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THE PREFACE.

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. When I first undertook this Subject I intended no more than an Introduction to something else; but being entred into it, and laying the several parts of it before me, I found so many obscure and doubtful passages to be clear'd, 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.

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 Oar from the Dros; 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 Oar 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 Mens Eyes are still so tender as not to be able
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 Samoyeds admire no Country like their own; and are impatient of any contradiction to their Fancies of the Beauties and Conveniences of it. And it is pity to rob Men of any such false Idea's, not entrenching upon Religion or Morality, which tend so much to the Eafe 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 hardned Snow, to what purpose should any go about to confute them, by proving that the Elytian Fields are more pleasant than those Northern Climats? 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 Climats 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 endeavoured to prove not onely that Plato's Atlantick Island, but the Elytian 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 Mens opinions, which are not so much founded on Reason, as on an over bearing 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.
The Preface.

If therefore any of our Neighbour Nations should think their own the richest, the pleasantest, the fruitfullest Coun-
trey in the World, I should by no means think it fit to di-
spute 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 misfa-
taken good Opinion in them; for it makes them less con-
tented and less fit to be governed than before; and
living under such a misperfusion can never doe 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 Countrey as they do their Pa-
rents; and no Man ought to suffer in his efeem 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
Countrey, makes a whole Nation his Enemies, which no
wise Man will ever doe; and whoever doeth it will one
time or other jeauly to repent his Folly.

But is it not possible for learned and ingenious Men to
enquire into and debate the several Antiquities of their
Nations without making a National Quarrel about them?
In matter of Self-defence there is a Moderam encul-
pate tutela to be observed; and so there ought certainly
to be in the defence of our Countrey; especially when the
Dispute relates neither to the safety, nor Profit, nor the true
Honour or efeem of it, but only to a mere point of Anti-
quity; wherein wise and learned Men may differ from each
other that are Natives of the same Countrey. 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 compa-
rising of ancient Histories, the credibility of Testimonies,
and a sagacity in searching, and skill in judging conser-
ning them. It is not every one that can plead eloquent-
ly 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 doe that
ought not onely 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 Nati-
ons together, and then with great impartiality to deliver
his judgment; but by no means to escape 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 to cry down the oth-
er 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
Lefe-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 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. Because he proves from good Authorities in his Book,
that the Scots could not be so early settled in Britain.
2. Because those Scotch 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 Advo-
cate in Scotland, hath been pleased to think it a part of
his Duty to answer this part of the Bishop's Book, not with-
out some kind of sharpness and unhandsome Reflexions on
a Person of his Character and Merit; but none like this.
That he admires that any of the Subjects of Great Bri-
tain did not think it a degree of Lefe-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 profe-
cute as write against the Bishop by virtue of his Office, for
disputing their Antiquities. As though the fundamental
Constitution of the British Monarchy were at all concern-
ed in the Credit of Hector Boethius, for upon it, as I
shall presently shew, the main fires of this matter doth
rest.

But because these are dangerous inflamations, and may
as well be urged against some part of the following Book,
I shall here make it clear how very unjust and unreasona-
able they are. For it is not the Antiquity of the Royal
Line
Line which is in dispute, but the Succession of it in such a Place; the Irish Antiquaries carry the Succession much farther back than Hector Boethius, or Lefly, or V. Grattain, Liber.

Buchanan do. And therefore they charge others far more with shortning 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 Lef-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 Ferquard, 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.

For, although Fordon doth mention the Succession of many Kings from Fergus the Son of Ferquard 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 Paflay, Scoon and other Places. He names indeed 45. 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 promises to be very distinct and particular. Yet after him comes Hector Boethius, of whom the learned Advocate tells us that Erasmy 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 Icolmkill, which he followed in writing his History. I cannot now enter upon the consideration of the Authority

A primo quidem hujus Regni Fer., etc. filius Ferchardi ad hunc Regem Fergulam filiam Erich inclusivé, 45. Reges ejusdem gentis & generis in hac Influa regnaverunt; sed & horum figillarum distincte condita tempora principatum ad profusos omnium, nam ad plenum Scripta non reperimus. Fordon Scotti. L. 4. c. 2.
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Authority of 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 his Authority be allowed, those who lengthen the Royal Line doe more injury to the Monarchy than those who shorten it. For the first Account he gives of it is this, "That the Scots in Britain being, pressed by the "Picts and Britains, they sent over into Ireland for af-"fidence; Ferquard sent his Son Fergus with Supplies;" who, faith he, left it to the choice of the Heads of the "Tribes, what Government they would have, whether a "Monarchy, Aristocracý or a Commonwealth; and "they pitched upon a Monarchy, and made Fergus their "King: which he faith was just 330 years before Chrift's "Nativity. After which he sets down Fergus his owning "that he received his Authority from the People; and "their Fundamental Contract to adhere to him and to "his Line, which if he may be believed, was ingraven "in Marble Tables, and then the Agrarian Law follow'd. And (which is very observable) the first Design we find laid for altering the Succession of the Crown and exclu-"sion the next Heir, is in Hector Boethius his account of the immediate Successour to Fergus the Son of Fer-"quard. For notwithstanding the binding Oath to the Po-

sperity of Fergus, yet immediately after his Death, he "faith, Feritharis was chosen King, although Fergus left Ferlegus his Son and Heir; and not onely fo, but a Law, "faith he, was past excluding the next Heir from any right to Government till he attained to such an Age. The ef-"fect whereof was, that Ferlegus attempting to recover his "Right from Feritharis was banish'd and utterly excluded. Hector himself confesses he was at jult Age when he demanded the Crown, but he was put by and severely rebuked, quod injuf"fum Patrum petilli et Regnum, but he did it without the Authority of the Senate; upon which they impris'oned him, but he made his escape and fled first to the Picts, then to the Britains, and after Fer-"ritharis his Death Main was chosen to succeed. This is "the jult and true account of this matter, as it is delive-"red by Hector Boethius, and after him by Lelly, who speaks more plainly of Ferlegus his exclusion; sed Ferlegum reculavit

vi
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recusavit Populus. Buchanan faith, that he was con-
demned in his Absence; but he would fain reconcile this
practice to their former Oath; (although the Advocate
himself faith, this Oath did in Law and Reafon bind
them to obey the Lineal Successflour according to the
proximity of Blood:) but Buchanan's pretence is because
the prefent King during the Minority of the Heir, was
but a King in truft, and the Heir at fuch an Age was
to succeed. But how well that was observed appears by this
first infance, and in truft, Hector Boethius and the reft
after him do put the whole power as to these Matters, in the
hands of the People, or at leaft of the Heads of the Clanns;
as will appear more afterwards.

It cannot therefore but be very surprifing to us to fee his
Majefly's Advocate fo zealoufly defending this History of
the firft Succession of their Kings, and reflecting upon a
Bifhop of our Church for calling it in quefion. And yet
he cannot deny that this Law was the Occafion of ma-
ny bloudy Civil Wars between the Uncles and Ne-
phews; and he calls it the Dispute betwixt fuch as
were for the Crown and fuch as were for Popular
Elections. From whence it follows, That Hector Boe-
thius his History of the firft Succession from Fergus is to fet
up the popular Claim. And quite through that firft Race
Hector makes the supreme unaccountable power in all cafes
of Male Administratior to be lodged in the Heads of the
People, and the Miniftral in the Monarch.

And therefore, we fhould have thought it had better be-
come his Majefly's Advocate to have overthrown fuch per-
nicious Principles to Monarchy, as are contained in this
account of the firft Race of their Kings from Fergus the
Son of Ferquard. And although Buchanan, among the
half-learned, bear the blame of thefe Antimonarchical
Principles, yet it is evident that he onely built on the
Just Right of
Foundations laid by thofe who fet up this firft Race, as the
Advocate himself conceived, whose Words are, All Bucha-
nan's Arguments for reftraining Kings being founded
on the Authority of our Hiftorians, who, as he faith,
affert that King Fergus was firft elected King by the
People. And therefore thofe Hiftorians who fet up this Suc-
ceffion in fuch a manner had no kindnefs to Monarchy, as
appears by what Leify himfelf faith about King Fergus and
his Successfours.
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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 it 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 Lelty as well as Buchanan be rejected. And this is too plain from the Answers he gives to this Confent of their Historians.

1. He saith, That Gathelus was not at all elected by the People. Whether 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 Gathelus? 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 Scotia the Daughter of Pharaoh, who was drowned in the Red Sea, and afterwards settled in Portugal, from him called Portus Gatheli, (as the Advocate observes) from whence a Colony of that Race transported it self into Ireland, and another into Scotland. Now, 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 not concerning Gathelus and his posterity in Ireland, but Fergus and his Successions in Scotland.

2. He answers, 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 chuse what Government they pleased? And the Words of Fergus in Hector Boethius are these, vestrum erit in hoc Negotio, quid utilius ad vestram Rempublicam fit discernere, nostrum vestra capessere imperia. Did ever Man more own the Supreme Authority of the People than Hector Boethius makes Fergus to doe in these Words? Whether these very Words
Words were spoken by him, even Hector dares not say; but he is sure they were such like. And afterwards he faith, tandem Fergusio Regnum decernunt; And to the same purpose Lefly, Fergusio Regnum ab omnibus decernit. 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. that we read nothing at all of the content 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; and consequently the Power of calling their Kings to account lay solely in them? No, faith he, Fergus succeeded in the Right of thofe 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 Poffe-terty? By what Authority then did they take upon them to imprison and depofe (a) Euenus III. and set up Cada-lanus as King? By what Authority did they take Arms against (b) Dardanus and set up Galdus, who took away his Life, communi omnium Ordinum confenfu, faith Lefly? By what Authority did they assemble against (c) Lugtachus, Galdus his Son, and sent Souldiers to (c) Hector, do dispatch him? By what Authority did they rise against (d) Mogallus his Successor, with a design to defroy him, as Hector confefeth, which they did effectually, as Lefly agrees? How came they to take upon them to imprison (c) Conarus and set up Argadus in his room? And to (e) Hector, of the Government in the time of (f) Ethodius II. and according to Lefly commit him to prison, where he was killed? How came they, notwithstanding the Law of Regency to set up (g) Athirco, while he was uncapable by it? I meddle not with those Kings who were killed by  

\[(a)\) Hoff. Barth. l. 2. f. 38.  
\[(b)\) Hoff. Lefly. p. 92.  
\[(c)\) Hoff. Barth. L. 2. f. 59.  
\[(d)\) Hoff. Barth. L. 2. f. 79.  
\[(e)\) Hoff. Barth. L. 2. f. 90.  
\[(f)\) Hoff. Barth. L. 2. f. 90.  
\[(g)\) Hoff. Barth. L. 2. f. 90. \]
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by secret Conspiracies, nor with open Usurers; such as Nathalocus and Donald of the Isles; but I once 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 Mens 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 (from the Controversie about Regency at the time when 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 this Story of Fergus and his Successions, be more liable to be charged with any degree of Lefe-Majesty.

4. But after all, the Advocate faith, That Fordon the most ancient of their Historians affirms, that Fergus made himself King. Indeed Fordon doth say, That Fergus the Son of Ferard, (as he calls him) hearing there were many Scots in the Northern parts of Albion, living without order and Government, and hearing a good account of the Countrey, 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 disperst Scots, and joining them all together in the Western parts, he made himself King over them. Which is no improbable Account, but Fordon faith not a word of all the former passages in the other Historians. And if Fordon be the most ancient of their Historians, what becomes of Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernicus, the two great supporters of Hector Boethius his 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) 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
number, either in Fordon or Hector Boethius; and hath very considerable differences from the Accounts either in him, or in Lesly and Buchanan. For after Fergus he leaves out Feritharis, and makes Main his next Successor; the next he calls Arindal whom they call Dornadilla; his Son, Rovcyn, 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 Genealogy next names Ther, whom they call Thereus, and his Son Rofin; but they say Josina succeeded Thereus, being his Brother. After this, we find a greater difference, for instead of Finnanus, Daritus, Euenus, Gillus, Euenus II. Ederus, Euenus III. Metellanus, Caratacus; we find there one Dethach, Jaw, Aliela, Euen, Ederskeol, Comermore; Some agreement there is, but a far greater diversify, and Hector's famous Caratacus quite omitted. Then succeeded Corbre, whom they call Corbred, after him Daradimare, by them fled Dar- danus; then another Corbre instead of their Galdus; and then Luthach, Lughtacus in them, then Mogalama, their Mogallus; Coner their Conurus; Ethath their Ethodius; Fiachrath their Satrahel; then another Ethath, whom they call Ethodius II. before whom they place King 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 Nathalous is shut out; and so after him are the two Donalds, for the next that follows is Thrinklind, whom they call Crathlintus; then Fencormach their Fincormacus, after him Romaich, their Romachus; then Enegufa, which is plainly their Anguisianus, and Fethelmech their Ethelmachus; then Engufafich and Ethet, instead of which they put Eugenius and Ethodius his Brother; whom both make Grandfather to Fergus II. whose Father they call Ethus, 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 Fergusses, but yet from hence it appears, (1.) That Hector did insert many things contrary to this ancient Genealogy;
alogy; 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 Decent, and when he puts in Reutha it is to answer Bede's Reuda, and Galduis for Tacitus his Galgacus, and Caratacus for the famous Britisli King of that Name; and 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 allow'd 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 Edanius, whereas they insert Constantius I. Congallus, Conranus, Eugenius III. Convallus, Kinnatilus between Dongard and Aidanus: After him he names his Son Octahbind, whom Fordon calls Ethodius-bind, which he faith is the same with Eugenius; and about him, Hector Boethius, as Buchanan observes, contradicts the Book of Pafly, for this faith, he lived in continual Wars, and the other that he enjoy'd a constant Peace; so that Boethius flies the authority of their Ancient Annals. Next after him they place Ferguard, of whom the Genealogy faith nothing at all; Fordon next to nothing. In cujus nihil actum est tempore, faith he; but the other Historians tell sad Stories of his vitious Life and tragical End. After Eugenius in the Genealogy we find Donewald breck, Fordon faith, he died after 14 years Reign; and to him succeeded Ferquard his Brother's Son, not mentioned 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 Mor- dacus 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, Convallus and Dongallus. They all agree with the Genealogist, that Kenneth
immediately succeeded Alphin; but then follows a won-
dersfull difference; for here they put in no fewer than 13
Kings between Kenneth and Malcolm the Son of Ken-
neth, whom the Genealogist places next after him; then
follows Duncan in all; between whom and Malcolm Can-
moir they put in Machabaeus. After Malcolm he takes
no notice of four Kings they insert between him and Da-
vid, and where 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 shortned the Succession
as will bring the whole into a much lefs 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 Fer-
gus II. and so the whole Succession will stand within the
same time that it now doth, from Fergus the Son of Erk.

And if the shortening the Royal Line be such an
injury to it, as the Advocate fuppofeth, it is well for
this ancient Genealogist that he lived so long fince, or
else he might have had a caft of the Advocate's Office.

Neither is the Authority of this Genealogist to be fligh-
ted by the learned Advocate, fince himfelf giving an ac-
count how their Tradition might have been, and was
preferred, be brings this very infiance of the Genealogy
of King Alexander in the year 1242, before Fordon's
time, and related fo by him that his Relation cannot but
be credited; and fo 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 preferved, then by this Way, we are to judge of the
Truth of their ancient Tradition; and confequently we muft
rejeft thofe Kings whose Names are not preferved in this
ancient Genealogy.

And to confirm this we have another faid to be more an-
cient in Fordon, which the Advocate attributes to Bal-
dredus, Abbat of Melros, (otherwife called Ealredus,
Abbat of Rhieval) in his Lamentation of King David,foon
after his death, who died A.D. 1151. But I confefs I do not
find,
find, that Fordon attributes this Genealogy to Baldredus, for he faith he had it from Walter de Wardlaw, Cardinal and the Bishop of Glasgow, who lived in the time of Robert II. faith Leify: which helps to discover 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 preferred 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 a third Genealogy in Fordon, which supplies in some measure the defects in that of King David, and it is the Succession of 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 Donald Brek; whereas in the other this Dongard is omitted; before Donwald-brek in this Genealogy, is Eugenius-bind called Occahebind 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 10 Kings between Fergus and Kenneth, whereas the common Historians make 28. 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 330 years before Christ's Nativity. 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 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 preserv'd as sacred there, i.e. at Icolmkill, I suppose, or the Island Jona. But it is observable that
that Hector mentioning the Coronation of this Alexander, takes notice of the Highlander's repeating the Genealogy by heart, and he carries it as far as Ga-thelus, but sets down nothing at all of the particulars, which he knew would by no means agree with his Cata-logue of Kings so long before Christ. And to confirm all these Genealogies, the Irish Genealogies in Gratianus Lu-cius agree with them in excluding so many Kings, which Hector hath inferred to make the account of time seem probable. Onely they make Fergus the Son of Erk to be the first who carried the Scots from Ireland into Albany; and the Ancestours before to have lived in Ireland, and to have been derived from the Monarchs there.

But when Hector Boethius found 330 years before Christ pitched upon by Fordon for the Scots coming into Scotland with so much punctuality, that he faith it was in the sixth year of Alexander, wherein he killed Dar-i-us and took Babylon, 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 his first coming to Britain; which are all great Confirmations of the Truth of this Account. But Fordon quotes no Author for this wild computation; one ly he subjoins a passage out of the Legend of S. Congall, which mentions the coming of Fergus the Son of Fer-quard out of Ireland into Britain, and after he mentions Rether for one of his Successours, the fame, he faith, with Bede's Renda. Suppofe all this be granted, yet what shadow of proof is there, that Fergus came into Scotland so long before Christ's Nativity? Fordon 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 enquirer into these Antiquities?

Things standing thus, and Hector Boethius with the help of his Physician of Aberdeen, (who, as Dempster, d
faith, was so very usefull to him in framing his History) set about the rectifying and curing the Body of their Antiquities, and endeavour 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 Gathelus and Scotia, 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 Fordon, who quotes some old Chronicles and Legends for it; especially the Legend of S. Brendan; an admirable and authentick Record. But to doe right to Hector in this matter, be faith ingenuously that their People follow'd the costume of other Nations therein. And as I have shew'd in the following Book at large (where I treat of these Antiquities) this humour had overspread all the Northern Nations, as soon as they broke off the Roman Yoke, and began not only to be divided 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 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 leisure 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 Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernius or others; out of these he frames a long series or Catalogue of Kings, which looked big, and raised Mens expectations, and seem'd well enough contrived to serve the pretence
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 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 Lefly; 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 Lefly doth nothing in effect but abridge him, whatever he pretends as to Records and the Annals of the Monasteries of Pafley and Scoon; which the Advocate suppofeth he saw at Rome, whither he faith 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 Lefly faith no such thing; for he appeals to the publick 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 Advocate seems to have forgotten what he had said before; viz. that the black Book of Scoon was among President Spotswod's Books; indeed he faith, King Charles I. ranfom'd 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 Pafley, and the famous Book of Plufcarden, as the Advocate believes, upon Buchanan's word, then in his time they were not carried to Rome. For my part, I do not question that there were MSS. Chronicles in Scotland before Fordon; for I find him frequently citing them; but by the things he quotes out of them they were not coniderable, nor done by any Authority, as the Annals of the Royal Monasteries of this Kingdom; his Continuer faith were and afterwards examined and compared. *I am sorry to find Sir R. Sib.*
bald reckon up among the Books he had never seen, (having made it his business so many years to illustrate his Country) not onely Cornelius Hibernicus and Veremundus, but the Annals of Palsey and Scoon: But however, we are glad that the Advocate assur'd us he hath a very old Abridgment of the Book of Palsey, and may this present heat against the Bishop of St. Apaph 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, clear'd up to the satisfaction of all learned and ingenious 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 doe it. For he ought just to have proved the matter in dispute by clear and indisputable Testimonies, before he had made his severe Reflexions and Inferences; but as Cicero said of the Musician who defined the Soul to be Harmony, ab Arte sua non recusit, 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 intended to the Royal Line, which I dare say, the Bishop of St. Apaph 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 Geoffry of Monmouth concerning the Succession of Britih Kings down from Brutus confuted? And is not this done by Buchanan? And the Advocate in plain English faith, 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. Apaph is so just to Truth, and so little a Friend to popular Fables, that he fairly gives up Geoffry before he attacks Hector Boethius; could any thing be more fairly and impartially done? or more convincing, that he onely 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
not wholly unlearned) 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 inju-
ties 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 fa-
bulous 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 Hunibaldus his Antiquities find no longer place in their Histories? And yet nothing seems more glorious, than to have their Royal Line deduced long before the time that Alexander took Babylon. For according to Hunibaldus his Account, which he took he faith out of an ancient MS. of Vaftaldus (such another Author as Veremundus) the Franks went from Troy under the Con-
duct of Francio towards the Palus Maecotus just about the time that Æneas went for Italy, where they fixed and built the City Sicambria, and at last removed into Ger-
many 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, 16 in the first, and 31 in the second. All which he gives a very particular account of, as to the times of their Reign for above 413 years before Christ's Nativity. And al-
though this ancient Succession of Kings was a long time received and magnified; as appears by Lazius and P. Æ-
milius, and Fordon quotes Sigebert for it; yet now their learned Historians are ashamed to mention it, much more to plead for it, and to charge those with a degree of Lef-
Majesty who call it in question.

Suffridus Petrus hath written the Antiquities of Frifo-
land much in the way that Hector Boethius hath done those of Scotland. He tells a very grave Story concer-
vring a Province in the Indies called Frefa, from whence a Colony was sent under Frifo, Saxo and Bruno, who went into Alexander's Army; and for this he quotes old Frisian Rythms, and one Patrocles, an old Indian Wri-
ter; and besides, he hath all the Advocate's Common places of Tradition, common Fame, the Testimonies of their own Historians, and he names Andreas Cornelius,
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(it seems there was a Cornelius Frisius as well as Hibernicus) Solco Forstemannus, Occo Scherlenfis, Joh. Uleterpius, and several others, who with one Consent deliver these Antiquities. But, faith be, 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 Frifo being admirably skill'd in Greek Learning set up a publick School at Stauria near the Temple of Stavo, and in the Temple a Library on pur- cese for Antiquities (like that of Icolmkill) and besides a Palace was built by Uffo, wherein was contained the Effigies of all their Kings from Frifo, (who came to Frieland just 313 years before Christ's Nativity) to the time of Charlemagn, for 1113 years. And are not these Antiquities very well attested? yet since Uubbo Emmiss 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 24th 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 Countrey for them; hac noftri Majores multis Libris tradiderunt, faith the pretended Berofus. 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 Tuyfco the Countrey from the Tanais to the Rhyne, Italy to Gomer, the Celtick Provinces to Samothes, and Celtiberia to Jubal. And this was just 131 years after the Floud; Gomer went into Italy the 10th year of Saturn the Father of Jupiter Belus; in the 12th Jubal went into Celtiberia, and not long after Samothes, called Dis, founded the Celtick Colonies; among which were the Britains, and from him their 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 Samothes in the 51st year of Ninus, who succeeded Jupiter Belus: This Magus in the Scythian Language is Magog,
Magog, and from him came so many terminations of the Names of Towns as Rhotamagum, Noviomagum, Juliomagum, Caesareomagum, &c. In the 34th of Semiramis, Jubelda Son of Iber, succeeded in Celtiberia; in the time of Ninias, Son to Semiramis, reign'd Sarron among the Celtæ, from him the learned Gauls were called Sarronidas, the same I suppose with our Advocate's Sanchies. In the 20th of Arius, Brigus reigned in Celtiberia, and in the 29th Dryius among the Celtæ; nothing can be more natural than to derive the Druids from him: who being converted, the Advocate tells us, 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 Aratus the seventh King of Babylon, Bardus was King over the Celtæ, and he was the Inventor of Musick and Verfes; and from him came the Bards, who were the Poets of their Traditions, as the Advocate styles them. After him succeeded Longo, then Bardus junior, after him Lucus, and then Celtes, and Galates, Narbon, Lugdus, Belgius, 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 Exaltations, a pretence to ancient Records, and to the common Tradition of the several Countries; for Berofus appeals both to Tradition and Writing; and so doth Manetho in the continuation of him, quæ ex nostris Historicis vel eorum relationibus consecutius sumus; so that here we have the two Supporters of Antiquities, which the Advocate builds upon, viz. Tradition and Records. And Metaethenes, another pretended continuier of Berofus faith, he took all out of the Royal Library at Suse, where the Persian Annals were preferred. But notwithstanding all these fair themes 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 Advocate faith, 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
take notice of their affairs. *There are very high expres-
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 Criticks for ma-
ny hundreds of years; and if there may have been some,
for any thing I know, who have applauded their Histories
from 330 years before Christ; but upon my little know-
ledge in Books, I dare venture to name him ten who have ap-
plauded the Antiquities of Berosus and Manetho, for one
who hath allowed theirs. But such hath been my misfor-
tune that I have met with Historians, Antiquaries and
Criticks, who have been far from applauding them; such a one was *Ubbo Em-
nius, 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 be not onely 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 Anno
"Dom. 829. But another of the same
"Charater, both an Historian, Antiqua-
"ry and Critick, viz. †M. Zuerius Box-
hornius hath passed a severer Censure up-
on them, for he faith, without doubt
their Antiquities are Fabulous; and
their pretended ancient Annals but late-
ly made. These may serve at present, to shew that all Historians, Antiquaries
and Criticks have not so much applauded
their Antiquities.

But this is not all, for the Advocate faith, 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 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
indeed was printed about five years before him, by the same
Badius Ascensius, and he was no great Critick, but a
very Scholaftick Historian, and a Man of great eflate in
his time, as the Advocate confeffeth; but he is fo far from
applauding the remote Antiquities of his own Country;
that he calls the Story of Gathelus and Scotia and their
coming out of Greece and Egypt a mere Figment, and
invented onely to match the Britains, who derived
themselves from the Trojans, and he condemns their An-
nals about Simon Brest; which fhews what a regard he
had to their Authority. And when he comes to Fergus he
sets down the old Verses about the time of it; but seems
to give very little credit to them; for he first mentions
Bede's Account about Reuda, and then relates what their
Annals say, i.e. their old Verses (for he quotes no o-
 ther) and then faith this doth not contradict Bede; for
faith he, Regni debile fundamentum Fergusius jecit;
he laid a very flender beginning of a Monarchy, which
was after enlarged by Reuda, whom he makes to be Re-
ther, and therein contradifts Hector's Veremundus and
the Catalogues of their Kings, according to which Reu-
da succeeds him. So that these Antiquities were fo far
from being universally received abroad that they went down
very hardly at home. And this same Historial School-
man expressly faith, 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 onely afferts, but
endeavours to prove in a Scholaftick manner as far as
Septimo & Finaliter. And is not this a degree of Lefé-
Majefly above the endeavouring to fhorten the Royal
Line? And they had far better deny any fuch Perfon as
Fergus, than to make him a King upon fuch terms, which
overthrow the Monarchy.

But who are these foreign Historians, Antiquaries and
Criticks, who at any time have fo much applauded these
Antiquities? Joseph Scaliger did indeed applaud his
own Wit for his Criticijn about Scoto-Brigantes in Se-
nca's Verses. But what is this to Fergus his coming fo
soon into Scotland? For Scaliger himfelf there grants, Scalig. in Tribu-
that these Scoto-Brigantes were still in Ireland; and he
believes that Claudius did make an attempt upon them
there, because Juvenal mentions the Coaits of Ju-

verna
vern as brought under the Roman Power. Scoti sunt in Hibernia adhuc, non in Britannia, are Scaliger's own Words. And I wonder to see Buchanan labour so hard about this passage, to so little purpose. But the Advocate saith that the fame Scaliger in his Notes on Eusebius hath a moft 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 330 years before Christ? That is to be proved, for Scaliger doth it not. He affirms, "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 Pau- "fanias about Antoninus his beating the Brigantes in "Britain; and the Inscriptions in Scotland, wherein "mention is made of the Lcg. 2. which signifies very little "to this purpose. For why could not the second Legion "fight against the Brigantes, supposing them to be Britains, "as well as supposing them to be Irish? But Scaliger's opinion was this, "The Brigantes and the Britains were "two different People; while they continued at home, they "were called by no other Name, but when they made excursions abroad, then they were called Scoto-britannines and "Scotobritannii; and so the word Scot, he saith, is not "a proper Name, but Appellative; and not Irish but Bri- "tish, for those who go from home in hopes of Booty, as "the names of Bedwin and Saracen; and so 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 ima- "gine. He is very angry with the Bihop of St. Afaph for repersenting their Anceflours as a company of barbarous Pilferers and Robbers (although he onely 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 reproachfull Etymolo- gie than to have magnified this Discourse of Scaliger so highly. But where is it that he mentions the first Suc- cession of their Kings with approbation, or Fergus his coming
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coming into Scotland before Christ's Nativity? All
that he faith is, " That the Scots might be a Nation be-
fore 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 stand-
ing Monarchy in Scotland from the time of Fergus I.
and of this Scaliger's faith not a word. For these Brigan-
tes coming out of Ireland might fix there for some time,
and return again to Ireland, as Gildas faith they did af-
terwards, or they might fix as a scatter'd People not uni-
ted under a Monarchy, as Fordon faith, they did before
Fergus his coming. So that if their Antiquities be no
more applauded by other Antiquaries and Criticks than
they are by Scaliger, this Argument will come to very
little.

And yet Salmafius and the rest he mentions, say much
less than Scaliger; Salmafius onely useth Scaliger's Criti-
cism about the Scoto-Brigantes without adding any thing.
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 Caledoni-
ans were not Scots; unless it be taken for Scythians, (of
which afterwards) but by Scots here we mean such as
came out of Ireland to settle in Britain; and such Gal-
gacus and his Souldiers were not. And the like improp-
riety Bergier, though a learned Antiquary fell into, when
he interprets the Caledonians by Scots; but such
as Dempfort is frequently guilty of, when he calls the Brit-
tains Englilh, because the English dwelt in Britain after-
wards. But improper expressions where they fall from learn-
ed Men by chance ought rather to be passed over with si-
ience than made use of as Arguments; unless those who
use them go about to prove what is implied in them. Si-
gonius his Name stands among the rest, being indeed a
learned Historian, Antiquary and Critick; but not one
word can I find produced out of him in his whole Book. What Baronius faith relates to the Conversion of the
Scottish Nation, and not to these Antiquities; of which
I have treated at large in the following Book. And
Favin
Favin and P. Æmilius speak only of an Alliance between Achæius King of the Scots and Charles the great; and what is this to Fergus and the Succession of Kings for 330 years before Christ's Nativity? which he faith in the beginning was applauded by all Historians, Antiquaries and Criticks, and as though this were not extra-vagant enough, be faith afterwards, that Baronius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Lipsius, Sigonius, Favin 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 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 doe 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 deess materia.

Therefore from the Testimony of Historians, Antiquaries and Criticks, 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.) 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
(1.) As to the Roman Antiquities, he cites a passage in Livy, in which he faith, 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, rarae perca temporae Literae, una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum, and not as the Advocate with too much art, hath translated them, that the best Records were the faithfull 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 faith Tradition is the best way to preserve the memory of things? Which is to make Livy speak inconsequently.) But he goes on saying, that what Memorials were left by the High Priests, or were in publick 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 alleged 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 confecrare 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 his 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 tali 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 faith, derived themselves from him who was called Julius. 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 time, and that some of them were
were preserved. That they had Annals both publick and private appears by Livy's own Words, who mentions both the Commentarii Pontificum and the publica & private monumenta; and 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 publickly exposed in a Table in his house that the People might be satisfied about them; and these be faith were called Annales Maximi; which he adds were continued down to the time of Mucius Scaevola, who was Pontifex Maximus about A. U. C. 623. These, as Servius faith, were after made up into 80 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 Volfius and others take notice, inserts several things as taken out of the Pontifical Annals which hapned 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 Cænuleus in Livy complains; but afterwards they were exposed to all. And it appears by Licinius Macer in Livy, that the Libri Linteæ (which seem to have been for the same purpose with the Annales Maximi but composed by the Magistrates) were preserved in Æde Monctæ, and in them the Names of the Magistrates were inserted; and in the same place Livy takes notice of the Annales prisci, and the Libri Magistratuum for determining a point about the Consuls of a year long before the burning of Rome; which hews that Livy did not think all their Records then destroyed. And afterwards be faith in the same Book, disputing about another Consul, that Augustus 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 Magistratuum by Livy, which he distinguishes from the Annales Prisci. And besides these Livy mentions private Records among them; of which Cicero speaks, which belonged to particular Families: and there is no probability these should be all lost in the burning of the City; for the Capitol
Capitol was not burnt, in which probably after the Romans found the Gauls coming upon them, they preferred their ancient Annals. And it is considerable, that Dionysius Halicarnassicus quotes a passage of Antiochus Syracusanus, (who lived before the burning of Rome, and wrote concerning the affairs of Italy) wherein he faith, 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 Dionylius quotes the Domestic Annals of the Sabins, and Festus the History of Cuma. So that the Roman Histories were built on better foundation than the very uncertain Tradition of the Natives; which the Advocate is pleased to make the surest Foundation of all Histories; but I am so much of another Opinion, that I think it (since the shortening of Mens 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 ancient Annals pretended near the time of Fergus I. nor in the time of any King of the first Race; nor nor from Fergus II. till after the Destruction of the Piets; 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 faith the same objections will lie;

(2.) Against the Jewish Antiquities. For faith be, the Jewish History had no historical Warrant for the first 2000 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 faith, that the Jewish History was challenged by Apion upon the same ground that theirs is now quarrel’d by the Bishop of St. Alæph. This looks something strange among us, for the Antiquities of any particular Nation so far short of the Jewish, to be parallel’d with them in point of Credibility; since the Records of Scripture are own’d to be divine and sacred, and not merely built on the authority of Tradition, or the Annals of the Jewish
Jewish Priests. Whatever Josephus or other Jews might say in defence of their Antiquities against the Greeks, we that own our selves to be Christians ought to look on Moses and the Prophets under a higher Character. I know a late Critick in great Vogue among some, hath endeavoured to reduce the Sacred History to the Authority of the ancient Annals of the Jews, but with all adding that we have onely some imperfect Abridgments of them, much like that which the Rector of Ranfrew made of the Book of Psalmy, which the Advocate 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 onely to shew the vast disparity of these Antiquities in question, and those of the Jews. It's 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;

"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, Phenicians had a most lafting way of preserving their Histories, for they had publick Annals made by their wisest Men and kept in sacred Places, but the Greeks were very defective in these things; having no publick Writings in their Temples or elsewhere; and that they had not the use of Letters in the time of the Trojan War; 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 publick Annals, which would have prevented Errores, and kept Men from a power of deceiving. But great care he faith from the most ancient times was taken of such things among the Egyptians and Babylonians. And for their Ance- flores, be faith they exceed 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 allow'd promiscuously to all, but certain Prophets were pitch'd upon who wrote the most remote Antiquities by divine inspiration; and the matters in their own times plainly and according to Truth; and therefore..."
"faith be, we have no such multitude of Books differing "from each other, as the Greeks have, but only 22, con- "taining 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, faith be, 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 Critick; for "without a liberty of abridging and transposing and inferring, "his new Inventions come to nothing. But as to the "silence of other Nations about them, he shews, "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 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 age? "Have they produced any such publick and sacred Annals writ- ten and preferred with so much care, as the ancient Jews had? "Have they had a Succession of Prophets among them whose "Books are preferred to this day with great Veneration without "addition or diminution? What mean then such strange Com- parisons? Can they produce any one Author contemporary "with Fergus I. and his Successors, who mention that Suc- cession?" As Josephus brings the Egyptian, Phœnician, "Chaldean Writers to attest the Story of the Scripture. "(3.) As to the Greek Antiquities be faith the Greeks "could have no Records for many hundreds of years "before they wrote. And what follows, but that there- "fore there is great uncertainty in the Antiquities of "Greece till that time? For which reason 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 Fa- "bulous; because, as Josephus observes, they had no "publick 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 Varro might "hold as to the Greek Antiquities; but it is unjustly ap- "plied by Camden to the Antiquities of other Nations;
for the utmost Eastern Nations the Chineses, and the utmost Western the Irish have preferred their Antiquities far beyond the time 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 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 Chineses, they are very remote from us, and we have had different accounts of them, as appears by comparing Gonfales Mendoza and Martinius together; and of their Antiquities as delivered by the former, a learned Man hath said 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; 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 Decad of the History from the beginning of the Empire to the Nativity of Christ. But their way of preferring Antiquities was peculiar to themselves, and therefore these cannot very well be made a Parallel for the Scotish or Irish Antiquities. Martinius hath indeed given a very playible Account of the remote Antiquities of China, but in such a manner as shews that even the Chineses had a dark and fabulous time as well as the Greeks, and he tells us, that themselves acknowledge that before the Reign of Fobius 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 Chineses that they were very early given
given to the finding out the best methods for calculation; and they used a Cycle of 60 years, 2670 years before Christ's Nativity; and therefore Martinus magnifies the Chinefes, 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 Chinefes 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 publick Annals, which are preserved to this day. For, notwithstanding the Perfection 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, there were means used to preserve their Annals; but Somedo faith, they could never recover a perfect Account of the first beginning of that famous Empire.

