The Making of the Church of England

THOMAS ALLEN TORREY, D.D.

THE MAKING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The Making of the Church of England

(A.D. 597-1087)

A Course of Historical Lectures

BY

THOMAS ALLEN TIDBALL, D.D.

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, SEWANEE
NOW SPECIAL LECTURER IN EARLY ENGLISH
CHURCH HISTORY, AUTHOR OF "CHRIST
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT."

BOSTON
THE STRATFORD COMPANY, Publishers
1919

The Alpine Press, Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

DEDICATED

TO

THE DEAR AND GRACIOUS MEMORY

OF

MARY JOSEPHINE TIDBALL

AND TO

MARY COLLINGWOOD TUCKER

PREFACE

WHILE I was Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Department of the University of the South, it was my custom to lecture to the Senior Class on the History of the Church of England in general. But I gave special attention to *Early* English Church History in particular, from the Foundation of that Church in A. D. 597 to the Norman Conquest about five hundred years later. Under the Title of "The Making of the Church of England," I have given for twelve years a Course of Lectures based upon the Sources and upon the best Authorities, Ancient and Modern, but put into a popular form and in familiar colloquial language. I have delivered these Lectures not only to my Classes, but to Summer Schools of Theology, and to other more popular audiences, and have always been asked to publish them. When I resigned my Professorship a few years ago, I was asked by my students and by the University authorities to retain a Special Lectureship in Early English Church History, which I now hold. But, as I am about to retire altogether, I take this method of complying with the wishes of my former students and other friends.

In connection with the Lectures to the Senior Class I assigned to them Parallel Readings in the best books on the subject — first and foremost, of course, Bede's "Ecclesiastical History of the English Na-

tion,'' and, as a companion to that, ''The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.'' Coming down to the best recent Histories of this period, they were expected to read the greater part of William Bright's ''Chapters in Early English Church History,'' or else the more recent and equally valuable book of William Hunt on ''The English Church from Its Foundation to the Norman Conquest.''

Besides this reading on the part of the students, I gave them in my Lectures much of the cream of these and other valuable books in numerous Quotations. And, as these quotations constitute the best part of the Lectures, they are incorporated into the body of this book, rather than consigned to the obscurity of foot-notes or appendices, on the principle that the cream should be on the top of the milk, and not at the bottom.

In addition to these more formal Lectures, in order that ''no guilty man might escape,'' I was always giving what I called ''Free and Easy Catechetical Lectures'' on the Text of some good Text-Book, Wakeman's or Patterson's, which the students were expected to study. By these varied methods I tried to make sure that every student should learn *something* of English Church History, and should acquire some familiarity with the best Literature on the subject.

These Lectures were not written nor published for learned scholars, but for intelligent and educated students who have had neither the time nor the opportunity to read the voluminous works of the great

Historians. This book is intended as a popular Introduction to the real Historians of the Period treated, in the hope that it may serve as "stepping-stones to higher things" and may tempt its readers to go farther and fare better.

THOMAS ALLEN TIDBALL

Sewanee, March 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

A Prelude to the Making of the Church of England

I

The Old British and Other Keltic Churches in Great Britain and Ireland Before the Coming of Augustine

The Beginnings of the Church in Britain.

I am to speak to you on "The Making of the Church of England." The subject is one of special interest to Churchmen, clerical and lay, but concerns also a far larger circle than our particular household of faith. The history of this Church is so interwoven with the whole history of England itself that the two studies cannot be separated without serious loss to each. In the introduction to the first volume of the largest and completest recent "History of the English Church," edited by the late Dean Stephens and the Rev. William Hunt, Mr. Hunt declares, "The English Church has exercised a profound influence on the history of the English people. It was a principal agent in the making of the Nation, and has had a strong effect on its character and institutions. Without it the England of to-day would have been other than it is. Every Englishman, probably every one of Anglo-Saxon race and speech, be his religious opinions

what they may, owes something to its influence, either in the present or the past." But in order to understand aright the early days of the English Church (the Church of the English race), we must go further back to the days of an earlier Church in the land conquered by the Anglo-Saxons. There was a country and a people here, under the older names of Britain and the British, centuries before there were any English in it. "There were great men here before Agamemnon"—good and great men before the coming of Augustine—a British and other Keltic Churches in Great Britain and Ireland long before the Jutes, the Saxons and the Angles landed upon these shores. The Genesis of this earliest Church, or Churches, must be taken into account in considering the making of the United Church of England, which was the ultimate welding together, by a very long and painful process, into one National Church, of churches and races once distinct and hostile.

The conversion of the Britons and the Scots (the latter term includes the Irish) came long before, and that of the Scots contributed largely to, the conversion of the English. It is of that earlier Christianity that I would speak in this preliminary lecture, because of its agency before and after Augustine's time in the evangelization of the British Isles, and because of the very large and important part which it played in the conversion of the English themselves.

Britain was first invaded by the Romans under

Julius Caesar B. C. 55, but did not become a settled Roman province till A. D. 84 under Domitian. When the Romans took possession the Keltic people whom they found dwelling here, and whom the English invaders afterwards found, consisted of two main divisions more or less amalgamated—viz.: the Goidels and the Brythons. Both were akin to the Gauls (Goidels, Gaedels, Gaels, Gauls). The Goidels, who were the first comers, displaced, or absorbed the earlier Iberian inhabitants. The conquering Goidels were themselves subsequently conquered by the Brythons, or Britons, and ultimately driven backward into the Western parts of Britain, and across the sea into Ireland. "At present the languages derived from that of the Goidels are the Gaelic of the Highlands, the Manx of the Isle of Man, and the Erse of Ireland. The only language now spoken in the British Isles which is derived from that of the Britons is the Welsh"—(S. R. Gardiner). The Britons were ultimately incorporated into the Roman Empire and civilization, but not so the Goidels of Ireland and Scotland. There were also, for long, different types of Christianity in these two divisions of the Keltic race.

During the centuries that Britain continued as a province of the Roman Empire Christianity had become widely, if somewhat thinly and loosely, diffused among the Britons. After the retirement of the Romans early in the fifth century and the invasion by the English, beginning about the middle of that century, these ruthless conquerors thrust back into the

West the surviving British Christians, and formed a dark and dense mass of heathenism between the Catholic Church on the continent of Europe and the British and Scotic Churches in the North and West. The latter were confined to what is now known as Cornwall and Devon, Wales and Cumberland, Ireland and Scotland. These vast regions were subsequently untouched by the missionaries under Augustine and his successors, who accomplished the conversion of the English only in the South-East corner of England. Immensely important as the Roman Mission was in laying the permanent foundation of the Church of the English race, we shall see how insignificant might have been their success, had they not been so largely reenforced by the missionary enthusiasm and enterprise of the Church of the Scots. Next to nothing, indeed, was done by the *British* Church for the conversion of their hated English conquerors. The times and conditions were most unpropitious even had they showed any desire to undertake such work, and they had no such desire. But the evangelizing of the vast and dominant English Kingdom of Northumbria from the Humber to the Forth, and of that other English Kingdom called Mercia, covering the whole middle of the island, was mainly due to the representatives of the Scotch-Irish Church from its two great centres, Iona and Lindisfarne.

What can we learn of the *origin and growth* of Christianity among the *Britons and other Kelts?*

There are no historical data for an *Apostolic* foun-

dation of the Church in the British Isles. There are legends of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Philip and Joseph of Arimathea preaching here; but these are now recognized by all competent authorities as fictions. Haddan and Stubbs, after examining every document bearing on the subject, have concluded that "statements respecting Apostolic men preaching in Britain in the first century rest upon guess, mistake, or fable." It is, further, impossible to say with certainty when, whence, or by whom the Christian Church in these islands was first introduced—just as it is impossible to say the same of the original Church in Rome. Foundations are generally out of sight. Most probably, Christianity came to Britain first in the person of some converted Roman soldier or traveller, or of some humble trader or rich civilian of Gaul, the nearest neighbor on the continent to the Britons and their nearest kinsfolk. We have the Welsh story of Ban the Blessed, the father of Caractacus the captive British king, who brought back to his native land the faith learned by him in his Roman prison. From the same source we have the supposed indentification of the Pudens and Claudia of St. Paul's 2nd Epistle to Timothy with the Roman Pudens and British-born Claudia, daughter of Caractacus commemorated in the poet Martial's verses. We have Bede's narrative of a British King named Lucius writing to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, a letter with the Macedonian cry, "Come and help us," begging that by the bishop's commission he might be made a Christian, and obtaining

the fulfilment of his request—"after which," says Bede, "the Britons retained their faith, thus received inviolate and in tranquil peace until the times of the Emperor Diocletian." But these stories, with all their later embellishments, are dismissed as baseless by the most careful historians. We have the beautiful and touching Mediaeval Romance of Joseph of Arimathea coming to the Isle of Avalon with his twelve companions and the two holy women, Mary and Martha, and bringing with them the priceless treasure of the Holy Grail,—and of Joseph planting his staff there which grew into the miraculous thorn-tree that burst into blossom every Christmas-day, of the land bestowed upon them by the King Arviragus, and the simple Church of wattles built thereon in honor of the Blessed Virgin—as Tennyson has it:

"That Joseph came of old to Glastonbury,
And there the heathen prince Arviragus
Gave him an isle of marsh whereon to build,
And there he built with wattles from the marsh
A little lonely church in days of yore."

But, alas, this lovely legend vanishes, too, like those of King Arthur under the prosaic touch of historical criticism, and leaves us nothing but the ruined Abbey at Glastonbury and its authentic and not inglorious history reaching far back into the dim distance of early British Christianity in the Roman time. But we are getting on ground more solid than the misty marshes of Avalon where we come to the late Canon Bright's "Early English Church

History," and read his calm conclusion:—"We cannot reasonably doubt that some Christians did cross the channel to our shore during the second century, if not earlier, and planted here and there some settlements of the Church. It was almost certainly from Gaul," he says, "certainly not, as far as we can judge, directly from the East—that these outposts of the advancing spiritual Kingdom were sent forth among the Roman provincials of Britain." Irenaeus, who in 177 was Bishop of Lyons, one of the earliest Christian foundations in the South of Gaul, in naming all the churches of the West known to his day, makes no mention of any Church in Britain. But very soon after this date Christianity must have taken root there (planted probably by refugees from the persecution at Lyons and Vienne in 177). Tertullian, about thirty years later, writing of the wide spread of the Gospel in the West, says,—"In all parts of Spain, among the various nations of Gaul, in districts of Britain inaccessible to the Romans but subdued to Christ, in all these the kingdom and name of Christ are venerated." Origen, about a generation later, writes to the same effect:—"The power of the Saviour is felt even among those who are divided from our world, in Britain." "When, before the coming of Christ, did the land of Britain hold the belief in the one God?" There is a singular dearth of information about the Church in Britain during the third century, due mainly, no doubt, to the all but complete obliteration of British history by the barbarity of their Saxon conquerors.

When we have passed into the fourth century, we have the story of the martyrdom of St. Alban, c. 304, which, spite of some legendary matter mingled with it in Bede's beautiful narrative, may be regarded as authentic. It is interesting that this proto-martyr of the British Church, Alban, the gallant soldier, who gave his life gladly for his faith and for his friend, is the first instance in England of a personal name attached to a Christian site. Since Julius Caesar captured that strong-hold of the Britons, it had been known as Verulamium; but after Alban's death there it was baptized with its new name, "St. Alban's." On the "flower-clad eminence" where the Christian soldier died the British Christians erected a church to his memory, supplanted afterwards by the stately Abbey Church which still stands and is now used as an English Cathedral. However obscure the origin and growth of the Church in Britain, there can be no doubt that long before the beginning of the fourth century, it was a Church fully organized with its own bishops, presbyters and deacons, and taking its proper part in the early councils of the Catholic Church. At the council of Arles, 314, the records show the names of three bishops from Britain—those of York, London, and either Lincoln or Caerleon-on-Usk, with the names of a presbyter and a deacon who attended them. The records of the council of Nicea, 325, do not show that British bishops were present there; but the connection of Constantine with Britain and his effort to make the council as general as possible,

make it highly probable that Britain was invited. Certainly the bishops of that country gave their formal assent to the decrees of this important council and those of Sardica in 347, whether personally present or not. At the Council of Rimini, or Ariminum, in 359, Sulpicius Severus, a Gallic chronicler c. 400, makes express mention of three exceptional British bishops, who were unable to pay their own expenses and accepted an allowance for this purpose from the Emperor. This fact may be taken, I think, as a fair indication that the Church in these islands was not a strong, or wealthy, or very influential one. This is confirmed by the dearth of memorials, of great buildings, or literary productions, or illustrious names. At Canterbury, Silchester and a few other places there are some remains of churches built when Britain was still a Roman province.

British Christians are recognized abroad as holding the true Catholic Faith in the time of the tremendous Arian struggle. They are congratulated by Hilary, the famous bishop of Poitiers in 358, on their "freedom from all contagion of the detestable heresy." They were probably, under pressure from the Emperor, inveigled with their fellow bishops at Rimini into assenting temporarily to an uncatholic formula. But they soon returned to the Nicene standard, for Athanasius in 363, writes of the Britons as among those "loyal to the Catholic Faith." Chrysostom says, "Even the British Isles have felt the power of the word, for there, too, churches and

altars have been erected — there too, as in the East, men may be heard disputing points in Scripture with differing voices, but not with differing belief." Jerome, about 395, to the same effect declares:— "Britain worships the same Christ, observes the same rule of truth" with other Christian countries. He finds Britons among the pilgrims to Palestine, and says that "the road to the heavenly hall stood open from Britain, as well as from Jerusalem." The final withdrawal of the Roman government from Britain in 410, and the disturbed state of Europe during the Teutonic migration left the island cut off from the commerce and civilization of the world, and its churchmen more isolated than ever. Many of their leading members and of the most promising youth of the country had followed the retiring legions. Nevertheless there were not wanting about this time signs of a renewed spiritual life and of missionary enterprise for the conversion of the Keltic peoples in the North. This appears particularly in the mission inaugurated by St. Ninian during the last decade of the fourth century. He was a native of Strathclyde in North Britain. After studying in Rome and receiving Episcopal consecration from Pope Siricius, he returned home to become a missionary bishop to his own people, and on the way he seems to have been profoundly impressed by a visit to the famous teacher, St. Martin of Tours. "To the memory of this saint, as Bede relates, Ninian built a church, not after the usual British fashion of wood, but like the Romans, of white stone,

which became renowned as the 'White House,' or Whithern. Here on a promontory of Wigton Bay are still the ruins of a Cathedral crowning a wooded mound, representing what was once emphatically named 'the Great Monastery' and known as a centre of religious light and thought for all who dwelt along the Solway and between the two Roman walls. So it was that in after ages St. Ninian was commemorated as the instrument by whom the 'Picts and Britons' had been converted to the knowledge of the faith" (Bright).

With the opening of the fifth century began the great Pelagian controversy in the Church about the sinfulness of human nature and the necessity of Divine grace to overcome it. This is not the place to deal with the doctrinal questions at issue. But Britain became conspicuously identified with and involved in the controversy, and for the first time acquired a wide reputation for heterodoxy. The story of its connection with this subject makes a marked epoch of its ecclesiastical history. Pelagius himself was an interesting and attractive character —a man of great originality and ability. St. Augustine of Hippo, his most formidable opponent, admits that in personal life he was "honorable, earnest, chaste and commendable; a holy man who had made considerable progress in the Christian life, a good and praiseworthy person." A good man is the most powerful advocate and most dangerous propagandist of a bad cause. Now Pelagius was, according to Augustine and contemporary writers generally, a

"Briton." His other chief antagonist, St. Jerome, with less charity and courtesy than Augustine, styles him "that big dog of Albion," and "a huge fellow stuffed to repletion with Scotch porridge"—"Scotch" meant "Irish" in those days. He is generally supposed, however, to have been a Welshman named Morgan (sea-born), the synonym of his Greek name Pelagius. It is quite certain that he was a native of the British Isles, but had left them before he became famous and never returned thither. He was somewhat of a rover, geographically as well as theologically, propagating his views in Rome and Carthage and Palestine. We first hear of him prominently in Rome, at which fountain-head of orthodoxy he appears to have picked up his pet heresy, with the assistance of an Irishman named Coelestius and a Syrian named Rufinus. His errors were powerfully refuted by Sts. Augustine and Jerome, condemned by numerous councils and not condemned by others. He was strongly condemned by the Pope Innocent, and as strongly commended for a while as a sound Catholic by the succeeding Pope Zosimus—the first who claimed to "inherit from St. Peter divine authority equal to that of St. Peter." But popes were not as terrible nor as infallible in those days as later, and, spite of Zosimus standing sponsor for Pelagius, 214 bishops in council at Carthage anathematized his views and Pelagius was banished by the Emperors, and Zosimus, the first heretical pope, was scared into orthodoxy. So much for the heresiarch

abroad. Now look at the story of Pelagianism in his native land. Its chief propagator here was named Agricola, son, we are told, of Severianus, a Gallican bishop. Gaul had caught the contagion from Italy and communicated it to her neighbor Britain. Agricola seems to have found the British soil open to the sowing of his seed, and Pelagianism grew apace among his own countrymen. The infection spread rapidly, and there was no doctor there equal to its cure. The Church had just lost many of its best and most influential men by the withdrawal of the Romans. For lack of leaders competent to deal with theological subtleties, they called in the help of their better-equipped brethen in Gaul. The Gallican Church promptly commissioned, possibly with the Pope's backing, two of their notable bishops, Germanus of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes, to meet the emergency. The story is told by Constantius, the contemporary of Germanus. Arriving in Britain these prelates made a grand tour of the country about 429 A. D. They carried on a vigorous crusade against the heretics, a sort of preaching mission, in churches and streets and fields, wherever they could best gather the clergy and the people. Their mission culminated in a notable public debate with the Pelagians, probably at Verulam, in which, before a vast audience the latter were completely worsted. Then the victorious bishops made a pious pilgrimage to the neighboring tomb of St. Alban, depositing sacred relics at his shrine and carrying

away some of the earth consecrated by the martyr's blood. During the ensuing Lent they revived the Church by their earnest preaching, and won many converts, baptizing them on Easter Eve and celebrating a joyous Easter with their new converts. But their sacred mission was rudely interrupted by a sudden descent upon the Britons of their old enemies the Picts and the more formidable Saxons. The good bishops were equal to this emergency also, and appear to have had military prowess equal to their theological. By the counsel and strategy of St. Germanus an ambush was prepared for the enemy, and, when they came on confident of an easy triumph, the carefully concealed Britons suddenly arose from their hiding-place, and, fresh from the baptismal laver of regeneration, with one mighty voice shouted three times their Easter "Alleluia" till the earth rang with the thunderous sound, and their panic-stricken assailants, without striking a blow, fled from the field of Maes-Garmon ("German's field"). This bloodless triumph became famous in Britain and Gaul as the "Alleluia Victory." At a later time, about 447, we are told that Germanus repeated his visit to the British Church to reclaim those who had relapsed into Pelagianism, bringing as his companion this time Severus, bishop of Trèves. Such signal services greatly endeared him to the people, and various churches and schools were dedicated to him, including the Cathedral on the Isle of Man, whose ruins still stand at the entrance to Peel Harbor.

The Beginnings of the Church in Ireland.

It is time to turn our attention to the Beginnings of Christianity in others parts of the British Isles. If the British Church failed entirely in its duty towards the conversion of their English conquerors, they were not wanting in missionary efforts among the neighboring and kindred peoples in the countries now known as Ireland and Scotland. It is worthy of note that at the very time when the English invaders were threatening to obliterate Christianity in Britain itself, Patrick, a North British missionary, was successfully planting it in Ireland. We have already seen how Ninian had established himself in Galloway, and, working his way northward to the Grampians, had preached to the Southern Picts, "a people that had more hair on their faces than clothes on their bodies." His "White House" at Whithern became a centre of learning and religious influence not only in this part of the Roman province, but even reached across the sea into Ireland, which had never come under the imperial rule. Ireland, then called "Scotia," was the original home of the Scots, who subsequently colonized in "Caledonia," or "Alban," where they became the dominant people. But this new home of theirs was not called "Scotland" until about the twelfth century. Ninian, after his labors among the Picts, is related to have emigrated to Ireland, where he was known as Monen —"My Ninian."

It is very difficult, indeed, to disentangle the true

history of St. Patrick from the bewildering mass of legends and controversies, with which it has become almost hopelessly involved.

The latest scholarly life of St. Patrick, and probably the most impartial, based upon a critical examination of the original sources and the whole Patrician literature, has recently been published (1905) by G. B. Bury, professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. The only authentic writings of Patrick, generally accepted, are his famous "Confession," and his "Letter against Coroticus," a ruler of Strathclyde in North Britain. The "Confession" is preserved in the most valuable "Book of Armagh"—a beautiful manuscript of the ninth century—in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, along with other Patrician documents. Among these are a few "Dicta," or "Sayings of Patrick," the earliest "Memoirs of Patrick," by Bishop Tirechan of the Seventh Century, and the first formal "Biography of Patrick," by Muirchu towards the end of the Seventh Century. There are also Irish "Annals," which supply material for history back to the fifth century, full of interesting legends, but of slight historical value.

The so-called "Confession" of St. Patrick is a sort of *Apologia pro vita sua,* written shortly before his death. It tells us very little of his outer life, but reveals the wonderful dealings of God within his inmost soul. In contrast with the myriad miracles recorded by his biographers, the one miracle which he mentions is the Almighty Grace of God, which

called and endowed a weak, sinful, and unlearned man for the marvellous work which he accomplished. His answer to all his enemies and detractors was virtually the same as St. Paul's, "I am the least of the Apostles, that am not meet to be called an Apostle. But by the grace of God I am what I am; and His grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."

Patrick was a Roman citizen of Britain, born in a village named Bannaventa, which has not been certainly identified. His father, Calpernius, was a small land owner, and a decurion, or member of the Roman town-council, and also a Christian Deacon, as his father Potitus had been a Christian Presbyter. The British name of the future Apostle of Ireland was Sucat; but, like his father and grand-father, he was best known by his Roman name—Patricius. He was probably born about 389, and brought up as a Christian; but he speaks of himself as "most rustic and unlearned," and bitterly laments some serious sin of his youth. He had reached the age of sixteen when a fleet of Irish freebooters landed in his native town, and Patrick and his sister were among the captives carried away to what he calls "the ultimate places of the earth," so far off did barbarous Ireland seem to a Roman citizen of Britain. According to his own story, he became the unhappy slave of a hard master who dwelt near the wood of Fochlad "nigh to the Western Sea"—a wild and

desolate region in North-Western Connaught—who "sent him into the fields to feed swine." Here, like the Prodigal Son, "he came to himself," and came to God. He describes fully this conversion, which profoundly affected his whole subsequent career. He tells us also of the visions and voices which promised him deliverance from his servitude. In obedience thereto he made his escape, and, after many perils over land, reached the nearest port (probably Wicklow), and found "the ship of his dreams." He was reluctantly allowed by the rough heathen crew to work his passage to an unknown port, which they reached in three days. Then, for two months of dreadful hardship, he toiled through a dreary wilderness until he made his escape from his new masters. "Though Patrick does not mention the scene of his journey in the narrative which he left behind him, he used to tell his disciples how he had "the fear of God in his journey through Gaul to Italy" ("Dicta"). It was in Italy, then, we must suppose, that he succeeded in escaping from them" (Bury). I can only give a brief summary of Bury's main conclusions as to the subsequent career of Patrick prior to his mission to Ireland, based upon a critical examination of the oldest sources. The first episode of his escape in Italy was his sojourn for some years in the famous Island-Monastery of the Mediterranean, Lerinus (or Lérins) founded by Honoratus in the fourth century, one of the most influential seats of religion and learning in Southern Gaul. Lérins became associated with some of the most illustrious

leaders of Western Christendom. Here, then, we may suppose, was Patrick's first initiation into monastic life at its best. But his real mission was not made known to him, until he left Lérins to visit his kinsfolk in Britain. His surviving relatives, he tells us, received him "as a son," and they implored him not to leave them again. But Patrick was soon to learn here in his old home that the work of his life lay far hence among the heathen. In a vision of the night, as he describes it in his "Confession," there stood before him a man named Victoricus—like St. Paul's Man of Macedonia—fresh from Ireland with a bundle of letters in his hand, "And he gave me one of these, and I read the beginning of the letter, which contained the 'Voice of the Irish.' And, as I read the beginning of it, I fancied that I heard the voice of the folk who were near the wood of Fochlad, nigh to the Western Sea. And this was the cry: 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come again and walk among us as before.' I was pierced to the heart and could read no more, and thereupon I awoke." St. Patrick was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. But, in spite of his fiery zeal for God, he was not a fanatic who rushed rashly into so great a work without proper preparation, and without the backing and commission of influential authorities in the Church. The evidence shows that he shortly retired to Gaul, and was located in Auxerre, a city which seems to have had very close relations with the British Church. Its bishop, then, was a famous man, Amator, by whom Patrick was or-

dained Deacon. As some fourteen years seem to have passed before he set out for Ireland, he must have encountered serious impediments and even opposition. Meanwhile Germanus had succeeded Amator as Bishop of Auxerre, had visited Britain and rendered signal service by putting down Pelagianism and strengthening the British Christians. This work of Germanus had the direct sanction of Celestine, Bishop of Rome. We are told that there was another deacon, more eminent at this time than Patrick, associated with Germanus. His name was Palladius, and he seems to have been instrumental in inducing Pope Celestine to send Germanus on his special mission to Britain. Now there is good authority for the statement that this same Palladius was the first bishop sent to organize the Christians already in Ireland. Prosper of Aquitaine, who was a contemporary writer and intimately associated with Rome, relates in his "Chronicle" that "Pope Celestine sent Palladius to the Scots (i. e., Irish) believing in Christ." This was in the year 431. Bede says the same. But this mission of Palladius to Ireland seems to have come to an end within a year by his death, and the best opinion is that in the year 432 Patrick took his place, being consecrated as bishop by Germanus, probably with the Pope's approval. And so at last, through much tribulation and disappointment and opposition, "the man and the hour arrived." The long desire of Patrick was realized, and he became the real Apostle of the Irish. The tradition is that Patrick had already set

out from Auxerre to work under Palladius, when the news reached Gaul that the bishop, Palladius, was dead. Patrick seems to have landed, like Palladius, at Wicklow, and to have worked his way northward towards the land of his former captivity. His work in Ireland probably lasted for about thirty years, and covered a great part of the island, but particularly the North. The actual details of his travels and toils have been well-nigh overwhelmed by the luxuriant imagination of his later biographers. But the main features of his labors and success have been rescued by sober historical criticism, and show that this first great missionary of the British race and true Apostle of Ireland was indeed a very remarkable man. I shall not atempt to go into the details of his abundant labors.

Among the long and bitter controversies concerning Patrick's career, no small part of it has to do with his relation to the Roman See. Much more importance has attached to this question than it deserves. But I will give Bury's calm conclusion. He finds evidence for one visit of Patrick to Rome about the year 441 in two ancient records,—one in the "Annals,"—the other in Tirechan's "Life of the Saint." The statement in the "Annals" is: "Leo is ordained Bishop of the Roman Church; Bishop Patrick is approved in the Catholic Faith." "Such approval," he says, "might have come in the shape of a formal epistle from the Roman bishop to the bishop of Ireland. But, when we find in our seventh

century authority, Tirechan, a statement that "Patrick was in Rome accompanied by Sachellus," and when we find that in his time there were relics of Peter and Paul and other martyrs procured by Saint Patrick, we may venture to combine these testimonies, and conclude that Patrick did visit Rome in the beginning of Leo's Pontificate." "Patrick," he continues, "had been eight years in Ireland when a greater than Celestine or Xystus was elected to the See of Rome. The Pontificate of Leo the Great marks an eminent station in the progress of the Roman bishops to that commanding position which they were ultimately to occupy in Europe. . . . It was in the year after his elevation that Patrick, according to the conclusion to which our evidence points, betook himself to Rome. No step could have been more natural, and none could have been more politic. . . . To report the success of his labors to the head of the western churches, of which Ireland was the youngest, to enlist his personal sympathy, to gain his formal approbation, his moral support and his advice, were objects which would well repay a visit to Rome, and an absence of some length from Ireland. . . . But it is possible that he may have had a more particular motive, which may explain why he chose just this time for his visit. Hitherto, active in different parts of the island, he had established no central seat, no primatial or metropolitan church for the chief bishop. Not long after his return, he founded the Church of Armagh, fixing his own See there, and establishing it as the

primatial church. This was a step of the highest importance in the progress of ecclesiastical organization, and it is not a very daring conjecture to suppose that Patrick may have wished to consult the Roman bishop concerning this design and obtain his approbation. . . . He may well have received practical advice from Leo—such advice as a later pontiff gave to Augustine for the conversion of the English."

As St. Patrick's end drew near, he seems to have retired from his Metropolitan See at Armagh, appointing his disciple Benignus as his successor there, and to have returned to the scene of his earliest labors beside Strangford Lough. Here he died at Saul near Downpatrick, and here, at the site of the present Cathedral, he was buried in the year of our Lord 461. "Judged by what he actually accomplished," it has been said, "he must be placed among the most efficient of those who took part in spreading the Christian faith beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire. He was endowed in abundant measure with the quality of enthusiasm, and stands in quite a different rank from the Apostle of England, in whom this victorious energy of enthusiasm was lacking, Augustine, the messenger and instrument of Gregary the Great. Patrick was no more messenger or instrument. He had a strong personality and the power of initiative; he depended on himself, or, as he would have said on Divine guidance."

Among the many treasures of the wonderful "Book of Armagh" is an Irish Hymn (the oldest

monument of the Irish-Keltic language) called "S. Patricii Canticum Scotticum," which Patrick is said to have composed when he went to convert the chief king of the island, Laoghaire at Tara. This Hymn was current before the ninth century as Patrick's, and may have been composed by him. It is generally known as the "Lorica of S. Patrick"—in Irish "Faeth Fiada," or the "Deer's Cry."

I can hardly close this sketch of the Irish saint better than by quoting the closing part of the Hymn in the verse translation of the Irish poet, Clarence Mangan, "which preserves in a wonderful manner the time and spirit of the original" (Dr. Todd).

"May Christ, I pray,
Protect me to-day
Against poison and fire,
Against drowning and wounding,
That so, in His grace abounding,
I may earn the preacher's hire.

Christ, as a Light,
Illumine and guide me!
Christ, as a shield, o'ershadow and cover me!
Christ be under me! Christ be over me!
Christ be beside me
On left hand and right!
Christ be before me, behind me, about me!
Christ this day be within and without me!

Christ the lowly and meek,
Christ the all-powerful, be
In the heart of each to whom I speak,
In the mouth of each who speaks to me!
In all who draw near me,
Or see or hear me.

At Tara today, in this awful hour,
I call on the Holy Trinity!
Glory to Him Who reigneth in power,
The God of the Elements, Father and Son,
And Paraclete-Spirit, which Three are the One.
The Everlasting Divinity!

Salvation dwells with the Lord,
With Christ, the Omnipotent Word,
From generation to generation,
Grant us, O Lord, Thy grace and salvation."

There can be no doubt of the truth of the statement that "Patrick's achievements as organizer of a Church and as propagator of his faith made Christianity a living force in Ireland which could never be extinguished." After his death, probably in the year 461, we find a vast number of churches and monasteries which made Ireland famous in the next century as "the Island of Saints" and "the Mother of a race of missionaries." His system, like that of Gaul where he learned it, centred in its wonderful monasteries, which fairly girdled the land like outposts and camps of a Christian army in an enemy's country. But there were some marked peculiarities about the later development of this system on eccentric lines which Patrick would hardly have approved. The later Irish Church had *no Diocesan* Episcopacy at all, as Patrick seems to have established, and as we find in Britain and everywhere else. There were many bishops, however, too many indeed. But these, while conferring Holy Orders and discharging the offices peculiar to the Episco-

pate, were no longer the heads and rulers of the ecclesiastical centres. They were subject to the Abbot, generally a Presbyter, who presided over and ruled the monasteries. Nor need we wonder at this unique method of government which came to characterize the Church of the Scots, first in Ireland and subsequently in Scotland, when we remember that these countries were mostly Christianized at the very time when they were almost cut off from Rome and Western Christendom generally—when Britain herself was gradually overwhelmed by the invasion of the heathen English. This ecclesiastical isolation goes far to explain the notable differences of usage which characterized the Scotch-Irish missionaries when they afterwards came into contact and collision with those from Rome. The Scotic system, however, if rude and irregular, was not ill-suited to their tribal organization and to the social and religious needs of the time and the people.

After the death of the great Apostle of the Irish, religion naturally declined for a while, but seems to have regained much of its pristine power by coming into closer connection with the surviving British churchmen in Wales, receiving thence its Liturgy, and renewing its life under the leadership of the Welsh teachers, David, Gildas and Cadoc. From them and their famous schools came what is called "the Second Order of Irish Saints," and the founders of similar and even greater schools in Ireland. It was these later Irish saints and scholars who sent forth that wonderful succession of mission-

ary leaders, who carried their fiery zeal to Gaul, to Germany, to Switzerland, to Italy, and even to the far-off Faroe Islands and Iceland. It was these men that kept Christianity alive and aggressive in the North and Northwest when the irruption of the Teutonic barbarians southward overwhelmed for a while the civilized world. From these came St. Columban the Apostle of Burgundy, St. Gall, his pupil the Apostle of Switzerland, Fridoline the Apostle of Swabia and Alsace, Truidpert of the Black Forest, Killian of Franconia, and St. Columba the Apostle of Scotland, whose successors not only converted Scotland, but shared so largely with the followers of St. Augustine, the Roman, in the conversion of England and the English.

