether ecclesiastics themselves ever made use of it.

It is in the Penitentials or Penitential Books that the system is seen at its worst. Such things had many names: *libri poenitentiales*, *poenitentialia*, *leges poenitentiae* or *poenitentium*, *poenitentiales codices*, *peccantium judicia*, and so forth. Apparently they were seldom put forth with the authority of any Council, but generally with that of some individual teacher or bishop, who had a reputation for piety and for skill in dealing with penitents. Councils as a rule seem to have condemned the use of them, or at any rate of certain provisions in them, as we have seen was the case with the Council of Clovesho. The best known examples are the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials of the period which we are dis-

5): "This is the alleviation of the penance of a man powerful and rich in friends; but one not possessing means may not so proceed, but must seek it in himself the more diligently: and that is also justest, that every one avenge his own misdeeds on himself with diligent compensation" (Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, bk. iv., ch. 9).

cussing, but such books were common enough on the Continent. It is erroneous to suppose that they were introduced into Britain from Rome, whether by Archbishop Theodore or any of his predecessors. It is quite clear from Adamnan's *Life of Columba* (i., 22; ii., 39; see Fowler's edition, p. 35) and other sources of information that penitential canons existed in the Keltic Church. We have extracts from the *Book of David*, Bishop of Minevia (St. David's) in the sixth century, which was of this character; and there is a *Book on the Computation of Penances* which is attributed to Cummian, who sided with Rome against his Keltic brethren on the Paschal question in the seventh century. It has been thought that Theodore's Penitential is largely based on Cummian's, but chronology is against this.[1] The later Penitential of Archbishop Egbert of York, however, does owe some of its items to Cummian. To what extent the Penitential which bears the name of Theodore is really his, is a question not easily determined. But that he did issue such a document, not for general information, but for the guidance of parish priests,

[1] Dean Hook thinks that Theodore must have been acquainted with the Penitential of John the Faster (d. A.D. 596), the opponent of Pope Gregory the Great (*Lives of the Archbishops*, I., p. 168). In the form in which it has come down to us, this Penitential has the horrible features alluded to below, and it was probably written under Theodore's own supervision.

is certain: and whatever harm it may have done by lowering the tone of spiritual life in an unwise attempt to raise it, we ought to remember with gratitude that it had a good deal to do with establishing the parochial system in England. The Penitential assumes all through that every English Christian has a church to worship in and a priest to minister to him both publicly and privately (Haddan's *Remains*, edited by Forbes, pp. 323 f.).

There is a Penitential which bears the honoured name of Bede, and some scholars of repute accept it as his. But the latest editor of Bede gives good reasons for doubting whether he ever compiled anything of the kind. Bede does not mention it in the list of his writings at the end of his *Ecclesiastical History*, nor does he allude to it elsewhere. Egbert, who was Bede's pupil, in compiling his Penitential, states that he borrows from Gregory and Theodore but says nothing about obligations to Bede, Moreover, Bede, who tells us so much about Theodore, never mentions that Theodore had issued a Penitential, which he surely would have done if he had used it: and the Penitential attributed to Bede is only a compilation from Theodore's and other works of the kind. "On the whole the arguments are against Bede's authorship, and we should be thankful to believe that Bede had nothing to do with such a matter. The penitential literature is

in truth a deplorable feature of the mediaeval Church. Evil deeds, the imagination of which may perhaps have dimly floated through our minds in our darkest moments, are here tabulated and reduced to a system. It is hard to see how any one could busy himself with such literature and not be the worse for it" (C. Plummer, *Baedae Opera Historica*, I., pp. clvii. f.).

The reader will find similar condemnations of these books in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, III., p. 367, IV., p. 932, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, II., p. 1608. They seem to have been much used in the Gallic Church, for a good many Frankish Penitentials are still extant: and there they were condemned by synodical authority early in the ninth century, by Councils at Chalons, A.D. 813, at Mainz, A.D. 829, and at Paris, A.D. 847; which also appears to show that they were so widely diffused and so generally employed as to be a serious and notorious evil. They are to be entirely rejected and discarded; and bishops are charged to destroy them wherever they come across them. Apparently these Frankish Penitentials were nameless, *quorum certi errores, incerti auctores*, and therefore it would be more easy to drive them out of use. But in England the names of Theodore and Egbert, which were rightly assigned to books of this kind, and the name of Bede, however wrongly assigned, would make it more difficult to get the Penitentials discarded,

and as a matter of fact they continued to be copied for a long time.

It is only right to remember, when we read of the appalling minuteness with which sins of the flesh are tabulated and estimated as to degrees of enormity, and therefore as to corresponding degrees of penance, that the whole system originated in misguided zeal in dealing with the vices of *heathens*, to whom such things were either a matter of course or a joke. But we cannot argue that, if the Penitentials had not been in the first instance framed for converts from paganism, such sins would hardly have been mentioned. The damning fact is that they continue to be mentioned, and discussed with increasing minuteness, when the Penitentials are to be used in dealing with persons who have had Christian progenitors for generations, and in particular with the inmates of monasteries. As Haddan long ago pointed out, in dealing with Montalembert's too favourable estimate of "The Monks of the West," if a whole series of minute laws is repeated again and again, through many centuries and in all countries, respecting "certain acts of wickedness as committed by a special class of men, we fear it is plain proof that such wickedness not only existed, but was common in that class.[1] In

[1] For the extraordinary severity of the penalties inflicted by monastic discipline on quite ordinary and even trivial faults, see I. Gregory Smith, *Christian Monasticism*, ch. vii.

truth, the framers of canons and penitentials must have been destitute of common sense, as well as common decency, if anything save stern necessity drove them to fill their pages with that which forms the staple of their contents." Any one who cares to verify the truth of this has the material provided for him in Vol. III. of Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* The later developments of the system in the matter of indulgences are sketched in Lindsay's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., pp. 213–227, and still more fully in H. C. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, vols. ii. and iii. On the one hand, the system did a great deal towards augmenting the power of Rome, especially by supplying the popes with the funds necessary for a temporal sovereign; on the other it was the occasion of the rebellion of Bohemia under John Huss and of the far more serious revolt under Luther and Zwingli. But we may with the utmost confidence refuse credit to the attempts of modern defenders of indulgences, when they argue that indulgences were already customary in the Church in the early period of which we have been treating. The Council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, declared that the power of granting indulgences had been conferred upon the Church by Christ Himself; and if it had been content with that statement, no one, in the absence of evidence,

could have disproved it. Conjectures as to what our Lord may have said to His Apostles in the forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension are limitless. But the Council went on to declare that this divinely conferred power had been used by the Church " in very ancient times." That is a statement which *can* be disproved. The instances which are cited in support of it can be shown to be either pure fabrications or instances of something quite distinct from an indulgence in the technical sense. The word *indulgentia* was for a considerable time used in its popular sense at a period when there were no indulgences in the later technical sense.

Before the Reformation it was generally admitted by Roman theologians that the system of indulgences was of comparatively late origin, and that it was unknown to the Fathers of the Church. But as soon as the Council of Trent had committed the Roman Church to the statement mentioned above, it became a point of honour to find some historical support for it. It was seriously argued that St. Paul's treatment of the great sinner at Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 1–11) was the granting of an indulgence; and for the purposes of this argument it is immaterial whether the highly improbable view, that the great sinner is the incestuous person of 1 Corinthians v. is correct or not. Again, the *libelli* granted by martyrs or confessors to those who had

lapsed under persecution are claimed as examples of indulgences. The difference in each of these cases is manifest. The earliest indulgences, in the technical sense, grew out of the commutations of penance systematized by the Penitentials. The penitent was allowed to substitute some work of piety for the whole or part of the penance imposed by his confessor; and priests sometimes took upon themselves to allow commutations or remissions which were not recognized by the Penitentials. It was, therefore, possible for an indulgent confessor to remit the whole of the canonical penance, if the penitent would spend money on what was regarded as pious work. This abuse continued in spite of official condemnation,[1] and it was one of the chief sources of the abuses which led to the revolt which was headed by Luther, for it was out of these commutations and remissions that the sale of indulgences grew.

The confusion which identifies the remission of the whole or part of a penance with the indulgence which grants remission of sin and the whole or part of what would otherwise have to be endured in purgatory, still continues in Roman works. In the "new edition, revised and enlarged with the assistance of the Rev. T. B. Scannell, B.D.," of *A Catholic*

[1] The attempt to confine the power of commuting penances to bishops failed. It was easy for the confessor and the penitent to act without the bishop, who might be difficult of access.

Dictionary (Kegan Paul, 1893), we read that "the History of Indulgences confirms the teaching of the present Church. . . . In primitive times many years of heavy penance were exacted for great sins, but these penances were curtailed if the penitent had displayed great contrition (Cyprian, Epp. 15–17 and 33). We read of one case (Euseb., *H.E.*, v., 32 [?]) in which the canonical penance, which had, as a rule, to be performed before absolution, was wholly remitted. The way in which this indulgence was most commonly granted deserves particular notice. A confessor in prison and expecting death for Christ, sent a letter of peace (*libellus pacis*) to the bishop in favour of some brother who was under penance—e.g., for apostasy—and the bishop, if satisfied of his contrition, restored him to the peace of the Church (see Cyprian, Epp. 15–17 and 33). Here we have the modern doctrine of indulgence in full operation among the Christians of the third century" (pp. 483 f.). And then follows an attempt to get the doctrine of the "treasury of merits" out of Cyprian, who says that God *paenitenti, operanti, roganti potest clementer ignoscere, potest in acceptum referre quidquid pro talibus et petierint martyres et fecerint sacerdotes* (*De Lapsis* 36); which does not carry us very far.

Lea has collected a number of instances of false statements with regard to the granting of indulgences during the early period of which we have

been treating. Not many perhaps would venture to quote as historical an indulgence of ten or twelve years said to have been granted about A.D. 550 to St. Patrick and the Irish. But from the thirteenth century onwards it has been repeatedly asserted, not only by Boniface VIII., but by Bellarmine and Baronius, that Gregory the Great granted an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines to those who visited the Roman Churches. Orthodox Roman writers, such as Papenbroek and Pagi, utterly reject the statement. "It probably arose from a passage in John the Deacon, who relates that Gregory was the first to regulate the 'stations' of the Roman basilicas by preaching in them twenty homilies at various times. He says nothing of indulgences or pardons or any other graces. The *Liber Diurnus*, or formulary for the use of the papal scribes up to at least the eighth century, in its collection of formulas for the restoration, building, re-building and dedication of churches, the collocation of relics and the privileges of monasteries and other pious foundations, has nothing in the nature of a concession of indulgences." Another instance, quoted by Baronius but rejected by Papenbroek and Pagi, is an indulgence said to have been granted by Sergius II. in 847. The Lateran Church contained some of the boldest forgeries. "It displayed a tablet stating that Sylvester I granted plenary remissions of all sins to all visiting it at any

time; that Gregory I confirmed this on rebuilding the church after its destruction by heretics (!), and that Boniface had declared that 'The Indulgences of the Lateran Church cannot be counted save by God alone, and I confirm them all' (Ferraris Prompta Biblioth. s.v. *Indulgentia*, Art. VI., n. 24)."[1] The Penitentials of Theodore and Egbert and of other unknown authors led on to these things, especially when the principles laid down in them came into contact with the theory of the "treasury of merits." That saints and martyrs, whether on earth or in Paradise, can intercede for their brethren, and that God is likely to listen to such intercessions, is one thing: that saints and martyrs have merits to contribute to a common fund, out of which the Church, or one of its officials, can make grants for the benefit of both the living and the dead, is quite another. There is plenty of evidence for a belief in the former in the early ages of the Church: belief in the latter comes later, and at first tentatively and doubtingly.[2] For obvious reasons, it is impossible to prove that there is no foundation for it. But our Lord has taught us that the most faithful servants have no other merit than that of having done what

[1] See Lea, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, III., pp. 133, 280.

[2] It was still undefined in the fifteenth century, but it was commonly believed and acted upon. And, as the treasury of merits was at the disposal of the Popes, it greatly increased their power.

it was their duty to do (Luke xvii. 10): there is nothing over and above their duty which may make them creditors rather than debtors to Him.

When Roman theologians expound the doctrine of indulgences as meaning that there must be true penitence and devotion in the hearts of those who desire to profit by the indulgence, otherwise it will avail nothing, they teach what is sound, but they make the indulgence useless. True penitence and devotion are certain to be accepted by God without either earning an indulgence by prayers at a prescribed spot or buying one for money. The value of an indulgence is real, if, as some theologians maintain, it acts automatically, quite independently of the disposition of the person who acquires it. The presence of deep contrition and hatred of sin, some declare, in no way increases the efficacy of the indulgence, any more than the absence of such feelings diminishes it. The treasure of merits is inexhaustible, and its application to the possessor of the indulgence depends upon the good-will of the Giver, not upon the good disposition of the receiver.[1] God has entered into a bargain,

[1] The Jesuit, J. P. Gury, gives this view: *Per se* nulla requiritur intentio; effectus enim indulgentiae, seu remissio poenae, pendet omnino a concessione Ecclesiae, non vero ab intentione agentis; unde licet se passive habeat, nec attendat ad indulgentiam, immo nesciat se illam lucrari dum ipsum contingit, nihilominus jus ad illam consequitur (*Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, p. 469).

and He does His part irrespective of the state of mind of the other party to the bargain. When He has promised certain results for visiting a church, the results will follow, whatever may be the mental attitude of the person who fulfils the conditions.[1] The question is, whether God has entered into any such bargain and made any such promise, or whether those who claim to be His ministers have, in the grossest manner, taken His Name in vain. But it shows what the establishment of a tariff of penances, followed by the establishment of a tariff of substitutions for penances, leads to, when it ends in a gigantic system which has to be defended by such arguments as those which have just been quoted. No doubt Penitentials were never intended, in the first instance, to be read by the laity; they were private guides to confessors. But it was inevitable that their contents should become generally known, all the more so, when the clergy themselves developed the system of indulgences out of them; and the general knowledge was pestilential. Sooner or later, reason and conscience must come to the conclusion that these prescribed observances, without a truly penitent heart, are of no avail, whereas the penitent heart is sure of recognition, without the prescribed observances.

[1] Lea gives references to Diana (*Summa*, art. *Indulgentiae requisita*, n. 5) and Pignatelli, one of the most distinguished theologians of the seventeenth century.

It is this which excites the derision of Erasmus and Zwingli, and the compassion of Luther. How strange, said they, that people should believe so ridiculous a doctrine! How sad, said he, that souls that are conscious of guilt, and are seeking for forgiveness, should be cheated into using means that can never secure forgiveness or peace!

But it must be carefully observed that the doctrine of the treasury of merits made a radical change in the theory of the penitential system as enlarged by the granting of indulgences.[1] The earlier indulgences were permissions to substitute some prescribed work to be performed by the penitent, with or without the assistance of others, for the penance which had been imposed in accordance with tabulated rules. But the doctrine of the treasury of merits implied that the penitent's obligation was discharged, not by any equivalent supplied by himself, but by a grant made to him out of this treasury by the Pope. The Pope, moreover, could make what rules he pleased as to the conditions on which this grant should be made; and, as the expenditure of Popes increased, it was very convenient to make the payment of a sum of money to be the chief condition for obtaining a grant. Luther preached one or two sermons against the evil practice before he posted his ninety-five Theses; in one of them he points out what a grievous instru-

[1] *The Cambridge Modern History*, II., pp. 125 f.

ment the sale of indulgences is, when placed in the hands of avarice.

The history of the development of practice and theory from the Penitentials of Theodore and Egbert to the Indulgences assailed by Luther is full of instruction and warning. Practice usually came first, and then theories were invented to justify it.

CHAPTER III

THE REVIVAL UNDER ALFRED

ELEVEN years ago, English History, after the lapse of exactly a thousand years, repeated itself in a remarkable way. A new century and a new reign began in the same year. In the year 901 the tenth century began, and in the year 901 the reign of an English King began. In the year 1901 the twentieth century began, and in the year 1901 the reign of an English King began. In 901 it was a King Edward that was succeeding to his parent's throne; and so it was again in 1901. Nor does the parallel end there. In 901 the parent whom King Edward succeeded was the best sovereign, and the best beloved sovereign, that the English nation had ever known; and so it was again in 1901.

In 901 the English nation was still young, and had not long been welded together as one nation under the terrible, but not altogether unwholesome blows, inflicted by the Danes. The English had only for a short period had the experience of living under the government of one king. But at

no time had the English nation, or any division of the English nation, had a king who in the beauty of his life, or in the excellence of his government, or in the affection and devotion with which he inspired his people, could compare with him whom we commonly speak of as "Alfred the Great." That title, admirably as it fits him, is comparatively a modern one: perhaps it is not older than the seventeenth century. It is certainly not the title which his own subjects gave him, still less is it one which he claimed for himself. He calls himself "King of the Saxons," a title which no one had used before, and which was not very common afterwards. But the title which his own subjects gave him was a nobler one than that of "Alfred the Great." He lived among them for fifty-two years, and he reigned over them for thirty; and during most of the thirty years the name by which he was known among his own people was "England's Darling," or "The Darling of the English." He had delivered them from their cruel enemies, the Danes. He had secured them against attacks for the future. He had given them good laws. And, in spite of a painful disease, which sometimes completely prostrated him with suffering, he laboured incessantly for their good; and not merely for their material prosperity, but chiefly for the enlightenment of their minds and the health of their souls. Consequently, for centuries after his death, wherever

there was a valuable institution of which the origin had been forgotten, the common explanation was that it had been founded by King Alfred. Whatever was beneficial to the nation was certain, men thought, to have come from him. And, in all this, popular legend and deliberate fiction have in the main been true enough to actual fact. They have done the hero whom they glorify no more than justice; for they have attributed to him the kind of things which he actually did, and have set him before us as the kind of prince which he actually was, the model Englishman, and the model English King. Thus Alfred realizes in history what had been told in legend respecting an idealized British King, and then himself becomes the centre of legends, which, however, realize rather than idealize him. The legendary King Arthur, in character and in exploits over the heathen, is reproduced in the historical Alfred; and then we have a legendary Alfred, who is the historical Alfred over again. Alfred has been called by Ranke, "one of the greatest figures in the history of the world," and by Freeman "the most perfect character in history." There is no need to criticize either expression.

The revival of England under Alfred the Great has been compared with that of France under Joan of Arc. But that is not the kind of revival with which we are concerned, glorious as it was in itself, and necessary for the revival with which we *are*

concerned. What we have to look at is Alfred's work in restoring the churches and monasteries which had been destroyed by the Danes, in reviving religion, and (with a view to this) in raising the intellectual level of the people, and especially of the clergy. It is about the last that we have most information.

Alfred built a house for nuns at Shaftesbury and a house for monks at Athelney, the latter being probably a thankoffering for the great services which he had been able to render the nation with the fortress at Athelney as his headquarters. And had he lived longer he would have made other foundations at Winchester and elsewhere. But, apparently, it was easier, after the ravages made by the Danes, to build religious houses than to find English people who were willing to enter on the religious life; and Alfred had to collect monks on the Continent to fill the new or restored monasteries. Was it that the English had noticed with what special fury the Danes had pillaged monasteries and massacred monks, and that they did not care to expose themselves to anything of the kind in the uncertain future? Or had the scandal of the sham monasteries, of which Bede tells us in his letter to Egbert, so discredited monasticism in England that no Englishmen were willing to take the places of those who had been slaughtered by the heathen invaders? Be that as it may, this was not a field in which Alfred had conspicuous success. It was not until a

little later that the monastic spirit was rekindled in England, partly through the influence of Dunstan, who himself became Abbot of Glastonbury at the early age of twenty-two.

The Ford Lecturer of 1901, who chose for his subject *The Life and Times of Alfred the Great* (Oxford Press, 1902), says that of synods or special ecclesiastical legislation under Alfred he can find no trace. More than one episcopal see had been extinguished by the Danes. In what way were they revived, and when were they revived? We know something about the two Archbishops of Canterbury in Alfred's reign, Ethelred and Plegmund, but very little about any other bishops or any other leading churchmen. We have the names of some, but we do not know what they did. "Beyond the broad fact of the ruin caused by the ravages of the Danes, the whole history of the Church under Alfred is most obscure. . . . A letter from Archbishop Fulk of Rheims to Plegmund shows that clerical and episcopal marriages were common in England at that time, and there are traces of something like hereditary succession to ecclesiastical lands. There is no evidence that Alfred attempted to alter this state of things; there is some evidence that he disapproved it. In the Soliloquies of St. Augustine, the Anglo-Saxon translation of which is almost certainly by Alfred, there is a passage in which Augustine declares that he has no desire to marry.

This, which in the original is purely personal to Augustine, is by the translator extended to all clergy: 'I say, however, that it is better for priests not to marry than to marry.'"[1] It appears also from one of the numerous letters of the ambitious and energetic Pope John VIII (872–882), which is addressed to the archbishops (Ethelred of Canterbury and Wulfhere of York) and bishops of the English Church, that the clergy generally had adopted the dress of laymen. This probably meant that they lived as laymen, and the Pope desired that clerical dress should be resumed. We know that a large number of priests had been murdered by the Danes, and that the schools for the education of the clergy had been for the time destroyed, and this, no doubt, had resulted in the admission of a low type of men to the ministry, men who had married before they were admitted to the priesthood, and who refused to adopt a stricter mode of life after their ordination.[2] Archbishop Fulk of Rheims wrote to Archbishop Plegmund of Canterbury in much the same

[1] Yet Archbishop Parker was of opinion that it was because the clergy were allowed to marry that the English prospered so much at this period; *monachorum loco succedebant presbyteri, qui in conjugio legitimo pie vivebant. Tunc vero Deus Opt. Max. praebuit se magis mitem atque placabilem erga Anglicanam gentem*: a remark which excites Lingard's scorn (*Anglo-Saxon Church*, II., p. 259).

[2] It is possible that lay dress was at first adopted as a disguise, to conceal the clergy from the Danes, and that it was continued as suitable to a less strict life.

strain as that in which John VIII had written to his predecessor. The English clergy were in much need of reformation. But, beyond Alfred's efforts to raise the level of religion and education in England generally, we do not know much about the means which he took to reform the clergy.

About these efforts, however, we know a good deal, and there is hardly any part of his great work on which the student dwells with greater pleasure. We may well believe that there was no part of his work which gave more delight and satisfaction to Alfred himself. His own craving for learning of the best kind made him sympathetic respecting the needs of others. The pretty story of his mother tempting him to learn to read when he was a child, by promising him a beautifully illuminated book as soon as he could read it, perhaps means no more than that he learnt the not very voluminous contents by heart by hearing them read to him. He does not seem to have known how to read until much later in life, and perhaps he never was able to write with ease. Much of his learning was, no doubt, acquired by getting other people to read to him: and, although the free character of his translations from Latin works can often be attributed to deliberate modification of the original work, in order to make it more edifying to his people, yet some of it, no doubt, was due to imperfect knowledge of Latin.

In improving the condition of education in England, the difficulty was to find teachers. Learning had been declining since the death of Bede, and the Danes had destroyed many of such educated men as still existed, together with libraries and schools. But the West of Britain had suffered less severely than the East. From Wales Alfred got Asser of Menevia, who is perhaps the author of the main portion of the Life of Alfred which is commonly quoted by his name (p. 35); and from the West of Mercia he got Werferth, who had the courage to accept the see of Worcester, and Plegmund, who eventually became Archbishop of Canterbury, together with Ethelstan and Werewulf, two clerics whom Alfred made his chaplains. These five, however, did not suffice, and Alfred sent to the Continent for others.[1] He obtained Grimbald, a priest and monk of the abbey of St. Bertin in Flanders, and John the Old Saxon, a monk of Corwey, whom Alfred placed at the head of the monastery which he founded at Athelney. These two foreign teachers have suffered in a strange way at the hands of historians. One of them has been doubled; the other has been made into one with a different person. Mabillon has made two Grimbalds, who both came

[1] It is worth noting that this introduction of foreigners into the kingdom, and giving them promotion, does not seem to have excited the jealousy of Alfred's subjects. It is not remembered against him as a blemish, as it is against some English kings.

to England under Alfred.[1] William of Malmesbury has identified John the Old Saxon with John Scotus Erigena, an identification which is commonly rejected by scholars, but which still finds support. Dean Hook says that there was a "tradition that the archbishopric was offered to Grimbald" before it was offered to Plegmund, and says that "the language of the Chronicle seems to confirm the tradition."[2] We can judge for ourselves as to the language of the Chronicle, but no authority is given for the existence of the tradition. It is very improbable that Alfred ever thought of appointing a foreigner to Canterbury. What the Chronicle says is that in 890 "Plegmund was chosen of God and of all the people to be Archbishop of Canterbury."

It is possible that, when Alfred first learnt Latin and made translations from Latin into English, he was thinking of his own improvement by increase of knowledge rather than of preparing himself for the education of his people; but it was this latter use to which he put the learning and skill which he acquired. He knew that it was in Latin that all the learning of the world, as it was then known in the West, was written; and he knew also that to read Latin had become a rare accomplishment in England; "therefore," he says, "it seems to me

[1] *Ford Lectures*, 1901, p. 137.
[2] *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, I., p. 323.

best, if you agree, that we should translate some books, those namely which are most necessary for all men to know, into the language which we all understand."

These words come from the frequently quoted Preface to Alfred's translation of Pope Gregory's Pastoral Care, and they are strong evidence that this was the earliest of his translations, and that subsequent translations of useful books are contemplated. The argument that in this translation he keeps closest to the original, because he had not yet acquired skill in making variations, is precarious. It is quite as likely that he did not wish to make very many changes. He omits very little and inserts only brief notes. There has been much discussion as to whether Alfred's translation of Bede or his translation of Orosius should be placed next. A good case can be made out for either arrangement, and the question is not of great importance. Of more interest are some of the numerous insertions which Alfred makes in Orosius. Among these is the well-known saying attributed by Suetonius to Titus, that the day was a lost one on which he had done no good to any one. Such an utterance would be sure to commend itself to such a man as Alfred, and we can well understand his desire to make it known to his people. With regard to the translation of Bede, doubts, which seem to be hypercritical, have been raised as to whether it is the

work of Alfred himself. Perhaps all that the criticisms tend to show is that some of the MSS. contain signs of revision by a different hand.