Now before any other Nation can presume to vye with the exactness of the Chinefes 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 publick Annals; as the Eastern People and the Romans did.

For instance, we are told from a late Irish Antiquary Geoffrey Keting, that the Pofterity of Gathelus and Scotia, or the Milefian Race settled in Ireland, A. M. 2736. after the Flood 1086, after Mofes passing the Red Sea 192. before Christ's Nativity 1308, from whence the Antiquity of the Irish Nation, is said not to be parallel'd, unless by the Chinefes onely.

Here is a pretence to very great Antiquity, and an appearance of exact Calculation; but I onely 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 onely Fancy and Opinion,
Opinion, unless there were some Characters of Time fixed and certain by Eclipses and Astronomical observations, or certain Periods of time, or coincident passages, which might connect the 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 Pofferity of Gatheletus, came into Ireland just 308 years before Christ's Nativity, here is 1000 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 1308 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, whoever intends to give satisfaction, will search Thucydides, Diodorus and Ptolemy to find out some undoubted Character; as that Thucydides faith that Pythodorus was then Archon at Athens, and it was the year of the Olympick Solemnities. Diodorus faith, this was the 87th Olympiad, and that Apfeudes was Archon the year before; Ptolemy faith 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,
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culation, argues too great presumption upon the Credulity of
Mankind. Thus as to the coming of Fergus I into Scotland juft 330 years before Christ, which the Advocate
faith 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.) As to the French Antiquities; which the Advocate
faith, may be more justly questioned on these
Grounds than theirs, we only desire them to be as ingen-
uous as the late learned Writers of their Antiquities have
been, who reject all before the Merovingian Race, as ei-
ther Fabulous, or so doubtful and uncertain, that they
make no Account of it, unless it be what they find in the
Roman Authours concerning the Franks, as may be seen by Dr. Fra-
in Hadrianus Valerius, a learned Historian, Antiquary, and

and Critick.

(5.) As to the Spanish, which are joined with the
French; what relates to their Antiquities before the Ro-
mans War in Spain, we grant to be parallel with
theirs. For although Strabo faith, they had the use of
Letters, and had some Records of ancient times a-
mong them; yet they are utterly lost. And although
Reinclus de Deo Endovellico seems to think, that An-
nius 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 alluded the old Spanish
Records, and nothave fathered his Antiquities on Per-
sons so remote as Berofus and Mancho.

But if they had the use of Letters and Records a-
mong them, might not the Irish and Scotifh 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.
Camden and Sir James Ware two learned Antiquaries
both think Ireland first peopled from Britain; and Cam-
den offers good Reasons for his Affertion, “as the agree-
ment of the British and Irish Languages in very many
words; the similitude of Customs and Manners; it’s being
anciently called the lefter Britain, and the inhabitants
of Britains; the conveniency of passage from Britain thither;
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which seem to be of far greater moment than anything brought to prove the Legend of Cæthelus and Scotia 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 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 Strabo observes out of Ephorus, divided the then known World into four Parts, the Eastern they called India, the Southern Ethiopia, the Western Cælia, and the Northern Scythia. And in the European Parts they knew but of two Nations beside the Greeks, and those are the Cælia and the Scythe. Those that inhabited Northward, faith Strabo, were called Scythe, and those to the West Celtæ; who were likewise called Iberi and Celtiberi, as he affirms; and these peoples Spain and Gaul, and from thence spread into the Neighbour Countries; and among the rest came over into Britain: Which in the Book 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 Scythe 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 Tacitus truly observes, the agreement was so very great between the Gauls and the old Britains, that although he suspected the Silures might come immediately from Spain, (or rather from the Iberi, which Strabo faith was a more general Name, and some of these went into Ireland) but upon the whole matter, he concluded all the Southern parts of Britain to have been peopled immediately from Gaul. But as to the 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 Britains as well as the Celtæ; and however they were united in interest against the Romans, as Galgacus shews in his excellent Speech to
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 Jornandes faith; and that they were provided of Shipping very early, I have proved in the following Book, 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 Holtenius his Papers affirms that the Scythians extended from the Palus Maotis to Countries wholly unknown to the Greeks. 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 the World being unpassable, the People still went farther and farther by the Rivers side, till at last finding themselves bounded by the vast Mountains in those Northern parts and the Sea beyond them, they sate 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 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 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 faith Wallingham, Scythæ, Schythici, Scoti, Scotici are all one; which he took from Radulphus de Diceto, Imag. Hiftor. ad A.1185. and Nennius expressly calls them Schythæ, and Gildas the Irish Sea Vallem Scythicam; and Alfred in the English Translation of Orofius calls the Scots Scyttan; and the Germans both Scythians and Scots Scutten; and the old Britains Ycst, as Cambden hath already observed. Brit. p. 82. And
And it is considerable that a late Irish Antiquary tells us that a Part of their Country in their own Language is called Gaethluighe, 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 faith, 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 Colganus observes on the Life of St. Cladroc, that whereas they are said to be derived from Scota who is said to be Pharaoh's Daughter, the true Name he faith was Scythia; and that Name was given her because her Husband came from Scythia. And the same Antiquary confesses that it appears by all their ancient Records, that they had their original from the Scythians, and Keting himself he faith at last yields it, and that the Name of Scotia was given because the Milesian Race came out of Scythia.

And to confirm the peopling of 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; wherein Giral dus Cambrensis is confess'd to agree with their own Antiquities; and another of the Dannanae from the Northern parts of Britain under Nuadus. But besides both these, and long after them they place the Dynasty of the Scots or Scythians under Herimon; and the Naltir Na-rann, a Book of great Authority among them faith that Herimon was the first King of the Scots in Ireland. And in his time, they say, the Piéls follow'd them thither, But that seems to be too soon. However that they came from the same parts will appear very probable from what Bede speaks of the Piéls coming from Scythia (i.e. Scandinavia) in their long Boats, and being carried by Tempeft to the Northern parts of Ireland, be faith 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.
been, if the Scots had come out of 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 Gothick or Scythick Tongue, which is Mother to most of them; only the Celtick and Latin being mixed with it. But to return to Bede, he faith, the Scots persuaded the Picts to go to Britain, and take Possession of the Northern Parts, as the Britains 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 Cafe, the Scottish Line should be prefer'd to their own. In process of time, faith Bede, some of the Scots themselves, hearing of the Goodness of the Western parts of Scotland, went thither under the Conduit of Rede, and either by Force or Friendship took possession of them; and from thence they were called Dalvendini, from this Rede 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 Scotia, or of Fergus his 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 Icolmkil, or of the Monks of Hy or Jona should say nothing of all this. For he seems to have concealed nothing he knew or had heard of; and fluffs 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, "That their Histories were 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 eafe for them to inform their Monasteries, and that the Monks at Iona or I-colmkill kept the Records there from the foundation of the Monastery about A.D. 560, where their Kings were buried until the Reign of Malcolm Can-more; that they had Annals in other Monasteries, as at Scoon, Paflay, k Plufcardin
"Plufcardin and Lindesfern, Abercorn and Melrofs; and that they had Historians who compiled Histories from them; among whom he reckons as the most ancient Veremundus a Spaniard, A.D. 1076. who dedicated his History to Malcolm Can-more; and Joh. Campbell, Turgott and Alredus Rivallenfis, who wrote of their affairs before Fordon. And he goes about to prove Veremundus could not be counterfeit by Hector Botethius, because he is cited by Balæus, Holinshed, Gefner, Chambers; and because Hector gives an account to James V. that he was sent from Icolmkill. Which is the substance of what he faith 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 his 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 Bards, who would transmit to Posterity his famous Actions; and therefore I cannot but wonder, that the learned Advocate should seem to fllick at 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 Britains 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 Britains, where Cæsar saith they had their Original Institution and the most facted Authority. 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 preferring the memory of things past; and Tacitus and Gildas could meet with no certain Account from Domeftick Histories. And as to his Sanachies and Bards, I shall only give him Buchanan's Answer.
swer in his own Words. Quod autem ad Bardos & Se-
neiones veteris memoriae custodes quidam confugi-
unt, prorfus perridicule faciunt. Which he proves,
"because the Bards were an ignorant sort of People, that
"had no Monuments of Antiquity; and the Sànaichies were
"Men wholly without Learning, and who lived by flat-
tering great Men; and therefore no certain Account of
"things can be expected from them. And withall, faith
"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 objeòts, that the Laws of Lyceurgus
were preserved in the Memories of Men for 600 years,
as Plutarch observes; and the Scots and other Nations
have preferred Laws for much longer time, without the
help of Letters.

But is there no difference between Laws of daily Prac-
tice, and Antiquities, which depend merely upon Memo-
ry, 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 Macalpine Laws, which Fordon faith
were composèd by Kenneth, who subdued the PIasts.
I know that Hector Boethius, who stands out at nothing,
pretends to deliver them as exactly as if he had lived at
that time; and Lefly 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; Buch-
anan just mentions them, and 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
they were all antiquated by the negligence of the Peo-
ple and the length of Time. Now if the Laws so much
later were quite forgotten, how come the Macalpin Laws
to be so exactly preserved? But it may be there was an-
other Chief of Laws at Jcolmkill, besides that of MSS.
which
which Hector Boethius faith Fergus brought from the Sacking of Rome in the time of Alaric. Yet even that would prove that Records are the beft prefervers 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 Jona, or Hy, or Icolmkill, i.e. Hy the Cell of Columba, founded about the year 560. and there, the Advocate faith, their Records were kept from the Foundation to the Reign of Malcolm Can-more. 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 Abbats of Hy not long after Columba, have 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 faith, he was the Son of Fedlimid the Son of Fergus, which Fergus, say the Irish Antiquaries, was second Husband to Eri-ca 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 St. 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 his coming with the first Colony into Scotland. The account they give in short is this, that Carbri 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 were styled Kings of Dalrieda) from him descended Eric the Father of Loarn, and Fergus who went into Scotland. To this Fergus succeeded Dom-mangardus, Comgallus, Gauranus and Conallus, the Son of Comgallus, in whose time Columba came into Scotland; for Adamnanus faith he converted with Conallus the Son of Comgill; who according to Tigernacus and the Ulter Annals gave the Island Hy to Columba.

But
But Bede faith it was given by the Pilis whom Columb Ed. 1, c. 3. 
ba converted to the Christian Faith. Which must seem 
strange, if the Scots then had the possession of those Parts; 
and therefore the learned Primate of Armagh inclines to the former opinion. The same Tigernacus in the Irish 
Annals makes Fergus the Son of Eric to have carried o-
ver the Dalredians into Britain six years after the death 
of St. Patrick; and the old Author cited by Camden 
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 Anceflour 
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, Grand-
child 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 his 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 some of the Kings of Ire-
land before; and I see no reason to question it, even be-
fore 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 100 years later than the Scotifh Antiquaries do place 
his coming, for they make the first coming of this Colony 
to be A. D. 503. just the time which the Bishop of St. A-
faph had pitched upon; but according to their Antiqui-
ties, Loarn the elder Brother was first King, and he dying 
Fergus succeeded A. D. 513. and because his Race suc-
ceeded 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 
Scotifh Antiquaries go upon the better Grounds? For, 
here the Advocate's Common Places of Historical Faith, 
I Common
Common Fame, Domestick Tradition, &c. can determine 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 Druids and Sanachies and Monks as well as those in Ireland; and that Columba founded a Monastery at Icolmkill, and their Kings 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 Scoon, and Paflay, and Pluscardin, and Lindesfern, and Abercorn, unless their Books be produced? It is by no means satisfactory to say 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 forever 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 faith, he had lately seen in a very old MS. brought from Icolmkill, written by Carbre Lifachair, who lived six Generations before St. Patrick, and so about our Saviour’s time. St. Patrick died about the end of the fifth Century, being above 100 years old, if the Irish Historians may be believed; but how fix Generations will reach from his birth to about our Saviour’s time, is not easy to understand. For although the ancients differ’d much in computing Generations; yet Censorinus faith they generally called 25 or 30 years by the Name of a Generation. Herodotus indeed extends a Generation to 100 years, yet even that will over doe here. But who was this Carbre Lifachair, who wrote so long since? I find one of that Name among the Kings of Ireland, about A.D. 284. and therefore I am apt to suspect that some body not very well versed in the Irish Language, finding this Name among the Kings, made him the Author of the Book. And the 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 Debate doth not concern the Saxons in Scot-
land (as all the Lowlanders are still called by the High-
landers) and many of the best Families of their Nobil-
ity settled there in the time of Malcolm Canmoir, af-
after he had married the Sister to Edgar; but it relating
wholly to those who came out of Ireland, the Irish Anti-
quaries 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
"Scotch? 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 I-
rish Antiquities. For they either relate to what happened
among them before Christianity was received in Ireland or after. As
their remote Antiquities, they might have some general
Traditional preserved 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 Bollan-
dus affirms that the Irish had no use of Letters till Saint
Patrick brought it among them; at which their pre-
"ent Antiquary is much offended; and runs back to the
Druids, as the learned Advocate doth. But neither of
them have convinced me that the Druids ever wrote An-
"nals. All that Caesar faith is, that in Gaul they made
use of the Greek Letters; which they might easily bor-
row from the Greek Colony at Marselles; but how doth it appear that they used these Letters in Ireland or Scot-
land? Or that they any where used them in any mat-
ters of Learning; which seems contrary to the Institution of the Druids, who were all for Memory, as Caesar faith,
and thought Books hurtfull to the use of it. So that
nothing could be more repugnant to their Discipline, than
the 150 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 bu-
iness; and so it was in Scotland, as appears by the High-
landers repeating the Genealogy of Alexander III. by heart.
But the great Error lay in fixing Times and Places, and
particular
particular Actions according to the Names of those Genealogies. And this was the true Reason of the mistake as to the Scotish 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, the 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 Erc, Ængus, Fedlim, Conar, the Son of Ederskcol, and so up to Fergus, called in the Irish Catalogue of Kings Fergusius Fortamalius, (whom the Author of the Synchronism makes contemporary with Ptolemy Philometer.)

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 ingeniously confess'd by Tigernacus in his Annals, that all their Antiquities to the Reign of Kimbaithus, their 73. King, are very uncertain; but he might have gone farther, and done no injury to Truth. 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 Cæarea, Baronna and Balba, with fifty other Women and but three Men coming from Ireland just forty days before the Floud; and the fifteenth day of the Moon? What becomes of Partholanus and his Company, who arrived in Ireland the 312th year after the Floud, in the Month of May, 14. of the Moon, and upon Wednesday? Is not this wonderful exactness at such a distance of time? And the late Antiquary confess'd he doth not know, how they came to understand the day of the Week and the Month so well. How come they to understand
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understand, that the second Colony under Nemethus came to Ireland, when it had been 30 years defolate; and after the destruction of that Colony that it remained so 200 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 Tigernacus, who died A.D. 1088. and the Synchronisms of Flannus, who died A.D. 1056. the Historical Poems of Coemannus, who is celebrated 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 Canmoir, with their Names and the time of their Reigns. Which Poem begins with Lorn, and Fergus the Son of Erc 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 join'd 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 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 insinuates upon it, 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 Irish Annals of Tigernacus the Annals of Ulter, Ynisfallin, m Dungall
Dungall 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 authentick Annals in the Monasteries. For there it is said, "That 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 Authentick Chronicle was to be made, "which was to be laid up in the Archives of the Monas-"teries 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 Authentick Annals in their Monasteries before that time to his knowledge. Buchanan, I know, doth several times quote the Book of Paflay, but it had been far better to have printed the Book itself, since Dempster faith it was in the hands of the Earl of Dumferlin, that others might have been better able to judge concerning it. But Fordon tells us, that Monas-tery was founded A.D. 1168. (or a year after, faith the Chronicle of Melros) now, the very foundation of the Monastery is here so late, that no great matter can be expected as to remote Antiquities. That at Scone, as Fordon faith, was founded not much sooner, A.D. 1107. As to Abercorn, though mentioned by Bede, yet Buchanan faith 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 the famous Book of Plascardin: 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 sooneft was founded by Alexander II. in the thirteenth Century; but Dempster rather thinks, it was
was 200 years after. I never heard that Aidan, Finan and Colman left any Annals at Lindesfarn; nor Columba or his Successors, at Icolmkill. If any such be ever found, it will be a great favour to inquisitive Men to oblige the World by publishing them, that if we are guilty of mistakes, we may rectifie them upon such great Authorities when they would safe to let them see the light.

As to the Chronicle of Melroffe, lately published at Oxford, we find no advantage at all to the Advocate's Cause by it. But here is an odd kind of Reflexion either on the MS. or the worthy Publisher of it, as though it were very unfaithfull in the things relating to the Scotch Nation. Whereas I have frequently perused the Original MS. in the Cotton Library, which is a very fair and ancient one. And those Verses be speaks of, which are ommitted, 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 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 Melros, 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 Censures. 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 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 Veremundus a Spaniard, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, A.D. 1076. who dedicated his History to Malcolm Canmoir; 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. Afaph hath unhappily questioned; whether there ever were such a Writer; and I do not think the
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 Veremundus: And then supposing there were, whether it were genuine, or made under his Name by Hector Boethius, or rather by his Physician of Aberdeen, who was so helpful to him, faith Dempster, in textenda Historia, i.e. in weaving the Materials for his History? I will not dispute so much the former, and the Testimony of Chambers, 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.) It is very well known that it was no unusual 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 Berosus, Manetho, Metrodotes (or Megathenes) 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 the of Annius in Italy, and by the Tuscan Inscriptions published by Inghiramius under the Name of Prosper Feflanus; 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 gratifie 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 ease matter to convince such of the imposture. For even Annius and Prosper Feflanus, as well as Veremundus have had their Advocates to plead for them.

(2.) We find as to the Scotish Antiquities many such Authors pretended to, who never wrote concerning them. As for instance, three Books of the History of Scotland by St. Adam Bishop of Catbnes, Auminus of the Right of the Culdees. King Achaisus his History of his Pre-deceflours.
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decefsour. Aldarus his History of Scotland and Ireland. St. Convallanus his History of the Kings of Scotland. The Chronicle of Dunfermlin. Elvanus Avallones his History of Scotland. St. Faftidius his Chronicle of Scotland. Fergus the great his Epifles to the Scots. Fulgentius his Epifle to Donald King of Scotland in the time of Severus. St. Glacianus his History of Scotland. St. Glodianus his Chronicle of the Picts, cited by Veremundus, faith Dempfter. Galdus his Epi- fles to the Britains. Hunibertus his Scotith Chronicle. Kenneth's Epitome of his Laws. St. Machorius of the Destruction of the Picts. St. Minnanus of the Union of the Scots and Picts. Marcerus of the coming of the Scots into Albion: He is said to be their first Author, and out of him Veremundus, faith Dempfter, took the Foundation of his History; but I do not find that any Man befides ever saw him. King Reuther's Scotith Hi- story. Salifax Bardus his Genealogy of their Kings in King Reuther's time. Here we have no less than 20 Authours relating to their Antiquities, every one mentioned as genuine by Dempfter; and yet as far as we can find, not one of the whole number was fo. Is it then any wonder, that Veremundus should be reckon'd among the reft?

(3.) No fuch Author was known to Fordon, as far as appears by his History; and he is very punctual in quoting the Authours he makes ue of, and sometimes transcripts large passages out of them; as out of Baldreus, as he calls him, and Turgot's Life of Malcolm, &c. Jocelin de Furnes, Vincentius, Adamnanus, and any old Legends or Chronicles he could meet with, as Chronica de Abernethy, & varia Chronicæ upon many occa- sions. I do not therefore deny that Fordon doth appeal to Chronicles before him; but I think the Argument fo much stronger againft Veremundus; when one who gathered all he could meet with never once takes notice of him, as far as I can find.

(4.) William Elphinston, (Chancellor of Scotland, Bishop of Aberdeen, and Founder of the University there, a Man highly commended by Hector Boethius) did, as Hector himfelf tells us in his Epifle to James V. search all Scotland for Monuments of Antiquity, and gave the first intimation of Veremundus in the Island Fona,
and followed him exactly in writing his History. Now as it happily falls out, this very History of Elphinstoun 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. He tells the Story of 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 contrac-
ted; the fifteenth about Gathelus his building the City Brigantia in Spain is transposed, another Chapter being set before it. In the seventeenth he follows Fordon exact-
ly about the Posterity of Gathelus coming into Ireland; and whereas Fordon only quotes Grutum Caput for say-
ing that Scotia had its Name from Scota, the most noble Person in that Colony; he faith it was in some Chronica; but what Chronica was ever written by Groff-
head, deserves to be enquired. 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 Scotch Writers; but as far as I can perceive, he ne-
ever read Fordon; nor saw Elphinston. In Chap. 20, where Fordon quotes an old Chronicle which affirms that Gathelus gave the fame 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 Elphinstoun left out; and he passes over Chap. 21, where the miserable condition of the Posterity of Gathelus in Spain for 240 years is set down. In some following Chap-
ters 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 his 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 Veremundus.

In the second Book he follows Fordon, not only in o-
ther things before, but when he describes the Islands of Scotland, and particularly Jona; only he leaves out Fordon's Hebrew Etymology, making Jona and Columba the fame; and he faith not one word of any Library or Records kept there, or any old Histories and Annals to be there found, as Hector Boethius affirms; all that he faith
is, that there was a Sanctuary for Transgressors. About Fergus and Rether he varies not a little 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 45 Kings between the two Fergus, 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 praefens non in Scriptis reperimus. Now from this expression I thus argue against Hector Boethius his 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 Jona, 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 Hiberniae Libros referimus. So that according to Elphinston's judgment the most certain account of their Antiquities is to be taken from
from the Irifh Authors. And so we may observe both in
him and Fordon, the Irish Legends of S. Brendan and
others, served them for very good Authorities.

And so much for the Advocate's ancient Historian Verem-
nundus the Spaniard. For I suppose the mention of him
by Bale, Getner, Hollinshed, &c. after he was so much
celebrated by Hector Boethius, deferves no farther con-
deration. But Vossius did not think him worth mention-
ingen; and although he blames Luddus (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 fabulous 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 cre-
dulity in point of miracles, whereas there is not the least
intimation that way; and Vossius faith that Leland on
the account of his fabulous arcs wrote sharp Verses up-
on him. What! for his having believed too many
Miracles? No certainly, but for his fabulous Antiqui-
ities. But he hopes to bring Hector Boethius better off
from the Censure of Bishop Gavin Dowglas, which the
Bishop of St. Afaph takes notice of from Polydore Vir-
gil, because Bishop Dowglas died A. D. 1520. and Boe-
thius his 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 Ad-
vocate 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 his Authority in the very
beginning of his History, for the Scottish Antiquities both
in Spain, Ireland and Albany. In his second Book he
faith, 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
bad from Icolmkill. In his third Book about Caesar's
Expedition, he still pretends to follow Veremundus. And
in his seventh Book he declares he had kept close to him
in the whole feries 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 Pa-
ris, A. D. 1526. It would take up that year in sending
it
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it thither, and 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 cenured, 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 his death: (if he died, as he saith, a. d. 1520.) and he pretends to no new discoveries, as Boe-thius doth. But why should the advocate imagine his history was not known by the learned men at home, such as bishop douglas was, before it was printed?

But to return to voslius, who is not sparing in mentioning any of our MSS. Historians which he found well attested: and particularly Aelredus, abbat of Rieval, who wrote the life of David king of Scots. But the advocate tells us some new concerning him, viz. that he was abbat of melros, which was called Rieval before King David's time. But Fordon expressly distinguishes the two monasteries of Rieval and melros; the one, he saith, was founded by King David, a. d. 1132. and the latter four years after. And in the chronicle of melros it appears that Richard was the first abbat there; to whom Waltheof succeeded, uncle to King Malcolm, a. d. 1148. (who succeeded King David a. d. 1153.) After Waltheof William was abbat of melros, a. d. 1159. after him Jocelin, a. d. 1170. In the mean time Aelredus dies abbat of Rieval, a. d. 1167. and Silva-nus was chosen in his place. From whence it is plain that the abbes of melros and Rieval were always distinct from their first foundation, and that Aelredus was never abbat of melros. This Aelredus may be called a scotic histrian, for his lamentation of King David extant both in Fordon and Elphinston; but I can find nothing of his writing relating to the scotic antiquities. I know he wrote a chronicon, which Boston of bury (who calls him Aelredus) 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.
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Turgott is likewise mentioned by Vossius, though a MS. Historian; because he saw very good evidence for his writing some part of the Scotch History. He lived faith the Advocate A.D. 1098. I grant that he is frequently cited by Fordon and Elphinstone, for the Acts of Malcolm and Margaret which he wrote; but I can find no more out of him than out of Acired as to their remote Antiquities, although they seem to have left out very little of what Turgott wrote. But I wonder how the Advocate came to discover Turgott to have been Archbishop of St. Andrews; when Dempster could have informed him that there was no Archbishop of St. Andrews till 300 years after. And he might have found in Fordon, that there was no Archbishop of St. Andrews till after James Kennedy, who was Bishop of St. Andrews, 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. Andrews, but it was not quietly enjoyed till his Successor Will. Sheues came into possession of his place.

But there is in Fordon an account of the Succession of the Bishops of St. Andrews from the time of the expulsion of the Picts; which is wholly left out in Elphinstone; and there Turgott is said to be consecrated Bishop A.D. 1109, and to continue there seven years. St. Andrews was before called Kilremont, as appears by Fordon, who calls them the Bishops of St. Andrews de Kilremont; Kil, as appears by the Scotich Historians, was a place of Devotion; Kilruil was the Church of Regulus (as Hector faith St. Andrews 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 Kiledices (from which title the fiction of the ancient Culdees came, as the Bishop of St. Alaph hath truly observed.) These Kiledices had the ancient Right of naming the Bishop, and were first excluded, as Fordon faith by William Wilhart, A.D. 1273: and next by William Fraer, after him by William Lamberton; upon which William Cumying Keldororum Prepositus, i.e. Dean of the Church appealed to Rome, but was overruled there. But the learned Primate of Armagh following Dempster too much, calls him Auminus; and yet Dempster quotes the Scotichronicon
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nicon for it, where it is plainly William Cumyng. But that the Killdees were nothing but the Dean and Chapter of St. Andrews, 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 faith was in them.

I should not so much have insisted on this mistake of the Advocate in making Turgott Archbishop of St. Andrews if he had not so severely reflected on the Bishop of St. Afaph for making Fordon a Monk, as though he did it merely for his own convenience to show 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 Dempster faith something thought him a Monk, and he could not find of what condition he was; and yet he faith he read him; and Vossius makes Joh. de Fordon a Monk in King John's time, Author of the Scotichronicon.

This Book of Fordon the Advocate faith was so esteemed that there were Copies of it in most of their Monasteries; and he faith 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 onely some few things, which stand in need of being farther cleared. As,

(1.) The Testimony of Eumenius in his Panegyrick to Constantius, from whence the Advocate proves that in the time of Caesar 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 Britains fought with in Caesar's time (just as Sidonius Apollinaris faith that Caesar conquer'd the Piets and Saxons in Britain, which is such another Prolepsis as Sirmontius observes, who makes the coming of the Scots into Britain after the Saxons; and he was a judicious Critick
Critick and Antiquary) but the true question is, whether Eumenius affirms that those Irish then dwelt in Britain? Yes, faith Buchanan, foli Britanni, are to be understood in the Genitive Case, and so these words relate to the Picts and Irish of the British Soil. No, faith the Bishop of St. Asaph, they are to be understood in the Nominative Case: and so they set forth the advantage in Constantius his Victory over a Roman Legion above that of Julius Cæsar, who fought onely with the Britains, 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 Claudius Puteanus, and therefore more correct than the Plantin Edition. Ad hoc Nationem tunc rudis, & foli Britanni Pictis modo & Hibernis affixa hostibus, adhuc feminudis, facile Romanis armis signiç. celescrunt.

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 shew, that he fought with the Britains 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 Britains 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 faith the comparison lies in this, that then they had been used onely 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 Britains greater experience in War, but of a Roman Legion corrupted, foreign Souldiers and Gallican Merchants drawn out of the Provinces to strengthen Carausius and Allecius in their Rebellion; so that the Comparison lies between the Britains alone in Caesar'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 his own manner of speaking, if he were to be understood in Bucha-
Buchanan's sense, it should have been Soli Britanni for the British Soil. For so he hath Victoria Britanni at the end of the same Oration; and in another Britannica Trophae. So that neither Sense nor Grammar do favour Buchanan's Construction. But he saith Jofeph Scaliger approves Buchanan's Construction in his Notes on Ti-bullus. 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 Claudian's Expression,

Scotorum cumulos fleuit glacialis Ierne.

be faith this is not to be understood of Ireland, but of a Countrey 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 Frofts 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 Countrey might in Latin be called Ierne from thence. But how doth it appear that Claudian or the Romans knew it by that Name? We are certain that Ierne commonly passed for Ireland among them; and that it was then accounted the Countrey of the Scots; as appears by the express Testimony of Orofius, who lived in that Age. And Dempfier, 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 Theodofius, and there destroyed by him. And Claudian explains himself elsewhere, when he faith,
Where it seems ridiculous to say, that the Scots put all Strawbergh into commotion; and this Ierne had the Sea lying between it and Britain, in whose Name Claudian speaks; and Buchanan understands this of Ireland.

(3.) He urges the great improbability that the Scots should manage so long a War, for 600 years, and not settle in Britain. But this is that which is called begging the Question; for the dispute is how long the Scots in Britain did make War upon the Britains? Claudian faith in his time, the Scots came from Ierne, and made the Sea foam with their Oars; Gildas faith the Irib usually returned home, intending to come back, and the Picts then rested for a time in the farthestmost 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 his Authority be allowed in this case, I think it is clear enough to decide the Controversie. For, (1.) Upon Maximus his withdrawing the Roman Legions and Britifh Infantry which never returned, he faith the Britains were then first infested with two cruel transmarine Nations, the Scots from the Southwefl, and the Picts from the North. If there had been a War of 600 years from before Julius Caesar's time, as the Advocate faith, how comes Gildas to be so extremely mistaken as to say the first War began after Maximus his withdrawing the Roman Militia? (2.) He still speaks of their coming by Sea, and carrying away their anniversary Prey beyond the Seas; and trans Maria fugaverunt, faith he, of the Roman Forces driving them back. How comes Gildas still to mention the Seas if they then inhabited the fame Island?

But the Advocate faith that by Seas the Friths are understood; and that in their old Laws the Frith of Forth is called Mare Scotiae, the Sea of Scotland; and the Frith of Dunbritton is called one part of the Mare Scoticum by the English Authours; and this passage to and fro he makes to be eafie, but the other home to Ireland.
Ireland almost impossible with their Boats in the Irish Seas; from whence he faith, that the Bishop of St. Aflap's Hypoth:sis 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, you think, they are 40 Miles broad in some places; and so makes the passage more difficult over them than from Ireland to Scotland; for, as Camden observes, there is hardly 13 Miles Camd. Brit. distance between some part of Scotland and Ireland. But this is to demonstrate the consistency of his own Hypoth:sis, and the absurdity of the Bishop's. (2.) The Irish Writers say, their Curroghs or light Boats cover'd with Lea-

ther were very convenient for transporting an Army, though not so proper for a Sea-fight. 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 faith, he was out at Sea 14 Days Northward in it. Now what absurdity or incredibility is there in it, that such Vessels should convey the Irish forwards and backwards over so narrow a passage as that between Ireland and those parts of Scotland which lay nearest to it? Why might not the Irish pass those Seas as well in these as the Britains did in Caesar's time, the Sea between Gaul and Britain; for he faith they gave Assistance to the Gauls; and they had then no other kind of Ships? And Caesar himself was so far from despising them, that he thought them a very useful invention and made use of them himself in Spain to transport his Souldiers. The Keel and Masts, he faith, were made of the lightest Wood, and the Bodies of them of Wicker, cover'd over with Leather, which he had learnt from the Britains. Lucan calls them little Ships, and not a miserable little kind of shapeless Boats, as the Advocate doth.

Primum cana felix made facto vimum, parvam Textur in Puppim, cafoq; induta juvenco, &c.

and in these he faith the Britains were sent to pass the Ocean.
In the old MSS. Glossaries in the Margin of Joffelin's Gildas, Curuca is rendered by Navis, and not a little shapeless Boat. And Solinus expressly saith (even in the place quoted by him) that it was common to pass between Ireland and Britain with these Curroghs. And such kind of Vessels covered with Leather were not only used by the Britains and Irith, but by the Ethiopians, Egyptians, Sabeans, Romans and Spaniards; as might be showed from the Testimonies of Agatharchides, Strabo, Virgil, Pliny and others. How comes it then to be almost impossible for the Irith to pass the Seas in such Vessels? And wherein lies the Absurdity and Incredibility of the Bishop's Hypothesis, when he makes them to cross but 13 Miles from Ireland to Britain in these Curroghs, and the Advocate allows the Friths over which they were to pass to be 40 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 underflood of the two Friths, viz. that Gildas saith, when the Roman Legion first defeated the Picts and the Scots, they commanded a Wall to be built between the two Seas to hinder their Incursion: which is confirmed by Bede, who saith this Wall began at Penneles-tun not far from Abercorny and ended at Alcluth, and was designed to keep out their Enemies. Now I desire to know to what purpose this Wall was built between the two Friths to keep out the Scots and Picts, if their Custome was, as the Advocate supposes, to cross over the two Friths and to land on this side the Wall? Did the Romans and Britains so little understand the Way of their Enemies coming, to put themselves to so much pains and trouble for no purpose at all? And Buchanan thinks the last Stone Wall made by the Romans for the Security of the Britains, mentioned by Gildas and Bede, was made in the same place where he thinks Severus his Wall stood before.
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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 Britains no Service. But Gildas and Bede say they attempted the Wall and forced themselves a passage over it; irrumpunt terminos faith Bede; and with their iron hooks drew the Britains from the Wall, faith 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 passing 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 Gildas faith after the making the second Wall, the Scots 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 shows 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 Conversion of the Scottish Nation to the Christian Faith. And here I am particularly concerned to answer his Arguments, since in the 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. 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 ill Nature to deny this Conclusion, if the Premisses be well proved.

(1.) As to the Conversion under King Donald; he shews,

1. 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 Britains; and not of the Scots.
2. He saith, the Druids were prepared to receive Christianity, and so would be able to be converted themselves and ready to convert the People. He speaks soon after, of a double 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? And the Irish Antiquaries say the Druids there were the great opposers of the Gospel. But still these Druids might be among the Britains and not the Scots.

p. 118.

3. He saith, That Donald was their first Christian King, A.D. 203. seems most fully proved. Not by anything 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.

p. 119.

4. He affirms, That Baronius allows their Conversion by Pope Victor, and he made Ecclesiastic History more his Task than the Bishop of St. Aphan, and was more disinterested. It is possible, the Bishop of St. Aphan 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 Baronius 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 Dempster is displeased 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 Baronius doth wonder, that such a Conversion should be omitted not only by Bede but by Marianus Scotus.

5. The
5. The Magdeburgian Centuries, he faith, agree with Baronius; and these are the Standards of Ecclesiastick History to the Professours of both Religions. He had as good have said they were the Hercules Pillars and there is no passage beyond them. But no learned Professours 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 onely by the Sorbonifts 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 Ecclesiastick Antiquity are extremely improved since that time. More ancient Authours having been published out of MSS. and better Editions by comparing the Authours before printed with MSS. and many counterfeit Authours discovered and far greater Enquiries have been made into all parts of Ecclesiastick 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.) As to the mission of 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 Circumstances of his being sent into Ireland. 3. That Dr. Hammond yields that the 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 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 Proper's Words to the eighth of Theodosius, which he had placed under Baslius and Antiochus Consuls; but he doth not determine whether these Scots were in Ireland or in Britain. But the Advocate faith, all that which Bede faith before and after concerning the Scots relates to the Scots in Britain, and therefore these Words are so to be understood.
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1. l. c. 1.

derstood. Whereas Bede in the very beginning declares, that Ireland was the proper Countrey of the Scots; and that Dumbriton Frith did anciently separate the Picts and the Britains; 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 antiquitus gentem Britonum a Scottis fecernere; but he never mentions the Scots but the Picts as the ancient Inhabitants on the Northern part of the Frith. But, faith the Advocate, 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 Britains and Picts? 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 Picts in this Countrey, by his first Chapter, but the English too. And it is an extraordinary sagacity that can discover this Chapter in Bede, to be 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.

p. 65.

Buch. 1. 2. p. 16.

p. 145.