The Beginnings of the Church in Scotland.

Let us now cross over again from Ireland to Scotland, and witness the beginning and advance of Christianity in that country. The work of its first evangelist, St. Ninian, was followed up by St. Kentigern, called also St. Mungo, known as the Apostle of Strathclyde. He was consecrated to the Episcopate by an Irish bishop about 550, and established his humble See at Cathures, now Glasgow, becoming thereby the founder of the future cathedral and city. After a considerable period of pioneer work in this region, Kentigern retired for a while to Wales and became the head of a vast monastery on the river Elwy, where he was succeeded by his pupil St.

Asaph, the founder of the future Welsh Cathedral of that name. Returning to Strathclyde about the year 573 with a band of his pupils, Kentigern resumed his labors with increased zeal and success until his aged body was laid to rest beside the altar of his rude cathedral, which perpetuates his memory so dear to the Scots. Thus an entering wedge into the land of the pagan Picts had opened the way for the far more auspicious mission of Scotland's great apostle, St. Columba.

We are more fortunate in having the materials for an authentic life of Columba than in the cases of Patrick, Ninian and Kentigern. These are found mainly in the "Life of Columba," by Adamnan, which its learned editor, the late Bishop Reeves of Down, calls "an inestimable literary relic of the Irish Church—the most valuable of that institution which has escaped the ravages of time." This Adamnan was the ninth Abbot of the Monastery of Iona in a rapid succession from Columba (679-704). He was born within a generation of the saint's death, and wrote his Memoir within a century of that event. He wrote at Iona the fountain-head, where he spent many years, and had the opportunity of conversing with those who had known Columba personally. Adamnan had access to all the materials, oral and written, which the island could furnish. I may add that we are fortunate also in having two such recent explorers of this field as the late Irish bishop of Down, Dr. Reeves, and the French Count de Montalembert in his "Monks of the West." For

popular sketches of St. Columba, the late Professor Stokes's, "Ireland and the Keltic Church," and the late Bishop Dowden's, "The Keltic Church in Scotland," leave little to be desired. I have drawn from all of these.

Columba, unlike Patrick, was an Irishman by race and birth and education. He was born at Gartan in Donegal, December 7th, 521, and was of the famous clan of the O'Donnells. He was of the bluest Irish blood on both sides of the house, being the great-great-grandson of Niall, the High King of Ireland. He was probably baptized with two names of opposite significance—Crinthann, a "wolf," and Columba, a "dove." The former name was fitly dropped when he dropped his war-like, and perhaps, wolf-like, feats in Ireland to become the devoted Christian Evangelist of Scotland. For his education, he seems to have first attended a monastic school of Bishop Finnian of Moville, who had himself been a pupil in the North British school founded by Ninian at Whithern. Here he was ordained Deacon. We next hear of him as associated with a mere secular sort of teacher, Gemman, who was a "Bard," one of the numerous professional poets and national chroniclers of Erin. Three Latin Hymns, and several Irish poems have been preserved, which are attributed to Columba with better reason than the Hymns ascribed to Patrick. But more important than either of these earlier teachers in the education of Columba was the illustrious monastic school of Clonard, founded by another Finnian in the beginning of the

sixth century, who had studied in the South British school at Menevia in Wales under St. David. Clonard is said to have had as many as 3,000 students at once. "From the school of Clonard," says Archbishop Usher, "scholars of old came out in as great numbers as Greek's from the side of the horse at Troy." Here, then, in this notable seat of learning, Columba was a pupil for some years, and during this time he was ordained Priest. There is a curious old story that Finnian, who was only a presbyter himself, wanted a resident bishop in his monastery, selected Columba and sent him to a neighboring bishop named Etchen, who was found ploughing in the field, and that this agricultural prelate, whose mind then was mostly on his plough, by mistake ordained him only presbyter. Certainly Columba remained only a presbyter for life, even after he became head of the monastery at Iona. In this respect he was followed by his successors there, and in the numerous daughter-monasteries subject thereto, it being regarded "as unbecoming that any of his successors should profess a higher dignity than their great patron." Columba, who, like the later Schoolmen, seems to have gone the round of the chief seats of learning accessible, is also related to have studied in the monastery of Glasnevin, now a beautiful suburb of Dublin. Bishop Reeves thinks that his life as a student was followed by no less than fifteen years of missionary labor in Ireland, founding numerous churches and monasteries in many parts of

the country—notably at Kells, Derry and Durrow, his favorite foundations.

Thus passed the first forty years—more than half of his life in his native land. Various reasons have been suggested for the sudden and wonderful change in Columba's character and career, which shifted the scene of his exploits from Ireland to Scotland. Whether true or not, we can hardly pass over the traditional story of the occasion which brought him to his new home, where he was to spend about thirty-five years of most heroic service for God and man. Columba had acquired to a remarkable degree, we are told, the Monk's favorite art of copying and beautifully illuminating rare manuscripts. The story is that, while visiting his early teacher, Finnian of Moville, he borrowed and secretly copied a precious Latin Psalter of his friend, and, when Finnian discovered this, he was very angry and claimed the copy. Columba was Irishman enough to refuse to surrender without a fight. An appeal was made to the King of Meath, who decided against the copyist, quoting the Keltic law, "To every cow belongs her calf," therefore "to every book belongs its copy, or child-book." At this decision Columba's Keltic blood was up, and he must fight it out to a finish. He did not justify as yet the name of "Dove," by showing a very dove-like disposition. "The Call of the Wild" had aroused the "Wolf" that was still in him. Like a hot-headed O'Donnell, he stirred up his own Northern clansmen, and a bloody battle between the two factions resulted in

victory for Columba and the slaughter of many of his enemies. A synod of the Irish Church excommunicated him as a man of blood. His confessor, or "soul-friend," as he called him, counselled submission and repentance. Impelled by remorse for his unworthy conduct, and a desire to atone for it by amendment of life, he resolved to begin his ministry afresh in foreign parts. With twelve chosen companions, Columba bade farewell to his beloved Erin, and, embarking in an open boat, the exile kept on his course until he was out of sight of Ireland, and landed, on the memorable evening of Whit-Monday, 563, at the island called Hü, now known as Iona.

Apart from this characteristic story of the times and the people, there seem to have been weighty and worthy reasons why this typical Irishman of his day should have sought a missionary field in "Alban," now known as "Scotland." For some years past there had been going on an emigration of his countrymen from the older Scotia—from the North coast of Ireland to the West coast of a new Scotland. Here the emigrants from Antrim, called then "Dalriada," had founded a new home called Dalriada also, after the old. It was this colony of nominally Christian people whose King Conal at the time of Columba's coming was his kinsman, and who probably gave him the island of Iona. There was also a special reason at this time why the ardent Irishman should come to the aid of his kinsfolk across the water. They were just now in imminent danger of extinction from their ferocious pagan

neighbors, the Picts, who under their "most powerful king," Brude, had recently defeated them in battle. Such then were the historical conditions—political and religious—when "the man and the hour arrived"—when the first great missionary of the Irish race became the noble Apostle of Scotland—the helper of his Christian kinsmen in their feeble colony here, and the converter of their enemies, the heathen Picts. Iona, at the coming of Columba, was a forlorn and insignificant island, about three miles long and one wide, off the coast of the large island of Mull on the west coast of Scotland. Here for two years he was fully occupied with establishing a secure and self-supporting settlement — building rude houses of wattle and clay and of oak-boards, a church, a refectory, cells for the monks and their Abbot, and a hospitium for their guests. They had to bring the ground, also, under cultivation for their food—ploughing, sowing, reaping, gathering the grain into their barns, grinding it in their mills, turning it into bread in their ovens. They had to gather some live stock, too, sheep and cattle and cows. Fortunately, there were fish enough at hand for feasts as well as fasts. All the while the daily round of monastic worship and study and discipline must be maintained. This was no place for idle meditation, or self-indulgent dreams. Worship and work went ever hand in hand. Columba was not only fitting his monks for missionaries of the Gospel, but he would give his neighbors here a picture and a model of a genuine Christian community, indus-

trial, social, educational, as well as ecclesiastical—with a daily round of work, manual, intellectual, and spiritual. During this time of settlement and organization the colony had grown into some two hundred persons. And then their sagacious leader was ready for the next step, and for a forward movement. He would transform this Christian brotherhood into a centre of constant effort, and turn his monks into marching missionary regiments for bold and well-planned attacks upon the strongholds of the heathen. Already they had made many converts among the peasants of Mull and the main land. But now the courageous Kelt would follow the example of Patrick in Ireland, and reach out for Royalty, for the Pictish King Brude, who could carry his people with him when converted to Christ. Attended by two Pictish converts and interpreters and by picked men of his monks, Columba set forth upon his first great missionary campaign, following the series of Loughs which now constitute the Caledonian Canal and divide Scotland into two parts. In this audacious expedition he penetrated to the very citadel of pagan power as far as Inverness on the east coast, to bid Brude the hostile King of the Picts, open his bolted gates and stubborn heart to the entrance of the Gospel of peace. By gaining such a convert, what an atonement for his part in the bloody feud of the Irish clans was Columba's successful work of healing the feud between the Christian Scot and the Pagan Pict! How much nobler his warfare for Christ in Scotland than that

which he had waged in his native land! Beginning with his triumph over the heathen magic of Broichan, the Druid chieftain, and the baptism of King Brude, Columba carried on in person for ten years his work of converting the Highland heathen; and then, leaving his disciples to follow it up, he withdrew to his Island-Monastery to make it the mightiest agency for Christ in the British Isles. Under his own able administration and that of his well-trained successors, Iona's evangelizing influence spread all over Scotland; and then, a generation after Columba's death, joined forces with Augustine's Roman monks in the conversion of the Northumbrian English. For thirty-four years Columba carried on in person his wondrous work, and of his mission as a peace-maker, the late Principal Story of Glasgow University, says: "The missions of Columba laid the first foundation of inter-tribal peace throughout Northern Britain, and so paved the way for the consolidation of the Picts, Scots, Britons and Saxons into one nation. It is not an exaggeration to say that not only the Scottish Church but the Scottish state recognizes its founder in Columba."

Indeed the Kingdom of Scotland properly began with that first colony of Irish in their new home of Dalriada, now Argyll, whose King was Conal at the coming of Columba. It was to aid these fellow-countrymen, partly at least, that Columba had settled at Iona, nor did he ever cease to befriend them during all his other labors. He secured them from the hostile attacks of King Brude and the

Picts. He took an active part, too, in their internal government. When one of their kings died, and the legitimate successor was incompetent, the saint took the bold step of consecrating a better man named Aidan to the throne. It is interesting to remember the tradition that he was consecrated upon the "Stone of Fate," used for long in the consecration of Scottish kings, later removed to Scone and afterwards to Westminster Abbey, where it still survives in the coronation chair of English kings.

Another notable case in which Columba came to the help of his fellow-countrymen of Dalriada, was when he accompanied their King in 575 to a great Synod of the Irish chieftains at Drumceatt in Ireland, and "gained Home Rule for Scottish Dalriada," by procuring for them exemption from the payment of a burdensome tribute to the High King of Ireland at Tara. It is gratifying to know that this was not the only occasion in which the exiled Columba visited his native land. He frequently exchanged visits with his former colleagues there, and was greatly beloved both by them and by the Irish people generally. His old monasteries there and numerous offshoots were glad to remain subject to the far-famed Abbot of Iona. At length, having rounded out a serene old age, early Sunday morning, June 9th, 597,—the same year that St. Augustine began his mission in England,—St. Columba closed his eventful career in Scotland—"the noblest missionary career," says Bright, "ever accom-

plished in Britain." A week before his death the first royal convert to Christ of the English race, Ethelbert, King of Kent, was baptized at Canterbury. Among the closing scenes of St. Columba's last day on earth are these touching stories drawn from Adamnan's narrative by Prof. Stokes:—"He visited his monks at their labors in the field, and blessed them. He visited the granary, and saw that the provisions were sufficient till the next harvest. Here Adamnan tells one of the most touching stories, illustrating Columba's keen poetic sympathy with nature and with animals (worthy of St. Francis). Half-way between the granary and the storehouse is a spot still marked by one of the ancient crosses of Iona called Maclean's Cross. There Columba met the white horse which had been employed to carry milk from the dairy to the monastery. The horse came and put his head on his master's shoulder, as if to take leave of him. The eyes of the faithful animal seemed bathed with tears. His attendant would have sent the horse away, but Columba forbade him. 'The horse loves me,' he said, 'leave him with me; let him weep for my departure. The Creator has revealed to this poor beast what He has hidden from thee a reasonable man.' Upon which, caressing the faithful brute, he gave him a last blessing.

After this he went to his cell, and worked at the transcription of a Psalter. When he came to Psalm XXXIV. 10, *'Inquirentes autem Dominum non deficient omni bono'*—they that seek the Lord shall

want no manner of thing that is good—'I must stop here,' he said. 'Baithene will finish the rest.' (Baithene was his kinsman and successor.) He then sent a last message to his followers enjoining peace and charity. It was now Saturday night, June 8th, 597. As soon as the midnight bell rang for the Matins of Sunday, he rose from his stone couch, ran to the church before the other monks, and there was found by his attendant prostrate before the altar. Columba opened his eyes once, turned them upon his brethen with a look full of serene and radiant joy, raised his right hand in an effort to bless them, and so passed away with a face calm and sweet, like that of a man who in his sleep has seen a vision of heaven."

And so the dove-like spirit of St. Columba took its flight to God. Of his dear Iona its founder said the day before his death, as he lifted up his hands and blessed the monastic buildings, "To this place, little and poor tho' it be, there shall come great honor, not only from Scottish kings and people, but from barbarous and foreign nations, and from the saints of other churches also." Standing on that illustrious island, Dr. Samuel Johnson declares, "that man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not be enforced upon the Plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona." As our own American Church poet Rev. William Croswell has it,

"The pilgrim at Iona's shrine
Forgets his journey's toil,
As faith rekindles in his breast
On that inspiring soil."

We will conclude this lecture with a parting glimpse at the *Old British Church proper*, with which we began. During the period of more than a century and a half, from the begining of Patrick's career in Ireland to the close of Columba's in Scotland, which was also contemporaneous with the beginning of Augustine's in what had become England—while the conversion of the Irish and the Scotch had been going on apace, the Anglo-Saxon tribes had gradually overrun the greater part of old Britain, and well-nigh wiped out British Christianity from the regions which the conquerors occupied. While the light of the Gospel was spreading steadily among the two Scottish peoples, a thick darkness of heathenism was settling down upon the British Church. The worship of Woden and Thor and other Teutonic gods was supplanting the religion of Christ in England. The population, the laws, the language, and the very names of the days of the week were changed. The churches and monasteries, the homes and the cities of the Christians were ruthlessly destroyed. Some fled over sea to Gaul and settled down in Armorica, to which they gave the name of Brittany. The rest who survived the Saxon slaughter took refuge chiefly in the mountains of Wales and the fastnesses of Cornwall and Devon. Gildas, the only contemporary British historian of the latter part of this period, writing about the middle of the sixth century, gives a frightful picture of the devastation wrought by the invaders, crying, with the captive psalmist, "O God, the

heathen have come into Thine inheritance; Thy holy temple have they defiled." But the worst part of his story is his woeful description of the moral and religious corruption in the small remnant of the British Church itself. His picture indeed, in all its dreadful details, is so appalling as to compel careful historians to conclude that it is overdrawn. For there are not wanting evidences of a continuous spiritual and ecclesiastical life in the Welsh Church. In 410, when the final withdrawal of the Romans occurred, we find only one Episcopal See in Wales, Caerleon-on-Usk. But later, after the influx of the refugees from other parts of Britain, we find as many as six Sees. By a subsequent union of several Sees before the coming of Augustine this number had been reduced to four—the same four which survive to-day, Llandaff, St. David's, St. Asaph's, and Bangor. These are still the survivals of the old British Church, the continuous lineal descendants of the earliest Bishoprics in Britain, with an unbroken historical succession and life. For centuries after Augustine they were independent both of Rome and of Canterbury, and they did not lose their identity when they were finally, but very gradually, after the Norman Conquest, engrafted into and absorbed by the *English* Church.

II

The Coming of Augustine and the Roman Mission to the English

Having taken a preliminary glimpse of the land and of the peoples and the churches which had occupied Great Britain and Ireland before the settlement of the Anglo-Saxons here, and between the time of their coming and the coming of St. Augustine's mission to them,—we take up now the often told story of the conversion of the heathen English to Christianity and the founding of the First Church of the English race.

Near the end of the sixth century—in the year that St. Columba died—another saint and hero, from a more potent seat than Patrick's Primatial See of Armagh or Columba's lonely Iona, began to play a prominent part in the re-conquest of Britain from pagan idolatry. The best part of Britain had now become "Engle-land," the home of the Teutonic tribes who had settled down here with their families to stay, and who, after a century and a half of conquest, formed a group of petty kingdoms commonly called "The Saxon Heptarchy." The work of converting these savages to Christ was a formidable task, but the work was well begun at least by the foremost man of Western Christendom, Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome—as great in personal character as

in official position. He was a man of noble birth and of great wealth, who, after holding the highest civil office then in Rome, that of imperial Prefect, had early renounced the world by becoming a monk and devoting himself and his wealth to the cause of God and of humanity. After founding six monasteries in Sicily, he established a seventh on the Coelian hill in Rome. Here he gradually rose from the humblest place therein to be its abbot. For about six years he was an Envoy of the Roman See to the capital of the Empire at Constantinople. By his self-sacrificing services to his native city in times of direst adversity, when there were flood and famines and pestilence within the walls and the Lombards raging and ravaging without, Gregory had really become the "Father of his country" before he became the Father of the English Church. "The Monastery of St. Andrew's on Mt. Coelius founded by Gregory," says the Count de Montalembert, "is the one which now bears the name of St. Gregory, and is known to all who have visited Rome. This incomparable city contains few spots more attractive and more worthy of eternal remembrances. . . . On the façade of the Church an inscription records that thence set out the first Apostles of the Anglo-Saxons, and preserves their names."

The situation in England at this time was peculiarly favorable to the reception of the mission sent thither by Gregory. Ethelbert, great-grandson of Hengist, and now King of Kent, the principal kingdom of the Heptarchy, had opened the way to the entrance of God's Word that giveth light by marry-

ing a Christian woman of the kindred Frankish race in Gaul. Bertha, daughter of Charibert King of Paris, and great-granddaughter of Clovis and Clotilda, had brought with her to her husband's court a Christian, Bishop Liudhard, as her confessor and chaplain. He does not seem to have accomplished anything towards Christianizing the Jutes here, although his presence and influence had doubtless favorably disposed Ethelbert towards the religion of his queen. Liudhard was permitted to restore the ancient Romano-British Church of St. Martin at Canterbury. He seems to have officiated there for years, but probably died before the coming of St. Augustine. Gregory's first contact with the English, in the person of the slave-boys at Rome, cannot be told too often, nor told better than in the familiar story of Bede: "It is reported that some merchants, having just arrived at Rome on a certain day, exposed many things for sale in the market-place, and abundance of people resorted thither to buy; Gregory himself went with the rest, and, among other things, some boys were set to sale, their bodies white, their countenances beautiful, and their hair very fine. Having viewed them, he asked from what country or nation they were brought? and was told, from the island of Britain, whose inhabitants were of such personal appearance. He again inquired whether those islanders were Christians or still involved in the errors of paganism? and was informed that they were pagans. Then fetching a deep sigh from the bottom of his heart, "alas! What pity," said he, "that the author of darkness

is possessed of men of such fair countenances." He therefore asked again, what was the name of that nation? and was answered that they were called Angles. "Right," said he, "for they have an angelic face, and it becomes such to be co-heirs with the angels in heaven. What is the name," proceeded he, "of the province from which they are brought?" It was replied, that the name of that province was Deira. "Truly are they De ira," said he, "withdrawn from wrath, and called to the mercy of Christ. How is the King of that province called?" They told him his name was Ælla: and here, alluding to the name, said, "Allelulia, the praise of God the Creator must be sung in these parts." Gregory must have been a considerable punster, according to this story, and have found relief to his overburdened heart, like Mr. Lincoln, in frequent flashes of homely wit. He was so profoundly impressed by this episode that he eagerly offered himself as an evangelist to the fallen angels of Anglia, and received the pope's reluctant consent. He had traveled three days journey on his way to England, when he was recalled by a popular uprising and protest against his leaving Rome in her own extremity. But a few years afterward, by a similar popular movement, by the united voice of senate and clergy and people, Gregory was forcibly promoted from the position of deacon and abbot to that of Supreme Pontiff. He found the Church which he was now set to rule threatened with shipwreck at its very centre. He himself compared it to "an old and violently shattered ship which admitted the water

on all sides, its timbers rotten, shaken by daily storms." But that ship was not destined to sink when it carried this new spiritual Cæsar as its captain. Nor, amid his overwhelming cares, did he forget his old desire for a better conquest of Britain than that of Cæsar. It was, doubtless, his loving recollection of the angel-faced lads which prompted him to write to the steward of his estates in Gaul, Candidius, to spend part of the income in purchasing English boys that they might receive a Christian education, and which made him censure the Gallican bishops for their neglect of the English in this matter. We are told that he often talked with his monks of his hopes for the conversion of the English, and he wrote about this time to his dear friend Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria, invoking his prayers. In a delightful little book by Charles Hole on "Early Missions to and within the British Islands," he says, "The straitened condition of Rome at that period has been spoken of, and ought to be kept in view. . . . If it ever occurred to Gregory that straitness at home was any argument against Foreign Missions, and that he should gather in all the Lombards before taking up the cause of the Anglo-Saxons, he must have discarded the suggestion. He carried on home missions and foreign missions concurrently, and others have acted in the same principle." It is a striking coincidence that, at the very time when Gregory was contemplating a mission to the English, the Keltic missionary Columban began his work among the Gauls, and Columba had been preaching for some years to the pagan

Picts. It is probable that these may have helped to excite the missionary zeal of Gregory; for nothing is more remarkable about him than his wide knowledge of and keen interest in the work of every part of the Church down to the minutest details.

But in the Spring of 596 the Pope took more vigorous measures for the accomplishment of his desire for the winning of the English to Christ. As he could not go in person, he selected a substitute. He chose Augustine, his familiar friend and prior of his own monastery, to head a band of monks and set forth on a mission to the Angles. They became disheartened when they got as far as Provence in Gaul and heard of the ferocious character of the heathen in Britain. "Struck with a sluggish timorousness," as Bede has it, they even sent their leader back to Rome to beg off from such a venture. But Gregory was made of sterner stuff, and would have no turning back. Their leader returned to them more resolute than before and armed with the Pope's appointment as abbot to the monks, and with the right to require a rigid obedience. He brought with him a personal letter from the Pope to the monks with these words, "Let not the toil of the journey, nor the tongues of evil-speaking men, deter you; but with all possible earnestness and zeal perform that which by God's direction you have undertaken, being assured that much labor is followed by an eternal reward."

Next to Bede's History *Gregory's Letters* constitute our chief source of information here. Of his Letters about 838 have been preserved, not very many

of them, however, bearing on this case. The journey through Gaul was also smoothed for these pioneer "Canterbury pilgrims" by Gregory's twelve commendatory letters to bishops and princes along the way. Provided also with Frankish interpreters, in the memorable Spring of 597, the party landed in Kent, at Ebbsfleet on the Isle of Thanet, where Hengist and Horsa had first landed with their hordes for the invasion of Britain. They sent a courteous message to the King, announcing their arrival and their errand. Without committing himself too far Ethelbert accorded them a kindly welcome to his country, and shortly after granted them an audience. Seated with his nobles and thanes, he received the emissaries of the Pontiff, who approached with what dignity and ceremony they could command. They advanced in solemn procession, bearing aloft in front a silver cross and a painted figure of the Christ, singing their Litany and "entreating the Lord for their own salvation and that of those to whom they came," the stately form of St. Augustine, towering like Saul head and shoulders above his fellows, bringing up the rear. The abbot, through his interpreter, preached to the King and his court "The word of life;" to which Ethelbert replied,—"Fair words and promises are these; but seeing they are new and doubtful, I cannot give in to them, and give up what I, with all the English race, have so long observed." He generously promised, however, that the strangers should be treated fairly and hospitably, and allowed to preach their belief to his people. They were assigned a

house in his capital city, "the Burgh of the men of Kent." And so, in stately procession the pilgrims made their entrance into Canterbury, chanting their pious intercession, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, in Thy great mercy, let Thine anger and wrath be turned away from this city and from Thy holy house, for we have sinned. Alleluia." Here they resumed the sacred routine of their monastic life, and at St. Martin's Church they "sang the Psalms, prayed, celebrated mass, preached and baptized." St. Martin's church still stands, rebuilt in the thirteenth century, but probably retaining yet some of the Roman work of Bertha's Church; and the view from it is to a churchman what its former Dean and historian Stanley styles "one of the most inspiring to be found in all the world." Soon the little band of missionaries were cheered by the baptism of Ethelbert himself, in which he was followed by many of his people. It was on Whitsunday in the year of Grace 597 that this Anglo-Saxon King entered into the unity of the Holy Church of Christ. "Since the Baptism of Constantine," says Count de Montalembert, "and, excepting that of Clovis, there has not been any event of greater moment in the annals of Christendom. . . . The Church of Canterbury has possessed unparalleled splendors," he adds, "No Church in the world, after the Church of Rome, has been governed by greater men, or has waged more glorious conflicts. But nothing in her brilliant annals could eclipse the sweet and pure light of that humble beginning."

Encouraged by his success, Augustine, according to

Gregory's directions, crossed over to Gaul, and at Arles, Nov. 16th, 597, was consecrated to be "Archbishop of the English" by Archbishop Virgilius and other Frankish prelates. In 601 the Pope conferred upon Augustine what had come to be a metropolitan insignia, the Pall, which in later times came to have a new and more dangerous meaning and to play a prominent part in Papal history. On the Christmas following Augustine's return to Canterbury he could gladden the heart of the Pontiff by reporting the baptism of over 10,000 converts, "the first fruits of the Anglo-Saxon race to Christ." The King's own palace was assigned to the first Archbishop of Canterbury, and a church built in the days of the Romans was restored and enlarged, and remodelled after St. Peter's at Rome. This became "Christ Church" and Canterbury Cathedral, the Mother-church of English Christianity. The only remains of this original Cathedral is "St. Augustine's Chair," in which so many generations of Archbishops have been enthroned for 1300 years. Another restored British church, which had become paganized, became "St. Pancras." Outside the city walls also rose a new monastery, for which Ethelbert subsequently built a stately abbey-church as a burial place for archbishops and kings — the site of the present St. Augustine's Missionary College. "The charter of this original monastery has been brought to light in our day as the oldest authentic record of the religious and political history of England" (cf. "Rise and Progress of the British Commonwealth" by Sir Francis Palgrave).

St. Augustine, good and true man as he was, was not like St. Gregory a born leader, bold in taking the initiative. Fortunately he leaned hard on his superior, and sought his advices and support as much as possible. We find him about this time sending two of his companions, Laurentius and Peter, to Rome asking re-enforcements for his work, and the counsel of his chief for the administration of his new Metropolitan See. His letters to the Pope reveal a rather narrow mind and a lack of originality in striking contrast to the broad and statesmanlike policy of Gregory in reply to the nine questions proposed by Augustine. "They are a curious collection," says Dr. Alfred Plummer. "With regard to some of them, we wonder how any reasonable Christian, with a moderate knowledge of Scripture, could be in any doubt. With regard to others, our wonder is given to Gregory's admirable answers. Augustine asks whether two brothers can marry two sisters; and Gregory says, "Of course they may." Augustine asks whether men may marry their stepmothers; and Gregory says, "Of course they may not." Surely, Augustine might have spared the Pope the trouble of answering such questions as these."

We can only notice some of the most serious points in this correspondence. Augustine asks for direction about the different *Liturgies* then in use in Rome and Gaul and elsewhere. The Pope advises him not to alhere too rigidly even to the Roman Liturgy which Gregory himself had recently revised, but to adopt whatever he found best in the Gallican or other use,—

"My pleasure is, that you should with great care select whatever you think will best please Almighty God, wherever you find it, whether in the Church of Rome or in the Church of Gaul, or in any other Church. And then plant firmly in the Church of the English that which you have collected from many Churches, depositing it in the minds of the English as their custom or use."

It was evidently the purpose of the Pontiff to establish the Roman mission in England, as soon as possible, into a national and autonomous branch of the one Catholic Church, with the liberty to determine its own rites and ceremonies and administer its own affairs. In his letter to Augustine, Gregory speaks of "The Roman Church," of "The Church of Gaul," and of "the new Church—The Church of the English"—exactly what is styled in Magna Charter and in the great act of supremacy under Henry VIII, "the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia." As the late Bishop of Bristol, Dr. Browne, who has made this subject the study of his life, declares, "He once mentions the Roman Church, when a question of Augustine forces him to do so; but he only mentions it then side by side with others,—"the Roman Church," he says, "the Gallican Church," and any other Church." And he mentions it only to say expressly that the English Church was not to be bound to follow it even in the most solemn act of the Church, the celebration of Masses." ("Augustine and His Companions.") It ought to be added that not once, in all the Letters of Gregory preserved by Bede, does he

say anything about the English Church being subject to the Roman Church or to the Pope, or claim to be the successor of St. Peter.

On one important point, however, Gregory's usual wisdom and tact and breadth of view seem to have failed him. For he gave Augustine a piece of advice which proved a stumbling-block to the Pope's otherwise statesman-like policy, which went far to prevent a wooden man like Augustine from doing a much greater work in England. Augustine had asked this question, "How are we to deal with the bishops of the provinces of Gaul and the British Isles?" The Pope had replied, "From the ancient times of my predecessors, the bishop of Arles has received the pallium; we must by no means deprive him of the authority he has received; we give you no authority among Gallican bishops. *All the bishops of the British Isles we commit to you,* my brother, that those who are unlearned may be taught, the weak may be strengthened by persuasions, the perverse corrected by *authority.*"

Gregory made a blunder here, and exceeded his own authority and Augustine's too, in conferring upon the latter as Archbishop and Metropolitan of the new English Church a jurisdiction over the British bishops of a very old church, which neither of them possessed, and which the bishops in Wales would be sure to resent. According to the 8th Canon of the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, "None of the bishops shall take possession of a province that was not from the first and originally under his hand or that of his pre-

decessors.'' Gregory was more than justified in sending missionaries to convert a new and heathen people in an old land, from which both the Church and State of earlier times had withdrawn. But he had no right to subject unasked the British bishops outside the Anglo-Saxon dominions to the new See of Canterbury. Even if he had the right, the scheme was foredoomed to failure. If not a crime, it was certainly a blunder,—and Gregory was not given to blundering. Doubtless, his information about the Church in Britain, in its then isolated condition, was meagre enough and Augustine's was more so; but, while he did not undertake to play the Pope in the later sense of that word, yet already we can see the thin edge of the wedge of the inherent universal supremacy of the Roman See beginning to obtrude itself. As Canon Bright has it, ''Vehement as were Gregory's protests against the adoption by the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the application to himself, of the title of 'Universal Bishop,' he always acted on that theory respecting his own office, which had been gradually developing itself from the early part of the fifth century, and was to develop itself yet more in aftertimes, pope after pope never retracting, but adopting and uniformly improving upon the pretentions of their predecessors.'' (Early English Church History.'')

In other respects the general scheme of organization prescribed by Gregory for Augustine to follow was sagacious and far-sighted, but I cannot follow it further. After all, the Papacy, or something like it, as the best Protestant historians admit, seems to

have been inevitable to meet the demands of the Middle Ages for a powerful centralized government of the Church to confront the chaos and disintegration of the Roman Empire and the swarming of the Germanic barbarians. As popes go, Gregory was certainly one of the best, and beats Henry VIII out of sight for Founder of the English Church. Henry was more than 900 years too late for that job, and certainly had no intention of starting a *new* Church. It has been well said, "We must not confound Rome the enlightener of the nations in the sixth century with Rome, the corrupter of the nations in the sixteenth century."

