



Herb. etc.

Toronto University Library

Presented by

University of Canada

through the Committee formed in

The Old Country

to aid in replacing the loss caused by

The disastrous Fire of February the 14th 1890

HECCE
S.

ORIGINES BRITANNICÆ;

OR,

THE ANTIQUITIES
OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

BY EDW. STILLINGFLEET, D. D.

BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT
OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

AS FIRST RECEIVED

IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

BY W. LLOYD, D. D.

BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

A NEW EDITION, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES
BY THE REV. THOMAS PINDER PANTIN, M. A.

OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD,
AND RECTOR OF WESTCOTE, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

VOL. I.

OXFORD:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

M.DCCC.XLII.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PREFACE OF THE EDITOR.

THIS work, “*Origines Britannicæ, or the Antiquities of the British Churches,*” having again been submitted to the press, an opportunity offers for stating, not merely, as the learned author has done, what his intentions were in publishing it; but also the character of the work, and of the replies or animadversions, which have been published by various writers. These, with other particulars, some of them exclusively relating to the present edition, may be considered not unworthy of attention.

In the commencement of his Preface, Dr. Stillingfleet informs us; “^a The design of the following book is to give as clear and distinct a view of the state and condition of the British Churches, from their first plantation to the conversion of the Saxons, as could be had at so great a distance, and by such a degree of light as is left us concerning them. I resolved to attempt something towards the rescuing this part of Church history, wherein we are so much concerned, from those fabulous antiquities which had so much

^a Preface, p. i.

debased the value, and eclipsed the glory of it." In the conclusion he observes; "^b The following book comes forth as a specimen of a greater design, which is to clear the most important difficulties of ecclesiastical history. . . . I have thought it the better way to undertake such particular parts of it which may be most useful, and I have now begun with these Antiquities of the British Churches; which may be ^c followed by others as I see occasion. But I hope none will have just cause to complain, that I have not used diligence or faithfulness enough in this present work, or that I have set up fancies or chimeras of my own, instead of the true Antiquities of the British Churches. I have neither neglected nor transcribed those who have written before me; and if in some things I differ from them, it was not out of the humour of opposing any great names, but because I intended not to deliver other men's judgments, but my own."

Thus much may suffice for the bishop's intentions. I may presently shew who those "great names" were, he occasionally differed from, and in what particulars his opinion was opposed to theirs.

The character of the work, as might be expected, has been variously represented. ^d Schelstrate, the advocate for papal power, and ^e Mackenzie with Cun-

^b Ibid. pp. lxxii. lxxiii.

^c Dr. Inett, the continuator of Stillingfleet, referring in his *Origines Anglicanæ, or History of the English Church*, Preface, p. iii. to the place here cited, states, accompanied with a much deserved eulogy on bishop

Stillingfleet; "He gave us hopes of receiving the history of the English Saxon Church from the same hand;" that is, from himself.

^d See pp. vi-viii. xxi. and notes of this Preface.

^e Ibid. pp. vi. viii-x. and notes.

ningham, the advocates for the traditional history of the Scots, have denied its facts, and endeavoured to substitute their own notions. Some, as ^f Dupin, the Roman Catholic, have spoken of it in the language of moderation; while others, ^g his friends and contemporaries, have expressed themselves in terms of admiration.

Bishop Nicolson, however, in his *English, Scottish, and Irish Historical Libraries*, professes to give a just character and analysis of this work, and also of those of its opponents.

Of the bishop's work, he tells us; “^h The latest of our British Church historians—and who shall come after him?—is the renowned Dr. Stillingfleet, late bishop of Worcester, whose *Origines Britannicæ* have perfected all the collections of former writers on that subject. The design of the book is to vindicate the liberties of the ancient British Church, against the pretended jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome: so that it reaches only from the first appearance of the Christian faith in this island, to the conversion of the Saxons. It is penned with an accuracy of judgment and purity of style peculiar to its great author; and clears many doubtful passages that had escaped the diligence of the famous ⁱ archbishop of Armagh.

^f *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. xvii. Siècle.* pp. 233–236. This work has been translated into English.

^g See *Stillingfleet's Life* prefixed to his works, vol. 1. p. 16, &c. I do not understand the writer of the bishop's life, where he says, *ibid.* p. 17, “Augustine

induced the British monks and others to come over to him.” See this work, ch. 5. p. 357, and Bede, the Anglo-Saxon historian, there referred to.

^h *English Historical Library*, part ii. ch. 1. pp. 77, 78.

ⁱ Archbishop Usher's book was first printed at Dublin, in

^k He rejects, for very good reasons, the Glastonbury legend of Joseph of Arimathæa; but ^l confirms the story of St. Paul's planting a Church in this our *τέρματι τῆς Δύσεως*. ^m The history of king Lucius he endeavours to set free from the monkish fopperies and contradictions that clog it in other authors; ⁿ explains the subscriptions of the British bishops in the council of Arles; ^o shews the probability of some of them being present in the council of Nice; ^p excellently illustrates the state of Arianism and Pelagianism, &c. ^q The Picts, he thinks (contrary to Camden's opinion) to have been a people originally distinct from the ancient Britons; and ^r agrees with Hector Boethius, for better reasons than ever he knew, that they were some of the old maritime inhabitants of the Baltic sea. ^s He teaches his readers how to judge of the antiquities and antiquaries of Scotland and Ireland; and ^t concludes with a very particular and full account of the great revolution in this island, upon the coming in of the Saxons. His Preface, as we have already hinted, ^u was attacked by sir George Mackenzie; and the book itself by Emanuel a Schelstrate, keeper of the Vatican library, in his Dissertation concerning Patriarchal and Metropolitcal Authority. To the latter there needs no

1639, under the title of *De Primordiis*, &c. and is since published by the name of *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*, London, 1687. Nicolson *ibid.* p. 76.

^k Chap. 1. pp. 6-34.

^l *Ibid.* pp. 38-45.

^m Chap. 2. pp. 58-66.

ⁿ *Ibid.* pp. 74-77.

^o Chap. 3. pp. 80-90.

^p Chap. 4. pp. 146-202.

^q Chap. 5. pp. 239, 240.

^r *Ibid.* p. 248.

^s *Ibid.* pp. 248-286.

^t *Ibid.* pp. 304-346.

^u Nicolson's *English Historical Library*, p. 77. under Lloyd; Editor's Preface to Lloyd's *Account of Church Government*; accompanying the present edition.

other reply, than only to tell him; ^x 1. The probable arguments alleged for St. Paul's preaching of Christianity in this isle, are not to be overthrown by less probable ones on the behalf of St. Peter; ^y nor should the man that admits king Lucius's and pope Eleutherius's epistles as genuine, reject the MS. account of abbot Dinoth and his monks. 2. ^z Mr. Launoy and Dr. Beveridge agree with Dr. Stillingfleet, in their exposition of the sixth canon of the Nicene council, as well as the anonymous French author (Dr. Dupin) of the treatise *De Disciplina Ecclesiæ*; who exactly jumps with our great prelate in his notion about the suburbicarian Churches. Dr. Basier's four positions, (in his *Ancient Liberty of the Britannic Church*, London, 1661,) asserting the legitimate exemption of the British Church from the Roman patriarchate, contain only a short essay towards the proof of what we have more amply advanced, and more clearly demonstrated in the *Origines*; not to mention that the greatest part of them are borrowed from John Barnes's *Catholico-Romanus Pacificus*. ^a (Oxon. 1680.)”

It appears desirable also to notice, that Bingham, in his excellent *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, ^b has, at greater length, replied to several of the leading objections raised by Schelstrate; some of which Nicolson

^x See Stillingfleet's arguments, ch. 1. pp. 37-48. and notes; especially p. 47. note ^t, where Schelstrate's argument is shewn.

^y Ibid. ch. 2. p. 66. and note 9. compared with ch. 5. p. 360. note ⁿ, where Schelstrate is cited. Schelstrate's *Dissert. de Auctoritat. Patriarch. et Metropol.*

cap. 1. n. 7, 8. which compare with Nicolson *ibid.* pp. 73, 74.

^z Stillingfleet *ibid.* chap. 3. p. 101, &c. and notes; p. 113, &c. and notes.

^a For the previous editions and the work itself, see Brown's *Fasciculus Rerum*, tom. 1. Præf. p. xxxii. tom. 2. p. 826.

^b Book ix. ch. 1. sect. 12.

has passed over. ^c Schelstrate having, in common with other Romanists, objected against the authenticity of Dinot's reply to Augustine, offers occasion for Bingham's remark, that this is "a weighty argument indeed from a person who professes he did not understand even the English tongue without the help of an interpreter." ^d Schelstrate also objects, that Dinot appeals to the bishop of Caerleon, as his ecclesiastical superior; whereas Bingham has shewn, in reply, several parallel cases in the Roman Church itself. ^e Schelstrate also endeavours to prove that the British bishops, in their conference with Augustine, did not question "the primacy of the Roman bishop, but Austin's metropolitcal jurisdiction over them." But this is denied at some length by Bingham, as it had been previously by Stillingfleet. ^f Schelstrate insists too that the British bishops in the council of Arles owned the pope's patriarchal power over them and all the western world. As Bingham's argument, in reply, much resembles that afforded us by Stillingfleet, it will be sufficient to refer to the latter, in order to shew that Schelstrate's pretences were already sufficiently answered, and indeed confuted.

Sir George Mackenzie was also opposed to Stillingfleet, as he had previously been to Lloyd, on the subject of the Scotch Antiquities. ^g Bishop Lloyd

^c Dissert. *ibid.* cap. 6. n. 9. compared with Præfat. ad Lector. p. 1. Bingham *ibid.* Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 360. and note ⁿ.

^d Dissert. *ibid.* Bingham *ibid.* Stillingfleet *ibid.* p. 361. and note ^p.

^e Dissert. *ibid.* Bingham *ibid.* Stillingfleet *ibid.* p. 358. and note ^f.

^f Dissert. cap. 4. n. 1, &c. *passim*, compared with Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 2. p. 83. note ^l, &c.

^g In the Preface to his His-

having taken a very different view of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain, from Hector Boethius and his followers, and denied the existence of many of their ancient kings, Mackenzie, more particularly on the latter point, replied to the arguments of Lloyd, in his "Defence of the Royal Line of Scotland," published in 1685. "In this tract," says Nicolson, in his English Historical Library, "^h the zealous author was so wholly on fire, that it was not safe for the bishop (Lloyd) himself to approach him; but his incomparable friend, Dr. Stillingfleet, took the ⁱ pains to confirm at large the bishop's positions, and to answer the most considerable of sir George's objections. Soon after the advocate published ^k a reply to his new antagonist, under the title of 'The Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland further cleared,' &c. I am not now concerned to inquire, whether these two great opponents, or their no less ingenious answerer, had the better in these debates; though I may perhaps hereafter weigh some of the arguments on both sides, if I live to publish my notes on the Scotch and Irish historians." In his Scottish Historical Library, Nicolson, in pursuance of his design, after reverting to ^l Lloyd, and his opponents, sir Robert Sibbald and sir George Mackenzie, proceeds to notice the last named work of sir George's, in answer to the objections of Stillingfleet; "wherein Mackenzie ^m farther explains

torical Account of Church Government in Great Britain and Ireland, pp. xxvi. xxxviii.

^h Part 2. ch. 1. p. 77. when speaking of Lloyd.

ⁱ In the Preface to his Ori-

gines Britannicæ.

^k 8vo. London, 1686.

^l Scottish Historical Library, part 2. chap. 3. p. 37. See the Editor's Preface to Lloyd *ibid*.

^m *Ibid*. p. 38.

his Roman authorities, adding the testimony of Krantzius, and other foreign writers. His adversary (he thinks) is too hard upon the Scotch historians, when he makes all those who mention the story of Gathelus and Scota, to be fabulous, and calls them that omit it crafty; and he judges him no less forward in objecting against the chief of them, that they differ in the number of their kings from the highland genealogist; not observing that he omits all those that reigned by usurpation, and also that succeeded in a collateral line. He likewise complains of his endeavours to lessen the credit of the Scottish history, because of its thwarting the Irish Annals, which are undoubtedly (and confessedly) of no manner of authority in themselves. Lastly, he believes Venerable Bede to have been a more credible voucher than the modern O'Flaherty; and thinks Dr. Stillingfleet can hardly be in earnest, when he offers to destroy the authority of the former of these historians upon the strength and credit of the latter." And in his Irish Historical Library, where speaking of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia*, Nicolson adds; " ⁿ Sir George Mackenzie, in his second Defence (the Antiquity of the Royal Line further cleared) expostulates warmly on the injuries done in this history to the modern Scotland; but the author had beforehand protested against the censures of men unacquainted with the Irish language, as incompetent judges."

Another Scottish writer, Mr. James Cunningham, who has, in his " ^o *Versiculus unus et alter*," endea-

ⁿ Irish Historical Library, *ibid.* ch. 1. p. 7.

part 3, chap. 2, p. 18. See some particulars of O'Flaherty's work,

^o See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 5. p. 12. note 2, &c.

voured to controvert the statements of Lloyd, on the foregoing matters, gives “*P*an Additamentum in correction of Dr. Stillingfleet’s Preface.” This Additamentum is wholly employed in criticising Stillingfleet’s notion of the controverted passage in Eumenius; in regard to which it will be sufficient to refer to the bishop’s Preface; where also Cunningham’s own view of the passage is shortly expressed.

I pass on to say somewhat concerning the present edition, in which the Notes have been much enlarged, as will appear from a comparison of the former editions with that now before us; and also from the various authorities and editions, quoted in their alphabetical and chronological order, at the conclusion of the work. The authorities and quotations of Stillingfleet have been studiously preserved, as given in the edition of 1685, published during his life; and wherever, as in some few cases, ^qthe quotations, for want of the particular editions employed by the author, have not been verified, or he has been misled by some preceding writers, in his authorities, there other, and generally the latest and best editions, and the proper authorities will be found, in order to avoid any difficulty which would otherwise arise. It is also necessary to observe, that the references made in the notes from one portion of the work to another, are every where made to the marginal paging, which is that of the edition of 1685; —a remark which equally applies to the accompanying edition of bishop Lloyd’s work, in respect to the edition of 1684. In cases where more editions than one

^p Stillingfleet’s Preface, p. lix. chap. 4. p. 229. note ⁿ, chap. 5. and note on “*Soli Britannici*.” p. 325. note ^p, as to the first
^q See chap. 3. p. 141. note ^t, references.

of an author have been quoted, there the chronological order has been observed, and thus the continual return of the places and dates of publication has been avoided; and if, in some few instances, this general rule has been departed from, it was intended to prevent any possible error.

Stillingfleet tells us, ^r that he has “not neglected nor transcribed those who have written before” him; and that “if in some things” he differed from “great names,” it was not out of opposition; for that he “intended not to deliver other men’s judgments, but” his “own.” Two of the writers thus alluded to, were undoubtedly Mr. Camden, in his *Britannia*, and archbishop Usher, in his *Antiquities of the British Churches*. He differed from Camden, ^s as to the Druids; ^t as to a passage in Asser’s *Alfred*; ^u the Picts’ origin; ^x the Saxons’ origin; ^y and the time of the Saxons’ arrival in Britain; in which particulars, conceding that the Picts’ origin, and perhaps that of the Saxons, have subsequently afforded matter for dispute, yet in the remainder Camden appears to have been certainly mistaken. Stillingfleet differed from Usher, ^z as to the subscriptions in the council of Arles; ^a the provinces of Roman Britain; ^b whether York was, under the Romans, the metropolis of Britain; ^c in some particulars as to South Wales; ^d as to the Roman supplies to the Britons; ^e the position of the

^r See in this Preface, p. iv.

^s Chap. 2. p. 57. and note f.

^t Chap. 4. p. 208. notes a, b.

^u Chap. 5. p. 239. compared with p. 240. and note d.

^x *Ibid.* p. 306. and note x.

^y *Ibid.* p. 316. and note u.

^z See chap. 2. p. 75. and note a.

^a *Ibid.* p. 76. and note u.

^b Chap. 4. p. 195. and note x.

^c *Ibid.* p. 203. and note p.

^d Ch. 5. p. 296. and note s, &c.

^e *Ibid.* p. 298. and note r.

Roman walls; ^f the Saxons' settlements in Germany; ^g Hengist and Horsa, as connected with the lesser Frisia; ^h and Brettia in Procopius. Among these matters of difference, it may be affirmed, that, in the subscriptions to the council of Arles, and the position of the Roman walls, the reasons which Stillingfleet has given are preferable to those of Usher; and perhaps the same may be said of some of the rest, though others may still admit of dispute. But notwithstanding these and other discrepancies, it must be acknowledged that Camden and Usher are the two principal authorities for the secular and ecclesiastical collections made by Stillingfleet in the prosecution of his work.

Other compilers of ecclesiastical history, whose works have been, and still are, held in deserved estimation, as archbishop Parker, bishop Godwin, sir Henry Spelman, and bishop Beveridge, do occasionally afford bishop Stillingfleet grounds of difference. It will be sufficient to mention some instances from them, without adverting to Selden and additional writers, of whom Stillingfleet occasionally speaks. He shews the error of the two first with respect to ⁱ a passage in William of Malmesbury, where they mistake a manuscript, belonging to St. Augustine's monastery at Canterbury, for an epistle of Augustine himself; and that of sir Henry Spelman, ^k as to some of the legends in favour of the Glastonbury traditions, and in some particulars ^l as it regards king Lucius. ^m Bishop Beveridge, in his excellent Annotations on the council of

^f Ibid. p. 307. and note ^m.

^g Ibid. p. 310. and note ^d, &c.

^h Ibid. p. 311. and note ^l.

ⁱ See ch. 1. p. 12. and note ^t.

^k Ibid. p. 9. and note ^b.

^l Ch. 2. p. 64. and note ^z.

^m Annot. in Pandect. Canon.

tom. 2. p. 52. col. 2, &c.

Nice, ⁿ as is shewn in the places below, is directly opposed to bishop Stillingfleet; for while Beveridge insists, that neither the name nor the power of patriarchs existed at the time of the council of Nice, nor for a considerable space afterwards; bishop Stillingfleet, on the contrary, insists, that ^o “the greater sees—had gotten the extent of more than a bare metropolitan power to themselves;”—as in the case of the bishop of Alexandria; whose power, ^p “if it extended over more provinces” than one “with full jurisdiction, then it was patriarchal.”

And as ^qStillingfleet has shewn himself of a different opinion from Camden, concerning the origin of the Picts, he has, by implication at least, differed from his friend ^rLloyd, who maintained, on that point, the same opinion as Camden. ^sLloyd too was of opinion that the “Irish legends of Kiaranus, Ailbeus, Declanus, and Ibarus,” as preceding Palladius and St. Patrick in the work of the conversion of that country, were such as he “dare not wholly reject,” ^t while Stillingfleet considered them “of very little credit.” ^uThe error of Lloyd, in “making Fordon a monk” is noticed and acknowledged by Stillingfleet.

In some of the minor details of his work, however, Stillingfleet’s opinions may be subject to a revision. The much disputed history of king Lucius, ^xLloyd

ⁿ Stillingfleet *ibid.* chap. 3. p. 103. note ^r, compared with p. 101, note ^w.

^o *Ibid.* p. 101.

^p *Ibid.* p. 103.

^q See this Preface, p. xii, and note ^v.

^r Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 3. p. 6. note ^g, &c.

^s *Ibid.* ch. 2. §. 3. p. 50

^t Stillingfleet *ibid.* chap. 2. p. 53.

^u Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xxvi. and note ^v, compared with Stillingfleet *ibid.* Preface, p. lvii.

^x Lloyd *ibid.* p. xxix. and notes ^d, ^e, p. xlvi. Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 2. p. 58, and note ^k, for

considered entirely fabulous; while ^y Stillingfleet took it for granted "there was such a person, who was a king, and a Christian," will supply us with several instances, in which the investigations of later writers possess superior claims to our attention. Stillingfleet asserts the existence of Lucius, as a Christian king, ^z "is proved from the two coins mentioned by archbishop Usher,—having an image of a king on them, with a cross, and the letters of LVC, as far as they could be discerned;" whereas Usher, ^a as it has been observed, "speaks but slightly of them. ^b 'It is not to be passed by,' says he, (as if at the same time it was scarce worth the observing,) 'that there were two very ancient coins found in England,' " &c. But ^c Ruding, in his *Annals of the Coinage*, has spoken only of the coins of two other British princes as genuine, while he has omitted these of Lucius altogether.—Another point in the history of Lucius, in which we may be allowed to entertain a contrary opinion to Stillingfleet, is, that although ^d he thinks "it most probable this king Lucius" was permitted "to govern these parts of the country" in-

Spanheim's *Disquisition*, as there quoted, and Tillemont, in his *Work on Ecclesiastical History under Eleutherius*, shew many difficulties in the accounts of Lucius, sufficient to abate the self-confidence even of the late Romish bishop Milner, in his *Strictures on (Southey's) the Poet-laureate's Book of the Church*, p. 5.

^y Stillingfleet *ibid.* p. 62.

^z *Ibid.*

^a *The Britons and Saxons not converted to Popery*, dialogue 2. sect. 4. p. 277; attributed to Geo. Smith, son of Bede's editor.

^b *Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 39. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 22.*

^c Stillingfleet *ibid.* note *b.* *Britons and Saxons ibid.* p. 278, compared with Spanhem. *ibid.* n. 10. in *Oper. tom. 2. col. 398.* One of these two coins attributed to Lucius, which is of gold, is preserved in the collection at the British Museum, and is "a decidedly false" one, as Mr. C. F. Barnwell informs me. "Of the other in silver nothing is known."

^d Stillingfleet *ibid.* p. 64, and note *y.*

cluded within the later counties of Surrey and Sussex ; yet, among others, ^e a pleasing writer of our day has shewn that South Wales has superior claims for the rule and residence of Lucius. These, however, as has been observed, are but matters of inferior importance.

It is to the general excellency and consequent usefulness of bishop Stillingfleet's work, that, in conclusion, our attention should be directed.

If we pass over his preface, being for the most part a defence of bishop Lloyd's previous work, and permit the principal matters therein to be still discussed between the followers of the ^f Pinkertons and the Goodalls of the last century, we shall at once arrive at the history of the British Church, as contained in his first chapter, p. 1, entitled, "Of the first planting of a Christian Church in Britain by St. Paul." Here, taking ^g the words of Gildas, in connexion with the passages adduced from the earliest writers of the Church, we have sufficient proofs of the introduction of Christianity into Britain, if not by an apostle, yet at least by apostolic men. And while the learned writer is anxious to shew the early introduction of the Christian faith into his native country, he, at the same time, is equally anxious to shew that the ^h fabulous histories,

^e Rees's Essay on the Welsh Saints, sect. 4. p. 84.

^f Pinkerton's Enquiry into the History of Scotland, compared with Goodall's Introduction to Fordon's Scotichronicon.

^g Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 1. p. 5, &c. compared with p. 37, &c.

^h *Ibid.* p. 6, &c. for the fabulous history of Glastonbury, p. 14, &c., as to its forged charters. The contents of page 15. should

be carefully compared with the following page ; and by comparing the contents of p. 18. with p. 19, and the places cited from Spelman's and Wilkins's Councils, in notes ^r and ^l, it will be evident that the charter of Ethelbert, king of Kent, adduced by bishop Jewel, in his Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, the fifth part, ch. 1. div. 1. in his Works,

and forged charters, which had for many ages obscured the truth of the early records of the British Church, needed only to be examined in order to convince others of their utter worthlessness.

In his second chapter, p. 49, "Of the succession of the British Churches to the first council of Nice," we have ⁱ the testimony of Tertullian to the prevalence of Christianity, in the second century, beyond the boundaries of the Roman Britain, with the vindication of this testimony against objectors. ^k Allowing the existence of Lucius as a Christian prince, we are carried on towards the latter portion of this century; and, at its close, we have from the united authority of Gildas, the British, and Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Church writer, still more cogent proofs, from ^l the martyrdoms which they relate, that the religion of Christ had taken deep root, and spread over the land. Early in the next century, we have ^m historical proof, not only of the episcopal form of Church government in Britain, but the names of its metropolitan bishops are preserved, and their presence in the councils of the Church established; while, in the location of their sees, we are reminded that, in exterior things, the Church possessed an early and due resemblance, in its apportionment, to the state.

In the third chapter, p. 88, "Of the succession of the British Churches from the council of Nice to the council of Ariminum," ⁿ he speaks of the probability of

p. 439, is a forgery, as I have observed to some now engaged in their republication.

ⁱ Stillingfleet *ibid.* chap. 2. p. 50.

^k *Ibid.* p. 58.

^l *Ibid.* p. 71.

^m *Ibid.* p. 74.

ⁿ *Ibid.* ch. 3. p. 89.

the British bishops being present at the council of Nice ; and of ^o the birth of the emperor Constantine in Britain. From the canons of the council of Nice, he takes occasion to shew ^p the difference between the rights of a metropolitan and a patriarch ; and ^q the independence of the British Churches. He also shews that ^r the bishop of Rome exercised his authority within, and not beyond that portion of Italy, which had the title of the Suburbicarian provinces ; while as ^s he proves from the case of St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, that the other provinces of Italy were independent of him. Stillingfleet then proceeds to answer the objections of the various Romish writers, ^t as regards the Churches of Illyricum, ^u of Gaul, ^x of Africa, and ^y of Britain, and to shew that ^z the council of Sardica conferred a new privilege, that of hearing appeals, upon the Roman bishop. He also shews that ^a the council of the western bishops, and among them the British bishops at Arles, was “ far from owning the pope’s patriarchal power over them, because they do not so much as desire his confirmation of what had passed in council ; but only send the canons to him to publish them.” He then replies to the pretences alleged from ^b St. Basil, St. Augustine, and some of the bishops of Rome, as to various expressions in their works which, it is contended, attribute to the Roman bishop a patriarchal power over the western Churches. This

^o Ibid. p. 90.

^p Ibid. p. 100.

^q Ibid. p. 106.

^r Ibid. p. 110.

^s Ibid. p. 113.

^t Ibid. p. 115.

^u Ibid. p. 119.

^x Ibid. p. 121.

^y Ibid. pp. 122. 132.

^z Ibid. p. 129.

^a Ibid. p. 130.

^b Ibid. p. 131.

chapter closes with ^c a further notice of the council of Sardica, ^dwhere Stillingfleet gives additional reasons for the British bishops being present.

It may be observed that this is an important chapter, as regards the government and independence of the western Churches.

The fourth chapter, p. 145, speaks “of the faith and service of the British Churches;” ^e the charge of Arianism is considered; its history is related at great length; and ^f the British bishops are shewn to have been present at the council of Ariminum; ^g the property and the privileges of Churches and of the clergy are considered, after which ^h the history of Pelagianism and its authors and promoters are treated of. ⁱ “The schools of learning” in Britain and their most famous men are next spoken of; after which, ^k the assistance which Germanus and Lupus, bishops of Gaul, rendered both against Pelagianism, and in the formation of schools, is gratefully acknowledged. ^l An account is given of Rome, as “the chief university of the empire;” which is followed by that of others, in other great cities of the provinces. The last subject of inquiry in this chapter is that of ^m “the public service of the British Churches;” upon which Stillingfleet concludes, ⁿ “that where the British or Gallican and Roman differed, our Church has not followed the Roman, but the” Gallican Church service.

In the fifth and concluding chapter, p. 238, we have

^c Ibid. p. 134.

^d Ibid. p. 135.

^e Chap. 4. p. 146.

^f Ibid. p. 176.

^g Ibid. p. 177.

^h Ibid. p. 180.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 202.

^k Ibid. pp. 189. 202. 210.

^l Ibid. p. 210.

^m Ibid. p. 216.

ⁿ Ibid. p. 237.

the history “of the declension of the British Churches.” Passing over ^o the previous matter, and merely observing that some things relating to the ^p Scotch and ^q Irish antiquities or their writers are more correctly reported in the Preface, ^r which was, as is usual, written after the body of the work, Stillingfleet observes that ^s “the first occasion” of the “declining state and condition” of the British Churches was, the “laying them open to the fury of the Picts and Scots.” ^t The arrival of the Saxons is next considered, and ^u the battles which Vortimer fought against them; ^x the destruction of the Churches by these pagans, and the massacres of the Britons follow; after which ^y the temporary relief afforded by the victories of Aurelius Ambrosius and Arthur is noticed; ^z the men of the greatest eminence in the British Church are named, as Dubricius, Iltutus, St. David and others; and ^a Gildas’s reproof of the vices of the British kings, judges, and clergy, is, in regard to its causes, feelingly lamented. This chapter, and the work itself, closes with ^b the arrival of the papal missionary, Augustine; and ^c the refusal of the British bishops to acknowledge his, and consequently, the authority of Gregory, bishop of Rome, who deputed him.

^o Chap. 5. p. 239, &c.

^p Compare *ibid.* pp. 254. 261, and notes there, as to Veremundus, with the Preface, p. lii. as to Grossum Caput, and Nicolson’s *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 2. p. 21, under Veremundus.

^q Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 271, and note ⁿ, with his Preface, p. xxxviii.

^r Preface, p. xxxvii., where Jornandes is referred to.

^s *Ibid.* ch. 5. p. 286.

^t *Ibid.* p. 304.

^u *Ibid.* p. 322.

^x *Ibid.* p. 325.

^y *Ibid.* pp. 328. 334, &c.

^z *Ibid.* p. 346.

^a *Ibid.* p. 354.

^b *Ibid.* p. 356.

^c *Ibid.* p. 357.

As the summary of contents prefixed to each chapter gives a tolerably accurate idea of the whole, I will only add, that Stillingfleet did not notice the objections against his work, raised by Schelstrate and Mackenzie, not to allude to others; and a probable reason for his silence was, that he had previously replied to the most considerable of them. In proof I may refer to the third chapter, ^d where he shews the futility of Schelstrate's arguments, as advanced in his *Antiquitas Illustrata*; and with respect to Mackenzie, Stillingfleet's Preface at large, and the corresponding portions of his fifth chapter, will afford a like reply. Yet in both cases, but more especially in that of Schelstrate, not a few of the leading passages, in his ^e*Dissertatio de Auctoritate Patriarchali et Metropolitana*, have been considered and replied to in this present edition, as may be seen under their several names and subjects in the Index, at the close of this volume.

I cannot refrain from making my due acknowledgments to those friends, who have been pleased, in various ways, to render me their valuable communications and assistance; in particular to the Rev. H. A. Stillingfleet, of How Capel; and the Rev. E. W. Stillingfleet, of Hotham; to the Rev. Tho. Cradock, of archbishop Marsh's Library, Dublin; and ^fRobert Travers, Esq. M. D., of Dundrum, near that city; to Sir

^d Chap. 3. p. 112, &c. 119. 122. 127. 132, &c. An answer, however, from Stillingfleet was expected. See Continuation of the present State of the Controversy, sect. 6. p. 36.

^e See pp. vi—viii. of this Preface.

^f This gentleman is now engaged in preparing for publication a Catalogue of Stillingfleet's library of printed books, amounting to near ten thousand volumes, included in primate Marsh's library.

Henry Ellis, and C. F. Barnwell, Esq., of the British Museum ; and at Oxford to the Rev. Dr. Bandinel, and the Rev. S. Reay, of the Bodleian Library ; to the Rev. Dr. Fox, provost, and the Rev. George Riggs, fellow and librarian of Queen's College, for their continued favours ; with whose assistance I have been enabled to complete the present edition of this work of “ § the greatest man of his time.”

THO. P. PANTIN.

*Westcote Rectory,
near Stow on the Wold,
21st December, 1841.*

§ Bishop Hough's Letter prefixed to Stillingfleet's Miscellaneous Discourses, p. xii. compared with Burnet's History of

his Own Times, p. 343, &c. vol. i. ed. Oxon. 1832, when speaking of Stillingfleet.

ORIGINES BRITANNICÆ;

OR,

THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

WITH A PREFACE

CONCERNING SOME PRETENDED ANTIQUITIES

RELATING TO BRITAIN,

IN VINDICATION OF W. LLOYD, D.D.

SUCCESSIVELY BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH, LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY,
AND WORCESTER.

BY EDW. STILLINGFLEET, D.D.

DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, AND CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY;
AFTERWARDS LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER.



CONTENTS.

PREFACE IN VINDICATION OF DR. LLOYD.. P. xxxi

CHAP. I.

OF THE FIRST PLANTING A CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN BRITAIN
BY ST. PAUL.

No Christian Church planted in Britain during the reign of Tiberius	2
Gildas's words misunderstood	4
The tradition concerning Joseph of Arimathæa and his brethren coming to Glastonbury, at large examined	8
The pretended testimonies of British writers disproved	10
St. Patrick's Epistle a forgery	19
Of the Saxon charters, especially the large one of king Ina ..	23
The antiquity of seals in England	26
Ingulphus's testimony explained	28
All the Saxon charters suspicious, till the end of the seventh century	25. 31
The occasion of this tradition, from an old British Church there	13. 37. 39
The circumstances about Joseph of Arimathæa and Arviragus very improbable	41
Sir H. Spelman vindicated	42
The state of the Roman province about that time	44
No such king as Arviragus then	46
Not the same with Caractacus	49
A Christian Church proved to be planted here in the apostles' times	51

The authentic testimonies of Eusebius, Theodoret, and Clemens Romanus, to that purpose	52
St. Paul, in probability, the first founder of a Church here . .	55
The time and opportunity he had for it after his release.	57
Of Pomponia Græcina, and Claudia Rufina, Christians at Rome, and their influence on his coming hither	64
St. Peter and St. Paul compared, as to their preaching here, and the far greater probability of St. Paul's	66

CHAP. II.

OF THE SUCCESSION OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES TO THE FIRST COUNCIL OF NICE.

The testimony of Tertullian concerning them cleared.	72
The national conversion of the Scots under king Donald fabulous	74
Of Dempster's old annals	76
Prosper speaks not of the Scots in Britain	77
The testimony of Severus Sulpicius examined.	80
Several testimonies of Origen concerning the British Churches in his time	83
The different traditions about king Lucius	85
The state of the Roman province here overthrows his being king over all Britain	89
Great probability there was such a king in some part of Britain, and then converted to Christianity	92
A conjecture proposed in what part of Britain he reigned	93
The most probable means of his conversion, and the story cleared from monkish fables	98
Of Diocletian's persecution in Britain, and the stopping of it by means of Constantius.	105
The flourishing of the British Churches under Constantine . . .	112
The reason of three bishops of Britain only present in the council of Arles	113
Of the great antiquity of episcopal government here	115
Of Geoffrey's flamines and archiflamines, how far agreeable to the Roman constitution	117
Maximinus's pagan hierarchy in imitation of the Christian. . . .	122
The canons of the council of Arles not sent to the pope to confirm, but to publish them	125

CHAP. III.

OF THE SUCCESSION OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES FROM THE
COUNCIL OF NICE TO THE COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM.

Great probabilities that the British bishops were present in the council of Nice	133
The testimonies of Constantine's being born in Britain cleared	135
The particular canons of that council explained	138
Especially those relating to the government of Churches ...	142
How far the right of election was devolved to the bishops ...	144
Of the authority of provincial synods there settled	148
Particular exceptions as to the bishops of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch from ancient custom	151
They had then a patriarchal power within certain bounds ...	155
No metropolitans under the bishops of Rome and Alexandria..	156
The just rights of the British Churches cleared	163
No evidence that they were under the Roman patriarchate....	166
The Cyprian privilege vindicated from all late exceptions ...	160
The patriarchal rights examined; and from them the pope's patriarchal power over the western Churches, at large disputed and overthrown.....	167
Pope Leo's arguments against the patriarch of Constantinople held for the western Churches against him	200
The British bishops present in the council of Sardica with those of Gaul	203
What authority granted by them to the bishop of Rome, and how far it extends.....	207

CHAP. IV.

OF THE FAITH AND SERVICE OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

The faith of the British Churches inquired into	218
The charge of Arianism considered	219
The true state of the Arian controversy from the council of Nice to that of Ariminum; and some late mistakes rectified.....	ibid.
Of several Arian councils before that of Ariminum.....	242
The British Churches cleared from Arianism after it	259

The number and poverty of the British bishops there present . . .	259
Of the ancient endowment of Churches before Constantine	260
The privileges granted to Churches by him	262
The charge of Pelagianism considered	265
Pelagius and Cœlestius both born in these islands	266
When Aremorica first called Britain	ibid.
What sort of monk Pelagius was	272
No probability of his returning to Britain	274
Of Agricola and others spreading the Pelagian doctrine in the British Churches	276
Germanus and Lupus sent by a council of Gallican bishops hither to stop it	279
The testimony of Prosper concerning their being sent by Celestine considered	284
Of Fastidius a British bishop	287
London the chief metropolis in the Roman government	288
Of Faustus originally a Briton but a bishop in Gaul, and the great esteem he had there	291
Of the Semipelagians and Prædestinarians	294
Of the schools of learning set up here by the means of Germanus and Lupus	299
Dubicrius and Iltutus the disciples of St. German, and of their Schools	ibid.
Of the monastery of Bangor, and the ancient western monasteries, and their difference as to learning from the Benedictine institution	303
Of Gildas's Iren, whether an university in Britain	307
Of the schools of learning in the Roman cities, chiefly at Rome, Alexandria and Constantinople, and the professors of arts and sciences, and the public libraries there	312
Of the schools of learning in the provinces, and the Constitution of Gratian to that purpose extending to Britain	318
Of the public service of the British Churches; the Gallican offices introduced by St. German	320
The nature of them at large explained, and their difference from the Roman offices, both as to the morning and communion service	322
The conformity of the liturgy of the Church of England to the ancient British offices, and not derived from the Church of Rome, as our dissenters affirm	347

CHAP. V.

OF THE DECLENSION OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

Britain never totally subdued by the Romans	358
That was the occasion of the miseries of the Britons in the province by the incursions from beyond the wall.	ibid.
Of the Picts and Scots their mortal enemies	361
The true original of the Picts from Scandinavia	368
That name given to the new colonies, not to the old inhabitants.	359
The Scottish antiquities inquired into	371
Fordon's account of them compared with that of Hector Boethius and Buchanan.	374
Of Veremundus, Cornelius Hibernicus and their ancient annals	381
The modern pleas for their antiquities considered	389. 419
An account of the antiquities of Ireland, and of the authority of their traditions and annals compared with Geoffrey's British antiquities in point of credibility	396
A true account of the fabulous antiquities of the northern nations	411
The first coming of the Scots into Britain according to the Irish writers	416
The first cause of the declension of the British Churches was the laying them open to the fury of the Scots and Picts	426
Of Maximus's withdrawing the Roman forces, and the emperor's sending numbers of Picts to draw them back	429
The miserable condition of the Britons thus forsaken, and supplies sent them for a time and then taken away	436
Of the walls built for their security, and the Roman legions there placed.	443
The great degeneracy of manners among the Britons	450
Of intestine divisions and calling in foreign assistance.	452
Of the Saxons' coming, who they were, and whence they came	454
Bede's account examined and reconciled with the circumstances of those times.	467
Of the reasons of Vortigern's calling in the Saxons	476
Of the dissatisfaction of the Britons upon their coming, and Vortigern's league with them.	477
Of the valour of Vortimer and Aurelius Ambrosius against the Saxons	479

The different account of the battles between the Britons and Saxons among our historians	484
The sad condition of the British Churches at that time.	ibid.
The imperfect account given by the British history.	495
Of king Arthur's story and success	498
Of persons in greatest reputation then in the British Churches, and particularly of St. David	515
Of the Britons passing over to Aremorica, and the beginning of that colony.	523
Gildas there writes his epistle ; the scope and design of it	528
The British kings he writes to.	ibid.
The independency of the British Churches proved from their carriage towards Augustine the monk	531
The particulars of that story cleared.	532
And the whole concluded.	

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION. i

THE design of the following book is to give as clear and distinct a view of the state and condition of the British Churches, from their first plantation to the conversion of the Saxons, as could be had at so great a distance, and by such a degree of light as is left us concerning them. ^aWhen I first undertook this subject, I intended no more than an introduction to something else; but being entered into it, and laying the several parts of it before me, I found so many obscure and doubtful passages to be cleared, so many common mistakes to be rectified, so many considerable parts of Church history which tended to illustrate it, that either I must give a very imperfect account of it, or so much exceed the proportions of a preface, that I concluded I had better alter my design, and with more pains and materials make it an entire work of itself. To this end I laid aside whatever related to the first occasion of my undertaking it, reserving that for its proper place and season; and then I resumed the consideration of this present argument, with larger and freer thoughts, and resolved to attempt something towards the rescuing this part of Church history, wherein we are so much concerned, from those fabulous antiquities which had so much debased the value and eclipsed the glory of it.

^a See this Preface, p. lxxii.

This I knew was a work, not only of much labour and industry in searching and comparing good and bad authors, printed and MS., foreign and domestic; but which required more than ordinary care and judgment in separating the ore from the dross; which being done as it ought, the question might be, whether it would not fall out here as in some mines, that the quantity of good ore would be so small as hardly to compensate for the pains of digging and refining it. But this was not all the difficulty to be foreseen; for some men's eyes ii are still so tender as not to be able to bear the strong impressions of light; especially in what relates to the antiquities of their own country.

For whatever the reason be of that love mankind do naturally bear to the country they are born in, we find it so universal, that even the Laplanders and Samoieds admire no country like their own; and are impatient of any contradiction to their fancies of the beauties and conveniencies of it. And it is pity to rob men of any such false ideas, not entrenching upon religion or morality, which tend so much to the ease and comfort of their lives. For, if men will be in love with a cold air and a barren soil, with ice and mountains, with living in caves and huts, and travelling upon the hardened snow, to what purpose should any go about to confute them, by proving that the Elysian fields are more pleasant than those northern climates? And so strong is the inclination that is rooted in mankind to the love of their country, that some learned and witty men, who have been born in none of the most tempting climates, have used great art and industry to represent them with such advantage to the world, as though paradise were but another name for their native country. Of which we have a remarkable instance in the late work of an ingenious person, who with mighty pains hath endea-

voured to prove not only that ^b Plato's Atlantic island, but the Elysian fields themselves are to be found in one of the remotest northern countries.

And it is to little purpose to go about to alter such men's opinions, which are not so much founded on reason, as on an overbearing passion for their native soil, which hurts no other part of the world, and makes their own seem more pleasant to themselves. Some will be apt to think, the greatest punishment to such persons, is to let them live at home and enjoy their own opinions; but I rather look on it as an effect of the wisdom of Divine Providence to make men contented with the places of their habitations: for if all mankind should love and admire one and the same country, there would be nothing but destroying one another in hopes to enjoy it; whereas now, since the true Paradise is lost, it seems to be most convenient for the world, that every nation should believe they have it at home.

If therefore any of our neighbour nations shouldⁱⁱⁱ think their own the richest, the pleasantest, the fruitfulest country in the world, I should by no means think it fit to dispute it with them, no more than I would the wisdom or goodness of their parents. For, however the truth of things be, it is best for children to believe well of them; and it may prove of very ill consequence to alter a mistaken good opinion in them; for it makes them less contented and less fit to be governed than before; and living under such a misper-suasion can never do them so much hurt as the unseasonable discovery of their error doth. From hence I look on all national quarrels as very foolish and mischievous, it being reasonable that all persons should love their own country as they do their parents;

^b Ola. Rudbeck. Atlant. part 1. ch. 7. §. 4. 5. ch. 23. §. 1. pp. 152. 574.

and no man ought to suffer in his esteem for that which it was never in his power to help. But whosoever fixes an ill character upon a person on the account of his country, makes a whole nation his enemies, which no wise man will ever do; and whosoever doeth it will one time or other see cause to repent his folly.

But is it not possible for learned and ingenuous men to inquire into and debate the several antiquities of their nations without making a national quarrel about them? In matter of self-defence there is a 'moderamen inculpatæ tutelæ' to be observed; and so there ought certainly to be in the defence of our country; especially when the dispute relates neither to the safety nor profit, nor the true honour or esteem of it, but only to a mere point of antiquity; wherein wise and learned men may differ from each other that are natives of the same country. And these matters are not to be decided in the field, nor at the bar, nor by a majority of voices, but depend upon the comparing of ancient histories, the credibility of testimonies, and a sagacity in searching, and skill in judging concerning them. ^{bb} It is not every one that can plead eloquently at the bar, or quote authors at second hand, or dispute warmly out of common places, that is presently fit to judge about such things; for he that takes upon him to do that ought not only to have a general skill in antiquity and the best authors, but to compare the histories and annals, the successions and the settlements of the neighbour nations together, and then with great impartiality to ^{iv} deliver his judgment; but by no means to espouse any particular interest, as though he were retained on that side. Which he plainly discovers if he appear resolved to maintain one side against the strongest evidence, and

^{bb} Mackenzie's Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland farther cleared, &c. c. 1. p. 5. c. 5. p. 179. See c. 1. p. 35. and note ^u.

to cry down the other in an ignominious and reproachful manner; as though nothing but particular piques and animosities, or, which is far worse, ill-will to the government, could lead men into such debates; nay as though it were a degree of lese-majesty, (as it is termed) to call in question some very remote and very uncertain traditions about the first succession of the kings of a neighbour nation. This I have particular reason to take notice of, from the usage the very learned and judicious ^c bishop of St. Asaph hath lately met with in this kind, merely because in his late excellent book he rejects the long succession of kings from Fergus the son of Ferquard, from the time of Alexander's taking of Babylon; which he doth chiefly on these two grounds: 1. ^{cc} Because he proves from good authorities in his book, that the Scots could not be so early settled in Britain; 2. Because those Scottish historians who have asserted it are not of sufficient authority to be relied upon; which he shews at large in his Preface.

Now upon this occasion, his majesty's learned advocate in Scotland hath been pleased to think it a part of his duty to answer this part of the bishop's book, not without some kind of ^dsharpness and unhandsome reflections on a person of his character and merit; but none like this, ^{dd} "that he admires that any of the subjects of Great Britain did not think it a degree of lese-majesty to injure and shorten the royal line of their kings." But there is more reason to admire at the strangeness of this accusation, unless it were intended to shew that he could as well prosecute as write against

^c Lloyd's Historical Account of ancient Church Government in Great Britain and Ireland, ch. 1. §. 5. p. 10.

^{cc} Lloyd *ibid.* §. 4. p. 7, &c

^d Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 200.

^{dd} Letter to Lord Chancellor of Scotland, p. (11.) 10. prefixed to his Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line.

the bishop by virtue of his office, for disputing their antiquities. As though the fundamental constitution of the British monarchy were at all concerned in the credit of Hector Boethius, for upon it, as I shall presently shew, the main stress of this matter doth rest.

But because these are dangerous insinuations, and may as well be urged against some part of the following book, I shall here make it clear how very unjust and unreasonable they are. For it is not the antiquity of v the royal line which is in dispute, but the succession of it in such a place; e the Irish antiquaries carrying the succession much farther back than Hector Boethius, or Lesley, or f Buchanan do. And therefore they charge others far more with shortening the royal line, making it to begin with Fergus; when they derive it long before by a continued succession from Simon Brek, and Herimon, and Gathelus, who they say was but six descents from Japhet. But if there be any degree of § lese-majesty (for I am very unwilling to put these hard words into proper English) in those who debate any thing wherein the honour of the royal line is concerned, let them clear themselves of it who lay the foundation of the monarchy in the election of Fergus. For that is truly the state of the case; those who contend so earnestly for the succession of the royal line from Fergus the son of Ferchard, placing his title to the monarchy in the choice of the heads of the tribes; which will appear from the words of Hector Boethius, who is in truth the main support of all this tradition.

e Vide Gratian. *Lucium* in *Cambrens. Evers.* p. 248. This work was written by John Lynch, a Romish priest. Nicolson's *Irish Historical Library*, ch. 1. p. 2. Mackenzie's *Epist. Dedic.* to *The Antiquity* ib. c. 1. pp. 2-5.

f Lloyd *ibid.* in his *Preface*, p. xxiii. &c. Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library* *ibid.* p. 33. See note z, p. vii. of this *Preface*.

§ Vide *Skenæi Regiam Majestat. Scotiæ*, in indice "*Læsæ majestatis.*"

For, although ^b Fordon doth mention the succession of many kings from Fergus the son of Ferchard to Fergus II., yet he professes he could find nothing particular concerning them; although he quotes several chronicles, and we are told he had the view of their annals, such as they were, of ⁱ Paisley, Scone, and other places. ^k He names indeed forty-five kings, but he desires to be excused as to the several times of their reigns, for he had not met with them written at large, but from the time of Fergus II. he promiseth to be very distinct and particular. Yet after him comes Hector Boethius, of whom the learned advocate tells us “that ^l Erasmus said he could not lie;” (which comes very near to infallibility in matter of fact;) and he is as distinct and particular in the first succession as he is in the second. From whence comes this mighty difference? Of this he informs us from Hector Boethius himself (and can we have a better authority than his that could not lie?) “that he had several books from ^m Icolmkill, which he followed in writing his history.” I cannot now enter upon the consideration of the authority of ^{vi} these books, (of which afterwards,) but, as far as yet appears, it depends upon the credibility of Hector.

But that which I am now to shew is, that if Hector Boethius’s authority be allowed, those who lengthen the royal line do more injury to the monarchy than those

^b See notes on Lloyd’s Preface, p. xxvi. and in this Work, ch. 5. p. 249.

ⁱ See p. xvii, and note, as to these books.

^k A primo quidem hujus regni Fergusio filio Ferchardi ad hunc regem Fergusium filium Erch inclusive, 45 Reges ejusdem gentis et generis in hac insula regnaverunt: sed et horum sigillatim distinguere tempora

principatum ad præsens omitimus, nam ad plenum scripta non reperimus. Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 4. cap. 2. lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 622. See ch. 5. p. 252. Mackenzie’s Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 100. ch. 4. pp. 118. 120.

^l Mackenzie’s Defence of the Antiquity &c. p. 29. See ch. 5. p. 263.

^m For the library at Icolmkill, see ch. 5. p. 255, and note n.

who shorten it. ⁿ For the first account he gives of it is this, "That the Scots in Britain being pressed by the Piets and Britons, they sent over into Ireland for assistance; Ferquard sent his son Fergus with supplies; who, saith he, left it to the choice of the heads of the tribes, what government they would have, whether a monarchy, aristocracy, or a commonwealth; and they pitched upon a monarchy, and made Fergus their king: which he saith was just ^o three hundred and thirty years before Christ's nativity. After which he sets down Fergus's owning that he received his authority from the people; and their fundamental contract ^p to adhere to him and to his line, which, if he may be believed, was engraven in marble tables, and then the Agrarian law followed." ^q And (which is very observable) the first design we find laid for "altering the succession of the crown and excluding the next heir," is in Hector Boethius's account of the immediate successor to Fergus the son of Ferquard. ^r For notwithstanding the binding oath to the posterity of Fergus, yet immediately after his death, he saith, Feritharis was chosen king, although Fergus left Ferlegus his son and heir; and not only so, but a law, saith he, was passed, excluding the next heir from any right to government till he attained to such an age. The effect whereof was, that Ferlegus attempting to recover his right from Feritharis was banished and utterly excluded. Hector himself confesses ^s "he was at just age when he demanded

ⁿ Boeth. Hist. Rer. Scotticarum, lib. 1. f. 6. lin. 25. See ch. 5. p. 253.

^o Usser. de Primord. Addend. p. 1018. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 15. p. 301, where it is four hundred and thirty years. Compare Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xl.

and n. ^t, with this Preface, p. xv.

^p Boeth. *ibid.* f. 10. 2. lin. 53. See ch. 5. p. 253.

^q See Mackenzie's *Jus Regium, or the Just and Solid Foundations of Monarchy*, p. 145.

^r Boeth. *ibid.* f. 10. 2. lin. 55.

^s *Ibid.* f. 15. lin. 19 et 39.

the crown, but he was put by and severely rebuked, ‘quod injussu patrum petiisset regnum,’ for doing it without the authority of the senate; upon which they imprisoned him, but he made his escape and fled first to the Picts, then to the Britons, and after Feritharis’s death Main was chosen to succeed.” This is the just and true account of this matter, as it is delivered by Hector Boethius, and after him by Lesley, who speaks more plainly of Ferlegus’s exclusion; †“sed Ferlegum recusavit populus.” †“Buchanan saith, “that he was vii condemned in his absence;” but he would fain reconcile this practice to their former oath; (although the advocate himself saith, x“this oath did in law and reason bind them to obey the lineal successor according to the proximity of blood;”) but Buchanan’s pretence is, “because the present king during the minority of the heir, was but a king in trust, and the heir at such an age was to succeed.” But how well that was observed appears by this first instance, and in truth, Hector Boethius and the rest after him do put the whole power as to these matters in the hands of the people, or at least of the heads of the clans; as will appear more afterwards.

It cannot therefore but be very surprising to us to see his majesty’s advocate so zealously defending this history of the first succession of their kings, and reflecting upon a bishop of our Church for calling it in question. And yet he cannot deny that this law “y was the occasion of many bloody civil wars between the uncles and nephews;” and he calls it “the dispute betwixt such as were for the crown, and such as were

† Leslai de Origine, Moribus, et Gestis Scotorum, lib. 2. p. 81.

‡ Buchanan. Rer. Scoticarum Hist. lib. 4. p. 29.

x Mackenzie’s Jus Regium, &c. p. 145.

y Mackenzie’s Defence ibid. p. (110.) 114.

for popular elections." From whence it follows, that Hector Boethius's history of the first succession from Fergus is to set up the popular claim. And quite through that first race Hector makes the supreme unaccountable power in all cases of male-administration to be lodged in the heads of the people, and the ministerial in the monarch.

^z And therefore, we should have thought it had better become his majesty's advocate to have overthrown such pernicious principles to monarchy, as are contained in this account of the first race of their kings from Fergus the son of Ferquard. And although ^{zz} Buchanan, among the half-learned, bear the blame of these antimonarchical principles, yet it is evident that he only built on the foundations laid by those who set up this first race, as the advocate himself confesseth, whose words are, " ^a All Buchanan's arguments for restraining kings being founded on the authority of our historians, who," as he saith, " assert that king Fergus was first elected king by the people." And therefore those historians who set up this succession in such a manner had no kindness to monarchy, as appears by what ^b Lesley himself saith about king Fergus and his successors.

viii It is true that the learned advocate hath, according to his duty, published a Just Defence of the Monarchy of Scotland; but I must crave leave to say, that ^c it

^z See Mackenzie's Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 1. p. 7.

^{zz} Nicolson's Scottish Historical Library, part 2. chap. 2. p. 32. See p. x. and note ^u, in this Preface.

^a Mackenzie's Just Right of Monarchy, p. 26. (*Jus Regium*, &c.)

^b Lesley *ibid.* pp. 77. 79.

^c Nicolson, in his Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 1. p. 13, refers to this passage, and observes, " other great judges were of a different opinion." Mackenzie's Antiquity *ibid.* p. 213. But see Fordon's admission, in this Preface, p. v. and notes, which compare with Emmius and Boxhornius, in p. xxii.

can never be defended upon good grounds, unless the account of Fergus the son of Ferquard, and the succession of kings from him, as delivered by Hector Boethius and Lesley, as well as Buchanan, be rejected. And this is too plain from the answers he gives to this “consent of their historians.”

1. He saith, “^d that Gathelus was not at all elected by the people.” Whither are we now carried? The question was concerning Fergus in Scotland, the answer is concerning one who is supposed to have lived I know not how many ages before him, and we know not where: and it had been to as much purpose to have said, “Adam was not chosen by the people.” But who was this ^eGathelus? In very truth, he was no other (according to these historians) than “a son of a certain king of Athens, who went into Egypt, and married Scota the daughter of Pharaoh, who was drowned in the Red sea, and afterwards settled in Portugal, from him called Portus Gatheli,” (as the ^fadvocate observes,) “from whence a colony of that race transported itself into Ireland, and another into Scotland.” ^gNow, saith he, “all those who are descended from his colonies were by law obliged to obey the eldest son and representative of that royal family.” What! by the law in king Fergus’s time? For there is none so much as mentioned before that fundamental contract; and was it not well kept after Fergus’s death? But if there had been any precedent, the other had been needless. However, the question is

^d Mackenzie’s *Jus Regium*,
&c. p. 27.

§. 5. p. 10. and note ^s.

^f Mackenzie’s *Jus Regium* ib.

^e As to Gathelus, see this
Preface, pp. xvi. &c. lxvi. ch. 5.
pp. 250. 252. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1.

p. 26.

^g *Ibid.* p. 28.

not concerning Gathelus and his posterity in Ireland, but Fergus and his successors in Scotland.

2. He answers, “^h that the heads of their tribes acknowledged Fergus for their king.” But do not these historians say expressly, “that they chose him, and that he left it to them to choose what government they pleased?” And the words of Fergus, in ⁱHector Boethius, are these, “Vestrum erit in hoc negotio, quid utilius ad vestram rempublicam sit discernere, nostrum vestra capessere imperia.” Did ever man more own the supreme authority of the people than Hector Boethius makes Fergus to do in these words? Whether these very words were spoken by him, even Hector dares not say; but he is sure “they were such like.” And afterwards he saith, “tandem Fergusio regnum decernunt.” And to the same purpose ^kLesley, “Fergusio regnum ab omnibus decernitur.” Is all this “a bare acknowledgment of him for their king?” What more emphatical words could be used to express a “free election,” and that the people gave Fergus the power, than these historians do use?

3. He goes on to give a farther answer, which is very remarkable in his majesty’s advocate, viz. “^l that we read nothing at all of the consent of the people, but of the heads of the tribes, who had no commission from the people, each of them having by his birthright a power to command his own tribe, and consequently the royal power was not derived from the people.” What is the meaning of all this, but only to shew that the royal authority was not derived from the rabble, but from the nobility or heads of the several clans;

^h Ibid. p. 27.

ⁱ Hect. Boeth. Hist. l. 1. f. 6.
2. lin. 67.

^k Leslæ. ibid. p. 77.

^l Mackenzie’s Jus Regium,
&c. p. 29.

and consequently the power of calling their kings to account lay only in them? No, saith he, "Fergus succeeded in the right of those chiefs to command their respective families." Then Fergus had no more power, as monarch, than the heads of the several clans had before. But did they, according to these historians, part with their rights of government to Fergus and his posterity? By what authority then did they take upon them to imprison and depose ^m Euenus III., and set up Cadalanus as king? By what authority did they take arms against ⁿ Dardanus, and set up Galdus, who took away his life, "communi omnium ordinum consensu," saith Lesley? By what authority did they assemble against ^o Lugtachus, Galdus's son, and sent soldiers to dispatch him? By what authority did they rise against ^p Mogallus his successor, with a design to destroy him, as Hector confesseth; which they did effectually, as Lesley agrees? How came they to take upon them to imprison ^q Conarus, and set up Argadus in his room? And to dispose of the government in the time of ^r Ethodius II., and, according to Lesley, commit him to prison, where he was killed? How came they, notwithstanding the law of regency, to set up ^s Athirco, while he was incapable by it? I meddle not with those kings who were killed by secret con-^xspiracies, nor with open usurpers, such as ^{ss} Nathalocus

^m Hect. Boeth. l. 3. f. 36. lin. 57. Leslæ. p. 103.
 1. 2. lin. 40, 41. See chap. 5. p. 257. Leslæ. p. 92.

ⁿ Hect. Boeth. l. 4. f. 59. 1. lin. 40, 41. Leslæ. p. 97. See chap. 5. p. 258.

^o Hect. Boeth. l. 5. f. 75. 2. lin. 42. See chap. 5. *ibid.* for this and the following notes ^p, ^q, ^r.

^p Hect. Boeth. l. 5. f. 79. 2.

lin. 57. Leslæ. p. 103.

^q Hect. Boeth. l. 5. f. 81. 1. lin. 1. Leslæ. *ib.* p. 103.

^r Hect. Boeth. l. 5. f. 90. 1. lin. 11. Leslæ. *ib.* p. 109.

^s Hect. Boeth. l. 6. f. 90. 1. lin. 31. See chap. 5. p. 259. and note ⁱ. Leslæ. p. 110.

^{ss} Mackenzie's Antiquity *ib.* ch. 4. p. 132.

and Donald of the isles; but I only set down what these historians deliver, as to the right and authority which the nobles assumed to themselves in case of male-administration, to shew that if these men's accounts must be received, the heads of the clans did not part with their share in the government so much, but upon occasion they did resume it. And therefore I have been apt to suspect (^t from the controversy about regency at the time when ⁿ Hector wrote) that all this history of the first race of kings was framed on purpose out of ill will to the monarchy, and with a design to advance the power of the nobility. And now let any true friend to the monarchy judge, whether those who shorten the royal line, or those who so earnestly contend for the story of Fergus and his successors, be more liable to be charged with any degree of lese-majesty.

4. ^x But after all, the advocate saith, "that Fordon, the most ancient of their historians, affirms, that Fergus made himself king." Indeed Fordon doth say, "^y that Fergus, the son of Ferard," (as he calls him,) "hearing there were many Scots in the northern parts of Albion, ^z living without order and government, and hearing a good account of the country, he was prompted by his ambition to go over to them; and taking with him a good number of young men, he gathered together the dispersed Scots, and joining them all together in the western parts, he made himself king over them." Which is no improbable account; but Fordon saith not a word of all the former

^t Leslæ. *ibid.* pp. 392. 396.

^u See Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. chap. 2. p. 30. note ^{zz}, p. vii. in this Preface.

^x Mackenzie's *Jus Regium*,

&c. p. 28. which compare with his *Antiq. ib.* ch. 1. pp. 8. 201.

^y Fordon. *Scotichron.* lib. 1. cap. 36. lib. 1. cap. 34. p. 583. See ch. 5. p. 250.

^z See p. xxv.

passages in the other historians. And if Fordon be the most ancient of their historians, what becomes of ^a Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernicus, the two great supporters of Hector Boethius's history? If they were after Fordon, how come they to be so well instructed in so many particulars in the "first succession," which Fordon was wholly unacquainted with?

I cannot deny that Fordon, speaking of the coronation of Alexander III. (as he calls him,) ^b mentions an old highlander, who, in the Irish tongue, repeated the genealogy of their kings backward, as far as Fergus the son of Ferquard. But therein he comes not up to the number, either in Fordon or Hector Boethius; ^{xi} and hath very considerable differences from the accounts either in him or in Lesley and Buchanan. For after Fergus he leaves out Feritharis, and makes Main his next successor; the next he calls ^c Arindal, whom they call Dornadilla; his son, Roveyn, they Nothatus; and his Rether is the same with their Reuther; but here they interpose a Reutha, to make their story agree with Bede's Reuda. But this genealogist next names Ther, whom they call Thereus, and his son Rosin; but they say Josina succeeded Thereus, being his brother. After this, we find a greater difference; for instead of Finnanus, Durstus, Euenus, Gillus, Euenus II., Ederus, Euenus III., Metellanus, Caratacus; we find there only Dethach, Jaw, Aliela, Euen, Ederskeol, Comermore. Some agreement there is,

^a See pp. xviii. xlix. and the notes there concerning these two authorities adduced by Mackenzie, and others previously.

^b Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 10. cap. 2. in Hearnii edit. vol. 3. p. 759. Oxon 1722. vol. 2. p. 82. Edinb. 1759. Nicolson *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 38. Mackenzie, in this

Preface, pp. xiii. xlv. and his *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 4. p. 139, &c. as to this and the following genealogies.

^c See *Additions to Camden's Britannia*, vol. 3. p. 447. notes 1, ^m, ⁿ. Mackenzie's *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 4. p. 131. for this and the other kings.

but a far greater diversity; and Hector's famous Caratacus quite omitted. Then succeeded Corbre, whom they call Corbred; after him Daradiamore, by them styled Dardanus; then another Corbre instead of their Galdus; and then Luthach, Lugtacus in them; then Mogalama, their Mogallus; Coner, their Conarus; Ethath, their Ethodius; Fiachrath, their Satrahel; then another Ethath, whom they call Ethodius II., before whom they place ^dking Donald, "in whose time," they say, "Christianity was first received in Scotland," who is utterly excluded by this ancient genealogy. For after this Ethodius follows in it Athirkiwr, which is their Athirco; then Findachar, which is their Findocus; and so Nathalocus is shut out; and so after him are the two Donalds; for the next that follows is Thinklind, whom they call Crathlintus; then Fencormach, their Fincormacus; after him Romaich, their Romachus; then Enegussa, which is plainly their Angusianus; and Fethelmech, their Fetelmachus; then Engusafich and Etheat, instead of which they put Eugenius and Ethodius his brother; whom both make grandfather to Fergus II., whose father they call Erthus, but the ancient genealogy and Fordon, Eirch.

Now by comparing this genealogy and Hector Boethius together, I am convinced that he did not forge all the names of his "first race of kings," between the two Ferguses; but yet from hence it appears, 1. That Hector did insert many things con-
 xii trary to this ancient genealogy; and when he did so, he had some end to serve in it. As when he puts in regents, which the genealogy never owns; but this was to support his law of incapacity: but in all this genealogy there is a direct lineal descent; and when

^d See p. lxiii. &c. and note there, as to this conversion.

he puts in Reutha, it is to answer Bede's Reuda; and Galdus for Tacitus's Galgacus; and Caratacus for the famous British king of that name; and ^e king Donald to answer our king Lucius, that they might have a Christian king in the time of the pope next succeeding Eleutherius. 2. That this genealogy may be allowed without any advantage to the succession of kings in Scotland from Fergus I., so long before the nativity of Christ; for it is very observable, that this ancient genealogist doth very much shorten the succession between Fergus II. and this Alexander. For he leaves out Eugenius II. and makes Dongard to succeed him; after him Cobren, and then Edanium; whereas here they insert Constantius I., Congallus, Conranus, Eugenius III., Convallus, Kinnatillus between Dongard and Aidanus: "after him he names his son Occahend, whom ^f Fordon calls Eothodius-bind, which he saith is the same with Eugenius; and about him, Hector Boethius, as ^g Buchanan observes, contradicts the book of Paisley; for this saith, "he lived in continual wars;" and the other, "that he enjoyed a constant peace;" so that Boethius slightes the authority of their ancient annals. Next after him they place Ferquard, of whom the genealogy saith nothing at all; ^h Fordon next to nothing. "In cujus nihil actum est tempore," saith he; but the other historians tell sad stories of his vicious life and tragical end. After Eugenius, in the genealogy, we find Donewald breck. ⁱ Fordon saith, "he died after fourteen years' reign;" and to him succeeded Ferquard, his brother's son, not mentioned

^e Lloyd's Preface *ib.* p. xlvi. and note.

^{ee} Mackenzie *ibid.* chap. 4. p. 127, &c. for other kings here mentioned.

^f Fordon. *Scotichron.* lib. 4.

cap. 38. lib. 3. cap. 31. p. 640.

^g Buchan. *ibid.* lib. 5. p. 45.

^h Fordon. *Scotichron.* lib. 4.

cap. 41. lib. 3. cap. 34. p. 642.

ⁱ *Ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 45. lib. 3.

cap. 37. p. 644.

in the genealogy; nor Malduinus, son to Donald; for the next is Ethac, i. e. Eugenius; and here they put in another Eugenius, Ambirkelethus, Eugenius VII., and Mordacus between Ethac and Ethfin; whereas the genealogist makes Ethafind son to Ethdre, to whom succeeded Ethas, i. e. Eugenius VIII., in their account; after him follows Alphin; but between these they have inserted Fergus III., Solvathius, Achaius, ⁱⁱConvallus and Dongallus. They all agree with the ^{xiii} genealogist, that Kenneth immediately succeeded Alphin; ^j but then follows a wonderful difference; for here they put in no fewer than thirteen kings between Kenneth and Malcolm the son of Kenneth, whom the genealogist ^{jj} places next after him: then follows Duncan in all; between whom and Malcolm Canmore they put in Machabæus. ^k After Malcolm he takes no notice of four kings they insert between him and David, and where ^{kk} they put another Malcolm he placeth Henry, and then they agree in William, Alexander and his son Alexander, in whom the genealogy begins, and so runs backward in a lineal ascent.

Now it deserves very well to be considered, that this ancient genealogist hath so much shortened the succession as will bring the whole into a much less compass. For the modern historians have inserted more kings in the second race, from Fergus the son of Erk, than are contained in the genealogy from Fergus the son of Ferquard to Fergus II.; and so the whole succession will stand within the same time that it now doth, from Fergus the son of Erk.

ⁱⁱ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 126.

^j *Ibid.* p. 124.

^{jj} *Ibid.* p. 123.

^k *Ibid.* p. 123.

^{kk} *Ibid.* p. 122. Mackenzie states, *ibid.* p. 121, that "our

historians mention all that did reign whether by right, or by usurpation, or whether in the direct or collateral line; this genealogist only the direct line" of Alexander III.

¹ And if the shortening the royal line be such an injury to it, as the advocate supposeth, it is well for this ancient genealogist that he lived so long since, or else he might have had a cast of the advocate's office.

¹¹ Neither is the authority of this genealogist to be slighted by the learned advocate, since himself giving an account "how their tradition might have been, and was preserved," he brings this very instance of "the genealogy of king Alexander in the year 1242, before Fordon's time, and related so by him that his relation cannot but be credited;" and so he repeats the beginning of it as it is in Fordon. But if he had taken the pains to compare it, he would have found how much it overthrew the credit of their historians. For if this was the way their tradition was preserved, then by this way we are to judge of the truth of their ancient tradition; and consequently we must reject those kings whose names are not preserved in this ancient genealogy.

And to confirm this we have another, said to be more ancient, in Fordon, which the advocate attributes to Baldredus, ^m abbot of Melrose, (otherwise called ⁿ Ealredus, abbot of Rieval,) in his Lamentation of King David, soon after his death, who died A.D. 1151. But I confess I do not find, that ^o Fordon attributes ^{xiv} this genealogy to Baldredus; for he saith, "he had it

¹ Mackenzie's Letter *ibid.* quoted in p. iv. of this Preface.

¹¹ Mackenzie's Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line, p. 20. Antiquity *ibid.* chap. 4. p. 114. See this Preface, p. x. and note b.

^m Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. (22.) p. 21. Antiquity *ibid.* chap. 4. pp. 116. 134.

ⁿ Bishop Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, under

Ealredus, and this Preface, p. lv. Nicolson's *English Historical Library*, part 1. chap. 4. p. 40. ch. 5. p. 47. part 2. ch. 1. p. 79. *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 2. p. 20.

^o Fordon. *Scotichron.* lib. 5. cap. 59. cap. 50. edit. Hearnii; vol. 2. p. 486. Oxon. 1722. vol. 1. cap. 60. p. 310. Edinb. 1759. Mackenzie *ibid.* ch. 4. p. 134. &c.

from Walter de Wardlaw, cardinal and the bishop of Glasgow, who lived in the time of Robert II.," saith ^p Lesley: (which helps to discover ^q Fordon's age.) And in this genealogy the first part, from David to Fergus, is cut off with an '&c.;" but the other part, from Fergus II. up to Fergus I., is preserved entire, and, except in the spelling of some few names, exactly agrees with the former genealogy, leaving out all those kings which are omitted in the other. But the latter genealogy having been corrupted before Fordon's time, he would not have it stand upon record against him; which caution he forgot when he came to Alexander III.

But there is still ^{qa} a third genealogy in Fordon, which supplies in some measure the defects in that of king David, and it is the succession of ^r Kenneth, the first monarch of Scotland, (the Picts being totally subdued by him;) and then he makes no more between them but Alphin, and then Achai, (which seems to be truer than the other which calls Alphin's father Ethas;) before him he places Ethfin, called Ethafind in the other; next him is Eugenius, in the other Ethodac; then Dongard the son of Donwald Brek; whereas in the other this Dongard is omitted: before Donewald-brek, in this genealogy, is Eugenius-bind, called Occa-hebind in the other; then Aidanus, in the other Edanus; then Gouran, called there Cobren; then Dongard; and so we are come to Fergus the Great; and there is but one difference, i. e. about Dongard, in these genealogies. And this makes but ten kings

^p Leslæ. *ibid.* p. 250.

^q See Lloyd's Preface *ibid.* p. xxvi.

^{qa} Mackenzie *ibid.* chap. 4. pp. 116. 211.

^r Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 1. §. 11. p. 41, &c. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 716. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 374.

between Fergus and Kenneth, whereas the common historians make twenty-eight, which is a very unreasonable addition to their own most ancient genealogies. But if this were not done, there would appear no probability that “the first Fergus should have come into Scotland three hundred and thirty years before Christ’s nativity.” ^s Which the learned advocate affirms in the very beginning of his Defence, “that all their historians are agreed on.” And yet farther to confirm these genealogies, he tells us “^t he had seen an old genealogy of the kings of the Albanian Scots, agreeing with that mentioned at the coronation of king Alexander II., and which has still been preserved as sacred there,” i. e. at Icolmkill, I suppose, or the island Iona. But it is observable that ^u Hector, mentioning the corona-^{xv} tion of this Alexander, takes notice of the “highlander’s repeating the genealogy by heart;” and he carries it as far as Gathelus, but sets down nothing at all of the particulars, which he knew would by no means agree with his catalogue of kings so long before Christ. And to confirm all these genealogies, the Irish genealogies in ^x Gratianus Lucius agree with them in excluding so many kings, which Hector hath inserted to make the account of time seem probable. Only they make Fergus the son of Erk to be the first who carried the Scots from Ireland into Albany; and the ancestors before to have lived in Ireland, and to have been derived from the monarchs there.

But when Hector Boethius found ^y three hundred

^s Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* . ^x Gratian. Luc. Cambr. Evers.
p. 1. Antiquity *ibid.* chap. 4. p. 248.
p. 120. ^y See p. vi. and note °, ch. 5.
^t Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 251. note °, for authorities in
p. 34. Usher. Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p.
^u Hect. Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 13. xl. ch. 1. §. 5. p. 10.
f. 295. 2. lin. 53.

and thirty years before Christ pitched upon by ^zFordon for the Scots' coming into Scotland with so much punctuality, that he saith, "it was in the sixth year of Alexander, wherein he killed Darius and took Babylon," ^a he thought it by no means fit to omit it; but to it he adds "the very year of the world, and of the building of Rome, and how long it was after Brutus's first coming to Britain;" which are all great confirmations of the truth of this account. But Fordon quotes no author for this wild computation; only he subjoins a passage out of ^{aa}the legend of St. Congall, which mentions the coming of Fergus the son of Ferquard out of Ireland into Britain, and after he mentions Rether for one of his successors, the same, he saith, with Bede's Reuda. Suppose all this be granted, yet what shadow of proof is there, that Fergus came into Scotland so long before Christ's nativity? ^bFordon confesses, "he knew not how long any of those kings after Fergus reigned;" how then came he to know so exactly the time of their coming? What certain note or character of time had they to help them in their calculation? If they could produce any such, and be able to adjust the times of the succession of their several kings by them, there might be a great deal said for this pretended antiquity; but when it is at the same time confessed they had no such thing, how could they satisfy any reasonable inquirer into these antiquities?

Things standing thus, and Hector Boethius, with the

^z Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 2. cap. 12. p. 593.

^a Hect. Boeth. ibid. lib. 1. f. 7. 1. lin. 6.

^{aa} Mackenzie's Antiquity ib. ch. 4. p. 119. with which compare in this Preface, p. xvi. as

to St. Brendan; p. li. ibid. as to other legends or chronicles, besides 'Grossum Caput,' in p. lii. ibid.

^b See p. v. for extract from Fordon.

help of his physician of Aberdeen, (who, as ^cDempster saith, was so very useful to him “in framing his history,”) set about the rectifying and curing the body of their antiquities; and endeavoured to bring it into better form, and to fill up the vacuities of it, and render it more agreeable to the palates of that time, which had more smattering of learning than in the ages before. And so he begins his history very formally in imitation of the best Roman authors, with deducing their history from ^dGathelus and Scota, deriving their succession from the Greeks and Egyptians, as the Romans did theirs from the Trojans. This I do not attribute to his invention, for it is at large in ^eFordon; who quotes some old chronicles and legends for it; especially the legend of St. Brendan, an admirable and authentic record. But to do right to Hector in this matter, he saith ingenuously, “that their people followed the custom of other nations therein.” And as I have shewed in the following ^fbook at large (where I treat of these antiquities) this humour had overspread all the northern nations, as soon as they shook off the Roman yoke, and began not only to be distinct kingdoms, but to have some affectation of the Roman learning, and to have persons of their own nation who began to write their histories; who thought they did nothing for the honour of their country, unless they could, some way or other, derive themselves from the Trojans, or Greeks, or Egyptians, whom they met with so often in the Roman authors; and the Romans in most provinces mixing together

^c Dempster. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. n. 175. See p. 1. and Nicolson's Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 2. p. 30.

^d See chap. 5. p. 252. and note ^c.

^e Scotichron. lib. 1. cap. 9. cap. 8. p. 570 See chap. 5. p. 250.

^f Chap. 5, in particular, p. 277.

with the northern people, excited a greater ambition in them, either to be like the Romans, or to exceed them in their pretended antiquities. And their inventions not being extraordinary, there is very little variety in their several accounts, as will appear by comparing them in their proper places.

In this point Hector Boethius hath acquitted himself well enough; but finding the succession of their kings very short and meagre, having no flesh to fill it, nor nerves to support it, nor colour to adorn it; therefore he sets himself to make up what he found defective, and to put it together under the names of ^g Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernicus, or others; out of these he frames a long series or catalogue of kings, which looked big, and raised men's expectations, and ^{xvii} seemed well enough contrived to serve the pretence to so great antiquity. This being done, he fills up the story of these kings, not out of their old annals, (as far as yet appears,) but in a great measure out of his own invention, so as to mix the commonwealth-learning of the Greeks and Romans with the history of their ancient kings: which hath done great prejudice to the ^h rights of the monarchy; for Hector's history took so much among the nobility, (for very good reasons to them,) that all that have written since him have depended upon his authority, as appears both by Buchanan and Lesley; unless it were where he grossly contradicted the Roman history, and there Buchanan leaves him; but for the main of his history he relies upon him; and ⁱ Lesley doth nothing in effect but

^g See p. xlix. and the note there, as to Veremundus. As to Cornelius Hibernicus, p. xviii. and note ^q, beside that ^p in p. xxii.

^h See note ^{zz}, (where Nicolson is referred to) p. vii, and note ^u,

p. x. in this Preface. Lloyd ib. Preface, p. xxxi.

ⁱ Leslæ. Paræn. ad Nobil. Scot. p. 29. This work is prefixed to his *De Origine, &c. Scotorum*.

abridge him, whatever he pretends as to records, and the annals of the monasteries of Paisley and Scone; which the ^kadvocate supposeth “he saw at Rome, whither,” he saith, “they were carried.” If so, it had been worth while to have procured well attested copies from thence; which had not been hard in all this time, so many gentlemen of that nation travelling thither, and seeing all the curiosities of their libraries. But Lesley saith no such thing; for he appeals to the “public archives of the kingdom,” and not to any MSS. at Rome; so that if they were any where, they were then in Scotland.

But the ^ladvocate seems to have forgotten what he had said before; viz. “that ^mthe black book of Scone was among president Spotswood’s books:” indeed he saith, “king Charles I. ransomed it from Rome;” but how that appears, I know not; but I know the circumstances he mentions about col. Fairfax, &c. relate not to the book of Scoon, but to a copy of Fordon, which was presented by him to king Charles II. And if Buchanan “had the use of the books of Paisley, and the famous book of Pluscarden,” as the advocate believes, upon Buchanan’s word, ⁿthen in his time they were not carried to Rome. For my part, I do not question that there were ^oMS. chronicles in Scotland before Fordon; for I find him frequently citing them; but by the things he quotes out of them they were not

^k Mackenzie’s Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line, p. (39.) 41.

^l Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 32.

^m See ch. 5. p. 263. From Nicolson’s Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 2. p. 26, it appears that “the black book of Scone,” that of “Paisley,” and

of “Pluscarden,” were but various copies of Fordon’s Scotichronicon, differing, however, in various particulars. See notes, pp. xxx. xlvi. of this Preface, and also p. lvii.

ⁿ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 32.

^o See ch. 5. p. 261.

considerable, nor done by any authority, as the annals of the royal monasteries of this kingdom, his continuer saith, “were, and afterwards examined and compared.”
 xviii I am sorry to find sir R. Sibbald reckon up among
 “^p the books he had never seen,” (having made it his business so many years to illustrate his country,) not only ^q Cornelius Hibernicus and Veremundus, but the annals of Paisley and Scone. ^r But, however, we are glad that the advocate assures us “^s he hath a very old abridgment of the book of Paisley;” and may this present heat against the bishop of St. Asaph provoke them to procure and publish their ancient annals, such as they are, which will be the greatest advantage to the world of this contention about their antiquities. And I am so far from any pique or animosity in this matter, that I should be glad to see those antiquities, which yet appear dark and confused, cleared up to the satisfaction of all learned and ingenuous men.

But I must beg pardon of his majesty’s advocate, if I take the freedom to say, he hath not taken the right method to do it. For he ought first to have proved the matter in dispute by clear and indubitable testimonies, before he had made his severe reflections and inferences; but as Cicero said of the musician who defined the ‘soul’ to be ‘harmony,’ “*ab arte sua non recessit,*” so this ingenious gentleman hath managed this whole debate in a way more agreeing to the character of an advocate than of an antiquary. For why so many insinuations, as though some “injury were

^p Sibbaldi Nuncius Scoto-Britannus, p. 13. premiss. ad Prodrom. Histor. Natur. Scotiæ.

^q Nicolson’s Irish Historical Library, part 3. chap. 2. p. 12. compared with his Scottish His-

torical Library, part 2. chap. 2. p. 21. See note ^p, p. xxii, and note in p. xlix.

^r See ch. 5. p. 248.

^s Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 32.

intended to the royal line," which I dare say, the bishop of St. Asaph doth really honour and esteem as much as his majesty's advocate himself? For, doth any man of understanding think that it is any injury to the royal line of Britain, to have the fabulous antiquities of Geoffrey of Monmouth concerning the succession of British kings down from Brutus confuted? And is not this done by Buchanan? And the advocate in plain English saith, "† those tempt men to lie, who endeavour to derive themselves from the Trojans." But why not, as well from the Greeks and Egyptians? But the bishop of St. Asaph is so just to truth, and so little a friend to popular fables, that " he fairly gives up Geoffrey before he attacks Hector Boethius. Could any thing be more fairly and impartially done? or more convincing, that he only designed to find out truth in these matters, without regard to that fondness some men still have for these British antiquities? For there are and will be some (and those not wholly unlearned) ^{xix} who are naturally inclined to believe fables; and have so passionate a zeal for such things, that they cry out upon all discoveries of this kind, as injurious to their country, if not to the royal line.

But may it not justly seem strange, that when our polite and learned neighbours have endeavoured with so much care to reform their histories, and to purge away all fabulous antiquities out of them; we of this island should grow angry and impatient when any undertake so generous a design? What injury is it thought to be to the royal line of France, that ^x Hunibaldus's antiquities find no longer place in their histories? And yet nothing seems more glorious, than to

† Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 15.

^x See chap. 1. p. 8. chap. 5.

^u Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xxii. p. 277.

have their royal line deduced long before the time that Alexander took Babylon. For according to Hunibaldus's account, which he took he saith out of an ancient MS. of Vastaldus (such another author as Veremundus), the Franks went from Troy under the conduct of Francio towards the Palus Mæotis just about the time that Æneas went for Italy, where they fixed and built the city Sicambria, and at last removed into Germany under Marcomir the son of Priamus, and Sunno the son of Antenor. After Francio, Hunibaldus sets down a formal succession of kings of two several races, sixteen in the first, and thirty-one in the second. All which he gives a very particular account of, as to the times of their reign for above four hundred and thirteen years before Christ's nativity. And although this ancient succession of kings was a long time received and magnified, as appears by Lazius and P. Æmilius, and ^y Fordon quotes Sigebert for it; yet now ^z their learned historians are ashamed to mention it, much more to plead for it, and to charge those with "a degree of lese-majesty" who call it in question.

^a Suffridus Petrus hath written the antiquities of Friesland much in the way that Hector Boethius hath done those of Scotland. ^b He tells a very grave story concerning a province in the Indies called Fresia, from whence a colony was sent under Friso, Saxo and Bruno, who went into Alexander's army; and for this he quotes old Frisian rhymes, and one Patrocles, an old Indian writer; and besides he hath all the advocate's ^c common places of tradition, common fame, the testi-

^y Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 3. p. 19. p. 632.

^z Camden. *ibid.* p. 5. vol. 1. p. v.

^a For a portion of his Anti-

quities, see ch. 5. p. 311. which compare with p. 312. and note v.

^b Suffr. Petr. de Origine Frisiorum, lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 304.

^c *Ibid.* cap. 3. p. 306.

monies of their own historians, and he names Andreas Cornelius, (it seems there was a Cornelius Frisius as well as Hibernicus,) Solco Fortemannus, Occo Scherlensis, Joh. Uleterpius, and several others, who with one consent deliver these antiquities. "But,"^d saith he, ye will object "that in so long a time and amidst so many wars such antiquities could hardly be preserved." To that he answers, "That Friso being admirably skilled in Greek learning set up a public school at Stauria, near the temple of Stavo, and in the temple a library on purpose for antiquities (like that of Icolmkill,) and besides a palace was built by Uffo, wherein was contained the effigies of all their kings from Friso (who came to Friseland just three hundred and thirteen years before Christ's nativity) to the time of Charlemagne, for eleven hundred and thirteen years." And are not these antiquities very well attested? yet since Ubbo Emmius hath confuted them, no learned advocate hath appeared in vindication of them.

Is it any disparagement to the royal line of Spain to have the first succession of kings there disputed; viz. from Jubal to Melicola the twenty-fourth king from him, who is said "to have reigned there, the very year after the destruction of Troy?" So very punctual are the authors of fabulous antiquities. And if you believe them, they have good ancient authors and the tradition of their country for them; "Hæc nostri majores multis libris tradiderunt," saith the pretended Berosus. And by these helps, we have great light given us into the antiquities of Europe; for thereby we understand that Janus, (who was somewhat elder than Gathelus, being Noah himself) gave Tuisco the country from the Tanais to the Rhine, Italy to Gomer, the Celtic provinces to

^d Ibid. cap. 4. p. 309. See ch. 5. p. 272.

Samothès, and Celtiberia to Jubal. And this was just “one hundred and thirty-one years after the flood;” Gomer went into Italy the tenth year of Saturn the father of Jupiter Belus; in the twelfth Jubal went into Celtiberia, and not long after Samothès, called Dis, founded the Celtic colonies; among which were the Britons, and from him their ^e Druids were called Samothei: after Jubal among the Celtiberians reigned Iberus his son, from whom came the name of Iberi; and among the Celtæ, Magus the son of Samothès in the fifty-first year of Ninus, who succeeded Jupiter Belus: this ^{xxi} Magus in the Scythian language is Magog, and from him came so many terminations of the names of towns, as Rhotamagum, Noviomagum, Juliomagum, Cæsaromagum, &c. In the thirty-fourth of Semiramis, Jubelda son of Iber, succeeded in Celtiberia; in the time of Ninias, son to Semiramis, reigned Sarron among the Celtæ, from him the learned Gauls were called “Sarronidæ,” the same I suppose with ^four advocate’s Sanachies. In the twentieth of Arius, Brigus reigned in Celtiberia, and in the twenty-ninth Dryius among the Celtæ; nothing can be more natural than to derive the Druids from him: “who being converted,” the advocate tells us, ^g “became their first monks, and in the Irish version of the New Testament the wise men are translated Druids;” therefore the Druids were originally Irish. In the time of Aralius the seventh king of Babylon, Bardus was king over the Celtæ, and he was the inventor of music and verses; and from him came the Bards, “who were the poets of their traditions,” as the ^h advocate styles them. After him succeeded

^e See Camden *ibid* p. 9. vol. 1. p. viii. Additions, pp. 9, 17, &c. and in this work, pp. xl. xlv. c. 2. p. 78. c. 5. p. 256, and notes.

^f Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid*. p. 14.

^g *Ibid*. p. 13.

^h *Ibid*. p. 14.

Longo, then Bardus junior, after him Lucus, and then Celtes, and Galates, Narbon, Lugdus, Belgicus, Allobrox, Romus, Paris, Lemannus, Galatas junior, and Francus.

Must we allow all these noble antiquities for fear of shortening the royal lines of the princes of Europe? And yet here is a great appearance of exactness, a pretence to ancient records, and to the common tradition of the several countries; for ⁱ Berosus appeals both to tradition and writing; and so doth Manetho in the continuation of him, “*quæ ex nostris historicis vel eorum relationibus consecuti sumus;*” so that here we have the two supporters of antiquities, which the advocate builds upon, viz. tradition and records. And ^k Metasthenes, another pretended continuer of Berosus saith, “he took all out of the royal library at Susæ, where the Persian annals were preserved.” But notwithstanding all these fair shows and specious pretences, there is not a man of tolerable judgment in Europe, who would venture his reputation to plead for these antiquities.

But the learned ^l advocate saith, “that their antiquities have been received with great applause for many hundreds of years by all historians, antiquaries and critics of other nations who had any occasion to take notice of their affairs.” These are very high expres-xxii

ⁱ See Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacr.* as to Berosus; b. 1. c. 3. s. 4. (in his collected works, vol. 2. p. 28.) *ibid.* s. 10. (p. 33.) *ibid.* c. 5. s. 4. (p. 49.) Of Manetho *ibid.* c. 2. s. 10, 11. (p. 22.) *ibid.* c. 3. s. 9. p. 31. *ibid.* c. 5. s. 5. p. 50, &c. Mackenzie's *Antiquity* *ibid.* c. 3. p. 79.

^k In his *Origin. Sacr.* chap. 6. s. 5. (p. 61.) Stillingfleet speaks of the forgeries of Annius of Viterbo. See Prideaux's Con-

nection of the *History of the Old and New Testament*, part 1. book 8. ann. 298. as to Annius; and where also, and part 2. book 2. ann. 260. as to Berosus; *ibid.* part 1. book 7. ann. 350. book 8. ann. 298. part 2. book 2. ann. 247. as to Manetho; part 1. book 8. ann. 298. as to Megasthenes.

^l Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 2. See ch. 5. p. 261.

sions, and argue a good assurance in the very beginning of his book. For my part, I do not pretend to acquaintance with all historians, antiquaries and critics for many hundreds of years; and so there may have been some, for any thing I know, who have applauded their histories from three hundred and thirty years before Christ; but upon my little knowledge in books, I dare venture to name him ten who have applauded the antiquities of Berosus and Manetho, for one who hath allowed theirs. But such hath been my misfortune that I have met with ^mhistorians, antiquaries and critics, who have been far from applauding them; such a one was ⁿUbbo Emmius, who declares his opinion freely, “That he could not allow any certainty in them, because they depend not upon any ancient annals, but unwritten traditions; and he not only speaks thus of the first succession of kings from Fergus I. to the second, but from Fergus II. to the destruction of the Picts by Kenneth, which he reckons A. D. 829.” But another of the same character, both an historian, antiquary and

^m Compare the following notes from Emmius and Boxhornius, with that from Fordon, &c. in note ^c, p. viii. of this Preface. See also p. xxix, where Emmius’s argument is employed by Stillingfleet; and p. xlix.

ⁿ Hoc solum judicamus, quæ de Scotis et eorum regibus ab anno 330. ante caput æræ Christianæ, cum Alexander Macedo rerum potiretur in oriente usque ad Fergusium 2. regem Scotiæ quadragesimum, cujus initium conjicitur a Scotis scriptoribus in annum Christi 404. qui ejectos e Britannia Scotos dicitur reduxisse, non ex annalibus vetustis vetustos autores habenti-

bus, sed ex ἀγράφοις traditionibus a recentioribus deprompta memorantur, ea nos pro certis habere non posse. Scimus enim quam lubrico atque instabili fundamento nitantur. Quinimo ne ista quidem satis certa nobis videntur quæ a Fergusii 2. initio, et Scottorum reditu in Britanniam in rebus Scoticis recitantur ad A. D. 829. quo Picti scribuntur in Britannia a Scotis esse deleti 6. scil. anno Kenethi 2. regum hujus gentis, ut traditiones habent LXIX. Ubb. Em. Op. Chronolog. lib. 5. p. 198. See Mackenzie’s Antiquity *ibid.* c. 1. p. 3. c. 2. pp. 76. 210.

critic, viz. ° M. Zuerius Boxhornius hath passed a severer censure upon them, for he saith, “ without doubt their antiquities are fabulous; and their pretended ancient annals but lately made.” These may serve at present, to shew that all historians, antiquaries and critics have not so much applauded their antiquities.

But this is not all, for the advocate saith, “ they have done it for many hundreds of years.” What, before they were known to the world? For Hector Boethius was the first person who pretended to give such a clear account of them after the discovery of P Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernicus at Icolmkill; and it is not many hundreds of years since he wrote, his book being first printed since the beginning of the sixteenth century. And what account had they of their first antiquities before? Joh. Major indeed was printed about five years ^{xxiii} before him, by the same Badius Ascensius, and he was no great critic, but a very scholastic historian, and a man of great esteem in his time, °as the advocate confesseth; but he is so far from applauding the remote antiquities of his own country, † that he calls the story of Gathelus and Scota, and their coming out of Greece and Egypt, a mere figment, and invented only to match the Britons, who derived themselves from the Trojans, and he condemns their annals about Simon Brek;

° De primorum gentis regum initiis multa haud dubie fabulosa habent Sctorum, quemadmodum et aliarum gentium postremis demum temporibus, compositi aut conficti annales; itaque fabulosa, quæ et tempora ipsa quibus tribuuntur, falsi arguunt, missa facimus, neque pro nostro ea faciunt instituto. Boxhorn. Hist. univers. p. 878.

P See note 9, p. xviii. and

the note, p. xlix. of this Preface, &c. ch. 5. p. 255. and note n. Maitland's History of Scotland, p. 125, as quoted by Jamieson ibid. with the remarks of the latter, in p. 305. of his work.

¶ Mackenzie's Defence, &c. ibid. p. (37) 38.

† Joh. Major ibid. lib. 1. f. 17. 1. c. 9. See c. 5. p. 252. which compare with Mackenzie's Antiquity ibid. c. 3. pp. 81. 210.

which shews what a regard he had to their authority. And when he comes to Fergus he sets down the ^sold verses about the time of it; but seems to give very little credit to them; for he first mentions ^tBede's account about Reuda, and then relates what their annals say, i. e. "their old verses," (for he quotes no other,) and then saith this doth not contradict Bede; for saith he, "Regni debile fundamentum Fergusius jecit;" "he laid a very slender beginning of a monarchy," which was after enlarged by Reuda, whom he makes to be Rether, and therein contradicts Hector's Veremundus and the catalogues of their kings, according to which Reuda succeeds him. So that these antiquities were so far from being universally received abroad that they went down very hardly at home. And this same historical schoolman expressly saith, "that Fergus had no other right but what the people gave him, and that it is in their power to take it away;" which he not only asserts, but endeavours to prove in a scholastic manner as far as "septimò et finaliter." And is not this a degree of lese-majesty above the endeavouring to shorten the royal line? Surely they had far better deny any such person as Fergus, than to make him a king upon such terms, which overthrow the monarchy.

But who are these foreign historians, antiquaries, and critics, who at any time have so much applauded these antiquities? ^xJoseph Scaliger did indeed applaud his own wit for his criticism about Scoto-Brigantes in ^ySeneca's verses. But what is this to Fergus's coming

^s Major. *ibid.* c. 11. fol. 18. 2.

^t See p. xxxix.

^u Major. *ibid.* l. 4. c. 17. fol. 76. 2.

^x See ch. 5. p. 284. Macken-

zie *ibid.* ch. 2. pp. 15. 69. 209, for this note, and note referring to Scaliger, in next page.

^y Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 16.

p. 725. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p.

so soon into Scotland? For ^z Scaliger himself there grants, "that these Scoto-Brigantes were still in Ireland;" and he believes "that Claudius did make an attempt upon them there, because Juvenal mentions the coasts of Juverna as brought under the Roman ^{xxiv} power." "Scoti sunt in Hibernia adhuc, non in Britannia," are Scaliger's own words. ^a And I wonder to see Buchanan labour so hard about this passage to so little purpose. But the advocate saith "^b that the same Scaliger in his notes on Eusebius hath a most learned and full proof of their antiquity, too learned to be answered by any adversary." What doth he mean by their antiquity? That of the nation? No one denies it. That of their settlement in Scotland three hundred and thirty years before Christ? That is to be proved, for Scaliger doth it not. He affirms, "^c That the Brigantes were a people of Ireland, and that during the flourishing of the Roman empire, they made frequent incursions into Britain; and for proof he brings the testimony of Pausanias about ^d Antoninus's beating the Brigantes in Britain; and the Inscriptions in Scotland, wherein mention is made of the leg. 2;" which signify very little to this purpose. For why could not the second legion fight against the Brigantes, supposing them to be Britons, as well as supposing them to be Irish? But Scaliger's opinion was this: "The Brigantes and the Britons were two distinct people; while they continued at home, they were called by no other

379. Camden. Brit. pp. 32. 89.
557. vol. 1. pp. xxxiii. xvii.
vol. 3. p. 1.

^z Scaliger. Castigat. in Tibull.
l. 4. p. 206.

^a Buchanan. *ibid.* l. 2. p. 22. 2.

^b Mackenzie's Defence of the
Antiquity, &c. *ibid.* p. (80) 82.

^c Scalig. Animadvers. in Euseb. n. 2060. p. 190. Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 726. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 379.

^d Pausan. in Arcadic. in Græcæ Descript. p. 689. See c. 2. p. 60. note ^o.

name, but when they made excursions abroad, then they were called Scotobrigantes and Scotobritanni; and so the word ^e ‘Scot,’ he saith, is not a proper name, but appellative; and not Irish but British, for those who go from home in hopes of booty, as the names of Bedouin and Saracen: and so as the Arabs were after called Saracens, so these Brigantes, when they so much infested Britain in Claudian’s time, and after, were called ‘Scoti.’” Now what there is in all this, that should so much please the advocate, I cannot imagine. He is very angry with the bishop of St. Asaph for representing their ancestors as a company of ^f “barbarous pilferers and robbers,” (although he only produces the testimony of Gildas;) how then comes he to be so much pleased with Scaliger, who makes the name ‘Scot’ to signify so much? I had thought he should have been more concerned to have disproved such a reproachful etymology than to have magnified this discourse of Scaliger so highly. But where is it that he mentions “the first succession of their kings” with approbation, or
 xxv “Fergus’s coming into Scotland before Christ’s nativity?” All that he saith is, “That the Scots might be a nation before they were known by that name,” (and who doubts it?) “as the Burgundians and Lombards were: and that the Brigantes out of Ireland might make inroads and excursions into Britain in the flourishing times of the empire.” And I see no reason to deny this, although it be not sufficiently proved. But the question is about a standing monarchy in Scotland from the time of Fergus I., and of this Scaliger saith not a word. For these Brigantes coming out of Ireland might fix there for some time, and return again to

^e See p. lxvii.

^f Mackenzie’s Defence, &c. *ibid.* pp. (104. 106. 108.) 108.

110. 112. compared with Lloyd *ibid.* ch. I. §. 6. p. 21, &c.

Ireland, as Gildas saith they did afterwards; or they might fix as a scattered people not united under a monarchy, as ^g Fordon saith they did before Fergus's coming. So that if their antiquities be no more applauded by other antiquaries and critics than they are by Scaliger, this argument will come to very little.

^h And yet Salmasius and the rest he mentions say much less than Scaliger; Salmasius only useth Scaliger's criticism about the Scoto-Brigantes without adding any thing. ⁱ Lipsius unhappily calls Galgacus a Scot; which was an improper expression, as I have proved in the proper place; because it is so evident from Tacitus, that the Caledonians were not Scots; unless it be taken for ^k Scythians, (of which afterwards;) but by Scots here we mean such as came out of Ireland to settle in Britain; and such Galgacus and his soldiers were not. And the like impropriety ^l Bergier, though a learned antiquary, fell into, when he interprets the Caledonians by Scots; but such as Dempster is frequently guilty of, when he calls the Britons English, because the English dwelt in Britain afterwards. But improper expressions, where they fall from learned men by chance, ought rather to be passed over with silence than made use of as arguments; unless those who use them go about to prove what is implied in them. Sigonius's name stands among the rest, being indeed a learned historian, antiquary, and critic; but not one word can I find produced out of him in his whole book. What ^m Baronius saith relates to the ⁿ conversion of the

^g See Fordon's words, in p. x. p. 43.
quoted from the Scotchchronicon,
l. 1. c. 36.

^b Mackenzie's Defence, &c.
ibid. p. (126) 130.

ⁱ See ch. 5. p. 283. and note i.
Mackenzie's Antiquity ibid. c. 2.

^k See pp. xxxvii. and note
as to the Scythians, xxxviii, &c.

^l Bergier Hist. des grands
Chemins, l. 1. c. 10. n. 9. p. 31.

^m See ch. 2. p. 52.

ⁿ Mackenzie's Defence, &c.

Scottish nation, and not to these antiquities; of which I have treated at large in the following book. Andr. xxvi Favyn and P. Æmilius speak only of “an alliance between Achaius king of the Scots and Charles the Great;” and what is this to Fergus and the “succession of kings for three hundred and thirty years before Christ’s nativity?” which he saith in the beginning “^o was applauded by all historians, antiquaries, and critics;” and as though this were not extravagant enough, he saith afterwards, “^p that Baronius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Lipsius, Sigonius, Favyn and others of the first rank (too many to be named) have passionately defended their antiquity, and not only sustained but praised their histories.” Whereas not one of these produced by him speaks any thing to the matter in question. But we hope to see these things better cleared in the third part of ^q sir R. Sibbald’s *Scotia Antiqua*, where he has promised to give a particular account of the state of the Scots in Britain before they had kings, then under kings from Fergus I. to Fergus II., and from thence to Malcolm Canmore. If he doth clear these parts of their antiquities, he will do a great thing; and for my part, I shall be as willing to believe Fergus to have come into Britain in the time of Alexander as any time after, provided there be sufficient evidence to prove it; which must be somewhat more convincing than his majesty’s advocate hath been pleased to make use of; but I remember Scaliger’s censure of Claudian, “*Addit de ingenio quantum deest materiae.*”

p. (107) 98. Baron. *Annal. Eccles.* tom. 5. ann. 429. §. 1, 2, 3, &c.

^o Mackenzie *ibid.* pp. 2. 10.

^p *Ibid.* p. (126) 130. *Anti-*

quity ibid. c. 2. p. 74. c. 5. pp. 156. 212.

^q Nicolson’s *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. c. 1. p. 9.

Therefore from the testimony of historians, antiquaries and critics, I proceed to examine the argumentative part of his book ; and setting aside all common places about historical certainty, tradition, common fame, &c., I shall keep close to the point before us, and examine the force and strength of his reasoning, which consists in these things :

1. “^r That upon the same reason we question their antiquities, we may call in question the Roman, Jewish, Greek, French, Spanish antiquities, all which depended upon tradition without records for a long time.”

This is indeed a material objection ; for we ought not to give a partial assent to some antiquities, and deny it to others, if there be the same ground either to give or deny assent to all. But this must be examined.

(1.) As to the Roman antiquities, ^s he cites a passage xxvii in Livy, in which he saith, “that the use of letters was not then ordinary ; the only certain preserver of the memory of things past,” (so Livy’s words are to be understood, “^{ss} raræ per ea tempora literæ, una custodia fidelis memoriæ rerum gestarum,” and not as the advocate, with too much art, hath translated them, that “the best records were the faithful remembrance of things past.” For if this were Livy’s meaning, why doth he complain of the want of the “common use of letters,” when he saith, “tradition is the best way to preserve the memory of things?” which is to make Livy speak inconsequently.) But he goes on saying,

^r Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 6. See chap. 5. p. 264, and note *k*.

^s Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 6. Anti-

quity *ibid.* c. 3. p. 82, &c.

^{ss} Liv. *Histor. lib. 6. init. et not. 2, 3. tom. 1. p. 350.*

“ that what memorials were left by the high priests, or were in public or private hands, were most part destroyed in the burning of the town.” He doth not say, “ all were lost,” but “ the most part.” This Livy allegeth to excuse the shortness and obscurity of his first books, for want of sufficient records; and he speaks like a very judicious historian in it. And when he gives an account of the remote antiquities of Rome, he is far from confident asserting them, but he speaks with great modesty and discretion about them, saying, “ that he would neither affirm nor deny them; being rather built on poetical fables than any certain monuments of affairs at that time; that an allowance must be made to antiquity; which was wont ‘ consecrare origines suas,’ to make their beginnings as sacred and venerable as they could. But as to such things he would be no advocate either for or against them.” Then he proceeds to deliver the common tradition about Æneas’s coming into Italy, and Ascanius succeeding him; but he cannot tell whether Ascanius the son of Creüsa, or another the son of Lavinia; “ *Quis enim rem tam veterem pro certo affirmet?*” Who can be certain in such remote antiquities? And yet at that time it was thought a great disparagement to the royal line, to have it questioned whether it were the elder Ascanius, because the Julian family, as Livy there saith, derived themselves from him who was called Iulus. It is true, Livy after this relates the Roman antiquities down to the burning of the city, when so many records were lost; but we are to consider, that the Romans had certain annals before that
xxviii time, and that some of them were preserved. That they had “ annals both public and private,” appears by Livy’s own words, who mentions both the “ commen-

tarii pontificum," and the "publica et privata monumenta;" and ^t Cicero affirms, that the Romans from the beginning had annals made up by the "pontifex maximus" of the transactions of every year; and these were publicly exposed in a table in his house, that the people might be satisfied about them; and these, he saith, were called "annales maximi;" which, he adds, were continued down to the time of Mucius Scævola, who was "pontifex maximus" about A. U. C. 623. These, as ^u Servius saith, were after made up into eighty great books, and were the standing monuments of their antiquities. And it is observable, that the author of the book *De Origine Gentis Romanæ*, as ^x Vossius and others take notice, inserts several things as taken out of the pontifical annals, which happened before the building of Rome; from whence they do justly infer, that matters of more remote antiquity were put into them, whether by the first "pontifex max." in Numa's time or after, it is impossible now to determine. It seems at first the people were not permitted to view these annals, as ^y Canuleius in Livy complains; but afterwards they were exposed to all. And it appears by ^z Licinius Macer, in Livy, that the "libri lintei" (which seem to have been for the same purpose with the "annales maximi," but composed by the magistrates) were preserved "in ^a Æde Monetæ," and in them the names of the magistrates were inserted; and in the same place Livy takes notice of the

^t Ciceronis de Orat. lib. 2. cap. 12. p. 159. et not. ibid.