But more interesting than even these three examples of Alfred's aims and methods (as illustrating his own character and his care for the well-being of his people) is his translation of one of the most famous works in mediaeval literature, that on the Consolation of Philosophy by Boethius, the Roman Consul who was put to death by Theodoric, King of the East Goths. He did this "in so excellent a manner," says Ethelwerd, "that the sorrowful book of Boethius seemed in a sense to be brought again to life." There is no doubt that, as in the other cases, Alfred believed that here also he was translating the work of a Christian. Whether Boethius was a Christian is still a matter for discussion; but in the ninth century he was believed to have been a saint, martyred for his orthodoxy by the Arian Theodoric; and this belief, as well as the contents of the book itself, commended it to Alfred, as to many of his own and subsequent generations. No one has ever found anything distinctly Christian in the *De Consolatione* of Boethius, but the translation, as Alfred published it, is very definitely Christian. It does not much matter how many of the insertions which he makes come from previous commentators or from the suggestions of Alfred's helpers; the fact that he inserted them

shows that he approved them, and they are therefore rightly cited as evidence of his tone of thought. The Christian philosopher knows that he is a free agent (otherwise there would be no difference between wickedness and holiness), and that it is a moral God, and not blind fate, that rules the world. Asser, at the end of his annals of the exploits of Alfred, tells how the King shamed his nobles and ministers into efforts to educate themselves and learn wisdom.

Legislation was another instrument of the revival under Alfred. His laws have been called "ecclesiastical," an epithet which is misleading. Of ecclesiastical legislation in his reign we know nothing. But his laws are rightly called "intensely religious in character." His placing the Decalogue, with the Apostolic Letter of Acts xv., as an introduction to his laws, shows that he means them to be regarded as having a religious basis, or at least as having been carefully brought into harmony with what is laid down in the Old and New Testament. As in the cases already mentioned, he translates even from the Vulgate, with freedom. He adapts the wording to the end which he has in view. But it is perhaps a mere slip, when he makes the fifth commandment run, "honour thy father and thy mother, *whom* the Lord gave thee," as if the mother, and not the land, was God's special gift. In the Apostolic letter (*v.* 29), he has the interesting interpolation (found in D, Sah. Aeth. and some Latin texts), "that which

ye would not that other men should do to you, do not ye to other men."[1] This is not an insertion made by Alfred, as some have thought; but the comment *is* his own: "By this law any one may know how he ought to judge another : he needs no other law-book."[2]

We perhaps cannot rightly include Alfred's great work in turning the local annals of the Church of Winchester into the National Chronicles of the English people among the efforts which he made to raise his subjects from the low conditions, both material and moral, in which he found them. And yet, in the course of ages, this step may have done a great deal towards inspiring patriotism and moulding national character, and we still reap the benefit of it in the possession of a unique national treasure.

Among the institutions which have been wrongly attributed to Alfred is the division of England into shires, hundreds, and tithings. William of Malmesbury in his *History of the Kings* (ii., 122) says: "Although, as some one has said, laws must give way among the strife of arms,"[3] yet Alfred amid the din of war enacted statutes by which his people might equally familiarize them with religious wor-

[1] There are considerable variations in the wording of this insertion in the texts which contain it, but the sense is the same.

[2] *Ford Lectures*, pp. 123 f.

[3] He alludes to Cicero (*Pro Milone*, iv., 10); *Silent leges inter arma.*

ship and military discipline. And since, from the example of the barbarians, even the natives had begun to sigh for plunder to such an extent that no one's caravan was safe without a guard of armed men, he appointed centuries, which they call "hundreds," and tenths, which they call "tithings," so that every Englishman, living according to law must belong to both a hundred and a tithing. If any one was charged with any offence, he must at once get members of his hundred and tithing to stand sureties for him. But if the accused, either before or after finding sureties, ran away, all the members of the hundred and tithing were liable to pay a fine to the king." And then he goes on to say that this regulation of Alfred's produced such peace in the country that golden bracelets were hung up at the crossways and were quite safe, because no one dared to steal them. It is just possible that this statement is not pure fiction, but only a great expansion of some historical fact. After the recovery of lands which had been occupied by the Danes, it must often have been difficult to restore the old landmarks. A new survey and division would be necessary, and to take a hundred hides of land as the unit in redistribution would be a natural arrangement.[1]

[1] Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I., p. 99; in his *Lecture on Early English History*, p. 11, he thinks that the tithing does not appear before the age of Canute.

With regard to the institution of *frankpledge* or *frithborh*, which William of Malmesbury connects with the origin of hundreds and tithings, there is a trace of something of the kind in a law of Athelstan (925–940): "If a reeve dare not warrant any of his lord's men, the suspected man must find twelve pledges among his kindred, who shall stand in security for him." But Stubbs thinks that this is a case of compurgation rather than of frankpledge. Not till the reign of Edgar (958–975) do we find something which is definitely in the direction of frankpledge. Then it was enacted that every man, whether accused or not, should have a surety, who would be bound to produce him in court whenever he was judicially summoned, and would have to answer for him if he did not appear. This is repeated in the legislation of Ethelred, Canute, and Edward the Confessor, and then we have the definite system, sometimes called "ten-man's-tale" (*tenmannetale*) in Yorkshire and other Northern shires. According to this law, all men had to form themselves into companies of ten, with a headman called a "capital pledge," and the members of each tithing were a perpetual bail for the appearance of any one of them in court. It is not certain that this system was in operation before the Conquest, but it was regarded as a benefit to the nation, and for that reason, seeing that its origin was uncertain, it was attributed to King Alfred.

Trial by jury is another excellent institution with which Alfred has often been credited, and the statement that we owe juries to him is still repeated. In the twentieth edition of Haydn's *Dictionary of Dates*, which carries us down to the autumn of 1892, we find under the head of "Juries": "By most authorities their institution is ascribed to Alfred about 886." Here again the obscure history of the origin of trial by jury gave an opportunity to the admirers of Alfred to do him honour: but the earliest mention of the employment of a jury in criminal and civil cases seems to be found in the Constitutions of Clarendon, 1164. Something a little like it is found in the period before the Conquest, when a ceorl was tried by the bishop and earldorman or sheriff, with a certain number of thegns as assessors. But this is very different from a jury of the man's equals.

But perhaps the most widely diffused error with regard to Alfred's supposed institutions is that which assigns to him the foundation of the University of Oxford. Here again the twentieth edition of Haydn gives support to an extraordinary misstatement. Under the head of "Oxford University" it is stated that "Alfred founded 'the schools' about 879." Yet this is as nothing compared with the celebration of a "millenary" by University College, Oxford, to which (it was reported) the historian Freeman sent a bit of

the cake which King Alfred, by his inattention, spoilt.

It would not have been surprising if a large number of writings had been wrongly attributed to Alfred, but the number of such attributions is small. Among them is a translation of part of the Psalter. William of Malmesbury (*History of the Kings*, ii., 123) says that Alfred "began to translate the Psalter, but ended his life when he had scarcely finished the first part." This may mean that he had barely made a beginning when his own life came to an end; but more probably *prima pars* means the first forty-one Psalms, the first of the five Books into which the Psalter was from very early times divided; or else the first fifty Psalms, for a common division in the Middle Ages was into three Parts, of fifty Psalms each. Hence the penance of having to recite fifty Psalms daily. The statement, whatever its exact meaning may be, is exceedingly credible, although it lacks confirmation. There is, however, in the National Library at Paris a MS. of the eleventh century, with the Latin and Anglo-Saxon translation in parallel columns, and, while the first fifty Psalms are translated into prose, the remaining hundred are done into verse. The conjecture of some scholars that the prose translation may represent the work of Alfred to which William alludes, is certainly an attractive one, but it remains an hypothesis which, with our present knowledge, can be neither proved

nor disproved: and of course it may be the work to which he alludes, without being the work of Alfred.[1]

In the same chapter in which William of Malmesbury makes the interesting statement about Alfred's translating part of the Psalter, he states that Alfred "gave to English ears the greater part of the Roman *bibliotheca*," by which he meant that Alfred translated a number of Latin writers, as what follows clearly shows. But "*Bibliotheca*," with or without some such epithet as "sacred" or "divine," was a common name for the Vulgate, and it is unfortunate that the most common designation of the Scriptures comes from *Biblia* rather than from *Bibliotheca*; hence we think of "the Books" as a Book, instead of regarding them as "the Library" of sacred Books. The exaggerated statement of William of Malmesbury about a translation of the majority of Latin writers might easily be understood to mean a translation of the greater part of the *Bible*.[2] But, whatever may be the origin of the assertion that Alfred translated the Bible, the assertion is quite incredible, and it stands on quite a different footing from the statement that he translated some of the Psalms.

[1] *Ford Lectures*, pp. 147 f.

[2] A similar statement is made by Ethelwerd (iv. 3): "The magnanimous Alfred . . . translated into his own language out of Latin, with rhetorical skilfulness, an unknown number of volumes."

Interesting, but very slightly supported by evidence, is the suggestion that Alfred translated Æsop's Fables into English. Mary of France, the poetess of the thirteenth century, says that she made her translation of the Fables into French from a translation made by an English king, and we need not doubt that an English version, believed to be the work of an English king, existed in her time. Her words are—

> De Griec en Latin le turna
> Li rois *Henris* qui moult l'ama
> Le translata puis en Engleiz ;
> E jeo l'ai rimé en Françeiz
> Si cum gel' truvai premièrement.

It is not clear whether this means that the king translated the Fables from Greek into Latin and then into English, or simply from Latin into English. The former is the natural meaning ; and in that case the only English king earlier than the thirteenth century who can be regarded as capable of translating from Greek into Latin or English is Henry Beauclerc, and we do not know that he ever learnt Greek. But the MSS. of Mary's poem differ considerably as to the name of the king. Instead of "Henris" we have our choice of "Alurez," "Affrus," "Auvert," "Auvres," and "Amez," all of which, with the exception of "Amez," might represent "Alfred." We may be sure that Alfred did not translate Greek into English, and we may

be nearly sure that Mary of France would not be able to understand Alfred's English. But if in the thirteenth century there was a tradition that Alfred had translated the Fables of Æsop, we once more have an instance of fiction giving as true a picture of Alfred as that which history gives. To translate such a book as the Fables in order to edify his people is exactly the kind of work in which Alfred delighted. The English king of whom Mary of France sings is probably Henry I, but her statement would be readily transferred to Alfred. As applying to Henry I, her statement is of value in answer to an objection which is urged against the Bayeux Tapestry as a contemporary authority for the Norman invasion of England. In the border of the Tapestry, there are items taken from Æsop's Fables, which, it is argued, were not known in the West in the eleventh century, and therefore the Tapestry must be the work of a later age. But if Henry I knew the Fables, they were known in the West in the eleventh century, and the Tapestry may easily be contemporary, whether it be the work of Henry's mother or not.[1]

There is a collection of proverbs called the Proverbs of Alfred, which, however, is known to be

[1] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, III., pp. 37 f.; IV., pp. 792 f. See the border underneath the scene in which Harold *velis vento plenis venit in terra* VVIDONIS *comitis*, viz. Guy, Count of Ponthieu.

of the thirteenth century. This again shows that a book of known usefulness but unknown authorship was quite readily assumed to be the work of England's Darling.

The revival under Alfred did not die with him; it continued under the very capable rulers who succeeded him. The English literature, which he may be said to have founded, lived on continuously, and the next century abounds both in chronicles and also in regulations, both civil and ecclesiastical, in the English language. We have the spirit of it in the preamble to Alfred's Dooms.

"I, then, Alfred, king, gathered these (laws) together, and commanded many of those to be written which our forefathers held, those which seemed to me good; and many of those which seemed to me not good, I rejected them, by the counsel of my 'witan.' . . ."

"I, then, Alfred, king of the West Saxons, shewed these to all my 'witan,' and they then said that it seemed good to them all to be holden."[1]

The committing to writing of the rules and customs "which our forefathers held," was in this case, as in earlier and later promulgations of written laws, caused by the crisis through which the nation had passed. When considerable disturbance has taken place and modifications are re-

[1] Stubbs, *Documents illustrative of English History*, p. 62.

quired, it becomes necessary to have things down in black and white. The crisis in Alfred's case was a double one: the conflict with the Danes, and the absorption of other kingdoms by the Kingdom of Wessex. And in this revival or creation of legislation two things are to be noticed. The king is not a despot; he does not issue decrees on his sole authority. Alfred, Ethelred, and even Canute, as did Ini before them, state that they act with the consent and by the counsel of the national "witan." Secondly it is by no means easy to decide how far the "witan" is acting as a civil or an ecclesiastical body. Of Church Councils, in the technical sense, there is little mention, but that might be explained by the fact that nearly all the persons who would have sat in such a body were members of the witan and vice versa. The influence of the Church upon legislation has been pointed out in a previous chapter. And once more we find the Church acting as a consolidating power. Before the Danish Conquest, the union of the English Christians under one archbishop led to the union of the English subjects under one king. And now, after the Danish invasion had ended in the equality of English and Danes being secured by the peace between Alfred and Guthrum, the Christianizing of the Danes led to a rapid amalgamation of the two races. Thus Alfred's good work lived after him and his often quoted wish was fulfilled: "My will was to live

worthily as long as I lived, and after my life to leave to them that should come after me my memory in good works."

This noble aspiration of Alfred, the royal reformer and scholar, working unceasingly for the enlightenment and edification of his people, leads us on to consider him, in conclusion, in his character as a royal saint. With whom shall we compare him here? His great-great-grandson, Edward (975–979),[1] and his descendant, Charles I, may possibly occur to some minds. For very different reasons these two English kings have obtained the title of "Martyr." They both were put to death unjustly by those who had no right to inflict death even if there had been just cause; and there was from early times a tendency to regard those who suffered death in this way as "martyrs." Thus Gregory the Great, in answering Augustine's questions about prohibited degrees, says that John the Baptist suffered martyrdom (Bede, *H.E.*, i., 27); and Oswin, the last King of Deira, who was cruelly

[1] The Chronicles vary between 978 and 979, but the latter is probably right. See C. Plummer, *Two Saxon Chronicles*, II., p. 166. The day of the assassination was March 18. His body was translated from Wareham to Shaftesbury by Dunstan in 980, and almost immediately miracles were reported as taking place at his tomb. Both death and translation (June 20) are commemorated in the Anglican Calendar. King Edmund does not seem to have been called a martyr, although he is said to have been assassinated while keeping the festival of St. Augustine of Canterbury, May 26, 946. See p. 133.

put to death by Oswy, August 20, 651 (*H.E.*, iii., 14) has been called a martyr. In addition to his unjust death, it may be urged on behalf of Charles I that he suffered because he would not betray the Church of England. But although, after the translation of "the holy King's body," Edward was said to have led an "angelic life," few people would seriously think of calling either him or Charles a saint.

There remain two other English kings who might be considered in this capacity—Edward the Confessor, who at one time was regarded as the patron saint of England, and Henry VI. But the saintliness of Alfred is of a far more attractive and instructive type than that of any of his successors on the English throne. It is manly, social, and free from superstition. The piety of the Confessor and of Henry VI is the piety of a monk; the piety of Alfred is the piety of a ruler and reformer of men. To Edward the Confessor all secular duties were wearisome toil, although he could take delight in hunting and hawking when business was despatched.[1]

[1] As an index of character, take Edward swearing, "By God and His Mother, I will hurt thee some day, if I can," to the peasant who attempted to stop him and his foreign favourites when out hunting—probably because they were trespassing. One cannot imagine that Alfred, whether or no he ever patiently took the woman's scolding for burning the cakes, would be guilty of such conduct as that. A somewhat similar outburst of temper is attributed to St. Willibrord in one of the legends respecting him. A peasant remonstrated

To Alfred secular duties were as much a sphere for devotion as his prayers. Both kings delighted in endowing monasteries, in collecting relics, in founding churches and praying in them. But this was the whole of Edward's religion; it was only part of the expression of Alfred's. Both may be said to have desired the well-being of their subjects; but while Alfred worked ceaselessly to secure it, Edward did little or nothing towards it. Such a heading for a chapter as "The Revival under Edward the Confessor" would be as incongruous as "The Revival under Henry VI." Among royal saints, Alfred stands supreme.

with him for trespassing, for which offence the saint is said to have deprived him of the power of drinking, and to have left him suffering the tortures of thirst for a whole year. No such monstrous acts are attributed to Alfred even by monkish admirers.

Students who desire to continue a study of this subject will find abundant material in the Jubilee Edition of *The Whole Works of King Alfred the Great, with preliminary Essays illustrative of the History, Arts, and Manners of the Ninth Century*; Vol. I, Oxford and Cambridge, 1852; Vol. II, in two parts, London, 1858. Vol. I contains the illustrative essays, together with Alfred's Poems, Charters, and Will. Vol. II contains the remainder of Alfred's writings, together with an essay on the Geography of King Alfred the Great. In all cases, modern English translations of the writings are given, and these are the valuable part of the work. Some of the essays are not up to the present standard of knowledge and criticism.

CHAPTER IV

THE REVIVAL UNDER DUNSTAN

THE good work begun and fostered by Alfred did not make very much progress for some time after his death, so far as religion and education are concerned. Under Edward the Elder (901–924) and Athelstan the Glorious (924–940), the development was political rather than religious. Edward, who is also called the Unconquered, became the first Lord of all Britain, after spending most of his energies in contests with the Danes, who were constantly submitting and rebelling again. Kings and princes of the Danes, Britons, and Scots became his vassals, and he became King of the English. Of his numerous children, three of his sons succeeded him, Athelstan, Edmund and Edred; one daughter married Sihtric, the Danish king of Northumbria, and five married foreign princes; viz., Charles the Simple, King of the West Franks; Hugh the Great, Duke of the French, founder of the Capets; Otto the Great, son of Henry the Fowler, afterwards Emperor; Eblus, a prince at the court of Henry; and Lewis, King of Provence or

Arles. Three daughters became nuns, and one son is said to have become a monk.

The great event of the reign of Athelstan is the Battle of Brunanburh in Northumbria (937), in which a coalition of Norwegians, Danes, Irish, Scots, and Britons was completely defeated, and the Kingdom of England was established. Henry of Huntingdon calls it *praeliorum maximum*, and the lay chronicler, Ethelwerd, says *uno solidantur Britannidis arva, undique pax.*

In the reign of Edmund the Magnificent (940–946) the five boroughs or burghs, Derby, Leicester, Nottingham, Stamford and Lincoln, were finally recovered from the Danes. Edward had possessed Leicester (918), Stamford (922), and Nottingham (924), but they seem to have become Danish again. They had formed a chain of fortresses all through Mercia, and often helped the Northern Danes in their outbreaks. Edmund captured them one by one and placed loyal English colonists in them. In this reign also the British kingdom of Strathclyde was conquered and abolished, the greater part of it being granted to the Scottish King Malcolm, on condition that he should hold the territory as a vassal of the English King.

It is under Edmund that the public life of the most remarkable ecclesiastic prior to the Norman Conquest begins. Dunstan was probably of noble birth, for he was related in some way to the Lady

Ethelfleda, who seems to have been of royal blood. He was also nearly related to Bishop Elfege (the Bald) of Winchester [1] and Bishop Kinesige of Lichfield. He was born in the first year of Athelstan, 925. He was educated at Glastonbury, where, as in so many English monasteries, secular clergy had displaced the monks; but he was often at the court of Athelstan (whose palace was near), until the favour of the King and his own eccentric behaviour made his jealous companions conspire together to get him banished from the court. He was a dreamer and perhaps somewhat hysterical; he was also more inclined to study than to play, and his companions accused him of trying to work spells against the King. The young bullies threw him into a pond, and it has been suggested that they did this to prove that he was a wizard. But they trampled him into the mud, which rather shows that their aim was to make him a disgusting object. And was the test of "sink or swim" invented before the Inquisition propounded it? Dunstan took refuge with his relation, the Bishop of Winchester. A serious illness made him yield to the bishop's advice in taking monastic vows, after which he returned to Glastonbury.[2] Here he built himself a

[1] Not to be confused with Elfsige, Bishop of Winchester, who was appointed to Canterbury under Edwy (p. 142).

[2] That he was deeply in love with some lady, and therefore was unwilling to become a monk, seems to be a romantic fiction.

small cell, in which he prayed, read the Bible, and practised copying and illuminating MSS., playing on the harp, and working metals, at which he became an expert. Like Luther, he believed that he was frequently tempted by the devil in a bodily form, and this conviction played a considerable part in the lives of both these reformers.[1] But the abundant materials for the life of Dunstan are a source of considerable difficulty to the biographer; for the history of this great man has been overlaid with the silliest of monkish legends, and unfortunately it is just these worthless legends which have had the strongest hold on popular memory. Moreover, so vigorous an ecclesiastic and statesman excited both much admiration and much enmity, and the partizans on both sides exaggerated and invented, in order either to glorify or discredit him. However, it is possible to extract a great deal about him that may be confidently or reasonably believed; and when this is done, Dunstan appears before us as a great leader and reformer in Church and State, through several reigns, at a critical period in English history. He is noblest as a statesman; and, as the minister of Edred and Edgar, and the guardian of Ethelred II, he has established a name of

[1] John Bunyan also believed that the spirits of evil were leagued against him and that he sometimes engaged in direct personal conflicts with Satan. Dunstan had had brain fever as a boy, and that malady sometimes leaves its victims permanently liable to delusions.

renown. It is as an ecclesiastical reformer that it is specially difficult to ascertain the exact truth about him, and also to judge rightly what can be ascertained respecting his policy. This applies specially to his action with regard to monasticism. But, to a large extent, his work as reformer was a continuation of that of Alfred—the revival of learning in England; and for that we have nothing but praise. Dunstan's revival of monasticism may also be regarded as a continuation of the work of Alfred. Very few of the monasteries which had been destroyed by the Danes were restored when the Danes were defeated, and the difference between Alfred's attempt and that of Dunstan was just this—that Alfred failed and Dunstan succeeded. Alfred failed, not because he was less in earnest or less able than Dunstan, but because the time was not ripe. The nation was too exhausted by warfare, and perhaps too disgusted with the laxity which had prevailed in many monasteries, to care to renew the experiment.[1] When Dunstan took the work in hand, times were more peaceful, and he brought a better type of monachism, which he had learned on the Continent, to the notice of devout Englishmen.

Athelstan seems to have never restored the young Dunstan to favour; but, as soon as he was dead, his brother Edmund sent for him and gave

[1] Alfred's ill success led to Edward's not attempting to make monks; he appointed secular clergy in preference.

him a high place at court. Here once more he became the victim of jealousy. He was denounced to Edmund, who accepted the charges made against him, and dismissed him in disgrace. Some time afterwards the King was nearly killed while hunting. Peril of death roused his conscience, he felt that he had been unjust, and he at once sent for Dunstan. He took him to Glastonbury and put him in possession of the building and lands, promising to give him whatever was needed for the maintenance of the services and the house.[1] This was probably in 942, when Dunstan would be about eighteen. He was not made abbot until some years later, perhaps 945. The earliest charter witnessed by him as abbot is a charter of Edred in 946.

We are left in considerable doubt as to what was the condition of things which Dunstan found at Glastonbury, and also as to what he succeeded in establishing there after he became abbot. But two things seem to emerge plainly. The new system was not a mere revival of the old; and it was not the pure Benedictine rule, for it is very doubtful whether Dunstan at this time knew the latter. Down to 942 there were no Benedictine monas-

[1] Edmund is reported to have said, "Be thou of this seat the lord and potent occupant, and whatsoever from thine own means shall be lacking for the increase of divine service, or for the completeness of the sacred rule, that I will supply devoutly of my royal bounty."

teries in Britain. But it was about that time that he came in contact with "venerable men, messengers from the Eastern kingdom," and he had got a promise from them that they would take him with them when they returned to their home. They happened to be at Edmund's court just when Dunstan was disgraced, and sympathized with him in his misfortune. Where was this *Oriens regnum?* Stubbs thinks that by it the nameless priest who is Dunstan's earliest biographer must mean the German kingdom, which was the writer's own home. If that is correct, it would be possible for these venerable messengers to tell Dunstan something about the pure Benedictine rule. But all this is somewhat conjectural. What is probable is that Dunstan found Glastonbury in the hands of a few secular clergy; that he added to these a number of monks; and that the rule under which they lived was an improvement on that of the monks who had preceded the secular clergy, and perhaps approximated to the Benedictine. It does not appear that Dunstan expelled the secular clergy, but it is possible that some of them departed rather than submit to his reforms. Thus much, however, is certain. The work of the inmates, whatever their status or rule, was to a very great extent educational, Dunstan himself being one of the chief teachers. We read of *scholastici* and *discipuli* more often than of *monachi*, which shows that the writer

is interested in them as students rather than as monks.

Edmund died May 26, 946,[1] and therefore Dunstan's appointment as Abbot of Glastonbury cannot be placed later than that; but it need not have been many months earlier. Edred, the new king, Edmund's younger brother, was about the same age as Dunstan. They had very likely been playmates before Dunstan was driven from Athelstan's court, and now Edred made him royal treasurer. Edred had miserable health and left much of the government in the hands of his mother and the treasurer (946–955). In days in which kings were expected both to eat well and fight well, a prince who could often take no solid food was excluded from a good deal of public life. But Edred's reign of nine and a half years was a fruitful one, and he did some vigorous work in Northumbria, where Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, gave much trouble by encouraging the Danes to assert their independence. In the campaign against them, "the glorious minster at Ripon which St. Wilfrid built was burned" by Edred's army. The D chronicler places this calamity in 948, but Florence of Worcester who often follows D, places it in 950. In 952, the turbulent Archbishop of York was imprisoned at

[1] He was assassinated by a robber on the Festival of St. Augustine of Canterbury, "Augustine the Less, who was the Apostle of the Angles," says Ethelwerd (iv., 6).

a place which is often identified, but not very probably, with Jedburgh,[1] and when he was released about two years later, he was not allowed to return to York, but was translated to Dorchester. This imprisonment of an archbishop shows that Dunstan was not working for the exaltation of ecclesiastics at the expense of the laity; he was working for the good of the whole kingdom, which not even the highest ecclesiastics must be allowed to disturb. But his drastic treatment of Wulfstan was much criticized in later times. Under his guidance Edred instituted a new method in dealing with the Danes, a method which was continued by Edgar, and which was very successful in keeping them from revolt and in training them to be good subjects. He allowed them to retain their own customs under their own earls, without vexatious interference from English officials; and this liberal treatment greatly diminished their restiveness.

Simeon of Durham tells us that King Edred was a man "who cultivated piety and justice, and one who lavished kingly gifts upon the Church of St. Cuthbert, as his brothers had done before him." He says that St. Cuthbert appeared to Alfred, when

[1] Judenburh looks like Jedburgh, but would not Edred and Dunstan have taken him farther from the Danes? Nevertheless, the imprisonment of Napoleon at Elba was at least as impolitic as the imprisonment of Wulfstan at Jedburgh would have been.

he was hiding in the marshes of Glastonbury, and promised him victory over the Danes. Athelstan and Edmund had each of them visited the shrine of St. Cuthbert on their way to Scotland. The saint's body was then at Chester-le-Street, and it was there that the royal gifts were offered.[1] One of Athelstan's gifts, a MS. of Bede's *Life of Cuthbert,* is still in existence (MS. C.C.C.C. No. 183). It has a picture of Athelstan offering the book at the shrine. During a visit to Northumbria with King Edred, Dunstan saw the relics of St. Cuthbert.