Through the instrumentality of Ethelbert arrangements were made for a meeting between Augustine and the British bishops of Wales in the year 602 or 603 at a place long after known as "Augustine's Oak"—a location still in dispute. "Augustine," according to Bede, whom we follow closely, "began to try to persuade them by brotherly admonitions to hold Catholic peace with himself and to undertake in conjunction with him the work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen for the Lord's sake." Of course there was room for considerable difference of opinion as to what constituted "Catholic peace." On this crux Bede is not explicit. The Britons were told that they did not keep Easter Sunday at the proper time and did several other things which were against the unity of the Church—evidently matters of little importance. "After a long disputation, they did not comply with the entreaties, exhortations or rebukes

of Augustine and his companions, but preferred their own traditions—they could not depart from their ancient customs without the consent and leave of their people," even when Augustine is said to have clinched his arguments by giving sight to a blind man after the British had attempted the miracle and failed. They proposed therefore a second meeting at which more of their number would be present. To this second conference "there came seven bishops of the Britons, and many most learned men, particularly from their most noble monastery" at Bangor Iscoed near Chester. Unfortunately Augustine received this august body sitting in his chair, which seemed discourteous and too archi-episcopal to promise a successful issue. But, spite of his supposed haughty bearing, his terms were really not illiberal, as Bede reports them. "He said to them, 'You act in many particulars contrary to our custom, or rather the custom of the universal Church, and yet, if you will comply with me in these three points: viz., to keep Easter at due time; to administer Baptism by which we are born again to God according to the custom of the holy Roman Apostolic Church; and jointly with us to preach the Word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all the other things you do, though contrary to our customs.' They answered that they would do none of these things, nor receive him as their archbishop; for they alleged among themselves that if he would not rise up to us, how much more will he condemn us as of no worth if we shall begin to be under his subjection?" There must have

been more in this interview than appears on the surface. The two insuperable hindrances to union on the part of the Britons were doubtless race-hatred of the Anglo-Saxons, who for 150 years had been their cruel conquerors, and submission to the authority of an unknown archbishop of the English—which meant to them the submission of seven bishops of an old beloved church to this one solitary bishop of a brand-new church just started. As in all quarrels there were faults no doubt on both sides, and the breach which it took more than five centuries to heal, was disastrous to both parties, especially to the British Christians, whose help was sorely needed in the conversion of the English heathen and who contributed nothing at all to that good and glorious work. The Scotch-Irish, who shared their traditions to the full, but not their persecutions, and who kept aloof for a time, did at a later day render heroic and most successful service in evangelizing the Anglo-Saxons and in the making of the English Church. The conference for "Catholic Peace" at Augustine's Oak ended in sectarian and schismatic strife and bitterness. This "Synod of the Oak" might well have been called the "Synod of the Oaks," for there was tough and unyielding material in both parties. Bede himself, whose sympathy was strongly with the Roman Mission, but who was broad-minded enough to love and revere the holy men of the Scottish Church, speaks very harshly of the British Church, and closes his account of the conference with their bishops with these stinging words: "To them the man of God,

Augustine, is said, in a threatening manner to have foretold that in case they would not join in unity with their brethren, they should be warred upon by their enemies, and, if they would not preach the way of life to the English nation, they should at their hands undergo the vengeance of death. All which, through the dispensation of the Divine judgment, fell out exactly as he had predicted.'' Nine years or more, after Augustine's death, there was a terrible massacre of these monks of Bangor Iscoed by order of Ethelfrid the pagan Anglican King.

For centuries the British Church continued distinct and independent alike of Rome and of Canterbury, preserving their peculiarities of race and language and ecclesiastical usage, along with their Catholic faith and polity—having done much for the evangelizing of their Irish and Scotch kindred, who in turn did vastly more for the conversion of England and of Continental Europe. Ultimately, when the Britons of Wales and Cornwall were conquered by the English, when their chiefs became at last subject to the English Government under the Normans, their bishops also submitted to the Primate of the English Church. It was in this slow and gradual way—mainly from the tenth to the thirteenth century—that the earliest Church of old Britain was absorbed by and incorporated with the Anglo-Norman Church, so that their history becomes an interesting part of the history of the Church of England.

Failing utterly to secure any additional laborers for his vast missionary field from the Welsh bishops,

Augustine had to content himself with the small reinforcement which Gregory had recently sent him, including the priests Mellitus, Justus and Paulinus. He consecrated Justus as first bishop of a new See in Kent at Rochester. Outside of Kent he was only able through Ethelbert's influence over his nephew, Sabert, King of the East Anglicans, to revive the old British See of Roman days at London. Here he established Mellitus for a very short-lived Episcopate. For each of these Ethelbert made liberal contributions, and St. Paul's Cathedral in London still owns an estate in Essex from the King of Kent's donation.

Shortly before Augustine's death, he consecrated one of his original companions, Laurentius, as his own successor at Canterbury (which was contrary to the Nicene Canons) "in fear," says Bede, "lest the unsettled Church might totter and fall if left destitute of a bishop for even an hour." In the year 604, May 26th, after a career in England of only seven years, having nobly laid the sure foundation of a work destined to survive all the changes and chances of English history, the first archbishop of Canterbury rested from his labors. "Whatever his shortcomings," says the late Canon Bright of Oxford, "Augustine of Canterbury was a good man, a devout and laborious Christian worker, who could and did face threatening difficulties and accept serious risks in loyalty to a sacred cause; a missionary whose daily conduct was a recommendation of his preaching, who could impress and convince men of various classes in a Teutonic people that had little in common with his

Italian antecedents; who, as archbishop, did his duty, as he read it, with all his might, if not without mistakes or failures, such as we may be tempted to judge more harshly than they merit; who, acting thus, accomplished more than appears at first sight, in that he originated so much of the work that was to make England Christian." ("Early English Church History.")

Gregory the Great died shortly before Augustine, March 12th, 604. English and American churchmen have good reason to be proud of so prominent a personage for the Founder of their Church, and no reason to be ashamed of the lesser man whom the Master-builder sent to lay the corner-stone.

And yet how small the beginnings of so big an enterprise, at the time of their death, and how unpromising the outlook for their immediate followers. Neither of these daring leaders lived to see much more than the laying of a sure foundation. Gregory the Great might have said, with a greater than he, St. Paul himself, one of the two Founders of his own Church at Rome, "I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon." Augustine's immediate successors must have found a situation well-nigh hopeless. Under Augustine and his associates Christianity was planted in Kent and in Essex, but was soon violently uprooted in the latter, and barely escaped the same fate in the former. After his death a similar work was successfully started by Paulinus in Northumbria, which was well-nigh wrecked when that tough old pagan, Penda of Mercia, upset the

dynasty which had accepted Christianity. Other missionaries from various quarters, at different times, converted the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy. And these converts were organized into one English Church on the foundation and under the system inaugurated by Augustine, and completed by his stronger successor and far greater organizer, Archbishop Theodore, of whom we shall hear later.

Lawrence, the second Archbishop of Canterbury, seems to have been a more conciliatory man than his predecessor, but had no better success in his efforts to heal the breach with the Keltic Christians. He tried to accomplish with the Irish what had failed with the British bishops, and addressed a gracious letter to "our most dear brothers, the lords, bishops and abbots, through all Scotia" (i. e. Ireland). He expressed his deep pain that Dagan, an Irish bishop, who had lately visited Canterbury, had declined to eat with the Roman missionaries, or even in the same house, and his own strong desire and hope of better things from the rest of his Irish brothers." But these brothers were not yet ready to fall on the neck of those whom they hardly counted half-brothers. With no better results he had a similar correspondence with his British cousins, who did not even answer his letter.

King Ethelbert died in 616, after a reign of fifty-six years. He should be remembered, not only as the first Christian King of the English race, but also as the "author of the earliest extant set of written Laws which embody the old English customs; and

the first place in these is given to the affairs of the Church." "Among other benefits," says Bede, "which he conferred upon the nation, by the advice of wise persons (the Witan), he introduced judicial decrees after the Roman model; which, being written in English, are still kept and observed by them. Among which he in the first place, set down what satisfaction should be given by those who should steal anything belonging to the *Church,* the bishop, or the other clergy, resolving to give protection to those whose doctrines he had embraced." These "Laws of Ethelbert," still surviving textually, have been called "the earliest specimen of jurisprudence in a barbarous tongue."

After Ethelbert's death Archbishop Lawrence had all he could do to hold his own in Kent. Eadbald, the unworthy son and successor of Ethelbert, took to himself for second wife the young widow of his father, and was ready to repudiate a religion which interfered with this popular old Teutonic practice. It was with great difficulty that he was brought to a better mind, but most of his people relapsed into their original heathenism and did not have far to go. In Essex, especially London, the repudiation of Christianity and of its Bishop Mellitus was complete after that prelate refused to give the sacramental bread to those unbaptized barbarians, the two sons of the late King Sabert. Essex became too hot to hold the Bishop of London, and he beat a hasty retreat from that bad town. Justus of Rochester joined him in his flight, and the two bishops did not feel safe until they

had put the English channel behind them and landed in Gaul. Nothing short of one of Bede's timely miracles stopped the archbishop himself from sharing the voyage of his brothers of London and Rochester. The miracle which kept Laurentius from putting to sea was an apparition of St. Peter to him the night before, who rebuked him for his cowardice, and scourged him soundly "with apostolic blows and knocks." The same miracle was made to do double duty by frightening King Eadbald into dropping his unlawful wife and returning to the bosom of the Church. Justus was brought back to his abandoned flock by the combined efforts of Archbishop and King. But the Londoners declined Mellitus with thanks, and continued stubborn in their heathenism for another forty years. Mellitus and Justus each in turn succeeded Laurentius as Archbishop of Canterbury. In fact, when Justus's turn came, he was the only bishop of the Roman mission left in England. He had only to appoint himself archbishop, and supply any irregularities by receiving the Pope's pall and permission to consecrate singly one Romanus for the vacant See at Rochester.

And now the scene shifts from Canterbury far northward, to the land, at last, from which had come Gregory's angelic boys of Deira. The only other offshoot from the sickly ecclesiastical plant in Kent was a short-lived one that sprang into sudden and rapid growth in the kingdom of Northumbria, now become what Kent had once been, the most powerful kingdom of the Heptarchy. Northumbria was the name given

to the vast region north of the river Humber up to the firth of Forth. It was divided into two provinces, Deira being the southern, with its capital at York, and corresponding somewhat to the present Yorkshire. The northern province was called Bernicia, with its capital at Bamborough, including the counties of Durham, Northumberland and Lothians. "Northumbria," says the Count de Montalembert, "was not merely the largest kingdom of the Saxon Heptarchy,—it is also that whose *history* is the most animated, dramatic and varied. This is naturally explained by the fact that it is the birthplace of the venerable Bede. This great and honest historian was born and always lived in Northumbria. Hence in his interesting narratives a natural prominence is given to the men and affairs of his native region along with an exact and detailed reproduction of the local traditions and personal recollections which he treasured up and reported with such scrupulous care." ("The Monks of the West.")

It is a notable fact that the most successful way of converting the Anglo-Saxon Kings, who "would not obey the Word," was through "the godly conversion of their wives." This became the regular use of the Saxon Church for royalty at least—almost the "Established Religion" of the English Kings. Northumbria, Mercia and Sussex followed the precedent established by Ethelbert at Canterbury. In each alike a Christian princess, with the aid of her chaplain, won over to her own faith her heathen husband—a

good old English custom which crops up every once in a while throughout the Anglo-Saxon race.

The mission of the Roman Paulinus, followed by the far more fruitful mission of the Scotch-Irish Aidan, to Northumbria (of which I shall speak in my next Lecture) were the most promising events of which we have heard yet in the making of the English Church—the most advanced steps toward the Conversion of the English. While the extensive work of Paulinus had little permanent result, it opened the way for greater things later. The story of these two wonderful missions is full of interest and instruction.

Edwin, whose name has been perpetuated in the city of Edinburg, was now King of Northumbria and Bretwalda, or Lord of Britain. He was the son of that Ælla, from whose dominions had come the slave boys that touched the heart of Gregory, and in whose kingdom he would have "Alleluia" sung. His prayer was about to be realized at last. Edwin asked for the hand of Ethelburga, daughter of Ethelbert of Kent, and sister of Eadbald then reigning. The royal consent to his sister's marriage was given on condition that she should be allowed the free exercise of the Christian religion and the service of a chaplain at the pagan court. The terms were accepted, and Edwin expressed his own willingness to adopt the faith of his bride if, in the opinion of his wise men, it was found a better religion. Paulinus was consecrated bishop in the summer of 625, and went with the new queen to her northern home, to be to her what Bishop Liudhard had been to her mother Bertha in then

pagan Kent. Edwin, like Ethelbert, was in no particular hurry to change his religion. But on Easter Eve, 626, the King was wounded and nearly slain by an assassin sent by the King of Wessex, and that same "most holy night of the Lord's Passion," the queen gave birth to a daugher. Paulinus seized this opportunity to press his message home to the King's heart. The father consented that the babe Eanfleda should be baptized in her mother's faith, and promised to become a Christian himself should he triumph over his enemy in the war at hand. On his return home victorious, he agreed to consult the Witan, or wise men of his kingdom, and summoned them to Goodmanham near York. Then and there he asked his counsellors what they thought of the proposed change of religion. Bede has preserved two of the opinions expressed which make a striking contrast. The chief priest named Coifi gave an answer which revealed a selfish and utilitarian old heathen of the deepest dye. "The old worship," said he, "seems to me worth nothing: no man has practiced it more than I, and yet many fare better and have more favor at your hand. If the gods had any power, they would rather help *me,* who have served them more than others. Let us then see what this new lore is good for; if it is better than the old, let us straightway follow it."—Very different was the touching and beautiful answer of another thane, who showed that God had not left himself without witness in one poetic soul:

"I will tell you, O King, what methinks man's life

is like, Sometimes, when your hall is lit up for supper on a wild winter's evening and warmed by a fire, in the midst a sparrow flies in by one door, takes shelter for a moment in the warmth, and then flies out again by another door, and is lost in the stormy darkness. No one in the hall sees the bird before it enters, nor after it has gone forth; it is only seen while it hovers near the fire. So it is, I ween, with this brief span of our life in this world; what has gone before it, what will come after it,—of this we know nothing. If the strange teacher can tell us, by all means let him be heard."

Wordsworth has embodied this parable in one of his beautiful "Ecclesiastical Sonnets":—

"Man's life is like a sparrow, mighty King!
That—while at banquet with your chiefs you sit
Housed near a blazing fire—is seen to flit
Safe from the wintry tempest. Fluttering,—
Here did it enter; there on hasty wing,
Flies out, and passes on from cold to cold;
But whence it came, we know not, nor behold
Whither it goes. Even such, that transient Thing,
The human Soul; not utterly unknown
While in the Body lodged, her warm abode;
But from what world she came, what woe or weal
On her departure waits, no tongue hath shown:
This mystery if the Stranger can reveal,
His be a welcome cordially bestowed."

Bede has not recorded the Sermon of Paulinus on this momentous occasion, but he has drawn a very vivid picture of the preacher and of the impression

which he made. As the spokesman for Christ seized this golden opportunity of presenting to his eager audience the Christian answer to the "whence?" and the "whither?" of man's brief life on earth,—as the preacher stood forth there at Goodmanham, "tall, with a slight stoop, black hair, a thin face, an aquiline nose, an aspect at once venerable and awe-striking,"—to proclaim the Gospel of eternal life, it must have been an impressive scene. Even Coifi was lifted for the while out of his sordid selfishness, and, we are told, "saw the truth shining out clearly in this new teaching." The King no longer halted between two opinions, and to his demand as to who should be the first to destroy the altars of a discarded religion. "That will I do," cried Coifi. Calling for horse and arms, the excited priest rode straight for the heathen temple nearby, hurled his spear at it, and bade his followers set fire to it. The Nation now by its Witenagemot accepted the better religion of their King. Edwin erected at once a wooden chapel at York where now stands the stately and splendid Minster, and on Easter Eve, 627, he was baptized in the spring still preserved in the crypt of the Cathedral. This was the birthday of the Northumbrian Church. Among the nobility baptized then with their sovereign was his great niece, the future illustrious St. Hilda of Whitby Abbey. Paulinus was established at York as its bishop, and the King began to build a larger and more august church of stone enclosing the little wooden structure. From this centre far and wide through the vast realm of King Edwin, from Edinburgh to the

Humber, the bishop traveled on foot, with the good James as his deacon, preaching, catechising, baptizing his converts in large numbers and laying a foundation on which those who came after him were to build up a great and glorious church. His journeys extended as far as to Lincoln, where soon arose a stone church of noble workmanship not far from that "sovereign hill" on which stands Lincoln Cathedral. In this first church, as Bishop of York and the only bishop then surviving in England, Paulinus consecrated Honorius as the fifth Archbishop of Canterbury.

But an appalling calamity fell upon the kingdom and Church of Northumbria in the year 633, after six years of arduous pioneer work by Paulinus. The rising and able King of Mercia in the midlands of England, Penda, well named "the Strenuous," the uncompromising foe of Christianity and champion of the old religion, had formed an alliance with Cadwallon of Gwynedd, the British and Christian King of North Wales. He had long thirsted to avenge the slaughter of his people under an earlier Northumbrian ruler Ethelfrid, who had massacred the 1200 monks of Bangor Iscoed. This powerful confederacy proved irresistible even to the strongest kingdom of the Heptarchy. At Heathfield, in Yorkshire, Edwin and his son Osfrid were slain in battle, his army was utterly routed and well nigh destroyed. The fury of the conquerors knew no bounds, and Cadwallon exceeded even the relentless Penda in his cruel slaughter of the hated English, sparing neither women nor

children, nor his own fellow-Christians among the Angles. The Church of Northumbria was almost wiped out. When the terrible tidings was brought to Paulinus, along with the head of the beloved Edwin, the bishop fled with the widowed Queen Ethelburga and her daughter Eanfled to Kent, just before the Pall of Archbishop of York reached him. Paulinus soon retired to the vacant See of Rochester, where he ended his days. Until the dawning of a better day and the coming of a new missionary force to Northumbria, only the courageous and constant Deacon James seems to have remained there to keep alive the smouldering fires of the Christian faith; which would burst erelong into a flame that would enlighten England afresh, beginning at Northumbria.

The death of the Christian King was almost invariably at this time a death-blow to the Church of his kingdom, and was followed by a relapse into heathenism. Indeed from the beginning of the English Church the King played a most important part in ecclesiastical affairs. But the collapse in Northumbria was the worst blow which had yet fallen upon the Roman missionaries. Forty years after the landing of Augustine, his followers were again shut up within the one kingdom of Kent. A more concentrated effort at the start would probably have produced more permanent results than the attempt to spread out too widely. Depth rather than breadth was what was now needed, and this was what the Scots would shortly supply. But before the coming of the Scots, there were two other zealous missionaries un-

der the Roman dominance, but independent—one of them at least—of the See of Canterbury, who won two other kingdoms of the Heptarchy to Christ. To these we will now turn our attention briefly.

While Paulinus was evangelizing the vast regions of Bernicia and Deira which constituted Northumbria, the conversion of East Angelia (Norfolk and Suffolk) was going on, started from another source. An earlier effort from Canterbury had proved utterly abortive. In the time of the good King Ethelbert, and under his influence, his nephew Redwald, then King of East Anglia, had received Baptism; but in this unusual case his queen was hostile to Christianity and induced her husband to attempt a remarkable compromise between Christianity and paganism by setting up in the same temple an altar to Christ and another to the heathen deities, so that his people, like the ancient Samaritans, might "fear the Lord and serve their own gods." The pioneer of a new movement among the East Anglians was a monk from Burgundy named Felix, who had offered himself for work among the English to Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury and had been assigned to this field as likely to be a promising one. For the then King Sigbert had recently become a Christian during a residence in Gaul, and Felix was warmly welcomed to his court. It seems highly probable that both Felix and Sigbert had received a missionary impulse from the Irish monks in Gaul under Columban. We hear now for the first time of the Gallican Church taking some part in the conversion of the English, for neglecting which they had been censured by

Gregory. Here king and bishop worked together in the cause of Christ, as later in Northumbria, and the King seems to have led the way in person. In 631 Bishop Felix established his See at Dunwich on the Suffolk coast and built a school and a monastery from which he evangelized the East Anglians successfully. He was also re-enforced by an Irish monk of noble birth, Fursey, who brought from Ireland with him two brothers and two other priests. Fursey also was welcomed by Sigbert, and became greatly beloved by his people for his saintly character and effective preaching. This was the first instance of a union of forces between the Keltic and the Roman missionaries, and Sigbert deserves credit for succeeding where Canterbury had failed, especially as we hear of opposition to Fursey from the monks of Canterbury. The schools and monasteries founded under these missionaries soon furnished East Anglia with a native clergy, who made Christianity a permanent power in this kingdom.

A few years later, in 634, there landed in what is now Hampshire the man who did for Wessex what Felix did for East Anglia, and a work of greater importance because of the dominant position which Wessex subsequently attained in England. This man was named Birinus, an Italian, but in no wise connected with the Canterbury monks. He had offered himself to the then Pope, who had the same name as the contemporary Archbishop of Canterbury, Honorius, to "scatter the seeds of the holy faith where no teacher as yet had visited." It is this Pope Honorius I., whose

condemnation for holding the monothelite heresy by the sixth Ecumenical Council and by several later popes stands somewhat in the way of the modern doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Pope Honorius, fortunately, was sounder on the missionary question than on some others, and accepted Birinus and had him consecrated bishop by Asterius, Archbishop of Milan, sojourning for the while in Genoa. Birinus found the West Saxons heathen enough to satisfy him. There was no need to go further to find a denser darkness, so he set to work here in *partibus infidelium*. Birinus began at the top, in the usual style then, and soon won a royal convert in the person of Cynegils, King of Wessex, who was duly baptized under very interesting circumstances. Cynegils had for sponsor no less a personage than the new King of Northumbria, Oswald, who was to do so much to win back his people to Christ, as we shall hear in our next Lecture. This prince had come to woo Cynegil's daughter for his own queen and so he happened to have the pleasure of standing sponser for his future son-in-law. Bishop Birinus, with such backing from royalty, was successful in making many converts among nobles and people. He established his episcopal seat at Dorchester, where the King gave him ample lands. Since Ethelbert, King of Kent, Cynegils was the most important accession to the Church because Wessex afterwards drew to itself the other kingdoms until its King was King of England. From this royal line of Cerdic the Saxon came Alfred the Great and the English succession straight down to Queen Victoria and her son and grandson.

A Supplement to Lecture No. II

The Coming of Augustine and the Roman Mission to the English

Excursus.

At the opening of this course of Lectures I spoke of the English Church as a principal agent in the making of the English Nation, and a most potent influence in the development and history of the English people, their character and institutions. The beginning of English Christianity is of the utmost importance because of the immense and far-reaching results. I have recently found a remarkable statement of this by a brilliant French Roman Catholic writer. "In modern Europe," says the Count de Montalembert, "at a distance of seven leagues from France, within sight of our northern shores, there exists a nation whose empire is more vast than that of Alexander or the Cæsars, and which is at once the fiercest and most powerful, the richest and most manful, the boldest and best regulated in the world. No other nation offers so instructive a study, so original an aspect, or contrasts so remarkable. She is of all the modern races and of all Christian nations the one which has best preserved the three fundamental bases of every society which is worthy of man—the spirit of freedom, the domestic character, and the religious mind. How, then, has this nation in which

a perfectly pagan pride survives and triumphs, and which has nevertheless remained, even in the bosom of error, the most religious of all European nations become Christian? . . . This is surely a question of radical interest among all the great questions of history, and one which takes new importance and interest when it is considered that upon the conversion of England there has depended and still depends, the conversion of so many millions of souls. English Christianity has been the cradle of Christianity in Germany; from the depths of Germany, missionaries formed by the Anglo-Saxons have carried the faith into Scandinavia and among the Slavs; and even at the present time, either by the fruitful expansion of Irish orthodoxy, or by the obstinate zeal of the Protestant propaganda, Christian societies which speak English and live like Englishmen come into being every day throughout North America, in the two Indies, in immense Australia and in the Isles of the Pacific. The Christianity of nearly half the world flows, or will flow, from the fountain which first burst forth upon British soil.

It is possible to answer this fundamental question with the closest precision. No country in the world has received the Christian faith more directly from the Church of Rome, or more exclusively by the ministration of monks. . . . From whence came these monks? From two very distinct sources—from Rome and Ireland. English Christianity was produced by the rivalry, and sometimes by the conflict, of the monastic missionaries of the Roman and of the Keltic

Church." ("The Monks of the West," Vol. I., Book VIII., pp. 643-647.)

There has been so much confusion of mind and inaccuracy of statement about the relation of the first Church of the English race to the old British Church on the one hand, and to the older Roman Church on the other, that we may well attempt to make this important matter as plain as possible. The principal source of confusion is the vague word *"Keltic."* The Count of Montalembert speaks of "the *Keltic* Church," but tells us that he means the *Irish.* But he might have meant the *Britons* or the *Scotch,* as these also were Kelts. The term "Kelt" or "Keltic" is a generic term, covering the British, the Irish and the Scotch.

It was the Keltic Scots (or Scotch-Irish) who did such noble and extensive work for the conversion of the English. But the Britons, who were kinsmen of the Scots and Irish, did nothing whatever for the conversion of the English. They held entirely aloof from the English Church for more than 500 years as is confirmed by all competent historians. I will give you a brief symposium of some of our best modern writers on the subjects in question:—The following are from William Hunt's "History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest:"

"The English first received the Gospel directly from Rome, and though men of another race (The Scots) for a time carried on the work begun by the Roman missionaries, our forefathers owed their evangeliza-

tion to the apostolic zeal of the greatest of the Popes." (Chap II., p. 16). Again, "From the British Church no help came, and it had no share either in the foundation or development of the English Church." (Chap. III., p. 38). "It may perhaps be as well to repeat the warning that we must not be led by any vague expression, such as 'the Keltic Church' to confuse the Scots and the Britons. The British Church contributed nothing to the evangelization of the English people. It has been said, "The Roman planted, the Scot watered, the Briton did nothing." (Chap. IV., p. 74.)

The late Bishop of Gibraltar and former Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, W. E. Colins, in his Lectures on "The Beginnings of English Christianity," declares, "That the British Christians left the English people severely alone was as much the result of a narrow conception of their faith as of any deliberate malice. But the fact must be clearly recognized. . . . The English Church derived from the first much of her best life from the spiritual sons of the abbots of Iona. But to trace back the origin of that Church to the older British Christianity, or to derive her life from it in any degree whatever, is to falsify history. . . . The British Church is not the mother of the English, but an elder sister; and at first, a very unfriendly one. The real connection between them is not a thing of the sixth century, or the seventh or the eighth, but of later days; of the centuries from the eleventh to the thirteenth. They are indeed knit together into one, but by

the bonds of union, not of birth; for the older British Church was by degrees merged in the English, as the older British kingdoms were." ("The Beginnings of English Christianity." pp. 97-98.)

I have quoted so often from William Bright's "Chapters in Early English Church History" that I will give you a quotation from one of his numerous lesser works, "Way Marks in Church History:" "We do not know of a single case in which the British Church as such did anything for the conversion of the English. . . . We may confidently say with the late Professor Freeman, 'It is contrary to all historical fact to speak of the ancient British Church as something . . . out of which the Church of England grew.' It is equally unhistorical to speak of the Welsh Episcopate as the 'fountain' of the English. There is, we may say it with thankfulness, a real continuity between the British and the English Church; but it consists in this, that by slow degrees—by a complex process which extended through some five centuries, the English Church absorbed the British into one body; the older and smaller stream flowed into the younger and larger, and became a veritable and inseparable part of it." ("Waymarks," pp. 237-299.)

Bishop Collins, in an essay on "England before the Reformation," declares: "It need hardly be said that the illusive dream must be once for all abandoned which would regard 'the British Church' as one of transcendant purity, directly apostolical in origin, Scriptural in doctrine and free from Papal corruption, and which holds that this pure Church was con-

fronted, displaced and superseded by a corrupt and popish organization. There can be no real question that the Christianity which the English received from the continent of Europe was far nobler than that which the Britons intentionally withheld from them." ("The Church Past and Present," p. 105.)

The Rev. J. H. Maude, in "The Foundations of the English Church," says, "One thing is certain, that British Christianity never effected, or attempted to effect anything whatever towards the conversion of the conquering English." . . . (p. 17.)

Rev. M. W. Patterson, in his "History of the Church of England," says, "The British Church in England contributed nothing directly towards the evangelization of the Anglo-Saxons."

Dr. Alfred Plummer, in his very recent work on "The Churches in Britain before A. D. 1000," says, "It seems right to add here a word of caution against the common confusion between the British Church and the English Church. This mistake is still made, even by persons who undertake to instruct others and therefore are specially bound to endeavor to be accurate; and this particular inaccuracy is not a mere slip, which any one might pardonably make, but a rather serious error, which it is quite easy to avoid. In the first ten centuries of the Christian era, the British Church and the English Church were quite distinct, and had very little to do with one another, although at a much later date they became united. . . . We must carefully avoid using the expression 'English Church' of anything that existed earlier than 597." (Vol. I., pp. 16-7.)

III

The Coming of Aidan and the Scotch-Irish Mission to the English.

Both the kingdom and the Church of Northumbria had come to grief when King Edwin fell on the fatal field of Heathfield and Bishop Paulinus hastily deserted his scattered flock, leaving only the faithful Deacon James to withstand the ravages of the heathen. The year that followed Edwin's death might well be called "the Hateful Year"—"hateful to all good men" is the phrase of Bede. Other misfortunes also befell in that same disastrous year. For a short time the kingdom was again divided into two, and came under the misrule of two scions of the old line of Ethelfrid — Osric in Deira and Eanfrid in Bernicia. Both of these became apostates from Christianity, repudiating their baptism to curry favor with Penda, King of Mercia, and with their own pagan followers. Both of them were soon slain by the furious British King, Cadwallon, the last hero of the Britons.

But a brighter day and many happy years came to State and Church when the younger brother of Eanfrid and nephew, on his mother's side, of Edwin, proved himself a patriotic and Christian prince by boldly confronting the oppressors of his country with "an army small in numbers, but fortified by faith in Christ." Oswald assembled his army on a hill auspiciously known as "Heavenfield." "The British

King Cadwallon," we are told, "though a Christian, had allied himself with Penda, the heathen King of Mercia, whom he exceeded in ferocity. The two allies thought to destroy the Northumbrian kingdom, Cadwallon because it was English, Penda because it was Christian, and both of them because they coveted the Northumberland territory." The night before the battle Oswald, who in his youth had been an exile at Iona and had become a Christian there, dreamed that its founder, St. Columba, appeared to him in shining robe, shielding the English army and promising victory to them. With this good omen, the next morning the King drew up his forces, and planting high on Heavenfield a wooden cross as the standard for his men, he aroused their faith and courage by a stirring appeal,—"Let us all kneel," he cried, "and join in prayer to the Almighty, the living and true Lord, that of His mercy He will defend us from our proud and cruel foe, for He knoweth that the cause for which we fight is just." Fresh from their prayers his army charged the superior numbers of the enemy with such an impulse and pressed them so hard, that the British, who had hitherto counted themselves invincible, gave way, were utterly routed and destroyed. The terrible Cadwallon himself fled from the field only to be overtaken and slain. A little chapel, called "St. Oswald's," now marks the supposed spot where the King set up his cross—the first erected in Bernicia. "Heavenfield," it was long said, "had fully made up for Heathfield." Heaven smiled once more upon a reunited Northumbria under the wise and

righteous rule of Oswald, who was revered as a saint for centuries through all the north country. And, indeed, he proved himself worthy of this name by his godly and Christian life, and by his devoted public and personal services in restoring the Church to his people. It was not to Paulinus, however, the pioneer missionary in the field, that Oswald turned for help, neither to Canterbury nor Rome. Few Roman missionaries were now left in England. Fresh blood was needed sorely, and a more ardent and unconquerable missionary zeal than England had yet seen. Fortunately Oswald knew where to find it. He turned to his beloved Iona, where, as a young refugee his own Christian faith had been kindled. The fifth abbot in succession from St. Columba was Seghine now presiding there—presiding even over the bishops attached to the community, though himself a presbyter—for that was long the Irish use in their monasteries. It was this very unusual use—the supreme control of the abbot which Columba established in Scotland; where there were still *no Diocesan* bishops, but merely bishops attached to the monasteries to ordain and perform functions peculiar to the Episcopal office. Such a bishop Seghine sent to Oswald, but the first one sent was a great failure, and was "sent back empty." Like Augustine's first band of monks, he was soon ready to turn back from such a forlorn hope. He wanted to go home. Bede has kindly drawn a veil over this man's name. He was not worth mentioning, but later tradition has called him Corman. I will give you Bede's account, which has a whole-

some lesson for the young clergyman in his first missionary field: "It is reported that when King Oswald had asked a bishop of the Scots to administer the word of faith to him and his nation, there was first sent to him another man of more austere disposition, who, meeting with no success and being unregarded by the English people, returned home, and, in an assembly of the elders, reported that he had not been able to do any good to the nation he had been sent to preach to, because they were uncivilized men and of a stubborn and barbarous disposition. The elders, as it is testified, in a great council seriously debated what was to be done, being desirous that the nation should receive the salvation it demanded, and grieving that they had not received the preacher sent to them. Then said Aidan, who was also present in the council, to the priest then spoken of, "I am of opinion, brother, that you were more severe to your unlearned hearers than you ought to have been, and did not at first, conformably to the Apostolic rule, give them the milk of more easy doctrine, till being by degrees nourished with the Word of God, they should be capable of greater perfection, and be able to practice God's sublimer precepts. Having heard these words, all present began diligently to weigh what he had said, and presently concluded that he (Aidan) deserved to be made a bishop, and ought to be sent to instruct the incredulous and unlearned, since he was found to be endued with singular discretion, which is the mother of other virtues; and accordingly being ordained, they sent him to their

friend, King Oswald, to preach; and he, as time proved, afterwards appeared to possess all other virtues, as well as the discretion for which he was before remarkable."