^u Servii Comment. in Virgil. Æn. l. 1. v. 377; for which see Ryckii Dissert. p. 437. following Stephan. de Urbibus. Aul. Gell. Noct. Attic. lib. 4. cap. 5. p. 271. not.

^x Voss. de Histor. Latin. l. 1. c. 1. p. 2.

^y Livii ibid. lib. 4. cap. 3. et not. 17. 18. p. 233.

^z Ibid. cap. 7. et not. 47. p. 238.

^a Ibid. cap. 20. p. 251.

“*annales prisci*,” and the “*libri magistratum*,” for determining a point about the consuls of a year long before the burning of Rome; which shews that Livy did not think all their records then destroyed. And afterwards he saith in the same book, disputing about another consul, that ^bAugustus, rebuilding the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, found there “*in thorace linteo*” the name of that consul. So that the Romans had not only the pontifical annals, but civil too, being made up by the magistrates, and therefore called “*libri magistratum*” by Livy, which he distinguishes from the “*annales prisci*.” And besides these, ^cLivy mentions private records among them, of which ^{cc}Cicero speaks, which belonged to “*particular families* :” and there is no probability these should be all lost in the burning
 xxix of the city; for the capitol was not burnt, in which probably after the Romans found the Gauls coming upon them, they preserved their ancient annals. And it is considerable, that ^dDionysius Halicarnasseus quotes a passage of Antiochus Syracusanus, (who lived before the burning of Rome, and wrote concerning the affairs of Italy,) wherein he saith, “*that he took his history out of ancient and undoubted records* :” which shews that there were certain written annals both at Rome and in other cities of Italy very early; and the same ^eDionysius quotes the domestic annals of the Sabines, and ^fFestus the history of Cuma. So that the Roman histories were built on better foundation than the very uncertain tradition of the natives; which the

^b Ibid. cap. 20. p. 250.

^c Mackenzie, in his *Antiquity* ibid. chap. 3. p. 110, refers to this passage, as favouring his own views, with regard to the Scottish history.

^{cc} Ciceronis in Bruto, cap. 16.

Vide Corradii Comment. in Bruto, pp. 109. 112.

^d Dionys. Antiq. Rom. lib. 1. inter Scripta Omnia, p. 10.

^e Ibid. lib. 2. p. 113.

^f Fest. de Verborum Significatione; v. Roma, lib. 16. p. 454.

advocate is pleased to make “^g the surest foundation of all histories;” but I am so much of another opinion, that I think it (since the shortening of men’s lives) the certain foundation of none. Let now the reader judge, whether the case of the antiquities in dispute be the same with that of the Romans; for here are no ^h ancient annals pretended near the time of Fergus I., nor in the time of any king of the first race; no, nor from Fergus II. till after the destruction of the Picts; nor any record yet produced for a long time after that: how then can any persons pretend, that if we reject their antiquities, we must reject the Roman?

But this is not all, for he goes higher, and saith the same objections will lie,

(2.) Against the Jewish antiquities. For, saith he, “ⁱ the Jewish history had no historical warrant for the first two thousand years but tradition, and after that time their transactions were mentioned in very few foreign histories; and annals of their own priests were thought good historical foundations in the opinion of Josephus, even for the sacred history.” And not long after he saith, “^k that the Jewish history was challenged by Apion, upon the same ground that theirs is now quarrelled by the bishop of St. Asaph.” This looks somewhat strange among us, for the antiquities of any particular nation, so far short of the Jewish, to be paralleled with them in point of credibility; since the records of Scripture are owned to be divine and sacred, and not merely built on the authority of tradition, or the annals of the Jewish xxx

^g Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 7.

^h See Emmius and Boxhornius, p. xxii. of this Preface.

ⁱ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 6. See

his Antiquity *ibid.* chap. 3. p. 105. for this and the following notes.

^k Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* pp. 9. 132.

priests. Whatever Josephus or other Jews might say in defence of their antiquities against the Greeks, we that own ourselves to be Christians ought to look on Moses and the prophets under a higher character. I know a late critic, in great vogue among some, hath endeavoured to reduce the sacred history to the authority of the "ancient annals of the Jews;" but withal adding, "that we have only some imperfect abridgments of them," much like that which the ^lrector of Renfrew made of the book of Paisley, which the ^madvocate saw in sir R. Sibbald's library: a doctrine so unreasonable and mischievous in the consequences of it, that I wonder it hath hitherto passed so easily through so many hands. But this is not my present business. I am now only to shew the vast disparity of these antiquities in question, and those of the Jews. It is very true that Apion did object against them, because the Greek writers took so little notice of them. But how doth Josephus answer him? He shews, "ⁿ that the Greeks were very late writers of history, and therefore incompetent judges of matters of so great antiquity; and he proves that the more ancient nations, as the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phœnicians, had a most lasting way of preserving their histories, for they had public annals made by their wisest men, and kept in sacred places, but the Greeks were very defective in those things, having no public writings in their temples or elsewhere; and that they had not the use of letters in the time of the Trojan war;

^l Nicolson, in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 2. p. 26, shews that this "abridgment of the book of Paisley" was in reality that of Fordon's *Scotichronicon*. See note ^m,

p. xvii.

^m Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 32.

ⁿ Josephus against Apion, b. 1. See Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacræ*, b. 1. chap. 1. §. 19. Works, vol. 2. pp. 12—15.

and their first historians were little elder than the Persians' war against the Greeks. And this reason he gives of the dissonancy of the Greek historians, because they had no public annals, which would have prevented errors, and kept men from a power of deceiving. But great care," he saith, "from the most ancient times, was taken of such things among the Egyptians and Babylonians. And for their ancestors," he saith, "they exceeded all others in their exactness this way, committing the care of these things to their high priests and prophets. But the authority of writing was not allowed promiscuously to all, but certain prophets were pitched upon who wrote the most remote antiquities by divine inspiration, and the matters in their own times plainly and according to truth; and therefore," saith he, "we have no such multitude of books^{xxxvi} differing from each other, as the Greeks have, but only °twenty-two, containing an account of all times past, written with great fidelity and authority. Afterwards their annals were continued, but not with equal authority, the succession of their prophets failing. And to shew of how great credit these books (of the first sort) are among us; in so long time," saith he, "no man hath dared either to add, or to take away, or to transpose any thing." Which is utterly inconsistent with the principles of the late critic; for without a liberty of abridging and transposing and inserting, his new inventions come to nothing. But as to the silence of other nations about them, he shews, "P that they were a people who lived in great retirement, that the Romans themselves were a considerable people before the Greeks knew them;" and after all, he shews

° Rainoldi Censura Librorum the Canon, ch. 2. n. 23. p. 15.
 Apocryphorum, tom. 1. col. 86. P Josephus *ibid.* as in note "
 Cosin's Scholastical History of in the last page.

“they were known to the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Greeks,” which he proves from many particular testimonies. Now what is there parallel to these things in the present case? Have they produced any such public and sacred annals, written and preserved with so much care, as the ancient Jews had? Have they had a succession of prophets among them, whose books are preserved to this day with great veneration, without addition or diminution? What mean then such strange comparisons? Can they produce any one author contemporary with Fergus I. and his successors, who mentions that succession? as Josephus brings the Egyptian, Phœnician, Chaldean writers, to attest the story of the Scripture.

(3.) As to the Greek antiquities, he saith, “^q the Greeks could have no records for many hundreds of years before they wrote.” And what follows, but that therefore there is great uncertainty in the antiquities of Greece till that time? For which reason ^r Varro, that great and judicious antiquary, rejected two parts in three of the times of the Greeks; “the one,” he said, “was wholly in the dark for want of records, and the other fabulous;” because, as Josephus observes, “they had no public annals,” but their first writers were poets, who minded to write rather things entertaining than true. But we are of late told, “that this saying of ^s Varro might hold as to the Greek antiquities; but it is unjustly applied by ^t Camden to the ^{xxxii} antiquities of other nations; for the utmost eastern nations, the Chinese, and the utmost western, the Irish, have preserved their antiquities far beyond the time

^q Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 7.

^r Censor. de Die Natali, c. 21.
p. 112, &c. Camden. *ibid.* as in
note ^t below.

^s Peter Walsh's Preface to
the Prospect of Ireland, p. 4.

^t Camden. *Britan.* pp. 5. 25.
vol. 1. pp. iv. xxv.

which Varro allows for true history." I grant Varro intended this chiefly for the Greeks, who made the greatest noise with their antiquities then; and yet ^u Varro himself, as St. Augustine tells us, began his account of the Roman antiquities with the succession of the Sicyonian and Athenian kings; not as though he would deliver it for certain historical truth, but as the most common received opinion. And in the fabulous times, he might endeavour to pick out what antiquities he thought came nearest to history. As to the Chinese, they are very remote from us, and we have had different accounts of them, as appears by comparing ^v Gonzales Mendoza and Martinius together; and of their antiquities, as delivered by the former, a learned man hath said, "^w that they seem to him like Manetho's Egyptian dynasties." However, Scaliger thought fit to insert the succession of their kings in his Chronological Canons, and makes the beginning of that empire coincident with the end of the thirteenth Egyptian dynasty; ^x but in his notes upon it, he complains of the want of farther information about them. Which the world hath since in great measure received by Martinius, both in his description of the country, and the first decade of the history from the beginning of the empire to the nativity of Christ. But their way of preserving antiquities was peculiar to themselves, and therefore these cannot very well be made a parallel for the Scottish or Irish antiquities. ^y Martinius hath indeed given a very plausible account

^u Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 18. cap. 2. part. 2. p. 506. et not. E. p. 511. Oper. tom. 7. col. 489.

^v Gonzales de Mendoza *Re-
rum Morumque in Regno Chi-
nensium*, lib. 3. cap. 1. pp. 67
—76.

^w Ubb. Em. Oper. Chronol. lib. 5. p. 142.

^x Scalig. Canon. Isagog. lib. 2. p. 158. lib. 3. p. 327. inter *The-
saur. Tempor.*

^y Martin. *Sinic. Histor.* lib. 1. p. 12.

of the remote antiquities of China, but in such a manner as shews that even the Chinese had a dark and fabulous time as well as the Greeks; and he tells us, “that themselves acknowledge that before the reign of Fohius they have no certain account of things, because then they had no use of letters;” but afterwards, they look upon the succession of their kings as delivered down to them with great fidelity. But there are two things this certainty of their history depended upon: 1. A fixed rule for the computation of times, without which it is impossible any nation should have an exact account of the ancient succession of their kings. And herein lay the great accuracy of the
xxxiii Chinese, that they were very early given to the finding out the best methods for calculation; and they used a cycle of sixty years, 2670 years before Christ’s nativity; and therefore Martinius magnifies the Chinese especially for “their skill and exactness in the succession of their princes,” which it is impossible to give a certain account of without a fixed measure of time; and therefore it hath been so often said, “that the Greeks had no certain history before the Olympiads.” 2. The Chinese did not suffer any persons to write history that would, but some of great reputation were appointed after the emperor’s decease to write his life; which being approved, was allowed as the only authentic history of him; and these being put together made up their public annals, which are preserved to this day. ^z For, notwithstanding the persecution of their histories in the time of Chingus, who endeavoured to suppress them, that he might be thought the founder of the empire; yet his son opposing his design, and many learned men being banished upon it,

^z Ibid. lib. 6. p. 211.

there were means used to preserve their annals; but ^a Semedo saith, they could never recover a perfect account of the first beginning of that famous empire.

Now before any other nation can presume to vie with the exactness of the Chinese in their antiquities, they must first shew us what means they had for the computation of times, by which we may judge of their antiquity and succession of their kings; and next they must give an equal account of the care taken time enough to preserve their history of public annals, as the eastern people and the Romans did.

For instance, ^b we are told from a late Irish antiquary, ^c Geoffrey Keting, that the posterity of Gathelus and ^d Scota, or the Milesian race, settled in Ireland, A. M. 2736, after the flood 1086, after Moses passing the Red sea 192, before Christ's nativity 1308, from whence "^{dd} the antiquity of the Irish nation is said not to be paralleled, unless by the Chinese only."

^e Here is a pretence to very great antiquity, and an appearance of exact calculation; but I only ask by what cycles the Irish proceeded when they began; how they could adjust the time so well to the age of the world; or what other certain way they had which might be reduced to it. If they had none, all this might be only fancy and opinion, unless there were ^{xxxiv} some characters of time fixed and certain by eclipses and astronomical observations, or certain periods of time, or coincident passages, which might connect the

^a Semedo, part 1. c. 22. Italian edit. p. 135. English transl. p. 106.

^b Prospect of Ireland, by P. Walsh, p. 6. See ch. 5. note ⁿ, p. 265, &c. where the subject is resumed. Concerning "the posterity of Gathelus," *ibid.* p. 275.

^c His Work, "The general History of Ireland," was translated by Dermo'd O'Connor.

^d See p. xxxviii. where her true name is said to be Scythia.

^{dd} Walsh's Prospect *ib.* p. 15.

^e See Mackenzie's Antiquity, c. 5. p. 143.

year of their descent into Ireland with such a year of the world, or after the flood. If nothing of this kind be produced, we must be excused if we do not yet think the Irish antiquities parallel to those of China. For if there be no such characters of time which may direct us in comparing one thing with another, it is possible that there may be one or two thousand years difference in the computation, and yet neither able to confute the other. For suppose I should say that the posterity of Gathelus came into Ireland just three hundred and eight years before Christ's nativity, here is one thousand years difference. "That is a small matter," you will say, "in so great antiquity;" but as small as it is, some account ought to be given of a thousand years. Now I desire to have some evident proof brought me of some event in the world which happened thirteen hundred and eight years before Christ's nativity, to which the Irish descent must be coincident. To make this more plain by example, suppose the question be in what age of the world the Peloponnesian war began; we should by no means think it sufficient for any man presently to set down, it was such a year of the world, such a year from the flood, so long before Christ; but we demand some certain character of this time, i. e. such which agrees to that and to no other; and here, whosoever intends to give satisfaction, will search Thucydides, Diodorus, and Ptolemy, to find out some undoubted character; as that ^eThucydides saith that Pythodorus was then archon at Athens, and it was the year of the Olympic solemnities. ^fDiodorus saith, this was the eighty-seventh Olympiad, and that Apseudes was ar-

^e Thucydidis Hist. l. 2. c. 2. Hist. tom. 1. lib. 12. cap. 36, 37. p. 98.

^f Diodori Siculi Bibliothecæ

chon the year before, § Ptolemy saith he was archon in the year of Nabonassar 316. So by comparing the Olympiads and the years of Nabonassar with the years of the world, we may come to a certainty in this matter. And besides §§ Thucydides mentions a great eclipse the first year of the war, which the astronomers say was 317 of Nabonassar, when Euthydemus succeeded Pythodorus at Athens. Such a method of proceeding by certain characters of time, is a way to convince reasonable men; but without any of these to think to impose upon mankind under a pretence of exact calculation, argues too great presumption upon the credulity of mankind. Thus as to the coming of Fergus I. into Scotland just three hundred and thirty years before Christ, which the advocate saith “^h all their historians affirm;” let them produce any one certain character of that time out of such annals as were written within the compass of knowing the truth of it, and we will never dispute this matter more.

But to proceed,

(4.) ⁱ As to the French antiquities; which the advocate saith, “may be more justly questioned on these grounds than theirs,” we only desire them to be as ingenuous as the late learned writers of their antiquities have been, who reject all before the ^k Merovingian race, as either fabulous, or so doubtful and uncertain, that they make no account of it, unless it be what they find in the Roman authors concerning the Franks, as may be seen in ^l Hadrianus Valesius, a learned historian, antiquary and critic.

§ Ptolem. Magn. Construction. lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 59, compared with Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, vol. 2. pp. 66. 408. note ^l, 411.

§§ Thucydidis *ibid.* cap. 28. p. 115.

STILLINGFLEET, VOL. I.

^b Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. 1. See p. xxii. and note ^m.

ⁱ *Ibid.* p. 7.

^k See ch. 5. p. 354.

^l Vales. Rer. Francic. tom. 1. p. 2, &c.

f

(5.) As to the ^m Spanish, which are joined with the French; what relates to their antiquities before the Romans' war in Spain, we grant to be parallel with theirs. For although ⁿ Strabo saith, "they had the use of letters, and had some records of ancient times among them;" yet they are utterly lost. And although ^o Reinesius de Deo Endovellico seems to think, that Anniius had some fragments of those antiquities which he mixed with his own inventions, yet I can see no reason for it; because he would then have alleged the old Spanish records, and not have fathered his antiquities on persons so remote as Berosus and Manetho.

"But if they had the use of letters and records among them, might not the Irish and Scottish derive both from them?" I answer, that the coming of the Irish immediately from Spain and not from Britain is not so evidently proved that any thing can be built upon it. ^p Camden and sir James Ware, two learned antiquaries, both think Ireland first peopled from Britain; and Camden offers good reasons for his assertion, "as the ^q agreement of the British and Irish languages in very many words; the similitude of customs and manners; its being anciently called the "lesser Britain," and the inhabitants "Britons;" the conveniency of passage from
xxxvi Britain thither; which seem to be of far greater moment than any thing brought to prove the legend of Gathelus and Scota and their posterity coming out of Spain. But because this opinion doth not seem to give any account of the Scoti in Ireland, (from whence

^m Mackenzie *ibid.*

ⁿ Strabonis *Geograph. lib. 3.*
p. 96. p. 139. in the margin.

^o Græv. *Syntagm. variar. Dis-*
sert. p. 120.

^p Camden. *Brit. p. 728. vol. 3.*
p. 465. *Waræ. de Hibern. et*

Antiq. Disquisit. cap. 2. p. 11.

Vide *Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.*
p. 579. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.*
p. 301.

^q See Major, in c. 5. p. 252.
Camden. Brit. p. 12. vol. 1. p. xi.
and note.

they certainly went into Scotland, as is now confessed on all hands,) therefore I shall endeavour to clear this matter, by proposing what seems most probable to me concerning the first peopling of these islands.

We are then to consider that the most ancient geographers, as ^r Strabo observes out of Ephorus, divided the then known world into four parts; the eastern they called India; the southern, Æthiopia; the western, Celtia; and the northern, Scythia. And in the ^s European parts they knew but of two nations beside the Greeks, and those are the Celtæ and the Scythæ. “Those that inhabited northward,” saith ^t Strabo, “were called Scythæ, and those to the west, Celtæ;” who were likewise called Iberi and Celtiberi, as he affirms; and these peopled Spain and Gaul, and from thence spread into the neighbour countries; and among the rest came over into Britain: which in the book ^u De Mundo commonly attributed to Aristotle, but by Buchanan to Theophrastus, is said, “together with Ireland,” (which are both there called “the British islands,”) “to be situate in the ocean not far from the Scythæ and the Celtæ.” But the latter were so much nearer in Gaul, that it is very reasonable to believe the first habitation here was by the Celtæ, who came from thence. And ^x Tacitus truly observes, “the agreement was so very great between the Gauls and the old Britons, that although he suspected the Silures might come

^r Strabonis Geograph. lib. 1. p. 23. p. 34. in the margin.

^s See ch. 5. p. 247. and note b.

^t Strabon. ibid. lib. 1. p. 22. p. 34. in the margin. Vide Camden. ibid. p. 87. vol. 1. p. xcvi. See ch. 5. ibid.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 723. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p.

378. See ch. 4. p. 207, and note ^t. Camden. ibid. p. 24.

vol. 1. p. xxiv.

^x Tacit. Vit. Agric. cap. 11. Oper. tom. 4. p. 79. Compare c. 5. pp. 245. 284. Camden. Brit. pp. 9. 466. vol. 1. p. viii. vol. 2. p. 441.

immediately from Spain," (or rather from the Iberi, which Strabo saith was a more general name, and some of these went into Ireland,) "yet upon the whole matter, he concluded all the southern parts of Britain to have been peopled immediately from Gaul." But as to the ^y Caledonians he affirms them to have been of a German extraction: i. e. taking Germany in the extent he took it in, which went as far as Sarmatia, and took in Scandinavia; from whence in probability the northern parts of Britain were first peopled. It is true that Tacitus calls them Britons as well as the Celtæ; and however they were united in interest against the xxxvii Romans, as ^z Galgacus shews in his excellent speech to them, yet Tacitus, we see, makes them of a different extraction. And these were originally from the European Scythæ, or from Scandinavia, which was abundantly peopled, and supplied other countries, as ^a Jornandes saith; and that they were provided of shipping very early, I have proved in the following book, ^b where I speak of the original of the Picts. And besides what is there said to shew that those who dwell in those northern parts, were then called Scythians, Scymnus Chius lately published out of ^c Holstenius's papers affirms "that the Scythians extended from the Palus Mæotis to countries wholly unknown to the Greeks." ^d For being tempted by the rivers, as Olaus Rudbeck conjectures, having no skill in navigation or astronomy, and the woods in the first ages of

^y Camden. *ibid.* p. 83. vol. 1. p. xci. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. pp. 578. Addend. 1017. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 300. See ch. 5. pp. 246. 283.

^z See ch. 5. p. 245, and note x.

^a Jornand. de Rebus Get. l. 1. c. 4. inter Gruter. Hist. August.

Script. Latin. p. 1089. See c. 5. p. 247.

^b See ch. 5. p. 239, &c.

^c Holsten. Not. in Steph. et Urbibus, p. 378.

^d Rudbeck. in Atlant. part. 1. c. 3. §. 10. p. 56.

the world being impassable, the people still went farther and farther by the river's side, till at last finding themselves bounded by the vast mountains in those northern parts and the sea beyond them, they sat down there, and in time so replenished those parts, that they were willing to discharge themselves by sending colonies abroad. To which end they accustomed themselves to the sea, and so from thence these ^e Scythians came into the northern parts of Britain, where they had the name of Caledonians; and upon new supplies coming after the Romans had subdued the southern parts of Britain, were then called Picts. But of these things afterwards. That which I now design, is to shew that some of these Scythæ being encouraged by the adventures of others who had settled in Britain, passed by the northern islands and went into Ireland; and so the Celtæ from Britain, who were called "Iberi" in Strabo, and these Scythæ met there as they did in Britain. But ^f Britain still retained its name; and therefore to distinguish themselves from those who remained there, their country was called "Ibernia" from the Iberi, and "Scotia" from these Scythæ; for saith ^g Walsingham, Scythæ, Schythlici, Scoti, Scotici, are all one; which he took from Radulphus de Diceto, *Imag. Histor. ad A. D. 1185*; and ^h Nennius expressly calls them "Schythæ," and ⁱ Gildas the Irish sea "Vallem Scythicam;" and Alfred in the English translation of

^e See p. xxv. ch. 5. p. 246, &c.

Britan. p. 86. vol. 1. p. xc.

^f Camden. *ibid.* pp. 1. 4. 17. vol. 1. pp. i. iii. xvii. Stillingfleet's Discourse of the true Antiquity of London; in his Works, vol. 3. p. 920. Lloyd *ib.* ch. 1. §. 3. p. 7.

^h Nennii *Hist. Brit.* §. 15. p. 13. note 23. ed. 1838. *Usser. de Prim. c.* 16. p. 731. *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* p. 382. See ch. 5. p. 301.

^g Walsingh. in *Hypodigm. Neustriæ.* p. 452. inter *Camdeni Anglica, Hibernica, &c.* Camden.

ⁱ *Gild. Hist.* §. 19. p. 24. n. 17. ed. 1838. *Usser. de Prim. c.* 15. p. 606. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 318. See ch. 5. p. 301. note ^m.

Orosius calls the Scots "Scyttan;" and the Germans both Scythians and Scots "Scutten;" and the old^k Britons "Yscot," as Camden hath already observed.

xxxviii And it is considerable that late^l Irish antiquary tells us, that a part of their country in their own language is called "Gæthluighe," i. e. Gothland, from the Goths or Scythians who took possession of it. He rather thinks the Getuli, a people of Africa, gave the name; but of their coming into Ireland there is no probability. And in the same place he saith, "that Lamfinnus was the first who brought a colony thither out of Scythia;" which he proves out of one of their most ancient monuments. And^m Colganus observes on the Life of St. Cadroe, "that whereas they are said to be derived fromⁿ Scota, who is said to be Pharaoh's daughter, the true name," he saith, "was Scythia; and that name was given her because her husband came from Scythia." ^oAnd the same antiquary confesses "that it appears by all their ancient records, that they had their original from the Scythians," and Keting himself he saith at last yields it, and "that the name of Scota was given because the Milesian race came out of Scythia."

And to confirm the peopling of^p Ireland from Britain and Scandinavia, we are to observe that the Irish antiquaries from their best records do speak of two great colonies which came thither from Britain, the one of the Belgæ, of which Slangius or Slanius was the head, who was the first monarch of Ireland; ^qwherein Giraldus Cambrensis is confessed to agree with their

^k Camd. ib. p. 86. v. 1. p. xcvi.

^l Flaherty Ogygi, p. 67.

^m Acta Sanctorum veteris et majoris Scotiæ seu Hibern. 6. Mart. p. 502. n. 40. which see in Flaherty ibid. p. 349.

ⁿ See p. xxxiii, notes b, d.

^o Flaherty ibid. p. 350.

^p Ibid. p. 171. c. 8, 9. part 3. For other statements see ch. 5. pp. 266—270.

^q Cambrensis. Evers. c. 8. p. 57.

own antiquities; and another of the Dannanæ from the northern parts of Britain under Nuadus. But besides both these, and long after them, ^r they place the dynasty of the Scots or Scythians under Herimon; ^s and the ^t Psaltir Na-rann, a book of great authority among them, saith “that Herimon was the first king of the Scots in Ireland. And in his time,” ^u they say, “the Picts followed them thither.” But that seems to be too soon. However that they came from the same parts will appear very probable from what ^x Bede speaks of the “Picts coming from ^y Scythia” (i. e. Scandinavia) “in their long boats, and being carried by tempest to the northern parts of Ireland;” he saith “they there found ‘gentem Scotorum,’” i. e. their countrymen the Scythians; “and they would fain have settled there with them.” And when they came to treat, we find no difficulty as to their understanding one another, which there would have been, if the Scots had come out of ^{xxxix} Spain and the Picts out of Scandinavia. I know Bede there makes the Picts’ and Scots’ languages to be different; but so they might be in continuance of time, although at first of the same original; as appears by the several languages now in Europe, derived from the original Gothic or Scythic tongue, which is mother to most of them; only the Celtic and Latin being mixed with it. But to return to ^z Bede, he saith, “the Scots

^r Flaherty *ibid.* part 3. c. 10.

^s *Ibid.* part 2. p. 85.

^t See ch. 5. p. 271, note ⁿ, and compare with Mackenzie’s *Antiquity*, c. 5. p. 173. See Preface to Nennius’s *Hist. Brit.* p. xvii. note 1. ed. 1838, from whence, among other interesting particulars, it appears that this work is “preserved in the Rawlinson MS. 502.” O’Connor, in

Rer. Hibern. Script. Vet. for this and other matters.

^u War. de Hibern. et Antiq. *disquisit.* c. 2. p. 7.

^x Bed. lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 41. *Usser. de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 578. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 300. *Camden. ibid.* p. 82. vol. 1. p. xc.

^y See ch. 5. pp. 239. 246.

^z Bedæ *ibid.* *Usser. ibid.*

persuaded the Picts to go to Britain, and ^a take possession of the northern parts, as the Britons had done of the southern." After this "they obtained wives from the Scots in Ireland;" which shews familiarity and mutual confidence (as being of the same extraction) and the Picts engaged that in a disputable case the "Scottish line should be preferred to their own. ^b In process of time," saith Bede, "some of the Scots themselves, hearing of the goodness of the western parts of Scotland, went thither under the conduct of ^c Reuda, and either by force or friendship took possession of them; and from thence they were called ^d 'Dalreudini,' from this Reuda and Daal which signifies a share or portion." This is all the account Bede gives of this matter; wherein there is not a word of Gathelus and Scota, or of Fergus's coming in the time of Alexander, or any time after. And it is somewhat strange, that such a man as Bede, so inquisitive into these matters, so well acquainted with the story of Icolmkill, or of the monks of Hy or Iona, should say nothing of all this. For he seems to have concealed nothing he knew or had heard of; and ^e stuffs out his books with some not very probable relations. And therefore it is not likely he would have omitted the former stories if he had heard of them.

2. The second argument of any seeming force in the advocate's discourse is, ^f "That their histories were

^a See Camden *ibid.* in the Additions, vol. 3. p. 721. 732, &c. See c. 5. p. 239.

^b Bedæ *ibid.* Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 587. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 306. Camden. *ib.* as in note ^d following.

^c See ch. 5. p. 242.

^d Camden. *ibid.* pp. 90. 706. vol. 1. p. xcvi. vol. 3. p. 383.

Additions, p. 384. See ch. 5. p. 280. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. p. 14. §. 9. p. 32.

^e See c. 2. p. 74. as to St. Alban; Nicolson's English Historical Library, part 2. c. 2. p. 82.

^f Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. 13. Antiquity *ibid.* c. 3. pp. 91, &c. 111, &c.

g first transmitted to posterity by the Druids in verses; and it is probable some of these Druids being converted, became their first monks, and so it was easy for them to inform their monasteries, and that the monks at Iona or Icolmkill kept the records there from the foundation of the monastery about A. D. 560, where their kings were buried until the reign of Malcolm Canmore; that they had annals in other monasteries, as at Scone, Paisley, Pluscardin and Lindisfarn, Abercorn and Melrose; and that they had h historians who compiled histories from them; among whom he reckons as the most ancient i Veremundus a Spaniard, A. D. 1076, who dedicated his history to Malcolm Canmore; and Joh. Campbell, Turgot and Alredus Rivallensis, who wrote of their affairs before Fordon. k And he goes about to prove Veremundus could not be counterfeited by Hector Boethius, because he is cited by l Balæus, Holinshed, Gesner, Chambers; and because Hector gives an account to James V. that he was sent him from Icolmkill." Which is the substance of what he saith about their old histories before Fordon.

To which I answer,

1. That here we have a very formal pedigree of historians, which might with equal probability have been carried back to Gathelus's first coming out of Egypt. For it is very hard to suppose so great a prince, and son to a king of Athens, should be without his Druids, or sanachies, or m bards, who would transmit

g Defence *ibid.* p. (24.) 23. See p. xx. note e in this Preface.

h Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 25.

i See p. xlix. note t, as to Veremundus. Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xxvi. as to Campbell; for Turgot, p. lvi. of this Preface;

for Alredus Rivallensis, p. lv. *ibid.*

k Mackenzie *ibid.* (29.) 28.

l See p. liv.

m Nicolson's English Historical Library, part 1. ch. 3. p. 25. Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 1. p. 17. and Tanner. *ibid.*

to posterity his famous actions ; and therefore I cannot but wonder, that the learned advocate should seem to stick at “ⁿ their ancient origination and descent ;” and be so unwilling to go any farther back than “ their first settlement in Scotland.” For no doubt the history of Gathelus and Scota were transmitted to posterity the very same way that the other was ; and the same arguments will indifferently serve for both. Nay, why should the British History be questioned ? since no doubt the ° Britons had Druids, sanachies and bards as well as the Scots or Irish. And yet the advocate will by no means allow the British antiquities, although they pretend to the very same grounds which he makes use of to support the Scottish. If the Druids were good historians in Scotland, why not much rather among the Britons ; where ^p Cæsar saith they had their “ original institution” and the “ most sacred authority.”^q But Buchanan absolutely denies “ that the Druids ever wrote histories ;” and he affirms from Cæsar, “ that when he came hither, they had no records or way of preserving the memory of things past ;” and Tacitus and Gildas could meet with no certain account from domestic histories. And as to his sanachies and bards, xli I shall only give him Buchanan’s answer in his own words : “ Quod autem ad bardos et seneciones veteris memoriæ custodes quidam confugiunt, prorsus perridicule faciunt.” Which he proves, because the bards were an ignorant sort of people, that had no monuments of antiquity ; and the sanachies were men wholly without learning, and who lived by flattering

under Bardi, for an interesting note. Camden. *ibid.* p. 9. vol. 1. p. ix, for the Druids, Saronidæ and Bards.

ⁿ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 15.

° See the following note.

^p Camden. *ibid.* p. 9. vol. 1. p. viii. See p. xx. note ^e.

^q Buchan. *ibid.* lib. 2. p. 12. See p. xlv.

great men; and therefore no certain account of things can be expected from them. And withal, saith he, since we find historians liable to so many mistakes after all the pains and care they take to search after the truth of things, what credit can be given to those who pretend to deliver history merely by their memories?"

But the advocate objects, "that the laws of Lycurgus were preserved in the memories of men for six hundred years, as Plutarch observes; and the Scots and other nations have preserved laws for much longer time, without the help of letters."

But is there no difference between laws of daily practice, and antiquities, which depend merely upon memory, where there is no use of letters? And as to laws themselves, I shall only desire the learned advocate to give an account of their ^s Macalpine laws, which ^t Fordon saith, "were composed by Kenneth, who subdued the Picts." I know that ^u Hector Boethius, who stands out at nothing, pretends to deliver them as exactly as if he had lived at that time; and ^v Lesley, who follows him very carefully, sets them down as he found them in him. But what ancient copy do they produce for these laws? Not one word of that. But was it not fit that he who had so many kings, should make a body of laws too? Fordon never pretends to know them, only "he thinks there were some of them still remaining." Joh. Major takes no notice of them. Buchanan just mentions them, and

^r Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 16.

^s Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 716. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 374. Nicolson, in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 7. p. 75, refers to this place, and agrees with Stillingfleet. Mackenzie, in his *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch.

3. p. 107, attempts a reply to Stillingfleet.

^t Fordon. *Scotich. lib.* 4. cap. 9. cap. 8. p. 663.

^u Hect. Boeth. *Hist. lib.* 10. f. 207. 1. lin. 30.

^v Leslæ. de Orig. Scot. lib. 1. p. 71.

saith, "they continued long after him," but how long he could not tell. But it is observable, that when he comes to mention the laws of Alexander III. so long after him, (for he died A. D. 1285, and the other, according to him, A. D. 854,) he saith, "^w they were all antiquated by the negligence of the people and the length of time." Now if the laws so much later were quite forgotten, how come the Macalpine laws to be so exactly preserved? But it may be there was another chest of laws at Icolmkill, besides that of ^xMSS. xlii which ^yHector Boethius saith Fergus brought from the sacking of Rome in the time of Alaric. Yet even that would prove that records are the best preservers of laws; and one would think no advocate in the world could be of another opinion.

2. From the Druids I proceed to the first monks of Scotland, who are said "to have left records in their monasteries of the history of former times." The first monastery there, is confessed to be "that of the island ^zIona, or Hy, or Icolmkill, i. e. Hy, the cell of Columba, founded about the year 560, and there," the advocate saith, "their records were kept from the foundation to the reign of Malcolm Canmore." Now we are fallen into an age of some light, such as it is, but whether it will be to the advocate's satisfaction, I know not. For Cummeneus Albus and Adamnanus, both abbots of Hy not long after ^aColumba, have

^w Buchanan. *ibid.* lib. 7. p. 71. 2.

^x See chap. 5. p. 255. and note ⁿ.

^y Usher, in his *De Primordiis*, cap. 15. p. 596. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 311, gives Boethius's statement concerning Fergus at the sacking of Rome, and his depositing the books he brought

from thence at Iona. Jamieson, *ibid.* p. 304, observes, "This account involves a gross anachronism."

^z Mackenzie's *Defence* *ibid.* p. 23.

^a See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 6. p. 63. *Usser. de Primord.* p. 688, &c. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 360, &c.

given an account of Columba, the founder of that monastery; and both wrote before Bede's time. By them it appears that Columba came out of Ireland thither; and Adamnanus saith, "he was the son of Fedlimid the son of Fergus," which Fergus, say the ^bIrish antiquaries, was second husband to Erica daughter of Loarn, brother to Fergus, who carried the first colony into Scotland; and that Fergus, grandfather to Columba, was son to Conallus, grandchild to Niellus Magnus, king of Ireland about A. D. 405, in whose time ^cSt. Patrick was carried captive into Ireland. And so from the time of Columba's coming, and his relation to the kings both of Scotland and Ireland, they have endeavoured to fix the time of Fergus's coming with the first colony into Scotland. The account they give in short is this, that ^dCarbre Riada was one of the sons of Conar II. king of Ireland about A. D. 165; from him the family and country where they lived was called Dalrieda, (and they while in Ireland ^ewere styled kings of Dalrieda;) from him descended Eric the father of Loarn, and Fergus who went into Scotland. To this Fergus succeeded Domangardus, Comgallus, Gauranus, and Conallus the son of Comgallus, in whose time Columba came into Scotland; for Adamnanus saith, "he conversed with Conallus the son of Comgill;" ^fwho, according to Tigernacus and the Ulster annals, gave the island ^gHy

^b Flaherty Ogyg. p. 471. See chap. 5. pp. 279—282. Beside the succeeding page, xliii, see also pp. xlv. xlvi. xlvi. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 8. p. 30.

^c Usser. de Primord. p. 587. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 306.

^d Cambrens. Evers. p. 69.

^e Flaherty *ibid.* p. 468.

^f Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 703. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 367. *Camden ibid.* in the Additions, vol. 3. p. 388. and note (k), with whom compare Jamieson *ibid.* p. 21.

^g See p. lxix. and note i.

xliii to Columba. But ^hBede saith, “it was given by the Picts, whom Columba converted to the Christian faith.” Which must seem strange, if the Scots then had the possession of those parts; and therefore the learned ⁱprimate of Armagh inclines to the former opinion. The same Tigernacus, in the Irish annals, makes ^kFergus the son of Eric to have carried over the Dalredians into Britain six years after the death of St. Patrick; and the old author cited by ^lCamden confirms the succession of Fergus from Conar, and his being the first king of Albany; which agrees with the Irish antiquaries’ saying, that Carbre Riada, the ancestor to Fergus, was the son of Conar, monarch of Ireland.

“But suppose all this, that Columba was descended from one Fergus and related to the other, who went over with the Dalredians into Scotland; and that he was there in the time of Conallus, son to Comgill, grandchild to this Fergus, how doth it hence appear that there was not another Fergus long before, and a succession of kings in Scotland from him?”

To this the Irish antiquaries reply, that their ancient annals do give a clear account of this Fergus’s race and time of going into Scotland; but although they have the succession of the kings of Ireland long before, and the remarkable things done in their time, yet there is no mention at all of any Fergus or his successors going to settle in Britain before this time. They do believe that there were excursions made by

^h Bed. lib. 3. cap. 3. 4. p. 106.
Usser. de Primord. p. 703. Brit.
Eccles. Antiq. p. 367. See p.
lxix. and note ⁱ.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. p. 703.
Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 367. See

note ⁱ in p. lxix.

^k Usser. de Primord. p. 610.
Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 320.

^l Camden. Brit. p. 707. vol. 3.
p. 389. See ch. 5. p. 280. Lloyd
ibid. ch. 1. §. 9. p. 34.

^msome of the kings of Ireland before; and I see no reason to question it, even before the times mentioned by Gildas; but they utterly deny any foundation of a monarchy there by Scots going out of Ireland before the time of Fergus the son of Eric, and that ⁿone hundred years later than the Scottish antiquaries do place his coming; ^ofor they make the first coming of this colony to be A. D. 503, just the time which the ^pbishop of St. Asaph had pitched upon; but according to their antiquities, Loarn the elder brother was first king, and he dying, Fergus succeeded A. D. 513; and because his race succeeded in that kingdom, therefore Fergus is supposed to have been founder of the monarchy.

The question now comes to this, whether the Irish or the Scottish antiquaries go upon the better grounds? For here the advocate's common places of historical faith, common fame, domestic tradition, &c. can deter-^{xliv}mine nothing, since these are equal on both sides, and yet there is a contradiction to each other about a matter of fact. We must then appeal to the records on both sides; and those who can produce the more authentic testimonies from thence are to be believed. The advocate pleads that it is very credible that they had such, "because they had ^qDruids and sanachies and monks, as well as those in Ireland; and that ^rColumba founded a monastery at Icolmkill, and ^stheir kings

^m Flaherty *ibid.* p. 464.

ⁿ *Ibid.* p. 472.

^o Mackenzie's *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 5. pp. 145—148, where for the kings mentioned in the last page, &c. See *ibid.* p. 153, and the following pages.

^p See ch. 5. p. 280. and Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 8. p. 31. and note ^m, for references to Usher on these

points. Mackenzie's *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 2. p. 13.

^q Mackenzie's *Defence* *ibid.* p. 13.

^r *Ibid.* p. 23.

^s Usher. *de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 699. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 366. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 5. §. 1. p. 100. *Camden. ibid.* in the *Additions*, vol. 3. pp. 714—716.

were buried there for a long time." But where are the annals of that monastery? or of any other near that time? To what purpose are we told of the monasteries that were at Scone, and Paisley, and Pluscardin, and Lindisfarn, and Abercorn, unless their books be produced? It is by no means satisfactory to say, "t they had two books, their register or chartulary, and their black book wherein their annals were kept;" for we desire to see them of what colour soever they be, and to be convinced by testimonies out of them, if they appear of sufficient authority. But if these cannot be produced, let them print the full account of Irish kings, which the advocate, in his advertisement, saith, "u he had lately seen in a very old MS. brought from Icolmkill, written by Carbre Lifachair, who lived six x generations before St. Patrick, and so about our Saviour's time." y St. Patrick died about the end of the fifth century, being above one hundred years old, if the Irish historians may be believed; but how six generations will reach from his birth to about our Saviour's time, is not easy to understand. For although the ancients differed much in computing generations; yet z Censorinus saith, they generally called "twenty-five or thirty years by the name of a generation." Herodotus indeed extends a generation to one hundred years, yet even that will

t Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (25.) 24. rations.'

u Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 33. Nicolson's Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 2. p. 19, and his Irish Historical Library, part 3. ch. 2. p. 10. as to Carbre Lifachair; Mackenzie afterwards acknowledged that this MS. was of no authority; see his *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 154.

x Mackenzie, in his *Defence* *ibid.* has 'centuries,' not 'gene-

y Usser. de Primord. Index Chronol. A. D. 493. p. 1121. Brit. Eccles. Antiqu. *ibid.* p. 524. col. 1.

z Censor. de Die Natal. cap. 17. pp. 79—81, which compare with Raphelii Annotat. in Sac. Scripturam, pp. 118. 364. Mackenzie's *Antiquity* *ibid.* chap. 5. p. 153, where he agrees with Stillingfleet.

not do here. But who was this Carbre Lifachair, who wrote so long since? ^a I find one of that name among the kings of Ireland, about A. D. 284, and therefore I am apt to suspect that somebody not very well versed in the Irish language, finding this name among the kings, made him the author of the book. And the ^b Irish antiquaries speak with some indignation against those Scottish writers, who pretend to debate these matters of antiquity relating to the Irish nation, without any skill in the Irish language. For this ^{xlvi} debate doth not concern the ^c Saxons in Scotland, (as all the lowlanders are still called by the highlanders,) and many of the best families of their nobility settled there in the time of ^d Malcolm Canmore, after he had married the sister to Edgar; but it relating wholly to those who came out of Ireland, the Irish antiquaries think it reasonable it ought to be determined by the Irish annals.

“ But will not the same objections lie against the Irish antiquities, which have been hitherto urged against the Scottish? For why should we believe that the original Irish were more punctual and exact in their annals, than those who went from thence into Scotland?”

I answer, that a difference is to be made concerning the Irish antiquities. For they either relate to what happened among them before Christianity was received in Ireland, or after. As to their remote antiquities, they might have some general traditions preserved

^a Cambr. Evers. *ibid.* p. 71. Flaherty Ogyg. p. 341.

^b *Ibid.* p. 464. Nicolson, in his Irish Historical Library, part 3. ch. 2. p. 18, speaks of this passage of Flaherty's Ogygia.

^c Camden. Brit. p. 85. vol. 1. p. xciv. See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 12, 13. pp. 43—48.

^d Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. pp. 581. 665. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 303. 349.

among them, as that they were peopled from Britain and Scythia, and had successions of kings time out of mind; but as to their exact chronology, I must beg leave as yet to suspend my assent. For ^e Bollandus affirms, “that the Irish had no use of letters till St. Patrick brought it among them;” at which their present antiquary is much offended, and runs back to the Druids, as the learned advocate doth. But neither of them has convinced me that the ^fDruids ever wrote annals. All that ^gCæsar saith is, that in Gaul they “made use of the Greek letters;” which they might easily borrow from the Greek colony at Marseilles; but how doth it appear that they used these letters in Ireland or Scotland? or that they any where used them in any matters of learning? which seems contrary to the institution of the Druids, who were all for memory, as Cæsar saith, “and thought books hurtful to the use of it.” ^hSo that nothing could be more repugnant to their discipline, than the “ⁱone hundred and fifty tracts of the Druids, which St. Patrick is said to have cast into the fire.” But I do not deny that they might have genealogies kept up among them by their Druids and sanachies and bards, who made it their business; and so it was in Scotland, as appears by the ^khighlander’s repeating the genealogy of Alexander III. by heart. But the great error lay in fixing ^{xlvi}times and places, and particular actions, according to

^e Bollandi Acta Sanctorum Mart. 17. Vit. Patric. §. 1. n. 4, 5. p. 517. O’Flaherty, Ogygia, cap. 30. p. 214. Mackenzie, in *ibid.* ch. 5. pp. 170. 179, notices this passage.

^f Camden. *ibid.* p. 3. vol. 1. p. iii. Tanner. *ibid.* under *Druidæ*, and note ^c, p. 234.

^g Ogyg. part. 3. cap. 30. p. 214. See p. xl. note ^p, in this Preface.

^h Vide Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 352. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 443, and the preceding matter.

ⁱ Ogyg. *ibid.* p. 219.

^k See p. x. and note ^b.

the names of those genealogies. And this was the true reason of the mistake as to the Scottish antiquities. For the genealogists carrying the pedigree of Fergus the son of Erk so much farther back, some afterwards either imagined themselves, or would have others think, that all those mentioned before him were kings in Scotland, as Fergus was; which by degrees was improved into a formal story of forty kings. And I am very much confirmed in this conjecture, because I find in the genealogy in Fordon, ¹the descent of Fergus the son of Erk, from Conar the Irish monarch, as it is in the Irish genealogies, and that by Rieda, called by them Carbre Riada, by the other Eochoid Ried, and several other names are the very same we now find in the genealogy of the Irish kings; as Eochoid, father to Ere, Ængus, Fedlim, Conar the son of Ederskeol, and so up to ^mFergus, called in the Irish catalogue of kings Fergusius Fortamalius, (whom the author of the Synchronism makes ⁿcontemporary with Ptolemy Philometor.) From whence I conclude, that the original mistake lay in applying the Irish genealogy to the kings of Scotland.

But if we go beyond these genealogies in Ireland, and come to examine the matters of fact relating to their remote antiquities, we shall find no more certainty there, than we have done in Scotland. And it is ingenuously confessed by ^oTigernacus in his annals, “that all their antiquities to the reign of Kimbaitus, their seventy-third king, are very uncertain;” but he might have gone farther, and done no injury to truth.

¹ See pp. xlii. xliii. and notes.

^m Mackenzie *ibid.* ch. 5. pp. 159—170; has discussed these points.

ⁿ Flaherty *Ogyg.* p. 114.

^o Flaherty *ibid.* p. 258. See next page, and ch. 5. p. 271. Mackenzie *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 171. Nicolson's *Irish Historical Library*, part 3. ch. 2. p. 11.

However, we cannot but acknowledge it to be a great piece of ingenuity, to own so much in those times when fabulous antiquities were so much cried up and believed. But what becomes then of ^p Cæsarea, Baronna and Balba, ^q with “ fifty other women and but three men, coming from Ireland just forty days before the flood, and the fifteenth day of the moon?” What becomes “ of ^r Partholanus and his company, who arrived in Ireland the three hundred and twelfth year after the flood, in the month of May, fourteenth of the moon, and upon Wednesday?” Is not this wonderful exactness at such a distance of time? And the late antiquary confesses he doth not know “ how they came to understand the day of the week and the month so ^{xlvi} well.” How come they to understand, “ that the second colony under ^s Nemethus came to Ireland when it had been thirty years desolate; and after the destruction of that ^t colony that it remained so two hundred years?” As to the Milesian colony from Spain, I discourse at large afterwards of it, and the authority of those annals these antiquities depend upon.

But then as to later times, since Christianity was among them, and some kind of learning did flourish in Ireland for some time, there is greater reason to have a regard to the testimony of their most ancient annals. Such are those of ^u Tigernacus, who died A.D. 1088; and the Synchronisms of Flannus, who died A.D. 1056; the historical poems of Coemannus, who is celebrated

^p See ch. 5. p. 267. Mackenzie's Epistle Dedicatory, p. 4, prefixed to the Antiquity *ibid.* Camden. *ib.* pp. 87. 728. vol. 1. p. xcvi. vol. 3. p. 465.

^q Flaherty Ogyg. Domest. part. 3. cap. 1. 2; which compare with Mackenzie *ibid.* chap. 5.

p. 144.

^r See ch. 5. p. 268.

^s Flaherty Ogyg. Domest. cap. 6. See ch. 5. p. 270. and the note ^p above.

^t Ogyg. Domest. cap. 7.

^u See ch. 5. p. 271.

as their chief antiquary, and he deduces his historical poem of the kings of Ireland to A.D. 1072, which is supposed to be the time he lived in; Modudius continues the history of their kings from A.D. 428. to A.D. 1022, and he lived A.D. 1143. * But besides these, the Irish antiquaries have found an Irish poem of the kings of Scotland, in the time of Malcolm Canmore, with their names and the time of their reigns. Which poem begins with Loarn, and Fergus the son of Ere as the first kings of Scotland, but takes notice of kings among the Picts before; without the least intimation of any among the Scots; which being joined with the testimony of their genealogies and the annals of Tigernacus, and of Jocelin in the Acts of St. Patrick, they conclude sufficient to prove that there was no monarchy in Scotland till the time of this Fergus of the Dalredian family. And it is not improbable that Bede should understand this colony under the conduct of these brethren, by his ^y “Duce Reuda;” because they being equal, the denomination was taken from the head of the stock; who was Rieda or Reuda; and Daal, the Irish antiquaries say, originally signifies a ‘stock,’ and only by consequence a ‘share’ or ‘portion.’

But the advocate still insists upon it, “^z that in their chief monasteries they had ancient annals kept;” which must be of greater authority than these Irish historical poems. This is a matter of fact, and there can be no argument drawn from the bare probability that there were such annals; but when they are produced and compared with the ^a Irish annals of Tigernacus, the

* Flaherty Ogyg. p. 466. Mackenzie *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 173.

^y See p. xxxix. and notes ^{b, c, d.}

^z Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* pp. 36. 44, &c. See much more on this subject, and the Chroni-

cle of Melrose, in Mackenzie’s Antiquity *ibid.* c. 5. p. 148.

^a *Ibid.* c. 5. p. 143. compared with Stillingfleet *ib.* c. 5. p. 271, &c. Nicolson’s Irish Hist. Library, part 3. ch. 2. pp. 11. 13, &c.

xlviiii annals of Ulster, Inisfallin, Donegal and others which the Irish antiquaries quote so often, besides their historical poems, we shall then be able to judge better between them in point of antiquity and credibility. At present it doth not seem so probable, that they have any such that are considerable, since they have not been alleged by so learned an advocate for their antiquities, who would not omit so material an evidence for his cause. And there is a passage in the conclusion of the continuation of Fordon which makes it more than probable, they had no ancient authentic annals in the monasteries. For there it is said, “^bThat in other countries, and as he heard in England, in all their monasteries of royal foundation, there was a certain person appointed to write the passages of the present times, and after the king’s death, at the next great council all these writers were to meet and to bring in their papers, which were to be compared and examined by skilful men appointed for that purpose, and out of all one authentic chronicle was to be made, which was to be laid up in the archives of the monasteries as such, from whence the truth might be known: the like he wishes were done in Scotland.” From whence it follows, that there were no authentic annals in their monasteries before that time to his knowledge. ^cBuchanan, I know, doth several times quote the book of Paisley, but it had been far better to have printed the book itself, since ^dDempster saith “it was in the hands of the earl of Dumferlin,” that others might have been better able to judge concerning it. But ^eFordon tells us,

^b Fordon. Scotch. lib. 16. c. 39. in Hearn. edit. vol. 4. p. 1348. vol. 2. p. 516. Goodall. edit.

^c Buchan. *ibid.* p. 39. 2. 45. 1. 50. 2.

^d Dempst. Hist. Scot. lib. 15. n. 1011.

^e Fordon. Scotch. lib. 8. c. 13. edit. Goodall. vol. 1. p. 460. The places in Fordon, l. 8. 13. 1. 5.

^f that monastery was founded A. D. 1168, (or a year after, saith the Chronicle of ^g Melrose ;) now, the very foundation of the monastery is here so late, that no great matter can be expected as to remote antiquities. That at ^h Scone, as ⁱ Fordon saith, was founded not much sooner, A. D. 1107. ^k As to Abercorn, though mentioned by ^l Bede, yet ^m Buchanan saith “ no one could find out so much as the footsteps of it ;” and so we are not like to expect much light from thence. It is very strange that Buchanan only should see “ ⁿ the famous book of Pluscardin :” for books do not easily grow famous by one man’s seeing them. But no great matter of antiquity is to be expected from thence, since that monastery at the soonest was founded by Alexander II. in the thirteenth century ; but ^o Dempster rather thinks, “ it was two hundred years” after. I never heard that Aidan, Finan and Colman left any ^{xlix} annals at Lindisfarn ; nor Columba or his successors at Icolmkill. If any such be ever found, it will be a great

c. 36, Goodall’s edition, do not clearly and exactly agree as to the years set down by Stillingfleet. In the former, l. 8. c. 13, it is said, that George bishop of Dunkeld, died in 1169, Paisley having been founded just before. In the beginning of l. 5. c. 37. it is said that the monastery of Scone was founded A. D. 1114.

^f Camden. *ibid.* p. 696. vol. 3. p. 340. Additions, p. 346.

^g *Ibid.* p. 686. vol. 3. p. 294. Additions, pp. 295. 297.

^h *Ibid.* p. 709. vol. 2. p. 394. Additions, p. 397.

ⁱ Fordon. *ibid.* lib. 5. c. 36. ed. Hearn. vol. 3. p. 499. vol. 1. p. 285. edit. Goodall.

^k Camden. *ibid.* p. 690. vol. 3. p. 305. Additions, p. 318. Mackenzie’s *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 5.

p. 175, and as to other monastic annals. He fortifies his reasoning with that of Stillingfleet, c. 1. p. 35. “ And such evidence ought to be allowed,” &c.

^l Bed. *Hist. Eccles.* l. 1. c. 12. p. 50. et not. 17.

^m Buchanan. *ib.* lib. 5. p. 40. 2.

ⁿ Nicolson in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 2. p. 27, notices this passage. See note ^m, p. xvii. In the Additions to Camden *ibid.* vol. 3. p. 429, we are informed ; “ The Chronicle of this place, quoted by Buchanan, is supposed to have been only a copy of Fordun.” Keith’s *Catalogue of the Bishops of the several Sees of Scotland*, p. 261.

^o Dempster. *Apparat. ad Hist. Scot.* l. 1. p. 78.

favour to inquisitive men to oblige the world by publishing them, that if we are guilty of mistakes, we may rectify them upon such great authorities when they vouchsafe to let them see the light.

As to the ^p Chronicle of Melrose, lately published at Oxford, we find no advantage at all to the advocate's cause by it. But here is an odd kind of reflection either on the MS. or the worthy publisher of it, " ^q as though it were very unfaithful in the things relating to the Scottish nation." Whereas I have frequently perused ^r the original MS. in the Cotton library, which is a very fair and ancient one. And those verses he speaks of, which are omitted, are not there in the same hand, but added in the margin by another, and seem transcribed from some other book; such verses being frequent in Fordon, and it may be are the greatest 'monuments of antiquity they have, being agreeable to the Irish historical poems. But seeing the first produced by the advocate go no farther back than Alpin the father of ^s Kenneth who subdued the Picts, they can afford very little light in these matters. And it had been but a reasonable piece of justice in the advocate, before he had charged such "unfaithfulness upon the MS. copy of Melrose," as it appears in the Oxford edition, to have looked either on the beginning or the end of the book; and then he might have spared his censure. For in the preface an account is given of the verses relating to the succession of the kings of Scotland: and in the end the very verses

^p See Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xxv. and note p.

^q Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. 24. Antiquity, ch. 3. p. 96. Nicolson's Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 2. p. 22, and note 10.

^r In Musæo Brit. Bibl. Cotton. Faustina, b. 9.

^s Compare Emmius on Kenneth, as quoted by Stillingfleet, p. xxii. of this Preface. See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 11. p. 41, as to his war with the Picts.

themselves are printed, and more at large than he quotes them.

From the annals of their monasteries I proceed to their historians; and the first mentioned by the advocate is “^t Veremundus a Spaniard, archdeacon of St. Andrew’s, A.D. 1076, who dedicated his history to Malcolm Canmore; “ and in his epistle appeals to the Druids and monks, and the monuments of antiquity kept by them in the isles of Man and Icolmkill.” This is an evidence to the purpose, and speaks home to the point. But the bishop of St. Asaph hath unhappily questioned whether there ever were such a writer; and I do not think the advocate hath cleared the point. There may be two things in dispute, with respect to this Veremundus; first, whether there ever were such a history appearing under the name of ^x Veremundus: and then supposing there were, whether it were genuine, or made under his name by Hector Boethius, or rather by his ^y physician of Aberdeen, who was so helpful to him, saith Dempster, “in texenda historia,” i. e. in weaving the materials for his history? I will not dispute so much the former, and the testimony of Chambers, “^z a lord of session and learned man,” as the advocate tells us, “who wrote A. D. 1572,” goes no farther, nor any other produced by him. But as to the second point I am very much unsatisfied, for these reasons.

1. ^a It is very well known that it was no unusual

^t Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 25. See Lloyd’s Preface *ibid.* p. xxvi. ch. vii. §. 4. p. 151, and notes there. Nicolson’s Scottish Historical Library, part 2. ch. 2. p. 20. Also note P, in this Preface, p. xxii. ch. 5. p. 254. p. 261. note ^m, &c.

^u Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (26) 25.

^x See p. xvi. and note ^g; also

ch. 5. p. 249, and note ^t.

^y See p. xv. and note ^e, which compare with p. li. as to Elphinston.

^z Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 26. Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 3. pp. 97. 211.

^a Nicolson *ibid.* p. 21. refers to this paragraph.

thing in that age to publish books under the names of ancient authors, which cost the critics a great deal of pains to discover the imposture, as is apparent in the ^b Berosus, Manetho, Metasthenes (or Megasthenes), Philo, Cato, Xenophon, Archilochus, Sempronius, published by Annius, who lived in the fifteenth century, and was buried during the popedom of Alexander VI. And not only authors, but other monuments of antiquity were then counterfeited, as appears by many in Gruter's collection of inscriptions, by those of Annius in Italy, and by the Tuscan inscriptions published by Inghiramius under the name of Prosper Fesulanus; which were the invention of Thomas Fœdrus, who lived at the same time with Hector Boethius. For in that age men began to be inquisitive into matters of antiquity; and therefore some who had more learning and better inventions than others, set themselves to work to gratify the curiosity of such who longed to see something of the antiquities of their own country. And such things were so greedily swallowed by less judicious persons, that it proved no easy matter to convince such of the imposture. For even Annius and Prosper Fesulanus, as well as Veremundus, have had their advocates to plead for them.

2. We find as to the Scottish antiquities many such authors pretended to, who never wrote concerning them. As for instance, ^c three books of the History of Scotland by St. Adam bishop of Caithness; ^d Auminus of the Right of the Culdees; ^e king Achaius's History of his Predecessors; ^f Aldarus's History of Scotland and Ireland; ^g St. Convallanus's History of the Kings of Scotland; ^h the Chronicle of Dumfermlin; ⁱ Elvanus

^b See p. xxi. and notes.

^c Dempster. Hist. Eccles. l. i. n. 2.

^d Ibid. n. 45.

^f Ibid. n. 92.

^h Ibid. n. 415.

^e Ibid. n. 52.

^g Ibid. n. 259.

ⁱ Ibid. n. 490.

Avalonius's History of Scotland; ^k St. Fastidius's Chronicle of Scotland; ^l Fergus the Great's Epistles to the Scots; ^m Fulgentius's Epistle to Donald king of Scotland in the time of Severus; ⁿ St. Glacianus's History of Scotland; ^o St. Glodianus's Chronicle of the Picts, cited by Veremundus, saith Dempster; ^p Galdus's Epistles to the Britons; ^q Hunibertus's Scottish Chronicle; ^r Kenneth's Epitome of his Laws; ^s St. Machorius of the Destruction of the Picts; ^t St. Minnanus of the Union of the Scots and Picts; ^u Marcerius of the coming of the Scots into Albion—he is said to be their first author, and out of him Veremundus, saith Dempster, "took the foundation of his history;" but I do not find that any man besides ever saw him—^x King Reuther's Scottish History; ^y Salifax Bardus's genealogy of their kings in king Reuther's time. Here we have no less than twenty authors relating to their antiquities, every one mentioned as genuine by ^z Dempster; and yet as far as we can find, not one of the whole number was so. Is it then any wonder, that Veremundus should be reckoned among the rest?

3. ^a No such author was known to Fordon, as far as appears by his history; and he is very punctual in quoting the authors he makes use of, and sometimes transcribes large passages out of them; as out of Baldredus, as he calls him, and Turgot's Life of Mal-

^k Ibid. n. 530.

^l Ibid. n. 532.

Preface *ibid.* p. xxxvi. See Tanner. *ibid.* under the names of the writers above, and Lloyd *ibid.* Preface, p. xxvi, &c.

^m Ibid. n. 547.

ⁿ Ibid. n. 561.

^o Ibid. n. 567.

^p Ibid. n. 592.

^q Ibid. n. 667.

^r Ibid. n. 761.

^s Ibid. n. 839.

^t Ibid. n. 851.

^u Ibid. n. 881.

^x Ibid. n. 1065.

^y Ibid. n. 1056.

^z Stillingfleet, in ch. 5. p. 248, reverts to this subject. Concerning Dempster's character as a writer, see note ^z in Lloyd's

^a Nicolson has some doubt on this subject; see him *ibid.* p. 21. and compare the reference to Fordon in the next page, preceding note ⁱ, as to Grossum Capt. Mackenzie's Antiquity *ib.* ch. 3. p. 98.

colm, &c. Jocelin de Furnes, Vincentius, Adammanus, and any old legends or chronicles he could meet with, as “^b Chronica de Abernethy, et variaë Chronica” upon many occasions. I do not therefore deny that Fordon doth appeal to chronicles before him; but I think the argument so much stronger against Veremundus; when one who gathered all he could meet with never once takes notice of him, as far as I can find.

4. ^c William Elphinston (chancellor of Scotland, bishop of Aberdeen, and founder of the university there, a man highly commended by Hector Boethius) did, as Hector himself tells us in his epistle to James V., “search all Scotland for monuments of antiquity, and gave ^d the first intimation of Veremundus in the island ^{lii} Iona, and ^e followed him exactly in writing his history.” Now as it happily falls out, this very ^f history of Elphinston is in being among us, and I have at this time by me eight books of it, which go as far as the thirteenth century. ^g He tells the story of ^h Gathelus and Scota, as others had done before him; or rather, just as Fordon had set it down. For there is very little variation from him in all the first book, only the eighth chapter in Fordon is very much contracted; the fifteenth about Gathelus’s building the city Brigantia in Spain is transposed, another chapter being set before it. In the seventeenth he follows Fordon exactly about the poste-

^b Mackenzie *ibid.* c. 5. p. 175.

^c Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 11. f. 254. 1. lin. 1.

^d See the following pages, particularly p. liii. to the contrary.

^e Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 7. f. 118. 2. lin. 71.

^f Nicolson, in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. c. 2. p. 27,

refers to this passage, giving a short account of Elphinston, and concludes; “The best, if not only entire copy of this History is among sir Thomas Fairfax’s MSS. in the Bodleian library.”

^g See ch. 5. p. 250. and note ^b.

^h Elphinston. *Scot. Chron.* 1. 1. c. 8.

rity of Gathelus coming into Ireland; and whereas Fordon only quotes ⁱ Grossum Caput for saying “ that Scotia had its name from Scota, the most noble person in that colony ;” he saith “ ^k it was in some Chronica ;” but what Chronica was ever written by Grosthead, deserves to be inquired. For it is certain Fordon quotes him in other places about Scota and the Scots. Which makes me wonder that Dempster doth not put him among his Scottish writers ; but as far as I can perceive, he never read Fordon ; nor saw Elphinston. In chap. 20, where Fordon quotes an old chronicle which affirms “ that Gaithelus gave the same laws to his people which Phoroneus did to the Greeks ; and that the Scots to this day glory that they have those laws :” this last clause Elphinston left out ; and he passes over chap. 21, “ where the miserable condition of the posterity of Gathelus in Spain for two hundred and forty years is set down. In some following chapters he confutes Geoffrey of Monmouth in the very words of Fordon, and uses his very expressions about “ the first peopling of Scotland from Ireland, the coming of the Picts, and the hard usage of the Scots by them, and Fergus’s going over out of Ireland ;” in all which not one authority is cited which is not in Fordon, and not the least intimation of any such author as ^l Veremundus.

In the second book he follows Fordon, not only in other things before, but when he describes the islands of Scotland, and particularly ^m Iona ; only he leaves out ⁿ Fordon’s Hebrew etymology, making Iona and Co-

ⁱ See p. li. and note ^a.

^k Fordon. Scot. lib. 1. c. 14. c. 13. p. 573. vol. 1. p. 14. See c. 5. p. 250.

^l See p. xxii. and note ^p. See Mackenzie *ibid.* c. 3. p. 99. c. 4.

p. 114.

^m See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 5. §. 1. p. 98. note ^a.

ⁿ Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 2. c. 10. ed. Goodall, vol. 1. p. 45. Jamieson *ibid.* p. 23.

lumba the same; and he saith not one word of any library or records kept there, or any old histories and annals to be there found, as Hector Boethius affirms; ^{liii}all that he saith is, “that there was a sanctuary for transgressors.” About Fergus and Rether he varies not a tittle from Fordon, and never mentions any other kings of that race; which he would never have omitted if he had known such an author as Veremundus. And he doth not suppose that Rether succeeded Fergus in the kingdom of Scotland, but that he came afresh from Ireland; and so makes this “the second coming of the Scots out of Ireland:” which plainly overthrows the constant succession of the monarchy from Fergus in Scotland: and he names no one king of Scotland from Rether to Eugenius, who was banished with all the Scots.

In the beginning of the third book he gives an account, after Fordon, of Fergus the son of Erk coming into Scotland, and he reckons “forty-five kings between the two Ferguses,” just as Fordon doth; and he desires to be excused, as he did, “for not setting down distinctly the times of their several reigns, because he could not then find any writings about them:” his words are, “*ad præsens non in scriptis reperimus.*” Now from this expression I thus argue against Hector Boethius’s Veremundus: He saith, “that Elphinston gave the first intimation of him, and that he followed him in his history:” either therefore Veremundus gave no account of this first succession, which Hector pretends to have from him; and so his authority signifies nothing at all in this matter; or Elphinston never saw him; for he saith, “he never could find any history of this first succession.” And therefore, if ever there were such a book under the name of Veremundus, it

was after Elphinston's days. For having searched the whole nation for ancient writings, and particularly Iona, as Hector testifies, and finding no history of the succession from Fergus, as himself declares, it is a plain evidence, that °Hector Boethius hath given a false account of Elphinston in relation to Veremundus, and in all probability of Veremundus too. But this is not all; for Elphinston doth not only say, "that he could not find any books relating to the succession of the kings from Fergus," but he refers his readers to the old Irish annals: his words are, "ad antiquos Hiberniæ libros referimus." So that according to Elphinston's judgment, the most certain account of their antiquities is to be taken from the Irish authors. And so we may liv observe both in him and Fordon, the Irish legends of St. Brendan and others, served them for very good authorities.

And so much for the advocate's ancient historian, Veremundus the Spaniard. For I suppose the mention of him by ^pBale, Gesner, Holinshed, &c. after he was so much celebrated by ^qHector Boethius, deserves no farther consideration. But ^rVossius did not think him worth mentioning; and although he blames ^sLuddus (as the advocate calls him) or Humphry Lhuyd, for being too severe upon Hector Boethius, yet it is evident that he looked on him as a ^tfabulous writer, and so durst not set him down on his authority. The advocate would excuse this censure of Vossius, as though it related only "to his credulity in point of miracles," whereas there is not the least intimation

° See p. li. and note d.

^p See Nicolson *ibid.* p. 21, as to Veremundus. See chap. 5. p. 262. and note b.

^q Boeth. *ibid.* f. 12. l. 14.

^r Voss. de *Histor. Latin.* lib. 3. cap. 13. p. 213.

^s See chap. 5. p. 286.

^t Mackenzie, *Defence* *ibid.* p. 31.

that way; and Vossius saith, “that Leland, on the account of his fabulousness, wrote sharp verses upon him.” What! for his having believed too many miracles? No certainly, but for his fabulous antiquities. ^u But he hopes to bring Hector Boethius better off from the censure of bishop Gavin Douglas, which the ^x bishop of St. Asaph takes notice of from Polydore Virgil, because “bishop Douglas died A.D. 1520, and Boethius’s history was not published till 1526, and he had not his records from Icolmkill till 1525.” To which I answer, that this looks like one of the miracles the advocate confesses that Hector did too easily report. For if he had the records on which this history was built but in 1525, how came his history to be published the following year? For he makes use of Veremundus’s authority in the very beginning of his ^y history, for the Scottish antiquities both in Spain, Ireland and Albany. In his second book he saith, “^z whatever he had written of the ancient kings of Scotland, he had taken out of Veremundus, Campbell and Cornelius Hibernicus;” all which he pretended to have had from ^a Icolmkill. In his third book about Cæsar’s Expedition, he still pretends to follow Veremundus. And in his seventh book he declares, “^b he had kept close to him in the whole series of his history.” Now how was this possible, if he had never seen Veremundus till A. D. 1525, and his history was published by Badius Ascensius at Paris, A. D. 1526?
 lv It would take up that year in sending it thither, and

^u Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 30. Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 102.

^x Lloyd *ibid.* Pref. p. xxxviii.

^y Hect. Boeth. Scot. Hist. lib. 1. f. 12. 1. lin. 14. See ch. 5. p. 253.

^z Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 2. f. 22. 2. lin. 57. See chap. 5. *ibid.*

^a Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 3. f. 35. 1. lin. 13. See chap. 5. p. 257.

^b Boeth. *ibid.* lib. 7. f. 118. 2. lin. 69.

revising and correcting and publishing so large a volume as his history makes. So that there must be some great mistake as to the year of his receiving those records, if he ever did. But if this were not the history bishop Douglas censured, what other was there at that time which could deserve it? It could not be Joh. Major, for his book was printed by Badius Ascensius after Douglas's death; (if he died, as he saith, A. D. 1520;) and ^che pretends to no new discoveries, as Boethius doth. But why should the advocate imagine ^dhis history was not known by the learned men at home, such as bishop Douglas was, before it was printed?

But to return to Vossius, who is not sparing in mentioning any of our MS. historians which he found well attested: and particularly ^eEalredus, abbot of Rhieval, who wrote the Life of David, king of Scots. But the advocate tells us some news concerning him, viz. "that he was abbot of Melrose, which was called Ryval before king David's time." But Fordon expressly distinguisheth the two monasteries of Rieval and Melrose; "^f the one," he saith, "was founded by king David, A. D. 1132, and ^gthe latter four years after. And in the chronicle of Melrose it appears that Richard was the first abbot there; to whom Waltheof succeeded, uncle to king Malcolm, A. D. 1148. (who succeeded king David A. D. 1153.) After Waltheof William was abbot of Melrose, A. D. 1159; after him Jocelin, A. D. 1170. In the mean time Ealredus dies abbot of Rieval, A. D. 1167, and Silvanus was chosen

^c See ch. 5. p. 252. and notes y and ^a.

^d Leslæ. *ibid.* lib. 9. p. 378. Dempster. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4. n. 405.

^e See p. xiii. and note ^a.

Mackenzie, *Defence* *ibid.* p. (22) 21.

^f Fordon. *Scotich. lib.* 5. cap. 43. edit. Goodall. vol. 1. p. 296.

^g See the Additions to Camden. *ibid.* vol. 3. pp. 297-299.

in his place. From whence it is plain that the abbeys of Melrose and Rieval were always distinct from their first foundation, and that Ealredus was never abbot of Melrose. This Ealredus may be called a Scottish historian, for his Lamentation of king David extant both in Fordon and Elphinston; but I can find nothing of his writing relating to the Scottish antiquities. I know he wrote a Chronicon, which Boston of Bury (who calls him Adelredus) saith, “was deduced from Adam to Henry I.,” but if there had been any thing in it to their purpose, those authors who cite a great deal out of it relating to our Saxon kings, would never have omitted what had been much more material to their history.

lvi ^hTurgot is likewise mentioned by ⁱVossius, though a MS. historian; because he saw very good evidence for his writing some part of the Scottish history. He lived, saith the advocate, A. D. 1098. I grant that he is frequently cited by Fordon and Elphinston, for the Acts of Malcolm and Margaret which he wrote; but I can find no more out of him than out of Ealred as to their remote antiquities; although they seem to have left out very little of what Turgot wrote. But I wonder how the advocate came to discover ^jTurgot to have been archbishop of St. Andrew’s; when ^kDempster could have informed him “that there was no archbishop of St. Andrew’s till three hundred years after.” And he might have found in ^lFordon, that

^h See Tanner’s *Bibliotheca*. ib. under his name, and p. iv. of Selden in *Præfat. ad Twysdeni Decem Scriptores*. Nicolson’s *English Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 5. p. 107. *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. chap. 2. p. 21, as it regards the point under consideration, in chap. 3.

p. 39. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 7. §. 3. p. 141.

ⁱ Voss. de *Histor. Latin.* lib. 2. cap. 48. p. 125.

^j Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (35) 36.

^k Dempst. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* 18. n. 1143.

^l Fordon. *Scotch.* l. 6. c. 48. edit. Goodall. vol. 1. p. 366.

there was no archbishop of St. Andrew's till after James Kennedy, who was bishop of St. Andrew's A. D. 1440, and was nephew to James I.; but after his death Patrick Graham first obtained the metropolitan right to the see of St. Andrew's; but it was not quietly enjoyed till his ^m successor, Will. Sheues, came into possession of his place.

But there is in ⁿ Fordon an account of the succession of the bishops of St. Andrew's, from the time of the expulsion of the Picts; which is wholly left out in Elphinston; and there ^o Turgot is said to be consecrated bishop A. D. 1109, and to continue there seven years. St. Andrew's was before called ^p Kilremont, as appears by Fordon, who calls them the bishops of St. Andrew's de Kilremont; Kil, as appears by the Scottish historians, was a place of devotion; Kilruil was the church of Regulus, (as ^q Hector saith St. Andrew's was called in the time of the Picts,) and Kilremont, as being the royal seat and the principal church, for Remont is Mons Regis; and from hence the clergy of this Church were called ^r Killedees, (from which title the fiction of the ancient Culdees came, as the

^m Leslæ. *ibid.* lib. 8. pp. 302. 305. Dempst. *Appar.* lib. 1. p. 63.

ⁿ Fordon. *Scotichron.* lib. 6. cap. 24. ed. Goodall. vol. 1. p. 339. Keith's *Catalogue of the Bishops of Scotland*, p. 3, &c.

^o Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 7. §. 3. p. 141. See ch. 5. p. 255.

^p See Jamieson *ibid.* chap. 7. p. 145, &c. ch. 15. p. 357, &c. In p. 349, Jamieson animadverts upon bishop Stillingfleet's notion as to Kilremont. But see *ibid.* Appendix, p. 383, where Stillingfleet's opinion is supported

from an ancient Scottish manuscript. Camden. *ibid.* p. 703. vol. 3. p. 370. Additions, p. 375.

^q Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 659. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 345, where Boethius is preceded by other authorities.

^r See Lloyd on the Culdees, *ib.* Preface, p. 1. &c. Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 659. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 345. As to the derivation and meaning of the word 'Culdee,' Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 7. p. 138. and Jamieson *ibid.* ch. 1. p. 3. may be consulted, the latter especially.

^s bishop of St. Asaph hath truly observed.) ‘These Killedees had the ancient right of choosing the bishop, and were first excluded, “as Fordon saith, by William Wishart, A. D. 1273, and next by William Fraser, after him by William Lamberton; upon which William Cumyng, ‘Keldeorum præpositus,’ i. e. dean of the Church, appealed to Rome, but was overruled there. But the learned ^x primate of Armagh, following Dempster too much, calls him Auminus; and yet lvii Dempster quotes the Scotichronicon for it, where it is plainly William Cumyng. But that the ^y Killedees were nothing but the dean and chapter of St. Andrew’s, not only appears by their right of election of the bishop, but by the exercise of the jurisdiction in the vacancy of the see, which Fordon saith was in them.

I should not so much have insisted on this mistake of the advocate in making Turgot archbishop of St. Andrew’s, if he had not so severely reflected on the bishop of St. Asaph for making ^z Fordon a monk, as though he did it “merely for his own conveniency to shew him interested for the independency of monks and Culdees from the bishops.” I grant it was a mistake, but not designed, and a very pardonable one; since ^a Dempster saith, “some thought him a monk, and he could not find of what condition he was;” and yet he saith, “he read him;” and ^b Vossius makes

^s Lloyd *ibid.* p. 139. and also p. 141. for other matters here related.

^t Fordon. *Scotich. lib. 6. cap. 42. edit. Goodall. vol. 1. p. 359.*

^u Fordon. *ibid. cap. 43. edit. Goodall. p. 360.*

^x Usser. *de Primord. cap. 15. p. 659. Brit. Eccl. Antiq. p. 346.*

^y Camden. *ibid. vol. 3. p. 287. in the Additions. Lloyd ibid.*

p. 141.

^z Mackenzie *ibid. p. (34) 35. Lloyd ibid. Preface, p. xxvi. and notes there.*

^a Dempst. *Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. n. 543.*

^b Voss. *de Histor. Latin. lib. 2. cap. 56. p. 142. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 670. Brit. Eccl. Antiq. p. 351. See ch. 5. p. 249.*

Joh. de Fordon, a monk in king John's time, author of the *Scotichronicon*.

^cThis book of Fordon, the advocate saith, "was so esteemed, that there were copies of it in most of their monasteries; and," he saith, "^d did agree with their ancient annals;" which I think will appear by the precedent discourse, not to be much to the advantage of his cause.

And so much for the authority of their annals and historians, from the original Druids and bards to Fordon and Elphinston.

Having thus gone through the most material points which I have not distinctly answered in the following book, there remain only some few things which stand in need of being farther cleared. As,

1. ^eThe testimony of Eumenius, in his Panegyric to Constantius, from whence the advocate proves, "^f that in the time of Cæsar there was another nation besides the Piets who then inhabited Britain, and were a colony of the Irish; and these must certainly have been Scots." The question is not, whether there were not, according to Eumenius, Piets and Irish, which the Britons fought with in Cæsar's time, (just as ^g Sidonius Apollinaris saith, "that Cæsar conquered the Piets and Saxons in Britain," which is such another prolepsis as Sirmondus observes, "who makes the coming of the Scots into Britain after the Saxons;" and he was a judicious critic and antiquary;) but thelviii

^c See note ^m. p. xvii. of this Preface.

^d Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (34) 36. *Antiquity* *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 104.

^e Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 5. p. 11. and notes. Camden. *ibid.* p. 85. vol. 1. p. xciii. As to Eumenius, see ch. 4. p. 215. of this work,

and in reference to the place quoted, ch. 5. p. 241.

^f Mackenzie *ibid.* p. 68 (70).

^g *Carm.* 7. v. 90. *inter Oper.* p. 335. *et not.* *et Sirmond. Oper.* tom. 1. col. 1199, 1200. *et not.* See ch. 5. p. 285. and note ^w, and the lines after note ^x.

true question is, whether Eumenius affirms, that those Irish then dwelt in Britain? Yes, saith Buchanan, “^h soli Britanni” are to be understood in “the genitive case,” and so these words relate “to the Picts and Irish of the British soil.” No, saith the ⁱ bishop of St. Asaph, they are to be understood in the “nominative case;” and so they set forth the advantage in Constantius’s victory over a Roman legion above that of Julius Cæsar, who fought only with the Britons, “a rude people and accustomed to no other enemies but Picts and Irish, a half naked people.” The words are thus printed in the late Paris edition, after the comparing of several MSS. by ^k Claudius Puteanus, and therefore more correct than the Plantin edition. “^l Ad hoc natio etiam tunc rudis, et soli Britanni Pictis modo et Hibernis assueta hostibus, adhuc seminudis, facile Romanis armis signisque cesserunt.”

The design of the orator was to lessen the reputation of Cæsar’s victory in comparison of that of Constantius; and to that purpose it was very material to

^h Buch. Rer. Scot. lib. 2. p. 21. 2. Nicolson’s Scottish Historical Library, part 2. chap. 3. p. 38. Goodall’s Introduction to Fordun, *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 9. to the same purpose.

ⁱ Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 5. p. 12.

^k Puteanus’s edition was published at Paris, 1643, those by Plantin, at Antwerp, in 1594. and 1599. The editions at Paris in 1655. and 1676. follow Puteanus.

^l Panegy. Vet. Eumenii Paneg. Constantio Cæsari, n. 11. p. 174. Paris 1676. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 586. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 305. Vide Camden. *ib.* p. 89. vol. 1. p. xcii. note E. p. cxvii. which compare

with Additions, vol. 3. p. 384, and note ^b, p. 727. Pinkerton, in his Enquiry into the History of Scotland, preceding the year 1056, part 3. ch. 1. p. 109, gives this controverted passage from the Panegyrici Veteres, by Schwarzius and Jaeger, at Nuremberg, 1779. tom. 1. p. 289. in iv Eumenii Panegyric. Constantio Cæsari, n. xi. where the words are, “Ad hoc natio etiam tunc rudis, et solis Britanni Pictis modo et Hibernis adueta hostibus, adhuc seminudi, facile Romanis armis signisque cesserunt.” The note upon the place by Schwarz is valuable, and fully agrees with Stillingfleet and Lloyd.

shew, that he fought with the Britons alone, who were themselves “a rude people, and had no other enemies but such as were as rude as themselves, the Picts and Irish.” Now to what great purpose was it for him to say that the Britons fought with the Irish of the British soil? Were they so much better disciplined, and so much more famous among the Romans for deeds of arms than the original Irish, that such an emphasis must be laid upon that? But the advocate saith, “^m the comparison lies in this, that then they had been used only to the Picts and Irish, but Constantius overcame them when they had been long trained up in war.” But if he had been pleased to have read the next paragraph, he would have found the orator taking no notice of the Britons’ greater experience in war, but of “a Roman legion corrupted, foreign soldiers and Gallican merchants drawn out of the provinces to strengthen Carausius and Allectus in their rebellion;” so that the comparison lies between the Britons alone in Cæsar’s time, and the strength of a well disciplined Roman army in the time of Constantius. And it is to be observed, that according to Eumenius’s own manner of speaking, if he were to be understood in Buchanan’s sense, it should have been *“soli Britannici,”* for “the British soil.” For so he hath “*victoria Britannica,*” at the end of the same oration; and in another, “*Britannica trophæa.*” So

^m Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (72.)
73. *Antiquity* *ibid.* chap. 2.
pp. 36—42.

ⁿ Cunningham, in the “*Ad-ditamentum*” to his “*Versiculus unus et alter,*” A. D. 1685, (see Lloyd *ib. c. i. §. 5. p. 12.* and note^z. denies Stillingfleet’s reasoning as to *Britanni*, and the substitution of *Britannici*; and in-

stances the words, *Ambiani, Bel-lovaci, Trigasimi, Langonici,* being employed adjectively; while Claudian expresses himself thus:
...*a Gadibus usque Britannum*
Terruit oceanum.....
...*debellatorque Britanni*
Littoris.....
Mackenzie’s *Antiquity*, chap. 2.
pp. 39. 208.

that neither sense nor grammar do favour Buchanan's construction. But he saith, "° Joseph Scaliger approves Buchanan's construction in his notes on Tibullus." I have searched the place, and can find no such thing; but I am afraid he mistook his own notes; for there Scaliger speaks about the Scoto-Brigantes, and, which is more, he saith, "the Scots were yet in Ireland." And because he is so accustomed to maxims of law, I shall put him in mind of one; "that a witness which a man brings for himself, he is bound to receive against himself."

2. As to P Claudian's expression,

Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne,

he saith, "¶ This is not to be understood of Ireland, but of a country of Scotland of that name, near to which the Romans had a camp, the remainders whereof are still discernible; and in which there are stones found with Roman inscriptions designing the stations of the legions; and Strathern in Scotland is more subject to long frosts than Ireland is."

This I confess is ingeniously observed. But I do not understand what the "Roman inscriptions" prove as to the Scots being in those parts of Britain; if the question were about the Romans, they would be of some use. I do not deny that Strathern had its name from the river Ern, and the country might in Latin be called 'Ierne' from thence. But how doth it appear

° Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. (70.) 72.

¶ De iv. Cons. Honor. v. 33. inter Oper. p. 113. p. 131. et not. *ibid.* et p. 777. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 579. cap. 16. p. 728. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 301. 380. See ch. 5. p. 285. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 4. p. 8. §. 6.

p. 17. Mackenzie's Defence *ib.*

p. 85. Antiquity *ibid.* chap. 2.

p. 15. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 57. 86. 729. vol. 1. pp. lix. xciv. vol. 3. p. 465. with the Additions in vol. 3. pp. 380. 727.

¶ Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.*

p. (85.) 88. Antiquity *ibid.*

ch. 2. pp. 49—54.

that Claudian or the Romans knew it by that name? We are certain that ^rIerne commonly passed for Ireland among them; and that it was then accounted the ^scountry of the Scots; as appears by the express testimony of ^tOrosius, who lived in that age. And ^uDempster, who fixes the Scots in Britain long before, yet is so convinced by these words of Claudian that they were in Ireland, that he supposes them driven thither by Theodosius, and there destroyed by him. And Claudian explains himself elsewhere, when he saith,

x Totam cum Scotus Iernen
Movit, et infesto spumavit remige Tethys. lx

Where it seems ridiculous to say, that “the Scots put all Strathern into commotion;” and ^ythis Ierne had the sea lying between it and Britain, in whose name Claudian speaks; and ^zBuchanan understands this of Ireland.

3. ^aHe urges “the great improbability that the Scots should manage so long a war, for six hundred years, and not settle in Britain.” But this is that

^r For references to Usher, see ch. 4. p. 207. note ^t, &c.

^s See ch. 5. pp. 282, &c. 301. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 4. pp. 7, 8, 9. and notes.

^t Oros. *adv. Paganos Hist.* lib. 1. cap. 2. p. 28. Usher. *de Primord.* cap. 16. p. 728. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 380. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 4. p. 8. See p. lxxvii. for this and other authorities.

^u Dempst. *Appar.* lib. 1. cap. 3. See his confession as to Bede and Isidore; Usher. *de Primord.* cap. 16. p. 737. *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* p. 385.

^x De Laud. *Stilich.* lib. 2. v. 251. *inter Oper.* p. 363. p. 393. et not. *ibid.* et p. 875. Usher.

de Primord. cap. 15. p. 594. cap. 16. p. 728. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* pp. 310. 380. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 4. p. 8. note p. §. 6. p. 19. note ^z. Camden. as in ch. 5. p. 295. note ^h.

^y See Gough's edit. of Camden. *ibid.* vol. 1. p. xciv. and note G.

^z Buchan. *lib.* 2. p. 16.

^a Mackenzie *Defence* *ibid.* pp. (101.103.) 104.107. *Stillingfleet* again refers to this subject, ch. 5. p. 284. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. p. 16, &c. Nicolson, in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 3. p. 38, favours the opinion of Mackenzie, as to the Scots inhabiting Britain, &c.

which is called “begging the question;” for the dispute is how long the Scots in Britain did make war upon the Britons? Claudian saith in his time “the Scots came from Ierne, and made the sea foam with their oars:” ^bGildas saith, “the Irish usually returned home intending to come back, and the Picts then rested for a time in the farthermost parts of the isle.” Why should not Gildas have said, that the Irish and Picts went back to the remote parts of the island, if they both inhabited there at that time?

If Gildas’s authority be allowed in this case, I think it is clear enough to decide the controversy. For, (1.) “Upon ^cMaximus’s withdrawing the Roman legions and British infantry which never returned,” he saith, “the Britons were then first infested with two cruel transmarine nations, the Scots from the ^{cc}south-west, and the Picts from the north.” If there had been “a war of six hundred years from before Julius Cæsar’s time,” as the advocate saith, how comes Gildas to be so extremely mistaken, as to say the first war began after Maximus’s withdrawing the Roman militia? (2.) He still speaks of “^dtheir coming by sea, and carrying away their anniversary prey beyond the seas;” and “trans maria fugaverunt,” saith he, of the Roman forces driving them back. How

^b Gild. Epist. §. 19. p. 17. 2. Hist. Gildæ, §. 19. p. 6. Hist. Gild. §. 21. p. 26. See ch. 5. p. 301. and note ^k. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. pp. 19. 23. Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 608. cap. 16. p. 729. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 319. 381. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 77. 90. vol. 1. pp. lxxxvi. xcvi.

^c Gild. Ep. §. 11. p. 13. 1. ed. Jossel. Hist. Gildæ, §. 11. p. 4. Hist. Gild. §. 14. p. 20, 21, where, in the latter page, see note 1.

under Gentibus. Mackenzie’s Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 2. pp. 34. 208. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 593. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 309. Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 1. §. 6. p. 18. See ch. 5. pp. 242. 284. 295. and notes.

^{cc} Goodall. *Introduct. ibid.* pp. 15-17.

^d Gildæ *ibid.* §. 11. p. 14. 2. Hist. Gildæ, §. 14. p. 5. Hist. Gildæ, §. 17. p. 23.

comes Gildas still to mention the seas, if they then inhabited the same island ?

^e But the advocate saith, “ that by seas the friths are understood ; and that in their old laws the frith of Forth is called ‘ mare Scotiæ,’ ‘ the sea of Scotland ;’ and the frith of Dunbarton is called one part of the ‘ mare Scoticum,’ by the English authors ; and this passage to and fro he makes to be easy, but the other home to Ireland almost impossible with their boats in the Irish seas ;” from whence he saith, “ that the bishop of St. Asaph’s ^f hypothesis is absurd and incredible, but his very consistent.”

To clear this, we may observe, (1.) that to make these friths “ to be called seas not improperly,” he saith, “ ^g they are forty miles broad in some places ;” and so makes the passage more difficult over them than from Ireland to Scotland ; for, as ^h Camden observes, there is hardly thirteen miles’ distance between some part of Scotland and Ireland. But this is to demonstrate the consistency of his own hypothesis, and the absurdity of the bishop’s. (2.) The Irish writers say, “ ⁱ their curroghs or light boats covered with leather were very convenient for transporting an army, though not so proper for a sea-fight. ^k Adamnanus, in the Life of St. Columba, describes one of them in which St. Cormac went to sea, with all the parts of a ship, and with sails and oars, and a capacity for passengers ; and he saith, “ he was out at sea fourteen

^e Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* §. 9. p. 32.
p. (102.) 106. Antiquity *ibid.*

^f Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* §. 9. p. 32.
ch. 2. pp. 27. 202. ⁱ Flaherty Ogyg. part. 3. cap. 34. p. 254. See chap. 5. p. 301.

^g Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* §. 9. p. 32.
p. 105. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. pp. 14. 22.

^h *ibid.* p. (103.) 106. ^k Adamnani de Columba, lib. 2. cap. 29. apud Canisii Antiq. p. 386. See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. Lection. tom. 5. p. 600.

mon to pass between Ireland and Britain with these curroghs." And such kind of vessels covered with leather were not only used by the Britons and Irish, but by the Ethiopians, Egyptians, Sabeans, Romans and Spaniards; as might be shewed from the testimonies of Agatharchides, Strabo, Virgil, ^qPliny and others. How comes it then to be almost impossible for the Irish to pass the seas in such vessels? And wherein lies the absurdity and incredibility of the ^rbishop's hypothesis, when he makes them to cross but thirteen miles from Ireland to Britain in these curroghs, and the advocate allows the friths over which they were to pass to be forty miles broad in some places? And how could they be secure they should not be driven into the broadest places? If these vessels then could convey them safely over the friths, why not as well from Ireland to the nearest parts of Scotland?

But I have another argument from Gildas that the seas cannot be understood of the two friths, viz. that ^sGildas saith, "when the Roman legion first defeated the Picts and the Scots, they commanded a ^twall to be built between the two seas to hinder their incursion:" which is confirmed by ^uBede, who saith, "this wall began at Penneltun, not far from Abercorny, and ended at ^xAlcluith, and was designed to keep out their enemies." Now I desire to know to what pur-

^q Usser. *ibid.* Camden. *ibid.*

^r See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 9. p. 32.

^s Gild. *Epist.* §. 13. p. 13. 2. §. 12. p. 4. §. 15. p. 21. Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 601. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 313. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. p. 20.

^t As to the Roman walls, see p. lxxviii. chap. 2. p. 60. chap. 5.

p. 242. and notes g, h. p. 298.

Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 1. §. 2. p. 3. §. 6. pp. 20. 22.

^u Bedæ *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 1. cap. 12. p. 50. Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 15. p. 602. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 314. Lloyd *ibid.*

^x See ch. 5. p. 298. note f.

pose this wall was built between the “two friths to keep out the Scots and Picts,” if their custom was, as the advocate supposes, to cross over the “two friths,” and to land on this side the wall? Did the Romans and Britons so little understand the way of their enemies’ coming, to put themselves to so much pains and trouble for no purpose at all? And ^yBuchanan thinks, “the last stone wall made by the Romans for the security of the Britons,” mentioned by Gildas and Bede, was made in the same place where he thinks
 lxiii “Severus’s wall stood before.” And it had been madness to erect a stone wall there to keep out the Scots and Picts, if they came out of Scotland over the two friths, and landed where the wall could do the Britons no service. But Gildas and Bede say, “they attempted the wall and forced themselves” a passage over it; “irrupunt terminos,” saith Bede; and “^z with their iron hooks drew the Britons from the wall,” saith Gildas. What need all this, if they came over the friths, and so left the wall between the “two friths” behind them? But from hence it is very plain, that Gildas knew nothing of their passing the friths, and therefore must be understood of their crossing the seas from Ireland to Scotland, and there joining with the Picts, and so marching towards the wall between the “two friths,” in order to their passing into the Roman province. And it is observable, that ^aGildas saith, after the making the second wall, “the Scots

^y Buchan. lib. 5. p. 40. 2. p. 607. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 318. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 6. p. 23. Camden. *ibid.* as in note ^y, ch. 5. p. 299.
 Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 605. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 315. Gildæ *ibid.* §. 14. p. 15. 1. Gild. Hist. §. 14. p. 5. Hist. Gildæ, §. 18. p. 24. Bed. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. p. 50.
^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 606. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 318. Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 1. §. 6. p. 23.

and Picts upon the Romans' withdrawing grew more confident, and took possession of the northern part of the island as far as the wall, 'pro indigenis,' in the place of the natives;" which shews that he looked on them as late comers, and then newly entered into possession there.

The last thing I shall take notice of is concerning the early ^b conversion of the Scottish nation to the Christian faith. And here I am particularly concerned to answer his arguments, since in the ^c following book I have rejected the tradition of the Scots' conversion under king Donald, and assert Palladius to have been sent to the original Scots in Ireland. ^d But the advocate thinks it so clear "that they were converted before A. D. 503, that from thence he concludes that they were settled in Scotland before that time." And it were a piece of very illnature to deny this conclusion, if the premises be well proved.

(1.) As to the conversion under king Donald; he shews,

1. " ^e That it is very probable the British Christians being persecuted by the Roman emperors in the southern parts, would go into the northern and propagate their religion there." But this proves only the probability of the conversion of the northern Britons, and not of the Scots.

2. ^f He saith, "the Druids were prepared to receive ^{xiv} Christianity, and so would be easy to be converted

^b See p. xi. of this Preface; also ch. 2. p. 51, &c. ch. 5. p. 259. and compare therewith *Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 612, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 321. Lloyd ibid. Preface, pp. xxx. xli. &c. ch. 2. §. 3. p. 50, &c. ch. 4. §. 1. p. 82, &c.*

^c Chap. 2. p. 52.

^d Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (112.) 116.

^e *Ibid.* p. (113.) 117.

^f *Ibid.* p. (114.) 118. which compare with note ^h following, in complete denial of this assertion.

themselves and ready to convert the people." He speaks soon after of a double ^g conversion of their nation from paganism and Pelagianism. Methinks these words do not argue the latter conversion to have been such, as to have left no dregs behind it. For how came the Druids' natural improvements to facilitate their conversion more than the philosophers' at Athens or Rome? ^h And the Irish antiquaries say the Druids there "were the great opposers of the gospel." But still these Druids might be among the Britons and not the Scots.

3. He saith, " ⁱ That Donald was their first Christian king, A. D. 203, seems most fully proved." Not by any thing yet said. But what then is the full proof? In short it is this. "It was a matter of fact." Very true. "Matters of fact must be proved by witnesses." True again. But who are these witnesses? Even "the historians of their country, and the annals of their monasteries." And so we are thrown back upon the debate of their authority, which I have gone through already. Let it therefore rest upon their credibility; only remembering that no such king as Donald doth appear in their most ancient genealogies.

4. He affirms, " ^k That Baronius allows their conversion by pope Victor, and he made ecclesiastic history more his task than the bishop of St. Asaph, and was more disinterested." It is possible the bishop of St. Asaph may have considered ecclesiastic history with as much care as Baronius himself; but I dare say, with greater judgment and impartiality. And of all things I cannot but wonder at the advocate's looking on Baro-

^g Ibid. p. (117.) 121.

^h Flaherty Ogyg. p. 203. contrary to note ^f, above.

ⁱ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (118.)

122.

^k Ibid. p. (115.) 119, compared with Baron. *Annal. Eccles.* A. D. 429. n. 4, 5.

nius as ‘ more disinterested,’ when the conversion from a pope was in question. Which shews him to be such a stranger to Baronius, that one would think he had never looked into him. For ^lDempster is displeas’d with Baronius, as “ one injurious to their nation, as to this first conversion,” saying “ that there were no Christians in Scotland before Palladius but such as fled thither out of this part of Britain because of persecution.” And ^mBaronius doth wonder that such a conversion “ should be omitted not only by Bede but by Marianus Scotus.”

5. “ The Magdeburgian Centuries,” he saith, “ ⁿ agree ^{lxv} with Baronius ; and these are the standards of ecclesiastic history to the professors of both religions.” He had as good have said they were the Hercules pillars and there is no passage beyond them. But ^ono learned professors of either religion allow these to be standards. How many errors in Baronius have been discovered by the learned antiquaries of his own communion ? What complaints have been made of his partiality to the court of Rome, not only by the Sorbonists but by the king’s advocates in France ? And as to the Magdeburgians, we commend them for their noble attempt and great diligence and industry ; but matters of ecclesiastic antiquity are extremely improved since that time. More ancient authors having been published out of MSS. and better editions by comparing the authors before printed with MSS., and many counterfeit authors discovered and far greater inquiries have been made

^l Dempst. Appar. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 22. See c. 2. p. 52. Vide Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 613. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 322.

^m Baron. ibid. A.D. 429. n. 2. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 615. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. ibid.

ⁿ Mackenzie ibid. p. (117) 121. Antiquity, c. 2. p. 55.

^o Vide Spanhem. Oper. tom. 1. Hist. Eccles. c. 2. col. 513–518. Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles. Mayer. Eclog. de Fide Baronii, &c. passim.

into all parts of ecclesiastic antiquities ; so that after so many new discoveries to make these the standards, were almost as absurd as to make Ptolemy the standard for modern geography. We do not disparage what he hath done, when we say many things have been found out since his time.

(2.) ^p As to the mission of ^q Palladius into Scotland, the advocate insists on these three things: 1. " That Bede affirms that he was sent to the Scots in Britain ;" 2. " That there is no probability in the ^r circumstances of his being sent into Ireland ;" 3. " That ^s Dr. Hammond yields that the ^t Scots were converted before Celestine's time ; and therefore it is more probable that Palladius was sent bishop to them."

To these particulars I shall give a distinct answer.

1. To ^u Bede's testimony, he affirms, " That in the eighth of Theodosius the younger, Palladius was sent by Celestine the first bishop to the Scots believing in Christ." Wherein Bede only applies Prosper's words to the eighth of Theodosius, which he had placed under Bassus and Antiochus consuls ; but he doth not determine whether these Scots were in Ireland or in Britain. But the advocate saith, " all that which Bede saith before and after concerning the Scots relates to the Scots in Britain, and therefore these words are so to be understood." Whereas ^x Bede in the very beginning de-

^p See ch. 2. p. 52, &c. Lloyd
ibid. ch. 2. §. 4. p. 51, &c.

^q Mackenzie, Defence ibid. p.
(114) 118. Antiquity ibid. c. 2.
p. 57, as it regards this and the
following notes, which compare
with Stillingfleet's reasoning in
p. lxxi.

^r Mackenzie's Defence ibid.
p. (119) 123.

^s See p. lxxi.

^t Mackenzie ibid. p. (122)
126.

^u Bed. ibid. l. i. c. 13. p. 51.
See ch. 2. pp. 52, 53, and note z.
in the latter page.

^x Bed. ibid. lib. i. c. i. p. 42.
See ch. 5. p. 282. on this sub-
ject. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.
pp. 579. 587. 593. 611. 615. 721,
&c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp.
301. 306. 309. 322. 377, &c.

clares, "that Ireland was the proper country of the Scots, and that Dunbarton frith did anciently separate the Piets and the Britons; but the Scots coming afterwards to the northern part of that frith, there settled themselves." Which words do evidently prove that Bede did not look on the Scots as ancient inhabitants there; for then he would have said that the frith did "y antiquitus gentem Britonum a Scotis secernere;" but he never mentions the Scots but the Piets as the 'ancient inhabitants' on the northern part of the frith. But, saith the advocate, z Bede's title of his chapter is "Of the ancient inhabitants of Britain, and he mentions the Scots among them." Very true; but shall not Bede explain himself whom he means by 'the ancient inhabitants,' viz. the Britons and Piets? For by the advocate's reasoning the Saxons will be proved to have been in Britain before Julius Cæsar, as well as the Scots; for they make up one of the five nations spoken of in that first chapter. And so Bede doth not only "settle the Scots and the Piets in this country, by his first chapter," but the English too. And it is an extraordinary sagacity that can discover this chapter in Bede, to be "a clear to a demonstration" that "he makes the Scots to be ancient inhabitants in Britain;" whereas to my dull apprehension Bede is clear the other way.

But the advocate proceeds to shew, "b that the name of Scots doth originally belong to the Scots in Britain, and only by way of communication to those in Ireland."

y See the exact words of Bede, Usser. de Primord. Addend. p. 1022. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. c. 15. p. 306.

z Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (60) 61.

a Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (65) 67. Antiquity *ibid.* c. 2. pp. 19. 201.

compared with the preceding and succeeding ones. See c. 5. p. 285, and note s.

b Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* p. (146) 156. 158, compared with his Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 183.

This were indeed to the purpose if it were proved. And there ought to be the more care in doing it, since it is so new and singular an opinion. For even ^c Buchanan saith “ that the Irish were at first called Scots; and from thence they passed into Albany; ^d and that by the name Scots their coming from the Irish is declared.” Joh. Major saith, “ ^e that Scotia among their ancestors was the common name for Ireland.” And if their ancient annals may be believed, the name of Scot came from ^f *Scota* the wife of *Gathelus*, whose posterity went first into Ireland, and then carried the name into Scotland. In *Fordon* and *Elphinston* there is another ^g *Scota* mentioned, as a leader of the first colony into Ireland, lxvii who gave the name to that country of *Scotia*; and ^h Joh. Major saith “ she was the mother of *Hiber*.” But whichsoever of these stands, unless the advocate will at last give up the cause of their ancient annals, which he hath contended so warmly for, he must renounce this opinion of his, “ that the name of Scots doth originally belong to the *Albion Scots*, and only by way of communication to the *Irish* ;” so that there is no need to produce the plain testimonies of ⁱ *Orosius*, *Bede* and *Isidore*, which make Ireland “ the proper country of the Scots.” But it is a wonderful subtilty from hence to infer, as ^k the advocate doth, “ as if it might have been justly doubted, and were not true in

^c Buchanan. *ibid.* l. 2. p. 16.

^d *Ibid.* p. 18. 2. *Usser. de Primord.* cap. 16. p. 733. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 383.

^e Major. *Hist. Scot.* l. 1. c. 9. fol. 17. 1. See ch. 5. p. 252, and note *v*.

^f See note *a*, c. 5. p. 252.

^g See c. 5. p. 250. note *c*.

^h See c. 5. p. 252.

ⁱ *Oros.* l. 1. c. 2. p. 28. See

p. lix. and note *t*. *Camden. ibid.*

p. 86. vol. 1. p. xciv. for these authorities. *Bed. lib.* 1. c. 1.

p. 42. *Isidor. Orig.* l. 14. c. 6.

inter *Oper.* p. 123. col. 2. *Usser. de Primord.* cap. 16. p. 728.

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 380. See pp. lix. lxvi, &c.

^k *Mackenzie's Defence* *ibid.* p. (151.) 162.

all senses." Doth he mean proper or improper senses? Their words are plain that Ireland in a strict and proper sense was the country of the Scots, i. e. the "*patria originis*," though the other might afterwards be "*patria incolatus et domicilii*;" ¹ as the advocate himself doth distinguish; but that which follows from hence is, that if the Scots came originally from Ireland, then the name of Scots doth not originally belong to the Scots in Britain but to those in Ireland, unless he can shew that the reason of the name doth agree to them only upon their removal into Britain. As, to take his own instance; no one will question that the colony of Virginia are called English, because the inhabitants of the country from whence they came are so called. But were not the Irish called Scots before they went into Scotland? If not, that could not be "*proprie Scotorum patria*," as Orosius and Bede and Isidore affirm; as England could not be said to be the proper country of the English unless the inhabitants were called English; and the colony of Virginia received its denomination of being English because they came from hence. Unless therefore the advocate be pleased to shew, that the name of Scots doth so belong to the Irish upon their remove into Britain that it could not agree to them in Ireland, it will be impossible for him to make out, that the name of Scots doth originally belong to the Irish in Britain, and only by way of communication to those in Ireland. I have already shewed that ^m Jos. Scaliger doth assign such a reason of the name of Scoti as agrees only to those who came over upon expeditions; but I believe the Scots will take it far better to receive their ^{lxviii} name from the Irish Scots, than to have had the original name given them on such an account.