'Of Edred's piety there is no question. No mention is made of his having had wife or child, and we may conclude that he had neither. His frequent attacks of illness might account for this. They at last wore him out, and he died, somewhat suddenly, at Frome, November 23, 955. He was not much over thirty years of age. When the attack which proved fatal came on, he sent to Glastonbury for Dunstan, who rode hard to Frome. Florence of Worcester, Simeon of Durham, and William of Malmesbury all say that on his way to Frome Dunstan heard a voice saying that Edred was at rest. Florence and Simeon add that his horse, unable to endure the awfulness of an angel's voice, fell dead under him. That Dunstan received a telepathic

[1] Simeon of Durham, *Hist. of the Church of Durham,* 25, 33, 34.

intimation of the King's death is credible enough, and furious riding would account for the death of the horse. None of these three writers has the story that Dunstan found the King's body at Frome, as the Conqueror's body was found at Rouen, deserted by his attendants. The earliest biographer omits it, and it may easily be a later invention. Dunstan and his monks took the body to Winchester and buried it in the Old Minster.

The death of the King who had been so devoted to him was a great blow to Dunstan. His influence was at once greatly diminished. Edwy, the eldest son of Edred's brother and predecessor Edmund, was chosen to succeed Edred. He was only a child at the time of Edmund's death, and had therefore been passed over; and now he cannot have been much more than fifteen. He was a very good-looking lad, and was sometimes called "the Handsome," and he was passionate and self-willed. Ethelwerd says that he "was called by the common people the second Pankalus, meaning all-beautiful." Dunstan came to his coronation, which was performed by Archbishop Odo at Kingston in January, 956. The conduct of Edwy and of Dunstan on the occasion has been described and commented upon, by writers both mediaeval and modern, *ad nauseam*, a fact which is all the more remarkable because not a very great deal is known about what actually took place. The following account seems

to be near the truth. There was the usual solemn banquet after the coronation, at which the archbishop and other bishops and nobles were present. With great indecency, Edwy left the table in order to visit his kinswoman, Elgiva or Aelfgifu, who, with her mother Ethelgiva or Aethelgifu, was waiting for him in a room near at hand. The insulted clergy and nobility demanded that he should be brought back, and it was decided that Dunstan and his kinsman Bishop Kinesige should have the unpleasant duty of fetching back the headstrong boy to the banquet. The exact relationship between Edwy and Elgiva is not stated, but it was such that the Canon Law regarded it as a bar to marriage, and it was an aggravation of the misconduct of Edwy on the coronation day that he had left the high table in order to visit a lady whom the Church did not allow him to marry. Either because of his own indignation, or because the obstinate young king refused to come, it is likely enough that Dunstan used force in bringing Edwy from his seat between the two ladies to his seat beside the archbishop. Edwy regarded Dunstan's behaviour as a personal affront, and Ethelgiva worked for vengeance. That is intelligible; but it is not reasonable to regard Dunstan's vigour in carrying out the commands of the witan about fetching back the King as an ambitious attempt on his part to gain influence over the young monarch. Dunstan

must have known that such a headstrong youth would be sure to resent such interference.

Ethelgiva succeeded in getting Dunstan dismissed, but not quite immediately, for there are charters attested by him in 956. She had the support of the West Saxon nobles, and is said to have incited some of Dunstan's own pupils against him, but to have failed with the monks of Glastonbury. Dunstan's cattle were driven away, and the friends with whom he took refuge were persecuted. Finally, he was outlawed; and then, his life being no longer safe in the kingdom, he fled to Flanders, where he found shelter in the Benedictine monastery of Blandinium at Ghent. This is the one important fact in the whole of this exciting, but somewhat sordid story. It was perhaps shortly before Dunstan escaped to Flanders that Edwy married Elgiva. We may suppose that one of the secular clergy performed the ceremony. Some of them may have held that a union which was not forbidden by Scripture was valid, although contrary to rule. Monks held that it was no marriage at all; but we need not accept William of Malmesbury's statement that Edwy "afflicted with undeserved calamities all the members of the monastic order throughout England, who were first despoiled of their property, and then driven into exile."[1] That is true of Dunstan, "the chief of the monks," but not of all the monks in England. It is probably true

that Glastonbury and Abingdon were dissolved; but this would be an attack on Dunstan rather than on monks. Elsewhere Edwy may have tried to check the monastic changes which Dunstan had introduced. William says that he turned Malmesbury into "a stable of secular canons" (*stabulum clericorum*). But the question of the comparative merits of monks and seculars had hardly become acute in Edwy's short reign, which was filled with more mundane conflicts; so that anything like a general persecution of monks is not probable. The fact that Edwy made grants to monasteries in his first year proves little; they may have been made before his marriage produced a crisis. Moreover, Edwy seems to have tried to strengthen his position by frequent gifts. The number of charters granted in his brief reign is very large, and he may have made grants to monasteries in order to win popularity. But this cannot have been frequent, for few of the charters are attested by abbots. As to dates, it is probable that the coronation and marriage of Edwy, and the persecution and flight of Dunstan, all took place in 956.

The importance of the flight to Flanders lies in this. Although Dunstan could hardly speak a word of Flemish, he found a friendly reception in Flanders. Aelfthryth or Eltrudis, the highly educated daughter of King Alfred, had married Baldwin II, the Bald, Count of Flanders. They had

been dead many years, but their son Arnulf was the reigning count, and he welcomed Dunstan, of whose interest in monasteries he had probably heard. Arnulf himself had been a restorer and founder of monasteries, and he sent Dunstan to live in the convent of Blandinium, which he had restored in 944. Here Arnulf's father and mother were buried, and here Dunstan had ample opportunity of learning the Benedictine rule in all its completeness, for there, as at other monasteries restored or founded by Arnulf, it was the strict Benedictine system which was maintained.

We need not concern ourselves much more with Edwy. His misrule drove the Mercians and Northumbrians to elect his young brother Edgar as their king. But Edwy continued to hold the country south of the Thames, and seems to have been not unpopular there. In 958, Archbishop Odo made him separate from Elgiva, a fact which has been exaggerated into stories about Edwy having a wife whom he had deserted for Elgiva, and other scandalous inventions. Florence of Worcester gives us our choice; Odo separated them, "either because she was reported to be his kinswoman, or because he preferred her to his own wife." Simeon of Durham gives us a different choice: "either because, as it was said, she was near of kin to him, or because he loved her wantonly under the character of a wife." Edwy died in October, 959, and later writers know

that Dunstan saw his soul being carried away by demons and saved it by his prayers.[1]

Edgar "the Peaceful" at once succeeded his brother "by the election of all the English people . . . and thus joined together in one the divided kingdoms," says Florence of Worcester. Like his brother, he was an attractive lad, and we find expressions, which had been used of Alfred, used of him: he is the "darling of the English," and their pride. He was only sixteen, and had already been king of the northern half of the kingdom for two years. The English seemed to have become enamoured of boyish kings, and the reign of Edgar was one on which they looked back with pleasure. Dunstan is credited with having been told by an angel at Edgar's birth that, as long as this child should reign with Dunstan to guide him, England should have peace. What is historically true is that Edgar at once recalled Dunstan as soon as he became King of Mercia, and retained him as his minister after his brother's death had made him ruler of the whole kingdom. It is a mistake to suppose that the revolt of Mercia had been stirred up either by Dunstan, or by Archbishop Odo, or by the monks. Dunstan did not return to England till the rebel-

[1] William of Malmesbury, after heaping abuse on Edwy, says: "But let his soul, long since laid to rest by the intercession of Dunstan, pardon my distress." He was buried in the New Minster at Winchester.

lion had been ended by the division of the kingdom between the two brothers. Odo's influence lay, not in Mercia, but in Kent, which remained loyal to Edwy; and Odo himself continued to frequent Edwy's court and sign his charters. Whatever monasteries there may have been in Mercia, it is quite certain that they could not have induced the kingdom to revolt, even if they had wished; and they would have feared to share the fate of Glastonbury and Abingdon. It was the misconduct of the young Rehoboam which cost him the loss of the Northern tribes; and now that he was dead, their chosen king had the South also. That Edwy died of a broken heart because Odo had made him put away Elgiva looks like romantic fiction invented to make the archbishop's severity look more odious. Odo died soon afterwards, and was succeeded by Elfsige or Elfsin, Bishop of Winchester. He set out for Rome to receive the pall, but succumbed to the cold of the Alps. William of Malmesbury seems to regard his death as a judgment on him for irreverent behaviour at Odo's tomb. Elfsin was probably opposed to Dunstan, or he would not have been made archbishop in Edwy's reign. When his companions returned and reported his death, Brihthelm, Bishop of Dorset, was appointed to Canterbury; but he was unable to maintain discipline and he was recalled to Dorset, where his see is uncertain; but it was probably either Sherborne or Wells.

There is confusion and doubt as to the exact years in which these events took place; also as to the exact point at which Dunstan returned from exile, and as to which king appointed Elfsin and Brihthelm to Canterbury. But if we place Edwy's marriage in 956, the separation by Odo and Odo's death in 958, Edwy's death in October, 959, and regard both Elfsin and Brihthelm as Edwy's nominations, we shall not be far wrong. Some authorities do not mention either Elfsin or Brihthelm among the Archbishops of Canterbury, but treat Dunstan as Odo's immediate successor. This may be either carelessness or prejudice.

Dunstan's promotion after his return was rapid. Edgar's Mercian witan decided that Dunstan ought to be made a bishop, and it looks as if he was consecrated as an episcopal adviser to the King, without any see. Very soon, however, the death of Kynewald of Worcester gave Dunstan a see, and soon after that he was made Bishop of London without resigning Worcester. This promotion he is said to have accepted unwillingly; but it shows how strictly the river Thames was made the boundary between the dominions of Edgar and Edwy, that London belongs to Mercia and Edgar appoints to the vacant see. The almost simultaneous failure of Brihthelm at Canterbury and the death of Edwy gave Edgar the opportunity of appointing Dunstan to Canterbury, and this pro-

bably took place before the end of 959.[1] In 960 Dunstan went to Rome and received the pall from the infamous John XII., and on his return he became the most influential person in the kingdom; and the fruit of his exile among the Benedictines in Flanders soon became apparent. In 961 he consecrated Oswald, nephew of Archbishop Odo, to be his successor in the see of Worcester. Odo had placed him at Winchester, which was then held by secular canons over whom he had presided. But he did not like ruling married clergy, and he got Odo to allow him to go to the Continent to learn the rule of St. Benedict, and Odo sent him to Fleury (Floriacum) on the Loire, whither Benedict's remains had been transferred from Monte Casino, when the Lombards overwhelmed that place.[2] This translation led to a great enthusiasm for the Benedictine rule in France; and in sending his nephew to Fleury Odo was placing him at the very best place to learn the Benedictine rule in its integrity. For although, as was commonly the case in countries of the Latin race, the monasteries in France had grossly decayed in discipline, yet Fleury had recently been reformed by Odo of Cluny and had recovered its strictness.[3] Oswald was ordained

[1] Some authorities say 961, but the evidence of charters signed by Dunstan in 959 as archbishop is conclusive.

[2] The inroads of marauders frequently caused the translation or sale of relics. See *The Chronicle*, year 1013.

[3] Philip I. of France on his deathbed (1108) wished to be

priest at Fleury, practised the rule in all its severity, learnt the constitution and the services by heart, and made himself thoroughly competent to teach the system. In 958 his uncle fell ill and sent for him; and on landing at Dover Oswald heard that Odo was already dead. He went to Oscytel, the Danish Archbishop of York, who was in some way related to him, and who introduced him to Dunstan. His appointment to Worcester quickly followed, and Worcester seems to have been regarded as the chief see in Mercia at this time.

In 963 Dunstan consecrated Ethelwold, who had been ordained with him at Winchester and had been under him at Glastonbury, to the see of Winchester on Sunday, November 29. Ethelwold, like Oswald, had wished to go to Fleury to learn true monasticism, but King Edred, by Dunstan's advice, kept him in England to restore the monastery at Abingdon, about 954. Not only Edred, but Edwy, gave rich gifts to Abingdon, and Ethelwold himself was a generous benefactor. Being unable to go himself, Ethelwold sent Osgar (who had come with him from Glastonbury to Abingdon) to Fleury to study the Benedictine rule, and on Osgar's return, with the particulars of it in writing, the rule was introduced at Abingdon. This seems to be the earliest instance of a true Bene-

buried at Fleury, and William of Malmesbury goes so far as to say that he became a monk there.

dictine house in England. Ethelwold pronounced a curse upon any of his successors who should alter the rule, and soon afterwards was taken by Edgar and Dunstan to fill the see of Winchester. His prayer for the future welfare of Abingdon has been recorded. Osgar, who brought the written rule from Fleury, succeeded him as abbot.

Two extraordinary stories, illustrating the moral ideas of the age, are related of these men. One of them concerns Ethelwold, the first abbot of Benedictine Abingdon. When Edred visited the house which Ethelwold was restoring, the abbot asked the young king to dine with him. The king not only accepted, but made himself master of the feast, and gave orders that no one should be allowed to leave the room until the full tale of drinking was accomplished. He had a number of Northumbrian thegns with him, and he and they continued to drink the abbot's mead all day long. The abbot's cask not only held out, but miraculously remained almost full, until the evening, by which time the Northumbrians were quite drunk. The other story concerns Osgar, the second abbot of Benedictine Abingdon. A letter was written from Fleury, partly in cipher, and seemingly in the interest of Abbo, the famous abbot of Fleury who was such a sturdy upholder of the rights of monasteries as against bishops.[1] In this cryptic communication

[1] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, VII., p. 159.

complaint is made of an abbot who has borrowed a commentary on the Pauline Epistles by Florus of Lyons, and has omitted to return it. The name Oscarus fits the cipher, and there is not much doubt that the appropriator of the MS. was the man who brought the Benedictine rule from Fleury to Abingdon. The frequent theft of MSS. and relics, as a kind of pious fraud, is one of the distressing features of mediaeval religious life, and it sometimes led to bitter animosity between the parties concerned, as in the case of Columba's copy of the MS. belonging to Finnian (Vol. I., p. 88). Simeon of Durham tells us how the bones of Bede were stolen from Jarrow (*History of the Church of Durham*, 42).[1]

There were now three men in England, all in high ecclesiastical positions, and all of them in favour with the King, who had learned the true Benedictine system, as it existed on the Continent, and were enthusiastic about introducing it into England. Two of them, Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, had had personal experience of the Benedictine rule, the one at Ghent and the other at Fleury: and the third had wished to learn it in the same way, but had got it both in writing and by word of mouth from one who had learned it in person. It is remarkable that Ethelwold, Bishop of Winches-

[1] See Robertson, *History of the Christian Church,* III., p. 246, for other instances.

ter, who had derived his knowledge at second hand, was far more rigorous in his methods of promoting the Benedictine system than either of the other two, who had lived on the Continent and had seen the working of the system there. Dunstan was too much of a statesman to believe that a disciplinary reform of this kind could be most securely established by revolutionary processes, which would be sure to provoke opposition and perhaps reaction, and he was too good a Christian to use severity where severity would be harsh and even cruel. Oswald was intermediate between the two, more energetic than Dunstan, and less uncompromising than Ethelwold. Dunstan's influence—on the whole, a moderating one—was diffused throughout the kingdom, and is therefore not so easily traced. He heartily sympathized with the revival of monasticism and with the Benedictine form of it, but he did not desire that intemperate changes should be hastily made. With regard to the other two reformers it is possible to arrive at an estimate of their respective successes. The movement was welcomed far less heartily in Wessex, where the rigorous Ethelwold had his see, than in Mercia, where the more moderate Oswald had his. This had been the case before they took up the work of monastic revival, and it continued to be so under their activity.

But one of the most hearty supporters of the movement was the King. The sight of the mon-

asteries that had been devastated by the Danes or had fallen into decay through neglect is said to have drawn from Edgar, when he was a lad, a vow that he would restore them. This was probably after he had been chosen king by the Mercians and Northumbrians. As against Edwy, who had contracted what they considered to be an incestuous union, the monks in both halves of the kingdom would support Edgar, and it would be natural that he should be ready to aid a reform which was promoted by monastic leaders like Dunstan, Oswald, and Ethelwold. And he may easily have seen that, if the more central parts of England were to be permanently rescued from the ignorance and irreligion into which Danish devastation had plunged them, and from which the revival under Alfred had only partially rescued them, it must be done by the revival of the old monasteries and the founding of new ones. Benedictine houses of a better type than the old monasteries would be colonies of teachers and centres of education throughout the land. Even if Edgar did not see this for himself, Dunstan was constantly at hand to point it out to him ; and it is certain that the King gave abundant help to the three reforming prelates.

Ethelwold began in drastic fashion. In the Old Minster at Winchester he found secular clergy, whose lives, if monkish writers are to be trusted, were very unedifying. He sent to Abingdon for

monks to take their place and when the seculars refused to make way for them, he sent to Edgar for help. Edgar readily complied;[1] and, backed by his authority, Ethelwold told the clerics that they must either become monks or go. A few took the vows, but most preferred to be turned out. Ethelwold treated the seculars in the New Minster in the same manner, and then proceeded to deal with the houses at Chertsey in Surrey and Milton in Dorset.[2] Everywhere he used Edgar's authority to turn out the seculars and put monks in their place, and everywhere the King confirmed the bishop's choice of abbots. It was a very simple method, and one which the dullest of rulers could carry out—submit or go. There was no attempt to convince, and no time was given for consideration; nor was any allowance made for possible hardships. Ethelwold's one idea for the reform of the clergy was "Become monks, or resign your cures." The number of seculars who were thus turned loose upon the world must have been considerable, and one wonders what became of them. We know of one, a kinsman of St. Swithun named Eadsige, who two

[1] If a letter of rather doubtful genuineness is to be trusted, Edgar got Pope John XIII to sanction the expulsion of the seculars. In that case the expulsion must be placed later than October 1, 965, when John XIII became Pope.

[2] All these were dealt with in the same year, 964, according to some authorities; but the process may easily have taken a year or two in each case.

years later took the vows and returned to the Old Minster at Winchester. Others may have done the like. But there is reason to doubt whether this rough method was in all cases quite successful. Some of the seculars belonged to noble families, and when they insisted on retaining their posts their retention of them was possibly winked at. Edgar may have found it politic to allow exceptions. Stubbs thinks it doubtful whether any of the cathedrals were quite cleared of secular canons before the Conquest.

Ethelwold's work in rebuilding ruined monasteries, and in erecting convents for monks or nuns where none had existed before, is worthy of all praise. Here also he had the support of the King, who sometimes not only granted the sites but made other gifts to the new houses. All these new houses were, of course, Benedictine, and Ethelwold used to visit them to see that discipline was properly maintained. It was Ethelwold who translated the body of St. Swithun, July 15, 970. He outlived his royal patron by nine years, and died August 1, 984. Dunstan is said to have foretold his death. In recording his death, the Chronicle calls him, "the benevolent Bishop of Winchester, Ethelwold, Father of monks." His successor, Aelfheah, was consecrated October 19.

The conduct of Oswald was much more moderate. If we may judge by what he did in the case

of his own church at Worcester, he never used force in introducing monks in the place of seculars. When the secular clergy refused to become Benedictines Oswald consulted Dunstan, who advised him to found a new church at Worcester and to man it with Benedictines. The services at the new church proved more attractive than those at the old, and at last the dean and his canons, finding themselves without a congregation, adopted the monastic habit and became a Benedictine house. Oswald specially sympathized with the promotion of learning which characterized the Benedictine system. A Winchester friend named Germanus had gone with him to Fleury and had remained there. Oswald induced him to return to England and be an instructor of the clergy. Oswald made him prior of a new house which he founded at Ramsey in Huntingdonshire, and afterwards Abbot of Winchcombe.

On November 1, 971 or 972, Oscytel, the Danish Archbishop of York, died. Oswald was his kinsman, and had gone with him when he went to Rome to receive the pall about 956. Dunstan advised Edgar to send Oswald to York, and he did so and told Oswald to go to Rome and receive the pall, which was given him by John XIII. On his return he took part with Dunstan in the perplexing ceremony of the coronation of Edgar at Bath in 973. It is not likely that Oswald's visit to Rome in any degree lessened his approbation of the Benedictine

rules as an instrument of reform in the national life. But it is evidence of his moderation and good sense that he made no effort to force it upon the Northumbrians. He had Danish blood in his veins, and from his intimacy with his predecessor, Oscytel, who had not introduced the Benedictine rule in Northumbria, he probably knew that the rule would not be very acceptable there. In this considerate policy he doubtless acted with the sanction, and possibly the advice, of both Edgar and Dunstan.

Dunstan's conduct with regard to the introduction of the Benedictine rule in England was still more moderate than that of Oswald. He does not seem to have checked Ethelwold in his high-handed methods; as they had the approval of the King, it might have been impolitic to try to check them. He would be losing influence with the King, without doing much good. Moreover, Dunstan thoroughly approved of the results of Ethelwold's work, however little he may have liked the violent way in which he attained them. When Dunstan became Bishop of Worcester, he found secular canons in the cathedral church, but he made no attempt to turn them out. Exactly the same thing happened when he became Archbishop of Canterbury. There also he left the seculars in possession. This is a much stronger instance, because his time at Worcester was so short, perhaps less than a year. At Canterbury he did not even do as much as that

which he advised Oswald to do at Worcester. He did not plant Benedictines side by side with the seculars as a counter-attraction. He was Archbishop for nearly thirty years (959–988), and during the whole of that time he did not set up any Benedictine monasteries in Kent.

The truth perhaps is that, while Dunstan fully approved of the celibacy of the clergy and of the monastic system, especially in its Benedictine form, yet he valued the latter chiefly as an instrument of education. The condition of England as regards learning and morality was so low that Dunstan made the raising of it his chief aim ; and his experiences in Flanders had shown him what excellent teachers might be obtained among the Benedictines. They might raise the tone of the nation. When he found that Edgar was an enthusiastic admirer of the Benedictine system, he encouraged this enthusiasm heartily. More than forty Benedictine houses seem to have been founded during Edgar's reign. But the aggressiveness of the movement, as it was promoted by Edgar and Ethelwold, ought not to be charged against Dunstan. With regard to that aggressiveness, and the claim made on behalf of Benedictines to what remained of the old monasteries, we can see that there was much self-assertion and some injustice. The new monks, we may say, wanted to have it both ways. They claimed to be quite different from, and very superior

to, the monks whose houses had fallen into disorder, or had been destroyed by the heathen Danes. On the other hand, they claimed the nation's gratitude for having brought it the good news of the Gospel and rescued it from the darkness of heathenism. It was quite true that the nation had been converted by missionaries who were monks and who lived the monastic life among them. But it was the monks of the older and despised system that had done this, and not the Benedictines. Just so far as the one claim could be justified, the other claim fell to the ground. Again, where the owners of the older monasteries had all perished, no injustice was done in granting the site and the ruins to Benedictines. Moreover, where seculars had displaced monks, there was perhaps not much injustice in displacing the seculars and putting monks in possession, although the new monks were not the exact representatives of the monks who had been the original possessors. But serious injustice was done when seculars who had the full rights of original possession were forced to yield to Benedictines. They may or may not have been unsatisfactory as priests, but the main objection to them was that they were not monks, and that many of them were married men living with their wives. There were foundations which from the first had had secular clergy. As has been said before, the first missionaries were monks, and the earliest foundations, such as Can-

terbury, Lindisfarne, and Diuma's monastery, which was the mother church of Mercia, were monastic. But Rochester and London, York, Lichfield and Hereford, were from the first secular; and the same is probably true of Leicester, Dorchester, and Worcester. Hence the unwillingness of Dunstan and Oswald to eject the seculars at Worcester.

The answer to this would probably be that, along with some injustice, an immense amount of good was done. The average morality of the clergy was greatly raised; the brutal ignorance of the people was greatly diminished; and something like a solid revival of learning was accomplished. And by no means the least satisfactory feature in the movement was that it was a national one. It was absolutely independent of Rome. Oswald may have brought home some suggestions from Rome when he returned after receiving the pall in 973. But no formal instructions were given and no demands were made. The reforms were carried out by English Bishops according to their own judgment, and with the authority of the English King. We are shocked at the perverted ideas of righteousness which could act on the assumption that the sanctity attributed to the monastic life must override all rights of proprietorship or long prescription; but this wrong principle was of English growth; it was put into action by the chief officers in Church and State; and it does not seem to have been resented

by the English nation. What took place at Worcester, where the worshippers spontaneously deserted the old college of St. Peter for the new monastery of St. Mary, is evidence of that; and we do not read of popular risings in support of the rights of the secular clerks.

But the best defence of the policy of Edgar, Dunstan, Oswald, and Ethelwold is the character of the results. There was a substantial revival of learning, the morality of the people was improved, heathen were converted, and a much better feeling was established between the English and the Danes. The restoration and foundation of numerous monasteries, manned to a large extent by men who were still in the fervour of a new life, contributed largely to these good effects. The example of men who were as yet keeping the Benedictine rule in its pristine strictness was a moral asset of great value to the whole nation; and to have houses of this type planted both in towns and also in places where there had previously been a wilderness was a social and industrial gain. The monks were often good artificers and good agriculturalists. As in the case of the Reformation which swept all monastic houses away, so in the case of Dunstan's revival of them, while we do not forget the violence of the means in the goodness of the results, we must not forget the goodness of the results in the rather frequent violence of the means.

With regard to the two chief actors in the revival, Dunstan and Edgar, it is very difficult to arrive at a just estimate. Dunstan is by some represented as a saint, who lives a life of ascetic piety, foretells the future, and works miracles; by others as a scheming and unscrupulous ecclesiastic, who shrank from no tyranny or fraud that would help him to gain his ends; in particular, who scandalously abused his influence over the King, encouraging him in weaknesses which might be turned to profitable account, while he corrected none of his vices. Edgar, in like manner, is described by some as an arrogant, sensual, and cruel young prince, all of whose good works are easily Dunstan's; by others as one of the greatest kings that England has ever had, who was "discreet, mild, humble, kind, liberal, merciful, powerful in arms, warlike, enacted good laws, and by God's assistance and his own prudence, fortitude, justice, and moderation, preserved during his life the limits of the kingdom." So says Florence of Worcester; and Simeon of Durham and William of Malmesbury are also loud in Edgar's praise. The Chronicle sings his praise in verse, but makes one exception to his fair fame (year 958): "One misdeed he did, that he loved foreign vices all too much, and brought too oft heathen customs within this land, and enticed hither outlandish men, and allured harmful people to this land." This, of course, cannot mean that he coquetted with idolatry, but that he was partial

to foreigners and their fashions. William tells us that Edgar was frequently visited by foreigners, who taught the English many vicious habits: from the Saxons they learnt cruelty, from the Flemings effeminacy, from the Danes drunkenness, having been previously free from such things. This statement as to the innocence of the English is sufficiently amusing, especially as regards drunkenness. But the combined result of the available evidence is that Edgar's was a very mixed character, that his good points have been exaggerated by his friends the monks, with whom the fact that he had founded or restored more than forty monasteries covered a multitude of sins, and that his bad points have been considerably blackened by scandal-mongers. It is hardly doubtful that he led a vicious life during the first part of his reign. Canute, William tells us, had a bad opinion of Edgar, as a slave to sensual passion and tyrannical towards his subjects; but William himself is inclined to make envious tattlers responsible for the evil tales about Edgar.