But the Advocate proceeds to shew, that the Name of Scots doth originally belong to the Scots in Britain, and onely by way of communication to those in Ireland. 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 Buchanan faith that the Irifh were at first called Scots; and from thence they passed into Albany; and that by the Name Scots their coming from the Irifh is declared. Joh. Major faith, that Scotia among their Ancestours was the common Name for Ireland. And if their ancient Annals may be believed, the Name of Scot came from Scota the Wife of Cathelus, whose Posterity went first into Ireland, and then carried the Name into Scotland. In Fordon and Elphinston there is another Scota mentioned, as a Leader of the first Colony into Ireland, who gave the Name

l. l. c. 9.
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Name to that Countrey of Scotia; and Joh. Major fith
She was the Mother of Hiber. But whichever of these
flands, unlefs the Advocate will at laft give up the Caufe
of their Ancient Annals, which he hath contended fo
warmly for, he muft renounce this opinion of his, that the
Name of Scots doth originally belong to the Albion
Scots, and onely by way of communication to the
Irish; so that there is no need to produce the plain Testi-
monies of Orosius, Bede and Isidore, which make Ire-
land the proper Countrey of the Scots. But it is a
wonderful subtlety from hence to infer, as the Advocate
doeth, as if it might have been juftly doubted, and
were not true in all fenses. Doth he mean proper or
improper fenses? Their words are plain that Ireland
in a firit and proper fense was the Countrey of the
Scots, i.e. the Patria Originis, though the other might
afterwards be Patria incolatus & Domicilii; as the
Advocate himfelf doth diftinguith; but that which fol-
ows 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 thofe in Ireland, unlefs he
can fhew that the Reafon of the Name doth agree to them
onely 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 Countrey from whence they came are fo called. But
were not the Irish called Scots before they went into Scot-
land? If not, that could not be proprie Scotorum Pa-
tria, as Orosius and Bede and Isidore affirm; as En-
gland could not be faid to be the proper Countrey of the
English unlefs the Inhabitants were called English; and
the Colony of Virginia received its denomination of being
English because they came from hence. Unlefs therefore
the Advocate be pleased to fhew, that the Name of Scots
doeth belong to the Irish upon their remove into Britain
that it could not agree to them in Ireland it will be im-
possible for him to make out, that the Name of Scots doth
originally belong to the Irish in Britain, and onely by way
of communication to thofe in Ireland. I have already
fhewed that Jof. Scaliger doth affign fuch a Reafon of the
Name of Scoti as agrees onely to thofe who came over up-
on Expeditions; but I believe the Scots will take it far
better
better to receive their Name from the Irish Scots, than to have had the original Name given them on such an Account.

(2.) As to the Circumstances of Palladius his Mission the main difficulty objected, 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 faith he went and died not, A. D. 431. but 434. This is the force of what the Advocate faith upon this matter. But the Bishop of St. Afaph 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, that the Northern part of Britain was by 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. Tacitus indeed faith, that by Agricola's Fortifications between the two Friths, the Britains 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 Feltus Avienus not long before, viz. in the time of Theodofius had distinguished the two Islands, the one inhabited by the Hiberni, and the other be calls Insula Albionum, which takes in all that we now call Britain. But according to the old Geographers, Ireland was accounted one of the British Islands; as appears by the Testimonies of Pliny, Apuleius, Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus and Marcianus Herculota, 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. Bede mentions the Insulani in the Chapter refer'd to; but nothing can be plainer, than that he speaks of the Britains on this side the Wall; 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 Bede, the Insulani are to be understood of those of Ireland, as Bede clearly expresseth himself, mislo in Hiber-
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Hiberniam exercitu. But the ingenious Advocate hath a fetch beyond this; for he faith that Bede by Ireland meant Scotland, which he sets himself to prove from this very passage. For, faith he, the same thing that is first said to be done in 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 could not mean any other than Ireland appears from hence, that he faith, the Nation which Egfred invaded had been always kind to the English; and the Irish Annals give an account of the very Place and Time of Egfred's landing in Ireland and the Captives he carried away from thence. But Bede elsewhere faith the Scots in Britain had been great Enemies to them; as appeared by the Battel at Degsaltan, 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 durft appear in the Field against the English. Which argues no great kindness between them; but Bede faith, 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 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, Ireland was called Scotia; which is so clear in Bede, that I wonder that any that carefully read him can dispute it. He faith 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 his Discourse. When he speaks of Laurentius his care not only of the Britains but of the Scots too, he explains himself to mean those who lived in Ireland, an Island near to Britain. Columba, he faith, came from Ireland to convert the Northern Picts, and obtained from their King the Island Hy, where he founded his Monaftery, which he faith 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
the Roman Caflome of Easter, and the Northern refufing it. From thefe Aidanus came, the firfl Scotch Bifbop
who fefled among the Englifh, being fent for by King Of-
wald. Furfeus, faith he afterwards, came from Ireland,
being of the moft noble Race of the Scots; and there he
mentions the Scots of his own Nation, and faith he
had preached a great while in Scotia before he came
into England; but he never takes notice, after his coming
over, of his being any where, but among the Britains before
he went to the East Angles. After Aidan's death Finan
came from the fame Scots, who perfiffed in the old way of the
keeping Easter; after Finan Colman fucceeded, who was
miffus a Scotia, who maintained the fame praftice; and
afterwards he returned home, in Scotiam regr effus eft;
but what he means by it Bede prefently informs us, when he
faith that Tuda fucceeded who had been brought
up among the Southern Scots, i. e. in the Southern
parts of Ireland. Tuda died of the Plague, which Bede
faith pafted into Ireland, whither many Englifh went in
the time of Finan and Colman, who were all kindly re-
ceived by the Scots. When Colman returned Bede, faith
he went firft to Hy, then to an Ifland on the Weft of
Ireland; but not a word of the Northern parts of Britain.
Afterwards he fbeweth how the greatefl part of the Scots
in Ireland were brought to compliance in the point of kee-
ping Easter by means of Adamnanus, who endeavoured
to reduce thofe of Hy but could not; but upon Egbert's
coming to them from Ireland, the Scotch Monks of the
Ifland Hy or Jona yielded, when Duumchadus was Ab-
bat there. And now let any indifferent Reader judge whe-
ther by Scotia Bede understand the Northern parts of
Britain or Ireland.

"But after all, doth not Bede fay, that the Ifland
"Hy did belong to Britain as a part of it? And what
then follows? Doth not Bede in the fame place fay it was
given by the Pictis not by the Scots to the Scotch Monks
who came from Ireland? So that upon the whole matter,
that which Bede understand by Scotia feems to be Ireland,
although he affirms the Scots to have fetted in the Nor-
thern parts of Britain, and to have fet 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 he so punctually sets down the Conversion of the South Picts by Ninnias a Britifh Bifhop and of the Northern Picts by Columba, a Scotifh or Ifh 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 Bifhop of St. Afaph answers, that Palladius might die so soon after his Mission that Pope Celeftine 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 Authours, which the Advocate calls a laborious Hypothefis, 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 sent to the Scots in Britain I cannot find. And for all that I fee by this Anfwer, the only fault of the Bifhop’s Hypothefis is, that it is too exact; and doth too much clear the appearance of contradiction between the two Mifions.

(3.) As to Dr. Hammond’s Testimony (who is defer vedly called by the Advocate a learned and Epifcopal En gli fh Divine) it is very easily anfwered. For, 1. He looks on the whole Story of the Scots’ Conversion as very uncertainly fet down by Authours. 2. He fays, that Bozius 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 leak notice of it. 4. That if Prosper’s Words be un derftood of the Scots in Britain, yet they do not prove the thing defigned by his Adver faries, viz. that the Churches there were governed by Bifhopes without Bifhopes; for Prosper fupposes that they remained barbarous still, and therefore the Plantation was very imperfect, and could not be underftood of any formed Churches. But the Advocate very wifely conceals one paffage which overthrows his Hypothefis, viz; that they could not be fupposed to receive the first Rudiments of their Conversion from Rome, viz. under Pope Victor, since the Scots joined with the Britains in rejecting the Roman Cuftoms. From whence we fee 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 his coming thither, was only from an uncertain Tradition, and for reconciling the seeming differences between Bede and Prosper; or rather for reconciling Prosper to himself.

But I remember the Advocate's observation in the case of their Predecessour'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.

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 Scotish 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 enquire more strictly into this Defence of such pretended Antiquities; both because 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 withall 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 Antiquities, 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 Romantick Fables of the Monkish times, and at last to settle their Antiquities on firm and solid Foundations.

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 Burthen to be undergone by any Man, when he is fit for it by Age and Consideration,
tion, 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 Chimæra's 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 Mens judgments, but my own.
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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 his Words mis-understood.
The Tradition concerning Joseph of Arimathea and his Brethren coming to Glastonbury, at large examined.

No Foot-steps 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 his 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 Arimathea and Arviragus very improbable.
The Antiquities of
Chap I.

St. Henry Spelman vindicated.
The State of the Roman Province in Britain about that

time.
No such King as Arviragus then.
Not the same with Caractacus.
A Christian Church proved to be Planted here in the Apo-

stles times.
The Authentick 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 and Græcina, Claudia Rufina, Chris-

tians 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.

I T 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, 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 con-
siders the small number of the years between our Savi-
our'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 se-
parate, till after the Council at Jerusalem; nor on that
of Hippolytus Thebanus in (d) Glycas, and of Eudocius in
(e) Nicephorus, who reckon the Martyrdom of St. Step-
hen, 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.

But
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, 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 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 Britains. (g) 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 (b) 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 onely, like the Houlholder 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 (i) Archb. Epher hath observed) That Joseph of Arimathea did bear them Company, and came over into Britain, to Preach the Gospel; Which according to his own Supposition, must be onely to the Jews in Britain, if there were any here; But if it be understood of the Gentiles, (k) Jac. Sirmondus faith in plain Terms, This Tradition contradicts the Scripture; For faith 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 Incouragement of his Example, those of the Differtation, began to Preach to the Gentiles at Antioch? Which is confuted by (l) Baronius himself. The strength of which Argument hath prevailed so much in France, That the (m) Defenders of this Tradition, have been there contented to let go the Reign of Tiberius, and to place it a great deal later, Anno Dom. 62. (n) For they evidently

---

(g) Baron. A.D. 35. n. 5.  
(i) Ulicer. de Primord. p. 15.  
(k) Sirmond. de moder. Denti.  
(l) Bar. A.D. 31. n. 15.  
(m) v. Lusonii Opus. de Lazaro, Gry. p. 33.  
dently saw, there was no Possibility of defending it upon other Terms, although hereby they make Lazarus and Joseph of Arimathea 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. (o) 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, faith he, If there were any such, they were either burnt by 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' east 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 Britains after it. Interea, faith he,

Interea glaciali frigore rigenti Insula, & veluti longiore terrarum recepisti, foli visibili non proxima verus ille non de firmamento folum (L. Sol) temporalis, fed de summa etiam coelo rum arce tempora cuncta excedente univerfo orbi

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 ever-fulgidum
praefulgidum fui corufcum of tendens tempore (ut scimus) summo Tiberii Ca- 
faris (quo absqueullo impedimento ejus propagatio- 
batur Religion comminata senatu nolente à Principe 
morte dilatoribus militum ejufdem) radios fuos pri- 
mum indulget, id est fua praecipua Christus. §.6.

This I take to be Gildas his true meaning: For it is 
certain, he speaks of a double shining of the Gospel, 
one more General to the World, the other more par- 
ticular to this Island: The former, he faith, 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 spoked of before, which was 
the fatal Victory over Boadicea, and the Britains, by 
Suetonius Paulinus, and the slavery they underwent af- 
ter it. Which happen’d in the time of Nero, about the 
middle of his Reign, almoft twenty years after Claudi- 
us had fent A. Plautius to reduce Britain into the form 
of a Province, to whom fucceeded P. Oftorius Scapula, 
A. Didius Gallus, and Veranius, in the Government of 
Britain, before Suetonius Paulinus came into the Pro- 
vince. For after Claudius his Triumph for his Victory 
in Britain, the Romans began to deduce Colonies, to 
settle Magiftrates and Jurisdictions here, after the 
manner of other Provinces, and fo continual inter- 
course was maintained between the Roman City, and 
the Britifh Colonies; Cities of Trade were fet up, and 
the Roman Merchants were very bufie in furnifhing 
new Provinces with neceflaries, and Superfluities: And 
the Province of Britain, in the beginning of Nero’s 
Reign was thought to be in fo fettled, and flavouring 
a condition, that (p) Dio faith, Seneca, had here at one 
time to the value of 300000. p. as Mr. Camden com- 
putes it. A vaft sum for a Philofopher! But that which
I infer 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 Battel between Boadicea, and Suetonius Paulinus, as will more fully appear in the following discourse. As to the more General Shinning 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 (q) Eusebius, and that passage concerning Tiberius and the Senate differing about Christ and his followers, which Eusebius took from (r) Tertullian, who speaks of it with great assurance; And (s) Oristus 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.

1. To examine the Tradition, concerning Jofeph of Arimathea, and his Brethren coming hither to plant Christianity.

2. To shew that there was a Christian Church planted here, in the Apostle’s times, and within that compass Gildas speaks of.

3. To prove the great probability, that St. Paul first founded a Church here.

1. As to the Tradition concerning Jofeph of Arimathea; I confess I look on it, as an Invention of the Monks of Glaffenburg 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 farther, 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 past by, by the most ancient and inquisitive
Writers of our affairs; so that neither the true Gildas, nor Bede, nor Alberius, nor Marianus Scotus, nor any of the ancient Annals should take the least notice of this Tradition. (t) Sanders indeed faith, That Polydore Virgil proves it from the most ancient Gildas, but he never attempted any such thing: For having set down the Tradition of Joseph of Arimathea, 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 Arimathea. And yet, (u) Card. Bona quotes Gildas for this Tradition, on the credit of Sanders, unless he were deceived by those who produce the Testimony of Gildas Albanius, in his Book of the Victory of Aurelius Ambrosius to the fame purpoze. But no such Book of the true Gildas could ever yet be found by those who have searched after it with the greatest diligence. (w) Leland particularly relates, concerning himself, What incredible pains he took to find out this piece of Gildas, and faith, That he hoped at last to have met with it in the Library at Glasfenbury, where Gildas is said by William of Malmsbury, 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 (x) Geffrey 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 Claudia Rufina, and the Epistles of Joseph of Arimathea, &c. which Bale thinks probable, that he did write, and therefore sets them down as Written: And from him a learned (y) 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 Gildas faith, 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 true, as the (z) learned Primate observes, That Gervase of Tilbury, Nauclerus, Trithemius and many others, say, That Geffrey followed Gildas in such a Book.
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 to those times, which might be of some weight if they were Authentick. And this is the Reason, why these Inventers of History have still given out, that they met with some Elder Writers, out of whom they have pretended to derive their Reports. Thus (a) Hennibaldus pretends, as much to follow the Old Sici-cambrian Manuscripts of Walfheid, for the remote Antiquities of the Franks, as Geoffrey doth the Old Britisb Manuscripts, either for the Succession of the Britisb Kings, or the first bringing of Christianity hither. But which makes this matter yet stranger, (b) Nennius himself, who sometimes passes under the Name of Gildas, faith nothing of this Tradition, where he speaks of the first receiving of Christianity in Britain; and yet Bale faith of him, That he collected his Writings out of the former Britisb Historians, such as Teliefn, Melkin, Gildas, and Elvodugus; and it is not probable, he would have left it out, if he had found it in any of them. But (c) Bale quotes one of these Britisb Authors, viz. Melkinus Avalonius for this Tradition about Joseph of Arimathea, and Arviragus; but withall he confesses him to be a very fabulous Writer. (d) Leland faith, That he met with the Fragments of Melkinus in the Library at Glaffenburg, by which he understood that he had written something of the Britisb affairs, but more especially concerning the Antiquity of Glaffenburg, and Joseph of Arimathea; Which, faith Leland, he affirms without any certain Author, and which himself could not approve, not thinking it at all Credible, that Joseph of Arimathea should be buried there, but rather some Eremit of that Name, from whence the mistake first arose. And (e) elsewhere, when he speaks of the Glaffenburg Tradition; He faith, That twelve Eremits are reported to have come thither, with one Joseph in the Head of them, but not he of Arimathea as
as he supposes. But still the Testimonies that concern this matter are derived from Glaftenbury, 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 Anno Domini 550. under King Vortuporius, fo Bale; but Pits places him ten years later, under Magocelius: They might as well have made him contemporary with Gildas Cambrius, or to have been Secretary to Joseph of Arimathea, 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 Glaftenbury, which Leland faw, 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 let down the passage of Abadar, a great man in Saphat, and the hundred and four thousand which were buried with Joseph of Arimathea at Glaftenbury. Yet this fanciful and ridiculous Legend is by (e) some thought to be the British History which William of Malmsbury appeals to for the proof of this Tradition; and, which he found in the Libraries of St. Edmund and St. Augulfin. But Malmsbury, having designed to set the Antiquity of Glaftenbury as high as he could, called that a British History, which is now found to be written by an Englišh Monk, as (f) Archbiſhop Ufber hath evidently proved (having several times perused it in the Cotton Library) there being the very fame passage in it which Malmsbury quotes. And that he was no Britain is most certain, because he calls the Saxon his Mother Tongue, and England his Countrey. And yet after all, there is not a word of Joseph of Arimathea or his Companions in it; all that is said is, "That in the Western parts of Britain there is a Royal Island called Gledion, large and compassed about with Waters full of Fish, and having other conveniences of humane life; but, which was most considerable, it was devoted to the Service of God. Here the first Disci- philes of the Catholic Law found an ancient Church,
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"not built as was reported by mens hands, but prepa-
red 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 que-
tion is, Who are here meant by these first Disciples
of the Catholick Law? not Joseph of Arimathea 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. (g) Spelman; a Remainder of the Britih Chris-
tianity in that Island. And this Passage affords us the
best light into the true Original of this Tradition, which
was after so much heightned and improved, as the
Monks of Glaffenbury thought convenient for the ho-
nour and privileges of their Monastery.

That which seems most agreeable to Truth from
hence is, That in the latter times of the Britih Chur-
ches, when they were so miserably harassed and perse-
cuted by the Pagan Saxons, they were forced to retire
into places of most difficult access for their own Secu-
ritv, and there they made them such Churches as were
fitutable to their present condition, and lived very reti-
red lives, being in continual fear of their barbarous
Enemies. Such a place this Island of Avalon, or Glaf-
fenbury was; which might be of far greater request
among the Britains, because it was the place where
King Arthur was buried; for I see no reason to ques-
tion 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 bur-
ried in the Island of Avalon. For (h) Giraldus faith,
he was present, and saw the Inscription and the Body;
which is likewise attested by the Historians of that
time, as (i) Leland proves at large. And the ac-
count given that his Body was laid so deep in the
Earth, for fear of the Saxons, farther confirms, That
this was a place of retreat in the Britih times, but

(g) Concil. Brit.  
(f) 15.

(h) Giral. de  
Infliti. Princ. &c  
in Specul. Eccl. 

(i) Leland, Col.  
Affert. Arthur.  
p. 28. &c.
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not without the apprehension of their Enemies Invasion.

This Church, according to the Inscription on the Brass Plate on the Pillar in Glaffenbury Church, was in length 60 Foot, in breadth 26. But that Inscription, as the learned and judicious Antiquary * Sir H. Spel-man observes, was by the Character not of above 300 years Antiquity, and favours very much of the Legend. In it we read, "That the Church was first built by jeph and his Companions, but was consecrated by "Christ himself to the Honour of his Mother. This being a very usefull 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. "For St. David having a design to confe-"crate this Church, our Lord appeared to him in a "Dream, and forbad him, having consecrated both "the Church and Church-yard before himself. And, "for a Sign thereof, he thurt his Finger through the "Bishop's hand. Which it seems was to pafs for the Token of a former Consecration. But, as much as this looks like a Monkifh Legend, (k) Alford and (f)Cressy are much displeased with Sir H. Spelman for call-"ing it in question. But they who can in earnest believe, That Christ himself did then consecrate a Church and Church-yard to the honour of his Mother, are past all Con-"fusion 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 Vir-gin, 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 are thought Proofs by some, which to others look only like bringing one Aburdity, to support another. But as yet we find, no Testimony to confirm this Tradition, but what is taken from Glaf-"fenbury, which is not the best Witness in a Cause which to nearly concern'd it self.

But these now mentioned Author's (m) at laft venture on a considerable Testimony, if it hold good,

viz.

---

* A.D. 63. m. 29.
* Church Hist. l. 2. c. 8.
* Alford. ib.
* Alford. ib. n. 25.
* Cressy. l. 2. c. 7.
viz. of Augustin the Monk, in an Epistle to Gregory, but upon Examination, that which they quote out of St. Augustin's Epistle is nothing else but the passage already mentioned by Malmsbury, which he found in a Book taken out of the Library of St. Augustin at Canterbury; and they might as well have quoted St. Edmund's Epistle to the Pope to the same purpose. For William of Malmsbury faith, He met with the same passage at St. Edmund's as well as St. Augustin's, i.e. in the Libraries of those Monasteries; I will not dissemble that they cite two considerable (n) Author's 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 Arimathea, which is not originally taken from the Glaффbury Legends, where it seems there was great choice of them; For (o) Capgrave mentions several, one, out of which the Life of Joseph of Arimathea there is extracted, is said to be taken out of a Book which the Emperor Theodosius found in the Palace of Pilate at Jerusalem; which is a very hopeful Introduction to a Legend; And there we find the History of Joseph of Arimathea, very distinctly set down, "How he was miraculously delivered out of Prison in Jerusalem and conveyed to Arimathea, whether 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, whether 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 shew'd him the Linen Cloth about his Head, after which he was baptized by Philip, and was present with him at 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 Discip
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"... and his Son Joseph. But an other Tradition faith, "They were fix hundred Men and Women who "were to conic over, having taken a Vow of Abstinence "till they came to Land, which they did all break, but "one hundred and fifty who past the Sea upon the "Shirt of Josephes, but the rest repenting, a Ship was "sent to convey them over which was built by King "Salomon, and with them came a Duke of the Medes "called Nacianus, formerly baptized by Joseph in the "City Saran, with the King of it called Mordrainus, "who valiantly killed a King of North-Wales, who "kept Joseph a Prisoner; After which he and his Com-
panions preached here in the time of Arvairagus. And "then follows the common Tradition, "of his giving "the Island of Avalon to them, and the twelve Hydes "of Land by the three Pagan Kings, Arvairagus, Mari-
us and Coitus. This is followed by another Traditi-
on out of the Acts of King Arthur, and the Inquisition of Lancelot de Lac; all which is concluded with the ad-
mirable Legend of Melkimus Avalonius already men-
tioned. There 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 Mr. Creefy, 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 Au-
thority for one part than for the other; and for all "that I can see, the holy Graal deserves as much cre-
dit as the Book taken out of Pilat's Palace or Melki-
mus Avalonius, especially since (p) Pits hath given the (p) Pits, &c. suppos'd Author for good a place, among his Britisb Writers, under the name of Eremita Britannus, and faith, he lived about the time of King Ina, Anno Dom. 720. And (q) Helinandus takes notice of the Viflon (q) Apud Vin-
to the British Eremit about that time concerning Joseph for. 129, c. 147; of Arimathea, and the Dih wherein our Saviour ate the Pasloiver with his Disciples, which fort of Dih he faith "was then called in French Graal; but others think the "true name was Sangreal, being some of Chrill's real blood which he shed upon the Crofs, which was said to be somewhere found by King Arthur. And to con-
D firm
f firm this, it is said in the authentick Writing of Mel-
kinus, That in the Coffin of Josephb were two Silver Ve-
fels filled with the Blood and Sweat of Jesus the Pro-
phet.

But left I should seem to expose the ancient a Tra-
dition, by setting down onely the fabulous Mixture
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 William of Malmsbury feems
most to rely upon: Among these, In the first place he
mentions the Charter of St. Patrick, as he calls it, which
is at large printed in the (r) Monasticon, and both in
(s) Alford and (t) Creffy, and is magnified by them as a
substantial proof of the Glaffenburg Tradition, which
Creffy faith was transcribed out of a very ancient MS.
belonging to Glaffenburg by Marianus Victorius; and for
this he quotes (u) Ger.Voffius de Hift.Lat. who faith one-
ly that Bale mentions a piece of his de Antiquitate A-
valonica, but he adds, that Bale deferves no credit in
Writers of great Antiquity. But the person Creffy means
(or at leaft his Author) was another Gerard Voffius,
Dean of Tongres, (w) who published part of this pre-
tended piece of St. Patrick among other ancient Writ-
ings, which will have no great authority among con-
sidering men, if they have no other Characters of An-
tiquity than this Charter of Saint Patrick. However,
Mr. Creffy is pleased to call it, a monument of the good-
ness of God towards this Nation, so early, in the very begin-
ing of Christianity; becaufc therein mention is made
of some Writings of St. Phaganus and Diruvianus where-
in was declared that twelve Disciples of the Holy Apo-
stles Philip and Jacob built the said ancient Church to the ho-
nor of the Blessed Virgin, by the appointment of the Arch-
angel 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 Arimathea be not men-
tioned. But St. Patrick goes on, and faith, That in other
Writings of a later date he found that Phaganus and Di-
ruvianus
ruvianus 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 mention’d: And to make all plain, it begins with the Date, Anno Dom. 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.

I confess this Charter offers very fair play towards the discovery of it’s own Forgery by such open Marks, and Characters as thefe. 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, Anno Dom. 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 publickly received, faith (x) Bucherius till about the time of Charles the Great. * Joachim Vadianus, faith, He never saw the Tear of our Lord in any ancient Charters, of which sort he had seen many: (y) 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. (z) Job. Aventinus affirms, that the use of it in Epifles and Charters, was brought in by Carolus Crassus, with whom (a) Nic. Vignier agrees, as to the Imperial Diplomata. But it seems probable, to have been brought into England before that time, for in the (b) Council at Celichyth, Anno Dom. 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 publick Acts we find it applied to, were those of Councils, as in that of Becanceld, under King Withred, Anno Dom. 694. But the same King doth not use it in the Tears of his Reign. The like Inftances about Councils, especially in the eighth and ninth Centuries are produced by (c) Mabillon: Who thinks, That D 2

Bede
Bede was the first who brought it into the use of History. But that could not be before Anno Dom. 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 publick 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 (d) William of Malmsbury confesseth, He was made Bifhop by Celeftine, 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 Baffus and Antiochus were Consuls, which was Anno Dom. 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 Alford confesses, both Malmsbury and the Glaffenbury Antiquities have it, 425. It is strange that Alford should say, He found no Exception against the Credit of this Charter, since even (e) Capgrave himself mentions it not without doubt, and Suspicion of the truth of it: And his own Brethren (f) Henfehenius, 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. Creffy 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 useth it? Which those learned Jefuites deny. Add to all this, that St. Patrick faith, He obtained from Celeftine twelve years of Indulgence, which being understood of Glaffenbury, implies a plain Impossibility: For St. Patrick is said, to retreat thither towards the end of his Life, and Celeftine dyed soon after his first sending into Ire-
land: So that I need not to insist on the Style, or the Names 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 (g) Monaslicon. The large Charter of King Ina, seems to be most considerable, and to favour the old Tradition, as it makes the Church at Glasfenbury 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 enquiry 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 Authentick, such as those in Ingulphus, William of Malmsbury, the Additions to Matthew Paris, &c. But for these two Reasons which seem to me to have weight in them.

1. Because it refers to other ancient Charters of that Church, as to the Exemption of the Monastery. And the Benedictin 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, Naupe, 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 Blesfenis, that there was a general Suspicion of Forgery in the Charters of Exemptions, which the Monasteries pretended to, Ut falsitas in omnium feri Monasteriorum exemptione praevaleat, &c. And he there particularly infinuates in the Bishop of Salisbury, charging the Abbot of Malmsbury,
Malmesbury, with producing false Charters for his Exemption from the Bishop's Right of Election: But which is yet more considerable, in the time of Gregory the ninth, when 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. (k) Caiaubon declares to the World, He read in an Old Manuscript belonging to the Church of Canterbury, wherein it was Regiftered: And wherein, as both he and Sr. Henry (l) Spelman, tell us, It is observ'd, That that Church enjoyed all its Lands and Privileges, only by Custom and Prescription, fine Cartis vel Munimentis Regis, without any written Charters, until Anno Dom. 694. When Wulfred King of Kent caufed the firft to be written, which was the fame with the Council of Becanceld. From hence Sr. 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 (m) Gervase reports of the Monks of St. Augustine, That they produced very Suspicious, and raised Charters. The Case was this, the Monks of St. Augustine pretended an Exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as those of Glaffenbury did from that of the Bishop of Wells; upon an Appeal to Rome, a Commission was granted to the Bishop of Durham, and the Abbot of St. Albans 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; The first was ancient, but rased and subfcribed, as if it were amended and without a Seal, which they called King Ethelbert's Charter. 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 St. Augustine's Charter. Against the First, The Rafor was objected, and the manner of Subcription, and want of a Seal. Against the Second, The lateness of the Writing, and the novelty of hanging Leaden Bulls to Charters, especially by Bishops
shops on this side of the Alpes: And besides, the Style was very different from the Roman. Both these Charters are extant in the (n) Monasticon, and a third of Ethelbert, with an Inscription of 36 Edw. III. But another Charter of Ethelbert is set down together with these in the (o) MS. Chronicle of St. Auguin's, the Author whereof was certainly a Monk there, being so zealously concern'd 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, That hanging Seals upon Wax were not then used, but only a Subscription of the Name of the person with a Sign of the Cross before it, in token of their Conversion. For (p) Ingulphus, 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. Author 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. Albans, before Henry II. When the (q) Sa- (q) Vit. Abbat. tons 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, alledge the Seal of Edward the Conserver to the Church of Westminister: But Edward brought in several Norman Customs, as Ingulphus shews, against the practice of his Predecessors. And this the Normans borrow'd 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 Lewis VI. as (r) Mabillon hath shewed at large. And some of our Learned (s) Antiquaries have thought, that pendant Seals were not brought into use here, till the time of Edw. I. For in a Charter of Henry I. granted to Anfelm, the great Seal was affixed on the left side of the Parchment. And (t) Brian Twayne affirms that he saw a Charter of William the Conqueror so sealed in the Linn-ley Library. But that this Observation is not certain, appears
appears by contrary Instances, as of the Pendent Seal to the Charter of Battel Abbey, printed by (w) Mr. Selden; and of the Charter of Henry II. to Glaffenbury Abbey, which (w) Dr. Caius faith 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 Custome might vary. And, notwithstanding the Testimony of Ingulphus, there might be Seals sometimes used to Charters though not so frequently. Mr. (x) Selden hath produced some Instances to that purpose, as in that of King Edgar to the Abbey of Perfore, which he faith 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 Charte antique, There are some, faith he, cum Sigillo; and one particularly cum Sigillo of King Cnout, which very much confirms what this Historian observes concerning Canutus his using a Seal. And our great (y) 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 stricte 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, 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.

And the fame 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 Custome 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 Ball appending to the Charter of St. Augustin, he makes a pitifull Anfwer, viz. That he, being

\[\textit{(w) Sold. Nor. ad Radmer. p. 166.}\\ \textit{(w) De Antiqu. Cam. Academ. l. t. p. 54.}\\ \textit{(y) Inf. l. 7. a.}\\\]
being deputed hither by the Pope, might use the 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. That when in the time of Henry III. this Privilege was questioned by the Archbishops 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 it self was preferred as a Monument in St. Augustine's. But if this were then so common a Custome, especially at Rome, why had they no such Bulls of Gregory the Great, who sent Augustine? To that he gives a frivolous Answer, viz. That Gregory died the same year of the endowment of St. Augustine's. But, did he leave no Successour? 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 suspicous, not only on the account of the Leaden Bull (which (z) Polydore Virgil could not find so early used even at Rome, and he allows it to be no elder than Anno Domini 772. and all the Instances brought before by (a) Dom. Raynaldus are confessed to be suspicous by (b) Mabillon himself) but there are several things in it which in (c) Sir H. Spelman's Judgment favour of the Norman times, as the Jus consuetudinarium, Judicia intus & foris, and the very Title of Archbishops, 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 (d) Isidore's explication of it, who was Gregory's Disciple, and understood the Language of that Age, Augustine could not properly call his Successours Archbishops, for he faith, That
That Title belong'd to them who had power over Metropolitans as well as other Bishops, and it was not before the ninth Age, as (e) 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 (f) Preface to the Monasticon concerning the Charters of Monks, that the elder they pretend to be, the more they are to be suspected; For which he is defervingly praised by (g) Papebrochius; but (h) 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 Benediction Charters in France; But he cannot deny many of them to be counterfeited (Papebrochius faith almost all) and at the Conclusion of his Discourse he vindicates the Monks 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 usefull 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 Bede's Epistle to Egbert, that in his time there were written Privileges granted to Monasteries among the Saxons, and something before that, among the Britains, by the Synod of Landaff, Anno Dom. 660. But he cannot prove, nor doth he attempt it, that there were any Charters among the Saxons before that of Withred, Anno Dom. 694. and if not, all the ancient Charters refer'd 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 Baldred as one of his Vice-Roys. In the middle he speaks of Baldred as one of his Predecessors, and joins him with Renewalchius, Kentwin and Cedwalla. But in the end he makes him
him to confirm what Ina has granted, Ego, Baldredus Rex, confirmavi. But who was this King Baldred? In the Kingdom of Kent, Edricus was in the beginning of Ina's Reign; according to the Savilian Faili, and Withredus from the sixth to the end. In the Kingdom of the East Saxons there were Sighardus, Senfredus, Osfa and Selredus. In the Kingdom of East Angles, Beorna and Ethelredus. In the Kingdom of Mercia, Adelredus, Kenredus, Ceolredus, Athelboldus. 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 Vice-Roy in some part of Ina's Dominions, how comes Ina to this Universal Monarchy or Power to command all the Kings of Britain, which is expressed in the Charter? Sed & 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, (i) Geoffrey of Monmouth makes him Grandchild to Cadwallader. And the (k) Author of the Additions to King Edward's Laws faith, he had the Kingdom of Britain with his second Wife Wala, Daughter of Cadwallader; and then Ina called a Parliament for the Intermarriage of Britains and Saxons. So that there was an Opinion among some, that Ina had the Monarchy of Britain, which Opinion was certainly follow'd by the Contriver of this Charter. But Mr. 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 (l) Pe- 
brochius 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 ha-
ving given such invidious Privileges to Battell Abbey, as may be seen in his Charter, the elder Monasteries thought much to be so 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 between the Abbey of St. Augufline and the Archbishop of Canterbury; between the Abbey of Malmesbury and the Bishop of Salisbury; and the Abbey of St. Albans and the Bishop of Lincoln. And at that time those Abbies 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 Saint Augufline's, as it is related by (m) 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 shamefullly 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 Augufline, 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 would yield up to him the main Points contested as to Jurisdiction. The 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 Controversie about Jurisdiction there was between Jocelin, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Abbey of Glassenbury, about Anno Dom. 1215, as appears by the Book called Secretum Domini Abbatis lately in the Arundell Library, but now in a private hand. So that there ap-
pears a sufficient inducement 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 wonderfull 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, Ita & 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 under too of Glæfenbury 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, Daniel having one share, and Aidelmi the other. And some years after Eadber tus 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 gros absurdity there is in the (n) 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 under no common Head, but continual

\(^{(n)}\text{Nonag. Vol. I. p. 146.}\)
ly fighting with each other, till the West Saxons prevailed. And the Care of the Abbey of Evesham seems to have been much the same with that of Glasfenbury. For

(0) W. Malm.

(0) 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 mention’d by Bede. And 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 Glasfenbury or Evesham. But he judicially imputes the occasion of founding this Monastery to some old Church of the Britains 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 doe the Monks busines, 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 of Kenred and Offa, the Bull of Constantine and the Privilege of Egwin. But yet this unlucky charge of Pope Constantine to Brightwaldus, 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 onely 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 Glasfenbury; I do not question that King Ina did found a Monastery there, where before had been an ancient Church in the Britifh times. But I fee 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 founding Names to amufe 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 of this Tradition, as is evident by the (p) MS. Chronicle of St. Augustine’s, wherein the Monks of Glasfenbury are charged with pretending to greater authority than they had reason for, that Monastery being first founded by King Ina, but they give out they had Land given by
by Arviragus a King of the Britains. And even (q) Wil- (q) Malmby, liam of Malmbury, although when he writes the Anti- quities of Glaffenbury, he seems firmely to believe Saint Patrick's being there, yet when he comes elsewhere to speak of his being buried there, he adds that cool- ing Expression, Si credere dignum, and takes not the least notice of Jofeph of Arimathea 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 King Ina was the first Founder of it. To which (r) Afferius agrees in an ancient MS. Copy of his Annals. For A. D. 726: he fayth, Ina went to Rome, and there died, having built and dedicated a Monastery in Glaffenbury. But what Presumption was it to fay, He dedicated it, if it were dedicated fo long before by Chrift himself, as the Vi- sion of St. David and the Glaffenbury Tradition affirm? I do not then deny that there was an ancient Church before Ina's time, which after the Western Saxons be- came Christians, grew into mighty Reputation, but all the Succedion of Abbats before, either of Worgre- fius, or Brightwaltus, or others, I look on as fabu- lous. For (s) Bede and others fay, Brightwaltus was Abbat of Reculver before he was Archbifhop; which is a good distance from Glaffenbury. But the first Abbat there was Hemgifius, to whom Ina granted a Charter; after him Beormwaldus, to whom King Ina granted fe- veral Lands by Charters, far more probable than this large one, whose authority I have hitherto difcufied. Thofe Charters are short, and the Style agreeable to thofe times, and not one Word of Jofeph of Arima- thea, or St. Patrick, or St. David, in any of them. And thofe, I believe, were the original Charters of that Abbey.