¹ Ibid. p. (152) 163.

^m See p. xxiv.

2. As to the circumstances of Palladius's mission the main difficulty objected ⁿ is "from St. Patrick's being sent so soon after into Ireland; which needed not have been if Palladius were sent before thither and not rather into Scotland, whither Bale saith he went and died, not A. D. 431, but 434." This is the force of what the advocate saith upon this matter. But the ^o bishop of St. Asaph had proved from Prosper, that Palladius was sent to the Scots in Ireland; because he distinguishes the two islands, the one he calls "Roman," i.e. Britain, the other "barbarous" where the Scots lived, to whom Palladius was sent, which could be no other than Ireland. To which the advocate answers, "^p that the northern part of Britain was by ^q Tacitus and Bede said to be reduced into an island by the Roman wall from sea to sea; and Bede in other places calls the Scots Islanders." ^r Tacitus indeed saith, that by Agricola's fortifications between the two friths, "the Britons were driven as into another island," but this is a very different way of speaking from that of Prosper, who makes a distinction between "two proper islands." And Prosper could not be ignorant that ^s Festus Avienus not long before, viz. in the time of Theodosius, had distinguished the two islands, the one inhabited by the Hiberni, and the other he calls "^t insula Albionum," which takes in all that we now call Britain. But according to

ⁿ Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (119) 123.

^o Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 4. p. 52, &c. and note ^d, p. 51, &c.

^p Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (116) 120.

^q P. lxii. and note ^t, for the authorities quoted by Usher and Lloyd.

^r Chap. 1. p. 33. notes ^a and ^b, for place in Tacitus.

^s See the place here quoted, ch. 5. p. 267. and note ^a; also Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 723. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 378. Camden. Brit. pp. 25. 728. vol. 1. p. xxiv. and note P. vol. 3. p. 465.

^t See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 3. p. 7. and notes ^r, ^s, and Stillingfleet *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 267.

the old geographers, Ireland was accounted one of the British islands; as appears by the testimonies of Pliny, Apuleius, ^u Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus and Marcianus Heracleota, ^x which have been produced by others, and need not to be repeated here. But no one ever mentioned Scotland as a distinct island, and therefore it is unreasonable to understand Prosper in that sense. ^y Bede mentions the “insulani” in the chapter referred to; but nothing can be plainer, than that he speaks of “the Britons on this side the wall; ^z who raised up the wall of turf between the two friths for their own security against their enemies beyond the wall.” In the other place of ^a Bede, the “insulani” are to be understood of those of Ireland, as Bede clearly expresseth himself, “misso in Hiberniam exercitu.” But the ingenious ^{lxix} advocate hath a fetch beyond this, for he saith “that Bede by Ireland meant Scotland,” which he sets himself to prove from this very passage. For, saith he, “^{aa} the same thing that is first said to be done in ^b Hibernia is afterwards said to be done in Scotia.” And might it not be so if Ireland were then called Scotia, as appears by the former testimonies? But that Bede

^u For “an Essay on Ptolemy’s Geography, so far as it relates to Britain,” see Horsley’s *Britannia Romana*, b. 3. c. 1. p. 356.

^x Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 722, &c. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 377, &c. *Waræi de Hibern. et Antiq. Disquisit.* cap. 1. p. 1. *Camden. ibid.* pp. 726. 728. vol. 3. pp. 463. 465, compared with p. 111. vol. 1. p. cxxviii.

^y *Bed. Hist. Eccles.* l. 1. c. 12. p. 50. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 601. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 314. See p. lxii.

^z See ch. 5. p. 297. note ^c.

^a *Bed. ibid.* l. 4. c. 26. p. 174. Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 730. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 381.

^{aa} Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (153) 165, and his *Antiquity ibid.* ch. 5. p. 184.

^b Nicolson, in his *Scottish Historical Library*, part 2. ch. 3. p. 38, and note 11, notices this passage; Smith, in his edition of *Bede*, note 23. p. 174. on b. 4. c. 26, agrees with *Stillingfleet* as above, which is opposed to *Sibbald* in *Camden. ibid.* *Additions*, vol. 3. p. 728. *Gibson’s Camden. ibid.* under *Thule*.

could not mean any other than Ireland appears from hence, that he saith, “ the nation which Egfred invaded had been always kind to the English ;” and the Irish annals ^c give an account of the very place and time of Egfred’s landing in Ireland and the captives he carried away from thence. But ^d Bede elsewhere saith the Scots in Britain had been great enemies to them, as appeared by the battle at Degsastan, where the whole army of the Scots was almost cut off by Edilfredus king of Northumberland, and their king Edan fled ; from which time none of the kings of Scotland durst appear in the field against the English. Which argues no great kindness between them ; but ^e Bede saith, that these had been “ nationi Anglorum gens super amicissima ;” and therefore his words must relate to the Scots in Ireland.

“ But doth not Bede say, that ^f Columbanus came from Ireland to Hy, and so to Britain ; and afterwards that Colman returned to Scotland, i. e. to Hy, from whence Columba came ? therefore Scotland was called Ireland ;” or rather, ^g Ireland was called Scotia ; which is so clear in Bede, that I wonder that any that carefully read him can dispute it. He saith indeed, “ that the Scots had a kingdom in Britain,” but where he speaks of the religion of the Scots he then means the Scots of Ireland ; as will easily appear by the series of

^c Flaherty Ogyg. p. 230. Smith’s note on Bede *ibid.* p. 174, as in note ^b, above.

^d Bed. *ibid.* l. 1. c. 34. p. 74. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 710. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 371. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 10. p. 37. See the Saxon Chronicle, p. 28, and Appendix, p. 376. Ingram’s edition. See ch. 5. p. 282. which compare with Mackenzie’s

Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 4. pp. 128. 211.

^e Bed. *ibid.* lib. 4. c. 26, and Usher, as in last page.

^f Mackenzie’s Defence *ibid.* p. 155. (166.)

^g Camden. *ibid.* pp. 86. 727. vol. 1. p. xciv. vol. 3. p. 464. Mackenzie’s Antiquity *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 191.

his discourse. When ^h he speaks of Laurentius's care not only of the Britons but of the Scots too, he explains himself to mean those who lived in Ireland, an island near to Britain. ⁱ Columba, he saith, came from Ireland to convert the Northern Picts, and obtained from their king the island Hy, ^k where he founded his monastery, which he saith "was the chief of all the Northern Scots," not of those in Scotland but in Ireland. For in the same chapter he distinguisheth "the Scots in the southern parts of Ireland," from those in the northern; the former following the ^l Roman custom ^{lxx} of Easter, and the northern refusing it. From these Aidanus came, the first Scottish bishop who settled among the English, being sent for ^m by king Oswald. Furseus, saith ⁿ he afterwards, "came from ^o Ireland, being of the most noble race of the Scots;" and there he mentions "the Scots of his own nation," and saith "he had preached a great while in Scotia before he came into England;" but he never takes notice, after his

^h Bed. *ibid.* lib. 2. c. 4. p. 82. Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 719. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 381. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 1. §. 4. p. 9.

ⁱ Bed. *ibid.* l. 3. c. 4. p. 106. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. pp. 687. 691. 700. cap. 16. p. 730. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 359. 362. 366. 381. 382. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 84. 707. 848. vol. 1. p. xciii. vol. 3. pp. 387. 714. Additions, pp. 388. 712. 714. See p. xlii. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 6. p. 63. §. 8. p. 70. ch. 7. §. 10. p. 172, &c. Mackenzie *ibid.* ch. 5. p. 188.

^k Bed. *ibid.* c. 3. p. 106. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. pp. 700. 703. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 366, 367.

^l Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.

p. 700. cap. 16. p. 934, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 366. 484, &c. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 8. p. 70. Stillingfleet's "Answer to Mr. Cressy's Epistle Apologetical;" vol. 5. p. 684, where also concerning Aidan, and others, p. 683. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 5. §. 4. p. 103. ch. 6. §. 4. p. 117.

^m Bed. *ib.* c. 3. 5. p. 107. Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 697. c. 17. p. 919. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 365. 476. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 5. §. 4. p. 104. §. 5. p. 105. Camden. *ibid.* p. 851. vol. 3. p. 744. Additions, p. 745. See Mackenzie *ibid.* c. 5. p. 190.

ⁿ Bed. *ibid.* c. 19. p. 122. Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 730. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 381.

^o See note x, p. lxvi.

coming over, of his being any where but among the Britons before he went to the East Angles. ^p After Aidan's death Finan came from the same Scots, who persisted in the old way of the keeping Easter; after Finan, Colman succeeded, who was "missus a Scotia," who maintained the same practice; and afterwards he returned home, "^q in Scotiam regressus est;" but what he means by it Bede presently informs us, when he saith "that ^rTuda succeeded who had been brought up among the Southern Scots," i. e. in the southern parts of Ireland. Tuda died of the plague, which Bede saith passed into Ireland, ^s whither many English went in the time of Finan and Colman, who were all kindly received by the Scots. When Colman returned, ^t Bede saith "he went first to Hy, then to an island on the west of Ireland;" but not a word of the northern parts of Britain. Afterwards ^u he sheweth how the greatest part of the Scots in Ireland were brought to compliance in the point of keeping Easter by means of Adamnanus, who endeavoured to reduce those of Hy but could not; but upon Egbert's coming to them from Ireland, ^x the Scottish monks of the island Hy or Iona yielded, when Duumchadus was abbot there. And now let any indifferent reader

^p Bed. *ibid.* cap. 25. p. 131. Usser. de Primord. Addend. p. 1036. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. c. 15. p. 365. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 5. §. 6. p. 107, and note z.

^q Bed. *ibid.* c. 26. p. 134. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 964. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 499. Lloyd *ibid.* §. 7. p. 109.

^r Lloyd *ibid.* §. 8. p. 110.

^s Bed. *ibid.* c. 27. p. 136. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 948. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 491. See Mackenzie *ibid.* c. 5. p. 186.

^t Bed. *ibid.* lib. 4. c. 4. p. 146. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 964. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 499. Lloyd *ibid.* p. 110. Camden. *ibid.* p. 757. vol. 3. pp. 580. 585, and Additions, p. 581.

^u Bed. *ibid.* l. 5. c. (16.) 15. p. 200. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 700. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 366.

^x Bed. *ibid.* c. (23.) 22. p. 217. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 700. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 366. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 8. p. 70. ch. 5. §. 8. p. 110, as to Easter.

judge whether by Scotia Bede understands the northern parts of Britain or Ireland.

“ But after all, doth not Bede say, ^y that the island Hy did belong to Britain as a part of it?” And what then follows? Doth not Bede in the same place say it was given by the ^z Picts, not by the Scots, to the Scottish monks who came from Ireland? So that upon the whole matter, that which Bede understands by Scotia seems to be Ireland, although he affirms the Scots to have settled in the northern parts of Britain, and to have set up a kingdom there.

From whence there appears no probability of Palladius's being sent to the Scots in Britain; Bede saying nothing of their conversion, when ^a he so punctually sets down the conversion of the South Picts by ^b Ninias a British bishop, and of the Northern Picts by Columba, a Scottish or Irish presbyter.

“ But if Palladius were sent to the Scots in Ireland, how came St. Patrick to be sent so soon after him?” To this the ^cbishop of St. Asaph answers, that Palladius might die so soon after his mission that pope Celestine might have time enough to send St. Patrick before his own death. And this he makes out by laying the several circumstances of the story together, as they are reported by authors, which the advocate calls “ ^da laborious hypothesis, and elaborate contrivance to divert all the unanswerable authorities proving that Palladius was sent to them in Scotland, A. D. 431.” What those ‘ unanswerable authorities’ are, which prove Palladius

^y Mackenzie's Defence *ibid.* §. 2. p. 50. §. 6. p. 63, &c. See p. (156) 168. ch. 5. p. 363.

^z See note ⁱ, in the last page.

^b See c. 5. p. 363, and note ^t.

^a Bed. *ibid.* l. 3. c. 4. p. 106.

^c Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 2. §. 4. p. 58,

Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. pp. 661. 687. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.

&c.

pp. 347. 359. Lloyd *ibid.* c. 2.

^d Mackenzie *ibid.* pp. (120. 122.) 123. 125.

sent to the Scots in Britain, I cannot find. And for all that I see by this answer, the only fault of the bishop's hypothesis is, that it is too exact, and doth too much clear the appearance of contradiction between the two missions.

3. As to ^e Dr. Hammond's testimony, (who is deservedly called by the advocate " ^f a learned and episcopal English divine,") it is very easily answered. For, 1. ^g He looks on the whole story of the " Scots' conversion as very uncertainly set down by authors." 2. He saith, " that Bozsius applies the conversion under Victor to Ireland, then called Scotia;" for which he quotes Bede. 3. That neither Marianus Scotus nor Bede do take the least notice of it. 4. That if Prosper's words be understood of the Scots in Britain, yet they do not prove the thing designed by his adversaries, viz. that the Churches there were governed by presbyters without bishops; for Prosper supposes that they remained barbarous still, and therefore the plantation was very imperfect, and could not be understood of any formed Churches. But the advocate very wisely conceals one passage which overthrows his hypothesis, viz. " that they could not be supposed to receive the first rudiments of their conversion from Rome, viz. under pope Victor, since the Scots joined with the Britons in rejecting the Roman customs." From whence we see lxxii that Dr. Hammond was far from being of the advocate's mind in this matter; and what he proposes as to some rudiments of Christianity in Scotland before Palladius's coming thither, was only from an uncertain tradition, and for reconciling the seeming differences between

^e See p. lxxv.

^f Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (122) 125, and in the letter prefixed, p. 4.

^g Hammond's *Vindication of the Dissertation about Episcopacy*, p. 160, &c. in his *Works*, vol. 2. p. 53.

Bede and Prosper; or rather for reconciling Prosper to himself.

But I remember the advocate's ^h observation in the case of their predecessor's apology against Edward I., viz. "that they designed, as most pleaders do, to gain their point at any rate;" and how far this eloquent advocate hath made good this observation through his discourse I leave the reader to determine.

ⁱ Having thus gone through all the material parts of the advocate's book, I shall conclude with a serious protestation that no pique or animosity led me to this undertaking, no ill will to the Scottish nation, much less to the royal line, (which I do believe hath the advantage in point of antiquity above any other in Europe, and, as far as we know, in the world.) But I thought it necessary for me to inquire more strictly into this defence of such pretended antiquities; both because ^k I owed so much service to so worthy and excellent a friend as the bishop of St. Asaph, and because if the advocate's arguments would hold good they would overthrow several things I had asserted in the following book; and withal I was willing to let the learned nobility and gentry of that nation see how much they have been imposed upon by Hector Boethius and his followers; and that the true honour and wisdom of their nation is not concerned in defending such ^lantiquities, which are universally disesteemed among all judicious and inquisitive men. And it would far better become persons of so much ingenuity and sagacity, to follow the examples of other European nations, in rejecting the

^h Mackenzie *ibid.* p. (135) *ibid.* c. 1. p. 11.
143.

^l Mackenzie *ibid.* c. 5. p. 194,
is highly displeas'd with this
observation.

ⁱ See ch. 5. p. 286.

^k See Mackenzie's *Antiquity*

romantic fables of the monkish times, and at last to settle their antiquities on firm and solid foundations.

^m As to the following book, it comes forth as a specimen of a greater design, (if God gives me life and opportunity,) which is, to clear the most important difficulties of ecclesiastical history. And because I look on a general Church history as too heavy a burden to be undergone by any man, when he is fit for it by age and
 lxxiii consideration, I have therefore thought it the better way to undertake such particular parts of it which may be most useful, and I have now begun with these Antiquities of the British Churches; which may be followed by others as I see occasion. But I hope none will have just cause to complain that I have not used diligence or faithfulness enough in this present work; or that I have set up fancies and chimeras of my own instead of the true antiquities of the British Churches. I have neither neglected nor transcribed those who have written before me; and if in some things I differ from them, it was not out of the humour of opposing any great names, but because I intended not to deliver other men's judgments, but my own.

^m See this Preface, p. i.

THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF THE
BRITISH CHURCHES.



THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF THE
BRITISH CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

OF THE FIRST PLANTING A CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN BRITAIN
BY ST. PAUL.

No Christian Church planted in Britain during the reign of Tiberius.—Gildas's words misunderstood.—The tradition concerning Joseph of Arimathæa and his brethren coming to Glastonbury, at large examined.—No footsteps of it in the British times.—The pretended testimonies of British writers disproved.—St. Patrick's epistle a forgery.—Of the Saxon charters, especially the large one of king Ina.—The antiquity of seals in England.—Ingulphus's testimony explained.—All the Saxon charters suspicious, till the end of the seventh century.—The occasion of this tradition, from an old British Church there.—The circumstances about Joseph of Arimathæa and Arviragus very improbable.—Sir Henry Spelman vindicated.—The state of the Roman province in Britain ² about that time.—No such king as Arviragus then.—Not the same with Caractacus.—A Christian Church proved to be planted here in the apostles' times.—The authentic testimonies of Eusebius, Theodoret, and Clemens Romanus, to that purpose.—St. Paul, in probability, the first founder of a Church here.—The time and opportunity he had for it after his release.—Of Pomponia Græcina, and Claudia Rufina, Christians at Rome, and their influence on his coming hither.—St. Peter and St. Paul compared, as to their preaching here, and the far greater probability of St. Paul's.

IT is an opinion generally received among our later writers, as ^a one of them tells the world, “that the conversion of the British nation to the Christian faith

^a Animadv. on the Church Hist. of Britain, pp. 5, 6. (Heylin's Examen Historicum.)

was performed towards the latter end of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar," i. e. about thirty-seven years after Christ's nativity. But whosoever compares the circumstances of those times, and considers the small number of the years between our Saviour's passion and the death of Tiberius, will find very little probability of the founding a Christian church so soon, in a place so remote as Britain.

To make this appear, I shall not insist upon the testimony of Apollonius in ^b Eusebius, concerning the ancient tradition, "that our Saviour commanded his apostles not to depart from Jerusalem within twelve years after his ascension;" nor on that of the ^c Alexandrian Chronicle, wherein it is said, "that the apostles did not separate till after the council at Jerusalem;" nor on that of Hippolytus Thebanus in ^d Glycas, and of Euodius in ^e Nicephorus, who reckon the martyrdom of St. Stephen "to be seven years after Christ's resurrection" (which some learned ^f chronologers think more probable than the common computation, which allows but one); before which time it is not pretended by any that the disciples were dispersed abroad.

3 But that which is of greater force and certainty, is, supposing the dispersion to have been within the reign of Tiberius, yet the scripture gives such an account of the extent and design of the disciples' preaching upon it, as utterly overthrows any probability of their coming hither, for the words are, "g Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word unto none but unto

^b Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 18, et not. ^a p. 236.

^c Chronic. Alex. p. 550.

^d Glyc. Annal. par. 3. p. 227.

^e Niceph. cap. 3. p. 134.

^f Jac. Cappell. Histor. Eccles. cent. 1. A.D. 38. p. 20.

^g Acts xi. 19.

the Jews alone." But the nearest of these places is at a great distance from Britain, and if they preached to none but to the Jews, they were not likely to convert the Gentile Britons. ^h Baronius grants, A. D. 35, "that hitherto the Jews had only the gospel preached to them;" although, at the same time, he pleads for the tradition of "Lazarus, Mary Magdalen, Martha and Marcella, coming then with Maximinus in a ship without oars to Marseilles," with a design, no doubt, to spread the gospel among the Gentiles in Gaul; for ⁱ Lazarus is supposed to have been bishop of Marseilles, and Maximinus of Aix. And he adds, out of a manuscript in the Vatican library (which not only, like the householder in the gospel, "brings forth things new and old," but sometimes things new for old, as happens in the case of this manuscript, it being lately written, as ^k archbishop Usher hath observed), "that Joseph of Arimathæa did bear them company, and came over into Britain, to preach the gospel;" which, according to his own supposition, must be only to the Jews in Britain, if there were any here. But if it be understood of the Gentiles, ^l Jac. Sirmondus saith, in plain terms, "this tradition contradicts the Scripture; for," saith he, "if the people of Marseilles (or Britain) had the gospel preached to them so soon, how comes it to pass that, six years after, Cornelius is said to be the first-fruits of the Gentiles? and that, upon the encouragement of his example, those of the dispersion began to preach to the Gentiles at Antioch?" which

^h Baron. Annal. Eccles. A. D. 35. n. 5. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 14. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 8. Basnag. Exercit. A. D. 35. n. 3. pp. 13—26.

ⁱ Bosquet. Hist. Eccles. Gallic.

lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 14. Usser. ibid.

^k Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 15. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 8.

^l Sirmond. de duobus Dionys. cap. 1. p. 7.

is confessed by ^m Baronius himself. The strength of which argument hath prevailed so much in France, “that the ⁿ defenders of this tradition have been there contented to let go the reign of Tiberius, and to place
4 it a great deal later, A.D. 62^o.” For they evidently saw there was no possibility of defending it upon other terms, although hereby they make Lazarus and Joseph of Arimathæa of great age when they undertook this voyage with their companions. But when such a tradition is either wholly rejected there, as disagreeing to the Scripture, or set so much later, on purpose to reconcile it with the Acts of the Apostles, it cannot but seem strange among us, that there should be such an opinion still so generally received, “that the gospel should be here preached before the end of the reign of Tiberius.”

But that which hath misled most of our writers, hath been a passage in Gildas, which they have applied to the particular preaching of the gospel in Britain, whereas it seems only to be understood of the general liberty of preaching it throughout the world, as will best appear by considering, not barely the words, but the circumstances of them. ^p Gildas, having undertaken to give some account of the ancient British church in the beginning of his epistle, in the first place, sadly laments the want of any domestic monuments, to give him certain information. “For,” saith he, “if there were any such, they were either burnt by

^m Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 41. p. 180.

ⁿ 13.

ⁿ V. Launoii *Opusc. de Lazaro, &c.* p. 348. in *Oper.* tom. 2. part. 1. p. 316.

^o *Natal. Alex. Hist. Eccles. sæc. 1. part. 2. p. 80. tom. 3. sæc. 1. dissert. xvii. proposit. 1.*

^p *Gild. Epist.* p. 7. ed. Josselin. 1568. *Hist. Gild.* §. 2. p. 2. §. 4. p. 13. *Usser. de Primord. et Brit. Eccles. Antiq. in Epist. Dedic. Camden. Brit.* p. 5. vol. 1. p. iv. *Lloyd's Church Gov.* preface, p. x.

our enemies, or carried so far by the banishment of our countrymen that they no longer appear, and therefore he was forced to pick up what he could out of foreign writers, without any continued series." From hence he proceeds to speak "of the Romans' easy conquest of Britain, but difficult keeping of it, the inhabitants being so unable to withstand the Romans, and yet so unwilling to obey them." Of which he gives a remarkable instance, in the revolt under Boadicea, and the harder usage of the Britons after it⁹. "Interea," saith he, "glaciali frigore rigenti insulæ, et veluti longiore terrarum recessu, soli visibili non proximæ verus ille non de firmamento solum (L. sol) temporali, sed de summa etiam cælorum arce tempora cuncta excedente universo orbi præfulgidum sui coruscum ostendens⁵ tempore (ut scimus) summo Tiberii Cæsaris (quo absque ullo impedimento ejus propagabatur religio comminata senatu nolente a principe morte dilatoribus militum ejusdem) radios suos primum indulget, id est sua præcepta Christus." §. 6. "In the mean time, Christ the true Sun afforded his rays, that is, the knowledge of his precepts, to this island, shivering with icy-cold, and separate at a great distance from the visible sun, not from the visible firmament, but from the supreme everlasting Power of heaven. For we certainly know, that in the latter end of the reign of Tiberius, that Sun appeared to the whole world with his glorious beams, in which time his religion was propagated without any impediment against the will of the Roman senate, death being threatened by that prince to all that should inform against the soldiers of Christ."

⁹ Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. Wheloc's note ^a on Bede's Eccles. p. 3. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 2. Hist. b. 1. c. 3. p. 28. Camden. ibid. p. 48. vol. 1. p. 1.

This I take to be Gildas's true meaning: for it is certain^r, he speaks of a double shining of the gospel, one more general to the world, the other more particular to this island: "the former," he saith, "was in the latter end of Tiberius, the latter was 'interea,' in the mean time," of which he first speaks, and that refers back to the time he had spoken of before, which was^s the fatal victory over^t Boadicea and the Britons, by Suetonius Paulinus, and the slavery they underwent after it. Which happened in the time of Nero, about the middle of his reign, almost twenty years after Claudius had sent^u A. Plautius to reduce^v Britain into the form of a province, to whom succeeded P. Ostorius Scapula, A. Didius Gallus, and Veranius, in the government of Britain, before Suetonius Paulinus came into the province. For after^w Claudius's triumph for his victory in Britain^x, the Romans began to deduce colonies, to settle magistrates and jurisdictions here, after the manner of other provinces, and so continual intercourse was maintained between the Roman city and the British colonies; cities of trade were set up, and the Roman merchants were very busy in furnishing new provinces with necessaries and superfluities. And the province of Britain, in the beginning of Nero's reign, was thought to be in so settled and flourishing a condition, that^y Dio saith, "Seneca

^r Usser. de Primord. Add. p. 1053. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 505. See p. 43. of the present chapter.

^s Camden. *ibid.* p. 36. vol. 1. p. xxxviii.

^t See p. 34.

^u See p. 31. Camden. *ibid.* p. 30. vol. 1. p. xxx.

^v For "a history of the Roman transactions in Britain,"

see Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, b. 1. c. 1—5, pp. 1—75. Roy's *Military Antiq.* b. 1. c. 1—3.

^w Camden. *ibid.* p. 323. vol. 2. p. 44. compared with the last note. For his coins relating to Britain, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 73. vol. 1. p. lxx.

^x See Camden. *ibid.* p. 43. vol. 1. p. xlvi.

^y Xiphilin. in *Neron*. In *Dion*.

had here at one time to the value of three hundred thousand pounds," as Mr. Camden computes it. A vast sum for a philosopher! But that which I infer ⁶ from hence is, that this was a very probable time, which Gildas hath pitched upon, for the bringing the gospel hither, viz. between the time of A. Plautius coming over, in the time of Claudius, and the battle between Boadicea and Suetonius Paulinus, as will more fully appear in the following discourse. As to the more general shining of the gospel to the world, he pitches upon the latter end of Tiberius as the certain time of it, in which he makes use of the very expressions of ^z Eusebius, and that passage concerning Tiberius and the senate differing about Christ and his followers, which Eusebius took from ^a Tertullian, who speaks of it with great assurance. And ^b Orosius gives a more particular account of it, all which is very agreeable to what Gildas had said before, "that he must make use of foreign writers in so great a defect of their own."

But to proceed clearly in this matter, there are three things I design, concerning the first planting a Christian Church here.

I. To examine the tradition, concerning Joseph of Arimathæa and his brethren coming hither to plant Christianity.

II. To shew that there was a Christian Church planted here in the apostles' times, and within that compass Gildas speaks of.

Hist. Roman. lib. 62. p. 701.
Camden. *ibid.* p. 330. vol. 2.
p. 71. Seneca's usurious transactions appear, among other causes, to have inflamed the Britons against the Romans.

^z Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2.

cap. 2. p. 47, et not. Fabricius, *Salutar. Lux Evang.* c. 12. p. 221. Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 1. p. 4. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 2.

^a Tertullian. *Apolog.* cap. 5. p. 57. et not. Havercamp.

^b Oros. lib. 7. cap. 4. p. 459.

III. To prove the great probability, that St. Paul first founded a Church here.

I. ^cAs to the tradition concerning Joseph of Arimathæa, I confess I look on it as an invention of the monks of Glastonbury, to serve their interests by advancing the reputation of their monastery. But because this tradition hath met with better entertainment than it deserved, among the generality of our late writers, who take it for granted, and believe that it is grounded on the testimony of ancient records, I shall, before I proceed further, take the pains to examine it, both as to the authority, and the circumstances of it.

It seems to be a little suspicious, at first view, that so considerable a part of the antiquities of this church should be wholly passed by, by the most ancient and 7inquisitive writers of our affairs; so that neither the true Gildas, nor Bede, nor Asserius, nor Marianus Scotus, nor any of the ancient annals should take the least notice of this tradition. ^dSanders indeed saith, “that Polydore Virgil proves it from the most ancient Gildas,” but he never attempted any such thing: for having set down the ^etradition of Joseph of Arimathæa with the best advantage, he only proves from Gildas, “that the Christian religion was very early received here,” which might be very true, although Joseph had never come from Arimathæa. And yet ^fcard. Bona quotes Gildas for this tradition, on the credit of

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 12. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 7, et in præfat. Basnag. Exercit. Hist. Crit. p. 26. Tanner. Biblioth. under Josephus Arimathensis.

^d Sander. præf. ad libr. de Schism. Anglic. Vide Usser.

de Primord. c. 2. p. 22. Add. p. 974. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12.

^e Usser. de Primord. c. 2. p. 19. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 11.

^f Bona, *Rever. Liturgic. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 3. in Oper. p. 350.*

Sanders, unless he were deceived by those who produce the testimony of Gildas Albanus, in his book of the Victory of Aurelius Ambrosius, to the same purpose. But no such book of the true Gildas could ever yet be found by those who have searched after it with the greatest diligence. ^g Leland particularly relates, concerning himself, “what incredible pains he took to find out this piece of Gildas,” and saith, “that he hoped at last to have met with it in the library at Glastonbury, where Gildas is said by William of Malmesbury to have ended his days, but not a leaf of it was to be seen, either there or in any of the old libraries in Wales, which he searched on purpose.” And after all, he refers us to the credit of ^h Geoffrey of Monmouth for it, where it must rest, till some better authority be produced for it. Yet Bale and Pits keep up the title of it, as they do of many others which were never in being, as the Annals of Gildas Cambrius, the Epigrams of ⁱ Claudia Rufina, and the Epistles of ^k Joseph of Arimathæa, &c. which Bale thinks probable that he did write, and therefore sets them down as written. And from him a learned ^l antiquary reckons them among our historical antiquities. And no better foundation can yet be discovered for this book of Gildas, it being as probable that he should write a book of that victory of Ambrosius, since ^m Gildas saith, “he was born upon the day of his obtaining it, if it were that on Badon hill.” But such probabilities are very far from testimonies. It is

^g Leland. Comm. de Script. Brit. in Gilda. p. 55. Tanner. *ibid.* under the several persons of the name of Gildas.

^h Galf. Mon. Hist. Brit. lib. 2. cap. 1. p. 33. 2d edit. Badii Ascensii. See preface to Gildas, §. 10. p. xiv. ed. 1838.

ⁱ Tanner. *ibid.* under her name.

^k Tanner. *ibid.* as in note c, p. 6.

^l Watts, Instrumento Historic. Manuscript.

^m Usser. de Primord. c. 13. p. 475. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 254.

true, as the ⁿ learned primate observes, “that Gervase of Tilbury, Naucerus, Trithemius, and many others; 8 say, “that Geoffrey followed Gildas in such a book written by him: but they produce no authority for any such book, but Geoffrey himself, and until some better appears, I must suspend my belief: it being common with such writers as himself, to pretend to such authorities as no one else ever had the fortune to find. For it being their business to give an account of times long before their own, it were a vain thing to hope for any credit, unless they could produce some testimonies nearer those times, which might be of some weight if they were authentic. And this is the reason why these inventors of history have still given out, that they met with some elder writers, out of whom they have pretended to derive their reports. Thus ^o Hunibaldus pretends as much to follow the old Sicambrian manuscripts of Washald, for the remote antiquities of the Franks, as ^p Geoffrey doth the old British manuscripts, either for the succession of the British kings, or the first bringing of Christianity hither. But, which makes this matter yet stranger, ^q Nennius himself, ^r who sometimes passes under the name of Gildas, saith nothing of this tradition, where he speaks of the first receiving of Christianity in Britain; and yet ^s Bale saith of him, “that he collected his writings out of the former British historians, such as ^t Teliesin, Melkin,

ⁿ Usser. de Primord. c. 5. p. 57. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 31.

^o Apud Trithem. Compend. Annal. lib. 1. p. 4. Oper. Hist.

^p See Index, under Geoffrey.

^q Nenn. c. 18. p. 104. §. 22. p. 18. After all, it is uncertain whether Nennius indeed wrote the History of the Britons, ascribed to him. See preface to

the last edition of 1838. Gunn's ed. pref. p. ix. &c. Lond. 1819.

^r Usser. ibid. in Epist. Dedic. Tanner. ibid. under Nennius.

^s As to Nennius and Elvudugus, Usser. de Primord. c. 17. p. 817. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 426.

^t Tanner. ibid. under these several names.

Gildas and Elvodugus;" and it is not probable he would have left it out, if he had found it in any of them. But ^u Bale quotes one of these British authors, viz. Melkinus Avalonius, for this tradition about Joseph of Arimathæa and Arviragus; but withal he confesses him to be a very fabulous writer. ^x Leland saith, "that he met with the fragments of Melkinus in the library at Glastonbury, by which he understood that he had written something of the British affairs, but more especially concerning the antiquity of Glastonbury, and Joseph of Arimathæa; which," saith Leland, "he affirms without any certain author, and which himself could not approve, not thinking it at all credible, that Joseph of Arimathæa should be buried there, but rather some eremit of that name ^y, from whence the mistake first arose." And ^z elsewhere, when he speaks of the Glastonbury tradition, he saith, "that twelve eremits are reported to have come thither, with one Joseph in the head of them, but not he of Arimathæa, as he supposes." But still the testi- 9 monies that concern this matter are derived from Glastonbury, insomuch that even the British historian hath the name of Avalonius from thence. But some make use of this testimony however to prove the antiquity of this tradition, since this author is said to have lived A. D. 550, under king Vortuporius, so Bale; but Pits places him ten years later, under Magoclunus. They might as well have made him contemporary with Gildas Cambrius, or to have been secretary to Joseph

^u Bal. de Script. Brit. lib. 1. n. 57. p. 55. Usser. de Primord. c. 2. p. 22. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12.

^x Leland. Comment. de Script. Brit. in Melkino, pp. 41, 42. Tanner. ibid. under Melkinus.

^y See Mosheim, in his Commentaries of the Affairs of the Christians before Constantine, vol. 2. p. 18. note.

^z Leland. ibid. in Elvano. p. 20. Tanner, ibid. under Elvanus.

of Arimathæa, when he wrote his epistles, for they have no more evidence to shew for the one than for the other. The truth is, there was an old legend which lay at Glastonbury, which Leland saw, and out of which Capgrave hath transcribed that part which concerns this matter, from whom Bale took it. But it is so grossly fabulous, that even Capgrave himself (whose stomach was not very nice as to legends) put an &c. in the middle of it, as being ashamed to set down the passage of ^aAbaddar, a great man in Saphat, and the hundred and four thousand which were buried with Joseph of Arimathæa at Glastonbury. Yet this senseless and ridiculous legend is by ^bsome thought to be the British history which William of Malmesbury appeals to for the proof of this tradition, and which he found in the libraries of St. Edmund and St. Augustine. But Malmesbury, having designed to set the antiquity of Glastonbury as high as he could, called that a British history, which is now found to be written by an English monk, as ^carchbishop Usher hath evidently proved, (having several times perused it in the Cotton library,) there being the very same passage in it which Malmesbury quotes. And that he was no Briton is most certain, because he calls the Saxon his mother tongue, and England his country. And yet after all, there is not a word of Joseph of Arimathæa or his companions in it: all that is said is^d, “that in the western parts of Britain there is a royal island called Gleston, large and compassed about with

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 22. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12.

^b Spelman. Conc. Brit. tom. 1. p. 6. §. 11. Wilkins, Concil. Brit. tom. 4. App. p. 689. col. 1.

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 6.

p. 107. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 56. Vide Gulielm. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glaston. Ecclesiæ, p. 293.

^d Usser. de Primord. p. 107. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 56.

waters full of fish, and having other conveniences of human life; but which was most considerable, it was devoted to the service of God. Here the first disciples of the catholic law found an ancient church, not¹⁰ built as was reported by men's hands, but prepared by God himself for the benefit of men, and which by miracles was shewed to be consecrated to himself and to the blessed Virgin. To which they adjoined another oratory made of stone, which they dedicated to Christ and to St. Peter." The question is, who are here meant by these "first disciples of the catholic law?" Not Joseph of Arimathæa and his companions, who are never mentioned by him, and who are never said "to have found a church there built to their hands;" but he speaks of some of the first Saxon Christians in those parts, who might probably find there such a low wattled church as is described in sir H. Spelman^e; a remainder of the British Christianity in that island. And this passage affords us the best light into the true original of this tradition, which was after so much heightened and improved, as the monks of Glastonbury thought convenient for the honour and privileges of their monastery.

That which seems most agreeable to truth from hence is, that in the latter times of the British Churches, when they were so miserably harassed and persecuted by the pagan Saxons, they were forced to retire into places of most difficult access for their own security, and there they made them such churches as were suitable to their present condition, and lived very retired lives, being in continual fear of their barbarous enemies. Such a place this^f island of Avalon, or

^e Spelman. Concil. Britann. pp. 11, 12. §. 15. Wilkins, *ibid.* p. 692.

^f Usser. de Primord. c. 14. p. 523. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 273.

Glastonbury was; which might be of far greater request among the Britons, because it was the place where king Arthur was buried; for I see no reason to question that which Giraldus Cambrensis relates concerning the finding the body of king Arthur there in the time of Henry II., with an inscription on a leaden cross, which in Latin expressed, that king Arthur lay there buried in the island of Avalon. For ^s Giraldus saith, “he was present, and saw the inscription and the body;” which is likewise attested by the historians of that time, as ^h Leland proves at large. And the account given that his body was laid so deep in the earth for fear of the Saxons, further confirms that this was a place of retreat in the British times, ¹¹ but not without the apprehension of their enemies’ invasion.

This church, according to the ⁱ inscription on the brass plate on the pillar in Glastonbury church, was in length sixty foot, in breadth twenty-six. But that inscription, as the learned and judicious antiquary, sir H. Spelman ^k, observes, “was by the character not of above three hundred years’ antiquity,” and savours very much of the legend. In it we read, “¹ that the

^g Girald. de Instit. Princ. et in Specul. Eccles. in Cotton. Biblioth. Mus. Brit. Vide Cave Hist. Lit. tom. 2. pp. 254, 255. Leland. de Rebus Brit. Collect. tom. 2. p. 103. marg. Usser. de Primord. c. 6. p. 119. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 63.

^h Leland. Collectan. vol. 2. p. 14. MS. pp. 14. 103, &c. Assert. Arthuri, p. 28, &c. Collectan. ibid. App. part. 1. fol. 28. b. In addition, Usser. de Primord. p. 117. cap. 14. p. 522. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.

p. 61. 272. See Index, under Arthur.

ⁱ For this inscription, as exactly copied from the original, see Spelman, ibid. pp. 7—9. Wilkins, ibid. tom. 4. App. p. 690.

^k Concil. Brit. §. 14. p. 11. Wilkins, ibid. p. 692.

¹ Spelman, ibid. p. 10. Wilkins, ibid. p. 690. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 16. cap. 6. p. 113. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 9. 60.

church was first built by Joseph and his companions, but was consecrated by Christ himself to the honour of his mother." This being a very useful point, but not very agreeing with the simplicity of the primitive Christians, wanted some more than ordinary confirmation, and such we are told it had^m. "For St. David having a design to consecrate this church, our Lord appeared to him in a dream, and forbad him, having consecrated both the church and churchyard before himself. And for a sign thereof, he thrust his finger through the bishop's hand." Which it seems was to pass for the token of a former consecration. But, as much as this looks like a monkish legend, ⁿ Alford and ^o Cressy are much displeas'd with sir H. Spelman for calling it in question. But they who can in earnest believe, "that Christ himself did then consecrate a church and churchyard to the honour of his mother," are past all confutation by reason, having their minds naturally framed to believe legends; and to such, one legend serves to confirm another; which is the way those persons take to confute sir H. Spelman. For Cressy, to prove the antiquity of dedicating churches to the blessed Virgin, brings the tradition of the temple at Saragossa, called "del Pilar, because the pillar on which her image was placed was brought thither by the ministry of angels." Now those things ^pare thought proofs by some, which to others look only like bringing one absurdity to support another. But as yet we find no testimony to confirm this tradition, but what is taken from Glastonbury, which is not the best witness in a cause which so nearly concerned itself.

^m Spelman, ib. Wilkins, ib. Usserii ib.

ⁿ Annal. Eccles. Brit. tom. 1. A. D. 63. n. 25. p. 53.

^o Church Hist. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 27.

^p Vide Alford. ibid. t. 2. A.D. 529. n. 5. p. 38. Usser. ibid. c. 6.

But these now mentioned authors^q at last venture
 12 on a considerable testimony, if it hold good, viz. of
 Augustine the monk, in an epistle to Gregory; but
 upon examination, that which they quote out of St.
 Augustine's epistle is nothing else but the passage
 already mentioned by ^rMalmesbury, which he found in
 a book taken out of the library of St. Augustine at
 Canterbury; and they might as well have quoted St.
 Edmund's epistle to the pope to the same purpose.
 For ^sWilliam of Malmesbury saith, "he met with the
 same passage at St. Edmund's as well as St. Augus-
 tine's," i. e. in the libraries of those monasteries. I will
 not dissemble that they cite two considerable ^tauthors
 of our own for this mistake; I wish they had been as
 ready to have followed them where they were in the
 right, as where they were guilty of an oversight, which
 the most careful writers may sometimes fall into. But
 it is an unhappy temper to follow great men only in
 their errors and imperfections.

So that upon the whole matter, we have not one
 testimony which reaches to the point concerning
 Joseph of Arimathæa, which is not originally taken
 from the Glastonbury legends, where it seems there
 was great choice of them. For ^uCapgrave mentions
 several; one, out of which the Life of Joseph of
 Arimathæa there is extracted, is said to be taken out
 of a book which the emperor Theodosius found in the

^q Alford. *ibid.* t. 1. A.D. 63.
 n. 39. p. 57. Cressy, *ibid.* lib. 2.
 cap. 7. p. 26.

^r See p. 9. of this chapter,
 and notes ^b, ^c, ^d.

^s Gulielm. Malmesb. in not. c.
 p. 9. Usser. de Primord. c. 6.
 p. 107. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.*
 p. 56.

^t Parker. *Antiq. Brit.* p. 3.

Parker. de Vet. *Eccles. Brit.*
 p. 4. Usser. *ibid.* Godwin. de
 Præsul. p. 12. Lond. 1616. de
Conv. Brit. p. 8.

^u Capgrav. in *Vita Josephi.*
 fol. 196. 2.—198. 1. in *Nov.*
Legend. Vide Usser. de Primord.
 c. 2. p. 15, &c. *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.*
 p. 8, &c. Alford. *ibid.* n. 16.
 p. 50.

palace of Pilate at Jerusalem; which is a very hopeful introduction to a legend. And there we find the history of Joseph of Arimathæa very distinctly set down, “how he was miraculously delivered out of prison in Jerusalem and conveyed to Arimathæa, whither the chief of the Jews sent a solemn embassy to him of seven persons, with an epistle, wherein they beg pardon for his imprisonment, and desire his company at Jerusalem; whither being come, upon their request he gives an account of his escape, the house being taken up by four angels, and Christ appeared to him, and carried him to the place where he buried him, and shewed him the linen cloth about his head; after which he was baptized by Philip, and was present with him at ^u the assumption of the blessed Virgin, and fifteen years after he came to Philip in Gaul, who sent him over into Britain with twelve of his disciples and ¹³ his son Josephes.” But another tradition saith ^x, “They were six hundred men and women who were to come over, having taken a vow of abstinence till they came to land, which they did all break, but one hundred and fifty who passed the sea upon the shirt of Josephes; but the rest repenting, a ship was sent to convey them over which was built by king Solomon, and with them came a duke of the Medes, called Nacianus, formerly baptized by Joseph in the city Saram, with the king of it, called Mordraius, who valiantly killed a king of North Wales, who kept Joseph a prisoner; after which he and his companions preached here in the time of Arviragus.” And then follows the common tradition ^y, “of his giving the

^u Vide Riveti Apolog. pro Virgin. Maria. l. i. c. 21. p. 661, &c.; but especially p. 668. in his Works, tom. 3.

^x Alford. *ibid.* n. 17. p. 51.

^y Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. pp. 13. 18—21. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 7. 10—12, particularly the latter pages.

island of Avalon to them, and the twelve^z hides of land by the three pagan kings, Arviragus, Marius and Coilus." This is followed by another tradition out of the Acts of king Arthur, and the Inquisition of Lancelot de Lac; all which is concluded with the admirable legend of ^a Melkinus Avalonius already mentioned. These are the choice materials in Capgrave's collection to confirm this tradition. And if he had found any better, he would no doubt have produced them. It must be confessed that ^b Mr. Cressy, with some scorn, rejects that part of the tradition taken out of the holy Graal, about the six hundred companions and the prince of Media, &c. But I can find no better authority for one part than for the other; and for all that I can see, the ^c holy Graal deserves as much credit as the book taken out of Pilate's palace, or Melkinus Avalonius, especially since ^d Pits hath given the supposed author so good a place among his British writers, under the name of Eremita Britannus, and saith he lived about the time of king Ina, A. D. 720. And ^e Helinandus takes notice of the vision to the British eremit about that time concerning Joseph of Arimathea, and the dish wherein our Saviour ate the pass-over with his disciples, which sort of dish, he saith, was then called in French 'graal;' but ^f others think the true name was 'sangreal,' being some of Christ's real blood which he shed upon the cross, which was said to be somewhere found by king Arthur. And to

^z Usser. de Primord. p. 21. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 11.

^a See p. 8. of this chapter.

^b Vide Alford. *ibid.* n. xviii. p. 51.

^c Usser. *ibid.* as in note ^e below.

^d Pits, de Illustr. Angliæ

Script. A. D. 720. 88. Tanner. *ibid.* under Eremita Britannus.

^e Apud Vincent. Spec. Hist. lib. 23. cap. 147. in Specul. Major. tom. 4. p. 327. 2. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 17. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 9.

^f Usser. *ibid.*

confirm this, it is said in the authentic writing of ¹⁴ Melkinus, that in the coffin of Joseph were two silver vessels filled with the blood and sweat of Jesus the prophet.

But lest I should seem to expose so ancient a tradition, by setting down only the fabulous mixtures which the monks thought to adorn it with, I now proceed from their dreams and visions, to what seems to have much more weight and authority in it, viz. their ancient records, which ^h William of Malmesbury seems most to rely upon. Among these, in the first place, he mentions the ⁱ charter of St. Patrick, as he calls it, which is at large printed in the ^k Monasticon, and both in ^l Alford and ^m Cressy, and is magnified by them as a substantial proof of the Glastonbury tradition, which Cressy saith “was transcribed out of a very ancient MS. belonging to Glastonbury by Marianus Victorius;” and for this he quotes ⁿ Ger. Vossius de Hist. Lat., who saith only that Bale mentions a piece of his *De Antiquitate Avalonica*; but he adds, “that Bale deserves no credit in writers of great antiquity.” But the person Cressy means (or at least his author) was another Gerard Vossius, dean of Tongres ^o, who published part of this pretended piece of St. Patrick among other ancient writings, which

^g Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 22. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12. See p. 8. note x.

^h Gulielm. Malmes. de Antiq. Glaston. Eccles. p. 292. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 14. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 7.

ⁱ Nicolson, in his *Irish Historical Library*, part 3. cap. 4. p. 38, notices this passage.

^k Monastic. Anglican. vol. 1. p. 11. vol. 1. p. 25.

^l Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 439.

n. 9. p. 553.

^m Cressy's Hist. lib. 2. cap. 5. n. 10. p. 25. Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 116. cap. 17. p. 878. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 61. 456.

ⁿ Vossi. de Histor. Latinis, lib. 2. cap. 16. p. 71. Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 439. n. 12. p. 554.

^o Miscellan. S. Patr. ad calc. Oper. Greg. Thaumaturg. p. 239. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 880. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 457.

will have no great authority among considering men, if they have no other characters of antiquity than this charter of St. Patrick. However, Mr. Cressy is pleased to call it “ a monument of the goodness of God towards this nation, so early, in the very beginning of Christianity;” because therein mention is made of “^p some writings of St. Phaganus and Diruvianus, wherein it was declared that twelve disciples of the holy apostles Philip and Jacob built the said ancient church to the honour of the blessed Virgin, by the appointment of the archangel Gabriel. And moreover, that our Lord himself from heaven dedicated the said church to the honour of his mother. As likewise, that three pagan kings bestowed upon them twelve portions of land.” If this hold good, it goes a great way towards the proving the ancient tradition, although Joseph of Arimathæa be not mentioned. But St. Patrick goes on, and saith^q, “ that in other writings
15 of a later date he found that Phaganus and Diruvianus obtained from pope Eleutherius thirty years of indulgence, as himself likewise procured from pope Celestine twelve years.” And towards the conclusion, “ he grants a hundred days of indulgence to those who would clear the way to a certain oratory there mentioned.” And to make all plain, it begins with the date, ^r A. D. 425, in these words: “ In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I Patrick, the poor humble servant of God, in the four hundred twenty-fifth year of the incarnation of our Lord, being sent by the most holy pope Celestine into Ireland,” &c.

^p Gulielm. Malmesbur. *ibid.* p. 296. Usser. *ibid.* as in note ^m, above; and *De Primord.* cap. 2. p. 20. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 11.

^q Gulielm. Malmesbur. *ibid.* p. 297. See quotations in notes ^l, ^m, as above.

^r In the Oxford edition of 1691, p. 296, it is A. D. 430.

I confess this charter offers very fair play towards the discovery of its own forgery, by such open marks and characters as these. For it is certainly known, that in St. Patrick's time no such way of computation was used from the year of our Lord. For Dionysius Exiguus writ his first epistle to Petronius A. D. 525, where he first mentions "the reducing the cycle to the years of Christ's incarnation, that people might be better acquainted with it;" after which it remained a great while in private use with the paschal cycle, and was not publicly received, saith ^s Bucherius, till about the time of Charles the Great. ^t Joachim Vadianus saith, "he never saw the year of our Lord in any ancient charters, of which sort he had seen many." ^u Some observe, "that it was never used in charters before the ninth age;" and therefore the more subtle pretenders to antiquity always left it out. ^v Joh. Aventinus affirms, "that the use of it in epistles and charters was brought in by Carolus Crassus," with whom ^w Nic. Vignier agrees, as to the imperial diplomata. But it seems probable to have been brought into England before that time; for in the ^x council at Celichyth, A. D. 816, "every bishop was required to take an account of the year of our Lord." And by some charters in Ingulphus, it appears to have been used here before it was used in France, or the empire, but not long before the eighth century; and the first public acts we find it applied to, were those of coun-

^s Bucherius Belg. Roman. lib. 2. cap. 8. n. 4. p. 84.

^t Farrag. Antiq. Alleman. in Goldast. Allem. Rerum Script. tom. 3. lib. 2. p. 44.

^u Papebroch. Propyl. ad t. 2. Apr. §. 102. p. 23. in Bolland. Acta Sanctor.

^v Aventinus Annal. Boior. lib. 4. p. 461. lib. 4. cap. 19. n. 36. p. 428.

^w Chronic. Burg. ad A. D. 885. p. 67.

^x Spelman. Concil. tom. 1. p. 330. c. 9. Wilkins ibid. tom. 1. p. 171. col. 1.

cils, as in that of ^y Becanceld, under king Withred, A. D. 694. But the same king doth not use it in the years of his reign. The like instances about councils, especially in the eighth and ninth centuries, are produced by ^z Mabillon, who thinks “that Bede was the first who brought it into the use of history.” But that could not be before A. D. 725, at which time he began to write his history; and he adds, “that from him, by the means of Boniface, it came into the use of the French councils and histories; and at last of all public charters both in France and the empire, as well as here.” But from all this it appears that there is no colour for this charter of St. Patrick, which reckons from the incarnation, a hundred years before Dionysius Exiguus first introduced that way of computation. Besides, it cannot possibly agree with the time of St. Patrick’s going first into Ireland; for ^a William of Malmesbury confesseth, “he was made bishop by Celestine, and sent by St. German into Ireland as an apostle.” But it is on all hands agreed, that Palladius was sent thither before him; and Prosper, who lived at that time, fixeth the sending Palladius to the year wherein Bassus and Antiochus were consuls, which was A. D. 431, the year of the first Ephesine council. So that this charter of St. Patrick cannot be true, no, not although we allow the different computation in Capgrave, who reads it 430. But ^b Alford confesses, both Malmesbury and the Glastonbury Antiquities have it 425. It is strange that Alford should say ^c, “he

^y Spelman. *ibid.* p. 191. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 57. col. 1. See p. 18.

^z Mabillon de Re Diplom. lib. 2. cap. 23. n. 13. p. 176.

^a Gul. Malmes. de Gest. Pont. lib. 2. p. 145. 255. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 840. Brit.

Eccles. Antiq. p. 437. Lloyd *ibid.* c. 2. §. 5. p. 61. c. 4. §. 3. p. 89. See p. 27. c. 2. p. 53. c. 4. p. 206. c. 5. p. 281.

^b Alford. *ibid.* n. 9.

^c *Ibid.* n. 12.

found no exception against the credit of this charter," since even ^dCapgrave himself mentions it not without doubt and suspicion of the truth of it. And his own brethren, ^eHenschenius and Papebrochius, deride his simplicity for believing it. And among other arguments they produce that of the mention of indulgences against it, which name they confess was not used for the relaxation of penance till the eleventh century; a very competent time after the date of this charter. The question is not as Mr. Cressy would put it, "whether every bishop, or the pope as chief, hath a power to relax penance?" but, whether the name of indulgences were then applied to such a sense as this charter uses it? which those learned Jesuits deny. Add to all this, that St. Patrick saith, "he obtained from Celestine twelve years of indulgence;" which being understood of Glastonbury, implies a plain impossibility. For St. Patrick is said to retreat thither towards the end of his life, and Celestine died soon after his first sending into Ireland. So that I need ¹⁷ not to insist on the style or the ^fnames contained in this charter, to prove the forgery of it, it being so manifest by the arguments already produced.

I now proceed to the charters, whereof there are several extant in the ^gMonasticon. The large charter of king Ina seems to be most considerable, and to favour the old tradition, as it makes "the church at Glastonbury dedicated to Christ and the blessed Virgin, to be the fountain of all religion, and the first in the kingdom of Britain." But upon a strict inquiry

^d Capgr. Vit. Patricii, in Nov. Legend. Angliæ, fol. 263. 1.

^e Bolland. Acta Sanct. Martii 17. Vit. S. Patricii Proleg. §. 10. n. 72, &c. p. 530.

^f Usser. de Primord. cap. 6.

p. 106. Brit. Eccl. Antiq. p. 56.

^g Monastic. Anglican. vol. 1.

p. 13. vol. 1. p. 25. Gul. Malmes.

de Antiq. Glaston. Eccles. p. 311.

Usser. de Primord. p. 112. Brit.

Eccles. Antiq. p. 59.

into the circumstances of this charter, I see great reason to call in question the truth of it, and not merely from the dissimilitude of style between this and other charters of the Saxon times which are allowed to be authentic, such as those in Ingulphus, William of Malmesbury, the Additions to Matthew Paris, &c., but for these two reasons, which seem to me to have weight in them.

I. Because it refers to other ancient charters of that church, as to the exemption of the monastery. And the Benedictine monks have a long time lain under so great a suspicion among those of their religion, as to this matter of forging charters of exemption, that no prudent persons will think those a sufficient foundation to build their faith upon, as to any ancient history which must depend upon their credibility. I shall not here mention what Gallonius, Launoy, Naude, and others abroad have said upon this subject, nor what insufficient answers ^h Mabillon hath lately made to their objections; but it is reasonable for us to consider, how much they have been charged here at home with this crime by the bishops of this Church, and how ill they have been able to defend themselves. It appears by the Epistle of Richard archbishop of Canterbury to Alexander the Third, in ⁱ Petrus Blesensis, that there was a general suspicion of forgery in the charters of exemptions which the monasteries pretended to; “*Ut falsitas in omnium fere monasteriorum exemptione prævaleat,*” &c. And he there particularly instanceth in the bishop of Salisbury, charging 18 the abbot of Malmesbury with producing false charters

^h Mabillon de Re Diplomat. tom. 24. p. 987. Alford. *ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 3. p. 226. tom. 4. A. D. 1177. n. 14. 18.

ⁱ Petr. Blesens. Ep. 68. in pp. 283. 285. Biblioth. Vet. Patrum, Bignæi,

for his exemption from the bishop's right of election. But which is yet more considerable, in the time of Gregory the Ninth, when ^j St. Edmond was archbishop of Canterbury, some monks of Canterbury were convicted of forging a certain charter of privileges: but the pope's legate took up the business, and procured a dispensation from the pope, which put an end to the cause. Which dispensation Dr. Casaubon ^k declares to the world, "he read in an old manuscript belonging to the church of Canterbury, wherein it was registered;" and wherein, as both he and sir Henry Spelman ^l tell us, it is observed, "that that church enjoyed all its lands and privileges only by custom and prescription, sine cartis vel munimentis regiis, without any written charters, until A. D. 694;" when Withred, king of Kent, caused the first to be written, which was the same with the ^m council of Becanceld. From hence ⁿ sir Henry Spelman gives a prudent caution, "concerning the most ancient charters which the monks pretended to, that they be not easily believed, there being so much suspicion of fraud in them." And that not only now, but was so of old, as appears by what ^o Gervase reports of the monks of St. Augustine, "that they produced very suspicious and rased charters." The case was this; the monks of St. Augustine pretended an exemption from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury, as those of ^p Glastonbury did from that of the bishop of Wells; upon an appeal to Rome, a commission was granted to the bishop of

^j Parker. *Antiq. Brit. Eccles.* in Edmundo, p. 256.

^k *Of Use and Custom*, p. 93.

^l Spelman. *Concil.* tom. 1. p. 125. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. Appendix, p. 733. col. 2.

^m See p. 15.

ⁿ Spelman. *ibid.* p. 126. Wilkins *ibid.*

^o Gervas. *Dorob.* A. D. 1181. inter 10. *Script.* col. 1458. edit. Twysdeni. Spelman and Wilkins *ibid.*

^p See p. 24.

Durham and the abbot of St. Alban's, to inspect their charters, and to let the archbishop examine them: but after great tergiversation, they at last produced two writings, which they called their originals; ^q the first was ancient, but rased and subscribed, as if it were amended and without a seal, which they called ^r king Ethelbert's charter; ^s the other was of much later writing, with a leaden bull hanging at it, and the figure of a bishop upon it, which they called ^t St. Augustine's charter. Against the first, ^u the rasure was objected, and the "manner of subscription, and want of a seal:" against the second, "^v the lateness of the writing, and the novelty of hanging leaden bulls 19 to charters, especially by bishops on this side of the Alps; and besides, the style was very different from the Roman." Both these charters are extant in the ^w Monasticon, and a third of Ethelbert, with an in-speximus of 36 Edw. III. But another charter of Ethelbert is set down together with these in the ^x MS. Chronicle of St. Augustine's, the author whereof was certainly a monk there, being so zealously concerned to defend these charters, and to answer some of the former objections against them. As to the want of a seal to Ethelbert's charter, he answers truly, "^y that hanging seals upon wax were not then used, but only a subscription of the name of the person, with a sign

^q Gervas. *ibid.*

^r Spelman. *ibid.* p. 118. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 728. Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 605. n. 3, 4.

^s Gervas. *ibid.*

^t Spelman. *ibid.* p. 121. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 729.

^u Gervas. *ibid.*

^v Gervas. *ibid.*

^w Monastic. Anglican. vol. 1. p. 23. vol. 1. p. 126. Spelman.

ibid. p. 118. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 728. Thorn. Chronic. in Twysdeni Hist. Anglic. Decem Script. tom. 2. col. 21, 23.

^x Chronic. MS. in Bibl. Aulæ S. Trinitatis, Cantabrigiæ. Vide Spelman. *ibid.* p. 112. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 724: and also the MSS. of St. Augustine's, in the Cotton library, British Museum.

^y Wilkins *ibid.* p. 732. col. 2.

of the cross before it, in token of their conversion." For ^zIngulphus, a very competent witness, declares, "that the ancient English charters, to the time of Edward the Confessor, were attested by witnesses who set their names with golden crosses, or other marks before them. But the Normans brought in the use of seals by impressions upon wax." But that MS. ^aauthor will not allow the use of such seals "till after the conquest, except in the time of Cnut, who was a stranger." Whereas in the contest between the bishop of Lincoln and the abbot of St. Alban's, before Henry II., when the ^bSaxon charters were disputed for want of seals, the other party knew not what to answer; but the king insisted on their confirmation by Henry I. And the monk, who writes the account of this proceeding, allegeth the seal of Edward the Confessor to the church of Westminster. But Edward brought in several Norman customs, as Ingulphus shews, against the practice of his predecessors. And this the Normans borrowed from the French, whose seals were generally affixed on the right side of the charter, and not pendent with labels, as they began to be about the reign of Louis VI., as ^cMabillon hath shewed at large. And so some of our learned ^dantiquaries have thought, that pendent seals were not brought into use here till the time of Edward I. For in a charter of Henry I. granted to Anselm, the great seal was affixed on the left side of the parchment. And ^eBrian Twyne affirms, that he saw a charter of

^z Ingulph. Hist. p. 512. ed. Sav. p. 901. inter Rer. Anglic. Script. Vet. tom. 1. p. 70. Camden. ibid. p. 320. vol. 2. p. 43. Wilkins ibid.

^a Wilkins ibid.

^b Vit. Abbat. S. Alban. p. 79. ad finem Mat. Paris. Histor.

Major. p. 1026.

^c Mabill. de Re Diplom. lib. 2. cap. 16. n. 10. 12. p. 139.

^d Parker. Antiq. Brit. Eccles. in Anselm. p. 117. ibid. p. 179.

^e Antiq. Acad. Oxon. Apol. lib. 1. n. 81. p. 47.

William the Conqueror so sealed in the Lumley library. But that this observation is not certain, 20 appears by contrary instances, as of the pendent seal to the charter of Battel abbey, printed by ^f Mr. Selden; and of the charter of Henry II. to Glastonbury abbey, which ^g Dr. Caius saith he saw “with a seal of green wax hanging to it by a string of red and white silk.” But from hence we may see how dangerous it is to make general rules as to these matters from some particular examples, when the custom might vary. And, notwithstanding the testimony of Ingulphus, there might be seals sometimes used to charters, though not so frequently. ^h Mr. Selden hath produced some instances to that purpose, as in that of king Edgar to the abbey of Pershore, which he saith had plain signs of three labels, by the places cut for their being hanged on; which is attested in a letter from Godfrey, archdeacon of Worcester, to Alex. III. And among the “chartæ antiquæ,” there are some, saith he, “cum sigillo;” and one particularly “cum sigillo” of king Cnout, which very much confirms what this historian observes concerning Canutus’s using a seal. And our great ⁱ lawyer hath produced the deeds of king Edwin, brother to king Edgar, and of king Offa, with seals to them. And therefore, I think, Ingulphus ought not to be taken in so strict a sense, that there were no seals in use before the Norman times, but that deeds or charters before were good or valid by bare crosses and marks, with subscriptions,

^f Seld. Not. ad Eadmer. Hist. p. 166.

^g De Antiq. Cant. Academ. lib. 1. p. 54. Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 122. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 64.

^h Seld. of the Office of Lord Chancellor, ch. 2, in his Works,

vol. 3. part 2. col. 1466, 1467.

ⁱ Inst. f. 7 a. Coke upon Littleton Inst. lib. 1. cap. 1. s. 1. 7 a, and note 4. Hargrave’s and Butler’s edit. Nicolson’s English Historical Library, part 3. c. 6. p. 198.

without seals; but that the Normans would allow none that had no seals to them. And this, upon due consideration, will appear to be the true meaning of Ingulphus.

^k And the same MS. author commends the discretion of the Saxon way of confirming charters above that of the Normans, "a seal of wax being so apt to decay, or to be lost or taken off." And he observes one particular custom of the Normans, "that they were wont to put some of the hair of their heads or beards into the wax of their seals." I suppose rather to be kept as monuments, than as adding any strength or weight to their charters. So he observes, "that some of the hair of William, earl of Warren, was to his time kept in the priory of Lewes."

To that of the leaden bull appending to the charter of St. Augustine, he makes a pitiful answer, viz. "^l that he, being deputed hither by the pope, might use the ²¹ same seal which he did at Rome." And so every legate might grant bulls with leaden seals, which would not be well taken at Rome. But it is much more to the purpose which he adds, viz. "^m that when in the time of Henry III. this privilege was questioned by the archbishop of Canterbury, because of this leaden bull, the earl of Flanders produced such another, given him by a foreign bishop, which he and his predecessors had used:" the fashion whereof he sets down, and the bull itself was preserved as a monument in St. Augustine's. But if this were then so common a custom, especially at Rome, why had they no such bulls of Gregory the Great, who sent Augustine? To that he gives a frivolous answer, viz. "ⁿ that Gregory died the

^k Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 732. col. 2.

^l Spelman. *ibid.* p. 123. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 730. col. 2.

^m Spelman. *ibid.* Wilkins *ibid.* p. 731. col. 1.

ⁿ Spelman. *ibid.* p. 124. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 731. col. 2.

same year of the endowment of St. Augustine's." But did he leave no successor? And had it not been more to their purpose to have produced one leaden bull of the pope's at that time, than twenty of Augustine's the monk? But he gives no manner of answer to the rasure of the first charter, nor to the late writing of the second. And although the using of leaden bulls were not so soon appropriated to the consistorial grants of the bishop of Rome, but princes and bishops might use them, as sir H. Spelman, and monsieur Du Cange, and Mabillon have all proved, yet there ought to be better proof brought of the matter of fact as to St. Augustine's privilege; for it is still very suspicious, not only on the account of the leaden bull, (which ^o Polydore Virgil could not find so early used even at Rome, and he allows it to be no elder than A. D. 772, and all the instances brought before by ^p Dom. Raynaldus are confessed to be suspicious by ^q Mabillon himself,) but there are several things in it which, in ^r sir H. Spelman's judgment, savour of the Norman times, as the "jus consuetudinarium, judicia intus et foris," and the very title of archbishop, as it is there used, was hardly of that antiquity in the western church, and was never given to Augustine by Gregory. But according to ^s Isidore's explication of it, who was Gregory's disciple, and understood the language of that age, Augustine could not properly call his successors ²² archbishops, for he saith, "^t that title belonged to them who had power over metropolitans as well as other

^o Polyd. Virg. de Invent. lib. 8. cap. 2. p. 479. Spelman. ibid. p. 124. Wilkins ibid. p. 732. col. 1, 2.

^p Apud Leon. Allat. de Consens. Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. 1. cap. 6. n. 2. p. 87.

^q Mabillon. de Re Diplomat.

lib. 2. c. 14. n. 9. p. 128.

^r Spelman. Concil. p. 124. Wilkins ibid. tom. 4. p. 732. col. 1.

^s Isid. Orig. lib. 7. cap. 12. inter Oper. p. 62. col. 2.

^t See ch. 5. p. 339. and notes there.

bishops;" and it was not before the ninth age, as ^u Mabillon and others observe, that it came to be commonly used for a metropolitan.

It was therefore a judicious rule laid down by the learned author of the ^v preface to the *Monasticon*, concerning the charters of monks, "that the older they pretend to be, the more they are to be suspected;" for which he is deservedly praised by ^w Papebrochius: but ^x Mabillon is very unwilling to allow it, "as overthrowing at once the authority of all their ancient charters:" and therefore he hath endeavoured with mighty industry to defend chiefly the old Benedictine charters in France; but he cannot deny many of them to be counterfeited, (Papebrochius saith almost all,) and at the conclusion of his discourse he vindicates the monks "^y by the commonness of the fault in elder times:" which is an argument of caution to us, rather than of any credit to be given to them. And it cannot be denied, that he hath laid down many useful rules for discerning the true and false, with respect to the customs of France. But we are still as much to seek as to our pretended charters, since the custom of making charters cannot be made appear to be so old here as it was there. He doth indeed endeavour to prove from ^z Bede's Epistle to Egbert, that in his time "there were written privileges granted to monasteries among the Saxons," and ^a something before that

^u Mabill. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 2. n. 13. p. 65.

^v *Propulæ. ad Monast. Angl.* p. 27. "Caute itaque," &c. p. 16. See p. 18. and note ⁿ.

^w Papebroch. *Propyl. ad t. 2.* Apr. c. 10. n. 125. p. 29. in *Bolland. Acta Sanctor.*

^x Mabill. lib. 1. cap. 4. lib. 3. cap. 2. pp. 16. 222.

^y *Ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 6. n. 10. p. 242.

^z *Ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 4. n. 4. p. 18. *Bede's Hist. Eccles. &c.* p. 305, &c. especially p. 312.

^a Mabill. *ibid.* As to the date A. D. 660, compare with *Spelman ibid.* p. 62. *Wilkins ibid.* tom. 1. p. 17, whose note compare with c. 4. p. 203. c. 5.

among the Britons, by the synod of Llandaff, A.D. 660. But he cannot prove, nor doth he attempt it, that there were any charters among the Saxons before that of ^bWithred, A. D. 694; and if not, all the ancient charters referred to in this charter of Ina must be false and counterfeit.

2. How comes king Ina to have so great authority over all the kings of Britain, the archbishops, bishops, dukes and abbots, as this charter expresseth? In the beginning of the charter, he mentions ^cBaldred as one of his viceroys. In the middle he speaks of Baldred as one of his predecessors, and joins him with Kenevalchius, Kentwin and Cedwalla. But in the end he
23 makes him to confirm what Ina has granted, “Ego, Baldredus rex, confirmavi^d.” But who was this king Baldred? In the kingdom of Kent, Edricus was in the beginning of Ina’s reign, according to the Savilian Fasti, and Withredus from the sixth to the end. In the kingdom of the East Saxons there were Sighardus, Senfredus, Offa and Selredus. In the kingdom of East Angles, Beorna and Ethelredus. In the kingdom of Mercia, Adelredus, Kenredus, Ceolredus, Athelbaldus. In the kingdom of Northumberland, Alfredus, Osfredus, Kenredus, Osricus. But among all these not one Baldredus appears. There was indeed one of that name king of Kent near an hundred years after; but what is that to the time of Ina? But suppose Baldred then in being, and only a viceroy in some part of Ina’s dominions, how comes Ina to this universal

p. 349, where Stillingfleet has declared himself of a contrary opinion to Usher, as regards Oudoceus.

^b See p. 18.

^c See p. 17. and note g for the references. Spelman. *ibid.*

p. 227. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 79.

^d For the successions of the various kings of the Saxon heptarchy; Spelman. *ibid.* in the Preface; Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. Appendix, p. 683.

monarchy or power to command all the kings of Britain, which is expressed in the charter? “Sed et omnibus regni mei regibus, &c. præcipio.” By what authority did the king of the West Saxons at that time make such a precept to all other kings in Britain? But, I remember, ^eGeoffrey of Monmouth makes him grandchild to Cadwallader. And the ^fauthor of the Additions to king Edward’s Laws saith, “he had the kingdom of Britain with his second wife Wala, daughter of Cadwallader; and then Ina called a parliament for the intermarriage of Britons and Saxons.” So that there was an opinion among some, that Ina had the monarchy of Britain, which opinion was certainly followed by the contriver of this charter. But ^gMr. Lambard confesseth, that these passages are not in the ancient MS. of king Edward’s laws, and it is a wonder they should ever come into them, being so destitute of any colour of authority, and so remote from the design of his laws.

As to these counterfeit charters, the opinion of ^hPapebrochius seems most probable to me, that they were for the most part framed in the eleventh century, when there was ignorance enough to make them pass, and occasion enough given to the monks to frame them for their own security, against the encroachments of others upon their lands, and the jurisdiction of bishops over their monasteries. And William the Conqueror having given such invidious ²⁴privileges to Battle abbey, as may be seen in his charter, the elder monasteries thought much to be so

^e Galfrid. lib. 9. p. 101. ed. tom. 1. p. 74.

Bad. Ascens.

^g In his Archaionomia, p. 148,

^f LL. Ed. Confess. cap. 35.

at the end of Wheloc’s edition of Bede.

p. 206. inter Leges Anglo-Saxon.

^h Propyl. ad tom. 2. Apr. c. 8.

edit. Wilkins. Spelman. ibid.

p. 219. et not. Wilkins Conc.

n. 103. p. 24. in Bolland. ibid.

far behind them, and therefore made themselves as great privileges by the favour of Saxon kings. From hence in the next age arose so many contests about jurisdiction between the bishops and the several monasteries, of which we read not before, as we have already observed ⁱ between the abbey of St. Augustine and the archbishop of Canterbury; between the abbey of Malmesbury and the bishop of Salisbury; and the abbey of St. Alban's and the bishop of Lincoln. And at that time those abbeys were charged with forging their charters. And when they were so charged were not able to defend them, as was remarkable in the case of St. Augustine's, as it is related by ^k William Thorn, a monk of that abbey: he confesseth, "the archbishop chargeth their privileges with forgery, and that the monks appealed to Rome, and that upon their appeal several commissions were granted to examine them;" but by his own relation, they shamefully declined to produce them as long as they durst, and still continued their appeal. But when they saw no remedy, they produced the charters of Ethelbert and Augustine, the copies whereof the delegates sent to Rome. But before they came thither the pope died; and the next pope, Lucius, sent an inhibition to the archbishop, requiring him not to invade their privileges till the question of forgery were determined; and he writes to king Henry II. in the behalf of the abbey. Things being at this pass, they fairly made a composition with the archbishop, viz. that he should withdraw his accusation of fraud, in the court of Rome, and they

ⁱ As to the disputes between the abbey of St. Augustine's and the archbishop of Canterbury, see in this chapter p. 19, &c.; that of Malmesbury and the bishop of Salisbury, p. 17; that

of St. Alban's and the bishop of Lincoln, p. 19.

^k Thorn. Chronic. c. 14. §. 3. inter Decem Scriptores *ibid.* col. 1831-1834. edit. Twysden. 1652.

would yield up to him the main points contested as to jurisdiction. ¹The form of which composition is at large extant in Thorn. And the confirmation of it by Henry II. in the other MS. chronicon of that abbey. Which in effect amounted to the monks giving up the cause of their charters. Such a ^m controversy about jurisdiction there was between Jocelin, bishop of Bath and Wells, and the abbey of Glastonbury, about A. D. 1215, as appears by the book called *Secretum Domini Abbatis*, lately in the Arundel library, but now in a private hand. So that there appears a sufficient in-²⁵ducement for them to forge such large immunities and exemptions, with respect to the bishop's jurisdiction, as this charter contains; and that seems to be the main point aimed at in it. But in order to it, some extraordinary matter was to be alleged in favour of this place; and nothing served so much in that age, as to amuse the people with wonderful stories of the antiquity of it, calling it "the mother of religion, and the place of visions and revelations and miracles, where St. Patrick and St. David dwelt in former times, before ever the Saxons came," (but not a word yet of Joseph of Arimathæa,) which were very plausible pretences for extraordinary privileges, and so they are alleged in this charter of king Ina, " ⁿIta et ipsa supereminentem privilegii obtineat dignitatem, nec ulli omnino hominum ancillare obsequium faciat in terris," &c. Which words are spoken of the blessed Virgin, but, according to the construction of that age, to be ^ounderstood of

¹ Thorn. *ibid.* col. 1836, 1837. p. 582.

^m Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 124. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 65. Vide Adam. de Domesham de Lite inter Episcopos Bathon. et Monachos Glaston. in Wharton. *Anglia Sacra*, vol. 1.

ⁿ See p. 22. note c. Usser. de Primord. c. 6. p. 113. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 60.

^o See p. 17. and note g. Usser. *ibid.*

Glastonbury abbey, because the church was believed to be consecrated to her by our Saviour himself.

But it seems strange that such a charter should ever pass for authentic with any who compare the language of it with the history of king Ina, as it is delivered by the monkish historians. For by them it appears what wars he had with his neighbour princes, and how far he was to the last from commanding kings and princes and archbishops, whose kingdom was confined to the West and South Saxons, and had but one bishop in it till the eighteenth year of his reign, when it was divided into two, ^p Daniel having one share, and Aldelm the other. And some years after Eadbertus was bishop of the South Saxons, so that he had but three bishops at the most, and never an archbishop in his dominions: how then could he call the several kings, archbishops and bishops together to pass this charter? The like gross absurdity there is in the ^q charter of Evesham abbey, wherein Brightwaldus is said to draw it up with the consent of all the princes in England met in council, as the pope Constantine explains it; which is somewhat hard to believe concerning that age, wherein they were
26 under no common head, but continually fighting with each other, till the West Saxons prevailed. And the case of the abbey of Evesham seems to have been much the same with that of Glastonbury. For ^r William of Malmesbury wonders how Bede came to omit the foundation of it, if it were so solemnly declared at Rome as the charters import, when Kenred and Offa were both there, which is mentioned by ^s Bede. And

^p Bedæ *ibid.* lib. 5. cap. 18. et not. p. 203. Cantab. 1722. Spelman. *ibid.* p. 208. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 747.

^q *Monastic. Anglican.* vol. 1. p. 146. vol. 2. p. 16. Spelman.

ibid. p. 211. et not. p. 213. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 749. and note, p. 750, col. 2.

^r W. Malmesb. de Gest. Pont. *ib.* 4. p. 162. p. 284.

^s Bedæ *ibid.* lib. 5. cap. 19. et

in truth it is very strange that so diligent a writer, especially of such things, as Bede was, should say not a word either of Glastonbury or Evesham. But he judiciously imputes the occasion of founding this † monastery to some old church of the Britons standing there in a desolate place, which Egwin, then bishop of Worcester, took a great fancy to, and so raised a monastery there. But such a plain story as this would never do the monks' business, and therefore they must have a legend of Egwin's chains, &c. and the vision of the blessed Virgin there, and large immunities granted to the place on these accounts, as they have fully done in the charters^u of Kenred and Offa, the bull of Constantine, and the privilege of Egwin. But yet this unlucky charge of pope Constantine to Brightwaldus^x, "to summon a council of the whole nation, princes and bishops, to confirm this charter," at a time when there were so many kingdoms not only divided, but most commonly in actual war with each other, makes this whole charter appear to be an undoubted forgery of the monks to obtain great privileges to themselves.

But to return to Glastonbury; I do not question that † king Ina did found a monastery there, where before had been an ancient church in the British times. But I see no ground to believe, that either Joseph of Arimathea or St. Patrick or St. David had ever been there. But these were great and well sounding names to amuse the people with, and by degrees advanced that monastery to so high a reputation, that the very monks of other places were concerned to lessen the authority

not. p. 204. Cantab. 1722.

† Spelman. *ibid.* p. 212. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 750. col. 1.

^u Spelman. *ibid.* p. 209. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 748. tom. 1. p. 71.

^x Spelman. *ibid.* p. 213. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 71. col. 1.

^y The Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 688. p. 57. expressly assigns the foundation to Ina.

of this tradition, as is evident by the ^z MS. chronicle of St. Augustine's, wherein the monks of Glastonbury are charged "with pretending to greater authority than they had reason for, that monastery being first founded by ²⁷king Ina, but they give out they had land given by Arviragus a king of the Britons." And even ^aWilliam of Malmesbury, although when he writes the ^bAntiquities of Glastonbury, he seems firmly to believe St. Patrick's being there, yet when he comes elsewhere to speak of his being buried there, he adds that cooling expression, "si credere dignum," and takes not the least notice of Joseph of Arimathæa and his companions. So much difference he thought there ought to be between writing the legend of a monastery and a true history. And there he plainly affirms, that ^cking Ina was the first founder of it. To which ^dAsserius agrees in an ancient MS. copy of his Annals: for A.D. 726, he saith, "Ina went to Rome, and there died, having built and dedicated a monastery in Glastonbury." But what presumption was it to say, "he dedicated it," if it were dedicated so long before by Christ himself, as the ^e vision of St. David and the Glastonbury tradition affirm! I do not then deny that there was an ^fancient church before Ina's time, which after the western Saxons became Christians, grew into mighty reputation; but all the succession of abbots before, either of ^gWorgresius,

^z Chron. S. August. MS. in Bibl. Aulæ Trinit. Cantab. See p. 19. note x. Usser. de Primord. c. 2. p. 18. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 10.

^a Malmesb. de Gest. Pontif. lib. 2. p. 145. 255. Usser. de Primord. c. 17. p. 893. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 463.

^b Gulielm. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glaston. Eccles. p. 296, &c. Usser. de Primord. c. 6. p. 110.

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 58.

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 108. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 57.

^d Asser. Ann. MS. A.D. 726. p. 151. vide Bedæ ibid. lib. 5. cap. 7. et not. Cantab. 1722.

^e See p. 11.

^f See p. 10.

^g Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 109. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 58. for some notice of

or Brightwaldus, or others, I look on as fabulous. For ^h Bede and others say, Brightwaldus was abbot of Reculver before he was archbishop; which is a good distance from Glastonbury. But the first abbot there was Hemgislus, to whom Ina granted a charter: after him Beorwaldus, to whom king Ina granted several lands by charters, far more probable than ⁱ this large one, whose authority I have hitherto discussed. Those charters are short, and the style agreeable to those times, and not one word of Joseph of Arimathæa, or St. Patrick, or St. David, in any of them. And those, I believe, were the original charters of that abbey.

But the abbey being thus founded and well endowed, then, like a man that hath made his own fortunes, who pretends to be derived from some ancient stock, so this monastery growing rich betimes, saw it must be cast much behind in place and dignity, unless it could lay claim to some greater antiquity. And for this, the ^k old British church was an admirable foundation. And St. Patrick and St. David being two saints of wonderful ²⁸ esteem in Ireland and Wales, they first set up with the reputation of their being at Glastonbury, ^l the former being buried there, and ^m the latter building a little chapel. The monks finding the advantage of these pretences, made a further step towards the advancement of their monastery, by giving out that their old church was the ⁿ first church in Britain, and that all religion came

Worgresius, Brightwaldus, and Hemgislus.

^h Bed. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 9. (8.) p. 189. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 111. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 59.

ⁱ See p. 17, &c.

^k See p. 10.

^l Usser. de Primord. cap. 6.

p. 110. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 58. but on the contrary, Camden, *ibid.* p. 766. vol. 3. p. 617. Additions, p. 620.

^m Usser. de Primord. p. 114. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 60.

ⁿ See p. 17. of this chap. and note *g*.

from thence into other parts ; which by degrees gaining belief, ° they at last pitched upon Joseph of Arimathæa as the person who came first hither, being a man whose name was every where in great esteem for the respect he shewed to our Saviour's body : and him they thought they might safely pitch upon, not being pretended to by any other church. But it was a considerable time before the name of Joseph of Arimathæa came to be mentioned, not being found in any of the Saxon charters, which speak most to the advantage of Glastonbury ; as may be seen by those of king ^pEdmond and king ^qEdgar in the Monasticon. But by the time of Henry II. the tradition was generally received, that the old church at Glastonbury was built by the disciples of our Lord, and that it was the original church of this nation ; as appears by the charter of Henry II. omitted in the Monasticon, but printed by ^rHarpsfield, and the learned primate of ^sArmagh, by which we see what authority the monks of Glastonbury had then obtained, for not only this tradition is inserted in the charter, as a thing certain, but a repetition is there made of several other charters, as seen and read before the king, which were undoubtedly counterfeit, such as that of king Arthur, and several others ; yet all these went down then, and were confirmed by the king's insepimus. From this time the monks of Glastonbury were triumphant, and no one durst dispute their traditions how improbable soever. This charter being confirmed by

° See p. 11, &c.

^p Monastic. Anglican. vol. 1. p. 15. vol. 1. p. 26. Gulielm. Malmesbur. de Antiq. Glaston. Eccles. p. 318. Spelman. ibid. pp. 427. 485. &c. Wilkins ibid. tom. 1. pp. 217, 258.

^q Usser. de Primord. cap. 6.

p. 114. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 60.

^r Harpsfield. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 2. p. 3.

^s Usser. Primord. cap. 6. p. 122. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 64. Vide Camden. ibid. p. 165. vol. 1. p. 58.

the ^t *inspeximus* of 6, 7 Edward II., of 1, 6 Edward III., and 1 Edward IV. And from hence it grew to be the common opinion of the nation, and was pleaded for the honour of it in the councils of Pisa, Constance, Siena and Basil, of which the ^u *primate* hath given a full account, and, as things passed among them then, our nation had as just right to insist on their tradition of 29 Joseph of Arimathæa, as the ^x *Spaniards* on that of St. James going into Spain; for certainly one tradition was as good as the other.

But having thus far examined the authority of this tradition, I now come to consider the circumstances of it. And supposing the testimonies to confirm it to have been of far greater authority than I find them, yet the very improbable circumstances of the story itself would be a sufficient reason for me to pass it over (leaving every one to believe as much of it as he sees cause), viz.

1. The tradition of the church mentioned by ^y *Eusebius*, ^z *Sophronius*, ^a *St. Chrysostom*, and ^b *Hippolytus Portuensis*, “that ^c *St. Philip* continued preaching in the eastern parts, about Phrygia, and suffered at Hierapolis.”

2. The ^d *eremitical* course of their lives so wholly different from that of the apostles and other disciples of our Lord, in an age of so much business and employ-

^t *Usser. ibid. not. t.*

^u *Id. cap. 2. p. 23, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 13, &c.*

^x *Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 5. cap. 2. p. 23. cap. 16. p. 743.*

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 3. 13. 388.

^y *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24. p. 243.*

^z *Sophron. de Script. Eccles. p. 71.*

^a *Chrys. de 12 Apost. Oper.*

tom. 5. p. 995. tom. 8. p. 11. in spuriis.

^b *Hippolyt. de 12 Apost. in Oper. App. p. 30, et not. p. 33.*

^c *Concerning his pretended preaching in Gaul. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 12. Brit. Eccl. Antiq. p. 7.*

^d *See p. 8.*

ment in preaching the gospel, who went from one city and country to another for that end.

3. The building of the church by a ^e vision of the archangel, and devoting it and themselves to the blessed Virgin, favours too grossly of monkish superstition to be near the time pretended.

4. The consecrating a churchyard together with a church, in order to the burial of persons in it at that time, is none of the most probable circumstances, and yet it is a material one, “quod ipse Dominus ecclesiam ^f simul cum cœmeterio dedicarat.” ^g Sir H. Spelman observes, “that the custom of compassing churches with churchyards was not so ancient:” and withal he adds, “that although the British cities had churches from the beginning of Christianity, yet there were no burying-places within cities, till Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, obtained leave for it, about A.D. 758.” Upon this ^h Alford and ⁱ Cressy charge him with a
30 manifest mistake and great impertinency. A mistake, in that Ethelbert and Augustine were both buried in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. And what then? Doth sir H. Spelman say there was no burying in churches before Cuthbert’s time? No; but that there was no burying-place in cities before that time. For the church of St. Augustine, or St. Peter and St. Paul, was without the city. For so the ^k MS. chronicle of

^e See p. 10.

^f Spelman. *ibid.* p. 10. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 690. where for “simul” it is “prius.” Usser. *de Primord.* c. 6. p. 114. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 60. has “prius.”

^g Spelman. *Conc.* p. 11. compared with p. 189. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 692. col. 1. compared with p. 756. col. 1. from whence

the error in date in the former pages of Spelman and Wilkins will be evident.

^h *Annal. ibid.* tom. 1. A.D. 63. n. 27. p. 54.

ⁱ *Church Hist. lib.* 2. chap. 8. n. 5. p. 27.

^k *Chron. MS. tit.* 12. See p. 19. note x. *Vid. Spelman. ibid.* p. 114. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 725. col. 2.

St. Augustine's saith, "that when the bodies of the kings and archbishops were carried thither to burial, they followed our Saviour, who suffered without the gate. And that it was like the children of Israel's going out of Egypt," &c. Which is sufficient to prove the truth of sir H. Spelman's observation, which relates to burying in cities and not in churches. And withal the reason alleged in one of the charters of ¹ king Ethelbert why that place was assigned for a burying-place is, "because the city is for the living, and not for the dead." But why do they not prove the antiquity of churchyards to be so great, which was the most to the purpose? But they say, "sir H. Spelman's observation was impertinent, Glastonbury being then a solitary place, and very far from being a city." It is true, if the weight had been laid by him only upon that, there being no evidence of any Roman city there. But his design was to prove, "that churchyards were not then adjoining to churches, because the cemeteries were without the city and the churches within in the British times;" and even in the Saxon times, ^m he saith, "although they buried in churches, yet those churches in which they buried were without the cities, till Cuthbert first procured the alteration by royal authority, and, some say, by papal too." But the monks of St. Augustine's denied the pope's confirmation.

But the main circumstance I shall insist upon is, the incongruity of this story with the condition of the Roman province at that time. For there was no such British king then as ⁿ Arviragus, and in that country, as will appear by the more southern parts of the island

¹ Monastic. Anglican. vol. 1. p. 290. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 756. p. 24. vol. 1. p. 127. Spelman. col. 2. p. 757. col. 1. *ibid.* p. 120. Wilkins *ibid.* p. 729. ⁿ See p. 32. Tanner. *ibid.* uncol. 1.

^m Spelman. Concil. tom. 1.

being reduced into the form of a province before A.D. 63, when the ^o Glastonbury tradition saith, Joseph of Arimathæa came first to Britain. For ^p Tacitus saith, it was done “as to the nearest part of the island when
31 A. Plautius and Ostorius Scapula were governors here,” and between them and ^q Suetonius Paulinus were ^r Didius Gallus and Veranius. In probability the Belgæ were subdued by Vespasian, of whom ^s Suetonius saith, “that he conquered here two powerful nations, above twenty towns, and the Isle of Wight,” by which we find his employment was westward, and the Belgæ and Damnonii were the two powerful nations that way. ^t And in all the actions afterwards, we find no care taken by the Roman generals to secure themselves against the Belgæ as they did against the Brigantes and Silures, among whom ^u Caractacus commanded; so that there could be no such British king at that time among the Belgæ as Arviragus is supposed to have been. For if there had been when ^x Ostorius marched northwards, having suppressed the Iceni, it is not to be supposed that he would have fixed his garrisons on the Severn

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 13. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 7.

^p Tacit. Vit. Agric. cap. 14. inter Oper. tom. 4. p. 82. et not. &c. p. 203. for the series of the Roman governors of Britain. Vide Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 45. n. 8. p. 23. A.D. 51. n. 1, &c. p. 31. Camden. *ibid.* p. 375. vol. 2. p. *166.

^q Camden. *ibid.* p. 35. vol. 1. p. 37. Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 61. n. 1. p. 43.

^r Camden. *ibid.* p. 34. vol. 1. p. 36. Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 55, &c. A.D. 60. n. 1. p. 37.

^s Sueton. in Vesp. cap. 4. Camden. *ibid.* p. 31. vol. 1. pp. 32.

115. 124. compared with p. 143. col. 1. in the latter edition. See note ^t following. Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 45. n. 8. p. 23.

^t Musgrav. Comment. ad Julii Vitalis Epitaph. p. 113. 122.

^u See p. 34. and note. Camden. Brit. pp. 31. 446. 457. vol. 1. p. 32. vol. 2. p. 395. and the Additions, p. 404. vol. 3. p. 2. Roy's Military Antiquities, in the Appendix, Diss. 1.

^x Tacit. Annal. 12. cap. 3. inter Oper. tom. 2. p. 61. et not. &c. p. 383. Vide Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 52. n. 1. 2, &c. p. 31. Camden. *ibid.* p. 31. 329. vol. 1. p. 32. vol. 2. p. 71.

and the Avon to secure the province. For, as our judicious antiquary hath well observed, “the design of Ostorius therein was to keep the provincial Britons from joining with the others;” and therefore all on this side those garrisons were within the Roman province. ^z Now the places where the garrisons were placed are by Tacitus said to be Antona and Sabrina. The latter is certainly the Severn, which parted the Belgæ and the Silures. ^a For Antona, Camden reads Aufona, (although Northampton comes nearer the former name, and Southampton had its name from the river Anton, which there runs into the sea; and ^b Ptolemy calls Trisanton, i. e. saith Camden, Traith Anton, the mouth of Anton;) but ^c he chooses Aufona, for this reason, because the two Avons rise both in the county of Northampton, and so cut the island, that none can pass out of the north, but they must cross one or the other of them, or else fall upon the Roman garrisons between, the remainders whereof he takes notice of between the rise of the two Avons at Gilsborough and Daventry; by which means he hindered all intercourse between the Brigantes and the Roman province, as the other did between the Silures and them. But if there had been such a British king as Arviragus among the Belgæ, what would the fortifying the Severn have signified, when the enemies ³² to the Romans lived on the Roman side? Tacitus indeed mentions an expedition of Ostorius against the Cangi, whom ^d Camden sometimes thought a small people among the Belgæ, but upon better consideration ^e he places them in Cheshire, where he found an

^y Camden. Brit. p. 375. vol. 2. p. 116.

p. * 166. Alford. *ibid.*

^c Camden. *ibid.* as in note *y*,

^z Camden. *ibid.* Roy *ibid.* &c.

Pref. *Introduct.* p. viii.

^d Brit. p. 168. vol. 1. p. 60.

^a Camden. *ibid.* †

also *Addit.* p. 75.

^b Camden. *ibid.* p. 188. vol. 1.

^e Brit. p. 463. vol. 2. p. 426.

inscription concerning the Ceangi. And ^fTacitus saith, “they were not far from the seacoast which looks towards Ireland.”

§ R. White of Basingstoke supposes this Arviragus to bestow the island on Joseph of Arimathæa, when ^hTrebellius Maximus was governor here, who succeeded Petronius Turpilianus the year C. Suetonius Paulinus was consul at Rome; which, according to the Savilian Fasti, was in the twelfth year of Nero, and A. D. 67, (four years after Joseph’s coming, ⁱ according to the Glastonbury tradition,) but that is no great matter, if at that time we are sure there was no such a king as Arviragus among the Belgæ: but he again contradicts the Glastonbury story. For Malmesbury saith, “^k that the barbarous king obstinately refused to quit his religion, but, out of pity to them, gave them the island to live in;” but White saith, “^l he was well affected to the Christian religion, and was in all respects an admirable prince.” This Arviragus he takes out of the ^m British History, where pleasant stories are told of him, and from thence in ⁿ Matthew Westminster, as of his opposing Claudius, and then marrying his daughter Genissa, and the reconciliation between him and Vespasian by her means, &c. And how his son ^o Marius

compared with the Additions, p. 439. Horsley’s Brit. Roman. b. 1. cap. 2. p. 34, &c. b. 2. cap. 3. p. 316, &c. Alford. *ibid.* n. 3.

^f Camden. *ibid.* p. 31. vol. 1. p. 32. in addition to note e. For the reverses which Ostorius afterwards experienced, as related by Tacitus, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 34. vol. 1. p. 36.

§ R. Whit. Basing. lib. 4. p. 293.

^h See Tacitus, as before, in Camden. p. 37. vol. 1. p. 39.

ⁱ See p. 30. and note °.

^k Gulielm. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glaston. Eccles. p. 292. Usser. de Primord. cap. 2. p. 13. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 7.

^l Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 21. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12.

^m Galf. Mon. lib. 1. cap. 25. See Camden. *ibid.* p. 254. vol. 1. p. 261.

ⁿ Matt. West. Flor. Hist. A. D. 44. p. 51.

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. omiss. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 24. See c. 2. p. 64.

succeeded him, and then Coillus, who was wonderfully beloved by the Roman senate. Here we have found at last the three kings of Glastonbury, Arviragus, Marius and Coillus, as they are extant in ^p Capgrave and others: so that the Glastonbury tradition had not its perfection till it had received these improvements from the British History. For William of Malmesbury, though he took so great pains in this matter, yet knew nothing of Arviragus, Marius and Coillus. He speaks indeed of ^q three pagan kings giving twelve portions of land to the twelve brethren, but he knew not their names. “^r Which grant,” he saith, “was confirmed by king Lucius to twelve others who were placed there, in imitation of the first twelve.” And this continued to the ³³ coming of St. Patrick. And yet towards the conclusion of this book he saith, “that ^s A.D. 601, the king of Domponia,” i. e. Devonshire and Cornwall, “gave to the old church in Glastonbury the land called ^t Ynis Withrin, or, the Island of Avalon.” Who this king was, he saith, he could not learn, but he concludes him to have been a Briton, by calling the island by the British name. But as to Arviragus, that there was a British prince of that name cannot be denied, since Juvenal mentions him in Domitian’s time.

^u Omen habes, inquit, magni clarique triumphi,
Regem aliquem capies, aut de Temone Britanno
Excidet Arviragus.

^p Usser. de Primord. cap. 2.

p. 21. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 12.

^q Gulielm. Malmesb. ibid.

p. 292. Usser. de Primord.

cap. 2. p. 13. 20. Brit. Eccles.

Antiq. p. 7. 11.

^r Usser. de Primord. cap. 6.

p. 105. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 55.

^s Gul. Malmesb. ibid. p. 308.

Usser. de Prim. Brit. Add. p. 1054.

Eccles. Antiq. cap. 6. p. 58.

^t Usser. de Primord. cap. 17.

p. 894. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.

p. 463.

^u Satyr. 4. ver. 125. et not. 126.

p. 127. Amst. 1684. compared

with Holyday’s note, p. 73. in his

translation. Usser. de Primord.

cap. 15. p. 583. Brit. Eccles.

Antiq. p. 304. et cap. 2. p. 12.

Camden. ibid. pp. 43. 254. vol. 1.

pp. 45. 261.

The ^v author of the Chronicle of Dover understands this passage as spoken to Nero; which agrees much better with the tradition of Glastonbury, but will by no means agree with Juvenal, who saith plainly enough that ^w satire related to Domitian and his flatterers. And this was a very insipid flattery to Domitian, unless Arviragus were a considerable prince then living, and an enemy to Cæsar. For what triumph could he have over a subject or a friend as Arviragus is supposed after the reconciliation with Vespasian? And no such enemy could appear at that time in these parts of Britain. For ^x Petilius Cerealis had conquered the Brigantes, and Julius Frontinus the Silures, and Agricola after them the Ordovices. And in the time of his government, Tacitus saith ^y, “even the confederate cities among the Britons, who stood upon terms of equality before, then submitted themselves to the Roman power, and received garrisons among them. ^z After this, Agricola proceeded northwards against new people, and destroyed them as far as the Frith of Taus (Tweed). Then ^a he fortified the passage between Glota and Bodotria (Dunbritton and Edinborough Frith). So that the Romans were absolute lords of all this side, “having cast out the enemy as it were into another island;” ^b as sir H. Savile translates the words

^v Chron. Dover. apud Leland. Collectan. tom. 2. p. 50. marg.

^w Usser. *ibid.*

^x Tacit. Agric. cap. 17. inter Oper. tom. 4. p. 85. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 38. 467. 521. 557. vol. 1. p. 1. vol. 2. pp. 441. 530. vol. 3. p. 2. Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 74. and 78. n. 1. A. D. 80. n. 2. See c. 5. p. 243.

^y Camden. *ibid.* p. 39. vol. 1. p. 41. Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 81. n. 2.

^z Camden. *ibid.* and Index to

vol. 3. ed. 1789. under Agricola. Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 82. n. 13. A. D. 83. n. 1. Lloyd *ibid.* c. 1. §. 2. p. 3, &c. See c. 5. p. 243. and notes.

^a Camden. *ibid.* pp. 82. 698. vol. 1. p. 90. vol. 3. p. 355. Additions, p. 358, &c. Lloyd *ibid.* c. 1. §. 2. p. 3.

^b In his edit. of 1598. p. 193. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 39. 691. vol. 1. p. 41. vol. 3. p. 320. compared with Additions.

of Tacitus. From which it is evident, there could be no such king as Arviragus at that time in these parts³⁴ of the island, over whom Domitian could expect a triumph.

But suppose there were, what is this to the eighth of Nero, when Joseph of Arimathæa is said to have come hither, at what time Arviragus is said to be king in Britain? It is possible he might live so long; but how comes he to be never mentioned in the Roman story, as Prasutagus, Cogidunus, Caractacus, Togodumnus and Galgacus are? Arviragus's name was well known at Rome in Domitian's time; why not spoken of before? ^c Some think he was the same with Prasutagus; but this cannot be, for Prasutagus was dead before the revolt of the Britons under Boadicea, ^d which was occasioned by the Romans' ill usage of the Britons after his death. And Prasutagus left only two daughters; what becomes then of his son Marius? whom ^e White would have to be Cogidunus. But Marius is said to succeed Arviragus, who was alive in Domitian's time, and Cogidunus had the cities conferred upon him before Suetonius Paulinus came into Britain, as appears by ^f Tacitus, which are things inconsistent. ^g Others say that Arviragus was the same with Caractacus; for this opinion Alford contends, and Juvenal, he saith, mentions the name by a poetical license, although he lived long before. But what reason is there to suppose that ^h Fabricius Veienti

^c D. Powel. in *Catalog. Regum Britannorum præmiss. ad Pont. Virunnii Britannic. Histor.* See ch. 2. p. 64.

^d Camden. *ibid.* pp. 35. 329. vol. 1. p. 37. vol. 2. p. 71.

^e White *Hist. Brit.* lib. 4. p. 384. Vide Alford. *ibid.* A.D.

73. n. 1. p. 68.

^f Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 3. p. 43. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 24. See ch. 2. p. 62.

^g Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 45. n. 9. p. 23.

^h See references to Usher in note ^u, p. 33.

should make such a coarse compliment to Domitian, that he should triumph over a man dead, and triumphed over once already by Claudius, who was never known at Rome by any other name than ⁱCaractacus, (as far as we can find,) by which he was so famous for his long opposition to the Romans? ^kBut it is very probable, that in Domitian's time, after the recalling Agricola, and ^ltaking away the life of Salustius Lucullus, his successor, the Britons took up arms under Arviragus. And the ^mlearned primate of Armagh mentions an old British coin in sir R. Cotton's collections with these letters on it ARIVOG, from whence he thinks his true name was Arivogus, which the Romans turned to Arviragus. And ⁿthe old scholiast there saith, "that was not his true name." ^oThe Britons being now up in arms, as far as we can learn, were not repressed till Hadrian came over in person, ³⁵and ^pbuilt the first wall, to keep them out of the Roman province. For before this, ^qSpartianus saith,

ⁱ For references to Camden, see p. 31. note ^u. For a supposed coin of Caractacus, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 71. vol. 1. p. 67.

^k Camden. *ibid.* as in note ^l, below. Vide Usser. de Primord. Index Chron. p. 1074. A.D. 82. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 507. col. 2.

^l Camden. *ibid.* p. 43. vol. 1. p. 45.

^m Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 583. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 304. with which compare Camden. *ibid.* by Gough, vol. 1. p. 68. note S, ed. 1789. See Bouteroue's Recherches Curieuses de Monoyes de France, 1666. pag. 59. fig. 1. Taylor Combe's Veterum Populorum et

Regum Numi, qui in Musæo Britannico adservantur, p. 6. It appears that the legend in reality is ARIVOS, and is by them attributed "to the Santones, a people of Aquitanian Gaul." See ch. 2. p. 62.

ⁿ Usser. *ibid.* where he calls him Arbila.

^o Camden. *ibid.* p. 45. vol. 1. p. 48.

^p Camden. Brit. pp. 46. 650. 698. vol. 1. p. 48. vol. 3. pp. 211. 355. See ch. 5. p. 242. and notes.

^q Spartian. in Hadrian. p. 3. inter Hist. August. Script. Camden. *ibid.* p. 557. vol. 3. p. 2. See ch. 2. p. 60. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 1. §. 3. p. 3. Usser. *ibid.* Index Chronol. A.D. 117.

“the Britons could not be kept in subjection to the Roman power.” So that here was a fit season in Domitian’s time (Agricola being recalled in the beginning of Domitian’s reign) for such a king as Arviragus to appear in the head of the Britons, and it was then a suitable compliment to him, to wish him a triumph over Arviragus. But ^rAlford saith, “that Claudius sent Caractacus home again, and after many years he died in peace, being a friend to the Romans.” How then comes Tacitus to take no notice of him, as he doth of Cogidunus? Is it probable the Romans would restore so subtle and dangerous an enemy as Caractacus had been to them? Cogidunus had been always faithful to them, but Caractacus an open enemy, and the Silures still in being, over whom he commanded, and not over the Belgæ, as he must have done, if he were the Arviragus who gave the hides of land to Joseph of Arimathæa and his companions.

These things I have here put together to shew for what reasons I decline the tradition of Joseph of Arimathæa’s coming hither to preach the gospel. And although they may not be sufficient to convince others, yet I hope they may serve to clear me from inexcusable partiality, which ^sMr. Cressy charges on all who call this tradition into question.

(2.) But, notwithstanding, I hope to make it appear from very good and sufficient evidence, “^t that there was a Christian Church planted in Britain during the apostles’ times.” And such evidence ought to be allowed in this matter which is built on the testimony of ancient and credible writers, and hath a concurrent probability of circumstances.

^r Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 53. n. 7.
tom. 1. p. 35.

^s Ch. Hist. b. 2. c. 1. n. 9. p. 21.

^t Usser. *ibid.* in præf.

I shall first produce the testimony of ancient and credible writers. For it is an excellent rule of ^u Baronius in such cases, “that no testimonies of later authors are to be regarded concerning things of remote antiquity, which are not supported by the testimony of ancient writers.” And there is a difference in the force of the testimony of ancient writers themselves, 36 according to their abilities and opportunities. For some had far greater judgment than others, some had greater care about these matters, and made it more their business to search and inquire into them; and some had greater advantages by being present in the courts of princes or councils of bishops, whereby they could better understand the beginning and succession of Churches. And for all these, there was none more remarkable in antiquity than Eusebius, being a learned and inquisitive person, a favourite of ^v Constantine, the first Christian emperor, (born and proclaimed emperor in Britain,) one present at the council at Nice, whither bishops were summoned from all parts of the empire, and one that had a particular curiosity to examine the history of all Churches, designing an ecclesiastical history out of the collections he made. The testimony of a person so qualified cannot but deserve great consideration, especially when it is not delivered by way of report, but when the force of an argument depends upon it. And ^w Eusebius, in his third book of Evangelical Demonstration, undertakes to prove, “that the apostles, who first preached the gospel to the world, could be no impostors or deceivers;” and among other

^u Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 1. n. 12.

^v See ch. 2. p. 74. ch. 3. p. 90.