With regard to Dunstan, Montagu Burrows thinks that "reaction from the contempt formerly poured upon fulsome legends" about him, "has produced a modern estimate almost as partial as that of his superstitious followers."[1] The more favourable estimate is at any rate supported by something better than "fulsome legends." The evidence is

[1] *Commentaries on the History of England*, p. 63.

fairly satisfactory, and, if it were not confused by prejudiced witnesses on both sides, would be convincing. We cannot easily acquit him of flattering Edgar, whom he called *Christi Vicarius*, or of magnifying the royal power in order to carry the reforms which he saw to be necessary. He was throughout his career much more of a statesman than a bishop. He is the predecessor of prelates like Becket and Wolsey and Laud, rather than of Anselm and Hugh. And there is truth in the statement that Dunstan knew how to turn to account some of the young King's weaknesses. Edgar was fond of magnificence, and Dunstan encouraged him to make royal progresses through England, which had the effect of bringing him into touch with his very various and imperfectly united subjects, and moreover helped the good administration of justice. If Edgar could sometimes be tyrannical himself, he did not readily suffer tyranny in the officials under him. It was perhaps partly the result of this love of display that he held the yearly naval reviews on the east, west, and north shores of the island; but the display had the good effect of showing the Northmen that the English were on their guard.[1] Closely akin to his love of magnificence was Edgar's love of popularity. When only a boy he had been chosen to

[1] Florence of Worcester, year 975. The statements about these naval reviews are exaggerations, but we need not doubt that such things took place and did good.

be king over those who were tired of his elder brother's misrule ; and he was barely seventeen when he was chosen to be King of all England. A lad who had had that experience was likely to find popularity a pleasant thing. Dunstan turned this propensity to good account by teaching the young King to earn the good will of his people by good works. Hence the building of so many monasteries ; and there were probably other public works of like character, the details of which did not interest monks and were not recorded.

The problem of the coronation of Edgar by Dunstan and Oswald, at Bath on Whit Sunday, May 11, 973, must influence our estimate of both Edgar and Dunstan. The traditional story is that Edgar had seduced a nun at Wilton, for which sin Dunstan imposed a penance, part of which was that he should not wear his crown for seven years, a privation which let the whole kingdom know that he was expiating a great offence, for which even a king must be made to suffer. In support of this story it is argued that Edgar must have been crowned at the beginning of his reign, and that the story adequately explains the extraordinary fact of a coronation after he had been king for more than thirteen years.

Chronology is fatal to the story. Edgar formed an irregular union, perhaps of the "handfast" kind, with a lady of Wilton, who was "veiled,"

but was probably not a professed nun; she is called Wulfrith, and in 961 or 962 she bore him a daughter who became St. Edith. This union took place *twelve* years before the coronation, and the seven years' penance is seen to be fiction!

Wulfrith refused to make the union a formal marriage, and Edgar then united himself, apparently in a similar way, with Ethelfled, called on account of her beauty "the Swan," daughter of Ordmaer, an ealdorman of the East Angles. Their son was Edward the Martyr, whose succession to the throne was disputed, possibly because his mother's union with Edgar was not a regular marriage, although Nicolas of Worcester (*c.* 1120) says that it was. In this case Edgar seems to have refused to make the ' handfast " a permanent union, and therefore was responsible for the bringing up of the son.

In 964 Edgar married Elfthrith, daughter of the ealdorman Ordgar. She had previously been married to Ethelwold of East Anglia, who died in 962. She bore Edgar two sons, Edmund, who died early, and Ethelred the Unready.[1] This marriage brings us within seven years of the coronation, and the fact that its results were so unhappy may have given rise to the story about the seven years' penance; all the more so as Elfthrith was credited with the murder of her stepson, Edward the Martyr. But

[1] Florence of Worcester, year 964. Geoffrey Gaimar has much to tell about Edgar's wives and children.

a story about seven years' penance would easily get transferred to the veiled lady of Wilton, when once it had been started.

We may give up the story of Edgar's having been deprived of the crown for seven years. And there is no evidence that he had ever been crowned before 963. Why not? Possibly because the disunited condition of the kingdom rendered it inexpedient. There had just been a schism, similar to that between Judah and Israel under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, and the reunion might prove to be only temporary; moreover, the Danes were sometimes very restless. A public proclamation of the fact that all were now expected to unite under a very youthful sovereign may have seemed very impolitic. But thirteen years later things were very different. Edgar was in his thirtieth year. Thanks to Dunstan, he had established a reputation for good government. He had made progresses throughout his dominions and had let his subjects see and hear him. He had preserved peace within the realm and had preserved it from invasion. By a few moderate concessions he had quieted the Danes. Along with E. W. Robertson, Stubbs, and other scholars, we may regard the coronation at Bath as "a solemn typical enunciation of the consummation of English unity, an inauguration of the king of all the nations of England, celebrated by the two archbishops, possibly in imitation of

the imperial consecration of Edgar's kinsmen, the first and second Otto, possibly as a declaration of the imperial character of the English crown itself." This theory receives some confirmation from the terms in which the chroniclers speak of him when they record Edgar's death, two years after the coronation. He was "the ruler of the Angles, the joy of the West Saxons, the protector of the Mercians" (Chronicle); "the emperor of the Anglian world, the flower and glory of preceding kings" (Simeon of Durham); "sole ruler of England, not less renowned among the English than Romulus among the Romans, Cyrus among the Persians, Alexander among the Macedonians" (Florence of Worcester). This is their way of expressing what the coronation by both archbishops was intended to symbolize.

About the characters of Edgar and Dunstan there will always be difference of opinion. But, when we regard them conjointly as king and minister, that is, as statesmen, our measure of praise must be high, for the results of their policy were excellent, and the legislation which they effected is of the same character. Their laws stand recorded, and we can judge for ourselves. We may divide our praise as we please, and give the larger portion either to the minister or to the King, but a very great deal must, in justice, be given to one or the other; but, seeing that Dunstan was twenty years older

than the King, that he was the leading man in the witan as well as the head of the national Church, and that Edgar was often away from the centre of things during his tours by land or sea, we may feel confident that the excellence of policy and of legislation is mainly due to the minister.

The ecclesiastical laws incorporate a good deal of legislation that is of much earlier date. This is true of the penitential canon which has given rise to the accusation that is sometimes brought against Dunstan, that he persecuted the married clergy. Nowhere else is anything said about married clergy. The canon runs thus: "If a mass priest or monk or deacon had a lawful wife before he was ordained, and dismisses her and takes orders, and then receives her again by lying with her, let every one of them fast as for murder and vehemently lament it." The reasonableness of not allowing a man to obtain orders under false pretences of celibacy can hardly be questioned; but whatever be the merits of the canon, it is not Dunstan's, but is of much earlier date. The following canons are thought to be his: "Let no priest receive a scholar without the leave of the other by whom he was formerly retained." "Let every priest teach manual arts with diligence." "Let no learned priest reproach him that is less learned, but mend him if he know how." "Let no noble-born priest despise one of less noble birth; if it be rightly considered, all men are of one origin."

Penance, he held, must not be confined to fasts and prayers; there must be a forgiving spirit in order to win forgiveness, and the offender must be ready to do works of mercy according to his means.

Although the seven years' abstention from wearing the crown is probably legendary, it is likely enough that Dunstan imposed some penance on the king. He certainly excommunicated a powerful nobleman who had contracted what was regarded as an incestuous marriage. The nobleman appealed to the king; but Dunstan paid no attention to the king's interference. The nobleman then went to Rome, and the Pope ordered Dunstan to absolve him. Dunstan declared that he would grant no absolution while the sinner continued in his sin. At last the man abandoned the unlawful union and came as a penitent to ask for pardon. Dunstan then absolved him, and restored him to communion. This disregard of a papal mandate reminds us of Wilfrid's appeal to Pope Agatho, and the rejection of the papal decision by King Egfrid and Archbishop Theodore. But in neither case does there seem to have been any denial of the Pope's jurisdiction. Egfrid and Theodore declared that the document which Wilfrid presented must either be a forgery or have been obtained by corrupt means. Dunstan declared that he would obey the Pope's orders when the offender had done what the Church required.

When Edgar died, July 8, 975, there was no adult

representative of the royal house. The choice lay between a boy of thirteen, Edward, the son of Edgar by his first wife, and a child of seven, Ethelred, the son of Edgar by his second wife. Ethelred's mother, supported by Dunstan's opponents, schemed to get her child chosen. But the two archbishops, Dunstan and Oswald, declared for the elder son and hallowed him as king. Forthwith there were grave dissensions on the monastic question. In Mercia there was a strong movement against Dunstan's policy; monks were expelled and secular clerks, married or unmarried, substituted. In East Anglia and in Essex this movement was successfully resisted, but it seems to have provoked something like civil war, for "a great army was assembled and bravely defended the monasteries."

Three or four years later, 978 or 979, Edward was murdered, probably with the complicity of his step-mother: but the subject is one of the obscure pages of history.[1] His half-brother, Ethelred the Rede-less, seems to have been crowned at once. At the coronation, Dunstan caused him to take the same oath as that which his father had taken at Bath in 973; that he would allow the Church of God and all Christian people to enjoy true peace; that he would forbid all robbery and wrong to men of all ranks; and that he would command justice

[1] Here again Geoffrey Gaimar gives many details.

and mercy in all judgments. This *Promissio Regis* Dunstan embodied in a document, with a commentary, which is still extant.

With the coronation of Ethelred Dunstan's public life as a statesman comes to an end ; but he no doubt still had some influence. The least disastrous years of the senseless young king are the nine in which Dunstan still lived (779–788). Dunstan lived chiefly at Canterbury, administering justice, especially with regard to the maintenance of the marriage-laws, and teaching the multitudes who came to hear him. He returned to the pursuits which had delighted him at Glastonbury forty years earlier—the services of the Church, music, and various handicrafts, and passed the last years of his life in comparative peace. He died in 988. He preached for the last time, and with difficulty, on Ascension Day, May 17, and celebrated the Eucharist. That evening it was seen that his strength was failing. On the morning of the Saturday, May 19, after the matin hymns were over, he sent for the congregation of the brethren. He commended his spirit once more to them, and received the *viaticum* of Christ's Sacrament that had been celebrated in his presence. Giving thanks for this he began to sing, " The merciful and gracious Lord hath made His marvellous works to be remembered : He hath given meat to them that fear Him " (Ps. cxi. 4, 5) ; and with these words he resigned his spirit into the hands of his Creator and slept in peace.

" O too happy is the man whom the Lord found thus watching ! " Such is the comment of the biographer Adelard,[1] who records all this, for which he doubtless had good authority. It reminds us of the story of the death of Bede.

Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Sonnets* (xxviii., xxix.) give a very misleading idea of Dunstan, as an enthusiast who—

> "as a dupe
> Shall soar, and as a hypocrite can stoop,
> And turn the instruments of good to ill,
> Moulding the credulous people to his will."

Wordsworth gives expression to a warning which is true enough in a majority of cases—

> "Woe to the Crown that doth the Cowl obey ! "

But it is singularly inappropriate as applied to Dunstan. The kings who listened to Dunstan were the benefactors of their country. It was the " redeless " king, who refused to listen to him, that brought disasters upon his subjects ; and when there was no Dunstan to offer advice the condition of England went rapidly from bad to worse. Dunstan's fame would have been deservedly greater if he had not been over-praised by foolish admirers, who often lauded what was trivial or legendary while they left his really great achievements almost unnoticed. It is not for the revival of monasticism, which with

[1] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, VII., p. 228.

him was a means and not an end, but for his continuation of the work of Alfred in educating, civilizing, and consolidating the nation, that Dunstan ought to command our lasting gratitude.

CHAPTER V

THE DANES

IT can hardly be a mere coincidence that, just at the time when Charlemagne had checked the inroads of barbarous tribes by land, the invasions of Europe by sea began. In both cases it was a movement from East to West, and in both cases it was an invasion of Christian territory by heathen emigrants; but there was considerable difference between the two series of incursions. The invasions by land had been made by whole tribes or nations, moving in a vast host, which plundered as it went, and either retired with its booty, when it had secured enough or had become weary of plundering, or settled permanently within or near the frontiers of the Roman Empire. But these invasions by sea were of a different character. There was no large mass of population on the move at once. The expeditions were made by comparatively small groups of adventurers, rarely more than a few hundreds; and the different groups had little connexion with one another after they had once left their common home. The

defeat, or even the destruction, of one of them had little effect upon the others, whereas in the case of tribes moving by land, the defeat of one was a considerable check on those which were coming on behind it. These shiploads of wanderers landed where they pleased, acted as they pleased, and stayed as long as they pleased, quite independently of other large or small fleets of wanderers which came from the same country and had perhaps started with them.

There is no clear evidence as to what set these various fleets of adventurers in motion, but love of adventure and love of plunder were certainly among the chief motives. It is likely enough that in addition to these there was the pressure of necessity. There was probably some widely felt disturbance, similar to that which set large tribes in motion previous to the break-up of the Empire in the West. In the Vikings' own country population had increased in excess of the means of subsistence. This would be likely to occur in Scandinavian territory, especially when agriculture was still in a rude condition. It is said that among these Scandinavian peoples custom or law was strongly against the division of estates, and therefore younger sons had very poor prospects.[1]

[1] Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, I., p. 92. He quotes Gale, 533; Snorre, Havinæ, 1777, p. 43; Messen, Stockholme, 1700, p. 4. In the *De reversione B. Martini à Burgundia* of St. Odo, Abbot of Cluny 927–942, it is stated (cap. 1): *Quoniam Danorum tellus sibi insufficiens est, moris est apud illos ut per*

If so, the more energetic among the younger members of families would be likely to go abroad to seek their fortunes. These and other motives may have contributed, but piracy has always been attractive to the acquisitive and adventurous, and both these qualities are common enough, especially among the young. Success in one adventure caused it to be repeated, and success in several soon created a fashion and even a fever. The unsettled condition of Europe owing to the long struggle with the Saracens made it a happy hunting ground for unscrupulous marauders who came well equipped and under the direction of some skilled and courageous leader. How the leader of each of these small fleets of sea-robbers was selected, we do not know. He may have been already a leader by birth or by achievement at home. He may simply have been the most daring or most capable member of the party after it was formed, "chosen to conduct a war or to reward a conquest." But there was no commander-in-chief, no admiral in command of the sum total of fleets, or of any large combination of them.

These Scandinavian marauders called themselves *Vikings* or *Wikings*, that is "Baymen," men from the bays and creeks (*viks*) of the Scandinavian peninsulars. It gives rather a wrong impression when

singula lustra multitudo non minima, dictante sortis eventu, a terra sua exulet, et in alienis terris mansionem sibi quoquomodo, ad propria non reversura, vendicet.

Froude speaks of them as " hole-and-corner " men,[1] which seems to imply that they were afraid to show themselves openly; and it gives something more than a wrong impression, when the second syllable is interpreted as meaning that these roving freebooters were kings. On the Irish coast they were known as *Eastmen;* all round the Continent, from the coast of Friesland to Sicily and Italy, they were commonly called *Northmen;* in England the usual name was *Danes.* The English chroniclers make no distinction between Northmen and Danes, and we can hardly do so, for we rarely know the exact part of Scandinavia from which any particular expedition came. But we can distinguish two main routes. One series of rovers went round the North of Britain to the Orkneys, and thence to Ireland and Devon and Cornwall. Another went across the North sea to East Anglia, and down the Channel to any place that pleased them, and so round the Peninsular and into the Mediterranean. It is by a later refinement that "Northmen," which originally meant "Scandinavians," came to be restricted to Norwegians as distinct from the Danes. The Swedes seem to have taken quite another direction, and to have pushed their way into Russia. It was just after the English nation had begun to feel its own unity (after the conflicting claims of Northumbria, Mercia and Wessex

[1] *Hist. Sketches, Norway Fjords,* p. 72.

to represent and absorb the whole had ended in favour of Wessex), that these terrible enemies began to visit the English coasts, and for a long time seemed to turn everything into the direst confusion. Egbert had probably learnt a good deal during his stay at the court of Charlemagne in the time of Mercian ascendancy ; and, when he returned to England after King Offa's death, he began, as King of Wessex, to initiate a development similar to that which was being worked out by the great Teuton ruler on the Continent. The Danes had already begun their inroads when he began his work.

The Danish invasions of England fall into three clearly marked periods, which rather closely resemble, in the first two stages, the process of the English conquest of Britain. There is first a time of mere piracy, when Danish vessels came over and pillaged on English territory for a few weeks or months, and then went home again with their plunder. At first, they never stayed in the island during the winter, and during their stay they simply encamped, without any erection of a permanent abode. Secondly, there is a time of Danish settlement, when they came to stay and occupy whole districts. During this period, not only were towns captured and held, but Danish dynasties were set up in various parts of England. Some of the chiefs who led the expeditions were younger sons of Danish royal families who had no chance of succession at home. And, after settlements

had been planted in England, more carefully organized expeditions, and on a larger scale, were planned and executed. In the later invasions there were cases in which two kings, or kings and earls, joined their separate forces into one large army and acted in concert. Thirdly, there is a time in which a King of all Denmark was for a while King of all England.

The first of these periods began in the days of Berhtric, King of Wessex, 786–802, who married Eadburg, daughter of Offa, King of Mercia, about 789. It is sometimes stated that the Chronicles give a definite year, 787, as the date of the first invasion.[1] But this is not correct: the statement is that "in Berhtric's days first came three ships of Northmen out of Herethaland," which perhaps means Hardeland or Hardesyssel in Jutland.[2]

Geoffrey Gaimar here makes a considerable addition to the Chronicle, on which he seems to work. "At this time the Danes came to fight against the English. They killed the king's seneschal, and seized and took the land. They did much evil in the country, though they had but three ships. Then they went back into their own land. They assembled their friends, and wished them to come into Britain. They desired to take it from the English, for they had deliberated

[1] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I., pp. 44, 45; Green, *Conquest of England*, p. 50; Sir J. H. Ramsay, *The Foundations of England*, I., pp. 229 f.

[2] Florence of Worcester is equally indefinite; "in his time."

among themselves, and said that it was their heritage, and that many men of their lineage had inherited the kingdom. They had entered it before the English, and a Danish king who was born in Denmark held the kingdom before any Saxon inhabited it; so did Ailbrith and Haveloc, and more might be named with them. Because of this, they said, Britain was in truth their lawful inheritance." It will be observed that Gaimar gives no exact date. He mentions the marriage of Berhtric and Eadburg, and then goes on, "At this time the Danes came." If he is correct about the feeling among the Danes that Britain of right belonged to them, then we must suppose that the idea of conquering Britain occurred to them almost from the beginning, and was not first suggested by the convenience of wintering in the island (see below). The prior right of the Danes would be based on the fact that the Jutes, about 449, under the legendary chiefs, Hengest and Horsa,[1] landed at Ebbsfleet in Thanet, and founded the kingdom of Kent, nearly thirty years before the coming of the South Saxons. It is worth noting that, on all three occasions, the first inroad is made "in three ships." Bede (i., 15) says that the Jutes, whom he calls *Anglorum sive Saxonum gens*, came to Britain *tribus longis navibus*; the Chronicle (477) says "three ships" of the South Saxons; and the Chronicle (787)

[1] There must have been chiefs, and they may have been called "the Horse" and "the Mare."

and Florence of Worcester (787) again say "three ships" of the first coming of the Danes.

The transition from the first to the second period may be placed about 851–855. Under both these years the Chronicle states that "the heathen men, for the first time, remained over winter," in the one case "in Thanet," in the other "in Shepey." A Mercian charter of 855 is dated "when the heathen men were in Wreocensetun," i.e., the dwellers round the Wrekin in Shropshire. The experience that it was worth while to remain in England all through the winter soon suggested the question whether it was worth while to go home at all, and at last it was frequently answered in the negative. At home, they would have nothing but their plunder to live upon, and they might just as well enjoy it in England.

In the first period, it was one of the earliest invasions which made the greatest sensation in England, and, through the influence of Alcuin, on the Continent also. This was the ravaging of Lindisfarne in June, 793, which was preceded by portents and followed by tokens of divine displeasure. The Chronicle records it with horror, and Simeon of Durham, both in his History of the Kings and in his History of the Church of Durham, gives a very vivid account of the horrors of this inroad. "The pagans from the Northern region came with a naval armament to Britain, like stinging hornets, and overran the country

in all directions, like fierce wolves, plundering, tearing, and killing, not only sheep and oxen, but priests and Levites, and choirs of monks and nuns. They came to the church of Lindisfarne, and laid waste all with dreadful havoc, trod with unhallowed feet the holy places, dug up the altars, and carried off all the treasures of the holy church. Some of the brethren they killed ; some they carried off in chains ; many they cast out, naked and loaded with insults ; some they drowned in the sea." Alcuin had returned to England in 790 and gone back to the court of Charlemagne in 792, and this ravaging of his own Northumbria so soon after his visit to it made a great impression on him. He speaks of it in at least five of his letters (*Epp.* 9, 13, 14, 15, 16 and he sent a poem, *De Clade Lindisfarnensis Monasterii*, to Higbald, Bishop of Lindisfarne. It is probable that the destruction of the church and monastery on the Holy Isle of St. Cuthbert seemed to every Englishman, and to all who had heard of St. Cuthbert, an act of frightful impiety and sacrilege. But the body of the saint had escaped ; the marauders had not noticed it, and the monks who had been cast out returned and watched over it once more.[1] Two years later than this the Scandinavian marauders reached

[1] See Platts, *Pioneers of our Faith*, p. 310. He gives a picture of the oaken coffin—still in existence in fragments at Durham—in which the body was finally removed to Durham, See also *Sculptured Stones in the Cathedral Library, Durham*, pp. 133–156.

Ireland, and there they seem to have formed settlements earlier than in Britain, for about 832 there was a Danish colony in North Ireland under a king named Thorkill, who had his headquarters at Armagh.[1] And at once there was an illustration of the fact that it is perilous to Britain to have an enemy quartered in Ireland. From their settlements there the Danes made descents on the West and South coasts of England. This was all the more serious for the English, because in Devon and Cornwall they could find the hereditary foes of the English and make them their allies. Florence of Worcester says that in 835 " the Danes, with a large fleet, made a descent upon the territory of the West Britons which is called Curvalia [Cornwall]. The Britons made a treaty with them, and in conjunction with them laid waste the boundaries of King Egbert's dominions. When that king heard of it, he collected his forces in haste, and engaged with the enemy at a place called Hengestesdune, which means Hengst's mount. He slew many of them, and put the rest to flight." The Chronicle calls these Britons " West-Welsh." [2] Their

[1] There were also Danish settlements under Danish rulers at Limerick and Dublin ; and Waterford was founded by the Danes. After 855 the power of the Danes in Ireland seems to have declined.

[2] Both the Chronicle and Florence gives 835 as the date ; Ethelwerd says 836 ; but 837 or 838 is probably right. Hingston Down is about six miles W. of Tavistock, between it and Callington. We have no sure evidence as to how many

uniting with the Danes may have been mere gratification of race-hatred against the English. But they may have hoped that with the help of the Danes they might still conquer the English and drive them out of the country. In any case, we have Christian Britons joining with heathen Danes against Christian English, as had happened before when the British King Cadwalla, although a Christian, united his forces with those of Penda, the heathen King of Mercia, against the Christian King Oswald (I., pp. 95 f.). In the previous year Egbert had barely escaped complete defeat at Charmouth in Dorset from a fleet of thirty-five Danish ships. The Chronicle says "ship-*loads*," and this has been understood as meaning that the battle was on land; for in the victory of Athelstan at *Sandwich* in 851 it is definitely stated that they "fought *on shipboard*." But in 875 and 882 the same word (*scip hlaesta*) is used, where a sea-fight is certainly meant. The battle at Charmouth is the first naval battle between English and Danes. Ethelwerd says expressly, "King Egbert waged battle with a heathen *fleet*." The Chronicle adds that "two bishops, Hereferth and Wigthen, died." Does this mean that they were killed in the sea-fight, or only that they died that same year? The word used for "died" rather implies the latter. They were both of them Bishops of Winchester.

men one of these war-galleys carried; but from 35 to 50 is a probable estimate. See *Enc. Brit.*, art. "Viking."

In the year before his death, 838, Egbert took a remarkable step which is probably connected with the constant danger from Scandinavian freebooters. About 825 he had sent his son Ethelwulf to gain the kingdom of Kent, and Baldred, King of Kent, was chased out of it and fled "northwards over the Thames." This was naturally resented by Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury, with whom Baldred had been on friendly terms. But about 833—the chronology is very perplexing—Ceolnoth became archbishop, and it is conjectured that he was a West Saxon, and that Egbert contrived to get him elected in order to strengthen his own hands. Be this as it may, in 838 an ecclesiastical council was held at Kingston, and at it Egbert and Ethelwulf entered into a compact of perpetual alliance with the Archbishop and Church of Canterbury, in which Ceolnoth promised for himself and his successors constant friendship to the kings (Ethelwulf had been made King of Kent) and their successors, while the kings promised to the archbishops in perpetuity freedom of election, protection and peace. Egbert and Ethelwulf proved their friendship at once by ceding to Canterbury an estate at Malling which had belonged to the King of Kent, but which Baldred had made over to Christ Church before flying from his kingdom. This compact was confirmed by Ethelwulf at another council held next year, after he had succeeded his father. There is in existence a similar charter of an alliance

between the Crown and the See of Winchester. It may have been made in 839 before the death of Egbert, but its genuineness is doubted by some. In the troubles with the Danes, Egbert and Ethelwulf would be glad to be secure of the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and that of the Bishop of Winchester would be well worth having. Such compacts are strong evidence of the power exercised by the English Church.