But the Abbey being thus founded and well endow- ed, then, like a man that hath made his own Fortunes, who pretends to be derived from some ancient Stock, fo this Monastery growing rich betimes, faw it must be caft much behind in Place and Dignity, un- less it could lay claim to fome greater Antiquity. And for this, the old Britifh Church was an admirable Foun- dation. And St. Patrick and St. David, being two Saints of
of wonderfull esteem in Ireland and Wales, they first set up with the Reputation of their being at Glafenbury; the former lying buried there, and the latter building a little Chapel. The Monks finding the advantage of these Pretences, made a farther step towards the advancement of their Monastery, by giving out that their old Church was the first Church in Britain, and that all Religion came from thence into other parts, which by degrees gaining belief, they at last pitched upon Joseph of Arimathea, as the person who came first hither, being a Man whose Name was every where in great esteem for the respect he shew'd 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 Arimathea came to be mention'd, not being found in any of the Saxon Charters, which speak most to the advantage of Glafenbury; as may be seen by those of King (t) Edmund and King Edgar in the Monasticon. But by the time of Henry II. the Tradition was generally received, that the old Church at Glafenbury 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 (v) Harpsfield, and the learned Primate of (w) Armagh, by which we see what Authority the Monks of Glafenbury had then obtained, for not one ly 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 Inexpimus. From this time the Monks of Glafenbury were triumphant, and no one durst dispute their Traditions how improbable soever. This Charter being confirmed by the Inexpimus of Edw. II. An. 6, 7. of Edw. III. An. 1, 6. and 1 Edw. 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 (x) Primate hath given a full account, and, as things passed among them then, Our
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Our Nation had as just Right to insist on their Tradition of Joseph of Arimathea, as the 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) S. Chrysostome, and (b) Hippolytus Portuensis, That Saint Philip continued Preaching in the Eastern parts, about Phrygia, and suffer'd at Hierapolis.

(2.) The 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 employment in Preaching the Gospel, who went from one City and Countrey to another for that End.

(3.) The building of the Church by a 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 Church-yard 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 simul cum Cemeterio dedicaret. (c) Sir H. Spelman observes, That the custom of compassing Churches, with Church-yards, was not so ancient: And withall 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, obtain'd leave for it, about Anno Dom. 758. Upon this (d) Alford and (e) Cresby charge him with a manifest mistake and great imperti-
impertinency. A mistake, in that Ethelbert and Augustine were both buried in the Church of St. Peter and Saint 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 (f) MS. Chronicle of St. Augustine's faith, That when the Bodies of the Kings and Archbishops were carried thither to burial, they follow'd our Saviour, who suffer'd 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 withall the Reason alleged in one of the Charters of (g) King Ethelbert, why that place was alligned 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 Church-yards to be so great, which was the most to the purpose? But they say, Sir H. Spelman's Observation was impertinent, Glæsenbury 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 Church-yards 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, (h) he faith, 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 Arviragus, and in that Country, as will appear by the more Southern parts of the Island being reduced into the form of a Province before Anno Dom. 63. when the Glæsenbury Tradition faith, Joseph of Arimathea came first to Britain. For (i) Tacitus faith, it was done as to the nearest part of the Island, when A. Plauti-
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A. Plautius and Oftorius Scapula were Governors here; and between them and Suetonius Paulinus were Didius Gallus and Veranius. In probability the Belge were subdued by Vespasian, of whom (k) Suetonius faith, That he conquer'd here two powerful Nations, above twenty towns, and the Isle of Wight. By which we find his employment was Westward, and the Belge and Damnonii were the two powerful Nations that way. And in all the Actions afterwards, we find no Care taken by the Roman Generals to secure themselves against the Belge, as they did against the Brigantes and Silures, among whom Caradlacus commanded; so that there could be no such Britijh King at that time among the Belge as Arviragus is supposed to have been. For if there had been when (1) Oftorius marched Northwards, having suppressed the Iceni, it is not to be supposed, that he would have fixed his Garrisons on the Severn and the Avon, to secure the Province. For; as our (m) Judicial Antiquary hath well observed, The design of Oftorius therein was to keep the Provincial Britains from joining with the others; and therefore, all on this side those Garrisons were within the Roman Province; 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 Belge and the Silures. For Antona, Camden reads Aufona, (although Northanton comes nearer the former Name; and Southanton had its Name from the River Anton, which there runs into the Sea; and Ptolemy calls Trifanton, i.e. faith Camden, Traith Anton, the Mouth of Anton) But 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 Reminders whereof he takes notice of between the rise of the two Avons at Gildsborough and Daintry; by which means he hindred 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 Britijh King as Arviragus among the Belge, what would the fortifying the Severn have signified, when

(k) Sueton. in


the Enemies to the Romans lived on the Roman side? Tacitus indeed mentions an Expedition of Ostorius against the Cangæ, whom (n) Camden sometimes thought a small People among the Belgæ, but upon better consideration, (o) he places them in Cheshire, where he found an Inscription concerning the CæANGI. And Tacitus faith, They were not far from the Sea coast which looks towards Ireland.

(p) R. White of Basing Stoke supposes this Arviragus to be the Island on Joseph of Arimathea, when Trebellius Maximus was Governor here, who succeeded Petronius Turpilianus the year C. Suetonius Paulinus was Consul at Rome; Which, according to the Saxon Fæfi, was in the twelfth year of Nero, and Anno Domini 67. (four years after Joseph's coming; according to the Glaſfenbury Tradition) but that is no great matter, if at that time we are sure there was such a King as Arviragus among the Belgæ: But he again contradicts the Glaſfenbury Story. For Malmsbury faith, That the Barbarous King obstinately refufed to quit his Religion, but out of pity to them, gave them the Island to live in; but White faith, He was well afeected to the Chriflian Religion: and was in all refepects an admirable Prince. This Arviragus he takes out of the (q) Britifb Hiflory, where pleafant Stories are told of him, and from thence in (r) Matthew Wefminfter, as, of his opposing Claudius, and then marrying his Daughter Gemiffa, and the reconciliation between him and Vefpafian by her means, &c. And how his Son Marius fucceeded him, and then Coilius who was wonderfully beloved by the Roman Senate. Here we have found at laft the three Kings of Glaſfenbury, Arviragus, Marius and Coilius, as they are extant in Capgrave and others: So that the Glaſfenbury Tradition had not its perfection till it had received these improvements from the Britifb Hiflory. For William of Malmsbury, though he took fo great pains in this matter, yet knew nothing of Arviragus, Marius and Coilius. He speaks indeed of three Pagan Kings giving twelve portions of Land to the twelve Brothers, but he knew not their Names. Which Grant, he faith, was confirmed by King Lucius to twelve others who were placed there, in imitation of the first twelve. And this
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This continued to the coming of St. Patrick. And yet towards the Conclusion of this Book he faith, That Anno Domini 601. the King of Domnonia, i.e. Devonshire and Cornwall, gave to the old Church in Glassonbury the Land called Ynis Withrin, or, the Island of Avalon. Who this King was, he faith, he could not learn, but he concludes him to have been a Britain, 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:

Omen habes, inquit, magni clavique Triumphi,
Regem aliquem capies, aut de Temone Britanno
Excidet Arviragus

The (s) Author of the Chronicle of Dover understands this Passage as spoken to Nero; which agrees much better with the Tradition of Glassonbury, but will by no means agree with Juvenal, who faith plainly enough that Satyr 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 Caesar. 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 (t) Petilius Cerealis had conquer'd the Brigantes, and Julius Frontinus the Silures, and Agricola after them the Ordovices: And in the time of his Government, Tacitus faith, Even the confederate Cities among the Britains, who hold upon Terms of Equality before, then submitted themselves to the Roman Power, and received Garrisons among them. After this Agricola proceeded Northwards against new People, and destroyed them as far as the Frith of Taus (Tweed.) Then he fortified the Passage between Glota and Bodotria (Dumbretton and Edenborough Frith;) So that the Romans were absolute Lords of all this Side, having cast out the Enemy as it were, into another Land, as Sir H. Savil translates the words of Tacitus. From which it is evident, there could be no such King as Arviragus at that time in these
these parts 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 Arimathea 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 Praefatagus, Cogidunus, Caraclacus, Togodiumus and Galgacus are? Arviragus his name was well known at Rome in Domitian's time; why not spoken of before? (w) Some think he was the same with Praefatagus; but this cannot be, for Praefatagus was dead before the Revolt of the Britains under Boadicea, which was occasion'd by the Romans ill usage of the Britains after his death. And Praefatagus left onely two Daughters, what becomes then of his Son Marius? whom (w) 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 Tacitus; which are things inconsistent. (x) Others say that Arviragus was the same with Caraclacus; for this Opinion Alford contends, and Juvenal, he faith, mentions the name by a Poetical Licence, although he lived long before. But what reason is there to suppose that Fabricius Veiinti should make such a course Complement 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 Caraclacus (as far as we can find) by which he was so famous for his long Opposition to the Romans? But it is very probable, that in Domitian's time, after the recalling Agricola, and taking away the Life of Salustius Lucullus, his Successor, the Britains took up Arms under Arviragus. And the (y) Learned Pri-mate of Armagh mentions an old British Coin in Sir R. Cotton's Collections with these Letters on it ARVOG, from whence he thinks his true name was Arvogus, which the Romans turned to Arviragus. And the old Scholiast there faith, that was not his true name. The Britains being now up in Arms, as far as we can learn, were not repressed till Hadrian came over in Person, and
and built the first Wall, to keep them out of the Roman Province. For, before this, (z) Spartanus faith, (z) Sparrian, (2) Alford, A.D. 55. 6, 7. the Britains 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 Britains, and it was then a suitable Complement to him, to wish him a Triumph over Arviragus. But (a) Alford faith, that Claudius sent Caractacus home again, and after many years he dyed in Peace, being a Friend to the Romans. So that here was a fit reason in Domitian's time (Agricola being recalled in the beginning of Vomitian Reign) for such a King as Arviragus to appear in the head of the Britains, and it was then a suitable Complement to him, to wish him a Triumph over Arviragus. But (a) Alford faith, that Claudius sent Caractacus home again, and after many years he dyed in Peace, being a Friend to the Romans. How then cometh Tacitus to take no notice of him, as he doth of Cogidunus? Is it probable the Romans would restore so subtile 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 Belgae, as he must have done, if he were the Arviragus who gave the Hydes of Land to Joseph of Arimathaea and his Companions.

These things I have here put together to shew for what reasons I decline the Tradition of Joseph of Arimathaea'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 unexcusable Partiality, which (b) Mr. Creffy charges on all who call this Tradition into question.

(2.) But notwithstanding, I hope to make it appear from very good and sufficient Evidence, that there was a Christian Church planted in Britain during the Apostles' times. And such Evidence ought to be allow'd in this matter which is built on the Testimony of ancient and credible Writers, and hath a concurrent probability of Circumstances.

I shall first produce the Testimony of ancient and credible Writers. For it is an excellent Rule of (c) Baron. A.D. 1. s. 12. Romanus 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, according to their Abilities.
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eties 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 enquire 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 Favorite of 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 (d) 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 Impostours or Deceivers; and, among other 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 ὑπὸ τὴν ἱλαμένας θάλασσαν, to those which are called the Britifh Islands. From whence he concludes, that some more than humane power did accompany the Apostles, and that they were no light or inconsiderable men, much less Impostours 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

(d) Euseb. Demo. Evang. 1. 3. 6. 7. p. 113.
the Britifh Islands were very well known all over the Roman Empire; Britain having been the Scene of many Warlike Actions from Claudius his time; The Occasion of Emperours 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 Revolt of Carusius and Allectus; The Victory and Death of Constantius here; The Succession of Constantine, and his being declared Empe- rour 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 Con- stantine going from hence, and being so much in the eftem of Eufebius, it is not to be conceived, that he should speak these Words at random, but that he had made a diligent Enquiry both of Constantine himfelf, to whom he was well known, and of others of his Court, concerning the State of the Britifh Churches, of what continuance they were, and by whom planted. After all which Eufebius affirms it with so much affurance, That some of the Apoftles preached the Gospel in the Britifh Islands.

Much to the fame purpofe (e) Theodoref speaks. (f) Theodore. Th. 4. Ser. 9. another learned and judicious Church Historian. For among the Nations converted by the Apoftles, he expressly names the Britains; and elfewhere faith, (f) That St. Paul brought Salvation to the Islands that lie in the Ocean, after he had mention’d Spain, and therefore in all probability the Britifh Islands are underftood by him. And in another place (g) he faith, (g) In 2 Ep. ad Tim. 4. v. 17. That St. Paul, after his Release at Rome, went to Spain, and from thence carried the Light of the Gospel to other Na- tions. What other Nations fo likely to be underftood as those which lay the nearest, and are elfewhere faid to be converted by the Apoftles, as the Britains are by him? St. (h) Jerome faith, That St. 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 faid, his going forth is from the end of Heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; And that his diligence in Preach- ing extended as far as the Earth itself. Which are

G more
more indefinite Expressions. But elsewhere he faith, (i) 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 (k) Clemens Romanus, who faith, St. Paul preached Righteousness through the whole World, and in so doing went (v) to Ægina, to the utmost bounds of the West. Which Passage will necesarily 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, faith, He was the first who brought a Fleet into the Western Ocean; By which he understands the Sea between Gaul and Britain. And (l) Eusebius several times calls the British Ocean, the Western, and joins the British Ocean and the Western parts together. And (m) elsewhere he mentions Gaul and the Western parts beyond it; by which he understands Britain. And (n) Theodoret reckons up the Inhabitants of Spain, of Britain and Gaul, (who, faith he, lie between the other two) as those who dwell in the bounds of the West; And among these the Britains must be in the utmost bounds, because the Gauls lie in the midst. (o) Herodotus faith, 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 Scythe; these latter comprehended all in the most Northern parts of Europe, and the Celtæ the Western; And among these the remotest were the Britains. Thence (p) Horace calls them, Ultimos Orbis Britannos; As (q) Catullus before him, Ultimosque Britannos. For before the Discovery of Britain, the Morini, who lived over against it, were said to be the utmost People of the Earth. So (r) Virgil calls them, Extremos hominum Morinos. And (s) Pliny, Ultimique hominum exstitimati Morini. Æthicus faith 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 (t) Catullus calls Britain, Ultimam Occidentis Insulam. And (u) Arnobius setting down the bounds of the Gospel East and West, for the East he mentions the Indians, and for the West the
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But I cannot but wonder what a learned man as (w) Job. Launoy means, when, being urged by his Adversaries with this place of Clemens his 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 (x) Venantius Fortunatus, where he describes St. Paul’s labours.

*Transit & Oceanum, vel qua facit Insula Portum,*

Quoque Britannus habet terras quodque ultima Thule.

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 Opportunity 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 rest of the Apostles, That he was the most likely to come hither of any of them.

(1.) That St. Paul had Leisure and Opportunity enough to come hither to preach the Gospel. It is agreed by (y) Eusebius, St. (z) Jerome, and others of (y) Euseb. in the Ancients, That St. Paul suffered at Rome, 14th. of Nero. (a) Baronius faith, the 13th. reckoning the years of Nero exactly from the beginning of his Reign in October; But (b) Petavius faith, That the Ancients reck’d the years according to the usual custome of a civil year. So that the 13th. of Nero’s Reign is the 14th. from the Calends of January. St. Paul was sent to Rome, when Festus was made Procurator of Judæa, in the room of Felix.
lix, 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 Judea, who was not condemned till the 12th of Claudius (from whence to the second of Nero cannot be reckoned those many years (c) St. Paul faith he had been Governor among the Jews); yet we are to consider, that Felix was not sent immediately from Rome, as (d) Baronius mistakes, but upon Cumanus his Sentence, had his former Government enlarged. Judea being then added to his Province, and part of the Province which he had before being given to Agrippa, as (e) Josephus faith; So that part of Galilee and Samaria having been under his Government before, Saint Paul might well say, he had been a Ruler among them many years, although he were dismissed in the second of Nero. And although (f) Tacitus faith, That Felix had been a long time Governor of Judea, yet it appears, by the distribution of the Province between Cumanus and him, That before Cumanus his Banishment, that which was properly Judea 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 Saint Paul's coming to Rome, Saint Luke faith, he abode there (g) two years. But (h) Maffitus observes from the Circumstances of Saint 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 he shew'd, as he conjectures, to Prisoners and Exiles on the Murther of Agrippina. But from this time to his returning to Rome, he went up and down Preaching the Gospel. To which time (i) Godeau, in his Life of Saint Paul, allows eight years: (k) Maffitus rather more; (l) Baronius the same; And he faith, it was time enough for him to pass through the whole World; Which Maffitus repeats after him. The Question now is, Where Saint Paul employ'd all this time? The Ancient Writers of the Church generally say, in the Western parts; So Clemens, Theodoret, St. Jerome, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and others. But I need not to insist on particular Testimonies, since the only Learned (m) Person who hath
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 (n) 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 (o) that they abode long at Iconium and Antioch, yet (p) Maffius shews, That this whole Peregrination took up but five years: Which is as much as (q) Baronius allows from the beginning of it, to the Council of Jerusalem. For that he placeth in the 4th of Claudius, and this in the 9th. But (r) he makes their return to Antioch in the 7th, so that he allows but three years to the founding and settling of many Churches. After the Council at Jerusalem, Saint Paul takes another Progress from Antioch, and went through (s) 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 Colonie: And from thence passed to Thessalonica, and so to Berea, Athens and (t) 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 (u) 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; (v) Baron, to which (w) Baronius allows a years time; And the next
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next he fixes at Ephesus, where St. Paul tarried three years (not exactly, but the far greatest part of it, having taught 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, whether he sent for the Elders of the Church, and took his solemn leave of them, saying, that they should see his face no more. From Miletus he passed to Phœnicia, and 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 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 (a) M. Velerus, speaking of the Preaching of the Apostles. St. Peter and St. Paul, in the 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 found went out into all the Earth: And on the other, great care was taken in the several Persecutions, especially that of Diocletian, to burn all the Monuments which concerned the Christian

(z) Acts 20. 25, 38.
(a) M. Velerus, de Vindel. R. 6.
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 Saint Paul. For Gildas faith, The Gospel was here received before the fatal defeat of the Britains by Suetonius Paulinus; which, according to Sir H. Savil’s Fasti, was the seventh of Nero, the eighth faith Petavius: And St. Paul being at liberty the fifth, had time 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, (b) Caesar faith, 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: 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 (c) 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 commended by Tacitus for its admirable Situation for Trading, and all Accommodations to that end; and, upon the best enquiry I can make, I very much incline to believe it of a Roman Foundation, and no elder than the time of Claudius (as will be made appear in another Discourse:) And that in the time of Suetonius Paulinus it was inhabited by Romans and Britains together, is evident from Tacitus; When Suetonius Paulinus drew out the Inhabitants, the City not being then defensible against the Britains, who in that Revolt destroyed LXX thousand Romans and their Allies, faith Tacitus; But (d) Dio faith, two Cities (London and Verulam; for Camalodunum was destroyed before) and Eighty thousand Men. This was a time of so much Disorder and Bloudhed, 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 Pomponia Gracina, Wife to A. Plautius, the Roman Lieutenant under Claudius in Britain; For that she was a Christian appears very
ry probable from the account Tacitus gives of her; (e) He faith, she was accused of foreign Superstitio, and that so far as to endanger her Life; But her Husband clear'd her, fitting 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 Superstitio, 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 of that time, such as (f) Suetonius, and (g) Pliny, as well as (h) Tacitus, to speak of Christiaity as a Barbarous and Wicked Superstitio (as appears by their Writings) being forbidden by their Laws; which they made the onely Rule of Religion. And this happen'd 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. Paul did make considerable Converts at his coming to Rome; Which is the reason of his mentioning (i) the Saints in Caesar's household. And it is not improbable that some of the British Captives carried over with Caradactus 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 (k) Moncatus doth, That Claudia, mention'd by St. Paul, was Caradactus his Daughter, and tw'n'd Christiaian, 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 Britain, who is so much commended by (l) Martial for her Wit and Beauty. But if these Epigrams were written in Trajan's time, as is very probable, It is somewhat of the latest for the Daughter of Caradactus who came in Claudius his time to Rome. But (m) Alford digests all this well enough, onely he is extremely concern'd, left she should be made the Apostle of Britain, and Preach here before St. Peter. But the (n) Author of the Antiquititates Britannie, whom he reflects upon, faith no such thing as
as he would impute to him. He only faith, That if she were a Christian she would acquaint her Countreymen as much with the Christian Doctrine as she did before with Martial's Wit. Wherein there is no Profaneness or Abfurdity. But he adds, that in a Noble Family, The rest of her kindred who were baptized with her might be the Occasions of dispersing Christianity in the British Nation. So that there was no need, 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 Countrey, 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 her of any of the Apostles. The several Traditions about St. James, Simon Zelotes and Philip, are so defective of any ancient Testimony or Probability, that the Competition among the Apostles can lie only between St. Peter and St. Paul. Some Writers of our Church History have endeavoured for particular Reasons, to prove St. Peter to have preached the Gospel in Britain; But their Proofs are very slight and inconsiderable, and depend chiefly on the authority of Simon Metaphrastes or other Legendary Writers; or some Monkish Visions, or some Domestick Testimonies of his pretended Successours, or some late partial Advocates, such as (o) Eulengrenius, who professe 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 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 her.

I take it for granted, that the Apostles were employ'd according to the Tenour of their Commissions, viz. That the Apostle of the Circumcision was to attend the Jews, and
and of the Uncircumcision the Gentiles. Now St. Paul faith, That (p) the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to him; as the Gospel of the Circumcision was unto Peter. This, (q) Baronius faith, 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 doe occasionally; This, as he proves from (r) St. Jerome, was the Principale Mandatum, the Main of the Commission to either of them. Which being suppos'd, It necessarily follows, that St. Peter's chief employment must be where the greatest numbers of Jews were. And from hence (s) Petrus deMarca infers, That St. Peter, having preached to the Jews in Judea, 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; And in this City, he faith, he wrote 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 (t) Eusebius, from Oribius, faith, That St. Peter preached to the dispersed Jews in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, &c. And (u) Epiphanius, even where he faith, 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 referred as the peculiar Province of St. Peter; For when St. Paul attempted to go into Bithynia, (w) he was forbidden by the Spirit, which then commanded him to come into Europe. And so he made for Macedonia. (x) Baronius grants, that St. Peter spent the greatest part
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part of his time in the Eastern parts, but about Anno Dom. LVIII. he finds him employed in the West, and particularly among the Britains. But what ancient authority, according to his own Rule, doth he produce for it? He names none but Metaphrases, and yet, as it falls out unluckily, when the fame Metaphrases his authority is produced, for St. Paul's preaching in the Western parts, he is apparently flighted by him (z) and for the very fame Reafon, which holds againft the former Testimony, viz. for quoting things out of Eusebius, which are not to be found in him. And elsewhere he faith, (z) he is of no authority in these matters. But Metaphrases his Testimony serves to a good purpose in St. Peter's Cafe, 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 Epiftle to the Romans. To which he anfwers, That Saint Peter came to Rome the second of Claudius, but being banifhed thence with other Jews the ninth of Claudius, he spent the time then in preaching the Gofpel in other places, and so very conveniently finds him in Britain, when St. Paul wrote his Epiftle to the Romans, which he placeth in the second of Nero. But it is by no means probable, faith (a) Valefius, That St. Peter fhould come to Rome before the death of Herod Agrippa. And (b) Baronius faith, That after his being delivered out of prison, he went to Caifaueca, Laodicea and Antioch (according to his own Author Metaphrases) and then into Cappadocia, Pontus, Galatia and Bithynia, and fo returned by Antioch to Jerusalem. So that if Metaphrases his authority be 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 Valefius 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 suppos'd, And that St. Peter went from Rome on the Eftat of Claudius. What makes him fo long abfent from thence as to the second of Nero, when (c) St. Paul in his Epiftle to the Romans falutes Aquila and Prifeilla as then pre-
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saint at Rome, who certainly left it before on the (d) 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 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 faith,

(c) 2 Tim. 4. 16.
(f) LaFaint. de Mort. Fas. c. 2.

What St. Peter too? So that upon the whole matter, the Opinion of (f) LaFaintius in his late published Book, seems most agreeable to truth, That St. Peter came not to Rome till the Reign of Nero, and not long before his Martyrdom; And this Baluzius confesses to have been the most ancient and received Opinion in the Church, since LaFaintius never disputes it: And what he faith of the twenty five years wherein the Apostles planted Churches, was in likelihood the Occasion of that mistaken Tradition concerning Saint 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.
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Of the Succession of the British Churches to the first Council of Nice.

The Testimony of Tertullian concerning them cleared:

It extends only to Britain.
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 Britains as well as others.
The Testimony of Sulpitius 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 flopping of it by the means of Constantius.
The flourishing of the British Churches under Constantin.
The reason onely of three British Bishops present at the Council of Arles.
The great Antiquity of Episcopal Government here.
Of the Flamines and Archiflamines 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 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 Messiah, because the uttermost parts of the Earth were given for his Possession. Tertullian flourished, as St. Jerome faith, under Severus and his Son; And in the time of Severus he wrote against the Jews, as (a) Baronius proves from several Passages in 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 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 Britains to such Terms, That they were contented to live beyond the Wall which Severus built; where Hadrian's Wall had been before. The part of Britain beyond the Wall was called Caledonia, as (b) Dio faith. And it is apparent, that the Romans were at that time fully acquainted with the Condition of the Britains, both within the Province, and without; And therefore Tertullian cannot be supposed to speak at random about this matter; when (c) he mentions the Nations of Gaul and the Britains, with as much assurance as he doth his Countrymen, the Moors, for receiving Christianity; And faith, 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,
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Jews, by mentioning this as a thing so well known at that time, if the Britains 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 Catholick 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 mention'd by Tertullian: For (d) Job. Fodorn and (e) Job. Mayor, from an ancient

Dislick in both of them

(Christi trans afflictis tribus annis atque ducentis Scotia Catholicam capi inire Fidem.)

say, That the Christian 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.

To which I answer, That it is true, Tertullian doth add the greater Emphasis to his Argument by saying, Et Britannorum inaccesa 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 Britains; who were driven thither, as appears by the Account given by (f) Xiphilin.
lin out of Dio, who faith, that the Britains were di-
vided into two forts, the Maetæ and the Caledonii; The
former dwelt by the Wall, and the latter beyond them.
These were the Extraprovincial Britains, and were di-


tinct both from the Piæs and the Scots, faith (g) Job.
Fordon, who carefully distinguishing those three Na-
tions when he speaks of their Wars with the Romans;
And he makes Fulgentius the Head of the Britains of
Albany in the time of Severus; But he supposes both
the Scots and Piæs 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, faith
(b) Hector Boethius, King Donald sent Embassadors, to
design him to send Persons fit to instruct them in the Chris-
tian Faith. And upon this, faith he, it was generally
received in Scotland. * Dempfler, according to his
custome, is very warm in this matter, and faith, all
their Annals and Histories agree, that King Donald and
the whole Kingdom of Scotland did then embrace Chris-
tianity; 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 Scotichronicon is the only Authority he hath to produce: And in his Preface he faith, That
King Edward I. destroy'd all the Monuments of the King-
dom; and it is somewhat unreasonable to complain of
the want, and to alledge 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 Meiflage from
King Donald, which is not to be found in Fordon.
But, as (i) Baronius observes, It is strange, that so re-
markable a Conversion should be omitted not onely by Bede,
but by Marianus Scotus, who mentions the Mission of
Palladius. And (k) Prosper faith, Upon the Mission of
Palladius, who was made the first Bishop over the Scotish
Christians, the People, who were barbarous before, were
made Christians.

But it is urged by Dempfler, not without shew of
Authority, that Palladius was sent to those which were
already Christians, and therefore Christianity must be
planted
planted among the Scots before the Mission of Palladius; and for this he quotes Beda, Ado Vienneufis, Hermannus Contraflus, Marianus Scotus, and others; and he blames Platina and Ciacconius who make him the Instrument of their Conversion, wherein he confesteth they follow Fabius Ethelward 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 (1) Nennius 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; And therefore what Prosper faith 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: Unles 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 Caffian, sometime after the death of Celestine: But when he wrote his Chronicon, in the time of Leo, The Scots being then converted; he faith, That Palladius was appointed to be Bishop over the believing Scots. Not that they did then believe before Palladius his coming, but that they did now believe when he wrote his Chronicon. For all the Testimonies of such as Preached there before Palladius are of very little Credit. 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 onely of the Britains, and not of the Scots.

(1) Nennii, s. 52.
And Dio knew of none but Britains that lived Northward in that Expedition of Severus, although, he faith, he went to the utmost extent of the Island, and at last concluded a Peace with the Britains upon their quitting no small part of their Country, although they soon revolted; So that here was a great number of Britains to be converted in those Places where the Romans never had been before Severus his 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 Britains, this doth not overthrow the continuance and propagation of the Christian Church among the Provincial Britains; For now, for a long time, the Christian Religion had a great Liberty of propagating it self; 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 Emperours, 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 Emperours 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 Dioclesian, when the Emperours made it their business to root out Christianity. But in the former Case, the Emperours restrain'd the People by their Edicts, but the People in some Places by false Suggestons frustrate the design of those Edicts, which Places excepted, the Christians enjoy'd a long time of Liberty; In which they neglected no opportunities to promote their Religion. And within this time the Christian Writers say, There was no Nation almost then known, where Christianity was not planted. So (m) Juufin Martyr tells Trypho; so (n) Eusebius and Ruffinus speak; and (p) LaStantius faith, That Christianity spread it self 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, Gildas affirms the continuance of a Church here, from the first Plantation of the Gospel,
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Gospel, though not maintain'd 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 Confessours and Martyrs; and the heat of it was no sooner over, but, as (q) Bede and (r) 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 (s) Sulpicius Severus, speaking of the Persecution of Christians in Gaul in the time of M. Aurelius Antoninus, faith, That Martyrdoms were then first seen in Gaul, the Christian Religion being more lately received beyond the Alpes. Which seems to overthrow the Antiquity of the Britanniack as well as the Gallick Churches. But in my opinion, (after so many Discourses written in a neighbour Nation about this Passag) we are to distinguish that which 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 Alpes. The other he was certain of, there being no authentick 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 Viena 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 Edicts for Persecution of Christians for above an hundred years together, viz. from the Persecution of Domitian, Anno Dom. 92. to the Edicts of Severus, Anno Dom. 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 (t) Eusebius tells us, was the seventeenth year of his Reign. (u) Baronius thinks that M. Aurelius sent private Edicts against the Christians. But (v) Tertullian faith, none of their good Emperours ever persecuted the Christians,
and instanceth in Trajan, Hadrian, Pius, Verus and M. Aurelius. (x) Eusebius faith, That Trajan abated the fierceness of the Persecution, but left the Laws in force upon information; That Hadrian, in his Rescript to Minutius Fundanus, Proconful of Asia, forbad a general Persecution of any as Christians; That, Antoninus Pius, not only pursued the same method, but threatened severe punishment to all Informers: the same he faith of M. Aurelius. In Commodus his time, he faith, the Christian Churches flourished very much in all parts; So that till Severus his Edict there was no Persecution, by virtue of any Edict of the Emperours; by the account which Eusebius gives. And (y) Laestantius 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 Governours of Provinces: But there was no general Persecution countenanced by the Emperours 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 (z) Irenaeus mentions the consent of the Celtick 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 Celtic, as they were one 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 mention'd by him, takes any particular Division of the People, but the general Name, as of the Germans and Iberi, and why not then the Celtic in as large a sense? Since (a) Strabo, (b) Plutarch, (c) Appian, and others, call the Gauls in general by the name of Celtic; and Tertullian manifestly rejects that sense of Celtic for one Division of the Gauls, when he mentions the several Nations of the Gauls which had embraced Christiannity. But I will not insist, as (d) Petrus de Marca doth, That Tertullian by the Galliarum diversa Nations means the four Provinces of Gaul into which Augustus

(a) Strabo. l. 1. 4. 7.
(b) Plutarch. in Cæsar. in Cæs.
(c) Appian. a. Civill. Best.
Thus did distribute 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, since the name of Gallia Cisalpina was much diffused; 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 Celtick Churches than Sulpiicus Severus intimates, much less to overthrow the Antiquity of the Britannick Churches. For, besides this Testimony of Tertullian concerning the British Churches; We have another of Origen, not long after, who faith, When did Britain before the coming of Christ confess in the Worship of one God? Which implies, that the Britains 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 so far as Britain to bring an Argument to prove, that all the Earth doth praise the Lord; Which, he faith, is fulfilled in the Christian Churches dispersed over the World. But I wonder what should make two such learned Antiquaries as (g) Mr. Camden and (b) 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 Britains 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 Caesar, That the Druids did never instruct the People in. But the Christian Religion alter'd the whole Scheme of the Druids Worship, and instead of their Taranis and Hefus, 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, Origen faith elsewhere, was seen in Britain as well as Mauritania.
Thus far I have endeavoured to clear the Apostolical Succession of the British Churches, which those have rendered more doubtfull, who have derived our Christianity from King Lucius his 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. 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 (k) Archbishop Ufier 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 employ'd in it. For (l) Petrus Equilinus faith, That he was baptized by Timothy, a Disciple of St. Paul; and he had it from a much better Author, for (m) Notkerus Balbulus faith, That King Lucius was baptized by Timothy; not the Timothy to whom Saint Paul wrote his Epistles; But the Brother of Novatus, whose Names are extant in the old Martyrology published by Rosny, 12 Cal. July, who were both, faith (n) Baronius, Sons to Pudens a Roman Senator; the same who is suppos'd to have been marryed to Claudia Rufina the Britains; and therefore his Son might not improbably be employ'd in this work of converting a British King. (o) Naucerus takes notice, That this Relation agrees best with the Tradition of the Church of Curia, a noted City of Rhætia. And (p) Pantaleon calls Lucius the Disciple of Timothy; out of the Annals of that Church. From whence (q) Marcus Vellerus fhes, that he did not die here in Britain, but went over into those parts of Rhætia to preach the Gospel, and there suffer'd Martyrdom: or, at least, ended his days; For they are not agree'd about the manner of his death. (r) Ægidius Tschudus faith the former, who adds, that there is a place near Curia called Clivus S. Lucii still; and (s) Münfler faith, near the Episcopal Palace, there is Monasterium Sancti Lucii. And (t) 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 (u) Roman Martyrology faith, That there his memory is still observed. (w) Notkerus Balbulus faith, That
be converted all Rhatia, and part of Bavaria. If so, they had great reason to preserve his Memory, and the British Church, on the account of King Lucius his converting their Country, hath as much right to challenge Superiority over Bavaria and Rhatia, 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 (x) Geoffrey, from the British History faith, That he died at Gloucester, and left no Heir to succeed him. Wherein he is follow'd by (y) John Fordon, who faith, 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 com- parente, Fordon seems to doubt, whether he did not withdraw in his old Age, according to the German Tradition.

(x) Nennius faith, That Anno Domini 164. Lucius, (2) Nenn. c. 11: King of Britain, with 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 Christi. One of the Cambridge MSS. post 164 annos. In the margin whereof it is said, That Nennius is grievously mistaken, because Evaristus his time cannot agree to either of the Computations, Evaristus dying, according to the old Catalogue of the Bishops of Rome made about An. D. 354. when Trebonius Gallus and Metilius Bradua were Consuls, which, according to the Fasti both of Onaprius Panvinius and Sir H. Savil, was Anno Dom. 109. But Archbishop 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 the Fasti, is Anno Dom. 172. But it will be too hard to press the point of Chronology too far, when (a) Bede, (2) Bed. Hist. l. 6. c. 4. according to different Computations, sometimes puts Anno Dom. 156. and at another time Anno Dom. 167.

But
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 his Popedom, I shall urge this matter no farther; since it must come within a very little compass, if the Characters of time must fuit with it, which, Marianus Scotus faith, was when Pollio and Aper were Confuils, the sixteenth of M. Aurelius, and Anno Dom. 176. according to the Dionysian account, although Marianus follows another himself. Which falls out to be the year before the Perfection of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna, which, as (b) Eusebius faith, was the seventeenth of M. Aurelius, when Irenæus was sent by them on a Message to Eleutherius. (c) Baronius places the Conversion of Lucius somewhat later, in the beginning of Commodus, Anno Dom. 183. But therein, as Archbifhop Ufber observes, he hath all the more ancient Historians against him; and it is only his own mistake in the Chronology of the first Bifhops of Rome, which makes him fay, the time of Eleutherius, will not agree to M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, wherein he is too much followed by our (d) learned Antiquary.