^w Euseb. *Demonst. Evang.* lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 112. Schelstrate needlessly objects, Dis-

sertation, c. 1. n. 3, against Stillingfleet's quotation of this passage in favour of St. Paul's coming to Britain.

arguments, he makes use of this, "that although it were possible for such men to deceive their neighbours and countrymen with an improbable story, yet what madness were it for such illiterate men, who understood only their mother tongue, to go about to deceive the world by preaching this doctrine in the remotest cities and countries?" And having named the Romans, Persians, Armenians, Parthians, Indians, Scythians, he adds particularly, that some passed over the ocean ^x ἐπὶ τὰς καλουμένας Βρεττανικὰς νήσους, "to those which are called the British islands." From whence he concludes, "that some more than human power did accompany the apostles, and that they were no light or inconsiderable men, much less impostors and deceivers." Now unless this had been a thing very well known at that time, that Christianity was planted here by the apostles, why should he so particularly and expressly mention the British islands? It cannot be said that they are only set down to denote the most remote and obscure places. For long before that time the British islands were very well known all over the ³⁷ Roman empire, Britain having been the scene of many warlike actions from ^y Claudius's time; the occasion of emperors' additional titles and triumphs; the residence of Roman lieutenants and legions; the place of many Roman colonies, cities and ways: but especially, about Constantine's time, it was the talk of the world, for the ^z revolt of Carausius and Allectus; the victory and death of Constantius here; the succession of Constan-

^x Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 740. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 386. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 1. p. 48. See ch. 3. p. 90.

^y Stillingfleet's "Discourse of the true Antiquity of London," in his Works, vol. 3. p. 900.

For the Roman legions in Britain, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 44. vol. 1. p. 46. Horsley's *Britan. Romana*, b. 1. cap. 6. p. 76. See ch. 5. p. 302, &c.

^z See ch. 2. p. 71. ch. 3. p. 89.

tine, and his being declared emperor by the army in Britain. So that scarce any Roman province was so much interested in the several revolutions of the empire as Britain, and therefore Constantine going from hence, and being so much in the esteem of Eusebius, it is not to be conceived that he should speak these words at random, but that he had made a diligent inquiry both of Constantine himself, to whom he was well known, and of others of his court, concerning the state of the British Churches, of what continuance they were, and by whom planted. After all which Eusebius affirms it with so much assurance, “that some of the apostles preached the gospel in the British islands.”

Much to the same purpose ^aTheodoret speaks, another learned and judicious Church historian. For among the nations converted by the apostles, he expressly names the Britons; and elsewhere saith, “^b that St. Paul brought salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean,” after he had mentioned Spain, and therefore in all probability the British islands are understood by him. And in another place ^c he saith, “that St. Paul, after his release at Rome, went to Spain, and from thence carried the light of the gospel to other nations.” What other nations so likely to be understood as those which lay the nearest, and are elsewhere said to be converted by the apostles, as the Britons are by him? St. Jerome ^d saith, “that St.

^a Theodoret. Oper. tom. 4. Serm. 9. p. 610. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 4. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 2. Addend. p. 505. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 1. p. 48.

^b Theodoret. tom. 1. in Psal. 116. p. 870. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 8. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4.

^c Theodoret. *ibid.* tom. 3. in 2 Ep. ad Tim. iv. 17. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 8. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4.

^d Hieron. in Amos. cap. 5. tom. 3. col. 1412. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 8. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4.

Paul, having been in Spain, went from one ocean to another, imitating the motion and course of the Sun of righteousness, of whom it is said, ‘his going forth is from the end of heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it;’ and that his diligence in preaching extended as far as the earth itself.” Which are more indefinite³⁸ expressions. But elsewhere he saith, “^e that St. Paul, after his imprisonment, preached the gospel in the western parts;” by which the British islands were especially understood; as will appear by the following testimony of ^fClemens Romanus, who saith, “St. Paul preached righteousness through the whole world, and in so doing went *ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*, to the utmost bounds of the west.” Which passage will necessarily take in Britain, if we consider what was then meant by the bounds of the west.” Plutarch, in the Life of Cæsar, speaking of his expedition into Britain, saith, “he was the first who brought a fleet into the western ocean;” by which he understands the sea between Gaul and Britain. And ^gEusebius several times calls the British ocean, the western, and joins the British ocean and the western parts together. And ^helsewhere he mentions “Gaul and the western parts beyond it;” by which he understands Britain. And ⁱTheodoret reckons up the inhabitants of Spain, of

^e De Script. Eccles. Hieron. Oper. tom. 4. part. 2. Catalog. Script. Eccles. col. 103. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 8. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4.

^f Clem. Epist. ad Corinth. p. 8. Epist. 1. cap. 5. p. 24. edit. Wotton. not. 3. Burton’s edit. of Clement. Annot. p. 54. Usser. de Primord. Add. p. 1053. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 1. p. 4. note ^m. Schelstrate, *ibid.* n. 4, refers to this passage of Cle-

ment, and the preceding ones from Theodoret and Jerome, and endeavours to shew that these authorities, and especially Clement’s, do not necessarily relate to Britain.

^g Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. 1. cap. 25. 41. lib. 2. cap. 28. pp. 513. 522. 550.

^h Euseb. de Martyr. Palæst. cap. 13. p. 437.

ⁱ Theodor. Oper. tom. 3. Hist. Religios. cap. 26. p. 881.

Britain and Gaul, (“who,” saith he, “lie between the other two,”) as those “who dwell in the bounds of the west;” and among these the Britons must be in the utmost bounds, because the Gauls lie in the midst. ^j Herodotus saith, “the Celtæ are the most western of all the Europeans.” Now the ancient Greek geographers knew of but two nations in Europe besides themselves, the Celtæ and the Scythæ; these latter comprehended all in the most northern parts of Europe, and the Celtæ the western: and among these the remotest were the Britons. Thence ^k Horace calls them “ultimos orbis Britannos;” as ^l Catullus before him, “ultimosque Britannos.” For before the discovery of Britain, the ^m Morini, who lived over against it, were said to be the utmost people of the earth. So ⁿ Virgil calls them, “extremos hominum Morinos.” And ^o Pliny, “ultimique hominum existimati Morini.” Æthicus saith they were “gentes oceani occidentalis.” But Britain being thoroughly made known in the time of Claudius, the “utmost bounds of the west” must be understood of Britain, especially since ^p Catullus calls Britain “ultimam occidentis insulam.” And ^q Arnobius setting down the bounds of the gospel east

^j Herod. lib. 4. p. 273. The words of Herodotus, as translated by Beloe, are, “The Celtæ, except the Cynætæ, are the most remote inhabitants in the west of Europe,” Herod. b. 4. c. 49. See Rennell’s Geography of Herodotus, sect. 3. pag. 41. Schweighæuser in Adnotat. t. 5. p. 216, &c.

^k Hor. Carm. lib. 1. cap. 35. v. 29. p. 35. where, p. 56, see Dr. Bentley’s note.

^l Catull. ad Furium et Aurelium, p. 22. Camden. ibid. p. 702. vol. 3. p. 368.

^m Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 823. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 429. Camden. ibid. pp. 16. 245. vol. 1. pp. 15. 221.

ⁿ Æneid. lib. 8. v. 727.

^o Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 19. c. 1. vol. 6. p. 297.

^p Catull. ad Cæsar. p. 48. Camden. ibid. p. 17. vol. 1. p. 17.

^q Arnob. in Psal. 147. ed. Erasmi, p. 212. in Biblioth. Patrum, tom. 8. p. 327. Usser. de Primord. Addend. p. 1194. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. c. 1. p. 2.

and west, for the east he mentions the Indians, and for the west the Britons. I cannot but wonder what so learned a man as ^r Joh. Launoy means, when, being urged by his adversaries with this place of Clemens's epistle to prove the apostolical antiquity of the Gallican Churches, he fairly rejects the authority of this epistle, which hath been so universally received by all learned men since the first publishing of it. But then he argues well, that if this passage holds for "Gaul, it will much more hold for Britain." So that from this undoubted testimony of Clemens, it follows, not only "that the gospel was preached in Britain in the times of the Romans," but "that St. Paul himself was the preacher of it." Which is affirmed by ^s Venantius Fortunatus, where he describes St. Paul's labours.

Transit et oceanum, vel qua facit insula portum,
Quasque Britannus habet terras quasque ultima Thule.

^t But because this may look only like a poetical expression,

(3.) To make this out more fully, I shall consider the concurrent probability of circumstances, together with these testimonies. And I shall make it appear, 1. from St. Paul's circumstances, that he had leisure and oppor-

^r Launoy de loco Sulpic. Severi, §. 20. p. 123. inter Dissert. tres.

^s Ven. Fortun. Vit. St. Martini, lib. 3. in Carmin. et Epist. &c. p. 317. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 8. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4.

^t Camden. *ibid.* p. 47. vol. 1. p. 50. supposes that the poet speaks, not of Paul's person, but "of his doctrine in general." Although Stillingfleet speaks of

these words as "a poetical expression" only; yet Schelstrate, *ibid.* n. 5. strives to make the contrary appear; and also that by 'Thule' Tacitus intends Iceland, in order to shew the greater improbability of Stillingfleet's notions. But Alford, with many more, insists, *ibid.* A. D. 306. n. 1. p. 326, that Tacitus's Thule was Shetland, and not Iceland. See chap. 5. p. 246. and notes.

tunity enough to have come hither ; 2. from the circumstances of Britain, that here was encouragement and invitation enough for him to come ; 3. from the circumstances of the ^b rest of the apostles, that he was the most likely to come hither of any of them.

1. That ^c St. Paul had leisure and opportunity enough to come hither to preach the gospel. It is agreed by ^d Eusebius, ^e St. Jerome, and others of the ancients, that St. Paul suffered at Rome, fourteenth of Nero ; ^f Baronius saith, the thirteenth, reckoning the years of Nero exactly from the beginning of his reign in October ; but ^g Petavius saith, “ that the ancients reckoned the years according to the usual custom of a civil year.” So that the thirteenth of Nero’s reign is the fourteenth from the calends of January. St. Paul was sent to Rome when Festus was made procurator of
40 Judæa in the room of Felix, which was, say Eusebius and St. Jerome, in the second of Nero ; and I see no reason to question it ; for although Felix succeeded Cumanus in the government of Judæa, who was not condemned till the twelfth of Claudius (from whence to the second of Nero cannot be reckoned those many years ^h St. Paul saith he had been governor among the Jews) ; yet we are to consider, that Felix was not sent immediately from Rome, as ⁱ Baronius mistakes, but upon Cumanus’s sentence, had his former government enlarged. Judæa being then added to his pro-

^b Camden. *ibid.*

^c Fabricius, in his *Salutaris Lux Evangelii*, cap. 5. p. 67. has enumerated the writers of the life, travels, &c. of St. Paul.

^d Euseb. in *Chron.* p. 162.

^e Hieron. in *Catal. Script. Eccles. Oper.* tom. 4. part. 2. col. 103.

^f Baron. A. D. 69. n. 1.

^g Petav. de *Doct. Temporum*, part. 2. cap. 14. p. 323.

^h Acts xxiv. 10.

ⁱ Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 50. n. 8. See the place itself in Baronius, and compare therewith Pagi, as referred to in *Basnagii Annal. Polit. Eccles.* vol. 1. p. 622. A. D. 51. n. 9.

vince, and part of the province which he had before being given to Agrippa, as ^k Josephus saith; so that part of Galilee and Samaria having been under his government before, St. Paul might well say, he had been a ruler among them many years, although he were dismissed in the second of Nero. And although ^l Tacitus saith, “that Felix had been a long time governor of Judæa,” yet it appears, by the distribution of the province between Cumanus and him, that before Cumanus’s banishment, that which was properly Judæa fell not to his share; and it is not probable that his government should outlast the favour of Pallas with Nero, which mightily declined in his second year. After St. Paul’s coming to Rome, St. Luke saith, he abode there ^m two years. But ⁿ Massutius observes, from the circumstances of St. Paul’s voyage, “that he could not come to Rome till the third of Nero.” So that he could not have his liberty till the fifth, upon occasion of the favours shewed, as he conjectures, to prisoners and exiles on the murder of Agrippina. But from this time to his returning to Rome, he went up and down preaching the gospel. To which time ^o Godeau, in his Life of St. Paul, allows eight years: ^p Massutius rather more; ^q Baronius the same: and he saith, “it was time enough for him to pass through the whole world;” which Massutius repeats after him. The question now is, where St. Paul employed all this time? The ancient writers of the Church generally say, in the western parts; so ^r Clemens, Theodoret,

^k Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. 2. cap. 11. p. 1071.

^l Tacit. Annal. 12. cap. 54. inter Oper. tom. 2. p. 76. et not. p. 392.

^m Acts xxviii. 30.

ⁿ Massut. de Vit. S. Paul.

lib. 13. cap. 1. p. 713.

^o Vie de S. Paul, lib. 2.

p. 380.

^p Massut. ibid. cap. 7. p. 761.

^q Baron. ibid. A. D. 61. n. 2.

^r See p. 37.

St. Jerome, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and others. But I need not to insist on particular testimonies, since the
 41 only learned ^s person who hath opposed this opinion doth ingenuously confess it to have been the common and received opinion of all the fathers. And I see no reason, by any thing he hath produced, to recede from it. For suppose we should grant, that he went back into the eastern parts, and visited the Churches there, some part of this time; yet there is enough still left for St. Paul to preach the gospel in Britain and other western parts, as the fathers say that he did. And if we compare the time spent by St. Paul in his former travels in the east, and allow him to use an equal diligence afterwards, there cannot appear any improbability that he should come into Britain, and establish a Christian Church here. Three peregrinations of St. Paul we have an account of in the Acts of the Apostles, before his voyage to Rome. The ^t first is of him and Barnabas, from Antioch to Seleucia, Cyprus, Perga, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe of Lycaonia; from whence they returned back and settled the government of the Churches then planted by them. And although it be said ^u that they abode long at Iconium and Antioch, yet ^v Massutius shews, “that this whole peregrination took up but five years:” which is as much as ^w Baronius allows from the beginning of it to the council of Jerusalem. For that he placeth in the fourth of Claudius, and this in the ninth. But ^x he makes their return to Antioch in the seventh, so that he allows but three years to the founding and settling so many Churches. After the council at Jerusalem,

^s L. Cappell. ad Hist. Apost. App. p. 29.

^t Acts xiii. xiv.

^u Acts xiv. 3. 28.

^v Massut. ibid. lib. 4. cap. 9. p. 222.

^w Baron. ibid. A.D. 46. n. 12.

^x Ibid. A.D. 49. n. 1.

St. Paul takes another progress from Antioch, and went through ^y Syria and Cilicia, from thence to Derbe and Lystra; and so through Phrygia, and Galatia, and Mysia; and then from Troas crossed the sea into Macedonia, where he first preached at Philippi, a Roman colony: and from thence passed to Thessalonica, and so to Berea, Athens, and ^z Corinth, where he tarried a year and six months and more, and then sailed into Syria, and made haste to Jerusalem, and so returned to Antioch. This second progress ^a Baronius reckons from the ninth of Claudius to the twelfth, and half the time was spent at Corinth. The third was again from Antioch over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, to which ^b Baronius allows a year's time; and the next he ⁴² fixes at Ephesus, where St. Paul saith he ^c tarried three years (not exactly, but the far greatest part of it, having taught ^d three months in the synagogue, and two years in the school of Tyrannus). From Ephesus he goes into Macedonia and Achaia, and having abode there three months, he returned through Macedonia to Troas, and from thence went to Miletus, whither he sent for the elders of the Church, and took his solemn leave of them, saying, "^e that they should see his face no more." From Miletus he passed to Phœnicia, and so to Jerusalem, where he was kept two years in custody, and then sent by Festus to Rome. This is a short account of St. Paul's labours and diligence in preaching the gospel before his imprisonment at Rome. And we cannot suppose a person of such indefatigable industry and pains should lie still so many years after. It is certain he thought he should never return more to

^y Acts xv. 41.

^z Acts xviii. 11. 18. 22.

^a Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 51. n. 56.
(A. D. 54. n. 1.)

^b Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 54. n. 1.

Acts xviii. 23. ^c Acts xx. 31.

^d Acts xix. 8. 10.

^e Acts xx. 25, 38.

the eastern parts, when he said so solemnly, "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." Which words do not only concern the Church of Ephesus, but all the other Churches planted by him in the east; and this he speaks not as his fear or conjecture, but out of certain knowledge. And therefore it is not probable he should return into the east, nor, if he did, would this hinder his coming into these parts afterwards, where he might plant Churches within that time. But it is objected, "that there are no certain monuments of such Churches planted by him in Italy, Gaul, Germany, or Spain." What certain monuments are there of new Churches planted by him in the east after his return? And it is so much less probable, because the eastern writers, who should know best, allot this time to his preaching in the west. But it is well observed by the learned ^fM. Velserus, speaking of the preaching of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul in these western parts, "that we are not to judge of the planting of Churches by the remaining annals and monuments, because on the one side we are certain that their sound went out into all the earth; and on the other, great care was taken in the several persecutions, especially that of Dioclesian, to burn all the monuments
43 which concerned the Christian Churches." But yet, as to Britain, we have undoubted testimony of a Christian Church planted here by the apostles, and by none so probably as St. Paul. For ^gGildas saith, "the gospel was here received before the fatal defeat of the Britons by Suetonius Paulinus;" which, according to sir H. Savile's Fasti, was the seventh of Nero, the eighth saith Petavius: and St. Paul being at liberty the fifth, had time

^f M. Vels. Rer. Vindel. lib. 6. inter Oper. p. 292. ^g See p. 5.

and conveniency enough to settle a Christian Church in Britain.

2. That there was encouragement and invitation enough for St. Paul to come into Britain, not only from the “infinite numbers of people,” which ^h Cæsar saith were here in his time, but from the new settlements that were daily making here by the Romans, after the first success, which they had in the time of Claudius: ⁱ for then colonies were drawn over hither; and not only military colonies settled for the security of the Roman conquests, such as that of Camalodunum is described by ^k Tacitus, formerly the royal seat of Cynobelin, king of the Trinobantes; but also civil and trading colonies, such as London was from the beginning, and therefore ^l commended by Tacitus for its admirable situation for trading, and all accommodations to that end; and, upon the best inquiry I can make, I very much incline to believe it of a Roman foundation, and no elder than the time of Claudius ^m (as will be made appear in another discourse): and that in the time of Suetonius Paulinus it was inhabited by Romans and Britons together, is evident from Tacitus; when ⁿ Suetonius Paulinus drew out the inhabitants, the city not being then defensible against the Britons, who in that revolt “destroyed seventy thousand Romans and their allies,” saith Tacitus; but ^o Dio saith, “two cities”

^h Cæsar. de Bell. Gall. lib. 5. cap. 12. pp. 115. 165.

ⁱ See p. 5. and note x.

^k Tacit. Annal. 12. cap. 32. 14. cap. 31. inter Oper. tom. 2. pp. 62. 172. Camden. ibid. p. 31. vol. 1. p. 32. and note ^o below. See ch. 2. p. 75. Stillingfleet's Discourse of the true Antiquity of London, Works, vol. 3. pp. 896. 905, &c.

^l Camden. ibid. pp. 36. 304.

vol. 1. p. 38. vol. 2. p. 3.

^m Discourse ibid. p. 896.

ⁿ Camden. ibid. pp. 36. 304.

vol. 1. p. 38. vol. 2. p. 3.

^o Xiphil. p. 168. in Dion. Excerpt. Hist. in Dion. Hist. Rom. lib. 62. p. 700. Stillingfleet's Discourse, Works ibid. p. 897. Camden. ibid. pp. 292. 323. 330. vol. 1. p. 337. vol. 2. pp. 45. 71. which compare with p. 35. vol. 1.

p. 37.

(London and Verulam; for Camalodunum was destroyed before) “and eighty thousand men.” This was a time of so much disorder and bloodshed, that Gildas with great reason places the planting of Christianity here before it. And St. Paul might have some particular encouragement at Rome to come hither from ^p Pomponia Græcina, wife to A. Plautius, the Roman lieutenant under Claudius in Britain; for that she was a Christian appears very probable from the account Tacitus gives of her; ^q he saith, “she was accused of foreign superstition, and that so far as to endanger her life; but her husband cleared her, sitting as judge according to the ancient form; and she lived long after, but in perpetual sadness.” If Tacitus were to describe the primitive Christians, he would have done it just after this manner, charging their religion with superstition, and the severity of their lives (abstaining from all the feasts and jollities of the Romans) as a continual solitude. It was the way of the men at that time, such as ^r Suetonius and ^s Pliny as well as ^t Tacitus, to speak of Christianity as a barbarous and wicked superstition, (as appears by their writings,) being forbidden by their laws; which they made the only rule of religion. And this happened when Nero and Calphurnius Piso were consuls, after St. Paul’s coming to Rome, and therefore it is not unreasonable to suppose her one of his converts, by whom he might easily be informed of the state and condition of Britain, and thereby be more encouraged to undertake a voyage thither. It is certain that St.

^p Alford. *ibid.* A. D. 49. n. 2. tom. 1. p. 27. Musgrav. *Antiq. Brit. Belg.* vol. 3. p. 71. vol. 4. cap. 7. p. 55. Dalrymple’s *Disquisitions*, chap. 2. p. 46.

^q Tacit. *Annal.* 13. cap. 32. inter *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 121. Vide

Alford. ibid.

^r Suet. lib. 6. cap. 16.

^s Plin. *Epist. lib.* 10. ep. 98. vel 97. p. 820. et not. 4. 5.

^t Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 15. cap. 44. inter *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 230.

Paul did make considerable converts at his coming to Rome: which is the reason of his mentioning "the saints in Cæsar's household. And it is not improbable that some of the British captives carried over with Caractacus and his family might be some of them; who would certainly promote the conversion of their country by St. Paul. But I cannot affirm, as ^v Moncæius doth, "that Claudia, mentioned by St. Paul, was Caractacus's daughter, and turned Christian, and after married to Pudens, a Roman senator; whose marriage is celebrated by Martial in his noted Epigrams to that purpose.' It is certain that Claudia Ruffina was a Briton, who is so much commended by ^w Martial for her wit and beauty. But if these Epigrams were written in ^x Trajan's time, as is very probable, it is somewhat of the latest for the daughter of Caractacus, who came in Claudius's time to Rome. But ^y Alford digests all this well enough, only he is extremely concerned lest she should be made the apostle of Britain, and preach here before St. Peter. But the ^z author of the *Antiquitates Britannicæ*, whom he reflects upon, saith no such thing as he would im-45 pute to him. He only saith, "that if she were a Christian she would acquaint her countrymen as much with the Christian doctrine as she did before with Martial's wit." Wherein there is no profaneness or absurdity. But he adds, "^a that in so noble a family, the rest of her kindred who were baptized with her

^u Phil. iv. 22.

^v Moncæius, de Incunab. Reg. Eccles. Christianæ Vet. Britan. p. 4, &c. Tanner *ibid.* under Claudia Rufina. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 43. 47. vol. 1. p. 45. Horsley *ibid.* b. 2. chap. 3. p. 336.

^w Martial. lib. 4. ep. 13. p. 221. lib. 11. ep. 53. p. 635. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 10. Brit.

Eccles. Antiq. p. 5. Camden. *ibid.*

^x See Tanner, as above, to the contrary, in note ^v. Usser. de Primord. p. 12. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 6.

^y Alford. *Annal. Eccles. A.D.* 35. n. 5, 6. in tom. 1. p. 34.

^z Parker. *Antiq. Brit.* p. 3. *De Vetust. Eccles. Brit.* p. 4.

^a Parker. *ibid.*

might be the occasions of dispersing Christianity in the British nation." So that there was no need ^b for his bidding Claudia to keep at home, and make room for St. Peter to come to Britain to preach the gospel. But if this Claudia were St. Paul's disciple, why might not she excite that apostle to go into her country, to plant Christianity there, as he had done with so much success in other places? And whether St. Peter or St. Paul were more probably the apostle of Britain, is now to be considered. And I affirm,

3. That St. Paul was the most likely to come hither of any of the apostles. The several traditions about ^c St. James, ^d Simon Zelotes and ^e Philip, are so destitute of any ancient testimony or probability, that the competition among the apostles can lie only between St. Peter and St. Paul. ^f Some writers of our Church history have endeavoured, for particular reasons, to prove ^g St. Peter to have preached the gospel in Britain; but their proofs are very slight and inconsiderable, and depend chiefly on the authority of ^h Simeon Metaphrastes, or other legendary writers, or some monkish visions, or some domestic testimonies of his pretended successors, or some late partial advocates, such as ⁱ Eysengrenius, who professes to follow Metaphrastes. All which together are not worth mentioning in comparison with the authors on the other side; I shall therefore examine the probability of the thing

^b Alford. *ibid.* n. 6. p. 35.

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 5. cap. 16. p. 743. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 3. 338.

^d *Ibid.* de Primord. pp. 7. 740. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 4. 386.

^e *Ibid.* de Primord. cap. 2. p. 12. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 7.

^f See chap. 2. p. 77. chap. 3. p. 108.

^g Usser. de Primord. pp. 7.

740. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 4. 386.

^h *Ibid.* de Primord. pp. 7. 743. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 4. 387.

Camden. *ibid.* as in note ^b, p. 39.

ⁱ Eysengren. cent. 1. part. 7. dist. 8. fol. 222. 2. Usser. *ibid.*

cap. 16.

from the circumstances of St. Peter, as I did before from those of St. Paul; and I shall endeavour to shew, that his business lay quite another way, and that there is no probable evidence of his coming hither.

I take it for granted, that the apostles were employed according to the tenor of their commissions, viz. that the apostle of the circumcision was to attend the Jews, and of the uncircumcision the Gentiles. Now St. Paul ⁴⁶ saith, “that ^k the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to him, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter.” “This,” ¹Baronius saith, “was agreed at the council at Jerusalem.” But he will not have it to be such a distribution of distinct provinces, as that the one upon no occasion should meddle with the Gentiles, nor the other with the Jews: but yet he grants, “that the apostleship of the Gentiles was in a particular manner committed to St. Paul, as of the Jews to St. Peter.” And whatever they might do occasionally, this, as he proves from ^mSt. Jerome, was the “principale mandatum,” the main of the commission to either of them. Which being supposed, it necessarily follows, that St. Peter’s chief employment must be where the greatest numbers of Jews were. And from hence ⁿ Petrus de Marca infers, “that St. Peter, having preached to the Jews in Judæa, employed himself in converting the Jews abroad both of the first and second dispersion.” The latter were chiefly in Egypt, at Alexandria, where he settled Mark the bishop over the converted Jews. From thence he went to Antioch; from thence to Babylon, where the head of the first dispersion lived; “^o and in this city,” he saith, “he wrote

^k Gal. ii. 7.

¹ Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 51. §. 16.
26. 28, 29.

^m Hieron. in *Ep. ad Gal.* c. 2.
Oper. tom. 4. part. 1. col. 241.

ⁿ Pet. de Marc. de *Concord.*
Sacerdot. et Imper. tom. 3. lib. 6.
cap. 1. n. 4. p. 6.

^o See Stillingfleet’s *Works*,
vol. 1. ser. 25. p. 412.

his Epistle to those dispersed Jews, over whose synagogues the patriarch of Babylon had jurisdiction." Clemens Romanus takes no notice at all of St. Peter's preaching in the western parts, as he doth of St. Paul's. But ^p Eusebius, from Origen, saith, "that St. Peter preached to the dispersed Jews in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia," &c. And ^q Epiphanius, even where he saith, "that St. Peter and St. Paul did both constitute bishops at Rome upon their going thence to preach the gospel in other places;" yet he adds, "that St. Paul went towards Spain, but St. Peter frequently visited Pontus and Bithynia," which was very agreeable to the design of his commission, there being so great a number of Jews in those parts. And Pontus and Bithynia seem to have been reserved as the peculiar province of St. Peter; for when St. Paul attempted to go into Bithynia, ^r he was forbidden by the Spirit, which then commanded him to come into Europe: and so he made for Macedonia. ^s Baronius grants, 47 "that St. Peter spent the greatest part of his time in the eastern parts, but about A.D. 58. he finds him employed in the west, and particularly among the Britons." But what ancient authority, according to his own rule, doth he produce for it? He names none ^t but Metaphrastes, and yet, as it falls out unluckily,

^p Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 88.

^q Epiphanius. Hæc. 27. n. 6. Oper. tom. 1. p. 107.

^r Acts xvi. 7.

^s Baron. ibid. A.D. 58. n. 51.

^t Alford. ibid. A.D. 58. n. 1. p. 38, &c., where he follows Baronius and Metaphrastes. Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, ibid. c. 1. n. 2, whose work depends, for the most part, upon the proof that St. Peter founded

in person the British Church, has insisted upon the pretended authority of Eusebius, as quoted by Metaphrastes: against whose unsupported testimony (see p. 45. note ^b) it is sufficient to quote Baronius and Bellarmine. The latter, in his work, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, under the year 850, observes, that Metaphrastes "wrote the lives of the saints, intermixed with many additions of his own."

when the same Metaphrastes' authority is produced for St. Paul's preaching in the western parts, he is apparently slighted by him, "and for the very same reason which holds against the former testimony, viz. " for quoting things out of Eusebius which are not to be found in him." And elsewhere he saith, " u he is of no authority in these matters." But Metaphrastes' testimony serves to a good purpose in St. Peter's case, viz. to clear a considerable difficulty, how St. Peter, if then bishop of Rome, should not be taken notice of by St. Paul, when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. To which he answers, " v that St. Peter came to Rome the second of Claudius, but being banished thence with other Jews the ninth of Claudius, he spent the time then in preaching the gospel in other places," and so very conveniently finds him in Britain, when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, which he placeth in the second of Nero. " But it is by no means probable," saith w Valesius, " that St. Peter should come to Rome before the death of Herod Agrippa." And x Baronius saith, " that after his being delivered out of prison, he went to Cæsarea, Laodicea and Antioch," (according to his own author Metaphrastes,) " and then into Cappadocia, Pontus, Galatia and Bithynia, and so returned by Antioch to Jerusalem." So that if Metaphrastes' authority be

Besides which, if, as is stated in the following page from Lactantius, note e, Peter came to Rome " not long before his martyrdom, it will necessarily follow, that he could have no time to travel to such a length of country north-westward, and preach the gospel among the Britons." Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. 1. p. 6.

From which we conclude, that the references made by Schelstrate *ibid.* to the Anglo-Saxon Church History need not our particular consideration.

tt Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 61. n. 4.

u *Ibid.* A.D. 44. n. 38.

v *Ibid.* A.D. 58. n. 51.

w Vales. in Euseb. l. 2. c. 16. p. 65.

x Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 44. §. 10.

good for any thing, St. Peter could hardly come to Rome the second of Claudius. And if the death of Agrippa followed soon after the delivery of St. Peter, as Valesius thinks, and St. Luke seems to intimate, then he could not be at Rome till the fourth of Claudius, for all agree that Agrippa died that year: so that there is no certainty of St. Peter's coming to Rome the second of Claudius. Yet let that be supposed, and that St. Peter went from Rome on the edict of Claudius; what makes him so long absent from thence as to the second of Nero, when ^y St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, salutes Aquila and 48 Priscilla as then present at Rome, who certainly left it before on the ^z account of that edict. So that this edict could be no reason of his being absent from Rome at the time of this epistle. But it falls out unhappily, that though St. Peter be made by Baronius and others "bishop of Rome for ^a twenty-five years," yet he can never be found in his own diocese in all that time before his martyrdom; but one excuse or other is still found for his absence, when there were several remarkable transactions which must have discovered him if he had been at Rome; as not only upon St. Paul's writing this Epistle to the Romans, but upon St. Paul's coming to Rome, upon his writing so many epistles from thence, upon the defence he made for himself, when he saith, "^b that all forsook him." What, St. Peter too? So that upon the whole matter, the opinion of ^c Lactantius, in his late published book, seems most agreeable to truth, "that St. Peter came not to Rome till the reign of Nero, and

^y Rom. xvi. 3.

^z Acts xviii. 2.

^a Fabricii Salutaris Lux Evangelii, &c. cap. 5. p. 95, &c. et not.^a Barlow's Brut. Fulm. p. 88.

^b 2 Tim. iv. 16.

^c Lactant. de Mort. Persec. cap. 2. in Oper. tom. 2. p. 184. et not. *ibid.* pp. 281. 397. 525. 555.

not long before his martyrdom.” And this ^d Baluzius confesses to have been “the most ancient and received opinion in the Church,” since Lactantius never disputes it: and what he saith of “^ethe twenty-five years wherein the apostles planted Churches,” was in likelihood the occasion of that mistaken tradition concerning “St. Peter’s being twenty-five years bishop of Rome.” So much may suffice to shew the greater probability, that the Christian Church in Britain was rather founded by St. Paul, than by St. Peter or any other apostle.

^d In not. ad Lactant. ib. p. 281. ^e Lactant. ib. c. 2. p. 184.

OF THE SUCCESSION OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES TO THE
FIRST COUNCIL OF NICE.

THE testimony of Tertullian concerning them cleared.—It extends only to Britons.—The national conversion of the Scots under king Donald fabulous.—Of Dempster's old annals.—Prosper speaks not of the Scots in Britain.—Tertullian to be understood of the provincial Britons as well as others.—The testimony of Sulpicius Severus examined.—Several testimonies of Origen concerning the British Churches in his time.—The different traditions about king Lucius.—The state of the Roman province here overthrows his being king over all Britain.—Great probability there was such a king in some part of it, and then converted to Christianity.—A conjecture proposed in what part of Britain he reigned.—The most probable means of his conversion, and the story cleared from monkish fables.—Of Diocletian's persecution in Britain, and the stopping of it by the means of Constantius.—The flourishing of the British Churches under Constantine.—The reason only of three British bishops present at the council of Arles.—The great antiquity of episcopal government here.—Of the flamines and archflamines of Geoffrey of Monmouth; how far agreeable to the Roman constitution.—Maximinus set up a pagan hierarchy in imitation of the Christian.—The canons of the council of Arles not sent to the pope to confirm, but to publish them.

HAVING shewed the great probability of the planting a Christian Church here in the apostles' time, and that by St. Paul; I am now to consider the succession of this Church; of which we have undoubted evidence from the unquestionable testimonies of ^a Tertullian and Origen, who mention it as a thing so very well known, that they use it as an argument against the Jews, to prove Christ to have been the promised Messias, because "^b the uttermost parts of the earth were given for his possession." Tertullian flourished, as St. Jerome saith, under Severus and his son; and in the time of Severus he wrote against the Jews, as ^c Baronius proves from several passages in

^a See below in this page for Tertullian's, and p. 57. for Origen's testimony.

^b Psalm ii. 8.

^c Baron. A.D. 210. n. 4.

that book. In his time the affairs of Britain were very well understood in other parts of the Roman empire, especially by men so learned and inquisitive as Tertullian. For ^d Clodius Albinus having set up for the empire in Britain, and being beaten by Severus, near Lyons, he took care to secure this province by sending Virius Lupus, his lieutenant, hither. But things growing troublesome here, Severus himself undertook an expedition hither, and brought the Britons to such terms, that they were contented to live beyond the ^e wall which Severus built; where ^f Hadrian's wall had been before. The part of Britain beyond the wall was called Caledonia, as ^g Dio saith. And it is apparent, that the Romans were at that time fully acquainted with the condition of the Britons, both within the province and without: and therefore Tertullian cannot be supposed to speak at random about this matter, when ^h he mentions the nations of Gaul and the Britons with as much assurance as he doth his countrymen the Moors, for receiving Christianity; and saith, "the kingdom of Christ was advanced among them, and that Christ was solemnly worshipped by them." Tertullian was a man of too much understanding to expose himself to the contempt of the Jews, by men-51

^d Usser. de Primord. Index Chronol. A.D. 197. 201. p. 1079. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 509. col. 2. Camden. *ibid.* p. 47. v. 1. pp. xlix. li.

^e See ch. 5. p. 242. notes, &c. In the Additions to Camden, *ibid.* vol. 3. p. 215. we are told of Severus's wall; "its date may be fixed to the year 208."

^f See ch. 1. p. 35, and note p.

^g Dion. Hist. Roman. lib. 76. in Severo, p. 866, &c. Usser. de

Primord. Add. p. 1021. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 15. p. 305. note †. See p. 54. As to the division of Roman Britain by Severus, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 111. vol. 1. p. cxxviii.

^h Tertull. cont. Judæos, c. 7. p. 189. edit. Rigalt. Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 144. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 75. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 1. p. 48. Camden. *ibid.* p. 47. vol. 1. p. l. and Additions, vol. 3. p. 287.

tioning this as a thing so well known at that time, if the Britons were then known to be no Christians; or if they had been such, and were returned to barbarism, the argument would have been stronger against him. When therefore such a passage doth not fall by chance from such a writer, but the force of an argument depends upon it, it is of so much greater weight. How ridiculous would it appear for a man to prove that popery is the catholic religion, by instancing not only in Italy and Spain, as the nations where it is universally received, but in Great Britain and Denmark and Sweden? No less was the absurdity then to prove Christ's universal kingdom by enumerating Gaul and Britain with other nations where Christ was worshipped, if there were no Christian Churches at that time in being among them.

But there are two objections against this passage of Tertullian, which must be removed: 1. That he speaks of that part of Britain which was not under the Roman power, and the conversion of it is said to be later than to be here mentioned by Tertullian. For ⁱ Joh. Fordon and ^k Joh. Major, from an ancient distich in both of them—

Christi transactis tribus annis atque ducentis,
Scotia catholicam cœpit inire fidem—

say, that the ^lChristian religion was received in Scotland in A.D. 203, about the seventh of Severus. But this was so little a time before Tertullian's writing, that it could hardly be so well known in Africa, as to afford strength to an argument against the Jews.

ⁱ Fordon. *ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 35. cap. 15. p. 612. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 321.

^k Major. *de Gest. Scot.* lib. 1. cap. 14. fol. 21. 1. ed. Badii Ascensii. *Usser. de Primord.* ^l See Preface, p. lxiii. and note.

To which I answer, that it is true, Tertullian doth add the greater emphasis to his argument by saying, “^m et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita;” “the gospel had access to those parts of Britain whither the Romans had none.” Which doth prove that Christianity was then received beyond the wall; but not by the Scots, who were not yet settled in those parts; but by the old Britons, who were driven thither, as appears by the account given by ⁿ Xiphilin, out of Dio, who saith, “that the Britons ⁵² were divided into two sorts, the Mæatæ and the Caledonii; the former dwelt by the wall, and the latter beyond them.” These were the extra-provincial Britons, and were distinct both from the Picts and the Scots, saith ^o Joh. Fordon, who carefully distinguisheth these three nations, when he speaks of their wars with the Romans; and he makes ^p Fulgentius the head of the Britons of Albany in the time of Severus; but he supposes both the Scots and Picts to have been in the northern parts long before, and that the Scots received the Christian faith in the time of Severus, Victor being then bishop of Rome, who succeeded Eleutherius; “to whom,” saith ^q Hector Boethius, “king Donald sent ambassadors, to desire him to send persons fit to instruct them in the Christian faith. And upon this,” saith he, “it was generally received in Scotland.”

^m See p. 50. note h.

ⁿ Xiphil. in Sever. in Dion. Hist. Roman. lib. 76. p. 866. Camden. *ibid.* p. 655. vol. 3. p. 231. and note ^d, which compare with p. 111. vol. 1. p. cxxviii. See ch. 5. p. 241. notes, &c. p. 283. Usser. de Primord. Add. p. 1032. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 15. p. 348.

^o Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 3. cap. 36. lib. 2. cap. 31. p. 604. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 616. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 323.

^p See ch. 5. p. 251. and note, and p. 259.

^q Hector. Boeth. lib. 5. p. 89. 1. lin. 24. See ch. 5. p. 259. Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 614. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 322.

^r Dempster, according to his custom, is very warm in this matter, and saith, “all their annals and histories agree, that king ^s Donald and the whole kingdom of Scotland did then embrace Christianity;” and is angry with Baronius for putting off their conversion to the time of Palladius. But notwithstanding all his boasting of the consent of annals and histories, the *Scoti-chronicon* is the only authority he hath to produce. And in his Preface he saith, “that king Edward I. destroyed all the monuments of the kingdom;” and it is somewhat unreasonable to complain of the want, and to allege the consent of them at the same time. And besides, he produceth something out of Fordon, concerning Paschasius of Sicily being sent by Victor into Scotland, and returning with a message from king Donald, which is ^t not to be found in Fordon. “But,” as ^u Baronius observes, “it is strange that so remarkable a conversion should be omitted not only by Bede, but by Marianus Scotus, who mentions the mission of Palladius.” And ^x Prosper saith, “upon the mission of Palladius, who was made the first bishop over the Scottish Christians, the people, who were barbarous before, were made Christians.”

But it is urged by Dempster, not without show of authority, that ^y Palladius was sent to those “which were already Christians,” and therefore Christianity

^r Dempster. *Apparat. ad Hist. Scot. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 22. Hist. Eccles. lib. 15. in Pallad. p. 517. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 613. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 322.*

^s See Preface, p. lxiii. and note, and p. lxiv.

^t See Usher, as above, in note ^r.

^u Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 429. n. 2.

See Preface, p. lxiv.

^x Prosper. *cont. Collator. in fine, cap. 41. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 197. Usser. de Primord. c. 11. p. 320. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 172. Lloyd ibid. p. 51. Camden. ibid. p. 730. vol. 3. p. 466.*

^y Consult Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 4. p. 52, &c. and Stillingfleet, in Preface, pp. lxv. lxxi.

must be planted among the Scots before the mission of Palladius; and for this he quotes ^z Beda, Ado Viennensis, Hermannus Contractus, Marianus Scotus, and others: and he blames Platina and Ciacconius, who make him “the instrument of their conversion,” wherein he confesseth they follow Fabius Ethelwerd and Ingulphus; but he takes no notice, that Prosper himself, in his Chronicon, affirms the same thing, and the others have it from him. So that Prosper makes the Scots to be converted by Palladius, and to have been Christians before his time, which are inconsistent. But ^aNennius seems to have hit upon the true account of this matter, viz. “that Palladius was sent by Celestine to convert the Scots, but finding no great success therein, he was driven on the coasts of Britain, and there died; and after his death St. Patrick was sent on the same errand.” And if the writers of his life may be believed, Palladius did very little towards the conversion of the Scots. ^b And therefore what Prosper saith of Celestine’s making a barbarous nation Christian, must be understood of his design and good intention, and not of the event, which came not to pass till some time after; and chiefly by the means of St. Patrick, who went after the death of Palladius. Unless we understand the words of Prosper, of those who were made Christians at the time of his writing; the design whereof being laid by Palladius is therefore attributed to him, when he wrote against Cassian, some time after

^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 799. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 417. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 4. p. 52.

^a Nenn. c. 55, 56. c. 54, 55. p. 112. §. 50. p. 41. Usser. de Primord. c. 16. p. 812. Brit.

Eccles. Antiq. p. 423. Lloyd *ibid.* §. 4. p. 56. Camden. *ibid.* p. 730. vol. 3. p. 467. See ch. 1. p. 16. and note ^a.

^b Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 4. p. 54.

the death of Celestine. But when he wrote his Chronicon, in the time of Leo, the Scots being then converted, he saith, "that Palladius was appointed to be bishop over the believing Scots." Not that they did then believe before Palladius's coming, but "that they did now believe when he wrote his Chronicon." ^c For all the testimonies of such as preached there before Palladius are of very little credit. ^d But nothing of all this relates to the Scots in Britain, but to the original Scots in Ireland, who were incapable of a national conversion in Britain, so long before they came to settle in it, as will appear afterwards. So that if there were any conversion of Scots before the mission of Palladius, it cannot at all respect this place of Tertullian, who speaks only of the Britons, and not of the Scots.

^c See Lloyd, who was of a different opinion, *ibid.* §. 3. p. 50. cap. 4. §. 2. p. 85. With Lloyd agrees Usser. *de Primord.* c. 16. p. 799. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 417. compared with the former parts of the same chapter, as to Cataldus, Sedulius, and other Irish Scots, (not to insist upon the testimonies of the Fathers of the Church therein adduced,) who either preceded Palladius and St. Patrick, or were their contemporaries. Baronius, in his *Annals*, A.D. 429. n. 4, in common with archbishop Usher, *De Primord.* p. 767. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 400, maintains, with some warmth, that there were Christians in Ireland, previous to Palladius's mission, and consequently to St. Patrick. These things being taken for granted, Schelstrate's attempt, in his *Dissertation against Stil-*

lingfleet, c. 6. n. 7, to set up a claim for the Roman patriarchate, in consequence of the missions of Palladius and Patrick, comes to nothing. But even admitting with Stillingfleet, that "all the testimonies of such as preached there before Palladius are of very little credit," yet, as he elsewhere observes, chap. 3. p. 103, "allowing it to be true" that Palladius and Patrick were deputed by the bishop of Rome, "no man of understanding can pretend to derive a patriarchal power from thence, unless there were a concurrence of jurisdiction from that time." See also in particular Usher's *Discourse of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British*, ch. 8. p. 75. Of the pope's spiritual jurisdiction.

^d See *pref.* p. lxxi.

And ^eDio knew of none but Britons that lived⁵⁴ northward in that expedition of Severus, although he saith, “ he went to the utmost extent of the island, and at last concluded a peace with the Britons upon their quitting no small part of their country,” although they soon revolted; so that here was a great number of Britons to be converted in those places where the Romans never had been before Severus’s last expedition: which the Scottish historians apply to the conversion of their nation, who were not yet come into Britain. But allowing that there were Churches planted among the northern Britons, this doth not overthrow the continuance and propagation of the Christian Church among the provincial Britons; for now, for a long time, the Christian religion had a great liberty of propagating itself; for from the time of Hadrian to Severus the Christians were generally free from persecution, excepting what the rage of the people brought upon them in some places, without any edict of the emperors, as in the time of the Antonini both at Rome, in Gaul, and some parts of the east: but these persecutions were neither general, nor continued so long as when the emperors published edicts on purpose; and therefore the persecutions under Trajan and the Antonini ought in reason to be distinguished from those under Nero and Domitian, Decius and Diocletian, when the emperors made it their business to root out Christianity. But in the former case, the emperors restrained the people by their edicts, but the people in some places by false suggestions frustrated the design of those edicts, which places excepted, the Christians enjoyed a long time of liberty; in which they neglected no opportunities to

^e Usser. de Primord. Addend. Camden. *ibid.* p. 48. vol. 1. p. 51. p. 1020. cap. 15. p. 664. Brit. See p. 50. Ec. les. Antiq. pp. 305. 348.

promote their religion. And within this time the Christian writers say, "there was no nation almost then known, where Christianity was not planted." So ^e Justin Martyr tells Trypho: so ^f Eusebius and ^g Ruffinus speak: and ^h Lactantius saith, "that Christianity spread itself into the east and west, so that there was scarce any corner of the earth so remote whither it had not pierced, no nation so barbarous that was not reduced by it." As to Britain, ⁱ Gildas affirms the continuance of a Church here, from the first plantation of the 55 gospel, though not maintained with equal zeal, to the persecution of Diocletian; and even that was so far from destroying it, that it gained strength and reputation by the courage of confessors and martyrs; and the heat of it was no sooner over, but, as ^k Bede and ^l Gildas both say, "the Christian Church flourished again in great peace and unity till the Arian heresy gave it disturbance."

2. It is objected, that ^m Sulpicius Severus, speaking of the persecution of Christians in Gaul in the time of M. Aurelius Antoninus, saith, "that martyrdoms were then first seen in Gaul, the Christian religion being more lately received beyond the Alps." Which

^e Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 354. in Oper. p. 210. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 51. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 28. for the authorities in notes ^e, ^f, ^g, and that of Gildas; and de Primord. cap. 1. p. 3. cap. 7. p. 141. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 2. 73.

^f Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 6. 7. (7.) lib. 5. cap. 21. pp. 147. 239.

^g Ruffin. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 8.

^h Lactant. de Mort. Persec. cap. 3. Oper. tom. 2. p. 188. For further proof of the notes

^e, ^f, ^g, ^h, see cap. 2. p. 27, &c. of Fabricius's *Salutaris Lux Evangelii*, and Grotius's *Truth of the Christian Religion*, b. 2. s. 18.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 3. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 2.

^k Bed. lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 47. Cantab. 1722. Usser. de Primord. c. 8. p. 197. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 106. See c. 4. p. 146, &c.

^l Gild. §. 8. p. 12. ed. 1568. Hist. Gild. §. 12. p. 19. ed. 1838.

^m Sulpic. Sev. lib. 2. (p. 381.) p. 383. et not.

seems to overthrow the antiquity of the Britannic as well as the Gallic Churches. But in my opinion, (after so ⁿ many discourses written in a neighbour nation about this passage) we are to distinguish that which ^o Sulpicius Severus absolutely affirms, viz. “that there were no martyrdoms in Gaul before that time;” from that which he supposes to have been the reason of it, viz. “that the Christian religion was more lately received on this side the Alps.” The other he was certain of, there being no authentic relation of any martyrdoms there before; but that which he assigns as the reason of it, hath no such certainty in it; for the Christian Churches might have been planted there before, and have escaped that persecution which befell the churches of Lyons and Vienna in the time of M. Aurelius: he might as well have argued, that Christianity was not here received till a little before the persecution of Diocletian, because we read of no martyrdoms before those of St. Alban, Julius, and Aaron, at that time. But if there were no edict for persecution of Christians for above an hundred years together, viz. from the persecution of Domitian, A. D. 92, to the edict of Severus, A. D. 204, then it was very possible that there might be Christian Churches in Gaul, and yet no martyrdoms till the persecution under M. Aurelius by a popular tumult, which, as ^p Eusebius tells us, was the seventeenth year of his reign. ^q Baronius thinks that M. Aurelius “sent private edicts against the

ⁿ Fabricii *ibid.*, cap. 17. p. 385.

^o Vide Petri de Marca *Epist.* ad Henr. Vales. n. 23. in *Oper.* tom. 4. p. 434. tom. 6. p. 225. Schelstrate endeavours, *ibid.* n. 6. to raise an argument in reply to Stillingfleet, on this passage of Severus. It is sufficient

to refer, for his confutation, to De Marca, just quoted, and the notes to Sulp. Severus, as above, the first of whom Stillingfleet here follows.

^p Euseb. lib. 5. (Procem.) cap. 1. p. 197.

^q Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 164. n. 6.

Christians." But ^rTertullian saith, "none of their good
56 emperors ever persecuted the Christians," and instanceth
in Trajan, Hadrian, Pius, Verus, and M. Aurelius.
^s Eusebius saith, "that Trajan abated the fierceness of
the persecution, but left the laws in force upon infor-
mation; ^t that Hadrian, in his rescript to Minutius
Fundanus, præconsul of Asia, forbade a general persecu-
tion of any as Christians; ^u that Antoninus Pius not
only pursued the same method, but threatened severe
punishment to all informers." ^v the same he saith of
M. Aurelius. ^w In Commodus's time, he saith, "the
Christian Churches flourished very much in all parts;"
so that till Severus's edict there was no persecution,
by virtue of any edict of the emperors; by the account
which Eusebius gives. And ^x Lactantius hardly allows
any persecution at all from Domitian to Decius. Not
but that the Christians suffered very much in some
places, through the rage of the people, and the violence
of some governors of provinces; but there was no
general persecution countenanced by the emperors'
edicts, and therefore, where the people were quiet or
intent upon other things, there might be Christian
Churches where there were no such martyrdoms as
those of Lyons and Vienna.

It is certain that ^y Irenæus mentions the consent of
the Celtic Churches, and those of Germany and the
Iberi, with the eastern and Libyan Churches. All the
question is, whether this ought to be restrained to the
Churches planted among the Celtæ, as they were one

^r Tertull. Apol. c. 5. p. 62.

^s Euseb. lib. 3. c. 33. p. 128.

^t Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 9. p. 153.

^u Ibid. cap. 13. p. 160.

^v Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 5. p. 216.

^w Ibid. cap. 21. p. 239. Usser.

de Primord. cap. 4. p. 47. Brit.
Eccles. Antiq. p. 26.

^x Lactant. de Mort. Persec.
cap. 3. Oper. tom. 2. p. 187.

^y Iren. Oper. lib. 1. cap. 3.
(10.) p. 49.

division of the Gauls in Cæsar's time, or whether he took the word in the larger sense, as comprehending all the Gauls. This latter seems much more probable, because Irenæus, in none of the others mentioned by him, takes any particular division of the people, but the general name, as of the Germans and Iberi, and why not then the Celtæ in as large a sense? Since ^z Strabo, ^a Plutarch, ^b Appian, and others, call the Gauls in general by the name of Celtæ; and Tertullian manifestly rejects that sense of Celtæ for one division of the Gauls, when he mentions the several nations of the Gauls which had embraced Christianity. But I will not insist, as ^c Petrus de Marca doth, "that Tertullian by the 'Galliarum diversæ nationes' means the four provinces of Gaul into which Augustus did distribute 57 it:" but I say, that there is no reason to limit the sense of Tertullian to one division of the Gauls, supposing the different nations do comprehend those of Gallia Cisalpina and Transalpina; although I see no ground to understand Tertullian so, ^d since the name of Gallia Cisalpina was much disused; especially after the new distribution of the empire by Hadrian. So that from the testimonies of Irenæus and Tertullian, we see no reason to question the greater antiquity of the Celtic Churches than Sulpicius Severus intimates, much less to overthrow the antiquity of the Britannic Churches. For, besides this testimony of Tertullian concerning the British Churches, we have another of ^e Origen,

^z Strabo. Geogr. lib. 1, 4, 7. pp. 22. 131. 202. pp. 34. 189. 293.

^a Plutarch. in Cæsare, in Crasso, in Oper. tom. 1. pp. 559. 719. compared with p. 315. where, however, the word is Galatæ, not Celtæ.

^b Appian. 2. Civ. Bell. p. 437.

^c Pet. de Marc. Epist. ad H. Vales. (ad calc. Dissert. tr. p. 431. Oper. tom. 4. p. 428.)

^d Launoi, Dispunct. Epist. de Tempore, cap. 7. p. 69. in Oper. tom. 2. part. 1. p. 92. et in Petri de Marca Oper. tom. 6. p. 181.

^e Origen in Ezek. hom. 4. fol. 139. Usser. de Primord.

not long after, who saith, “when did Britain before the coming of Christ consent in the worship of one God?” Which implies, that the Britons were then known to be Christians; and, by being so, were brought off from the former idolatry. And unless so learned a man as Origen had been fully satisfied of the truth of this, having choice enough of other instances, he would not have run as far as Britain to bring an argument to prove, “that all the earth doth praise the Lord; which,” he saith, “is fulfilled in the Christian Churches dispersed over the world.” But I wonder what should make two such learned antiquaries as ^f Mr. Camden and ^g bishop Godwin so far to mistake the sense of Origen, to understand him as if he had said, that Britain, by the help of the Druids, always consented in the belief of one God, whereas it is very plain, that Origen speaks of it as a great alteration that was made in the religion of the Britons after the coming of Christ. And Origen doth not only speak of the belief, but of the worship of one God, which it is certain from Cæsar that the Druids did never instruct the people in. But the Christian religion altered the whole scheme of the Druids’ worship, and instead of their ^h Taranis and Hesus, and Teutates, and Belenus, and Andate, it taught them to believe and worship one true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent to be the Saviour of the world; “whose power,” ⁱ Origen saith elsewhere, “was seen in Britain as well as Mauritania.”

cap. 1. p. 1. cap. 7. p. 144. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 1. 74. Lloyd
ibid. cap. 2. §. 1. p. 48.

^f Camden. Brit. p. 47. vol. 1. p. 1.

^g Godwin. de Præsul. p. 23. De Conversione Brit. p. 16. Usser. ibid. cap. 1. p. 1. et not. ^d.

^h Camden. ibid. p. 12. 70. vol. 1. pp. xii. lxxvii. Usser. ibid.

ⁱ Orig. in Luc. cap. 1. hom. 6. fol. 96. Usser. de Primord. c. 7. p. 144. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 74. Lloyd ibid.

Thus far I have endeavoured to clear the apostolical ⁵⁸ succession of the British Churches, which those have rendered more doubtful, who have derived our Christianity from king ^j Lucius's message to pope Eleutherius, and the persons he sent over to convert him and the whole nation, as the tradition goes, to the Christian faith. ^k But there is a considerable difference to be observed about this tradition, not merely about the time of the conversion of this king Lucius (of which ^l archbishop Usher hath given so full an account, that to his diligence therein nothing material can be added), but concerning the means and manner of his conversion, and the persons employed in it. For ^m Petrus Equilinus saith, "that he was baptized by Timothy, a disciple of St. Paul;" and he had it from a much better author, for ⁿ Notkerus Balbulus saith, "that king Lucius was baptized by Timothy;" not the Timothy to whom St. Paul wrote his Epistles; but ^o the brother of Novatus, whose names are extant in the old martyrology published by Rosweyd, 12 Cal. Julii; "who were both," saith ^p Baronius, "sons to Pudens a Roman senator;" the same who is supposed to have been married to ^q Claudia Rufina the Briton; and therefore his son

^j Lloyd *ibid.* pref. p. xxix. and note. See p. 67. of this chap. and note ^z. Nicolson's English Historical Library, part 2. c. 1. p. 73. Camden. p. 47. vol. 1. p. 1.

^k Spanhem. *Oper.* tom. 2. col. 389—399. Tanner. *ibid.* under Lucius, note ^d.

^l Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 30, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 17, &c.

^m Pet. de Natal. lib. 1. c. 24. fol. 3. b. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 31. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 17.

ⁿ Notker. Martyrol. 8 Calend. Junii, in Basnag. Monument. Eccles. tom. 2. part. 3. p. 132. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 52. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 29.

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 32. cap. 4. p. 53. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 18. 29. *ibid.* Primord. cap. 4. p. 53. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 29.

^p Baron. A. D. 166. n. 2. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 33. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 18.

^q See chap. 1. p. 44.

might not improbably be employed in this work of converting a British king. ^r Nauclerus takes notice, “that this relation agrees best with the tradition of the Church of Curia, a noted city of Rhætia.” And ^s Pantaleon calls Lucius the disciple of Timothy; out of the Annals of that Church. From whence ^t Marcus Velserus shews, “that he did not die here in Britain, but went over into those parts of Rhætia to preach the gospel, and there suffered martyrdom; or, at least, ended his days:” for they are not agreed about the manner of his death. ^u Ægidius Tschudus saith the former, who adds, “that there is a place near Curia called Clivus S. Lucii still;” and ^v Munster saith, “near the episcopal palace there is Monasterium Sancti Lucii.” And ^w Ferrarius in his new Topography to the Martyrologium Romanum, reckons king Lucius of Britain one of the martyrs of Curia, which the Germans call Chur, and the Italians Choira. And the ^x Roman Martyrology saith, “that there his memory is still observed.” ^y Notkerus Balbulus saith,

^r Naucler. Chron. vol. 3. Gen. 6. p. 565. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 31. cap. 4. p. 52. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 17. 28.

^s Pantal. de Viris illustrib. Germ. part. 1. p. 116. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 31. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 17.

^t M. Velser. Rer. Vindel. lib. 6. Usser. de Primord. c. 6. pp. 134. not. c, 136. not. h. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 70. not. c, 71. not. h.

^u Tschud. Descript. Rhæt. Alpin. cap. 15. in Schard. Germ. Antiq. Illustr. tom. 1. p. 543. Usser. de Primord. p. 136. not. h. p. 137. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 71. compared with Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 201. n. 2. 5. tom. 1. p. 199.

^v Munster. Cosmograph. lib. 3.

p. 518. Usser. *ibid.*

^w Ferrar. Nova Topograph. p. 44. Usser. *ibid.*

^x Rom. Martyr. 3 Non. Dec. p. 530. edit. Baron. Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 135. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 70.

^y Notker. Balbul. 8 Calend. Junii, in Basnag. *ibid.* Usser. *ibid.* Schelstrate notices this passage, in his Dissertation, cap. 2. n. 10. with Stillingfleet's argument immediately following. He is anxious to disprove, what Stillingfleet does not assert, that Lucius became a preacher of the gospel abroad, contrary to various writers, and the Roman Martyrology here cited. In n. 11. after mentioning the case of the Æthi-

“that he converted all Rhætia, and part of Bavaria.”⁵⁹ If so, they had great reason to preserve his memory, and the British Church, on the account of king Lucius’s converting their country, hath as much right to challenge superiority over Bavaria and Rhætia,^z as the Church of Rome hath over the British Church on the account of the conversion of Lucius by Eleutherius. If this tradition hold good, the other cannot; which differs as to time, persons, and the remainder of his life, which our writers say was spent here; and ^aGeoffrey, from the British History, saith, “that he died at Gloucester, and left no heir to succeed him.” Wherein he is followed by ^bJohn Fordon, who saith, “that after the death or disappearance of king Lucius the royal stock failed, and then the Romans appointed governors instead of kings.” But, by that expression, “vel non comparente,” Fordon seems to doubt, whether he did not withdraw in his old age, according to the German tradition.

^cNennius saith, “that A.D. 164, Lucius, king of Britain, and all the inferior kings of Britain, were baptized upon an embassy sent by the Roman emperors and pope Evaristus.” But the old MS. in the Cotton library hath it, “post 167 annos post adventum

opian Church, and St. Athanasius, he winds up by producing the authority conferred by Gregory bishop of Rome on his missionary Augustine, in the seventh century, to prove the previous right of the western patriarchate over Britain. But he attempts no reply to Stillingfleet’s argument on this point, in ch. 3. p. 122. which see, with note there.

^z See chap. 3. p. 108.

^a Galfr. Monu. lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 34. 1. Vide Usser. de Primord.

cap. 3. p. 34. cap. 6. pp. 134. 138. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 19. 24. 70. 72. As to the Brit. Hist. which Geoffrey follows, see chap. 5. p. 274, note.

^b Fordon. Scotichron. lib. 3. cap. 36. lib. 2. cap. 31. p. 604. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 43. cap. 6. p. 134. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 24. 70.

^c Nenn. ibid. cap. 18. p. 103. §. 22. p. 18. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 34. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 19.

Christi." One of the Cambridge MSS. "post 164 annos." In the margin whereof it is said, "that Nennius is grievously mistaken, because Evaristus's time cannot agree to either of the computations, Evaristus dying, according to the old catalogue of the bishops of Rome made about A. D. 354, when Trebonius Gallus and Metilius Bradua were consuls, which, according to the Fasti both of Onuphrius Panvinius and sir H. Savile, was A. D. 109." But archbishop ^d Usher observes, "that in one copy of Nennius he found the name of Eleutherius;" therefore I pass it over. And yet the time of Eleutherius will not agree with either of these computations: for he was made bishop of Rome, according to the same catalogue, in the consulship of Severus and Herennianus, which, according to those Fasti, is A. D. 172. But it will be too hard to press the point of chronology too far, when ^e Bede, according to ^f different computations, sometimes puts 60 A. D. 156, and at another time A. D. 167. But as long as it is generally agreed to have been in the time of M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and the beginning of Eleutherius's popedom, I shall urge this matter no further; since it must come within a very little compass,

^d Usher. *ibid.*

^e Bed. *Hist. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 44.* *Epit. Hist. (Hist. lib. 5. cap. 24.) p. 489.* *Wheloc's edit., p. 219.* *Smith's edit. Usher. ibid. and in the following pages.* *Schelstrate ibid. n. 7. adduces Bede's Ecclesiastical History, as above, in conjunction with the place in Tertullian, cited in this chapter, p. 50. note h, and that of Sulpicius Severus, in p. 55. note m, &c. in order to shew that Christianity was introduced in Britain much later than is generally imagined. It is sufficient*

to refer, for confutation, to Gildas, as in *c. 1. p. 4. and p. 36.* for other authorities. As to the MS. *History of the Kings of England, and the Pontifical of Anastasius, mentioned by Schelstrate, ibid. n. 8, it may be observed, that they afford no real support to his cause. See Usher, as quoted in chap. 1. p. 3. note k. Pearson. de Serie et Success. primorum Romæ Episcoporum, cap. 12. p. 127. in Oper. Posthum.*

^f Vide Usher. *ib.* as in note g, following.

if the characters of time must suit with it, which, ^g Marianus Scotus saith, was when Pollio and Aper were consuls, the sixteenth of M. Aurelius, and A. D. 176, according to the Dionysian account, although Marianus follow another himself. Which falls out to be the year before the persecution of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna, which, as ^h Eusebius saith, was the seventeenth of M. Aurelius, when Irenæus was sent by them on a message to Eleutherius. ⁱ Baronius places the conversion of Lucius somewhat later, in the beginning of Commodus, A. D. 183. But therein, as archbishop ^j Usher observes, he hath all the more ancient historians against him; and it is only his own mistake in the chronology of the first bishops of Rome, which makes him say, the time of Eleutherius will not agree to M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, wherein he is too much followed by our ^k learned antiquary.

Having then found no such inconsistency in the point of time, but that if there were such a king as Lucius in Britain then, he might well send to Eleutherius such a message; I now proceed to consider, how far this tradition of king Lucius can agree with the state of the British affairs at that time. The Britons being impatient of the Roman yoke in Hadrian's time, ^l he comes over and brings new legions with him; and settles the whole province in quietness, and built his

^g Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 36. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 20.

^h Euseb. lib. 5. Procem. cap. 1. p. 197. Cantab. 1720.

ⁱ Baron. ibid. A. D. 183. n. 3. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 38. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 21.

^j Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 39. compared with p. 32. and note^x. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 21.

with p. 18. note^x. Baron. ibid. A. D. 183. n. 3.

^k Camden. Brit. p. 47. vol. 1. p. xlix. and notes. Usser. de Primord. p. 39. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 21.

^l See Camden. ibid. p. 74. vol. 1. p. lxxi. for Hadrian's and the following emperors' coins relating to Britain.

^m wall, to keep the other Britons in order. Notwithstanding this, in Antoninus's time, the war broke out more fiercely; and not only the ⁿ other Britons forced their passage into the Roman province, but, as ^o Pausanias saith, "the Brigantes rebelled, who, for that cause, had part of their country taken from them." But ^p Lollius Urbicus being sent hither, he drove the Britons back, built another wall further northwards, where ^q Agricola formerly had placed his garrisons, as appears by the ^r inscriptions there taken up: so that Lollius Urbicus drove the Britons one hundred miles northward; for so much is the distance between the walls of
 61 Hadrian and Antoninus. For all this, the Britons brake out again with so much violence in the beginning of ^s M. Aurelius Antoninus's reign, that Calphurnius Agricola was sent against them, and from that time we read of no disturbance here till the time of Commodus, when ^t Ulpus Marcellus was Roman lieutenant. This being the true state of Britain at that time, what place is here left for such a king over Britain as Lucius is represented? ^u He must either be

^m See chap. 1. p. 35. chap. 5. p. 242. and notes there as to the several Roman walls.

ⁿ Capitol. in Antonin. p. 19. inter Hist. August. Script. Camden. ibid. p. 46. vol. 1. p. xlix.

^o Pausan. in Arcad. In Græciæ Descript. p. 689. See preface, p. xxiv. Camden. Brit. pp. 46. 556. 558. vol. 1. p. xlix. vol. 3. p. 1.

^p Camden. ibid. pp. 40. 650. vol. 1. p. xlix. vol. 3. p. 211.

^q Camden. ibid. p. 649. vol. 3. p. 211. which compare with the Additions, p. 215.

^r Camden. Brit. pp. 650. 699. vol. 3. pp. 211. 355. Usser. de Primord. Add. p. 1024. cap. 3.

p. 42. et not. ^c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 15. p. 316. cap. 3. p. 23. not. ^c. Lloyd ibid. cap. 1. §. 2. p. 3.

^s Jul. Capitol. in M. Aurel. p. 25. inter Hist. August. Script. Camden. ibid. pp. 46. 660. vol. 1. p. xlix. vol. 3. p. 232. Usser. de Primord. Index Chron. CLXI. p. 1076. cap. 3. p. 43. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 508. col. 2. cap. 3. p. 24.

^t Dion. Hist. Roman. lib. 72. in Commodo p. 821. Camden. ibid. p. 46. vol. 1. p. xlix. where Ulpus Marcellus's excellent character is set forth.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 42. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 23.

over the Britons beyond the wall, which overthrows one main part of the tradition as to his ^x settling the Churches here after his conversion; or, he must be the head of the revolting Britons who were repressed by Calphurnius Agricola; or, he must be a subordinate king to the Romans, such as Cogidunus and Prasutagus had been. But then, how comes he to command ^y all Britain? to have several kings under him? to change the affairs of religion as he thought fit? Were these privileges ever allowed to such titular princes? It is very true, “that ^z the Romans did often suffer kings to govern provinces under them;” but then they were provinces wholly subdued and compassed about with the Roman forces on all sides: but no instance can be given where they suffered an hereditary king of the same country to enjoy full power over his subjects, whilst a great part of the country was in arms against them, and ready to break out into a war, wherein the Romans were in continual fear, that the natives within the province should join with those without for their destruction. For them, in such a case as this, to trust such a king as Lucius with the government of the province, is to suppose them to have utterly lost those arts whereby they attained so vast an empire. The case of Antiochus in Asia, Herod and his children in Judæa, Deiotarus in Galatia, Ariobarzanes in Cappadocia, and of many others that might be named, will not at all make it probable, where the circumstances were so different, and especially in such an island as Britain was then accounted, being encompassed with

et not. *. referring to Baronius
ibid. A. D. 183. §. 6.

^x Ibid.

^y See p. 59. and note ^c. Usser.
de Primord. cap. 3. p. 41. Brit.

Eccles. Antiq. p. 23.

^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 3.

p. 43. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 24.

Camden. ibid. pp. 47. 72. vol. 1.
pp. xlix. lxxix.

a sea, which the Romans thought dreadful and almost impassable,

62

^a Semota et vasto disjuncta Britannia ponto
Cinctaque inaccessis horrida littoribus,

whither supplies could not come without difficulty; and where the inhabitants despised death and danger, as they found by so tedious a war, which was kept up so long here: and, after all, they were forced to keep out their enemies by walls from sea to sea, in several places; so that the Romans never had the whole island in subjection. And therefore it is very improbable, that they should trust the power over it in the hands of a native of the same country; which consideration makes me very hard to believe the monkish traditions concerning king Lucius.

But I do not deny that there was such a person in this island, or that he had royal authority in some part of it, or that he was converted to Christianity at that time, or that the Christian Church here flourished by his means. That there was such a person, who was a king and a Christian, is proved, besides the concurrence of so many authors from Bede's time, from the two coins mentioned by ^b archbishop Usher, one silver, and the other gold, having an image of a king on them, with a cross, and the letters of LVC, as far as they could be discerned. But if it be further asked,

^a Catalect. a Jos. Scalig. edit. in Camden. Brit. p. 34. vol. 1. p. xxxv.

^b Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 39. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 22. Camden. *ibid.* p. 70. vol. 1. p. lxxv. for British coins at large; where of Lucius it is added, p. lxxvi. col. 2. note 1, his "existence is very problematical." Ruding, in his Annals of the

Coinage, vol. 1. p. 197, speaks of the coins of Segonax, a petty king of Kent, and Cunobiline's, as genuine; and thinks those of Carausius and Allectus may be of British mintage; but passes over these of Lucius unnoticed. See however *ibid.* plate 2. fig. 26. and vol. 3. p. 231. Also ch. 1. p. 34. note ^m.

in what part of Britain this king Lucius lived, I shall only propose my conjecture, and leave it to the judgment of others. It is well known that the Romans were so well satisfied with the fidelity of ^c Cogidunus, that they bestowed some cities upon him. And Tacitus saith, “he continued firm to the Roman interest to his time.” And where kings were faithful to them, the Romans were kind to their posterity, and kept them up in the same dignity as long as they behaved themselves as they expected from them. Of this we have a clear instance in Herod’s posterity; for Archelaus, Herodes Antipas and Philip, his sons, succeeded into their shares of his kingdom. Then Herod Agrippa, his grandchild by Aristobulus, was made king by Caius Caligula, whose government was enlarged by Claudius, and his brother Herod had the kingdom of Chalcis given him. Sometime after his father’s death, ⁶³ Claudius bestowed first the kingdom of Chalcis upon his son Agrippa, then the tetrarchy of Philip, which was enlarged afterwards by Nero, and he continued till the war, and was the last king over the Jews. Now from hence we observe, that the Romans thought it no ill policy in some cases to continue the same royal dignity to the children of those who deserved so well of them as Cogidunus had done. And it seems most probable to me, that where ^d Ptolemy places the Regni, were the cities which ^e Cogidunus had the rule over; not from the name, but from the circumstances of those places, which have fewer Roman monuments or towns than any other in Britain, and therefore were

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 43. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 24. Camden. ibid. p. 31. vol. 1. p. xxxii.

^d As to the Regni, Horsley ib. b. 3. chap. 1. p. 375. compared

with chap. 2. p. 440.

^e Camden. Brit. p. 211. v. 1. p. 167. and in the Additions, p. 193. Horsley’s Brit. Roman. b. 2. c. 3. p. 332.

most likely still under their own prince, who kept up the British customs. ^{ee} Wherever the Romans inhabited, they may be traced by their ^f ways, by their buildings, by their coins, by their urns, by their inscriptions: ^g but scarce any thing of this nature could be found in Surrey or Sussex by the most diligent inquirers. ^h Leland indeed discovered some Roman coins near Kingston upon Thames, where others have been taken up since: (but Camden could hear of no Roman antiquities thereabouts.) And ⁱ some suppose the place where those coins were taken up, to have been a station of the Roman soldiers under Asclepiodotus, when he marched that way from Portsmouth to London, in the expedition against Allectus. If so, it was too late for the days of king Lucius. All that ^j Camden pretends to, is only a military way near Ockley, which was necessary for the conveniency of the Roman soldiers passing to the remoter parts of the province, and some coins about Gatton; but as to his ^k Noviomagus, which he will have to be Woodcote in Surrey, ^l Mr. Somner hath well proved from the course of the ^m Roman Itinerary that it must lie in Kent, in the road to Portus Rutupis; and Woodcote is as far

^{ee} Musgrav. Comment. ad Jul. Vital. Epitaph. p. 124.

^f See Bergier's work, *Histoire des Grands Chemins de l'Empire Romain*. tom. 1. liv. 1. c. 30. p. 113, &c. liv. 3. c. 43. p. 546, &c. relative to Britain. Reynolds's *Iter Britan.* Introd. p. 64. not. *. Horsley's *Britan. Roman.* b. 1. c. 8. p. 121.

^g *The Archæologia*, vol. 9. p. 196.

^h Leland. *Itiner.* p. 398. MS. vol. 6. fol. 25. marg. Gale's *Antonin. Itiner.* p. 71.

ⁱ Burton on *Antonin. Itiner.*

p. 77.

^j Camden. *Brit.* p. 213. vol. 1. p. 168, in which latter edition, p. 176. col. 2, the Roman road from Dorking to London is spoken of, as also in p. 193.

^k *Ibid.* p. 216. vol. 1. p. 170. Gale, in his edition of *Antoninus' Itinerary*, p. 73, agrees with Camden.

^l Somner. *Antiq. Canterb.* p. 24. But see, in reply, the *Additions to Camden. ibid.* pp. 178. 225. 228.

^m Horsley's *Britan. Roman.* b. 3. c. 2. p. 379.

from it as London. In all Sussex there ^a is no remainder of any Roman building, or way, or colony, or coins yet discovered to the world, except towards the sea-side, which the Romans kept to themselves. In Antoninus Pius's time, ^oSeius Saturnius was Archigubernus in Classe Britannica; which shews that the ⁶⁴ Romans had then a fleet here, and that he was admiral of it. And in after-times, the ^p Comes litoris Saxonici per Britanniam had several garrisons on the sea-side for security of the coasts, as appears by the ^q Notitia Imperii, where the places are set down, among which, two were on the coasts of Sussex, ^r Anderida and ^sPortus Adurni: by the former our learned antiquaries ^tCamden and ^uSelden understand Newenden in Kent; but that stands too much within land. Mr. Somner, in a MS. discourse of the Roman ports and forts in Kent, rather thinks it to be Pevensey in Sussex, or Hastings, as more agreeing with ^xGildas, who saith, "that the Romans placed their forts for security of the coasts in litore oceani ad meridionalem plagam, upon the very coasts;" and so the rest of them stood, as Reculver, Richborough, Dover, Lime, which were all in Kent; and the Portus Adurni was Aldrington near Shoreham in Sussex. From hence it appears, that the

^a See Camden. *ibid.* vol. 1. p. 193. in the Additions. Horsley *ibid.* b. 2. c. 3. p. 332. as in note ^d above.

^o D. tit. ad. S. C. Trebell. lib. 36. (Digest. Vet. Justiniani, lib. 36. Ad Senatus consultum Trebellii, tit. 1. p. 886. col. 2.) Camden. *ibid.* p. 46. v. 1. p. xlix.

^p Camden. *ibid.* pp. 53. 230. vol. 1. pp. lvi. 210. Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 336. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 181. See ch. 5. p. 304.

^q Notit. Imper. Occid. cap. 72. p. 161.

^r See ch. 5. p. 332.

^s Vide Camden. *ibid.* pp. 220. 223. vol. 1. pp. 186. 188. which compare with the Additions, pp. 196. 199. col. 2. 206. 248.

^t Camden. Brit. p. 247. vol. 1. p. 223.

^u Selden. Mare Claus. lib. 2. cap. 6. p. 148.

^x Gild. Epist. §. 14. p. 15. 2. Hist. Gild. §. 14. p. 5. *ibid.* §. 18. p. 24.

Romans, being secure of the coasts, and having their soldiers dispersed in the colonies about, and being so near the metropolis at London, where the chief governors of this part of Britain resided, they might better permit a British king to govern these parts of the country. ^y And this is the most probable account I can think of, as to this king Lucius within the Roman province.

^z Sir H. Spelman would bring him to his Iceni, but without any colour of probability; "Lucius," saith he, "was the son of Coilus, Coilus of Marius, Marius of Arviragus." And what then? "Some," he saith, "would have him to be Prasutagus, who was king over the Iceni." But doth not ^a Tacitus say, "that Prasutagus died before the revolt of the Britons under Boadicea? and that he left Nero his heir, and his two daughters, hoping thereby to secure his kingdom?" If he were Arviragus, he was dead before the revolt of the Iceni. And if Marius were his son, how comes he never to be mentioned in the story afterwards; no, not in that most remarkable battle between his mother and Suetonius Paulinus? But ^b Hector Boethius calls Arviragus one of the Iceni, as though his authority were to be mentioned against Tacitus, who was the Geoffrey of Scotland, so many and so improbable are 65 his fictions. ^c Baronius, after trying several ways to reconcile the tradition of king Lucius with the Roman

^y From Gough's edition of Camden, *ibid.* vol. 1. p. xlix. note I, it appears Mr. S. Gale agreed with Stillingfleet.

^z Spelman. *Concil.* t. 1. p. 36. Wilkins *ibid.* t. 4. p. 705. col. 2. p. 706. col. 1. Vide Usser. *ibid.* as in note ^a following. See ch. 1. p. 32.

^a Tacit. *Annal.* 14. cap. 31. inter *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 172. Vide Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 3. p. 43. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 24. See ch. 1. p. 34. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 35. 329. vol. 1. p. xxxvii. vol. 2. p. 71.

^b Spelman. et Wilkins, *ibid.*

^c Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 183. n. 6.

story, concludes with that as the most probable, ^d “that he was a king under the Roman power in Britain, such as Prasutagus was.” But he was only king over the Iceni, and not over all Britain, and although among the Britons there were many kings over particular cities, (as they then called the people under one government,) yet there was no one king over the whole island. But in cases of great difficulty they pitched upon one as supreme, as on Cassibelan, upon the invasion of Cæsar: so that the old British government was neither popular, as some pretend, nor under one monarchy; but the people were governed by several petty monarchs, as appears by the unquestionable testimonies of ^e Diodorus Siculus, ^f Strabo, and ^g Pomponius Mela: “fert populos et reges populorum,” saith Mela: “olim regibus parebant,” saith ^h Tacitus: which prove both the antiquity and number of British monarchs. And what ⁱ Dio saith of a democratical government among the Britons is only spoken of the Mæatae and Caledonii, in their great confusion, when all the reins of government were cast off, and the people did what they list, as Tacitus describes them in his time, saying, ^k “that they were drawn off from their former obedience to their kings, by the heads of several factions among them.” So that although in the most ancient times here was monarchical government, yet it was not extended over all Britain, as the monkish tradition pretends concerning king Lucius, and I know not how many predecessors of his, even

^d Baron. in Martyr. Rom. Maii 26. p. 325.

^e Diodor. Sic. Biblioth. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 21. p. 347. Usser. de Primord. cap. 3. p. 41. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 23. Camden. ibid. p. 22. vol. 1. p. xxi.

^f Strabo. ibid. lib. 4. p. 138.

^g Mela, lib. 3. cap. 6. p. 56.

^h Tacit. Vit. Agric. cap. 12. inter Oper. tom. 4. p. 80.

ⁱ Dio Hist. Roman. lib. 76. in Sever. p. 866.

^k Tacit. in Camden. ibid.

from the coming of Brutus to his days. But neither our religion nor our government need such fictions to support them.

Supposing then that king Lucius succeeded Cogidunus, though not immediately, in the government of that part of Britain committed to his care; I see no inconvenience in allowing that king Lucius, hearing of the Christian doctrine, either by the old British Christians, such as Elvanus and Medwinus are supposed to have been, or by some of M. Aurelius's soldiers coming hither, after the great deliverance of the Roman army by the prayers of the Christians, (which 66 had then lately happened, and occasioned great discourse every where, "the emperor himself," as ¹Tertullian saith, "giving the account of it in his own letters,") might upon this be very desirous to inform himself thoroughly about this religion, and there being then frequent intercourse between Rome and Britain, by reason of the colonies that were settled, and the governors and soldiers passing to and fro, he might send Elvanus and Medwinus to Eleutherius to be fully instructed in this religion; and either the same persons alone, or ^mtwo others with them, (called Faganus and Duvianus commonly,) coming into Britain, might have so great success as to baptize king Lucius, and many others, and thereby enlarge the Christian Church here.

The ⁿold book of Llandaff gives a much more modest account of this whole matter than either Geoffrey of Monmouth or any of his followers.

¹ Tertull. Apolog. cap. 5. Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 5. p. 216. Oros. lib. 7. cap. 15. p. 494. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 46. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 25.

p. 53. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 29. as to these two individuals.

ⁿ Monast. Angl. vol. 3. p. 188. vol. 6. p. 1218. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 49. Brit. Eccles.

^m Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. Antiq. p. 27.

“ There we find only that king Lucius sent Elvanus and Medwinus to Eleutherius, the twelfth bishop of Rome, to desire that he might be made a Christian through his instruction; upon which he gave God thanks, that such a heathen nation did so much desire Christianity; and then, by the advice of the presbyters of the city of Rome, they first baptized these ambassadors, and, being well instructed, they ordained them, making Elvanus a bishop, and Medwinus a teacher; and so they returned to king Lucius, who with the chief of the Britons were baptized; and then, according to the instructions of Eleutherius, he settled the ecclesiastical order, caused bishops to be ordained, and the Christian religion to be taught.” There is nothing in all this account but what seems to have great probability in it. The same account is in ^o Capgrave, out of John of Tinmouth, in the Life of Dubricius; and this seems to have been the original tradition of the British Church; which ^p Geoffrey of Monmouth hath corrupted with his flamins and archflamins; and others afterwards made an epistle for ^q Eleutherius to king Lucius, but could not avoid such marks in the way of writing as evidently discover the imposture; and when the monks’ hands were once in, they knew not how to give over. For some of them carry ^r Faganus and Diruvianus (as some call him) to Glastonbury; ⁶⁷ ^s others make them consecrate the church at Winchester, to which they say king Lucius had a particular kindness, and gave all the lands and privileges which the flamins had, to the bishop and monks

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 50. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 27.

^p See p. 77. of this chapter, with note, as to this matter.

^q Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 101. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 53.

^r Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 104. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 55.

^s See ch. 4. p. 176. and note. Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 126. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 66.

(a gift that would never make them the richer or the safer). Others make king ^t Lucius to found St. Peter's church at Westminster, the ^u church in Dover castle, ^v St. Martin's by Canterbury, ^w St. Peter's in Cornhill, where the metropolitan church, they say, was placed by him, and Theanus made the first bishop, who was succeeded by Elvanus, who went on the embassy to Eleutherius; and besides these, they make him to found and endow so many churches, with such unlikely circumstances, as hath made others question, ^x whether there was ever such a person in the world as king Lucius; that being the common effect of saying much more than is true, to make what is really true more doubtful and suspicious.

But there is one difficulty yet to be cleared; for all this story, in its best circumstances, seems to imply, that there was no Christian Church here before. For if there had been, what need he to have sent as far as Rome to be instructed? unless the bishop of Rome were then known to be the head of the Church, which were a sufficient reason for it. To this I answer, that if the contest lay between these two things, whether it be more credible, that Christianity was planted here before king Lucius, or that king Lucius was baptized by order from Eleutherius; I should very much prefer the former, because the authority of ^y Gildas, as to the British Christianity, is to be relied on before the later writers; and Gildas asserts the one; and although he had as much reason as Bede, or any

^t Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 128. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 67.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 129. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 68.

^v Ibid.

^w Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 66. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 36.

^x See p. 58. note ^k. Lloyd ibid. Preface, p. xlvi. Nicolson ibid. part 2. chap. 1. p. 73.

^y See Wheloc ibid. note ^a, p. 29. on Bede, b. 1. c. 4. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 52. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 28.

after him, he never takes the least notice of king Lucius and Eleutherius. And if a negative argument will hold any where, it is where a person hath as much reason to know as any that follow him, and as great occasion to discover what he knows; both which will hold in the case of Gildas compared with Bede or later writers. ^z It were worth while for us to know whence Bede had his first information of this matter; for he professes to follow other writers about the 68 British affairs, and in many places he follows Gildas exactly, but in this he passes by what Gildas saith about the primitive Christianity of Britain, and instead thereof puts in this story of king Lucius. ^a Bale saith, that “ Elvanus Avalonius was a disciple to those who were the disciples of the apostles, and that he preached the gospel in Britain with good success; but king Lucius being persuaded by his druids, would not come to any resolution; but to satisfy himself lest he should be deceived by his countrymen, he sent Elvanus and Medwinus to Eleutherius. And Elvanus upon his return wrote a book *De Origine Ecclesiæ Britannorum; Of the first Beginning of the British Church.*” And Pits is sure to follow him where he hath no reason: but Leland never mentions this book, nor the writings of Medwinus Belgius, and of king Lucius himself, all relating to this matter: but ^b Leland only takes notice, “ that Elvanus and Medwinus were employed upon an embassy to Eleutherius, that by his means he might become a Christian, which,” saith he, “ is very unreasonable to suppose, unless he were first informed what Christianity was, which he thinks was preached

^z See p. 58. note j. Usser. *ibid.* p. 50. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 27. in præfat.

^a Bal. de *Script. cent.* 1. n. 27. in Elvano, p. 19.
^b Leland. *Comment. de Script.* p. 22. Usser. de *Primord.* cap. 4.

to king Lucius by them, being two of the old British Christians." And there he relates "how by chance he met with an old MS. of the British affairs joined with Geoffrey of Monmouth, wherein this story is told exactly as it is in the book of Llandaff: and no mention is made of any other persons sent back but those that went." And, as far as I can judge, Bede followed this old British tradition, only leaving out the names of the persons sent, and the establishment of the British Churches after the baptism of king Lucius. ^cFor Bede saith as little as he well could that tended to the honour of the British Churches. So that according to this, which seems the truest account of this embassy, Elvanus and Medwinus were British Christians themselves, and therefore sent to Eleutherius, having been probably the persons employed to convince king Lucius; but he knowing the great fame of Rome, and it being told him, not only that there were Christians there, but a bishop in that city, the twelfth from the 69 apostles, had a desire to understand how far the British Christians and those of Rome agreed; and he might reasonably then presume, that the Christian doctrine was there truly taught, at so little distance from the Apostles, and in a place whither, as ^d Irenæus argues in

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 192. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 103.

^d Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3. p. 175. Schelstrate, after giving the whole of this sentence, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* chap. 1. n. 9, insists that the words of Irenæus wholly relate to the Church, not the city of Rome. But Stillingfleet had previously in his Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, part 2. chap. 6. §. 12, (in his Works, vol. 4. p. 424.) shewn that "Irenæus was not disputing what

was to be done by Christians in doubts of faith; but was inquiring into a matter of fact;" the "secret tradition left by the apostles, as the Valentinians pretended." He then proceeds to reason at length, as on the present occasion; with which compare Jewel's Reply to Harding's Answer, art. 4. div. 9. p. 181. edit. 1611. Barrow's Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, p. 234. London, 1680. who, and also many more, fully agree with Stillingfleet; among whom Rich-

this case, "a resort was made from all places, because of its being the imperial city." ^eThese were reasonable considerations, which might move king Lucius to send this embassy to Rome, and not any opinion of St. Peter's having appointed the head of the Church there, of which there was no imagination then, nor a long time after in the British Churches, as appears by the contest of the British bishops with Augustine the monk; of which in its due ^f place.

If any credit were to be given to king ^g Arthur's diploma to the university of Cambridge, this matter would be fully cleared; for there it is expressly said, "That king Lucius was converted by the preaching of the doctors of Cambridge, for which reason he gave large privileges to that university, which were con-

erius, the Roman catholic, in his *Historia Conciliorum Generalium*, lib. 1. cap. 2. s. 14. p. 61, Coloniae, 1683, says the words have reference to "Rome, because it was the head of the world, the principal metropolis, and seat of the Roman emperor." The deeply interesting note ^z, in vol. 2. pp. 91—99. of Mosheim, in his *Commentaries of the Affairs of the Christians, before the Time of Constantine*, London 1813, must not be omitted. As to the *Principium Sacerdotium* of the Roman Church, spoken of by the emperor Honorius, nothing can be elicited from it; nor from the 162nd Epistle of Augustine, both of which Schelstrate *ibid.* selects as instances of the superiority and power of the Roman Church over others. For Honorius, in this same epistle, (*Holstenii Romana Collectio*, p. 82. Romae, 1662.) speaks of the privileges of that Church as

constituted by the fathers, long since; which, as in the first council of Nice, can. 6, shew that such were of human and positive, not divine appointment; while St. Augustine's expression, concerning "the principality of the apostolic see," which Schelstrate has derived from Perron, Du Moulin, in his *Nouveauté du Papisme*, in reply to the latter, has shewn, lib. 6. c. 10. pp. 417. 419, Genev. 1633, that the same expression is applied to other Churches than that of Rome, and to St. Paul equally with any other apostle. See also Stillingfleet's *Rational Account &c.* part 2. chap. 5. §. 9. in his *Works*, vol. 4. p. 385.

^e Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 48. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 26.

^f See chap. 5. p. 357, &c.

^g Caj. de Antiq. Cantab. Acad. lib. 1. p. 51. Usser. de Primord. cap. 4. p. 50. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 27. See chap. 5. p. 340.

firmed by king Arthur." And in the MS. Annals of Burton it is said ^h, "that A.D. 141, nine of the doctors and scholars of Cambridge were baptized." I am not ignorant what objections have been made by learned antiquaries against both these passages, and how hard it is to reconcile them to the language and history of that time; nor that this passage in the Annals of Burton was put into the MS. copy by another hand, as the learned ⁱprimate observed by comparing the copy of them in the library of C. C. C. But on the other side, it is justly pleaded, that in the ^jbull of Honorius I. bearing date A.D. 624. 20 Febr. there is mention made of the privileges granted to the university of Cambridge by pope Eleutherius; and that withal he takes notice of doctors and scholars there. And that this bull of Honorius is allowed to be authentic in the bull of Eugenius IV. upon the controversy about jurisdiction between the bishop of Ely and the university of Cambridge, bearing date A.D. 1433, 14 Cal. Oct. which is a sufficient proof to all that rely on the pope's authority, that in the time of king Lucius and Eleutherius there might be a sufficient
70 number of learned men in Cambridge to have instructed king Lucius in the Christian faith; and that it is not improbable, that Elvanus and Medwinus might be of that number, especially considering that Camboritum, or, as many copies have it, ^kCamboricum, was a Roman colony, and mentioned in the best copies among the twenty-eight cities of Britain, and the Roman colonies had their ^lschools of learning, wherein the several

^h Usser. *ibid.* as in note ⁱ following.

ⁱ Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 4. p. 51. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 28.

^j Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 6.

p. 131. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 68.

^k Stillingfleet's *Discourse of the true Antiquity of London*, in his *Works*, vol. 3. p. 906.

^l See chap. 4. pp. 204. 210, &c.

professors of arts and sciences did instruct both the Roman and British youth. Of which I may have occasion to discourse afterwards.

After this time, we meet with little concerning the British Churches till the persecution of Diocletian, in which they had a considerable share, for the time it lasted here: for although the names of no more are preserved than only of St. Alban, Aaron and Julius; yet both ^mGildas and ⁿBede say, “that many more suffered martyrdom then in Britain,” as ^oBaronius acknowledgeth. And although Diocletian being a prince of infinite ambition, as appeared by his commanding himself to be worshipped as God, and therefore had so great an antipathy to Christianity, that his whole reign might be called, as ^pM. Velserus saith, “one perpetual persecution,” yet he had so much art as to throw off the odium of it upon others; to which purpose he first made choice of Maximianus, a brutish and fierce man, who stuck at nothing for the shame or the cruelty of it, as he is set forth by Eutropius and Victor; and therefore was a fit instrument, as occasion served, to execute Diocletian’s malice against the Christians; which he did not fail to perform, as appeared by the Thebean legion which suffered in the first expedition against the Bagaudæ, for refusing to take an oath to extirpate the Christians as well as the rebels, as ^qSigonius and ^rVelserus relate the story. But the great persecution under Diocletian of which Gildas and Bede speak, did not certainly begin till A.D.

^m Gild. §. 8. p. 10. 2. Hist. Gild. §. 8. p. 3. Hist. Gild. §. 10. p. 17. For this and the following note, Usser. de Prim. cap. 7. pp. 147. 170. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 76. 91.

ⁿ Bed. lib. 1. cap. 6, 7. pp. 45-47.

^o Baron. A.D. 303. n. 144.

^p Velser. Com. in S. Afram. inter Oper. p. 449.

^q Sigon. de Occid. Imper. lib. 1. p. 11.

^r Velser. Comment. in Conv. Afræ, inter Oper. ibid.

^s 303, Diocletian and Maximianus being one the eighth, the other the seventh time consuls, as ^t Lactantius hath evidently made to appear: but in the next year, upon the resignation of these two, ^u Galerius Maximianus and 71 Constantius Chlorus were declared emperors; and it is generally said by the ecclesiastical writers, that Constantius stopped the persecution in the provinces under his government. So that either the persecution in Britain must be before the other, or it could continue but a little time. To solve this, ^v Alford saith, “there is no other way, but to make this persecution to have been in the third of Diocletian and the first of Maximianus.” At which time, ^w Baronius saith, “a very sharp persecution was begun against the Christians at Rome.” Which was about the time when Maximianus began his expedition into Gaul against the Bagaudæ, and in his passage over the Alps the ^x Thebean legion suffered. The circumstances of which story are so agreeable in all respects, that I see no reason to call in question the truth of it, it being not only preserved by Eucherius, but by Venantius Fortunatus, Helinandus, Beda, Usuardus and Ado. But Maximianus made then no long stay in Gaul, and for several years after both Diocletian and he were so taken up in warlike expeditions, that they had no leisure for a sharp and long persecution. And I can however see no ground for any persecution in Britain about that time by Diocletian or Maximian. For when he came against the Bagaudæ, ^y Carausius

^s Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 147. compared with p. 167. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 76. with p. 88.

^t Lactant. de Morte Persec. cap. 12. Oper. tom. 2. p. 199.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 170. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 91.

^v Alford. Annal. Eccles. A.D.

286. n. 5, &c. tom. 1. p. 278, &c.

^w Baron. A.D. 286. n. 30, 31.

^x Vide Baron. ibid. A.D. 297. n. 1, 2, &c. Fabricii ibid. cap. 7. p. 141.

^y Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.

p. 584. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 304. Camden. ibid. p. 50.

vol. 1. p. liii.

was employed to secure the seas against the Franks and the Saxons ; but, understanding Maximian's design to take him off, he watched his opportunity, and with a good fleet and considerable army comes for Britain, and takes possession of the government here, and Maximian had no fleet left to pursue him thither. This revolt of Carausius happened within few years after Diocletian and Maximian were joint emperors, viz. A.D. 286.

But ^zAlford saith, "the old writer of St. Alban's life pitches upon A. D. 286 for this persecution." ^a And a MS. copy of Beda which he had met with agrees with that time. But he urges further, " ^b that after the rebellion of Carausius, when Constantius was Cæsar, the provinces beyond the Alps were committed to him, and that was A.D. 292." And if there were no persecution under Constantius, this must be before he was Cæsar. But, for any thing Alford saith, the persecution might have been under Carausius, or Allectus, before Constantius came to the possession of Britain. ⁷²

^c For Carausius, as appears by ^dAur. Victor and ^eEutropius, was let alone with the government of Britain ; "which," saith ^fOrosius, "he enjoyed seven years, and after him ^gAllectus, three years more;" so that for several years after Constantius's being Cæsar, he had no influence on the affairs of Britain: at the end of those

^z Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 286. n. 11. p. 280.

^a *Ibid.* n. 12. p. 280.

^b *Ibid.* n. 5. p. 278.

^c Camden. *ibid.* pp. 51. 304. vol. 1. p. liii. vol. 2. p. 3. Concerning the deaths of Carausius and Allectus, see Additions to Camden, in vol. 1. pp. 299. 320. For their coins, Camden. *ibid.* p. 75. vol. 1. p. lxxii. and p. 62. note ^b, in this chapter.

^d Aur. Victor. in Diocletian. inter Hist. August. Script. Latin. Minor. 749. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 584. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. 304. Horsley *ibid.* b. 1. chap. 5. p. 69.

^e Eutrop. lib. 9. p. 126. inter Roman. Script.

^f Oros. lib. 7. cap. 25. p. 526.

^g Usser. de Primord. Index Chron. p. 1082. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 510. col. 2.

ten years, ^h Allectus being killed, and his army routed by Asclepiodotus, Constantius came over, as appears by ⁱ Eumenius, in the very nick of time to preserve the city of London from being pillaged by the Franks, and then he was received with wonderful joy by the inhabitants, being delivered from the tyranny they underwent in the times of Carausius and Allectus; and after his death ^k medals were coined in London to testify the city's gratitude to him; whereon was the effigies of Constantius of one side, and on the other "a temple between two eagles," with this inscription, "Memoria felix;" and under the temple, "P. L. N." "Pecunia Londin. Notata," ^l as some explain it. For by the eagles and inscription it appears that these coins were intended for the apotheosis of Constantius; and so Joseph Scaliger and ^m Camden understand them. ⁿ Zosimus saith, "Constantius, while he lived, had his chief residence in Britain;" and if a persecution happened here, he must be accessory to it, which is contrary to what is constantly affirmed of Constantius. For ^o Eusebius saith, "he never joined with the other emperors in destroying churches." ^p Sozomen and ^q Cassiodore say, "that he gave full liberty to the Christians, and that their Churches flourished under him;" and

^h Camden. *ibid.* p. 51. vol. 1. p. liv.

ⁱ Eumen. Paneg. n. 17, 19. inter Panegyric. vet. tom. 1. pp. 298. 303.

^k Camden. *ibid.* p. 67. N^o. 16. and as in note ^l. in this page. Alford. *ibid.* A.D. 306. n. 5. tom. 1. p. 327.

^l Camden. *ibid.* pp. 75. 305. vol. 1. p. lxxii. vol. 2. p. 4.

^m Camden. *ibid.*

ⁿ Zosim. Hist. lib. 2. inter Sylburg. Roman. Hist. Script.

Græc. Minor. tom. 3. p. 672. Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 170. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 91. Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 2. §. 1. p. 49.

^o Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 13. Vit. Constant. lib. 1. cap. 13. pp. 396. 506. For this and the following notes, Usser. de Primord. c. 15. p. 170. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 91. Lloyd *ibid.* where also for other authorities.

^p Zosim. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 15.

^q Hist. Tripart. lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 208. col. 2. inter Oper.

^r Optatus saith, “ that the Donatists made their application to Constantine, to appoint judges out of Gaul,” and give this reason, “ because there was no persecution under his father’s government.” And accordingly the council of Arles consisted of bishops chiefly out of Gaul and Britain.

That which upon the whole matter appears most probable to me, is, that the persecution was begun while Diocletian and Maximianus had the empire in their hands; and although Constantius and Galerius had the titles of Cæsars; yet the supreme government was in the others’ hands, as appears by what Orosius saith of Diocletian’s usage of Galerius upon his return ⁷³ from the Persian war, and by the inscriptions in Spain (if they be authentic) produced by ^s Baronius, ^t Velserus and ^u Gruterus. In one of which Diocletianus and Maximianus are only mentioned; and this must be after the persecution, for there it is said, “ *Nomine Christianorum deleto.*” And in the other, “ *Superstitione Christi ubique deleta.*” And there Diocletian is only named Augustus, and Galerius as adopted by him. Baronius thinks such inscriptions were set up every where, but time hath only preserved those in Spain. But if they were set up in Spain, under the government of Constantius, it is an argument, that while Diocletian and Maximianus held the empire, they did what they pleased in these matters: for although the name of Cæsar carried in it something of supreme authority, yet ^x Aurelius Victor, when he takes notice of the first beginning of the difference of the titles of Augustus and Cæsar, he saith, “ though they were both titles of

^r Optat. Oper. lib. 1. p. 25.

^s Baron. A. D. 304. n. 9, 10.

^t Vels. Not. ad Conversion.

Afr. inter Oper. p. 448.

^u Gruter. Inscript. p. 280. 4.

^x Victor. in Trajano, inter Hist. August. Script. Latin. Minor. p. 740.

sovereignty, yet they who enjoyed them did not differ less in their power than they did in their titles." And therefore ^y Lactantius saith, "when Diocletian called Galerius by the name of Cæsar after his Persian victory, he cried out, "Quosque Cæsar?" How long should he continue Cæsar? And the impatience of this made him force Diocletian to resign the empire, as ^z Lactantius, who was upon the place, assures us; nay, when Diocletian offered him, "that all four should be declared Augusti," he refused for this reason, because he knew, while Diocletian continued in power, he should have only the name. And ^a Lactantius further saith, "that the edict against the Christians was sent to Constantius without asking his consent;" and he confesses, "Constantius complied so far as to ^bpull down their churches." But his kindness, when declared Augustus, made them willing to forget the rest. So that the persecution was general till their resignation; but upon Constantius being declared Augustus, it ceased in all these parts; in which, ^c Eusebius affirms, "it did not last two years, although it continued ten years in the east." And within that time the persecution took away St. Alban, ⁷⁴ Aaron and Julius, and other martyrs here, as ^d Gildas and Bede relate, who give a more particular account of the ^e sufferings of the first, ^f not without some mixture of improbabilities or interpolations; but as to the rest, we have nothing but their names preserved, and

^y Lactant. de Mort. Persec. cap. 9. tom. 2. *ibid.* p. 195.

^z Cap. 18. *ibid.* p. 207. See ch. 3. p. 91.

^a Cap. 15. *ibid.* p. 202.

^b Vide Baluz. not. *ibid.* p. 297.

^c Euseb. de Martyrol. Pal. cap. 13. p. 437. in Hist. Eccles. Usser. de Primord. cap. 15.

p. 170. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 91.

^d See notes ^m, ⁿ, p. 70. Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. pp. 149, 165. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 78. 87.

^e With the foregoing pages, the Appendix to Smith's edition of Bede, n. 4. p. 659, may be compared, as it regards the time in which St. Alban suffered martyrdom.

^f Nicolson *ibid.* p. 82.

the places they belonged to. The ^gfirst is said to have been a Roman officer at the municipium of Verulam, the first British town which had Roman privileges; and the other, citizens of ^hCaerleon, where there was a Roman colony.

Constantius dying at ⁱYork, his eldest son, ^kConstantine, was declared Cæsar by the army in Britain. For although Constantius did what in him lay to secure the succession to him, as ^lEusebius saith, yet that did not signify much without the concurrence of the legions. And ^mLactantius saith, “that he commended him to the soldiers, and so delivered the empire to him.” This consent of the army is expressed by ⁿEumenius, and by the emperor ^oJulian; and ^pAurelius Victor saith, “all that were present promoted his being emperor.” But he was not declared Cæsar by Galerius Maximianus till afterwards, as ^qBaluzius hath clearly proved out of Lactantius and

^g Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 147. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 76. See Stillingfleet's Discourses of the true Antiquity of London, in his Works, vol. 3. pp. 904. 912, as to Verulam and Caerleon; p. 914, &c. as to the Roman municipia, colonies, &c. Camden. Brit. p. 292. 323. 490. 572. vol. 1. p. 337. vol. 2. pp. 45. 480. 490. vol. 3. p. 9, on several of the foregoing particulars. Richard of Cirencester's Description of Britain, b. 1. c. 7. p. 68, with the notes.

^h Camden. *ibid.* p. 489. vol. 2. p. 479; and the Additions, p. 488. *Archæologia*, vol. 5. p. 62, &c.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 171. et not. ^d. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 91. et not. ^d. Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 1. p. 49. See

ch. 4. p. 195. and note.

^k Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 173. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 93. Lloyd *ibid.* For his coin and that of his mother Helena, see Camden. *ibid.* p. 75. vol. 1. p. lxxii.

^l Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. 1. cap. 9. 21. pp. 503. 511.

^m Lactant. de Mort. Persec. cap. 24. p. 217. *ibid.*

ⁿ Eumen. Paneg. in Paneg. Veter. n. 8. tom. 1. p. 383. Usser. *ibid.* Camden. *ibid.* p. 52. 572. vol. 1. p. liv. vol. 3. p. 10.

^o Julian. Orat. 1. ad Constant. p. 13.

^p Usser. *ibid.* not. ^c.

^q Baluz. Not. ad Lactantium, tom. 2. p. 314, which compare with Usser. de Primord. Add. p. 1056. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Add. p. 505.

others, who, when he saw he could not help it, sent him the purple robe. Thus Constantine, being firmly settled in the throne, took care in the first place of the tranquillity of these parts, where he was proclaimed emperor; and, as ^r Lactantius saith, “the first thing he did was to secure full liberty to the Christians.” And now we may well suppose all that ^s Gildas and ^t Bede say to have been accomplished, viz. “that the Christians rebuilt their churches, destroyed to the ground, and therein celebrated their holy sacraments, and kept solemn festivals in memory of so great a deliverance.” And from this time we may date the flourishing condition of this Church, which before must labour under great difficulties; the governors of provinces before Constantius, and the generality of the people, being set against the Christians.