From about 851, when they first wintered in England, we may date the beginning of the Danish policy to attempt the conquest of England, and the mischief wrought by them is indescribable. Such a project was most attractive. There was the innate love of fighting and plunder, and England was both more spacious and more fertile than the Danes' own home, which did not want them to return to it. There was also all the intensity of feeling caused by a radical difference of religion. The two religions had everywhere been mutually exclusive. The Danes knew that wherever Christianity had spread on the Continent, the temples and images and sacred trees of their ancestral gods had gone down, and that in recent years the continued worship of them had been punished with death; and they probably knew that in England also such worship was penal. It would be a grim delight to destroy in turn the churches and monasteries, and everything within them that was revered by the detested Christians. Moreover, experi-

ence had taught them that in churches and monasteries rich booty was often to be found, either belonging to the monasteries or deposited there for safety. When, as sometimes happened, there was no treasure to be carried off, more thorough destruction of buildings and inmates was the common way of expressing their resentment. In this way the Scottish schools were almost entirely destroyed by them, and the English schools also suffered greatly, and these catastrophes caused incalculable injury to culture in Western Europe. It is impossible to estimate the number of monastic libraries which were destroyed in the indiscriminate hunt for the treasures which they were supposed to conceal, or the number of teachers who were ruthlessly put to death. Destructiveness, vengeance and greed were the three spirits which animated the vigorous activity of the Danes.[1]

It has been argued that "the maritime expeditions of the Scandinavians were not exclusively directed to objects of plunder or conquest," because "annual fairs were held on the shores of the Baltic to which trading ships resorted from all parts of the Scandinavian peninsular." Of course, the home population often followed "the peaceful pursuits of commerce": that proves nothing respecting the emigrants who sailed out to seek their fortune in other lands. More-

[1] See Schaff, *Mediæval Christianity*, I., p. 107.

over, it is likely enough that some of these emigrants frequented the annual fairs on the shores of the Baltic : they went thither to sell their plunder. Not many of the emigrants contented themselves with the peaceful pursuits of commerce ; they sold neither what they had manufactured, nor what they had purchased, but what they had taken by violence from others. But we must remember that our information about the mischief done by the Danes comes from monkish chroniclers, whose monasteries the invaders had destroyed.

In his graphic chapter on the Northmen,[1] Milman says, " They seemed to defy, in their ill-formed barks, the wildest weather ; to be able to land on the most inaccessible shores ; to find their way up the narrowest creeks and shallowest rivers." That seems to show that the barks were not so very ill-formed. It was mainly because of their admirable seamanship that the Northmen were so powerful all round Europe in the ninth and tenth centuries, and excellent seamanship is hardly possible in " ill-formed barks." We may safely credit the Northmen with considerable skill both in shipbuilding and in the working of iron, for the arming of themselves and their ships. Some of their vessels have been found buried in mud, notably a complete war-galley at East Sottrup in South Jutland. It is 72 feet long, and there is a model of it in

[1] *Latin Christianity*, Bk. V., ch. ix.

the Pitt-Rivers Collection in the New Museum at Oxford.[1]

After the Danes had settled in England, the history of England is to a large extent the history of the struggle with the Danes; and this struggle becomes more and more a fight for existence and dominion between the Scandinavian settlers and the English. The former are not often reinforced by fresh hordes of invaders from their own country, although they are sometimes helped by fleets from the Scandinavian settlements in Ireland.

At the year 865 there is this significant entry in the Chronicle: "This year the heathen army sat down in Thanet and made peace with the men of Kent, and the men of Kent *promised them money for the peace*," but the heathen army stole away in the night and ravaged East Kent. Florence of Worcester (under 864) says: "The pagans wintered in the Isle of Thanet, and made a firm compact of peace with the people of Kent, who promised them money, if

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's Hist. of England*, I., p. 57, gives a picture of one found at Gokstad, now in the University at Christiania. The Vikings were greatly superior to the English in equipment and training. They had better ships, far better weapons and armour, and better tactics. The "fyrd" raised to fight them consisted of undrilled men armed anyhow. See Oman, *Hist. of the Art of War; the Middle Ages*, 1898; Creasy, *Hist of England*, I., pp. 131–6. The Scandinavian war-galleys may have been copied from the Roman. The word "sail" comes from *sagulum*, and its equivalent is found in all Teutonic languages.

they would observe the treaty. Nevertheless, the pagans, like foxes, stole out of their camp by night, and breaking the treaty and contemning the promise of money (for they knew that they could obtain greater wealth by secret plunder than in peace) laid waste the whole of the Eastern part of Kent." Ethelwerd says truly enough that the Kentish men, "ignorant of what was coming, prepare money to purchase peace." This shows that the policy of paying blackmail to the Danes had been thought of long before the time of Ethelred II and Siric. Indeed, it was not merely thought of but acted upon before Siric and certain ealdormen reduced the policy to a system and started the hateful Danegeld. In 872, the Chronicle simply says that "the West Saxons made peace; and then the Mercians made peace"; but Ethelwerd adds that it was paid for. The same thing occurs in 876; the Chronicle states that King Alfred made peace, and Ethelwerd adds that at the same time he gave money.

The year 878 may be taken as marking the turning of the tide, by which time, not only had Northumbria and Mercia been conquered by the Danes, but even Wessex had been overrun, and for a time Alfred's kingdom was reduced to the Isle of Athelney.[1]

[1] The "isle" is formed by the junction of the Tone and Parret, and it was a little to the north of it that Alfred's Jewel, now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, was found. A swamp joined the two streams and formed the island.

"Many of the people they drove beyond the sea, and of the remainder the greater part they subdued and forced to obey them, *except King Alfred.*" It was again one leader against the world, and again the one leader was victorious.

After what is commonly called the "Peace of Wedmore," which was really concluded at Chippenham, Guthrum and twenty-nine of the most distinguished Danes were baptized, Alfred being godfather to Guthrum. England was to be divided between them. All that was south of the Thames and west of the Watling Street was to belong to Alfred, and the Danes were to evacuate it. With regard to the rest of England, Bernicia was to remain English under English princes, who, however, were largely in subjection to Danish lords. Deira became a Danish Kingdom, with York as its capital. East Anglia was also a Danish Kingdom, with Guthrum as king. He was nominally the vassal of the King of Wessex, but he was practically independent. The N.E. half of Mercia seems to have been held by Danish proprietors, under whom the English were serfs. Thus, wherever the Danes had settled, all the English kingdoms were extinguished, with the exception of Bernicia; everywhere else the Danelaw prevailed, not merely by might, but by right. Eight years later, 886, Alfred secured much better terms from Guthrum, according to which he recovered London and the surrounding country. Thirty-five

years later the whole of the Danelaw submitted to Edward, the Unconquered King, as Florence of Worcester calls him. Florence is probably right in placing this submission in 921; but the Winchester Chronicle places it in 924.

At first sight, Alfred seemed to have lost half his dominions: really, he was King of the English to an extent which no king, not even Egbert, had been before. It was a case in which the saying that the half is more than the whole, πλέον ἥμισυ παντός, as Hesiod says, was eminently true. His hold over *Danish* Northumbria and East Anglia was, no doubt, much weaker than that of Egbert had been over *English* Northumbria and East Anglia; but his dominion over Sussex, Kent, and East Mercia was far greater than Egbert's had ever been. Sussex and Kent were completely merged in Wessex, and the title which Alfred now received was singularly accurate. He was more than King of the West Saxons, but he was not yet King of the English: he was called "King of the Saxons," and he and his successors were regarded as the natural champions of the English Church and the English Nation, especially in reference to the Danes, so long as they remained heathen and hostile. The long struggle with the Danes, which seemed at the time to be a distintegrating force, contributed a great deal to the consolidation of England as a United Kingdom. Alfred and his successors had, what Egbert and his

predecessors had never had, the support of a national sentiment. To adhere to one king and lord was declared by the Witan to be a religious duty. On the other hand, the Legatine Council of 787 exhorts kings to obey their bishops, to honour the Church, and to have prudent counsellors fearing the Lord and honest in conversation, that the people, instructed and comforted by the good examples of kings and princes may profit to the praise and glory of Almighty God.[1]

Whatever contributed to the consolidation of England as one kingdom contributed to the permanence of the consolidation of the Church, already accomplished by Archbishop Theodore. But, for the moment, the recognition of the Danish Kingdoms in Deira and East Anglia, and of the Danish predominance of N.E. Mercia, went a long way towards cutting the newly established English Church in two. The see of York and the other sees of Northumbria were almost as much cut off from the see of Canterbury as sees on the Continent were from both.[2] The Archbishops of York were sometimes Danes, Oscytel was Archbishop of York about 956 to 971, and was related to Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury about 942 to 959. Both were Danes, and therefore for two or three years both archbishops were of Danish birth. Oswald,

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, III., p. 453.

[2] On the isolation of the English Church at this time, see Stubbs, *Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series*, p. 182.

who followed Oscytel at York, was a nephew of Odo and in some way related to Oscytel, so that he also was of Danish descent;[1] and, like several Archbishops of York during this period, he held his first see of Worcester in conjunction with the see of York. The conjunction of the two sees is almost certainly due to the fact of the Danish occupation of Northumbria.[2] Sometimes it was impossible for the archbishop to get sufficient income from York, because Danes had possession of the sources of it. Moreover, seeing that Archbishops of York had sometimes given trouble by encouraging Danes to rebel, as Wulfstan had done in 952, it was expedient to have some hold over them. It might be difficult for the Archbishop of Canterbury to have much control over the Archbishop of York, but he could deal with his own suffragan, the Bishop of Worcester. Even a century later, we find Edward the Confessor giving approval to the union of the sees of York and Worcester, although it must have been obvious that the same man could not adequately discharge the duties of both. But this Danish interruption of friendly

[1] Another relation of Oscytel, and friend of Dunstan, was Thurcytel, the famous abbot of Crowland. Evidently there were not a few Danes on the side of religion and order.

[2] William of Malmesbury says that Oswald was charged to retain Worcester, lest the monks, whom he had recently introduced there, should be disturbed. He seems to have resided at Worcester more than at York, and when he died in 992 he was buried at Worcester.

correspondence between York and Canterbury was accidental and temporary. It was not a deliberate policy of the Danes, and it came to an end when they accepted Christianity and thus became absorbed in the English Church and nation.[1]

This absorption took place easily and rapidly. After the Danish conquest of so much of England there was no such mutual repulsion between conquerors and conquered as there had been between conquerors and conquered after the English conquest of so much of Britain. In both cases the bitterness of defeat had been intensified by the fact that the victors were heathen while the vanquished were Christians. But in the one case it was Teutons conquering Kelts, while in the other it was Teutons conquering Teutons. There was race-hatred and radical difference of national character to keep Britons and English apart, but neither of these stood in the way of amalgamation between English and Danes. They could understand one another's language; they had similar characteristics; and to some extent they had similar customs. In particular, both had the important customs of compurgation and wergild, with a system of grad-

[1] The monk of Ramsey, who wrote the Life of Archbishop Oswald, shows that the Danes who occupied York made a good use of it. It was a centre of trade and had a population of 30,000 to 50,000. But of course Christianity did not flourish under their influence. Two of the suffragan sees of York, Hexham and Whithern, perished; and the same thing happened in Lindsey, at least for a time.

uated fines for offences against the law. There may in some cases have been a change in terminology with regard to certain customs and laws, but in not many cases does there seem to have been any great modification of the customs and laws themselves, in order to bring Danish and English usage and legislation into harmony.[1] In the Danelaw, the Englishman might have to descend one step in the social scale, but, having made that descent, he knew where he was, according to the customs of both nations. Indeed, some have thought that the Englishman in the Danelaw enjoyed, on the whole, more freedom than the Englishman in Wessex and English Mercia. But the subject of Scandinavian influence upon the social and constitutional life of the English is not one on which a great deal can, with any certainty, be said.

There is a subject of even greater interest about which provokingly little seems to be known. By what means were the Danes in England converted to Christianity? Respecting the way in which the Saxons and Angles were converted, both in the new country and in the old, we know a great deal. We know both the men who took the lead in accomplishing it, and we know the methods which they employed. But

[1] The laws of Canute are but a reproduction of those of Edgar and Ethelred; not a single custom can be assigned to his rule with any certainty that it cannot be found earlier (see Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I., p. 201; see also Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Constitutional History*, p. 12).

who took the lead in converting the Danes in England? And how did they set about this excellent work? The answer to the first question is Alfred; but we know of hardly any one besides. With regard to the second question, we know that the chief instrument in the conversion of the English in Britain and in the conversion of the Frisians and Saxons on the Continent cannot have been the chief instrument in converting the Danes in England. The old method had been to plant monasteries and use them as missionary centres. But the Danes had destroyed the monasteries, both in the territory which they permanently occupied, and also in that which Alfred had compelled them to evacuate. Even in the latter territory, the influence of Alfred was not sufficient to get the monasteries restored, and still less restoration can have taken place in the Danelaw. Possibly not much was done for the conversion of the Danes until after the restoration of monasticism by Dunstan and Oswald. But, by whatever means, it was accomplished, quietly and effectually. How much was accomplished in the century between the baptism of Guthrum and the renewal of the Danish invasions in the long reign of Ethelred the Redeless, it is difficult to ascertain; but both before and after the revival of heathenism during the second Danish conquest, the conversion of the pagan invaders seems to have progressed without violent or prolonged resistance. When the second Danish

conquest was complete, and a Danish king who was a Christian was established on the English throne, conversions were likely to be frequent and permanent. What is specially to be noted is, that, as soon as the Danes had accepted the religion of the English, their amalgamation with the English began. In some cases no such acceptation was necessary, for some of the later Scandinavian invaders were already Christians before they reached our shores.

It has been mentioned already how Willibrord paid a brief missionary visit to Denmark, but was not able to do much, beyond bringing away thirty Danish boys to be trained as missionaries and sent back to convert their countrymen. Alcuin, in one of his letters, indicates that Charlemagne had thoughts of attempting the conversion of the Danes. When we consider his methods in dealing with the Saxons, we can hardly wish that these thoughts should have been carried out into action. His son, the Emperor Lewis I (*le Pieux* or *le Débonnaire*), may be said to have made a beginning. Harold Klack, a petty Danish king, was driven from his dominions in 826, and fled to Lewis for succour. Previous to this, Lewis had established a Christian mission in Denmark, and he now promised to help Harold Klack, if the latter would accept Christianity himself and allow missionaries to preach anywhere in his dominions. The king consented, and he and other members of his family were baptized at Ingelheim; and, when they

returned to Denmark, they took with them two zealous preachers, Ansgar and Aubert, monks of Corbie near Amiens, trained under Adelhard and Paschasius Radbertus.[1] They were also connected with the New Corbie or Corwey in Westphalia, and it was probably from there that they started for Denmark. They had considerable success for two years, 827–829, when King Harold was again driven out. Ansgar went off to preach in Sweden, while Aubert returned on account of ill health to New Corwey. But in 831 a new see was founded at Hamburg, with the whole of Scandinavia in its diocese, and Ansgar was consecrated as its first bishop. Gregory IV (827–844) gave him the pallium and made him his Legate; but Christendom has given him a nobler title as "the Apostle of the North." The Emperor Lewis (814–840) richly endowed the see, and Ansgar made good use of the money in spreading the Gospel among the Scandinavians. This provoked the hostility of the heathen Danes, and in 834 they sacked Hamburg and burnt Ansgar's monastery, church and library. Ansgar and the Christians had to fly, and he took refuge at Bremen, where the bishop, jealous of Ansgar's promotion, refused to help him, and his own disciples forsook him. But the Emperor again befriended him, and, when the see of Bremen became vacant in 846, it was united with Hamburg,

[1] *Hist. Lit. de la France*, V., pp. 277–283.

and Ansgar became Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, with his seat at Bremen. The Danish mission once more went forward. The first church in Denmark was erected at Hedeby, and was allowed to have bells, which was a great concession, for bells are said to have been regarded with horror by the heathen Teutons. When Clotaire II was besieging Sens in 615, Bishop Lupus ordered the bells of St. Stephen's to be rung, and this caused a panic in the Frankish army and it took to flight (see Baronius).[1] Ansgar continued to work in Denmark and Sweden till his death at Bremen, February 3, 865. He was succeeded by his pupil Rimbert, who wrote his life and continued his apostolic labours until his death in 888, when he was succeeded by Adalgar (888–909), who was succeeded by Unni.

Gorm the Old was the first King of all Denmark, and his wife Thyra Danabod became a Christian, and both Rimbert and Adalgar were allowed to continue mission-work among the Danes. But in Unni's time (909–936) Gorm became afraid of the Christians, drove out the missionaries and burnt their churches. Henry the Fowler, King of Germany, came to the rescue, defeated Gorm, and compelled him to readmit the missionaries and put a stop to human sacrifices. These were specially common in the islands, which were still wholly pagan. But

[1] This story is sometimes given of the siege of Orleans in 610.

Archbishop Unni failed to convert either Gorm or his son, Harold Blaatand (Bluetooth), but Unni's successor, Adaldag (936–988), or some of his missionaries, made a considerable impression on Harold. He seems to have become convinced of the truth of Christianity, or at any rate of its superiority to heathenism, but, like the Emperor Constantine, he refused to be baptized. He helped Adaldag in his work of building churches, founding bishoprics, and obtaining various concessions for the Christians.

Of course all this was very distasteful to the old-fashioned Danes, who, whether or no they still believed in the national gods, had a profound belief in the kind of spirit and temper which the old religion represented and to some extent inspired. To them it seemed as if Christianity was ruining the national character. Peace was preferred to war and sobriety to revelry. If this kind of thing was to be tolerated and even encouraged by those in authority, they would not stay in Denmark to witness it. They emigrated to Pomerania and settled at the mouth of the Oder at Jomsborg. From here, they year after year sent expeditions to Denmark to harass the Christians, and inflicted an immense amount of suffering and loss. At one time they had the support of Sweyn, the son of Harold Bluetooth.

Harold had succeeded his father Gorm as king of all Denmark without having received baptism. But the Emperor Otto I had defeated Harold, and as a

condition of peace required him to be baptized, and he and his son Sweyn were baptized together. Harold now became a fanatical promoter of Christianity, which he tried to force upon his people with so much rigour that he drove them to rebel. Sweyn, like Julian, became so disgusted with this kind of Christianity that he apostatized and joined the rebels; and when he succeeded his father in 986, he persecuted the Christians. He was still a vigorous supporter of heathenism when his son Canute was born, about 994, the year in which Sweyn and Olaf invaded England and were brought off by the heavy tribute of 16,000 pounds of silver. Canute, therefore, was brought up a heathen. But Sweyn afterwards repented and was rebaptized, perhaps about 1000, and it is possible that Canute received baptism at the same time. But most of these dates are uncertain.[1] It is stated that before his death at Gainsborough, in February, 1014, Sweyn charged Canute to aid in spreading the Gospel. That is the Danish tradition. The English legend that Sweyn was killed by St. Edmund of East Anglia, who returned to life to take vengeance on him, for the dishonour which Sweyn had done to the town in which his uncorrupted body was treasured, is given by Florence of Worcester and Simeon of Durham at length, and more briefly

[1] Harold Bluetooth's death is placed by different writers in 980, 986 and 991; his baptism in 960, 965 and 972.

by William of Malmesbury; but neither the Chronicle nor John of Wallingford give any hint of it.[1]

These facts about the spread of Christianity among the Danes in their own country help us to understand the comparative ease with which the Danes in England became united in religion with the conquered English; some of them had accepted Christianity, or had heard a good deal about it, before they came hither; and we may conjecture that what they saw of its results in England inclined them towards it. But it is a matter of certainty rather than of conjecture that, as soon as large numbers of Danes became Christians their common Christianity greatly promoted the union of the two nations. Just as the English Church had been the means of uniting Saxons, Angles and Jutes of different kingdoms into one English nation, so also it was the English Church which, in the eleventh century, healed the dissensions and obliterated the differences between the English and the Danes.[2]

It was by a decree of the Witan, that, in 991, tribute to the amount of 10,000 pounds of silver was paid to the Danes, "as the price of their cessation from the frequent plunderings, burnings and slaughterings, which they used to make on the sea-coast, and of

[1] Robertson, *Hist. of the Chr. Church*, Bk. V., ch. iv.; Schaff, *Mediæval Christianity*, I., pp. 111–120.

[2] "The Danish provinces had become before the Conquest scarcely distinguishable from the Anglo-Saxon, as far as concerned national feeling, and the more important questions of law and manners" (Stubbs, *Hist. Introductions*, p. 108).

their concluding a lasting peace." The Chronicle says that this advice was first given by Archbishop Siric; Florence of Worcester adds the ealdormen Ethelward and Alfric; and we may conclude that these three took the lead in advocating this policy It is quite evident that Ethelred the Redeless is not the only person to be blamed in this matter. Indeed, with regard to the first payment to the Danes in his reign, he is not mentioned; and with regard to all the other payments made by him, excepting the last in 1014, it is expressly mentioned that he acted on the advice or with the consent of the Witan or the nobles; and we need not suppose that in 1014 he acted without them. As we have seen, Alfred himself had been driven to buy peace from the Danes; and so powerful a ruler as Henry the Fowler, King of the Germans 919–936, had done the same kind of thing in dealing with barbarians who were too strong for him. But under Ethelred it was frequent, and it was systematized as a national tax. It is possible that the Danegeld was the first instance of regular taxation in our constitutional history; for previous aids were made, not in money, but in kind. It may possibly have been instituted in imitation of a similar measure which had been adopted by Charles the Bald in Gaul in 861, 866 and 877, but evidence is wanting. It has been compared with our own income-tax, in that it was started as an exceptional measure to meet the emergencies of war, and then

became a regular method of raising money for various purposes.

Dr. Hodgkin has pointed out how the amounts of this impost increased under Ethelred.[1] Each time the sturdy beggars demanded a higher sum. Only in the last payment is there a considerable reduction. In 991, the English paid 10,000 pounds of silver; in 994, 16,000; in 1002, 24,000; in 1007, 36,000; in 1012, 48,000—an enormous sum; in 1014, 21,000. To this must be added a local payment made by the men of East Kent in 1009. Thus, in less than a quarter of a century the English paid to the Danes 158,000 pounds of silver, which was probably worth twenty times as much then as it is worth now. If so, then the pressure on a sparse and impoverished population must have been terrific, amounting to more than eight millions sterling. We are told that the Church claimed exemption from the Danegeld in later times, but was not always able to obtain it. Under Ethelred, hardly any exemptions can have been allowed; the marvel is that such sums could have been raised at all; and sometimes the Danes became very restive when there was a long interval between promise and payment. The Chronicle, at 1011, points out the folly of doing neither one thing nor the other, neither fighting the Danes nor paying the money, so that they went everywhere in bands

[1] *Political History of England*, I., p. 382.

and did untold mischief, till all the tribute was paid.[1]

It was mentioned above how the Danes systematically destroyed monasteries, and monastic schools and libraries, and thus swept away the chief instruments of education and learning. There was another way in which their inroads proved disastrous to religion and culture. Men who might otherwise have devoted themselves to literature and art had to give all their time and attention to studying the arts of warfare. If they would not join the fyrd for the defence of the country, they had to see how they could defend their own lives and homes. Even the clergy sometimes had to fight; and we have seen that the Chronicle *may* mean that two bishops were *killed in battle* at Charmouth (p. 181). On the Continent it was quite common for bishops and clergy to take the field, and this was one of the scandals against which Boniface had to contend. By this withdrawal of men's minds and bodies from peaceful pursuits much of the good work done in the revival under Dunstan was stopped or undone when the Danish invasions began again. But this was not without some compensating advantage, however inadequate, in that

[1] For the later history of the Danegeld, see Stubbs, *Lectures on Early English History*, pp. 29, 137–139, 176, 179, 185, 186, 302; *Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series*, pp. 147–150. It was abolished by Edward the Confessor, but revived by the Conqueror, and it appears in the Rolls for the last time in 1163. Other taxes then took its place.

these greater troubles put a check for a time on the bitter disputes as to whether regulars or seculars should have possession of cathedrals and monasteries. The extremists were unable to force celibacy on all the clergy.

The Danes in Ireland, like the Danes in England, became gradually converted to Christianity, but here again we know very little about the process. It is probable that in both cases marriage had a good deal to do with many conversions. These Scandinavian buccaneers cannot have brought many women with them, even when they left their native land without any expectation of returning to it. When they settled in a country they found wives in their new home, and these wives, both in England and in Ireland, would almost always be Christians. It was natural enough that such husbands should in time "be won over by the behaviour of their wives" (1 Pet. iii. 1). It is remarkable, however, that although the Danes in Ireland were willing to accept Christianity from the Irish among whom they lived and with whom they intermarried, yet they were not willing to receive bishops from them. They sent their ministers to England to be consecrated, possibly because in England there had been bishops who were Danes. In this indirect way the Church in Ireland, which had hitherto been purely Keltic and very isolated and independent, was brought, through English Bishops, into some sort of connexion with the Roman see.

Irish Bishops received consecration from Archbishops of Canterbury who had received the pallium from Rome. The conversion of the Danes in Ireland is placed about the middle of the tenth century, and the beginning of the intercourse with Canterbury in the second half of the eleventh.

In Scotland also the Danish invasions led to an interesting modification of episcopal jurisdiction. It has been pointed out (I., pp. 106 f.) that the source of jurisdiction in the Keltic Church of North Britain was the Abbot of Iona, although he was only a presbyter. In 806, the Danes landed in Iona, assailed the monastery, and killed sixty-eight of its inmates. In 849, the relics of St. Columba were moved for greater safety to Dunkeld, and although the Abbot of Iona still continued to have the control of the monks of his order, yet the jurisdiction over the Keltic Church which the Abbots of Iona had previously possessed now passed, with the bones of the founder, to the Abbots of Dunkeld. Fifty-five years later, Dunkeld was considered to be in peril, and the primacy was again moved—this time to St. Andrew's, where it became attached to the Bishops of St. Andrew's, who were called *Episcopi Scotorum,* to whom the other bishops of the kingdom of Scotland were thenceforward subject, as they had previously been to the Abbots of Iona and of Dunkeld. Thus the apparent anomaly of bishops being subject to presbyters came to an end, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction

in Scotland became assimilated to episcopal jurisdiction in other parts of Christendom.[1]

It no doubt facilitated the conversion of the Danes, wherever they settled, that they had brought no priests with them to their new homes. There was no hierarchy, whose interests and prejudices had to be considered or else excited into fury; no superior class, who urged the masses to resist the new teachers to the uttermost. Apparently there were no priests to bring with them. In Scandinavia there were temples and sacred spots and trees; but at the altars each worshipper was his own priest. The Danes had no sacerdotal class to cause trouble in England, because they had no such class at home. This fact rendered their conversion more easy.

"The Danish invasions," says Church, "though mischievous and cruel, disturbed, but did not arrest, the national growth. It is indeed remarkable, how readily the Danish new-comers, after a generation or two, became fused with the English stock; how readily they received the English religion, and accepted the English speech. When once settled down in peace, the adventurous intruders were gradually tamed among the English population near them, and became in England undistinguishable from Englishmen, except as English provinces were distinguished

[1] Robertson, Bk. V. ch., vii.; he cites Haddan and Stubbs, II., pp. 148, 172; also Stuart, Pref. to the *Book of Deer*, cii., cxxvii.

from one another. . . . Through Danish [as afterwards through Norman] rule, the English speech, the English usages, the English slow, resolute sturdiness of temper, are absolutely proof against the strong influences of a foreign court and a foreign territorial nobility. The people had reached a toughness and consistency of character, and a strength of common ideas and habits, which enabled it to bear the rough assault. It did not become Danish, it did not become Norman. It was strong enough to absorb the genuine Norsemen fresh from the sea and forest; it was strong enough to absorb the altered and more civilized Northmen of William the Conqueror. For this education of the English nation, incomplete undoubtedly, but so distinctly marked, so deeply rooted, and so enduring, we are indebted mainly to the Kings of Wessex, from Egbert to Edgar the Peaceful. . . .