Having then found no fuch inconsistency in the point of time, but that if there were fuch a King as Lucius in Britain then, he might well send to Eleutherius fuch a Message; I now proceed to consider, how far this Tradition of King Lucius can agree with the State of the Britifh Affairs at that time. The Britains being impatient of the Roman Yoke in Hadrian's time, he comes over and brings new Legions with him; And settles the whole Province in quietness, and built his Wall, to keep the other Britains in order. Notwithstanding this, in Antoninus his time, the War broke out more fiercely; and not onely the (e) other Britains forced their Passage into the Roman Province, but, as (f) Paufanias faith, The Brigantes rebelled, who, for that caufe, had part of their Countrie taken from them. But Lollius Urbicus being sent hither, he drove the Britains back, built another Wall farther Northwards, where Agricola formerly had placed his Garrifons, as appears by the (g) Inscriptions there taken up: So that Lollius Urbicus drove the Britains 100 miles Northward; For fo much is the distance between the Walls of Hadrian

(b) Euch. L. 5. c. 1.
(c) Baron. A.D. 182. n. 3.
(e) Capitol. in Antonin.
(f) Paufan. in Arcad.
drian and Antoninus. For all this, the Britains brake out again with so much violence in the beginning of (b) M. Aurelius Antoninus his Reign, that Calpurnius Agricola was sent against them, and from that time we read of no disturbance here till the time of Commodus, when (i) Ulpius 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? He must either be over the Britains beyond the Wall, which overthrows one main part of the Tradition as to his settling the Churches here after his Conversion, or, he must be the Head of the Revolting Britains who were repressed by Calpurnius Agricola; or, he must be a subordinate King to the Romans, such as Cogidunus and Praetogras had been. But then, how comes he to command 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 Titulary Princes? It is very true, that 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 suffer'd an Hereditary King of the same Country to enjoy full power over his Subjects, whilest 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 to vast an Empire. The Case of Antiochus in Asia, Herod and his Children in Judea, Dejotarbus 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 a Sea, which the Romans thought dreadfull and almost impassable,
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 Countrey; 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 mention'd by (1) Archbishop Ufher, one Silver, and the other Gold, having an Image of a King on them, with a Crofs, and the Letters of L V C, as far as they could be discerned. But if it be farther asked in what part of Britain this King Lucius lived, I shall onely 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 Cogidunus, that they bestow'd some Cities upon him. And Tacitus faith, he continued firm to the Roman Interest to his time. And where Kings were faithfull 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: Some-
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Sometime after his Father's death, Claudius bestow'd 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 desired so well of them as Cogidumus had done: And it seems most probable to me, that where Ptolemy places the Regni; were the Cities which Cogidumus 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 most likely still under their own Prince, who kept up the British customs. Wherever the Romans inhabited, they may be traced by their Ways, by their Buildings, by their Coins, by their Urns, by their Inscriptions: But scarce any thing of this nature could be found in Surrey or Sussex by the most diligent Enquirers. (m) Leland indeed discover'd some Roman Coins near Kingston upon Thames, where others have been taken up since: (but Camden could hear of no Roman Antiquities thereabouts.) And (n) some suppose the place where those Coins were taken up, to have been a Station of the Roman Souldiers under Aeclepiadotus, when he marched that way from Portsmouth to London, in the Expedition against Alleius. If so, it was too late for the days of King Lucius. All that (o) Camden pretended to, is one- ly a Military way near Ockley, which was necessary for the conveniency of the Roman Souldiers passing to the remoter parts of the Province, and some Coins about. Gaton; but as to his Noviomagus which he will have to be Woodcote in Surrey, (p) Mr. Sommer hath well proved from the cours of the Roman Itinerary, that it must lie in Kent, in the Road to Portus Rutupis: and Woodcote is as far from it as London. In all Sussex there 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 his time (q) Seius Saturnus was Archigabernus in Claffe Britannica; Which shews, that
that the Romans had then a Fleet here; and that he was
Admiral of it. And in after-times, the Comes litoris
Saxonici per Britanniam, had several Garrisons on the
Sea side for Security of the Coasts, as appears by the
(r) Notitia Imperii where the Places are set down, a-
mong which were on the coasts of Suffex Anderida
and Portus Adurni; By the former our learned Anti-
quaries (s) Camden and (t) Selden understand New-
enden 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 Penfey in Suffex, or
Halling, as more agreeing with (u) Gildas, who
faith, that the Romans placed their Forts for Security of
the Coasts in litore Ocani ad Meridionalem Plagam, upon
the very Coasts; And to the rest of them stood, as Recul-
ver, Richborough, Dover, Lim, which were all in Kent;
and the Portus Adurni was Aldrington near Shoreham in
Suffex. From hence it appears, that the Romans, being
secure of the Coasts, and having their Souldiers disper-
sed in the Colonies about, and being so near the Metrop-
olis at London, where the chief Governors of this part of
Britain resided; They might better permit a Britifh
King to govern these parts of the Countrey. And this
is the most probable account I can think of, as to this
KingLucius within the Roman Province.

(m) Sir H. Spelman would bring him to his Iceni,
but without any colour of Probability; Lucius, faith
he, was the son of Coillus, Coillus of Marius, Marius of
Arviragus. And what then? Some, he faith, would have
him to be Prafutagus, who was King over the Iceni. But
do not (x) Tacitus say, that Prafutagus died before
the Revolt of the Britains under Boadicea? And that he
left Nero his heir, and his two Daughters, hoping there-
by 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 mention'd in
the Story afterwards; no, not in that most remarkable
Battel between his Mother and Suetonius Paulinus? But HectoR Boethius calls Arviragus one of the Iceni,
as though his authority were to be mention'd against
Tacitus, who was the Geffry of Scotland, so many
and so improbable are his Fictions. (y) Barovius, af-
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Oxid. c. 72.

(s) Camden Brit.
p. 247.

(t) Selden. Ma-
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c. 5.

(u) Gild. Efig.
§ 14.

(w) Spelman. 
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14. c. 31.
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A.D. 172. n. 9.
ter trying several ways to reconcile the Tradition of King Lucius with the Roman Story, concludes with that as the most probable, (z) That he was a King under the Roman Power in Britain, such as Prasutagus was. But he was onely King over the Iceni, and not over all Britain, and although among the Britains 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 Caesar: So that the old Britifh Government was neither Popular as some pretend, nor under one Monarchy, but the People were govern’d by several petty Monarchs, as appears by the unquestionable Testimonies of (a) Diodorus Siculus, (b) Strabo, and (c) Pomponius Mela; Fort populos & Reges populorum, faith Mela; Olim Regibus parebant, faith (d) Tacitus, which prove both the Antiquity and Number of Britifh Monarchs. And what (e) Dio faith of a Democratical Government among the Britains is onely spoken of the Maetae 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, That they were drawn off from their former obedience to their Kings, by the Heads of several Factionis among them. So that although in the most ancient times here was Monarchical Government, yet it was not extended over all Britain, as the Monkifh Tradition pretends concerning King Lucius, and I know not how many Predecessours of his, even 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 Cogidubnus, though not immediately, in the Government of that part of Britain committed to his care; I fee no inconvenience in allowing, that King Lucius heating of the Christian Doctrine, either by the old Britifh Christians, such as Eluanus and Medwinus are suppos’d to have been; or by some of M. Aurelius his Souldiers coming hither, after the great deliverance of the Roman Army by the Prayers of the Christians (which had then
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then lately happen'd and occasion'd great discourse every where, the Emperor himself, as (f) Tertullian faith, giving the account of it in his own Letters) might upon this be very desirous to inform himself throughly about this Religion, and there being then frequent intercourse between Rome and Britain, by reason of the Colonies that were settled, and the Governours and Souldiers passing to and fro, he might find Eluanus and Medwinus to Eletherius to be fully instructed in this Religion. And either the same persons alone, or two others with them (called Faganus and Duviacinus 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 (g) old Book of Landaff gives a much more modest account of this whole matter than either Geoffrey of Monmouth, or any of his followers. There we find only that King Lucius sent Eluanus and Medwinus to Eletherius 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 Embassadors; and, being well instructed, they ordained them, making Eluanus a Bishop and Medwinus a Teacher; And so they returned to King Lucius, who with the chief of the Britains were baptized; And then, according to the Instructions of Eletherius, 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 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 Geoffrey of Monmouth hath corrupted with his Flamins and Archiflamins; and others afterwards made an Epistle for Eletherius 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 Faganus
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nus and Diruvianus (as some call him) to Glæfenbury; others make them Consecrate the Church at Wimbeifer, to which they say King Lucius had a particular kindness, and gave all the Lands and Privileges which the Flaminus had, to the Bishop and Monks. (A Gift that would never make them the richer or the safer.) Others make King Lucius to found St. Peter’s Church at Westmister, the Church in Dover Castle, St. Martin’s by Canterbury, 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 Eluanus, 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, 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 doubtfull 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 Gildas, as to the British Christianity, is to be relied on before the later Writers; and Gildas afferts the one; and although he had as much reason as Bede, or any 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. It were worth while for us to know whence Bede had his first Information of this matter; for he pro-
profeffes to follow other Writers about the **British Affairs**, and in many places he follows Gildas exactly, but in this he passes by what Gildas faith about the **Primitive Christianity of Britain**, and in stead thereof puts in this Story of King Lucius. (b) *Bale* faith, that "**Eluanus** & **Avalonius** was a Disciple to these 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, he should be deceived by his Countreymen; he sent **Eluanus** and **Medwinas to Eleutherius. And Eluanus upon his return wrote a Book De Origine Ecclesiae Brittanorum; 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 Medwinas Belgius, and of King Lucius himself, all relating to this matter: But (i) *Leland* only takes notice, "that **Eluanus** and **Medwinas** were employed upon an Embaflly to Eleutherius; that by his means he might become a Christian, which faith he, is very unreasonable to suppose, unless he were first informed what Christianity was, which he thinks was preached 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 joyn'd with Geoffrey of Monmouth, wherein this Story is told exactly as it is in the Book of Landaff: and no mention is made of any other Persons sent back but those that went. And, as far as I can judge, Bede follow'd 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. For Bede faith as little as he well could that tended to the honour of the British Churches. So that according to this, which feems the truest account of this Embaflly, **Eluanus** and **Edwinas** were British Christians themselves; and therefore sent to Eleutherius, having been probably the Persons employ'd 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
the Apostles, had a desire to understand how far the Britib 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 (k) Irene- 

ues argues in this case, A resort was made from all places, because of its being the Imperial City. These 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 Britib Churches, as appears by the Contest of the Britib Bishops with Augustine the Monk; of which in its due place.

If any credit were to be given to King (l) Arthur's (l) Cas de An-
Diploma to the University of Cambridge, this matter would be fully clear'd; For there it is expressly said, "That King Lucius was converted by the preaching of the Doctours of Cambridge, for which reason he gave" large Privileges to that University, which were con-
"firmed by King Arthur. And in the MS. Annals of Burton it is said, " That Anno Domini 141, nine of the " Doctours 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; Not that this Passage in the Annals of Burton was put into the MS. Copy by another hand, as the learned (m) Primate observed, by com-
paring the Copy of them in the Library of C. C. C. But on the other side, it is justly pleaded, that in the Bull of Honorius I. bearing date An. Dom. 624, 20 Febr. there is mention made of the Privileges granted to the University of Cambridge by Pope Eleutherius; and that withall he takes notice of Doctours and Scholars there. And that this Bull of Honorius is allowed to be authen-
tick in the Bull of Eugenius IV. upon the Controversy about Jurisdiction between the Bishop of Ely and the University of Cambridge, bearing date An. D. 1432. 14 Cal. 08. 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 number

L
of learned Men in Cambridge to have instructed King Lucius in the Christian Faith; and that it is not improbable, that Eulianus and Medwius might be of that number, especially considering that Camboritum, or, as many Copies have it, Camboricum, was a Roman Colony, and mention'd in the best Copies among the 28 Cities of Britain, and the Roman Colonies had their Schools of Learning, wherein the several Professours 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 Dioclesian, 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 (v) Gildas and (o) Bede say, That many more suffer'd Martyrdom then in Britain, as (p) Baronius acknowledgeth. And although Dioclesian being a Prince of infinite Ambition, as appear'd by his commanding himself to be worshipp'd as God, and therefore had so great an Antipathy to Christianity, that his whole Reign might be called, as (q) M. Velferus faith, 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 Britifh and Fierce Man, who stick at nothing for the Shame or the Cruelty of it, as he is fet forth by Eutropius and Veflor; and therefore was a fit Instrument, as occasion serv'd, to execute Dioclesian's Malice against the Christians; which he did not fail to perform, as appear'd by the Thebean Legion which suffer'd in the first Expedition against the Bagaudae, for refusing to take an Oath, to extricate the Christians as well as the Rebels, as (r) Sigeinis and (s) Velferus relate the Story. But the great Persecution under Dioclesian, of which Gildas and Bede speak, did not certainly begin till Anno Domini 303. Dioclesian and Maximianus being one the eighth the other the seventh time Consuls, as (t) Laflantius hath evidently made to appear: But in the next year, upon the Resignation of these two, Galerius Maximianus and Constantius Chlorus were declared Emperours; and
it is generally said by the Ecclesiastical Writers, *that Constantius kept 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, (w) Alford faith, there is no other way, but to make this Persecution to have been in the third of Dioclesian and the first of Maximianus. At which time, (w) Baronius faith, 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 Bagaudae, and in his Passage over the Alpes, the Thebean Legion suffer'd. 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 preferred by Eucherius, but by Venantius Fortunatus, Helinandus, Beda, Osuardus and Ado. But Maximianus made then no long stay in Gaul, and for several years after, both Dioclesian and he were so taken up in Warlike Expeditons, 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 Dioclesian or Maximian. For when he came against the Bagaudae, Carausius was employ'd 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 hither. This Revolt of Carausius happen'd within few years after Dioclesian and Maximian were joint Emperours, *viz:* An. Dom. 286.

But Alford faith, the old Writer of Saint Alban's Life pitches upon Anno Dom. 286. for this Persecution. *And a MS. Copy of Beda which he had met with agrees with that time.* But he urges farther, *that after the Rebellion of Carausius, when Constantius was made Cæsar, the Provinces beyond the Alpes were committed to him, and that was Anno Dom. 292. And if there were no Persecution under Constantius, this must be before he was Cæsar. But, for any thing Alford faith, the Persecution might have been under Carausius, or Allecius, before Constantius came
to the Possession of Britain. For Carausius, as appears by (x) Aur. Victor and (y) Eutropius, was let alone with the Government of Britain; which, faith (z) Orosius, he enjoy'd seven years, and after him Allectus, three years more; So that for several years after Constantius his being Caesar, he had no influence on the Affairs of Britain: At the end of those ten years, Allectus being killed, and his Army routed by Asclepiodatus, Constantius came over, as appears by (a) Eumenius, in the very nick of time to preferve the City of London from being pillaged by the Franks, and then he was received with wonderfull joy by the Inhabitants, being delivered from the Tyranny they underwent in the times of Carausius and Allectus; And after his Death Medals were coin'd in London to testify the City's gratitude to him; whereon was the Effiges 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, 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 Camden understand them.

(b) Zosimus faith, That Constantius, while he lived, had his chief residence in Britain; And if a Persecution happen'd here, he must be Accessory to it, which is contrary to what is constantly affirmed of Constantius. For (c) Eusebius faith, he never joyn'd with the other Emperours in destroying Churches. (d) Sozomen and (e) Cæsareus say, That he gave full liberty to the Christians, and that their Churches flourished under him; And (f) Optatus faith, 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 consilfed 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 Dioclesian and Maximianus had the Empire in their hands; and although Constantius and Galerius had the Titles of Caesars, yet the supreme Government was in the others hands, as appears by what Orosius faith
faith of Dioclesian's usage of Galerius, upon his return from the Persian War; And by the Inscriptions in Spain (if they be authentic) produced by (g) Baro-ni-us, (h) Velerus and (i) Gruterus. In one of which Dioclesianus and Maximianus are alone mention'd; And this must be after the Persecution, for there it is said Nomine CHRISTIANORVM DELETO. And in the other SUPERSTITIONE CHRISTI VBIQ; DELETA. And there Dioclesian is only named Augustus, and Galerius as adopted by him. Baroni-us thinks such Inscriptions were set up everywhere, but time hath only preserved those in Spain. But if they were set up in Spain, under the Government of Con-stantius, it is an Argument, that while Dioclesian and Maximianus held the Empire, they did what they pleased in these matters: For although the name of Caesar carried in it something of supreme Authority, yet (k) Au-relius Victor, when he takes notice of the first beginning of the difference of the Titles of Augustus and Cæsar, He faith, Though they were both Titles of Sovereign-ty, yet they who enjoy'd them did not differ less in their Power than they did in their Titles. And therefore (l) Laßantius faith, when Dioclesian called Galerius by the name of Caesar after his Persian Victory, he cried out, Quomque Caesar? How long should be continue Caesar? And the Impatience of this made him force Dioclesian to resign the Empire, as Laßantius, who was upon the Place, affures us; Nay, when Dioclesian offer'd him, That all four should be declared Augusti, he refused for this reason, Because he knew, while Dioclesian continued in Power, he should have only the Name. And Laßantius farther faith, That the Edict against the Christians was sent to Constantius without asking his consent; and he confesses, Constantius complied so far as to pull down their Churches. But his kindness, when declared Augustus, made them willing to forget the rest. So that the Persecution was general till their Reigna- tion; But upon Constantius being declared Augustus; it ceased in all these parts; in which, (m) Eusebius afirms, it did not last two years, although it continued ten years in the East. And within that time the Persecution took away St. Alban, Aaron and Julius, and other Mar-
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tyrs here, as Gildas and Bede relate, who give a more particular account of the Sufferings of the first, not without some mixture of Improbabilities or Interpolations; but, as to the rest, we have nothing but their Names preferved and the Places they belonged to. The first is said to have been a Roman Officer at the Municipium of Verulam, the first Britifh Town which had Roman Privileges; and the other, Citizens of Caerleon, where there was a Roman Colony.

Constantius dying at York, his eldest Son, Constantine, was declared Cæfar by the Army in Britain. For although Constantius did what in him lay to secure the Succession to him, as (n) Eusebius faith, yet that did not signify much without the Concurrence of the Legions. And (o) Laflantius faith, That he commended him to the Souldiers, and so delivered the Empire to him. This Consent of the Army is expres'd by (p) Eumenius, and by the Emperour (q) Julian; and Aurelius Victor faith, All that were prefent promoted his being Emperour. But he was not declared Cæfar by Galerius Maximianus till afterwards; as Baluzius hath clearly proved out of Laflantius and others, who, when he faw he could not help it, sent him the Purple Robe. Thus Constantine, being firmly settled in the Throne, took care in the first places of the Tranquillity of these parts, where he was proclaimed Emperour, and, as Laflantius faith, The first thing he did was, to secure full Liberty to the Christians. And now, we may well suppose, all that Gildas and Bede fay, 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 muft labour under great difficulties; the Governours of Provinces before Constantius, and the Generality of the People, being fet against the Christians.

But the first Evidence we meet with of the settled Condition of the Britifh Churches, is, the number of Bishops which went from Britain to the Council at Arles, Anno Domini 314, where we find three Bishops subscribing to it, Eborius, Bishop of York; Restitutus, Bishop of
of London; and Adelphus, de Civitate Colonia Londinensis: So it is in (r), Sirmundus his best Copy. And although (s) 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 Colonia Londinensis? The Learned (t) Primate thinks it to be Colchester; that being called in Antoninus Colonia. (w) Sir H. Spelman likewise supposeth 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 Arabick Writers say the Council of Nice was (of which Mr. Selden hath dis- couraged at large) or at least as (x) Cummannius and (y) Ado thought this Council of Arles was, which they made to consist of 600 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 Judici- um St. Augufine often calls it) wherein the main thing to be done was, to hear the Parties and to give Judg- ment; And in the former Judgment but 19 Bishops were summoned. It is said, (z) That St. Augufine makes the number of Bishops at Arles to be 200. But I fee no sufficient ground to understand those words of this particular Council; but of all the Bishops which had condemned them in several Councils, among whom he reckons the Italian, Spanish and Gallick 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 (a) Sum- mons to Chrestus Bishop of Syracuse in Sicily, (the only one remaining, and which (b) Baronius thinks was the
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same that was to the rest) wherein he is required to come out of that Province, and to bring two Presbyters with him, as Valeius shews against Baronius and Sirmondus the words are to be understood. And (c) Hilary, speakiing of the Councils of his time, faith, That one or two Bishops were sent for out of a Province, and he instanceth in the Council of Ancyr, and the great Council at Ariminum: So here we meet with Chresius out of the Province of Sicily, Quintafius 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 18 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 faith Mr. Camden: therefore in all probability, since the other two Bishops were out of the other two Provinces, Maxima Caufariensis 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 (d) Beda, now Chefler; the other, Civitas Legionis ad Ycam, where was a Colony of the 11. Legion, which Province is sometimes called Britannica Secunda. And therefore this Bishop Adelphius came ex Civit. Col. Leg. 11. which the ignorant Transcribers might easily turn to ex Civit. Col. Londin. The only Objection is that which is suggested by the Learned (e) Primate of Armagh, viz. That there were four Provinces of Britain at that time, and that Flavia Caufariensis was one of them; having its name from Constantine, who assumed the name of Flavius; But Goltzius his Copy deferves not to be so much prefered before (f) Camden’s; And the name of Flavia Caufariensis might either be taken from Flavius Vegetianus, as (g) Berterius thinks, or from Fl. Theodorus, before whole time Camden faith 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 Argu-
Argument to the contrary; since it was the Custom to send but one or two out of a Province where they were most numerous. And I see no reason to question 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 (b) Greek Author of the Martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, who, faith, Saint Peter had 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 farther 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 (i) 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, Anno Dom. 258. And (k) Tertullian puts the proof of Apostolical Churches upon the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles: which were a endless 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 lofs of Records of the British Churches, we cannot draw down the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles time (for that of the 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 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. That there were twenty eight Cities among the old Britains, That in these there were twenty five Archbishops, and three Archbishops, 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...
ftorians, who swallow Geoffry of Monmouth whole without chewing: I find two of my Predecessors, men considerable in their times, produced to the same purpose, viz. (l) Radulphus de Direito, and Rad. Baldock. Others say, (m) That these twenty eight Cities were not all furnished with Bishops in King Lucius his 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 Eluanus and Medwinnus; For the same Authours 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 Britains, the Tradition doth not depend upon the Credit of Geoffry or Nennius; For Bede and before him Gildas say the fame thing, viz. That there were so many Cities among the Britains, while the Romans had Power here, which I fee no caufe to doubt but they were Cities made by the Romans, or by the Britains in imitation of them, as I shall prove in 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 Britifh Druids, but to the Roman Colonies. That there was some Subordination among the Druids, concerning which whole (n) 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 it self. 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 prudent, these things may justly be supposed con-

---

(l) Maçon, de Minijler. Angl. l. 2. c. 7.
(m) Animadverf. on Church Hist. of Brit. p. 18.

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 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 follow'd the Pattern of the City of Rome, having a Senate, Consuls, Praetors, Censors, Aediles, Quaestors, &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 (o) Latimus Pacatus, in his Panegyrick to Theodosius, mentions, Reverendos municipali purpurâ 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 Flamines 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 (p) Gruter. But (q) 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. (r) Flamini Divorum omnium. Now faith 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 these Flamines 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 seem'd very probable in the Roman Inscriptions. And (s) Sertorius Ursatus seems to make no doubt concerning it in this Inscription,

**DIVO AVGUSTO**

**ALBINVS. ALB. F. FLAMEN**

**DIVAE. AVG. PROVINCIÆ**

**LV SITAN.**

But
But it is an eafy mistake for a Flamen D. Aug. one of Augustus his Flamins, in that Province. Of which fhort there are many Examples. But there are other (t) In- 
scriptions wherein we reade of

\[FLAMINICA PROVINCIÆ\]

LVSITANIAE

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 Flaminiae. But this doth not prove, that the Flamines had any Jurifdtion over a Province; Which had been indeed to the purpose. Among the Romans, although there were none called Archiflamines, yet there were Flamines maiores & minores, as appears by Feflus and others. The leffer are thought by fome to be called Veflamines in the Incriptions both of

(u) Gruter. Lexi. 
(p. 382, 1. 452.)

(w) Reinf. In- 
script. p. 385.

(X) Cicero de

\[Alia Ref.\]

And the Pontifes themselves were divided likewise into Maiiores and Minores; as appears both by Feflus and the Incriptions: Thofe lefer were at first Atfegfours in the College or Court of Pontifes; But afterwards became onely Officers to them; And among them there was a Pontifex Maximus too: But, as Feflus faith, he was onely the fift in the College: But all this relates onely to the City. That which comes nearer to our bufinefs is the Conideration of the Sacerdotes Provinciarum, as they are called in the (y) Theodosian Code. (z) Jac. 

Gothofredus faith, The difference between the Flaminis and thefe was; That the Flamins belong'd to particular Cit- 

ies; But thefe had whole Provinces under their Care; and fo, in the Law, the Honor Flaminii was distinct from the Honor Sacerdotii; this latter is called Archierofyne in the fame Code; And the Title and Office ftill continu- 

ed in the time of Theodosius M. And it is there descri-
bed to be a Care that Divine Offices were performed in their Temples; and such as these were (a) Sopelianus in Asia, and (b) Chrysantius in Lydia, and (c) Arfacius in Galatia, to whom an Epistle of Julian is still extant giving him charge to look after his Office with great 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 Arfacius to take all things commendable from the Christians; and no doubt this was thought so by his Predecessours, 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 (d) Eusebius faith, That Maximinus appointed not one of the Cities, but Agazæus, Chief-priests in the Provinces, where Valeius mistakes his meaning; for he thinks all the Innovation of Maximus 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 Maximus, 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 (e) Laclantius, in his excellent Piece lately published out of MS. by Balazius, faith expressly of Maximus, Novo more Sacerdotes maximos per singularas 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 doe the Office of Priests themselves; but to look after 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, He appointed other Priests over the Provinces, in a higher degree above the rest. Although then Valeius asserted that such were elder than Maximus, yet Laclantius, whose authority is far greater, hath determined the contrary.

I am
I am not ignorant that, long before Maximinus his time, (f) Tertullian mentions the Praefides Sacerdotaes, but those do not relate to this matter, but to the Spectacula, as appears by the place. (g) Some infit on the Sacerdotes Provinciales in (h) Tertullian; 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 (i) Canon of the African Code we find the Sacerdotes Provinciae, but that Council was long after, Anno Dom. 407. And these seem to be no other than Advocates, who were to appear for the Caufes which concerned the Temples and Sacrifices throughout the Province. According to which method, the African Bishops there defirc, That the Churches might have Advocates too, with the same Privileges: Which Request was granted by (k) Honorius; and was the first Introduction of Lawyers into the Service of the Church, who were called Defensores Ecclesiarum, and were afterwards Judges in Ecclesiastical Caufes. But that which comes nearer to this matter is, the Authority of the Afiarchae, who in fome Coins; mentioned by (l) Spanheimius, are faid to be Priests over thirteen Cities; And this in the Law is called (m) Sacerdotum Afiæ: But these seem to have been no other than thofe who took care of the pubfick Solemnities in the common Assembly in Asia, when the People met out of thefe Cities to perform them either at Ephesus or Smyrna, or any other of the Cities within this combination, as is observed by many (n) Learned Men. And although there were but one Chief at a time, yet the Office seem’d to have paffed by turns through thefeveral Cities; And he in whose City the Solemnities were to be kept, was the President for that time, and had the Title of Afiarcha. But (o) Alb. Rubenius shews from Arifides and Dio, That the Afiarchae had a Superintendancy over the Temples and the Priests within the Community of the Afiian Cities; But thofe were onely, he faith, For the Temples erected to the Caefars out of the common Stock; The Temple of Diana at Ephesus belonging to the Ionia Community, and not to that of Asia. Heredes Atticus is called in the InSCRIPTION at (p) Athens, Ἀγαμέμνων ὁ Σελευκεὺς,
Caesar's
Cæsar’s High-priest. But that seems to be only a Title, without Power. But it appears by the (q) Inscript. (q) U. p. 114. 

And this I have endeavour’d 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 linical Succession of Bishops, as they could in other Churches, where Writings were preferred, yet as soon as through the Churches 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, Quæ decrevimus Commmi Concilio, Charitati tuae significationem, ut omnes sciant quid in futurum observare debent.

(r) Baronius 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 (s) Petrus deMarca faith, As the Emperours sent their Edicts to their Prefecti Prætorii. Was that to confirm them? It is true, they say, the 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 onely to signify to him what they had done, and to direct him to communicate these Canons to others? Would such a Message from a Council have been born, since
since the Papal Supremacy hath been owned? Nay, how
faucily would it have looked in any Council within the
Patriarchats of the East to have done so? But these Bi-
sbops of Arles knew no other Style then, but Charitati
tue; 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, They were assem-
bled at the Emperor's
Command, and were so
far from expecting Direc-
tions from him, that they
tell him they had a Divine
Authority present with
them, and a certain Tra-
dition and Rule of Faith;
They wished indeed, he had
been present with them,
and to have judged toge-
ther with them. Was this
to make him sole Judge? or
could they believe him at the
same time to be their Su-
preme Head? They could
have been glad of the Com-
pany 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 Sirmondus and Baroni-
us. By this we see what Opinion the Britifh Bishops
and their Brethren had of the Pope's Supremacy.

But now to their 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. But
this
this latter part was repealed, as Binius confesses, by the Council of Nice, which refer'd this matter to the Bishop of Alexandria.

(2.) As to the Clergy, There were Canons which related to Bishops, Priests and Deacons. (1.) To Bishops, and those were four: (1.) That no Bishop should trample upon another, Can. 17. which Albinus well interpret of invading another's Diocese. (2.) As to travelling Bishops, that they should be allow'd 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, C. 4. takes notice only of three Bishops as necessary to be present, because many Eastern Provinces had not seven; as Chrysitianus Lupus observes on that Canon. In an African Council in Cesionius 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 Traditores in the Time of Persecution, i.e. to have given up the Sacred Books or Veilels, or to have betrayed their Brethren, and this proved by Authentick 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 forfage 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.

(3.) As to Lay Communion: (1.) Those that refuse to continue in their Employment as Souldiers, now the Persecution was over, were to be suspended Communion, Can. 3.
The words are, *de his qui Arma projicunt in Pace*. Of which some do hardly make tolerable sense. *BINIUS faith it must be read in Bello.* But nothing can be more contrary to *Peace than War*; How then should such a mistake happen? *ALBASPINUS faith, It is against those who refuse to be Souldiers in time of Peace:* Baronius faith, *It is against them that apostatize in time of Peace;* But if a Metaphorical Sense will be allow'd, 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 debarr'd Communion till they had recover'd themselves. And much to this purpose *Josephus Egyptianus and Job, Antiochenus do understand the 12. Can. of the Council of Nice.* But if a Metaphorical Sense be thought too hard; Then, I suppose, the meaning is, against those who renounced being Souldiers, as much now in time of the Churches Peace, as under Persecution, when they could not be Souldiers without committing Idolatry, as appear'd in the Persecution of *Lucinius* and others. *Constantine, as Euseb. de vit. Conf. l. 2. c. 35.*

(1) Euch. de vit.
(1) Euseb. faith, gave them all leave to forfake their Employment that would. But the Council of *Arles might well apprehend*, That if all Christians renounced being Souldiers, They must still have an Army of Heathens, whatever the Emperours 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, Lucinius, 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 doe; 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 Governours of remote places should carry with them the communicatory Letters of their own Bishop, and not be debarr'd Communion, unless they acted against the Discipline of the Church. This I take to be the meaning of *Can. 7.* (4.) That those who
who were 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 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 recover'd and shewed amendment, Can. 22. (11.) That those who were baptized in the Faith of the Holy Trinity should not be re-baptized, Can. 8. And this was the Canon which Saint 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.

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 clear'd.
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 clear'd.
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
which are very imperfect and confused in the best Copies, do not discover any of the Britifh 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, πάνας λήστες, is the word used by (a) Eusebius. And presently after he faith Constantine's Edict was divulged πάνας λήστες, in all Provinces of the Empire. How can this be? If there were no Summons in the Provinces of Gaul and Britain? And to prevent all Objections, as to difficulty and charges of Paffage, Eusebius adds, That he had given order to have the public Carriages ready, and all Expences to be defrayed for them. To this purpose Tractories were to be given them by the Emperour's Order, which secured their Paffage and Provision in all Places; The form of which is ex-
stant in (b) Baronius. And the Classis Britannica lying near to Britain to secure these Coats from the Franks and Saxons, who were then troublesome, (and over which Carausius so lately was appointed Admiral to clear the Seas) the Bishops here could not want con-
veniency to transport them. (2.) Constantine expres-
sed 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 E-
pifle to the Church of Alexandria, (c) he faith, He had brought together a great number of Bishops; But more fully in his Epifle 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 Council of Arles, what numbers of Bishops there were in thefe Western Provinces, how could Constantine use fuch Expressions as thefe, if they were not fummoned to appear? And (d) Eusebius faith, Those that were summoned did come according to appointment with great readiness, not only for the sake of the Council, but of the Emperour; And he after faith, That the most eminent Bishops of all Churches,
as well those of Europe as Asia and Africa did come to Nice. Did not Euseb. know of the Churches of Britain? Yes, most certainly, For he mentions their early conversion to Christianity, as I have already shew'd; And in that very Book of the Life of Constaticn, he mentions the Churches of Britain, as well as those of Gaul and Spain: And there Constaticn infists upon the consent of the Western and Northern Churches about Eafler, 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 Oecumenical 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 Constaticn's relation to Britain. For he was not onely 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 (e) Constaticn and him together, he faith, That his Father deliver'd Britain from Slavery, Tu etiam Nobiles ilic oriendo fectisti: The question now is, Whether these words relate to his Birth, or to his being proclaimed Cæsar here? Livineius is for the latter, after (f) Lipilus; But I see no reason to decline the most natural and proper fense, viz. That he brought a great honour to Britain by being born in it. (g) Eumenius, in another Panegyric, applauds the happiness of Britain, That had the firft flight of Constaticn Cæfar. This is likewise capable of both fenses; But he immediately falls into a high commendation of Britain, for its Temper, Fertility, Riches and Length of days. If this were Constaticn's own Countrey, this was done like an Oration; If not, to what purpose is all this? And then he parallels Britain with Egypt, where Mercury was born; Which shews that he spake of the Place of Nativity. Besides, the former Panegyrist made his Oration to Maximianus and Constaticn together, upon his Marriage of Theodora his Daughter; But it is not so probable that he would to him so much own Constaticn's being made Cæfar in Britain; For that was not according to the Rules of Government, in the Court
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Court of Maximianus and Diocletian; for as Galerius told Diocletian when he would have had four Augufi:—

\( \text{No, faith ke, That is against your own Maxim, which is to have onely two Augusti, and for them to name two Caefars} \)

Therefore it is not likely, That the Oratour should, to Maximianus his face, own him to be made Cafer, without the consent of those who were then Augufi: But if he speaks of his being made Cafer by Galerius, it is very doubtfull whether he were then in Britain. For

\( \text{(b) Laftantius faith, he took time to confider about it, and was very hardly brought to it: But (i) Nazarius, and (k) Praxagoras, both fay, That Conftantine went into Gaul soon after his Father's death; And therefore Gaul firt faw him Cafer, according to the constitutio-} \)

\( \text{tion of the Empire at that time. So that this one Testi-} \)

\( \text{mony of the Panegyift weighs more with me than ten} \)

\( \text{Cedrenus's or Nicephorus's who fay he was born in the} \)

\( \text{East. But I produce this onely as an argument of the} \)

\( \text{improbability, That the British Churches should be o-} \)

\( \text{mitted by Conftantine in the Summons to his Ocumene-} \)

\( \text{rical Council; or, That they being fummon'd should ne-} \)

\( \text{glect to go. (4.) They were certainly fummon'd, and} \)

\( \text{did go to the Councils of Sardica and Ariminum} \)

\( \text{after, and to that of Arles before, and why should we} \)

\( \text{believe them left out in that of Nice? This argument} \)

\( \text{alone prevailed with Mr. (l) Selden to believe them pre-} \)

\( \text{sent at the Council of Nice. And we are now forced to} \)

\( \text{make use of the beft Probabilities, since Athanafeus his} \)

\( \text{(m) Synodicon hath been fo long loft, wherein all their} \)

\( \text{Names were fet down who were then prefent; And} \)

\( \text{that Catalogue of them, if it were distinct, which (n) E} \)

\( \text{E. (n) Epiph. bar. piphanius had feen.} \)

\( \text{There being then fo much reafon to believe the} \)

\( \text{British Bifhops prefent in the Council of Nice, we have} \)

\( \text{the more caufe to look into the Conftitution of the Ec-} \)

\( \text{clesiaftical Government there fettled, that fo we may} \)

\( \text{better understand the juft Rights and Privileges of the} \)

\( \text{British Churches. After the Points of Faith and the} \)

\( \text{Time of Eafler were determined; The Bifhops there} \)

\( \text{assembled made twenty Canons for the Government and} \)

\( \text{Discipline of the Church, in which they partly re-infor-} \)

\( \text{ced the Canons of the Council of Arles, and partly ad-} \)
The Antiquities of
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ded new. Those that were re-inforced were, (1.) Against Clergy-mens taking the customary Usury then allow'd, 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 re-inforced 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 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 admitted to the Eucharist, Can. 11. (3.) For those Souldiers 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 happen'd to be in danger of Death before they had pass'd 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 ancient
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cient Custom in the Christian Church to forbear kneeling in the publick Devotion on the Lord's days, and between Easter and Whitfontide, 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.

(1.) 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 (o) Chriftianus Lupus (o) Christiani.