^u But the first evidence we meet with of the settled condition of the British Churches, is the number of bishops which went from Britain to the council at Arles, A.D. 314, where we find three bishops subscribing to it; ^v Eborius, bishop of ^w York; ^x Restitutus, bishop of London; and Adelfius, ‘de civitate colonia Londinensium:’ so it is in ^y Sirmondus’s best copy. And although ^z Mr. Selden seems to question the antiquity of it, yet the other vouches it to be very good and ancient. But what then is the ‘civitas co-

^r De Mort. Persec. cap. 24. p. 217. *ibid.*

^s Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 193. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 103. Camden. *ibid.* p. 53. vol. 1. p. lv.

^t Bedæ Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 47.

^u Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 3. §. 2. p. 72.

^v See note ^a, p. 75, for re-

ferences.

^w See Stillingfleet’s Discourse, as above, for this and the following places.

^x Camden. *ibid.* p. 305. vol. 2. p. 4.

^y Sirmond. Conc. Antiq. Galliaë, tom. 1. p. 9.

^z Selden. in Eutyech. Orig. Alexand. p. 118.

lonia Londinensium?' The learned ^aprimate thinks it to be Colchester; that being called in Antoninus 'Colonia.' ^bMr. Selden takes it to be Camalodunum, and so written 'Camalodon,' which the ignorant scribes made 'Col. Londinensium.' ^cSir H. Spelman likewise supposes it to be the old colony of Camalodunum. But, I think, a far more probable sense may be given of it, if we consider the way of summoning bishops to councils at that time. For it is unreasonable to imagine that every Roman colony or city sent a bishop: for then every council would have been as full as the Arabic writers say the council of Nice was, (of which Mr. Selden hath discoursed at large,) or at least as ^dCummianus and ^eAdo thought this council of Arles was, which they made to consist of six hundred bishops: an unreasonable number to be called together on such an occasion, as the giving way to the restless importunity of the Donatists to have their cause heard over again. It is not to be presumed that Constantine would summon so great a number to make up a court, ("episcopale judicium," St. Augustine often calls it,) wherein the main thing to be done was, to hear the parties and to give judgment: and in the former judgment but nineteen bishops were summoned. It is said, "^f that St. Augustine makes the number of bishops at Arles to be two hundred." But I see no sufficient ground to understand those words of this particular council; but of all the bishops which

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. pp. 60. c. 8. 195. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 33. 104.

^b Selden. in Eutychn. p. 118.

^c Spelman. Concil. tom. 1. p. 39. Wilkins, tom. 4. ibid. p. 710. col. 1.

^d Usser. Veter. Epist. Hibern.

Sylog. Epist. 11. p. 28.

^e Adonis Chron. in Biblioth. Vet. Patrum, tom. 9. part. 2. p. 280. col. 2.

^f Augustin. ad Ep. Parm. l. 1. c. 5. See the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works, v. 9. col. 17. note c.

had condemned them in several councils, among whom he reckons the Italian, Spanish, and Gallic bishops, who met at Arles. But when I compare the subscriptions to that council, published out of the most ancient MS., with a passage in Hilary, I am apt to believe, that, excepting those that were very near about Arles, there were no more than a bishop out of a province with one or two presbyters. So it is expressly in the ^g summons to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse in Sicily, (the only one remaining, and which ^h Baronius thinks 76 was the same that was to the rest,) wherein he is required to come out of that province, and to bring two presbyters with him; as Valesius shews, against Baronius and Sirmondus, the words are to be understood. And ⁱ Hilary, speaking of the councils of his time, saith, “that one or two bishops were sent for out of a province;” and he instanceth in the council of Ancyra, and the great council of Ariminum. So here we meet with Chrestus out of the province of Sicily, Quintasius out of the province of Sardinia, and so in most of the rest, the distinct provinces are set down out of which they came. And at that time there were ^j eighteen provinces of Gaul and Britain, and so many bishops appeared at Arles, besides Marinus the bishop of the place. But to supply the defect of some other provinces, there were more out of that province wherein Arles stood than out of any other. In Britain there were then three provinces, according to the MS. copy of Sextus Rufus, saith ^k Mr. Camden: therefore

^g Euseb. l. 10. c. 5. p. 485.

^h Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 314. n. 43.

ⁱ Hilar. de Synod. p. 220. in Lucubration. in Oper. col. 1153.

^j See Usser. de Primord. c. 5. p. 94. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 50.

Stillingfleet's Works, vol. 4. p. 379. See ch. 4. p. 195. with the preceding.

^k Camden. *ibid.* p. 111. vol. 1. p. cxxviii, where, and in the following page, for the later divisions of Roman Britain.

in all probability, since the other two bishops were out of the other two provinces, 'maxima Cæsariensis,' and 'Britannia prima,' the third bishop was out of the third province of 'Britannia secunda,' wherein there were two noted colonies, the one called 'colonia Divana' in the coin of Septimius Geta, and 'civitas legionum' in ¹ Beda, now Chester; the other, '^mcivitas legionis ad Yscam,' where was a colony of the IInd legion, which province is sometimes called 'Britannica secunda.' And therefore this bishop Adelphius came 'ex civit. col. leg. II,' which the ignorant transcribers might easily turn to 'ex civit. col. Londin.' The only objection is that which is suggested by the learned ⁿ primate of Armagh, viz. "that there were four provinces of Britain at that time, and that 'Flavia Cæsariensis' was one of them; having its name from Constantine, who assumed the name of Flavius." But Goltzius's copy deserves not to be so much preferred before ^o Camden's. And the name of 'Flavia Cæsariensis' might either be taken from 'Flavius Valentianus,' as ^p Berterius thinks, or from 'Fl. Theodosius,' before whose time, Camden saith, we never met with 'Britannia Flavia.'

There being then but three bishops present at the council of Arles, is so far from being an argument that there were no more in Britain, that it is rather an argument to the contrary; since it was the custom ⁷⁷ to send but one or two out of a province where they were most numerous. ^q And I see no reason to ques-

¹ Bed. lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 80.

^p Bert. Pithan. Diatr. 1. c. 5.

^m Camden. ibid. p. 489. vol. 2.

p. 64. Usser. ibid. See ch. 5.

p. 479.

p. 287. b.

ⁿ Usser. de Prim. c. 5. p. 96.

^q See Stillingfleet's Ordination

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 51.

Sermon, in his Works, vol. 1.

^o Camden. Brit. p. 111. vol. 1.

p. 371, &c.

p. cxxviii.

tion a succession of bishops here from the first founding of a Christian Church. To prove this, I shall not rely on the testimony of the anonymous ^r Greek author of the Martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, who saith, "St. Peter here ordained bishops, priests and deacons;" but upon the reason of the thing, there being no other Church in the Christian world which derived from the apostles, which had not a succession of bishops from them too: and we cannot trace the history of other Churches further than we can do that of their bishops. As for instance; the first conversion of the Churches of Africa is much in the dark; but as soon as we read any thing considerable of them, we meet with a council of bishops, viz. of ^s Agrippinus and his brethren, out of the provinces of Africa, Numidia and Mauritania, and he was not the immediate predecessor of St. Cyprian, who suffered in the persecution of Valerian, A.D. 258. And ^t Tertullian puts the proof of apostolical Churches upon the succession of bishops from the apostles; which were a senseless way of proceeding, unless it were taken for granted, that wherever the apostles planted Churches, they appointed bishops to take care of them. Although, therefore, by the loss of records of the British Churches, we cannot draw down the succession of bishops from the apostles' time, (for that of the ^u bishops of London by Jocelin of Furnes is not worth mentioning,) yet we have great reason to presume such a succession, when upon the first summoning a council by Constantine, three British bishops

^r Apud Patric. Jun. Not. ad Ep. Clement. p. 14. ed. Wotton. ad fin. p. 11. Usser. de Primord. cap. 1. p. 7. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 4. See ch. 1. p. 45, &c. ch. 3. p. 108.

^s Cypr. Epist. 71. in Oper.

p. 196.

^t Tertull. de Præscr. Hæret. cap. 32. in Oper. p. 213.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 66. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 36. See Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 3. §. 1.

p. 71.

appeared, one out of every province, as they did in other parts.

But some pretend to give a more punctual and exact account of the settling of our Church government here, viz. “^v that there were twenty-eight cities among the old Britons; that in these there were twenty-five flamins and three archiflamins, in whose places, upon the conversion of the nation by king Lucius, there was the like number of bishops and archbishops here appointed.” And for this, besides the rabble of our monkish historians, who swallow 78 Geoffrey of Monmouth whole without chewing, I find two of my predecessors, men considerable in their times, produced to the same purpose, viz. ^w Radulphus de Diceto, and Rad. Baldock. Others say, “^x that these twenty-eight cities were not all furnished with bishops in king Lucius’s time, but that the honour of it belongs to him, because he began it.” But this is making a new story, and in effect denying the truth of the old tradition. However, I deny not but that it is as certain that king Lucius settled bishops here, as that he was converted by Elvanus and Medwinus; for the same authors deliver both. But how far his power extended, and consequently how many cities had episcopal government then settled in them, is now impossible to be known. As to the “twenty-eight cities among the Britons,” the tradition doth not depend upon the credit of Geoffrey or ^y Nennius. For

^v See p. 66. and compare there-with Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. pp. 56. 99. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 31. 52. Ibid. in Præfat. Lloyd ibid. cap. 3. §. 2. p. 72. In the commencement of Usher’s ch. 5, as above, is the passage here given.

^w Mason. de Minister. Angl. lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 78; in the translation by Lindsay, p. 62, &c.

^x Animadv. on Church Hist. of Brit. p. 18. (Heylin’s Examen Historicum.)

^y Gunn’s Notes, 9, 10. p. 96. in his edition of Nennius, 1819.

^z Bede, and before him Gildas, say the same thing, viz. “that there were so many cities among the Britons, while the Romans had power here;” which I see no cause to doubt but they were cities made by the Romans, or by the Britons in imitation of them, as I shall prove in ^a another discourse. But that which follows from hence is, viz. that the government here settled being in Roman cities, the correspondence must not be to the British druids, but to the Roman colonies. That there was some subordination among the druids is unquestionable. For ^b Cæsar affirms, “that there was a prince of the druids;” and the last age hath discovered a famous urn of one Chyndonax, chief of the druids; concerning which whole ^c books have been written, and several discourses published, without any great satisfaction to me: but it is not to any purpose to tell why, since I yield the thing itself. And it is improbable there should be a prince of the druids, without an intermediate subordination; and the druids being so far dispersed, it was a reasonable thing that the superior druids should have their particular limits assigned them, that they might the better understand and give account of those under them, and not interfere or intrench one upon another. As far then as we suppose them to be reasonable and 79 prudent, these things may justly be supposed concerning them; so that setting aside the name of flamins and archiflamins, for which there is no foundation at all, (as to either among the druids, and not for the

^z Bede, b. i. c. i. p. 41. and Smith's Appendix, p. 655, &c. Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 59. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 32.

^a Stillingfleet on the true Antiquity of London; Works, v. 3. p. 896, &c.

^b Camden. *ibid.* p. 10. vol. 1. p. viii.

^c Guenebault le Reveil de l'antique Tombeau de Chyndonax. Licet. Resp. ad Quæst. per Epist. lib. 1. ep. 25. p. 181, &c.

latter word among the Romans,) yet the thing itself hath no such absurdity or improbability in it. But the cities here being Roman, as I suppose, the government must be suitable to that of Roman colonies, and they that know any thing of the nature and constitution of them, do know that they exactly followed the pattern of the city of Rome, having a senate, consuls, prætors, censors, ædiles, quæstors, &c. And, besides the rest, they had their several flamins and pontifices too. But there were many of these flamins in each city or colony; thence ^d Latinus Pacatus, in his panegyric to Theodosius, mentions, “reverendos municipali purpura flamines, insignes apicibus sacerdotes,” speaking of a Roman colony: but there can be no resemblance between a multitude of flamins in a city, and one bishop over a diocese. The flamins were the priests of some peculiar deity, from whom they took their denomination, as may be at large seen in Gruter’s book of Roman Inscriptions. But among them there was a certain order of place and dignity; for we read of a ‘primus flamen’ in ^e Gruter. But ^f Jac. Gutherius hath an observation which will tend to clear this matter. For among the Roman Inscriptions we meet with one extraordinary of this kind, viz. “^g flamini divorum omnium.” “Now,” saith he, “the name ‘flamen’ was common to all the priests in the Roman cities; but the ‘flamen divorum omnium,’ was the chief priest among them.” And so there is no such mighty absurdity as hath been imagined, in supposing

^d Pacat. Paneg. §. 37. inter Paneg. Vet. tom. 2. p. 381. et not.

^e Inscript. Rom. Corpus, tom. 1. p. 29. inscr. 12. The editions of 1616. and 1707. are alike, but the latter is preferable.

^f Jac. Guther. de veteri Jure

Pontificio, lib. 1. cap. 6. inter Græv. Thesaur. Antiq. Roman. tom. 5. p. 15.

^g Gruter. Inscr. ibid. tom. 1. part. 2. p. 359. inscr. 3. p. 490. inscr. 2. et 3.

these flamins to be put down, and the Christian bishops to succeed in their places: especially if we could have made out that there were “flamines provinciarum,” as at first appearance seemed very probable in the Roman Inscriptions. And ^h Sertorius Ursatus seems to make no doubt concerning it in this inscription:

DIVO AVGVSTO
ALBINVS. ALB. F. FLAMEN
DIVÆ. AVG. PROVINCIÆ
LVSITAN.

80 But it is an easy mistake for a “flamen D. Aug.” one of Augustus’s flamins, in that province: of which sort there are many examples. But there are other ⁱ inscriptions wherein we read of

FLAMINICA PROVINCIÆ
LVSITANIÆ.

But all that Sertorius Ursatus infers from hence is, “that there were temples dedicated to ‘municipia,’ and to provinces, and these temples had their flamines and flaminicæ.” But this doth not prove that the flamins had any jurisdiction over a province; which had been indeed to the purpose. Among the Romans, although there were none called ‘archiflamines,’ yet there were ‘flamines majores et minores,’ as appears by Festus and others. The lesser are thought by some to be called ‘veflamines,’ in the Inscriptions both of ^k Gruter and ^l Reinesius. Festus saith, the ‘majores flamines’ were the ‘patricians;’ the ‘minores,’ the ‘plebeians:’ but the late publisher of

^h Sertor. Ursat. Monum. Patav. lib. 1. §. 6. p. 239.

ⁱ Gruter. Inscript. tom. 1. p. 323. inser. 7, 8.

^k Gruter. Inscript. p. 364. 1. 498. 8. tom. 1. part. 2. p. 364.

inscr. 1. p. 498. inscr. 8.

^l Reines. Inscript. p. 385.

Festus saith, that the ‘majores flamines’ were the ‘Dialis,’ ‘Martialis,’ and ‘Quirinalis;’ the rest of the fifteen who were added afterwards, were the ‘minores.’ The ‘flamen Martialis’ and ‘Quirinalis,’ were of the college of ‘pontifices,’ as appears by ^m Cicero. And the ‘pontifices’ themselves were divided likewise into ‘majores’ and ‘minores,’ as appears both by Festus and the Inscriptions. These lesser were at first assessors in the college or court of ‘pontifices;’ but afterwards became only officers to them: and among these there was a ‘pontifex maximus’ too; “but,” as Festus saith, “he was only the first in the college.” But all this relates only to the city. That which comes nearer to our business is the consideration of the ‘sacerdotes provinciarum,’ as they are called in the ⁿ Theodosian Code. ^o Jac. Gothofredus saith, “the difference between the flamins and these was, that the flamins belonged to particular cities;” but these had whole provinces under their care: and so, in the law, the ‘honor flaminii’ was distinct from the ‘honor sacerdotii:’ this latter is called ‘archierosyne,’ in the same Code, and the title and office still continued in the time of Theodosius M. And it is there described to ⁸¹ be “a care that divine offices were performed in their temples.” And such as these were ^p Scopelianus in Asia, and ^q Chrysantius in Lydia, and ^r Arsacius in Galatia, to whom an epistle of Julian is still extant, giving him charge to look after his office with great

^m Cic. de Arusp. Resp. (6.) in Cic. Orat. tom. 2. part. 2. p. 517. et not. *ibid.*

ⁿ Cod. Theod. Tit. de Dec. l. 46. 75, &c. in J. Gothofr. Cod. Theod. tom. 4. pp. 384. 425.

^o J. Gothofr. ad Cod. Theod. 12. tit. 1. de Dec. l. 21. 112.

tom. 4. p. 365.

^p Philostr. de Vit. Sophistar. xxi. Scopel. p. 515. et not. inter Philostrat. omnia.

^q Eunap. de Vit. Philosoph. &c. in Chrysant. p. 179, &c. tom. 1. p. 111.

^r Julian. Ep. 49. p. 202.

care, and to warn and punish the inferior priests if they neglected their duty. So that we have now found out what did bear a great correspondence among the Romans to our bishops and archbishops.

But it still remains a question, whether they did not rather borrow this from the Christians, than the Christians from them? For Julian, in that epistle, makes it his business to persuade Arsacius to "take all things commendable from the Christians:" and no doubt this was thought so by his predecessors, who first set up this sacerdotal government of provinces among them. And, if I mistake not, it began much later than the first settlement of episcopacy in the British Churches. For ^sEusebius saith, "that Maximinus appointed not only priests in the cities, but ἀρχιερεῖς, chief-priests in the provinces," where ^tValesius mistakes his meaning: for he thinks all the innovation of Maximinus was the appointing them himself, whereas they were wont to be chosen by the 'decuriones' in the cities. But he speaks of it "as a new thing of Maximinus," to appoint such an order and office among the priests, which had not been known before. And that which puts this matter out of doubt is, that ^uLactantius, in his excellent piece lately published out of MS. by Baluzius, saith expressly of Maximinus, "novo more sacerdotes maximos per singulas civitates singulos ex primoribus fecit," i. e. that by a new custom he appointed chief-priests in the several cities, of the greatest persons in them, who were not only to do the office of priests themselves, but to look after

^s Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 14. lib. 9. cap. 36. tom. 2. Oper. p. 231. et not. pp. 231. 331. col. 1. 385. cap. 4. pp. 399. 443.

^t Vales. Not. in Euseb. ibid. col. 2. 481. col. 2, &c. 715. pp. 399. 443.

^u Lactant. de Mort. Persec.

the inferior priests, and by their means to hinder the Christians from their worship, and to bring them to punishment. But, as though this were not enough, “^v he appointed other priests over the provinces, in a higher degree above the rest.” Although then Vale-
sius asserted that such were elder than Maximinus, yet Lactantius, whose authority is far greater, hath determined the contrary.

I am not ignorant that, long before Maximinus's⁸² time, ^wTertullian mentions the ‘*præsides sacerdotales*,’ but those do not relate to this matter, but to the ‘*spectacula*,’ as appears by the place. ^xSome insist on the ‘*sacerdotes provinciales*,’ in ^yTertullian; but Rigaltius shews there ought to be a comma between them, it being very unlikely the provincial priests should have golden crowns when those at Rome had not. And in a ^zcanon of the African Code we find the ‘*sacerdotes provinciæ*,’ but that council was long after, A.D. 407. And these seem to be no other than advocates, who were to appear for the causes which concerned the temples and sacrifices throughout the province. According to which method, the African bishops there desire, “that the Churches might have advocates too, with the same privileges.” Which request was granted by ^aHonorius, and was the first introduction of lawyers into the service of the Church, who were called ‘*defensores ecclesiarum*,’ and were afterwards judges in ecclesiastical causes. But that

^v Lactant. *ibid.* p. 232.

^w Tertull. de Spectac. cap. 11.
in Oper. p. 78.

^x Alb. Piccol. de Antiq. Jure
Siculæ Eccles. part. 2. cap. 11.
p. 117.

^y Tertull. de Idololat. cap. 18.
in Oper. p. 96.

^z Cod. Afric. cap. 97. in Bib-
lioth. Juris Canon. Veter. Gul.
Voelli et Henr. Justelli, tom. 1.
p. 383. et Obs. et Not. p. 437.

^a Cod. Theod. 16. tit. 2. l. 38.
in J. Gothofr. Cod. Theod. tom. 6.
p. 76.

which comes nearer to this matter is, ^b the authority of the ‘Asiarchæ,’ who in some coins, mentioned by ^c Spanhemius, are said to be “priests over thirteen cities;” and this in the law is called “^d sacerdotium Asiæ.” But these seem to have been no other than those who took care of the public solemnities in the common assembly in Asia, when the people met out of these cities to perform them either at Ephesus or Smyrna, or any other of the cities within this combination, as is observed by many ^e learned men. And although there were but one chief at a time, yet the office seemed to have passed by turns through the several cities: and he in whose city the solemnities were to be kept, was the president for that time, and had the title of ‘Asiarcha.’ But ^f Alb. Rubenius shews from Aristides and Dio, “that the Asiarchæ had a superintendency over the temples and the priests within the community of the Asian cities;” but these were only, he saith, “for the temples erected to the Cæsars out of the common stock;” the temple of Diana at Ephesus belonging to the Ionian community, and not to that of Asia. Herodes Atticus is called in the inscription at ^g Athens, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν, 83 Cæsar’s high-priest. But that seems to be only a title, without power. But it appears by the ^h inscrip-

^b Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles. A.D. 55. n. 7, 8. p. 672.

^c Spanhem. de Præstant. et Usu Numismat. Antiq. dissert. 8. p. 692. dissert. 9. p. 643.

^d L. 17. De Muner. et Honor. in Digest. Vet. Justin. lib. 50. tit. 4. p. 949. L. 8. De Vacat. et Excus. Muner. tit. 5. p. 953. Spanhem. *ibid.* dissert. 8. p. 692. marg.

^e Cujac. Observ. lib. 2. cap. 13.

Pet. Fabr. Semest. lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 18. Albasp. de Veter. Eccles. Ritibus Observ. lib. 1. cap. 22. p. 44. col. 2. Seld. ad Marm. Arund. p. 164. Works, vol. 2. col. 1569.

^f Alb. Ruben. de Urb. Neocoris, p. 246. ad fin. “De Re Vestiaria.”

^g Spon’s Voyage, tom. 2. p. 220. en Inscript. Antiq.

^h Spon. *ibid.* tom. 3. p. 114.

tion at Thyatira, that the 'Asiarcha' was called the high-priest of Asia, and had power to place priests in the cities under his care. But still this falls short of such chief-priests in the provinces as Maximinus appointed.

And thus I have endeavoured to clear the antiquity and original institution of episcopacy here, by shewing that it was not taken up, according to the monkish tradition, from the heathen flamins and archiflamins; but came down by succession from the first planting of apostolical Churches. For although we cannot deduce a lineal succession of bishops, as they could in other Churches, where writings were preserved, yet as soon as through the Church's peace they came to have intercourse with foreign Churches, (as in the council of Arles,) they appeared with a proportionable number of bishops with those of other provinces: and their succession was not in the least disputed among them, they subscribing to the sentence and canons as others did. And what canons did then pass, did no doubt as much concern the British Churches to observe, as any other Churches whose bishops were there present. Which canons were passed by their own authority; for they never sent to the bishop of Rome to confirm, but to publish them, as appears by the synodical epistle which they sent to him. Their words are, "ⁱQuæ decrevimus communi concilio, charitati tuæ significamus, ut omnes sciant quid in futurum observare debeant." ^kBaronius had good luck to find out the necessity of the pope's confirmation here: whereas they plainly tell him, "they had already decreed them by common consent, and sent them to him to divulge them," i. e. as ^lPetrus de Marca saith, "as the empe-

ⁱ Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 314. n. 58.

^k Baron. *ibid.* n. 68.

^l Pet. de Marca de Concord. *ibid.* tom. 3. lib. 7. cap. 14. n. 2.

rors sent their edicts to their præfecti prætorio." Was that to confirm them? It is true, they say, ^m the

p. 347. Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* n. 6, after referring to Stillingfleet's notice of Baronius, under note ^k, adds, "De Marca's interpretation seems not well to agree to this place." As Stillingfleet has only partially related his words, it may not be amiss to give them more exactly, in order to understand that De Marca, himself a Roman catholic archbishop, considered the council of Arles to be the superior, and the bishop of Rome the inferior power. De Marca says, "The council of Arles, the first assembled out of the western provinces, reported the transactions of that synod to Sylvester, the pope; not, however, to request a confirmation of them, but to commit their publication to him; after the manner of the Roman emperors, who transmitted their rescripts to the prætorian prefects; or according to the method which at this day obtains with us, (in France,) when the king sends his rescripts to the courts of parliament." See also Du Moulin *Nouveauté du Papisme*, liv. 4. cap. 2. p. 321. Spanhem. *Histor. Christianæ*, sæcul. 4. cap. 9. n. 3. col. 908. in *Oper. tom. 1. Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles. tom. 2. A. D. 314. n. 17, &c.*

^m See ch. 3. pp. 114. 130. Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* cap. 4. n. 1, charges Stillingfleet with inserting 'diocese,' for 'dioceses,' in this place; and at the same time in n. 2. insists that the word 'dioceses' ought to be understood in the same

sense as in the *Notitia Imperii*; and thus including the whole of the western empire within the patriarchate of Rome. But the word 'diocese' was scarcely used in such sense, even in a civil point of view, at that time; the *Notitia Imperii* being not published till about, or rather after, the council of Nice. Add to which, that in an ecclesiastical sense, 'diocese' was, in the Churches whose bishops appeared at the council of Arles, used sometimes for a single Church, at others for a bishoprick; and thus the bishop of Rome, whose province extended over a considerable part of Italy, might, in comparison with other bishops, be said to have 'a larger diocese,' or 'dioceses;' as Stillingfleet has it in p. 130. Indeed, what is conclusive against Schelstrate, 'diocese,' in its most extensive sense, and in compliance with the *Notitia*, is first used in the council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, long after the time of the council of Arles. Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, vol. 1. b. 9. c. 1. s. 12. p. 350. Salmasius, in his *Apparatus ad Libros de Primatu*, p. 257. Du Pin *ibid.* *dissert. 1. §. 11. p. 41.* Beveregii *Pandectæ Canonum*, in *Annotat. tom. 2. p. 94. col. 1.* Justellus, in his *Notes to the Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ*, p. 220. Parker's *Account of the Government of the Christian Church*, §. 19. p. 229. Cave's *Dissertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church*, ch. 3. n. 6. p. 128.

pope had a larger diocese; but if these words had implied so much as a patriarchal power over the bishops there assembled, how could they assume to themselves this power to make canons; and only to signify to him what they had done, and to desire him to communicate these canons to others? Would such a message from a council have been borne, since the 84 papal supremacy hath been owned? Nay, how saucily would it have looked in any council within the patriarchates of the East to have done so? But these bishops of Arles knew no other style then but “*charitati tuæ;*”ⁿ and they signify to the bishop of Rome what they had already decreed, but not what they had prepared for him to confirm. And they are so far from owning his authority in calling them together, that they tell him, “*Communi copula charitatis et unitate matris ecclesiæ catholicæ vinculo inhærentes ad Arelatensium civitatem piissimi imperatoris voluntate adducti Quos et Dei nostri præsens auctoritas et traditio, ac regula veritatis ita respuit Judice Deo, ac matre ecclesia quæ suos novit aut comprobatur, aut damnati sunt aut repulsi Et utinam, frater dilectissime, ad hoc tantum spectaculum interesses Et te pariter nobiscum judicante cœtus noster majori lætitia exultasset.*” “They were assembled ^Pat the emperor’s command, and were so far from expecting directions” from him, that they tell him they had “a divine authority present with them, and a certain tradition and rule of faith.” They wished indeed, “he had been present with them, and to have judged together with them.”

ⁿ Forbesii Hist. Theol. Instruction. lib. 10. cap. 4. n. 4. in Oper. tom. 2. p. 455.

^o Baron. *ibid.* n. 66.

^p Comber’s Roman Forgeries,

p. 68. in Gibson’s Preservative against Popery, vol. 3. tit. 11. cap. 4. Basnag. *Annal.* tom. 2. p. 653. A.D. 314. n. 14.

Was this to make him sole judge? or could they believe him at the same time to be their supreme head? They could have been "glad of the company of their brother of Rome," as they familiarly call him. But since his occasions would not permit his absence from home, they acquaint him what they had done, and so send him an abstract of their canons, as may be seen at large both in ^q Sirmondus and ^r Baronius. By this we see what opinion the ^s British bishops and their brethren had of the pope's supremacy.

But now to their ^t canons: those may be reduced to three heads; either to the keeping of Easter; or to the discipline of the clergy; or to lay communion.

1. As to Easter, that council decreed, Can. 1, "that it should be observed on the same day and time throughout the world: and that the bishop of Rome should give notice of the day, according to custom."

85^u But this latter part was repealed, as Binius confesses,

^q Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. tom. i. p. 5, &c.

^r Baron. *ibid.* n. 67.

^s See p. 74. for these bishops.

^t Spelman. *ibid.* p. 39. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 708, which compare with Baronius, as above, n. 59, &c. See ch. 3. p. 91.

^u Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* n. 7, after referring to the first part of this paragraph, denies Stillingfleet's assertion here made, as it regards Binius. But as Binius copied Baronius, (see Gibson's Tracts against Popery, vol. 3. tit. 11. *Introd.* p. 42,) it will be sufficient to quote Baronius in his Annals, to establish Stillingfleet's statement. Baronius then, *ibid.* A.D. 325. n. 110, says, "It was the pleasure of the holy synod of Nice to impose upon

the bishop of Alexandria the care of signifying the day of Easter, year after year." And in n. 111. he shews this from an epistle of Leo, bishop of Rome, to the emperor Marcian. In n. 112. Baronius affords proof of Stillingfleet's assertion; "Before the time of the Nicene council, the ancient custom of the Church was, that the day of the Easter festival should be sought from the bishop of Rome, as is expressed in the first canon of the council of Arles." Schelstrate afterwards, in the above and the following portions of the chapter just cited, endeavours to shew the authority of the Roman Church, as it regarded Easter, both before and after the time of the council of Nice. Stillingfleet, however, in his An-

by the council of Nice, which referred this matter to the bishop of Alexandria.

II. As to the clergy, there were canons which related to ^v bishops, priests and deacons.

1. To bishops; and those were four: (1.) "That no bishop should trample upon another," can. 17; which Albaspineus well interprets of invading another's diocese. (2.) "As to travelling bishops, that they should be allowed to perform divine offices in the city they came unto," can. 19. (3.) "That no bishop should consecrate another alone, but he ought to take seven with him, or at least three," can. 20; which shews the number of bishops then in the western provinces and so in Britain at that time. The Nicene canon, can. 4, takes notice only of three bishops as necessary to be present, because many eastern provinces had not seven; as Christianus Lupus observes on that canon. In an African council in ^w Cresconius we find, "that because two had presumed to consecrate a bishop, they desire that twelve may be present;" but Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, refused it for this reason, "because in the province of Tripolis there were but five bishops." Therefore when the council of Arles appoints seven, it doth suppose these provinces to have a greater number of bishops. (4.) "That if any were proved to have been '^x traditores' in the time

swer to Mr. Cressy's Epistle Apologetical, chap. 4. §. 9. (in his Works, v. 5. p. 685,) shews, on the contrary, that Easter was observed, not only in the eastern, but in the western Churches, at various times, notwithstanding the authority, as is pretended, of the Roman Church. The same is evident from Smith's Appendix to Bede, *ibid.* num. 9. p. 694. Bingham's Antiquities

of the Christian Church, vol. 2. book 20. ch. 5. s. 2. p. 309; not to insist upon others.

^v See Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 3. §. 3. p. 73.

^w Voelli et Justelli Biblioth. Juris Canon. veter. tom. 1. App. p. xxxiv. col. 2.

^x Fabric. Bibliograph. Antiq. cap. 11. n. 27. p. 574. Compare Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 303. n. 10, 11, &c. with Daillé's work, *Adversus*

of persecution," i. e. to have given up the sacred books or vessels, "or to have betrayed their brethren, and this proved by authentic acts; then they were to be deposed." However their ordinations are declared to be valid, can. 13.

2. As to inferior clergy: (1.) "excommunication is denounced against those that put out money to use," can. 12. (2.) "That they were not to forsake the Churches where they were ordained," can. 2. And deprivation is threatened on that account, can. 21. (3.) "The deacons are forbidden to celebrate the Lord's supper," there called "offering," can. 15.

III. As to ^ylay communion: 1. "Those that refuse to continue in their employment as soldiers, now the persecution was over, were to be suspended communion," can. 3. The words are, "de his qui arma projiciunt in pace." Of which some do hardly make tolerable sense. Binius saith, it must be read "in bello." But nothing can be more contrary to peace than war; how then should such a mistake happen? Albaspineus saith, "it is against those who refuse to be soldiers in time of peace:" ^zBaronius saith, "it is against them that apostatize in time of peace;" but if a metaphorical sense will be allowed, that which seems most probable is, that many Christians, now the persecution was over, neglected that care of themselves and that strictness of discipline which they used before; and therefore such are here threatened, if not to be thrown out, yet to be debarred communion till they had recovered themselves. And much to this purpose ^aJosephus Ægyptius and ^bJoh. Antiochenus do understand the 12th can. of the

Latinorum de Cultus religiosi
Objecto traditionem, lib. i. c. 35.
p. 205.

^y See chap. 3. p. 92.

^z Ibid. n. 59.

^a Bevereg. Pandect. Can. t. i.
p. 694.

^b Voelli et Justelli Biblioth.
Juris Can. veter. tom. 2. pp. 562.
640.

council of Nice. But if a metaphorical sense be thought too hard ; then, I suppose, the meaning is, against those who renounced being soldiers, as much now in time of the Churches' peace, as under persecution, when they could not be soldiers without committing idolatry, as appeared in the persecution of Licinius and others. Constantine, as ^c Eusebius saith, "gave them all leave to forsake their employment that would." But the council of Arles might well apprehend, that if all Christians renounced being soldiers, they must still have an army of heathens, whatever the emperors were ; and therefore they had reason to make such a canon as this, since the Christians ever thought it lawful to serve in the wars ; provided no idolatrous acts were imposed, which was frequently done on purpose by the persecutors, as Maximianus, Licinius, Julian, &c. And this I think the true meaning of this difficult canon.

2. "For those who drove the chariots in races, and acted on theatres, as long as they continued so to do ;" there being so many occasions of idolatry in both of them, "they were to be cast out of communion," can. 4, 5. 3. "That those who were Christians and made governors of remote places should carry with them the communicatory letters of their own bishop, and not be debarred communion, unless they acted against the discipline of the Church." This I take to be the meaning of can. 7. 4. "That those who were ⁸⁷ received into the Church in their weakness should have imposition of hands afterwards," can. 6. 5. "That those who brought testimonials from confessors should be bound to take communicatory letters from their bishop, can. 9. 6. "That those who found their wives in adultery, should be advised not to marry again while

^c Euseb. de Vit. Const. lib. 2. cap. 33. p. 552.

they did live," can. 10. 7. "That those young women who did marry infidels should for a time be suspended communion," can. 11. 8. "That those who falsely accused their brethren should not be admitted to communion as long as they lived," can. 14. 9. "That none who were excommunicated in one place should be absolved in another," can. 16. 10. "That no apostate should be admitted to communion in sickness; but they ought to wait till they recovered, and shewed amendment," can. 22. 11. "That those who were baptized in the faith of the holy Trinity should not be rebaptized," can. 8: and this was the canon which St. Augustine on all occasions pressed upon the Donatists, as Sirmondus and Launoy think; and therefore they suppose this council to be called so often a plenary and universal council, not from the number of bishops present, but from the provinces out of which they came; and so it was the first general council of the western Church.

CHAP. III.

88

OF THE SUCCESSION OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES FROM THE
COUNCIL OF NICE TO THE COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM.

GREAT probabilities that the British bishops were present in the council of Nice.—The testimonies of Constantine's being born in Britain cleared.—The particular canons of the council of Nice relating to the government of Churches explained.—How far the right of election was devolved to the bishops.—Of the authority of provincial synods there settled.—Particular exceptions as to the bishops of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch from ancient custom.—They had then a patriarchal power within certain bounds.—No metropolitans under the jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria.—The just rights of the British Churches cleared.—No evidence that they were under the Roman patriarchate.—The Cyprian privilege vindicated from all late exceptions.—The patriarchal rights examined; and from them the pope's patriarchal power over the western Churches at large disputed and overthrown.—Pope Leo's arguments against the patriarch of Constantinople held for the western Churches against him.—The British bishops present in the council of Sardica.—What authority granted by them to the bishop of Rome, and how far it extends.

HAVING deduced the succession of the British Churches down to the appearance of the British bishops at the first council of Arles, I now come to the famous council of Nice; and although the subscriptions still remaining, which are very imperfect and confused 89 in the best copies, do not discover any of the British bishops to have been there present, yet there are many probabilities to induce us to believe that they were. For, 1. Constantine declares, that his design was, to have as full an appearance of bishops there from all parts as he could well get together. To that end he sent forth an universal summons for the bishops to come out of all provinces, *ἀπανταχόθεν* is the word used by ^a Eusebius. And presently after he saith Constantine's edict was divulged *πανταχοῦ*, “in all provinces of the empire.” How can this be, if there were no

^a Euseb. de Vit. Const. lib. 3. cap. 6. p. 579.

summons in the provinces of Gaul and Britain? And to prevent all objections, as to difficulty and charges of passage, Eusebius adds, "that he had given order to have the public carriages ready, and all expenses to be defrayed for them." To this purpose 'tractoriæ' were to be given them by the emperor's order, which secured their passage and provision in all places; the form of which is extant in ^bBaronius. And the ^cClassis Britannica lying near to Britain to secure these coasts from the Franks and Saxons, who were then troublesome, (and over which ^dCarausius so lately was appointed admiral to clear these seas,) the bishops here could not want conveniency to transport them. 2. Constantine expressed great satisfaction in the numbers that did appear from all parts. So that there is no reason to question, that they did answer his expectation. For in his epistle to the Church of Alexandria, ^e he saith, "he had brought together a great number of bishops;" but more fully in his epistle to the Churches; "that to the settlement of the Christian faith it was then necessary, that all the bishops should meet together, or at least the greatest part:" therefore he had assembled as many as he could. But when it appears by the ^fcouncil of Arles, what numbers of bishops there were in these western provinces, how could Constantine use such expressions as these, if they were not summoned to appear? And ^gEusebius saith, "those that were summoned did come according to appointment with great readiness, not only for the sake of the council, but of the emperor;" and he after saith, "that the most eminent ⁹⁰ bishops of all Churches, as well those of Europe as Asia

^b Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 314. n. 48.

^c See chap. 2. p. 63. chap. 5.

p. 304.

^d See ch. 2. p. 71. and notes.

^e Socrat. lib. 1. c. 9. pp. 30.33.

^f See chap. 2. p. 75.

^g Euseb. *Vit. Const.* lib. 3.

cap. 6, 7. p. 579.

and Africa, did come to Nice." Did not Eusebius know of the Churches of Britain? Yes, most certainly, for he mentions their early conversion to Christianity, as ^h I have already shewed; and in that very book of the ⁱ Life of Constantine, he mentions the Churches of Britain, as well as those of Gaul and Spain: and there ^k Constantine insists upon the consent of the western and northern Churches about Easter, as well as the southern and some of the eastern. Now if their consent were so considerable as to add weight in this matter, it is not to be supposed they should be left out, when he designed an œcumenical council, as far as it was in his power to make it so, which certainly extended to all the provinces within the empire. 3. It is not probable the Churches of Britain should be left out, considering ^l Constantine's relation to Britain. For he was not only proclaimed emperor here on the death of his father; but, if the panegyrist who lived in that time may be believed, "he was born here." For, comparing ^m Constantius and him together, he saith, "that his father delivered Britain from slavery, 'tu etiam nobiles illic oriendo fecisti:'" the question now is, whether these words relate to his birth, or to his being proclaimed Cæsar here? Livineius is for the latter, after ⁿ Lipsius; but I see no reason to decline the most natural and proper sense, viz. "that he brought a great honour to Britain by being born in it." ^o Eumenius, in another

^h In chap. 1. p. 36.

ⁱ Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. 3. cap. 19. p. 588.

^k Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 195. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 105. Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 3. p. 75.

^l See chap. 1. p. 36.

^m Panegy. Max. et Const. inter Panegy. vet. tom. 1. p. 336. where in the note upon the place

the writer differs from Stillington. Camden. Brit. p. 573. vol. 3. p. 10. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 174. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 94.

ⁿ Lipsius de Mag. Rom. lib. 4. cap. 11. p. 248. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. pp. 173. 183. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 93. 98.

^o Eumen. Panegy. Constant.

panegyric, applauds the happiness of Britain, "that had the first sight of Constantine Cæsar." This is likewise capable of both senses; but he immediately falls into a high commendation of Britain, for its temper, fertility, riches, and length of days. If this were Constantine's own country, this was done like an orator; if not, to what purpose is all this? And then he parallels Britain with Egypt, where Mercury was born; which shews that he spake ^p of the place of nativity. Besides, ^q the former panegyrist made his oration to Maximianus and Constantine together, upon his marriage of Theodora his daughter; but it is not so probable that he would to him so much own Constantine's being made Cæsar in Britain; for that was not according to the rules of
 91 government, in the court of Maximianus and Diocletian; for as Galerius told Diocletian when he would have had four Augusti; "rNo," saith he, "that is against your own maxim, which is to have only two Augusti, and for them to name two Cæsars." Therefore it is not likely that the orator should, to Maximianus's face, own him to be made Cæsar, without the consent of those who were then Augusti: but if he speaks of his being made Cæsar by Galerius, it is very doubtful whether he were then in Britain. For ^s Lactantius saith, "he took time to consider about it, and was very hardly brought to it:" but ^t Nazarius and

§. 9. 4ter Panegy. vet. tom. 1. p. 38. Usser. de Primord. c. 8. p. 173. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 93. Camden. Brit. pp. 2. 52. 572. vol. 1. pp. ii. lv. vol. 3. p. 10.

^p See the authorities quoted in Gough's edition of Camden. *ibid.* vol. 1. p. liv. note R; Tanner's *Bibliotheca*, under Constantinus, not. ^a; Alford, in his *Britannia Illustrata*, cap. 1. §. 2. pp. 31—172.

^q See note ^m as above. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 174. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 93.

^r Lactant. *ibid.* cap. 18. p. 206. in Oper. tom. 2. See chap. 2. p. 73.

^s Lactant. de Mort. Persec. cap. 25. *ibid.* p. 217.

^t Nazar. Paneg. n. 16. inter Panegy. vet. tom. 2. p. 47. et not.

^u Praxagoras both say, “that Constantine went into Gaul soon after his father’s death;” and therefore Gaul first saw him Cæsar, according to the constitution of the empire at that time. So that this one testimony of the panegyrist weighs more with me than ten ^v Cedrenuses or Nicephoruses who say “he was born in the east.” But I produce this only as an argument of the improbability, that the British Churches should be omitted by Constantine in the summons to his œcumenical council; or, that they being summoned should neglect to go. 4. ^w They were certainly summoned, and did go to the councils of Sardica and Ariminum after, and to that of Arles before, and why should we believe them left out in that of Nice? This argument alone prevailed with ^x Mr. Selden to believe them present at the council of Nice. And we are now forced to make use of the best probabilities, since Athanasius’s ^y synodicon hath been so long lost, wherein all their names were set down who were then present; and that catalogue of them, if it were distinct, which ^z Epiphanius had seen.

There being then so much reason to believe the British bishops present in the council of Nice, we have the more cause to look into the constitution of the ecclesiastical government there settled, that so we may better understand the just rights and privileges of the British Churches. After the points of faith and the ^a time of Easter were determined, the bishops there

^u Phot. Cod. 62. col. 63.

^v Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* pp. 180. 185, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 97. 100, &c. Camden. *ibid.* pp. 51. 573. vol. 1. p. liv. vol. 3. p. 10.

^w See p. 135. chap. 4. p. 176. chap. 2. p. 74.

^x Selden. in Eutychn. pp. 117.

123.

^y Socr. lib. 1. cap. 13. p. 42. *ibid.*

^z Epiph. Hær. 69. n. 11. p. 735.

^a Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 3. §. 4. p. 75.

assembled made ^b twenty canons for the government and discipline of the Church, in which they partly reinforced the ^c canons of the council of Arles, and 92 partly added new. Those that were reinforced were, (1.) “^d against clergymen’s taking the customary usury then allowed,” can. 17: (2.) “against their removing from their own diocese,” can. 15; which is here extended to bishops; and such removal is declared null: (3.) “against deacons giving the eucharist to presbyters, and in the presence of bishops,” can. 18. 2. As to lay communion, the canon against re-baptizing is reinforced by can. 19, wherein those only who renounced the Trinity are required to be re-baptized, and the canon against being excommunicated in one Church, and received into communion in another, can. 5, whether they be of the laity or clergy.

For the new canons about ^e lay communion, they chiefly concerned the lapsed in times of persecution. As, (1.) “If they were only catechumens, that for three years they should remain in the lowest form, not being admitted to join in any prayers of the Church, but only to hear the lessons read, and the instructions that were there given,” can. 14. (2.) “For those that were baptized, and fell voluntarily,” in the late persecution of Licinius, “they were for three years to remain among those who were admitted only to hear, for seven years to continue in the state of penitents, and for two years to join only with the people in prayers, without being

^b As to the number of canons in this council, see Stillingfleet’s Works, vol. 4. p. 374, &c. Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. tom. 2. In Annot. pp. 42 a. 108 b. 203 a, &c. Voell. et Justell. Biblioth. tom. 1. pp. 334. 420, &c. For the canons themselves,

Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 58. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* p. 29.

^c See chap. 2. p. 84.

^d On these canons it will be desirable to consult bishop Beveridge’s Annotations, tom. 2. *ibid.* p. 42.

^e See chap. 2. p. 85.

admitted to the eucharist," can. 11. (3.) "For those soldiers who" (in that persecution when Licinius made it necessary for them to sacrifice to heathen gods if they would continue in their places) "first renounced their employments, and after by bribery or other means got into them again, for three years they were to be without joining in the prayers of the Church, and for ten years to remain in the state of penitents; but so as to leave it to the bishop's discretion to judge of the sincerity of their repentance, and accordingly to remit some part of the discipline," can. 12. (4.) "If persons happened to be in danger of death before they had passed through all the methods of the Church's discipline, they were not to be denied the eucharist; but if they recover, they were to be reduced to the state of penitents," can. 13. But there was one canon added of another nature, which concerned uniformity, and that is the last of the genuine canons. It had been an ancient⁹³ custom in the Christian Church to forbear kneeling in the public devotion on the Lord's day, and between Easter and Whitsuntide, but there were some who refused to observe it; and therefore this canon was made to bring all to an uniformity in that practice, can. 20.

But there are other canons which relate more especially to ecclesiastical persons, and those either concern the discipline of the clergy, or the government of the Church.

I. For the discipline of the clergy, they are these:

1. "None who had voluntarily castrated themselves were to be admitted into orders," can. 1. For it seems Origen's fact, however condemned by some, was as much admired by others, and § Christianus Lupus

^f Vide Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annot. pp. 44 b. 45 a. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* p. 69.

§ Christian. Lup. Not. in Concil. Nicæn. Can. inter Schol. et Not. in *Canones*, &c. tom. 1.

thinks the sect of the Valesii, who castrated all, came from him; but I do not find that Origen did propagate any sect of this kind; and ^h Epiphanius makes one Valens the author of it; however this great council thought fit to exclude all such from any capacity of Church employments; but it is generally supposed, and not without reason, that the fact of Leontius, a presbyter of Antioch, ⁱcastrating himself because of his suspicious conversation with Eustolia, gave the particular occasion to the making this canon. 2. "None who were lately catechumens were to be consecrated bishops or ordained presbyters," can. 2: for however it had happened well in some extraordinary cases, as of St. Cyprian before, and others after this council, as St. Ambrose, Nectarius, &c. yet there was great reason to make a standing rule against it. 3. "^kNone of the clergy were to have any woman to live in the house with them, except very near relations, as mother, or sister," &c. can. 3. For some, pretending greater sanctity, and therefore declining marriage, yet affected the familiar conversation of women, who made the same pretence. For ^lBudæus hath well observed, that *συνείσακτος* is "a companion of celibacy;" so that when two persons were resolved to continue unmarried, and agreed to live together, one of these was *συνείσακτος* to the other. And ^mTertullian, writing against second marriages, seems to ⁹⁴advise this practice, "Habe aliquam uxorem spiritualem;

p. 15. Vide Ruel. et Hartman. Concil. Illustr. tom. 1. p. 496.

^h Epiphanius. advers. Hæreses, contra Vales. tom. 1. p. 489.

ⁱ Baron. ibid. A.D. 325. n. 147. Vide Athan. ad solit. vit. agent. Oper. tom. 1. pp. 812. 822. 827. tom. 1. pp. 347. 356. 360.

^k Bevereg. ibid. pp. 45 b-47 a.

Voell. et Justell. ibid. p. 70.

^l Budæi Comment. Linguae Græcæ, col. 148. in Oper. tom. 4. Basil. 1577. In the edition of 1529, p. 99, this passage is wholly omitted.

^m Tertull. de Monog. cap. 16. p. 535. De Exhort. Castit. c. 12. p. 524. in Oper

adsume de viduis ecclesiæ," &c. And it soon grew into a custom in Africa, as appears by ⁿSt. Cyprian, who writes vehemently against it, and shews the danger and scandal of it. And that this conversation was under a pretence of sanctity appears by ^oSt. Jerome's words, speaking of such persons, "sub nominibus pietatis quærentium suspecta consortia;" and again, "sub nomine religionis et umbra continentiæ." But elsewhere he calls it "pestitis agapetarum," for it spread like the plague, and was restrained with great difficulty; and at last laws were added to canons, these being found ineffectual. 4. "If any persons were admitted loosely and without due examination into orders, or upon confession of lawful impediments had hands notwithstanding laid upon them, such ordinations were not to be allowed as canonical," can. 9; which is more fully expressed in the next canon as to one case, viz. "that if any lapsed persons were ordained, whether the ordainers did it ignorantly or knowingly, they were to be deprived," can. 10. 5. "If any among the Novatians returned to the Church, and subscribed their consent to the doctrine and practice of it, their ordination seems to be allowed." ^pJustellus, and some others, think a new imposition of hands was required by this canon; if any of the Novatian clergy were admitted into the Church. And so ^qDionysius Exiguus and ^rthe old Latin interpreter do render it. But ^sBalsamon, Zonaras and others understand it so, as that the former imposition of hands,

ⁿ Cypr. Epist. 4. in Oper. Bevereg. Annot. ibid. tom. 2. p. 7. Epist. 62. p. 102. in Oper. p. 67, &c. Lloyd ibid. cap. 6.

^o Hieron. ad Rustic. ad Gaudent. ad Eustoch. Oper. tom. 4. §. 9. p. 126.

^q Voell. et Justell. ibid. t. 1. part. 2. col. 771. 799. et 33. p. 117.

^r Justell. Codex Canon. Eccles. univers. p. 142, &c. ^r Ibid. p. 284.

^s Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. tom. 1. p. 68.

whereby they were admitted into the clergy were hereby allowed. If the words of the canon seem to be ambiguous, and their sense to be taken from the practice of the Nicene Fathers in a parallel case, then they are rather to be understood of a new imposition of hands. For in the case of the Meletians who were ordained in schism too, they determined in their ^tsynodical epistle that they should be received *μυστικοτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ*, “with a more sacred imposition of hands;” but it is not agreed whether this implies a reordination or not. “Valesius thinks it doth, but others take it only for a “simple benediction,” or the “laying on of hands upon reconciliation to the Church.” And ^vGodfrey Hermant hath at large proved reordination in this 95 case to have been against the sense of the Church; wherein he hath the advantage of Valesius: as is evident to any one that reflects on the occasion of the Luciferian schism; which began upon the council of Alexandria’s allowing the ordination of the Arian bishops. And it would be very strange if schism were more destructive to orders than plain heresy. But “the Novatian bishop was to have no jurisdiction where there was one of the catholic Church;” can. 8.

Among the canons which relate to the settlement and polity of the Church, these three are very material: 1. about election and consecration of bishops; 2. about provincial synods; 3. about the bounds of jurisdiction. For the seventh canon is but a ^wcompliment to the bishop of Jerusalem, giving him the honour of a metropolitan without the jurisdiction.

^t Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 14. p. 143. Addition, p. 739. tom. 1.

^u Vales. Not. in Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 27. col. 2. *ibid.*

^w Vide Bevereg. Annot. *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 64.

^v La Vie de S. Athanase, liv. 2.

I. About election and consecration of bishops. The canon is, “^x that a bishop ought chiefly to be constituted by all the bishops in the province; but if this be too difficult, either through urgent occasions or the length of the way, yet ^y three must be present for that purpose, and have the consent of the absent under their hands, and so to make the consecration. But the confirmation of all things done in the province must be reserved to the metropolitan,” can. 4. ^z By this canon the government of the Church came now to be settled under Constantine, and with his approbation. And here we find, that every province had a number of bishops within itself, who were to take care of the ecclesiastical government of it, but so as the consent of the metropolitan were obtained: ^a so that the ^brights of metropolitans, as to the chief ecclesiastical government of every province, are hereby secured; for the last clause doth not merely refer to the consecration of bishops, but takes in that, with other ecclesiastical affairs of the province. The only difficulty lies in the first clause, what is meant by the bishops of the province “constituting a new bishop;” whether the right of election is hereby devolved to them, or whether it be only the right of consecration upon the election of the people? Which is therefore here fit to be inquired into, because the ancient practice of the British

^x Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. tom. 1. p. 63.

^y Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 6. p. 123, &c.

^z Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annot. p. 47.

^a Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* against Stillingfleet, chap. 5. n. 1, cites these words, down to “secured,” in connexion with others. See p. 99, note ^u.

^b As to metropolitans, see

Bingham's Works, vol. 1. b. 2. chap. 16. s. 1, 2, 3, where the opinions of Usher, Beveridge, Hammond, De Marca, &c., are given. Du Pin, *De antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, diss. 1. §. 6. p. 14. §. 8. p. 18. Parker's Government of the Christian Church, §. 12. p. 161, &c. Fabric. *Bibliograph. Antiq.* c. 15. p. 664.

Churches may from hence be gathered; which we may justly presume was agreeable to the Nicene 96 canon. And because the signification of the Greek word is ambiguous, we shall first see what sense the Greek writers do put upon it. ^c Balsamon interprets *καθίστασθαι* by *ψηφίζεσθαι*, which is, “choosing by suffrage;” and he in plain terms saith, by this canon, “the right of election was taken from the people, and given to the bishops of the province.” And it is not Balsamon alone, as some imagine, that was of that opinion, but ^d Zonaras, Aristenus, ^e Matthæus Blastares, as any one may find. But we are told, “if they are all of that mind, they are greatly mistaken, because this council, in their synodical epistle to those of Alexandria and Egypt, declare their judgment, ^f that if any bishops decease, others reconciled to the Church may be admitted in their room, if they be worthy, and the people do choose them, *καὶ ὁ λαὸς αἰροῖτο.*” One would think by this, that the council of Nice had put this matter wholly into the people’s hands, but if we look into that synodical epistle, we shall find it much otherwise. For the case was this: ^g the council declares their tenderness towards those that had been made bishops and priests in the Meletian schism, allowing their orders upon due submission, but not to exercise any jurisdiction to the prejudice of those in possession; but if any bishops died, those Meletian bishops might succeed, but with these three provisos: (1.) “that they be judged worthy.” By whom? by the people? No, certainly; for then there had been no need for the following clause; but this judgment belonged to the bishops of the pro-

^c Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. tom. 1. p. 63.

^d Bevereg. *ibid.*

^e *Ibid.* tom. 2. p. 259.

^f Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 28. et not. Vales. *ibid.*

^g Du Pin’s Eccles. Hist. t. 1. p. 599. col. 2.

vince, according to this canon. (2.) "If the people choose them?" What people? the Meletian party? No; they are excluded, because of their being in schism, from having any thing to do in the choice, although they were admitted to communion. For they are forbidden before ^h *προχειρίζεσθαι ἢ ὑποβάλλειν ὀνόματα*, "to put up the names of the persons to be chosen, or to hold up their hands;" and so all right of suffrage was taken from them on the account of their schism; so that what right of choice was in the people, it was only in the sound and untainted party, and, after all, it was no more but a nomination by the people; for the true right of election was still in the bishops. For, (3.) all this signified nothing without the consent of the bishop of Alexandria, which immediately follows the other. And is it a fair thing to mention that clause only in the 97 middle, and to leave out the two other, which reduce it to a bare nomination, and the Meletian party excluded too? Would those who contend among us for popular elections like them upon these terms? ⁱ It is one thing for the people to propose or nominate persons to be chosen; and another for them to have the right of election: and it is one thing for a person chosen to have the consent of the people; and another for them to have the power to reject him, because he doth not please them: and again, it is one thing for the people to be allowed to enjoy some privileges till the inconveniences of them have made them be taken away by just laws; and another for them to challenge such a right as inherent in themselves, and without which there lies no obligation on them to submit. If these things were

^h Socrates *ibid.* p. 28. et Vales. not.

ⁱ Compare Bingham's Works, v. 1. b. 4. chap. 2. with The ori-

ginal Draught of the Primitive Church, ch. 4. p. 138, &c. ch. 6. p. 260, &c.

better understood, it would allay some men's heats about these matters; for granting that in the time of the council of Nice, the people had the liberty of proposing names, or objecting against the persons to be chosen; and although their consent were generally desired, yet all this doth not put the right of election in them; for all that they could do signified nothing without the consent of the bishops and metropolitan; and none are properly said to choose but those upon whose judgment the determination depends, the rest do but propose and offer persons to be chosen. So that the utmost the people could have by this canon was a right of nomination; which upon seditions and tumults was justly altered; and there can be no plea for resuming it, unless it be proved to be a divine and unalterable right, which can never be done, nor is it so much as pretended by those who seem to court the people's favour, by pleading for popular elections at this day from the precedents of former times.

But I will not deny the people then had a further right of exception against the persons chosen, but therein they were considered as witnesses, and not as judges: if their exceptions were just and well proved, the bishops as judges were to proceed canonically against them, and then they went to a new nomination, but still the judgment rested in the provincial synod. So in the 16th canon in the council of Antioch it is provided, "j that although all the people choose one actually a bishop, yet if he takes possession of his see without a perfect provincial synod, the metropolitan being present, he is to be cast out." This canon doth more fully explain the fourth canon of the council of Nice; for here the case is put of the people's choice,

j Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 445.

which is there only implied: and here it is put concerning one actually a bishop, and so needing no new consecration, but being out of employment in his own see, by some extraordinary accident, is chosen into another by consent of the people. Now if the people had there the power of election, what hindered this bishop from being fully possessed of his bishopric? And yet this canon determines, "that such a one was to be cast out, if he did not come in by the full consent of the metropolitan and a provincial synod;" and to shew the force of this canon, by virtue of it, Bassianus was rejected from being bishop of Ephesus, by the ^k general council of Chalcedon, where 630 bishops are said to have been present. The case was this, Bassianus was consecrated bishop of Euaza, by Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, but it was against his will, and he never went thither. Basilius, who succeeded Memnon, sends another bishop to that city in a provincial synod, but leaves Bassianus the dignity of a bishop; Basilius being dead, Bassianus is chosen by the people of Ephesus, and enthronized by Olympius without a provincial synod. But after four years, Stephanus is put in his room, because he came not in canonically. The case was heard at large by the council of Chalcedon, and this canon of Antioch was alleged against him, and so he was thrown out by the council. From whence I infer, (1.) that the choice of the people at that time was not allowed, but the main force of election lay in the provincial synod. And so Maximus, bishop of Antioch, Julianus Coensis, Diogenes Cyzicensis declared that it belonged to the bishops of the province to appoint a new bishop, as being most competent judges, and this was the way to prevent disorder in the city. (2.) That the bishops'

^k Concil. Chalced. act. 11. Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 2. Annot. p. 191. col. 2.

appointing was not mere ordaining or consecrating, as 99 some say. For this canon of Antioch speaks of a bishop already consecrated, and so likewise the ¹twelfth canon of Laodicea is to be understood; the same case being supposed which is mentioned in the canon of Antioch. And if he were unconsecrated before, the Laodicean canon refers the whole matter, as far as I can discern, as to the capacity and fitness of the person, to the provincial synod. And if the following canon 13. be understood of bishops, the consequence will be, that the people will be wholly excluded from their election, till it can be made appear, that at that time the generality of the people were shut out, and the election restrained to the common council; which is contrary to the examples brought for popular elections, as appears by the instance of Alexandria in the choice of Athanasius, where the "whole multitude" is mentioned, and the "suffrages" of "the whole people," and afterwards the "*plebis vulgique judicium*" in St. Jerome, the "*vota civium*" in Leo is as much spoken of as the "*honoratorum arbitrium*;" and by the same reason any of the people may be excluded, the rest may; or at least it shews, that the people have no inherent and unalterable right, without which all other pretences signify nothing, where law and customs have determined the contrary. And that the customs even then differed appears from St. Jerome *ad Rusticum*, where he mentions either the people or the bishop choosing.

2. Another canon is, about the frequency of provincial synods. For in the fifth canon it is provided, "that no person excommunicated by one bishop should be received into communion by another;" according to the council of Arles; but then no provision was

¹ Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. tom. I. p. 458.

made for the case of appeals; if any person complained that he was unjustly excommunicated, which it is natural for men to do. For this purpose, the Nicene council decrees, “^m that provincial synods be held twice a year, in Lent and autumn,” ⁿ which was confirmed by many other ^o canons. And at these all

^m Concil. Nicæn. canon. 5. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 64.

ⁿ See p. 95. and note ^a, in connexion with which Schelstrate, *ibid.* chap. 5. n. 1, quotes the words of Stillingfleet, in this present page, commencing with “which,” and ending with “metropolitan,” intending thereby to shew, *ibid.* n. 2, 3, from the cases of Dionysius of Alexandria, Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and that of Athanasius, together with the council of Sardica, the superior power of the Roman bishop over the Church. In reply it may be observed, that the accusers of Dionysius ought, in the first place, to have convened a synod at Alexandria, which they, contrary to the ecclesiastical rule, neglected; and, secondly, that though they referred the matter to the bishop of Rome, yet, as Du Pin observes, and proves from like cases, “the same evinces not that the Roman bishop had a supreme authority in judgments against bishops.” Du Pin *ibid.* dissert. 2. cap. 2. De Dionys. Alexandr. p. 152. Basnag. *Annal.* *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 400. A. D. 259. n. 8. With respect to Paul of Samosata, the emperor Aurelian directed the adjudication to be made, not by the bishop of Rome alone, but by the other bishops of Italy, which proves that the Roman

bishop possessed no special prerogative in this matter. Du Pin *ibid.* p. 154. Blondel de la Primauté, p. 63. Salmasii de Primatu, cap. 17. p. 297. In the matter of Athanasius, when inquired into, it will be found that he was received into communion by the bishop of Rome, but not restored to his see, as is pretended, by him. Du Pin *ibid.* p. 158; while the canon of the council of Sardica, referred to by Schelstrate, was a novelty dependent upon the bishops in that council. Du Pin *ibid.* p. 107. See in this chapter pp. 125. 136. 141, &c. and notes.

^o Concil. Antioch. cap. 20. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 449. Chalced. cap. 19. Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 137. African. cap. 62. Labbei Sac. Concil. tom. 2. col. 1113. Regiens. can. 7. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 3. col. 1228. can. 8. Araus. can. 29. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 3. col. 1451. Agath. can. 71. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 4. col. 1394. Emerit. can. 7. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 6. col. 501. Ferrand. tit. 143. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 452. col. 2. Mart. Bracar. tit. 18. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* App. p. viii. Innocent. ad Vict. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 197. col. 2. Leo ad Anastas. Leonis Oper. tom. 1. ep. 12. cap. 7. p. 442. Voell. et Justell. *ibid.* p. 233. col. 2. Hincmar. ep. 47. cap. 20. in Oper. tom. 2. p. 777.

such causes were to be heard and determined, and persons excommunicated were to be held so by all, unless the provincial synod repealed the sentence. And although the case of bishops be not here mentioned, yet the ^PAfrican fathers with great reason said, it ought to be understood, “since causes are to be heard within the province,” and no jurisdiction is mentioned by the council of Nice, beyond that of a metropolitan, those only excepted whose rights are secured according to the prescription then in use in the following canon. For if any other superior authority had then been known, that was the proper place to have inserted it, where the right of appeal is determined, that being the most plausible pretence for removing causes to a superior court. And it is impossible that the Nicene fathers should have stopped at provincial synods, if they had known or believed that Christ had appointed a vicar upon earth, who was to be supreme judge in all ecclesiastical matters. For it would have been as absurd as if our judges should declare, that all causes are to be determined in the country courts, when they know there are superior courts of judicature appointed in Westminster-hall.

It hath been thought a matter of some difficulty to state the difference between the ^qrights of a patriarch and a metropolitan. But there are two things chiefly wherein the distinction lies, viz. a greater extent of jurisdiction founded on the consecration of metropolitan bishops in several provinces, and a power of

^P Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 675, &c. compared with *Annotat.* t. 2. p. 49. in can. 5. *Concil. Nicæn.* Voell. et *Justell.* *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 408. *Observat.* p. 443. *Richer. Histor. Concil. general.* tom. 1. cap. 2. n. 10. p. 47. *Stilling-*

fleet's Rational Account of the Grounds &c. part 2. c. 5. §. 14. in his *Works*, vol. 4. p. 393, &c. ^q Beveridge, *Annotat. ibid.* tom. 2. p. 53, on the rights of patriarchs; and in p. 59, on those of metropolitans.

receiving appeals, or, “judicium in majoribus causis,” even after provincial synods have determined them. And since in matters of appeal there must be a stop somewhere, the only question before us is, where the council of Nice fixed it. I say, in a provincial synod by this canon: for I am certain it takes notice here of no ecclesiastical judicatory beyond this. In matters of faith, or upon extraordinary occasions, by the summons of an emperor, or a general concurrence of Christian princes, a general council is the highest court: but in the standing and ordinary method of proceeding, (where there have been no ancient privileges to the contrary, of which the following canon is to be understood,) a provincial synod is the last court of appeal, according to the council of Nice. So that all foreign jurisdiction is excluded by this canon; and the ^r British Churches had a full power within themselves to end all causes that did arise within their own provinces. And it was mere usurpation in any foreign bishop to interpose in any differences in the British Churches, because the council of Nice had circumscribed the liberty of appeals to provincial synods. And this was it which made the ^s African fathers so stout in defence of their just rights, against the manifest encroachments of the bishop of Rome: and the British Churches had as great privileges and as just rights in these matters as the African Churches.

3. About settling the ancient bounds of jurisdiction, as to ^t patriarchal Churches, in the famous ^u sixth canon; which hath been the occasion of so many warm

^r See Stillingfleet's Rational Account of the Grounds, &c. part 2. c. 5. p. 370, &c. in his Works, vol. 4. “Of the Roman Church Authority.”

^s Stillingfleet's Rational Account, *ibid.* p. 393, &c.

^t See note ^w following.

^u Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 66. tom. 2. Annot. p. 50.

debates. ^v In the former canon, the Nicene fathers fixed the general right of appeals; and in this canon they settle the particular bounds of ^w patriarchal jurisdiction, according to ancient custom: so that none ought to violate the privileges which Churches had hitherto enjoyed. The words are, “^x Let ancient customs prevail, for the bishop of Alexandria to have jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis; because the bishop of Rome hath a like custom; likewise in Antioch, and other provinces, let the privileges of Churches be preserved: let no man be made a bishop without the consent of his metropolitan. If differences arise, let the majority of votes determine.” In this canon there are three things principally designed: (1.) ^y to confirm the ^z ancient privileges of some of the greater sees, as ^a Rome, ^b Alexandria and ^c Antioch; (2.) to secure the privileges of other Churches against their encroachments upon them; (3.) to provide for the quiet establishment of metropolitan Churches; which last is so plain that it will need no further discourse. But the other two are of great consequence to our design. (1.) To confirm the ancient privileges of some of the greater sees; which had gotten the

^v See p. 99. and notes.

^w In what manner Stillingfleet makes use of the term “patriarchal,” see lower in this and the following pages, particularly p. 104; and compare therewith Bevereg. Annot. t. 2. *ibid.* p. 54, &c. from which it will plainly appear, that this word is to be understood of those Churches which were “patriarchal as to extent, but metropolitanical in the administration.” See Cave’s Dissertation concerning the Government of the Ancient

Church, ch. 2. p. 46, &c.

^x See note ^u, above. See also p. 132.

^y Schelstrate, in his *Dissertat. ibid.* ch. 5. n. 4, 5, refers to this and the previous sentence, beginning with “Let ancient customs,” in connexion with another, which see in p. 104. note ^w.

^z Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annot. p. 49.

^a *Ibid.* p. 56. col. 2, &c.

^b *Ibid.* p. 52. col. 1, &c.

^c *Ibid.* p. 58. col. 1, &c.

extent of more than a bare metropolitan power to themselves, as is plain in the ^dcase of Alexandria, which seems to have been the occasion of this canon. Not merely from the ^eschism of Meletius, (as is commonly thought,) which the council took care of another way, in the ^fsynodical epistle to the Churches of Egypt. But because so large a jurisdiction as had ¹⁰² been exercised by the bishops of Alexandria and Rome and Antioch, seemed repugnant to the foregoing canon about provincial synods. It is true that Meletius after the schism did consecrate bishops in Egypt, in opposition to the bishop of Alexandria; but the question between them was, not concerning the bounds of jurisdiction, but about the validity of Meletius's deposition by Peter of Alexandria: which Meletius not regarding, fell into a schism, and, to maintain this schism, he consecrated near thirty bishops, as appeared by the list he gave in to Alexander, after the council of Nice, extant in ^gAthanasius. Whereby it is evident, that Meletius's schism could not be the occasion of this canon: for that schism did not at all relate to the several provinces of Egypt here mentioned, which would have continued, if the bishop of Alexandria's authority had been confined to a single province; and what stop could it put to the schism, to say, his authority extended over all the Roman provinces in Egypt? for the question was, who had the authority? not, how far it extended? But, upon the former ^hcanon about provincial synods, there was a very just occasion to add this concerning

^d Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 52. col. 1,
&c.

^e *Ibid.* p. 49. col. 2.

^f Theodoret. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 9.
p. 31.

^g Athanas. *Apol.* 2. p. 789. in
Oper. tom. 1. *Apolog. contra*
Arianos, p. 187. Vide Athanas.
ibid. p. 777. tom. 1. *ibid.* p. 177.

^h See p. 99.

the bishops of Alexandria and Rome: for if no salvo had been made for them, as to the largeness of their jurisdiction, the next thing had been for all the provincial synods to have immediately cast off all respect to them, except only those of their own province. Now in Egypt here are three distinct provinces mentioned as subject to the bishop of Alexandria, viz. ⁱEgypt, Libya and Pentapolis; and so the Nicene fathers reckon them in their Epistle to the Churches of Egypt, and in these ^kAthanasius mentions an hundred bishops; but sometimes he names only Egypt and Libya, as in his Epistle to the African bishops; sometimes Egypt and the two Libyas; and in both comprehending Thebais under Egypt; sometimes he names Thebais; and several times, as it is here, only Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis: which, as ^lJustellus saith, comprehend the whole Egyptian diocese. But ^mAmmianus Marcellinus reckons them otherwise, viz. Egypt, Thebais and Libya, to which posterity, he saith, added Augustamnica and Pentapolis: but Pentapolis 103 was not comprehended under Libya, being always a distinct province, and by the division of Augustus was under the proconsul of Crete, by the name of 'Cyrenaica.' However ⁿEpiphanius takes in Libya, Pentapolis, Thebais, Ammoniacia and Mareotis: and saith plainly, "that all the provinces of Egypt were under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria. And this," he saith, "was the custom before the council of

ⁱ See p. 101. note ^u.

^k Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 788.
tom. 1. *ibid.* p. 187.

^l Vide Justell. Not. in Cod. Canon. Eccles. univers. p. 221. Voell. et Justell. Biblioth. t. 1. *ibid.* p. 91. col. 1.

^m Amm. Marcel. Hist. Rom.

lib. 22. cap. 16. p. 263.

ⁿ Epiph. Hær. 68. n. 1. t. 1. p. 717. et Petav. Animadv. t. 2. p. 274. *ibid.* Basnag. Exercit. *ibid.* p. 307. on Petavius. Basnag. Annal. *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 719. col. 2, &c. Car. a Sancto Paulo Geograph. Sacr. p. 257.

Nice." For he speaks of the quarrel between Peter, bishop of Alexandria, and Meletius, then bishop of Thebais; of whom he saith, "° that he was next to the bishop of Alexandria, but in subjection to him, all ecclesiastical matters being referred to him: for it is the custom for the bishop of Alexandria to have the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all Egypt." By which it is plain, that the bishop of Alexandria had then a true patriarchal power by ancient custom, i. e. an ecclesiastical authority over the bishops in several provinces, answering to the power which the "P præfectus augustalis" had over them in the civil government. It is not at all material whether the name of 'patriarch' or 'diocese' (in that sense as it takes in the extent of patriarchal jurisdiction) were then in use, for it is the thing we inquire after, and not the use of words. And if the bishop of Alexandria had at that time the power of 9 consecration of bishops, of calling councils, of receiving appeals throughout all Egypt, no men of sense can deny that he had a true patriarchal power. I grant "he had no metropolitans then under him in the several provinces." But what then? the manner of administration of the patriarchal power might be different then from following times: but the extent of the power is the thing in question. Either then the bishop of Alexandria had a barely metropolitical power or patriarchal. If barely metropolitical, then it could not reach beyond one province: if it extended to more provinces, with full jurisdiction, then it was patriarchal. And it is a wonder to me, some learned men in their warm debates about this canon could not discern so plain a truth. But it is often said, "r that there were

° Epiphanius. *ibid.* n. 1.

9 Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 2. Annot.

P Pancirolli Comment. in No- tit. Imper. p. 75, &c.

p. 52. col. 1.

r Parker's Account of the Go-

no such things as patriarchs at this time in the Church, nor any dioceses here taken notice of, as they imply an union of several provinces under a patriarchal jurisdiction." Suppose there were not under those names; but a jurisdiction over several provinces there was in the bishop of Alexandria, which is a true patriarchal power; and appeals were brought to him out of the several provinces, as appears not only by the plain testimony of ^s Epiphanius in the case of Meletius, but by the jurisdiction exercised by ^t Dionysius over Pentapolis, long before the council of Nice. And ^u Athanasius saith, "the care of those Churches then belonged to the bishop of Alexandria." If it be said, "^v that there were then no metropolitans under the bishop of Alexandria, but he was the sole metropolitan, and therefore this was no patriarchal, but a metropolitan power;" I answer, (1.) This doth not solve the difficulty, but rather makes it greater; because it doth more overthrow the metropolitan government of the Church here settled by the council of Nice. For then there were several provinces without metropolitans. How then could the canons here made be ever observed in them, as to the consecration of bishops and provincial synods? (2.) I do confess there was something peculiar in the case of the bishop of Alexandria. ^w For all the provinces of Egypt were under his imme-

vernment of the Church, §. 14. p. 196, &c. §. 15. p. 197, &c. Cave's Dissertat. *ibid.* chap. 2. p. 46. chap. 4. p. 137, &c. Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 2. Annot. p. 52. col. 2, &c.

^s Epiphan. *ibid.*

^t Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 2. Annot. p. 52. col. 1.

^u Athanas. de Sent. Dionys. p. 552. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 246.

^v Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 53. col. 2. p. 54. col. 1.

^w Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, ch. 5. n. 4, 6, adduces these words of Stillingfleet, and those which follow, down to "Rome and Alexandria," in order to prove, n. 6-10, that the bishops of Antioch, as well as those of Alexandria, not to insist upon those of Rome, were properly

diate care, which was patriarchal as to extent, but metropolitanical in the administration. And so was the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome at that time, which is the true reason of bringing the custom of Rome to justify that of Alexandria. For, as it is well observed

patriarchs, and had, at this time, metropolitans subject unto them. And to establish his reasoning as to Antioch, a fragment of Bede, relating to the synod of Cæsarea, on the disputes concerning Easter, is brought forward; of which we need only notice, that if it is genuine, which is scarcely probable, it will not prove Schelstrate's point. Comber's Roman Forgeries in the Councils, in Gibson's Tracts against Popery, vol. 3. tit. 11. c. 2. p. 55. Reiseri Anti-Bellarminus Vindicatus, p. 230, &c. Basnag. Annal. *ibid.* t. 2. p. 185. A.D. 190. n. 7. Schelstrate then produces an epistle of Jerome's to Pammachius, in which reference is made to Cæsarea as the metropolis of Palestine, and Antioch as the metropolis of the whole east; to which it will be sufficient to answer, that Jerome speaks not only doubtingly, but after the fashion of his own, not the time of the Nicene council, Basnag. *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 718. A.D. 325. n. 48. Parker's Account of the Government &c. *ibid.* §. 16. p. 217, &c. With respect to the bishop of Alexandria, Schelstrate endeavours to prove him to be a patriarch, because that in certain portions of the works of Athanasius and Epiphanius, Meletius here mentioned is denominated an archbishop, though under the direction of the bishop of Alexandria.

Yet not only Beveridge, *ibid.* tom. 2. Annotat. pp. 48. 52, &c. on the fourth and sixth canons of the council of Nice, shews plainly to the contrary, but also Basnag, *ibid.* n. 49. p. 719, whence it appears that this bishop's jurisdiction formed but one entire ecclesiastical province, in which he was the sole metropolitan. As to the word "archbishop," here made use of, see Du Pin *ibid.* dissert. 1. §. 3. p. 5. Basnag. Exercitat. Historico-Critic. p. 317; and, in particular, the Benedictine editors upon the place in Athanasius, tom. 1. p. 188. and præfat. p. xxix. Upon the whole, the words of De Marca, as applicable to the bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, with regard to this latter canon of the council of Nice, deserve remembrance: "We must not, indeed, attempt to deny, that in that canon of Nice, those three principal bishops are spoken of as metropolitans, and nothing more; in the next century, they have, in the council of Ephesus, the additional title of archbishops conferred on them; in the council of Constantinople they are graced with the dignity of exarchs of dioceses; and at length, in the council of Chalcedon, they are promiscuously spoken of as archbishops, exarchs, and by the newly invented term of patriarchs."

by ^x Christianus Lupus, “the bishop of Rome had then no metropolitans under him within the provinces subject to his jurisdiction;” and so all appeals lay immediately from the several bishops to him. And therein lay the exact parallel between the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. So that I do not question but the first part of this canon was brought in as a proviso to the former, which put the last resort into provincial synods. For Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, could not but think himself extremely concerned in this matter, and although he prevailed against Arius in matter of doctrine, yet if he had gone home so much less than he came thither, having great part of his authority taken from him by provincial synods, this would have weakened his cause so much in Egypt, that 105 for his sake the Nicene fathers were willing to make an exception as to the general rule they had laid down before; which proved of very ill consequence afterwards: for upon this encouragement, others in following councils obtained as large privileges, though without pretence of custom; and the Church of Rome, though but named occasionally here, to avoid envy, yet improved this to the utmost advantage: and the agents of the bishop of Rome had the impudence, in the ^y council of Chalcedon, to falsify the title of this canon, and to pretend a supremacy owned by it, which was as far from the intention of this council as a limited patriarch is from being head of the Church. And it is impossible for them, with all their arts and distinctions they have used, to reconcile this canon with an universal and unbounded supremacy in the bishop of that Church. For it would be like the saying

^x Lup. in Canon. part. 5. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annotat. p. 808.

^y Concil. Chalced. act. 16.

p. 50. col. 1.

that the sheriff of Yorkshire shall have jurisdiction over all three Ridings, because the king of England hath power over all the nation. What parallel is there between these two? But if the clause be restrained to his patriarchal power, then we are certain the council of Nice did suppose the bishop of Rome to have only a limited power within certain provinces; which, according to ^z Ruffinus, who very well understood the extent of the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction, was only to the suburbicary Churches; which is the "greater diocese" mentioned by the council of Arles, it so very much exceeding the diocese of any western bishop besides. And it is observable, that ^a Athanasius, as he calls Milan the metropolis of Italy, i. e. of the Italic diocese, so he calls Rome the metropolis of Romania, i. e. of the Roman diocese. But the council of Nice fixing the last appeal to provincial synods in other places, utterly overthrows a patriarchal as well as unlimited jurisdiction, where ancient custom did not then prevail.

(2.) This canon was designed to secure the privileges of other Churches. For that is the general nature of exceptions, to make the rule more firm in cases not excepted. So that all Churches are to enjoy their just rights of having the last resort to provincial synods, that cannot be brought within these exceptions allowed ¹⁰⁶ by the council of Nice. And here we fix our right as to the ^b British Churches, that they were not under any patriarchal jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome before the council of Nice, i. e. that he never had the authority to consecrate the metropolitans or bishops of these

^z Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 51. col. 2.
p. 52. col. 1.

^a Athanas. *ad Solit. Vit. Agent.*
p. 831. in *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 363.

^b Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 58. col. 2,
&c. See p. 100. and note ^r of this
chapter; also p. 110. chap. 5.
p. 364.

provinces; that he never called them to his councils at Rome; that he had no appeals from hence; that the British bishops never owned his jurisdiction over them, and therefore our Churches were still to enjoy their former privileges of being governed by their own provincial synods. It was upon this ground the ^cCyprian bishops made their application to the council of Ephesus; because the bishop of Antioch did invade their privileges contrary to the Nicene canons pretending to a right to consecrate their metropolitan, which they knew very well was a design to bring their Churches in subjection to him. The council upon hearing the cause declared their opinion in favour of the Cyprian privilege; and not only so, but declared it to be “^da common cause that concerned other Churches which were bound to maintain their own rights against all usurpations; and that no bishops should presume to invade another’s province; and if they did usurp any authority over them, they were bound to lay it down, as being contrary to the canons; savouring of worldly ambition; and destructive of that liberty which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us with his own blood.” And therefore the council decreed, “that every province should enjoy its own rights pure and inviolable, which it had from the beginning, according to the ancient custom.” This important canon is passed over very slightly by ^eBaronius and others, but ^fCarolus a Sancto Paulo saith “it proceeded upon a false suggestion,” although the bishops of Cyprus do most solemnly avow the truth of their ancient privilege. ^gChristianus Lupus “imputes the decree to the partiality of the council

^c Bevereg. *ibid.* col. 1.

^d Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. Canon. Concil. Ephes. 8. p. 104, &c.

^e Baron. *Annal.* tom. 1. A.D. 431. n. 145.

^f Geograph. Sacr. Patriarch. Antiochen. p. 282.

^g Lupus in *Can. Ephes.* p. 386, inter Schol. et not. in *Canones*, tom. 1.

against the bishop of Antioch ;” although he confesses, they insisted upon the Nicene canons. Which even ^h Leo I. in his eager disputes with Anatolius bishop of Constantinople pleads for as inviolable, and as the standard of the rights of Churches. And by the decree of the council of Ephesus, ⁱ all Churches are bound to stand up for their own rights against the usurpations of 107 foreign bishops.

But ^j Joh. Morinus apprehending the force of this consequence, makes it his business to overthrow it by shewing “ that this was a particular and occasional thing, and therefore not to be made an example to other Churches.” A twofold occasion he assigns ; first, “ ^k the difficulty of passage by sea from Cyprus to Antioch, especially in winter, when it was very possible a metropolitan might die, and rather than live so long without one, they chose to set up one themselves ; another is the forty years’ schism in the Church of Antioch, between Euzoius, Meletius and Paulinus.” But these are only slight and frivolous evasions. For the Cyprian bishops never alleged the first inconvenience, nor did the bishop of Antioch the second : no, not when Alexander was unanimously chosen, as Morinus confesseth, and made his complaint of the Cyprian privilege to Innocentius I. as may be seen by his eighteenth epistle ; to whom the pope gave an ignorant answer, as appears by Morinus himself : for he pretends “ that the Cyprian bishops had broken the Nicene

^h Leo Epist. 78. c. 3. 79. c. 2. 80. cap. 2. inter Oper. tom. 1. pp. 595, 597, 599. Parker’s Account of the Government, *ibid.* §. 24. p. 296. See p. 132.

ⁱ See Stillingfleet’s Rational Account, *ibid.* Works, vol. 4.

p. 381, for a comparison of the rights of the British and Cyprian Churches.

^j Morin. Exercit. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 13.

^k Vide Car. a Sancto Paulo, *ibid.* p. 282.

canons, in consecrating their own metropolitan, because," saith he, "the council of Nice had set the Church of Antioch, not over any province, but over the diocese;" by which he must mean the eastern diocese, within which Cyprus was comprehended: but there is not one word of the diocese in the Nicene canons, and these things are referred to ancient customs, as Morinus acknowledgeth; and he saith, "the diocese of the Orient, as distinguished from Asiana and Pontica was not settled at the time of the Nicene council." And yet he brings the testimony of Innocentius to disprove the allegation of the Cyprian bishops; when he confesses, "that he was so mistaken in the Nicene canons," on which he grounds that right; and the Cyprian bishops had the Nicene canons to plead for themselves, as the general council of Ephesus thought, who understood them far better than Innocentius seems to have done. If what he saith had been true, it is not to be thought that the council of Ephesus would have determined in favour of the Cyprian bishops. But Morinus urges against them, (1.) "that they named only three bishops, Troilus, Sabinus, and Epiphanius." But do they not aver 108 that it had been always so from the apostles' time? (2.) "That no one pleaded for the bishop of Antioch." What then? If they were satisfied of the truth of their allegation, the Nicene council had already determined the case. (3.) "They only do it conditionally, if it were so:" but they enjoyed their privilege by virtue of it; which shews it could not be disproved. (4.) "¹The Cyprian privilege was granted in Zeno's time, upon finding the body of St. Barnabas." ^m But it is evident they enjoyed it before; by the decree of the council of

¹ Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annot. p. 147. col. 2.

Sacr. et Eccles. col. 84. in Oper. tom. 1.

^m Vide Spanhem. Geograph.

Ephesus. And it was not properly a privilege; for that implies a particular exemption; but it was a confirmation of their just rights: and not only as to them, but as to all provincial Churches. So that this decree is the magna charta of metropolitan Churches, against any encroachments upon their liberties: and so the council thought it, when “ⁿ it appoints all metropolitans to take copies of it, and voids all acts that should be made against it.”

It is necessary now to inquire, ^o whether the bishop of Rome had a patriarchal power over the British Churches before the council of Nice: and the only way to do that, is to examine the several patriarchal rights which were allowed in the Church. And if the marks of none of them do appear, we have reason to conclude, he had no patriarchal power. For however ^p some urge the conversion of Britain by Eleutherius as a pretence to the bishop of Rome's authority, yet, allowing it to be true, no man of understanding can pretend to derive a patriarchal power from thence, unless there were a concurrence of jurisdiction from that time. Neither were it of force, if ^q St. Peter himself had preached the gospel here, and settled the bishops of these Churches; for, by the same reason, there could have been no patriarchates at Antioch or Alexandria (where he is supposed to have placed ^r St. Mark): but if notwithstanding, the bishops of those Churches had a true patriarchal power, then so might the metropolitans of the British Churches have their proper rights,

ⁿ Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 104.

^o Consult Stillingfleet's Rational Account, *ibid.* p. 395. in his Works, vol. 4. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. Annot. p. 58. col. 2.

^p See ch. 2. p. 59. Basnag. Exercitat. Hist. Crit. p. 27.

^q See chap. 1. p. 45. chap. 2. p. 77.

^r Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 16. et not. p. 65. Fabric. Salut. Lux Evangel. cap. 46. p. 735.

although St. Peter himself had founded these Churches. ^s Morinus saith, “the patriarchal power consisted in these four things: 1. in the consecration of metropolitans, and the confirmation of other bishops; 109 2. in calling councils out of the several provinces under his jurisdiction; 3. in receiving appeals from provincial synods; 4. in the delegation of persons with authority from him to act in the several provinces.” The first is that upon which the rest are founded: as we see in the case of the bishop of Antioch and the bishops of Cyprus; for if he could have carried the point of consecration of the bishop of Constance, he knew all the rest would follow. In the patriarchate of Alexandria it appears by the epistles of ^t Synesius, “that the bishops of Pentapolis, although then under a metropolitan of their own, yet had their consecration from the bishop of Alexandria.” When Justinian advanced the bishop of Justiniana prima to the dignity of a patriarch, by giving him power over seven provinces, he ^u expresses the patriarchal power by this, “that all the bishops of those provinces should be consecrated by him,” and consequently be under his jurisdiction, and be liable to be called to his council, as Justinian elsewhere determines: and when the ^w bishop of Justinianopolis removed from Cyprus thither, he not only enjoyed the Cyprian privilege there, but was allowed for a patriarch by the ^x council in Trullo, and consequently, the conse-

^s Morin. Exercit. Eccles. l. 1. cap. 29. p. 85. Bevereg. tom. 2. ibid. Annot. p. 58. col. 2, &c.

^t Synes. Epist. 67. 76. in Oper. pp. 210. 223. Vide Car. a Sancto Paulo ibid. p. 261, &c.

^u Novell. 131. cap. 3. Authentic. Justinian. Novell. Coll. 9. De Eccles. tit. 6. p. 256. col. 1. inter Gothofred. Corp. Juris

Civilis, p. 184. Basnag. Annal. t. 3. A.D. 535. n. 13. p. 718. Spanhem. ibid. col. 124, &c.

^w Novell. 123 et 137. Gothofred. Corp. Juris Civilis. Nov. 123. cap. 10. p. 170. cap. 22. p. 173. Nov. 137. cap. 1, &c. p. 195, &c.

^x Bevereg. ibid. tom. 1. p. 202. tom. 2. Annot. p. 154.

eration of the bishops in the province of Hellespont belonged to him.

And when the patriarchal power was settled at Constantinople, that was the chief thing insisted upon, at least as to metropolitans. The first attempt the bishop of Constantinople made towards any true patriarchal power (for all that the ^y council of Constantinople gave him was a mere honorary title) was the ^z consecrating bishops in the dioceses of Asiana, and Pontica, and Thracia: and this was charged on St. Chrysostom as an innovation in the synod “^aad quercum,” i. e. in the suburbs of Chalcedon. And his ^b actings in the council at Ephesus, and consecrating of many bishops in that diocese, could not be justified by the canons of the Church: the best excuse is what ^c Palladius makes, viz. “that his going into Asia was upon the great importunity of the bishops and clergy there:” for what ^d Morinus saith, “that he did this by the pope’s authority,” is ridiculous; it being not once thought of by St. Chrysostom or his friends. And for a bishop of Constantinople to ¹¹⁰ act by authority from the bishop of Rome, was then as absurd, as for the czar of Muscovy to act by commission from the emperor of Germany. For it is plain, that one stood upon equal privileges with the other; as fully appears by the ^e council of Chalcedon, and the warm debates which followed it, between the two sees. And what could have served Leo’s turn better against Anatolius, than to have produced St. Chrysostom’s delegation from one of his predecessors? But in the

^y Concil. Const. c. 3. Bevereg. ibid. tom. 1. p. 89. tom. 2 Annot. p. 95. See p. 115.

^z Bevereg. ibid. tom. 2. p. 95. col. 2.

^a Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 59. col. 53—60.

^b Soz. lib. 8. cap. 6. p. 333, &c.

^c Pallad. Vit. Chrys. p. 133.

^d Morin. Exercit. Eccles. l. 1.

cap. 14. p. 38.

^e Bevereg. ibid. tom. 1. p. 145.

tom. 2. Annot. p. 124. col. 2. p. 125.

council of Chalcedon, where the right of the patriarch of Constantinople was at large debated, this act of St. Chrysostom was alleged as a remarkable precedent to prove a patriarchal power: and there ^f a canon was passed, “that the metropolitans of those three dioceses should be consecrated by the bishop of Constantinople,” which was the establishment of his patriarchal authority over them. Upon this pope ^g Leo insisted on the council of Nice and the canons there made, and pleaded strongly, “that this was an unjust invasion of the rights of those Churches which ought to be inviolably preserved.” And we desire no better arguments against the pope’s pretended patriarchal power over these western Churches, than what Leo insisted on for the dioceses of Asia, Pontus and Thrace, against the patriarchal power of the bishop of Constantinople. For we plead the very same things; that all Churches ought to enjoy the rights of provincial synods: and that no person can be excused in violating the Nicene canons. But if it be pretended, “^h that the bishop of Rome had always a patriarchal power over the British Churches;” let any one instance be given of it: let them tell us when he consecrated the metropolitans or bishops of the three provinces of Britain; or summoned them to his councils; or heard their causes; or received appeals from hence; or so much as sent any one legate to exercise authority in his name: and if they can produce nothing of this kind, there is not then the least appearance of his patriarchal power.

We do not deny that the bishop of Rome had any patriarchal power in those times; but we say, it was confined within the Roman diocese; as that did com-

^f Concil. Chalced. cap. 28. Parker *ibid.* §. 24. p. 296, &c. Bevereg. *ibid.*

^g Cave *ibid.* ch. 6. p. 284, &c.

See p. 133.

^h See p. 106. note ^b.

prehend the Churches within the ⁱ suburbicary provinces ; and within these he exercised the same authority that the eastern patriarchs did, i. e. “ he consecrated ¹¹¹ bishops, called synods, and received appeals,” which are the main patriarchal rights. But if we go beyond these provinces, ^j Petrus de Marca himself is extremely put to it to prove the exercise of a patriarchal power ; he confesses “ the matter is not clear either as to consecrations or councils,” but he runs to references, consultations and appeals in greater causes ; and yet he ^k confesses, as to appeals (which only do imply a just authority), “ there is no one certain evidence of them before the council of Sardica.” So that by the confession of the most learned and judicious of those who plead for the pope’s being patriarch of the west, no proper acts of patriarchal power can be proved beyond the Roman diocese, before the council of Nice. And the same ^l learned archbishop doth grant, “ that the bishop of Rome did not consecrate even in Italy out of the Roman diocese, as appears by the bishops of Milan and Aquileia ; nor in Africa, nor in Spain, nor in Gaul.” And, after these concessions, it is impossible to prove the bishop of Rome patriarch of the western Churches. Which some late writers of that Church have been much concerned at, and have endeavoured to shew the contrary. ^m Christianus Lupus hath written a dissertation on purpose ; but the greatest thing he saith to prove it is, “ that to affirm, that the bishop of Rome had no such authority, is an Eusebian and schismatical

ⁱ See p. 113, and note a. Stillingfleet’s Irenicum, part 2. c. 7. §. 7. Works, vol. 2. p. 391. Rational Account, part 2. chap. 6. §. 14. Works, vol. 4. p. 426, &c.

^j Pet. de Marca de Concordia

ibid. tom. 1. l. 1. c. 7. n. 7. p. 56.

^k Ibid. cap. 10. n. 1. p. 71. et Observat. &c. p. 166, &c.

^l Ibid. tom. 3. lib. 6. cap. 4. n. 6—9. p. 30.

^m Lup. in Canon. part. 5. pp. 764. 772.

error, and came first from the council of Philippopolis :” yet he grants, “ⁿ that in the western provinces, the metropolitans did consecrate their suffragans, and they their metropolitans. But all this,” he saith, “was done by special privilege.” But where is any such privilege to be seen? It is evident by the Nicene canons, ° every province had its own just rights for these things. And if there were any privilege, it must be produced on the other side. He doth not deny, “that ^p Leo disowned having any thing to do in the consecration of the Gallican bishops, in his epistle to the bishops of Vienne,” or that ^q Hincmarus saith, “the Transalpine bishop did not belong to the consecration or councils of the bishop of Rome.” And therefore ecclesiastical causes were to be heard and determined by provincial synods : but he
 112 thinks to bring off all at last, by saying, “^r that these were privileges indulged, because of distance from Rome.” Which is a mere shuffle, without any colour for it, unless such privileges could be produced, for otherwise it will appear to be common right; and yet this is the main which a late author, ^s Emanuel à Schelstraet, hath to say about this matter. But this hath been the common artifice of Rome; where any bishops insisted on their own rights and ancient customs and canons of councils, to pretend that all came from privileges allowed by the see of Rome; and the defenders of it are now shamefully driven to these arts, having nothing else left to plead for the pope’s usurpation. But this last ^t author (the present keeper of the Vatican

ⁿ Ibid. p. 790.

° See p. 95, &c.

^p Leo Ep. 89. cap. 8. Epist. 10. cap. 9. inter Leonis Oper. tom. 1. p. 433.

^q Hincmar. Ep. 47. cap. 21.

in Oper. tom. 2. p. 778.

^r Lup. ibid. p. 813.

^s Schelstrat. Concil. Antioch. Can. 9. cap. 14. p. 473.

^t Schelstrat. Antiquit. illustr. dissert. 2. cap. 1—5. p. 57, &c.

library, which makes so great a noise in the world for Church records) having endeavoured, in a set discourse, to assert the “ pope’s patriarchal power over the western Churches,” I shall here examine the strength of all that he produceth to that purpose. He agrees with us in determining the patriarchal rights, which he saith lie in these three things: 1. “^u in the right of consecration of bishops and metropolitans; 2. ^v in the right of summoning them to councils; 3. ^w in the right of appeals.” All which he proves to be the just and true patriarchal rights from the seventeenth canon of the eighth general council. And by these we are contented to stand or fall.

1. ^x As to the “ right of consecration of bishops and metropolitans throughout the western Churches.” He confesses, “ that such a right was not exercised, because the metropolitans in the several provinces were allowed to consecrate the bishops belonging to them, upon the summons of the provincial synod;” and for this he produces ^y the fourth canon of the council of Nice. Here then is a plain allowance of the metropolitan rights by this general council; but how doth this prove the patriarchal? or rather, is it not a plain derogation from them? “ No,” saith he, “ ^z the patriarchal rights are preserved by the sixth canon.” I grant it; but then it must be proved, that the patriarchal rights of the bishop of Rome did, at the time of the council of Nice, extend to all the western Churches, which I utterly deny. Yet I grant further, that the 113 bishop of Rome had all the patriarchal rights within

Schelstrate refers to these words, in his Dissertation, as before, against Stillingfleet, ch. 2. n. 1, 2. See p. 120. note ^u.

^u Ibid. ch. 4. art. 1. p. 82.

^v Ibid. art. 2. p. 93.

^w Ibid. art. 3. p. 110.

^x Ibid. art. 1. n. 94. p. 83.

^y See p. 95. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 63. tom. 2. Annot. p. 47, &c.

^z See p. 101, and notes.

the provinces which were then under his jurisdiction, and were therefore called the ‘^a suburbicary Churches.’ But these were so far from taking in all the western Churches, that they did not comprehend the ^b provinces of Italy properly so called: but he offers to prove out of Gratian, and from the testimony of Pelagius, bishop of Rome, “^c that by reason of the length of the way, the bishops of Milan and Aquileia did consecrate each other.” But is such authority sufficient to prove that the bishops of Milan and Aquileia were of old subject to the Roman patriarchate? We have nothing to prove this, but the bare word of one who was too much concerned to be a competent witness; and too much alone to be a sufficient witness in this matter. The length and difficulty of the way was no hinderance afterwards for obtaining the pope’s consent for the consecration of the bishop of Milan, as appears by the instance of ^dGregory produced by him; why then should that be alleged as the reason before? for the ways were not one jot shorter or easier to pass. But if we compare the election and consecration of St. Ambrose at Milan with that of Deus dedit in St. Gregory’s time, we shall see an apparent difference in the circumstances of them. For at the first there was a provincial synod by the emperor’s appointment, as ^eTheodoret relates it, who referred the choice to the emperor; but he declining it, and the city falling into great heats about it, St. Ambrose was of a sudden chosen, being then

^a See pp. 105, and note ^z; 110, note ¹; 114, note ^g. Fabric. *Salar. Lux Evangel. cap. 15. n. 3. p. 358.* Fabric. *Bibliograph. Antiq. cap. 5. n. 16. p. 209.* But especially Boehmer’s *Observatio 13. ad §. 4 c. 7. lib. 1. in Marca ibid. tom. 1. p. 161.* where Bas-

nage, Richer, Du Pin, Pagi, &c. are referred to.

^b See p. 114, note ^g.

^c Schelstrat. *ibid. n. 96. p. 85.*

^d Schelstrat. *ibid.*

^e Theod. *Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 5, 6. (6, 7.) p. 153.*

governor of the province, and so was enthronized by the bishops there present. Not one word here of the consent of the bishop of Rome required, or so much as mentioned; and yet pope Damasus was as ready to assert any thing that looked like a right of his see, as Pelagius or Gregory. But at that time St. Ambrose at Milan had as great authority as Damasus at Rome; and the ^f Italic diocese was as considerable as the Roman. If the length and difficulty of the way were the true reason why St. Ambrose did not go to Rome; yet why no messenger sent? why no agent from the pope to declare his consent? But then the extent of the Roman diocese was better understood, wherein all ¹¹⁴ the bishops were to receive consecration from the bishop of Rome, having no metropolitan of their own; but this did not reach so far as Milan. This Roman diocese was truly patriarchal, having ^g several provinces under it, and was therein peculiar and made a precedent for the bishop of Alexandria, all the other western Churches being then governed by their several bishops and metropolitans. ^h Jac. Leschassier thinks “that five of the eleven provinces of Italy made up this diocese;” I mean the provinces of Augustus, and not of Constantine; “and within these were about seventy bishops who belonged to the consecration of the bishop of Rome, having no other metropolitan; and with this,” as he observes, “the old Notitia of the Vatican, produced by ⁱBaronius, agrees;” wherein the suffragans of the bishop of Rome are said to be the bishops of Campania, the Marsi, Tuscia, Umbria and Marchia: which Notitia is

^f For a description of this diocese, of which Milan was the capital. Spanhem. *ibid.* col. 138, &c.

^g Cave's *Dissert.* *ibid.* p. 111. Spanhem. *Geogr. Sacr.* col. 129,

130, &c. (in tom. 1. *Oper.*)

^h *Les Occurres de Leschassier*, p. 454.

ⁱ *Baron. ibid.* A.D. 1057. n. 18. *De Marca ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 12. not. 59. in tom. 1. p. 31.

the same with the *Provinciale Romanum*, published by ^kMiræus, and compared by him with four MSS., wherein are set down all the bishops of the Roman province, as it is there called. ¹Ferd. Ughellus reckons up “seventy bishops of those who were immediately under the bishop of Rome’s jurisdiction, and had no metropolitan over them;” these were within the provinces of Latium, Valeria, Tuscia, Picenum and Umbria; which neither answering exactly to the ^mjurisdiction of the Roman prefect, nor to that of the ‘vicarius urbis,’ we are not to judge of the extent of this diocese from that of the civil government, but from ancient custom, to which the council of Nice doth expressly attribute it. In the *Diurnus Romanus*, lately published by ⁿGarnerius out of an ancient MS., there is one title, “*De Ordinatione Episcopi Suburbicarii a Romano Pontifice*,” where the whole process, as to the consecration of a new bishop, is set down, but from thence it appears, that none but the suburbicary bishops belonged to his consecration. We freely grant then, ^othat the bishop of Rome had a patriarchal power over several provinces; as the bishop of Alexandria was allowed to have by the council of Nice in imitation of him; and that within this diocese he did exercise this as a patriarchal right to consecrate bishops within those several provinces, as 115 the bishop of Alexandria did: but we deny that ever the bishop of Rome did exercise this part of his patriarchal power beyond the forementioned provinces.

^p But to prove the larger extent of the pope’s power

^k Miræi Notit. Episcop. p. 64.

¹ Ughell. Ital. Sacr. tom. 1. col. 5.

^m Spanhem. *ibid.* col. 129, 130, &c. may be referred to.

ⁿ Garn. *Diurn. Rom.* cap. 3. p. 52.

^o See p. 101, and notes.

^p Schelstrate, in his *Dissertation* against Stillingfleet, has devoted the whole of the third chapter to the consideration of the case of the Churches of Illyricum; and desires to shew a

as to consecrations the epistle of Siricius to Anysius bishop of Thessalonica ^a is urged, "whom the pope makes his legate in the part of Illyricum, and charges him, that no consecrations should be allowed which were made without his consent: and the same appears by the epistles of Boniface to the bishops of Thessaly and Illyricum, and of Leo to Anastasius." All which are published together by ^r Holstenius out of the Barberine library; or rather out of his transcripts by card. Barberine (but ^s Hieron. Aleander cites a passage out of the same collection as in the Vatican library): but from whencesoever it came, the objection seems to be the more considerable, because, as ^t Holstenius in his notes observes, "^u Blondel had denied that it could be proved by any monument of antiquity, that the bishop of Thessalonica was legate to the pope before the time of Leo."

But, to give a clear account of this matter, Leo himself, in his epistle to Anastasius, derives this authority

parallel claim over the Churches of Britain and Illyricum, upon the supposition, *ibid.* n. 4, that it is not at all necessary for the asserting the subjection of these Churches to the Roman patriarchate, that they should have been instituted by Peter or his successors." And this right he argues from the place in *De Marca*, for a reply to which, see p. 132, note ^d, and some of the later epistles of the Roman bishops. In addition to what *Stillingfleet* has advanced on the matter of the Churches of Illyricum, *De Marca*, *Baluzius* and others, here cited, see *Du Pin De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, dissert. 2. cap. 2. §. 3. p. 210. *Spanheim*, in his *Geographia Sacra et Ecclesiastica*, col. 122,

&c. *Hist. Christ. sæcul. 5. c. 6. col. 981. 987, 988.* in *Oper. t. 1. Parker's Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years, §. 28. p. 324.*

^q *Schelstrat. Antiq. illustr. ibid. n. 97. p. 85.*

^r *Collect. Roman. a Holsten. pp. 43. 65. 143.* which should be compared with *De Marca ibid. tom. 2. lib. 5. cap. 22. p. 483, &c.*

^s *H. Aleander. de Region. suburbic. diss. 2. p. 167.*

^t *Holsten. Not. ad Coll. Rom. p. 295.*

^u *Primaute, p. 393.* *Blondel* has followed *Chamier*, in his *Panstratia Catholica*, tom. 2. p. 269. *De Œcumenico Pontifice*, lib. 13. cap. 16. n. 9.

no higher than from Siricius, who gave it to Anysius bishop of Thessalonica, “^v certa tum primum ratione comisit, ut per illam provinciam positis, quas ad disciplinam teneri voluit, ecclesiis subveniret.” Siricius immediately succeeded Damasus, who died according to ^w Holstenius, 11 Dec. 384; three years after the ^x council of Constantinople had advanced that see to the patriarchal dignity; which gave great occasion of jealousy and suspicion to the bishops of Rome, that being the imperial city as well as Rome; and ^y Socrates observes, “that from that time Nectarius the bishop of Constantinople had the government of Constantinople and Thrace, as falling to his share. This made the bishops of Rome think it high time to look about them, and to enlarge their jurisdiction, since the bishop of New Rome had gained so large an accession by that council; and to prevent his farther encroachments westwards, his diocese of Thrace bordering upon Macedonia, the subtlest device they could think of, to secure that province and to enlarge their own authority, 116 was, to persuade the bishop of Thessalonica to act as by commission from the bishop of Rome: so that he should enjoy the same privileges which he had before. And being backed by so great an interest, he would be better able to contest with so powerful a neighbour as the bishop of Constantinople. And if any objected, That this was to break the rules settled by the council of Nice; they had that answer ready; That the bishop of Constantinople began; and their concernment was, to secure the rights of other Churches from being in-

^v Collect. Roman. *ibid.* p. 145. ^w Holsten. *Diagrammat. Chronog. Pontif. Damasi.* inter not. ad Collect. Roman. p. 303.