"But there was another influence continually at work, not so manifest in historical incidents, but diffused through the society of the time, without which the policy of the kings would have had more to contend against. The great agency of fusion and unity was the Church. Its archbishops and bishops were in immediate relation with the king and his chiefs, their fellow-councillors and authoritative advisers; its priests and monks were in close contact with the various classes of the people, sharing their fortunes and their ideas, the one source to them of instruction and of culture. The Church had its fluctuations of

vigour and decline; of efforts after learning and goodness, and of corrupt stagnation; and, like everything else, it savoured of its age, its rudeness, its incompleteness, its ignorance. But the Anglo-Saxon Church was eminently a popular Church. Its leaders were deeply concerned in the public interests of the State. More dispassionate and better-informed history has recognized in Dunstan, once the byword for priestly arrogance and cruelty, a genuine patriot and reformer to whom amends are due, the chosen friend and councillor of the Wessex kings, especially Edgar." [1]

It may excite surprise that the Danes were so constantly victorious over a nation which exhibited so much staying power and solidity of character as the English. Why did not the qualities which enabled them to absorb the Danes rather than be absorbed by them enable them to win more victories in the field? The reason has already been partly indicated. There was no national army with which to meet the invaders, but only a hastily summoned local body of volunteers, who scarcely knew anything of drill and were very badly armed. Each fighter brought his own weapon, and the weapons differed greatly. Moreover, it was difficult to get the English in one part of the country to leave their farms or other business in order to defend the lands of men who

[1] *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, pp. 175–182.

lived hundreds of miles away. The old kingdoms had not yet become so united that the men of Wessex could see that they had common interests with the men of East Anglia and Northumbria. It was the sufferings inflicted by the Danes in all the old kingdoms that helped to create that kind of unity. And the Danes had the additional advantage of being always able to refill their ranks by fresh recruits from Scandinavia, which had plenty of spare population ready for adventures and fighting, whereas the slaughter of the English was a dead loss to them. See p. 172.

These great advantages ceased when the Danes had settled in large numbers in England. Settlement meant marriage, the creation of a home and the acquisition of possessions in lands, houses, and cattle. The wives were often English women, whose influence would be for peace with the English. The Danes ceased to be warriors eager for a fray and with no property to lose, and became colonists with a stake in the country. They had homes which could be harried in war and goods which could be pillaged. They lost their marvellous mobility, which had been the chief cause of their successes in Europe. So long as they could surprise any part of the coast, or the banks of any large river, land anywhere, commandeer the horses, scour the country for miles round, and then depart as quickly as they came, they could do very much what they pleased. They were gone

before a superior force could be raised to oppose and defeat them. But when they became settlers, the English had plenty of time to raise adequate forces to subdue them. If they made inroads into English territory, the English could do the like in the territory which had been ceded to the Danes. Moreover, they could no longer get reinforcements, whenever they needed them, from Denmark; for the fleet which Alfred had created, and which his son and his three grandsons maintained, had command of the sea, and could often cut off the Danish ships, which were seldom equal to the English fleet in numbers. Lastly, while English territory was entirely free from Danes, Danish territory was by no means free from English. In East Anglia and in some other parts the Danes were actually a minority, and in every part of their territory there were some English. These English had lost both property and position by having to give place to Danes and submit to Danish law, and they were always ready to help their countrymen against the Scandinavian colonists. When these facts are considered, the early successes of the Danes are very intelligible, and the success of Edward the Elder in reducing them to submission in 921, and of his sons in quelling their frequent rebellions, is equally intelligible. The second Danish conquest, 991–1014, needs no explanation. Ethelred the Redeless received the kingdom in good condition and disaster was kept off for a considerable time. But

while he allowed the national defences to run down, the Danes came with large fleets carrying whole armies. Here and there a gallant English leader, such as Ulfkytel, ealdorman of East Anglia, himself of Danish descent, beat them off ; but such patriotism was more than counteracted by the treachery of the two ealdormen to whom Ethelred granted commands, Alfric and Edric Streona. That in the end England should be governed by Danish kings, and that the English Witan should will to have it so, rather than prolong a ruinous struggle, need not excite our surprise.

There can be little doubt that the success of Alfred and his son and grandsons in preventing the Danes in England from being reinforced from Scandinavia was a bad thing for the Continent. The Danish armies, which had hoped to land in England, did not return home again when their purpose was frustrated, but sailed along the coasts of Europe and did incalculable mischief. It was just as easy to land there as in England, and perhaps as much plunder was to be had on the Continent as in England or Ireland. But everywhere their power was on the wane, and possibly the old Berserker fury was less intense. The settlement in Normandy was the only large and important settlement that remained permanent and dominant. Elsewhere the settlements were insignificant or the settlers became lost in the original population.

The impression produced at the time throughout

the whole of Western Europe was that civilization was being destroyed by these Scandinavian pirates. Coming after the Saracens, they were like the locusts after the hail. But, without intending anything of the kind, they really worked in the interests of civilization. Charlemagne may deserve nearly all the praise that has been bestowed upon him by modern admirers, but he had very serious defects. Like Mahomet, he made the mistake of attempting too much. He was not content with reforming his own dominions and legislating for his own time; he tried to be a universal benefactor and to legislate for posterity. "He had the rudeness of a barbarian endeavouring to rise above barbarism," and "was one of those who think that they know enough and have strength enough to mould the world at their will."[1] If he could have had his way, and if he could have had successors like himself, the progress of civilization would have been arrested, and Western Europe would have settled down into a respectable, but dull and unfruitful, mediocrity. The ferocious inroads of the Danes prevented that. All round the vast dominions of Charlemagne they made conquests and founded kingdoms; and, even when they were most destructive, they imparted new life to decadent populations by forcing them to defend themselves. In England, at one time or other during the long struggles under

[1] Church, p. 135. See also C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages*, I., pp. 158 f.

Alfred, and again under Ethelred, almost every person had to fight, if not for his country, at least for his family and his farm. The Danes ruined culture for the moment wherever they landed and prevailed, but in the long run civilization has gained by the shock which they gave to the premature organization of the great Charles.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

TWENTY-FIVE years before the Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain, any one who spoke of the possibility of the Empire which they represented being on the point of dissolution would have seemed to be raving. It was simply incredible that the most widely and firmly established institution that the world had ever seen should come to an end. It was difficult to conceive how the world could go on without it; and it was almost as difficult to imagine what European society would be like, if the Roman Empire were taken out of it. Such a catastrophe was to the last degree improbable—so much so as to be almost unthinkable. It would mean the abolition of conceptions and customs, which were so deeply rooted in the minds and lives of men as to seem to be essential elements in their existence, elements the destruction of which would reduce everything to chaos.

Twenty-five years after the withdrawal of the legions from Britain, it was evident that the inconceivable

catastrophe had begun. The Empire was a moribund body, and the eagles were already gathered together to consume it. Goths, Vandals, Sueves, Herules, Burgundians, Franks, Lombards were all on the move, partly inside, partly outside the frontiers of the Empire, some of them driven onwards by the most formidable enemy of all, the terrible Huns. To the Huns destruction was not, what it is to many invaders, dire necessity as a means of successful conquest; it was a glorious pastime, without which life would be insipid and dull. They destroyed, when destruction brought them no kind of advantage. Even the great check which they received at Chalons, in the autumn of 451, did not prevent them from rushing onwards into Italy, and in a short time they were at the gates of Rome. Sickness in their ranks made Attila listen to the intercessions of Pope Leo, and Rome was spared (453). But the Roman Empire had been shaken at its very centre. Two years later it was not only shaken, but its capital was taken and sacked by the Vandals of Genseric, who was not to be turned aside by the prayers of Leo. Genseric, like Attila, was supposed to regard himself as an instrument of Divine vengeance. Attila was believed to accept with pride the designation of "The Scourge of God"; and when the pilot of Genseric's galley asked him whither he was to steer, "To those with whom God is wroth" was the answer. Genseric lived to see the end of the line of Roman Emperors in the West in

476 and died in the following year. The imperial insignia were sent by Odoacer to the Emperor Zeno at Constantinople, and were not used again in Rome until Charles the Great revived the august title and was crowned as Roman Emperor by Leo III in 800.

But no one believed that the Roman Empire in the West had come to an end.[1] In the three centuries between Romulus Augustulus and Charles the Great there was no belief that what had for so many centuries been the foundation of law and order had been broken up. It was significant that neither Odoacer nor Theodoric assumed the title of Emperor; but there was still a Roman Senate and a Roman Consulship. These might be called unrealities, mere ghosts of powers that were dead; but there was one great reality which was never destroyed, and that was Roman law. Even more completely than the Latin language in Italy and Spain and in most of Gaul, it conquered the conquering invaders. Just as they to a large extent dropped their own dialects and adopted a language which was much more Latin than Teutonic, so to a large extent they adopted into their own codified customs provisions borrowed from Roman law. As life became more complex, cases frequently arose to which their own simple customs could not be applied, and then it was almost necessary to have

[1] W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World*, p. 186; Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. ii.

recourse to Roman law. The proportion varied considerably among the different tribes of invaders settled in different parts of the Continent, but in nearly all of them Roman law had some influence, and in some a very great deal.

This catastrophe to the Roman Empire in the West, however much it may have been disguised at the time, has no disguise for us. Political power passed from Romans to barbarians, whose leaders assumed the Roman offices, and set up or slew Roman Emperors, just as they pleased, and, when they pleased, decided that there should be no more of them. A professor of Modern History has insisted that, "in all our studies of history and language, we must cast away all distinctions of 'ancient' and 'modern,' of 'dead' and 'living,' and must boldly grapple with the great fact of the unity of history."[1] But such a catastrophe as the downfall of the Roman Empire in the West involved an amount of change in everything that goes to make history which cannot be ignored. The student who tries to gloss it over with phrases about the unity of history is endeavouring to shut his eyes to obvious and useful landmarks. The break-up of the Empire was a response to the call from the Throne, uttered, not at the end of the world but in the full course of its career, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. xxi. 5). It was the beginning,

[1] E. A. Freeman, *The Unity of History*, p. 11.

if not of a new heaven, at any rate of a new earth; and developments, which had been impossible and inconceivable before, were made possible and began to be realized. It is both legitimate and instructive to regard this catastrophic change as a dividing event in history, showing where what is ancient ends, and what is mediaeval, and preparatory to modern history, begins. No event at all conparable to it, in the magnitude of the changes which it introduced or made possible, can be found.

It is quite certain that the various hordes which broke in upon the Western Empire and produced this enormous change had very little idea of what they were doing. They were headed by no Hannibal, or Julius Cæsar, with a definite aim in view. They were independent of one another, except so far as one pushed another on, and they were often antagonistic to one another. They wanted better territory than they had at home, and more of it; they wanted change of life; and they wanted any plunder that might come in their way. They had no idea that, along with their violence and destruction, they were bringing new vigour and freedom into a sickly and servile condition of society, and that the settlements which they founded, just to please themselves and satisfy their temporary needs, contained within them the complex future of Europe. Orosius, the pupil of Augustine of Hippo, made a brave assertion and a far-sighted surmise when he declared that the bar-

barians were not the enemies of society, and that perhaps a day might come when posterity would see that the chiefs, who were now looked upon as destructive foes, had been really great rulers of men.

The Middle Ages begin with the break-up of the Western Empire, and end with the break-up of the Western Church; and they cover, when regarded from a religious point of view, three fairly distinct periods, of which the first alone concerns us—that which ends near the close of the tenth century. If we want a distinctive name for it, we may call it the *missionary* period. It is the age of the conversion of the Northern nations, and among these conversions none were more important than those of the Franks and of the English. The conversion of the Franks may be said to have been the chief cause, independently of the intrinsic truth of doctrine, of the triumph of orthodoxy over the Arianism, which the Goths and Vandals had brought with them into the West. The conversion of the English was doubly important, first as being the foundation of the earliest national Church in Western Christendom, and secondly as leading to the conversion of so many heathen on the Continent. The English Church was not only the most national, it was also the most missionary, among all the Christian communions which came into existence between the fifth and the eleventh centuries. The Keltic Church of Ireland[1] was still earlier in the mission field,

[1] See *Haddan's Remains*, "The Scots on the Continent."

but its work was more fitful and less organized, and therefore less enduring than that of the English missionaries, who, for more than three centuries, were active and successful in planting and sustaining Christian congregations in Northern and Central Europe. This continued at least until the reign of Canute, who sent English monks and clergy to complete the conversion of Denmark. Both Hakon the Good in the middle of the tenth century, and Olaf the Saint in the first quarter of the eleventh, made large use of Christian priests from England in the conversion of Norway. We may divide this missionary period into three; but the divisions, though convenient, overlap: the independent work of the Irish and Frankish missionaries; the organized and Romanized work of Boniface and his colleagues; and the coercion exercised by Charlemagne. The last is the earliest example of a bloody crusade in the supposed interests of Christianity.

Some of these missionaries are credited with an enormous number of converts—thousands of baptisms in one day. Where this is sober fact, the explanation is that subjects followed the example of their king or chief, with very little comprehension of what they were doing. Where this was done without threats or coercion of any kind, the evil, though great, was not irreparable. The instruction, which ought to have preceded baptism, could be given afterwards, and in a great many cases was so given. In that

case this wholesale baptizing of masses of people might be compared to infant-baptism. The uninstructed heathen were in much the same condition as unconscious infants. But the parallel does not carry us very far. Infant baptism is defensible, and it has been adopted from the earliest times by almost the whole of Christendom. Neither of these statements, holds good of the baptism of uninstructed adults, in whose case nothing is gained, and very much is lost, by granting baptism before instruction. It is evident that, in the conversion of the English, the baptism of wholly ignorant or very imperfectly instructed multitudes must have taken place sometimes. In a letter of Gregory I to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria (579–607), written in June 598, he congratulates him on the growth of the Alexandrian Church, and mentions as an encouraging parallel the success of the monk whom he had sent to Britain, through whose activity more than 10,000 Angles had been baptized at the previous Christmas. Bede tells us that Ethelbert compelled no one to embrace Christianity, but only showed affection to the believers (i. 26); yet, in stating that his successor Eadbald had as yet refused to receive the Gospel, he mentions that those who had been induced *either through favour or fear* of Ethelbert to accept Christianity now began to relapse (ii. 5). And, some forty or fifty years later, idolatry was made penal in Kent, and the eating of flesh in Lent also.

Relapses were the natural result of wholesale baptisms, whether there had been coercion or not. Another result was the extraordinary mixture of heathen customs and rites with Christianity.

Where baptism was insisted upon as the only alternative to death, as in Charlemagne's dealing with the Saxons, the results were still more disastrous. As baptism had been made a sign of submission to a conqueror, apostasy became the natural and almost necessary means of asserting the regaining of freedom. We have seen that Pope Hadrian approved this treatment of the Saxons, although Alcuin ventured gently to deprecate it. Alcuin saw that men can be compelled to be baptized, but they cannot be compelled to believe. They may be frightened into saying that they believe, but that is not faith. Such remonstrances are rare. The Pope was only following the teaching of Augustine of Hippo in giving his sanction to coercion. It began with the Donatists. At first Augustine said that he did not like to see the schismatics forced into communion by the exercise of secular authority. After years of hesitation, he came to the conclusion that the use of the secular arm was justifiable; but Gibbon exaggerates when he says that the persecution of the Donatists had Augustine's "warmest approval." In the end, Augustine sanctioned the use of force, not only against turbulent schismatics, but against the heathen, and became "the patriarch of Christian persecutors." Tertullian, with his strong

common sense, had pointed out, that no one, not even a human being, would wish to be worshipped by an unwilling worshipper; and Chrysostom had declared, that it is not lawful for Christians to overthrow error by compulsion and force. "Yet shortly afterwards a change set in, which was principally brought about by the great master of the Latin Church, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. Formerly he had taught as Chrysostom did; but he now affirmed that, through the experience gained from the compulsory conversion of the Donatists, he had arrived at more correct views. These he sought to establish by such palpable sophisms and such gross perversion of the utterances of Christ and of the Apostles, that we seem to recognize no longer the acute theologian faithful to tradition, but rather the disciple of heathen sophists and rhetoricians. Nevertheless, his opinion gradually, though slowly, made its way; his teaching was pregnant of results for Western Christendom. . . . Crusades took the place of missions, and by them the tribes were exterminated rather than converted."[1]

The civilization which was destroyed by the avalanche of barbarian tribes was very different from the civilization which was created by Christianity. The civilization of ancient Greece and Rome was thoroughly selfish; it was the civilization of a privileged

[1] Döllinger, *Academische Vorträge*, III., pp. 278 f.; *Historical and Literary Addresses*, pp, 233 f.

class at the expense of other classes. So far from endeavouring to communicate it to those who had no share in it, the privileged class jealously excluded others from enjoying it. It was necessary that the many should toil and fight, in order that the few might have leisure and peace for the pursuit of self-culture. The philosophy which the select few taught, and sometimes practised, had very little philanthropy in it and still less religion. Even where it promulgated lofty principles, it supplied no motive-power for their fulfilment. The net result was a general degradation, redeemed here and there by a few noble lives, but without power of recovery. We may perhaps say with truth that it was almost a misfortune to Gaul and Spain that they received Christianity while the old Empire was still standing with unbroken frontiers, within which they were situated. The consequence was that the Church in these countries became tainted with the spirit of old Rome. The clergy became secularized. They accepted imperial offices and even fought in imperial armies. If the population were raised somewhat and made more free, the clergy became debased and servile. And this evil spread to the Franks, when they burst in upon Gaul and under Clovis accepted Christianity. The secularity of the clergy is one of the chief difficulties with which missionaries and reformers had to contend. Monasticism was a partial remedy, but a very partial one.

Nevertheless, although the Church suffered grievously from these two evils—wholesale baptisms, which left the baptized population more pagan than Christian for a generation or two, and the lowering of tone among the clergy, through accepting, and even contending for, secular offices—yet the superiority of Christian civilization over the civilization which it displaced could not be denied.[1] It proved its strength by abiding when the other crumbled away. Even in this matter of secularity its power was often shown. It sometimes happened that the laymen who ought to have taken the lead shirked the labours and perils of doing so in such troubled times; and then Christian bishops came forward and led. Public spirit was more often found within the Church than outside. And a bishop who had once taken the lead was likely to keep it, for he held his see for life, and the duties which he had added to his episcopal office came to be regarded as belonging to it. Even by heathen, or by worldlings who cared nothing about religion, bishops were often regarded as the representatives of social justice and freedom. Romans, who saw their own powerful organization giving way under the pressure of new and perplexing

[1] "The freedom of modern Europe is based, not on the freedom of Greece or Rome, but on the ancient freedom of the Teutonic nations, civilized, organized and reduced to system by agencies, of which Christianity and the system of the Church are far the greatest and most important" (Stubbs, *Lectures on Early Eng. Hist.*, p. 197; see also p. 237).

forces, could not but feel respect for an organization which not only held its own under the same pressure, but increased both in extent and strength. And the barbarians, who knew far less about the Christian Church than the Romans did, were nevertheless impressed by what they saw of it. If they gave up their own idolatry, it would be in favour of this mysterious religion, with its unknown, all-pervading Deity, rather than in favour of the worn-out idols of old Rome. And it was a religion with which it was necessary to reckon. The pagans who invaded the Empire had never to make up their minds whether they would accept the imperial Pantheon or not; but they had frequently to make up their minds whether they would accept Christianity or not. It was the exception when the refusal to accept it involved temporal penalties, although such cases were far too frequent. But these barbarians had, each of them, reason and a conscience; and there were features, both in the doctrines preached and in the lives of those who preached them, which set them thinking, and which refused to be ignored. These teachers were on the side of things which the barbarians knew to be good, purity in family life, honesty, loyalty, fidelity, and freedom; they might be right when they praised things which the barbarians could not so easily appreciate, benevolence to all, forgiveness of injuries, humility; and they might even be right when they taught that there was only one God,

who was everywhere present, taking account of men's actions and words and inmost thoughts. It is quite true that, for centuries after the conversion of the barbarians, the condition of the Church in the West was, in the main, a disgrace to the religion which it professed, owing to the paganism which had filtered into it and the worldliness which it had openly assumed; but its light never went out. It was still able to produce saints, and to raise the moral standard of some of those who were pulling the Church's moral standard down.

The English Church was less infected with these evils than the Churches on the Continent. Wholesale baptizing of ignorant heathen had been less common here, and there had been no accepting of imperial offices by the clergy, for Britain had for long been outside the Empire. The civil power of the bishops was not a secular duty imposed upon them, or assumed by them, in addition to their ecclesiastical duty; it was part and parcel of their ecclesiastical duty. The bishops were the chief advisers of the king in the Witan; and in the courts of law and the folk-mote they sat as judges and presidents with the ealdormen and sheriffs. Their influence in all was great.[1] In the Witan they sat as "wise men," as counsellors, not as spiritual rulers. In synods they sat as ecclesiastics. But it is not always easy to say whether the

[1] Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, pp. 8, 9.

body which issued decrees was a meeting of the Witan or a council of the Church, and whether the decrees it issued were national laws or ecclesiastical canons. In no other country were the clergy so little of a caste, so united in all duties with the civil rulers, so thoroughly governed by national laws administered by national courts. The clergy did not become secularized, because as yet there was no outside secular power to claim their services for work which ought to be done by laymen; nor did they shirk either the ecclesiastical or the civil side of their duties. It was the civil rulers who were more often inclined to shirk. In the period which is sometimes called the Triarchy, when the numerous kingdoms had been reduced to three (613–829), as many as thirty kings and queens have been counted who threw up their civil duties and retired into monasteries. These retirements from royal courts were regarded as meritorious surrenders of the splendours of the world. But there may have been both cowardice and sloth in such abdications; and it is quite certain that they sometimes involved the deserted subjects in much confusion, and even in war. Moreover, they set an example of weakness. Even in Bede's time there had been a weakening of moral fibre both among the clergy and the laity; and how little there was of patriotism or national spirit was soon shown by the inability of the English, especially in Northumbria and East Anglia, to repel the invasions of the Danes (I., pp. 155, 160).

Nevertheless, the absorption of the vast numbers of victorious Danes who had gradually established themselves in England in the reigns of Ethelred I and Alfred showed the great staying power of the English. In the course of about three generations, the wise and generous policy of Dunstan and the kings whom he guided had brought something like harmony between the two races who had been such deadly foes, and the Danes were becoming good Englishmen. This process was hardly complete when the second Danish invasions began, and on a far larger scale than the earlier ones. The new invaders were not fitful bands, but large armies led by kings, and they found much help from their countrymen, hitherto pacified and living contentedly in the Danelaw. As in the earlier invasions in the time of Ethelwulf (853, Chronicle and Florence of Worcester), they were helped by a rising in Wales, which now had an opportunity of paying off old scores, and was ready to co-operate with the Scandinavians on the East coasts. The English, far from united among themselves, were thus caught between two formidable foes. They were helped also —and this is the worst feature of all—by the amazing treachery of Alfric and of Edric Streona, "the Grasper," as some interpret his second name, ealdormen of Mercia. Alfric has already been mentioned as one of the ealdormen who joined with Archbishop Siric in recommending the policy of buying off the Danes (p. 201). Alfric's first act of treachery was in 992,

when he sent information to the enemy, and left his own ship to be captured by them. The other treacherous acts perpetrated by him and Edric lie outside our period, as does the Danish sovereignty which they helped to bring about. Our chief concern is with the fortunes of the English Church.

The masterful hand of Archbishop Theodore had turned a missionary Church (or rather, scattered groups of missionary centres in different kingdoms) into a national Church; and the national Church had at once shown the vigour and enthusiasm which spring from union and organization by sending to the Continent a stream of missionaries to whom the conversion of the pagans in Germany and Holland is largely due.[1] Through these missionaries, and especially through Boniface and those whom he trained or influenced, immense impetus was given to the growing power of the Popes; so much so, that Boniface had been called "the Proconsul of the Papacy." All the territories which were added to Christendom were brought into the closest connexion with Rome and placed under the jurisdiction of the Roman Bishops. The independence of the Keltic missionaries was crushed out, and the national character of the English Church was not imitated. Centralization, with Rome as the centre, was the policy adopted, and its effect upon the ecclesiastical and political history of Europe has been enormous. It would have amazed Boniface

[1] Stubbs, *Lectures on Early Eng. Hist.*, pp. 356–8.

himself, whose aim was, not to augment the power of the Papacy, but to secure a centre of unity.

England supplied the first instance of a national Church in the West. It may be almost said that there was no other, no other so truly national; just as there was no other country which produced a literature which was so truly national. The two facts illustrate one another, and are probably connected. No other Church infused its influence so fully into the feelings and habits of the people.[1] In no other country, as has been pointed out, did Church and State work together so harmoniously, for each had to a considerable extent the same rulers, the king having much influence in ecclesiastical legislation, while the clergy had much influence in civil legislation. In no long time after the pontificate of Theodore of Tarsus, all the clergy in England were Englishmen. They spoke the English language, and had an Englishman's way of looking at things; consequently their conversation and their preaching were perfectly intelligible, and, as a rule, sympathetic. They were thus, without effort, and almost without knowing it, a potent agency for obliterating the differences between the various kingdoms. Some of the clergy travelled a good deal. They might labour at various times in Northumbria and Mercia and Wessex. Wherever they went, they treated all who came to them in the

[1] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I., p. 33.

same way; one diocese was the same as another.[1] The people had the same services, the same kind of sermons, the same ministrations in their own homes. All this did a great deal towards making the Church popular and preparing the way for the unification of the kingdom.

It has been already shown (I., pp. 172, 174) that the English dioceses generally followed the divisions which already existed between the different kingdoms. Each kingdom ought to have its bishop with as much reason as it had its king; and then experience proved that one bishop was not sufficient, and dioceses were divided. Much the same principle was followed in the creation of parishes. Each township ought to have its priest, and thus a parish was simply the earlier township regarded in its ecclesiastical character. But in this case experience produced an opposite result. Whereas in the case of the kingdoms, which were generally too large for one bishop to supply the requisite attention, division was found to be necessary; in the case of the townships, which were sometimes too small to support a priest, grouping was found to be necessary. Consequently, some parishes contained two or three townships, which joined together in providing maintenance for a priest. There is probably no early instance of a township being divided between two parishes.

[1] Gardiner and Mullinger, *Intr. to Eng. Hist.*, pp. 26, 27.