It was thus that, thirty years after Augustine's death, in the year 635, little Iona stepped in where mighty Rome had nearly failed. With the coming of Aidan began the Golden Age of saintly self-devotion and evangelistic fervor which was to do so much to win England to Christ. While we should not under-rate the first noble impulse to England's conversion which came straight from Gregory the Great and from Rome, nor the organizing and unifying power of that great Church, then the best in the world, which ultimately welded together into one the separate and scattered forces at work, it is hard to overestimate the splendid services of the Scottish saints who were then altogether independent of the Roman mission and a noble example to it. Nor is the secret of their wonderful success hard to find. It was the power of their simple self-sacrificing lives and of their fervid and untiring zeal in preaching to others the Gospel which they embodied in their own Apostolic lives. In his "Monks of the West," the liberal Roman Catholic writer, Montalembert, declares of this period: "What is distinctly visible is the influence of Keltic priests and missionaries everywhere replacing and seconding Roman missionaries, and reaching districts which their predecessors had never been able to enter. The stream of the Divine Word thus extended itself from

North to South, and its slow but certain course reached in succession all the people of the Heptarchy. . . . As to the two Northumbrian kingdoms and those of Essex and Mercia, which comprehended in themselves more than two-thirds of the territory occupied by the German conquerors, these four countries owed their first conversions exclusively to the peaceful invasion of the Keltic monks, but who, the first obstacles once surmounted, showed much more perseverance and gained much more success."

From the bleak and barren Island of the Northwest came Aidan to breathe a warmth and fructifying life into what was spiritually a "wilderness," mak ing the "desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose," —breathing the very spirit of the living God into the "dry bones" of the Northumberland Church until they "stood up a great army." He chose for the new kind of work which he inaugurated a new centre more congenial to his own taste and task. It was not at York, the seat of the Roman Mission of Paulinus, but at a little island like his dear Iona that he established himself and his monastery modelled after the simple but mighty one from which he had come. At Lindisfarne, known later as the "Holy Isle," he found the retreat for prayer and study so grateful to the Scotch-Irish monks, and at the same time a place very close to the royal residence at Bamborough of Oswald, henceforth his king and beloved friend and fellow-laborer in the Gospel. This was no place, indeed, to found a great

Cathedral and administrative centre of a well-organized Diocese; and later the See was removed in 883 to Chester-le-Street, and in 995 to glorious Durham. But the time for that was not yet. Lindisfarne, like Mont St. Michel off the coast of France, was joined to the mainland at low tide by two miles of wet sand. It suited well Aidan's love of retirement and study and the purposes of his episcopal monastery, of which he was both Abbot and Bishop,—and which he meant to make the centre of his missionary work, and also a training-school for future missionaries. Here he began, almost at once, to gather a class of twelve English lads, and to train a succession of *native born* devoted missionaries and saints, who came ere long to rival in England the Ionian monks. Out of this school came Eata, his own successor at Lindisfarne, the two famous brothers, Chadd and Cedd, the evangelists of Southern England; and Wilfrid, the most famous of Northern churchmen and the evangelist of Sussex.

We may pause here a moment to notice that, about the time when Aidan's Northern School was founded, we begin to hear for the first time of a *native-born* clergy in the *South*. "Evidences are not wanting," says William Hunt, "that the efforts made at Canterbury and at Dunwich to train up a native clergy were bringing forth good results. The first bishop of English race, a Kentishman named Ithamar, was consecrated by Honorius to the See of Rochester in 644, and was not inferior to his predecessors either in holiness of life or learning."

"Again, in 647 Honorius consecrated Thomas from Ely to succeed his former master Felix as Bishop of the East Anglians, and, on his death, another Englishman, Berchgils, a native of Kent. . . . And, on March 26th, 655, the *first English Archbishop,* a West Saxon named Frithonas was consecrated by Ithamar to the See of Canterbury, and took the name of Deus Dedit." To return to our narrative of Aidan's achievements, until he could educate out of his English boys a native clergy, he had no lack of clergy for immediate use. Irish and Scotch monks were only too eager to join him in large numbers. Devotion, study and cultivation of the ground was the work of these farmer-monks while on the island; but they accompanied or followed their itinerant abbot-bishop on his extensive and untiring missionary tours afoot through a vast region. Until he had learned to speak English himself Aidan had need of an interpreter, and the King did not disdain to discharge frequently this humble office in person. King and Bishop often journeyed together on foot through the country, the Bishop preaching and the King interpreting to his people the message of the Gospel. It was a rare sort of partnership in any age or country, and as beautiful and effective as it was rare. Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel and Joshua, the son of Jozadak, did not work together more harmoniously in building the House of the Lord, nor Moses and Aaron as the joint-leaders of the Israelites through the wilderness, than Oswald and Aidan in evangelizing the Northumbrian folk.

The King, it has been said, was as determined to erect the cross in the hearts of his people as to plant it on the hill of Heavenfield. He gave generously also of money and lands for churches, monasteries and schools throughout his realm. In all Bernicia, we are told, there was not a single church-building when Aidan came, and two only are mentioned as surviving in more favored Deira. Many were now built—simple structures, no doubt of wood thatched with rushes, which served chiefly as mission-stations, for parish-churches were not yet. These were served mostly by travelling monks, or were connected with monasteries, which sprang up here and there as new centres of study and devotion and training schools for the young and future evangelists. In this way, while the mission at Canterbury gradually dwindled for lack of laborers, the Scotic mission grew apace, and was soon ready to put forth vigorous offshoots in other Kingdoms. The main secret of its success was undoubtedly the beautiful character and winning personality of St. Aidan. Although he had come to Northumbria without asking or receiving any sanction whatever from either Canterbury or Rome, and although he adhered strictly to the Scotic uses of Iona, to which the Roman ecclesiastics objected so strenuously, his lovely disposition and character were such as to effectually disarm their hostility and command their admiration. Bede, who was almost a bigot for the Roman use and severely critical of the Scotic, never questions the validity of Aidan's orders nor the Catholicity of his religion

in things essential. He never tires of singing the praises of a character so singularly free from fault and so winsome to all who knew him. He tells us also that Aidan was revered by Archbishop Honorius of Canterbury and by Bishop Felix of East Anglia. The late Professor Bright, of Oxford, in his "Early English Church History," has welded together very effectively the various passages of Bede which bear upon the character of Aidan, and I cannot do better than to give you some of these, "'A man,' he begins, 'of the utmost gentleness, piety and moderation;' and in subsequent passages he tells us that 'Aidan was earnest in promoting peace and charity, purity and humility, was superior to anger and avarice, despised pride and vain glory, was a conspicuous example of entire unworldliness, strictly temperate in all his habits, sedulous in study and devotion, full of tenderness for all sufferers, and of righteous sternness towards powerful offenders;' that he 'took pains to fulfil diligently the works of faith, piety and love, according to the usual manner of all holy men,' and in a word to 'omit not one of the duties prescribed in the evangelical, apostolic, and prophetic Scriptures, but to perform them to the utmost of his power.' . . . Occasionally Aidan would retire for devotional solitude to the chief islet of the Farne group lying off Bamborough, on which in Bede's time 'it was usual to point out the spot where he was wont to sit alone.' We find also that he brought in the practice of fasting on all Wednesdays and Fridays until 3 p. m., except dur-

ing 'the fifty days of Easter.' In his actual mission work he travelled on foot, unless compelled by necessity to ride. This habit of walking enabled him easily to enter into conversation with any one whom he met, rich or poor,—to win him over if a heathen, to encourage and exhort him if a believer. While he and his companions travelled they used 'to meditate on Texts of Scripture, or recite Psalms;' 'this was their daily work.'. . . In his dealings with the rich Aidan showed his superiority to 'fear or favor;' he never witheld a rebuke deserved by misdoings of theirs, but always administered it with the authority befitting a bishop. . . . On the other hand, if a rich man offered him money it went promptly to the poor, whose sufferings were ever in the thought of this true 'cherisher of the needy and father of the wretched.'

One thing alone Bede could not approve in Aidan, —the inevitable Keltic error about the Pashal reckoning. . . . 'His keeping the Pasch out of its time I do not approve of nor commend. But this I *do* approve of, that what he kept in thought, reverenced, and preached in the celebration of his Paschal festival, was just what *we* do, that is, the redemption of mankind through the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension into heaven of the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.' ''

The good King Oswald, like his predecessor Edwin, had his "Heathfield" too, and after a reign of only eight glorious years, fell in battle with the same strenuous pagan, Penda of Marcia, August 5th,

642, at the age of thirty-eight. The battle was fought at Maserfield near the town in Shropshire which still commemorates Oswald's name, "Oswestry." His dying words for his men passed into a proverb, "O God, have mercy on the souls!' said Oswald falling to the ground. His head severed from the body, was recovered at Lindisfarne and removed in 875, within the coffin of St. Cuthbert when the monks abandoned the island before the ferocity of the Danes. William of Malmsbury relates that when the coffin of St. Cuthbert was opened in Durham in 1104 "the head of Oswald, king and martyr, was found between Cuthbert's arms." It was seen there again in the present century, according to William Hunt's recent history. The late Bishop of Durham, Dr. Lightfoot in his "Leaders in the Northern Church," has an historical sermon on St. Oswald from the text, "Like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might." After drawing a striking parallel between Oswald and the young King of Judah, Josiah, he quotes the following words from the book of Ecclesiasticus, merely changing the name of Josiah to Oswald:—"The remembrance of Oswald is sweet as honey in all mouths, and as music in a banquet of wine. He behaved himself uprightly in the conversation of the people, and took away the abominations of idolatory. He directed his heart unto the Lord, and in the time of the ungodly he established the worship of God."

Christianity was now too deep-rooted in Northumbria to be plucked up by Penda, nor was he successful in conquering the country. He laid siege, indeed to Bamborough, but did not succeed in taking it, and shortly retired to other mischief elsewhere. Then the kingdom was again divided. A brother of Oswald named Oswy ruled in Bernicia, with Eanfleda, daughter of Edwin and granddaughter of Ethelbert, for his queen. The new King of Deira was Oswin, described by Bede as the ideal of kingly beauty and virtue, who became very dear to Aidan for his resemblance in character to Oswald. The closing part of Bede's panegyric is as follows: "The King Oswin was comely and tall; pleasant of speech and courteous in manner; open of hand to all, whether noble or not noble. Thus it came about that all men loved him for his royal dignity of mind and look and character; and men, even the most noble, flocked to his service from other provinces. Among his great qualities of valor and moderation and peculiar sweetness, greatest of all was his humility."

But Oswin, as Aidan said of him, was "too good for this world," and it was not long before he joined Oswald in a better world. He was cruelly betrayed and murdered by an assassin employed by Oswy of Bernicia. The crime of the one King, and the untimely end of the other, so full of promise, were too much for Aidan, and shortened his days. In the closing part of his espiscopate he took great pleasure in the founding of a nunnery at Hartlepool by

the saintly Hilda, great-niece of King Edwin, and in helping the abbess, who was of a kindred mind, to rule well the new religious house. Twelve days after the death of Oswin, while visiting at the King's country house near Bamborough, Aidan was seized suddenly with mortal sickness; and, before he could be moved to his bed-room in the villa, he expired on the ground under an awning hastily set up close to the church, his head resting against a post. He died in the seventeenth year of his episcopate, the last day of the month of August, 651.

It is related that an English shepherd-boy, keeping watch over his flock by night on the Lammermoor hills, while his comrades slept, saw a vision of angels bearing a soul to heaven; and a few days after learned that it was at this hour that God took to Himself the saintly soul of Aidan, first bishop of Lindisfarne. The shepherd-boy was Cuthbert, and the vision determined his future life. He devoted himself to the service of God in the monastery of Melrose, and later suceeded to Aidan's See at Lindisfarne and to his work in Bernicia.

Lightfoot says, "Augustine was the Apostle of Kent, but Aidan was the Apostle of England." If this statement be too strong, and I think it is, certainly the whole story of the making of the English Church furnishes no lovelier character, no nobler missionary service, far-reaching in its influence, than those of the Scotic missionary and English bishop rightly canonized by the Roman Church as "Saint Aidan."

"The history," says Bright, "of the Church *in Northumbria* during the larger part of the seventh century is conspicuously *the backbone* of the history of the Church in England. It is striking to see how the region which was first to come before St. Gregory's thoughts in regard to an English mission, and yet, for just thirty years was inaccessible to missionary attempt, no sooner in any sense accepted Christianity than it concentrated into itself the chief interest of the great drama of national conversion; this being due, no doubt, in part to the relative scantiness of our information as to other districts, but also largely to the force and impressiveness of the characters that walk the Northumbrian stage"—I would add,—and to the rare historian and biographer of Northumbria and its heroes, the unrivaled Bede.

In magnifying, however, the winsome personality of Aidan, and his glorious work for Northumbria and for England, it is unnecessary, however, unfair, and *unhistoric,* to belittle the *earlier* work of either Augustine's seven laborious years in Kent or of Paulinus's six untiring years in Northumbria. Admittedly, "Augustine was the Apostle of Kent," and Paulinus was the Apostle of Northumbria in the *same sense,* using the word "Apostle" in the sense then current of *Pioneer Missionary,* the first in the field, or *Founder.* And in that same sense, Augustine was "the Apostle of *England,*" too, the first to bring the Christian Gospel and Church to our heathen ancestors the English race. We know very little about

the personality and character of this man; and what we know is not exactly fascinating. Certainly he had not the charm, the lovableness, the wisdom, nor the success of Aidan as a winner of souls to God, or of hearts to himself. But, none the less, he *was* Aidan's *predecessor* in the English field, as Paulinus was also in the Northumbrian field.

Augustine, acting for and inspired by a greater than himself, viz. Gregory, the Great Bishop of Rome, did successfully lay a firm and lasting *foundation of the English Church.* This Church, thus founded, has outlived all the pecularities and eccentricities of the Scotch-Irish missionaries, except their intense personal and missionary religion,—which is their greatest glory and their imperishable contribution to the cause and Church of Christ. We shall see later that this invaluable contribution of theirs might have been lost to the English Church without the support of the stronger and better organizing and centralizing and unifying genius of the then Roman Church under one of the greatest of all its Bishops, Gregory the Great.

The Christianizing influence of Aidan was not by any means confined to the sixteen years of his episcopate. He did not live to see the largest results of his own labors. His immediate successor as bishop and abbot was Finan, a man of more Irish temper and less winning ways than Aidan, but one who did a faithful work. He replaced the very humble church-building by one unpretentious but more suitable to the episcopal See, and constructed it in the

Scotic fashion, not of stone, but entirely of hewn oak, with a covering of reeds. He put some *oak* also into his stubborn refusal to comply with those who began to demand his compliance with the Roman Easter. The thirteen years that followed Aidan's death witnessed a vast enlargement of his work throughout Northumbria, its extension south of the Humber, and into the vast regions of the midlands. It soon found lodgment within the very household of Penda himself, and thence pervaded his realm, the last stronghold of heathenism. Mercia comprised all the midland part of Britain, having Northumbria on the north, Wessex and Sussex on the south, Wales on the west, and east Anglia on the east.

The Matrimonial method of propagating the faith was still the English fashion, and broke out again in fresh quarters. In the case now to be reported a double marriage took place in two very important families. Oswy, now King of reunited Northumbria, married his son to Penda's daughter, and his daughter Alchfleda to Peada, Penda's son, "an excellent youth," on the usual condition that she would have the right to retain her own religion. Peada, now King of the Middle Angles, was prepared to go further, and declared, "I *will* be a Christian, whether I obtain the maiden or not"—a resolution which I commend highly to the young men before me. Peada was accordingly baptized, with his attendants, and took home with him a band of Christian monks from Aidan's school. The four learned and zealous priests who returned with him to his own kingdom

to propagate his new faith were Diuma, a Scot, and three Englishmen, natives of Northumbria, Cedd, Adda and Betti. They had great success among the middle Anglians, and won many converts of all classes. Even Penda began at last to relent in his inflexible hostility, and allowed missionaries in his own Mercia, declaring that his main objection was not to true Christians, but false ones—"The mean wretches," he called them, "who have put their faith in this new God, and then will not trouble themselves to obey Him"—an old and ever new stumbling block to the progress of Christ's Gospel.

The conversion of the East Saxons soon followed, and Essex, from which Mellitus, the Roman bishop of London, had been rudely expelled, now welcomed the Scotic missionaries. Oswy of Northumbria tried to atone for his sin in procuring the death of his rival Oswin by doing all he could for the cause of Christianity. The then King of the East Saxons—another Sigbert—was a close friend of Oswy's and a frequent visitor at his court, where Oswy used his influence to make him a Christian. Sigbert became a convert, and was baptized by Bishop Finan, and asked for missionaries to convert his people. These were now in such demand from various quarters that the supply at Lindisfarne began to run short.

So Finan transferred Cedd to Essex, and gave him another monk to help him. They had such encouraging success that Finan, in conjunction with two other Scottish bishops, consecrated Cedd bishop of the East Saxons in 654. Bede, with all his prejudice

against the peculiarities of the Scotic Church, evidently found no shadow of a flaw in the validity of their espiscopal orders. His language here is worthr quoting: — "Finan, on learning how the work of the Gospel prospered with Cedd, made him bishop, having called in two other bishops to assist him in the ordination. Cedd, having received the degree of the episcopate, returned to his province, and fulfilling with greater authority the work which he had begun, made churches in different places, ordaining priests and deacons to assist him in the work of faith." It has been objected that it was the usual custom of the Scots for only one bishop to consecrate to the episcopate. In this case, at least, three are expressly mentioned, and we have already seen that the Roman missionaries in England had several times, and with papal sanction, consecrated to the Episcopal office and to the archbishopric by the hands of a single bishop. Spite of the Nicene decree that such consecrations should be by not less than three bishops, consecration by a single bishop was not considered invalid. Gregory had expressly permitted it to Augustine until he should have three or four bishops in England to unite with him. "As a matter of fact in England Augustine consecrated the three bishops who afterwards succeeded him at Canterbury, Lawrence, Mellitus and Justus without assistants,—Justus consecrated Paulinus, Paulinus consecrated Honorius the fifth Archbishop, and Ithamar consecrated Deusdedit the sixth Archbishop also, without assistants, not to mention other cases,

such as the early consecrations of Theodore." (J. H. Mande.)

There is no evidence that Cedd undertook to establish his own Episcopal seat at London, the original See, or even that he had any definite and official See. He appears to have resided mostly with his monks attached to two main monasteries and centres of missionary work—the one at a place which Bede calls Ythanceaster, and the other at Tilbury. He is also reported to have resorted frequently to Deira on preaching tours, and to have received from the King the site of a monastery which he founded at Lastingham, then a wild and weird spot amidst "the haunts of robbers and the lairs of wild beasts rather than the dwellings of men." This subsequently became a favorite resort of Cedd, who seems to have imbibed the Scotic love of retirement and to have divided his time between his new monastery here and his episcopal work in Essex. In the faithful discharge of the latter we find one of the earliest cases in England of the exercise of episcopal severity which went to the extreme point of excommunication. The questions of Marriage and Divorce troubled the Church then as now, and called for extreme methods. Cedd had excommunicated one of Sigbert's nobles and kinsmen for adhering to an unlawful marriage. He was cut off from social intercourse with all churchmen. The King, however, ventured to accept an invitation to the house of the offender. Returning from a dinner party there, he met the irate bishop, leaped in terror from his horse,

knelt and craved the bishop's forgiveness. But the inflexible prelate, touching the royal transgressor with a stick that he held in his hand, predicted the King's death in the house from which he had just come. And indeed this man, so recently his host, brought about shortly the murder of Sigbert in revenge for what he considered the craven conduct on the part of the King. But Sigbert's untimely death did not, as in many previous cases, check the progress of Christianity in the kingdom. It went steadily forward under his successor.

But while Cedd was pursuing his mission of peace in Essex, Penda the irrepressible, was at his old tricks again, and was on the war-path for the last time. Already he had recently invaded East Anglia, slain its Christian King Anna, and set up Anna's unworthy brother Ethelhere as the conqueror's vassal, using him also as an ally for another invasion of Northumbria. Spite of the intermarriages between Oswy's family and Penda's, spite of Oswy's efforts for peace, his offers of priceless gifts and of his own son as hostage, nothing availed to satisfy Penda's passion for overrunning and annihilating the Northumbrians. Then Oswy braced himself up for a final conflict which could no longer be averted, crying out, "If the pagan will not accept our gifts, let us offer them to Him who will, the Lord our God." Then he made a vow that if God would give him victory over his enemies, he would dedicate to the monastic life his little girl Elfled, and would give the lands for the building of no less than twelve

monasteries. With this doubtful act of piety Oswy prepared to meet Penda and his allies, including again princes of the Britons, of the Picts also, and the new renegade Christian ally, Ethelhere of Essex. They came on, swarming like locusts, thirty legions in all, each under its own chief. The two unequal armies met at Winwidfield, and there Penda, who in twenty-two years had killed five important kings, all Christians and all Angles, made the last stand for heathenism in England until the coming of the Danes. His vast army was swept utterly away by the inferior force under Oswy. "The stars in their courses," and the waters in their wrath fought against the heathen hosts. The most formidable foe of Northumbria and of Christianity was smitten down to rise no more, and with him fell most of his chieftains. So perished on that day the enemies of the Lord by the waters of the Winwaed. Just as the river of Kishon swept away the forces of Sisera, so the Winwaed waters, we are told, swollen into a flood by recent rains, swept away the Mercians, swept away "many more in their flight than the sword had destroyed while fighting." The battle of Wingfield, as it was generally called, November 15th, 655, is called by Freeman "a turning-point in the history of our island." With the fall of Penda came the independence of Northumbria. "With Penda," says Milman, "fell Paganism."

Oswy the Conqueror now redoubled his efforts for the advancement of the victorious faith, not only in his now secure Kingdom, but also in that of the

fallen Penda, Mercia, which came for some time under his control as overlord. He kept strictly the vow made before the battle of Wingfield. Of the twelve monasteries which he founded, six were located in Bernicia, and the other six in Deira—"wherein earthly warfare should cease, and in which there should be a perpetual residence and subsistence for monks to follow the warfare which is spiritual, and pray diligently for the peace of the nation." Oswy's daughter Elfled was duly given up to Hilda at Hartlepool to become "first a learner and then a teacher of the monastic life."

Before we pass out of Northumbria to note the establishment of Christianity in Mercia, we may well pause for a moment to contemplate the character and work of that gracious Lady Hilda, Abbess first of Hartlepool and afterwards of far-famed Whitby Abbey. We have already noticed the remarkable influence exerted by Christian women who married kings of heathen realms. But single women also, consecrated to perpetual virginity, played no insignificant part in the Christian work of our ancestors. The most conspicuous instance of this was St. Hilda who came of the royal family of Northumbria, and spent her early life at court, but devoted the rest to ministering to the poor, and especially to promoting the cause of religious education. In this repsect her career was one of the most illustrious of all the founders of the English Church. Bishop Lightfoot does not hesitate to rank her among the three most potent personages in the early Northumbrian Church—Oswald

the King, Aidan the Bishop, and Hilda the Abbess. He ranks her, indeed, "among the chief makers of England in the childhood of the English nation," and says:—"With the tact and sympathy of a woman, she united the sound judgment and self-restraint of a man. The great and lowly alike were drawn towards her. Kings and princes sought her advice in the perplexities of statesmanship; bishops exchanged spiritual counsels with her. Monasteries were then the sole depositories of knowledge, and the sole schools of learning. The religious house with which she was connected was twofold. There was a side for women, and a side for men—an arrangement not uncommon in those days. The chivalry of their Christianity and of their race gave the precedence to women. Hilda ruled over both. Her house was a great training-school for the clergy. Not less than five of her pupils became bishops of important Sees — two of York, one of Dorchester, one of Worcester, and one of Hexham. This last was the famous St. John of Beverley. What wonder that all who came near her saluted her with the endearing name of 'Mother' — a title not yet, it would seem, given by virtue of their office to Abbesses of religious houses, but specially accorded to her, as we are told, by reason of her signal piety and grace. She was indeed 'a Mother in Israel.' Nor is it only as a school of theology, a nursery of clergy, that her house demands our respect. Here English literature was cradled. The earliest of English poets, Caedmon received under Hilda the training and

the inspiration which transformed him, like Amos of old, from a simple cowherd into a prophet and teacher of men."

Let us now proceed to notice briefly the measures taken for the conversion of the two other kingdoms of the Heptarchy—*Mercia* and *Sussex*. Mercia had now come under the authority of Oswy as Bretwalda. He allowed his son-in-law Peada, son of Penda, to continue as under-king of the Middle Anglians in Southern Mercia. We have already seen how the conversion of this part was successfully begun by the four missionaries from Lindisfarne who followed Peada thither at the time of his marriage. This work went on prosperously until the tragedy of Peada's death, who was assassinated with the probable connivance of his wife. Nor was the cause of Christianity checked by this unhappy affair, for all Mercia remained for three years longer under Oswy's personal rule. Then the Mercians rose against Oswy, and regained their independence, with a younger brother of Peada named Wulfhere as King. The return to the old dynasty did not affect the progress of Christianity, for as Bede, himself a Northumbrian, observes with characteristic generosity "free and with a king of their own the Mercians joyfully served Christ the true King." Wulfhere was himself a Christian and a zealous promotor of its progress during the sixteen years of his reign, and thereby the rest of Mercia was successfully evangelized. One of Peada's first missionaries, Diuma a Scotchman had already been conse-

crated a bishop by Finan. Later he was succeeded by another monk from Lindisfarne, Trumhere, an Englishman. We are also told that a rich and noble monk named Saxulf, about this time, built and became first Abbot of a famous and influential monastery for central England at Peterborough. Wulfhere gradually extended his sway, and used his power also to extend his religion with it, especially in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, which he conquered. Both these new possessions passed to the King of the South Saxons, Ethelwalch, who was persuaded to receive baptism, but it does not appear to have had much effect upon Sussex. He either would not, or could not gain any converts among his own people. Sussex was last of all the English kingdoms to receive the Gospel, and when they did finally receive it, it came not from their next-door neighbors at Canterbury, but from far-off Northumbria.

The conversion of Sussex did not begin until twenty years later, but we will take it out of its chronological order in order to complete our survey of Christianity in the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy. This was one of the oldest of all the kingdoms, but was one of the smallest, and had long been one of the most backward in coming forward, not only in receiving the Gospel, but also in its national life. Cut off by its impenetrable forests and marshes, it had remained almost untouched by all that was going on in the rest of England, its people as barbarous as when they first landed here. The king and

queen, indeed, were nominal Christians, and had received into their realm a settlement of half a dozen Irish monks with Dical as Abbot, but even the Irish fire, which had kindled a flame in so many other lands, seemed almost extinguished by the coldness of the South Saxons. The monks had simply settled down in a monastery at Bosham to hold the fort until better days should come. This was the forlorn situation of Sussex spiritually when "the man and the hour arrived again"—when one of the most famous ecclesiastics of England, or Europe, himself in evil case then, took refuge there in the year 681 from his enemies, who were many and mighty. We shall hear more of the new-comer, for his career was an eventful and stormy one which shook the whole western Church.

He was a man of rare ability and varied accomplishments, trained in the school of Lindisfarne, but an uncompromising advocate of Rome. He was a native of Northumbria, and had been bishop there. Indeed he had already held not a few of the highest ecclesiastical positions in England. In the intervals between his various episcopates, his numerous and extensive travels, his frequent fights, his imprisonments and flights, his ups and downs generally, Wilfrid of York once in a while proved himself a most devoted and effective missionary in a most unpromising field. He had already attempted the conversion of the ferocious Frisians. And now, on the dreary coast of Sussex, this fallen prelate of the North, himself in evil case, finds a field where

none had gathered any harvest before him, and he simply did the job. Some fifteen years before, he had been wrecked on this same inhospitable coast, and "the barbarous people had showed him no little *un*-kindness" then, and he had barely escaped with his life from these savage Saxons. Now he seizes the opportunity to return good for evil, and to save the lives as well as the souls of his former captors. It has been well said of Wilfrid, that he was at his best in adversity. Prosperity seemed to spoil him. Thomas Fuller writes quaintly, "As it is observed of nightingales, that they sing the sweetest when farthest from their nests, so this Wilfrid was most diligent in God's service when at the greatest distance from his own home." You may have noticed, more probably of some other man than of yourself, that he was a better Christian elsewhere than in his own home. Things were about at their worst in Sussex when Wilfrid turned up this time. No rain had fallen for three years, gaunt famine was stalking through the land, and hunger was driving the people to suicide. In parties of fifty, we are told, they would join hands, and cast themselves headlong into the sea to escape the pangs of hunger. The sea was swarming with fish, but these silly folk had not wit enough to catch any thing but a few eels in shallow water. Wilfrid was a versatile man, and fisherman enough to catch both fish and men. He soon showed the dull Saxons the art of deep-sea fishing,—showed them how to join together their little eel-nets into a big drag-net, and thrust out into the sea for a

draught worth having. The result was like that of the Master's word on the Galilean Lake when they had toiled all the night and taken nothing.

Three hundred fish at a catch the famishing heathen hauled ashore, and Wilfrid was hailed as their deliverer. "By which good service," says Bede, who knew how to make a story end well, "the prelate turned their hearts powerfully to love him, and they were the readier to listen hopefully to his preaching about heavenly benefits, after they had through his agency received temporal good." When the drought broke up on the day that his first converts received baptism, and there was abundance of rain, that settled it for the conversion of the Saxons. They hailed him as if he had been Elijah. "And so," says Bede, "having cast off their old superstitions and renounced their idoltary, the heart and flesh of the people rejoiced in turning to the living God, understanding that He who is the true God had enriched them by his heavenly grace with both inward and outward blessings." The King rewarded the Apostle of his people by bestowing upon him a royal villa for his residence and with it a spacious domain and all its belongings, the promontory of Selsey, which he made a monastery and episcopal See, which became the centre of a successful and permanent missionary work. It remained the See of Sussex until the Norman Conquest, when it was removed to Chichester, where it now is. We are told of another act of Wilfrid's, which also shows him again at his best. A part of the royal donation to

him at Selsey consisted of two hundred and fifty persons "as bondsmen and bondswomen; he saved them all by baptizing them from slavery to the devil, and by granting them their liberty set them free from the yoke of slavery to man." And Bede closes this charming story with the words, "For five years Wilfrid exercised in these parts the office of the episcopate, both by words and by deeds, deservedly honored by all."

IV

The Coming-Together of the Roman and the Scotch-Irish Missions to Make the English Church

We have seen how the Christian religion had reached the various Anglo-Saxon tribes in England, and gradually overspread the whole Heptarchy, from two separate sources far apart—from Rome by way of Canterbury in the South, and from Iona by way of Lindisfarne in the North. These two streams of evangelizing influence had hitherto flowed apart, although occasionally coming close together in several of the kingdoms. Felix and Fursey had worked peaceably side by side in East Anglia. Aidan's gentle and fraternal spirit had prevented friction between the Keltic and the Roman factions in Northumbria, and under Finan his successor there had been no outbreak. But Colman, the next bishop of Lindisfarne, found the Roman party steadily growing in power and prestige; and he himself, although of saintly character, seems to have lacked the conciliating spirit of his predecessors. In his time the differences of ecclesiastical custom between the Scottish and the Roman missionaries broke out into open and stormy disputation. Their differences appear to us very unimportant and even trivial, not touching in the least the fundamentals of Catholic

faith and Apostolic order. They were merely questions about the proper time of keeping Easter, about the ceremonials of baptism and the shape of the priestly tonsure—the Romans shaving only the crown of the head in circular fashion, and the Scots shaving across the forehead from ear to ear in the shape of a crescent. It was the first Ritualistic controversy in England, but not the last. In a recent book on "The Foundations of the English Church," by J. H. Maude, he says, "It was merely an unintentional divergence of practice entirely due to absence of communication. . . . The present age, however, can hardly afford to assume any airs of superiority in this matter, or to regard it as strange that small matters of detail should excite strong feeling." The distinguished Thomas Hodgkin, author of "Italy and Her Invaders," himself a Quaker, says naively, "There is a well-known law of Theological dynamics that the bitterness of feeling between rival churches is in inverse proportion to the magnitude of the issues between them."

Underneath these superficial differences of practice, however, which might have been adjusted, there lay a deeper issue and the real bone of contention—the question of Roman dominance, or ecclesiastical independence. Neither the old British Church of the Roman province, nor the Keltic churches in Ireland and Scotland had known any thing of the authority of the Roman See in Great Britain—except, rather vaguely, perhaps, the generally acknowledged Primacy of that See in order of time and importance, and

its recognition as the model church of the West. There was a deference generally paid, too, to its decisions on appeal in important matters of discipline and its letters of advice (called "decretals"), which had not yet become letters of command. But the great distance of the Keltic churches from Rome and the lack of communication, especially after the retirement of the imperial government from Britain and the chaos of the English invasions, must have rendered any Papal letters to these parts practically "dead letters." But with the coming of Augustine, came plenty of letters from the Pope, live letters, too, and very good ones, for which we owe him an everlasting debt of gratitude. The best letter of all, however, was the one which Gregory the Great was too wise to write and did not write—claiming that, as successor of St. Peter, he had absolute authority and supremacy over all churches in general, and over the new English Church in particular which he himself founded and nursed. He did write other letters expressly repudiating the title of "Universal Bishop" for himself or any body else. Gregory's worst and vaguest letter to Augustine, which might be interpreted to squint that way, was the one in which he says, "All the bishops of the British Isles we commit to you, my brother . . . that the perverse may be corrected *by authority.*" *Whose* authority, Gregory's, or Augustine's, or both? I give it up.