See Baluz. in *Marca*, lib. 5. c. 23. n. 5. on this passage; tom. 2.

p. 492.

^w Holsten. *Diagrammat. Chronog.*

^x See p. 109, and note ^y.

^y Soer. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 5.

c p. 8. p. 270.

vaded by him : by which means they endeavoured to draw those Churches bordering on the Thracian diocese, first to own a submission to the bishop of Rome as their patriarch ; which yet was so far from giving them ease, which some, it may be, expected by it, that it only involved them in continual troubles, as appears by that very ^z collection of Holstenius. For the bishops of Constantinople were not negligent in promoting their own authority in the provinces of Illyricum, nor in withstanding the innovations of the bishop of Rome. To which purpose they obtained an imperial edict to this day extant in both ^a codes, which strictly forbids any innovation in the provinces of Illyricum, and declares, “ that if any doubtful case happened, according to the ancient custom and canons, it was to be left to the provincial synod, but not without the advice of the bishop of Constantinople.” ^bThe occasion whereof was this, Perigenes being rejected at Patræ, the bishop of Rome

^z Which compare with Parker *ibid.* §. 28. p. 324, &c.

^a Theod. 16. lib. 45. t. de *Episc.* Jac. Gothofred. *Cod. Theodosian.* tom. 6. p. 89. where p. 89. Gothofred’s important Commentary should be read. *C. Just. de SS. Eccles.* lib. 6. Justinian. *Cod.* 15. col. 1. Jac. Gothofred. *Corp. Juris Civilis*, cod. 1. tit. 2. *De Sacro Sanctis Eccles.* 6. p. 6. Spanhem. *Geograph. Sacr. et Eccles.* *ibid.* col. 112. See p. 117. and note ^e.

^b Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* n. 5, insists that Stillingfleet has committed no small error in supposing that the three bishops of Thessaly, in particular, here mentioned, had any thing to do with the matter of Perigenes ; but that he had mistaken him for Perreus, a

Thessalian bishop. However this may be, it appears certain from the Additions of Baluze to Marca’s fifth book, *ibid.* ch. 24. n. 7. 9. 12. 13. 14. ch. 29. n. 2. ch. 34. n. 5. tom. 2. pp. 496, &c. 532. 574. that the bishops of Illyricum at large, and consequently those of Thessaly among the rest, took part in the affair of Perigenes ; and this it should appear according to the edict of Theodosius, here referred to, on which De Marca, *ibid.* tom. 2. lib. 4. c. 2. n. 1. p. 176. observes : “ that in any doubts as to the interpretation of the canons, the same was not to depend on the metropolitan bishop alone, but upon the sacerdotal convention and synod of the whole diocese of Illyricum.”

takes upon him to put him into Corinth, without the consent of the provincial synod: this the bishops of Thessaly, among whom the chief were Pausianus, Cyriacus and Calliopus, look upon as a notorious invasion of their rights; and therefore in a provincial synod they appoint another person to succeed there. Which proceeding of theirs is heinously taken at Rome, as appears ^cby Boniface's epistles about it, both to Rufus of Thessalonica, whom he had made his legate, and to the bishops of Thessaly and the other provinces. But they make application to the patriarch of Constantinople, who procures this law, in favour of the ancient provincial synods, and for restraint of the pope's encroachments, but withal, so as to reserve the last resort 117 to the bishop of Constantinople. At this, Boniface shews himself extremely nettled, as appears by his next epistle to Rufus, and encourages him "^dto stand it out to the utmost;" and gives him authority to excommunicate those bishops, and to depose Maximus, whom they consecrated according to the ancient canons. But all the art of his management of this cause lay in throwing the odium of it upon the ambition of the bishop of Constantinople; and thus the contention between the bishops of the two imperial cities proved the destruction of the ancient polity of the Church, as it was settled by the council of Nice.

It is said by ^ePetrus de Marca and Holstenius, "that all this attempt of Theodosius was to no purpose, because afterwards the bishops of Macedonia submitted to the pope's power, and that rescript was

^c Holsten. Collect. Roman. pp. 54. 65. 69.

^d Collect. Roman. p. 64.

^e De Concord. *ibid.* tom. 2. lib. 4. can. 2. n. 1. p. 177. Boeh-

mer's Observat. p. 349. and that on lib. 5. cap. 24. n. 9. p. 764. more particularly in agreement with Stillingfleet. Also Baluz. p. 177. *ibid.* in lib. 4. cap. 2. n. 1.

revoked by ^fanother of Theodosius published in the Roman Collection." It cannot be denied, that for some time the bishop of Rome prevailed, but it appears that it was not long, by the sad complaint made to Boniface II. of the prevalency of the patriarch of Constantinople in those parts made by ^gStephen, bishop of Larissa, the metropolis of Thessaly, and his brethren Theodosius, Elpidius and Timotheus. And our ^hauthor himself confesses, that it appears by the Notitiæ, "that these provinces were at last wholly taken away from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, and made subject to the patriarch of Constantinople."

From which account of the matter of fact we have these things very observable: (1.) That there was no precedent could be produced as to the pope's interposing in their consecrations before the time of Siricius. It is true, Damasus's Epistle to Acholius is mentioned sometimes by the following popes; but any one that reads both his Epistles in the ⁱRoman Collection, will find that neither of them do relate to this matter. And the former is not only directed to Acholius, but to several other bishops; and the design of it is, "^kto advise them to take care that a worthy person be put into the see of Constantinople, in the approaching council:" and to the same purpose is the following Epistle to ^lAcholius. But what is this to the pope's power about consecrations in the provinces of Illyri-118 cum? And how was Acholius more concerned than Euridicus, Severus, Uranius, and the rest of the bishops? (2.) That the bishop of Rome's interposing in their consecrations was disliked and opposed as an

^f Holsten. Collect. Roman. cap. 13. act. 1. n. 2. p. 421.
pp. 83. 282.

ⁱ Holsten. *ibid.* pp. 37. 42.

^g Holsten. *ibid.* p. 1, &c.

^k *Ibid.* p. 40.

^h Schelstrat. Concil. Antioch.

^l *Ibid.* p. 42.

innovation by the bishops of those provinces. Which appears by the ^m Epistles of pope Boniface about the case of Perigenes. For by the canons of the Church, the consecration and designation of the bishops of the province was left to the provincial synods: and therefore they did not understand on what account the bishop of Rome should interpose therein. (3.) That the ⁿ law of Theodosius was principally designed to restore the canonical discipline and the authority of provincial synods. For the words are; “Omni innovatione cessante, vetustatem et canones pristinos ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenuerunt, per omnes Illyrici provincias servari præcipimus.” Which cannot be well understood of any other canons than such as relate to the ecclesiastical government of provinces, and not of any peculiar customs there, as Gothofred mistakes the meaning of them. And in case any difference did arise, it was to be left “conventui sacerdotali sanctoque judicio,” i. e. “to the provincial synod,” and not to any legate of the bishop of Rome; whose encroachment was that innovation which was to be laid aside: as is now plain by the Roman Collection, without which this law was not rightly understood, as appears by the several attempts of Baronius, Perron and Gothofred. (4.) That although by the means of Honorius, upon the importunity of the bishop of Rome, this rescript was recalled by ^oTheodosius; yet the former only was entered into the codes both of Theodosius and Justinian, which hath all the formality of a law, being directed to the prætorian præfects of Illyricum, and hath the date by consuls annexed; but the revocation is only a rescript from Theodosius to Honorius, and refers to an edict sent to the prætorian præfects

^m See p. 116.

ⁿ Ibid. and note w.

^o Holsten. Collect. Roman. pp. 81. 83.

of Illyricum; which not appearing, the other being entered into the code, gives great ground to believe that this revocation was voided, and the former stood as the law; which ought rather to be presumed to be the act of Justinian himself, the privileges of Constantinople being concerned herein, than merely the pique of Tribonian and the collectors of the laws against the 119 Roman see, as ^p Holstenius suggests. So that from this whole matter it appears what opposition the pope's interposing in foreign consecrations met with, not only from the bishops of those provinces, but from the imperial laws.

But let us now see what patriarchal authority, as to consecrations, the bishops of Rome exercised in these more western Churches. As to Gaul, our ^q author confesseth, "that the bishops of Rome did not challenge the practice of consecrations to themselves, as appears by the words of Leo to the bishops of the province of Vienne," which he produces: "Non nobis ordinationes vestrarum provinciarum defendimus;" (for so he understands these words of consecrations, although they are capable of another meaning, viz. "that he did not take upon him to manage the affairs of the Gallican Churches," but only took care that they should do it themselves according to the canons, which was Leo's pretence in that ^r Epistle;) but then "he distinguisheth between the right itself, and the exercise of it, which may be parted with by particular privileges granted, but the right itself may be still reserved." And the same he after saith in general of the ^s western provinces, wherein he can trace no footsteps of the

^p Holsten. Not. ad Collect. p. 88.
Roman. p. 284.

^q Schelstrat. Antiq. Illustr. dissert. 2. cap. 4. act. 1. n. 101.

^r Leo, Epist. 10. cap. 9. inter Leonis Oper. tom. 1. p. 433.

^s Schelstr. ibid. n. 105. p. 92.

practice; and therefore concludes, it must be from “privileges granted by the bishops of Rome, by reason of distance, which the patriarch of Alexandria would not grant.” But we are now proving the right by the practice, and therefore it is unreasonable to allege a right without it; † for this way of proving is ridiculous, viz. to prove that the pope had patriarchal rights, because he did exercise them; and then to say, though he did not exercise them, yet he had them; and so to prove that he had them, because he was patriarch of the west. Yet this is in truth the way of proof this late author useth; he sheweth from Lupus, “that all consecrations of metropolitan and provincial bishops belong to the patriarch.” Then to prove a patriarchal power, it is necessary to prove, that all the consecrations within the provinces do belong to that see. But how doth this appear as to the western provinces? Did all the consecrations of bishops within
 120 them belong to the bishops of Rome? If not, then they were not within the Roman patriarchate: if they did, we expect the proof of it by the practice. No, he confesseth, “the practice was different; but still they had the patriarchal right.” How so? “Yes,” saith he, “that is plain, because the bishop of Rome was patriarch of the west.” “This way of proving may be good

† Schelstrate, in his Dissertation, *ibid.* against Stillingfleet, refers to these words, in ch. 2. n. 2. See note ^u following.

^u Schelstrate’s Dissertat. as before, ch. 2. n. 2. Schelstrate follows up his reference, *ibid.* n. 3, to this and the former passages, in pp. 112. 119, by observing that he could not have expected Stillingfleet would have opposed the rights of the bishop of Rome, as patriarch of the

west, when king James I. had, as “a western king,” stated that he “would adhere to the western patriarch.” (In *Apolog. pro Jur. Fidelitat.*) But Spinckes, the non-juror, in his excellent Reply to the Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion, p. 70, observes, that the king so spake, “out of a design of promoting unity in the Church, and not from any authority the pope had reason to

against De Marca, who had granted the pope to be the western patriarch; but it is ridiculous to those that deny it.

But he attempts something further, viz. "v that the bishop of Rome had, before the council of Nice, the power of deposing bishops in Gaul, as appears by Martianus of Arles, deposed by Stephanus." This w Martianus had openly declared himself of the Novatian party: at which Faustinus, bishop of Lyons, and other bishops in Gaul were very much troubled, and expressed their resentments of it, but he slighted their censures of him. Both parties made applications to St. Cyprian, and Martianus desired to preserve communion with him; but he was utterly rejected there for joining in the Novatian schism. But it seems, by St. Cyprian's Epistle, "he had still hopes not to be condemned at Rome," although the schism began there. For, saith he, "how ill would it look, after Novatian himself had been so lately and universally rejected, to suffer ourselves to be deceived by his flatterers!" St. Cyprian and his colleagues were in no danger, for they had already detected and condemned him; therefore this must be understood of Stephen, which is the reason he presses him so hard, and with some authority, to dispatch his letters to the people of Arles to choose another bishop in the place of Mar-

claim over these nations." But the king's design depended "upon the restoration of the Church to its primitive state;" in which case, "a primacy of order and honour might be easily conceded to the Roman bishop in the west." Spanhem. Oper. tom. 2. Miscell. Sac. Antiq. 7. animadv. 12. n. 7. col. 1191. As to Nilus and Barlaam, Greek

writers of modern times, whom Schelstrate mentions in favour of the western patriarchate, it is sufficient to state, that they only speak of such patriarchate as a matter of human enactment.

v Schelstrat. Antiq. Illustr. ibid. n. 101. p. 89.

w Cyprian. Epist. 68. in Oper. p. 176. Ep. 67. in Oper. p. 115.

tianus, “Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelatæ consistentem a te literæ,” &c. And a little before he tells him, “he ought to send his mind at large to their brethren the bishops of Gaul, that they ought not suffer him to insult over their fraternity,” &c. And the reason he gives for this freedom which he useth with him is, “because they held the balance of the government of the Church in common among them; and, being several pastors, they took care of the same flock, who ought all to join in condemning such a follower of Novatian, and thereby preserve the reputation of their
 121 predecessors, Cornelius and Lucius, who were glorious martyrs; and he especially who succeeded them.” And so, not doubting his compliance, in a friendly manner he desires him “to let him know who succeeded Martianus at Arles, that he might know to whom to write.” I appeal to any man of common sense, whether this looks like the application made to the western patriarch, to whom St. Cyprian himself owed subjection as such. For when the bishops of Rome began to challenge a patriarchal power over the Churches of Thessaly, they expected application to be made to them in a style suitable to that dignity, as is very remarkable in the *Roman Collection. As in the petition of Stephanus, bishop of Larissa, the metropolis of Thessaly, “Domino meo sancto ac beatissimo et revera venerando patri patrum, et archiepiscopo atque patriarchæ Bonifacio data supplicatio a Stephano exiguo.” And in the very same style † Elpidius, Stephanus and Timotheus. These write like men that knew their distance, and what authority the bishop of Rome then challenged: but the meek and humble St. Cyprian seems to stand upon equal terms with the

* Holsten. Collect. Roman. p. 20.

† Ibid. p. 31.

bishop of Rome, or rather, as if he were upon the higher ground, he takes upon him to tell him his duty, and rather checks him for his neglect in it, than owns any authority in him superior to his. So that if any patriarchal power be to be inferred from this epistle, it would be much rather, that St. Cyprian was patriarch of the west, than the bishop of Rome; since he is rather superior, who directs what another should do, than he who doeth what is directed. And if from hence it follows, “that the execution of the canons was in the bishop of Rome,” it will likewise follow, that the directing that execution was in the bishop of Carthage.

But we are told, “^z that even in Africa no consecrations were allowed, without the consent of the bishop of Rome.” This is great news indeed, of which the African Code gives us no information. But ^a Holstenius finds it in an epistle of Siricius, or of Innocentius, (which he pleases, for the same rules are in both,) only in the canon law it is taken from Innocentius, and the true sense is given of it, “Extra conscientiam, metropolitani episcopi, nullus audeat ordinare episcopum.” But what is this to the Roman ¹²² patriarchate? And our author doth not seem to rely upon it: but he alleges a passage in Optatus, “that Eunomius and Olympius, two bishops, were sent to Carthage to consecrate a bishop in the place both of Cecilian and Donatus.” And Albaspinæus saith, “they were sent by the pope’s authority.” But this observation of his he hath not from ^b Optatus, by whom it rather appears, that they were sent by the emperor,

^z Schelstrat. Antiq. Illust. ib. n. 102. p. 90.

^a Not. in Coll. Rom. p. 265.

^b Optat. Oper. lib. 1. p. 28,

where in note ^c, see the Annotation of Albaspinæus here referred to.

who stopped Cecilian at Brixia. And no one that reads the passages about Milthiades at that time, and how Constantine joined Marinus, Maternus and Rheticius in commission with him, can ever imagine that the bishop of Rome was then esteemed the patriarch of the west; and, as such, to have had jurisdiction over the bishops of Africa.

The last ^c attempt to prove the pope's patriarchal power, as to consecrations in the western Churches, is "from his authority of giving palls to the metropolitans:" which he proves from Gregory's Epistles, as to the bishops of Arles and London; and from an Epistle of Boniface, bishop of Mentz, "wherein," he saith, "it was agreed in France, that the metropolitans should receive palls from the Roman see." But how far are we now gone from the council of Nice, and the rules of Church polity then established? ^d We do not deny that the bishops of Rome did assume to themselves in following ages a more than patriarchal power over the western Churches: but we say there are no footsteps of it in the time of the council of Nice; and that what power they gained was by usurpation upon the rights of metropolitans and provincial synods then settled by general consent of the bishops of the Christian Church. But this usurpation was not made in an instant, but by several steps and degrees, by great artifice and subtilty, drawing the metropolitans themselves, under a pretence of advancing their authority, to betray their rights. And among the artifices of the court of Rome this of the pall was none of the least; for by it the

^c Schelstrat. *ibid.* n. 100. p. 88. Vide Bedæ, lib. 1. c. 29. p. 70. Spelman. *ibid.* pp. 90. 237. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 1. pp. 14. 91. col. 1.

Account &c. part 2. ch. 5. §. 16. in his Works, vol. 4. p. 397, had previously considered this matter at much greater length. See note y, the latter part, in ch. 2. p. 58. of the present work.

^d Stillingfleet, in his Rational

popes pretended to confirm and enlarge the privileges of metropolitans, which hereby they did effectually overthrow, as though they received them merely from the favour of the bishop of Rome, which did undoubtedly belong to them by ancient right. But that this¹²³ was a mere device to bring the metropolitans into dependence on the court of Rome, appears by the most ancient form of sending the pall in the ^e *Diurnus Romanus*, where it is finely called, “the shewing their unanimity with St. Peter.” But what the nature and design and antiquity of the pall was, is so fully set forth by ^f *Petrus de Marca* and ^g *Garnerius*, that I shall say no more of it: only that from hence the ancient rights of the metropolitan Churches do more fully appear, because it was so long before this badge of subjection was received in these western churches; for the synod which Boniface mentions, wherein the “metropolitans consented to receive palls from Rome,” was not till the middle of the eighth century: and great arts and endeavours were used in all the western Churches, before they could be brought to yield to this real badge of the pope’s patriarchal power over them. Which is particularly true of the British Churches, which preserved their metropolitan rights as long as their Churches were in any tolerable condition; and that without suffering any diminution of them from the pope’s patriarchal power: as will further appear in this discourse.

2. The next patriarchal right to be examined, is that of calling bishops within their jurisdiction to

^e Garner. *Diurn. Rom.* p. 88. tom. 3. p. 923. Spanheim, in his
^f *De Concord.* *ibid.* tom. 3. *Histor. Christian. sæc. 6. cap. 6.*
 lib. 6. cap. 6. pp. 39. 46, &c. s. 3. col. 1091. in *Oper.* tom. 1.
Ibid. Observ. tom. 3. p. 259. ^g Garner. *App. ad Not. c. 4.*
Basnag. Annal. A.D. 594. n. 8. *Diurn. Rom.* p. 193.

councils. It is truly observed by ^h De Marca, "that those who received consecration from another, were bound by the ancient discipline of the Church to attend to his councils;" and in the sense of the old canon law, "ⁱ those two expressions, to belong to the consecration, or to the council, were all one." And so every metropolitan had a right to summon the bishops of his province, and the primates or patriarchs, as many as received consecrations from them. Thus the bishop of Rome's patriarchal council consisted of those within his own diocese or the suburbicary Churches. Where there being no metropolitans, the Roman council did much exceed others in the number of bishops belonging to it: thence ^k Galla Placidia relates, "how she found the bishop of Rome compassed about with a
 124 great number of bishops which he had gathered out of innumerable cities of Italy, by reason of the dignity of his place." It seems then no bishops of other western Churches were summoned to the Roman councils. ^l But the bishops of Sicily were then under the Italian government, and reckoned with the Italian bishops. It may be questioned, whether in Ruffinus's time they were comprehended within the suburbicary Churches. But in Leo's time the bishops of Rome had enlarged their jurisdiction so far as to summon the bishops of Sicily to their councils. This is evident from ^m Leo's Epistle to all the bishops of Sicily, where he charges them "every year to send three of their number to a council in Rome:" and this he requires in

^h De Concord. *ibid.* tom. 1. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 3. p. 50. See p. 160. for observat.

ⁱ De Constantin. Patriarch. p. 162. in the paragraph "Porro nobis," *Oper.* tom. 4. p. 182.

^k Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 449. n. 159.

^l Vide Spanhem. *Geograph. Sacr.* col. 131. *Oper.* tom. 1. where he agrees with Stillingfleet.

^m Leon. *Epist.* in *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 466.

pursuance of the Nicene canons; from whence it seems probable, that the bishop of Rome did ⁿ by degrees gain all the Churches within the jurisdiction of the “vicarius urbis,” as his patriarchal diocese. For Sicily was one of the ten provinces belonging thereto. But our ^o author saith, “that the council of Nice speaks there only of provincial councils, and not of patriarchal.” What then? Was Sicily within the Roman province, considering the bishop of Rome merely as a metropolitan? That is very absurd, since ^p Sicily was a province of itself, and as such ought to have had a metropolitan of its own; and so all the other neighbour provinces to Rome: whereas we read of none there; but as far as the bishop of Rome’s jurisdiction extended, it was immediate, and swallowed up all metropolitan rights. I know ^q Petrus de Marca thinks “there were metropolitans within the suburbicary Churches;” but I see no authority he brings for it besides the Nicene caupon and the decrees of Innocentius and Leo, which relate to other Churches. But any one that carefully reads the epistles of Leo to the bishops within those provinces, and compares them with those written to the bishops without them, will, as ^r Quesnel hath well observed, find so different a strain in them, that from thence he may justly infer, that there were no metropolitans in the former, but there were in the latter. When he ^s writes to the

ⁿ Spanhem. *ibid.*

^o Schelstrat. *ib.* art. 2. n. 108. p. 97.

^p Spanhem. *ibid.* col. 67.

^q De Concord. tom. 1. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 4. p. 51. On this place Fimian has a note, tom. 1. p. 52, where he follows Stillingfleet. In the same vol. and edit. p. 162.

is Boehmer’s Observation, and also Car. a Sanct. Paul. Geogr. Sacr. Ital. p. 36. to the same purpose.

^r Not. in Leon. Epist. 17. inter Leonis Oper. tom. 2. p. 835.

^s Leo, Epist. 6. cap. 2. *ibid.* Leonis Oper. tom. 1. p. 422.

bishop of Aquileia, he takes notice of his provincial synod, and directs the epistles of general concernment to the metropolitan; as he doth not only to him, but 125 to ^t the bishop of Ravenna too. And when ^u Eusebius, bishop of Milan, wrote to him, he gives an account of the provincial council which he held. But there is nothing like this in the epistles sent to the bishops within the ten provinces, no mention is therein made of metropolitans, or of any provincial synods. But here we find the bishops of Sicily in common summoned to send three of their number to an annual council at Rome. From whence I conclude, that the pope's patriarchal council lay within the compass of these suburbicary Churches. I do not deny but upon occasion there might be more bishops summoned to meet at a council in Rome; as when ^v Aurelian gave the bishops of Italy leave to meet at Rome in the case of Paulus Samosatenus; and when ^w they met with Julius, in the case of Athanasius; and such like instances of an extraordinary nature, and very different from the fixed canonical councils, which were provincial elsewhere, but in the Roman diocese they were patriarchal; yet they extended no further than to the bishops within the suburbicary Churches. And whosoever considers the councils of Italy in St. Ambrose's time, published by ^x Sirmondus, will find that the bishops of the Italic diocese did not think themselves obliged to resort to Rome for a patriarchal council. And, which is more observable, the latter of them extremely differs from Damasus about the same mat-

^t Ep. 120. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 672.

^u Ep. 135. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 716.

^v Euseb. lib. 7. c. 24. p. 364.
See p. 99. and note ⁿ.

^w See p. 136.

^x Sirmond. *Append. ad Cod. Theod.* p. 97. *et inter Oper.* t. 1. col. 754.

ter; which was the consecration of Maximus to be bishop of Constantinople. For ^y Damasus, in his Epistle to Acholius, &c., bitterly exclaims against the setting up Maximus, as though all religion lay at stake, and admonished them at the next council at Constantinople to take care that a fitter person be chosen in his room: and the same he reinforces in another epistle to ^z Acholius alone. But ^a St. Ambrose, and the bishops of Italy with him, in a conciliar address to Theodosius, justify the consecration of Maximus, and dislike that of Gregory and Nectarius. Now in this case I desire to know, whether this council owned the bishop of Rome's patriarchal power? For ^b Em. a Schelstraet, following Christianus Lupus, saith, "that in the pope's patriarchal power is implied, that the bishops are only to consult and advise, but the determination doth wholly belong to the pope as ¹²⁶ patriarch; and that the bishop of Alexandria had the same power appears by the bishops of Egypt declaring they could not do any thing without the bishop of Alexandria." Let us then grant, that the bishop of Rome had the same authority within his patriarchal diocese; doth not this unavoidably exclude the bishops of the Italic diocese from being under his patriarchate? For if they had been under it, would they have, not barely met, and consulted, and sent to the emperor without him, but in flat opposition to him? And when afterwards the western bishops met in council at Capua, in order to the composing the differences in the Church of Antioch, although it were within the Roman patriarchate, yet it being a council of bishops

^y Holsten. Collect. Roman. p. 37. *ibid.* p. 104. et inter Sirmond. Oper. tom. 1. col. 757.

^z *Ibid.* Collect. Rom. p. 42.

^a Sirmond. as above, Append.

^b Schelstrat. *Antiq. Illust.* ib. n. 109. p. 98.

assembled out of the Italic diocese as well as the Roman, the bishop of Rome did not preside therein, but St. Ambrose, as appears by ^c St. Ambrose's epistle to Theophilus, about the proceedings of this council; for he saith, "he hopes what Theophilus and the bishops of Egypt should determine in that cause about Flavianus, would not be displeasing to their holy brother, the bishop of Rome." And there follows another ^d epistle in St. Ambrose which overthrows the pope's patriarchal power over the western Churches by the confession of the pope himself. For that which had passed under the name of St. Ambrose is now found by ^e Holstenius to be written by Siricius, and is so published in the Roman Collection, and since in the ^f Collection of Councils at Paris. This epistle was written by Siricius to Anysius and other bishops of Illyricum, concerning the case of Bonosus, which had been referred to them by the council of Capua, as being the neighbour bishops, and therefore, according to the rules of the Church, fittest to give judgment in it. But they, either out of a compliment or in earnest, desired to know the pope's opinion about it. So his epistle begins, "Accepi literas vestras de Bonoso episcopo, quibus, vel pro veritate, vel pro modestia, nostram sententiam seiscitari voluistis." And are these the expressions of one with patriarchal power, giving answer to a case of difficulty which canonically lies before him? But he afterwards declares, he had nothing to do in it, since the council of Capua had 127 referred it to them, and therefore they were bound to

^c Ambros. Oper. lib. 10. ep. 78.
ed. Erasm. tom. 3. p. 239. t. 2.
ep. 56. col. 1007.

^d Epist. 79. ed. Erasm. ibid.
p. 240. Oper. tom. 2. col. 1008.

^e Holsten. Collect. Roman.
p. 189.

^f Concil. Labb. tom. 2. p.
1033.

give judgment in it. “Sed cum hujusmodi fuerit concilii Capuensis judicium—advertimus quod nobis judicandi forma competere non possit.” If the bishop of Rome had then patriarchal power over all the western Churches, how came he to be excluded from judging this cause by the proceedings of the council of Capua? Would pope Siricius have borne this so patiently and submissively, and declined meddling in it, if he had thought that it did of right belong to him to determine it? If the execution of the canons belongs to the bishop of Rome as the supreme patriarch, how comes the council of Capua not to refer this matter immediately to him, who was so near them; but, without so much as asking his judgment, to appoint the hearing and determining it to the bishops of Macedonia? We have no reason to question the sincerity of this epistle, which card. Barberine published as it lay with others in Holstenius’s papers taken out of the Vatican, and other Roman MSS. by the express order of Alexander VII. And although a late ^gadvocate for the pope’s power in France against De Marca, hath offered several reasons to prove this epistle counterfeit, yet they are all answered by a ^hdoctor of the Sorbonne. So that this epistle of Siricius is a standing monument, not only against the pope’s absolute and unlimited power, but his patriarchal, out of his own diocese.

But to justify the pope’s patriarchal power in calling the western bishops to his council at Rome, we have several ⁱinstances brought; as of some Gallican bishops present at the council under Damasus; ^k Wilfrid, an

^g David des Jugemens Canon. des Evesques, p. 562.

^h Boileau de antiquis et majoribus Episc. Causis, cap. 29. p. 138.

ⁱ Schelstrat. *ibid.* n. 113. 115.

p. 102, &c.

^k See Stillingfleet’s Rational Account, *ibid.* part 2. ch. 5. in his Works, vol. 4. p. 396. Answer to Cressy’s Epistle apologetical, ch. 4. §. 5. vol. 5. p. 678.

English bishop, under Agatho, a legate from the council held in Britain; with Felix of Arles and others; and some others of later times. But what do extraordinary councils, meeting at Rome, prove, as to the bishop of Rome's being patriarch of the western Churches? Do the western councils, meeting at Milan, Arles, Ariminum, Sardica, or such places, prove the bishops of them to be all patriarchs? These things are not worth mentioning, unless there be some circumstance to shew that the bishop of Rome called the western bishops together by his patriarchal power, for 128 which there is no evidence brought. But there is a very great difference between councils assembled for unity of faith or discipline, from several dioceses and provincial synods, and patriarchal councils called at certain times to attend the patriarchal see, as is to be seen in the ¹Diurnus Romanus, where the bishops, within the Roman patriarchate, oblige themselves to obey the summons to a council at Rome, at certain fixed times, as Garnerius shews; which, he saith, "was three times in the year." But he adds, "this extended no further than to the bishops within the suburbicary Churches, who had no primate but the bishop of Rome;" and so this was a true patriarchal council.

3. But the last right contested for is, that of appeals in greater causes. By which we understand such application of the parties concerned as doth imply a superior jurisdiction in him they make their resort to, whereby he hath full authority to determine the matters in difference: for otherwise appeals may be no more than voluntary acts in the parties, and then the person appealed to hath no more power than their consent gives him. Now in the Christian Church, for preservation of peace and unity, it was usual to advise

¹ Garner. Diurn. Rom. p. 66.

in greater cases with the bishops of other Churches, and chiefly with those of the greatest reputation, who were wont to give their judgment, not by way of authority, but of friendly correspondence; not to shew their dominion, but their care of preserving the unity of the Church. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the Italic council, of which St. Ambrose was president, who did interpose in the affairs of the eastern Church; not with any pretence of authority over them, but merely out of zeal to keep up and restore unity among them. They knew very well how suspicious the eastern bishops were of the western bishops meddling in their matters ever since the council of Sardica, (of which afterwards,) but they tell them, “it was no new thing for the western bishops to be concerned when things were out of order among them.” “^mNon prærogativam,” say they, “vindicamus examinibus, sed consortium tamen debuit esse communis arbitrii.” They did not challenge a power of calling them to account, but they thought there ought to be a mutual ¹²⁹ correspondence for the general good, and therefore they received Maximus’s complaint of his hard usage at Constantinople. Will any hence infer, that this council, or St. Ambrose, had a superior authority over the patriarch of Constantinople? So that neither consultations, advices, references, nor any other act which depends upon the will of the parties, and are designed only for a common good, can prove any true patriarchal power. Which being premised, let us now see what evidence is produced from hence for the pope’s patriarchal power over the western Churches. And the main thing insisted upon is, “ⁿ the bishop of

^m Sirmond. App. ad Cod. ⁿ Schelstrat. ibid. art. 3. n. 123.
Theod. p. 106. et inter Sirmond. p. 112.
Oper. tom. 1. col. 757.

Rome's appointing legates in the western Churches to hear and examine causes, and to report them." And of this, the first instance is produced of the "several epistles of popes to the bishops of Thessalonica, in the Roman Collection:" ^o of which a large account hath been already given. And the first beginning of this was after the council of Sardica had, out of a pique to the eastern bishops and jealousy of the emperor, allowed the bishop of Rome the liberty of granting ^p a re-hearing of causes in the several provinces; which was the pretence of sending legates into them: and this was the first considerable step that was made towards the advancing the pope's power over the western Churches. For a present ^q doctor of the Sorbonne confesseth, "that in the space of three hundred and forty-seven years," i. e. to the Sardican council, "no one instance can be produced of any cause, wherein bishops were concerned, that was ever brought to Rome by the bishops that were the judges of it." But if the pope's patriarchal power had been known before, it had been a regular way of proceeding from the bishops in provincial synods to the patriarch. And withal he saith, "^r before that council no instance can be produced of any judges delegates for the review of judgment passed in provincial synods: and whatever privilege or authority was granted by the council of Sardica to the bishop of Rome, was wholly new, and had no tradition of the Church to justify it, ^s and was not then received either in the eastern or western Churches." So that all the pleas of a patriarchal power, as to the bishop of Rome, with respect

^o See pp. 116. 121. 125.

^p See p. 137, &c.

^q Boileau de antiquis et majoribus Episcoporum Causis,

cap. 14. p. 71.

^r Ibid. p. 75.

^s Ibid. cap. 18. p. 91, &c. cap. 27. p. 132, &c.

to greater causes, must fall very much short of the 130 council of Nice. As to the instance of † Marcianus of Arles, that hath been answered already; and as to the deposition of bishops in England by the pope's authority in later times, it is of no importance, since we do not deny the matter of fact, as to the pope's usurpations; but we say, they can never justify the exercise of a patriarchal power over these Churches by the rules established in the council of Nice.

But it is said, "that the council of Arles, before that of Nice, attributes to the bishop of Rome 'majores dioceses,'" i. e. according to De Marca, "all the western Churches;" but in answer to this, † I have already shewed how far the western bishops at Arles were from owning the pope's patriarchal power over them, because they do not so much as desire his confirmation of what had passed in council; but only send the canons to him to publish them. But our author and Christianus Lupus say, "that such is the patriarch's authority, that all acts of bishops in council are in themselves invalid without his sentence, which only gives life and vigour to them; as they prove by the patriarch of Alexandria." But if the bishop of Rome were then owned to be patriarch over seven or eight dioceses of the west, according to De Marca's exposition; how came they to sit and make canons, without the least mention of his authority? So that either they must deny him to be patriarch, or they must say he was affronted in the highest manner by the western bishops there assembled. † But as to the expression of 'majores

† See p. 120.

‡ See chap. 2. p. 83, 84. and notes ^{l m} in the former page.

‡ Schelstrate, in his Dissertation against Stillingfleet, ch. 4. n. 3. 5, notices this passage, and

endeavours to shew that 'diocese' or 'dioceses' must here be understood in the civil and most extensive sense of the word. But see proof to the contrary, in p. 83. note ^m. Alciatus, in his

dioceses,' it is very questionable, whether in the time of the council of Arles the distribution of the empire by Constantine into dioceses were then made, and it seems probable not to have been done in the time of the council of Nice, dioceses not being mentioned there, but only provinces; and if so, this place must be corrupt in that expression, as it is most certain it is in others; and it is hard to lay so great weight on a place that makes no entire sense. But allowing the expression genuine, it implies no more than that the bishop of Rome had then more extensive dioceses than other western bishops; which is not denied, since even then 131 he had several provinces under his immediate government, which no other western bishop had.

^w St. Basil's calling the bishop of Rome, "chief of the western bishops," implies nothing but the dignity of his see, and not any patriarchal power over the western Churches.

It must be a degree of more than usual subtilty to

tract on Military and Civil Offices, at the end, which tract is prefixed to Pancirollus's edition of the Notitia, makes the division of the empire into dioceses, by Constantine, to have taken place after the building of Constantinople. Basnage, in his *Annales Politico-Ecclesiasticæ*, tom. 2. p. 751. col. 1, fixes upon A.D. 333. for Constantine's new distribution of the empire, relying upon a passage in Zosimus; which year was posterior to the council of Nice, that being held A.D. 325. Baronius *ibid.* under the year 330, n. 29, &c. to the same purpose. We may add from Parker's *Account of the Government of the Church*, §. 15. p. 212, what will be a sufficient

reply to this and other things in Schelstrate:—"The truth is, this error of confounding the state of the Church and empire after Constantine, with the state of both before, is very common among learned men, and hath indeed brought great confusion upon this whole matter. And as for the Church, this is notorious at least in all the writers of the Church of Rome, to accommodate ancient prescription to modern practice, and to derive what they find in use in the latter ages of the Church from the first times of it, though there are then no footsteps of any such usage."

^w Schelstrat. *Antiq. Illustr.* *ibid.* art. cap. 3. n. 77. p. 73.

infer Damasus's patriarchal power over the west, * because St. Jerome joins Damasus and the west together, as he doth Peter and Egypt: therefore Damasus had the same power over the west which Peter had over Egypt. It seems St. Jerome's language about the different hypostases did not agree with what was used in the Syrian Churches, and therefore some charged him with false doctrine; he pleads for himself, that the Churches of Egypt, and the west, spake as he did, and they were known then neither to favour Arianism nor Sabellianism; and, to make his allegation more particular, he mentions the names of the patriarch of Alexandria and the bishop of Rome. But a cause extremely wants arguments which must be supported by such as these.

If † St. Augustine makes Innocent to preside in the western Church, he only thereby shews the order and dignity of the Roman see; but he doth not own any subjection of the western Churches to his power, since no Church did more vehemently withstand the bishop of Rome's encroachments than the Churches of Africa

* Ibid. n. 78. p. 73. See Salmasius, as in note †. Stillingfleet, in his Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, part 2. ch. 1. §. 15, &c. in his Works, vol. 4. p. 302, speaks particularly of this and other passages of the Fathers, which have been perverted by the Romish partisans.

† Schelstrat. Antiq. Illustr. ibid. n. 79. p. 74. Schelstrate, in his Dissertation against Stillingfleet, ch. 2. n. 4, again insists upon the passage of Augustine against Julian, b. 1. ch. 2, with the addition of another, that that

father acknowledged the Roman power and authority to be paramount in the western Church. We may add to the reference in the next note † Salmasius de Primatu Papæ, cap. 21. p. 385, in his notice of this passage against Julian, where he observes, that the presidency of Innocent rather relates to the Church of Rome in particular, than to the western Churches at large, and he fortifies his opinion by a similar passage in Jerome, which Stillingfleet notices in this present page.

did in St. Augustine's time; ^z as is notorious in the business of appeals, which transaction is a demonstration against his patriarchal power over the African Churches. And the bishop of Rome never insisted on a patriarchal right, but on the Nicene canons, wherein they were shamefully baffled.

It cannot be denied that ^a pope Innocent, in his epistle to Decentius Eugubinus, would bring the western Churches to follow the Roman traditions, upon this pretence, "that the Churches of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the islands lying between, were first instituted either by such as were sent by St. Peter or his successors." But whosoever considers that epistle well, will not for Innocent's sake lay too much weight 132 upon it. For, is it reasonable to think, that the double unction, the Saturday fast, the eulogiæ sent to the several parishes in Rome were apostolical traditions which all the western Churches were bound to observe, because they were first planted by those who were sent from Rome? ^b But the matter of fact is far from being evident, for we have great reason to believe, there were Churches planted in the western parts, neither by St. Peter nor by those who were sent by his successors.

^z See Stillingfleet's Rational Account &c. part 2. c. 5. Works, vol. 4. p. 386, &c.

^a Schelstrat. Antiq. Illustr. *ibid.* n. 80. p. 74. Schelstrate, in his dissertation, as above, again refers to this passage in Innocent's epistle. Several writers have considered it either a forgery or of very doubtful authority; as Cocus in his Censura, &c. p. 111; Cave *Histor. Literar.* tom. 1. p. 379; Du Pin, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1.

p. 337; Dr. Claggett, in his tract on Extreme Unction in Gibson's Tracts against Popery, vol. 2. tit. 7. p. 76, notices that the passage here cited contains "most notorious and silly falsehoods." See Salmasius *ibid.* p. 393, &c.

^b Schelstrate in his *Dissertation*, *ibid.* n. 7, quotes from hence to the end of the paragraph: for his object therein, see note ^d following.

Yet let that be granted; what connexion is there between receiving the Christian doctrine at first by those who came from thence, and an obligation to be subject to the bishops of Rome in all their orders and traditions? ^cThe patriarchal government of the Church was not founded upon this, but upon the ancient custom and rules of the Church; as fully appears by the council of Nice. And therefore the Churches of Milan and Aquileia, though in Italy; the Churches of Africa, though probably the first preachers came from Rome, never thought themselves bound to follow the traditions or observe the orders of the Roman Church, as is very well known both in St. Cyprian's and St. Augustine's times. But if the pope's power be built on this ground, what then becomes of the Churches of Illyricum? Was the gospel brought thither from Rome? And, as to the British Churches, this very plea of Innocent will be a further evidence of their exemption from the Roman patriarchate; ^dsince Britain cannot be comprehended within those "islands which lie between Italy, Gaul,

^c Consult the sixth canon of the first council of Nice, with Beveridge's Annotation, in his *Pandectæ Canonum*, tom. i. p. 66. tom. 2. p. 49. See p. 101. and notes.

^d Schelstrate, as in note ^b above, and also in n. 8, endeavours to shew the contrary, and cites De Marca, in his *De Concordia Sacerdot. et Imper.* lib. i. cap. 5. n. 3. in support of his views. But he forgets to add from De Marca *ibid.* n. 4. p. 41. tom. 1, the acknowledgment which the latter makes: "that if any one is so hard to please as to refuse credit to these testimonies, unless we shew that the Roman bishop has been denominated by some one patri-

arch of the west, we, even in this matter, will submit to him." This acknowledgment, as Salmasius, *ibid.* p. 397, observes, decides the dispute. Parsons, in his *Three Conversions*, *ibid.* part 1. ch. 1. n. 20, had long preceded Schelstrate in the same attempt, but in a very doubting manner: "It seemeth," says he, "to be somewhat confirmed by that which Innocent I. hath left written," &c. But as Fuller, in his *Church History of Britain*, b. 1. cent. 1. §. 7; "Make the map an umpire, and the epithet, 'Inter-jacent,' will not reach Britain, intending only the islands in the Midland sea." See Burgess's *Tracts*, pp. 117. 51, &c. *Usser. de Primord.* cap. 16. p. 787.

Spain, Africa and Sicily," which can only be understood of those islands which are situate in the Mediterranean sea.

And if no instance can be produced of the bishop of Rome's patriarchal jurisdiction over the British Churches, why should not we claim the same benefit of the Nicene canons which ^e Leo urges so vehemently in such a parallel case? Neither can it be said, that afterwards subjection and consent makes a just patriarchal power; for neither doth it hold as to the British Churches, ^f whose bishops utterly refused to submit to Augustine the monk; and if it doth, all the force of Leo's arguments is taken away. For there were both ^g prescription pleaded, and a consent of the bishops of the dioceses concerned in the ^h council of Chalcedon. ⁱ But Leo saith, "the Nicene canons are beyond both these, being dictated by the Spirit of God, and passed by the common consent of the Christian Church; and that it was a sin in him to suffer any to break them." "ⁱ Quoniam dispensatio mihi credita est, et ad meum tendit reatum, si paternarum regulæ sanctionum, quæ in synodo Nicæna ad totius ecclesiæ regimen, Spiritu Dei instruente, sunt traditæ me, quod absit, connivente violentur." . . . "^j Quoniam contra statuta paternorum canonum, quæ ante longissimæ ætatis annos in urbe Nicæna spiritualibus sunt fundata decretis, nihil cuique audere conceditur." . . . "^k Superbum nimis est et immoderatum, ultra proprios terminos tendere, et antiquitate calcata alienum jus velle præripere, atque ut unius

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 411. where "Chrysostom distinguishes the British islands as lying in the ocean, from the islands of the Mediterranean, which was not called the ocean."

^e See p. 106. and note ^m.

^f See ch. 5. p. 357, &c.

^g See p. 110. and notes.

^h See Parker's Government of the Christian Church, &c. §. 24. p. 296.

ⁱ Leo ad Marcian. Aug. ep. 78. cap. 3. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 595.

^j Leo ad Pulcher. ep. 79. n. 2. in Oper. *ibid.* p. 597

^k *Id. ibid.*

crescat autoritas tot metropolitanorum impugnare primatus quietisque provinciis, et olim sanctæ synodi Nicenæ moderatione dispositis, bellum novæ perturbationis inferre, atque ut venerabilium patrum decreta solvantur, quorundam episcoporum præferre consensum cui tot annorum series negavit effectum. Nam 60 fere annus hujus conniventia esse jactatur qua se prædictus episcopus æstimat adjuvari, frustra cupiens id sibi prodesse, quod etiam si quisquam ausus est velle, nullus tamen potuit obtinere." . . . " ¹ Nulla sibimet de multiplicatione congregationis synodalia concilia blandiantur, neque trecentis illis decem atque octo episcopis quantumlibet copiosior numerus sacerdotum vel comparare se audeat vel præferre: cum tanto divinitus privilegio Nicæna sit synodus consecrata, ut sive per pauciores sive per plures ecclesiastica judicia celebrentur omni penitus auctoritate sit vacuum quicquid ab illorum fuerit constitutione diversum."

Either this is true or false. If false, how can the pope be excused who alleged it for true? If true, then it holds as much against the bishop of Rome as the bishop of Constantinople. And as to the prescription of sixty years, he saith, " the canons of Nice were before, and ought to take place, if the practice had been never so constant," which he denies. Nay, he goes so far as to say, " though the numbers of bishops be never so great that give their consent to any alteration of the Nicene canons, they signify nothing, and cannot bind." Nothing can be more emphatical or weighty to our purpose than these expressions of pope Leo, for securing the privileges of our Churches, in case no patriarchal power over them can be proved before the council of Nice. And it is all the reason in the 134

¹ Ad Anatol. Ep. 80. cap. 2. ibid p. 559.

world, that those who claim a jurisdiction should prove it, especially when the acts of it are so notorious that they cannot be concealed; as the consecration of metropolitans and matters of appeals are, and were too evident in latter times, when all the world knew what authority and jurisdiction the pope exercised over these Churches. I conclude this with that excellent sentence of pope Leo: ^mPRIVILEGIA ECCLESiarUM SANCTORUM PATRUM CANONIBUS INSTITUTA, ET VENERABILIS NICÆNÆ SYNODI FIXA DECRETIS, NULLA POSSUNT IMPROBitate CONVELLI NULLA NOVitate VIOLARI: "The privileges of Churches which were begun by the canons of the holy Fathers and confirmed by the council of Nice can neither be destroyed by wicked usurpation nor dissolved by the humour of innovation."

In the next great council of Sardica, which was intended to be general by the two emperors Constans and Constantius, it is commonly said, that ⁿ Athanasius expressly affirms the British bishops to have been there present. But ^o some think this mistake arose from looking no further than the Latin copy in Athanasius, in which indeed the words are plain enough to that purpose; but the sense in the Greek seems to be the same. For Athanasius pleads his own innocency from the several judgments which had passed in his favour. First, by one hundred bishops in Egypt; next, by above fifty bishops at Rome; thirdly, in the great council at Sardica, ἐν ᾗ, in which, as some say, above ^p three hun-

^m Leo, Epist. 78. cap. 3. ad Marcian. *ibid.* p. 595.

ⁿ Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 720. in Oper. tom. 1. Apolog. contra Arianos, p. 123. Usser. de Primord. c. 8. p. 195. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 105. Spelman Concil. t. 1. p. 46. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 712. Camden. *ibid.* p. 54. vol. 1.

p. lvi. besides Selden and Burton, as quoted by Cave in the following note.

^o Cave, in his *Histor. Liter.* tom. 1. p. 356. col. 1, agrees with the notion adverted to by Stillingfleet, as did Lloyd *ibid.* c. 3. §. 5. p. 76. before him.

^p On the numbers of bishops

dred bishops out of the several provinces there mentioned consented to his innocency. But here lies an ¹³⁵ insuperable difficulty, for ^q Athanasius himself elsewhere affirms, “that there were but one hundred and seventy bishops in all there present:” and therefore it is impossible he should make three hundred there present. Which some have endeavoured to reconcile, by saying, “the latter was the true number present; but the former of those bishops scattered up and down who did agree in the sentence which passed in favour of Athanasius:” but then the Greek here cannot be understood of those present in council; and, on the other side, if it be not so understood, then the words do not prove what he designs, viz. that he was acquitted in the Sardican council; in which, although the number were not so great, I see no reason to exclude the British bishops.

It is true, that in the ^rsynodical epistle of that council, only Italy, Spain and Gaul are mentioned; and so likewise in the ^ssubscriptions. But it is well observed by ^tBucherius, that Athanasius reckons up the British bishops among those of Gaul. And ^uHilary, writing to the Gallican bishops of “Germania prima and Germania secunda, Belgica prima, Belgica secunda, Lugdunensis prima, Lugdunensis secunda, provincia Aquis-

present in the council of Sardica, vide Bevereg. Annot. in Pandect. Canonum, tom. 2. p. 199. col. 1. That it was not a general council, Basnag. Annal. ibid. tom. 2. A.D. 347. n. 4. p. 795, &c. De Marca ibid. tom. 3. lib. 7. cap. 3. n. 5. p. 298.

^q Ad solit. Vit. agent. p. 818. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 352. Bevereg. ibid. tom. 2. p. 199; who thinks that scarcely eighty bishops were

present. Basnag. ibid. n. 2. p. 794.

^r Athanas. Apolog. p. 756. Oper. tom. 1. p. 155.

^s Athanas. ibid. p. 767. tom. 1. p. 168.

^t Bucher. Belg. Roman. lib. 9. cap. 4. n. 4. p. 276.

^u Hilar. de Synod. p. 218. inter Lucubration. Oper. col. 1149, 1150. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 196. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 105.

tanica and provincia novem populona;" after he hath distinctly set down these, he then immediately adds, "and to the bishops of the provinces of Britain." Which makes me apt to think, that about that time the bishops of Britain were generally joined with those of Gaul, and are often comprehended under them where they are not expressly mentioned. And, to confirm this, ^v Sulpicius Severus, speaking of the summons to the council of Ariminum, mentions only of these western parts Italy, Spain and Gaul; but afterwards saith, "that the bishops of Britain were there present." So that ^w Britain was then comprehended under Gaul, and was so understood at that time; as Sicily was under Italy, as ^x Sirmondus shews. And Sextus Rufus doth put down the description of Britain under that of Gaul, as ^y Berterius hath observed. For otherwise, who could have thought that Athanasius had meant the bishops of Britain, when he reckons up only the provinces of Gaul? But he declared that they were present with the Gallican bishops.

136 But it hath been urged with great appearance of reason, that "^z since the British bishops were present at the council of Sardica, the British Churches were bound to observe the canons of it; and appeals to the bishop of Rome being there established, they were then brought under his jurisdiction, as patriarch of the western Churches." To give a clear account of this, we must examine the design and proceedings of that council. The occasion whereof was this: ^a Athanasius, bishop

^v Sulpic. Sev. lib. 2. p. 419.
Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 196.
Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 105.

^w See ch. 4. p. 215. and notes there.

^x Sirmond. Advent. cap. 5.
inter Oper. tom. 4. col. 76.

^y Berter. Diatr. 1. c. 3. p. 32.

^z See Schelstrate's Dissertation
ibid. chap. 6. n. 3.

^a See p. 99. note ⁿ. Bevereg.
tom. 2. ibid. Annot. p. 199. col. 1.
Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles.
tom. 2. Index Athanas. Du Pin

of Alexandria, being deposed for some pretended misdemeanours by ^btwo synods of eastern bishops, and finding no redress there, by the prevalency of the Arian faction, makes application to the western bishops, and to Julius bishop of Rome, as the chief of them, and earnestly desires that his cause might be heard over again, bringing great evidence from the bishops of Egypt and other places, that he never had a fair hearing, but was run down by the violence of the Eusebian party at ^cTyre and Antioch. The bishop of Rome communicating this with the western bishops, as at large appears by Julius's epistle in ^dAthanasius, he, in their name as well as his own, sends to the eastern bishops, that this cause might be heard before indifferent judges: and to that end, that they would come into these parts, and bring their evidences with them. This they decline; upon which, and a fuller examination of the matter, ^ethey receive Athanasius, Marcellus and others into communion with them. This gives a mighty distaste to the eastern bishops; at last the two brothers, ^fConstantius and Constans, agree, there should be a general council called at Sardica, to hear and determine this matter. The bishops meet; but the western bishops would have the restored bishops admitted to communion, and sit in council; this the eastern bishops utterly refuse; and upon that withdrew to Philippopolis; and declare

de Antiq. Eccles. Disciplina, p. 157, &c. Richer. Hist. Concil. general. tom. 1. cap. 3. p. 81, &c.

^b Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 28-32. p. 65. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 84. Sozom. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 25. p. 77. lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 97. with Valesius's notes, and observations, at the end of the vol. p. 385, &c. Theodoret. Hist.

Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 30. p. 62.

^c See note ^b.

^d Athanas. Oper. tom. 1. Apolog. contra Arianos, p. 141, &c.

^e See Stillingsfleet's Rational Account *ibid.* part 2. ch. 5. §. 8. Works, vol. 4. p. 385.

^f Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 20. p. 103, &c. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 11. p. 106, &c. et not.

against their proceedings at Sardica, as repugnant to the Nicene canons: the western bishops continued sitting, and made ^g new canons to justify their own proceedings. This is the true state of the matter of fact, as far as I can gather it out of the authentic writings on both sides. For the one side insists upon the justice of “^h re-hearing a cause, wherein there was
 137 so great suspicion of foul dealing;” and the other, “that the matters which concerned their bishops were not to be tried over again by others at a distance; and that this was the way to overthrow the discipline of the Church, as it had been settled by the council of Nice and the ancient canons of the Church.” It is apparent by the synodical epistle of the Greek bishops who withdrew to Philippopolis, that this was the main point insisted on by them; “ⁱ that it was the bringing a new law into the Church—for the eastern bishops to be judged by the western; the ancient custom and rule of the Church being, that they should stand or fall by their own bishops.” The western bishops on the other side pleaded, “^k that this was a cause of common concernment to the whole Church; that there had been notorious partiality in the management of it; that Athanasius was condemned, not for any pretended miscarriages so much, as for his zeal against Arianism; that the cause was not heard in Egypt, where he was charged, but at a great distance, and therefore in common justice it ought to have a new hearing by the eastern and western bishops together.” But the eastern bishops finding that the western would not forsake the communion of Athanasius and the rest, they looked on the

^g Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 482,
 &c. tom. 2. Annot. p. 199. col. 1.

ⁱ Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 347.
 n. 100.

^h Cave *Histor. Liter.* tom. 1.
 p. 356.

^k Athanas. *Oper. ibid.*

cause as prejudged, and so went away. However the other proceeded to the clearing the bishops accused, which they did by a ^l synodical epistle, and then made several ^m canons, as “against translations from mean bishoprics to better,” can. 1; “and using arts to procure them,” can. 2; “against placing bishops in such places where a single presbyter would serve, and the absence of bishops at consecrations,” can. 6; “against their unseasonable applications to the court,” can. 7, 8, 9, 20; “against being made bishops ‘^m per saltum,’” can. 10; “against their nonresidence,” can. 11, 12; “against receiving those who were excommunicated by others,” can. 13; “about the appeal of presbyters,” can. 14; “against taking presbyters out of another’s diocese,” can. 15; “against their nonresidence,” can. 16; “about the reception of banished bishops,” can. 17; “about Eutychianus and Musæus, and the persons ordained by them,” can. 18, 19.

But the main canons of this council are the ⁿ third, fourth and fifth, which concern the ^o re-hearing of the causes of bishops, and the interest the bishop of Rome was to have therein. For the right understanding ¹³⁸ whereof we are to consider the several steps and methods of proceeding therein established.

1. “That the causes of bishops in the first instance were still to be heard and determined by the bishops of the province:” that is plain by the first part of

^l Athanas. *ibid.* Theodoret. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 73.

^m Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 482. Labbei Concil. tom. 2. col. 627, &c. Stillingfleet follows Gentian Hervet’s edition of these canons; while Lloyd follows a different arrangement, that of Dionysius Exiguus and Isidore Mercator. See Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 2. §. 8. p. 65. and

notes: Du Pin de Antiq. Eccles. Discipl. diss. 2. c. 1. §. 3. p. 104, &c. Basnag. *Annal. Politico-Eccles.* tom. 2. A.D. 347. n. 10. p. 799, &c.

ⁿ Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 485, with the scholia of Balsamon, Zonaras and Aristenus. Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 199. for his annotation on the fourth canon.

^o See p. 129.

^p can. 3, "which forbids any bishop, in case of difference with another, to call bishops out of a neighbour province to hear it." This was agreeable to the ^q Nicene can. 5. Herein it is supposed that they reflect on the council of Antioch's proceedings against Athanasius; but the council of Antioch did not proceed upon St. Athanasius in the first instance, but upon this ground, viz. "^r that being deposed in the council of Tyre, he afterwards returned to the bishopric of Alexandria, without being first restored by a greater synod." But this seems to have been very hard usage of so great a man: for they first made the canons themselves, ^s can. 4. 12, and out of them they framed an article, by virtue whereof they deprived Athanasius. And herein lay the art of the Eusebian party; for if they had framed the canon so as it is extant in ^t Palladius, it would never have passed the council; for it was not a council of mere Arians, as is commonly thought, but of many ^u orthodox bishops, together with them who in some things were overreached by the artifices of the Eusebian party. And they did not meet purposely against Athanasius, but ninety-seven ^v bishops were summoned by the emperor to meet at the solemn dedication of the great church at Antioch, called 'Dominicum aureum,' ^w as they had done before on the like occasion at Jerusalem. And ^x Eusebius saith, "such assemblies of bishops were frequent at such times." These being

^p Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 1. p. 485.

^q Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 64. et t. 2. Annot. p. 49. col. 1. p. 200. col. 2.

^r Socrat. *Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 85.* Sozomen. *Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 97.*

^s Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. Canon. Concil. Antioch. pp. 434. 441.

^t Pallad. *Vit. Chrysost. p. 78.*

^u Hilar. *de Synod. p. 227. inter*

Lucubrat. Oper. col. 1168, &c.

^v Athanas. *de Synod. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 894. tom. 1. p. 737,* where the bishops are said to be ninety only. Vide Socrat. *ibid. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 85.* Sozomen. *ibid. lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 97. et not.*

^w Phot. *Biblioth. Cod. 257, 258. col. 1419. 1431.*

^x Euseb. *lib. 10. c. 3. p. 463.*

met together, framed several canons for the better ordering and government of the Churches, out of which, being passed by general consent, the Eusebians, who hated Athanasius, framed sufficient articles against him. For, by the fourth canon, “^y if a bishop, being deposed by a synod, doth officiate, he is never to be restored:” by the twelfth, “^z if a bishop deposed makes application to the emperor, and not to a greater council of bishops, he is not to be restored.” But now Athanasius, being deposed by the Tyrian synod, was restored upon his application to the emperor, without any synod called to that end, and did execute his office 139 as bishop of Alexandria; and for this reason the council of Antioch confirmed his deposition.

A ^alate author goes about to prove, “that the canon against Athanasius did not pass the council of Antioch, but that it passed an assembly of forty Eusebians, when the rest were gone.” But this is incredible, (as ^bBaronius’s conceit is ridiculous, who takes the thirty-six mansions that Antioch was distant from Alexandria, for thirty-six Arian bishops,) and there is no testimony of antiquity to prove it. But there is no reason to imagine any other canon against Athanasius besides these two, for they effectually did his business. That which ^cPalladius saith, “that in the canon it was said, whether the bishop were deposed justly or unjustly,” is very improbable: but that which gave occasion for him to say so was, because the ancient canon, called “apostolical” twenty-eight, had in it the word ^dδικαίως, ‘justly,’ which they left out, the better to effect their design; that so the merits of the

^y Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 434.

^z *Ibid.* p. 441.

^a Schelstrat. de Concil. Antioch. *dissert.* 5. cap. 3. n. 2. p. 668.

^b Baron. A.D. 341. n. 5. Vide Basnag. *Annal.* *ibid.* t. 2. p. 774. col. 2. A.D. 341. n. 4.

^c See p. 138. Basnag. *ibid.*

^d Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 18.

cause might not be inquired into. But there was an error in the first instance committed, not by the council of Antioch, but by that of Tyre; unless the extraordinary summons of that council by the emperor's command, as ^e Eusebius saith, be a "dispensation," as to "the regular proceedings in common cases:" but there was scarce any thing regular in the proceeding of that council; for, according to the rules of the Church, this cause ought to have been heard in Egypt, by the bishops there; and they justly complain of the neglect of this in their ^f synodical epistle. And ^g Liberius made a reasonable proposition to Constantius, "that a council might be summoned at Alexandria, that this cause, which had given so much disturbance, should be heard upon the place, all parties being present;" which was the best expedient at last: but the most natural way was to have begun there; and therefore the Sardican council did very well to reduce the Nicene canon about proceeding within the ^h province in the first instance.

2. "ⁱ If the party be grieved at the sentence passed against him, then that there be a re-hearing of it granted," can. 3. This the council of Antioch allowed, 140 ^k can. 12, "by a greater synod of bishops, but takes away all hopes of restitution from him that made his appeal to the emperor." The meaning of the canon is, not to exclude an address for a greater synod; but an appeal, to have the emperor reverse the sentence, without any further hearing by another assembly of bishops. So that the final resort was hereby settled in

^e Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. 4. cap. 41. p. 648.

^f Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 726, &c. in Oper. tom. 1. Apolog. p. 128, &c.

^g Concil. Labb. tom. 2. p. 778.

^h See p. 138. note 9.

ⁱ Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. Can. Conc. Sardic. p. 485.

^k Bevereg. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 441. et tom. 2. Annot. p. 191. col. 1.

a greater council, from which no appeal should lie. This canon is supposed to be particularly designed against Athanasius; but I do not find that he made application to the emperor to be restored with a ‘non-obstante’ to the sentence of the Tyrian council, but to have a more indifferent hearing by another council: so the bishops of Egypt testify in their synodical epistle extant in Athanasius. But their proceeding against him at Antioch was, because after this he took possession of his see without another sentence of a greater synod. But the great difficulty is, to reconcile this canon with the ^lfifteenth of the same council, “which takes away all liberty of appeal from the unanimous sentence of a provincial synod.” ^m Petrus de Marca, a man of more than ordinary sagacity in these matters, was sensible of this appearance of contradiction; and he solves it thus, that no appeal is allowed from a provincial synod, can. 15. But notwithstanding, by can. 12, there is a liberty of proceeding by way of petition to the emperor, for a re-hearing the cause by a greater synod. And in this case the emperor was to be judge, whether it were fit to grant another hearing or not: and although by this canon, in the case of a general consent, no neighbour bishop could be called in, as they might in case of difference by ⁿcan. 14; yet if the emperor thought they proceeded partially, he might either join bishops of another province with them, or call a more general council out of the province, as Constantine did at Tyre. This was the undoubted right of the emperors, to call together assemblies of bishops for what causes they thought expedient. But ^oSocrates expressly saith,

^l Bevereg. *ibid.* t. 1. p. 444.

^m De Concord. *ibid.* tom. 3. lib. 7. cap. 2. n. 6. p. 291.

ⁿ Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 444.

^o Socrat. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 2. cap. 40. p. 154.

“that no appeal was allowed by the canons of the Church:” for speaking of Cyril of Jerusalem’s being deposed, he saith, he appealed to a greater court of
 141 judicature, which appeal Constantius allowed; but then he adds, “that he was the first and only person who, contrary to the custom and canons of the Church, made such an appeal.” ^p H. Valesius contradicts Socrates, because of the appeal of the Donatists to Constantine from the council of Arles. But this is nothing to the purpose, for the actions of the Donatists were not regarded; and besides, their appeal was to Constantine, “to hear the cause himself;” but here Cyril appealed to a greater number of bishops, according to the canon of Antioch, and then appeared at the council of Seleucia to have his cause heard. ^q Baronius is much puzzled with this expression of Socrates, because “it would take away appeals to the pope;” but the eastern bishops never understood any such thing; and Cyril made his appeal to a greater synod. ^r The canons of Sardica, which Baronius quotes, were not received, and scarce known in the eastern Church. Athanasius fled to the western bishops, because he was so ill used in the east; not because of any authority in the bishop of Rome to receive appeals. But Cyril went according to the canons of Antioch, making application to Constantius to be heard by a greater synod. ^s Sozomen saith, “that Constantius recommended the cause of Cyril to the council of Ariminum:” but that cannot be, since ^t he expressly forbad the western bishops in that council to meddle with the causes of the eastern

^p Vales. Annot. in Socrat. Hist. Eccles. *ibid.*

^q Baron. A.D. 359. n. 79.

^r Vide Bevereg. Annot. t. 2. p. 199.

^s Sozom. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 17. p. 154.

^t Hilar. in Fragm. lib. 2. p. 44. in Oper. col. 458. Paris. 1631. col. 1341. Paris. 1693.

bishops; and declares, whatever they did in that matter should have no effect." Therefore the council to which Constantius referred this cause, must be that of Seleucia, which was assembled at the same time: which seeming to take off from the ^uright of provincial synods established in the council of Nice, ^vSocrates condemns as uncanonical, and saith, "he was the first that proceeded in this method of seeking to the emperor for a greater council."

But then, 3. the council of Sardica made an innovation in this matter. For although it allows the liberty of a re-hearing, yet it seems to take away the power of granting it from the emperor, as far as in them lay, and gives it to Julius, bishop of Rome, "^w for the honour of St. Peter: and, if he thought fit, he was to appoint the neighbour bishops of the province to hear it, and such assessors as the emperor was wont ¹⁴² to send." To which was added, can. 4, "^x that no bishop should enter into the vacant bishopric upon a deposition, and application for a new hearing, till the bishop of Rome had given sentence in it." But then, can. 5, it is said, "^y that if the cause be thought fit to be re-heard, letters are to be sent from him to the neighbour bishops to hear and examine it: but if this do not satisfy, he may do as he sees cause." Which I take to be the full meaning of can. 5. And this is the whole power which the council of Sardica gives to the bishop of Rome.

Concerning which we are to observe, 1. that it was a new thing: for if it had been known before, that the supreme judgment in ecclesiastical causes lay in the bishop of Rome, these canons had been idle and im-

^u See p. 99.

^v Socrat. *ibid.*

^w See p. 99. note ⁿ. Bevereg.

ibid. tom. i. p. 485.

^x Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 487.

^y Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 488.

pertinent. And there is no colour in antiquity for any such judicial power in the bishop of Rome, as to re-hearing of causes of deposed bishops before these canons of Sardica: so that ^z Petrus de Marca was in the right, when he made these “the foundation of the pope’s power.” And if the right of appeal be a necessary consequent from the pope’s supremacy, then the non-usage of this practice before, will overthrow the claim of supremacy. In extraordinary cases, the great bishops of the Church were wont to be advised with; ^a as St. Cyprian, as well as the bishop of Rome, in the cases of Basilides and Marcianus: but if such instances prove a right of appeals, they will do it as much for the bishop of Carthage as of Rome. But there was no standing authority peculiar to the bishop of Rome given or allowed before this council of Sardica. And the learned publisher of ^b Leo’s works hath lately proved at large, “that no one appeal was ever made from the Churches of Gaul, from the beginning of Christianity there to the controversy between Leo and Hilary of Arles, long after the council of Sardica.” ^c But such an authority being given by a particular council upon present circumstances, as appears by mentioning Julius, bishop of Rome, cannot be binding to posterity, when that limited authority is carried so much further, as to be challenged for an absolute and supreme power founded upon a divine right, and not 143 upon the act of the council. For herein the difference

^z De Concord. *ibid.* tom. 3. lib. 7. cap. 3. n. 6. p. 298.

^a See p. 120. note ^w.

^b Leon. *Oper.* tom. 2. diss. 5. cap. 14. &c. p. 485, &c.

^c Richer. *Hist. Concil. gen.* tom. 1. c. 3. n. 4, &c. p. 89, &c. *Cave Hist. Literar.* t. 1. p. 356.

col. 2. *Bevereg.* t. 2. *ibid.* Annot. p. 199. col. 2, &c. *Du Pin De Antiq. Eccles. Disciplin.* dissert. 2. §. 3. p. 107. *Stillingleet* *ibid.* Works, vol. 4. p. 402, &c. where the points here insisted upon are irrefragably proved.

is so great, that one can give no colour or pretence for the other. 2. That this doth not place the right of appeals in the bishop of Rome, as head of the Church; but only transfers the right of granting a re-hearing from the emperor to the bishop of Rome. And whether they could do that or not is a great question; but in all probability Constantius's openly favouring the Arian party was the occasion of it. 3. That this can never justify the drawing of causes to Rome by way of appeal; because the cause is still to be heard in the province, "by the neighbour bishops, who are to hear and examine all parties, and to give judgment therein." 4. That the council of Sardica itself took upon it to judge over again a cause which had been judged by the bishop of Rome, viz. ^d the cause of Athanasius and his brethren: which utterly overthrows any opinion in them, that the supreme right of judicature was lodged in the bishop of Rome. 5. That the Sardican council cannot be justified by the rules of the Church, in receiving Marcellus into communion. For not only the eastern bishops in their synodical epistle say, "^e that he was condemned for heresy by the council at Constantinople, in Constantine's time, and that Protogenes of Sardica and others of the council had subscribed to his condemnation;" but ^f Athanasius himself afterwards condemned him. And ^g St. Basil blames the Church of Rome for admitting him into communion. And ^h Baronius confesses, "that this brought a great disreputation upon this council," viz. the absolving one condemned for heresy, both before and

^d See p. 136. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 20. p. 105.

^e Hilar. Frag. in Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 347. n. 82.

^f Sulpic. Sever. Hist. Eccles.

lib. 2. p. 400.

^g Basil. Cæsar. Archiep. Oper. tom. 3. epist. (52.) 69. p. 163.

^h Baron. A.D. 347. n. 60, 61.

after that absolution. 6. ⁱ That the decrees of this council were not universally received, as is most evident by the known ^k contest between the bishops of Rome and Africa about appeals. If these canons had been then received in the Church, it is incredible that they should be so soon forgotten in the African Churches; for there were but two bishops of Carthage, Restitutus and Genethlius, between Gratus and Aurelius. ^l Christianus Lupus professes "he can give no account of it." But the plain and true account is this; there was a design for a general council, but the 144 eastern and western bishops parting so soon, there was no regard had by the whole Church to what was done by one side or the other. And so little notice was taken of their proceedings, that ^m St. Augustine knew of no other than "the council of the eastern bishops;" and even ⁿ Hilary himself makes their confession of faith to be done by the Sardican council. And the calling of councils was become so common then, upon the Arian controversies, and the deposition of bishops of one side and the other were so frequent, that the remoter Churches very little concerned themselves in what passed amongst them. Thence the acts of most of those councils are wholly lost, as at Milan, Sirmium, Arles, Beziers, &c.; only what is preserved in the fragments of Hilary, and the collections of Athanasius, who gathered many things for his own vindication. But as to these canons, they had been utterly for-

ⁱ In addition to note c, in the last page, see Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, at the end of his account of this council, vol. 1. p. 607.

^k Stillingfleet *ib.* Works, v. 4. p. 391, &c.

^l Christian. Lup. in Can. Sar-

dic. p. 215. *inter schol. et not.* in Canon. &c.

^m Aug. c. Cresc. lib. 3. c. 34. in Oper. tom. 9. col. 454. Basnag. *Annal. Politico-Ecclesiast.* tom. 2. A.D. 347. n. 4. p. 796. col. 1.

ⁿ Nic. Fabri. *Opusc.* p. 39.

gotten, if the see of Rome had not been concerned to preserve them; but the Sardican council, having so little reputation in the world, ° the bishops of that see endeavoured to obtrude them on the world as the Nicene canons: which was so inexcusable a piece of ignorance or forgery, that all the tricks and devices of the advocates of that see have never been able to defend.

° See Stillingfleet's Letter to bishop Barlow, in the former's Miscellaneous Discourses, p. 221. which compare with dissert. 12. in Leon. Oper. t. 2. p. 638, &c.

OF THE FAITH AND SERVICE OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

THE faith of the British Churches inquired into.—The charge of Arianism considered.—The true state of the Arian controversy, from the council of Nice to that of Ariminum.—Some late mistakes rectified.—Of several Arian councils before that of Ariminum.—The British Churches cleared from Arianism after it.—The number and poverty of the British bishops there present.—Of the ancient endowment of Churches before Constantine.—The privileges granted to Churches by him.—The charge of Pelagianism considered.—Pelagius and Celestius both born in these islands.—When Aremorica first called Britain.—What sort of monk Pelagius was.—No probability of his returning to Britain.—Of Agricola and others spreading the Pelagian doctrine in the British Churches.—Germanus and Lupus sent by a council of Gallican bishops hither to stop it.—The testimony of Prosper concerning their being sent by Celestine considered.—Of Fastidius a British bishop.—London the chief metropolis in the Roman government.—Of Faustus originally a Briton. But a bishop in Gaul.—The great esteem he was in.—Of the Semipelagians and Prædestinarians.—Of the schools of learning set up here by the means of Germanus and Lupus.—Dubricius and Iltutus the disciples of St. German. The number of their scholars, and places of their schools.—Of the monastery of Bangor, and the ancient western monasteries, and their difference, as to learning, from the Benedictine institution.—Of Gildas's Iren, whether an university in Britain.—Of the schools of learning in the Roman cities, chiefly at Rome, Alexandria and Constantinople, and the professors of arts and sciences, and the public libraries there.—Of the schools of learning in the provinces, and the constitution of Gratian to that purpose: extending to Britain.—Of the public service of the British Churches; the Gallican offices introduced by St. German.—The nature of them at large explained, and their difference from the Roman offices, both as to the morning and communion service.—The conformity of the liturgy of the Church of England to the ancient British offices, and not derived from the Church of Rome, as our dissenters affirm.

THE succession of the British Churches being thus deduced from their original to the times of the Christian emperors, it will be necessary to give an account of the faith and service which were then received by them.

And it is so much the more necessary to inquire into the faith of the British Churches, because they are charged with two remarkable heresies of those

times, viz. Arianism and Pelagianism; and by no less authority than that of ^aGildas and ^bBede.

The charge of Arianism is grounded upon "the universal spreading of that heresy over the world," as Bede expresses it, and therefore to shew how far the British Churches were concerned, we must search into the history of that heresy, from the council of Nice to the council of Ariminum, where the British bishops were present.

It is confidently affirmed by a late ^cwriter, "that the Arian faction was wholly suppressed by the Nicene council, and all the troubles that were made after that were raised by the Eusebians, who were as forward as any to anathematize the Arians, and all the persecutions were raised by them, under a pretence of prudence ¹⁴⁷ and moderation; ^d that they never in the least appeared after the council of Nice in behalf of the Arian doctrine, but their whole fury was bent against the word *ὁμοούσιος* and Athanasius; ^e that in the times of Constantius and Constans the cause of Arius was wholly laid aside by both parties, and the only contest was about the word *ὁμοούσιος*; ^f that the Eusebian cause was not to restore Arianism, but to piece up the peace of the Church by comprehending all in one communion, or by mutual forbearance."

But if it be made appear, that the Arian faction was still busy and active after the Nicene council; that the contest about *ὁμοούσιος* was with a design to overthrow

^a Gild. Epist. §. 9. p. 12. Hist. Gild. §. 9. p. 4. Hist. Gild. §. 12. p. 19. Camden. ibid. p. 55. vol. 1. p. lvii.

^b Bed. lib. 1. cap. 8. 10. 17. pp. 47. 54. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 197. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 106. Stillingfleet ad-

verts to this subject, chap. 2. p. 55, and in this chapter, p. 180.

^c Parker's Religion and Loyalty, part 1. p. 354.

^d Ibid. p. 374.

^e Ibid. p. 415.

^f Ibid. p. 468.

the Nicene faith; that the Eusebians' great business was, if possible, to restore Arianism; then it will follow, that some men's hatred of prudence and moderation is beyond their skill and judgment in the history of the Church: and the making out of these things will clear the history of Arianism to the council of Ariminum.

But, before I come to the evidence arising from the authentic records of the Church, it will not be unpleasant to observe, that this very writer is so great an enemy to the design of reconcilers, that it is hardly possible, even in this matter, to reconcile him to himself. For he tells us, that the most considerable Eusebians in the western Churches, viz. "g Valens, Ursacius, and their associates, had been secret Arians all along; h that the word 'substance' was left out of the third Sirmian creed, to please Valens and his party; who, i being emboldened by this creed, whereby they had at length shaken off all the clogs that had been hitherto fastened on them to hinder their return to Arianism, moved, at the council at Ariminum, that all former creeds might be abolished, and the Sirmian creed be established for ever." Doth this consist with "j the Arian faction's being totally suppressed by the council of Nice, and none ever appearing in behalf of the Arian doctrine after; and the Eusebians never moving for restoring Arianism, but only for a sort of comprehension and toleration?" In another place he saith, "k the Eusebians endeavoured to supplant the Nicene faith, though they durst not disown it." And was the Arian faction then totally suppressed while the 148 Eusebians remained? These are the men whom he

g Ibid. p. 484.

h Ibid. p. 508.

i Ibid. p. 510.

j See *ibid.* pp. 354. 468.

k *Ibid.* part 2. p. 3.

calls the ¹ old Eusebian knaves ; and for the Acacians, he saith, “ ^m when they had got the mastery, they put off all disguise, and declared for Arianism.” Is it possible for the same person to say, that “ after the Nicene council, they never appeared in behalf of the Arian doctrine” in the eastern and western Churches ; and yet, “ when they put off their disguise, they declared for Arianism ?” What is this but appearing openly and plainly for the Arian doctrine ? And if we believe so good an author as himself, their contest after the council of Nice was so far from being merely about the word *ὁμοούσιος*, that he frequently saith, that controversy did take in the whole merits of the cause, as will appear from his own words in several places. As when he speaks of the council of Nice, he saith, “ ⁿ The whole controversy was reduced to the word ‘ consubstantial ;’ which the Eusebians at first refused to admit, as being no Scripture word, but without its admission, nothing else would satisfy the council, and good reason they had for it, because to part with that word after the controversy was once raised, would have been to give up the cause ; for it was unavoidable, that if the Son were not of the same substance with the Father, he must have been made out of the same common and created substance with all other creatures ; and therefore when the Scriptures give him a greater dignity of nature than to any created being, they thereby make him of the same uncreated substance with the Father ; so that they plainly assert his consubstantiality, though they use not the word. But when the truth itself was denied by the Arian heretics, and the Son of God thrust down into the rank of created beings, and defined to be a creature made of nothing, it was time for the Church

¹ Ibid. p. 4.^m Ibid. part 1. p. 528.ⁿ Ibid. pp. 358. 360.

to stop this heresy, by such a test as would admit of no prevarication, which was effectually done by this word; and, as cunning and shuffling as the Arians were, they were never able to swallow or chew it, and therefore it was but a weak part of the Eusebians to shew so much zeal against the word, when they professed to allow the
149 thing; for if our Saviour were not a mere creature, he must be of the same uncreated substance with the Father, because there is no middle between created and uncreated substance; so that whoever denied the consubstantiality could not avoid the heresy of Paulus Samosatenus, which yet the Arians themselves professed to defy; for if he were a mere creature, it is no matter how soon or how late he was created.”

And therefore it is not to be imagined that the Eusebians should really believe the consubstantiality of the Son, and yet so vehemently oppose the use of the word. Would any men of common sense, who did believe the bread and wine in the eucharist to be turned into the very body and blood of Christ, set themselves with all their force and interest to overthrow the term of ‘transubstantiation?’ So, if the Eusebians did believe the Son of the same substance with the Father, to what purpose should they cabal so much as they did all the reign of Constantius, to lay aside the word *ὁμοούσιος*? If it be said, It was by way of comprehension, to take in dissenting parties; then it is plain they were really dissenting parties still, and consequently did not differ only about the use of a word, but about the substance of the doctrine. And as those who do believe the doctrine of transubstantiation are for the use of the word, and those who believe it not would not have the word imposed; so it was in all the councils under Constantius, those who chiefly opposed the word

‘ consubstantial,’ did it, because they liked not the doctrine; and those who contended for it, did it, because they knew the doctrine was aimed at under the pretence of laying aside an unscriptural word. And the same author tells us from St. Hilary, “ ° the consequence of shutting out the word *ὁμοούσιος* was, that it must be decreed either that the Son was a creature made out of nothing, or out of another substance uncreated and distinct from the Divine nature.” And when he gives an account of the council of Seleucia, held at the same time with that of Ariminum, he saith, “ p they brake into two parties, of the Acacians, who defied the council of Nice and all its decrees, and the old Eusebians, who pretended to stick only at the word ‘ consubstantial:’” and upon their appeal to the emperor there are these two 150 things remarkable: 1. q that those who were for laying aside all discriminating words were Arians of the highest sort, viz. “ Aëtians, who held the blasphemy of dissimilitude:” 2. that those who were for retaining the word ‘ substance’ went on this ground, “ r that if God the Son exist neither from nothing nor from any other substance, then he must be of the same substance with the Father: which was the very argument,” he saith, “ approved by the council of Nice for settling the word *ὁμοούσιος*.” This is a sufficient argument to me, that those who from the council of Nice did chiefly oppose that word, did it with a design to overthrow the doctrine of the Son’s being of the same substance with the Father. Which will more fully appear by a brief deduction of the Arian history from the council of Nice to that of Ariminum; not from modern collections, but from the best writers about that time.

The Arian faction finding themselves so much over-

° Ibid. p. 484.

p Ibid. p. 520.

q Ibid. pp. 520. 523.

r Ibid. p. 524.

voted in the council of Nice, that they despaired to carry any thing there by fair means, betook themselves to fraudulent arts, hoping thereby to hinder either the passing or the executing any decree against them. At first, they endeavoured to blind and deceive the council by seeming to profess the orthodox faith, but they made use of such ambiguous forms of words as might serve their ends, by couching an heretical sense under a fair appearance of joining in the same faith with the rest. ^sThis being discovered by the more sagacious defenders of the old Christian faith, they at length fixed upon the term *ὁμοούσιος* as the only effectual test to discriminate the Arians from others; and when they had used their utmost skill and endeavour to keep this test from passing, and found they could not prevail, they bethought themselves of another way to keep the faction alive, although the heresy might seem at present to be totally suppressed. And that was, by suffering Arius and his two fast friends, Secundus and Theonas, to be condemned by the council, and to be banished by the emperor; but the chief heads of the faction, Eusebius of 151 Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice, with others, resolved upon an expedient to clear themselves, and yet to keep up the faction; which was, by subscribing the confession of faith, and denying to anathematize Arius and his followers. This is plain from the epistle of Eusebius and Theognis, extant in ^uSocrates and ^vSozomen, wherein they own their subscription to the decree of faith, but declare, “that they utterly refused to subscribe the anathema against Arius and his adherents;

^s Athan. de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc. p. 921. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 760.

ⁱ Theod. ibid. lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 30.

^u Socr. ibid. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 43.

^v Sozom. ibid. lib. 2. cap. 16.

because they did not believe them guilty of the heresy charged upon them ; as they found both by writing and conversation with them.” This epistle was written by them during their banishment, in order to their return to their bishoprics, from which they had been driven by Constantine’s own order ; and the reason of it is given in his epistle to the Church of Nicomedia, viz. “ w for communicating with the Arians whom he had caused to be removed from Alexandria for their heresy and disturbance of the peace of the Church there ;” and the same account is given of it in the synodical epistle of the bishops of Egypt extant in ^x Athanasius. Which shews their resolution to keep up the faction in spite of the council of Nice : for if they had any regard to the decree there passed, they would not have presumed to have communicated with those who were expressly anathematized by the council ; and had very hardly escaped it themselves, as Constantine there upbraids them in his epistle. But, upon this notorious contempt, they were deposed from their bishoprics, and sent into banishment ; where they grew very uneasy, and resolved upon any terms to be restored ; knowing that if they continued there, the faction was indeed in danger to be wholly suppressed : and for that end they wrote that submissive letter to the leading bishops, promising an universal compliance upon their restoration. And the main ground they built their hopes upon, was, “ because Arius himself upon his submission was recalled ;” as they declare in the end of that epistle.

Which intrigue was carried on by ^{y z} a secret Arian, chaplain to Constantia, the emperor’s sister, recom-

w Theod. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 20. .
p. 51.

^x Athanas. *Apol.* p. 727. in
Oper. tom. 1. p. 129.

STILLINGFLEET, VOL. I.

y Socr. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 25.
p. 60.

^z Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 27.
p. 82.

mended to the emperor at her death; who, being received into favour, whispered into his ear very kind things concerning Arius and his adherents; adding, that they were unjustly banished, and that the whole controversy was nothing but a pique which the bishop of Alexandria had taken against one of his presbyters, for having more wit and reputation than himself; and that it would become Constantine, in point of honour and justice, to recall Arius, and to have the whole matter examined over again. Upon this, Arius is sent for, and bid by the emperor to set down his confession of faith plainly and honestly; which is extant in the ecclesiastical historians, under the name of Arius and Euzoius, and was framed in such a specious manner, as made the emperor believe that Arius was indeed of the same mind with the Nicene fathers, only leaving out the word ‘*consubstantial.*’ But he would not undertake to determine himself, whether he should be received into communion upon this; but he referred the whole matter to the bishops then met at Jerusalem; who, saith ^aSozomen, “unanimously approved this confession of faith, and wrote a circular letter upon it for receiving Arius and his adherents into communion;” notwithstanding the peremptory decree of the council of Nice to the contrary. Which epistle is extant in ^bAthanasius, who looks on it as the first blow given to the authority of the council of Nice; and he understands it of that Arius who was author of the heresy, and not of the other Arius, as some modern writers do.

“^c And here,” Athanasius saith, “they began to open their design in favour of the Arian heresy, which

^a Sozom. *ibid.* p. 84.

^b Athanas. *Apol.* p. 801. et
Synod. Arim. et Seleuc. p. 890.

in *Oper.* tom. I. pp. 199. 734.

^c Athanas. *ibid.* pp. 891. 735.

till then they had concealed." For they knew that work was not to be done at once; but this was a good step towards the lessening the authority of the Nicene council; which being once removed, the faction did not question they should be able to set up Arianism speedily. They were not so plain-hearted to declare presently for what they aimed at, nor to put it to the vote, whether the Nicene faith should be destroyed or not. For that having the great advantage of so public a settlement, and such a general consent of the Christian world, it was not to be overthrown at once, nor by open violence, but to be taken in pieces by degrees; and the generality were to be cheated into Arianism, under other pretences and in-153
situations. And the first thing was, to persuade the world that the Arians had been hitherto misunderstood, and their doctrine misrepresented by such factious and busy men as Athanasius and a few others, therefore it was absolutely necessary to weaken the authority of the council, as being influenced by a small number of men who overswayed the rest. Neither was it safe to begin with the matter of faith, for that would give too great an alarm; but it was a much more plausible way to bring the Arians into communion, as being much misrepresented and not owning the doctrines which the Athanasian party did charge them with, and being once joined in communion together, it would be fit to lay aside all terms of discrimination, as tending to faction; especially such as were lately set up, to put a distinction between the Arians and others. And when these things were done by other councils, the authority of the council of Nice would fall to the ground, and, as they supposed, the Nicene faith together with it. But such designs could

not be carried on so secretly and subtilely, but the wiser sort suspected what was doing, as ^d Athanasius saith; and therefore they soon called another council at Antioch, where they made vehement protestations to the contrary. “^e We,” say they, “are no followers of Arius; for, being bishops, how can we follow a presbyter?” as though the world could be deceived by such pitiful reasonings. But after they declare, “that they embraced none but the ancient faith,” but withal confess they had received Arius to communion; and then make a profession of their faith very agreeable to that of Arius and Euzoius, delivered to Constantine; wherein they assert “the coeternity of the Son with the Father,” but leave out his being “of the same substance.” But fearing this would not give satisfaction, they added another, wherein they owned “^f the Son to be God of God, Lord of Lord, the unchangeable image of his deity, substance, will, power and glory:” but after they express themselves more fully, when they say, “^g they believe three distinct hypostases and an unity of consent;” which overthrows the Nicene faith, it being built on the unity of substance and not of will. It cannot be denied, that the crude
 154 expressions of Arius in the first heat of the controversy were here rejected, viz. “^h that there was a time before the Son was, or that he was a creature like other creatures;” for they knew these expressions would not then be borne, and therefore they were forced to refine Arianism to the utmost degree, to make it pass down the better, till the prejudice against it by the council of Nice were wholly removed. To which end they set forth several other confessions of

^d Athanas. *ibid.* pp. 891. 735.

^e *Ibid.* pp. 892. 735.

^f *Ibid.* pp. 892. 736. ^g *Ibid.*

^h Athanas. *ibid.*

faith to prevent the suspicion of what they aimed at ; but these were in the time of Constantius.

I return therefore to the reign of Constantine, which excellent prince ⁱ would suffer no alteration to be made in the Nicene faith in his time ; and therefore the secret Arians were forced to great dissimulation and hypocrisy, and to carry on their design under other pretences. So ^jTheodoret saith, “ that Eusebius and his party outwardly complied in the council of Nice out of fear ;” and he applies to them the saying of the prophet, “ This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.” And elsewhere he saith, “ ^kThe Arians in the council subscribed to the Nicene faith, that being in sheep’s clothing, they might devour like ravening wolves.” ^lSozomen saith, “ It was reported that Eusebius and Theognis, after their return from banishment, corrupted the person to whom the subscriptions of the council of Nice were committed, and rased out their own names ; and then openly declared against the Son’s being of the same substance with the Father ; and that even to Constantine himself :” but that doth not seem credible to me. It being much more probable, which ^mSocrates relates, viz. “ that Eusebius and Theognis having recovered the possession of their Churches upon their return from banishment, had frequent access to the emperor, who honoured them as his converts ;” and under that pretext of embracing the Nicene faith, did more mischief than otherwise they could have done, and so made a very great disturbance in the Church ; which he im-

ⁱ Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 93. See p. 163.

^j Theod. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 7, 8. p. 27, &c.

^k *Ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 19. p. 48.

^l Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 21. p. 71.

^m Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 56.

putes partly to their love of Arianism, and partly to their hatred of Athanasius: but the latter, as Athanasius at large proves, was on the account of the former.

155 For it being their design to introduce Arianism without owning it, next to their lessening the authority of the council of Nice, the most effectual means they could think of was, by all possible arts to blacken and render odious those persons who most vigorously defended the Nicene faith. And from hence began the great quarrel against Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, and Athanasius. As to the former, he gives an account in the fragment of a homily extant in ⁿTheodoret, “ what shuffling the Arians used in the council of Nice to preserve their bishoprics; and, for that reason, subscribed to the decree of faith; and so, having escaped the censures they deserved, they did sometimes secretly, sometimes openly, propagate the opinions there condemned. One of their great arts,” he saith, “ was to decline such as well understood the controversy, and made it their business to oppose them.” And so Eustathius himself found to his sorrow. For Eusebius of Nicomedia and his party meeting together at Antioch, whom ^oTheodoret expressly calls ‘the Arian faction,’ they there proceeded to the deposing Eustathius, upon the accusation of an infamous person suborned to that purpose, and afterwards prevailed with Constantine to banish him; which being done, Theodoret saith, “ ^p there was a succession of bishops who were secret Arians, as of Eulalius, Euphronius and Flaccillus; and that was the reason the orthodox party then separated themselves,

ⁿ Theod. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 7, 8.
p. 27.

^o *Ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 21. p. 52.
^p *Ibid.* cap. 22. p. 53.

and were called Eustathians.” ^q Socrates and ^r Sozomen confess, “that the quarrel about Arianism was renewed soon after the council of Nice both in Egypt and in Bithynia, Hellespont and Constantinople.” But Socrates saith, “^s It was begun about the word *ὁμοούσιος*,” which was indeed the pretext of the quarrel, but the true ground was Arianism. Socrates, being a man not thoroughly versed in these matters, blames both sides, “^t for contending about they knew not what; both agreeing in the same doctrine, and yet not agreeing among themselves.” But he did not penetrate into the depth of the Arians’ designs, as Theodoret, a man of far greater judgment and learning, did. And he ^u proves from Eustathius, an eminent bishop of that time, and one present in the council of Nice, that 156 “Arianism lay at the bottom;” and that they complied at first only out of fear, but had the same hatred to the true faith they ever had; but after the council they durst not so openly shew it. ^v Sozomen saith, “the Arian party charged those who asserted Christ of the same substance with the Father,” (as the council of Nice had determined,) “with Sabellianism and blasphemy; and the followers of the Nicene faith charged the others with idolatry and innovation; as asserting three distinct Gods as to substance, when the council had declared the Son of the same substance with the Father.” ^w And he ingenuously confesseth, that it was generally believed that Eustathius was deposed at Antioch for adhering to the Nicene faith, and declaring

^q Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 23.
p. 56.

^r Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 21.
p. 72.

^s Socrat. *ibid.* p. 57.

^t *Ibid.* p. 58.

^u Theodoret. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 8.

p. 28.

^v Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 18.

p. 68.

^w *Ibid.* cap. 19. p. 68.

himself against the Arian party then prevailing in the east.

Who finding such success in their first attempt on Eustathius, they next proceed against Athanasius, the other great champion of the council of Nice. They ^x had conceived an inveterate hatred against him for his great zeal and activity in that council, but their rage brake forth, after they heard that he succeeded Alexander in the see of Alexandria. Eusebius of Nicomedia was his mortal enemy, who was removed to be near the court, (though against the canons;) yet he brake through all, thereby to have opportunity to fill the emperor's mind with jealousies and suspicions of all those that opposed them, and especially of Athanasius. And ^y Socrates gives the true reason of the great spite against Athanasius, viz. "that unless he were removed, there was no hopes of the Arian doctrine prevailing:" which he there confesses was the thing the Eusebians aimed at. And now they thought such a snare was laid for Athanasius, which it was hardly possible for him to escape. For, upon Arius's submission, they advise Constantine to send him to Alexandria, there to be received by Athanasius, as the only way to put an end to all the disturbances of the Church. Away goes Arius with the emperor's command to Athanasius; who, according to their imagination, ^z refusing to admit him, being anathematized by the council, as the ^a first broacher of a dangerous
157 heresy, they easily exasperated the good emperor against him, as a seditious and turbulent person; and so plied him with one accusation upon another, that at

^x Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 725.

^m Oper. tom. 1. p. 128.

^y Socrat. ibid. lib. 1. cap. 27.
p. 63.

^z Sozom. ibid. lib. 2. cap. 18.

pp. 68. 72.

^a Athanas. Apol. p. 778. ibid.
p. 178.

last Constantine sent for him to appear before him upon an information against him of no less than treasonable practices. But upon a full hearing of the matter by the emperor himself, ^b he was acquitted, and sent back with marks of his favour and vindication of his innocency; in an epistle to the people of Alexandria, part of which is extant in ^c Sozomen and ^d Theodoret, but at large in ^e Athanasius. One would think this should have discouraged his enemies from any further prosecution of him; but these Eusebians were men of restless, ambitious, implacable spirits, that scrupled no means to compass their ends, which they thought they could never do, unless they could blast the reputation of Athanasius. To this end, they laid a most malicious design against him. First, ^f they draw in the ^g Meletian party in Egypt to join with them; who hoped to get their ends one upon the other afterwards; but at present they were willing to join together against their common enemy, for so Athanasius was accounted by them. And ^h Eusebius promised the Meletians great favour at court, if they would manage the business against Athanasius: which they undertook; and by their means so many complaints were brought against Athanasius to the emperor, that he was forced, for the general satisfaction, to appoint a council at ⁱ Tyre, which was according to the Eusebians' desire, where things were managed with so little regard to justice or common honesty,

^b Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 27.
p. 63.

^c Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 22.
p. 73.

^d Theod. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 27.
p. 60.

^e Athanas. *Apol.* p. 779, &c.
p. 179.

^f Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 22.
p. 73.

^g Athanas. *Apol.* pp. 777. 178.

^h Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 22.
p. 73.

ⁱ See ch. 3. pp. 136. 138. and notes there.

that, after he had plainly cleared himself as to the main accusations, he yet found they were resolved to condemn him; ^j and therefore he privately withdrew from thence to the imperial court, to acquaint the emperor with the horrible partiality there used. Upon ^{jj} this he writes a very smart letter to them; and requires them to come speedily to him, ^k to give him an account of their violent proceedings. They send a select number of their party to court, with Eusebius of Nicomedia in the head of them, who there quit all the accusations brought against Athanasius at Tyre, 158 and start a new one, which touched the emperor in a very tender part, viz. “^l that he had threatened to hinder the bringing corn from Egypt to Constantinople;” which was in effect to threaten the starving his beloved city; which nettled the emperor so much, that it transported him beyond his usual temper, and immediately he gave order for banishing Athanasius into Gaul. Not long after Constantine died, “but before his death,” saith ^m Theodoret, “he gave order for the recalling Athanasius, to the great regret of Eusebius of Nicomedia then present.”

ⁿ Let any one now judge, whether “in Constantine’s time the Arian faction were wholly suppressed, and whether Eusebius and his party were men that only pretended to prudence and moderation.” Who made use of the most malicious, unjust, abominable means, to suppress the chiefest opposers of the Arian faction? What will not such men say to serve a turn, who dare to tell the world, “that the Eusebians were no less

^j Sozom. *ibid.* cap. 25. p. 80.

^{jj} Socrat. *ibid.* l. 1. c. 34. p. 69.

^k Athanas. *Apol.* 803. p. 201.

^l Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 35. p. 71. Athanas. *ibid.* pp. 203. 132.

^m Theod. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 32.

p. 64.

ⁿ See references to Parker’s *Religion and Loyalty*, in this chapter, pp. 146, 147.

enemies to the Arians than to the orthodox, and that it is a great and common mistake, that Eusebius was the ringleader of the Arian faction?" If it be a mistake, others have it from Athanasius, and it is hard to believe that man ever read °Athanasius's writings, who dare say the contrary. All the bishops of Egypt, in their synodical epistle from Alexandria, charge the P Eusebians with "a restless desire to promote Arianism;" and affirm, "that their malicious prosecution of Athanasius was for no other end;" that "their councils were called with a design to overthrow that of Nice;" that "they had written against them as Arians;" q that "the Eusebians joined with the Meletians only for the sake of Arianism;" that "the persons sent by the council of Tyre into Egypt were Arians, and therefore declared enemies; r and whatever their pretences were, nothing but the advancing Arianism lay at the bottom." Were so many bishops guilty of so gross a mistake, who had certainly greater opportunity of knowing, and skill in judging the men and their designs than the most quicksighted person of our age can have? It would be endless to recite all the passages in Athanasius's Apology, and Epistles, and Discourses of the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, to prove that the Eusebians carried on the Arian design, since a great part of them is spent in the proof of it. 159 But we are told, with confidence enough, "s that the synod of Alexandria, in their synodical epistle, do not in the least accuse the Eusebians of Arianism, but only of holding communion with them," i. e. with the Arians. This cannot but seem strange to any one

° Athanas. Apol. 2. pp. 777.
178.

q Ibid. 731. p. 133.

P Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 727.
ibid. tom. 1. p. 130.

r Ibid. pp. 733. 135. Ibid.

pp. 736. 137.

s Parker ibid. part 1. p. 373.

that will be at the pains to peruse that excellent epistle. And even in that page it is expressly said, “^t their violent and malicious proceedings against Athanasius were on purpose to discourage others from daring to oppose Arianism, and this with a particular design to introduce that heresy. Could any man be thought to take so much pains to set up a doctrine they had no kindness to? i. e. would any but secret Arians endeavour to set up Arianism? unless we suppose them such tools to be made use of by others to do their business, and then to be laid aside. But the Eusebians were no such mean politicians; for they were at the top of business, having all the advantages and opportunities to carry on their own ends; and therefore we have all the reason in the world to conclude them secret Arians, who were at so much trouble to lessen the credit of the opposers of Arianism, which they looked on as one of the most effectual means to introduce it. And although they did not openly declare themselves in behalf of the Arian doctrine, after the council of Nice, which had been to hinder their own design in the time of Constantine, yet they made use of all the methods which bad men do to carry on their ends, viz. by false insinuations, lying pretences, and all manner of malicious proceedings against those who stood in their way; as is most notorious in the case of Athanasius.

^u After the death of Constantine, we are told “that all the councils under Constantius that are commonly accounted Arian, have as fully and clearly condemned Arianism, as the Nicene council itself: it is true, they could not digest the word *ὁμοούσιος*; but otherwise, as for the whole scheme of Arianism, they have in all

^t Athanas. Apol. 2. pp. 738. 139.

^u Parker *ibid.* part 1. p. 375.

their creeds anathematized it with all clearness and fulness of expression." This is somewhat strange doctrine for one who pretends to have read Athanasius, who hath taken so much pains to lay open the juggling of the Arian faction in all those councils; and one 160 would think, by this manner of writing, such a man took a particular pleasure in contradicting him. For in his ^v book of the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, he saith, "none of the councils under Constantius could be brought to anathematize the Arian heresy, as the council of Nice did." ^w He saith, "that Constantius himself was an Arian heretic, ^x and that his chief design in all those councils was, to take away the force of the council of Nice." He saith indeed, "^y they were not such fools to own this, but this was the true reason of all the councils they called, and the disturbance they made, ^z to the great scandal of the Christian world." Nay, he saith, "^a that in all their councils they never once mentioned the Arian heresy as an evil thing; and if any heresies were mentioned, the Arian was excepted, which the Nicene council anathematized, and they received with great kindness such as were known to be Arians; which is an argument that the calling these councils was not for establishing the truth, but for overthrowing the council of Nice." And to shew what Constantius's own mind was, he observes, "^b that when he came to die, he would be baptized by none but Euzoius, who had been several times deposed for Arianism;" and he there affirms, "that Constantius continued an Arian to the last." As to the word *ἡμοούσιος*, about which so much

^v Athanas. de Synod. Arim.
et Seleuc. p. 873. tom. i. p. 719.

^w Ibid. pp. 870. 716.

^x Ibid. pp. 889. 733.

^y Ibid. pp. 874. 720.

^z Ibid. pp. 870. 717.

^a Ibid. pp. 874. 720.

^b Ibid. pp. 907. 748.

stir was made, he takes notice, “^c that all the offence that was taken at it was by the Arians; and the true cause was, because it struck at the root of their heresy.” And as to the word ‘substance,’ “^d he wondered they should so vehemently oppose it, when themselves confessed the Son was from the Father; for either he must be from something without him, or something within him distinct from his substance, or he must be of the substance of the Father; or they must make the Word and the Son to be no real substance, but mere names; and so they did not really believe what they expressed.” And he further shews, “^e that no other way of speaking doth sufficiently express the difference between the Son of God and his creatures, which are only the effects of God’s will.” From whence he concludes, “^f that the opposition to these terms,” whatever was pretended, “was from a dislike of the doctrine established in the council of Nice. ^g For if it had been a mere doubt about the
161 signification of the words, they ought to have explained their own sense, and withal to have condemned the Arian heresy.

It cannot be denied that there were ^h some who agreed in the substance of the doctrine with the council of Nice, but yet disliked the term *ὁμοούσιος*; as to these, ⁱ Athanasius confesses them to be brethren, as long as “they acknowledged the Son not to be a creature, nor to be from another substance distinct from the Father.” And among these he reckons ^j Ba-

^c Ibid. pp. 909. 749.

^d Ibid. pp. 909. 750.

^e Ibid. pp. 910. 750.

^f Ibid. pp. 914. 754.

^g Ibid. pp. 915. 755.

^h See the places in Sozomen and Hilary, to this effect; the

latter mentions British bishops among the rest. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. pag. omiss. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 8. p. 105.

ⁱ Athanas. ibid.

^j Ibid. pp. 916. 755.

silius of Ancyra, whose doctrine he doth not seem to dislike, provided that to the “similitude of substance in the Son,” they add “his being of the substance of the Father.” And in this sense the τὸ ὁμοιούσιον comes to the same with the τὸ ὁμοούσιον. There were two great arguments these used against the term ὁμοούσιος; the first was, ^k that it implied a partition or division of the divine substance, as a son among men is said to be of the same substance with his father, but so, as that there is a division of the same common nature in the several individuals.” To this Athanasius answers, ^l that the divine generation must not be apprehended like the human; but our conceptions of God must be agreeable to the Divine nature; and therefore we must not imagine the Son of God to be of the substance with the Father, after the same manner that the son of man is. For as he is the Son, so he is the Word and Wisdom of the Father: and the internal word or conception in man is no divisible part of himself; but lest the notion of Word should seem to destroy his real subsistence, therefore the notion of Son is added in Scripture to that of Word, that we may know him to be a living Word, and substantial Wisdom. So that when we say, the Son is consubstantial to the Father, we understand it not by way of division, as among bodies, but abstracting our minds from all corporeal things, we attribute this to the Son of God in a way agreeing to the Divine nature, and mean by it, that he is not produced by his will, as the creatures are, nor merely his Son by adoption; but that he is the true eternal Son of God, by such an emanation as splendour from light, or water from the fountain. And therefore when they interpreted the term ‘Son’ in a way agree-162 able to the Divine nature, he wonders they should stick

^k Ibid. pp. 916. 756.

^l Ibid. pp. 916. 756.

so much at the word ‘ consubstantial,’ which was capable of the same interpretation.” The second objection was, “ that those who condemned the Samosatene heresy rejected the word *ὁμοούσιος*.” In answer to this, Athanasius shews, “ ^m that the word was so much used and allowed in the Christian Church before the Samosatene heresy was heard of, that when Dionysius of Alexandria was accused to Dionysius of Rome for rejecting it, the council thereupon was so much concerned, that the bishop of Rome wrote their sense to the bishop of Alexandria about it: ⁿ he returns an answer, wherein he owns all the sense contained under it, as appears by his epistle in Athanasius; but for those who opposed Paulus Samosatene, he saith, they took the Word in a corporeal sense, as if it implied a distinct substance from the Father. But, saith he, those who condemned the Arians saw further into this matter, considering that it ought not to be applied to the Divine nature as it is to corporeal substances; and the Son of God not being a creature, but begotten of the substance of the Father; therefore with great reason they used the word *ὁμοούσιος*, as being most proper to express the sense of the Christian Church against the Arian heresy;” ^o as he shews there at large.