The laity who supplied the means of livelihood for the clergy, did so voluntarily. They may sometimes have made their offerings unwillingly, but there were no penalties to enforce payment. On the analogy of Jewish law, they were taught that it was a duty of Christians to give a tenth; and not all of what was given went to the priest. A common division was a distribution between the clergy, the Church, and the poor; but in some parts of the Continent a fourth portion went to the bishop, and in Germany the bishop sometimes got the whole. Where the voluntary offerings were insufficient, charitable persons sometimes gave a piece of land, the proceeds of which made an augmentation fund.

It is obvious that a purely voluntary system would not work satisfactorily. Some who could best afford to help in maintaining would be found to shirk. Consequently, in the last quarter of the eighth century, we find that, both on the Continent and in England, the payment of tithe was made obligatory. This was done in 779 by Charlemagne, who decreed that all in his dominions should pay tithe, and that in each diocese the bishops should decide as to its distribution. This making of tithe obligatory was regarded as very vexatious, and was sometimes a serious hindrance to the making and permanent retention of converts. Pagans naturally did not like to have to pay for becoming and remaining Christians. The sending of Roman Legates to England by Pope Hadrian in

786 in connexion with the proposal to make Lichfield a Metropolitan see (I., p. 178) led to tithes being made obligatory in this country. At councils held by them in 787 this was done, and the councils were virtually Witanagemots, for they were attended by the kings and ealdormen, who confirmed the decrees. In the tenth century the mention of tithes in legislation is frequent, and in some cases detailed directions are given, notably in the laws of Edgar.[1]

It is perhaps still necessary to affirm that "the famous *Donation* of Ethelwulf had nothing to do with tithe." By that celebrated act, the King of Wessex and Kent gave a tenth part of his own estate to be used for charitable purposes, and freed a tenth part of the folklands, whether held by clergy or laymen, from all liabilities, excepting the *trinoda necessitas*, viz., the obligation to military service in the fyrd, to the repair of bridges, and to the maintenance of fortifications. Of course this *Donation* had no effect outside Ethelwulf's own dominions. He had no power to free the folkland in other kingdoms from any of its burdens.[2]

A contrast has been drawn between the Keltic Church in Ireland and the Anglo-Saxon Church in England, in respect of independence of Rome. The

[1] Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I., pp. 227, 228, 237.

[2] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, XVIII., p. 42 ; Haddan and Stubbs, III., 636–648 ; Lord Selborne, *A Defence of the Church of England*, pp. 123–159, and *Ancient Facts and Fictions concerning Churches and Tithes*, *passim*.

Irish Church had its own liturgy, hymns and psalmody. It never asked the see of Rome to determine anything respecting its native bishops; and, until the Synod of Holmpatrick in 1145, it never asked Rome for "that symbol of subjection, which the pall came to be." Very few of the Irish pilgrims went to Rome, although one or two early saints are said in legendary stories about them to have gone there. The multitude of Irish missionaries and travellers who went to the Continent between the sixth and twelfth centuries went anywhere rather than to Rome, and some of them, notably Columban, came into direct collision with the authority of Rome about the time of keeping Easter, episcopal jurisdiction, and so forth. On the other hand, the English Church had what might be called a settlement or school at Rome. It got ritual, psalmody and Church ornament from Rome. Its pilgrims (and it had many, including kings) commonly went to the *limena Apostolorum*, to the city which possessed the bones of St. Peter and St. Paul. And it was from Rome that its Archbishops received the pall.[1]

But although this contrast certainly exists, it is possible to over-estimate it. A closer view shows that the independence of both Churches is far more remarkable than the independence of the one and the dependence of the other. In neither is there the smallest support to be found for the Ultramontane theory

[1] *Haddan's Remains*, pp. 290–3.

of the Papacy. The reverence for the first see in the West, which was stronger in England than in Ireland, was of a childlike character—the veneration for an ancient, distant, and not very well known, centre of Christianity. If the appeals of Wilfrid tells for dependence on the one side, the way in which Rome's answers to the appeals were treated, even by Theodore himself, tell more strongly for independence on the other; and we have seen that Dunstan refused to act upon the decision of a Pope, when he saw that the Pope was in the wrong. In the Penitential of Theodore the regulations of the Greek Church and of the Roman Church are treated as precedents which are equal in authority, and Roman customs are set aside when they seem to be inferior to the Greek. After the Roman Legation respecting the see of Lichfield, there was very little interference on the part of Rome for several centuries, and the decision of the Pope and his legates in that matter had only a very temporary result. The fact that the English language remained almost wholly free from Latin influence, and that it continued to be used in sermons, and even in some parts of the service, is further proof of independence. Every one had to know the Creed and the Lord's Prayer in the vernacular; the Gospels and the Psalms (both prose and verse) could be known in the vernacular by all who could read; and, when persons were married, they made the promise to one another in their own tongue. Pilgrims from England

went commonly, but not exclusively, to Rome; some went to Palestine, and in Alfred's day even to India. The liturgy in use was by no means purely Roman. Some offices came from the South of France; and (what is very surprising) some rites in the pontifical were taken from the British Church. Maskell (III., p. cxi.) says that "certain parts of the ordinal appear to have been introduced into the Anglo-saxon pontificals from the more ancient Forms of the British Church." And the English Church had festivals of its own, and saints of its own, before they were recognized by Rome.

In one particular (and it is a particular which is strong proof of internal strength and devotion) both the Irish Church and the English Church were superior to Rome during this period, viz., in missionary activity and zeal. Can we find any one in the Roman Church who has the genuine missionary spirit in any marked degree, excepting Gregory the Great. And what difficulty *he* had in getting people to undertake the missions which he saw to be necessary, and which he could not undertake himself! Even after Augustine and his company have been induced to start, they beg to be allowed to return before they have got half way. And it was six years before the Pope could send another band to reinforce them, although it was long known in Rome that Augustine's mission was doing well. It was no "forlorn hope" that was needed, but a force to secure increased success.

Contrast with this apathy the streams of enthusiastic missionaries that went from the Keltic Church in the sixth and seventh centuries, and from the English Church in the eighth and ninth. And in this matter the English work was far superior to the Keltic. It was better organized and was more systematic. The result was that the English work was much more permanent. The sees and monasteries founded by English and Frankish missionaries to a large extent swallowed up Irish and Scottish foundations, which had no centre of unity and no willingness to submit to any jurisdiction. It was due to these enthusiastic labourers sent out from the British Isles, far more than to any who were sent out from Rome, that, by the end of the tenth century, the Christian Church in Europe had not only recovered the territory which had been wrested by barbarian tribes from the Western Empire, but had occupied ground that had never been held by the Roman legions. Tertullian's rhetorical flourish, about there being places that the Romans could not reach which had submitted to Christ (I., p. 4), was in A.D. 1000 the statement of sober fact.

And to a very large extent the *civilizing* and *educational* work of the Church was done from centres in the British Isles. One has only to mention the great Irish schools, and such names as Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin to show the truth of that. Both Irish and English missionaries founded great schools on the

Continent. Boniface, with his numerous fellow-workers drawn from England, did an immense deal for education in Germany. It was the custom, if not the law, in the English Church, that there should be a school in every cathedral city, e.g. at Canterbury, York, Dunwich and Winchester. Many monasteries had schools, as Lindisfarne, Hexham, Ripon, Jarrow, Wearmouth; and so also had large towns. It is said that collegiate churches of pre-conquest origin and early grammar schools existed at Derby, Bedford, Leicester, Warwick, and other places. Of the various Irish schools on the Continent that at St. Gall may serve as an example. In the ninth and tenth centuries Greek was studied there, and at that time such study was rare in the West. And in the tenth century St. Gall was still connected with the British Isles by means of a remarkable brotherhood for the maintenance of Masses for the dead. The abbots of St. Gall and Reichenau—twin monasteries like those of Wearmouth and Jarrow—were heads of the brotherhood, which included persons of ecclesiastical and civil rank in various nations, including English bishops and at least one English king—Athelstan the Glorious.

It may seem to be paradoxical to make such a statement, but it may safely be asserted, that two of the things which, in the period that we have been considering, did most in preparing the way for the future greatness of the English Church were its intensely national character, and its unbroken connexion with

the Church of Rome. These two things appear to be out of harmony with one another ; indeed, to be even opposed to one another. A Church which is closely bound to a foreign see can hardly be a national Church ; and a national Church will not allow itself to be closely bound to a foreign see. Everything depends upon what is meant by being "closely bound." If it means being in bonds of servitude, then the objection just stated will hold ; but, if it means ties of affection and respect, then the objection falls to the ground. A Church need not lose any of its claim to being a national Church, because it maintains an attitude of reverential affection and gratitude to a Church of greater dignity than itself, and from which it has received great benefits. The man who secured for the Church of England these two great advantages—a decided national character and an effective union with the Church of Rome—was Theodore of Tarsus. Enough has been said already as to whether Augustine or Aidan has the best claim to be regarded as the apostle of England (I., pp. 100–104). The real founder of the English Church was Theodore, who had the advantage of coming after Augustine and Aidan, and possessed far more genius and statesmanship than either of them. All three may have been equal in their devotion to the cause of establishing the Gospel in England ; but Theodore possessed in the highest degree the gift which could make that devotion effectual.

Theodore was not the English nation's choice. There was no English nation to choose him. And he was not the choice of two kings who asked Pope Vitalian to help in the matter. The man whom they had selected and whom they asked the Pope to consecrate was Wighard (Bede, *H.E.*, iv., 1). But Wighard died, and then Vitalian, without waiting for the kings to elect some one else, chose the masterful Greek from Tarsus, and sent him to fill the see of Canterbury. An archbishop with such antecedents was not likely to cut the Church which he came to reduce to order adrift from Rome. If he had done so, either with or against the wishes of the people to whom he ministered, the consequences to Christianity would have been disastrous. Rome, as we have seen, had been remiss in sending men to reinforce and follow up the mission of Augustine. Keltic missionaries had to a considerable extent filled the gap, and there was a possibility that the somewhat eccentric and narrow form of Christianty which they brought with them would prevail throughout England. Just five years before the coming of Theodore, Wilfrid had lessened this possibility by his victory in the conference at Whitby, 664; but the possibility still existed and might at any time be turned into fact. The only security against it was close union with the more enlightened and cosmopolitan see of Rome. Theodore steadily set to work to encourage the adoption of usages which were in harmony with those of Rome and to stamp out

those which were peculiar to the Keltic communion. This needed firmness, rather than violence, although Theodore did not shrink from forcible measures, where he thought that they were necessary. There was no difference of doctrine between Rome and either the British clergy or the Scottish clergy from Iona, and those who refused to conform in ritual, and the time for keeping Easter, retired and made way for those who were already in agreement with the rest of the Western Church or were willing to become so. As the services were in Latin, changes of ritual were felt mainly by the clergy; they were scarcely noticed by the laity, and probably did not offend those who did notice them. They therefore inflicted very little hardship; and, with regard to the Easter cycle, there was no doubt that the Keltic rule for fixing the time of the festival was a faulty one. If Theodore had not insisted upon uniformity in these things by conforming to the usages of the rest of Western Christendom, there was danger lest the English Christians should be overwhelmed by the insular and stagnant influences of the Keltic Churches, and should be cut off, as these had been, from the culture and development of the West. Iona and the British Church were so much nearer than Rome was; there were no terrible Alps to be passed on the way; and, as the experience of the last thirty years had shown, Iona was more zealous about missions to the English than Rome had been. It would be fatal to allow the development of

English Christianity to be checked by being cut off from the healthy influences of the Continent, and especially of Rome.

But, at the same time, Theodore had no intention of making the English dioceses mere dependents upon the see of Rome. His main object was to make the scattered and disconnected missionary centres one Church, united under the primary see of Canterbury. It was to have its own co-ordinated dioceses, its own native clergy, trained for the ministry in English schools, and the whole was to be regulated by councils held at frequent intervals. These three things may be said to sum up his system : dioceses of moderate size, capable of being adequately worked by one man ; an educated native clergy ; and annual synods. To what extent he organized the parochial system, we do not know. Some parishes were no doubt in existence before he came, and parishes could not be formed until the means for maintaining a ministering priest could be found ; but we may be sure that he gave such a system a helping hand, and reduced it to order, so far as he was able. The main result was that, during his twenty-one years of work in England, he created a united Church, which became in quite a marvellous degree a national Church. And this had consequences of which Theodore himself can scarcely have dreamed. The unity of the Church became the foundation, the model, and the chief cause of the unity of the nation. It was a long time before civil

rulers were able to do with the disconnected and sometimes hostile kingdoms what Theodore did with the disconnected dioceses, and unite them in one organized whole; but, while this problem was being painfully worked out, it was the English Church which was the substitute for a united nation, and which led to an English Nation being at last formed.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

VOLUMES I. AND II.

	A.D.
British Bishops at Arles	314
British Bishops at Ariminum	359
Capture of Rome by Alaric	410
First Mission of Germanus to Britain	429
The Hallelujah Victory, Easter	430
Second Mission of Germanus to Britain	447
Death of Germanus, July 31	448
Settlement of the Saxons, about	449
End of the Western Empire	476
Battle of Mons Badonicus, about	493
Gildas writes the *De Excidio Britanniae*, about	537
Accession of Ethelbert, King of Kent, about	560
Coming of Columba to Britain ; Foundation of Iona	563
Gregory sends Augustine to Britain	596
Arrival of Augustine in Britain	597
Baptism of King Ethelbert, June 2	597
Consecration of Augustine as archbishop ; Death of Columba	597
Coming of Mellitus with letters from Gregory	601
Conference with British Bishops at Augustine's Oak, about	602
Death of Gregory, March 12	604
Justus, Bishop of Rochester	604
Mellitus, Bishop of the West Saxons	604
Death of Augustine, May 26 ; Succession of Laurence	605
Death of Boniface IV, May 25	615
Death of Columban, November 21	615
Death of Ethelbert, February 24 ; Conversion of Eadbald	616
Death of Laurence, February 2 ; Succession of Mellitus	619
Death of Mellitus, April 24 ; Succession of Justus	624

	A.D.
Paulinus consecrated by Justus, July 21, and sent to Northumbria	625
Edwin, King of Northumbria, baptized, April 11	627
Death of Justus, November 10; Succession of Honorius	627
Felix consecrated by Justus and sent to the East Angles, about	628
Birth of Benedict Biscop	628
Battle of Hatfield, October 12; Death of Edwin	633
Birth of Wilfrid	634
Battle of Heavenfield; Accession of Oswald	634
Aidan sent from Iona; Foundation of Lindisfarne	635
Cynigyls, King of the West Saxons, converted by Birinus	635
Birth of Aldhelm, about	639
Birth of Ceolfrid	642
Battle of Maserfield, August 5; Death of Oswald	642
Death of Paulinus, October 10	644
Hilda takes the veil	647
Wilfrid enters Lindisfarne	648
Death of Birinus, December	650
Benedict Biscop and Wilfrid leave Kent for Rome	653
Cedd Bishop to the East Saxons	654
Wilfrid leaves Rome	654
Consecration of Deusdedit, first Saxon Archbishop, March 26	655
Penda defeated and killed at Winwaed, November 15	655
Diuma Bishop of the Mercians, about	655
Foundation of Whitby	657
Birth of Willibrord, about	657
Colman succeeds Finan at Lindisfarne	661
Wilfrid at Ripon	661
Wilfrid ordained priest, about	663
Conference at Whitby	664
The yellow Pest; Deaths of Tuda, Deusdedit, and Cedd	664
Consecration of Wilfrid by Agilbert at Compiègne	665
Benedict Biscop's second visit to Rome, about	665
Consecration of Chad by Wini and two British Bishops	665
Wilfrid returns to Britain and retires to Ripon	666
Benedict Biscop's third visit to Rome (from Lérins)	667
Theodore consecrated at Rome for Canterbury, March 26	668

	A.D.
Theodore leaves Rome for Britain, May 27	668
Theodore reaches Canterbury, May 27	669
Theodore restores Wilfrid to York	669
Foundation of Lichfield	669
Hadrian founds a school at Canterbury	671
Benedict Biscop's fourth visit to Rome	671
Return of Benedict Biscop	672
Birth of Bede, about	673
Theodore holds the Council of Hertford, September 24	673
Foundation of Elmham	673
Benedict Biscop founds Wearmouth	674
Cuthbert retires to Farne	676
Foundation of Hereford	676
Benedict Biscop's fifth visit to Rome	678
Wilfrid's diocese divided; he appeals to Rome	678
Wilfrid in Frisia and in Rome	679
Council at Rome, November	679
Wilfrid's appeal heard, March	680
Return of Benedict Biscop with John the archchanter, about	680
Bede enters the monastery at Wearmouth	680
Theodore holds the Council of Hatfield, September 17	680
Wilfrid returns to Britain and is imprisoned	680
Death of Hilda, November 17	680
Benedict Biscop founds Jarrow	681
Wilfrid released; he works in Sussex	681
Benedict Biscop's sixth visit to Rome, about	684
Consecration of Cuthbert, March 26	685
Wilfrid restored to York	686
Death of Cuthbert, March 20	687
Death of Benedict Biscop, January 12	690
Death of Archbishop Theodore, September 19	690
Mission of Willibrord to Frisia	690
Wilfrid again expelled	691
Willibrord's first visit to Rome, about	695
Willibrord's second visit and consecration	695
Council of Easterfield; Wilfrid's second appeal	702
Wilfrid at Rome to plead in person	702
Return of Wilfrid; he is restored to Hexham and Ripon	704

	A.D.
Foundation of Sherborne	705
Foundation of Selsey	709
Death of Wilfrid at Oundle, October 3	709
Council of Clovesho	716
Boniface goes to Frisia, about	718
Bede visits Egbert at York	733
Bede's letter to Egbert, November	734
Death of Bede, May 25	735
Resignation of Daniel, Bishop of the West Saxons	744
Death of Bishop Daniel	745
Council of Clovesho	747
Letter of Boniface to Archbishop Cuthbert, about	747
Death of Archbishop Cuthbert, October 26	760
Jaenbert consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, about	765
Alcuin sent to Rome by King Alfwold	780
Alcuin meets Charlemagne at Parma, Spring	781
Alcuin migrates to the court of Charlemagne	782
The "contentious synod" at Chelsea, about	785
Higbert made Archbishop of Lichfield by Offa and Hadrian	786
Death of Archbishop Jaenbert, August, about	792
Death of Pope Hadrian, December 25	795
Death of King Offa, July 29	796
Coronation of Charlemagne by Leo III	800
Higbert ceases to be Archbishop of Lichfield	802
Council of Clovesho confirms Higbert's resignation	803
Death of Alcuin	804
English Bishops protest against fetching the pall from Rome	806
Death of Charlemagne, January 28	814
Danes join with the Welsh against Egbert	835
Birth of King Alfred	848
Alfred sent to Rome to Leo IV	853
Ethelwulf takes Alfred to Rome	855
Death of Ethelwulf, January 13	858
Accession of Alfred	871
Alfred wins London, about	885
Alfred secures foreign teachers, about	893
Death of Alfred, October 26, about	901

	A.D.
Edward takes possession of London and Oxford	912
Death of Edward and accession of Athelstan, about	924
Birth of Dunstan	925
Athelstan's expedition to Scotland	934
Battle of Brunanburh	937
Death of Athelstan, October 27	940
Edmund places Dunstan at Glastonbury, about	942
Dunstan made Abbot of Glastonbury, about	946
Edmund assassinated, May 26	946
Edred makes Dunstan his treasurer	946
Wilfrid's minster at Ripon burned, about	950
Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, imprisoned	952
Death of Edred at Frome, November 23	955
Edwy crowned by Archbishop Odo at Kingston, January	956
Persecution and flight of Dunstan	956
Death of Wulfstan	956
Edgar elected king in Mercia; return of Dunstan, about	957
Divorce of Edwy by Archbishop Odo	958
Death of Edwy, October; Edgar King of all England	959
Edgar appoints Dunstan to Canterbury	959
Dunstan goes to Rome for the pall	960
Dunstan consecrates Oswald as Bishop of Worcester	961
Dunstan consecrates Ethelwold as Bishop of Winchester	963
Ethelwold begins to expel the secular clergy	964
Ethelwold translates the body of St. Swithun, July 15	970
Oswald promoted to York, about	972
Dunstan and Oswald crown Edgar at Bath, May 11	973
Death of Edgar, July 8	975
Edward the Martyr assassinated, about	979
Dunstan and Oswald crown Ethelred the Redeless at Kingston	979
Death of Dunstan, May 19	988
Siric, Archbishop of Canterbury, advises the Danegeld, about	991
Death of Oswald of York, February	992
Death of Siric	995
Translation of the body of St. Cuthbert to Durham	995
Great victories of the Danes, 997, 998, and	999

INDEX

TO VOLUMES I AND II

Abbo of Fleury, ii. 146
Abbots with jurisdiction over bishops, i. 106; ii. 205
Abingdon, Monastery of, ii. 139, 145
Acca, Bishop of Hexham, i. 142, 143
Adalbert, missionary, ii. 29
Adaldag, Archbishop of Bremen, ii. 198
Adamnan, Abbot of Iona, i. 33, 86, 96
Adelard, monk of Blandinium, i. 36
Adelbert, opponent of Boniface, ii. 53–55
Adrian; *see* Hadrian
Aesop's *Fables*, ii. 119, 120
Agatho, Pope, i. 127, 193
Agilbert, Bishop of Dorchester, i. 119; ii. 13; Bishop of Paris, i. 121, 123
Aidan, St., Sent from Iona, i. 93
  works with King Oswald, i. 94, 97, 98
  dies at Bamborough, i. 83, 100
  compared with Augustine, i, 56. 100–104
Alaric, i. 38
Alban, St., i. 13, 18
Alcuin, i. 138, 178, 192; ii. 27, 65, 73, 178, 179
Aldgilsus, King of Friesland, ii. 5
Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, ii. 33
Alfred the Great, the revival under, ii. 101–125
  Chronicles instituted by, i. 26; ii. 113
  Translations made by, i. 19, 27; ii. 109–112
  a royal saint, ii. 123–125
  Life of, by Asser, i. 35
  compared with Dunstan, ii. 130
  institutions wrongly attributed to him, ii. 113–117
  writings wrongly attributed to him, ii. 117–121
Alleluia victory, i. 11
Alliances between Church and Crown, ii. 182, 183
Alto, missionary hermit, ii. 59
Amiatinus, Codex, i. 142
Andrews, St., Bishops of, ii. 205

Angels present in Church, i. 139
Anglo-Saxons, Character of the, i. 72
Antipodes, Question of, ii. 56, 57
Ansgar, missionary to Denmark, ii. 196, 197
Antiquity of man in Britain, i. 1
Appeals to Rome, i. 126–128 ; ii. 4, 56–58
Apostasy of converts, i. 71, 167 ; ii. 74, 221, 222
Archbishopric at Lichfield, i. 176–179
Arles, British Bishops at, i. 8, 13, 180
Arnulf of Flanders, ii. 140
Arthur, King, i. 28, 29 ; ii. 103
Asser, i. 35 ; ii. 108, 112
Athelney, ii. 104, 108, 187
Athelstan, ii. 126, 127, 130, 135, 239
Attila the Hun, i. 39 ; ii. 215
Augustine of Canterbury, i. 49, 53 ; ii. 237
  starts for Britain and turns back, i. 60
  reaches Britain, i. 62
  consecrated Archbishop to the English, i. 67
  sends questions to Gregory, i. 67–69
  the Apostle of England, i. 102-104
  names Laurentius as his successor, i. 105
  meets seven British Bishops, i. 185
Augustine of Hippo
  urges Orosius to write a history, i. 18-19
  sanctions religious persecution, ii. 223

Baldred, King of Kent, ii. 182
Baldwin II of Flanders, ii. 139
Bamborough, i. 97, 99
Baptisms, Wholesale, ii. 220, 222, 225
Bards, i. 88, 91
Baronius, ii. 95
Bath, Coronation of Edgar at, ii. 152, 161–164
Bavaria, ii. 38–40, 49
Bayeux Tapestry, ii. 120
Bede, The Venerable
  Ecclesiastical History of, i. 22–26, 36, 131, 143 ; translated by Alfred, ii. 110
  Life of Cuthbert by, i. 80–84 ; ii. 14, 15
  other biographies by, i. 33, 80, 194
  prayer of, i. 132
  the title "Venerable," i. 132
  fame of, i. 137 ; ii. 44
  success in teaching, i. 141, 144
  devotion, i. 145
  not the author of a Penetential, ii. 88
  quotations from, i. 5, 11, 17, 34, 46, 47, 49, 50, 65, 81, 103, 129, 131, 134, 139, 144, 166, 169, 175, 185, 194 ; ii. 11, 13, 17, 177

Bells, Teutonic dislike of, ii. 197
Benedict Biscop, i. 123, 131, 141, 157, 168
visits Rome six times, i. 142
Benedictine rule, ii. 131, 145, 146, 147–157
Berhtric, King of Wessex, ii. 176
Berhtwald, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 25, 33
Bertha, Queen of Kent, i. 56, 58, 64
Bibliotheca, Meaning of, ii. 118
Birinus, Roman missionary, i. 96, 115
Bishops with two sees, ii. 143, 191
without sees, i. 12, 67, 107, 173, 183, 185; ii. 42
as soldiers, ii. 203
Need of more, i. 154; ii. 49, 53
Blandinium, Monastery of, ii. 138, 140
Boëthius, ii. 111
Bobbio, Monastery of, i. 86
Boisil, Prior of Melrose, ii. 15, 16
Boniface, Bishop of Dunwich, i. 187
Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, i. 67, 192; ii. 31–71, 220
work at Nutscelle, ii. 32, 33
first missionary enterprise, ii. 34, 35
first visit to Rome, ii. 36–38
second visit and consecration, ii. 41, 42
Boniface, correspondence with Bishop Daniel, ii. 44, 45
third visit to Rome, ii. 49
reforms the Frankish Church, ii. 51, 52
is opposed by Adelbert and others, ii. 53–59
last mission to Friesland, ii. 60–62
is slain by the heathen, ii. 62, 63
his devotion to Rome, ii. 66–69, 230
Book of Kells, i. 88, 109
Bremen a missionary centre, ii. 197
Bretwalda, Powers of the, i. 66, 197
Bright, W., i. 100, 184, 185, 188
Brihthelm, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 142, 143
British Church, Characteristics of the, i. 9–17
British and English Churches distinguished, i. 16
British Christians do not convert the heathen English, i. 50, 52, 58, 71
Britons, Westward retreat of the, i. 50
Broichan the Druid, i. 90, 91
Brude, King, i. 90, 91
Brunanburh, Battle of, ii. 127
Brunichild, Queen, i. 59
Bryce, J., ii. 216
Bugga (Eadburga), ii. 36
Bunyan, John, ii. 129
Burrows, Montagu, ii. 159