The old British Church had refused to accept the authority given to Augustine. Their kinsmen, the

heroic Scotic missionaries, who had won the greater part of England for Christ, who had succeeded most abundantly where the Romans had nearly failed, were not prepared to surrender the venerable customs of their fathers, and of their saintly Founder Columba, much less their ecclesiastical independence which they felt to be involved, without a struggle.

Yet the time had come in the Providence of God for the making of one national Church of England as the great preliminary to the making of one England. One of the latest "Manuals of English Church History" in a single volume, and the best from an Evangelical standpoint, is that of the late Charles Hole, for twenty years lecturer in church history in King's College, London—a valued associate of Dean Wace. He says of this crisis, "The process of conversion had resulted in the formation, not of a Church (in the strict, later sense), but of a set of distinct church-missions, which, originating in varying circumstances, patronized by rival kings, and addressing different races, might have been, as to doctrine and church constitution, a cluster of jealous and jarring communities. A nearer view reveals these missionary churches as consenting in impor tant points, differing in some minor ones. They were in constitution Episcopal, in faith Catholic and Orthodox according to the criteria of that age. . . . Two nations, the Franks first, the Anglo-Saxons next, had the distinction of being *originally* Orthodox and Catholic by conversion, and so, likewise had the British, Irish, and Scotic Kelts of an earlier

day. In certain usages, however, . . . the Heptarchal churches differed among themselves according to the sources of their conversion."

We are now to see the first stages of that gradual process by which these separate churches of the several kingdoms passed beyond the mission-stage, and became welded together into one common and compact organization known as the English Church. The two separate streams of missionary influence and conversion, whose life-giving and fertilizing waters had penetrated to almost every part of the country, were now about to flow together into one broad and brimming river which should make glad the City of God. The fusion of the diverse elements of Roman and of Keltic Christianity would erelong be moulded into proper shape and symmetry. But the two streams could not meet and mingle into one without some turbulence, without a considerable "troubling of the waters." The "waters'-meet" of the English Church was at a place long afterwards called "Whitby," in the year of Grace 664, at the Abby founded there seven years before by the Lady Hilda. The spot is still marked by the stately ruins that stand on the Yorkshire Cliffs fronting the German ocean—"one of the most note-worthy land marks in the history of England."

The settlement of the differences between the two parties was brought about by Oswy, then the powerful King of Northumbria and Over-lord of Britain. His own domestic felicity, as well as the peace and prosperity of the Church in his realm, were threat-

ened by the rivalry of the factions, especially by the serious inconvenience of his wife and himself keeping Easter at two different times. The King had held fast to the practice of his revered bishops, Aidan, Finan and Colman. His Queen Eanfled had been taught in Kent to follow her mother Ethelburga and to observe Easter as appointed by the Roman Kalendar. Thus it came to pass on a certain occasion that, while Oswy was rejoicing in the glad festivities of Easter, Eanfield and her children were still observing the penitential fast of Holy Week. It was high time, the King thought, to put a stop to such incongruities in his court, and the two classes of churchmen must settle their differences. The King therefore, called them together in a sort of national synod, and told them to "get busy." The leading representatives of the Scotic school were King Oswy who presided, Bishop Colman, Bishop Cedd, and the Abbess Hilda. On the other side were Queen Eanfled and Prince Alchfrid, her son, Agilbert, bishop of the West Saxons, Romanus, chaplain to the Queen, James the deacon, and last but not least, Wilfrid, of whom we recently heard as the first successful missionary to the South Saxons, twenty years later. He plays so conspicuous a part at this turning-point of English Church history and later on, that a brief sketch of his earlier career will not be out of place here. Wilfrid was a native of Northumbria, born in 634 of noble and wealthy parents. At the age of thirteen his stepmother was quite willing to part with the precocious

youth, and sent him, nothing loth to leave her, to the Northumbrian court, where he made his appearance richly attired and armed, well mounted and attended. The handsome and graceful lad, intelligent and courteous, readily gained the favor of the Queen. Discerning his inclination for the monastic life, she opened the way for him to enter Lindisfarne, where he spent three years as a novice under the Scottish training and discipline, acquiring a reputation for rare scholarship, and gaining the affection of both teachers and pupils. He seems, however, to have become dissatisfied with the narrow range of his Scottish tutors, and to have had already a yearning for the wider culture of Rome. Accordingly, with the approval of the authorities, the Queen sent him to Canterbury, where for a year he studied its church usages, and thence to Rome itself in the company of Benedict Bishop, another noble Northumbrian famous afterwards as a scholar and traveller, a founder of monasteries and promoter of ecclesiastical art. Wilfrid found at last what he had longed for in the Eternal City, and, under the Pope's favor, had rare opportunities of studying the Roman rules and ritual at the fountain-head. On his way to and from that city he halted at Lyons, and became a favorite with its Archbishop Annemundus, who would gladly have adopted him as his son and heir. Here he spent three more years of clerical study and received the Roman tonsure. Upon his return to Northumbria in 658, Wilfrid became the intimate friend of Prince Alchfrid, and

also his tutor. The prince was already won over to the Roman rather than the Scotic usages. This young King of Deira had recently established a monastery at Ripon, and put it under the charge of Eata the Abbot, and Cuthbert, one of the monks of Melrose Abby. In 661, Alchfrid had fallen so completely under the spell of Wilfrid and his strong Roman proclivities, that he removed the Scotic monks from Ripon and made Wilfrid abbot, and had him ordained priest by Agilbert, bishop of Wessex and a leader of the Roman party. This, then, was the gifted and accomplished young man chosen to champion the cause of Rome against Iona at the Whitby Conference, which soon narrowed down to a debate between Colman and Wilfrid. Bede has given us an account at considerable length of this contest, and another account is found in the biography of Wilfrid by Eddi. We will give a sketch of the most salient points of the debate, which was not very accurate or logical on either side, but in which Colman was no match for the brilliant and versatile Wilfrid.

King Oswy, on taking the chair, declared that "it behooved those who served one God to observe the same rule of life; and, as they all expected the same kingdom in heaven, so they ought not to differ in the celebration of the divine mysteries; but rather to inquire which was the truest tradition, that the same might be followed by all." He then commanded his Bishop Colman first to declare what the custom was which he observed, and whence it de-

rived its origin. Then Colman said, "The Easter which I keep, I received from my elders who sent me bishop hither; all our forefathers, men beloved of God, are known to have kept it after the same manner; and, that the same may not seem to any contemptible or worthy to be rejected, it is the same which St. John the Evangelist, the disciple beloved of our Lord, with all the churches over which he presided, is recorded to have observed." Bishop Agilbert was then called upon to "show whence his custom of keeping Easter was derived." Agilbert asked that his disciple, the priest Wilfrid, might speak in his stead. Then Wilfrid, being ordered by the King to speak, delivered himself thus: "The Easter which we observe we saw celebrated by all at Rome, where the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul lived, taught, suffered, and were buried; we saw the same done in Italy and in France, when we travelled through those countries for pilgrimage and prayer. We found this same practiced in Africa, Asia, Egypt, Greece, and all the world—except only these and their accomplices in obstinacy — I mean the Picts and the Britons who foolishly in these two remote islands of the world, and only in part even of them, oppose all the rest of the universe." This was really the strongest argument for Wilfrid's party, and against the Scottish use—viz.: the Catholicity of the Roman Easter — though stated with scorn and rudeness towards his opponents. To this Colman replied with calm dignity, "It is strange that you will call our labors foolish, wherein we follow the example of

so great an Apostle who was thought worthy to lay his head on our Lord's bosom." Wilfrid had no difficulty in showing that the Keltic Easter had no real warrant from St. John. "Is it to be believed," said Colman, "that our most reverend Father Columba and his successors, men beloved by God, who kept the Easter after the same manner, acted contrary to the Divine writings?" To which Wilfrid answered, "I do not deny those to have been God's servants and beloved by Him, who, with rustic simplicity but pious intentions, have themselves loved Him. Nor do I think that such keeping of Easter was very prejudicial to them, as long as none came to show them a more perfect rule; and yet I do believe that they, if any Catholic adviser had come among them, would as readily have followed his admonitions as they are known to have kept those commandments of God which they had learned to know. But as for you and your companions, you certainly sin, if, having heard the decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Universal Church, and that the same is confirmed by Holy Writ (for this last Wilfrid had no warrant) you refuse to follow them; for, though your fathers were holy, do you think that their small number in a corner of the remotest island is to be preferred before the Universal Church of Christ throughout the world?" Here Wilfrid was getting back on solid ground, though not likely to carry his opponents with him by his offensive way of putting it. Finally Wilfrid carried his case by thundering out the favorite Text of all Romanists,

even when, as here, it has nothing whatever to do with the subject in hand. "If that Columba," he cried, "of yours (and I may say *ours* also, if he was Christ's servant) was a holy man and powerful in miracles, yet could he be preferred before the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, to whom our Lord said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and to thee I will give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' " This clinching sophistry of Wilfrid's, delivered, doubtless, in his most imposing and impressive manner, carried conviction straightway to the King, who, no doubt, had made up his mind beforehand, and who had little trouble in making up the minds of his people. "Is it true, Colman," said the royal president of the conference, "that these words were spoken to Peter by our Lord?" He answered, "It is true, O King." Then said he, "Can you show any such power given to your Columba?" Colman answered, "None." Then added the King, "Do you both agree that these words were principally directed to Peter, and that the keys of heaven were given him by our Lord?" They both answered, "We do." Then Oswy concluded—whether in jest, or in sober earnest, it is hard to say—"And I also say unto you, that he is the door-keeper whom I will not contradict, but will, as far as I know and am able, in all things obey his decrees, lest when I come to the gates of the kingdom of heaven, there should be none to open

them, he being my adversary who is proved to have the keys."

"The King having said this," is Bede's naive conclusion of the matter, "all present, both great and small, gave their assent, and, renouncing the more imperfect institution, resolved to conform to that which they found better."

Bede's statement that "all present, both great and small, gave their assent," is qualified by the title of his next chapter—"Colman, being worsted, returned home." Poor Colman, doubtless, felt "*small*" enough to fall under that class of assenters, but he did not, could not conscientiously, consent to a decision which seemed to him to repudiate and despise (though it did not) the teaching of those saintly men who had won Northumbria to Christ. And so Colman mournfully turned his back upon his dear Lindisfarne and the noble work he had loved so well, and "went back into Scotland to consult with his friends there as to what was to be done in this case." Nor did he ever return. From Iona he went still further to Ireland, where the old Keltic customs survived, and built a monastery off the coast of Mayo, spending the rest of his life on the remote Island Inisboffin, and dying there about twelve years later. Colman also "took with him such as would not comply with the Catholic Easter," his Irish monks who stood loyally by him, and thirty Northumbrian monks who clung to their master. As a parting request, he asked that the conforming monks of Lindisfarne might have for their Abbot in his

stead the gentle and congenial Eata, an old pupil of Aidan's and then Abbot of Melrose. This gladly granted, Abbot Colman and his companions bade farewell to the Holy Isle, consecrated by thirty years under the Scottish saints. They took with them some of the sacred bones of Aidan, its first bishop, to deposit at his old home in Iona.

To quote again from the Count de Montalembert: —"What heart is so cold as not to understand, to sympathize and to journey with him along the Northumbrian coast and over the Scottish mountains, when, bearing homeward the bones of his father Aidan, the proud but vanquished spirit returned to his northern mists, and buried in the sacred Isle of Iona his defeat, and his unconquerable fidelity to the traditions of his race." There is nothing more pathetic in Bede's book than his "Farewell to that old Scotic Church of Northumbria," of which, Canon Bright says, "It could not but pass away, for it could not provide what Northumbria then needed; it had but a temporary mission, but that mission it fulfilled with a rare simplicity of purpose. It brought religion straight home to men's hearts by sheer power of love and self-sacrifice." Here is the substance of Bede's Tribute to the Scottish Saints of Northumbria:—" 'The place which Colman governed shows how frugal he and his predecessors were, for there were very few houses except the Church found at their departure; indeed no more than were barely sufficient for their daily residence; they had also no money, but

cattle; for if they received any money from rich persons, they immediately gave it to the poor. . . . The King himself, when opportunity offered, came only with five or six servants, and, having performed his devotions in the Church, departed. But, if they happened to take a repast there, they were satisfied with only the plain and daily food of the brethren, and required no more: for the whole care of these teachers was to serve God, not the world, to feed the soul and not the belly. For this reason the religious habit was at that time in great veneration; so that wheresoever any clergyman or monk happened to come, he was joyfully received by all persons as God's servant; and, if they chanced to meet him upon the way, they ran to him, and bowing, were glad to be signed with his hand or blessed with his mouth. Great attention was also paid to their exhortations; and on Sundays they flocked eagerly to the Church, or the monasteries, not to feed their bodies, but to hear the word of God; and, if any priest happened to come into a village, the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the word of life; for the priests and clergymen went into the village on no other account than to preach, baptize, visit the sick, and in few words, to take care of souls; and they were so free from worldly avarice that none of them received lands and possessions for building monasteries, unless they were compelled to do so by the temporal authorities; which custom was for some time after observed in all the churches of the Northumbrians. But enough has been said

on this subject.' ''— Enough, surely, to make it very plain that, whatever gain came to the Anglo-Saxon Church by the decision at Whitby (and the gain was very great) there was also very serious loss in the departure of Colman and his companions. The Church can ill-afford to lose at any time men of the spirit of the Keltic missionaries, who were full of the spirit of God. The humility, the childlike simplicity, unworldliness, and generosity, the unbounded love and self-devotion to Christ and His Gospel, the deep and pure personal religion, the inflexible missionary zeal, the striking individuality and independence, the love of liberty—which characterized the Keltic saints, and set their stamp indelibly upon English religion,—if the Church had had lost this by the decision at Whitby, no other gains could have compensated for such a loss. But, in losing Colman and his non-conforming monks, it must not be supposed that the Church of England lost the whole Keltic stock of clergy and laity, much less the large number of their disciples and followers who continued to feel their influence and example. Even the ardent Romanist Wilfrid himself could not forget or forsake the evangelizing and missionary impulse which he had received at Lindisfarne, and which made him an Evangelist of the benighted Frisians and the backward South Saxons. Among those of the Scotic party who accepted the Roman customs because they were more Catholic, were Bishop Cedd, who had acted as interpreter, Tuda, who succeeded Colman in the Northumberland epis-

copate, Chadd, brother of Cedd, who later filled the same see, Eata, the new Abbot of Lindisfarne, the hermit-saint Cuthbert, and erelong the English disciples of the Scots generally. It would be the greatest blunder, however, to suppose that these became Romanists in the later and modern sense, that they surrendered the best characteristics of Keltic Christianity, or that the Anglo-Saxon Church surrendered at once its independence, and became thereby subject to the Roman See. Nothing of the sort was asked, or granted at Whitby. The Roman Church of that day was very different from later mediaeval and modern Romanism. Papal pretensions and aggressions, and English submission thereto were to come later, but not for a long time yet. And it was the Keltic love of ecclesiastical liberty that helped to make the English Church so stubborn in its resistance to papal aggression for centuries to come. As Bishop Lightfoot says, "Through the long ages of Roman domination the English Church was the least enslaved of all the churches. Her statute-book is a continued protest against this foreign aggression. Her ablest kings were the resolute opponents of Roman usurpation. When the yoke was finally thrown off, though the strong will of the reigning sovereign was the active agent, yet it was the independent spirit of the clergy and people which rendered the change possible. Hence there was no break in the continuity of the English Church. Of this independent spirit which culmin-

ated in the Reformation, Aidan, our spiritual father, was the earliest embodiment."

No, the English Church has never altogether lost the spiritual impulse of the Keltic Christianity in its golden days. But its best days were over now in England, and its continued isolation from the rest of western Christendom in Scotland and Ireland would prove disastrous there erelong. The reviving stream of Scotic influence which had come down like a mountain torrent from Iona to Lindisfarne, and had flowed out thence through the greater part of the Heptarchy, did not by any means run dry at Whitby. It only mingled its waters with that other stream from Rome to make one mightier river of God for all England. The two together would prove more effective than the two separated. The gains were far greater than the loss to England and to Christendom, when the Anglo-Saxon Church entered into free and full fellowship with Latin Christianity—then the greatest power for good in the world. In his "History of the English people," Mr. Green gives a vivid picture of the missionary power of the Irish Church in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe. "For a time," he says, it seemed as if the course of the world's history was to be changed, as if the older Keltic race that Roman and German had swept before them had turned to the moral conquest of their conquerors,—as if Keltic and not Latin Christianity was to mold the destinies of the churches of the West." But he presents another picture when he comes to a later time

and to the wholesome effects of the conclusion at Whitby. "Trivial in fact," he declares, "as were the actual points of difference which severed the Roman Church from the Irish, the question to which communion Northumbria should belong was of immense moment to the after-fortunes of England. Had the Church of Aidan finally won, the later ecclesiastical history would probably have resembled that of Ireland. Devoid of that power of organization which was the strength of the Roman Church, the Keltic Church in its own Irish home took the Clan system of the country as the basis of church government. . . . Hundreds of wandering bishops, a vast religious authority wielded by hereditary chieftains, the dissociation of piety from morality, the absence of those larger and more humanizing influences which contact with a wider world alone can give, this is the picture which the Irish Church, of later times presents to us. It was from such a chaos as this that England was saved by the victory of Rome in the Synod of Whitby."

Yes, it was high time for the Church of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to emerge from its purely mission stage, to advance beyond the stage of isolated, scattered settlements here and there, grouped loosely around some monastic or episcopal seat, with neither parochial nor diocesan organization; time for it to become one united and compact organism. It needed an efficient and settled government of its own, with an uniform system of regular institutions and definite laws, which should bind all its members

together into one common body, and bring it into closer relations with the larger and richer life and civilization and learning of the Catholic Church in the rest of Europe. Clearly, this was a stage of advancement to which the Scotch-Irish Church was not equal. It was something which Rome alone could then supply, with its genius for organization, and law and order. In Mr. Wakeman's brilliant book, "An Introduction to the History of the Church of England," he says of the Keltic Church,—"It could arouse, but it could not maintain; it could win, but it could not govern. The combination of Keltic self-sacrifice and zeal with the discipline and the culture of Rome was needed before the English Church could fully awake to the responsibilities of her high-position. . . . The Keltic Church found its best method of work in the personal contact of soul with soul, its truest source of influence in the example of the Christ-like life lived once more among men. Without the assistance of Rome there could never have been built up in England a great organized and cultured church, able to hold its own among the storms of Christendom. Without the help of the Saints of Iona, that Church would have been but a mechanism of bones and flesh wanting the life-giving soul. . . . Both the arguments (of Colman and Wilfrid at the Whitby Conference) were unhistorical, but behind the arguments used lay the real questions which were involved—isolation or unity, law or chaos, culture or ignorance, progress or backwardness. . . . Roman tradition

and papal authority were the forces which in the coming ages were to conquer the barbarian world, and consecrate it to the service of Christ. The decision at Whitby meant that the Church of England had determined to take her part in that noble work."

Before taking up the epoch-making career of Theodore, the first *great* Archbishop of Canterbury, let us glance briefly at some of the events which followed the Whitby Conference, and some of the principal personages concerned. Tuda, who succeeded Colman as Northumbrian bishop, was carried off by a terrible plague that visited England. Then came Wilfrid's great opportunity, of which he did not avail himself very worthily. Being appointed to succeed Tuda, he wanted things done in the best Roman style. He resolved, therefore, to transfer the Northumbrian See from humble Lindisfarne to York, where Gregory had fixed the second Archbishopric of England, and where Bishop Paulinus had fixed his See. Wilfrid resolved, also, to be consecrated by bishops of whose Roman regularity and Orthodoxy there could be no question. So King Oswy sent him to the King of the Gauls, and the famous champion of Rome was received with great honor at Court. He was consecrated Bishop at Compiêgne by twelve bishops, of whom his old friend Agilbert, formerly Bishop of Wessex now of Paris, was one. These prelates carried him into the church in a golden chair, and everything was done with Parisian pomp and ceremony. Wilfrid

was so enamored of his prelatical honors abroad that he remained away from his see for about a year. Meanwhile there was trouble at home, and his diocese became weary of waiting for the wilful Wilfrid. Accordingly the King appointed Chad in his place. Chad went to countryfied Kent to be consecrated without any city style. But the Archbishop of Canterbury Deusdedit had also been carried off by the plague, and the See was vacant. The only bishop accessible was Wini the West Saxon Bishop at Winchester. Here then Chad was consecrated by Wini and two *British* bishops secured to make the canonical number of three. I wonder what Wilfrid and the other high-churchman thought of these two. This is the only instance in which the old British bishops had as yet cooperated in any way with the Church of the English. It looked as if the British in Cornwall and Wales were relenting and becoming reconciled to their Saxon neighbors. Chad, whom Bede describes as "a holy man of modest behavior, well read in the Scriptures and diligently practicing those things which he had learned therein, being thus consecrated bishop, began immediately to devote himself to ecclesiastical truth and to chastity; to apply himself to humility, continence and study; to travel about, not on horseback, but after the manner of the Apostles on foot, to spread the Gospel in towns, the open country, cottages, villages and castles; for he was one of the disciples of Aidan, and endeavored to instruct his people by the same actions and behavior, accord-

ing to his and his brother Cedd's example." There was evidently no immediate danger of Keltic simplicity and devotion dying out under brother Chad's episcopate. The contrast to Wilfrid's "golden chair" and magnificence is rather striking.

Shortly after Chad had entered upon his reluctant episcopate, "clothed with humility," which fitted him better than cope and mitre, Wilfrid at last made a modest start homeward from giddy Gaul in princely prelatical style with only one hundred and twenty attendants. As he was crossing the channel, a sudden storm of the usual sort drove his ship ashore on the South Saxon coast, from which he barely escaped with his life, and to which at a later time he returned to do a noble evangelizing work, which more than compensated for his follies. Upon his arrival in Northumbria, finding himself supplanted in his See, he submitted with a good grace, and went quietly to work in his monastery at Ripon, for Wilfrid was never an idler. He was always a busy body, whether in his own affairs or in others. This, however, did not satisfy his restless energies; for—during a vacancy in the episcopate of Mercia — he performed such successful episcopal functions there that the King would gladly have given him that See. Here also he founded new monasteries, and among them Lichfield. His energies also extended into Kent, where at the King's request, he supplied for a time the vacant See of Rochester. At Canterbury, too, we find his brilliant personality and versatile genius attracting to him-

self a band of talented young men, especially those skilled in music, architecture and other ecclesiastical arts. One of them was Eddius Stephanus or Eddi, his future biographer. Some of these followed him back to Northumbria, and enabled him to do great things there for the restoration and adornment of its churches. Not long after, a question was raised as to the regularity of Chad's appointment to York, and that modest gentleman meekly resigned the See, and Wilfrid was promptly and properly put in his place, — Chad retiring to the quiet and congenial episcopate of Lichfield.

I cannot conclude this lecture better than by presenting to you two strongly contrasted pictures of the two types of Churchmen, the Keltic and the Roman, now comprehended in the United Church of Northumbria, soon to be the one Church of the English race. I will give you the beginning of Wilfrid's glorious Episcopate at York,—as condensed by Bright from Eddi; and the close of Chad's humble but glorious also, Episcopate at Lichfield,—as condensed by William Hunt from the venerable Bede:

"Wilfrid was then at the height of his prosperity and popularity. We seem to see him going about his diocese with the energy of one born to 'repair the breaches' and 'build the old waste places:' at York he 'shuddered' to see his cathedral fallen into a miserable dilapidation—the roofs decaying, the windows devoid of glass, and the inner walls blotched with rain and haunted by birds. He repaired the roofs, covered them with lead, glazed the

windows, cleaned the walls with lime, decked the altar with new furniture, and obtained new property for the Church. At his beloved Ripon he reared 'a basilica of polished stone, towering to a great height, with pillars of varied form, and arched vaults, and winding cloisters;' and invited the King, his brother Alfwin and a number of sub-kings, reeves and abbots to attend the dedication 'in honor of the Prince of the Apostles.' On such a day he was truly in his element; and we may imagine the interest with which the function would be watched by a little boy then being trained up in the monastery, afterwards the great missionary, Archbishop Willibrord. The altar, vested in purple and cloth of gold, was elaborately blessed, the paten and chalice hallowed, the Eucharist celebrated. Then Wilfrid in front of the altar, with his face towards the people, recited a list of the lands recently or previously bestowed upon him, and also the sanctuaries once held by the British Church. . . . Wilfrid added to his other gifts adornments for God's House, a large golden cross, and a canopy of the Gospels in four volumes, written in letters of gold on richly colored parchment, all contained in a case wrought with gold and jewels—a treasure long preserved in Ripon Minster. At Hexam, also, on land given by the pious queen Ethelred, he built in honor of St. Andrew a church of great length and height, with 'manifold columns and porches, a complication of ascending and descending passages'. . . which Eddi describes as 'a structure that, as far as he knew, had no equal

on this side of the Alps.' The crypt of this church still remains as a monument of that time."

This great churchman, evidently, believed, with David, that, ("where it can be had") "the House to be builded for the Lord God must be exceeding magnifical."

"The bishop," we are further told, "also exerted himself for the improvement of Divine Service: he set Eddi and Aeona to carry on the special work of Church-Song." But, if Wilfrid was magnificent as a church-builder, and active as a promoter of choral worship, he was also indefatigable as a Chief Pastor. "He is depicted as riding about incessantly to baptize and confirm, holding ordinations forming new church settlements, and, amid all this whirl of activities, retaining his habits of ascetic devotion. . . . At the same time, no austerity of manner was discernible in him; he made himself 'dear and loveable' to people of all races, and his gracious geniality, the outcome of a genuinely kind heart, was like sunshine to all who felt its presence. He was the typical man of Church and Nation.

"This is the picture of Wilfrid in the splendors of a well-deserved ascendency. We shall see erelong how the unique brilliancy of his position contributed to provoke a great vicissitude, which did but bring into fuller light the real nobleness of a princely and a Christian soul."

Now look on the other picture of the saintly Chad's Last Days. "Chad fixed his See at Lichfield, and lived there for two years and a half. . . . He

spent his time for the most part in travelling about preaching the Gospel, as he had done in Northumbria. Yet he had, of course, some seasons of rest. Near his Church at Lichfield, which was dedicated to St. Mary and stood to the East of the present Cathedral, he built himself a hut, and there he dwelt when he was not engaged in preaching in other parts, and passed his days in reading and prayer with some seven or eight of his monks. Ever recognizing the presence of God and mindful of the uncertainty of life, he was full of godly awe, which was apparent in all his words and actions. . . . This consciousness of standing always in the awful presence of God was the secret of his deep humility. Early in the year 672, the plague carried off a large number of his monks, and so it happened on a time that he was staying in his house with only one monk named Owine. This Owine had left all that he had and appeared at Chad's monastery at Lastingham carrying an axe and a hatchet; for, as he had not enough learning to study the Scriptures, he determined to serve God by working with his hands. He had followed Chad to Lichfield, and was with him when the call came to the bishop which had come to so many of his monks. One day when he was working in the fields near the bishop's dwelling, Owine deemed that he heard sweet voices singing, and the sound was as though it was coming down from heaven to earth, and at last it filled the oratory where he knew that Chad was. As he looked towards the building, Chad opened the window and clapped his hands, as he

was wont to do when he would call some one to him. Owine obeyed the call, and Chad bade him go to to the Church and fetch "the seven brethren," evidently the elders of the monastery, and come back with them. When they had come, he exhorted them to live in love and peace together, and diligently to observe the monastic rule and all that they had learned from him, 'For,' said he (of his approaching death), 'the gentle guest who has of late visited our brethren, has deigned to come to me today and call me from this world,' and he bade them tell the brethren to pray for him and to watch with prayer and good works for the day of their own departure. Seven days later, he died, after having received the Holy Eucharist. While other fathers of the English Church equalled St. Chad in diligence and devotion, his place is high among those 'holy and humble men of heart,' who, having lived as in the constant presence of God, stand before their Lord's face, and praise Him and magnify Him forever."

The comprehensiveness of the Anglican Communion has not yet failed to include such different types of Churchmen as Wilfrid and Chad.

V

The Coming of Theodore, and the Organization of the Early English Church

There are always these two principal constituents of a real Church:—*Life* and *Organization*. But these twain must become one,—they must be married to one another. Without the regenerate life of men, which comes from the presence and power of a living and life-giving Christ within individual souls, there can be only the semblance of a Church, only its empty shell. And, without an organism of its own, even the most Christian life will lack the necessary instrument for its conservation and propagation among men. The Apostolic figure of the Church is not that of "stones," however beautiful and polished, lying scattered and separate; but of a "building fitly framed together,"—or, better still, of a "living body," with its intimate and sympathetic connection of all the members.

Now the Evangelization of the English, probably of a larger part of them,—their conversion to Christ and their real Christian life, was largely due to the Scotch-Irish missionaries from Iona, the livest and most successful missionary force then in Western Europe. But the ultimate Organization of English Christianity, starting from different sources and representing different types, — its Consolidation into

one English Church, was mainly the work of the Church of Rome, then the most unifying and effective organization in Christendom.

The Foundation of the English Church was laid securely by Augustine, the Pioneer, sent from Rome for that purpose. But the Building erected thereon was begun by a far greater man than he, by the first great Archbishop of Canterbury, who was a Greek monk sent from Rome. This man was Theodore of Tarsus, a native of St. Paul's birthplace. "Tarsus," it has been well said, "had produced a St. Paul to found churches at the extreme east of Europe; and it produced a Theodore to consolidate newly founded churches at the extreme west. The apostle and this organizer were very unlike one another in many things; but both of them had great gifts for the work which God required them to do." (Alfred Plummer.)

Bede says of Theodore, "He was the first of the archbishops whom the whole English Church consented to obey." The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle says, "Before Theodore the archbishops were Roman, after him they were all English," and English they continued to be for three hundred and fifty years. "This marks him," says Professor Montagu Burrows in his "Commentaries on the History of England," "even more than Augustine, as a central figure for all time in English history. The English Church under him ceased to be a mission church, and became national. . . . The Keltic Church was blended with the Roman, but the composite Church, though Romanized, was still opposed to what was afterwards called ultra-

montanism. . . . It was indeed a Roman organization, and yet in a sense it was non-Roman and National. Like Columba, Augustine and Aidan, Theodore is the typical man of his own times."

Yes, the Keltic spirit and life, breathed into the Roman order and organization, were the chief constituents that created the English Church into a living organism, akin to both its predecessors, but different from both — *sui generis*. And the master mind, the resolute will, and the strong hand that brought this about were those of Theodore. The Conference at Whitby brought, rather slowly, uniformity of observance, but the new kind of Archbishop brought unity of organization and administration. He made the two parties not only act alike, but act together as one body. Let us see how Theodore came upon the scene, and the part he played when he got there. It is a curious story. The last Archbishop of Canterbury and the first English-born archbishop, called Deusdedit, had been carried off by the plague, some years before, and the vacancy had not yet been filled. None of the recent incumbents had gone outside of Kent, nor amounted to very much there. It was high time for a new type. It was rather indicative of a new order of things that the two principal Kings, Oswy of Northumbria and Egbert of Kent, agreed together to fill the vacancy at Canterbury by uniting in the choice of a monk there named Wighard, who was also acceptable to the whole Church. In order that Wighard might have the benefit of wider observation and experience at Rome, now the recognized

model of the English Church, and the prestige of consecration by the bishop of the Apostolic See, he was sent thither, but died before he could be consecrated. Although the two kings do not seem to have asked the Pope, Vitalian, to select another man for them in the place of Wighard, he found it convenient to take this for granted, and no objection was made. The Pope's first choice was an accomplished abbot of a monastery near Naples, named Hadrian, of African race (not a negro, however). Hadrian modestly declined the honor, but recommended a friend, whom he thought more competent. This was a Greek monk not yet in orders, although he was sixty-six years of age, who had but recently come to Rome. He had studied at Athens, was a scholar in Greek and Latin, in sacred and secular learning, and eminent in philosophy, so that he was called "the Philosopher." This man was Theodore of Tarsus. The Pope accepted him on condition that Hadrian, who stood sponsor for him, should accompany him to England and help him in the difficult work ahead. The Monothelite heresy was very prevalent among the Greeks then, and was regarded as worse than the plague. The Pope probably feared that this Greek might be infected, and intended that Hadrian should stand guard over his orthodoxy.

At any rate Hadrian, who had spent much time in Gaul, would certainly be a valuable ally and adviser to his friend. So the lay-monk was hurried through the minor orders, and out of his Greek tonsure into the Latin; and, then, on March 26th, in the year 668,

he was consecrated by the Pope as "Archbishop of the Church of the English." Besides Hadrian, the noted English scholar and traveler, Benedict Biscop, also accompanied the new prelate as teacher and interpreter in the English language. After a considerable stay in Gaul, at Arles and Paris, where he was the guest of Bishop Agilbert—who could give him much information about the English Church—the Archbishop and Biscop arrived at Canterbury, where Hadrian soon joined them. The Metropolitan See had now been vacant for five years. The outlook was far from encouraging. The contentions between the two factions, although nominally healed at Whitby, had brought about a chaotic condition. There were no regular parishes yet nor settled pastors—no Diocesan system in the strict sense. The so-called Dioceses were the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, generally very large, with but one bishop for each, and he not tied to his see.