(2.) None who were lately Catechumens, were to be consecrated Bishops or ordained Presbyters, Can. 2. For however it had happen'd well in some extraordinary Cases, as of St. Cyprian before, and others after this Council, as St. Ambrose, Neftarius, &c. yet there was great reason to make a standing Rule against it. (3.) None of the Clergy were to have any Women 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 (q) Budæus hath well observed that "sæculare, (q) Bud. Con. maximæ, is a Companion of Celibacy; So that when two Persons were resolved to continue unmarried and agreed to live together, one of these was "sæculare to the other. And (r) Tertullian, writing against second Marriages, seems to advise this Practice, "Habe aliquam O Vuxorem

\footnotesize{(q) Bud. Con.}
\footnotesize{(r) Tertull. de Mag. c. 15. De Exhort. Con. p. 145.}
\footnotesize{Flin. c. 12.}
Uxorem spiritualam; adsum de Viduis Ecclesiae, &c. And it soon grew into a Custome in Africa, as appears by
ed. Oxon.

(1) Cypr. Ep. 4. (s) St. 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 (r) St. Jerom's words, speaking of such persons, Sub nominibus pietatis quaretiam faspeita confortia; and again, Sub nomine Religionis & umbra Continentie. But elsewhere he calls it Peitis Agapetarum, for it spred like the Plague, and was restrained with great Difficulty; And at last Laws were added to Canons, these being found inccectual. (4) If any persons were admitted loosely and without due Examination into Orders, or upon Confession of lawfull 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 Confent to the Doctrine and Practice of it, their Ordination seems to be allowed. Jusstellus, and some others, think a new Impofition of hands was required by this Canon; If any of the Novatian Clergy were admitted into the Church. And so Dionysius Exiguus and the old Latin Interpreter do render it. But Balsamon, Zonaras and others understand it so, as that the former Impofition of hands, whereby they were admitted into the Clergy were hereby allow'd. 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 Impofition of hands. For in the Case of the Meletians who were ordained in Schism too, they determined in their Synodical Epiftle that they should be received προσευχομένες χειροτονημεν, with a more sacred Impofition of hands; But it is not agreed whether this implies a Reordination or not. (u) Valefius thinks it doth, but others take it only for a simple Benediction, or the Laying on of hands upon Reconciliation to the Church. And (w) Godfrey Hermant hath at large proved Reordination in this Case to have been against the sense of

(u) Valef. Mor. in Socran. 1. 1. c. 9.

(w) Exog de S. Adam. 1. 2. c. 19. in nit.
of the Church; wherein he hath the advantage of Vas-lesius: 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 Heresie. 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 Complement to the Bishop of Jerusalem, giving him the honour of a Metropolitan without the Jurisdiction.

(1.) About Election and Consecration of Bishops. The Canon is, 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 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 referred to the Metropolitan, Can. 4. By this Canon the Government of the Church came now to be settled under Constantin, and with his Approbation. And here we find, That every Province had a number of Bishops within it self, who were to take care of the Ecclesiastical Government of it, but so as the comfort of the Metropolitan were obtained: So that the Rights of Metropolitan, 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 onely 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 onely the right of Consecration upon the Election of the People? Which is therefore here fit to be enquired into, because the ancient Practice of the British Churches may from hence be gathered, which we may justly presume was agreeable to the Nicene Canon.
And because the signification of the Greek word is ambiguous, we shall first see, what Senec the Greek Writers do put upon it. Balsamon interprets ἀρτοφυγία by ἀρτοφυγία which is chusing by Suffrage; And he in plain terms faith, 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 Zonaras, Arifienus, Matthæus Blafites, 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 Epifile to those of Alexandria and Egypt, declare their Judgment, (x) That if any Bishops deceafe, others reconciled to the Church may be admitted in their room, if they be worthy, and the People do chufe them, καὶ δὲ Λαός αἰτήσας. One would think by this, That the Council of Nice had put this matter wholly into the Peoples hands, but if we look into that Synodical Epifile, we shall find it much otherwife. For the case was this. The Council declares their tendernefs towards thofe that had been made Bishops and Priests in the Meletian Schifm, allowing their Orders upon due Submission, but not to exercife any Jurifdittion to the prejudice of thofe in Poffeffion; But if any Bishops died, thofe Meletian Bishops might succeed, but with these three Provifoes. (1.) That they be judged worthy; By whom? by the People? No certainly; For then there had been no need of the following Claufe, but this Judgment belonged to the Bishops of the Province, according to this Canon. (2.) If the People chufe them? What People? The Meletian party? No; They are excluded, because of their being in Schifm, from having any thing to doe in the Choice, although they were admitted to Communion. For they are forbidden before προεξελεγκτεὶ ἐν Ἀσκληπείῳ εἴδωλα, to put up the names of the Perfons to be chosen, or to hold up their hands; And fo all right of Suffrage was taken from them on the account of their Schifm; So that what right of choice was in the People, it was onely in the found 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 content of the Bishop of Alexandria, which imme-
immediately follows the other. And is it a fair thing to mention that Clause only in the 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? 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 better understood, it would allay some minds 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 doe signified nothing without the Consent of the Bishops and Metropolitane; 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 alter'd: 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 Peoples 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 farther 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 Judg-
Judgment rested in the provincial Synod. So in the 16 Canon in the Council of Antioch it is provided, That although all the People choose one actually a Bishop, yet if he takes Possession of his See without a perfect Provincial Synod, the Metropolitane 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 Cafe is put of the Peoples choice, 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 Bishoprick? 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 Metropolitane and a Provincial Synod; And to shew the force of this Canon, by virtue of it, Baffianus was rejected from being Bishop of Ephesus, by the general (y, Council of Chalcedon, where 630 Bishops are said to have been present. The Cafe was this, Baffianus 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 Baffianus the dignity of a Bishop; Basilius being dead, Baffianus is chosen by the People of Ephesus, and enthronized by Olympus without a Provincial Synod. But after four years, Stephens is put in his room, because he came not in canonically. The Cafe 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 Cornis, 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 appointing was not mere ordaining or consecrating, as some fay. For this Canon
Canon of Antioch speaks of a Bishop already consecrated, and so likewise the 12 Canon of Laodicea is to be understood; The same case being supposed which is mention'd 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 Athanafius, where the whole multitude is mention'd, and the Suffrages of the whole People, and afterwards the Plebis Vulgique Judicium in St. Jerom, 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 signifie nothing, where Law and Customs have determined the contrary. And that the Customs even then differ'd appears from St. Jerom 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 excommunicate by one Bishop, should be received into Communion by another; according to the Council of Arles; but then no Provision was made for the Caufe of Appeals; If any Person complain'd, that he was unjustly excommunicate, which it is natural for men to do. For this purpose, the Nicene Council decrees, That Provincial Synods be held twice a year, in Lent and Autumn, which was confirmed by many other (z) Canons. And at these all such Caufes 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 cafe of Bishops be not here mention'd, Yet the
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African 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 Metropolitane, 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 determin'd, that being the most plausible pretence for removing causes to a superior court. And it is impossible that the Nicene Fathers should have stop'd 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 determin'd in the country courts, when they know there are *superior courts of judicature appointed in Westminster*. *It hath been thought a matter of some difficulty to state the difference between the rights of a patriarch and a metropolitane. But there are two things chiefly, wherein the distinction lies, viz. a greater extent of jurisdiction founded on the consecration of metropolitane bishops in several provinces; and a power of 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 judicature beyond this*. In matters of faith, or upon extraordinary occasions, by the summons of an emperour, 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 *British churches* had a full power within themselves to end all causes that did...
did arise within their own Provinces. And it was mere usurpation in any Foreign Bishop to interpose in any differences in the Britifh Churches, because the Council of Nice had circumscribed the Liberty of Appeals to Provincial Synods. And this was it which made the African Fathers to stout in defence of their just Rights, against the manifest incroachments of the Bishop of Rome; and the Britifh 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 Patriarchal Churches in the famous sixth Canon. Which hath been the occasion of so many warm Debates. In the former Canon, the Nicene Fathers fixed the general Right of Appeals; and in this Canon they settle the particular Bounds of Patriarchal Jurisdiction, according to ancient Custome: So that none ought to violate the Privileges which Churches had hitherto enjoyed. The Words are, “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 Custome; 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 design’d. (1.) To confirm the ancient Privileges of some of the greater Sees; as Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. (2.) To secure the Privileges of other Churches against their encroachments upon them. (3.) To provide for the quiet establishment of Metropolitane Churches, which last is so plain that it will need no farther discourse; But the other two are of great conquence to our design. (1.) To confirm the ancient Privileges of some of the greater Sees; which had gotten the extent of more than a bare Metropolitane Power to themselves, as is plain in the case of Alexandria, which seems to have been the occasion of this Canon. Not merely from the Schism of Meletius (as is commonly thought) which the Council took care of another way, in the (a) Synodical Epiffle to the Churches of Egypt. But because

(a) Theodor.
to large a Jurisdiction as had been exercised by the Bishops of Alexandria, and Rome, and Antioch, seem'd 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 his deposition by Peter of Alexandria; Which Meletius, not regarding, fell into a Schism, and, to maintain this Schism, he consecrated near Thirty Bishops, as appear'd by the list he gave in to Alexander, after the Council of Nice extant in (b) Athanasius. Whereby it is evident, That Meletius his Schism could not be the Occasion of this Canon; For that Schism did not at all relate to the several Provinces of Egypt here mention'd, 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 Canon about Provincial Synods, there was a very just occasion, to add this concerning 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 cut off all respect to them; except only those of their own Province. Now in Egypt here are three distinct Provinces mention'd as subject to the Bishop of Alexandria, viz. Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis; And so the Nicene Fathers reckon them in their Epistle to the Churches of Egypt, and in thefe (c) Athanasius 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 Libya's; 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 Jusstellus faith, comprehend the whole Egyptian Diocefe: But (d) Ammianus Marcellinus reckons them otherwise, viz. Egypt, Thebais and Libya, to which Posterity, he faith, added Augustamnica and Pentapolis: But Pentapolis was not
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 *Cyrenia*. However (*e*) Epiphanius takes in *Libya*, *Pentapolis*, *Thebais*, *Ammoniaca*, and *Mareotis*: And faith plainly, *That all the Provinces of Egypt were under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Alexandria. And this, he faith, was the Cuslome before the Council of Nice. For he speaks of the quarrel between Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, and Meletius, then Bishop of Thebais; of whom he faith, *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 Cuslome 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 Cuslome, i.e. an Ecclesiastical Authority over the Bishops in several Provinces, answering to the Power which the Prefeitus 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 enquire after, and not the use of words: And if the Bishop of Alexandria had at that time the Power of Confeuration 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 Adminiftration 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 faid, *That there were 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 Epiphanius in the case of Meletius, but by the Jurisdiction exercised by Dionysius over Pentapolis, long before the Council of Nice. And (f) Athanasi faith, the Care of those Churches then belonged to the Bishop of Alexandria. If it be said, That there were then no Metropolitanans under the Bishop of Alexandria, but he was the sole Metropolitian, 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 Metropolitanans; 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. For all the Provinces of Egypt were under his immediate care, which was Patriarchal as to Extent, but Metropolitan in the Administration. And so was the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome at that time, which is the true reason of bringing the Custome of Rome to justify that of Alexandria. For as it is well observed by (g) Chriftianus Lupus, The Bishop of Rome had then no Metropolitanans 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 Provifc to the former, which put the left reftort 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 les than he came thither, having great part of his Authority taken from him by Provincial Synods, this would have weakened his Caufe so much in Egypt, that for his fake the Nicene Fathers were
Chap. III. *the British Churches.*

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 (b) Council of Chalcedon to falsifie 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 faying 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 Rufinus, who very well understood the Extent of the Bishop of Rome's Jurisdiction was only to the Suburbicary Churches; Which is the greater Diocese mention'd by the Council of Arles, it so very much exceeding the Diocese of any Western Bishop besides; And it is observable, that (1) Athanafius, (b) Consil. Chalced. Art. 15. 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
low'd by the Council of Nice. And here we fix our Right as to the 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 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 govern'd by their own Provincial Synods. It was upon this ground, the Cyprian 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 Metropolitane, 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 a 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 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 Baronius and others, but (k) Carolus à Sancto Paulo saith it proceeded upon a false Suggestion, although the Bishops of Cyprus do most solemnly avow the truth of their ancient Privilege.

(l) Christianus Lupus imputes the Decree to the Partiality of the Council against the Bishop of Antioch; although he confesses, they insisted upon the Nicene Canons. Which even (m) 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, all Churches are bound to stand up for their own Rights.


(m) Leo Epist. 78, 79, 80, ed. Avn.
Rights against the Usurpations of foreign Bishops.

But (n) Job. 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, the difficulty of Passage by Sea from Cyprus to Antioch, especially in Winter; when it was very possible a Metropolitane 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 Euzouz, Meletius and Paulinus. But these are only flight and frivolous Evasions. For the Cyprian Bishops never alleged the first Inconveniencie, nor did the Bishop of Antioch the second: No, not when Alexander was unanimously chosen, as Morinus confeseth, and made his Complaint of the Cyprian Privilege to Innocentius I. as may be seen by his 18 Epifle; To whom the Pope gave an ignorant Answer, as appears by Morinus himself: For he pretendeth that the Cyprian Bishops had broken the Nicene Canons, in confequently their own Metropolitane, because, faith he, The Council of Nice had fet the Church of Antioch, not over any Province, but over the Diocefe; By which he muft mean the Eastern Diocefe, within which Cyprus was comprehended: But there is not one word of the Diocefe in the Nicene Canons, and these things are refer'd to ancient Customs, as Morinus acknowledgeth; And he faith, the Diocefe of the Orient, as distinguisht from Asia 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 confesst, 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 faith had been true, it is not to be thought that the Council of Ephesus would have determin'd in favour of the Cyprian Bishops. But Morinus urges against them. (i.) That they named only three Bishops, Troilus, Sabinus and Epiphanius. But do they not aver that it had been always to
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 determin’d the case. (3.) They only doe it conditionally, if it were so: But they enjoy’d their Privilege by virtue of it; which shews it could not be disproved. (4.) The Cyprian Privilege was granted in Zeno’s time, upon finding the Body of St. Barnabas. But it is evident they enjoy’d it before; by the Decree of the Council of 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 Metropolitane Churches, against any Incroachments upon their Liberties: And so the Council thought it, when it appoints all Metropolitanes to take Copies of it, and voids all Acts that should be made against it.

It is necessary now to enquire, whether the Bishop of Rome had a Patriarchal power over the Britifh Churches, before the Council of Nice: And the onely way to doe that, is to examine the severall Patriarchal rights which were allow’d 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 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 Saint Peter himself had preached the Gospel here; and settled the Bishops of these Churches. For, by the fame reason, there could have been no Patriarchates at Antioch or Alexandria, (where he is supposed to have placed Saint Mark:) but if notwithstanding, the Bishops of those Churches had a true Patriarchal power; Then it might the Metropolitane of the Britifh Churches have their proper Rights. Although Saint Peter himself had founded these Churches. (a) Morinus faith, The Patriarchal power confisted in these four things. (1.) In the Consecration of Metropolitane, and the Confirmation of other Bishops. (2.) In calling

(o) Morin. Expr. ch. 3. in. 4. 29.
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 all 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, 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 (p) 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 (q) 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 (r) Bishop of Justinianopolis removed from Cyprus thither, he not only enjoy'd the Cyprian privilege there, but was allow'd for a Patriarch by the Council in Trullo, and consequently, the Consecration of the Bishops in the Province of Hellefont belong'd to him.

And when the Patriarchal power was settled at Constantinople, that was the chief thing insifted upon, at least as to Metropolitan:es. The first attempt the Bishop of Constantinople made towards any true Patriarchal power (for all that the (s) Council of Constantinople gave him was a mere honorary Title) was the consecrating Bishops in the Dioceses of Asia, and Pontica, and Thracia: And this was charged on St. Chrysostome as an Innovation in the Synod (t) ad Quercum, i.e. in the Suburbs of Chalcedon. And his (u) acts 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 (v) Palladius makes, viz. That his going into Asia, was upon the great importance of the Bishops and Clergy there: For what (x) Morinus faith, That he did this by the Pope's authority, is ridiculous; It being not once thought of by St. Chrysostome or his Friends. And for a Bishop of Constantinople
flantinople to 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 Council of Chalcedon, and the warm Debates which follow'd it, between the two Sees. And what could have served Leo's turn better against Anatolius, than to have produced St. Chrysostome's Delegation from one of his Predecessours? But in the Council of Chalcedon, where the Right of the Patriarch of Constantinople was at large debated, this Act of St. Chrysostome was alleged as a remarkable Precedent to prove a Patriarchal power: And there (y) a Canon was pass'd, 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 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, 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 summon'd them to his Councils; or heard their Causes; or received Appeals from hence; or so much as sent anyone 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 comprehend the Churches within the Suburbicary Provinces; And within these he exercised the same Authority that
the Eastern Patriarchs did, i.e. He consecrated Bishops, called Synods and received Appeals, which are the main Patriarchal rights. But if we go beyond these Provinces, (z) 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 (a) 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 (b) 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 endeavour'd to shew the contrary. (c) Christianus Lupus hath written a Dissertation on purpose; But the greatest thing he faith to prove it is, That to affirm, that the Bishop of Rome had no such authority, is an Eusebian and Schismatical Error, and came first from the Council of Philippopolis; yet he grants, That in the Western Provinces, the Metropolitans did consecrate their Suffragans, and their Metropolitans. But all this, he faith, 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 (d) Leo disjoin'd having any thing to do in the Consecration of the Gallican Bishops, in his Epistle to the Bishops of Vienna, or that (e) Hincmarus faith, The Transalpine Bishops 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 thinks to bring off all at laft, by saying,
faying, (f) 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, (g) Emanuel a Schelfhaet hath to say about this matter: But this hath been the common Artifice of Rome; Where any Bishops insifted on their own Rights and ancient Customs, and Canons of Councils, to pretend that all came from privileges allow'd 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 Ufurpation. But this Jaff (h) Author (the present Keeper of the Vatican Library, which makes to great a noise in the World for Church Records) having endeavour'd, in a Let Discourse, to aûert the Pope's Patriarchal power over the Western Churches, I shall here examine the strengt of all that he produceth to that purpose. He agrees with us in determining the Patriarchal Rights, which he faith lie in these three things: (1.) In the right of Consecration of Bishops and Metropolitans. (2.) In the right of summoning them to Councils. (3.) 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.) 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 allow'd to consecrate the Bishops belonging to them; upon the Summons of the Provincial Synod; And for this he produces the 4th 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, faith he, The Patriarchal Rights are prefered 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 farther, That
That the Bishop of Rome had all the Patriarchal Rights, within the Provinces, which were then under his jurisdiction, and were therefore called the Suburbicary Churches. But these were so far from taking in all the Western Churches, that they did not comprehend the Provinces of Italy properly so called: But he offers to prove out of Gratian, and from the Testimony of Pelagius, Bishop of Rome, 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 hindrance afterwards for obtaining the Pope's consent for the Consecration of the Bishop of Milan, as appears by the instance of Gregory 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 (i) Theodoret relates it, who refer'd 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 Governor of the Province, and so was Inthronized, by the Bishops there present. Not one word here of the consent of the Bishop of Rome required, or so much as mention'd; And yet Pope Damaus 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 Damaus at Rome; And the Italick 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 the Bishops were to receive Consecration from the Bishop of Rome, having no Metropolitane of their own; But this did not reach so far as Milan. This Roman Diocese was truly Patriarchal, having several Provinces under it, and was therein peculiar and made a Precedent for the Bishop of Alexandria, all the other Western Churches being then govern'd by their several Bishops and Metropolitanes. (k) Jac. Lefchaffier 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 Metropolitane; And with this, as he observes, the old Notitia of the Vatican, produced by (l) Baronius, 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 the same with the Provinciale Romanum, published by (m) Miræus, and compared by him with four MSS., wherein are set down all the Bishops of the Roman Province, as it is there called. (n) Ferd. Ugellus reckons up seventy Bishops of those who were immediately under the Bishop of Rome's Jurisdiction, and had no Metropolitane over them; These were within the Provinces of Latium, Valeria, Tuscia, Picenum and Umbria; which neither answering exactly to the Jurisdiction of the Roman Prefeit, 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 Custome, to which the Council of Nice doth expressly attribute it. In the Diurnus Romanus, lately published by (o) Garneriæus out of an ancient Manuscript, there is one Title, De Ordinatione Episcopi Suburbicarii à Romano Pontifice, where the whole Proceeds, 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, that 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 the
the Bishop of Alexandria did: But we deny that ever the Bishop of Rome did exercise this part of his Patriarchal power beyond the foremention'd Provinces.

But to prove the larger Extent of the Pope's Power as to Consecrations the Epistle of Siricius to Anyius Bishop of Thessalonica (p) 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 Holstenius out of the Barberine Library, or rather out of his Transcripts by Card. Barberine (but (q) Hieron. Alexander cites a Passage out of the same Collection as in the Vatican Library) but from whence ever it came, the Objection seems to be the more considerable, because, as (r) Holstenius in his Notes observes, (s) 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 no higher than from Siricius, who gave it to Anyius Bishop of Thessalonica, certa tum primum ratione commissi, ut per illam Provinciam positis, quas ad disciplinam teneri voluit, Ecclesias subuenrent. Siricius immediately succeeded Damasus, who died according to (t) Holstenius, 11 Dec. 384. Three years after the Council of Constantinople had advanced that See to the Patriarchal dignity; which gave great occasion of Jealousie and Suspicion to the Bishops of Rome, that being the Imperial City as well as Rome; And (u) Socrates observes, (a) Socr. I. 56. 8; 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 inlarge their Jurisdiction, since the Bishop of New Rome had gained so large an accession by that Council; And to prevent his farther Incroachments Westwards, his Diocese of Thrace bordering upon Macedonia, the subtilest Device they could think of, to secure that Province and to inlarge their own Authority, was, to per-
fuade 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 back'd by so great an Interest, he would be better able to contest with so powerfull 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 invaded by him: By which means they endeavour'd 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 case, which some it may be expected by it, that it only involved them in continual Troubles, as appears by that very Collection of Holffenius. For the Bishops of Constantinople were not negligent in promoting their own Authority in the Provinces of Illyricum, nor in witholding the Innovations of the Bishop of Rome. To which purpose they obtained an Imperial Edict to this day extant in both (w) Codes, which strictly forbids any Innovation in the Provinces of Illyricum, and declares, That if any doubtfull Case happen'd, 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. The occasion whereof was this, Perigenes being rejected at Patra, the Bishop of Rome 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, Pauniamus, 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 by (x) 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 Intrac- hments, but withall, so as to referve the last resort to the
the Bishop of Constantinople. At this Boniface shews himself extremely nettled; as appears by his next Epistle to Rufus, and encourages him, to fland it out to the utmost; And gives him authority to excommunicate these 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 (y) Petrus de Marca and Holstenius, That (z) De Concord. II. 4. c. 2. n. 11, 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 revoked by another of Thedosius 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 fait Complaint made to Boniface II. of the Prevalency of the Patriarch of Constantinople in those parts made by Stephen, Bishop of Larissa, the Metropolis of Thessaly, and his Brethren Theodosius, Epipolius and Timotheus: And our (z) Authour himself confesses, that it appears by the Notitiae, 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 Faed we have these things very observable. (1) That there was no Precedent could be produced as to the Pope's interfering in their Consecrations before the time of Siricius. It is true, Damasus his Epistle to Acholius is mention'd sometimes by the following Popes; But any one that reads both his Epistles in the (a) Roman Collection will find, that neither of them do relate to this matter: And the former is not onely directed to Acholius, but to several other Bishops; And the Design of it is, To advise them to take care, that a worthy Person be put into the See of Constantinople in the approaching Council; And to the fame purpose is the following Epistle to Acholius. But what is this to the Pope's power about Consecrations

---


(b) Colleq. Rom. p. 42.
secrections in the Provinces of Illyricum? And how was Acholius more concerned than Eutudius, 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 Innovation by the Bishops of those Provinces. Which appears by the 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 Law of Theodosius was principally designed to restore the Canonical Discipline and the Authority of provincial Synods. For the words are, Omni innovatione cefante, vetustatum & Canones prisci Ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenerunt, per omnes Illyrici Provincias servari precipimus. Which cannot be well understood of any other Canons than such as relate to the Ecclesiastical Government of Provinces, and not of any peculiar Cufloms there, as Gothofred mistakes the meaning of them: And in case any difference did arise, it was to be left Convienti sacerdotali sanctoque judicio, i.e. To the provincial Synod, and not to any Legate of the Bishop of Rome; Whose incroachment 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, Peron and Gothofred. (4.) That although by the means of Honorius, upon the importance of the Bishop of Rome this Refcript was recalled by (b) Theodosius: Yet the former only was enter'd into the Codes both of Theodosius and Justinian; which hath all the formality of a Law, being directed to the P. P. of Illyricum, and hath the date by Consuls annexed; but the Revocation is only a Refcript from Theodosius to Honorius, and refers to an Editment sent to the P. P. of Illyricum; which not appearing, the other being enter'd 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 Trionian.
bonian and the Collectours of the Laws against the Roman See, as (c) 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 (d) 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 Vienna, which he produces. Non nobis Ordinationes veslrrum Praecipiarum defendimus: (for fo 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 doe it themselves according to the Canons, which was Leo's Pretence in that (e) Epistle) but then he distinguishes between the Right it self, and the Exercise of it, which may be parted with by particular privileges granted, but the Right it self may be still referred; And the same he after faith in general of the (f) Western Provinces, wherein he can trace no Footsteps of the 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 metropolitane 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 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, faith he, That is plain, because the Bishop of Rome was Patriarch of the West. This way of proving may be good against De Marca, who had granted the Pope to be the Western Patriarch; but it is ridiculous to thole that deny it.

But he attempts something farther, viz. (g) 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 (h) 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 Sentiments of it, but he flighted 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, faith he, How ill would it look, after Novatian himself had been so lately and universally rejected, to suffer our selves to be deceived by his Flatterers? St. Cyprian and his Collegues were in no danger, for they had already detected and condemned him, therefore this must be understood of Stephen, which is the Reason he presseth him so hard, and with some Authority to dispatch his Letters to the People of Arles to chuse another Bishop in the place of Martianus, Diriguntur in Provinciam & ad Plebem Arelatæ consilientem à 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 Pastours, 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 Predecessours, Cornelius.
nelius and Lucius, who were glorious Martyrs: and he especially who succeeded them. And fo, 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 (i) Roman Collect-
on; As in the Petition of Stephanus, Bishop of Larissa, the Metropolis of Thessaly, Domino meo sancto ac beatissimo revera venerando Patri Patrum, & Archiepiscopo atque Patriarchae Bonifacio data supplicatio & Stephano exiguo: And in the very same Style ELPIDIUS, STEPHA-
nus 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 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 inferr'd 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 Bisho of Rome, it will likewise follow, that the directing that execution was in the Bishop of Carthage.

But we are told, (k) that, even in Africa, no Consecra-
tions were allow'd, without the consent of the Bishop of Rome: This is great News indeed, of which the African Code gives us no information: But (l) HOLFENIUS 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, Metropolitan Episcopi, nullus audet ordinare Episcopum. But what is
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this to the Roman Patriarchate? And our Author doth not seem to rely upon it; But he alludes a Passage in Optatus, that Eunomius and Olympius, two Bishops, were sent to Carthage to confercate a Bishop in the place both of Cecilian and Donatus: And Albaspinæus faith, they were sent by the Pope's Authority. But this Observation of his he hath not from (m) Optatus, by whom it rather appears, that they were sent by the Emperor, who stopt 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 (n) Attempt to prove the Pope's patriarchal Power, as to Conferences 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 faith, 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-politie then established? 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 Popes pretended to confirm and inlarge 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.
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tedly belong to them by ancient Right: But that this
was a mere Device to bring the Metropolitans into de-
pendence on the Court of Rome, appears by the most
ancient Form of sending the Pall in the (o) Dionysius
Romanus, where it is finely called, the shewing their
unanimity with St. Peter. But what the Nature and De-
sign, and Antiquity of the Pall was, is so fully set forth
by (p) Petrus de Marca, and (q) Garnierinus, that I shall
say no more of it: Oney that from hence the ancient
Rights of the Metropolitane Churches do more fully ap-
ppear, because it was so long before this Badge of Sub-
jection was received in thefe Western Churches; For
the Synod which Boniface mentions, wherein the Met-
ropolitans contended to receive Palls from Rome, was not till
the middle of the 8th Century: And great Arts and En-
deavours 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 par-
ticularly true of the British Churches which preferred
their Metropolitane Rights, as long as their Churches
were in any tolerable condition; And that without
suffering any diminution of them from the Pope's pa-
triarchal Power: As will farther appear in this Dis-
course:

(2.) The next Patriarchal Right to be examined, is
that of calling Bishops within their Jurisdiction to Councils.
It is truly observed by (r) de Marca, That those who re-
ceived Confeeration from another, were bound by the an-
cient Discipline of the Church attend to his Councils; And
in the Sense of the old Canon Law, (s) those two
Expressions, To belong to the Confeeration, or to the Coun-
cil, were all one. And fo every Metropolitane had a
Right to summon the Bishops of his Province, and the
Primates or Patriarchs, as many as received Confera-
tions from them. Thus the Bishop of Rome's patriarchal
Council contifled of thofe within his own Diocfe or the
Suburban Churches. Where there being no Met-
ropolitans, the Roman Council did much exceed others
in the number of Bishops belonging to it: thence Gal-
la Placidia relates, how she found the Bishop of Rome
compaffed about with a great number of Bishops which he
had
had gather'd out of innumerable Cities of Italy, by reason of the Dignity of his Place. It seems then no Bishops of other Western Churches were summon'd to the Roman Councils. But the Bishops of Sicily were then under the Italian Government, and reckon'd with the Italian Bishops. It may be question'd, whether in Ruffinus his time they were comprehended within the Suburbanary Churches. But in Leo's time the Bishops of Rome had infringed their Jurisdiction so far, as to summon the Bishops of Sicily to their Councils. This is evident from 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 pursuance of the Nicene Canons; From whence it seems probable, That the Bishop of Rome did 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 (t) Author faith, 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 Metropolitane? That is very absurd, since Sicily was a Province of itself, and as such, ought to have had a Metropolitane 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 swallow'd up all Metropolitane Rights. I know (w) Petrus de Marca thinks there were Metropolitanes within the Suburbanary Churches; But I see no Authority he brings for it besides the Nicene Canon 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 (x) Quen nel hath well observed, find so different a strain in them, that from hence he may justly infer, that there were no Metropolitanes in the former, but there were in the latter. When he (x) writes to the Bishop of Aquileia, he takes notice of his provincial Synod, and directs the Epistles of general concernment to the Metropolitane, as he doth not only to him, but to (y) the Bishop of Ravenna
Ravenna too. And when (z) 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 summon'd 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 summon'd to meet at a Council in Rome; As when (a) Aurelian gave the Bishops of Italy leave to meet at Rome in the Cafe of Paulus Samosatenus. And when they met with Julius, in the Cafe of Athanasius, and such like Infances 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 Saint Ambrose's time, published by (b) Sirmondus, will find that the Bishops of the Italick Diocese did not think them selves obliged to refer to Rome for a Patriarchal Council. And, which is more observable, the latter of them extremely differs from Damasus about the fame matter; which was the Consecration of Maximus to be Bishop of Constantinople. For (c) 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 fame he re-inforces in another Epistle to Acholius alone. But (d) St. Ambrose, and the Bishops of Italy with him, in a Conciliar Address to Theodotus, justify the Consecration of Maximus, and dislike that of Gregory and Neftarius. Now, in this Cafe I desire to know, whether this Council own'd the Bishop of Rome's Patriarchal Power? For (e) Em. à Schelfvraet, following Chriftianus Lupus, faith, That in the Pope's patriarchal Power is implied, that the Bishops are only to consult and advife, but the determination doth wholly belong to the Pope.
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Pope as 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 Italick 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 Emperour without him, but in flat opposition to him? And when afterwards the Western Bishops met in Council at Capua, in order to the compofing the Differences in the Church of Antioch, although it were within the Roman Patriarchate, yet it being a Council of Bishops assembled out of the Italick Diocese as well as the Roman, the Bishop of Rome did not preside therein, but St. Ambrose; as appears by (f) St. Ambrose his Epistle to Theophilus, about the proceedings of this Council; For he faith, 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 (g) 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 pased under the name of St. Ambrose is now found by (b) Holstenius to be written by Siricius, and is so published in the Roman Collection, and since in the (i) Collection of Councils at Paris. This Epistle was written by Siricius to Anyius and other Bishops of Illyricum, concerning the Cafe of Bonosus, which had been referr'd 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 complement or in earnest, desired to know the Pope's opinion about it. So his Epistle begins, Accepi literas vefras de Bonofo Episcopo, quibus, vel pro veritate, vel pro modestia, nostram sententiam seipiari voluifis. And are these the Expressions of one with Patriarchal Power, giving anwser to a Case of difficulty which canonically lies before him? But he afterwards declares, he had nothing to doe in it, since the Council of Capua had referr'd it to them, and
and therefore they were bound to give Judgment in it. Sed cum huicmodi fuerit Concilii Capaeensis judicium—advertimus quod nobis judicandi forma competere non posset. 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 born 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' his Papers taken out of the Vatican, and other Roman MSS. by the express Order of Alexander VII. And although a late (k) Advocate for the Pope's Power in France against De Marco, hath offer'd several Reasons to prove this Epistle counterfeit, yet they are all answer'd by a (l) Doctor of the Sorbon. 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 (m) Inflances brought; As of some GALlican Bishops present at the Council under Damasus; Wilfrid, an 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 which there is no evidence
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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 (n) Diurnus 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 faith, was three times in the year. But he adds, this extended no farther than to the Bishops within the Suburbanary 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 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 Italick 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. (o) Non Prae-rogativam, say they, vindicamus examinis, sed Confortium tamen debut esse communis arbitrii. They did not challenge a Power of calling them to account, but they thought

(o) App. ad Cod. Theod. p. 166.
thought there ought to be a mutual Correspondence for the general good, and therefore they received Maximus his 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 intimated upon is, (p) The Bishop of 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. 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 Jealousie of the Emperour allow'd the Bishop of Rome the Liberty of granting 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 Sorbon confesseth, that in the space of 347 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 withall, he faith, 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 justifie it; 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 to greater Causes must fall very much
much short of the 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 Dioce- ses, i.e. according to De Marca, all the Western Churches; But in answer to this, I have already shew'd 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 paffed in Council; But only send the Canons to him to publish them. But our Author and Christianus Lapus fay, 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 Dioceces of the West, according to De Marca's exposition; how came they to fit and make Canons, without the least mention of his Authority? So that either they must deny him to be Patriarch, or they must fay he was affronted in the highest manner by the Western Bishops there assembled. But as to the expression of Majores Dioceces, it is very questionable, whether in the time of the Council of Arles, the distribution of the Empire by Conftantine into Dioceces were then made, and it seems probable: not to have been done in the time of the Council of Nice, Dioceces 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 fentence. But allowing the expression genuine, it implies no more than that the Bishop of Rome had then more Extenfive Dioceces than other Western Bishops; Which is not denied, since even then he had several Provinces under his
his immediate Government, which no other Western Bishop had.

(1) 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 subtility to infer Damasus his Patriarchal Power over the West, (s) 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 (t) 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 Submission of the Western Churches to his Power, since no Church did more vehemently withstand the Bishop of Rome's Incroachments than the Churches of Africa did in St. Augustine's time; As is notorious in the business of Appeals, which transact is a demonstration against his Patriarchal Power over the African Churches. And the Bishop of Rome never insifted on a Patriarchal Right, but on the Nicene Canons wherein they were shamefully baffled.

It cannot be denied that (u) 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 upon it. For,
Is it reasonable to think, that the double Unction, the Saturday Fast, the Eulogium 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? 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. 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? The Patriarchal Government of the Church was not founded upon this, but upon the ancient Custome 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 farther evidence of their exemption from the Roman Patriarchate; since Britain cannot be comprehended within those Islands which lie between Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa and Sicily, which can only be understood of those Islands which are situated 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 Leo urges so vehemently in such a parallel Case? Neither can it be said, that afterwards, Submission and Consent makes a just Patriarchal Power; for neither doth it hold as to the British Churches, 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 Prescription
tion pleaded, and a Consent of the Bishops of the Dioceses concerned in the Council of Chalcedon. But Leo faith, the Nicene Canons are beyond both these, being dictated by the Spirit of God, and pacified by the common consent of the Christian Church; And that it was a Sin in him to suffer any to break them. Either this is true or false. If false, how can the Pope be excused who alledged 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 50 years, he faith, 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 Expres-
sions 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
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Nulla sibimet de multiplicatione congregationis synodalitatem blandientur, neque recensionis illis decem atque octo Episcopis quantumlibet copiosis numero- rius Sacerdotum vel comparare se audeat vel praeter: cum tanto divinitus privilegio Nicæa sit Synodus consecrata, ut five per pauciores five per plures Ecclesiastica Judicia celebrentur omnibus autoreitate sit vacuum quicquid ab illorum fuerit constitutione diversum. Ad Anatol. Ep. 80. n. 1.

with that excellent Sentence of Pope Leo, PRIVILEGIA ECCLESIAE SANCTORVM PATRVM CANONIBUS INSTITUTA, ET VENERABILIS NICÆAE 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 destroy’d 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 Conflans and Constantius; it is commonly said, that (w) Athanasius expressly affirms the British Bishops to have been there present. But some think this mistake arose from looking no farther 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 100 Bishops in Egypt; next, by above 50 Bishops at Rome; thirdly, in the great Council at Sardica, e. g. in which, as some say, above 300 Bishops out of the several Provinces there mention’d consented to his Inno-

Innocency. But here lies an insuperable difficulty, for
* Athanasius himself elsewhere affirms, that there were
but 170 Bishops in all there present: and therefore it is
impossible he should make 300 there present. Which
some have endeavour'd 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 pre-
sent 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 fee no reason to exclude the Britifh Bishops.