From these passages of Athanasius it appears that there was a third party then in the Church distinct from the Nicenists and the Eusebians. The former would by no means yield to any relaxation of the council of Nice; because they evidently saw that this design was carried on by those who made it their business under that pretence to introduce Arianism, who were the Eusebians. But there were others extremely concerned for the peace of the Church, and on that

^m Ibid. pp. 918. 757. ⁿ Ibid. pp. 918. 758. ^o Ibid. pp. 920. 759.

account were willing to let go the term *ὁμοούσιος*, hoping the doctrine might be secured by other expressions; and this facility of theirs gave the greatest advantage to the Eusebian party in all their councils, who continually almost overreached and outwitted them, under the pretence of accommodation. For by this artifice they gained their votes, and when they had them, made use of them merely to serve their own 163 designs; as appears by the account the historians give of the management of the Arian affairs under the reign of Constantius.

P. Socrates saith, “that immediately after the death of Constantine, Eusebius and Theognis, the heads of the Arian faction, apprehended it now to be a convenient season for them to throw down the Nicene faith, and to set up Arianism; and to this purpose they endeavoured to hinder Athanasius from returning to Alexandria. But first they gained the eunuchs and court-favourites, then the wife of Constantius himself, to embrace Arianism:” and so the controversy of a sudden spread into the court, camp, cities and all places of the east; (for the western Churches continued quiet during the reign of Constans, to whose share all the western provinces in a short time fell.) After the death of Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, the two parties openly divided in the choice of a successor; † the one choosing Paulus, and the Arians, Macedonius; this nettled Constantius, who coming to Constantinople calls a council of Arian bishops, who depose Paulus, and set up Eusebius of Nicomedia; who presently falls to work, going with the emperor to Antioch, where, under the pretence of a dedication, as is observed in the precedent chapter, a council of ninety bishops was assembled;

P Socr. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 80.

† *Ibid.* cap. 6–8. p. 83.

“^r but the design was,” saith Socrates, “to overthrow the Nicene faith.” Here they made some canons to ensnare Athanasius (^s of which before). As to the matter of faith, they durst not openly propose the nulling the council of Nice; but they gained this great point, that the matters of faith might be discussed after it, and so they set open the gate for new councils which by degrees might establish the Arian heresy.

^t Sozomen saith, “that after the death of Constantine the secret Arians began to shew themselves more openly; among whom Eusebius and Theognis especially bestirred themselves to advance Arianism.” He agrees with ^u Socrates as to the spreading of it in the court and elsewhere; and in the other particulars, to the council at Antioch; but he saith, “^v they framed their confession of faith in such ambiguous terms, that 164 neither party could quarrel with the words.” But they left out any mention of the ‘substance of Father and Son,’ and the word ‘consubstantial;’ and so in effect overthrew the council of Nice.

This is that confession of faith, which the council in Isauria called “^w the authentic one made at Antioch in the dedication.” But it was not so authentic but they thought good to alter it; and some months after sent another to Constans to explain themselves more fully; whereby they reject those who said, “^x the Son was made of nothing or of another hypostasis, and not from God.” Who could imagine these to have been any other than very sound and orthodox men? especially

^r Ibid. cap. 8. p. 84.

^s See cap. 3. p. 138.

^t Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 93. See p. 154.

^u Socrat. *ibid.*

^v Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 98.

^w Athanas. *de Synod.* pp. 904. 746.

^x *Ibid.* pp. 895. 738.

when three years after, they sent a larger confession of faith into the western parts for their own vindication, wherein “*y* they anathematize those who held three Gods, or that Christ was not God, or that he was begotten of any other substance besides God,” &c. But that there was juggling under all this appears, because, as Athanasius observes, they were still altering their forms; for this again was changed several times at Sirmium, before they resolved upon that which was to be carried to the council of Ariminum. And although the difference in the matters of faith as delivered by them seemed now very nice and subtle, yet they were irreconcilably set against the council of Nice and all that adhered to it. Which was a plain evidence that they concealed their sense under ambiguous words, or that they saw it necessary at present to seem orthodox, that so they might the better set aside the council of Nice; which being once effected, it would be an easy matter to set up Arianism, which was the thing they designed.

This intrigue was not discovered fully till after the council of Ariminum, but was certainly carried on all along by the Eusebian party, who without these artifices could never have deceived the eastern bishops, who joined with them till they more openly declared themselves in the council of Seleucia; and then the difference was not between the Acacians and Eusebians, as some have weakly conjectured, but between the old Eusebians, who now appeared to be Arians under the name of Acacius, and the followers of Basilius of Ancyra, who stuck chiefly at the word *ὁμοούσιος*; of whom 165 Athanasius speaks before. Now to draw in these men, and to hold them fast, who had great sway in the

y Ibid.

eastern Churches, the Eusebians were forced to comply in words with them, and in all probability to suffer them to draw up these creeds, provided only that they left out the Nicene decree and anathemas, which would do their business at last. So that the Eusebians were forced to the utmost dissimulation and hypocrisy, to be able to carry on the Arian design in the eastern and western Churches. But whatever their words and pretences were, their actions sufficiently manifested their intentions. For they set themselves with the utmost violence against all who constantly adhered to the council of Nice, and openly favoured and preferred all the declared or secret friends to Arianism. They caused Athanasius to be banished a second time from Alexandria, and appointed Gregory in his place, “who continued there,” saith ^zTheodoret, “with great cruelty for six years, and then was murdered himself by the Alexandrians;” ^a but that seems to have been a mistake for George of Cappadocia, who succeeded him. For ^bAthanasius saith, “he died a natural death,” but he at large describes the ^chorrible persecution both of the clergy and laity then in Egypt, who would not comply with the Arians; for his business was to set up Arianism, as ^dAthanasius saith. After his death, Constantius finding so little success in those violent courses, ^esends for Athanasius with great earnestness to come to him; and gives him free liberty to return to Alexandria; and solemnly swears to him, “he would never more receive any calumnies against him;” and writes several letters on his behalf: and ^fone very kind one to himself after

^z Theod. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 4. p. 823. *ibid.* p. 356.
^a Valesius in his Annotation, *ibid.* agrees with Stillingfleet.
^b Athan. *ad solit. Vit. agen.*
^c *Ibid.* pp. 816. 350.
^d *Ibid.* pp. 817. 351.
^e *Ibid.* pp. 823. 356.
^f *Ibid.* pp. 824. 358.

the death of his brother Constans, who was a true friend to Athanasius; and then his greatest enemies courted him, and begged his pardon for what they had done; being forced to it by the violence of the torrent against him: and even ^g Ursacius and Valens, two warm men of the Eusebian party, publicly recanted what they had done against him, without his seeking, and then anathematized the Arian heresy. But this was done while Constans was alive, and so great a number appeared in 166 the western Churches on his side; but Constans being dead, the Eusebian party persuade Constantius, to take heart once more and to try what he could do to restore Arianism; then ^h Valens and Ursacius recant their recantation, and lay it all on the fear of Constans; and now to shew the emperor's zeal for Arianism, ⁱ the public allowance is taken from Athanasius and his party, and given to the Arians; and the magistrates threatened, if they did not communicate with them; and not only the people banished that refused, but the bishops were summoned to appear in the courts, and were there told, "^k they must immediately subscribe or lose their places." But all this while toleration was granted to all but to the followers of the council of Nice. And thus all places were filled with tumult and disorder, and the people forced their bishops to the tribunals for fear of being punished themselves. And the reason of this violence was, because ^l the Arian heresy was so much hated by the people, and they hoped by this means to bring them to own it. ^m Heraclius, the emperor's lieutenant, declared in his name, "that Athanasius

^g Ibid. pp. 826. 359. See p. 179. in this chapter, and note ⁿ.
p. 168, and note ^v in this chapter. Athan. ibid.

^k Ibid. pp. 829. 362.

^l Ibid. pp. 830. 362.

^h Ibid. pp. 827. 360.

ⁱ Ibid. pp. 829. 361. See

^m Ibid. pp. 846. 377.

was to be cast out, and the Churches given to the Arians;" and required the people to receive such a bishop as he should send, viz. George of Cappadocia, a violent Arian. But the tragical account of all the persecutions which the orthodox Christians then underwent in Egypt, from these men of prudence and moderation, is at large set down by Athanasius himself; and in the concurrent testimony of the people of Alexandria: so that nothing seems to have been more violent and cruel in the heathen persecutions than was acted then under Syrianus and Heraclius in Egypt. And that it was wholly for the sake of Arianism, Athanasius evidently proves by this argument, "n that if a man were guilty of never so great crimes, if he professed himself an Arian, he escaped; but if he were an opposer of Arianism the greatest innocency could not protect him."

But this was not the case of Egypt alone, but in other places, "o the best qualification for a bishop was to stand well inclined to Arianism;" as Athanasius 167 affirms. "But otherwise, though the persons were never so well deserving, one fault or other was found with them to cast them out:" Pso, saith he, it was with Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, "a man famous for his piety and zeal, yet because he appeared against Arianism, feigned accusations are brought against him, and he is ejected with his clergy, and none but favourers of Arianism placed in their room;" and the like examples he brings at Laodicea, Tripolis, Germanicia, Sebastea, Hadrianople and many other places; insomuch that a considerable bishop scarce any where appeared against Arianism, but they found some pretence or other to put him out, and where they could allege no other cause, they

n Ibid. pp. 810. 345.

o Ibid. pp. 812. 346.

p Ibid.

said, “^q it was the pleasure of Constantius.” ^r But their dealing with Paulus, the bishop of Constantinople, was very remarkable. He being chosen by the anti-Arian party, and standing in the way of Eusebius of Nicomedia, whose heart was set upon that bishopric, being so near the imperial court, he first procured Paulus’s banishment to Pontus, then he was sent in chains to Singara of Mesopotamia, thence to Emesa, thence to Pontus, thence to Cucusus, where he was at length strangled by the Eusebian party, as Athanasius saith he had it from the persons there present. But although Macedonius who succeeded at Constantinople were of a temper violent enough, as ^s Sozomen shews, yet ^t Theodoret observes, “that even he was expelled Constantinople, because he would not hold the Son of God to be a creature;” for, although he denied Christ to be consubstantial with the Father; yet he asserted him to be like the Father in all things, and made the Holy Ghost to be a creature; by which he seemed to deny the Son to be so, and therefore could not keep the favour of the Arian party, which then governed all in the eastern Churches; but yet in such a manner, as by no means yet to declare for Arianism. And therefore ^u Theodoret takes notice, that after the death of Leontius, Eudoxius was the first who pulled off his visard, and declared openly for Arianism; but Leontius’s way was, to promote only those in the Church, he was beforehand sure of, and to suffer no other to come into orders, by which means, saith he, “most of the clergy

^q Ibid. pp. 813. 347.

^r Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 15. 27. pp. 92. 119. Sozom. ibid. lib. 4. c. 2. p. 132. Theod. ibid. lib. 2. cap. 5. p. 72.

^s Sozom. ibid. lib. 4. cap. 2.

p. 132.

^t Theod. ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6.

p. 73.

^u Theod. ibid. cap. 25. p. 108.

168 were Arians, and the people still continued sound in the Nicene faith," till Eudoxius's persecution began.

This was the miserable condition of the eastern Churches under the prudence and moderation of the Eusebian party; but the western Churches continued quiet and very little disturbed with the Arian heresy while Constans lived; who was ready not only to maintain the true faith in his own dominions, but to give his assistance for the relief of those who suffered in the eastern parts. Which was the reason of the calling of the council of Sardica by consent of both emperors, although that happened only to widen and enlarge the breach. However the Sardican council had such effect in the western parts, as to the business of Athanasius, that, as ^v Athanasius tells Constantius, Valens and Ursacius, two very busy factors in the Arian cause, "freely own the malicious intrigue that was carried on in the prosecution of him." The first council of Milan is supposed by ^w Petavius to be called the same year that of Sardica ended. But ^x Sirmondus thinks it very improbable there should be two councils in one year; and therefore he believes it rather to have been the year before: which is the more probable opinion. This council of Milan was assembled on the occasion of several bishops there meeting to wait on the emperor Constans in order to a general council, to put things in order in the Christian Church, which the Arian faction had so much disturbed. While they were there the four eastern bishops arrived, with the long confession

^v Athanas. *ibid.* pp. 826. 839. 359. 370. See p. 165. in this chapter.

^w Petav. de Phot. *Damn.* c. 1. inter Sirmond. *Oper.* tom. 4.

p. 585. col. 1.

^x Sirmond. *Diatr. de anno Syrm. Synod. inter Oper.* tom. 4. col. 536.

made at Antioch, and desire the western bishops' concurrence with them in it. These express their dislike of any new confession of faith, especially after the Nicene ; but, since they were so free of their anathemas at the end of their confession, they desired them to make short work of it, to anathematize the Arian heresy ; which they utterly refused to do, and so discovered the juggle of that seeming orthodox confession. This appears by Liberius's epistle in the collection of Church records in *v* Hilary's Fragments ; in which he tells Constantius, " that these four bishops were so far from anathematizing the Arian heresy then in order to peace, that upon being pressed to do it, they rose up in a ¹⁶⁹rage and left the council." From hence the western bishops smelt their design, however covered over with fair pretences of peace and reconciliation. Which they further discovered by their own legates, whom they sent into the east, who made this offer to the bishops there, that they would accept of their own terms of accommodation, provided " they would but condemn the Arian heresy, which upon consultation they refused to do." Upon these plain discoveries, the western bishops could easily see through all their proposals for peace ; being only made with a design to make them betray the faith. So that as long as Constans lived the Arian faction could make little or no impression on the western Churches ; but he being soon after taken off by the treachery of Magnentius, captain of his guards ; and the whole empire falling to Constantius upon his victory over Magnentius, a sudden alteration here happened about these matters. Valens and Ursacius who had so solemnly retracted their former unjust sentence of Athanasius, now lay it upon their fear of Constans, and

v Hilar. Frag. Oper. col. 456. Paris. 1631. col. 1331. Paris. 1693.

appear in the head of the Arian faction, and with them, as ^z Severus Sulpicius saith, “the two Pannonias declared for Arianism.” And now they having an emperor to their mind, resolve to lose no time, but carry things on with a mighty violence, and banish all who would not subscribe to the condemning Athanasius. For this stale pretence must still be made use of to deceive the people, and to make way for Arianism; and yet this prevailed so far, that, as Hilary saith, in the preface to his Fragments, “the people wondered what made so many bishops go into banishment, rather than condemn one;” and the design of those Fragments is, to shew “that the matter of faith lay at the bottom of all this violence against Athanasius.” Which proceeded so far, that in the council called at Arles, Paulinus, bishop of Triers, was, for opposing the condemning Athanasius, and desiring the matters of faith might first be settled, deposed by the council and banished by the emperor. And so great then was the power of fear upon them, that some of those very persons who had cleared Athanasius at the council of Sardica, did now subscribe to his
 170 condemnation; among whom was Vincentius of Capua, the pope’s own legate; as ^a Athanasius himself confesses. Not long after, Constantius summons another council at Milan; where ^b Socrates and ^c Sozomen say, “above three hundred western bishops were assembled:” here again the Arian faction made a great outcry about Athanasius; but Dionysius, bishop of Milan, and Eusebius of Vercelles, laid open the design so far as to make the council be broken up and themselves to be banished by the emperor’s edict. While the emperor continued

^z Sev. Sulpic. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. p. 403.

^a Athanas. ad Constant. p. 692. Oper. tom. 1. p. 312.

^b Socrat. ibid. lib. 2. cap. 36. p. 134.

^c Sozom. ibid. lib. 4. cap. 9. p. 139.

at Milan, Liberius, bishop of Rome, was summoned to attend upon him there, in order to his banishment, if he did not condemn Athanasius; ^dTheodoret hath preserved the most material passages that happened between them; one whereof is, that if Constantius really designed the peace of the Church, the first thing was to be a general subscription of the Nicene faith; after which other things would more easily be composed. But this would not be hearkened to; and so Liberius was banished; but afterwards he unworthily complied not only to the condemnation of Athanasius, but he professed his consent to the Sirmian creed, as appears by his epistle in ^eHilary's Fragments; for which Hilary bestows his anathemas very freely upon him. But it is of late pleaded on behalf of Liberius, "that he subscribed only to the first Sirmian confession in the council against Photinus, which was express against the Arian heresy." Whereas Hilary (who, I think, knew this matter somewhat better) saith in so many words, "Hæc est perfidia Ariana," i. e. that what he subscribed, contained in it the Arian heresy. But where doth Hilary or any one else say, that Liberius "only subscribed the first confession of Sirmium," and upon that was restored? Nay, ^fSozomen saith, "that Constantius at first required him in terms to renounce the Son's being consubstantial to the Father: but afterwards they joined together the confession against Paulus Samosatenus and Photinus, with that of Antioch at the dedication, and to these Liberius subscribed." So that he struck in wholly with the Arian faction which undermined the authority of the council of Nice, and

^d Theod. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 16. Paris. 1693.

p. 92.

^f Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 15.

^e Hilar. in *Fragm. in Oper.* p. 149.

col. 426. Paris. 1631. col. 1336-7.

171 he betrayed the faith, if he did not renounce it. The Eudoxians at Antioch, he saith, gave out “that both Osius and Liberius had renounced the Nicene faith, and declared the Son to be unlike the Father:” but Liberius cleared himself by rejecting the doctrine of the Anomæans, i. e. the open and professed Arians; and this Ursacius, Valens and Germinius then at Sirmium were willing to accept of, having a further design to carry on in these parts, which was like to be spoiled by the Anomæans appearing so openly and unseasonably in the east. And for the same reason, they were willing to call in that which Hilary calls the blasphemy of Osius and Potamius, as being too open and giving offence to the followers of Basilius of Ancyra in the east. For now the emperor having banished so many bishops and struck so much terror into the rest, thought it a convenient time to settle the Church affairs to his mind in these western parts, and to that end he summoned a general council; but justly fearing the eastern and western bishops would no more agree now than they did before at Sardica, he appoints the former to meet at Seleucia in Isauria, and the latter at Ariminum; whose number, saith ^g Severus Sulpicius, “came to above four hundred,” and to the same purpose ^h Sozomen. When they were assembled, Valens and Ursacius acquainted them with the emperor’s good intentions in calling them together, and as the only expedient for the peace of the Church, they proposed, “that all former confessions of faith should be laid aside, as tending to dissension; and this to be universally received, which they had brought with them from Sirmium;” where it was drawn up by several bishops, and approved by the

^g Sever. Sulpic. *ibid.* lib. 2.
p. 419.

^h Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 17.
p. 155.

emperor. Upon the reading this new confession of faith, wherein “the Son is said to be like the Father, according to the Scriptures, and the name of substance agreed to be wholly laid aside:” the bishops at Ariminum appeared very much unsatisfied; and declared, they were for keeping to the Nicene faith without alteration; and required of the Arian party there present to subscribe it, before they proceeded any further; which they refusing to do, they forthwith ⁱ excommunicated and deposed them, and protested against all innovations in matters of faith. And of these proceedings ¹⁷² of theirs, they send an account by several legates of their own, wherein they express their resolution to adhere to the Nicene faith, as the most effectual ^{k l m} bar against Arianism and other heresies; and they add, that the removing of it would open the breach for heresy to enter into the Church. They charge Ursacius and Valens with having once been partakers of the Arian heresy, and on that account thrown out of the Church; but were received in again upon their submission and recantation; but now they say, in this council of Ariminum, they had made a fresh attempt on the faith of the Church, bringing in a doctrine full of blasphemies; as it is in Socrates; but in Hilary’s Fragments it is only, that their faith contained “*multa perversæ doctrinæ;*” which shews that they looked on the Sirmian creed as dangerous and heretical. And in the same ⁿ Fragments it appears by the acts of the council, that they proceeded against Valens, Ursacius,

ⁱ Athanas. ad Afric. p. 934.
Oper. tom. 1. p. 893.

^k Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 37.
p. 140.

^l Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 4. c. 18.
p. 156.

^m Theod. *ibid.* lib. 2. c. 19.
p. 98.

ⁿ Hilar. *Fragm.* col. 459. in
Oper. Paris. 1631. col. 1344,
&c. Paris. 1693.

Germinius and Caius as heretics and introducers of heresy; and then made a solemn protestation, that they would never recede from the Nicene faith.

Their ten brethren whom they sent to Constantius to acquaint him with the proceedings of the council, he would not admit to speak with him: for he was informed beforehand by the Arian party how things went in the council, at which he was extremely displeased, and resolved to mortify the bishops, so as to bring them to his will at last. He ^o sends word to the council, how much his thoughts were then taken up with his eastern expedition, and that these matters required greater freedom of mind to examine them than he had at such a time; and so commands the legates to wait at Hadrianople till his return. The council perceived by this message that his design was to weary them out, hoping at last, as ^p Theodoret expresses it, to bring them to consent “to the demolishing that bulwark which kept heresy out of the Church,” i. e. the authority of the council of Nice. To this smart message the council returned a resolute reply, “that they would not recede from their former decree;” but humbly beg leave to return to their bishoprics **173** before winter; being put to great hardships in that strait place. This was to let the emperor know how he might deal with them, and he sends a charge to his lieutenant, not to let them stir till they all consented. And in the mean time effectual means were used with their legates in the east to bring them to terms; an account whereof we have in ^q Hilary’s Fragments, which were to null all the former proceedings, and to receive

^o Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 19. p. 158.

^p Theod. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 19. p. 159.

^q Hilar. *Fragm.* col. 452. in *Oper.* Paris. 1631. col. 1346.

Paris. 1693.

those who were there deposed to communion. Which being done, they were sent back to decoy the rest of the council, who at first were very stiff, but by degrees they were so softened, that they yielded at last to the emperor's own terms. The very instrument of their consent is extant in ^r Hilary's Fragments, wherein they declare their full agreement to the laying aside the terms of 'substance' and 'consubstantial' in the creed : i. e. to the voiding the authority of the council of Nice, which was the thing all along aimed at by the Arian party. And ^s Athanasius saith, it was there declared "unlawful to use the word 'substance' or 'hypostasis' concerning God."

It is time now to consider, how far those Churches can be charged with Arianism, whose bishops were there present, and consented to the decrees of this council. It is a noted saying of ^t St. Jerome on this occasion, "that the world then groaned and wondered at its being become Arian." Which a late author saith, "is a passage quite worn out by our innovators." Whom doth he mean by these innovators? the divines of the Church of England, who from time to time have made use of it? Not to prove an apostasy of the catholic Church from the true faith, which no man in his wits ever dreamt of, but from hence to overthrow the pretended infallibility of general councils, or such as have been so called. And notwithstanding the opprobrious name of 'innovators' (which, as we find in those of the Church of Rome, often belongs to those who give it to others), it is very easy to prove, that this

^r Ibid. col. 453. in Oper. col. 1347.

^s Athan. ad Afric. pp. 934. 894.

^t Hier. c. Lucif. Oper. tom. 4. part. 2. col. 300.

^u Parker's Religion and Loyalty, part 1. p. 516.

one instance of the council of Ariminum doth overthrow not only the pretence to the infallibility of general councils, but the absolute binding authority of any, till 174 after due examination of the reasons and motives of their proceedings. For it is apparent by the whole series of the story, as I have faithfully deduced it, that the whole design of the Arian party was to overthrow the authority of the council of Nice; which they were never able to compass by a general council till this of Ariminum, agreeing as they declared with the eastern bishops. So that here was a consent both of the eastern and western Churches, the council of Ariminum being approved by ^{x y z} a council at Constantinople the same year. What is now to be said, when the bishops assembled in council both in the eastern and western Churches did effectually, as far as their decrees went, overthrow the Nicene council? If it be said, that the council of Ariminum decreed nothing positively against the Nicene faith; we are to consider, that the reversing the decree of the Nicene council was in effect overthrowing the faith thereby stablished; ^a and so St. Hierom saith, “Tunc Usiæ nomen abolitum est, tunc Nicenæ fidei damnatio conclamata est.” And then these words follow, “Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est:” and if nothing would ever be able to stop out the Arian heresy but the Nicene faith, as is confessed; and this council took away the authority of that council, then it at least made way for the introducing heresy, and left all men to be heretics that had a mind to be so. ^b And so St. Hierom saith, Valens and Ursacius after the council boasted, “that they never

^x Sozom. *ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 24. p. 168.

^y Socrat. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 41. p. 156.

^z Hieron. *ad Lucif. inter Oper.* tom. 4. col. 299, 300.

^a Parker *ibid.* p. 517.

^b *Ibid.*

denied the Son to be a creature, but to be like other creatures:" from whence ^c St. Ambrose takes it for granted, that Christ's being a creature did pass for good doctrine in the council of Ariminum. But we are told, that "^d St. Jerome only complains of the world's being cheated and trepanned into Arianism by the bishops' being so weakly overreached and outwitted by an handful of Arians." Doth not St. Jerome plainly say, "the name of substance was there laid aside, and the council of Nice condemned?" And could this be a mere cheat and trepan to those who were so much aware of it, as to declare at first, "^e they would never give way to it, because they saw the danger of it;" and to renew their protestations against it, after the emperor's severe message to them about it? So that, whatever it was, it could be no cheat or trepan in those who made such ¹⁷⁵ decrees at first, deposed the Arian bishops, sent such messages to the emperor as they did. Which is a plain demonstration that they saw and knew what they did; and understood the consequences of it. ^f But they were frightened into this consent at last. I grant they were so. But what then becomes of the infallibility of councils, if mere fear can make so many bishops in council act and declare against their consciences? If in such meetings the persons were capable of being swayed by any particular bias from asserting the truth, what security can there be as to men's faith from their authority, any further than we can be secure they were not influenced by any temporal hopes or fears? So that we are not barely to respect the definitions of councils, but to examine the motives by which they were acted in passing those decrees; and if it appear,

^c Ambros. Oper. Epist. lib. 5. ep. 33. ad Valent. ed. Eras. t. 3. p. 150. Oper. tom. 2. ep. 21. col. 862.

^d Parker *ibid.* p. 516.

^e *Ibid.* pp. 512. 515.

^f See *ibid.* p. 516.

they did act freely and sincerely, and deliver the general sense of the Christian Church from the beginning, as it was in the case of the Nicene council, then a mighty regard ought to be shewed to the decrees of it; but if partiality, interest, fear, or any other secular motive be found to sway them in their debates and resolutions, then every particular Church is at liberty to refuse their decrees, and to adhere to those of more free and indifferent councils. And this was the case here, as to the council of Ariminum, if the Church had been absolutely tied up to the decrees of councils, however passed, there had been an utter impossibility of restoring the true Christian faith; for there was no such council assembled to reverse the decrees of it; but in every Church, the banished bishops being returned, not long after, upon the death of Constantius, they took care to settle the true faith in the western Churches, by lesser assemblies of the several bishops. A remarkable instance whereof appears in ^g Hilary's Fragments, where we find the Gallican bishops met at Paris, renouncing the council of Ariminum, and embracing the Nicene faith. The like we have reason to believe was done in the British Churches, because in Jovian's time, ^h Athanasius particularly takes notice of the Britannic Churches as adhering to the Nicene faith; and ⁱ St. Jerome, and 176 ^k St. Chrysostom, several times mention "their agreeing with other Churches in the true faith." Which

^g Hilar. Fragm. col. 431. in Oper. Paris. 1631. col. 1353. Paris. 1693.

^h Athanas. ad Jov. p. 246. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 781. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 196. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 106. Lloyd ib. chap. 3. §. 5. p. 76.

ⁱ Hieron. ad Marcel. ad Evag. Oper. t. 4. part. 2. epist. 44. col.

551. See Camden and Usher, as quoted in ch. 5. p. 348. and note there.

^k Chrysost. Oper. tom. 3. p. 696. tom. 6. p. 635. tom. 8. p. 111. ed. Savil. tom. 10. p. 638. tom. 1. p. 575. tom. 3. p. 71. ed. Bened. See Camden. ibid. p. 48. vol. 1. p. 1.

is a sufficient argument to clear them from the imputation of Arianism, which did no otherwise lie upon them, than as they had bishops present in the council of Ariminum.

For ¹Severus Sulpicius, speaking of the care Constantius took to provide lodging and entertainment for the bishops at Ariminum, out of the public charge, he saith, “their bishops refused to accept it, only three out of Britain, not being able to maintain themselves, made use of the public allowance, rather than be chargeable to their brethren: which,” he saith, “he heard Gavidius their bishop blame them for; but he rather thinks it a commendation for them, in the first place, to have been so poor, and next, that they chose not to be burdensome to their brethren, but rather to live on the emperor’s charge.” This had been better said of any place, than at the council of Ariminum, where the emperor’s kindness was a snare to their consciences; unless it be said, that the emperor took greater advantage by their bearing their own charges, to make them sooner grow weary of staying there; and that if the rest had followed the example of the Britons, the emperor might have been weary before them. But how came the British bishops to be so poor above the rest, who were not only able to live at their own charges, but to supply their brethren? which shews as much the plenty of the rest as it doth the poverty of the Britons. What became of all the endowments of the British Churches by king Lucius? The British history published by ^mGeoffrey of Monmouth saith, “that king Lucius gave not only all the lands which

¹ Sever. Sulpic. ib. l. 2. p. 420. vol. 3. p. 467. See p. 180.
 Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 196. ^m Galfr. Mon. lib. 2. cap. 2.
 Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 105. p. 33. Usser. de Primord. cap.
 Lloyd ibid. §. 5. p. 77. Camden. 6. p. 125. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.
 ibid. pp. 55. 730. vol. 1. p. lviii. p. 66.

belonged to the heathen temples to the Churches built by him, but added very much to them with many privileges." The same is said from him by most of our monkish historians, whose authority is no greater than Geoffrey's, from whom they derive their information; only enlarging it as occasion serves; as ⁿ Thomas Rudburn doth very particularly for the church of Winchester, who makes the old lands of the flamins to be twelve miles compass about the town; and king 177 Lucius added, he saith, "to the new church all the suburbs of the city, with the privilege of 'Dunwallo Molmutius,' i. e. of a sanctuary." Methinks then the British bishops might have been in as good a condition as the rest of their brethren at Ariminum; unless their lands were taken away in the persecution of Diocletian, as ^o Rudburn seems to intimate; which is all as true as that "monks continued there from Lucius to the second year of Diocletian," which was a long time before his persecution began, or there were any such monks in the world. But it seems strange, that the British bishops should be then under such poverty, when Liberius, in his conference with Constantius, told him, "the Churches were able to bear the charges of their bishops in going to councils, without the public carriages;" for even before Constantine's time they had endowments besides the ^p voluntary oblations of the people, which in great churches were very con-

ⁿ See ch. 2. p. 67. and note ^s.
Usser. de Primord. cap. 6. p. 126.
Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 66.

^o Usser. *ibid*.

^p See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, b. 5. chap. 4. s. 15, for the Oblations in particular; but the whole chapter as to the Revenues of the ancient Clergy, &c.; chap. 5.

on Tithes and First-fruits. Fabric. Bibliograph. Antiq. cap. 13. n. 23. p. 679. de Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis; cap. 16. n. 2. p. 768. 770. Decimæ, Primitiæ. Stillingfleet's Ecclesiastical Cases, in his Works, vol. 3. p. 676, as to Oblations; p. 615, &c., 68c, &c. as to Tithes.

siderable: but that there were certain endowments besides appears both by the edicts of Maximinus and Constantine. By that of Maximinus, not only houses, “but the lands which belonged to the Christians, whether seized into the ^q emperor’s hands, or in the possession of any city, or given or sold, are all commanded to be restored.” And that this doth not relate to their private possessions, but to the public revenue of their Churches, will appear by the following edict of Constantine and Licinius; which, in the first place, commands all their churches to be restored; and then is added: “Because the Christians are known not only to have those places where they assemble, but others, which likewise of right belong to their body, i. e. their Churches;” for so the words of the edict in ^r Lactantius are, “sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur ad jus corporis eorum, id est, Ecclesiarum non hominum singulorum pertinentia;” “these are commanded to be restored without any delay or dispute:” which is again enforced by another edict of Constantine to Anulinus, extant in ^s Eusebius with the former, and there are mentioned “houses, gardens, or whatsoever possessions they had.” Those who would have nothing more meant by these expressions, but “some fields and gardens, rather than lands,” may consider, that when the Church had plentiful possessions they were called by no other names. So ^t St. Ambrose, “Agri Ecclesiæ solvunt tributum.” And in another law of ^u Constantine, directed to the provincials of Palestine, to the same purpose, and with as full and large expressions; and howsoever

^q Euseb. *ibid.* lib. 9. cap. 10. p. 457.

^r Lact. *de Mort. Perfec.* cap. 48. in *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 246.

^s Euseb. *ibid.* lib. 10. cap. 5. p. 483.

^t Ambros. *de Trad. Basilic. Oper.* tom. 3. lib. 5. p. 157. ed. Erasm. tom. 2. cap. 33. col. 872. ed. Bened.

^u Euseb. *Vit. Constant.* lib. 2. cap. 39. p. 555.

they became alienated, the present possessors were to be satisfied with the mean profits: but by all means he commands a restitution to be made, not only to particular persons, but to the Churches too. But if the endowments of Churches were not then considerable, what need so many edicts for the restoration of them? But Constantine did not only take so much care to restore what the churches had before, but in case there were no heirs at law to the martyrs and confessors, ^xhe bestows their lands and goods on the Churches. And after this, about four years before the council of Nice, he published the famous constitution, still extant in the ^yTheodosian code; wherein “a full liberty is given to all sorts of persons to leave what they thought fit by will to the catholic Churches of Christians.” And this, as ^zGothofred saith, was the true donation of Constantine; for, by means of this law, riches flowed into the Church, and especially at Rome. For although, as ^aPaulus saith, by an edict of M. Aurelius, the “collegia licita,” societies allowed by the laws, “were capable of receiving legacies and estates,” yet by the ^blaws of the empire, the Christians were no legal society to that purpose before. And by a late constitution of Diocletian, “societies were excluded from receiving inheritances without a special privilege;” yet now, by this law, all those bars being removed, riches came in so fast in some places, that there needed new constitutions to set bounds to so great liberality.

And the privileges which Constantine gave to the

^x Ibid. cap. 36. p. 554.

^y C. Theod. 16. tit. 2. l. 4.
Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theodosian.
tom. 6. p. 23.

^z Ibid. Comment. p. 24, &c.

^a D. 34. de rebus dubiis, l. 20. cum Senat. Digest. vet. Justinian. p. 728. Balduin. as in the following note.

^b Balduin. de Leg. Const. p. 23.

° clergy of exemption from public services, drew so many to take orders, especially in corporations, where the services were very burdensome, that Constantine was forced to publish edicts to restrain the numbers of them; which were not intended “to hinder persons of estate and quality from entering into orders,” as some have suggested, but only such whose estates were liable to the public services, as those who were ‘^d decuriones origine,’ and not merely ‘^e incolatu,’ were; who bore all the offices, and did the public duties, having lands given them on purpose in the first settlement of colonies, which were called ‘*prædia reipublicæ*,’ as ^e Pancirol observes; and therefore Constantine had reason to forbid such entering into orders to the prejudice of the government. And so the title of the constitution is, “*De ordinatione Clericorum in Curiarum et Civitatum præjudicium non facienda* ;” which was at that time a very just and reasonable constitution. But afterwards men of great honour and dignities came into the Church, as not only St. Ambrose at Milan, who was the consular governor over Liguria and Æmilia, and St. Paulinus, a Roman senator, “behind none in birth,” saith ^f St. Ambrose, having a great estate in Aquitania, was made priest at Barcelona, and bishop of Nola; but many examples of this kind were in one age in the Gallican Church, as ^g Honoratus, bishop of Arles, of a senatorian and consular family; St. Hilary of Arles, of a very noble family, and born to great riches; Sidonius

^c C. Theod. 16. tit. 2. l. 2, 3, 6. Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theodosian. tom. 6. pp. 22. 30.

^d Berter. Diatr. 1. cap. 10. vide p. 131, &c. Vide Camden. ibid. p. 635. vol. 3. p. 171.

^e Pancirol. de Magistr. Municip. cap. 1. p. 187 b. (at the

end of his Commentary on the Notitia Imperii.)

^f Ambros. Oper. tom. 3. lib. 6. ep. 36. edit. Erasm. tom. 2. ep. 58. col. 1013.

^g Vincent. Barralis, Chronolog. Sanct. et Abbat. Lerinens. pp. 4. 16. 33.

Apollinaris, whose father and grandfather were ‘præfecti prætorio Galliarum,’ and himself married to the daughter of the emperor Avitus, made ‘præfectus urbi, et patriicius,’ one of the greatest persons and wits in Gaul, was made ^h bishop of Auvergne; ⁱ St. German, bishop of Auxerre, was of noble parents, and governor of a province; ^k St. Ruricius, bishop of Limoges, descended from the Annician family, as Venantius Fortunatus saith, which was of that fame at Rome, that ^l St. Jerome saith, “very few of it missed the consulship, and two brothers of it were consuls together,” as Claudian saith, a thing never seen before or since. ^m From this family Arnoldus Wion proves that the emperors of Germany are descended: and of this same family another Ruricius succeeded his grandfather in the same bishopric.

But besides that general law which gave permission to others to give liberally to churches, Constantine, of his own revenue, allowed a proportion of corn to be given to the clergy of the greater cities; of which ⁿ Athanasius speaks, when he saith, “Constantius took it away from him and his clergy, and gave it to the Arians;” but the gift itself was continued all the time 180 of Constantius; then it was taken away by ^o Julian, and in part restored by Jovian.

It is then no wonder that the bishops at ^p Ariminum refused the public allowance, being maintained by the revenues of their churches; but it seems the

^h Vit. Sidonii Apol. inter Oper. Sirmond. tom. 1. unpagued.

ⁱ Constant. Vit. German. De Vitis Sanctorum, tom. 4. p. 126. col. 1.

^k Venant. Fortunat. Carmin. lib. 4. cap. 5. p. 98.

^l Hier. Ep. 8. Oper. tom. 4.

part. 2. epist. 97. col. 785.

^m Lign. Vitæ in Præfat. §. 6.

ⁿ Athanas. ad solit. p. 829. Oper. tom. 1. p. 361, and see p. 166 in this chapter.

^o Theod. ibid. lib. 4. cap. 4. p. 151.

^p See p. 176.

British Churches were not then in so rich a condition to maintain their bishops so long abroad; for Constantine, drawing all the wealth and trade of the empire eastward, for the greater advancement of his new city, and this country having been so long harassed with wars, and scarce recovered from the effects of them; (for the Scots and Picts had been very troublesome to them, both in the times of Constans and Constantius; the ^q former came himself over into Britain to suppress them, and the latter sent Lupicinus, his general, who arrived at London about the time the council of Ariminum was dissolved;) and therefore in a time of such confusion in the British province, it is not strange that these Churches should not be in so plentiful a condition as those which were the seat of trade and government. And ^r Ammianus Marcellinus observes, “that the provincial bishops lived in a much meaner condition than those of the greater cities,” especially of Rome; and, although a heathen, he very much commends them for their “temperance, humility, and modesty.”

^s But Arianism was not the only heresy the British Churches were charged with; for ^t Gildas from hence makes every following heresy to find a passage hither; among which the chief was Pelagianism. And ^u Bede doth insinuate, “that Pelagius, being a Briton, and spreading his doctrine far and near, did corrupt these Churches with it;” which some ^x late writers having

^q Am. Marcel. Hist. Rom. lib. 20. cap. 1. p. 181. See ch. 5. pp. 286, 287, and notes.

^r Am. Marcel. *ibid.* lib. 27. cap. 3. p. 373.

^s See p. 146.

^t Gild. Ep. 1. §. 9. p. 12. Hist. Gild. §. 9. p. 4. *Ibid.* §. 12. p. 19. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8.

p. 197. Hist. Eccles. Antiq. p. 106.

^u Bed. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 10. p. 48. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 213. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. *ib.* p. 115.

^x Bal. de Scrip. lib. 1. cap. 38. p. 37. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 215. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.

taken up have affirmed, that both Pelagius and Cœlestius, after their repulse at Rome, came over into Britain and dispersed their doctrine here. ^y Leland sadly laments the condition of the Church of God, that had no sooner recovered itself from Arianism, but a new heresy sprung up to disturb the peace, and infect the minds of Christians: but as Egypt brought forth the author of the former heresy, so did ^z Britain the author of this, which took his name from hence; and 181 is supposed to have been ^a ‘Morgan’ in British, which by his conversation at Rome he turned into ‘Pelagius;’ and ^b St. Augustine saith, he was commonly called ‘Pelagius Brito,’ to distinguish him, as he supposed, from another Pelagius of Tarentum. ^c Leland observes, that some made him a Briton, as being born in that Bretagne which was called Aremorica, on the continent: but I do not find that it had then lost its name of Aremorica. The first time we find the name of Britannia given to that country, is in the ^d subscription of Mansuetus to the council of Tours, where he is named ‘episcopus Britannorum,’ after which time it was frequently called Britannia Cismarina, Minor, Celtica, &c. ^e Dempster (not a Jesuit, but a lawyer) takes it very ill of Browerus the Jesuit, that he makes Pelagius a Scot; but not as Dempster understands him; for ^f he

p. 116. See also in this chapter p. 188. Pits, de Illustr. Angliæ Scriptor. p. 84. Jansen. de Hær. Pelag. lib. 1. p. 27. col. 2.

^y Leland. Comment. de Scrip. Brit. in Pelagio, p. 33.

^z Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 7. §. 5. p. 155.

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 207. Addenda, p. 993. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 112.

^b Aug. *ibid.* Epist. 106. ad Paulin. Oper. tom. 2. Epist. 186. col. 663. Usser. de Primord. cap.

8. p. 206. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 111.

^c Leland. *ibid.* p. 33.

^d Sirmond. Concil. Gal. tom. 1. p. 126. A. D. 461. Camden. *ibid.* p. 80. vol. 1. p. lxxxviii. Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 422. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 226.

^e Dempster. Hist. Eccles. lib. 15. n. 1012.

^f Brower. in Venant. Fortunat. Carmin. &c. lib. 3. pp. 69. 74.

explains himself, “that he meant one that came out of Ireland, and therefore was ‘*Scoticæ originis,*’” for which he quotes St. Jerome: but archbishop ^g Usher hath observed, “that he speaks there, not of Pelagius, but of Cœlestius, whom he makes the Cerberus to the Pluto,” (according to his usual way of complimenting his adversaries;) but both, he thinks, came out of the British islands. The late ^h publisher of Marius Mercator endeavours to shew “that our learned primate was herein mistaken, and that St. Jerome doth not speak of Cœlestius, but of Pelagius himself; and that by Pluto he means Ruffinus, dead in Sicily three years before St. Jerome’s writing these words: but notwithstanding he did still bark through Pelagius’s mouth, whom he compares to a great Scotch mastiff, from which country he is derived in the neighbourhood of Britain.” If these words relate only to Ruffinus and Pelagius, it is certain that St. Jerome would have it believed, that Pelagius came out of Ireland. That which makes it most probable that he means them is, that in the preface to his ⁱ Commentaries on Ezekiel, he mentions the death of Ruffinus, and then saith, “he hoped now he should be quiet to go on with his Commentaries on the Scriptures;” but not long after he complains, “that there were others, which in his room opened their mouths against him.” ^k In the beginning of his Commentaries on Jeremiah, which he undertook after he had finished those on Ezekiel, he mentions ¹⁸² one who carped at his Commentaries on the Ephesians,

^g Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 209. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 113.

^h Garner. Dissert. 1. in Mar. Mercat. cap. 5. inter Oper. Mar. Mercat. p. 139.

ⁱ Hier. in Ezek. lib. 6. Præfat.

tom. 3. col. 697, 698. Usser. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 223. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 120.

^k Hier. Oper. tom. 3. col. 527, 528. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 208. cap. 9. p. 225. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 112. 120.

and calls ¹Grunnus (i. e. Ruffinus) his forerunner ; and saith, he was “Scotorum pultibus prægravatus,” made fat with Scotch flummery. All this agrees very well with Pelagius, whom ^mOrosius describes as a very corpulent man : but there is one thing which makes the former opinion not improbable, which is, that ⁿSt. Jerome himself takes so much notice, “that Pelagius at that time wrote little or nothing about these matters, but Cœlestius was the man who appeared, especially in the two main points about original sin, and the possibility of perfection.” ^oIn his epistle to Ctesiphon, he saith, “that the author of the sect still held his peace, and his disciples wrote for him ;” “magistorum silentia profert rabies discipulorum.” Methinks ‘rabies’ agrees well enough with ‘cerberus,’ and here it is meant of the disciple Cœlestius, and not of Pelagius ; which expression answers very well to the other, “^pMutus magister latrat per Albinum canem.” And he speaks as if he designed to draw him from his closeness and retirement, which doth far better agree to the “mute person,” than to the “barking cerberus.” There is then no improbability, that Cœlestius and Pelagius may be both meant ; ^qbut if any other country hath a mind to challenge Cœlestius to themselves, I think they may be allowed to put in their claim notwithstanding these expressions. But it is very unworthy in the same

¹ Usser. *ibid.* Voss. *Hist. Pelag.* lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 6. Baron. *Annal. Eccles. A.D. 402.* n. 39.

^m Oros. *Apol.* cap. 27. in *Oper.* p. 621. Usser. *de Primord.* *ibid.* p. 207. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 112.

ⁿ Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 8. p. 208. cap. 9. pp. 225. 228. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* pp. 113. 121. 122.

^o Hier. *ad Ctesiph.* p. 256.

tom. 2. *Oper.* tom. 4. part. 2. col. 482. Usser. *de Primord.* *ibid.* p. 227. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 122.

^p Usser. *de Primord.* cap. 8. p. 208. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 113. *Camden. ibid.* p. 90. vol. 1. p. xcix.

^q Vide Usser. *de Primord.* *ibid.* p. 209. cap. 16. p. 786. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* pp. 113. 411.

r author to prove Pelagius to have been an Irish Scot, and at the same time to charge his vices on the British nation. He cannot deny, "that Pelagius had a great natural sharpness of wit," since ^s St. Augustine and his other adversaries allow it; but then he saith, "it was fierce and contentious, after the fashion of his country," and which he could not shake off by his long conversation at Rome. He grants that his Exhortations to Piety "were vehement and earnest, but written in an uncouth and imperious style, 'more gentis,' according to the humour of his nation." But why must the British nation be reproached for the particular faults of Pelagius? It is a very ill way of confuting Pelagius to attribute men's vices and virtues to their countries; and is contrary both to the discretion of a philosopher, and to the grace of a Christian. Pelagius might have ¹⁸³ had the same temper if he had been so happy as to have been born in a neighbour country; and I do not see how his way of writing doth affect the British Churches, where the Christians might be very wise and humble, notwithstanding this severe and unjust character of the British nation, which (as all national reproaches) is not so great a reproach to any as to him that gives it. But the greatest adversaries to Pelagius did not give him so ill a character; ^t St. Augustine saith, "he had the esteem of a very pious man, and of being a Christian of no mean rank." Was this 'pro more gentis' too? And of his learning and eloquence ^u St. Augustine gives sufficient testimony in his epistle

^r Garner. *ibid.* cap. 4. p. 134. inter Oper. Mar. Mercator.

^s See notes ^t, ^u, following.

^t Aug. de Peccat. Meritis. et Rem. lib. 3. cap. 1. et 3. de Gestis Palæst. Pelag. cap. 22. ep. 106. Oper. tom. 10. col. 71. 73. 216. tom. 2. col. 663, &c. Usser. de

Primord. cap. 8. p. 205. cap. 9. p. 221. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 111. 119.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 234. cap. 10. p. 285. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 125. 157. Chrysostom also speaks in like manner of Pelagius; Usser. de

to Juliana, the mother of Demetrius, to whom Pelagius wrote an epistle highly magnified for the wit and elegance of it. But Garnerius will not allow "that Pelagius was able to write it himself, without the assistance of his disciples, Cœlestius and Annianus." But why should this be so hard a thing for a man whom he confesses to have had a great deal of natural wit, and ^x St. Augustine saith, "he lived long, yea, very long in Rome, and kept the best company there?" Could a Briton never attain to so much purity of the Roman language as to write an epistle to the envy of those "meliore solo prognatorum," as he speaks, "who were born in more happy soils?" What mean such unbecoming reflections on the country of Pelagius, when himself confesses he had so much mother wit? and one would think of the two, that is the better soil which produceth more wit than words.

^y Our monkish historians make Pelagius not only a monk at Bangor, but the abbot there; ^z so the author of the Polychronicon, and John of Tinnmouth; Leland takes it from them, to whom Bale adds, "that he was made bishop in the east," but without any authority. ^a Leland saith, "that he went over into Aremorica, to visit his countrymen who were newly settled there, being carried over by ^b Maximus. ^c Gildas seems to imply, that Maximus was originally a Briton, when he calls him "germen plantationis suæ;" but ^d Bede takes

Primord. cap. 8. p. 214. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 115.

^x Aug. de Peccat. Orig. cap. 8. 21. Oper. tom. 10. col. 256. 263. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. pp. 205. 214. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 111. 116.

^y Vide Camden. *ibid.* pp. 457. 767. vol. 2. p. 422. vol. 3. p. 617. See p. 205. Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 7. §. 5. p. 154.

^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. pp. 207. 210. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 112. 114.

^a Leland. Comment. de Scrip. Brit. (in Pelag.) p. 34.

^b See ch. 5. pp. 287. 351, &c.

^c Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 198. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 106.

^d Bed. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 48.

no notice at all of his country. ^e The Saxon Annals, Fabius Ethelwerd, Huntingdon, and others, say, “ he ¹⁸⁴ was born in Britain;” but ^f Zosimus affirms, “ that he was a Spaniard, and took it ill that he was no more preferred, when his countryman, Theodosius, was made emperor:” however this were, it is certain that ^g he was declared emperor in Britain, and that he went out of Britain with the forces here, and that Gratian’s legions revolted to him, upon which he fled and was killed; and that Maximus being unsatisfied with Gratian’s share of the empire, went into Italy against Valentinian, and was after four years destroyed at Aquileia. But in all the proceedings of Maximus ^h I see no ground for the settling the colonies of Britons in Aremorica; for he landed at the mouth of the Rhine, saith Zosimus, and was well received by the Roman legions thereabouts. What occasion then was there for his coming against the Aremorici: or, if he had driven them out, had he nothing to do with his soldiers but to people countries with them? But we find the Aremorici in quiet possession of their country after this time; so that we see no reason at all for Pelagius to go to his countrymen in Aremorica. From thence ⁱ Leland carries him to all the places of learning in Gaul, as there were many at that time; “and while he was thus passing up and down, he met with Julianus of Campania, whose wit and learning recommended him to Pelagius.” But this cannot hold, ^j for

^e Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 199. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 107.

^f Zosim. Hist. lib. 4. inter Sylburg. Rom. Hist. Scrip. Græc. Minor. tom. 3. p. 760. Camden. ibid. p. 57. comp. with p. 748. vol. 1. p. lx. comp. with vol. 3. p. 544. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 198. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 107. et De Primord. p. 1071.

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Add. p. 501.

^g See p. 183. note ^b. Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 198. cap. 15. p. 593. Add. p. 1071. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 106. 309. Add. p. 506. Camden. ibid.

^h Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 421. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 225.

ⁱ Leland. ibid.

^j See pp. 182, 183. and notes.

Pelagius lived a long time in Rome before his heresy was discovered: after the discovery of it, many years passed before Julian appeared in it. And in the last work of ^k St. Augustine, just before his death, he calls Julian ‘a young man,’ although he had been a ^l bishop in Campania, at a place called Æculanum, thence his title was ‘episcopus Eclanensis.’ The town stood, saith ^m Holstenius, near Mirabella; but since its destruction the see was removed to Frigento, and the bishop called ‘episcopus Frequentinus.’ If Pelagius, passing through Gaul, ⁿ made so long a stay in Rome, as St. Augustine saith, before he was suspected of heresy, there is no probability at all in the monkish tradition of his being abbot of Bangor: and there is not much more of Bangor’s being so famous a monastery at that time, 185 or of Pelagius’s being a monk therein: ^o for the British monasteries were no elder than St. Patrick’s time, as I may have occasion to shew afterwards. ^p And even at Rome itself the monastic state had not been long known there, being brought out of the east by Athanasius, and Eusebius of Vercelles. ^q And in Pelagius’s time, those were called ‘monks’ at Rome who had no office in the Church, but yet retired from the common employments of the world for sacred studies and devotion; and where any number of these lived together, that was called a monastery. Such was the ‘monasterium Pinneti’ mentioned by ^r Ruffinus, not far from Rome, probably a house of Melania, whither they were

^k Oper. tom. 10. Op. Imperfect. contra Julian. lib. 3. (n. 171. in Vignier. Suppl. t. 2. p. 155.) cap. 169. col. 1116. Vide Usser. de Primord. cap. 10. p. 288, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 158.

^l Usser. *ibid.*

^m Holsten. in Cluver. Ital. p. 1203. inter Annot. p. 273.

ⁿ See p. 183. note x.

^o See p. 205.

^p See Lloyd *ibid.* cap. 7. §. 5. p. 154. Camden. *ibid.* p. 457. vol. 2. p. 422.

^q Vide Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 210. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 113. Lloyd *ibid.* p. 155.

^r Ruffin. Opusc. p. 9.

went to retire in times of greater devotion. Garnerius confesses “that Pelagius was no otherwise a monk, than as those were then called so who led stricter lives than others within their own houses;” of which number he reckons Pammachius, Paulinus, Melania, Demetrias, and others at that time, to whom Pelagius was well known, and much esteemed by them, before his heresy was discovered. The chief employment of these persons, next to their devotions, was the study of the Scriptures, as appears by St. Jerome’s Epistles; and some grave person made it his business to instruct his disciples therein: so St. Jerome did at Bethlehem; so Ruffinus did Pammachius, Melania, and her family; and so Pelagius did at Rome, where he had scholars whom he brought up, as appears both by Cœlestius and Julianus, whom he instructed very young, and by ^s Timasius and Jacobus. From this employment it was that he wrote his ^t short Commentaries on St. Paul’s Epistles, and his Epistles to Melania and Demetrias; but after he was accused of heresy, his time was spent in vindication of himself in Africa, Asia, and Rome; and after many bandyings to and fro from want of understanding the meaning of Pelagius, ^u he was, besides the councils in Africa, at last condemned in a council at Antioch, under Theodotus, as ^x Marius Mercator shews; and from thenceforward ^y he spent the remainder of his life in obscurity, dying somewhere in the east.

^z From whence it appears, that there is no proba-

^s Usser. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 236. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 126.

p. 134, &c.

^x Mar. Mercat. in Comment.

^t Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. pp. 205. 212. cap. 9. pp. 216. 233. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 111. 114. 124.

cap. 3. p. 18.

^y Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 308. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 167.

^u Ibid. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 254, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.

^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 8. p. 215. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 116.

bility that Pelagius and Cœlestius should come back to
 186 Britain to spread their heresy here : for he complained
 of his age when he set forth his Commentaries at
 Rome, about A.D. 404 : and he was certainly in the
 east at the ^a council of Diospolis, A. D. 415, from
 whence ^b he sent Cœlestius to Rome, but ^c abode there
 himself with Albina, Pinianus, and Melania ; and wrote
 letters to clear himself, first to ^d Innocentius, and then
 to ^e Zosimus, who was so well satisfied therewith, that
^f he wrote a sharp letter to the African bishops (who
 had condemned him) in his vindication, severely tax-
 ing his accusers ; although there were heresy in that
 confession which Cœlestius tendered to Zosimus, and
 which he esteemed orthodox. And ^g St. Augustine is
 fain to make use of all his wit to bring the pope off
 from approving of heresy. ^h Hen. de Noris confesseth
 “ that he was circumvented by the Pelagians ; ” “ but
 it was in a matter of fact,” saith ⁱ Jansenius ; what,
 when he denied original sin in that very paper he
 delivered in to Zosimus ! ^k Cappellus thinks it better
 to deny Zosimus’s letter ; but therein he is condemned
 by ^l Petavius and others who have lately written about

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 242, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 129, &c. for the transactions of this council.

^b Usser. de Primord. cap. 10. p. 261. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 146.

^c Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 285. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 156.

^d Usser. de Primord. cap. 9. p. 252. cap. 10. pp. 265. 285. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 133. 147. 156.

^e Vide *ibid.*

^f Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 263. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 146.

^g Aug. de Peccat. Origin. cap.

6. ad Bonifac. lib. 2. cap. 3. Oper. tom. 10. col. 255. 434. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* pp. 264. 304. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 147. 164. See Du Pin de Antiq. Eccles. Discip. p. 348, &c. who agrees with Stillingfleet as to Zosimus and Augustine.

^h Noris Hist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 12. p. 78.

ⁱ Jansen. Hist. Pelag. p. 20. col. 1.

^k Cappell. de Appellat. cap. 2. §. 28. p. 51.

^l Petav. Dogm. Theol. tom. 2. de Hær. Pelag. cap. 1. §. 15. p. 593. Garner. Diss. 2. de Sy-

this matter, and say, "that Cappellus's opinion is singular and false," being contradicted by the testimonies of Marius Mercator, Facundus Hermianensis, and St. Augustine: and one of them blames the pope "for too great easiness," and the other "for too great hastiness," and doth think "that the business of appeals, then contested by the African bishops, stuck in the pope's stomach, which made him willing to take this occasion to rebuke them." But the ^m African fathers proceeding smartly against the Pelagians, notwithstanding Zosimus's letter, made him to comply too, in condemning both Cœlestius and Pelagius, notwithstanding his former epistle. So that upon the whole matter, Pelagius and Cœlestius by their own natural wit had, in all probability, been too hard for a whole succession of popes, Innocentius, Zosimus, and Sixtus, had not the African fathers interposed, and freely told them what the true doctrine of the Church was; for ⁿ they offered to subscribe Innocentius's epistles. Zosimus was very well satisfied, and thought them peevish and unreasonable that were not. ^o Sixtus was their patron at Rome, before the African bishops appeared so resolute in the cause. ^p And had it not been for them, for all that I can see, Pelagianism had spread with the approbation of the Roman see.

But notwithstanding it was at last condemned ^q at

nodis in Causa Pelag. inter Oper. Mar. Mercat. p. 203. Natal. Alex. ibid. sæc. 5. part. 1. p. 169. tom. 5. sæc. 5. cap. 3. §. 7. p. 39.

^m Usser. de Primord. cap. 10. pp. 268. 280. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 149. 154.

ⁿ Aug. ad Bonif. lib. 2. cap. 3. 4. Oper. tom. 10. col. 434, 435. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 262. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 146.

^o Aug. Ep. 104. Oper. tom. 2.

Ep. 191. col. 709. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 282. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 155.

^p In addition to the foregoing authorities, see Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles. tom. 3. pp. 281. 285. A. D. 417, 418. Du Pin ib. p. 172, &c.

^q See note ^m preceding. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 285. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 156.

Rome, and ^r imperial constitutions published against it; yet it found a way over into the British Churches, by the means of one Agricola, the son of Severianus, a Pelagian bishop, as ^s Prosper informs us. It appears by the rescript of ^t Valentinian III. A. D. 425, “there were several Pelagian bishops in Gaul.” And the severe execution of the edict there was probably the occasion of this Agricola’s coming over hither and spreading that doctrine here. ^u Bale and ^x Pits run into many mistakes about this Agricola. 1. They call him Leporius Agricola, and then confound the two stories of Leporius and Agricola together: for after his preaching Pelagianism, they mention his conversion and recantation by St. Augustine’s means. Now there was one Leporius of whom ^y Cassian and ^z Gennadius speak, that was a disciple of Pelagius, who was driven out of Gaul by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, and Cylinnius of Forum Julii, and so went into Africa, where being convinced by St. Augustine, he published his recantation extant in ^a Sirmondus’s Gallican Councils, and elsewhere; and Aurelius, Augustinus and Florentius, gave an account of it to the bishops of Provence; but there is no Pelagian error there mentioned, but something of Nestorianism: and by Leontius succeeding

^r Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* pp. 271, &c. 295. 301, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 150, &c. 161. 163, &c.

^s Prosper. in Chron. Florent. et Dionys. Cons. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 400. Usser. de Primord. c. 11. p. 320. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 172. Camden. *ibid.* as in note ^m, p. 194.

^t Concil. Gall. tom. 1. p. 54. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 313. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 169.

^u Bal. de Scrip. Brit. cent. 1.

n. 45. p. 44. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 321, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 173.

^x Pits de illust. Angliæ Script. æt. 5. n. 34. p. 87.

^y Cassian. de Incarn. lib. 1. cap. 4. in Oper. p. 968. For this and the following notes ^z, ^a, ^e, Usser. *ibid.*

^z Gennad. de Script. cap. 59. in Hieron. Oper. tom. 5. col. 39. cap. 60.

^a Sirmond. Concil. Gall. t. 1. p. 51.

Cylinnius in his see, before A.D. 420, it follows, that Leporius recanted before the Pelagian heresy was spread into these parts; and therefore this Leporius could have nothing to do in it: besides, it seems probable that this Leporius, after his recantation, continued in Africa; for one Leporius, a presbyter, is ^b mentioned in the election of Eradius in the see of Hippo, A.D. 426, and ^c St. Augustine saith, “ he was a stranger.” 2. ^d Bale makes him the son of Severus Sulpicius, a Pelagian priest in Britain: but Prosper and Bede say, he was the son of Severianus, a bishop. It is true ^e Gennadius charges Severus Sulpicius with Pelagianism in his old age; but if he died, as the ^f Sammarthani say, A. D. 410, Pelagianism was not ¹⁸⁸ known to the world then; and ^g Guibertus Abbas frees him from the imputation of it: but this Severus never was a bishop, and therefore could not be the father of Agricola. 3. ^h They both make him a monk of Bangor; which had need to have been a large place to receive all that they send thither. 4. They say he did write against one ⁱ Timotheus, a British heretic; “ two books,” saith Bale; “ but one,” saith Pits; which arises from a mistake of ^k Sigebert’s copy, where Britannia is put for Bithynia, as our learned archbishop Usher hath observed: and Pits seemed to have some mistrust of

^b Aug. Ep. 110. Oper. tom. 2. p. 147. Vide t. 2. n. 25. col. 15. col. 788. ^g Apud Bolland. Acta Sanct.

^c Aug. Serm. 50. de diversis. Jan. 29. §. 2. n. 13. p. 968. Oper. t. 5. serm. 356. col. 1388. ^h Usser. de Primord. ibid.

^d For Bale and Bede, Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 17, here quoted, p. 323. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Usser. ibid. p. 174.

^e Gennad. de Script. cap. 19. p. 318. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. in Hieron. Oper. tom. 5. col. 32. p. 172.

^f Gall. Christ. tom. 1. n. 24. ^k Quoted by Camden. ibid. p. 60. vol. 1. p. lxxiii.

this, for he doth not affirm his spreading his doctrine in Britain as the other doth.

But Pelagianism was not spread here by Agricola alone: for ^lProsper, speaking of Celestine's care to root it out of Britain, he saith, "it had taken possession here by the enemies of God's grace, 'solum suæ originis occupantes,' returning to the soil from whence they sprang:" so that there were more than one, and those Britons who, being infected with that heresy themselves, did return hither to infect others. From hence ^msome have thought that Cœlestius at least, if not Pelagius, did come hither, being driven out of Italy by Celestine; as ⁿProsper relates: which Jansenius thought not improbable: but it now appears by the Commitorium of Marius Mercator delivered to Theodosius in the consulship of Dionysius and Florentius, i. e. A. D. 429, that Cœlestius did return into the east, and was banished from Constantinople by the emperor's edict; from whence it follows, that Cœlestius came not into these parts; nor do we read what became of him after the council of Ephesus, wherein he was condemned by two hundred and seventy-five bishops, as the same Marius Mercator shews. Whose account of these things, being a person of that time, and active in this cause, hath cleared several things, which were much in the dark before.

But whosoever they were who brought Pelagianism hither, it appears by Prosper that they were ^oBritons,

^l Prosper. c. Coll. c. 41. in p. 27. col. 2. See p. 180.
 Oper. tom. 1. p. 197. Usser. de ⁿ Usser. de Primord. ibid.
 Primord. ibid. p. 320. Brit. p. 308. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.
 Eccles. Antiq. p. 172. Lloyd p. 167.
 ibid. cap. 2. §. 4. pp. 51. 55. ^o See note ^l above, and in ad-
 Camden. ibid. p. 729. vol. 3. dition, Camden, p. 60. vol. 1.
 p. 466. p. lxiii.

^m Jansen. Hist. Pelag. lib. 1.

and had too great success here by the spreading of Pelagianism. But care was taken by the sounder part to get it out; and therefore distrusting their own sufficiency to deal with such subtle adversaries, “they send 189 for help,” saith ^p Bede, “to the bishops of Gaul, who called a great council, and unanimously chose Germanus and Lupus,” two bishops of great reputation, to come over on purpose. They readily undertook the employment, and performed it with great success, as it is at large related by ^q Constantius and Bede. It is affirmed by a late ^r author, “that the acts of the council which sent Germanus and Lupus are still in being, with the instructions given them at their coming hither:” if ever they come to light, they will very much clear this intricate part of the history of the British Churches. For there is now ^s fifteen years difference among writers about the time of their coming. Prosper saith it was A. D. 429; but Sigebert, as ^t Sirmondus observes, places it A. D. 446, to which he thinks Bede’s relation doth best agree; and Sirmondus himself puts it that year Aetius III. and Symmachus were consuls, in the twenty-first of Valentinian III. and fifth of Leo I. If this computation of the time be true, then it is impossible that St. German should be sent hither by

^p Bed. lib. 1. cap. 17. p. 54. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 320. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 173.

^q Constant. Vit. Germani. De Vitis Sanctorum, tom. 4. p. 129. col. 1. Usser. de Primord. ibid. pp. 326. 332. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 176. 179. Bed. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 17, 18, 19. pp. 54. 56.

^r Garner. diss. 2. cap. 21. inter Oper. Marii Mercator. p. 231.

^s On this diversity of dates, consult Usser. de Primord. ibid.

pp. 320. 325. 335. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 172. 175. 180. Bedæ Chronicon sive De sex Ætatibus, p. 27. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 17. et not. p. 54.

^t Sirmond. Not. in Concil. Gall. tom. 1. p. 86, where there is no mention of Sigebert. In Smith’s edition of Bede’s Eccles. Hist. n. 9. p. 54. on b. 1. ch. 17, Sirmond speaks of the date, 429, as an interpolation; and that Celestine had nothing to do with Germanus’ and Lupus’ coming into Britain.

Celestine, as Prosper affirms; for "Sixtus was pope after Celestine, A. D. 432. And it is incredible, that if he had been sent hither by commission from him, neither ^x Constantius in his *Life of St. German*, who lived so near that time, nor the author of the *Life of St. Lupus Trecensis*, nor ^y Bede should take any notice of it. But they all mention the particular application made by the Britons to the Gallican bishops for their assistance; and their meeting in council on purpose, and choosing and dispatching St. German and Lupus, without any intimation of Celestine. ^z Baronius and ^a Jansenius go about to reconcile these things, by saying, "either that the pope approved him whom the council chose; or that the pope left it to the council to choose:" but neither of these will hold. For ^b Prosper saith, "that Celestine sent him, 'vice sua,' in his own name and stead;" which is very different from appointing a council to choose one to be sent: and ^c Constantius saith, "that immediately they went;" which shews they did not stay for the pope's approbation. And withal, the kindness was not so great at that time between
190 Celestine and the Gallican bishops, that either he should send to them to appoint, or they should wait for his direction in this matter. For Prosper and Hilary had made great complaints of them at Rome, as favouring Pelagianism too much. And, among these, Hilary, bishop of Arles, was the chief. For ^d Prosper complains

^u Lloyd *ibid.* c. 2. §. 4. p. 55. and note.

^x Usser. de Primord. p. 323. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 174.

^y See note P above.

^z Baron. A. D. 429. n. 10. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 324. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 174.

^a Jansen. *Hist. Pelag. lib.* 1. p. 28. col. 2.

^b Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* pp. 320. 323. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* pp. 172. 174.

^c Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 326. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 176.

^d Prosper. *Ep. ad Aug. inter Aug. Epist.* 225. in Prosper. *Oper. tom.* 1. p. 8. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 344. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 186.

of him particularly in his epistle to St. Augustine, which was sent to him A.D. 428, or 429, ^e as the late editors of St. Augustine's Epistles conclude; so that Hilary was bishop of Arles at that time before St. Augustine's death, A.D. 430. ^f After his death, the same Prosper and another Hilary join in a complaint to Celestine, and went to Rome on purpose; as appears by his ^g answer, who therein reproves the bishops of Gaul, "for giving too much countenance to some presbyters who vented new doctrines," viz. Cassian and his followers; "and who reflected on the memory of St. Augustine." It is not therefore any ways probable that the Gallican bishops, having been complained of so long before St. Augustine's death, that he wrote a book in answer to them before he died, should be intrusted by Celestine to choose persons to go over into Britain to confute Pelagianism, when he suspected them, from Prosper's information, to be too much inclined to it. It seems therefore most likely that St. German and Lupus were sent by a council of Gallican bishops, without the pope's concurrence, since Constantius, who certainly knew all the circumstances of this matter, saith nothing at all of it. And this ^h St. German was so great with Hilary, bishop of Arles, that he joined with him in the deposing Chelidonius (for which pope Leo was so incensed against him) as Honoratus affirms in his Life: which was no new acquaintance, but of so long standing, that if Hilary of Arles were at that time suspected at Rome, St. German would hardly have

^e The Benedictine edition of Augustine's Works, tom. 2. col. 820. 824.

^f Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 347. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 186.

^g Sirmond. Concil. Gall. t. 1.

p. 59. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 360. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 194.

^h Vide Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 382. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 204. See ch. 5. p. 316.

been pitched upon by Celestine for his legate into Britain.

I wonder how ⁱ Baronius and ^k Vossius came to mistake the Hilary who joined with Prosper, for Hilary bishop of Arles; since this Hilary never was a disciple of St. Augustine's, as the other was; and he was certainly bishop of Arles, after St. Augustine's death, when ^l Celestine mentions the other Hilary as present
191 with Prosper at Rome, when they informed against the bishops of Gaul. ^m For Honoratus succeeded Patroclus in the see of Arles; Prosper saith, that Patroclus was killed, A. D. 426. Honoratus continued but two years in the see: and so ⁿ Hilary might well be newly bishop of Arles, when Prosper and the other Hilary sent to St. Augustine, as plainly appears by their epistle; so that Semipelagianism did not, as archbishop ^o Usher supposes, then begin in Gaul, when St. Germanus and Lupus were here employed against Pelagianism, but was begun before, and embraced by those very bishops who sent them hither; who for their own vindication appeared zealous against Pelagianism, and were therefore willing to embrace this opportunity to send two of their number into Britain. And it is the more strange, that so learned a person should fall into this mistake, when he had so fully proved, as ^p Holstenius confesses, that Hilary, bishop of Arles, did favour the Semipelagians; and it is certain that Prosper did complain of him to St. Augustine (if the copies be not corrupt, as

ⁱ Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 426. n. 20.

^k Voss. *Hist. Pelag.* lib. 1.

cap. 19. p. 70.

^l See note g above.

^m Usser. de *Primord.* cap. 11.

p. 313. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.*

p. 169.

ⁿ Usser. de *Primord.* *ibid.*

p. 347. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 187.

^o Usser. de *Primord.* cap. 11.

p. 344. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.*

p. 185.

^p Holsten. *Animad. ad Martyr.*

Rom. p. 283. Vide Usser. de

Primord. p. 346. *Brit. Eccles.*

Antiq. p. 186.

he shews they are not) before St. German's voyage into Britain. For ^q St. Augustine received the complaint time enough to write his two books of Predestination and Perseverance, in answer to it, after his book of Retractations, and before his elaborate work against Julian, and therefore they are probably supposed to be written, A. D. 428. If we then yield that St. German's coming hither was when Prosper saith, A. D. 429, yet we find that Semipelagianism had prevailed among the Gallican bishops before that time, or else there was no cause at all for Prosper's complaint.

And to make it appear yet more improbable, that Celestine should send St. Germanus and St. Lupus; we are to consider, that ^r Lupus was brother to Vincentius Lirinensis, and were both of the same society. Which ^s Vincentius was a great stickler in the Semipelagian cause, as all the members of that society that were considerable were engaged in it; and when the pope wrote so smartly against the accusers of St. Augustine's doctrine, it is very unlikely he should pitch upon one of that society most suspected for it, and whose brother appeared so early and so warmly in it; not only by the 192 objections under his name in Prosper; but by the whole design of his ^t Commonitorium; which, if I mistake not, was levelled against those who went about to broach a new doctrine about predestination, as they said, under St. Augustine's name. And they who carefully read

^q Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 349, compared with p. 312. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 187, with p. 169.

^r Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 325. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 175.

^s Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 367. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 198. *Voss. Hist. Pelag. lib. 1.*

cap. 9. p. 39. *Basnag. Annal. Politico-Eccles. tom. 2. dissert. nona. n. 33, 34. p. 554. tom. 3. A. D. 434. n. 10, 11, 12. pp. 377-378. 379.*

^t *Stillingfleet's Rational Account, part 1. chap. 3. §. 10-13. ch. 6. §. 6. ch. 9. §. 8. in his collected Works, vol. 4. pp. 88. 163. 269.*

over that discourse, and consider the drift of it, will find I am not mistaken: but ^u Baronius is, when he would clear the author of the *Commonitorium* from favouring those who impugned St. Augustine's doctrine about predestination; which was quite another thing from ^x favouring Pelagianism, which Cassianus Faustus, and this Vincentius all professed to abhor.

But what shall be said to ^y Prosper, who affirms "that Celestine sent St. German?" 1. ^z Prosper, in his undoubted work against Cassian, doth not affirm it. For there he only saith, "that Celestine took care to free Britain from Pelagianism." Why is not the mission of St. German here mentioned, when it had been most seasonable against the chief of the Semipelagians? No doubt Prosper would not have lost this opportunity of magnifying Celestine's care, by sending bishops of so great reputation. Especially, if these bishops were not Semipelagians; but if so, why doth he not mention them in that work as such, when he complains how much Semipelagianism did prevail, and even among their bishops? 2. The Prosper published by Pithœus never mentions it, which he thought to be the genuine *Chronicon* of Prosper. ^a Hadrianus Valesius concludes one or the other not to be genuine; since they differ in point of time, and it is not probable the same man would write two several books about the same matter with such diversity. ^b Bucherius thinks it impossible the same person should write both; yet both pass under the name of Tyro Prosper; and so he saith the ancient MS. of it, which he had (which was like that ^c Pontacus

^u Baron. Not. ad Martyrol. 24. Maii, p. 322. Baron. Annal. Eccles. A.D. 431. n. 180.

^x Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 358. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 193.

^y See p. 188.

^z Prosper. c. Cass. ad fin. in Oper. tom. 1. p. 197.

^a Rer. Franc. lib. 3. p. 102.

^b Doctr. Tem. cap. 12. p. 212.

^c Pontac. Appar. p. 28. ad Chronica, &c. where the word is *Lodonense*.

calls Lodunense) had that name in the title of it; but Pontacus's had the title of Prosper Aquitanus, where he is said to be "episcopus Regini," and great debate hath been, whether he was bishop of Regium Lepidum in Italy, or of Regium (Riez) in Gaul; but ^dSirmondus 193 proves, "he was neither one nor the other;" by the testimonies of Gennadius, Victorius, Marcellinus, and others; and by Faustus immediately succeeding Maximus in that see: and so leaving no room for Prosper between them. But there was a Prosper, bishop of Orleans at that time; and another Prosper, bishop of Regium Lepidum in Italy, as ^eUghellus shews, which might occasion the mistake: but, besides these, ^fSirmondus tells us, there was another Prosper in Gaul who wrote a Chronicon too, and ended at the same time with Tyro Prosper; with this difference, that the one was only an appendix to St. Jerome, the other an entire Chronicon, as Gennadius expresses it. Which is supposed to be that published by Labbe out of several MSS. But ^gthose who have carefully examined it have found such a difference in the computation used in the several parts of it, that they cannot think them written by the same author; and therefore conclude that published by Pithœus to be the genuine Chronicon of Prosper, as far as it reaches; and that the first part, which should make it entire, is not yet discovered. So that it remains uncertain whether this passage be in the true Prosper or not. Our ^hlearned primate of Armagh was of opinion, "that the Chronicon published by Pithœus was not written by Prosper, but by Genna-

^d Sirmond. Not. ad Sidon. inter Oper. tom. 4. col. 411, 412.
 Apoll. lib. 8. ep. 15. inter Oper. ^g Le Cointe Annal. Eccles.
 Sirmond. tom. 1. col. 1085, 1086. Franc. A. D. 455. n. 7. p. 78.
^e Ughell. Ital. Sacr. tom. 2. A. D. 433. n. 18. p. 68.
^f p. 299. ^h Usser. de Primord. cap. 13.
^f Sirmond. Hist. Prædest. c. 5. p. 429. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 231.

dius ;” because Boston of Bury saith, “ that Gennadius added a Chronicon to St. Jerome.” And, I confess, the passage in it about the heresy of the Prædestinati doth better agree with Gennadius than Prosper ; and for that reason Sirmondus hath found out another Prosper. But the president ⁱ Mauguin saith, “ it was counterfeited by the Semipelagians in Prosper’s name ; and that there is no mention in any authors of another Prosper who published a Chronicon, which ended at the time the true Prosper did, viz. A. D. 444.” Sirmondus saith, “ all the ancient copies had the name of Prosper upon them.” And it is so quoted by Sigebert ; but if he had a mind to pass for the other Prosper, he would never have differed so materially as he doth from him. So that this whole matter is very dark and obscure yet. 3. Suppose it be granted that Prosper wrote so, yet there is greater reason to believe Constantius than Prosper in this matter. For Constantius was not only living in that age ; but a person of great reputation, as appears by Sidonius Apollinaris’s epistles to him ; and one that wrote with great fidelity, saith ^k Baronius ; and therefore it cannot be supposed that he should not expressly set down by whom St. German was sent into Britain. Besides, ^l Constantius is not alone ; but the author of the Life of St. Lupus gives the same account ; and so doth Bede, (with whom Paulus Diaconus, Freculphus, Erricus, and Ado Viennensis agree,) and he places their coming after the reign of Theodosius ; and therefore it was impossible that Celestine should send them.

St. Germanus and Lupus being thus employed by the bishops of Gaul, in a solemn conference at ^m Verulam

ⁱ Maug. Hist. et Chronic. Dissert. p. 519.

^k Baron. *ibid.* A.D. 429. n. 9.

^l See p. 189, and note x.

^m Matt. West. *ibid.* A.D. 446.

p. 80. Usser. de Primordi. cap. 11. p. 328. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 176. Camden. *ibid.* p. 293. vol. 1. p. 337.

they disputed with the Pelagians; and had so great success therein, and by their preaching up and down in many places, “that they left the Britons well settled,” as they supposed, “in the ancient faith.” But no sooner were they returned, but ⁿ some of the Pelagians got ground again; which occasioned another message to St. German, who then took with him ^o Severus, bishop of Triers; and then they prevailed so far as to procure the banishment of these heretical teachers, according to the edict of Valentinian; and from thenceforward Bede observes “that the British Churches continued sound and orthodox.”

But here it will be proper to consider how justly two British bishops have been charged with Pelagianism; the one is Fastidius, and the other Faustus.

As to Fastidius, ^p Leland confesses, “that his memory had been lost, but for the mention which Gennadius makes of him;” ^q who saith of him, “that he was ‘Britannorum episcopus;’ and wrote a book to one Fatalis, ‘De vita beata,’ wherein the doctrine was very sound and good.” ^r Trithemius highly commends him, “as a man of great wit and eloquence, an excellent preacher, and very pious man.” ^s Bale saith, “that, being made bishop, he preached over all Britain, and was, as is reported, metropolitan of London:” what Bale speaks upon report, ^t Pits affirms with confidence, that he was archbishop of London. ^u Archbishop Usher 195

ⁿ Usser. *ibid.* in Præfat.

Camden. *ibid.* p. 58. vol. 1. p. lxi.

^o Bed. lib. 1. cap. 21. p. 57. Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 381. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 204.

^r Trithem. Script. Eccles. p. 65.

^s Bal. cent. 1. n. 41. p. 40.

^p Leland. Comment. de Script. Britan. (in Fastidio) p. 32.

^t Pit. de illust. Script. Angl. æt. 5. n. 30. p. 86.

^q Gen. Catalog. inter Hieron. Oper. tom. 5. p. 39. See note ^u, below, for this and notes ^r ^s ^t.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 317. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 171.

thinks, they had no other ground for this, but a different reading in Gennadius, ‘*Britanniarum episcopus.*’ “From whence they concluded, he must be archbishop of London, that being, as they supposed, the metropolis of Britain; but he rather inclines to the opinion of Berterius, ^x that York was then the metropolis of Britain; not only because it was a ^y Roman colony, but because the prætorium and emperor’s palace was there.” ^z But these arguments are not sufficient to overthrow London’s being the chief metropolis of the Roman times. For every ^a province had its metropolis; and the superiority of one metropolis above another depended on the residence of the Roman governor, the ‘*vicarius Britanniarum.*’ I grant that in the time of the wars with the northern Britons, York was the chief seat of the emperor when he was here, as in the times of ^b Severus and Constantius; but that was for the conveniency of attending the wars, and being near to give directions and send supplies. But the preeminence of places in the Roman account did depend more upon the civil than the military officers; these being more uncertain than the other, and where the supreme court of judicature was, that was the chief metropolis, and that was where the supreme governor of those provinces had his residence. Thus every province had a president in the metropolis; but where there was a superior officer over these presidents, as the ‘*vicarius Britanniarum*’ was over the five provinces, the place of his residence was the highest metropolis, because the presidents’ courts were in subordination to his, whether they were

^x Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 97. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 52.

^y See ch. 2. p. 74, note g, as to Roman colonies and municipia; and as to York, Camden. Brit. p. 572. vol. 3. p. 9.

^z See p. 196, and note d.

^a See ch. 2. p. 76, and notes.

^b Camden. *ibid.* pp. 49. 572. vol. 1. p. li. vol. 3. p. 10. See ch. 2. p. 74. note i.

consular or presidial; and therefore the solemn ‘conventus’ out of the provinces were appointed there. Of these things we have a clear instance in the case of Arles, where by the constitution of ‘Honorius, “the seven provinces, over which that was the metropolis, were to have an annual assembly there,” where the chief magistrate resided; and the reasons there given are, the great conveniency of that city being upon the river Rhone, both for other business and trading into all parts. The same reasons will hold to make London the chief metropolis in the Roman times, because of its 196 admirable situation for trade and commerce, and the opportunity of sending into, or receiving dispatches from the foreign provinces and the emperor’s court wherever it was. So that I see no reason to question London’s being the chief metropolis among the Romans. The argument from York’s being a colony signifies nothing after Antoninus gave the ‘jus civitatis’ to the whole empire; and London was a colony before York, (^d as I may shew elsewhere,) and of a higher nature, when it was called ‘Augusta, which shews that it was then the imperial city of Britain, that name being given to no other city in Britain besides. And it is observed by the learned ^f Marc. Velserus, “that those cities which had the title of ‘Augusta’ conferred upon them were the ‘capita gentium,’ the chief metropolises of the provinces;” and since by the general rule of the Church, the ecclesiastical government did follow the civil, there is no reason to question, but if Fastidius were then

^c Sirmond. Not. ad Sidon. Apollin. pp. 245. 147. not. inter Sirmond. Oper. tom. I. col. 1257, 1258.

^d Stillingleet’s Discourse of the true Antiquity of London, in his Works, vol. 3. p. 914.

^e Am. Marcel. *ibid.* lib. 27. 8. *ibid.* 28. 3. pp. 383. 406. Camden. *ibid.* p. 305. vol. 2. p. 4. Usser. de Primord. cap. 7. p. 169. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 90.

^f Vels. Rer. Vindel. lib. 5. inter Oper. p. 255.

bishop of London, he was ^g the chief metropolitan over the Churches of Britain.

But whether Fastidius were metropolitan, or only a British bishop, his doctrine is of late charged to be inclinable to Pelagianism. For Holstenius found in ancient MS. the book Fastidius wrote “De Vita Christiana” with his name to it, and so published it; but it is not directed “ad Fatalem,” but to a certain widow. In this book a late ^h Augustinian hath discovered, as he thinks, some tincture of Pelagianism; but to any candid reader his exceptions will appear very frivolous, and there is so much of true primitive Christianity in the rest of it, as makes good the character which Gennadius and Trithemius give of him. Out of which book, and no great one, ⁱ Bale hath made four; one “De Vita Christiana,” a second “De Doctrina Spiritûs.” a third “De Viduitate servanda,” a fourth, “Admonitiones Piaæ.” Pits keeps the same number, but lest he should seem to take all out of Bale, he alters the title of one of them; and because Gennadius saith his doctrine was “Deo digna,” therefore Pits, very artificially, makes the title of his second book to be “De Doctrina Deo digna vel spirituali.” Boston of Bury makes him the author of two books, by mistaking Gennadius; but as far as 197 we can find, there is but one extant. ^k Dempster hath found “Fastidius to have been born upon the mountains of the western parts of Scotland,” and he makes him

^g Wharton. Hist. de Episc. Londin. p. 61. Wharton's Anglia Sacra, vol. 1. p. 65. Twysden. Decem Script. col. 1685. For an interesting argument on the metropolitical rights of Britain in the first ages, see Stillingfleet's Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, part 2. ch. 5. §. 16. in his

Works, vol. 4. p. 397.

^h Hen. de Noris, Hist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 19. p. 124.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 317. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 171. Tanner. *ibid.* under Fastidius.

^k Dempster. Hist. Eccles. l. 6. n. 530. Usser. *ibid.*

author of a fifth book called “Chronicon Scotorum,” which is a strain beyond Pits. He positively affirms, that he lived A. D. 440. Trithemius saith, about A. D. 420.

As to Faustus, his case is much harder. That he was originally a Briton I find not denied by any; for although ^l Facundus calls him a Gaul, yet that was because of his being a bishop so long there, as Sirmondus observes; he being “ortu Britannus, habitaculo Regiensis,” as ^m Alcimus Avitus saith, in his epistle to Gundobadus, king of the Burgundians, “to whom,” he saith, “Faustus was known.” In his ⁿ epistles to Ruricius, Faustus speaks of his living in a “state of banishment, and the comforts he found in it;” this our learned ^o primate understood of his living “out of his own country;” but ^p Hen. de Noris, “of a banishment by Euaricus an Arian king then in Gaul, which he supposes he underwent for writing against the Arians.” If he had produced any testimony of such banishment, there might have been reason to have understood his expression so; but since there is none, and his words are general as to his country, I see no cause to take them in any other sense. For men do not use to call that their country where they live as strangers, and he speaks of the kindness of Ruricius so to him, that he did “patriam in peregrinatione facere,” which cannot well bear any other sense, than that he made up “the want of his own country to him.” ^q Sirmondus grants

^l Facund. contra Mocian. p. 562. Usser. de Primord. c. 13. p. 439. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 236, for this and notes ^m and ⁿ.
^m Alc. Avit. ep. 4. p. 35. in Sirmond. Opusc. var. tom. 2.
ⁿ Canis. Antiquæ Lect. tom. 5. p. 435.

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. p. 439. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 236.
^p Noris Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 16. p. 297.
^q Sirmond. Not. ad Facund. p. 562. inter Sirmond. Oper. t. 2. col. 825, 826. Usser. ibid.

he was a Briton, but he adds, "he was one of those
^r Britons who dwelt upon the Loire," i. e. in the parts of
 Aremorica. There is no question, but in the time of
 Faustus, there were great numbers of Britons there; for
^s Jornandes saith, "that Riothamus, their king or
 general, went with twelve thousand Britons against
 Euricus, king of the Visigoths." Which Riothamus
^t Sidonius Apollinaris writes to, and mentions the
 "Britons with him;" but it may be justly a question,
 whether there were any colonies of Britons on the con-
 tinent, before Faustus's birth; for ^u Faustus was made
 abbot of Lerins before the Saxons came first into
 198 Britain; for he was abbot when St. Caprasius died, as
 the author of his Life affirms, which was about A. D.
 430. But their coming was not till A. D. 449, and it
 will be hard to make out ^x any settlement of the Britons
 on the Loire before. It is then most probable that
 Faustus went at first out of Britain into Gaul, where
 he attained to a wonderful reputation both for piety
 and learning. "He was worshipped as a saint," saith
^y Noris, "in the Church of Riez," and his name was
 preserved in the Calendar of the Gallican Church.
 Molanus was the first who durst adventure to strike
 out his name; Baronius followed him, but upon admo-
 nition restored it, as ^z Bollandus observes, who likewise
 takes notice, that he was called a saint by Cl. Robertus,
 by Ferrarius, and by Pet. Galesinius, in his Martyrology,

^r See chap. 5. p. 351.

^s Jornand. cap. 45. p. 111.
 inter Grut. Hist. August. Script.
 Latin. See chap. 5. *ibid.* for this
 and the following note.

^t Sidon. Apoll. lib. 3. ep. 9.
 inter Oper. p. 73. et not. Sir-
 mond. p. 40. inter Oper. Sir-
 mond. tom. 1. col. 919, 920.
 Usser. de Primord. c. 12. p. 423.

Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 226.

^u Usser. de Primord. cap. 11.
 p. 343. cap. 12. p. 424. Brit.
 Eccles. Antiq. pp. 185. 229.

^x See chap. 5. *ibid.*

^y Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 16.
 p. 297.

^z Acta Sanct. ad 16 Jan. n. 3-
 5. p. 28.

who adds, "that his books are piously and learnedly written, and that miracles are said to be wrought by him." It is certain he was a person in mighty esteem in his own time, as appears by the passages of ^a Sidonius Apollinaris, of ^b Ruricius, and others, concerning both his eloquence, learning, and piety. Of whom Sidonius Apollinaris gives that excellent character, "that he had learnt to speak better than he was taught, and to live better than he spake:" ^c he was bishop of Riez, A.D. 462, for at that time he was joined with Auxanius in determining the controversy between Leontius of Arles and Mamertus of Vienne. But nothing can more manifest the esteem he was then in among the Gallican bishops, than that in the council of Arles he was pitched upon as the fittest person to draw up their sense in the great points then so much agitated about predestination and grace, as appears by his ^d preface to Leontius. ^e At this council thirty bishops were present, and there Lucidus presented his recantation of the errors he held about predestination, and after this Faustus wrote his books of Grace and Free-will, to which, he saith, another council at Lyons caused some things to be added. In these books it is thought that, under a pretence of confuting those errors, he sets himself against St. Augustine's doctrine, as seems clear by one expression in his first book, "^f that if it be true that some are predestinated to life, and others to de-

^a Sidon. Apoll. Oper. lib. 9. ep. 3. 9. et in Euchar. ad Faust. pp. 252. 262. 385. inter Sirmond. Oper. t. 1. col. 1092, &c. 1099, &c. 1267. Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. pp. 424. 426. 438, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 229. 235.

^b Ruric. Epist. lib. 1. ep. 2. in Biblioth. Patrum, tom. 8. p. 560.

^c Usser. *ibid.*

^d Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 424. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 229.

^e Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 434. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 234.

^f Voss. Histor. Pelag. lib. 6. thes. 14. p. 618.

struction, ‘ut quidam sanctorum dixit, non judicandi nascimur, sed judicati:’” but these words may refer to what follows, as well as to what went before, “as a certain holy man hath said, We are not born to be judged, but we are judged before we are born.” According to which doctrine, saith Faustus, “there can be no equity in the day of judgment.”

§ It hath been a great question among some learned men, whether there were any persons who drew ill consequences from St. Augustine’s doctrine, and were therefore opposed by Faustus and others, or whether it were the mere doctrine of St. Augustine that was so opposed by them, and urged with those consequences as following from it. I see no reason to deny, that the Semipelagians did charge the followers of St. Augustine with the same things which are made the opinions of those who are called the “predestinarian heretics” by ^h Sigebert, Gennadius, Hincmarus, and others. But yet that there were certain persons who did own such bad consequences as the overthrowing the liberty of man’s will and the necessity of our endeavours, will appear from these two reasons. 1. St. Augustine’s doctrine was so misunderstood by some in his lifetime, as appears by the controversy amongst the Adrumetine monks. The case was this; Florus, one of that society, going to Uzala, a city near Utica, between Hippo and Carthage, where Euodius was then bishop, a friend of St. Augustine’s, there met with ⁱSt. Augustine’s large Epistle to Sixtus against the Pelagians, which being sent home, and Florus himself going to Carthage, before his return they were fallen into

§ Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* pp. 160. p. 434, attached to Parr’s 429. 434. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Life of Usher.

pp. 231. 234.

ⁱ Valent. ad Aug. ep. 216.

^h Usser. *ibid.* See Letters 159, Oper. tom. 2. col. 797.

great heats upon the occasion of that epistle. “Some of them,” as ^jSt. Augustine himself saith, “did so preach up the grace of God, as to deny freewill, and consequently to say, that God in the day of judgment would not render to men according to their works:” others said, “that our freewill was assisted by the grace of God, that we may know and do the things that are right; that the Lord, when he comes to render to every man according to their works, may find our works good, which he hath prepared that we may walk in them. And they,” saith he, “who judge thus do judge rightly.” Therefore those who thought other-²⁰⁰ wise did mistake his doctrine; for, as he saith, “if there be no grace, there can be no salvation; if there be no freewill, there can be no day of judgment.” To what purpose is all this, if some of these did not so misunderstand his doctrine as to overthrow all liberty of will in mankind? And so ^kEuodius, in his answer to those Adrumetine monks, shews “that there is still freewill in us, but wounded by the fall, and only recoverable by the grace of Christ.” ^lJansenius “grants that they did misunderstand St. Augustine’s doctrine, thinking that freewill was wholly destroyed by it; and that no man ought to be reprov’d when he doeth amiss, but that others ought to pray that he may have grace to do better.” But the president ^mMauguin will not allow this; for he saith, “that St. Augustine was at first falsely informed of the state of the controversy among them by Cresconius and Felix; but after Florus’s coming he found they were

^j Aug. ad Valent. ep. 214. Oper. tom. 2. col. 791.

^l Jansen. Hist. Pelag. lib. 1. p. 27. col. 2. lib. 7. cap. 1. p. 161.

^k Hist. Prædest. cap. 1. inter Sirmond. Oper. tom. 4. col. 401,

^m Prædest. Fab. confut. cap. 1. p. 451, &c.

Semipelagians who misunderstood his doctrine." But to what purpose then doth ⁿSt. Augustine take such pains to prove even in the book he wrote after the coming of Florus, "that there is freewill still left in mankind?" "Liberum itaque arbitrium confitendum nos est habere, et ad malum, et ad bonum faciendum." Not so as to exclude "the necessity of divine grace," as he proves at large, "but yet in such a manner as to shew its consistency with divine commands, and the just reproof and punishment of those who do amiss^o." Which shews plainly, that he thought there were some still who misinterpreted his doctrine, not barely to object against it, but to make ill use of it. Therefore ^pNoris had no reason to conclude that the error of the Adrumetine monks was Semipelagianism. 2. It appears evidently from the case of Lucidus, and the councils of Arles and Lyons. I grant that the objections mentioned by Prosper and Hilary were made by the Semipelagians, and not by any predestinarian heretics at that time in Gaul; and therein ^qSirmondus was certainly mistaken, as he was likewise, when he saith, "that the epistle of Celestine was against the latter and not against the former." But it appears by Faustus's epistle to ^rLucidus, that there were some who did so assert predestination as to make all men's
201 endeavours vain and useless; and this dangerous error he renounced in his recantation delivered to the council of Arles. ^sMauguin is very hard put to it when he saith, "that all these things were the mere invention

ⁿ De Corrept. et Grat. cap. 1. Oper. tom. 10. col. 751.

^o Ibid. cap. 4. 14. 15. 16. Oper. tom. 10. col. 752. 774. 775, &c.

^p Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 15. p. 281.

^q Hist. Prædest. cap. 2. 3. inter Sirmond. Oper. tom. 4. col. 403-407.

^r See p. 198. note e.

^s Prædest. Fab. confut. cap. 7. p. 546.

of Faustus ;” whom he makes to be countryman with Pelagius and Cœlestius, and “to have sucked in the poison of Pelagianism with his milk.” He grants that he was famous for his wit, eloquence, and philosophy ; but especially for a profound cunning, which † Isidore mentions in him ; from whence he endeavours to prove by many arguments, “that these councils and epistles were all forged by Faustus.” But he is so far from persuading learned men to be of his mind, that † Noris himself confesseth “he can never assent to it ;” and although it be looked on as part of the cunning of Faustus, that he designed to convey his books so privately to his countrymen the Britons, as appears by the epistle of Sidonius Apollinaris to him, yet it is utterly incredible that he should forge two councils, and set down the names of several bishops as present in them, with whom Sidonius Apollinaris was particularly acquainted, and yet he not discover the cheat and imposture. But the Jansenists yield, that both those councils were held about A. D. 475. But they say, “that the bishops were partly Semipelagians, partly deceived by Faustus who was so ;” and Noris doth not deny “that there were other persons who were then charged with those opinions which Lucidus held. But,” he saith, “they were not many nor considerable enough to make a sect ; and that they did not willingly yield those consequences. But not knowing how to answer the Semipelagians, they were forced to assert them ; which their adversaries therefore charged them with as their own opinions :” which seems no improbable account of those called Predestinarians. It cannot be

† Isid. de Vir. illustr. cap. 14. Eccles. Antiq. p. 233.
 inter Oper. p. 356. col. 2. Usser. † Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 15.
 de Primord. ibid. p. 434. Brit. p. 292.

denied, that ^x Faustus's books were severely censured after his death, not only by the Scythian monks at Constantinople, among whom Joh. Maxentius was the chief, but by the African bishops, who were then exiles in Sardinia, by whom Fulgentius was employed to write against them. ^y But Possessor, one of the African exiled bishops, being then at Constantinople, and finding great heats about Faustus's books, sends to pope 202 Hormisdas to know his judgment about them, which he did at the request of Vitalianus and Justinianus, two of the greatest men in the emperor's court. ^z He returns a cautious answer as to Faustus, which, by the way, shews how little credit is to be given to the decree of Gelasius about apocryphal books, for therein Faustus's books are condemned. But if this had been done by Gelasius, is it probable that Hormisdas, his successor, would have stuck so much at it as Maxentius saith that he did? But he refers them for the sense of the Church to St. Augustine, and Prosper, and Hilary; and the definitions of his predecessors. ^a Maxentius rails against this answer, as unsatisfactory, and next to heretical, and sets St. Augustine's sayings against those of Faustus. Afterwards ^b Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, not only wrote against Faustus's doctrine, but by his means chiefly it was condemned in the second council of Orange; which asserted the necessity of preventing grace, the denying whereof was the main error charged on Faustus, not so much as to good works, (for ^c Jansenius hath at large proved, that the Semi-

^x Usser. de Primord. cap. 14.
p. 479. Brit. Eccles. Antiq.
p. 256.

^y Usser. de Primord. ibid. p.
478. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 255.

^z Usser. ibid.

^a Usser. ibid.

^b Usser. de Primord. ibid. p.
491. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 261.

^c Jansen. Hist. Pelag. lib. 8.
cap. 6. p. 185, &c. cap. 7. p. 189,
&c.

pelagians did yield the necessity of internal grace as to them;) but Faustus and Cassian and Gennadius denied it as to faith or good inclinations.

But to return to St. Germanus and his companions into Britain: if we give credit to our antiquaries, they did other kindnesses to the British Churches besides the confuting Pelagianism, whereof two are most considerable: 1. ^dThe institution of schools of learning among the Britons; 2. ^eThe introduction of the Gallican liturgy into the use of these Churches.

1. As to ^fschools of learning, none were more famous among the Britons than those of Dubricius and Iltutus, who are both said to have been the disciples of St. German. The anonymous author of the chronicle in ^gLeland, saith, "that St. Germanus and Lupus, having rooted out Pelagianism, consecrated bishops in several parts of Britain, and among the rest they placed a cathedral at Llandaff, and made Dubricius archbishop, who disposed of his disciples to several churches. ^hHe made Daniel bishop of Bangor, and ⁱsent Iltutus to a place from him called ^kLlan Iltut, or the Church of Iltutus." ^lCamden saith, "to this ²⁰³ day it is called Llantwit, where the foundations of many houses are still to be seen;" near the place called Bovium in the Itinerary, now ^mBoverton. But there is another place near Nidum, or Neath, whose name

^d Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 338, &c. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 182, &c.

^e Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 343. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 185.

^f See chap. 2. p. 70.

^g Collect. vol. 2. p. 42. marg. Vide Leland. Comment. de Script. Brit. p. 50.

^h Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 88. cap. 14. p. 526. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 47. 274.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. p. 472. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 252.

^k See note ^l following, and the additions to Camden, ibid. vol. 2. p. 500.

^l Brit. p. 498. (and p. 497.) vol. 2. p. 494. Vide Usser. ibid.

^m Anton. Iter Britan. p. 125. (Gale's edition.) Camden. ibid. p. 499. vol. 2. p. 495.

comes very near it, Llanyltd. The ⁿ old register of Llandaff, after it hath mentioned “the frequent messages the Britons sent to the neighbour bishops of Gaul for assistance against the Pelagians, and the coming of Germanus and Lupus sent by them,” it adds, “^o that they consecrated bishops in many places, and made Dubricius archbishop over all the Britons, ‘dextralis partis Britanniae,’ of the right hand part of Britain:” with which John of Tinmouth and Capgrave agree. What this “right hand part of Britain” was at the time of the consecration of Dubricius is not so easy to understand; ^p archbishop Usher takes it for South Wales, it being the custom of the Britons to call the south the right hand side; so Asserius Menevensis calls Sussex the “region of the right hand Saxons.” But it is observable that ^q Asserius there makes Demetia, or South Wales, to be but a part of what he calls “dextralis pars Britanniae.” For when he saith in general, “that all the country of the right hand of Britain submitted to king Alfred,” he then instanceth particularly in Hemeid, king of Demetia, and Houil, and other kings of Guent, by which North Wales is as much understood as South Wales is by the other; and therefore ^r I rather think Dubricius was made archbishop over all the Britons in those parts. For ^s Ranulphus Cestrensis saith, “the bishop of Caerleon

ⁿ Vide Monast. Anglic. vol. 3. p. 188. vol. 6. p. 1218. Usher. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 337. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 182.

^o Usher. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 79. cap. 13. p. 447. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 43. 239.

^p Usher. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 80. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 43. To the same effect Girald. Camb. Itiner. Camb. lib. 1. cap. 2. in Camden's Anglica, &c. p. 827.

^q De Gestis Alfred. ad A. D. 884. p. 15. in Camden. ib. Usher. de Primord. cap. 5. p. 80. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 43. Gunn's note 100. p. 169. in Nennius. See also ch. 5. p. 241.

^r See ch. 5. pp. 348. 361.

^s Polychron. lib. 1. cap. 52. inter Galei Hist. Brit. et Anglic. Script. 15. vol. 1. p. 204. Usher. de Primord. ibid. p. 87. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 47.

had seven suffragan bishops under him;" and †Matt. Westminster saith, "that Dubricius was made archbishop of Caerleon," (although he might have a seat at Llandaff, as the register of that Church affirms, by the gift of Mouricus.) But it appears that he had then archiepiscopal power; ^u and possibly, upon the disturbance of those times, the see might for a time be removed to Llandaff; from whence it was again removed by ^x St. David to the town bearing his name. But the bishops of Llandaff who succeeded were so unsatisfied with it, that ^v the register of that Church saith, "that from Oudoceus the second from Dubricius, (for he succeeded Teliaus in that see,) "they chose rather to be consecrated by the archbishops of Canterbury, than ²⁰⁴ by their own metropolitan of St. David's," as appears by the protestation made by the bishop of Llandaff to Calixtus II. in the council of Rheims, A. D. 1119. ^z But, I confess, it doth not seem very probable that a British bishop should go for consecration to Augustine the monk or his successors; for the British bishops did all look on them as intruders; and if any should have done it, how would they have been received by the British Churches at that time? It is therefore far more probable, either that they went over to the ^a British archbishop at Dol in Brittany, or that there was a succession preserved for some time of the archbishops of London among the Britons, after the retirement of Theonus and Thadiocus, the two other

† Matt. Westm. A. D. 490. et 507. pp. 92. 96. Usser. de Prim. cap. 5. p. 72. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 39. See chap. 5. p. 329.

^u On the disputes between St. David's and Llandaff, see ch. 5. p. 348.

^x Usser. de Primord. ibid. p.

81. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 44.

^y Usser. de Primord. ibid. p.

85. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 46.

^z See chap. 5. p. 349.

^a Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. pp. 73. 83. cap. 14. p. 559. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 40. 45. 290.

metropolitans of London and York, who, as ^b Matt. Westminster saith, “did withdraw when their churches were destroyed by the Saxons, with many of their clergy, into Wales;” where, as long as that succession continued, they might exercise some parts of their function, leaving the main to the archbishop of Caerleon, to whom of right it belonged: and ^c Ranulphus saith, “that province extended as far as the Severn, and so took in Chester, Hereford, and Worcester.” But before Dubricius was so much advanced, ^d the authors of his Life speak of the “great number of scholars which flocked to him from all parts of Britain;” not the rude and vulgar only, but persons of greatest reputation, among whom they name St. The- liaus, Samson, Aidanus, and many others. Two places they mention, where he received and instructed his disciples, one at Hentlan, on the river Wye, where they say “he had a thousand students with him, whom he brought up in human and divine literature;” and the other was at Moch-rhos, where he had a place for study and devotion.

Iltutus, by ^e Vincentius, and the ^f author of the Life of Samson, is said positively to have been a disciple of St. Germanus; and the ^g author of the Life of Gildas saith, “that in the ^h school of Iltutus

^b Matt. Westm. A. D. 586. p. 104. Usser. de Primord. cap. 5. pp. 68. 77. 83. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 37. 42. 45. Camden. *ibid.* p. 306. vol. 2. p. 5. See chap. 5. p. 346.

^c Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 87. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 47. vide Camden. *ibid.* p. 466. vol. 2. p. 441.

^d Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. p. 445. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 238.

^e Vincent. Spec. Hist. lib. 21. cap. 105. in Specul. Major. tom. 4. p. 292. 1. For this and notes ^f, ^g, Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 472. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 252. See chap. 5. p. 354.

^f Biblioth. Floriac. p. 468. ed. Joan. A Bosco.