These bishoprics, too, were now mostly vacant. The only bishops left at Theodore's arrival were Wilfrid and Chad and Wini. Wilfrid and Chad were claimants to the same See, and Wini was a doubtful character with a very shady episcopate. A wise, resolute and energetic man was required to deal with the situation, and such Theodore proved to be during the twenty-two years of his episcopate, although he was far from young at the start. His appointment was as thoroughly justified as that of the late Archbishop Temple, his far-off successor. "He was called upon to unite the Church of the English, to organize it by

giving it an efficient and orderly Episcopate and the means of self-government, to institute a rational disciplinary system, and to train "the religions" of both sexes from an overweening enthusiasm for extravagant asceticism to a zeal for learning and teaching."

Benedict Bicop was appointed by Theodore to the temporary charge of the Abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury, and Hadrian accompanied the new archbishop in his first round of visitation throughout his vast province. He visited all the Sees of the Heptarchy, studying the situation in each, supplying what was lacking, strengthening the things that remained, establishing with a firm hand his Metropolitan authority, disseminating the rule of right living and the Catholic mode of celebrating Easter. He was everywhere received with honor, and his authority was everywhere recognized as that of "the right man in the right place," who was sorely needed.

One of Theodore's first measures was to fill the *vacant* Sees. Putta was consecrated for Rochester, Bisi for East Anglia, and Leutherius for Wessex. When Northumbria was reached, Theodore effected an amicable settlement of a difficult case. Not satisfied with the regularity of Chad's consecration to that very important See, he promptly secured his resignation. According to Bede, the very humble Chad, answered in characteristic fashion, "If you are persuaded that I received the episcopate in an irregular manner, I willingly retire from the office, for I never thought myself worthy of it." Wilfrid was promptly put back in the place to which he had been originally

appointed, and resumed business at the old stand. Having supplied whatever he regarded as lacking in Chad's orders, the Archbishop soon had him transferred to Lichfield, as we have seen. In this connection we have one of the very few personal traits of Theodore which Bede has preserved, and which shows that the stern, autocratic and strong-handed prelate was not without a tender place in his heart. His special liking for the holy and humble Chad increases our liking for Theodore. The Archbishop insisted that Chad should not make such long episcopal journeys on foot; and when he could not otherwise overcome the bishop's reluctance to the luxury of riding on horseback, he said, "You *shall* ride," and then lifted Chad bodily into the saddle. I wonder what Chad would have thought of an automobile. This sounds not unlike some of the stories of Archbishop Temple.

Having thus made a fair beginning towards the stupendous work of organizing his Church, Theodore's next step was to summon the first deliberative and legislative body of the whole English Church. It met at Hertford on September 24th, 673. According to the Nicene rules and the canons of the later General Councils, a Provincial Synod was a necessary part of a regular Church organization. Such Synods had become usual in the Western church elsewhere, and even the banished British Church in Wales had not given up its Synods. The new English Church, its successor and supplanter, was now to take its proper place in Catholic Christendom by organizing

its first Provincial Synod. Theodore the Metropolitan presided. Only four of his six bishops were present in person. Wilfrid was represented only by his delegates, and Wini, the simoniacal bishop of London, did not show up either in person or by proxy. Strictly speaking, the Synod was composed of Bishops only, according to the ancient usage, which might have been improved. But it was no violation of Catholic custom that there should sit with the bishops on this occasion, as Bede has it, "Many other teachers of the Church who loved and were acquainted with the canonical statutes of the fathers." Bede has preserved the account of the Archbishop himself duly attested by Titillus, his notary. Its proceeding opened with the solemn invocation: "In the name of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who reigns forever and ever, and governs His Church, it was thought meet that we should assemble, according to the custom of the venerable canons, to treat about the necessary affairs of the Church."

Then follows the Primate's Address, "I beseech you, most dear brothers, for the love and fear of our Redeemer, that we may all treat in common for our faith; to the end that whatsoever has been decreed and defined by the holy and reverend fathers may be inviolably observed by all." "Much more," the Archbishop spoke, "tending to the preservation and unity of the Church." Then each bishop in order was asked "whether he consented to observe the things that had been formerly canonically decreed by the fathers." To which each answered, "Placet"—"It so pleases

us, and we will all most willingly observe with a cheerful mind whatever is laid down in the Canons of the holy fathers."

Whereupon the Primate produced a collection of such Canons, beginning with the so-called "Apostolic Canons" and including those of the principal Councils from Nicea to Chalcedon. From these he selected ten as specially appropriate to the then needs of the English Church.

In brief, this is the summary: (I) That all should keep Easter on the Sunday after the 14th moon; (II) That no bishop should trespass on the diocese of another; (III) That no bishop should trouble any monastery or take away its possessions; (IV) That no monk should wander from his own monastery to another unless by permission of his abbot; (V) That no clergyman should leave his diocese without letters commendatory from his diocesan, and should return if summoned by his bishop, on pain of excommunication; (VI) That stranger bishops and clergy should not officiate in a diocese without leave of the diocesan; (VII) That a synod should meet twice a year—after debate, once a year (at a place called Clovesho) was agreed upon; (VIII) That precedence among bishops should be regulated by the dates of consecration; (IX) That the number of the episcopate should be increased—which was debated, but action was deferred; (X) That only lawful marriage should be allowed; That no one should leave his wife except, as the Gospel teaches, for the cause of fornication, and that

no Christian who had put away his wife should marry another.

When these Canons had been accepted the Notary wrote them out, and the archbishops and bishops formally signed their names thereto. "This act," says Bishop Stubbs, "which seems to be a formal acceptance on the part of the English Churches of the common Diocesan system of the Church at large, is of the highest historical importance as the first constitutional measure of the collective English race; no act of secular legislation can be produced parallel to it before the reign of Alfred, or rather of his son Edward."

Such, then, was the first legislative body that made laws for all the English,—the precursor, therefore, not only of the later Convocations of the Church, but also of the National Witenagemots and Parliaments of England—so that Theodore holds an important place among the Makers of England, as well as of the English Church. "It was the Ecclesistical Synods," says Green, "which by their example led the way to our National Parliament, as it was the Canons enacted in such Synods which led the way to a national system of law." "This year 673," says Charles Hole, "was at least 150 years before the civil rule of the Heptarchy coalesced into a Monarchy. In other words, the English Church is much older than the English Monarchy."

The Canon passed at Hertford which prescribed an *annual* church council could hardly be carried out with any regularity during the unsettled condition of

political affairs and the wars between the kingdoms. But the precedent was established, and Theodore certainly held a second Synod at Hatfield in 680—the only other in his day of which we have any record. This was called in compliance with Pope Agatho's desire that the English Church should take action in regard to the monothelite heresy. This was done in the most orthodox fashion. A notable fact mentioned by Bede, in his account of this Synod, is its acknowledgment, at so early a date of what is called the "*Filioque*" in the Creed, the double procession of the Holy Spirit from the *Father and the Son.* After declaring its acceptance of the Five Ecumenical and the Lateran Council at Rome, it closes with an "ascription of glory to God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son in an ineffable manner, as those holy apostles, prophets, and doctors did declare."

Theodore, having now made the Diocesan Episcopate a practical reality, and tied the bishop to his See, and given him a definite body of laws by which to administer it,—the next step was to increase the number of English bishops from seven to seventeen. He proposed to accomplish this by dividing the immense sees coterminous with the kingdoms, until each bishop should have a manageable diocese, in which he might have a chance to do the work required. He had raised this question in the Synod at Hertford, but it had met with opposition, and no action had been taken. It was undoubtedly a necessary thing to do, and it could only be done by radical measures, in which

Theodore strained "the one-man power"—sometimes a necessity but always dangerous—to the utmost. His first efforts in this direction caused little trouble. The sickness and retirement of Bisi from the bishopric of East Anglia gave him the opportunity to divide that diocese into two, one for the North folk and the other for the South folk. In Mercia he took the autocratic measure of deposing Winfrid the successor of Chad for some disobedience of which we are ignorant, and dividing that immense diocese into five—Lichfield, Hertford, Worcester, Leicester and Sydnacester. His method of proceeding seems to have been to get the approval of the King and his Witan, and then to go ahead, whether the bishop chiefly concerned liked it or not. The division of Wessex was, however, postponed until after the death of its bishop. But the battle-royal came when Northumbria was reached, and two strong wills like those of Theodore and Wilfrid came into collision. Then you could see the fur fly. Wilfrid was already in hot water with King Egfrid and his new queen (new queens are apt to be partial to new methods), and they were only too glad to see him shorn of a good part of his power and pomp.

It must be admitted, I think, that Theodore dealt far from frankly or fairly with Wilfrid, when, in conjunction with his enemy the King and after consulting other bishops, he proceeded to divide Wilfrid's diocese and even to consecrate bishops for the three newly created sees therein, without consulting him or even giving him notice beforehand. It seems

to have been taken for granted by all parties that Wilfrid would never consent—which was doubtless true—and that the thing must be done without his consent. Wilfrid seems to have been absent at the time, but, upon his return he appeared promptly before Egfrid and Theodore in a Northumbrian gemot, and demanded why his diocese was thus cut up without his consent. He found little comfort in the cool reply, "We find no fault in you, but we have thought good to do this, and we shall abide by it." William of Malmesbury fitly quotes Juvenal's "*sic volo, sic jubeo.*" Without further parleying Wilfrid announced that he would carry his case to what he considered the fountain-head of authority, of equity and justice. He soon appeared in person at Rome and made his appeal for justice to Pope Agatho,—one of whose predecessors had sent Augustine to found the Church of the English, and another, Vitalian, had recently chosen and consecrated Theodore as archbishop of the English. This first instance in English history of an appeal to the Pope against the action of the English civil and ecclesiastical authorities was a precedent destined to bring ever-increasing trouble and conflict as the papal pretensions steadily advanced, and was never finally settled until it was settled right at the Reformation. Wilfrid, of course, was received with greater eclat than ever at Rome. Theodore simply sent one of his monks, Kenwarld, with a written statement of his side of the controversy. The case was duly considered by the Pope and his council. They decided (wisely enough) that Wilfrid

should be restored to his original bishopric, that the intruding bishops should be ousted, and, this done, that Wilfrid himself, with the consent of a synod to be called at York, should choose bishops as assistants with whom he could live peaceably, who should be consecrated by Theodore. The usual penalties were denounced against all who should attempt to resist this sentence, or not receive it obediently. Wilfrid returned in triumph to Northumbria bearing as the banner of his victory the papal decree with its leaden *bullae* and its Apostolic seal duly attached. But the presentation of this formidable document to the King and his Witan was far from striking terror into their stubborn hearts. They rejected with indignation and scorn the man who had sought the interference of any foreign authority, even the most venerated, in their domestic affairs. There is no question, I think, that, as things stood then, Wilfrid had the right to appeal from the decision of his Metropolitan to the Pope, and that the Pope had the right to pronounce the decision of the Papal court; but it is probable that the "Decretal" was not regarded yet as a command, and that neither party was bound to accept it as more than advice. It is worthy of notice that neither Theodore nor King Egbert and his council raised the question as to the Pope's right to decide the case. They avoided even considering it, but took a short cut towards disposing of the matter by denying the genuiness of the decree, charging Wilfrid with bribery and imposture. For these high crimes and misdemeanors the civil authorities sen-

tenced him to nine months imprisonment to be followed by banishment. As Mr. Hole has it, "No blame of the Pope is expressed, but only of Wilfrid, whose attempt to browbeat the indignant thanes in the Pope's name was probably the great and sole occasion of their anger. Such was the resistance which the first act of ultramontanism encountered among the Anglo-Saxons." ("A Manual of English Church History.")

Mr. Hole also raises a question as to the *Contents* of the Papal Letters because "the historian gives *no text*," and the only historian here is Wilfrid's biographer and biased partizan, Eddi. But, taking the Letters as genuine, their censure of Theodore was not very severe. "Their decision," says Dr. Alfred Plummer, "was a very wise one. Wilfrid had been irregularly deprived of the greater part of his diocese, and the bishops who had been violently intruded must be expelled. *But*—Theodore had done the right thing, though he had done it in the wrong way. Wilfrid must hold a council at York, and with the council's concurrence select bishops to assist him. He must choose men with whom he could work peaceably, and then present them to Theodore to be consecrated. Thus each side got what was essential—Wilfrid that his rights as Bishop of York should be respected; Theodore that so large a diocese should have more than one bishop." ("The Churches in Britain before A. D. 1000.")

Wilfrid's lack of patriotism and loyalty to his own Nation and Church was punished by the loss of the

See of York, by imprisonment for nine months, followed by banishment. It was after this banishment that he devoted six years of heroic and successful service to the conversion of the Sussex barbarians, and proved his Christian heroism. Defeat never daunted him, nor made him idle nor despondent. It brought out his best qualities.

Theodore, unmoved by the decision of Rome, proved himself, though foreign-born, a loyal Englishman and Churchman, like Archbishop Langton of a later day, and went calmly on with his work of dividing up the unwieldy diocese of Northumbria, making a new see now as far north as the firth of Forth. He was not minded to be a mere Roman Legate, but set the example of ignoring Papal interference with the rights of the English Church and Nation which distinguished England for centuries to come. With all due and even devout deference for the Apostolic See, which had sent him hither, the Archbishop of the English would attend to his own business and rule his own suffragans.

It is gratifying to know that Theodore and Wilfrid were subsequently reconciled, and that the Archbishop, softened by his approaching end, used all his influenced to repair the wrong done to Wilfrid. He was too good and great a man not to show his appreciation of that prelate's splendid services in Sussex by opening the way for his restoration to a great part of his original bishopric. The death of King Egfrid and other changes in Northumbria gave the opportunity for Wilfrid's return. At Theodore's request,

the new King, Aldfrid, restored Wilfrid to the See of York, much diminished in size, and to the monastery at Ripon. During a vacancy in the new Sees of Hexham and Lindisfarne, he had charge also of those. Thus, temporarily at least, Wilfrid regained a great part of his former prestige.

Theodore died September 19th, 690, aged eighty-eight. On his tomb at Canterbury, Bede, tells us, was engraven an epitaph of thirty-four verses, but it has been well said that Bede himself surpasses all that they may have said by his simple testimony, "In his Episcopate the English Churches received more spiritual benefit than they could ever gain before his time."

Few men were more competent than the late Bishop Stubbs of Oxford to sum up the signal services of this great archbishop:—"It is difficult, if not impossible," he says, "to overstate the debt which England, Europe, and Christian civilization owe to the work of Theodore. He was the real organizer of the administrative system of the English Church, and in that work laid the foundation of National unity. He brought the learning and culture of the Eastern Empire into the West, and, with the aid of Hadrian and Benedict Bishop, established schools from which the scholars and missionaries of the following century went out to rekindle the light of Christian culture in France and the recently converted parts of Germany; and thus formed a most important link between ancient and modern life; his culture was for the time

enlightened and tolerant, and, although he has never been canonized, or even beatified, both his character and his work seem to place him among the first and greatest of the saints whom God has used for the building up of the Church and development of the culture of the world." ("Dictionary of Christian Biography.") After Theodore's death (at which Wilfrid was probably not the chief mourner) that wilful man broke loose again. Failing to profit by his humiliating experiences, he brought upon himself the same troubles all over again—which shows that Theodore had not been the chief offender. Wilfrid and King Alfrid, successor of Egfrid, soon quarreled about his rights and dignities. The case went against the bishop in England. Again he appealed to Rome, and Pope Sergius took his part. Aldfrid, like his predecessor, would brook no papal interference in his kingdom. The new Archbishop Bertwald sided with the King and his Witan, Wilfrid's claims and the Pope's together were rejected by a great national synod of the whole Church at Easterfield in 702, and Wilfrid was deposed. Again he journeyed to Rome, at the age of seventy, and another pope, John VI, pronounced in his favor, and again the papal decree fell flat in England, and Wilfrid was in greater disfavor than ever. Finally, after the death of King Aldfrid, a compromise was effected in a Northumbrian local synod on the banks of the river Nidd in 705, and Wilfrid was limited until his death in 709, to the bishopric of Hexam and his old monastery at Ripon—

John of Beverley being promoted from Hexham to the more important one of York. His later appeals to Rome—his Romo-mania—only served to lose him the dignified position which Theodore had gained for him as bishop of the wealthy and historic See of York. "Let us hope," says Bright, "that the once fiery and imperial spirit of Wilfrid, bent and chastened by age and troubles, was content with the prospect of grief and peace in exchange for the hope of ascendancy."

The Rev. M. W. Patterson, in his recent "History of the Church of England," has well summed up his character:—"In 709 Wilfrid died. If his career is analysed, it will be seen that the cause of his many troubles was his opposition to national sentiment and his overbearing, unconciliating temper. He had the characteristic Roman lust for ecclesiastical domination; his haughty temper could not brook opposition. Humble and lowly in his own private life, he was bent on magnifying his ecclesiastical office and the claims of Rome. He was the fore-runner of Thomas Becket. Yet with all this he was full of love for the poor, a zealous missionary to the heathen, eager to win souls for Christ. His was a mixed nature, of a type that has often been found in ecclesiastics."

Wilfrid, by his brilliant and versatile, but erratic, genius; and Theodore by his calm, orderly common sense, by his clear-headed and hard-headed talents for organization,—each contributed much to the making of the Church of the English race. Even

their tremendous conflict was overruled to serve a good purpose. It did more than almost anything else to develop a National spirit in State and Church, to call forth in each the love of independence and self-government, and the spirit of resistance to foreign domination.

Exactly how Wilfrid lost his preeminent prestige and popularity in Northumbria we do not know. Nor are we likely ever to know, since the most competent historians, ancient and modern, who have sifted all the "sources" and weighed all the evidence in the case, have not been able to bring in a verdict. The jury cannot agree.

Bede must have known all the facts, but he would not tell. He tells us too little, and Eddi tells entirely too much, and of too biased a character. The ice was doubtless very thin in some places, and Bede kept away from these, while Eddi (not seeing the sign, "Danger," which Bede had put up), went in over his head. Bede's account is simply this, "There arose a dissension between the King Egfrid and the most reverend Bishop Wilfrid, and the bishop was driven from his see, and two bishops put in his place." Wilfrid was evidently a genius and highly accomplished, but of most imperious spirit and vaulting ambition, with his eye probably on an Archbishopric for himself at York — which came, indeed, to that great see later, but not until about twenty-five years after Wilfrid's death. We are told, often, that there were "charges" against him, but we are not told exactly what the charges were.

No crimes are charged against him—there was no question af faith or morals involved. But the probabilities are that his unique and commanding personality, and the vast power and wealth under his control made him a formidable rival to both King and Archbishop, and a constant menace to the peace of both State and Church. Egfrid found Wilfrid's pastoral staff overshadowing his own sceptre, and also a rival to the Primate's Pall. It was necessary to the rule of both that his vast power and wealth should be diminished and his immense diocese divided into several. Why should he alone be an exception to Bede's broad statements: "Theodore was the first archbishop whom *all* the English Church obeyed," and "Theodore visiting all parts, ordained bishops in *proper* places, and, with their assistance, *corrected* such things as he found *faulty.*" Here was something "faulty," which King and Archbishop, in the interest of the Common Weal, in behalf of the best interest and unity of both State and Church, combined to correct. The King seems to have played the most conspicuous part, and to have done the most talking (with the voluble young queen's assistance); but the grand old man, Theodore, grim, and solemn and silent, was "the man behind the guns." He was wise enough to know that there is a time to keep *silence.* He had already managed to lose his *hearing* sufficiently to turn a deaf ear to Rome, and now he was *dumb* also.

Where Theodore had found seven bishoprics in England he left seventeen—about the same number

that Henry VIII found at his accession to the throne. No fewer than twenty-one bishops were consecrated by him in twenty-two years. He made the Diocesan system of the English Church virtually what it has continued to be ever since, except that he more wisely (certainly for his own times) centred it in one Metropolitan See, instead of two, as proposed by St. Gregory. And his Diocesan system, following the tribal divisions of each kingdom, laid the foundation and prepared the way for the English Parochial system, which was slowly developed through the succeeding centuries into what it has long been. Just as the Bishop, whom he found little more than a royal chaplain and chief missionary for each kingdom, became the responsible head of a territorial diocese, so the chaplain of some thegn or large landholder, gradually became the settled Priest for that holding and its people. Its territory became his Parish, for which he was responsible as the Parson *(persona ecclesiae)*. Bede notices at least the beginnings of such rural churches and local clergy. Theodore had been familiar with the "paroichia" in the Eastern Empire as the local ecclesiastical centre, and may well have desired an adaptation of his native system which fitted in so admirably with the Teutonic Township. The term "paroichia" was of varying signification in the early Church, but it finally denoted simply the *country communities*. The change from roving monks, preaching at rude mission-stations, to a resident parochial clergy was brought about by encouraging the nobleman to build

a church on his estate, or in his township, to endow it with lands and tithes, having the right of appointing the parish priest. That is the English Parish system which was slowly evolved out of the Archbishop's effective organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

Look now at other practical achievements and their beneficent results, -- especially in the notable fields of *Education,* and of *Missionary enterprise.* Even the best organized Church would be of little worth without a godly and well-learned clergy. Theodore did much to promote the cause of better Education. It would be long before England would have such a parochial clergy as would enable her to dispense with the monasteries, which were the chief centres both of learning and of missionary work with both the Keltic and the Roman evangelists. The growth of Monasteries under Theodore was very considerable,—including such important ones as Peterborough, Ely, Malmesbury, Abington, and the refounding of the old British establishment at Glastonbury. Wilfrid also had done much in this direction. But Benedict Bishop was now the great leader in building and developing the best side of monastic life. He had come back to England with Theodore from Rome, and had taken charge of the monastery at Canterbury until Hadrian, another expert and the archbishop's closest colleague, was ready to devote the rest of his life to this establishment. It was Biscop who afterwards built Jarrow and Wearmouth in the North, and enriched them

with the rare literary and artistic treasures which he had gathered in five visits to Rome and other centres of culture. But Theodore himself had a large share in the promotion of Schools, monastic and other. Combining in himself both Eastern and Western learning, this great leader did much towards diverting the later monastic life of the Scots from morbid seclusion and extravagant ascetisism into healthier and more serviceable channels, making the monasteries centres of study and scholarship for clergy and laity. He took a *personal* part in the teaching at Canterbury, where he and Hadrian created something like a University for higher education, which furnished the model for similar Schools at York and elsewhere. Among his pupils were John of Beverley, afterwards bishop of Hexham and later of York,—and Aldhelm, soon to be considered one of the first scholars of his day in England, afterwards the saintly Abbot of Malmesbury and first Bishop of Sherborne. Each of these scholars of Professor Theodore has told a good story of their illustrious teacher. We are told by John that Theodore lectured sometimes on Medicine. On this subject, however, he can hardly be counted a very high authority. "Nobody knows it all, not even the youngest" (nor yet the oldest). And, as Professor of Materia Medica, the Primate left something to be desired. For John of Beverley quoted a maxim of his, that "it was dangerous to bleed a patient when moon and tide were waxing," and also expressed his belief that "hare's flesh was good for dysentery."

Aldhelm wrote a letter to a friend which shows that more vigorous remedies were applied in the case of some obstreperous Irish students who badgered the elderly philosopher. "He treated them," we are told, "as the truculent boar treats the Molossian hounds. He tore them with the tusk of Grammar, and shot them with the deep and sharp syllogisms of Chronography, till they cast away their weapons, and hurriedly fled to the recesses of their dens."

"Forasmuch," says Bede of Theodore and Hadrian, "as both of them were well read both in sacred and in secular literature, they gathered a crowd of disciples, and there daily flowed from them rivers of knowledge to water the hearts of their hearers; and, together with the books of Holy Writ, they also taught them the arts of ecclesiastical poetry, astronomy and arithmetic. A testimony of which is, that there are still living at this day some of their scholars who are as well versed in the Greek and Latin tongues as in their own in which they were born. Nor were there ever happier days since the English came into Britain."

Few of us, I think, are aware of the *Literary accumulations* in Great Britain at this period, and of the *Educational influences* which afterwards went forth into Europe from a real revival of learning here. In his recent valuable "Commentaries on the History of England," Professor Burrows has the following statement: "Bede owed his remarkable education not only to the Keltic stock of learning concentrated at Jarrow, and to the importations

of Wilfrid and Biscop from Rome, but also to the labors of Theodore and Hadrian. It is not too much to say that in this way the British Isles became the repository of the literary stores which had been swept off the barbarized Continent during the Dark Ages; and then the medium by which they were restored to the world. In Ireland, in Scotland, in Northumbria, and in Kent, the ancient accumulations, destroyed elsewhere, were safely treasured up for future use, and were ready to be dispersed again when Charles the Great reduced Europe to order. Then came once more the turn of the Continent, when Charles' tutor, the Northumbrian Alcuin (born in the year in which Bede died, and educated in the school at York), who had gathered up into himself the whole harvest of English cultivation, became the chief agent of the great Emperor in the education of Europe. . . . When England, ruined and laid waste (by the Danes), rallied from crushing disaster, it was fain to import from abroad the pupils of the men whom it had formerly sent forth. Who could have foreseen that, amidst the decay of moribund civilizations, the replenishing agency, like the supply of electric fluid to exhausted atmospheres, should always be ready at hand to repair the waste?''

If Caedmon was the father of English Poetry, Bede was the father of English History, and indeed of English Literature—the man in whom ''the whole learning of an age seemed to be summed up.'' In his Epitaph at Durham he is styled, ''An English-

man, born in an obscure corner of the world, who by his knowledge enlightened the whole universe—who searched the treasures of all divine and human learning." To him, more than all others together, we are indebted for our knowledge of the Early English Church during the first century and a quarter of its existence. Making some allowance for his Roman bias, and more for the credulity which he shared with his age in regard to the Miraculous, the venerable Bede stands unrivalled in his day as "the discoverer of the true scope and method of an historian." There is little to record of a life so singularly uneventful, and yet so extremely fruitful. His whole life from the year 675 to 735 was spent on the estate on which he was born, and which was given by King Egbert of Northumbria to Benedict Biscop for the twin monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow. At the age of seven Bede was handed over to Biscop, and spent the rest of his life in one or other of these united monasteries—mostly at Jarrow. He was ordained Deacon at the age of nineteen, and Priest at thirty by John of Beverley, Bishop of Hexham, and there is no evidence that he ever travelled further than to York, which was quite unlike our *New* York. But under Biscop and his successor Ceolfrith at Jarrow, the ecclesiastical historian of the English people enjoyed here for his purposes what Bishop Stubbs calls "advantages which could not perhaps have been found any where else in Europe at the time; perfect access to all the existing sources of learning in the West.

Nowhere else could he acquire at once the Irish, the Roman, the Gallican, and the Canterbury learning; the accumulated stores of books which Benedict had bought at Rome, and at Vienne; or the disciplinary instruction drawn from the monasteries of the Continent, as well as from the Irish missionaries." His studies and writings were almost encyclopædic, covering well nigh every subject known to his day. He left behind him forty-five or more books, "including scores of commentaries on the Scriptures compiled from the Christian Fathers, translations of the Bible and Liturgy into the vulgar tongues, a book upon the Saints and Martyrs, biographies of his contemporaries, treatises on orthography, astronomy, rhetoric, poetry, etc." Besides his written books, he carried on an extensive correspondence with persons throughout the Heptarchy and at Rome, from whom he got valuable local information at first hand. Of all his books, however, the "Ecclesiastical History" is his masterpiece. His whole monotonous, but happy life, was spent in learning, teaching, writing, the devotions and labors of a monk. "I ever found it sweet," he says, "to learn or to teach or to write," yet he delighted to leave his books whenever the monastery bell summoned him to the daily devotions, "dreading," he said, "lest the angels who hovered there might have to ask, 'where is Bede? Why comes he not with the brethren to the appointed prayers?' "— (a question which the angels might well ask at more modern seats of learning.) And so this good man's schol-

arly life was "full of sweetness and light" up to the end—his path "as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." That Light did not fail him "at Eventide."

Cuthbert, a fellow-monk, who describes his death, tells us how greatly he desired to finish his last book, a translation of St. John's Gospel into English. At last his boy-scribe Wilbert cried to the dying saint and scholar, "Dear Master, there is only one sentence more not written down." "It is well," he answered, "write it." In a little while the boy said, "Now it is finished." He answered, "It is well, thou hast said the truth; it is finished; Take my head in thy hands, for I love to look on my holy place, where I have been wont to pray, and would call once more on my Father." Then, as he lay on the floor of his cell, he chanted the "Gloria Patri," and so breathed out his serene soul to God!

None can doubt in his case the fulfilment of the beautiful prayer with which he closes his Ecclesiastical History: "And I beseech Thee, good Jesu, to grant to me, to whom Thou hast given to drink in with delight the words of Thy knowledge, that through Thy goodness I may at length attain unto Thee the Fountain of all wisdom, and appear forever before Thy Face. Amen!"

Even more notable and honorable than the Educational work of the English Church, after its organization by Theodore, was its glorious *Missionary Work*, not only at home, but abroad—its *Foreign* Missions. The Evangelizing spirit of the Church

had not been quenched by the withdrawal, or overshadowing of the Scots, who had kindled it in England at the same time that they were sending such missionaries as Columbanus and Gallus to Gaul and Switzerland. The Scotch-Irish Missionaries had their worthy successors among the English now, who were seized with the desire to convert their heathen kinsmen on the Continent; and their extraordinary success was largely due to the fact that they combined the Evangelizing power of the Scots with the Organizing power of Rome. Out of Wilfrid's monastery at Ripon came a Northumbrian youth, who, after drinking in also the Irish learning and zeal, undertook the work of evangelizing the Frisians, which his old Master Wilfrid himself had inaugurated. In the spirit and after the example of St. Columba of Iona, Willibrord with twelve companions landed at the mouth of the Rhine in the year 690, and labored with such signal success among the Frisians of Pipin Heristal's dominions that the Pope made him Archbishop of Utrecht. One of his companions, from England also, Swidbert was consecrated by Wilfrid of York as the first missionary bishop consecrated and sent from the English Church. In 719 Willibrord was joined in Frisia by an Englishman from Wessex, Winfrid of Crediton, who then entered upon one of the most extraordinary and far-reaching missionary careers in the whole history of Christianity. Under his new name of *Boniface*, Winfrid became the great Missionary Bishop of Germany and Archbishop of Maintz. He

brought over to Germany many English monks and nuns to reinforce him in his vast fields, and several of them became bishops under him. St. Boniface was the equal of St. Columba as an indefatigable and successful missionary. He was the equal, if not the superior, of Theodore as an organizer and an ecclesiastical statesman. Unlike both, he was an uncompromising Papist, because the Papacy, as then constituted, seemed to him, under the conditions then existing in Western Europe, the only power that could could save Continental Europe from chaos. Willibrord and Winfrid (Boniface) paid back to the Pope the debt which England owed the Roman See for the sending of Augustine to found the English Church, and sending Theodore to organize it into the National Church of the English race. Boniface both evangelized the Germans and organized them into a powerful Church. He also reformed and reorganized the almost effete Church of the Franks in Gaul. In Gaul, as in England, the Scotch-Irish could missionize, but could not organize.

At the age of seventy Boniface laid aside his Metropolitan dignity to return to his first-love, to resume his missionary labors among the ferocious Frisians, who put him to a cruel death. There in the year 755 he completed his splendid career with the martyr's crown. Thus the Frankish and German nations were indebted to the English Church for the revival both of religion and learning—for

Boniface and *Alcuin*, the two foremost men of that age in Europe except Charles the Great.

"And it was by Anglo-Saxon missionaries from the seventh to the eleventh centuries," says Bishop Stubbs, "that Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Iceland were converted to the Gospel." ("Lectures on Early English History.")

VI

The Coming of the Danes, and the Ruin and Revival of the English Church

During the course of the century and a half that followed the death of Archbishop Theodore both State and Church passed through vicissitudes many and various, culminating in the Coming of the Danes, and the commencement of the greatest crisis that the British Isles had known since the Coming of the English. We have seen what glorious achievements Christianity had accomplished in the century between the Coming of Augustine and the Passing of Theodore. Slowly but surely it had won from heathenism all the kingdoms of the Heptarchy. Then we see the Heptarchy, slowly but surely, also becoming a Triarchy—the dominant kingdoms of Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex annexing or controlling the other kingdoms, and each of the three struggling for the mastery. The Overlordship had passed from Kent to Northumbria, from Northumbria to Mercia, from Mercia to Wessex, where it was to remain permanently in the line of Egbert until the Triarchy had become a Monarchy, and the English peoples gradually merged into one nation. The process by which this came to pass was, briefly, as follows:—Egbert became King of Wessex in 802, after an exile of thirteen years spent at the Court of Charlemagne,

where he probably saw the Imperial crown of the Caesar's placed upon the head of Charles the Great by Pope Leo III, on the famous Christmas-day of the year 800. Here, doubtless, the West Saxon King had been fired with the ambition to become sole sovereign of all England. In about thirty years he had conquered the British Kingdom of West Wales, or Cornwall down to Land's End; had followed this up by his victory at Ellandun where he had won the Kingdom of Mercia. Shortly afterwards Sussex and Essex submitted to his sway, and then Kent, where Ethelwulf, his son, father of Alfred, was made sub-king. Egbert's conquests culminated in 831, by the submission of Northumbria, and he was acknowledged as supreme over all the kingdoms of the English, so that this date is sometimes reckoned as "the birth-year of this Monarchy." It should be added, however, that this new-born monarchy in the House of Egbert of Wessex was not really full-grown until the reign of Athelstan the Glorious (924-941) grandson of Alfred the Great, who was grandson of Egbert.