It is true, that in the (x) Synodical Epistle of that
Council, only Italy, Spain and Gaul are mention'd;
And fo likewise in the (y) Subscriptions. But it is well
observed by (z) Bucherius, that Athanasius reckons up
the Britifh Bishops among those of Gaul. And (a) Hi-
lary, writing to the Gallican Bishops of Germany prima
and Germania secunda, Belgica prima, Belgica secunda,
Lugdunensis prima, Lugdunensis secunda, Provincia A-
quitanica 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 Bi-
shops of Britain were generally joyn'd with those of
Gaul, and are often comprehended under them where
they are not expressly mention'd. And, to confirm this,
(b) Sulpicius Severus, speaking of the Summons to the
Council of Ariminum, mentions only of these We-
"tern parts Italy, Spain and Gaul; But afterwards faith,
That the Bishops of Britain were there present. So that
Britain was then comprehended under Gaul, and was
so understood at that time; as Sicily was under Italy,
as (c) Sirmondus shews. And Sextus Rufus doth put
down the description of Britain under that of Gaul, as
(d) 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.
But it hath been urged with great appearance of Reafon, that 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 Bifhop of Rome being there established, they were then brought under his Jurifdiction, 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; Athanafius, Bifhop of Alexandria, being deposed for some pretended mifdemeanours by two Synods of Eastern Bishops, and finding no redrefs there, by the prevalency of the Arian Faction, makes Application to the Western Bishops, and to Julius Bifhop of Rome, as the chief of them, and earnestly desires that his Caufe 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 Eufebian party at Tyre and Antioch. The Bifhop of Rome communicating this with the Western Bishops, as at large appears by Julius his Epiftle in Athanafius, he, in their name as well as his own, fends to the Eastern Bishops, That this Caufe might be heard before indifferent Judges: And to that end, that they would come into thefe Parts, and bring their Evidences with them. This they decline; Upon which, and a fuller Examination of the matter, they receive Athanafius, Marcellus and others into Communion with them. This gives a mighty diffaft to the Eastern Bishops; at laft the two Brothers, Conftantius and Conftans, agree, there fhou’d be a general Council called at Sardica, to hear and determine this matter. The Bishops meet; But the Western Bishops would have the reftored Bishops admitted to Communion, and fit in Council; This the Eastern Bishops utterly refufe; and upon that withdrew to Philippopolis; And declare againft their Proceedings at Sardica, as repugnant to the Nicene Canons: The Western Bishops continued fitting, and made 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 authentick Writings on both Sides. For the one fide infuits upon the Justice of re-hearing a Caufe, wherein there was
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; That it was the bringing a new Law into the Church; For the Eastern Bishops to be judged by the Western; The ancient Custome and Rule of the Church being; That they should stand or fall by their own Bishops. The Western Bishops on the other side pleaded, 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 forfake the Communion of Athanasius and the rest, they look'd on the Cause as pre-judged, and so went away. However the other proceeded to the clearing the Bishops accused, which they did by a Synodical Epistle, and then made several Canons, as against Translations from mean Bishopricks 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 unreasonable Applications to the Court, Can. 7, 8, 9, 20. Against being made Bishops per Salmum, Can. 10. Against their Non-residence, 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 Non-residence, Can. 16. About the Reception of banished Bishops, Can. 17. About Eutychianus and Mufaeus, and the persons ordained by them, Can. 18, 19.

But the main Canons of this Council are the third, fourth and fifth, which concern the re-hearing of the Causes of Bishops; And the interest the Bishop of Rome was to
to have therein. For the right understanding where-of 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 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 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. That being deposed in the Council of Tyre, he afterwards returned to the Bishops 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, 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 (e) Palladius, it would never have passed the Council; For it was not a Council of mere Arians, as is commonly thought, but of many (f) 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 97 (g) Bishops were summoned by the Emperor to meet at the solemn Dedication of the great Church at Antioch called Dominicum Aureum; (h) as they had done before on the like occasion at Jerusalem; And (i) Eusebius faith, Such Assemblies of Bishops were frequent at such times. These, being 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, if a Bishop being deposed by a Synod, doth officiate, he is never to be restored; By the twelfth, 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
any Synod called to that end; and did execute his Office as Bishop of Alexandria; and for this reason, the Council of Antioch confirmed his Deposition.

A (k) late Author goes about to prove, That the Canon against Athanasius did not pass the Council of Antioch, but that it passed an Assembly of 40 Eusebians, when the rest were gone: But this is incredible (as (l) Baronius his Conceit is ridiculous, who takes the 36 Mansions that Antioch was distant from Alexandria for 36 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 bullifhs. That which Palladius faith, 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 fo was, because the ancient Canon called Apostolical 28. had in it the word δικαια, justly, which they left out, the better to effect their Design; That foi the merits of the Cause might not be enquired 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 Emperour's Command, as (m) Eusebius faith, 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 (n) Synodical Epiftle; And (o) Liberius made a reasonable Proposition to Constantius; That a Council might be summoned at Alexandria; That this Cause, which had given s 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 Sardian Council did very well to reduce the Nicene Canon about proceeding within the Province in the first Instance.

(2.) If the Party be grieved at the Sentence passed against him, then that there be a re-bearing of it granted, Can. 2. This the Council of Antioch allow'd,
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 farther hearing by another Assembly of Bishops. So that the final resort was hereby settled in a greater Council, from which no Appeal should lie. This Canon is supposed to be particularly design'd against Athanasius; But I do not find that he made Application to the Emperor to be restored with a Non-objante 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 fifteenth of the same Council, which takes away all Liberty of Appeal from the unanimous Sentence of a provincial Synod. (p) 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 allow'd 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 Can. 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 Emperours, to call together Assemblies of Bishops for what Causes they thought expedient. But (q) Socrates expressly faith, That no Appeal was allow'd by the Canons of the Church; For speaking of Cyril of Jerusalem's being deposed, he faith, he appealed to a greater Court of Judicature, which Appeal Constanatus allow'd;
allow'd; 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.* 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 appear'd at the Council of Selucia to have his Cause heard. (r) 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. 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 Constantine to be heard, by a greater Synod. (s) Sozomen faith, that Constantine recommended the Cause of Cyril to the Council of Ariminum; But that cannot be, since (t) he expressly forbade the Western Bishops in that Council to meddle with the Causes of the Eastern Bishops; And declares, whatever they did in that matter should have no effect. Therefore the Council to which Constantine referred this Cause, must be that of Selucia, which was assembled at the same time. Which seeming to take off from the Right of Provincial Synods established in the Council of Nice, Socrates condemns as uncanonical, and faith, 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 Inovation 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, for the honour of St. Peter, And, if he thought fit, he was to appoint the Neighbour Bishops of the Province to hear it,
it; and such Affairs as the Emperor was wont to send, To which was added, Can. 4. That no Bishop should enter into the vacant Bishoprick 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, 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 doe 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 impertinent. 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 (u) 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; 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 doe 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 allow'd before this Council of Sardica. And the learned Publisher of (w) 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. 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 farther, as to be challenged for an absolute and supreme Power founded upon a Divine Right, and not upon the Act of the

(v) Dr. Concord. l. 7. c. 3. n. 6.

(w) Tom. 2. dif- fert. 5. c. 14. &c.
the Council. For herein the difference 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 onely transfers the Right of granting a re-hearing from the Emperour to the Bishop of Rome. And whether they could doe that or not is a great Question; But in all probability Constantius his openly favouring the Arian Party was the occasion of it. (3.) That this can never justifie 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 it self took upon it to judge over again a Cause which had been judged by the Bishop of Rome, viz. The Cause of Athanafius 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 Sar- dican Council cannot be justified by the Rules of the Church, in receiving Marcellus into Communion. For not onely the Eastern Bishops in their Synodical Epiftle say, That he was condemned for Herefie by the Council at Constantinople in Constanfines time, and that Proto- genes of Sardica and others of the Council had subscribed to his Condemnation; But (x) Athanafius himself afterwards condemned him; And (y) St. Basl blames the Church of Rome for admitting him into Communion: And (z) Baronius confesses, that this brought a great disreputation upon this Council, viz. the abfolving one condemned for Herefie, both before and after that Abfolution. (6.) That the Decrees of this Council were not universally received, as is most evident by the known Conteft 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, Reftitutus and Genethlius between Gratus and Aurelius. (a) Chrifti- nus Lupus proffefles he can give no account of it. But the plain and true account is this, There was a Defign for a General Council; But the Eastern and Weftern Bishops

\[(x)\text{ Sulph. Se-}
\[(y)\text{ Basil. Ep. 50.}
\[(z)\text{ Bar. A. D. 347. n. 55.}
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\[(b)\text{ Lup. in Can.}
\[(c)\text{ Sardic. p. 215.}
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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 (b) St. Augustine knew of no other than the Council of the Eastern Bishops; and even (c) 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. onely what is preferved 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 forgotten, 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 inexcusabje a piece of Ignorance or Forgery, that all the Tricks and Devices of the Advocates of that See, have never been able to defend.
CHAP. IV.

Of the Faith and Service of the British Churches.

THE Faith of the British Churches enquired into.
   The Charge of Arianism considered.
The true State of the Arian Controversie, 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 Constantin.
The Privileges granted to Churches by him.
The Charge of Pelagianism considered.
Pelagius and Celestius both born in these Islands.
When Arcomórca 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 consider'd.
Of Faustius a British Bishop.
London the chief Metropolis in the Roman Government.
Of Faustus originally a Britain. But a Bishop in Gaul.
The great esteem he was in.
Of the Semipelagians and Predestination.
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 Banchor, and the ancient Western Monasteries, and their difference, as to Learning, from the Benedictine Institution.

Of Gildas his Iren, whether an University in Britain.

Of the Schools of Learning in the Roman Cities, chiefly at Rome, Alexandria and Constantinople, and the Professours of Arts and Sciences, and the publick Libraries there.

Of the Schools of Learning in the Provinces, and the Constitution of Gratian to that purpose: extending to Britain.

Of the publick 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 Emperours, 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 enquire 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 (a) Gildas and (b) Bede.

The Charge of Arianism is grounded upon the universal spreading of that Heresie 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 Heresie, from the Council of Nice to the Council of Ariminum, where the British Bishops were present.

It is confidently affirmed by a late (c) Writer, That the Arian Faction was wholly suppress by the Nicene Council, and all the Troubles that were made after that were raised by the Eusebiains, who were as forward as any to anathematize the Arians, and all the Persecutions were raised

(a) Gild. Epist. p. 12.
(b) Bed. l. 1. 6. 8. 10. 17.
(c) R. & L. Par. 1. p. 354.
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...under a Pretence of Prudence and Moderation; That they never in the least appear'd after the Council of Nice in behalf of the Arian Doctrine, but their whole fury was bent against the word ἐικονισθεῖσα and Athanæus; That in the times of Contantius and Contans the Cause of Arians was wholly laid aside by both Parties, and the only Contest was about the word ἐικονισθεῖσα; That the Eufebian 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 ἐικονισθεῖσα was with a design to overthrow the Nicene Faith; that the Eufebians great business was, if possible, to restore Arianism; then it will follow, that some Mens 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 Authentick 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 Eufebians in the Western Churches, viz. Valens, Urfacius, and their Associates had been secret Arians all along; that the word Substance was left out of the third Sirmian Creed, to please Valens and his Party; who, 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 conflict with the Arian Faction being totally suppress'd by the Council of Nice, and none ever appearing in behalf of the Arian Doctrine after; and the Eufebians never moving for restoring Arianism, but only for a sort of Comprehension and Tolerance? In another place he faith, (d) the Eufebians endeavoured to supplant the Nicene Faith, though they durst not disown it. And was the Arian Faction then totally suppress'd while the Eufebians remained? These are the
the Men whom he calls the old Eusebian Knaves; And for the Acacians, he faith, when they had got the Mystery, 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 *homoousios*, that he frequently faith, that Controversie 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 faith, "The whole Controversie was reduced to the word *confubstantial*; 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 Controversie 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 *confubstantiality*, though they use not the word. But when the Truth itself was denied by the Arian Hereticks 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 to stop this Heresie, 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 thing; For if our Saviour were not a mere "Creature,
"Creature, he must be of the same uncreated sub-
stance with the Father; because there is no middle
between created and uncreated Substance; so that
whoever denied the Consubstantiality could not avoid
the Heretic of Paulus Samosatenum, which yet the Ar-
rians themselves professed to define; 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 Euf-
ebians 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, yet 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 caball so much as they did all the
Reign of Constantius, to lay aside the word ?
If it be said, It was by way of Comprehension, to take in
dissenting Parties: then it is plain they were really dif-
fenting 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 Doc-
trine 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 Constan-
tius, 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 a-
side an unscriptural word. And the same Author tells
us from St. Hilary, "the Consequence of shutting out
the word & was, that it must be decreed ei-
ther that the Son was a Creature made out of no-
thing, 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 faith, 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 fluck only at the word Consubstantial: and
upon
upon their Appeal to the Emperour, there are these two things remarkable. 1. That those who were for laying aside all discriminating words were Arians of the highest sort, viz. Actians, who held the Blasphemy of Diffimilitude. 2. That those who were for retaining the word Substance went on this Ground, 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 faith, approved by the Council of Nice for settling the word ὑμεῖος. 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 Armignon; not from modern Collections, but from the best Writers about that time.

The Arian Faction finding themselves so much overvoted 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 coughing an Heretical Sense under a fair appearance of joining in the same Faith with the rest. (e) (f) This being discovered by the more sagacious Defenders of the old Christian Faith, they at length fixed upon the term ἐκκλησία, 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 betook themselves of another way to keep the Faction alive, although the Heresy might seem at present to be totally supprest. And that was, by sufferings of two of them, and his two valet Friends, Secundus and Theonas, to be condemned by the Council, and to be banished by the Emperour; but the chief Heads of the Faction, Eufebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice, with others, resolved
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 (g) Socrates and (h) Sozomen, 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; because they did not believe them guilty of the Hereie 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 Bishopricks, from which they had been driven by Constantine’s own Order; and the Reason of it is given is his Epistle to the Church of Nicomedia, viz. (i) for communicating with the Arians whom he had caused to be removed from Alexandria for their Hereie 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 (k) Athanasius. Which shows their Resolution to keep up the Faction in spite of the Council of Nice: For if they had any regard to the Decree there past, 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 Bishopricks, 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 suppress’d: and, for that end, they wrote that submissive Letter to the leading Bishops, promising an universal Compliance upon their Restauration. 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 (l) (m) a secret Arian, Chaplain to Constantine, the Emperor’s Sifter, recommended to the Emperor at her Death; who, being received into Favour, whisper’d into his Ear very kind things concerning Arius and his Adhe-
rents; adding, that they were unjustly banished, and that the whole Controverfie was nothing but a Pique which the Bifhop of Alexandria had taken againft one of his Presbyters, for having more Wit and Reputation than himself; and that it would become Conftan-
tine, 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 Emperour to fet down his Confefion of Faith plainly and honest-
ly; which is extant in the Eccleflailical Historians, under the Name of Arius and Euzoius, and was framed in fuch a fpecious manner, as made the Emperour be-
lieve that Arius was indeed of the fame Mind with the Nicene Fathers, only leaving out the word Confubstan-
tial. But he would not undertake to determine him-
self, whether he fhould be received into Communion upon this; but he referr'd the whole matter to the Bishops then met at Jerusalem; who, faith Sozomen, u-
animously approved this Confefion of Faith, and wrote a Circular Letter upon it for receiving Arius and his Adhe-
rents into Communion; notwithstanding the peremptory Decree of the Council of Nice to the contrary. Which Epifle is extant in (n) Athanafius, who looks on it as the firft Blow given to the Authority of the Council of Nice; And he understands it of that Arius, who was Author of the Herefie, and not of the other Arius, as fome modern Writers do.

And here, Athanafius faith, they began to open their De-
Sign in favour of the Arian Herefie, which 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 lefning the Authority of the Nicene Council; which being once removed, the Faction did not queftion they fhould be able to fet up Arianifm fpeedily. They were not fo plain hearted to declare prefently for what th. y aimed at; nor to put it to the Vote, whether the Nicene Faith fhould be destroyed or not. For that, having the great Advantage of fo publick a Settlement, and such a general Confeft of the Christian World, it was not to be overthrown at once, nor by open vio-
lence, but to be taken in pieces by degrees; and the generality were to be cheated into Arianifm, under other
other pretences and insinuations. And the first thing was, to persuade the World, that the Arians had been hitherto misunderstood, and their Doctrine misrepresented by such factious and bufie 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 overpowered 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 Gound, and, as they supposed, the Nicene Faith together with it. But such Designs could not be carried on so secretly and subtilly, but the wiser sort suspected what was doing, as Athanasius faith; and therefore they soon called another Council at Antioch, where they made vehement Protestations to the contrary. We, say they, are no followers of Arians; 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 withall confess they had received Arians to Communion; and then make a Profession of their Faith very agreeable to that of Arians and Euzipius, delivered to Constantin; 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 (o) 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, 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 ex-

(o) Ad. p. 893.
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Theognis, who proves, therefore was, or that he was a Creature like other Creatures; for they knew these expressions would not then be born; and therefore they were forced to refine Arianifm 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 Faith to prevent the suspicion of what they aimed at; but these were in the time of Constantine.

I return therefore to the Reign of Constantine, which excellent Prince (p) 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 hypocritie, and to carry on their design under other pretences. So (q) Theodoret faith, That Eufebius 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 faith, (r) The Arians in the Council subscribed to the Nicene Faith, that being in Sheeps clothing, they might devour like ravening Wolves. (s) Sozomen faith, It was reported that Eufebius and Theognis, after their return from Banifbment, corrupted the Person to whom the Subscriptions of the Council of Nice were committted, and rased out their own Names; and then openly declared against the Son's being of the same Subfance with the Fa ther: and that even to Constantine himfelf. But that doth not feem credible to me. It being much more probable, which (t) Socrates relates, viz. That Eufebius and Theognis having recover'd the poffeffion of their Churches upon their return from Banifbment 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 otherwife they could have done: and so made a very great Difturdance in the Church: which he imputes partly to their love of Arianifm, and partly to their hatred of Athanafius: but the latter, as Athanafius at large proves, was on the account of the former.

For,
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 Eufathius, Bishop of Antioch, and Athanasius. As to the former, he gives an Account in the Fragment of a Homily extant in (w) Theodoret, "what shuffling the Arians used in the Council "of Nice to preserve their Bishopricks; and, for that "Reason, subscribed to the Decree of Faith; and so, "having escaped the Censures they deferred, they did "sometimes secretly, sometimes openly, propagate "the Opinions there condemned. One of their great "Arts, he faith, was to decline such as well under- "stood the Controversie, and made it their business "to oppose them. And fo Eufathius himself found to "his sorrow. For, Eufebius of Nicomedia and his "Party, meeting together at Antioch, whom (w) Theodo- ret expressly calls the Arian Faction, they there proceed to the deposing Eufathius, upon the Accusatation of an infamous Perfon suborned to that purpose, and afterwards prevailed with Constantin to banish him; which being done, Theodoret faith, There was a Succe- sion of Bishops, who were secret Arians, as of Eulalius, Euphronius and Flaccillus; and that was the Reason the Orthodox Party then separated themselves, and were called Eufathians. (x) Socrates and (y) Sozomen confess, that the quarrel about Arianism was renewed soon after the Council of Nice both in Egypt and in Bithynia, Helle- spont and Constantinople. But Socrates faith, It was begun about the word τροχεῖα, which was indeed the Pretext of the Quarrel, but the true Ground was Ari- anism. Socrates, being a Man not thoroughly verfed in these Matters, blames both sides, for contending a- bout they knew not what; both agreeing in the same Doc- trine, 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 Lear- ning did. And he proves from Eufathius, an eminent Bishop of that time, and one present in the Council of Nice.
Nice, that 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 flew it. (z) Sozomen faith, 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. And he ingenuously confesseth, that it was generally believed that Euflathius was deposed at Antioch for adhering to the Nicene Faith; and declaring himself against the Arian Party then prevailing in the East.

Who finding such success in their first attempt on Euflathius, they next proceed against Athanafius, the other great Champion of the Council of Nice. They (a) 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. Euflebius 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 Emperour's Mind with Jealousies and Suspícions of all those that opposed them, and especially of Athanafius. And (b) Socrates gives the true Reason of the great Spite against Athanafius, viz. that unless he were removed, there was no hopes of the Arian Doctrine prevailing: which he there confesses was the thing the Euflebians aimed at. And now they thought such a Snare was laid for Athanafius, which it was hardly possible for him to escape. For, upon Arius his Submission, they advise Constantine to fend him to Alexandria, there to be received by Athanafius, as the onely way to put an end to all the Disturbances of the Church. Away goes Arius with the Emperour's Command to Athanafius: Who, according to their imagination, (c) refusing to admit him, being anathematized by the Council, as the (d) first Broacher of a dangerous Heresie, they easi-
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ly exasperated the good Emperour against him, as a feditious and turbulent Person; and fo plied him with one Accusation upon another, that at 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 Emperour himself, (e) he was acquitted, and sent back with Marks of his Favour and vindication of his Innocency; in an Epiftle to the People of Alexandria, part of which is extant in (f) Sozomen and (g) Theodoret, but at large in (h) Athanasius. One would think this should have discouraged his Enemies from any farther Prosecution of him; but these Eufebians were Men of restless, ambitious, implacable Spirits, that scrupled no means to compass their ends, which they thought they could never doe, unless they could blast the Reputation of Athanasius. To this end, they laid a molt malicious Design against him. First, (i) they draw in the (k) 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 to Athanasius was accounted by them. And (l) Eufebius 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 Emperour, that he was forced for the general Satisfaction, to appoint a Council at Tyre, which was according to the Eufebians desire, where things were managed with so little regard to Justice or common Honesty, that, after he had plainly cleared himself as to the main Accusations, he yet found they were resolv'd to condemn him; and therefore he privately withdrew from thence to the Imperial Court, to acquaint the Emperour with the horrible Partiality there used. Upon (m) this he writes a very smart Letter to them, and requires them to come specially to him, (n) to give him an account of their violent Proceedings. They send a Select Number of their Party to Court with Eufebius of Nicomedia in the Head of them, who there quit all the Accusations brought against Athanasius at Tyre, and start a new
one which touched the Emperor in a very tender part, viz. 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 Athanafius into Gaul. Not long after Constantine died, but before his death, faith (p) Theodoret, he gave order for the recalling Athanafius, to the great regret of Eufebius of Nicomedia then present.

Let any one now judge, whether in Constantine's time the Arian Faction were wholly suppress'd; and whether Eufebius 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 Eufebians were no less Enemies to the Arians than to the orthodox, and that it is a great and common Mistake, that Eufebius was the ringleader of the Arian Faction? If it be a Mistake, others have it from Athanafius, and it is hard to believe that man ever read (p) Athanafius his Writings, who dare say the contrary. All the Bishops of Egypt in their Synodical Epistle from Alexandria charge the (q) Eufebians with a relentless desire to promote Arianism; and affirm, that their malicious prosecution of Athanafius 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; that the Eufebians 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; 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 quickfitted Perfon of our Age can have?

It would be endless to recite all the passages in Athanafius his Apology, and Epistles, and Discourses of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, to prove that the Eufebians carried on the Arian Design, since a great
part of them is spent in the proof of it. But we are
told, with confidence enough, that the Synod of A-
lexandria, in their Synodical Epistle, do not in the leaft
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 that will be at the pains
to peruse that excellent Epistle. And even in that page,
it is expressly said, (r) their violent and malitious pro-
ceedings 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 kindnes to? i.e. Would any
but secret Arians endeavour to set up Arianism? unless
they suppose them such Tools to be made ufe of by oth-
ers to doe their busines, and then to be laid aside.
But the Eusebians were no such mean Politicians; for
they were at the top of busines, having all the ad-
vantages and opportunities to carry on their own
ends; and therefore we have all the Reafon in the
World to conclude them secret Arians, who were at
so much trouble to leffen the Credit of the Oppofers of
Arianism: Which they lookt on as one of the moft ef-
fecual means to introduce it. And although they did
not openly declare themselves in behalfl of the Arian
Doctrine, after the Council of Nice; which had been to
hinder their own Design, in the time of Confiantine,
yet they made ufe of all the Methods which bad Men
do to carry on their ends; viz. by fable Influations,
lying pretences, and all manner of malitious proce-
dings againft thofe who stood in their Way; as is
moft notorious in the cafe of Athanasius.

After the Death of Confiantine we are told, that all
the Councils under Confiantius that are commonly accou-
ted Arian, have as fully and clearly condemned Arianism,
as the Nicene Council it felf; It is true, they could not
diggeft the Word ουανος; but otherwife, as for the whole
Scheme of Arianism, they have in all their Creeds ana-
thematized it with all clearenes and fulnefs of Exprefsion.
This is somewhat strange Doctrine for one who pre-
tends to have read Athanasius, who hath taken fo much
pains to lay open the juggling of the Arian Faition in
all those Councils; and, one would think, by this manner of Writing, such a Man took a particular pleasure in contradicting him. For in his (c) Book of the Councils of Ariminiun and Seleucia, he faith, none of the Councils under Constantius could be brought to anathematize the Arian Heresie, as the Council of Nice did. He faith, that Constantius himself was an Arian Heretick, and that his chief Design in all those Councils was, to take away the force of the Council of Nice. He faith indeed, 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, to the great Scandal of the Christian World; Nay, he faith; that in all their Councils they never once mention’d the Arian Heresie as an evil thing; and if any Herefies were mention’d, the Arian was excepted, which the Nicene Council anathematized; and they received with great kindnees such as were known to be Arians; which is an Argument that the calling thofe Councils was not for establishing the Truth; but for overthrowing the Council of Nice. And to shew what Constantius his own Mind was, he observes, that when he came to die he would be baptized by none but Euzoiius, who had been feveral times deposed for Arianifm; and he there affirms, that Constantius continued an Arian to the laft. As to the word *ειδενς* about which fo much stir was made, he takes notice, that all the offence that was taken at it, was by the Arians; and the true Caufe was, because it struck at the root of their Herefie. And, as to the word *Subftance*, he wonder’d 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 Subftance, or he must be of the Subftance of the Father; or they must make the Word and the Son to be no real Subftance, but mere Names; and so they did not really believe what they expressed. And he farther shews, 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, that the opposition to these Terms, whatever was pretended, was from a dislike of the Doctrine established in the Council of Nice. For if it had been a mere doubt about the signification of the words, they
they ought to have explained their own sense, and without having condemned the Arian Heresie.

It cannot be denied that there were some, who agreed in the Substance of the Doctrine with the Council of Nice, but yet disliked the term θεότης; as to these Athanafius 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 Basilius of Ankyra; 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 θεότης comes to the same with the ἰδιότης. There were two great Arguments, these used against the term θεότης: The first was, 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 Athanafius answers, “That the Divine Generation must not be apprehended like the humane; 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 left 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 Spendor from Light, or Water from the Fountain. And therefore when they interpreted the term Son in a way.
"way agreeable to the Divine Nature, he wonders
they should stick so much at the word Consubstantial,
which was capable of the same Interpretation. The
second Objection was, That those who condemned the
Samofatenian Heresie, rejected the word ἐνοπάντος. In an-
swer to this, Athanaflus shews, "that the word was
so much used and allowed in the Christian Church
before the Samofatenian Heresie was heard of, that
when Dionyfius of Alexandria was accused to Diony-
fius of Rome, for rejecting it; the Council there-
upon was so much concerned, that the Bishop of
Rome wrote their fience to the Bishop of Alexandria
about it, he returns an Answer, wherein he owns all
the fience contained under it, as appears by his Epif-
tle in Athanaflus; but for those who oppofed Paulus
Samofatenus, he faith, they took the Word in a cor-
poral fience, as if it implied a distinct Subftance
from the Father; But, faith he, those who condem-
ned the Arians farther into this matter; confider-
ing 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
Subftance of the Father; therefore with great Reafon
they ufed the word ἐνοπάντος, as being most proper to
express the Sense of the Christian Church againft the
Arian Heresie; as he shews there at large.

From thofe paffages of Athanaflus it appears that
there was a third Party then in the Church different
from the Nicenifls and the Eufebians. The former would by
no means yield to any relaxation of the Council of
Nice; becaufe they evidently faw that this Design was
carried on by thofe who made it their buifiness under
that pretence to introduce Arianifm, who were the
Eufebians. But there were others extremely concern-
ned for the Peace of the Church, and on that account
were willing to let go the term ἐνοπάντος, hoping the
 Doctrine might be secured by other exphuations; and
this facility of theirs gave the greatest advantage to the
Eufebian Party in all their Councils, who continually
almost overreached and outwitted them, under the
pretence of Accommodation. For by this Artifice they
gained their Votors, and when they had them, made
use of them merely to serve their own Designs; as appears by the Account the Historians give of the management of the Arian Affairs under the Reign of Constantius.

(t) Socrates faith, that immediately after the death of Constantine, Eusebius and Thyogonis, 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-favorites, then the Wife of Constantius himself, to embrace Arianism: and so the Controversie 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 Successour; the one vying Paulus, and the Arians, Macedonius; this nettled Constantius, who coming to Constantinople calls a Council of Arian Bishops, who depos'd 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; but the Design was, faith Socrates, to overthrow the Nicene Faith. Here they made some Canons to ensnare Athanasius (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 discusst after it, and so they set open the Gate for New Councils which by degrees might establish the Arian Heresie.

(u) Sozomen faith, that after the death of Constantine the secret Arians began to shew themselves more openly; among whom Eusebius and Theognis especially hir'd themselves to advance Arianism. He agrees with Socrates as to the spreading of it in the Court and elsewhere; and in the other particulars, to the Council at Antioch; but he faith, they framed their Confession of Faith in such ambiguous terms, that neither Party could
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 Authentick one made at Antioch in the Dedication. But it was not so Authentick but they thought good to alter it; and some months after sent another to Confessans to explain themselves more fully; whereby they reject those who said, the Son was made of Nothing or of another Hypothesis, and not from God. Who could imagine these to have been any other than very found and orthodox Men? Especially when three years after, they sent a larger Confession of Faith into the Western Parts for their own Vindication, wherein 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 Athanafius 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 seem'd 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 easie 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 appear'd to be Arians under the Name of Acacius, and the Followers of Basilius of Antioch.
who stuck chiefly at the word ἡμινεώτος; of whom Athanasius speaks before. Now to draw in these Men, and to hold them fast, who had great sway in the 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 Anathema's, which would doe their busines at last. So that the Eusebians were forced to the utmost Diffimulation 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 preferr'd 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; faith (x) Theodoret, with great Cruelty for six years, and then was murdered himself by the Alexandrians; but that seems to have been a mistake for George of Cappadocia, who succeeded him. For (y) Athanasius faith, he died a natural death; but he at large describes the horrible Persecution both of the Clergy and Laity then in Egypt, who would not comply with the Arians; for his busines was to set up Arianism, as Athanasius faith. After his Death, Constantius finding so little success in those violent courses, sends for Athanasius with great earnestness to come to him; and gives him free Liberty to return to Alexandria; and folemnly swears to him, he would never more receive any Calumnies against him; and writes several Letters on his behalf: and one very kind one to himself after the death of his Brother Conflans, who was a true Friend to Athanasius; and then his greatest Enemies courted him, and begg'd his Pardon for what they had done; being forced to it by the violence of the Torrent against him: and even Ursacius and Valens, two warm Men of the Eusebian Party, publickly recanted what they had done against him, without his seeking, and then anathematized the Arian Heresie. But this was done while Conflans was alive, and

(x) Theod. I. 2.

(y) Athan. ad filir. vit. agen.
and so great a Number appeared in the Western Churches on his side; but Constans being dead, the Eusebian Party persuade Constanitus, to take heart once more and to try what he could do to restore Arianism; then Valens and Ursacius recant their recantation, and lay it all on the Fear of Constans; and now to shew the Emperour’s zeal for Arianism, the publick allowance is taken from Athanafius 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 refufed, but the Bishops were summoned to appear in the Courts and were there told, 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 fill’d with Tumult and Disorder, and the People forced their Bishops to the Tribunals for fear of being punifhed themselves. And the Reafon of this Violence was, because the Arian Heresie was so much hated by the People, and they hoped by this means to bring them to own it. Heraclius, the Emperour’s Lieutenant, declared in his Name, that Athanafius was to be cast out, and the Churches given to the Arians; and required the People to receive such a Bishop as he should fend, viz. George of Cappadocia, a violent Arian. But the tragical Account of all the Persecutions, which the orthodox Chriftians then underwent in Egypt, from these Men of Prudence and Moderation is at large fet down by Athanafius 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 fake of Arianism, Athanafius evidently proves by this Argument, That if a Man were guilty of never fo great Crimes, if he profefled himself an Arian, he escaped; but if he were an Oppofer of Arianism the greatest Innocency could not protefet him.

But this was not the Cafe of Egypt alone, but in other Places, The best Qualification for a Bishop was to stand well inclined to Arianism; as Athanafius affirms.
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But otherwise, though the Persons were never so well deserving; one fault or other was found with them to cast them out: So, faith he, it was with Eulathius, 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, Seba/slea, Hadrianople and many other places; insomuch that a considerable Bishop scarce any where appear'd against Arianism, but they found some pretence or other to put him out, and where they could alledge no other Cause, they said, It was the Pleasure of Constantius. 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 Eufebius of Nicomedia, whose heart was set upon that Bishoprick, being so near the Imperial Court, he first procured Paulus his Banishment to Pontus, then he was sent in Chains to Singara of Mesopotamia, thence to Emesa, thence to Pontus, thence to Cucufus, where he was at length strangling by the Eufebian Party, as Athanasius faith, he had it from the Persons there present. But although Macedonius who succeeded at Constantinople were of a temper violent enough, as (z) Sozomen shews, yet (a) 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 Confubstantial 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 seem'd 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 Theodoret takes notice, (c. 2) that after the death of Leontius, Eudoxius was the first who pulled off his Vizard, and declared openly for Arianism; but Leontius his way was, to promote only those in the Church, he was before hand sure of, and to suffer no other to come into Orders; by which means, faith he, most of the Clergy were Arians, and
the People still continued sound in the Nicene Faith, till

Endoxius his Persecution began.

This was the miserable Condition of the Eastern
Churches under the Prudence and Moderation of the Eu-
sebian Party: but the Western Churches continued qui-
et and very little disturbed with the Arian Heresie while
Constantian 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 suffer'd in the
 Eastern Parts. Which was the Reason of the calling
of the Council of Sardica by consent of both Empe-
 rours, although that happen'd only to widen and in-
large the Breach. However the Sardican Council had
such effect in the Western Parts, as to the business
of Athanasius, that as (b) Athanasius tells Constan tus,
 Valens and Ursacius, two very bufie Factours in the
 Arian Cause, freely own the malitious Intrigue that was
carried on in the prosecution of him. The first Council
of Milan is suppos'd by (c) Petavius, to be called the
same year that of Sardica ended. But (d) Sirmondus
thinks it very improbable there should be two Coun-
cils in one year; and therefore he believes it rather to
have been the year before: which is the more proba-
ble Opinion. This Council of Milan was assembled
on the occasion of several Bishops there meeting to
wait on the Emperor Constantius in order to a General
Council, to put things in order in the Christian Church,
which the Arian Faction had so much disturb'd. While
they were there the four Eastern Bishops arrived, with
the long Confession 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 Anathema's at the end of their Confession,
they desired them to make short Work of it, to ana-
thematz the Arian Heresie; which they utterly reju-
ded to doe, and so discover'd the Juggle of that see-
ing orthodox Confession. This appears by Liberius
his Epistle in the Collection of Church Records in (e) Hi-
 lary's Fragments; in which he tells Constantius, that
these four Bishops were so far from anathematizing the A-
rian Heresie then in order to Peace, that upon being pre-

(b) Athanas.
anus, p. 226, 832.

(c) Petav. de
Phocin, Damm.
cr. 1.
(d) Sirmond.
Distat. de ann.
Syrn. Symdi).