Cadwalla, British King, i. 95, 96; ii. 181
Caedmon's poems, i. 134
Cædwalla, King of Wessex, ii. 10
 pilgrim to Rome, ii. 11, 32
Cambridge Modern History, ii. 99
Canterbury, School at, i. 125, 135, 143
 Secular clergy at, ii. 153, 155
Canute, ii. 115, 122, 159, 193, 199, 220
Carloman, Resignation of, ii. 50, 51
Cedd, Bishop, at Lastingham, i. 162–165
 not Bishop of London, i. 182–185
Celibacy of the clergy, ii. 44, 48, 154, 165
Centralization in the Western Church, i. 128, 129, 147, 148; ii. 36, 230, 241
Ceolfrid, Abbot, i. 131, 141, 157
Ceolnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 182
Chad, Abbot of Lastingham, i. 168
 Bishop of York, i. 123, 187, 188
 Bishop of Lichfield, i. 126
Charlemagne (Charles the Great), i. 139, 177
 converts heathen by force, ii. 46, 73–76, 220
 attempts too much, ii. 212, 213
Charlemagne (Charles the Great) makes tithe obligatory, ii. 233
 is crowned Emperor by Leo III, ii. 216
Charles the Bald, ii. 201
Charles Martel, ii. 27, 29, 34, 37, 42
 defeats the Saracens at Tours, ii. 49
 dies same year as Gregory III, ii. 50
Charles the Martyr, King, ii. 123, 124
Charmouth, Naval battle at, ii. 181
Chester, "the Camp," i. 48
 captured by Ethelfrid, i. 46
Chester-le-Street, ii. 135
Childeric III, last of the Merovingians, ii. 55
 deposed by Pippin le Bref, ii. 50, 51, 68
Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, ii. 69
Chronicles, i. 18, 26, 27, 45; ii. 113
 quoted, ii. 164, 177, 178, 180, 186, 187, 201, 202, 229
Chrysostom on religious persecution, ii. 223
Church, The English, promotes national unity, i. 195–199; ii. 122, 200, 207, 208, 243
Church, R. W., ii. 3, 206, 212
Cicero, i. 141
Civilization of Christian Rome, i. 55; ii. 226
 of heathen Greece and Rome, ii. 223–225

Clement, opponent of Boniface, ii. 53–55
Clergy, different kinds of, i. 158
Clotaire II, ii. 197
Clovesho, Councils at, i. 126; ii. 64, 84
Clovis, Conversion of, ii. 75
Codex Amiatinus, i. 142
Coffin of St. Cuthbert, i. 99; ii. 179
Coins, Saxon, in Rome, i. 179
of archbishops, i. 181
Collier, J., i. 192; ii. 5
Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 116–119
Columba, Founder of Iona, i. 33, 86, 88, 89, 96, 106, 110, 118, 119; ii. 23, 147, 205
Columban, the Apostle of Burgundy, i. 85; ii. 23, 235
Compurgation, ii. 80
Conference at Augustine's oak, i. 185
Conquest of Britain by the English, i. 38–46
Conquests of England by the Danes, ii. 175–188, 199–211
Consecration by one bishop, i. 184; ii. 48
Constantius of Lyons, biographer, i. 33
Conversion of the Danes, ii. 194–206
of the English, i. 52, 62–72
Conversions, Wholesale, i. 70; ii. 75, 220-223
Corbinian, Bishop of Freisingen, ii. 6, 39, 49
Cornwall, Danes find allies in, ii. 180
Coronation of Charlemagne at Rome, ii. 216
Edgar at Bath, ii. 152, 161–164
Councils, Ecclesiastical, i. 126, 134; ii. 48, 49, 51, 53, 64, 84, 89, 91, 228, 234
Creasy, ii. 186
Cummian, ii. 87
Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 100; ii. 5, 14, 15, 134
Lives of, i. 34, 80–84
Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 44, 64
Cynegyls, King of Wessex, i. 96
Cynibill, brother of Cedd, i. 163
Cyprian and the *libelli*, ii. 94

Dagobert II, ii. 6–8
Dalgairns, J. B., ii. 1
Danegeld, ii. 186, 187, 199, 200–203
Danelaw, ii. 188, 193, 229
Danes, Conquests by the, ii. 172–205
Conversion of the, ii. 194–206
absorbed by the English, ii. 192, 195, 200, 206, 229
made bishops in England, ii. 145, 190
Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, i. 34; ii. 35, 42, 44

Deira, ii. 29, 188
Delehaye, Père, i. 76
Deusdedit, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 123, 175
Deventer, Libuinus of, ii. 71–73
Diarmait, King, i. 89
Dido, Bishop of Poitiers, ii. 7
Dioceses, English, Foundation of, i. 172
  Division of, i. 126, 189, 190
  Boundaries correspond with the civil boundaries, i. 172, 174, 189; ii. 232
Diuma, Bishop of the Mercians, ii. 156
Dobda, Keltic Bishop, ii. 55
Döllinger, ii. 223
Donation of Ethelwulf, ii. 234
Dooms (Laws), ii. 79, 121
Dress, Clerical, ii. 106
Druids, i. 88, 90
Dunkeld, Abbots of, ii. 205
Dunstan, The revival under, ii. 126–170
  life at Glastonbury, ii. 128–135
  flies from Edwy to Flanders, ii. 138–140
  restored by Edgar, ii. 143
  favours the Benedictine rule, ii. 147–157
  character of, ii. 158–161, 208
  canons attributed to him, ii. 165
  Wordsworth's injustice to him, ii. 169
  Lives of, i. 36, 37
Eadburga (Bugga), ii. 36
Eadfrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 81
Eadmer, i. 31, 37
Eanfrid, King of Northumbrians, i. 93
Early Christianity in Britain, i. 9–17
Easter, Controversy about, i. 12, 49, 114–120, 188; ii. 242
Ebroin persecutes Wilfrid, ii. 5–8
Echternach, ii. 27, 28
Eddi (Eddius), i. 34, 187, 194
Edgar, King, ii. 85, 115, 141–167
  his character, ii. 158, 159
Edith, daughter of Edgar, ii. 162
Edmund, King, ii. 123, 127–133, 199
Edred, King, ii. 133, 135, 146
Edric Streona, the traitor, ii. 211, 229, 230
Edward the Confessor, ii. 124, 125, 191, 203
Edward the Elder, ii. 126, 210
Edward the Martyr, ii. 123
Edwards, the two, ii. 101
Edwy, ii. 136–141
Egberht, St., ii. 12–23
Egbert, Archbishop of York, i. 138, 154, 174; ii. 44, 87, 88
Egbert, King of England, ii. 182
Egfrid, King of Northumbrians, i. 127, 190; ii. 5, 14
Eleutherus, Pope, i. 5–7

Elfege, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 128
Elfthrith, Queen, ii. 162
Elgiva, wife of Edwy, ii. 137, 140
Eltrudis, wife of Baldwin II, ii. 139
Emmeramnus, missionary, ii. 38
English character, i. 72; ii. 207
English Church prior to the English State, i. 18, 111-114, 195-198; ii. 200, 243
  a missionary Church, i. 53, 67, 192; ii. 1, 230
  a national Church, ii. 219, 227, 231, 239, 243
  how far independent, ii., 235-237, 240
English language in mission work, ii. 2, 3
English missions superior to Keltic, ii. 238
English nation formed under Alfred, ii. 189
Epitaph on Cædwalla, ii. 11
  on Willibrord, ii. 29
Ethelbert, King of Kent, i. 62-66, 70
Ethelfrid, King of Northumbrians, i. 46, 93
Ethelgiva, ii. 137, 138
Ethelhun, ii. 13, 14, 20
Ethelred, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 105
Ethelred the Redeless, ii. 167, 201, 210
Ethelstan, Alfred's chaplain, ii. 108
Ethelwalch, King of South Saxons, ii. 9, 10
Ethelwald, King of Deira, i. 162
Ethelward, ealdorman, ii. 201
Ethelwerd, chronicler, i. 31; ii. 118, 127, 133, 181
Ethelwin, Bishop of Lindsey, ii. 13
Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 145-151
Ethelwulf, King of Kent, ii. 182, 229
Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, ii. 221
Eusebius, i. 3

Faricius, biographer, i. 33
Fastidius, Bishop, i. 12
Fasting as magic, i. 164
  as penance, ii. 82, 84, 85, 166
Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183
Finnian's dispute with Columba, i. 88, 89
Five burghs, ii. 127
Fleury, Benedictine monastery, ii. 144, 145, 146, 152
Florence of Worcester, i. 32, 182; ii. 21, 27, 53, 133, 135, 140, 141, 158, 160, 162, 164, 178, 180, 186, 189, 199, 229
Ford Lectures, i. 35; ii. 105, 109, 113, 118
Fowler, J. T., i. 87, 152
Frankpledge, ii. 115
Franks, bad converts, ii. 75,

Freeman, E. A., ii. 3, 103, 120, 176, 217, 231
Friesland (Frisia), ii. 5, 8, 11, 22, 28, 30, 34, 62
Frome, ii. 135
Froude, A., ii. 174
Fulda, Monastery of, ii. 53, 55, 63
Fulk, Archbishop of Rheims, ii. 105, 106

Gaimar, Geoffrey, ii. 162, 167, 176
Gall, St., ii. 239
Gardiner, S. R., ii. 186
Gardiner & Mullinger, i. 37 ; ii. 232
Gaul, Episcopal sees in, i. 173
Geila, ii. 39
Geoffrey of Monmouth, i. 6, 29, 30
Germanus of Auxerre, i. 11, 12, 32
Gewilieb, Bishop of Mainz, ii. 52
Gildas, i. 6, 18, 19–22
  Bede's use of, i. 20
Glastonbury, ii. 131
Gorm, King of Denmark, ii. 197
Greek, Knowledge of, i. 125 ; ii. 56, 119
Green, J. R., i. 132 ; ii. 176
Gregorovius, ii. 11
Gregory the Great, i. 57 ; ii. 26, 221
  answers Augustine's questions, i. 68, 184 ; ii. 123
  his missionary zeal, i. 58–60 ; ii. 237
Gregory the Great, "the servant of the servants of God," i. 61
  plans dioceses for Britain, i. 170, 171, 194
  Pastoral Care of, i. 27 ; ii. 110
Gregory II, ii. 32, 36, 41, 47
Gregory III, ii. 47, 48, 50
Gregory IV, ii. 196
Gregory, Abbot of Utrecht, ii. 40, 41, 62, 72
Grimbald, priest of St. Bertin, ii. 108
Grimoald, Mayor of the Palace, ii. 6–8
Grimoald, Duke of Bavaria, ii. 6, 39
Gury, J. P., Jesuit, on Indulgences, ii. 97
Guthrum, Danish King, ii. 122

Haddan's *Remains*, ii. 88, 90, 219, 235
Haddan & Stubbs, i. 185 ; ii. 64, 91, 190, 234
Hadrian I, i. 154, 177 ; ii. 46, 73, 233
Hadrian, teacher at Canterbury, i. 125, 135
"Handfast" union, ii. 161, 162
Harold Blaatand (Bluetooth), ii. 198, 199
Harold Klack, ii. 195
Hatfield, Synod at, i. 193
Heathenism, Aggressive, ii. 183, 198, 199
Heavenfield, Battle of, i. 95, 133

Henry of Huntingdon, i. 31; ii. 127
Henry the Fowler, Emperor, ii. 197, 201
Herefrid, friend of Cuthbert, i. 82
Heritage in the Church, i. 168
Hertford, Synod at, i. 126, 134
Hesiod, ii. 189
Hewalds, The two, martyred, ii. 22
Hexham, i. 142, 143, 181; ii. 4
Higbert, Archbishop of Lichfield, i. 178
Hii or Hy; *see* Iona
Hilda, Abbess of Whitby, i. 115, 119
Hildegar, Archbishop of Cologne, ii. 58, 59
Hist. Lit. de la France, ii. 21, 25, 29, 38, 55, 146, 169, 196
Hobhouse, W., *Bampton Lectures*, ii. 73, 216
Hodgkin, T., i. 113, 114, 133; ii. 202
Holy Isle; *see* Lindisfarne
Hook, Dean, ii. 87, 109
Hope, Mrs., on Virgilius, ii. 58
Hort, i. 142
Huns, Inroads of the, ii. 215

Indulgences, ii. 84, 91, 96
Ini, King of West Saxons, ii. 33, 79, 122
Intercession of saints, ii. 96
Invasions of Britain, Teutonic, i. 38–46, 196, 197; ii. 3, 192
Iona or Hy, i. 89, 110, 118; ii. 14, 15, 205
jurisdiction of the Abbots of i. 106; ii. 205

Jaenbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 177
James the Deacon, i. 115, 194
Jarrow, i. 131, 133, 136, 143; ii. 239
Jedburgh, ii. 134
John, Bishop of Hexham, i. 131
John the Archchanter, i. 194
John the Baptist, ii. 123
John the Faster, ii. 87
John the Old Saxon, ii. 108
John VI, Pope, ii. 11
John VII, ii. 11
John VIII, ii. 107
John XII, ii. 144
John XIII, ii. 150
Joseph of Arimathea, i. 4, 5
Judenburh, ii. 134
Jury, Trial by, ii. 116
Justus, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 105
Jutes, i. 38; ii. 177
Juvavum (Salzburg), ii. 39

Kaiserswerth, Monastery of, ii. 25
Keene, H. G., i. 23
Kells, Book of, i. 88, 109
Keltic Bishops, i. 107, 180, 182; ii. 55, 204, 205
Keltic Church of Iona, i. 84–94; ii. 19, 205, 242
Keltic Church of Ireland, i. 88, 89; ii. 219, 234–236

Keltic ecclesiastical usages, i. 12, 15, 49, 103, 106, 108–111, 114–120, 163, 165, 173; ii. 87, 242
Keltic missionaries, i. 85, 90, 92, 107, 110; ii. 3, 43, 50, 54, 60, 238
Kenyon, F. G., i. 142
Killian and Geila, ii. 39
Kinesige, Bishop of Lichfield, ii. 128, 137
Kynewald, Bishop of Worcester, i. 183; ii. 143

Lake, Kirsopp, i. 151
Lastingham, Convent of, i. 164, 167
Lateran Church, Forgery in the, ii. 95
Laws, ii. 79, 112, 121, 165, 193
Lea, H. C., ii. 91, 98
Learning, Growth of, i. 135; ii. 69, 107–112, 157, 239
Legates, Papal, i. 178; ii. 47, 58, 69, 196, 233, 236
Legends, i. 4, 5, 76; ii. 103, 124, 199
Lent, Fast of, ii. 74, 221
Leo I, Pope, ii. 215
Leodegar, Bishop of Autun, ii. 7
Lewis I, Emperor, ii. 195, 196
Libelli, ii. 92
Liber Diurnus, ii. 95
Libuinus, ii. 71–73
Lichfield an archbishopric, i. 176–179
Lindisfarne, i. 81, 108, 110, 116, 118, 143, 181
ravaged by Danes, ii. 179
Lindsey, i. 126, 190; ii. 91
Lingard, ii. 85, 106, 172
Links with the Past, i. 23, 24
Literature, Birth of English, i. 134
Liuthard, Bishop, i. 56-58
Liutprand, King of the Lombards, ii. 38
Lives of saints, i. 32–35, 73–84, 86
Lombards, ii. 36
London, See of, i. 176, 181, 183
Lucius, mythical King of Britain, i. 5, 7
Lullus, Bishop of Mainz, ii. 61, 63, 64
Lupus, Bishop of Sens, ii. 197
Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, i. 11
Luther, ii. 91, 99, 100, 129
Luxeuil, Monastery of, i. 85, 86

Mabillon, ii. 108
Madan, i. 109
Makower, ii. 227
Malmesbury, ii. 139
Marklo, Assembly at, ii. 72
Marriages, Prohibited, ii. 39, 54, 68, 137
Martianus Capella, ii. 57
Martin, St., i. 10, 12, 64, 65
Mary of France, poetess, ii. 119, 120
Martyr, Lax use of the term, ii. 123
Maserfield, Oswald slain at, i. 98, 99
Maskell, W., ii. 237
Mayors of the Palace, ii. 6, 7, 24, 37, 55

Mellitus, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 104, 182
Melrose, Monastery of, ii. 15
Milman, Dean, ii. 185
Milton, Seculars expelled from, ii. 150
Miracles in Lives of saints, i. 76–79 ; ii. 70, 71
Missionary period in Modern History, ii. 219
Mixture of Christianity and paganism, ii. 38, 41, 43, 48, 52
Mochonna of Ulster, i. 110
Modern History rightly distinguished, ii. 217
Monasteries, Insanitary, i. 120, 166
  Sham, i. 155 ; ii. 104
  Secular clergy in, i. 160 ; ii. 149–157
  Destruction of, ii. 32, 104, 130, 184, 194, 203
Monastic revival, ii. 104, 147–157
Monastic schools, ii. 69, 108, 149, 157, 184, 203
Monasticism, i. 147–169
  Evils of, i. 148, 160
  Good features in, i. 149
  Not of Christian origin, i. 151
  Benedictine form of, i. 153 ; ii. 131, 132, 140, 144–156
Monks, Avarice of, ii. 65
  Good work of, ii. 165
  the evangelizers of England, i. 72, 152, 161
Montalembert, ii. 75, 90
Monte Casino, ii. 144
Moon, Visions of the, ii. 23
Mosheim, ii. 67

National reforms, ii. 156
  sentiment, ii. 190
  unity, ii. 122, 200, 207, 208, 243
Native English clergy, i. 175, 192
Nennius, i. 5, 28
Neustria, ii. 5
Newman, J. H., on Pope Zacharias, ii. 57
Nicolas of Worcester, ii. 162
Ninian, St., i. 10
Northmen, ii. 174, 185

Oaks, Sacred, ii. 46, 183, 206
Oath of allegiance to Rome, ii. 37, 41, 47
Odilo, Duke of Bavaria, ii. 49, 55
Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 35 ; ii. 136, 140, 142–145
Odoacer, ii. 216
Offa, King of Mercia, i. 176–180 ; ii. 11
Oidilwald, King of Deira, i. 162 ; ii. 29
Oman, ii. 186
Ordgar, ealdorman, ii. 162
Origin of Christianity in Britain, i. 3, 10
Orosius, i. 6, 18, 19 ; ii. 110, 218
Osbern, biographer of Dunstan, i. 37
Oscytel, Archbishop of York, ii. 145, 152

Osgar, ii. 145, 146
Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 144
and Archbishop of York, ii. 152
Oswald, King of Northumbrians, i. 93, 114
compared to Josiah, i. 95
defeats Cadwalla, i. 96, 133
slain at Maserfield, i. 98
Oswin, King of Deira, murdered, i. 100; ii. 123
Oswy, King of Northumbrians, i. 114–119; ii. 124
Otto I, Emperor, ii. 126, 198
Oundle, Wilfrid's death at, i. 130

Paganism in Britain, i. 8, 9, 44, 51, 120
Pall (*pallium*), ii. 47, 68, 142, 152, 156, 196, 235
Parishes, Origin of, ii. 88, 232
Parker, Archbishop, ii. 106
Paschal question, i. 12, 49, 114–120, 188; ii. 242
Patrick, St., i. 87, 90
Paulinus, Apostle of Northumbria, i. 93, 103, 105, 116
Bishop of Rochester, i. 105
Peace of Wedmore, ii. 188
Pearson, C. H., ii. 212
Pebbles as charms, i. 91
Pelagianism in Britain, i. 11
Pelagius, i. 8
Penances, ii. 81
commutation of, ii. 82–86, 93
Penda, King of Mercia, i. 95, 98, 99; ii. 181
Penitential System, ii. 77–100
Penitential of Egbert, ii. 87, 88
of Theodore, i. 169; ii. 87
Penitentials, Frankish, ii. 89
Pestilences, i. 120, 138, 166; ii. 13, 44
Peter's Pence, i. 179
Picts, i. 11, 84, 85, 89, 119, 190
Platts, C., ii. 6, 11, 179
Plegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 181; ii. 105, 108, 109
Plummer, C., i. 83, 152, 165, 173, 184, 195; ii. 23, 89, 123; *see Ford Lectures*
Presbyters ruling bishops, i. 106; ii. 205
Priests not found among the heathen Danes, ii. 206
Procopius' description of Britain, i. 54
Protestant prejudices, i. 56, 101
Psalms as penances, ii. 83
translation of, ii. 117

Quarrels between Church and State, i. 179, 180
Quarto-deciman Easter, i. 12, 117

Race-hatred between Britons and English, i. 17, 30, 49, 52, 110; ii. 192
Radbod, King of Friesland, ii. 17, 23, 26, 34, 39

Radbod, Bishop of Utrecht, ii. 25
Ralph de Diceto, i. 195
Ramsay, Sir J. H., ii. 176
Rathmelsigi, Monastery of, ii. 13, 20
Ratisbon, ii. 38, 39, 50
Rebaptism, ii. 56, 199
Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France, ii. 27, 42, 51, 52, 59, 61, 63
Redwald, King of East Angles, i. 93; ii. 38
Reeves, Bishop, i. 87
Reforms, Aggressive, ii. 154–159
Relics, ii. 63, 65, 135, 147
Rimbert, biographer of Ansgar, ii. 197
Rimini, British Bishops at, i. 15
Ripon, i. 116; ii. 12, 133
Robertson, E. W., ii. 163
Robertson, J. C., ii. 5, 86, 147, 200
Robertson and Plummer, ii. 2
Roman Empire, Downfall of the, ii. 214–219
Roman Law, ii. 216
Roman missions to Britain, i. 51–53, 104, 107, 172
Roman remains in Britain, i. 8, 13, 14
Rome the centre of West, i. 56; ii. 4, 24, 26, 35–38, 41, 241
  Devotion of Boniface to, ii. 38, 41, 66, 69
Romescot or Peter's Pence, i. 179
Royal pilgrims, ii. 11
  retirements, ii. 50, 228
Rupert, Bishop of Salzburg, ii. 38, 50

Salzburg, ii. 39, 55–58
Saracens, ii. 37, 49
Saxon Chronicles, i. 18; ii. 113
Schaff, P., ii. 35, 46, 67, 70, 184, 200
Schmiedel on miracles, i. 78, 79
Schools, i. 125, 135, 142, 144; ii. 69, 108, 149, 157, 184, 203, 239
Schröck, ii. 67
Scots, i. 84, 89, 109
Sebaldus, St., ii. 26
Secular clergy expelled, ii. 132, 149, 150
Severus of Treves, i. 12
Selsey, i. 181, 191; ii. 33
Sergius, Pope, ii. 24, 26, 32
Seven British Bishops, i. 185
Sherborne, i. 190
Sidnacester, i. 190, 199
Sigebert, King of East Saxons, i. 114
Silchester, Christian remains at, i. 14
Simeon of Durham, i. 31; ii. 134, 135, 140, 147, 158, 164, 178, 199
Siric, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 160; ii. 187, 201, 229
Smith, I. G., ii. 31, 48, 70, 90
Soissons, Synod at, ii. 53

Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, i. 3
Stanley, Dean, i. 65
Stephen, Pope, ii. 58, 68, 69
Stubbs, i. 158, 159, 162, 169, 180 ,191, 192, 198, 199 ; ii. 114, 115, 121, 151, 163, 190, 193, 200, 203, 225, 230, 234
Sturmi, Abbot of Fulda, ii. 53, 63
Suidbert, Bishop of the Frisians, ii. 11, 24, 25
Sussex, Wilfrid in, i. 122, 129, 130 ; ii. 9
Sweyn, King of Denmark, ii. 199
Swithun, St., ii. 150, 151
Synods ; *see* Councils

Tacitus, i. 38
Tennyson, ii. 20, 21
Tertullian, i. 4, 7 ; ii. 22
Teutonic languages, i. 119 ; ii. 3
Theodore of Tarsus, i. 17, 71, 157, 175, 193
 consecrated archbishop, i. 123
 character of, i. 124
 divides dioceses, i. 126, 174 ; ii. 4
 restores Wilfrid to York, i. 195, 198
 great merits of, i. 199, 200
 Founder of the English Church, ii. 240
 Penitential of, ii. 87
Theodoric, King of East Goths, ii. 111, 216
Theodoric and Theodebert, i. 58, 59
Thor, The god, ii. 46, 74
Tithe, ii. 65, 233
Tithings, ii. 113, 114
Tonsure, Questions about the, i. 15, 49, 114, 119 ; ii. 48
Translations of Scripture, i. 146 ; ii. 112, 117
 of other books, ii. 105, 110, 111, 119
Trent, Council of, ii. 91
Trinoda necessitas, ii. 234
Tuda, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 121
Twelve, a mission number, ii. 22
Twysden, Sir Roger, ii. 4

Ulfkytel, ealdorman, ii. 211
Union of the Church prior to the union of the kingdom, i. 18, 111–114, 195–198 ; ii. 122, 200, 207, 208
Unni, Archbishop, ii. 197, 198
Utrecht, ii. 23, 29, 35, 40, 72
 See of, ii. 27, 58

Veiled lady, ii. 161, 163
Vikings, ii. 173, 186
Villages as episcopal sees, i. 181
Virgilius (Fergal), missionary, ii. 48, 55, 56
 Papal condemnation of, ii. 57, 58
Visions, ii. 15, 16, 23

Vitalian, Pope, i. 123, 125, 195; ii. 241
Vulgate, Copies of the, i. 142
Faulty translation in, i. 69

War-galleys, ii. 181, 185, 186
Werewulf, Alfred's chaplain, ii. 108
Werferth, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 108
Wergild, ii. 78
Western Church, Centralization in the, i. 128, 129, 147, 148; ii. 36, 230, 241
Whitby, Synod at, i. 116–119, 165
Wigbert, missionary, ii. 17, 18
Wighard, elected archbishop, i. 197; ii. 241
Wight, Isle of, i. 172; ii. 10
Wilfrid at Whitby, i. 116–119
consecrated in Gaul, i. 121, 187
appeals to Rome, i. 126, 130, 193; ii. 4
missionary work, ii. 3–12; *see* Sussex
at Ripon, i. 186, 187
restores Dagobert to Austrasia, ii. 6, 7
dies at Oundle, i. 130
Lives of, i. 34, 35
William of Malmesbury, i. 30, 31, 33, 37, 132; ii. 14, 73, 109, 113, 115, 117, 135, 138, 141, 191, 200
Willibrord, missionary, i. 192; ii. 21–31, 124, 195
Winbert, Abbot, ii. 34, 35
Wini, Bishop of Winchester, i. 188
Wiro, missionary, ii. 30
Woden, the god, i. 121; ii. 9
Wordsworth on Dunstan, ii. 169
Wulfoald, Mayor of the Palace, ii. 7
Wulfram, Bishop of Sens, ii. 17
Wulfred, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 182
Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, ii. 133, 134, 191
Wulstan, Archbishop of York, i. 21

Yellow pest, i. 120, 137
York, Danish occupation of, ii. 192

Zacharias, Pope, ii. 50, 51, 56–58, 68
Zwingli, ii. 91, 99

Printed by BUTLER & TANNER, *Frome and London.*