And what was the cohesive power, the centralizing and unifying power behind this movement for the Making of one English Nation? What but the Making one English Church, which preceded it by at least 150 years, and prepared the way for it, setting the example, and giving the inspiration thereto? It would be easy enough to multiply proofs of this statement by quoting many of the best historians. Time will allow me to quote only a few, and I select

those which we use in our Senior Class. In his "History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest," Hunt declares,—"In this making of England, the Church of England bore a signal part. Amid the divisions and struggles of the Heptarchic period, the Church alone represented the idea of Unity. It was the Church of all the kingdoms, and of none of them exclusively; it was not the Church of Kent, or of Mercia, or of Wessex, but of the English nation. Each kingdom had its own legislative assembly; the Church alone had assemblies gathered from every kingdom. A layman of one kingdom was a stranger, perhaps an enemy, in another; a churchman was at home in all. Bishops were not necessarily natives of the kingdoms in which their dioceses lay. . . . Thus the Church foreshadowed and set an example of a unity which was gradually attained by the nation."

Mr. M. W. Patterson, in his "History of the Church of England," says, "The Church of England is not, and never has been, a State Church. She existed in these islands long before there was a united State of England. She drew her credentials from our Lord Himself, her frame of government from the the Apostolic Church. The State did not establish the Church; it would be more true to say that the Church established the State."

Dr. Alfred Plummer, in his "Churches in Britain before A. D. 1000," says, "Theodore created a United Church, which became in quite a marvellous degree a National Church. . . . The unity of the

Church became the foundation, the model, and the chief cause of the unity of the nation. . . . It was the English Church which was the substitute for a United Nation, and which led to an English Nation being at last formed."

But, I must pass more directly to the special subject of this particular lecture. We have already seen how the various distinct agencies in the conversion of the English, viz.: Italian, Keltic, Burgundian and Frankish had been welded together into one National Church, with provinces, dioceses, and the beginning of parishes, with monasteries and schools, synods and conferences. Amid all the confusion and strife and changes in the kingdoms, the Church of the English had become the one united and stable organization to set the example and lead the way to English National Unity. "It could weld together," says Wakeman, "into one stable fabric the ill-assorted elements of Roman and Keltic Christianity, keeping and utilizing with rare skill the best of both systems. It could take the lead in the noble work of the conversion of the German tribes (on the Continent) of similar blood. It could teach Englishmen to feel, act, and think as members of one society in the unity of the Catholic Church. The primary duty now before the Church became no longer to win but to train, no longer to establish but to develop, no longer to call for great sacrifices and heroic resolutions, but to demand the steady, painful, daily building up of character through the replace-

ment of heathen license by Christian discipline. In such days the rough, coarse, passionate nature of our old English forefathers began to reassert itself, and the barbarian burst through the web of civilization which Christianity had woven round him."

The first hundred and fifty years of the life of the English Church has been called its "Golden Age," because then it appeared as its best, both at home and abroad, in unity of organization and spirituality of life, in its leaders of learning and of missionary zeal. But before the death of Bede in 735, whose unique narrative we lose now for the rest of our story, he sees signs of increasing degeneracy and decay. He writes to Egbert, the Archbishop of York, deploring the relapse from a higher standard, and urging the crying need of revival and vigorous reforms. Boniface, too, the English Winfrid and the great Apostle of Germany, writes back to his native Church in terms of severest censure, calling for a council to deal promptly and sternly with the moral corruption of his beloved England. Nor did the English Alcuin, the famous scholar and former head of the school at York, now at the Court of Charlemagne, forget to write many letters to the same effect. The monasteries, intended as centres of learning, discipline and missionary zeal, were, in some cases, becoming the homes of idleness and laxity, of luxury and even of vice. The genuine, if mistaken, devotion, which had led kings, queens and nobles into these calm retreats of saintly living, had come to make monastic life a fashionable fad for princes and

princesses who carried their worldly ways into the religious houses, and into the popular pilgrimages to Rome, making both a by-word of reproach. Boniface pictures the frivolity and bad repute of English ladies on their way to and from the city which held the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul; and Pope Zachary demands that the bishops deal promptly with the laxity and sin of clergy and people. Accordingly the provincial Synod of Cloveshoo in 747 legislated against religious ladies that used skill in needlework for the adornment of their own persons rather than of God's altars. Pseudo-monasteries must cease to be places of gossip, feasting and drinking, the resorts of minstrels, musicians and buffoons. Monks must no longer be allowed the national vice of excessive drinking, especially of "rising up early to follow strong drink." Other canons were passed prescribing greater care in ordaining fit men for the sacred ministry, and stricter regulation of the lives of the clergy, regulars and seculars. Worldly employments must cease on the Lord's day, the people must be taught the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, the Services for Baptism and Holy Communion in their own tongue.

Meanwhile Theodore's policy of unity of organization under one Archbishop of Canterbury was changed for the worse by the creation of two additional archbishopries, and rivalry which arose between them. In 735 Egbert, brother of the Northumbrian King, was made first Archbishop of York, and a most worthy one he proved. When the great Mercian King Offa,

the intimate friend of Charlemagne, became overlord, he wished to consolidate his kingdom and to mark its supremacy by setting up its own Archbishopric at Lichfield. In order to give greater prestige to the new Metropolitan See, Offa invited the Pope Hadrian I. to erect it, which he did by sending two Legates to hold provincial synods in England, and at one of these at Chelsea in 787 Higbert, Bishop of Lichfield, was made Archbishop and given the larger part of the See of Canterbury. Fortunately this action was reversed sixteen years later, and the new Archbishopric was abolished. The national character of the Church and its influence for encouraging national unity were endangered by this policy of making new Metropolitan Sees as appendages to political divisions. Still more threatening was the introduction into England for the first time of Papal Legates, although we hear no more of them until the eve of the Norman Conquest.

Something more radical and arousing than the visit of papal legates was needed to awaken the English Church from moral and spiritual lethargy, and we are now to hear of another kind of visitors. The awakening came by the sword of the heathen, and by a visitation similar to that which came to the old British Church when the heathen English burst upon them with fire and sword. From across the North Sea in their broad-bottomed boats, and up all the bays and creeks and rivers of England, began to swarm the Vikings, Norwegians, Frisians and Danes, to repeat what had been done on the same

soil three hundred years before by the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes. Mr. Green gives us a vivid picture of the coming of the Danes.—"The first sight of the Northmen is as if the hand on the dial of history had gone back three hundred years. The Norwegian fiords, the Frisian sandbanks, poured forth pirate fleets such as had swept the seas in the days of Hengist and Cerdic. There was the same wild panic as the black boats of the invaders struck inland along the river reaches, or moored around the river-islets,—the same sights of horror, firing of homesteads, slaughter of men, women driven off to slavery or shame, children tossed on pikes or sold in the market-place, as when the English invaders attacked Britain. Christian priests were again slain at the altar by worshippers of Woden; letters, arts, religion, government disappeared before these Northmen as before the Northmen of old. But when the wild burst of the storm was over, people, government (Church) reappeared unchanged. England still remained England; the conquerors sank quietly into the mass of those around them; and Woden yielded without struggle to Christ. The secret of this difference between the two invasions was that the battle was no longer between Briton and German, between Englishman and Welshman, between men of different races. The life of these Northern folk was in the main the life of the earlier Englishmen. Their customs, their religion, their social order were the same as our English forefathers had been; they were in fact kinsmen bring-

ing back to an England that had forgotten its origins the barbaric England of its pirate forefathers. Nowhere over Europe was the fight so fierce, because nowhere else were the combatants men of one blood and one speech. But just for this reason the fusion of the Northmen with their foes was nowhere so peaceful and so complete." ("Short History of the English people.")

The first appearance on English shores of the coming storm from the North, that was to make the whole heavens black with clouds and wind, was as "the arising of a little cloud out of the sea like a man's hand." The "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," which, now that we have lost Bede, becomes our chief source of information, records for the year 787: "This year first came three ships of Northmen out of Haerethaland (Denmark) — These were the first ships of Danishmen which sought the land of the English nation." The next notice of the "Chronicle" is more ominous, and more rhetorical: —"793, this year dire fore-warnings came over the land of the Northumbrians, and miserably terrified the people; these were excessive whirlwinds and lightnings; and fiery dragons (probably Zeppelins or aeroplanes?) were seen flying in the air. . . . A little after that, in the same year, the ravaging of heathen men lamentably destroyed God's church at Lindisfarne through rapine and slaughter." Again, the record for 794 says: "And the heathens ravaged among the Northumbrians, and plundered Egfert's monastery at the mouth of the Wear" (Bede's old

neighborhood). These are fair samples of what followed for two hundred years, during which, more and more, far and wide, "the ravages of heathen men lamentably destroyed God's Church" until there was not a monastery and hardly a church left standing in Northumbria. The same story is repeated in the other kingdoms. The Chronicle does not mention the Northmen again till 832, when we read: "This year the heathen men ravaged Sheppey," (an island off the coast of Kent—they are moving Southward now). Meanwhile they have spread themselves over the islands off the North and West coasts of Scotland, destroying Columba's famous monastery in 802, and later overrunning the great part of Ireland. After the year 832 they came every year for twenty years to England, each time appearing suddenly, and usually in a fresh place. They made straight for the Church or the monastery, where gold and silver and other treasures satisfied their lust of plunder, and fire and sword satisfied their fanatical hatred of Christianity. They regarded their English kinsmen as apostates from the old religion of the Teutons (what the Kaiser calls, "our old God"). They had a special antipathy to the Christian religion which was ousting their own. Besides the churches and monasteries, the few English cities, Canterbury, Rochester, Winchester, London and York were well-nigh destroyed. And so the terrible work of the Danes went on throughout the fair fields of England until "the land which was as the Garden of Eden before them, behind them

was a desolate wilderness." From the middle of the ninth century it was no longer a mere succession of raids for plunder and slaughter, but a steady invasion from all sides for conquest and settlement, with formidable armies and vast fleets and great kings at the head of them. The Danes had come to *stay* and to supplant the English. The pressure of the increased population driven in upon their countries by Charlemagne compelled them to seek a new home, and they found one much to their liking during their frequent visits to England. It was a delightful contrast to the bleak and barren and frigid regions from which they came. Soon Northumbria and East Anglia were theirs beyond recovery, then Mercia was overwhelmed, giving them two-thirds of England. Not until they attempted the conquest of Wessex did they encounter a foeman equal to the task of turning the tide. Before this the English here and there, and especially in Wessex under Egbert and his son, Ethelwulf, had made a brave but spasmodic and ineffectual resistance. They had ceased to be a warlike people, and were ill prepared for defense against a foreign foe. They had no organized army, no navy at all. Kings and thegns, bishops and abbots, at the head of such forces as they could hastily gather, had fought and died for their homes and their altars, their families and their country. King Edmund of East Anglia had won the martyr's crown by a death like that of St. Sebastian, tied to a tree and shot through and through with arrows, because

he would not renounce his religion to save his throne or his life.

But at last God raised up in Alfred of Wessex a peerless leader to shed an imperishable glory over the English race.

Alfred, youngest son of King Ethelwulf and his Queen Osburh, was born at Wantage in Berkshire in 848. His father, who had long desired to make a pilgrimage to Rome, gave this little son a picturesque start towards greatness and royalty by sending him at the age of four in the company of other nobles to Rome, as the advance guard to announce the King's own coming two years later. Pope Leo IV. was so delighted with the attractive child that he adopted him as a son, anointed him with oil, and placed a crown upon his head. His father's visit to Rome lasted a whole year, in which the King lavished most costly gifts upon the Pope and promised a yearly offering — the forerunner of "Peter's Pence." On his way home Ethelwulf visited the Emperor Charles the Bald, where he sealed his friendship with the Frankish Count, and also sealed his fate at home, and spoiled the dignity of both visits abroad, by taking for his second wife Charles's daughter, Edith, aged twelve. Charles, with an eye to business rather than romance, had his daughter crowned queen by the famous Archbishop Hincmar. On the King's return to Wessex with his juvenile queen, the Witan and the people were so indignant at his folly that they "sent him in his resignation," and put his own son Ethelbald on the throne. On

his father's death two years later Ethelbald made the scandal complete by marrying his father's widow. Two years afterwards Edith, on the death of her second husband, married her third, Baldwin, Count of Flanders, and became thereby the ancestress of Matilda, wife of William the Conqueror—whom we shall meet shortly on English soil repeating the performance of the Danes. Ethelwulf had left four sons, each of whom had succeeded in turn to the throne. Two died very early, leaving Ethelred as King when the Danes closed in upon Wessex and penetrated to the very heart of it, to finish the conquest of England. Ethelred, aided by his youngest brother Alfred, made a brave resistance with the balance of success against him, but managed to hold their enemies in check for a while. After Ethelred's death, Alfred now King at twenty-two years of age, led a forlorn hope with all odds against him. During seven years of ceaseless conflict, his resources seemed about exhausted, and it looked as if England and the English Church would soon share the fate of Britain and the British Church. During the winter of 877-8 Wessex was in its last ditch, and the young man who carried its fortunes and all England's in his hands was shut up in a rude fort in the isle of Athelney, amid the marshes of the river Parret, in worse plight than Washington at Valley Forge. But, with the budding of Springtime, the fairest flower of all English manhood began to bloom, and a career opened before the world which has had no counterpart in English his-

tory until our own Washington. There was hope yet for a ruined country and church which could produce Alfred the Great and the Good, who, however, was called by his English contemporaries, "England's Darling." This was England's compensation for the ravages of the heathen who "lamentably destroyed God's Church."

The stories of the "cakes" and the "harper's disguise" tell us only of the occasional diversions of Alfred during his hiding in the marshland. There was more serious work going on in that fertile brain, which was to bring forth abundant fruit in the Revival of English State and Church. The organizing of an army, and even the beginning of a navy — of England's great sea-power — were the most immediate results of the meditations that made the King-in-disguise forget to turn the cakes. He was getting ready to turn the *tables* on the Danes. And soon the old "Chronicle" begins to change its monotonous and melancholy tone for the year 878: "Then in the seventh week after Easter the King rode to Brixton on the east side of Selwood; and there came to meet him all the men of Somerset, and the men of Wiltshire, and that part of the men of Hampshire which were on this side of the sea; and they were joyful at his presence. On the following day he went from that station to Iglea, and on the day after this to Heddington, and there fought against the whole army, put them to flight, and persued them as far as their fortress; and there he sat down fourteen days. And then their army delivered

to him hostages, with many oaths that they would leave his kingdom, and also promised him that their King should receive baptism; and this accordingly they fulfilled." This is the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle's" simple narrative of one of the Decisive Battles of the World at Ethandun, or Eddington, and the Peace of Wedmore, followed by the Baptism of Guthrum, or Gorm, the Danish King, with King Alfred for his sponsor. The after-results were the Revival and restoration of the English Nation and Church. It was the beginning, too, of the Conversion and the Civilization of the Danes, and of their peaceful amalgamation with the English race—to the ultimate advantage of both parties.

By the Peace of Wedmore about one half of England, already in secure possession of the Danes, was conceded to them, on condition that they left the rest undisturbed. The dividing line was the River Thames up to London, and thence by the old "Watling Street" road to Chester and the Irish Sea. Thus the Danes got Northumbria, East Anglia, and the eastern half of Mercia. Guthrum, the Danish King, formally accepted the Christian religion, and pledged himself to keep the peace and to cease raiding and plundering. No better terms were possible. It was too late to turn the Danes out of the whole of England. The next best thing was to keep them out of half of it, and confine them within that part which now took the name of the Danelaw. Here time and the influence of the English among whom they dwelt, the influence of a higher civiliza-

tion and purer religion might be trusted to make the Danes what the English themselves had gradually become.

And so Alfred turned his attention to the Regeneration of his own kingdom. Ten years of peace were before him, and he made the most of them—fifteen years, indeed, with the exception of one short, successful struggle. "This will I say," he declared, "that I have sought to live worthily the while I lived, and after my life to leave to the men that came after me a remembering of me in good works." No nobler aim for a man's life was ever more worthily fulfilled. War with the Danes was not by any means over yet, and he took wise measures to meet the enemy prepared the next time, by sea as well as land. But good fighter as the King was, his achievements in peace were greater far than his deeds as a warrior. The breathing spell now allowed his kingdom was turned to the best account in the Restoration of law and order and good government—of education and sound learning, and most of all, of religion, which he made the base of all. "Whether we regard his laws, his police, his redivisions of population, his reconstituted assemblies, his creation of a navy, his management of the church, his education of the clergy, of the upper classes, and of the poor, the record is amazing." (Burrows.) In each of these departments of reform Alfred appears, not as an original creative genius, but rather as a man of practical common sense, who took the best that was readiest to his hand, and adapted it

to the immediate needs of his people. He codified the Laws of his predecessors, selecting the most righteous and the most workable, and made them a national law for what was left of England. "Those things," he says, "which I met with, either of the days of Ine, my kinsman, or of Offa, King of the Mercians, or of Ethelbert, who first among the English race received baptism, those which seemed to me rightest, those I have gathered, and rejected the others." And few men have been better judges of the "rightest" all around. Alfred's code opens with the Ten Commandments, and sums them up with the Golden Rule. These were the basis of his laws, as of his own life.

If Alfred's Laws did more for England than his wars, greater still and more lasting were his services in behalf of Education and of Literature. He found virtually nothing left of either of these in his own kingdom. With the destruction of the monasteries, went teachers, schools and books. As he declares, "So entirely has knowledge escaped from the English people that there are only a few priests on this side of the Humber who can understand the Divine Service, or even explain a Latin Epistle in English. . . . . I cannot remember one south of the Thames when I began to reign." And so, in his unsettled times he set himself to provide that "at least every freeborn youth should abide at his book till he can well understand English writing." But the sword of the Danes had left few competent teachers in England, which had taken the lead heretofore. How was this lack to

be supplied? "Formerly," writes Alfred, "men came hither from foreign lands to seek for instruction, and now, when we desire it, we can only obtain it from abroad." And so from Wales and Western Mercia, which had suffered less from the invaders, and then from Continental Europe the King summoned learned teachers for the new schools and monasteries which he founded—among them Asser, a British monk from St. David's, who became the King's intimate friend and adviser, and later his biographer when he had settled down as bishop of Sherborne. Plegmund, a hermit, in hiding from the Danes on a lonely island near Chester, was brought forth from obscurity to become ultimately Archbishop of Canterbury for twenty-four years, and so popular that the "Chronicle" for the year 890, says, "he was chosen of God and all the people to be Archbishop of Canterbury." Besides these two eminent finds from "out West," from the remoter regions of Mercia, came also Werfrith, Bishop of Worcester, and Athelstan and Werwulf, the King's chaplains. Two foreigners, at least, were imported from the Continent; Grimbald from St. Omer in Flanders and John of Old Saxony.

But at the head of all England's teachers in his day, so far as permanent influence upon education and letters is concerned, stands Alfred himself,—first a learner in his court-school (like Charlemagne in the similar school for nobles under the English Alcuin), devoting eight hours of every twenty-four to study, until the royal learner became competent,

by the aid of his more learned colleagues, to do for Literature what he had done for Laws. Alfred took the best manuals of his time within his reach (which in those days were all in Latin), and rendered them into English. These he carefully edited, and sometimes enriched by his own wise and, often charming, prefaces and notes—which make the beginning of English Prose. On this wise he dealt with five famous books, which were translated out of Latin into English—which meant then Anglo-Saxon—as follows:—

I. The Liber Pastoralis, or "Pastoral Care" of Pope Gregory the Great translated by Alfred himself, who sent a copy to every English bishop. Three copies still survive.

II. Bede's "Ecclesiastical History," still surviving in Anglo-Saxon.

III. Orosius's "History Against the Pagans," by a Spanish priest, a contemporary and friend of St. Augustine c.417, and, like the great bishop's book "The City of God," a Christian Apologetic.

IV. "Dialogues of Gregory the Great"—popular narratives in aid of personal religion.

V. Boethius's "Consolations of Philosophy," written by Boethius, a Roman Consul, imprisoned and put to death c.524 by Theoderic, King of the East Goths—Moral Meditations based principally on Plato and Aristotle—not particularly Christian in the original, but made so by Alfred in his translations, which emphasize the superior consolations of the Christian Religion. "In all these works," it

has been well said by Mr. Cruttwell (in his book called, "The Saxon Church and the Norman Conquest") "Alfred throws off the King and speaks to the reader as man to man. But a still more striking proof of his genius is shown by his remodelling of the old 'Chronicle' (from which I have frequently quoted), which in his hands and for some time after him (down to the middle of the twelfth century), became the most authentic source of English history. A bare annalistic record of public events had existed in Wessex from the time of Birinus till the death of Ine, written in Latin and known as the Bishop's Roll. This had been revived under Egbert, and considerably amplified by St. Swithun, bishop of Winchester, who gathered together many early traditions as well as materials for the history of his own time. It was this Roll that now blossomed out into a spirited original narrative, which gave a wholly new power to the English tongue. There can be little doubt that a large part of the Chronicle for Alfred's reign was written by himself. The impulse he thus gave bore fruit rapidly. Not only was the Chronicle continued after his death, but an outburst of literary productiveness in the vernacular ensued, wholly without parallel among Continental nations, bearing witness to the inspiring power of the King's example."

At the risk of wearying you, I cannot forbear to add Mr. Green's statement of this in his remarkable book on "The Conquest of England":—

"It is thus that in the Literatures of Modern

Europe that of England leads the way. The Romance tongues—the tongues of Italy, France and Spain—were only just emerging into definite existence when Alfred wrote. . . . . None of the German folk across the sea were to possess a prose literature of their own for centuries to come. English, therefore, was not only the first Teutonic Literature —it was the earliest prose literature of the modern world. And at the outset of English literature stands the figure of Alfred. The mighty roll of books that fills our libraries opens with the translations of the King."

But the Revival of a ruined Church and of a well-nigh ruined Religion was one of the best of all Alfred's achievements, and indeed the basis of all his reforms. He was a King who sought first the Kingdom and Righteousness of God for himself and for his people. Among clergy and laity alike the upheaval caused by the Danish invasion had wrought a terrible deterioration in discipline and in character. The meagre notices of Church affairs during these troublous times do not furnish much material for the ecclesiastical historian, but they show one shining mark in Alfred as a Church-Reformer—"building the old wastes and repairing the breaches."

In addition to his Code of laws for his own people, which, as we have seen, were intensely religious,—as Over-lord of Guthrum the Danish King settled in East Anglia, Alfred prepared a special code for these Danish converts to Christianity. There would be an immense work for the English Church for

many a year in the Christianizing of this vast heathen horde who had now become a permanent part of the population. There would be need of strenuous restraints upon this fierce and violent race who had been nurtured in a savage paganism. England, for the while, need not go to foreign parts to convert the heathen. The home-supply would be sufficient to occupy the missionaries for a while. Alfred had to reconvert his own people in order that they might help in the conversion of the Danes. We find him taking prompt and vigorous measures to replace the ruined monasteries. He founded three himself—one for women at Shaftesbury, with his own daughter Ethelgify as Abbess,—and two for men, one at Winchester, and another at Athelney in memory of his awful winter there and the glad springtime that brought deliverance. But one of his most difficult tasks was to find Clergy of any education for bishops, or abbots, or even parish priests. Many had fallen under the sword of the Danes, and many had fallen from grace. Alfred did the best he could until his schools could furnish an educated and godly ministry. Many sees must remain vacant until competent men could be provided. But so fruitful was the stimulus which the King gave to education and learning and religion that a few years after his death no less than seven bishops were consecrated in one year (909). But, after all, the King's greatest contribution to a revived church was his own personality, the example and influence of his own full-orbed Christian character. "We have loved," he

said, "only the name of being Christians, and very few our *duties.*" Alfred was the foremost of that few in his day and country who both lived and did his Christian duty to God and to man. His most conspicuous quality was his absolute and unselfish devotion to the service of his Lord and of his beloved people. Like David, "he fed them with a faithful and true heart, and ruled them prudently with all his power."—King Alfred, never of robust health, died at the early age of fifty-two—"one of the greatest figures in the history of the World," says von Ranke. The general consensus of the best historians as to his character finds fit expression in the words of Freeman, "Alfred is the most perfect character in history. . . . No other man on record has ever so thoroughly united all the virtues both of the ruler and of the private man. In no other man on record were so many virtues disfigured by so little alloy. A saint without superstition, a scholar without ostentation, a warrior all whose wars were fought in the defense of his country, a conqueror whose laurels were never stained by cruelty, a prince never cast down by adversity, never lifted up to insolence in the hour of triumph; there is no other name in history to compare with his. . . . The virtue of Alfred, like the virtue of Washington, consisted in no marvellous displays of superhuman genius, but in the simple, straightforward discharge of the duty of the moment. But Washington, soldier, statesman and patriot, like Alfred, has no claim to Alfred's character of scholar and master

of scholars." (Freeman's "Norman Conquest," Vol. I. pp. 49-53).

For the remainder of this Lecture I will give you some account of *two great figures* that stand out most conspicuously in the English Church and State during the Danish troubles that followed the reign of King Alfred. These are the figures of *Dunstan*, the first great Ecclesiastical Statesman in England, and Cnut, England's great Danish King. Dunstan was born near Glastonbury about 924. He was of noble family, a nephew of Alfeah, bishop of Winchester, and probably related to the royal family, with which he was most intimately associated. He was a very precocious boy, and soon acquired all the learning that he could get then in England. His ardent devotion to study brought on brain fever, which affected his nervous system and imaginative temperament, and made him at times the victim of fantastic visions. He early developed remarkable artistic talents in music, painting, and metal work, and such rare skill in mechanics as gave him the reputation of a magician. In early youth, at the court of Athelstan, grandson of Alfred, Dunstan's beauty and accomplishments made him a great favorite in the ladies' bower, but excited the hostility and persecution of his rude and ignorant rivals. Their rough usage—they threw him once into the horse-pond—brought on a severe attack of brain-fever, which drove him from court, and changed the current of his life. He built himself a hermit's cell, whither he retired from the world, and gave him-

self up to study and prayer—diverting himself sometimes by his fondness for working in metals.

Here, like St. Anthony and Martin Luther, he fought the devils of temptation in realistic fashion.

> St. Dunsban, as the story goes,
> Caught the devil by the nose."

The story is that once in his disordered fancy, as he toiled at his forge, he seized the foul fiend by the nose with his red-hot tongs. But Dunstan was not long allowed his ascetic solitude. If he would be a monk, the new King Edmand would have him master of his new trade, and made him Abbot of Glastonbury at the age of twenty-two. Here he began his career as a reformer of the monastic life, rebuilding the old monastery on a large scale with his private wealth, setting his own house in order, and making it a model to other monasteries as a religious centre and also a school of higher learning. At the same time Dunstan began his other new career as a Statesman, becoming Treasurer of the Kingdom and Adviser to the King. During the succeeding reign, under the youthful and delicate Edred, the chief power of the Kingdom fell into Dunstan's hands. But his bold and high-handed action at the Coronation of the boy, Edwy, cost him his place at Court. This youth was so infatuated with his kinswoman, Elgivy, whom the Church forbade him to marry, that he rudely left the banquet with his lords and counsellors for Elgivy's charming society, and Dunstan brought him back forcibly to his insulted

guests. Shortly afterward Dunstan was outlawed, and fled to Flanders. While at Ghent he spent his time in studying the Benedictine Monastic system, which he subsequently helped Archbishop Odo to introduce into England. A revolt against Edwy's rule gave his brother part of the Kingdom, and then Edwy's death made Edgar sole sovereign of all England. Dunstan was recalled, made bishop of Worcester, then of London, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury in 960, and virtually Prime Minister to the King. From this time on Dunstan played the double rôle of Church Reformer and the foremost Statesman in England. History has only recently begun to do Dunstan justice. Out of the mass of monkish legends on the one side, and ignorant prejudice on the other, the real man has slowly emerged, and is now seen to be very much of a man. Instead of the blind and bigoted ecclesiastic which he has been represented to be, he is revealed as a far-seeing statesman, and an earnest but moderate ecclesiastic—pursuing a definite, but pacific policy in each capacity, and doing much to give to his King the name of "Edgar the Peaceful." It was clearly Dunstan's policy to push forward resolutely the Church Revival of King Alfred and his successors, to raise the standard of discipline, of moral and religious life among the clergy, both regulars and seculars,—and at the same time to consolidate the West Saxon Kingdom and supremacy into one strong English nationality, which should absorb and assimilate all the diverse elements, especially the resident

Danish population which was fast becoming Englished, civilized and Christianized. "He employed Danes," we are told, "in the royal service, and promoted them to high posts in Church and State." The wisdom of this statesmanlike policy was fully justified by the results.

The English Monasteries had never had a common effective organization under one central authority, such as generally prevailed in Western Christendom. Their isolation and independence had tended to looseness of discipline and of life. The demoralization of the Danish invasion had wrecked the whole system, such as it was. Alfred had made a beginning of restoration and reform, but it needed to be pushed forward. This was undertaken by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, with a strong hand and a resolute will, but he encountered a desperate resistance. There had been a long and bitter struggle between the two classes of clergy—regulars and seculars, or the monks and the parochial clergy—which had nearly rent in twain the slowly reviving English Church. Archbishop Odo was a Dane and a Benedictine Monk. He had accompanied his King Athelstan, too, in his military campaigns, culminating in the great victory of Brunaburgh. He had been soldier enough to carry his stern military methods into the Church, enforcing the Benedictine regulations upon all the monasteries, and clerical celibacy upon all clergy alike. Dunstan, his successor, was as earnest an advocate as Odo of the reformed Benedictine system. He believed, too, in priestly celibacy

as the ideal for the clergy, but the Statesman did not undertake to force it upon all indiscriminately like the old soldier. He did not expect the married clergy generally to drop their wives all at once, and make a rush for the new ideal. Dunstan knew that it would take time and tact to make celibacy the rule, or even the ideal, in slow and easy-going England. The bishops of Worcester and of Winchester expelled the married Canons from their Cathedrals and substituted Benedictine monks; but Dunstan allowed them to retain their places at Canterbury under stricter rule. His influence was undoubtely given to the monastic clergy, but he showed a statesmanlike and Christian moderation in dealing with the secular clergy, and in not trying to force his own ideals too fast. By so doing Dunstan promoted the peace and good of the Church, as he certainly promoted the order and prosperity of the English nation.

The latter part of his public career was stormy, but after his retirement from political life he passed his days peacefully at Canterbury in prayer and praise, in preaching regularly in his Cathedral, and writing pastoral letters to his bishops, in music and the making of musical instruments,—his favorite amusement, as of old, the working in metal, the making of bells and organs. "But as he looked out upon the world which he had left, he could not but have felt that he had been permitted to set his mark for good upon the English Church," and even more upon the English nation. It has been noted

that the year of his death 988, was the commencement of the last and greatest invasion of the Danes —the Danish Conquest of England.

"We are now called upon," says Mr. Cruttwell, "to witness one of those dramatic transformations of character, which Shakespeare has pictured for us in Prince Hal, and of which in all history is no more striking instance than that of Cnut."

The coming of the Danish King Sweyne, and then of his son Cnut, resulted, after a terrible struggle, in giving a Danish King to all England in 1017. By a strange and merciful Providence it gave England, in Cnut, one of the best Kings it has ever had. Beginning with slaughter and banishments, as soon as his position was secure, this ruthless barbarian was completely transformed. Cnut became erelong a model King, wise, just, and devout, and greatly beloved. He pursued the same pacific policy with his English subjects that Edgar and Dunstan had pursued with the Danes, carrying it much further, and succeeded in welding England into one Nationality as had never been done before. Foreigner as he was, he ruled like a native-born prince by the old constitution of the realm, administering "Edgar's Law" wisely and justly, knowing no difference between conqueror and conquered. He put the four great provinces into which the kingdom was now divided under English instead of Danish Earls. He used English troops for the Conquest of Norway, and English priests for the conversion of Denmark, and made some of them bishops of Danish Sees. Cnut

proved himself worthy of English trust by trusting the English himself. Thus for eighteen years he promoted peace and good will in State and Church. His own marriage to the Norman Emma, the widow of the English King Ethelred, seemed to bring about the marriage of Dane and English. To the Church, in particular, he showed the greatest reverence and generosity. He made reparation for his father's and his own cruelty and crimes by the most liberal gifts and benefactions. He encouraged a high standard for the clergy, and rewarded merit. At Bury St. Edmund's he built and endowed a Benedictine Abbey to the memory of the martyred English King Edmund slain by the earlier Danes. He translated to Canterbury with great honor the body of Archbishop Elphege who had fallen nobly in defending the city from Danish outrages. Cnut, as King of Denmark, Norway, most of Sweden, and all England, was the greatest potentate of his day in Europe except the King of Germany, the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. There is no reason to question the sincerity of his love for England, and for the religion of the English, which had now become his own. There was hope for a Church, which, lately ruined and desolated, could make such a convert as Cnut, and which could erelong transform his Danish followers into Christians and Churchmen and law-abiding English subjects. It was the personal character and influence of Cnut which brought order and peace out of chaos in England, for at his death his dynasty went to pieces almost immediately

under his degenerate sons. No wonder that "Merrily sang the Monks in Ely when Cnut King rowed by."