^g Vit. Gild. *ibid.* cap. 3. p. 431. in Biblioth. Floriac. *ibid.*

^h Archaiologia, vol. 3. p. 116. Camden. *ibid.* as in pp. 202, 203. notes ^k and ^l.

many noblemen's sons were brought up;" among whom he reckons as the chief, Samson, afterwards archbishop of the Britons, viz. at Dol in Brittany; Paulus, bishop of the Oxismii, the most northern of the Aremorici, 205 (which bishopric is since divided into three, Treguier, St. Pol de Leon, and St. Brieu,) and Gildas, called Sapiens, of whom afterwards: ⁱ Leland to these adds David and Paulinus; and saith, "his school flourished like an university among the Britons." ^k Bollandus and Henschenius make a very probable conjecture, "that when St. German came into Britain, and found the decay of learning to have been the great occasion of the spreading of Pelagianism, he appointed Dubricius and Iltutus to undertake the education of the British clergy;" and that by these means, as ^l Bede saith, "these Churches continued afterwards pure and free from this heresy:" which was a wise and reasonable institution. And hereby we see the British churches were not defective in learning in their lowest condition, when the Britons were forced to leave their habitations and to fly into corners.

Of which, besides these nurseries of Dubricius and Iltutus, we have a famous instance in the monastery of Bangor, which even ^m Bede saith, "was furnished with learned men at the coming of Augustine into England." This Bangor was distant but ten or twelve miles from Chester, as ⁿ Ranulphus Cestrensis and Bradshaw, in

ⁱ Leland. Comment. de Script. Brit. in Iltuto, p. 63.

^k Act. Sanct. Feb. 9. Vit. S. Teliai. Com. præv. §. 1. n. 3. p. 303.

^l See p. 194. note °.

^m Bed. *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 80. *Usser. de Primord.* cap. 6. p. 133. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 69. *Camden. ibid.* as in note p, below. See ch. 5. pp. 357. 359.

ⁿ Polychr. lib. 4. cap. 31. fol. 226 a. 178 b. This passage is not included in Gale's edition of this writer. See Nicolson's English Historical Library, part 1. ch. 5. p. 53. Bradshaw's Life and History of St. Werburg, book 2. ch. 3. near the end. *Usser. de Primord. ibid.* p. 133. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 70. note †.

his Life of St. Werburg, say. ^o Leland in his Itinerary describes the place as “standing in a valley, and having the compass of a walled town, and two gates remaining half a mile distant from each other.” ^p Camden supposes it to be the ‘Bomium’ in Antoninus, being ten miles distant from Deva, i. e. Chester. That which was most observable in this ^q British monastery was, that men there were bred up to learning and devotion together, and so more resembling our colleges than ^r the Egyptian monasteries, where men were brought up to ignorance and labour, as much as to devotion. Wherein the Benedictines followed them according to their first institution: ^s for St. Benedict himself not only despised learning, as the writers of his Life say; but he takes no care about it in the rule of his order; and when ^t Boniface gave an account to Zachary of his setting up a Benedictine monastery at Fulda, he sets
206 the monks out by their “abstinence and hard labour with their own hands, without servants.” It is true that ^u Trithemius speaks much of “the schools of learning in the Benedictine monasteries,” but not before A.D. 890, which was after the ^x constitutions of Charles the Great, “who appointed schools for instructing youth both in monasteries and cathedrals;” which gave the

^o Collect. vol. 2. p. 63. marg. Itiner. p. 308. MS. vol. 5. fol. 33. marg. Additions to Camden. *ibid.* vol. 2. p. 429. col. 1. Vide *Usser. de Primord.* p. 134. et not. ^a. *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* p. 70. not. ^a. Camden. *ibid.*

^p Camden. *Brit.* p. 457. vol. 2. p. 422, which compare with the Additions in p. 429, of the same volume.

^q See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 7. §. 7. p. 160.

^r Vide Camden. *ibid.*

^s See Stillingfleet's Discourse

concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, ch. 4. §. 5. in his Works, vol. 5. p. 100. His Answer to Cressy's Epistle apologetical, ch. 3. §. 1-11. in his Works, *ibid.* p. 627.

^t Bonifac. Mogunt. Epist. 141. p. 211.

^u Chronic. Hirs. A.D. 890. p. 26.

^x Capit. Anseg. lib. 1. cap. 71. lib. 5. t. 95. inter Baluz. Capitular. Regum Francorum, t. 1. col. 237. 714. 840. tom. 2. col. 1134.

first countenance and encouragement to learning at that time; and ^yLupus Ferrariensis saith, “that the reviving of learning was then owing to him:” but although these constitutions extended no further than to grammar schools; yet from hence, those who were inclined to learning in the monasteries applied themselves more to it; and by degrees gained a great reputation by it, as Rabanus Maurus at Fulda, whose esteem drew Lupus thither, and many others; which example prevailing, and the monks finding such resort to increase their wealth as well as reputation, as ^zAub. Miræus observes; from that time the monasteries were desirous to have some of their number to be eminent for learning, which had been before so much neglected by them, as wholly besides the rule of their order. ^a But the monasteries of the western Churches before St. Benedict’s time, such as that of St. Ambrose, St. Eusebius of Vercelles, St. Augustine in Africa, St. Martin in Gaul, were chiefly intended as nurseries to the Church, and the persons educated therein, were brought up with a design to do the Church service afterwards. This method of education taking so much in other Churches (as in Gaul, where so many eminent bishops were taken out of the ^b monastery of Lerins, according to the rule of Caprasius,) St. German, who was so well acquainted with St. Honoratus, St. Hilary of Arles, and others of that education, might probably be the first instrument of setting up this way in the British Churches. And to confirm this, ^cSt. Patrick, who carried over this monastic

^y Lup. Epist. 1. Bibl. Patr. tom. 15. p. 4. Lugd. 1677.

^z Orig. Monast. l. 2. c. 1. p. 85.

^a See p. 185. Lloyd *ibid.* c. 7. §. 5. p. 154.

^b Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. pp. 325. 343. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 175. 185.

^c Lloyd *ibid.* chap. 7. §. 5. p. 156.

education into Ireland, spent many years under the discipline of St. German, as ^d Probus and ^e Jocelin the writers of his Life do agree. And those who have written of St. German have mentioned him as one of his disciples, as ^f Erricus of Auxerre. And ^g William of Malmesbury saith, “ he was not only a disciple of 207 St. German, but being made bishop by Celestine, ^h he was sent by St. German into Ireland.” And in the ⁱ Irish monasteries there were schools like those of Dubricius and Iltutus for the breeding of youth in learning. For therein, as ^k Rouse, an antiquary in Edward the Fourth’s time, saith, “ the masters did teach ‘secundum formam studiorum antiquorum,’ according to the ancient method of learning;” which our learned ^l primate understands “ of joining the studies of human learning with divine;” of which he produces an instance in a MS. of the library of Worcester; being a commentary of an Irish bishop upon Martianus Capella’s Astrology which he read to his disciples in the monastery of St. Remigius in Down. And the author of the ^m Opus Tripartitum of the Life of St. Patrick saith, “ that he set up at Armagh ‘ summum studium literale.’” Which in the language of that time is the same with an university, only this is a law term, and implies a legal society incorporated for the profession of learning,

^d Prob. Vit. Patr. apud Bed. Oper. t. 3. col. 228. For notes ^d and ^e, Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 837. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 436.

^e Jocel. Vit. Patr. cap. 22. in Messingham. Florileg. p. 11.

^f Biblioth. MSS. Labbei, t. 1. p. 537. Vide Usser. ibid. Camden. ibid. p. 730. vol. 3. p. 467.

^g De Gestis Pont. lib. 2. pp. 145. 255. See ch. 1. p. 16.

^h See ch. 2. p. 53. and note ^c.

ⁱ That of Bangor, in the county of Down, was celebrated, Camden. ibid. p. 767. vol. 3. p. 617. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 911. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 472.

^k Usser. de Primord. ibid. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. ibid.

^l Usser. de Primord. ibid. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. ibid.

^m Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 859. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 447.

which the ⁿ civilians tell us, “none but the supreme authority of a nation can do.” In this school at Armagh, ^o Caradoc of Lancarvan in his *Life of Gildas* saith, “that he was a professor, ‘studium regens et prædicans in civitate Ardmaca.’” But the anonymous author of his *Life* published out of an ancient MS. by Joh. à Bosco ^p saith, “that Gildas, going over into Ireland in the time of Ammeric, i. e. about A. D. 566, found both religion and learning much decayed there, and that he built many churches and monasteries, and brought up many noblemen’s sons therein. ^q In his younger days,” he saith, “Gildas went to Iren, and visited the schools of many learned men, and inquired their opinions in philosophical and divine matters.”

Some question hath been made by learned men, what this author means by ^r ‘Iren.’ The most easy and obvious sense is to take it for Ireland, where there were so many schools of learning in the monasteries of St. Patrick’s foundation; and ‘Iris’ is used by ^s Diodorus Siculus for Ireland: and ^t ‘Ierne’ in the book “*de Mundo*,” and Apuleius; and the inhabitants are called ‘Irenses’ by ^u Ordericus Vitalis; and the country is

ⁿ Choppin. de Doman. Franc. lib. 3. tit. 27. p. 581. Limn. Jur. public. Imper. lib. 8. cap. 1. n. 31.

^o Usser. *ibid.*

^p Biblioth. Floriac. Vit. Gild. cap. 10. p. 438. edit. Joan. A. Bosco. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 905. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 469.

^q Biblioth. Flor. *ibid.* cap. 6. p. 434. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 907. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 470.

^r See Preface p. lix. chap. 5. p. 285.

^s Diod. Sic. lib. 5. p. 309. Usser. de Primord. cap. 17. p. 907. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 470. Camden. *ibid.* p. 726. vol. 3. p. 463.

^t De Mund. p. 64. ed. Vulcan. Usser. de Primord. cap. 16. p. 723. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 378. See Preface, p. xxxvi. Camden. *ibid.*

^u Ord. Vital. lib. 10. ad A.D. 1098. inter Du Chesnii Hist. Norman. Script. Antiq. p. 767. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 734. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 383. Camden. *ibid.*

208 called ‘Erin’ by the inhabitants, as archbishop ^xUsher observes; but the marginal note of Joh. à Bosco hath led some quite out of their way in seeking for this place; which is, “that Iren was an university then in Great Britain;” and from hence they have proceeded to prove our famous university of Oxford to be meant by it. ^y First, “Iren,” say they, “was mistaken for Icen, and that for Ychen, and Ychen for Rydychen, and Rydychen in the British tongue signifies the same with ‘vadum boum,’ and that is the same with Oxford.” I cannot think learned men write these things any otherwise, than as sports of wit, which are intended for the diversion, and not for the conviction of the reader. As likewise, when the same authors produce out of Constantius’s Life of St. German, “^z regionis illius universitas,” to prove the antiquity of their university. But that passage in the copy of Asserius ^a printed by Camden is more material, viz. “that St. German stayed half a year in Oxford, and approved the orders made by Gildas, Melkin, Nennius and Kentigern.” I know what heats have been about this passage among very learned men. For my part I see no cause to mistrust the sincerity of archbishop Parker in the edition of his very ancient copy, where this passage was not to be found; ^b and I do not question Camden’s fidelity in

^x Hist. Gottesch. c. 9. p. 114.

^y Brian. Twyni Antiq. Acad. Oxon. Apol. lib. 2. n. 84. p. 146. Hist. Acad. Oxon. lib. 1. p. 9. Wood’s History and Antiquity of the University of Oxford, vol. 1. p. 21. Concerning the antiquities of the university of Oxford, see the various writers enumerated by Nicolson, in his English Historical Library, part 2. chap. 8. p. 126.

^z Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 342. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 184.

^a Asser. de Ælfrid. Rebus Gestis. in Camden. Anglica, &c. p. 16. Camden. Brit. in following note. Usser. de Primord. ibid. p. 340. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 183, where the authenticity of this passage is overthrown.

^b Vide Camden. Brit. p. 268. Camden’s Life, prefixed to his

publishing Asserius out of some other copy ; but it had been fair to have given an account whence he had it, and for what reasons he inserted it in another edition of Asserius ; and why he preferred the Savilian copy before the other. But I cannot but wonder that these learned men have taken no more notice of the inconsistency of this passage with the history of those times. For these persons all lived a considerable time after St. German, as it were easy to prove, if it were worth the pains. For Gildas was not born till at least ^{bb}forty-four years were past after St. German's death : which thus appears ; ^c he saith he was born the year of the victory of Aurelius Ambrosius over the Saxons at the ^d Mons Badonicus, which was ^eforty-four years after they came hither, A.D. 449 ; and by comparing St. German's embassy to Valentinian at Ravenna, where he died, we shall find that St. German was dead the year before the Saxons' arrival, A.D. 448, as the ^fSamar-209 thani shew. But against this there is a considerable objection from what ^gBede saith, " that the Saxons and

Britannia, by Gough, p. vi. n. ^u ; in Oxfordshire, pp. 287. 299, and notes. Bed. Hist. Eccles. Append. n. 14. p. 732. Wise's edition of Asserius's Annals, p. 133 : in p. 153, he refers to Stillington.

^{bb} In the opinion of Usher, de Primord. cap. 13. p. 477. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 254. and also of Smith, in his note on Bede, *ibid.* b. 1. ch. 16. p. 53. n. 38. Bede, by mistaking Gildas, has given rise to a considerable error ; and that this victory and the birth of Gildas did not take place " forty-four years after the Saxons came hither," but forty-four years previously to Gildas' writing, that is, in the year 520. If

so, Bede has antedated this victory, as connected with Gildas' birth, twenty-seven years. In connexion herewith, see Preface to Gildas, §. 5. p. viii. ed. 1838.

^c Usher, de Primord. cap. 13. p. 475. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 254.

^d Hist. Gild. §. 26 p. 34. n. 1. ed. 1838.

^e Bed. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 21. and note in Smith's edition, p. 58. col. 1. See chap. 5. p. 317.

^f Gall. Christian. tom. 2. n. 7. p. 267. tom. 12. n. 6. col. 264. See notes ^m and ⁿ following.

^g Bed. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 20. p. 56, et not. 9.

Picts joined together after St. German's coming, which occasioned ^h the victory by singing Alleluiah according to St. German's direction ;" and it is so much stronger, in that the very same expressions are in ⁱ Constantius. But this may be easily solved by those that consider the ^k frequent incursions the Saxons made on the Britons before they were sent for over, as appears by the 'comes litoris Saxonici per Britanniam,' appointed to secure the coasts from the Saxons ; and that ^l Gildas therefore wonders the Britons should send for the Saxons, "of whom they were so much afraid before ;" and when the Roman forces were withdrawn, no doubt they did more boldly and frequently disturb them.

Besides, ^m Constantius saith in St. German's Life, "that he succeeded St. Amator in his see, and continued therein thirty years and twenty-five days." But St. Amator died A.D. 418, as our learned ⁿ primate hath proved, "because the calends of May on which he died were that year, as Constantius saith, the fourth day of the week," which agrees to 418. If it be said, "that this passage of Asserius is meant of an elder Gildas, called Gildas Albanus, ^o whose Life the same excellent antiquary supposes to be written by Caradoc of Lancarvan ;" I answer, that when he comes to fix the times in his ^p Chronological Index, he doth over-

^h Usser. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 333. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 179. Camden. *ibid.* in the Additions, vol. 2. p. 596.

ⁱ Usser. de Primord. c. 11. p. 332. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 179. See ch. 5. p. 317.

^k Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 335. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 181. See ch. 5. p. 304.

^l Usser. de Primord. cap. 12. p. 388. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 207. See ch. 5. p. 304.

^m Constant. Vit. German. l. 2. c. ult. in De Vit. Sanct. tom. 4. p. 132. Usser. de Primord. *ibid.* p. 382. Brit. Eccles. 205. See ch. 5. p. 317.

ⁿ Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. p. 382. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 205.

^o Usser. de Primord. cap. 13. p. 468. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 250. See Preface to Gildas, p. xxvii. ed. 1838.

^p Usser. de Primord. Index

throw his own supposition: for Caradoc, by his own confession, makes Gildas “contemporary with king Arthur,” and he is said by him to be born A.D. 493. And therefore Caradoc’s Gildas can be no elder than the Gildas Badonicus. Although therefore the want of skill may make Caradoc set his Gildas elder than he ought to have done; yet whosoever will compare that Life published by Joh. à Bosco with the other by Caradoc, will find that they were designed for the same person. And therefore ^qLeland, with far more judgment, mentions but one Gildas; whereas ^rBale and Pits make more; but it is their vanity to multiply authors as well as books. St. Kentigern was baptized as soon as he was born, by ^sServanus, one of the disciples of Palladius, whose mission had the same date with the first 210 coming of St. Germanus and Lupus; and therefore it is not very probable that St. German should see the orders of Gildas and Kentigern, much less those of ^tMelkin and Nennius, whose ages fall so far short of the others.

But although St. German’s being at Oxford cannot be proved by such obscure and incoherent passages as this; yet I doubt not but by the evidence already produced, he did take care to advance learning and piety in the British Churches wheresoever he came: both

Chronolog. p. 1121. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Index Chronolog. p. 524. col. 1. A.D. 493.

^q In Comment. de Script. Brit. tom. 1. cap. 32. p. 51, &c. compared with the last note.

^r Tanner. *ibid.* under Gildas mentions several of that name. In the Preface, §. 3. p. vi. to Gildas, ed. 1838, the writer following Usher concludes “that there were at least two individuals called Gildas, surnamed respectively ‘Albanus,’ and

‘Badonicus,’ and that they were not contemporaries:”—the latter being “the author of the work now printed.”

^s Usher. de Primord. cap. 15. p. 672. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 352.

^t Usher. de Primord. Index Chronolog. pp. 1140. 1175. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. pp. 531. col. 1. 543. col. 1, where Melkinus is said to have flourished A.D. 550. and Nennius is set down A.D. 858.

which were falling very much to decay upon the irruption of the barbarous nations. ^u While the Roman empire flourished there was care taken for the encouragement of learning, especially in greater cities. At Rome by the constitution of Valentinian we may see the orders then made for regulation of students there; as for entering their names who came thither out of the several provinces by the ‘magister census,’ with the testimonials from the governors of provinces, of the place of their birth and quality, who then were to declare what studies they designed to follow, and an account was to be given of their lodgings; and particular officers were appointed, called ‘censuales,’ to make an inspection into their lives, that they did avoid all clubs called there ‘consociations,’ or frequent appearing at the sports, or affecting unseasonable and public entertainments. If any were found faulty, they were to be chastised, and sent away home, but none were permitted to stay after twenty at Rome, and an account of these things was to be taken monthly, and given in to the ‘præfectus urbis,’ and returned to the emperor every year; as appears by the ^x constitution itself in the Theodosian code. By which we find, that Rome itself was then the chief university of the empire, to which students resorted from all the provinces, and the emperor thought it not below his cognizance to have notice sent him of the numbers, qualities, and behaviours of the students; but lest the splendour and vanities of Rome should tempt them to forsake the service of their country, they were not permitted to

^u See the authors on this subject, in Fabric. Biblioth. Antiq. cap. 21. n. 3. p. 937, &c. Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. 1. cent. 4. part 2. ch. 1. n. 4. p. 345. note e. Spanhem. Hist.

Christ. sæc. 5. cap. 3. col. 962. 963. in Oper. tom. 1.

^x C. Theod. 1. 14. tit. 9. l. 1. A.D. 370. Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. tom. 5. p. 197. where see Gothofred’s Commentary, p. 198.

stay there after twenty years of age; for then not having the difficulties of the language to conquer which ²¹¹ they were used to while children, at fifteen they were thought fit to be instructed in other studies, and five or six years was all the time this law allowed them to prosecute them under the masters at Rome. Where, besides an infinite number of private teachers in that vast city, there were public professors appointed, who had their schools within the area of the capitol, which were called ‘*auditoria publica*,’ as we may reasonably infer from the ^y constitution of Theodosius; where the ‘*exedrae*’ of the porticoes of the capitol at Constantinople are appointed to make ‘*auditoria*’ for the public professors there: and Constantinople followed the pattern at Rome. These ‘*exedrae*’ were, as ^z Vitruvius describes them, places of capacity within the porticoes, with seats round, in which the rhetoricians and others were wont to discourse; or, according to ^a Cicero, they were “*cellae ad colloquendum aut meridiandum*,” such as Crassus had at Tusculum, and Cotta at Rome, where those great men were wont to sit for their diversion and discourse with each other: and the Greek Glossary renders ‘*exedra*,’ a school; such a one ^b Strabo describes in the museum at Alexandria, which consisted of a walk, an ‘*exedra*,’ and a great house where the learned men did all live and eat together upon a public allowance, under the government of a person appointed by their kings, and after by the Cæsars. This museum

^y C. Theod. l. 15. tit. 1. l. 53. Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. t. 5. p. 325, and Gothofred’s Commentary, p. 326, following, for the notes ^z, ^a, ^b, in this page.

^z Vitruv. de Architect. lib. 5. cap. 11. p. 98.

^a De Orator. lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 343. et not. p. 454. et not.

The word here employed by Cicero, is not ‘*cellae*,’ but ‘*exedrae*.’ Vide Alex. ab Alexandro Genial. Dierum, t. 2. lib. 5. c. 11. not. 1. p. 102, where Budæus is referred to.

^b Geograph. lib. 17. pp. 546. 793.

was adjoining to the palace, and near it was the famous library of Ptolemy Philadelphus: for that was “in bruchio,” as ^c Epiphanius saith, and was distinct from the other library afterwards ‘in Serapeo’ mentioned by ^d Ammianus Marcellinus. This ‘bruchion’ was a region of the city, as Epiphanius saith; and some will have its name from the *πυρουχείον*, the granary of Alexandria being there, and by contraction it was called *πυρουχείον*. So the MS. of ^e Eusebius mentioned by Valesius hath it. But ^f Salmasius would have the name taken “from the stores laid in there for the college of learned men in the museum,” which Ammianus Marcellinus calls “*præstantium hominum domicilium* ;” and this *πυρουχείον*, he saith, is the same with *πρυτανείον*, and Eustathius saith, “the one signified the same at Alexandria, 212 which the other did at Athens ;” and, he observes, that it was accounted a great favour in the emperors to grant any learned man *τὴν ἐν μουσείῳ σίτησιν*, i. e. “a fellowship in the college.” So ^g Athenæus mentions it as the kindness of Hadrian to Pancrates the poet, for flattering Antinous, “that he gave him a right of commons in the museum ;” as he did likewise to Dionysius the sophist, and Polemon, and Nicetas Smyrnæus, as Philostratus in their lives relates. Aristonicus wrote the history of the museum at Alexandria, and of the philosophers and learned men who flourished in it, and the manner of their living there; out of whom ^h Photius saith that Sopater borrowed part of the twelfth book of his Miscellanies. But this book being lost, as

^c Epiph. de Ponder. n. 9. 11. in ejus Oper. tom. 2. pp. 166. 168. et Petav. Animadv. p. 379.

^d Amm. Marcell. ibid. lib. 22. (cap. 15.) cap. 16. p. 266.

^e Euseb. ibid. lib. 7. cap. 32. p. 367.

^f Salmas. in Spartian. p. 52. inter Hist. August. Script.

^g Athen. Deipnosoph. lib. 15. cap. 6. p. 677. et Casaub. Animadv. col. 958. t. 5. lib. 15. c. 21. p. 468. tom. 8. Animadv. p. 94.

^h Phot. ibid. Cod. 161. p. 342.

likewise those of Callimachus and Alcidamas, no particular account can be given of the history of it. Only in general we know, that the most learned persons in their several professions were invited thither, and had there all the encouragements which freedom from care, good air, (for the museum was celebrated for that by Strabo,) suitable society, and an excellent library could give them; the keepers whereof were men of the greatest reputation, as Demetrius Phalereus, Zenodotus Ephesius, Eratosthenes, Apollonius, Aristonymus, Chæremón, Dionysius, &c. In this museum it was that ⁱHadrian proposed questions to the professors; and in it were ἀγῶνες instituted, or sports by Philadelphus to Apollo and the Muses, after the finishing his library, and rewards given to those that overcame in the opinions of the five judges appointed for that purpose. From hence came the ‘commissiones’ and ‘agones sacri’ among the Romans, at which judges were appointed; among whom ^jHorace mentions Metius Tarpa for one. These were sometimes performed in the capitol, as ^kRycquius observes, i. e. in the porticoes where the ‘exedræ’ were like those at Constantinople. What the number of public professors was at Alexandria and Rome is not certainly known, but at Constantinople their number is determined by a ^lconstitution of Theodosius. In the public schools called there ‘auditorium capitolii’ and ‘auditorium nostrum,’ there were to be for the Latin tongue “three orators, and ten 213 grammarians;” for the Greek, “five sophists and ten grammarians; one professor of philosophy and two of

ⁱ Spartian. in Hadrian. p. 10. inter Hist. August. Script. See note ^f, p. 211.

^j Horat. in Satyr. lib. 1. 10. v. 38. et in Arte Poet. v. 387, with Bentley’s note, p. 434.

^k De Capitol. Roman. Com-

ment. cap. 35. p. 131.

^l C. Theod. 1. 14. tit. 9. l. 3. in Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. tom. 5. p. 203, where see Gothofred’s Commentary, p. 204. Baron. ibid. A.D. 425. n. 23.

law." These had their distinct schools allotted them called 'publicæ magistrationes' and 'cellæ' in the law; and all others were forbidden to teach in public, either within the capitol, or elsewhere, upon pain of infamy for the fact, and banishment out of the city. ^mThe emperor Valens, by another constitution, appointed for the public library at Constantinople "seven antiquaries to look after the books, four Greek and three Latin, who were to have a public allowance;" so that there was a 'bibliotheca palatina' there as well as at Rome, and both in probability were near the capitol, where the professors taught; for that at Rome was called 'bibliotheca capitolina,' concerning which ⁿJoh. Sarisburiensis saith, "it was reported that Gregory the Great caused it to be destroyed, out of a fear, that heathen learning should abate men's love to the Scriptures;" which was a very foolish and superstitious fear. For men know better how to value the Scriptures by it. And he did ill then to fetch the soul of Trajan out of purgatory, (but I hope one story is no truer than the other,) for he founded the 'bibliotheca Ulpia,' which was next to the 'palatina;' and Victor saith, "there were twenty-seven more public libraries in Rome." If this story be true, Gregory rather followed the steps of Julian than of Constantine; for the one envied learning to the Christians as much as the other promoted it; ^oVictor's Epitome saith of Constantine, that he did, "nutrire artes bonas, præcipue studia literarum;" and his ^pconstitutions still extant do shew the great kindness he had for learning and learned men; granting

^m Cod. Theod. l. 2. in Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. tom. 5. p. 202. wheresee Gothofred's Commentary, p. 202. Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 372. n. 116.

ⁿ Polycrat. lib. 18. cap. 19. p. 646.

^o Baron. *ibid.* A. D. 330. n. 25.

^p C. Theod. 13. tit. 3. l. 1, 2, 3. in Jac. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. tom. 5. pp. 23. 27. and Gothofred's Commentary, p. 23. Baron. *ibid.*

great privileges and public salaries to the professors of learning in the several cities of the empire. But ^qJulian, finding that Christianity did spread by the learning of the Christians, he first drew the choice of public professors to himself, by making his approbation necessary after the ‘judicium ordinis’ and ‘decretum curialium,’ and so excluded the Christians. Afterwards ^rhe expressly declared, “he would endure none to interpret heathen authors, who argued against their religion:” but no constitution appears in the code besides the former tending that way. Upon this “Proæresius,” saith ^sSt. Jerome, “left the chair at Athens,” although he had a particular indulgence by Julian. And ^tOrosius adds, “that the Christian professors of learning almost universally forsook their places:” but both mention an express edict of Julian’s to that purpose. ^uSome writers speak of another edict “forbidding Christian children to learn;” but I can find no edict to that purpose; and it seems to me to have been only a consequence of the former; since Christian parents would not send their children to be taught by heathens, having seen the sad effect of it in the apostasy of Julian, under his heathen tutors, ^xMardonius, Maximus and Iamblichus.

But by this edict we find how universally learning was then diffused through the provinces of the Roman empire, which was in great measure due to Antoninus Pius, of whom ^yJul. Capitolinus saith, “that he

^q Cod. Theod. *ibid.* l. 5. in Jac. Gothofred. *Cod. Theod.* tom. 5. p. 30. and Gothofred’s *Commentary*, p. 31. *Baron. ibid.* A.D. 362. n. 286.

^r Julian. *Ep.* 42. p. 194. *Baron. ibid.* n. 288.

^s Hieron. *Chron.* vide *Thes. Tempor.* Euseb. *Pamphili Chron.*

lib. post. p. 185. *Baron. ibid.* n. 297.

^t Oros. *lib.* 7. cap. 30. p. 546.

^u *Baron. ibid.* n. 296.

^x *Baron. ibid.* A.D. 337. n. 57. A.D. 345. n. 8, 9, &c.

^y *Vit. Anton. Pii*, p. 21. *inter Hist. August. Scriptor.*

appointed honours and pensions to rhetoricians and philosophers through all the provinces;” which were confirmed and enlarged by the several edicts of Constantine to that purpose, already mentioned. And ^{yy} Fr. Balduin takes particular notice of his zeal to promote learning. In Gaul ^z St. Jerome mentions the “florentissima studia Galliarum;” and Constantius, in the Life of St. German, the “auditoria Galliarum;” after which, he saith, he went to Rome as the chief university especially for law: thence ^a Sidonius Apollinaris calls it ‘domicilium legum,’ and ^b St. Augustine saith, “he went thither to study the laws.” But other professions flourished elsewhere; as at Carthage, ^c Salvian saith, “there were professors of all arts and sciences:” and at Sicca Veneria in Africa Arnobius was professor of rhetoric. Near Lyons in Gaul the sixty cities had dedicated an altar to Augustus, where the Rhone and the Arar meet; there Caius Caligula appointed prizes to be played both in Greek and Latin eloquence: and not that only, but philosophy was there taught: thence ^d Odilo, abbot of Clugny, about A. D. 1020, calls Lyons of old “the mother and nurse of philosophy.” In the time of Diocletian and Maxi-

215 mianus, the nobility of Gaul were brought up to learning at Augustodunum, (Autun), and there Eumenius was both rector and professor, as appears by his speech to Constantius, where ^e he celebrates so much the “scholæ mœnianæ, quondam pulcherrimo opere et stu-

^{yy} De Legibus Constant. lib. 2. p. 142.

^z Ad Rustic. Oper. tom. 4. part. 2. col. 771.

^a Sidon. Apollin. Oper. lib. 1. ep. 6. p. 13. et in Sirmond. Oper. tom. 1. col. 853.

^b Confess. lib. 6. c. 8. in Oper. tom. 1. col. 125.

^c De Gubern. Dei, lib. 7. in Oper. p. 170.

^d Vit. Maioli, Vit. Adell. in Biblioth. Clunian. Mart. Marr. col. 282. 356.

^e Orat. pro Restaur. Schol. n. 3. inter Paneg. Vet. tom. 1. p. 225. et not.

diorum frequentia celebres ;” which having suffered very much in the rebellion of the Bagaudæ, under the latter Claudius, he was extremely concerned to have them rebuilt, which is the design of his excellent oration. But long before, in Tiberius’s time, ^f Tacitus saith, “the sons of the nobility did there, ‘liberalibus studiis operari,’ improve themselves in learning.” ^g Eusebius mentions, in the time of Nero, Staius Ursulus of Toulouse, a famous professor of rhetoric; and ^h Ausonius reckons up many of those who had been famous there and at Bourdeaux, and other places. But to spare our pains in particular places, there is extant in the Theodosian Code, an ⁱ edict of Gratian, “requiring all the chief cities of these parts of the Roman empire to settle and maintain in them professors of learning, both of the Greek and Roman languages.” This edict was directed to the ‘præfectus prætorio Galliarum,’ and was commanded to be observed through all his diocese, which ^k Gothofred restrains to the provinces of Gaul, excluding Britain, for which ^l I see no reason; since ^m Ausonius, who was himself in that office in Gratian’s time, comprehends the Britons under his jurisdiction. And the ⁿ Notitia Imperii places the provinces of Britain under him after Gratian’s time, ^o which Notitia, he thinks, was made about A.D. 426: by virtue of which edict we are to search for the ancient schools of learning among the Britons, in the chief cities of the provinces

^f Annal. 3. c. 43. in Oper. t. 1. p. 164.

^g In Chronic. p. 163.

^h Auson. Oper. in Profess. pp. 145. et not.

ⁱ C. Theod. 13. tit. 3. l. 11. in Jac. Gothof. Cod. Theod. tom. 5. p. 39.

^k Ibid. Com. p. 40. col. 2.

^l See chap. 3. p. 135.

^m Oper. in Mosell. v. 407. p. 419.

ⁿ Pancirol. Comment. in Notit. Imperii, p. 117 b. Camden. ibid. pp. 44. 53. vol. 1. pp. xlvi. lvi. and notes.

^o See chap. 5. pp. 302, 303, and notes there.

at that time; especially at ^p London, which was the ‘caput gentis,’ being Augusta, or the imperial city; and so at York and Caerleon. So that the British Churches, as long as the Roman power continued here, had the same advantages for learning which they had in other provinces; but when the Roman forces were withdrawn, and nothing but miseries and desolation followed, then ^q St. German’s care proved a most seasonable relief to them in providing such schools as those of Dubricius and Iltutus for the breeding up of persons 216 qualified for the service of the Church; as far as the miseries of those times would permit.

The last thing to be considered is, ^r the public service of the British Churches. And in an ^s ancient MS. in the Cotton library, about the original of divine offices, Germanus and Lupus are said “to have brought into the use of the British Churches, ‘ordinem cursûs Gallorum;’” by which ^t archbishop Usher understands the Gallican liturgy: for ^u ‘cursus,’ in the ecclesiastical use of the word, is the same with ‘officium divinum,’ as Dominicus Macer, in his late Hierolexicon, shews; thence ‘cursum celebrare,’ is ‘to perform divine offices;’ and so the word ‘cursus’ is often used in ^x Fortunatus’s Life of St. German, bishop of Paris, and in our ^y Saxon

^p See p. 195.

^q See p. 202, &c.

^r Mabil. de Liturg. Gallic. lib. 1. cap. 2. n. 14. p. 15.

^s See note ^t following. Palmer, in his Orig. Liturg. vol. 1. s. 11. p. 176, differs from Usher and Stillingleet on this point.

^t Usher. de Primord. cap. 11. p. 343. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 185. See Lloyd *ibid.* ch. 7. §. 6 p. 159. Bingham’s Antiquities of the Christian Church, b. 13. ch. 1. sect. 7.

^u Mabil. *ibid.* de Cursu Gallic.

§. 1. n. 1. p. 379.

^x Surii de Vit. Sanct. tom. 3. cap. 64. 79. pp. 135 b. 136 a. 28 Maii. Mabil. *ibid.* p. 428.

^y Bed. lib. 4. cap. 18. p. 161. App. p. 719. Concil. Calchuth. cap. 7. Spelman. Concil. *ibid.* p. 295. Wilkins Concil. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 147. col. 2. Bingham *ibid.* Asser. vit. Alfr. (Asser. de Ælfred. Gestis,) ad A.D. 866. in Camden. Anglic. &c. p. 5.

writers: ^z but this ‘cursus Gallorum’ is there distinguished from the ‘cursus Orientalis,’ and the ‘cursus Ambrosii,’ and the ‘cursus Benedicti,’ (which little differs, he saith, from the ‘cursus Romanus.’) And this was that which Germanus and Lupus had learnt in the monastery of Lerins, where it was used by Casianus and Honoratus, as the author of that book affirms, which I find to have been the same which ^a sir H. Spelman commends for its great antiquity. And that author derives the Gallican liturgy from St. John by Polycarp and Irenæus; which MS. Mabillon was inclined to think to have been the book which Gregorius Turonensis wrote ‘de Cursibus Ecclesiasticis,’ but for the quoting the ^b Life of Columbanus and Attala, which was not written till after his death.

This will oblige us to inquire, ^c what the Gallican liturgy at this time was, and how far different from the Roman. ^d It is agreed on all hands, that there was a material difference between them, but wherein it lay is not so easily understood. When Gregory sent Augustine the monk into England, to settle the Saxon Churches, and he ^e was consecrated by the archbishop of Arles; one of the questions ^f Augustine proposed was, “since there was such difference between

^z As to these points see Mabil. *ibid.* de Liturg. Gallic. p. 5.

^a Spelman. *Concil. Brit. tom.* 1. p. 177. Vide MS. in Musæo Brit.; *Bibl. Cotton. Cleop. E. I.* n. 2. Wilkins *ibid.* tom. 4. p. 741. col. 2. Mabil. *ibid.* De Cursu Gallic. §. 1. n. 2. 3. p. 380.

^b Mabil. *vet. Analect. tom.* 1. p. 9. De Liturg. Gallic. p. 379.

^c Palmer *ibid.* sect. 9. p. 143. Liturgy of Gaul, sect. 6. p. 111. Liturgy of the Patriarchate of Rome.

^d Mabil. *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 4. n. 7. p. 29. et in *Præf.* p. 1. *Bonæ Rerum Liturg. lib.* 1. cap. 12. n. 1. 9. inter *Oper. pp.* 369. 379.

^e See Smith’s note upon Bede *ibid.* b. 1. cap. 27. p. 62. Wharton in his *Anglia Sacra*, tom. 1. p. 89, note.

^f Bed. *Hist. Eccles. lib.* 1. cap. 27. *Interrog.* 2. p. 63. *Bonæ ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 6. n. 2. inter *Oper. p.* 346.

the offices of the Roman and Gallican Churches, which he should follow?" Gregory answered, "that he should choose what he thought most proper for the English Church." Which implies, that there was a diversity 217 still between them, and that the pope did not oblige him to follow the example of the Roman Church; chiefly, I suppose, because the queen, being a Christian before, and using the Gallican liturgy in the public service, ^g and her bishop being of the Gallican Church, it would have given great offence to them to have had it taken away; as likewise to all the British Churches which had been accustomed to it. If the books of Musæus, mentioned by ^hGennadius, were extant, we should easily understand wherein the difference lay; for he being a presbyter of the Church of Marseilles, and a man learned in the Scriptures, was desired by Venerius, the bishop there, "to draw up a form of public service, consisting of two parts, viz. the morning service and the communion service." The first he finished in the time of Venerius, and is highly commended by Gennadius for its order, usefulness, and decency: the second in the time of Eustathius, his successor, which he likewise commends for its great weight and exactness. And there was great reason at that time to bring the Church service into order, because Cassian and others endeavoured to introduce the monastic customs which he had observed in Egypt and elsewhere, as appears by the design of his Monastic Institutions, especially the ⁱsecond and third books,

^g Bed. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 25. p. 60. Stillingfleet's Answer to Cressy *ibid.* ch. 4. §. 3. Works, vol. 5. p. 673.

^h Gennad. de Scriptor. cap. 79. Hieron. Oper. tom. 5. col. 43. cap. 81. Mabil. *ibid.* cap. 4. n. 5.

p. 28. De Cursu, §. 2. 33. p. 406. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. sect. 3. note ^u, &c. sect. 12. note ^{*}. See p. 225, and note ^q.

ⁱ Vide Mabil. *ibid.* §. 1. not. 4. 5. p. 382.

which he dedicated to Castor, bishop of Apta Julia, at the same time that Venerius was bishop of Mar-seilles, where Cassian lived. This Musæus was there-fore employed to draw up the most convenient order for the public service, from whence we may be able to judge of the difference in both parts between the Gallican and Roman offices.

^jI begin with the first, viz. the morning service, which consisted of lessons, hymns, and psalms, agree-able to the lessons, and short collects after them.

^kIn the Church of Rome for a long time, viz. for above 400 years, they had nothing before the sacrifice, as the old ritualists agree, besides the ^lepistle and gospel; then Celestine appointed the psalms to be used, or, as ^mWalafr. Strabo and Micrologus say, caused ‘antiphonæ’ to be made out of them and sung. The epistle was constantly taken out of St. Paul, as ⁿWalafr. Strabo proves out of the Pontifical book; but “^oin process of time,” he saith, ^p“other lessons were ²¹⁸taken out of the Old and New Testament, agreeably to the time;” which might be borrowed from the Gallican Church, as other enlargements of their offices by the ritualists’ confession were; and in probabi- lity the distribution of the lessons was first begun by Musæus, which we have digested according to the

^j See Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 10.

^k Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 502.

^l See Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. sect. 5.

^m Walafr. cap. 22. p. 406. col. 1. ed. Hittorp. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. sect. 2. notes ^a, ^b. See p. 220. and note ^g. Microlog. cap. 1. p. 437. col. 1. Bonæ *ib.* Mabil. *ibid.* De Liturg. Gallic.

cap. 4. n. 2. notes ^a, ^b, p. 25.

ⁿ Walafr. et Mabil. *ibid.*

^o Walafr. ed. Hittorp. *ibid.* p. 407. col. 1.

^p Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 522. See Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. sect. 3. Palmer *ibid.* Morning Prayer, sect. 10. p. 225. sect. 12. p. 231. Evening Prayer, sect. 4. p. 255. sect. 6. p. 256.

Roman custom in the ^q *Lectionarius*, published by Pamelius, by some attributed to St. Jerome. After the lessons followed the ^r ‘*responsoria*,’ or proper hymns, for so ^s Isidore saith, “they were called, because, one singing, the whole choir did answer;” and ^t Rabanus Maurus calls auch an anthem, ‘*responsorius cantus*,’ and these differed from the ‘*antiphonæ*,’ because in them the whole choir sung each verse ‘*alternatim*.’ But ^u Rupertus thinks, “they had their name because they answered to the lessons, being sung immediately after them,” for “the refreshment of the hearer’s mind,” saith ^x Amalarius. ^y But besides the lessons and hymns, he methodized the psalms so as to be read agreeably to the times and the lessons, and not in the order wherein they stand, ^z which seems to have been peculiar to the Gallican Church. The most ancient custom of the Church, as ^a Menardus proves from Justin Martyr and others, was “to begin the public service with the lessons.” And ^b St. Ambrose, in one place, seems to mention no more in his ^c Church at Milan besides the lessons and the sermon, before his expounding the Creed to the ‘*competentes*,’ but in the same epistle he speaks of ^d the psalms that were

^q Vide Pamel. *Liturg. Eccles. Latin.* tom. 2. p. 1.

^r Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 1. sect. 3. 11.

^s De *Eccl. Offic.* lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 3. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 4. Bingham *ibid.* sect. 3. note ^v.

^t De *Instit. Cleric.* lib. 1. cap. 33. p. 328. col. 2. p. 329. col. 1. Bonæ *ibid.*

^u De *Offic.* lib. 1. cap. 15. in *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 609. col. 1. Bingham *ibid.*

^x Amal. lib. 4. cap. 3. p. 217. col. 2. ed. Hittorp.

^y Mabil. de *Liturg. Gallic.* lib.

1. cap. 4. n. 5. p. 28. *ibid.* De *Cursu Gallic.* §. 2. n. 33. p. 406.

^z Bingham *ibid.* sect. 4. differs in some measure from Stillingfleet.

^a In *Sacram. Gregor.* p. 4.

^b Ambros. *Oper.* lib. 5. ep. 33. in Erasm. edit. tom. 3. p. 158. *Oper.* tom. 2. ep. 20. col. 853.

^c Palmer *ibid.* sect. 7. p. 125. *Liturgy of the Exarchate of Milan.*

^d Palmer *ibid.* Morn. Prayer, sect. 9. p. 223, &c. Evening Prayer, sect. 3. p. 254.

read in the morning service, and ^e elsewhere “of the people’s answering to the psalms:” and it is generally said by the ancient ritualists, that St. Ambrose “brought into the use of the western Church the custom of singing the psalms verse by verse in turns by both sides of the choir: so ^f Isidore, ^g Rabanus, ^h Walafrius Strabo, and ⁱ Radulphus Tungrensis; and so ^k Paulinus in his Life saith, “he brought up the use of ‘antiphonæ’ in the western Church:” and ^l Sigebert adds, “that he took it from the Greeks.” And ^m St. Augustine sets down the occasion of it, viz. “when the people at Milan were persecuted by the Arians, and resolved to abide in the Church; and therefore to keep them well employed he thought upon this custom of ²¹⁹ the eastern Churches;” which not only continued there, but from thence spread into other Churches, not without opposition in some places; as ⁿ St. Augustine confesses, “it met with some at Carthage;” but withal he saith, “he wrote in vindication of it.” In the eastern Church it was of ancient use, if ^o Socrates say true; for he saith, “it begun upon a divine vision to Ignatius,

^e Ambros. Oper. ed. Erasm. tom. 4. p. 128. in Hexaem. lib. 3. cap. 5. Oper. tom. 1. col. 42. Mabil. ibid. §. 1. n. 13. p. 389. Bingham ibid. sect. 11. note ^u.

^f De Offic. lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 3. col. 1.

^g Rab. lib. 2. cap. 50. p. 354. col. 1.

^h Walafri. cap. 25. p. 411. col. 2.

ⁱ Rad. cap. 12. p. 545. col. 1.

^k Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 25. n. 19. lib. 2. cap. 4. n. 1. pp. 486. 507. inter Oper. Bingham ibid. note ^a.

^l Sigeb. Chr. A. D. 387. inter German. Scriptor. tom. 1. p. 485.

^m Confess. lib. 9. cap. 6. 7. Oper. tom. 1. col. 162. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 25. n. 19. lib. 2. cap. 4. n. 1. Mabil. ibid. p. 388, &c. Bingham ibid. note ^z, b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 606. col. 2. note ^r.

ⁿ Retract. lib. 2. cap. 11. Oper. tom. 1. col. 45. Bonæ ib. lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 1, &c. inter Oper. p. 502. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. note ^b, b. 15. ch. 5. sect. 10. note ⁿ.

^o Socr. lib. 6. cap. 8. p. 322. with the notes of Valesius and Pagi therein. Mabil. ibid. n. 6. 7. pp. 383. 384. for this, and note ^q.

at the ^p Church of Antioch." But ^q Theodoret saith, "Flavianus and Diodorus brought it up there;" but the words of Theodorus Mopsuestenus in ^r Nicetas seem to intimate "that they took this custom from the Syriac Churches:" however, Theodoret attributes the beginning of singing the psalms of David in that manner in the Greek Churches to them; from whence he saith, "it spread into other parts." But we find by ^s St. Basil, "it was very hardly received in the Church of Neocæsarea, because it was not introduced by Gregory, who first settled the Church there. Neither," saith he, "were the litanies which they then used brought in by him." And for that custom of singing he saith, "it was practised in the Churches of ^t Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, as far as Euphrates." But it came later into the western Church: ^u Card. Bona saith, "that Damasus first commanded it to be used in all Churches by his apostolical authority;" but ^x Card. Baronius saith, "it is a plain falsehood which the Pontifical book affirms of Damasus's appointing the psalms to be sung in all churches," and he adds, "that the epistles of St. Jerome and Damasus about it are counterfeit: yet those are the authorities which, as appears by ^y Pamelius, the ancient ritualists rely upon.

^p Palmer *ibid.* sect. 1. p. 15. Liturgy of the Patriarchate of Antioch.

^q Theod. lib. 2. cap. 24. p. 107. Bonæ *ibid.*

^r Nicetæ Choniatæ *Thesaur. Orthod. Fid.* lib. 5. cap. 30. p. 482. ed. 1592. See Valesius' note *ibid.* Mabil. *ibid.*

^s Basil. Cæsar. Archiep. *Oper.* tom. 3. epist. (63.) 207. p. 311. Bona *infra* note ^u. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 1. sect. 10. note ^t.

ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 605. col. 2. For the Liturgy of the Exarchate of Cæsarea, ascribed to St. Basil, see Palmer *ibid.* sect. 2. p. 45.

^t For the Liturgy of Alexandria, see Palmer *ibid.* sect. 4. p. 82.

^u *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 2. cap. 4. n. 1. inter *Oper.* p. 507.

^x *Annal. Eccles. A. D.* 384. n. 20.

^y Pamel. *Liturgic.* tom. 1. p. 258.

All that Baronius will allow to be done in the time of Damasus was, that St. Jerome's psalter was then introduced at Rome. And yet we are told, ^zthat to this day the old translation of the psalter is used in St. Peter's, and is called 'psalterium Romanum' in the Rule of St. Francis, which he forbids to be used in divine service; but the same is only used in the Ambrosian office. And ^aCard. Bona observes, that St. Gregory composed the 'antiphonæ' at the 'introitus,' and at the 'responsoria,' &c. out of the old version before St. Jerome's time: of which he gives this reason, ^b"that the people at Rome were so accustomed to it, that they would not learn the New Testament ²²⁰of St. Jerome:" and the same author ^cobserves likewise, "that the old Italic version was not only used in Rome, but in all the suburbicary Churches, and other Churches, Gaul only excepted." ^dAnd from thence St. Jerome's translation was called 'versio Gallicana,' because it was immediately received into the use of the Gallican Churches; so that I see not how ^eBaronius can make good his own assertion, "that St. Jerome's translation of the psalter was introduced by Damasus." But the use of 'allelujah' by St. Jerome's means, as ^{ee}St. Gregory saith, "was brought from the Church of Jerusalem;" which ^fBaronius thinks "is rather to be understood of some particular manner of

^z Gavant. in Brev. Sect. 5. cap. 8. n. 3. vide Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 4. 5. inter Oper. p. 504. Mabil. ibid. §. 2. n. 23. p. 398. See Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 3. sect. 17 near the end.

^a Rer. Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 3. §. 4. inter Oper. p. 504.

^b Bonæ ibid.

^c Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 371.

^d Bonæ ibid. Mabil. ibid. §. 2. n. 21. p. 395, &c. Bingham ibid. and notes ^z and *.

^e Baronii ibid.

^{ee} Regist. lib. 7. ep. 63. in Oper. tom. 2. p. 230. 1. tom. 2. lib. 9. ep. 12. col. 940. Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 527. See Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 2. sect. 4.

^f Baronii ibid. n. 21.

using it." But how he can justify the ancient use of the singing psalms at Rome, either before or after Damasus's time, till Celestine was pope, I cannot imagine, if the Pontifical book say true, for that expressly affirms, "that ^g Celestine appointed David's psalms to be sung 'antiphonatim' before the sacrifice, and that it was not done before, but only the epistles of St. Paul and the holy gospel were read." Which words are repeated by Alcuinus, Amalarius, Rabanus Maurus, Walafridus Strabo, Berno Augiensis, and several other ritualists and historians, as may be seen in ^h Pamelius's collection and ⁱ Cassander's, besides the authors themselves. But ^j Baronius saith, "the use of singing the psalms was from the beginning in the Roman Church," which we are to take upon his word, for he brings no proof of it. It is true, that ^k St. Augustine saith, "that we have the precept and example of Christ and his apostles, for singing in our assemblies." But he speaks not of David's psalms, nor of the Church of Rome; and he saith, "the customs of Churches were very different about this matter." "^lIn the Churches of Africa," he saith, "they confined themselves to the prophetic hymns," for which they were upbraided by the Donatists, as too grave and formal; ^m but he allows singing to be one of the solemn parts of divine service, with which he joins reading the lessons, preaching, and prayer, either aloud by the

^g See p. 217. and note ^m.

^h Liturg. tom. 1. p. 554.

ⁱ Liturg. cap. 18, 21. pp. 37, &c. 41, &c. Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 1.

^j Baron. ibid. A. D. 60. n. 33.

^k Aug. Epist. 119. cap. 18. Oper. tom. 2. ep. 55. cap. 34. col. 142. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 25. n. 19. De Divina Psalmodia

cap. 17. §. 2. n. 3. pp. 486. 876. inter Oper.

^l Bonæ Rerum Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 349. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. note ^a. b. 14. ch. 1. sect. 15. note ^e.

^m Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 1. sect. 1. note ^f.

bishop, or in common, by the deacon's giving notice. ⁿ Justin Martyr mentions the "hymns of the Church," without declaring whether they were composed or inspired; and so do ^o Pliny and ^p Tertullian in some ²²¹ places; but in his ^q Apology he saith, "both were used." ^r Eusebius mentions the hymns composed by Christians which proved the divinity of Christ; and ^s the great esteem the hymns of Nepos were in; and ^t the complaint against Paulus Samosatenus for laying aside the hymns made to the honour of Christ. The council of ^u Laodicea first restrained the use of private hymns in the Church's service, the Greek canonists understand this canon of apocryphal psalms, such as ^v Solomon's Psalter published by La Cerda out of the Augsburg MS. which he highly magnifies, and almost believes to be genuine; but if this canon be extended to all human compositions, it was never received in the western Church, wherein the ^x hymns of St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, Prudentius, and others, have been generally used. And the Ambrosian hymns were received into the service of the Gallican Church, as appears by the second council at ^y Tours; and ^z Cassander

ⁿ Apol. p. 60. Apol. 1. inter Oper. p. 51.

^o Epist. lib. 10. ep. 97. p. 819. et not. 2. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 25. n. 19. inter Oper. p. 486. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 2. sect. 2. note ^a.

^p Tertull. de Virg. Velat. cap. 17. p. 183. ad Uxor. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 172. in Oper.

^q Apol. cap. 39. p. 32. in Oper. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 5. note ^e.

^r Euseb. ibid. lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 252. See Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 2. sect. 3. note ^e, p. 565.

^s Euseb. ibid. lib. 7. cap. 24. p. 350. Bingham ibid. note ^g.

^t Euseb. ibid. cap. 30. p. 362. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 25. n. 19. Bingham ibid. note ^f.

^u Laod. Conc. can. 59. Beve-reg. Pandect. Canon. tom. 1. p. 480. tom. 2. Annot. p. 198. col. 2. Mabil. ibid. De Cursu Gallic. §. 2. n. 26. p. 400. Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 1. sect. 17. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 603. col. 2.

^v Psalter. Solom. Lugd. 1626. ^x Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 602. col. 2. 606. col. 2, &c. b. 14. ch. 2. sect. 10, 11.

^y Concil. Turon. 2. can. 23. Mabil. ib. et §. 5. n. 56. p. 423.

^z Cass. Praef. ad Hymn. Eccl. in Oper. p. 151.

observes, "that not only those made by St. Ambrose, but others in imitation of him, were called by his name," which ^aWalafridus Strabo confirms; but among those the 'Te Deum,' is not reckoned by Cassander, ^bneither is it of the "Ambrosian composition, for those hymns ended their sentence every fourth verse," as he observes. 'Te Deum' is commonly said to have been made by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, at his baptism, and to prove it the ritualists quote the Chronicle of Datius, bishop of Milan. But ^cGavantus observes, "that the learned men of Milan deny that there is any such thing as a Chronicle of Datius among them:" ^dMaillon sent to them to inquire particularly about it, and they returned answer, "that they had no such thing, but that there was such a title put upon a book written by other authors." In an old collection of hymns, and an old Latin and French psalter, mentioned by ^earchbishop Usher, this hymn is attributed to St. Nicetius; and there were two of that name in the Gallican Church, the former of which might probably be the author of it: the one was bishop of Triers, and subscribed to the council of Auvergne, A. D. 535, highly commended for his eloquence and sanctity by ^fGregorius Turonensis, ^gFortunatus, and 222 others; and the other of great fame too and bishop of Lyons, who subscribed to the council there A. D. 567: but against this latter there is a strong objection from the mention of this hymn in the Rule of St. Benedict, cap. 11, who died, according to Baronius,

^a Walafr. cap. 25. p. 413. col. 2.

^b Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 2. sect. 9. Palmer *ibid.* Morning Prayer, sect. 11. p. 226.

^c Gavant. Thesaur. Sacr. Rit. tom. 2. in Brev. sect. 5. cap. 19.

^d Vet. Analect. tom. 1. p. 5.

^e Usser. de Symb. p. 3.

^f Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc. lib. 10. cap. 29. inter Hist. Franc. Scriptor. a Du Chesne, tom. 1. p. 453.

^g Venant. Fortunati Carmin. lib. 3. cap. 11. p. 81.

A. D. 543. It is likewise mentioned in the Rule of ^h Cæsarius, drawn up by ⁱ Tetradius, cap. 21, who died about the same time; and in the Rule of ^k Aurelianus, who was present in the council of Lyons, A. D. 549, in the time of Sacerdos, predecessor to Nicetius. ^kBut I see no reason against the former Nicetius, since ^l Menardus confidently affirms “there is no mention of this hymn in any writers before;” and therefore we may look on this hymn as owing its original to the Gallican Church.

Besides, ^m Cassian takes notice “that in the Gallican Churches, ‘Gloria Patri,’ &c. was said by the people at the end of every psalm.” But ⁿ Walafridus Strabo observes, “that at Rome they used it rarely at the end of the psalms; but more frequently after the ‘responsoria.’” From hence the three cardinals, ^o Bellarmine, ^p Baronius and ^q Bona, all conclude “those ritualists mistaken who make Damasus the author of adding the ‘Gloria Patri,’ &c. to the end of every psalm: and that the epistle under the name of St. Jerome to him about it is notoriously false,” and withal they say, “that the other ritualists are mistaken who attribute it to the council of Nice;” because then there would not have been such difference in the use of it in several Churches. In the Ethiopic eucharistical office of the three hundred and

^h Holst. Cod. Reg. part. 2. p. 93.

ⁱ Holst. *ibid.* p. 112.

^k Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 2. sect. 9. note g to the same purpose.

^l Not. in Sac. Greg. p. 401.

^m Cass. Instit. Monach. lib. 2. cap. 8. Oper. p. 28. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 2. De Psalm. cap. 16. n. 6. inter Oper. pp. 502. 826. col. 2. Mabillon *ibid.* §. 2. n. 32. p. 405. Bingham *ib.*

b. 13. ch. 10. s. 14. note 7. See p. 228. note d.

ⁿ De Rebus Eccles. cap. 25. p. 413. col. 1. edit. Hittorp. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 2. s. 1. note h.

^o Bellar. de Miss. lib. 2. c. 16.

^p Baron. A.D. 325. n. 175.

^q Bonæ de Psalm. cap. 16. inter Oper. p. 826. col. 2. n. 6. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 2. sect. 1. note g.

eighteen fathers at the council of Nice, bestowed on me by my worthy friend, Dr. Castell, this hymn itself is not used; but the office consists chiefly of a lofty and divine paraphrase upon it. In the liturgy of Dioscorus it is used in the middle of the prayers. It is evident from ^r St. Basil's discourse concerning it, that the hymn itself was of ancient use in the eastern Church; but he doth not say in what part of the Church's service it was used; but ^s Cassian saith, "over all the east it was used only to conclude the antiphona;" by which he understands a hymn between the psalms: ^t Walafridus Strabo observes great diversity in the use of it in the western Churches; "Some put it," he saith, "into all 223 offices; some at the end of every psalm; some at every breaking off the longer psalms; some after the responsals;" but the use in general was universally approved, only the Greeks found fault with the Latins for putting in the middle, "^u sicut erat in principio," but the use thereof was required in all the Gallican Churches in the time of ^x Cæsarius, archbishop of Arles (as ^y uniformity was required by other councils). ^z Cardinal Bona, following Baronius, makes that council much elder which

^r Ad Amphil. c. 7. c. 27. in Oper. Basil. Cæsar. Archiep. tom. 3. pp. 13, 54, &c.

^s Cassian. lib. 2. cap. 8. Oper. p. 28. Mabillon *ibid.* Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 10. s. 14. note ^y.

^t Hittorp. *ibid.* p. 412. col. 2. Palmer *ibid.* Morning Prayer, sect. 7. p. 220. Evening Prayer, sect. 2. p. 253.

^u Vide Bonæ Rer. Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 3. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 503. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. c. 2. s. 1. note ^e.

^x Concil. Vas. 2. c. 5. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 4. col. 1680. Mabillon *ibid.* §. 2. n. 34. p. 407. §. 5. n. 56. p. 423. Bingham *ibid.* and

b. 14. ch. 2. s. 1. note ^f.

^y Concil. Agath. c. 30. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 4. col. 1388. Mabillon *ibid.* Præf. ad Liturg. Gallic. p. 2. De Cursu Gallic. §. 1. n. 19. p. 395. §. 2. n. 26. p. 400. §. 5. n. 49, 50. pp. 418, 419. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 5. s. 2. notes ^b, ^c, ^d, ^e, ^f. Venet. can. 15. Labbei *ibid.* tom. 4. col. 1057. Epaon. can. 27. Labbe. tom. 4. col. 1579. Gerund. can. 1. Labbe. tom. 4. col. 1568. Brac. 2. can. 12. Labbe. *ibid.* tom. 5. col. 841. Tolet. 4. can. 2. Labbe. *ibid.* tom. 5. col. 1704.

^z Bonæ de Divina Psalmodia *ibid.* (in Vasens.) Baron. Annal.

required the use of this hymn, and soon after the council of Nice; but that cannot be, if the subscriptions in Sirmondus be true; and he observes that mistake in Baronius to have risen from misunderstanding a passage of Ado Viennensis. So that the morning service of the Gallican Churches consisted chiefly in lessons, hymns and psalms of St. Jerome's translation, with 'Gloria Patri' at the end of every psalm. ^aThe Latin tongue being yet the common language of the Roman provinces.

But are we to suppose, that they met together for the worship of God without any prayers? I answer, that they had then two sorts of prayers in their assemblies :

1. ^b Private prayers of each particular person by himself.

2. A concluding collect, which was the common prayer, wherein they all joined.

1. That they had such private prayers in their assemblies I prove from ^c Cassian, who reproves the custom of some in the Gallican Churches, " who fell to their private devotions on their knees, before the psalm was well ended." "^d But," he saith, " the Egyptian monks used to spend some time in prayer to themselves standing, and then fall down for a short space in a way of adoration, and presently rise up again, continuing their devotions standing." All which is capable of no other sense, but that between the psalms a time was allowed in the Gallican Churches as well as Egyptian monasteries,

Eccles. A. D. 325. n. 176. A. D. 442. n. 3. Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. tom. 1. p. 225.

^a Mabillon *ibid.* §. 2. n. 29. p. 403.

^b Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. chap. 1. s. 1.

^c De Instit. Mon. lib. 2. cap. 7. Oper. p. 27. Vide Bonæ Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 5. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 514. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. chap. 8. s. 4. note ^z. b. 15. chap. 1. s. 4, and note ^z.

^d See note ⁱ, p. 217.

for private devotions in the public assemblies. ^e Gregor. Turonensis saith, “that in the Gallican Churches the deacon did ‘*silentium indicere*;’” and the priest did it by the ^f Mozarabic liturgy, which Eugenius Roblesius understands only of “making the people attentive;” which I grant was part of the deacon’s office and design 224 in commanding silence, as appears by several passages in the ancient liturgies both Greek and Latin. But there was a further meaning in it, and that the people were for a time there to attend to their own private prayers, appears not improbable to me on these considerations. (1.) ^g Gregory Turonensis saith, in the place before mentioned, “that the king took that time to speak to the people, who immediately break forth into a prayer for the king;” not that any collect was then read for him, for that was not the proper time for it; but it being a time of secret prayers, they were so moved with what the king said, that they all prayed for him. (2.) Among the heathens, when they were bidden ‘*favere linguis*,’ yet then ^h Brissonius saith, “they made their private prayers;” and as the deacon’s commanding silence seems to be much of the same nature, it is not probable that the Christians should fall short of their devotions. (3.) The great argument to me, is the small number of collects in the ancient Churches; for the Christians spent a great deal of time in the public service on the Lord’s days and the stationary days; but

^e Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc. lib. 7. cap. 8. inter Hist. Franc. Script. a Du Chesne, tom. 1. p. 379. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 372. Mabill. De Liturg. Gallic. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 11. p. 21. cap. 5. n. 5. p. 38. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 1. s. 1. and note f.

^f Eug. Robles. de Officio Moz-

arab. cap. 28. in Auctar. Biblioth. Patrum, tom. 2. col. 1650. Paris. 1610. Bonæ ibid. et c. 11. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 366. Mabil. ibid. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 11. p. 21. For the Liturgy of Spain, Palmer ibid. sect. 10. p. 166.

^g Mabillon ibid. p. 21.

^h De Formulæ, p. 9.

all the other offices could not take up that time, there being no long extemporary prayers, nor such a multitude of tedious ceremonies in all parts, as the Roman Breviary and Missal introduced, and the ⁱ collects of greatest antiquity, being very few and short, ^k it seems most probable, that a competent part of the time was spent in private devotions. A remainder whereof is still preserved in the office of ordination of priests in our Church, whereby “silence is commanded to be kept for a time, for the people’s secret prayers.” And the same custom was observed at the bidding of prayers, which was a direction for the people what to pray for in their ^l private devotions; after which followed the Lord’s prayer as the concluding collect. But either that or another was still used after these silent prayers, and that is the true ancient reason of the name: for ^m Micrologus saith, “the name ‘collecta’ was, because the priest therein did ‘omnium preces colligere,’” or, as ⁿ Walafrius Strabo saith, “necessarias omnium petitiones compendiosa brevitate colligere.” This was distinct from the prayer made ^o ‘ad collectam,’ before the people went to the stationary Churches; of which ²²⁵ Onuphrius Panvinius and Fronto in his *Calendarium Romanum* have said enough. But as to the Gallican Churches, the ^p council of Agde shews that after the other offices were performed in the morning and even-

ⁱ See Palmer *ibid.* Morning Prayer, sect. 16. p. 242. Evening Prayer, sect. 10. p. 260.

^k Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 9. s. 2. note g.

^l Vid. Matt. Parker. *Concion.* in *Obit. Bucer.* p. 65 b. in *Hist. de Vita Bucerii, &c.*

^m *Micr. lib.* 3. *ibid.* p. 437. col. 2.

ⁿ *Walaf. cap.* 22. *ibid.* p. 407. col. 1. Vide *Bonæ ibid.* lib. 2.

cap. 5. n. 3. *inter Oper.* p. 516. on this and note ^m.

^o *Microlog. ibid.* *Bonæ ibid.* lib. 2. *cap.* 5. n. 3.

^p *Con. Agath. c.* 30. *Labbe. ibid. tom.* 4. *col.* 1388. *Bonæ ibid. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. n. 4. *inter Oper.* p. 332. *Mabillon ibid. De Cursu Gallic. §.* 5. n. 61. p. 425. *Bingham ibid. b.* 13. *ch.* 11. s. 6. note ^s. b. 15. *ch.* 1. s. 4. and note ^b.

ing service, the people were to be dismissed by the bishop ‘collecta oratione,’ i. e. with a concluding collect.

2. As to the communion service ^q Gennadius saith, “that Musæus composed a large volume of the sacraments, with several offices according to the seasons, with a diversity of lessons, and psalms, and anthems, and prayers and thanksgivings.” This book is called “Liber Sacramentorum,” and so is ^r Gregory’s, saith ^s Menardus in several MSS., and the old missal published by Illyricus is called ^t “Ordo Sacramentorum;” which was the name given to the books of liturgic offices, which were called “Sacramenta,” ^u both by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, as Menardus shews. ^x Cardinal Bona confesses, “that there is undoubted evidence that the old Gallican liturgy differed from the Roman;” and ^y Charles the Great not only saith, “that there was such a difference in the celebration of the divine offices; but that the Gallican Churches were very unwilling to change theirs for the Roman,” ^z Matthias Flacius Illyricus (not Flavius, as Le Cointe pretends to correct his name) having found an ancient MS. missal, and discerning several different prayers in it from the Roman missal, thought this to have been the ancient Gallican missal, wherein he is followed by ^a Le Cointe, who hath printed

^q Gennad. in Musæo. Hieron. Oper. tom. 5. col. 43. cap. 81. Mabillon *ibid.* De Liturg. Gallic. lib. 1. cap. 4. n. 5. p. 28. See p. 217. note ^b.

^r Mabillon *ibid.* cap. 3. n. 2. p. 16.

^s Not. in Sac. Greg. p. 1. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 1. s. 6.

^t Bonæ *ibid.* Append. inter Oper. p. 611.

^u Bingham *ibid.*

^x *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 1. cap. 12.

n. 5. inter Oper. p. 372.

^y Car. de Imag. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 132. inter Imper. Decret. de Cultu Imag. edit. Goldast. Bonæ *ibid.* n. 1. p. 369. inter Oper. Mabillon *ibid.* Præf. p. 1. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 2. p. 16. See p. 237.

^z Bonæ *ibid.* n. 2. Mabillon *ibid.* Præf. p. 4. cap. 3. n. 4. p. 17.

^a *Annal. Eccles. Franc.* t. 2. A. D. 601. n. 20. p. 488. Bonæ *ibid.* n. 2, 3. Mabillon *ibid.* Præf. p. 4. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 5. p. 18.

it at large in his Annals; with an epitome of it published by Menardus out of an ancient copy. But ^b he shews that Illyricus's copy could not be of that antiquity he pretends, viz. "before the time of Gregory the Great:" there being several things in it not of that age; which were not in the old missal of 986, and were in another of later date: to which Le Cointe returns no answer; but because this differs from the Roman missal, he concludes it must be the Gallican; whereas, upon perusing it, it will appear rather to be a ^csupplement to the Roman missal for the devotion of those that celebrate it, consisting chiefly of private prayers to be used by them before celebration, and during the singing of the several hymns: for the common parts of the office, as the 'introitus,' 'epistola,' 'graduale,' 'evangelium,' 'offertorium,' 'secreta,' 'præfatio,' 'communio,' et 'post-communio,' are only referred to, and not set down; whereas if this had been the Gallican missal, all those parts would have been set down rather more distinctly than others. ^dCard. Bona thinks it "not to have been before the end of the tenth century, about which time several such private missals were made." But he concludes, that certainly this was not the old Gallican missal: "what it was," he thinks "hard to determine," and I think so too; if such authors as Hilduinus must be relied on. It is true, ^e he mentions "the old missals which contained the Gallican liturgy from the first reception of the Christian faith, till the Roman missal was received;" but he is an author of no authority, and quotes these

^b Menard. App. ad Lib. Sacr. p. 381. Vide Bonæ ibid. n. 2, 3. ut supra. Mabillon ibid. n. 6. p. 18.

^c Bonæ ibid. n. 3, 4. Mabillon ibid. p. 19.

^d Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 371. Mabillon ibid. Præf. p. 4. cap. 3. n. 6. p. 18.

^e Bonæ ibid. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 372. Mabillon ibid. n. 8. p. 20.

missals for a thing notoriously false, viz. “^f the martyrdom of Dionysius Areopagita in Gaul.” And he pretends, that Innocentius, Gelasius and Gregory, “all endeavoured to alter the Gallican liturgy,” which continued in use till Pepin’s time: so that from Hilduinus no certain note can be taken. It is much more material which ^g Berno Augiensis saith, “that in the archives of their monastery, he found an old missal wherein the offices were very differently ordered from what they were in the Roman.” And he mentions one remarkable particular of the Roman missal, which is the

1. Difference I shall observe in the communion-service, viz. “^h that the creed was not said nor sung at Rome after the gospel,” of which he saith, they gave this reason, “because the Roman Church was never infected with heresy;” which, he saith, “the emperor Henry I. was so little satisfied with, that he never ceased, till they had introduced it at Rome;” which, saith ⁱ Baronius, was done A. D. 1014, but he seems not pleased “that the former custom was broken.” ^k Before that time, none that speak of the customs of the Roman missal ever mention the creed, as may be seen in Alcuinus, Amalarius, Rabanus, and others. And this cannot be understood barely of the Constantinopolitan or Nicene creed, as ^l Menardus well proves, “because then Berno would have spoken more distinctly.”
 227 And the Athanasian creed, as far as we can trace it, was first used in the Gallican Churches, and that use

^f Bonæ ibid. Mabillon ibid.

ch. 2. s. 8.

^g De Rebus ad Missam Spect. cap. 2. in Hittorp. ibid. p. 421. Bonæ ibid.

ⁱ Baron. A. D. 1014. n. 5. Bonæ ibid.

^k Bonæ ibid.

^h Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 8. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 538. Mabillon ibid. cap. 2. n. 6. p. 7. Bingham ibid. b. 10. ch. 4. s. 17. b. 14.

^l Not. in Greg. Sacr. p. 370. See Palmer ibid. vol. 2. The holy Communion, sect. 6. p. 53, &c.

first mentioned by Abbo Floriacensis in some fragments sent by Nicolaus Faber to ^mBaronius. But whosoever considers the universal silence about that creed before, and compares it with the profession of faith in the first canon of the fourth council of Toledo, which then took so many of the Gallican offices into the service of the Spanish Churches, will see reason to believe that this creed was originally of a ⁿ Gallican composition, and thence was carried into Spain upon the conversion of the Goths from Arianism, wherein several expressions are taken out of St. Augustine's works. ^o Ruffinus shews, "that those that were to be baptized did at Rome repeat the creed;" but that is another thing from its use in the liturgy, which both Baronius and ^p Bona confess was so lately introduced at Rome. So that here we have one considerable difference of the Roman offices from those of other Churches; for ^q Isidore saith, "that the Nicene creed was then used in the Gothic Churches in the time of sacrifice;" ^r as the Church service was then called; for that it had no relation to that which is called "the sacrifice of the mass," appears by ^s Concil. Aurel. 3. can. 29, where we find the name of 'sacrifice' applied to the evening service, "sacrificia matutina missarum, sive vespertina;" and so ^t Cassian uses "sacrificia vespertina" in allusion to the custom of sacrificing among the Jews. And ^u Hono-

^m Baron. A.D. 1001. n. 3.

6. col. 2. ed. Hittorp.

ⁿ See Stillingfleet's Works, vol. 4. p. 37. Bingham *ibid.* b. 10. ch. 4. s. 18. Palmer *ibid.* Morning Prayer, sect. 14. p. 233.

^r Bingham *ib.* b. 13. ch. 1. s. 5.

^o Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 8. n. 2. in Oper. p. 538.

^s Mabillon *ibid.* cap. 6. n. 1. p. 54.

^p *Ibid.* See Bingham, b. 10. ch. 4. s. 17. note ¹.

^t Cassian. de Instit. Monach. lib. 3. cap. 3. Oper. p. 45. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 1. s. 5. note ^h.

^q De Eccles. Offic. cap. 16. p.

^u Vit. Hilar. Arel. cap. 21. inter Leon. Oper. p. 748.

ratus, in the Life of St. Hilarius of Arles, calls it “sacrificium vespertinæ laudis.” And “missa” was then used for the public service, as ^xCassander and others shew. ^yIn the Rule of St. Benedict, “missæ” are to be taken for the concluding collects at the canonical hours. ^zCassian useth “missa” for any public meeting at prayers, thence he speaks of “missa nocturna” and “missa orationum,” and “missa canonica,” for the nocturnal office among the monks; ^aand in the Concil. Agath. c. 30, we read of “missæ vespertinæ.” But afterwards the name was appropriated to the most solemn part of public worship, viz. the communion service. ^bIn which the creed was appointed by the third council of Toledo, c. 2, in all the Churches of Spain and Gallæcia; or, as some 228 copies have it, ‘of Gallia;’ which is confirmed by an edict of Reccaredus to that purpose; which extended to that part of Gallia Narbonensis, then under the Gothic power; where a ^ccouncil met under Reccaredus, about the same time; in which ‘Gloria Patri’ was decreed to be used at the end of every psalm; ^dwhich was observed by the other Gallican Churches in Cassian’s time. It seems very probable, that the Spanish Churches did follow the customs of the Gallican in other parts of the divine offices as well as this; which appears by the passage in the epistle of Carolus Calvus produced by

^x Liturg. cap. 17. p. 34.

^y Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 2. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 331.

^z Cassian. de Instit. lib. 2. cap. 13. lib. 3. cap. 5. Oper. pp. 35. 54. Bonæ ibid. n. 1, &c. cap. 21. n. 3. inter Oper. pp. 330. 423. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 1. s. 4. note ^t.

^a Bonæ ibid. Bingham ibid.

^b Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 8. n. 2. inter Oper. p. 537. Mabilon ibid. cap. 1. n. 2. p. 2. cap. 4. n. 10. p. 31. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. s. 26. and note ^l. b. 10. ch. 4. s. 17. note ^t.

^c Concil. Narbon. 1. can. 2. in Sirmond. Concil. Antiq. Gall. tom. 1. p. 399.

^d See p. 222. note ^m.

^e Card. Bona, where speaking of the ancient Gallican offices before the introduction of the Roman; he saith, “he had seen and heard how different they were by the priests of the Church of Toledo, who had celebrated the offices of their Church before him.” Which had signified nothing to this matter, unless the Gothic and Gallican offices had then agreed. I do not say that the old Gallican service can be gathered from all the parts of the Mozarabic liturgy, as it was settled by ^f Card. Ximenes, in a chapel of the Church of Toledo; or as it is performed on certain days at Salamanca, because many alterations might be in those offices as well as others in so long time; and such no doubt there were, as ^g Mariana confesseth, “by the length of time;” although it did bear the name of Leander and Isidore. For ^h Julianus Toletanus is said to have reviewed the whole office, and to have altered and added many things, and Johannes Cæsaraugustanus and Conantius, and after them Petrus Ilerdensis, and Salvus Abbaildensis, besides such whose names are not preserved; but so far as we can trace the ancient customs of the Gothic missal, we may probably infer what the customs of the Gallican Churches at that time were, and thereby shew the difference between them and the Roman offices. As besides this of the creed;

2. The prophetic lessons were always to be read by the rules of the Mozarabic liturgy: and accordingly three books were laid upon the altar in the Gallican

^e Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 372. See p. 237. and note ⁿ.

^f Gomes. de Vit. Ximen. lib. 2. in Hispan. Illust. tom. 1. p. 970. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 11. n. 3. inter Oper. p. 365. Mabillon ibid. cap. 2. n. 11. p. 13. De Cursu

Gallic. §. 1. n. 16. p. 392, &c.

^g Marian. de Rebus Hisp. lib. 6. cap. 5. in Hispan. Illust. t. 2. p. 360. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 11. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 363.

^h Ildephons. de Script. Eccles. in Append. p. 99. in Miræi Biblioth. Eccles. Bonæ ibid.

Churches, as ⁱGregorius Turonensis observes, “that of the Prophets, and of the Epistles, and of the Gospels.”
^k But nothing but the epistle and gospel were read at
 229 Rome, as is shewed already; ^l which manifests that the book under St. Jerome’s name, called the Lectionarius or Comes, must be counterfeit; because therein lessons out of the Prophets are set down: and the authorities of Berno Augiensis, Micrologus and Radulphus Tungrensis, which are the best ^m Pamelius could find, are not great enough against so plain evidence to the contrary, to prove this Lectionarius to have been made by St. Jerome. And he confesses that Amalarius several times only mentions the “auctor Lectionarii” without St. Jerome’s name, who lived a good while before them. But in this the Roman Church had its peculiar rites; for, in the Church of Milan, first a lesson out of the Prophets was read before the epistle, as appears by ⁿ Sulpicius Severus. And in the Greek Church, ^o St. Basil saith, “that lessons out of the Old as well as the New Testament were read.” By the ^p council of Laodicea, “all the canonical books were appointed to

ⁱ Greg. Turonen. *ibid.* lib. 4. cap. 16. lib. 8. cap. 7. *inter Hist. Franc. Script.* a Du Chesne, t. 1. pp. 313. 396. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 5. *inter Oper.* p. 372. Mabillon *ibid.* De Liturg. Gallic. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 10. p. 21.

^k See p. 217.

^l Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. note ^s.

^m Tom. 2. Liturg. in Præfat. Vide Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 2. *inter Oper.* p. 524.

ⁿ Sever. Sulpic. Vit. Martini, lib. 3. Pamel. *ibid.* tom. 1. p. 276. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 10. n. 2. lib. 2. cap. 6. n. 3. *inter*

Oper. pp. 362. 525. Stillingfleet has been misled by the reference in Pamelius. The place quoted is not to be found in Severus Sulpicius, but in Gregorii Turonens. de Virtut. et Mirac. S. Martin. lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 315, which agrees with Bona, in the place last quoted.

^o Basil. Cæsar. Archiepisc. Homil. 13. 21. in *Oper.* tom. 2. pp. 114. 163, &c. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 3. s. 2. notes ^k, 1.

^p Concil. Laod. can. 59. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. 1. p. 480. Bonæ *ibid.* See p. 221. and note ^u.

be read." ^q Zonaras observes, on the sixteenth canon of that council, "that before this council there were nothing but prayers before the consecration:" but therein he was certainly mistaken; for ^r Justin Martyr shews, "that the lessons were read long before, and that out of the Prophets as well as Apostles." But ^s Balsamon and Aristenus restrained this canon only to Saturdays; and it enjoins "the reading of the Gospels" then, which was not accustomed before, there being no religious assemblies in those parts on that day: but by the same canon we find, "that where the Gospels were read, other Scriptures were appointed to be read too." It is observed by ^t Dominicus Macer, that "at the lessons of the Old Testament the Greeks do sit; but stand at those out of the New." ^u Sozomen reckons it as a peculiar custom of Alexandria, "that the bishop did not rise up at the gospels:" and ^x Nicephorus Callisthus saith, it was contrary to the practice of all other Churches.

3. ^y After the gospel, the sermon followed in other Churches; but in the old Roman offices, there is no mention at all of any sermon to the people. ^z Card. Bona saith, "that it hath been the uninterrupted practice of the Church from the apostles' times to our own, for the sermon to follow after the gospel." And

^q Bevereg. *ibid.* p. 460. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. chap. 3. s. 2. note ^q.

^r *Apol.* 2. p. 98. *Apol.* 1. in *Oper.* p. 83. Bonæ *ibid.* n. 1. inter *Oper.* p. 523. Bingham *ibid.* note ^h.

^s Bevereg. *ibid.*

^t *Hiero-lexicon.* v. *Lectio.* p. 349.

^u Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 19. p. 307. Bingham *ibid.* s. 10. note ^m.

^x Nicephor. Callist. *Eccles. Hist.* tom. 2. lib. 12. cap. 34. p. 298.

^y Mabillon *ibid.* cap. 4. n. 13, 14. p. 34. cap. 5. n. 8. p. 40. Bingham *ibid.* b. 13. ch. 1. s. 2. b. 14. ch. 1. s. 1. ch. 3. s. 5. Palmer *ibid.* vol. 2. *The holy Communion*, sect. 7. p. 58, &c.

^z *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 2. cap. 7. n. 6. inter *Oper.* p. 534.

230 he doth sufficiently prove the antiquity of it from the testimonies of ^a Justin Martyr and ^b Tertullian, and the general practice of it in other Churches, especially the Gallican; but he offers no proof that it was observed in the Church of Rome. But ^c Sozomen observes it as the peculiar custom of that Church, “that there was no preaching in it, neither by the bishop nor by any one else.” ^d Valesius seems to wonder at it, but he saith, “if it had not been true, Cassiodore, who certainly knew the customs of that Church, would never have repeated it.” ^e In the Sacramentary of Gregory, the offertory immediately follows after the gospel; and ^f Micrologus saith, “finito evangelio, statim est offerendum,” cap. 10. And to the same purpose in the ^g Ordo Romanus: but in the Ordo of the western Churches, published by ^h Cassander with the other, there “the bishop is to be attended on after the gospel, in order to his preaching;” but if he will not, “then the creed is to be sung.” And according to this custom the ⁱ Gemma Animæ is to be understood when it saith, “that after the gospel the bishop preaches to the people.” It is true, that in the Church of Rome Leo did make some sermons on solemn occasions; “but he was the first that did it,” saith ^k Quesnel, if Sozomen may be believed. It is possible, that upon some extraordinary occasions the bishops of Rome might speak to the people before his

^a Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 4. sect. 3. note t.

^b Bingham *ibid.* sect. 1. note g.

^c Soz. *ibid.* lib. 7. cap. 19. p. 307. Bingham *ibid.* b. 14. ch. 4. sect. 3. and note p.

^d In not. ad Soz. *ibid.*

^e Pamel. *ibid.* tom. 2. p. 178.

^f De Eccles. Observ. cap. 10. p. 440. col. 1. in Hittorp. *ibid.*

^g In Hittorp. *ibid.* pp. 12. 17.

^h Liturg. pp. 52. 105.

ⁱ Gem. Animæ, lib. 1. cap. 25. in Honor. Oper. in Biblioth. Vet. Patrum, tom. 20. p. 1050. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 7. n. 7. inter Oper. p. 534.

^k De Vit. et Gestis Leonis, p. 257. inter Leonis Oper. tom. 2. Bingham *ibid.* notes r and s.

time, as Liberius is said by ¹ St. Ambrose to have done at St. Peter's : but this signifies nothing to the constant office of preaching, which was not used in the Church of Rome by any bishop before Leo, nor by many after, as it was in other Churches. In the Gallican Churches, as ^m Christianus Lupus observes, the bishops called their office 'prædicationis officium,' as appears by the profession both of bishops and archbishops, among ⁿ Sirmondus's Formulæ, published out of ancient copies. And in the royal confirmation they were charged to be diligent in preaching. The same author tells us, ^o " that Charles the Great was so strict in requiring it, that he made the penalty of the neglect of it to be no less than deposition," which is warranted by the ^p apostolical canon 58. ^q The council in Trullo, can. 19, " charges the bishops to preach constantly, but especially on the Lord's days; the want whereof was extremely lamented afterwards in the Greek Church by ^r Barlaam and ^s Gregorius Protosyncellus. And the neglect of it in the Armenian Churches hath brought the episcopal order into so great contempt, as ^t Clemens Galanus reports, (who was a long time among them,) that he saith, " they use their bishops for little else but to give orders;" but the only men in esteem are their 'vartabret,' (whom he renders 'magistri,' their preachers,) whom the people regard far beyond their

¹ Ambros. de Virg. veland. lib. 3. in Oper. ed. Erasm. tom. 1. p. 112. Oper. tom. 2. col. 173.

^m In Can. Trull. inter schol. et not. in Canones, &c. tom. 2. p. 901. Vide Bonæ ibid.

ⁿ Sirmond. tom. 2. Conc. Gall. Form. 12, 13. p. 654.

^o Vide Bonæ ibid.

^p Bevereg. ibid. tom. 1. p. 38. Annot. tom. 2. p. 30. Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 4. sect. 2. note ^t.

b. 2. ch. 3. sect. 4. note ^k.

^q Bevereg. ibid. tom. 1. p. 177. Annot. tom. 2. p. 131. Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 4. sect. 2. note ⁱ.

^r Barlaam, Epist. 1. in Bibl. Patrum edit. Bignæi, tom. 26. p. 5.

^s Greg. Apol. ad Marc. Ephes. inter Florent. Synod. tom. 2. p. 476. edit. Steph. Paulin.

^t Concil. Eccl. Armenæ, &c. cap. 28. p. 454.

bishops, "because," they say, "they represent Christ himself, as he was rabbi, or the teacher of his Church." But to return to the western Churches. In the Church of Milan, ^u St. Augustine saith, "he heard St. Ambrose every Lord's day;" and he saith, ^x "he accounted it the proper office of a bishop to preach," which he performed, as in other Churches, ^y after the gospel, before the dismissal of the 'catechumeni :'^z but by the Mozarabic liturgy the sermon was after their dismissal.

4. The Gallican Churches had peculiar offices after the sermon; so ^a Walafridus Strabo saith, "that some of those prayers were still in use among many." And ^b Micrologus, "that the prayer, 'Veni Sanctificator, &c.' was taken out of the Gallican Ordo." But to make this more clear we are to consider, that there were some parts of the communion service wherein ^c all the ancient offices agreed; as in the ^d 'Sursum corda,' and 'Habemus ad Dominum,' used in the eastern as well as western Churches: and there are as plain testimonies of their use in the African and Gallican Churches as the Roman, before the Roman offices came to be imposed on other Churches. The 'Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro,' and 'Vere dignum et justum est æquum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere,' are mentioned by ^e St. Cyril, ^f St. Chrysostom,

^u Confess. lib. 6. cap. 3. Oper. tom. 1. col. 121.

^x Ambros. Oper. tom. 1. p. 1. De Offic. lib. 1. cap. 1. ed. Erasm. Oper. tom. 2. col. 2. Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 4. sect. 2. note p.

^y Ambros. Epist. 33. lib. 5. in Oper. tom. 3. p. 160. edit. Erasm. tom. 2. epist. 20. col. 855. edit. Bened. Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 5. sect. 13. note o.

^z Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 11. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 366. Mabil.

ibid. cap. 2. n. 11. p. 11.

^a Walafr. 22. p. 407. col. 1.

^b Microlog. cap. 11. p. 440. col. 1. ibid. Mabil. ibid. cap. 5. n. 12. p. 43.

^c Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 10. n. 1. 2. inter Oper. p. 551.

^d Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 8.

^e Ibid. b. 13. ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 602. col. 1.

^f Ibid. ch. 6. sect. 5. p. 616. col. 2.

§ St. Augustine, and other ancient writers. ^h This latter part in the Mozarabic liturgy is called ‘inlatio.’
ⁱ The ‘trisagion’ was generally used; I do not mean that which was said to have come by revelation in the time of Proclus at ^k Constantinople, but that which the Greeks call *ἐπιτίκιος*, and is called ‘trisagium’ in the Ambrosian missal, and was used with a more ample paraphrase in the ^l eastern Churches. ^m All these parts are retained in the excellent office of our Church; not from the Church of Rome, (as our dissenters ²³² weakly imagine,) but from the consent of all the ancient Churches in the use of them; which it hath followed likewise in the putting them into a language understood by the people, (as ⁿ Cassander fully shews.) And in the use of the hymn ‘Gloria in excelsis,’ which, with the addition to the Scripture words, was used in the eastern Churches, as appears by the ^o Apostolical Constitutions, and a passage in ^p Athanasius’s works, and several Greek MSS. of it; this was called ‘hymnus angelicus,’ from the beginning of it, and ‘hymnus

§ Ibid. ch. 5. sect. 7. p. 609. col. 2.

^h Bonæ ibid. n. 1. Mabil. ibid. cap. 2. n. 11. p. 12. cap. 3. n. 17. p. 24. See p. 233. note ^l.

ⁱ Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 10. n. 4, 5. inter Oper. p. 554. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 9, 10.

^k For the Liturgy of Constantinople, see Palmer, ibid. sect. 3. p. 73.

^l For other Liturgies not already alluded to as described by Palmer, see ibid. sect. v. p. 106. for the Liturgy of the Church of Ephesus; in the Additions, p. 190, &c. for the Liturgy of Armenia; p. 194, &c. for the Nestorian Liturgies; p. 196, &c. for

the Indian Liturgies.

^m See Palmer ibid. vol. 2. The holy Communion, from sect. 1. p. 19, throughout.

ⁿ Liturg. cap. 28. 36. pp. 63. 86, &c. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 4, throughout.

^o Constit. Apost. lib. 7. cap. 47. c. 48. In Labbe Sac. Concil. tom. 1. col. 452. Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 4. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 511. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 10. sect. 9. note ^o. b. 14. c. 2. s. 2. See ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 31.

^p Athanas. Oper. tom. 1. p. 1057. tom. 2. p. 122. among the doubtful works of Athanasius. Bonæ ibid. Bingham ibid. b. 13. note p. b. 14, 15. ibid.

matutinus,' from the ancient time of using it, as appears not only from other MSS. but from the famous Alexandrian copy of the LXX. where it is set down in large letters, and called by the name of the 'morning hymn.' Its use in the Gallican Church is attested by the ^qancient MS. in the beginning of this discourse; and ^rAlcuinus makes St. Hilary of Poictou to have been the enlarger of it. ^sThe prayer for the Church militant; ^tfor kings and princes, ^uand all ranks and orders of men; ^xthe commemoration of saints departed; ^ythe reading the words of institution, ^zand using the Lord's Prayer; were in all the ancient liturgies as parts of the communion service, and therefore are not to be looked on as appropriated to the canon of the mass in the Church of Rome.

Wherein then did the difference consist between the Roman and Gallican Churches at that time as to this service?

In answer to this question, I shall go through the other parts of it and shew the difference.

1. The Gallican office began with a peculiar con-

^q See p. 216.

^r Alcuin. cap. 42. De Divinis Officiis. De Celebrat. Missæ et ejus Signif. p. 80. col. 2. Bonæ ibid. Mabil. ibid. cap. 4. n. 6. p. 29.

^s Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 11. n. 3. cap. 4. n. 3. inter Oper. pp. 558. 510. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 12, compared with ch. 1. sect. 2. of the same book. b. 10. ch. 10. sect. 4.

^t Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 11. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 559. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 10. sect. 5. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 14.

^u See note ^s. Bonæ ibid. lib. 2.

cap. 11. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 560. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 18-21.

^x Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 14. n. 1. 2. De Divina Psalm. cap. 13. inter Oper. p. 570. p. 785. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 15. 16. b. 23. ch. 3. sect. 13.

^y Bonæ Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 13. sect. 1. inter Oper. p. 555. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 11.

^z Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 15. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 575. Bingham ibid. b. 13. ch. 7. sect. 3. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 27.

fession of sins made by the priest, which was called ‘apologia;’ a form whereof ^a cardinal Bona hath published out of a very ancient MS. in the queen of Sweden’s library, and which he proves to have been the old Gallican office. It is true, that several forms of such confessions are in the ^bSacramentary of Gregory, but all different from the Gallican form. In the old missal of Rataldus, abbot of Corbey, published by ^c Menardus, instead of the apology, we read that form, “Suscipe confessionem meam, unica spes salutis meæ, ²³³ Domine Deus meus,” &c. And then follows a particular enumeration of sins, and a general confession of them. And a different form is produced by ^dMenardus out of another ancient missal, which he calls the Codex Tilianus, and seems most agreeable to the old Gallican mentioned by Bona; and there is ^ea great variety of forms of confession and supplication in the old missal published by Illyricus. But I observe, that the form prescribed in the Roman missal is in none of them; viz. ^f“confiteor Deo omnipotenti, B. Mariæ semper virgini, B. Michaeli archangelo, &c. et omnibus sanctis, &c. ideo precor B. Mariam, &c. omnes sanctos, &c.... orare pro me ad Dominum nostrum:” for all the ancient forms of confession were only to God himself, and so they continued for one thousand years after Christ; ^gabout which time Menardus saith, “the several ancient missals before mentioned do bear date.” The common ritualists attribute the present form to

^a Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 1. n. 1. Mabil. *ibid.* in Missal. Gothic. p. 251. Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 1. sect. 1. and note ^d.

^b Sac. Greg. p. 242. Bonæ *ib.*

^c Sac. Greg. p. 262. Bonæ *ib.* lib. 2. cap. 2. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 499.

^d Greg. Sac. p. 269. Bonæ *ib.*

^e Bonæ *ibid.* App. inter Oper. p. 616, &c.

^f Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 2. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 499.

^g Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 3. inter Oper. p. 371. See Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 1. sect. 1.

Pontianus or Damasus, but “without any authority,” saith ^h Card. Bona. The first mention I can find of confession to saints, is that which he sets down out of the Codex Chisii, which being in the ⁱ Lombard character, he guesses to have been before the end of the tenth century, and with this ^j Micrologus agrees; the author whereof lived towards the end of the eleventh century. So that this part of the Roman missal was neither in the Gregorian nor Gallican offices, being of a much later original.

2. ^k The Gallican office had peculiar prefaces and collects different from the Roman. By the prefaces are understood that part of the service which immediately goes before the consecration, and is called in the Gallican office ^l ‘contestatio,’ in the Gothic, ‘illatio,’ shewing not only the general fitness for us at all times to give thanks to God, but the particular reason of it with respect to the day; of which kind of prefaces the Roman Church allowed but nine, which were attributed to pope Gelasius. But ^m Card. Bona saith, “that number is to be found only in the missals after A. D. 1200;” for before there were many more, as appears by Gregory’s Sacramentary: but how they came to be left out afterwards in the Roman missal is a mystery, ²³⁴ of which none of the ritualists give any tolerable account. However this is enough to shew their ignorance, when they so confidently attributed the proper

^h *Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 2. n. 5. inter Oper. p. 499.*

ⁱ *Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 372.*

^j *Microlog. cap. 23. p. 445. col. 2.*

^k *Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 6, 7, 8. inter Oper. p. 373. Mabil. ibid. De Liturg. Gallic. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 17. p. 24. cap. 5. n. 3.*

p. 37. pp. 190. col. 2. 193. col. 2.

^l *Bonæ ibid. et lib. 2. cap. 10. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 551. Mabil. ibid. cap. 2. n. 11. p. 12. cap. 3. n. 17. p. 24. cap. 5. n. 15. p. 45. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. sect. 8. note ^h.*

^m *Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. 10. n. 3. inter Oper. p. 554.*

prefaces to Gelasius; as though Gregory would have slighted so much the decree of his predecessors, as to have appointed so many more, if Gelasius had limited the number to nine. But however it was in the Roman Church, the Gallican Church had peculiar prefaces for all solemn occasions, of which ⁿ Card. Bona hath produced three remarkable instances; two out of the former ancient MS. of nine hundred years old, which formerly belonged to Petavius, a senator of Paris; and the third out of a copy of the Palatine library, translated to the Vatican, of the same age. From these excellent monuments of antiquity, compared together, we may in great measure understand the true order and method of the communion service of that time, both in the Gallican and British Churches, especially on saints' days; for no other offices are preserved, or at least made known to the world. ^o And on those occasions the service began with particular collects for the day; then followed the commemoration out of the Diptychs; then another collect, 'post nomina;' after which the collect, 'ad pacem;' then the particular prefaces relating to the saint whose memory was celebrated, with a larger account of his good actions than is used in any of the Gregorian prefaces, expressed in a devout and pathetic manner; which ended in the 'trisagion,' and was continued by another collect to the consecration; after which followed a devout prayer for benefit by the holy sacrament; and after another collect for the occasion followed the Lord's Prayer, with a conclusion for the day; and the whole service was concluded with a

ⁿ Rerum Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 6. inter Oper. p. 373. Mabil. ibid. c. 3. n. 12. p. 22.

^o Bonæ ibid. n. 6, 7, 8. inter

Oper. p. 373. Mabil. ibid. cap. 5. n. 7. p. 39. n. 12. p. 43. n. 17. p. 46, &c. p. 290. col. 2, &c. p. 193. col. 2, &c. p. 329. col. 1, &c.

benediction of the people, a collect after the eucharist, and a short thanksgiving. This is a just and true account from these authentic offices of the public service then used in the British Churches following the Gallican, from the time of St. German, whose particular office is one of those preserved by Card. Bona; ^p and in the peculiar preface his great zeal is mentioned "in preaching and going up and down doing good in Gaul, Italy and Britain for thirty years together."

235 3. As to the canon of the mass, as it is called in the Church of Rome, or "the prayer of consecration" used in the Church of Rome, and magnified "as apostolical," ^{pp} St. Gregory affirms, as plainly as he well could, "that it was first composed by a private person," and was not of apostolical tradition. Who that scholar was, it is now impossible to know, and not at all material, since it is apparent that it was received into the public use of the Church. ^q Some small additions, they say, were made to it by several popes, till Gregory's time, who, according to the ritualists, shut up this canon. But I see no reason to believe that consecration of the eucharist was at that time performed in other Churches by the words of this canon. ^r For, setting aside the eastern Churches, which had forms of their own; ^s the African Churches did not follow the Roman form. For although ^t Optatus mentions "illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio;" which implies, that there was a

^p Bonæ *ibid.* n. 8. (in *Cntestat.*) Mabil. *ibid.* p. 330. col. 2.

^{pp} Greg. *Epist.* lib. 7. ep. 63. *Oper.* tom. 2. p. 230. 2. tom. 2. lib. 9. epist. 12. col. 940. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 2. cap. 11. n. 2. *inter Oper.* p. 557.

^q Bonæ *ibid.*

^r Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12.

n. 9. lib. 2. cap. 13. n. 1. *inter Oper.* pp. 378. 565. See Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 3. s. 11.

^s For the Liturgy of Africa, see Palmer *ibid.* sect. 8. p. 134.

^t Optat. *Oper. contra Donat.* lib. 2. p. 45. Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 3. s. 12. and note 9.

certain form to be observed; yet this doth not at all prove, that it was the Roman canon: and it evidently appears that it was not, by the testimonies of ^u Marius Victorinus, and ^x Fulgentius, two African writers, who both mention some prayers used in the eucharist, which are not in the Roman canon, and those not prefatory; but such as do relate to the main parts of the canon. It is true, the writer about the sacraments, under St. Ambrose's name, (for ^y Card. Bona will not allow him to be St. Ambrose,) doth produce several expressions in the form of consecration which agree with the Roman canon; but then he adds a very considerable passage, which I hardly believe those who are most zealous for the Roman canon will say was ever part of it. "^z Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi." ^a And in the Gallican Church, the form of consecration, as appears by the office of St. German, was nothing else but repeating the words of institution, after the conclusion of the "Trisagion," and "Gloria in excelsis." After which followed a ^b prayer, "for God's holy Word and Spirit, to descend upon the oblation they made, that it might be a spiritual sacrifice well pleasing to God; and that God, by the blood of Christ, would with his own

^u Victor. advers. Arium, lib. 1. in Biblioth. Patrum, Bignæi, tom. 4. p. 262. col. 2. Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 3. inter Oper. p. 350.

^x Fulgent. Rusp. contra Fabian. Excerpt. c. 14. ad Corinth. 1. p. 35. edit. Sirmond. Bonæ ibid.

^y Rer. Liturg. lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 4. inter Oper. p. 351.

^z Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4.

cap. 5. Oper. tom. 4. p. 393. ed. Erasm. tom. 2. col. 371. ed. Ben. Bonæ ibid. lib. 2. cap. 13. n. 1. inter Oper. p. 565. Albertin. De Sacrament. Eucharist. p. 513. col. 2. Bingham ibid. b. 15. ch. 3. s. 11, and note ^t.

^a Bonæ ibid. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 8. inter Oper. p. 378. Mabilion ibid. p. 331. col. 1.

^b Bonæ ibid. Mabilion ibid. col. 1. et 2.

right hand defend those his ‘sacraments;’ and then followed the ^d Lord’s Prayer and other collects. ^e This prayer after consecration Card. Bona knows not what to make of, as seeming wholly inconsistent with transubstantiation; for if that doctrine had been then believed, and by consecration the elements turned into the body of Christ, to what purpose doth the church then pray “for the Word and Spirit to descend upon the elements,” when they are actually united already? But ^f he makes a very hard shift to interpret these words, not of a descent on the elements, but on the hearts of the communicants: but the words are, “descendat super hæc quæ tibi offerimus Verbum tuum sanctum,” which are so plain and evident concerning the elements, that nothing but mere force can make any man to understand them of the receivers. Besides, that office concludes with a particular prayer for the benefit of those that had partaken of the body of Christ, wherein this expression is remarkable, ^g “Christe, Domine, qui et tuo vesci corpore, et tuum corpus effici vis fideles, fac nobis in remissionem peccatorum esse quod sumpsimus;” i. e. “O Christ, our Lord, who wouldest have thy people eat thy body, and become thy body, grant that we may be that which we have taken for the remission of our sins.” And it is certain, the meaning of this prayer was not that Christians might become the natural body of Christ; and therefore it was not then believed, that the faithful did in the eucharist take the natural body of Christ; but that which was the body of

^c The word is not ‘sacramenta,’ but ‘famulos.’ Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 8. inter Oper. p. 378. Mabillon *ibid.* p. 331. col. 1.

^d Bonæ et Mabillon *ibid.*

^e See note following.

^f *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 2. cap. 13.

n. 5. lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 9. inter Oper. pp. 569. 379.

^g Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 8. inter Oper. p. 378. Mabillon *ibid.* p. 331. col. 2. *Aspice, Domine, qui et tuo, &c.*

Christ in such a mystical sense as the Church is. ^hBut transubstantiation was no part of the faith of the Church at that time, and therefore it is no wonder to meet with expressions so disagreeing to it in their solemn devotions. And it is well observed by ⁱCard. Bona, that the custom of elevation of the host, in order to adoration, is found in none of the ancient sacramentaries, nor in the *Ordo Romanus*, nor in the old ritualists, such as Alcuinus, Amalarius, Walafrius, Micrologus and others. The same had been ingenuously confessed before by ^kMenardus, in the same words: and although there may be elevation, where there is no belief of transubstantiation, yet, since the custom of elevation was lately introduced into the western Churches, and in order to ²³⁷ adoration of the body of Christ then present by transubstantiation; it seems very probable, that doctrine was not then received by the Church, the consequences whereof were not certainly in use: for there was as much reason for the elevation and adoration at that time as ever could be afterwards. But my business is now only to shew wherein the Gallican and British Churches differed from the Roman, and not wherein they agreed.

4. The last difference was as to the Church music, wherein the Romans were thought so far to excel other western Churches, that the goodness of their music proved the great occasion of introducing their offices: for ^lCharles the Great saith, “that his father Pepin

^h Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 5. s. 4.

ⁱ *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 2. cap. 13. n. 2. inter *Oper.* p. 567. Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 5. s. 4. *ibid.* note ⁿ.

^k *Not. in Sac. Greg.* p. 374. Bingham *ibid.* b. 15. ch. 5. s. 4. and note ^s.

^l *De Imag.* lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 132. inter *Imper. Decreta*, de *Cultu Imag.* edit. Goldast. Bonæ *ibid.* lib. 1. cap. 12. n. 1. inter *Oper.* p. 369. Mabillon *ibid.* *De Liturg. Gallic.* lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 2. p. 16. et *Præf.* p. 1. See p. 225.

brought the Roman way of singing into the Gallican Churches, and their offices along with it." And although he saith, "many Churches stood out then, yet by his means they were brought to it." And he caused some of the best masters of music in Rome to be brought into France, and there settled for the instruction of the ^m French Churches. By which means the old Gallican service was so soon forgotten, that in ⁿ Carolus Calvus's time, he was forced to send as far as Toledo, to have some to perform the old offices before him; so great a power had the Roman music, and the prince's authority in changing the ancient service of the Gallican Churches. But thus much may suffice to have cleared the ancient service of these western Churches, and to have shewed their difference from the Roman offices.

° From which discourse it will appear, that our Church of England hath omitted none of those offices wherein all the ancient Churches agreed; and that where the British or Gallican and Roman differed, our Church hath not followed the Roman, but the other; and therefore our dissenters do unreasonably charge us with taking our offices from the Church of Rome.

^m F. Pithœi Glossar. v. Cantus Gallican. in Baluz. Capit. Reg. Franc. tom. 2. p. 711.

ⁿ Carol. Calv. Epist. ad Cler. Raven. Bonæ ibid. n. 5. inter

Oper. p. 372. Mabillon ibid. Præf. p. 3. lib. 1. cap. 3. n. 9. p. 20.

° Bingham ibid. b. 14. ch. 2. s. 8. note γ. ch. 3. s. 12. note *.

5561. HECCLE.

Author Stillingfleet, Edward, (Bp.) S.

Title Antiquities of the British Churches, with Lloyd's

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

—
Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.
—

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