During a pilgrimage to Rome, the good King wrote to his English subjects:—"I have vowed to God to lead a right life in all things, to rule justly and piously my realms and subjects, and to administer just judgment to all. If heretofore I have done aught beyond what was just, through headiness or negligence of youth, I am ready with God's help to amend it utterly."

VII

The Coming of the Normans, and the Increase of Papal Power in the English Church

The Danes had done this much for England: they had made it all one Kingdom,—and one Kingdom it remained henceforth under all claimants to the throne. Moreover the Danes in England had now become merged into one people with the English. But hardly had this been accomplished when the invasion of another set of Northmen, called Normans, brought yet another kindred but wholly different people to rule the English and to be ultimately blended with them into one race and State and Church.

The loyalty and love which his English subjects gave to good King Cnut were turned to loathing and contempt for the Danish dynasty under his two degenerate sons, Harold I and Harthacnut. When the latter of these kings, a more worthless savage even than his brother, "died as he stood at his drink," it did not require much persuasion on the part of Earl Godwin for the Witan in 1043 to restore the old English royal line of Alfred and Ethelred in the person of Ethelred's son Edward. As the son also of the fair and famous Norman Emma, Edward was the step-son of Cnut, so that his election to the throne was according to the fitness of things. But his

reign, so far from strengthening the cause of the English nation and Church, only served to prepare the way for the new foreign domination in each. Thirty out of the forty years of Edward's previous life had been spent in congenial exile from his native land at the Norman Court in France, where he had virtually become a Norman himself in speech and temperament and sympathies. On the English throne he was far more of a foreigner than Cnut the Dane had been. Fortunately, however, the beginning of his reign was largely controlled by Godwin, then the foremost and ablest statesman of his country, the maker and manager of kings, and a thorough-going Englishman. This great Earl of Wessex, who had been almost the viceroy of Cnut, held for a while the same position under Edward the Confessor, with the additional advantage of being his father-in-law. Godwin, though hard and grasping, was as wise and cautious as he was eloquent and popular. The weakest point of this strong man was his nepotism, his policy of promoting his own family—good, bad, and indifferent—which made him uphold such a reprobate as his outlawed son Swein. And it was this weakness which lost him for a while the popular favor when he came into collision with the growing rival party at Edward's Court. The national and patriotic party led by Godwin had their hands full in keeping the King from yielding up everything to his foreign favorites the Normans, with whom he was fast filling the best places in State and Church. The Norman Conquest of England was

not as sudden as it seems. Edward's reign only served to bridge over the interval between the Danish Conquest and the more complete and lasting Conquest by the Normans. He opened the way for the latter. Edmund the Confessor, was not only more Norman than English, but more monk than King, or man. The Church occupied his thoughts and plans more than the State, and his ecclesiastical predilections were all in favor of the rapidly-growing Papal system of Hildebrand, of which the Normans were now the most strenuous champions. The National Church of England had kept itself up to this time comparatively independent of the increasing encroachments of the new-fashioned papacy on the continent. It was the only National Church left in Europe which had not surrendered to the Roman supremacy. Its time for this was to come later, and Edward the Confessor was the advance guard of the Papacy, as well as of the Normans in England. He undertook to Normanize and to Romanize the English Church. And to Romanize meant now, as it had not in the times of Augustine and of Theodore, to *Papalize.* The English were the first people to attain to nationality, and they were the last to surrender the chief characteristic of their Church—its independence and self-government. This was to lie dormant for a while, and it was then to pass through a tremendous struggle for life, but it would ultimately prove "the survival of the fittest." Its power of persistence would conquer all conquerors in the long run. But the battle was begining, and Edward

the Confessor probably did as much by his weakness as William the Conqueror did by his strength to undermine the strong sense of Nationality in English State and Church. Even the stern hand of Earl Godwin, which was holding back the Danes and other outside foes of England, was not strong enough to save it from the Norman foe that had found lodgment within in the person of the King. It was especially into the Church, into its chief bishopsprics and abbacies, that Edward had admitted his Norman favorites, and these were far from being the best that Normandy could furnish. A Norman monk named William, whom he made bishop of London, seems to have been the only good appointment of the lot. Ulf, whom he made bishop of Dorchester, was so conspicuously incompetent that the old Chronicle says, "he did nothing bishoplike, so that it shames us to tell more." The climax of these appointments was reached when the See of Canterbury became vacant. The monks of Canterbury duly elected one of their number, Aelfric, a kinsman of Earl Godwin, but the King passed him over and bestowed the Primacy on Robert, the Norman Abbot of Jumiège, whom he had previously made bishop of London. Robert became the King's prime favorite and adviser in ecclesiastical affairs, and at the same time one of the most unpopular men in England. Robert refused to consecrate Spearhafoc, who was appointed bishop of London by King and Witan, declaring he had been forbidden to do so by the Pope. "We hear first," says Freeman,

"of bishops going to Rome for consecration or confirmation, and of the Roman court claiming at least a veto in the nomination of the English King." Besides the Norman bishops, the foreign influence was further extended by the establishment of alien Priories filled with foreign monks and constituted as branches of Norman monasteries. Thus the pious King surrounded himself with a party thoroughly hostile to Godwin and the English patriotic party, and no less opposed to the spirit and methods of the National Church. A violent collision between the two factions occurred at Dover in which some of the Norman nobles in the train of Eustice, Count of Boulogne and the King's brother-in-law, were roughly handled. This occurred when Godwin was out of favor not only at Court but with the people, and he was outlawed and banished. During his exile William, Duke of Normandy, and a powerful rival of Godwin, paid a visit to Edward his royal kinsman, and took occasion to spy out the land that seemed so likely to fall into his hands. He found Edward doing his own work so well that it seemed hardly worth while to interfere, and the King is said to have promised William then the succession to the throne. The English only required a brief absence on the part of Godwin, and the complete control of affairs by the foreigners, to demand the recall of the only man who could restore order in England. Within a year he and his son Harold appeared in the Thames with a fleet and an army which swelled into a popular uprising by the time they reached

London, and made a clean sweep of the Norman party. Archbishop Robert and Bishop Ulf had to cut their way out of London, sword in hand, and make for the nearest port to Normandy. "There," says the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, with evident delight and sarcasm, "he lighted on a crazy ship and betook himself at once over sea, and left his pall and all Christianity here in the country, so as God willed it, as he had before obtained the dignity as God willed it not."

The Confessor calmly surrendered to Godwin's dominance again, and devoted the remaining twelve years of his reign to confessing his sins and other congenial religious exercises. The cultus of St. Peter became now his favorite devotion, and, to celebrate the glories of the Prince of the Apostles, Edward erected one of the noblest monuments ever seen in England, the Abbey Church of Westminster. Godwin died shortly after his restoration; but his power with even more of his popularity, though less of his prudence, passed to Earl Harold his son. "Harold," we are told, "was at this time thirty years old, in the prime of his splendid manhood. His tall and well-knit frame, his frank manners and genial humor, combined with his military and statesmanlike capacity to make him the obvious leader of the nation, and the typical embodiment of the English ideal. . . . Harold's qualities were such as speedily to secure him a complete ascendancy in the King's counsels" (Cruttwell). Edward loved Harold, but never even liked Godwin. Harold's eccle-

siastical policy, however, was quite the reverse of Edward's. When he did, reluctantly, appoint a foreigner to office in the Church, he chose a German Lorrainer as an offset to the Norman ecclesiastics, and gave his countenance to the secular rather than the regular clergy, especially in the great Abbey and Collegiate establishment which he built at Waltham.

Edward the Confessor died in 1066, a week after the consecration of his great West Minster, and there he was buried; and there Harold, whom he had designated on his death-bed as his successor, was crowned for a reign of only nine months. But within that same year another King was crowned there also on Christmas-day 1066—the Norman Conqueror of Harold the last of the Saxon kings.

Shortly before this, Harold had defeated the terrible invader, the Norwegian Goliath, Harold Hardrada, and Tostig, the traitorous brother of the English Harold, at Stamford Bridge; but had fallen on the fatal field of Senlac near Hastings in his heroic struggle with the mighty Norman. Professor Burrows's "Commentary" on this is a fine tribute to Harold's last act of heroism. "We should be inexcusable," he declares, "if we did not admit that as a gallant soldier, fighting to the death for England against the foreign invader, Harold will always have a grand place in the list of national heroes. He must have it. It is perhaps the finest thing in English history, — that noble stand, with a half-disciplined, half-armed force, against the organized host

of France and Normandy, led by the greatest captain of the age. In all other respects, morally, religiously, and politically, Harold was neither better nor worse than his contemporaries." ("Commentaries on the History of England.") Those of you who enjoy a good historical romance, as an occasional diversion from Hebrew, or Dogmatics, and as perhaps an aid to livelier Homiletics, might well afford to read (in vacation-time, of course) one of Bulwer's best novels, "Harold—the Last of the Saxon Kings;" and, as another of the same sort and same period, Charles Kingsley's "Hereward the Wake—Last of the English."

The death of Harold left England without any national leader competent to cope with William the Norman, who had come to claim the throne. There was none of Harold's line fit to succeed him,—none of the old royal line of Alfred but a boy Eadgar, grandson of Edmund Ironsides. He indeed was proclaimed King, but almost his first public act was to head the representatives of the English nobles, clergy and people, to offer the crown to the irresistible Norman on his arrival in London. "They bowed to him for need," is the pathetic chronicle. It would take years yet for William to conquer all England, but future resistance would be only local and occasional, and was bound to be futile. William claimed the English throne, not as Conqueror, but as the legitimate heir to it; but until his forced election by the Witan, he had no legal or moral claim whatever. "William was not descended, even

in the female line, from any English King; his whole kindred with Edward was that Edward's mother Emma was William's great aunt." (Freeman.) He was a bastard besides. Edward, indeed, seems to have promised the crown to William. Harold, too, during an unwilling detention as a prisoner at the Norman court, had probably taken an oath under duress to support William's claim. But neither the promise of the one nor the oath of the other gave any valid right. The crown was not theirs to give to any successor. It was not yet hereditary, and William was not the heir. He never acquired any sort of right until he was hastily elected by the panic-stricken Witan, and duly crowned in Engglish fashion. But, although the Norman Duke had come to England with no backing there to his claim, and only one Englishman had fought for him at Hastings, he crossed the Channel with a very formidable backing on the other side—with the public sentiment of all Europe to support him. He had proclaimed Harold far and wide as a perjurer, a traitor, and an enemy to Holy Church; and Western Christendom outside of England espoused the Norman's cause. The Roman Church, above all, had taken up the quarrel of William with England, with the Pope to sanction the expedition as a religious Crusade, and to bless the banner that floated triumphant over the field of Senlac. Pope Alexander II even spared one hair of St. Peter for a ring on William's finger. The Papacy had its own quarrel with the English Church, which had held out so strongly

against the claims of Rome to universal and supreme authority. William's expedition was for the Conquest of the English Church to Rome, as well as for the Conquest of the English throne for himself.

It has been well said, "The changes in the religious life of England brought about by the Norman Conquest were not less important than those subsequently due to the Reformation. During the fifty years which followed the coming of William, the Church of England became cosmopolitan instead of insular, feudal instead of national, papal instead of independent. For five hundred years the connection between the Church of England and the Church of Rome had been but slight. Archbishops had received their palls from the pope. Peter's pence had been paid with commendable regularity. . . . But no serious attempt had been made by the popes, since the days of Wilfrid, to impose their own will unasked upon the English Church, or to interfere with her own management of her own business. Her bishops and archbishops were appointed by the King and the Witan. Her laws were either made by synods of bishops, and accepted and forced by the King, or made by the King and Witan and accepted by the bishops. They were interpreted by courts held under the joint presidency of the bishop and the alderman. The ecclesiastical struggles which agitated the Continent hardly affected the English Church at all. She was a passive, perhaps unconscious, spectator of the terrible degradation of the papacy in the tenth

century. She was unmoved by its extraordinary revival under the influence of Hildebrand in the eleventh century." (Wakeman.)

It is hard to imagine a more striking contrast than that between the English and the Normans at this time. Although sprung originally from the same Northern Teutonic stock, and destined erelong to be fused into one people in England, their characteristics were almost opposite. The Normans were another variety of the same Northmen commonly called Danes in England, who had already conquered England. While one set of them were invading England in the ninth century, another were doing the same thing in France. There they had conquered the country on either side of the river Seine, to which they gave the name of Normandy. During the two centuries that followed, these had become Frenchmen, just as their brothers across the Channel had become Englishmen. It was their peculiarity to become merged always into the people among whom they settled, appropriating whatever they found better in the conquered, and generally improving on it. They were nowhere a home-making or nation-making people, but cosmopolitans, who absorbed from other nations, and gave a new vigor and enterprise to such nations. They were probably the most progressive people in Europe at this time—delighting in whatever was splendid and imposing and on a large scale. They had quickly taken on the type of civilization and Christianity most generally accepted in Europe, and which was

reaching out for the control of the world. They accepted with enthusiasm the dazzling scheme of the Hildebrandian Papacy, and became the allies of the popes for the subjection of the European states to papal authority.

Already, under Robert Guiscard and other adventurous nobles, they had made themselves masters of Sicily and Southern Italy. There they constituted themselves a sort of standing army and body-guards to the Papacy in its struggles with the Empire for temporal and spiritual power. They became also the leaders in the Crusades, and were the first to recover the Holy City of Jerusalem from Moslem misrule and restore it to Christendom. In Normandy, during the century which preceded their coming to England, they had welcomed the revival of learning and art and religion which had spread Northward from Italy. Normandy had become famous for its great monastic schools, its splendid Norman churches unrivalled anywhere, and glorious monasteries which sprang up as if by magic all all over their Duchy, displaying a richness of imaginative genius in architecture, then the foremost art, which had no equal in the world. They had also appropriated the Roman love of order and discipline and organization, along with the Roman religion, as thoroughly as if these had been their own creations.

Thus it is easy to see that the coming of the Normans brought much that was good and great and sorely needed to England, whatever might be the attending and ultimate evils. They gave a new

impulse and a higher impulse, unquestionably, to a Church which had latterly become ignorant and narrow and sluggish. As Mr. Patterson remarks, "That which Carlyle calls the "pot-bellied equanimity" of the Anglo-Saxons required discipline and drill, and they got it, both in the secular and religious spheres, from Norman drill-sergeants." The English Church needed waking up to a larger and better life, and the Normans awoke it to a struggle which called forth all its dormant capacities. Whatever temporary hardships and losses might be involved, the outcome, in the long run, would be a greater and more glorious Church of England for the Anglo-Norman race. As has been said, "the infusion of the finer Norman blood into the English and Danish composition, . . . after the day of adversity was past, made the conquered people glory in their checkered history." (Burrows.)

William the Conqueror would have been a great man in any age or country. He was born at Falaise in 1027, and succeeded his father Robert, Duke of Normandy, when he was only seven years old. He reigned for fifty-two years over his Norman duchy. It is related that when he was a baby, this natural son of Robert II and of the tanner's daughter Arlotta, clutched a straw from the floor and held it so fast in his little fist that it could not be taken from him. The child was father to the man. Having enlarged his dominions in France greatly, and often proved his military skill and prowess, he was now to show even greater ability as a ruler and

statesman on a larger scale than ever before; for he did not abandon his Norman duchy when he took England. It was not until four or five years after the battle of Senlac that William, having put down all serious revolt, became master of all England. Then he turned his attention to reorganizing the whole political and ecclesiastical life of the English. In doing this his policy was as shrewd and far-sighted as it was stern and relentless. Like Cnut, he aimed to be a real English King, but, unlike the Dane, he could not be loved by the English, and did not deserve to be. Love was not his strong point. He was always feared, however, and very often respected. He reversed Cnut's policy of putting an Englishman wherever he could by "turning the rascals out" of every place they held. Hard and merciless as he was to his Anglo-Saxon subjects, he did not attempt to overthrow their Kingdom and Church, their laws and institutions. His idea was to leave these mostly intact, but by degrees to gradually adapt them to the altered conditions—to transform every thing by putting the bold, progressive Norman spirit into the whole machinery of government. He gradually changed the entire *personel,* substituting his Norman friends for his English enemies everywhere. Thus a new set and a new type of men, with new language, ideas, habits, took the place of the old land-owners, earls and thegns, bishops and abbots, until the English Nation and Church were quite metamorphosed, and "hardly knew where they were at." I cannot do

more here than to point out some of the leading changes wrought by his ecclesiastical policy.

In his way William was a religious man—a devout son of the Church, according to the standard of his time and country; and among the princes of his day exceptionally faithful to his wife, and free from simony in his ecclesiastical appointments. But the English Church, which had been intensely national and ardent in its support of Harold, must be bent to the will of the Conqueror. The English bishops, in particular, had been among his strongest opponents, and William was "very stark towards those who withstood him." At first the King only filled the *vacant* Sees with Norman bishops; but, when he determined to depose the remaining English bishops, instead of playing the tyrant himself and overriding English law, he shrewdly deferred to the Pope, and allowed him the long-sought opportunity of taking a hand in English ecclesiastical affairs. In order to clear the decks for action, the Archbishop of Canterbury must be the first to go overboard. This was Stigand, the friend and partisan of Godwin and Harold. He had been promoted to Canterbury, without giving up Winchester, when Robert the Norman archbishop had to flee for his life. This See had not been connically vacated. Robert had been driven away and outlawed, but he still claimed his office, and the Pope had sustained the claim. Consequently the appointment of Stigand had been irregular, to say the least. To make matters worse, Stigand, having no pall of his own, had

assumed that left behind by Robert in his hasty flight. Later he had received a pall from Benedict X, who had not made good his own election and had been turned out as a schismatic anti-pope. There were not unfrequently in those days two popes, and sometimes three in the field. Even Harold himself had not allowed Stigand to officiate at the consecration of his new Waltham Abbey, or at the funeral of Edward the Confessor, or at Harold's own coronation. William had been crowned by the Archbishop of York, although he allowed Stigand to be present, and otherwise treated him with consideration. And yet Stigand had held the Primacy for nineteen years. Now William wanted the place for a better man, and one who would carry out his ecclesiastical policy. So he allowed the Pope the rare privilege of turning out the Archbishop of Canterbury, and incidentally other bishops at the same time. The King graciously invited the Pope to send his Legates to England—something which had not happened there for about 300 years. Accordingly at a great National Council at Winchester in Easter Week, 1070, William was first crowned over again by the Papal legates, and then began the business of deposing the national bishops. Stigand's case was soon disposed of. He was not only removed from his high office, but was kept under restraint at Winchester for the rest of his life. Then followed his brother Athelmar, the East Anglian bishop, and Athelwin of Durham. Soon after Athelric, Bishop of Selsey, was disposed of. (It was a cold day for *Athels.)* When the English

bishops were finished up, the abbots took their turn in going out. Only one English bishop was left to keep up the Anglo-Saxon line; and his case is a most interesting one. "Old Bishop Wulfstan," we are told, "was indebted to the holy simplicity of his life for being allowed to hold his See of Worcester during the reigns of William II. He had been appointed much against his own will to the See of Worcester in 1062. Florence of Worcester tells us that Wulfstan declared "he would rather have his head cut off than be a bishop." He was summoned before the Council sitting in Westminster Abbey, and charged like other bishops with ignorance of the French language. Being ordered, says Roger of Wendover, to give up his bishop's staff, he was willing to obey the Council, but he would only surrender it to Edward the Confessor who had given it him. Advancing to the Confessor's tomb there in the Abbey, and invoking in English the King whom both Normans and English regarded as a saint, he said, "Master, thou knowest how unwillingly I took upon myself this charge. . . . To thee, therefore, I resign the charge which I never sought." "He then laid his crozier on the tomb. Then, turning to the living King, he said in the few Norman words he could command, 'A better than thou gave it me: take it if thou canst.' No one dared to take it. The story runs that no one could take it, for that it adhered to the tomb till Wulfstan, at the command of William himself, took it, and remained bishop of Worcester, the Cathedral of which he built, until his death at the age of sixty-eight."

In connection with the rebuilding of the beautiful Worcester Cathedral, another touching story of the venerable bishop illustrates his saintly character. When the Minster was sufficiently advanced to admit of the monks entering it, and the order was given for dismantling the roof of the old building erected by St. Oswald, we are told that Wulfstan wept. He was reproached by his monks for not rather rejoicing over so great a work, but replied, "I look at the matter otherwise, for wretched are we who destroy the works of the saints, that we may gather fame for ourselves. That age of blessed men knew not indeed how to rear pompous temples, but rather how under any sort of roof-tree to sacrifice themselves to God, and to draw their flock by their example; contrariwise we of the present time vie with one another in heaping up stones and neglecting souls."

The removal of the English bishops and the replacing them with Normans, was followed in not a few cases by the removal fo their Sees from small villages, or decayed towns, to larger and busier centers. That of Wells was removed to Bath, Selsey to Chichester, Dorchester to Lincoln, Lichfield to Chester, and Sherborne to Old Sarum, afterwards to Salisbury. To the King's nephew Osmund, Bishop of Old Sarum, we owe the revision of the English Liturgies known as the "Use of Sarum," which became subsequently the principal use of the English Church and the basis of our Prayer Book. It must not be supposed, however, that these Episcopal changes of the King were intended simply to provide places for his

own favorites. However unjust his policy towards the incumbents and to the English people, William seems to have been conscientious and judicious in his appointment of Norman bishops. Green calls William's bishops "pious, learned, energetic." "The Conqueror's bishops," says Stubbs' "were generally good and able men, though not of the English type of character. They were not merely Norman barons, as was the case later on, but scholars and divines chosen under Lanfranc's influence." Even so decided a Low Churchman as Charles Hole declares, "These higher Norman ecclesiastics did not come in, like the Italian dignitaries of a later day, to plunder the Church of England and carry off the spoils. Their energies and the wealth they gathered were expended in their adopted land. They could not preach to the people in their native tongue; but they could in other ways dignify religion and make it attractive to the higher classes. They were planting the soil with great palaces of religion, which have outlived most of the proudest castles that defended them. These cathedrals have marked England, we may hope forever, with the Divine Name of Christ, in lines of the most impressive beauty that architecture can represent. Men like these must have helped to soften the stern despotism in which they had a part. Pledged as they were to the people, the English as well as the Normans, they were unconsciously helping to unite the two races, so building up a second and stronger England than the nation which had fallen with Harold." ("A Manual of English Church History.")

This brings us to the remarkable man, who was behind the King's ecclesiastical policy, whom he made Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England—the greatest archbishop between Theodore and Anselm. *Lanfranc* was an Italian, born in Pavia about 1005, where he studied law and became a teacher of jurisprudence. When about thirty-five years old he was attracted to Normandy by its demand for scholars. For a few years he conducted a successful school at Avranches. Then he suddenly resolved to renounce the world and secular teaching and devote himself to the religious life in some solitary retreat. As he wandered through the forests of Ouche he fell among thieves who stripped him of his small store of valuables and left him bound to a tree with his hands tied behind him. In this evil plight he tried to pray, but found to his dismay that he had forgotten how. His loud cries for help, however, whether to God or man, or both, brought him succor from some passing Good Samaritan, who loosed him and directed him to the humble cell of a man of God in the neighborhood. This was Herlwin of Bec, engaged in building an oven when the unhappy traveler presented himself begging to be made a monk.

Here Lanfranc spent a long novitiate of hard discipline in a monastery which had much religion and no learning. Herlwin himself, formerly famous as a knightly soldier, had just learned to read at the age of forty. He and his ignorant monks needed a teacher as much as Lanfranc needed religious guidance and discipline. The latter soon resumed his teaching, now

as a Canonist and Theologian, and attracted so many students from near and far that Bec became famous throughout Europe. With Lanfranc as Prior it soon had to be enlarged. Among his pupils were Anselm, his successor at Canterbury, and another Anselm who became Pope Alexander II. It was here that he entered the field of controversy with the famous Berengar of Tours and put forth a notable treatise in defense of Transubstantiation, then gaining acceptance as the scholastic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. He might have been better employed, especially as his doctrine was not true; and "it was not in theology," it has been well said, "that Lanfranc's talents were to shine brightest, but in the field of practical statesmanship."

It was while Lanfranc was Prior at Bec, that William, Duke of Normandy, became first his bitter enemy and later his fast friend. In defiance of Pope and Council the masterful Duke had married his cousin Matilda of Flanders within forbidden degrees of relationship. Lanfranc expressed openly his strong condemnation of the marriage, and the enraged William ordered him to leave the duchy and do it quickly. So, amid the lamentations of his brethren and his pupils, Lanfranc sorrowfully departed from his beloved Bec. The monastery could only boast of one horse, and that went lame as the good prior rode away. The story goes that Lanfranc met William on the road to Rouen and bowed politely to him—the lame horse bowing also, after his kind, in sympathy with his master's forlorn situation and his own. Wil-

liam demanded whither the rider was going, and the bold prior answered cheerfully, "I am leaving your duchy in obedience to your command, and would do so more quickly, if you would give me a better mount." William replied, "You are the first criminal I have met who asked a boon of his judge." That was the beginning of their close friendship and partnership in the government of England.

Lanfranc remained at Bec till William promoted him to the new monastery which the Duke erected at Caen in return for the dispensation regarding his marriage with Matilda which Lanfranc got for him from Rome. William's wonderful Abbey at Caen still stands, bearing in its stern grandeur the impress of his genius. William afterward offered Lanfranc the bishopric of Rouen, which he declined. But the King of England would take no refusal when his friend tried to beg off from the Archbishopric of Canterbury on the plea that he did not speak the English language. The English language was now at a discount in England, and William himself was not a first class performer with it.

Lanfranc has been described by a recent historian, Cruttwell, as "next to Hildebrand the first Churchman of his time. Less heroic in his conceptions and less covetous of power than the Pope, he excelled him in prudence and sagacity of judgment. His supreme merit lies in his perfect grasp of the problem before him. By appealing to William's genuine religious feeling, by never thwarting his will, he continued to steer the Church of England during these eventful

years with complete success, neither sacrificing its just rights nor coming into collision with the royal prerogative. . . . Lanfranc's policy was that of Hildebrand tempered by prudence, softened by sympathy, and above all, limited by William's despotic will. For William, though genuinely loyal to what he conceived to be the rights of the Pope, was entirely resolved to wield supreme authority within his realm, and to share it neither with Pope nor Archbishop." ("The Saxon Church and the Norman Conquest.")

And so it came to pass that the Duke of Normandy and the Prior of Bec, who now thoroughly understood one another, undertook together, in their new rôles as King and Archbishop, to reform the English Church after the Norman fashion, and, to a certain extent, after the Roman fashion. They, and their newly appointed bishops were men who acknowledged the authority of the new kind of Papacy, and accepted some of the new-fangled Romish doctrines. There were several other conspicuous features of the Hildebrandian scheme which the King and the Archbishop did their best to promote. One was the much needed reform of the monasteries according to the stricter discipline and the higher learning of the Clugny pattern. Another was the celibacy of the clergy, for which Lanfranc labored more zealously than wisely, with only partial success. He had to content himself, like Dunstan, with a compromise. The married clergy were excluded from the Cathedral chapters. Marriage for the future was forbidden even to the paro-

chial clergy, but those already married were not compelled to abandon their wives.

Another part of the Hildebrandian program which it suited William to carry out, strange to say, was the entire separation of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The King probably hoped by this means to balance the bishop's power against that of the barons. Hitherto it had been the immemorial legal system of the Anglo-Saxons that the civil and the ecclesiastical courts should constitute *one body* presided over by the bishop and the alderman (or sheriff) sitting side by side in the court of the Shire. The Witanagemot, too, was as much an ecclesiastical as a civil council of the nation, composed of clergy as well as nobles. Bishops and their clergy were as much subject to the one common law of the land as the humblest layman. They did not constitute a separate caste, much less independent rulers of the laity, as the Theocracy of Hildebrand proposed. With less sagacity and foresight than usual, William withdrew the bishops and abbots entirely from civil courts, and constituted them a separate ecclesiastical court with jurisdiction over all ecclesiastical persons and causes. This new arrangement was destined to give endless trouble in England under William's sons and successors for centuries to come. Among other dangers it opened the way for appeals to the Roman court from the decisions of the English ecclesiastical courts. It also tended very soon to put all grades of ecclesiastics, from archbishops to grave-digger, even though guilty of the most atrocious crimes, beyond the reach of the civil court. It went

far towards bringing about the future struggles of the Church with the Crown on the one hand and with the Papacy on the other.

But, there was another side to this situation, which must not be forgotten, viz.: "If these measures were fitted in some ways to denationalize the English Church and bring it into closer relation with the central authority at Rome, any such tendency was more than counterbalanced by the legislation, also supported by Lanfranc, which placed the *Royal Supremacy* on a footing which it had never before attained. Thus it was enacted that bishops, like barons, were to pay homage to the Crown, and the clergy were to acknowledge no one as Pope until the Royal consent had first been obtained; that no Letters from Rome were to be published till approved by the King; that no Council was to pass laws or Canons except such as should be agreeable to the King's pleasure; that no bishop was to implead or punish any of the King's vassals without the King's precept; and that no ecclesiastic was to leave the country without leave obtained.

William and Lanfranc were willing enough to go a considerable way with the new Papal policy in bringing about what they considered needed reforms; but they drew the line at—in fact they erected a solid stone wall in front of—the Royal Supremacy over the English Church. In this respect William the Norman out-Englished the English, and out-Henryed Henry VIII, by taking a *Protestant* position as pronounced as Henry's. The one and only respect in which

Henry VIII was ever Protestant was that he was against the Pope. When the Pope claimed to be the Supreme Head of the Church in England, William, like Henry, proposed to occupy that position himself, and so announced and so acted. When Hildebrand became Pope in 1073, and, in return for the signal service rendered to William the Conqueror by his predecessor in the Papacy, Alexander II, demanded that William should pay three years' arrears of Peter-pence and *do homage* to the new Pope for his crown, the answer came promptly and emphatically, "One request I have granted, the other I refuse. Homage to thee I have not chosen, nor do I choose to do. I never made a promise to that effect, neither do I find that it was ever performed by my predecessors to thine." The King grimly concluded his letter to this effect by piously asking for the Pope's prayers. We are not told whether he got them or not. That is another story. But he went on calmly investing his new bishops in England with ring and staff at the very time when Pope Gregory VII was excommunicating and deposing his own Emperor for doing the same thing—when Henry IV stood shivering in the snow for three days in bare feet and no overcoat over his penitential garb at Canosa. Hildebrand had taken the measure of the man on the English throne, and had learned that "there is a time to keep silence." Whatever homage the English Church might come to render to the Papacy, the old idea of an independent National Church under its own Primate and King was not utterly wiped out by William and Lanfranc; and

would be heard from again when the Normans had become Englishmen and the English Church had ceased to be Roman and become again Catholic and Protestant against a recreant Rome. Lanfranc seconded the King in his stand against the Papacy venturing too far in England. Although he went to Rome to get his pall, he declined to repeat his visit, even when he received from Hildebrand an imperious letter to the following effect: "Hitherto you have out of pride or negligence abused our patience. . . . By virtue of our Apostolic authority we enjoin you that, setting aside all pretences and insignificant apprehensions of danger, you make your appearance at Rome within four months," closing the letter with the threat of his being thrown out of St. Peter's protection, and deposed from his office. Although Lanfranc lived eight years after the receipt of this letter, his only answer was to stay at home and attend to his duties as Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England.

"The main Results of the Norman Conquest" are thus summed up by Mr. Freeman, the highest English authority on this subject: "We can hardly be wrong in calling it the most important event in English history since the first coming of the English and their conversion to Christianity. It was a great and violent change which, either in its immediate or in its most distant results, touched everything in the land. Yet there was no break, no gap, parting the times before it from the times after it. The changes which it wrought were to a great extent only the strengthening

of tendencies which were already at work. The direct changes which we may look upon as forming the conquest were done gradually and under cover of legal form. No old institutions were uprooted, though some of them were undermined by new institutions set up alongside of them. The revolution which seemed to be the overthrow of freedom led in the end to its new-birth. Under an unbroken succession of native kings, freedom might have died out, as it did in some other lands. As it was, the main effect of the Conquest was to call out the ancient English spirit in a more definite and antagonistic shape, to give the English nation new leaders who were gradually changed into countrymen, and, by the union of the men of both races, to win back the substance of the old institutions under new forms."

This seems to be the proper place for closing our study of "The Making of the Church of England." After the coming of the Normans there was hardly any new kind of material added to the marvelous mixture of ingredients, racial and other, that contributed to the constitution of the English Church. All the constituents are now in, that went to the Making of this Church. The Reformation, of course, is a very important subject, but does not belong here. That was the Re-formation, or Re-making. The Making of this Church, we have seen, was only part of a larger work, because the Church of the English was itself a factor and a principal one in the Making of the English *Nation,* the English *Race,* the English *Language* and *Literature,* and, above all, the making

of *English Character.* All of us who, in any measure, share in these great blessings owe something at least to the grand old English Church, and might well hail her in the slightly altered words of Tennyson's Welcome to the Danish Princess of Wales, now the Dowager Queen Alexandra of England.

"Saxon or Dane or Norman we,
Teuton or Kelt, or whatever we be,
We are all *one* in our *welcome of thee!*"