(e) Hilar. Frag.
39, p. 414.
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fed to doe it, they rose up in a Rage and left the Council. From hence the Western Bishops smelt their Design, however cover'd over with fair Pretences of Peace and Reconciliation. Which they farther discover'd 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 Herefie, which upon consultation they refused to doe. Upon these plain Discoveries, the Western Bishops could easily see through all their Proposals for Peace; being onely 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 Constantine upon his Victory over Magnentius, a sudden alteration here happen'd 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 appear in the Head of the Arian Faction, and with them, as (f) Severus Sulpicius faith, the two Pannonia's 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 faith, 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, depo'd by the Council and banish'd by the Emperor. And so great then was the Power of Fear upon them, that some of those very Persons, who had clear'd Athanasius at the Council of Sardica, did now subscribe
subscribe to his condemnation; among whom was Vincentius of Capua the Pope's own Legate; as (g) Athanasius himself confesses. Not long after, Constantius summons another Council at Milan; where, (b) Sozomen says, above three hundred Western Bishops were assembled. Here again the Arian Faction made a great outcry about Athanasius; but Dionyfius, Bishop of Milan, and Eusebius of Vercelis, laid open the Design fo far as to make the Council be broken up and themselves to be banished by the Emperor's Edict. While the Emperor continued at Milan, Liberius, Bishop of Rome, was summon'd to attend upon him there, in order to his Banishment, if he did not condemn Athanasius; (k) Theodoret hath preserved the most material passages that happen'd between them; One wherein 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 hearkned to; and so Liberius was banished; but afterwards he unworthily complied not onely to the Condemnation of Athanasius, but he professed his consent to the Sirmian Creed, as appears by his Epistle in (l) Hilary's Fragments; for which Hilary bestows his Anathema's very freely upon him. But it is of late pleaded on behalf of Liberius, that he subscribed onely to the first Sirmian Confession in the Council against Photinus which was express against the Arian Heresie. Whereas Hilary (who, I think, knew this matter somewhat better) faith in so many Words, Hæc est perfidia Ariana, i.e. that what he subscribed, contained in it the Arian Heresie. But where doth Hilary or any one else say, that Liberius onely subscribed the first Confession of Sirmium, and upon that was restored? Nay, (m) Sozomen faith, 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 Samofoamenus and Photinus, with that of Antioch at the Dedication, and these Liberius subscribed. So that he struck in wholly with the Arian Faction which undermined the Authority of the Council of Nice, and he betray'd the Faith, if he did not renounce
nounce it. The Eudoxians at Antioch, he faith, gave out that both Ofius and Liberius had renounced the Nicene Faith, and declared the Son to be unlike the Father; but Liberius clear'd himself by rejecting the Doctrine of the Anomæans, i.e. the open and profesped Arians; and this Ursacius, Valens and Germinius then at Sirmium were willing to accept of, having a farther Design to carry on in these Parts, which was like to be spoild 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 Ofius 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 Arimines; whose Number, faith (n) Severus Sulpi-\(\text{c}\)\(\text{i}\)us, came to above four hundred, and to the same pur-pose (o) Sozomen. When they were assembled, V\(\text{a}\)lens and Ursacius acquainted them with the Emperor's good Intentions in calling them together, and as the onely Expedient for the Peace of the Church, they pro-posed, that all former Confessions of Faith should be laid aside, as tending to diffension; 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 Emperor. Upon the reading this New Confession of Faith, wherein the Son is said to be like the Father, according the Scriptures, and the Name of Substance agreed to be wholly laid aside: the Bishops at Arimines 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 farther; which they refusing to doe; they forthwith (p) excommunicated and depossed them, and prote-fled against all Innovations in matters of Faith. And
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of these Proceedings 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 (q) (r) (s) Bar against Arianism and other Heresies, and they add, that the removing of it would open the Breach for Heresie to enter into the Church. They charge Ursacius and Valens with having once been Partakers of the Arian Heresie, 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 perverse Doctrinae; which shews that they looked on the Sirmian Creed as dangerous and heretical. And in the same (t) Fragments it appears by the Acts of the Council, that they proceeded against Valens, Ursacius, Germinius and Caius as Heretics and Introducers of Heresie; and then made a solemn Protestation, that they would never recede from the Nicene Faith.

Their ten Brethren whom they sent to Constans 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 mortifie the Bishops, so as to bring them to his Will at laft. He (u) 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 laft, as (v) Theodoret expresses it, to bring them to consent to the demolishing that Bulwark which kept Heresie out of the Church, i.e. the Authority of the Council of Nice. To this smart Message the Council returned a refolute Reply, That they would not recede from their former Decree; but humbly beg leave to return to their Bishopricks before Winter.
ter; 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 (x) Hilary's Fragments, which were to null all the former Proceedings, and to receive those who were there depoed to Communion. Which being done, they were sent back to decay 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 Hilary's Fragments, wherein they declare their full Agreement to the laying aside the Terms of Substance and Confubstantial 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 (y) Athanasius faith, it was there declared unlawful to use the word Substance or Hypothesis 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 (z) St. Jerome on this Occasion, that the world then groaned and wondered at its being become Arian. Which a late Author faith, 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 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 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 (a) (b) (c) 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 reverting the Decree of the Nicene Council was in effect overthrowing the Faith thereby stablished; And so St. Hierome faith, Tunc Ufiae Nomen abolitum eft, taxc Nicene Fidei damnatio conclamata eft. And then these words follow, Ingemuit totus Orbis & Arianum fe effe minatus eft: and if nothing would ever be able to stop out the Arian Heresie but the Nicene Faith, as is contended; and this Council took away the Authority of that Council, then it at least made way for the introducing Heresie, and left all Men to be Hereticks that had a mind to be so. And so St. Hierome faith, Valens and Ursacius after the Council boasted, that they never denied the Son to be a Creature, but to be like other Creatures: from whence (d) 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 St. Jerome onely complains of the World’s being cheated and trepan’d into Arianism by the Bishops being so weakly overreached and outwitted by an handfull 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, they would never give way to it, because they saw the Danger of it; and to renew their Proteftations against it, after the Emperour’s severe Meffage to them about it? So that, whatever it was, it could be no cheat.
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Cheat or Trepan in those who made such Decrees at first, depofed the Arian Bishops, fent such Messages to the Emperour as they did. Which is a plain Demonstration that they faw and knew what they did; and understood the Confequences of it. But they were frighted into this Content at left. I grant they were fo. But what then becomes of the Infallibility of Councils, if mere Fear can make so many Bishops in Council act and declare againft their Confiences? If in fuch Meetings, the Perfons were capable of being fway'd by any particular bias, from asferting the Truth, what Security can there be as to Mens Faith from their Authority, any farther than we can be fecure they were not influenced by any Temporal Hopes or Fears? So that we are not barely to reftect the Definitions of Councils, but to examine the Motives by which they were acted in passing those Decrees; and if it appear, they did act freely and sincerely, and deliver the general fentfe of the Christian Church, from the beginning, as it was in the Cafe of the Nicene Council, then a mighty regard ought to be fhewed to the Decrees of it; but if Partiality, Interest, Fear, or any other fecular Motive be found to fway them in their Debates and Resolutions, then every particular Church is at liberty to reftufe their Decrees, and to adhere to thofe of more free and infentfe Councils. And this was the Cafe here, as to the Council of Ariminum, if the Church had been absolutely tied up to the Decrees of Councils, however paft, there had been an utter Imppofibility of reforing the true Christian Faith; for there was no fuch Council asembled to reverse the Decrees of it; but in every Church, the banifhed Bishops being returned, not long after, upon the death of Constantius, they took care to fettle the true Faith in the Western Churches, by leffer Assemblies of the feveral Bishops. A remarkable Iftance whereof appears in (e) Hilary's Fragments, (f) Hilar. Frag. p. 431. where we find the Gallican Bishops met at Paris, rencourting 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, (f) Athanasius particularly takes notice of the Britannick Churches, as adhering to the Nicene Faith;
and (g) St. Jerome, and (b) St. Chrysostome, several times mention their agreeing with other Churches in the true Faith. Which 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 (i) Severus Sulpicius, speaking of the Care Constantius took to provide Lodging and Entertainment for the Bishops at Ariminum, out of the publick Charge, he faith, their Bishops refused to accept it, only three out of Britain, not being able to maintain themselves, made use of the publick allowance, rather than be chargeable to their Brethren. Which, he faith, he heard Gavdius 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 burthensome to their Brethren, but rather to live on the Emperour's charge. This had been better said of any Place, than at the Council of Ariminum, where the Emperour's kindness was a Snare to their Consciences; unless it be said, That the Emperour 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 Britains, the Emperour 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 Britains. What became of all the Endowments of the British Churches by King Lucius? The British History published by (k) Geoffrey of Monmouth, faith, That King Lucius gave not only all the Lands which 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 inlarging it as occasion serves; As Thomas Rudburn doth very particularly for the Church of Winchester, who makes the old Lands of the Flamics to be twelve miles compass about the Town; And King Lucius added, he faith, to the

New Church, all the Suburbs of the City, with the Privilege of Dunwallo Molmitius, i.e. of a Sanctuary. Methinks then the Britifh Bishops, might have been in as good a condition as the rest of their Brethren at Ari-
minum; unless their Lands were taken away in the Persecution of Diocletian, as Ruddburn 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 Britifh Bishops should be then under such Poverty, when Liberius, in his Conference with Constan-
tius, told him, The Churches were able to bear the Charges of their Bishops in going to Councils, without the publick Carriages. For even before Constantine's time, they had endowments besides the voluntary Oblations of the People, which in great Churches were very considerable. But that there were certain Endowments besides, appears both by the Edicts of Maximinus and Constan-
tine. By that of Maximinus, not onely Houses, but the Lands which belon'd to the Christians; whether seiz'd in-
to the (l) 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 publick 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 re-
stored; and then is added, because the Chriftians are known, not onely 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 (m) Lac-
tantius arc. (Sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur ad justu-
corporis eorum, id est, Ecclesiaram non hominum singulo-
rum pertinentia) These are commanded to be restored, without any delay or dispute. Which is again inforced by another Edict of Constantine to Anulinus extant in (n) Eulebius with the former, and there are mention'd Houses, Gardens, or whatsoever Possessions they had. Tho' who would have nothing more meant by these Ex-
pressions, but some Fields and Gardens, rather than Lands, may confider that when the Church had plentifull Possessions, they were called by no other Names. So St. Am-
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St. (o) Ambrose, Agri Ecclesiae solvunt Tributum. And in another Law of (p) Constantine directed to the Provincials of Palestine to the same purpose, and with as full and large Expressions; And howsoever they became alienated, the present Possessours 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 Restauration 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 Confessours, he 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 (q) Theodosian 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 Gothofred faith, was the true Donation of Constantine, for, by means of this Law, Riches flowed into the Church, and especially at Rome. For although, as (r) Paulus faith, by an Edict of M. Aurelius, the Collegia licita, Societies allowed by the Laws, were capable of receiving Legacies and Estates, yet by the (s) Laws of the Empire, the Chriftians were no legal Society to that purpose before: And by a late Constitution of Dioclesian, Societies were excluded from receiving Inheritances without a special Privilege; yet now, by this Law, all those Bars being removed, Riches came in so fat in some Places, that there needed new Constitutions to set bounds to so great liberality.

And the Privileges which Constantine gave to the (t) Clergy of exemption from publick Services, drew so many to take Orders, especially in Corporations, where the Services were very burthenfome; That Constantine was forced to publish Edicts, to restrain the Numbers of them; which were not intended, to hinder Persons of Eftate and Quality from entering into Orders, as some have suggested, but only such whose Estates were liable to the publick Services, as those who were (u) Decuriones origine, and not merely incolatu were; who bore all
the Offices, and did the publick Duties, having Lands given them on purpose in the first Settlement of Colonies which were called Prædia Reipublicæ, as (w) Pancirol obseres; And therefore Constantine had reason to forbid such entring into Orders to the Prejudice of the Government. And fo the Title of the Constitution is, De ordinatione Cleriorum in Curiamur & Civitatum praedulcium non facienda. Which was at that time a very just and reasonable Constitution. But afterwards Men of great Honour and Dignities came into the Council, as not onely St. Ambrose, at Milan, who was the Consular Governor over Liguria, and Æmilia, and St. Paulinus, a Roman Senator, behind none in Birth, faith (x) St. Ambrose, having a great Estate in Aquitania, was made Priest at Barcelona, and Bishopp of Nola, but many Examples of this kind were in one Age in the Gallican Church, as (y) Honoratus, Bishopp of Arles, of a Senatorian and Consular Family; St. Hilary, of Arles, of a very Noble Family, and born to great Riches; Sidonius Apollinaris, whose Father and Grandfather were Praefecti Praetorio Galliarum, and himself married to the Daughter of the Emperour Avitus, made Praefectus Urbis, & Patricius, one of the greatest Persons and Wits in Gaul, was made (a) Bishopp of Auvergn; St. (b) German, Bishopp of Auxerre, was of Noble Parents, and Governour of a Province; Saint (c) Ruwicius, Bishopp of Limoges, descended from the Annician Family, as Venantius Fortunatus faith, which was of that Fame at Rome, that St. (d) Hierome faith, Very few of it missed the Consulship, and two Brothers of it were Consuls together, as Claudian faith, a thing never seen before or since. (e) From this Family Arnoldus (f) Lign. Vitæ in Profar. Wion proves that the Emperours of Germany are descend. And of this fame Family another Ruwicius succeeded his Grandfather in the same Bishopprick.

But, besides that general Law which gave Permissi- on to others to give liberally to Churches, Constantine of his own Revenue allow'd a proportion of Corn to be given to the Clergy of the greater Cities; Of which (f) Athanasius speakes, when he faith, Constantius took (x) Athanas. ad it away from him, and his Clergy, and gave it to the Arians; But the Gift itself was continued all the time of Constantius

(a) Vit. Sidonii Apoll. (b) German patric. (c) German (d) Hier. Ep. 3. (e) From this Family Arnoldus (f) Lign. Vitae in Profar. Wion proves that the Emperours of Germany are descend. And of this fame Family another Ruwicius succeeded his Grandfather in the same Bishopprick.

But, besides that general Law which gave Permissi- on to others to give liberally to Churches, Constantine of his own Revenue allow'd a proportion of Corn to be given to the Clergy of the greater Cities; Of which (f) Athanasius speaks, when he says, Constantius took (x) Athanas. ad
Then it was taken away by (g) Julian, and in part restored by Jovian.

It is then no wonder that the Bishops at Ariminum refused the publick allowance, being maintained by the revenues of their Churches; but it seems the 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 County having been so long harassed with Wars, and scarce recovered from the Effects of them; (for the Scots and Piets had been very troublesome to them, both in the times of Conflans and Constantius; the 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 (i) 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.

But Arianism was not the onely Heresie the British Churches were charged with; for (k) Gildas from hence makes every following Heresie to find a passage hither; among which the chief was Pelagianism. And (l) Bede doth insinuate, That Pelagius, being a Briton, and, spreading his Doctrine far and near, did corrupt those Churches with it; which some (m) late Writers, having taken up, have affirmed, that both Pelagius and Celefius, after their Repulse at Rome, came over into Britain, and dispersed their Doctrine here. (n) Leland sadly laments the Condition of the Church of God, that had no sooner recover'd it self from Arianism, but a new Heresie sprung up to disturb the Peace, and infect the minds of Christians; but as Egypt brought forth the Author of the former Heresie, so did Britain the Author of this, which took his name from hence; and is supposed to have been Morgan in British, which
which by his conversation at Rome he turned into Pelagius; And (o) St. Augustine saith, He was commonly called Pelagius Brito, to distinguish him, as he supposed, from another Pelagius of Tarentum. Leland observes, that some made him a Briton, as being born in that Bretagn 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 (p) Subscription of Manuetus to the Council of Tours, where he is named Episcopus Britannorum, after which time it was frequently called Britannia Cismarina, Minor, Celtica, &c. (q) Dempfer (not a Jesuit, but a Lawyer) takes it very ill of Browerus, the Jesuit, that he makes Pelagius a Scot: But not as Dempfer understands him, For (r) he explains himself, That he meant one that came out of Ireland, and therefore was Scottice Originis. For which he quotes Saint Jerome. But Archbishop (s) Ufher hath observed, That he speaks there, not of Pelagius, but of Coelestius, whom he makes the Cerberus to the Pluto, (according to his usual way of complementing his Adversaries) But both, he thinks, came out of the British Islands. The late (t) Publisher of Marius Mercator, endeavours to shew, That our learned Primates were herein mistaken; And that Saint Jerome doth not speak of Coelestius, 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 his Mouth, whom he compares to a great Scotch Masliff, 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 (u) Commentaries on Ezekiel, he mentions the death of Ruffinus, and then faith, 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 open'd their Mouths against him. In the beginning of his Commentaries on Jeremiah, which he undertook after he had finished those on Ezekiel,
Ezekiel, he mentions one who carp'd at his Commentaries on the Ephelians, and calls Grunnis, (i.e. Rufinus) his Forerunner; And faith, he was, Scotorum pulchritus prægnavatus, made fat with Scotch Fummary. All this agrees very well with Pelagius whom (w) Orosius describes as a very corpulent Man; But there is one thing which makes the former Opinion not improbable, which is, That St. Jerome himself takes so much notice, that Pelagius at that time wrote little or nothing about these matters, but Cœleftius was the Man who appeared, especially in the two main Points about Original Sin, and the Possibility of Perfection: (x) In his Epistle to Cæphi-phon, he faith, That the Author of the Sed still held his Peace, and his Disciples wrote for him; Magiftrorum flen-tia profert rabies Dicipulorum. Methinks Rabies agrees well enough with Cerberus, and here it is meant of the Disciple Cæleftius, and not of Pelagius; Which Expreflion answers very well to the other, Matus Magifler latrat per Albimum Canem. And he speaks as if he designed to draw him from his clofenes and retir-ement; Which doth far better agree to the mute Perfon, than to the barking Cerberus. There is then no Improbability, that Cæleftius and Pelagius, may be both meant; But if any other Country hath a mind to challenge Cæleftius to themselves, I think, they may be allow'd to put in their Claim notwithstanding these Exprefions. But it is very unworthy in the fame (y) Author, to prove Pelagius to have been an Iriph Scot, and at the fame time to charge his Vices on the Britifh Nation. He cannot deny, That Pelagius had a great natural Sharpnes of Wit, since St. Augulfine and his other Adverfaries allow it; But then he faith, it was fierce and contentious, after the fashion of his Country; and which he could not shake off by his long Conversa-tion at Rome. He grants that his Exhortations to Pe-ty were vehement and earneft, but written in an uncouth and imperious Style, more Gentis, according to the hu-mour of his Nation. But why must the Britifh Nation be reproached for the particular faults of Pelagius? It is a very ill way of confuting Pelagius, to attribute Mens Vices and Vertues to their Countries; And is contrary both to the discretion of a Philofopher, and to
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to the Grace of a Christian; *Pelagius* might have 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 wife
and humble, notwithstanding this severe and unjust
Character of the *British* Nation; Which (as all Na-
tional 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; Saint
(z) *Augustine* faith, *he had the esteem of a very Piou-
man, and of being a Christian of no mean rank.* Was
this *Pro more Gentis* too? And of his Learning and E-
loquence *St. Augustine* gives sufficient Testimony, in
his Epistle to *Juliana*, the Mother of *Demetrias*, 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 *Coelestius* and *Annianus*.
But why should this be so hard a thing for a Man
whom he confesses to have had a great deal of Natu-
ral Wit, and (a) *St. Augustine's* faith, *He lived long;
yea, very long in Rome*, and *kept the best Company
there?* Could a *Britain* never attain so much Puri-
ty of the *Roman* Language as to write an Epistle to
the Envy of those *meliores* *fieri prophatorum*, as he speaks,
who were born in more happy soils? What mean such un-
becoming reflexions, 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
foil which produceth more *Wit* than *Words*.

Our Monkish Historians make *Pelagius* not only a
Monk at *Bangor*, but the *Abbot* there; So the Au-
thor of the *Polychronicon*, and *John of Tinmouth*; *Le-
land* takes it from them; To whom *Bale* adds, *That
he was made Bishop in the East;* But without any Autho-
ritv. (b) *Leland's* faith, *That he went over into Armo-
rica, to visit his Countrymen who were newly settled there;
being carried over by Maximus*. *Gildas* seems to imply,
That *Maximus* was originally a *Britain*, when he calls
him *German plantationis facie*; But *Bede* takes no notice
at all of his Country. *The Saxon Annals*; *Fabius E-
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After, not it and it and it and people. But (c) Zosimus affirms, That he was a Spaniard, and took it ill that he was no more prefer'd, when his Countreyman Theodosius was made Emperor; However this were, it is certain that 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, I see no ground for the settling the Colonies of Britains in Aremorica. For he landed at the Mouth of the Rhine, faith 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 doe with his Souldiers, but to people Countries with them? But we find the Aremorici in quiet possession of their Countrey after this time. So that we see no reason at all for Pelagius to go to his Countreymen in Aremorica: From thence 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, For Pelagius lived a long time in Rome before his Herezie was discovered; After the Discovery of it, many years passed before Julian appeared in it; And in the last Work of (d) St. Augustine, just before his death, He calls Julian a young man; Although he had been a Bishop in Campania, at a Place called Eculum, whence his Title was Episcopus Eclanum. The Town stood, faith (e) Holstenius, near Mirabella; But since its Destruction, the See was removed to Frigento, and the Bishop called Episcopus Frequenti- 
nus. If Pelagius, passing through Gaul, made so long a Stay in Rome, as St. Augustine faith, before he was suspected of Heretick, there is no probability at all in the Monkth Tradition of his being Abbat of Bangor. And there is not much more of Bangor's being so famous a Monastery at that time, or of Pelagius his being
being a Monk therein: For the British Monasteries were no elder than St. Patrick's time, as I may have occasion to shew afterwards. And even at Rome it self the Monastic state had not been long known there; being brought out of the East by Athanasius and Eusebius of Vercelles. And in Pelagius his 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, mention'd by Rufinus, not far from Rome; Probably a House of Melania; whither they were wont to retire in times of greater Devotion. Formerly there 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, mention'd by Rufinus, not far from Rome; Probably a House of Melania; whither they were wont to retire in times of greater Devotion. Garnerius confesses that Pelagius was no other wise 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 Heresie was discover'd. 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 Rufinus did Pammachius, Melania and her Family; And so Pelagius did at Rome, where he had Scholars whom he brought up, as appears both by Celseius, and Julianus whom he instructed very young, and by Timafius and Jacobus. From this Employment it was that he wrote his short Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, and his Epistles to Melania and Demetrias; But after he was accused of Heresie, 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, he was, besides the Councils in Africa, at last condemned in a Council at Antioch, under Theodotus, as Marius Mercator shews; And from thence forward, he spent the Remainder of his Life in Obscurity, dying somewhere in the East.

From whence it appears, that there is no probability, that Pelagius and Celseius should come back to Britain,
Britain, to spread their Herefie here. For he complain’d of his Age, when he set forth his Commentaries at Rome, about Anno Domini 404. And he was certain-ly in the East at the Council of Diospolis, Anno Domi-ni 415. from whence he sent Celestius to Rome; but abode there himself with Albina, Pintarius and Melanias; and wrote Letters to clear himself first to Innocentius, and then to Zosimus, who was so well satisfied there-with, that he wrote a sharp Letter to the African Bishops (who had condemned him) in his Vindication; severely taxing his Accusers; Although there were Herefies in that Controversy which Celestius tended to Zosimus, and which he esteemed Orthodox. And (b) St. Augufline, is fain to make ufe of all his Wit to bring the Pope off from approving of Herefie.” (i) Henr. de Noris confesseth that he was circumvented by the Pelagians: But it was in a matter of Faith, faith (k) Janfe-nius; What, when he denied Original Sin in that very Paper he delivered in to Zosimus! (l) Cappellus thinks it better to deny Zosimus his Letter; but therein he is condemned by (m) Petavius and others who have lately written about this matter, and fay, that Cappel-lus his Opinion is singular and faiie, being contradicted by the Testimonies of Marius Mercator, Facundus Hermi-anenflis and St. Augufline: And one of them blames the Pope for too great easiness; and the other for too great heatinesse; and doth think, that the business of Appeals, then contended by the African Bishops fluck in the Pope’s stomack; which made him willing to take this Occa-sion to rebuke them. But the African Fathers proceeding fmarfly against the Pelagians, notwithstanding Zosimus his Letter, made him to comply too, in condemning both Celestius and Pelagius, notwithstanding his for-mer Epiftle. So that upon the whole matter Pelagius and Celestius, by their own natural Wit, had, in all probability been too hard for a whole Succeffion of Popes, Innocentius, Zosimus and Xylus, had not the A-frican Fathers interpofed, and freely told them what the true Doctrine of the Church was. For (n) they offer’d to subscribe Innocentius his Epifles; Zosimus was very well satisfied, and thought them peevish and unreasonable that were not; (o) Xylus was their Patron at
at Rome, before the African Bishops appear'd so resolute in the Cause. And had it not been for them; for all that I can see, Pelagianism had spread with the Approval of the Roman See.

But notwithstanding it was at last condemned at Rome, and Imperial Conclavities published against it; Yet it found a Way over into the British Churches, by the means of an Agricola, the Son of Severianus, a Pelagian Bishop, as Prosper informs us. It appears by the Recipient of (q) Valentinian III. Anno Dom. 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. (r) Bale and (s) Pits ran into many Mistakes about this Agricola. (t) 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. Augufline's means. Now there was one Leporius of whom (t) Cassian and (u) Gennadius speak, that was a Disciple of Pelagius, who was driven out of Gaul by Proclus, Bishop of Marseilleis, and Cylinnius of Forum Julii, and so went into Africa, where being convinced by St. Augufline, he published his Recantation extant in (w) Sirmonius his Gallican Councils and elsewhere; And Aurelius, Auguflineus and Florentius, gave an account of it to the Bishops of Provence; But there is no Pelagian error there mention'd, but something of Neslianifm: And by Leontius succeeding Cylinnius in his See, before Anno Dom. 420. It follows, that Leporius recanted before the Pelagian Herefie was spread into these Parts; And therefore this Leporius could have nothing to doe in it: Befides, it seems probable that this Leporius, after his Recantation, continued in Africa; For one Leporius, a Presbyter, is (x) mention'd in the Election of Eradius in the See of Hippo, Anno Dom. 426. and (y) St. Augufline faith, he was a Stranger. (z) Bale makes him the Son of Severianus Sulpicius, a Pelagian Presbyr in Britain: But Prosper and Bede fay, he was the Son of Severianus, a Bishop. It is true (z) Gennadius charges Severus Sulpicius with Pelagianism in his old Age; But if he died, as the
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(a) Gals.Christia. (a) Sammarthani say, Anno Dom. 410. Pelagianism was not known to the World then; And (b) Guibertus Ab-bas frees him from the imputation of it: But this Severus never was a Bishop, and therefore could not be the Father of Agricola. (3.) 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 Timotheus, a British Heretic; two Books, faith Bale; but one, faith Pits; Which arises from a Miflake of Sigebert's Copy, where Britannia is put for Bithynia, as our Learned Archbishop Ufher hath observed: And Pits seemed to have some mistrust of 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 (c) Prosper, speaking of Celestine's care to root it out of Britain, he faith, 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 Britains who, being infected with that Heresie themselves, did return hither to infect others. From hence (d) Jansenius thought that Celestius at least, if not Pelagius, did come hither, being driven out of Italy by Celestine; as Prosper relates: which Jansenius thought not improbable: But it now appears by the Commonitorium of Marius Mercator delivered to Theodorus in the Consulship of Dionysius and Florentius, i.e. Anno Domini 429. That Celestius did return into the East, and was banished from Constantinople by the Emperor's Edict; From whence it follows, That Celestius came not into these Parts; nor do we read what became of him after the Council of Ephesus, wherein he was condemned by 275 Bishops, as the fame Marius Mercator shews. Whose account of these things, being a Person of that time, and active in this Cause, hath clear'd several things, which were much in the dark before.

But whosoever they were who brought Pelagianism hither, it appears by Prosper that they were Britains, and had too great Success here by the spreading of Pelagianism. But care was taken by the founder part to get it out; and therefore, distrusting their own sufficiency...
ciency to deal with such subtile Adversaries; they send for help, faith (e) 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 (f) Constantius and Bede. It is affirmed by a late (g) 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 fifteen years difference among Writers about the time of their coming. Prosper faith it was, Anno Dom. 429. But Sigebert, as (h) Simon donus observes, places it, Anno Dom. 446. To which he thinks Bede's Relation doth best agree; And Simon donus himself puts it that year Aetius III. and Symmachus were Consuls, in the 21 of Valentinian III. and 5 of Leo I. If this Computation of the time be true, then it is impossible that St. German should be sent hither by Celestine, as Prosper affirms; For Xyfius was Pope after Celestine, Anno Dom. 432. And it is incredible, That if he had been sent hither by Commission from him, Neither Constantius in his Life of St. German, who lived so near that time; Nor the Author of the Life of St. Lupus Trecenis; Nor Bede should take any notice of it. But they all mention the particular Application made by the Britains to the Gallican Bishops for their Assent; and their meeting in Council on purpose, and chusing, and dispatching St. German and Lupus, without any intimation of Celestine. (i) Baronius and (k) Janfenius 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 chuse; But neither of these will hold. For Prosper faith, That Celestine sent him, Vice sua, in his own Name and stead; Which is very different from appointing a Council to chuse one to be sent: And Constantius faith, That immediately they went; Which shews they did not stay for the Pope's Approbation. And withall, the kindnefs was not so great at that time between Cele
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fline 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 (1) Prosper complains of him particularly in his Epistle to St. Augustine, which was sent to him, Anno Dom. 428, or 429. 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, Anno Dom. 430. 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 (m) Answer, who therein reproves the Bishops of Gaul, for giving too much countenance to some Presbyters who vented new Doctrines, viz. Caffian 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 chuse Persons to go over into Britain to constitute 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, faith nothing at all of it. And this 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 been pitched upon by Celestine for his Legate into Britain.

I wonder how (n) Baronius and (o) 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 Celestine mentions the other Hilary as present with
with Prosper at Rome, when they informed against the Bishops of Gaul. For Honoratus succeeded Patroclus in the See of Arles; Prosper faith, that Patroclus was killed, Anno Dom. 426. Honoratus continued but two years in the See: And so Hilary might well be newly Bishop of Arles, when Prosper and the other Hilary sent to St. Augustine, as plainly appears by their Epiftle; So that Semipelagianism did not, as Archbishop (p) Ufber (q) Ufter de Prim. p. 344., supposes, then begin in Gaul, when St. Germanus and Lupus were here employ’d against Pelagianism, but was begun before, and embraced by those very Bishops who sent them hither; Who for their own Vindication appear’d 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 (q) 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 he shews they are not) before St. German’s voyage into Britain. For St. Augustine received the Complaint time enough to write his two Books of Predestination and Perseverance, in answer to it, after his Book of Retractions; and before his elaborate Work against Julian, and therefore they are probably supposed to be written, Anno Dom. 428. If we then yield that St. German’s coming hither was when Prosper faith, Anno Dom. 429. yet we find that Semipelagianism had prevailed among the Gallican Bishops before that time, or else there was no caufe 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 Lupus was Brother to Vincentius Liviensis, and were both of the same Society. Which 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
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early and so warmly in it; Not only by the Objections under his Name in Prosper; But by the whole Design of his Commonitorium; Which, if I mistake not, was levell'd 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 over that Discourse, and consider the drift of it, will find I am not mistaken: But (r) 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 favouring Pelagianism, which Celeftine, Fanfus, and this Vincentius all professed to abhor.

But what shall be said to Prosper, who affirms that Celestine sent St. German? (1.) (s) Prosper, in his undoubtedly Work against Caffian, doth not affirm it. For there he only faith, That Celestine took care to free Britain from Pelagianism. Why is not the Mission of St. German here mention'd, 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, bytridge 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 Pithaeus never mentions it, which he thought to be the genuine Chronicon of Prosper. (t) 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. (u) Buccherius thinks it impossible the same Person should write both; yet both pass under the Name of Tyro Prosper; and so he faith the ancient MS. of it, which he had (which was like that (w) Pontacus calls Ludovense) had that Name in the Title of it; But Pontacus his had the Title of Prosper Aquitanius, where he is said to be Episcopus Regni, and great debate hath been, whether he was Bishop of Regnum Lepidum in Italy;
Chap. IV. the British Churches.

Italy; or of Regnum (Riez) in Gaul; But (x) Sirmon-
dus proves, he was neither one, nor the other; By the
Testimonies of Gennadius, Victorius, Marcellinus, and o-
thers; And by Faustus immediately succeeding Maxi-
mus in that Sec: And so leaving no room for Prosper
between them. But there was a Prosper, Bishop of Or-
leans at that time; and another Prosper, Bishop of Re-
gium Lepidum in Italy, as (y) Ugellus shews, which (z)
might occasion the Mistake; But, besides these,
(z) Sirmon dulus tells us, there was another Prosper in
Gaul who wrote a Chronicon too, and ended at the fame
time with Tyro Prosper; with this difference, that the
one was onely an Appendix to St. Jerome, the other an
entire Chronicon, as Gennadius express it. Which is
suppos'd to be that published by Labbe out of feve-
ral MSS. But (a) tho' those who have carefully examin'd
it have found such a difference in the Computation used
in the several parts of it, That they cannot think them
written by the fame Author; And therefore con-
clude that published by Pitheus 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
discov'd. So that it remains uncertain whether this
Passage be in the true Prosper or not. Our (b) Lear-
ned Primate of Armagh was of opinion, That the Chro-
nicon published by Pitheus was not written by Prosper,
but by Gennadius; because Boslon of Bury faith, That
Gennadius added a Chronicon to St. Jerome. And, I
confes, the Passage in it about the Heresie of the Præ-
delinati doth better agree with Gennadius than Pro-
ser; And for that Reafon Sirmon dus hath found out
another Prosper. But the President (c) Mauguis faith, 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. Anno Domini 444. Sirmon dus
faith, All the ancient Copies had the Name of Prosper
upon it. And it is so quoted by Sigebert; But if he
had a mind to pass for the other Prosper, he would ne-
ever have diffier'd 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 fo, yet there
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 his Epistles to him; and one that wrote with great fidelity, faith Barovius; And therefore it cannot be supposed that he should not expressly set down by whom St. German was sent into Britain. Besides, 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, Freca rpbus, Erricus and Ado Viennejjs 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 employ'd by the Bishops of Gaul, in a solemn Conference at Verulam 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 Britains well settled, as they supposed, in the ancient Faith. But no sooner were they returned, but some of the Pelagians got ground again; which occasion'd another Meriage to St. German, who then took with him 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 thence forward 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 Faafidius, and the other Faustus.

As to Faafidius, (i) Leland confesses, that his memory had been lost, but for the mention which Gennadius makes of him; (k) who faith 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. (l) Trithemius highly commends him, as a man of great Wit and Eloquence, an excellent Preacher, and very pious Man. (m) Bale faith, that, being made Bishop, he preached over all Britain, and was, as is reported, Metropolitan of London: What Bale speaks upon the report; (n) Pits affirms with confidence, that he was

Arch-
Archbishop of London. (o) Archbifhop Uther thinks, (o) uter, de
they had no other ground for this, but a different rea-
ding in Gennadius, Britanniarum Episcopus. From whence
they concluded, He must be Archbishop of London, that be-
ing, as they supposed, the Metropolis of Britain; But he
rather inclines to the opinion of Berterius; That York
was then the Metropolis of Britain: Not onely because it
was a Roman Colony, but because the Praetorium and
Emperour's Palace was there. But these Arguments are
not sufficient to overthrow London's being the chief
Metropolis of the Roman times. For every Province had
its Metropolis; And the superiority of one Metropolis
above another depended on the Residence of the Ro-
man Government, the Vicarius Britanniarum. I grant
that, in the time of the Wars with the Northern Bri-
tains, York was the chief Seat of the Emperour when
he was here, as in the times of Severus and Constantius;
but that was for the conveniency of attending the
Wars, and being near to give Directions and send
Supplies. But the Preheminence of Places in the Ro-
man 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 Governour 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 con-
sular or presidial; and therefore the solemn Convventus
out of the Provinces were appointed there. Of these
things we have a clear instance in the Cafe of Arles;
where by the Constitution of (p) Honorius, the seven
Provinces, over which that was the Metropolis, were to
have an annual Assembly there, where the chief Magis-
trate resided; and the Reasons there given are, the
great conveniency of that City being upon the Ri-
ver Rhone, both for other business and trading into
all parts. The fame Reasons will hold to make Lon-
don the chief Metropolis in the Roman times, because of
its
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its admirable situation for Trade and Commerce, and the opportunity of sending into, or receiving Dispatches from the foreign Provinces and the Emperor's Court where ever 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, (as I may shew elsewhere) and of a higher nature, when it was called (q) 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 (r) Marc. Vellerus, That those Cities which had the Title of Augusta conferred upon them, were the Capita Gentium, the chief Metropoles 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 Faustinus were then Bishop of London, he was the chief Metropolitane over the Churches of Britain.

But whether Faustinus were Metropolitane, or only a British Bishop, his Doctrine is of late charged to be Inclinable to Pelagianism. For Holfenis found in ancient MS. the Book Faustinus 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 (s) Augulfinius 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 Trihemius give of him. Out of which Book, and no great one, Bale hath made four, one De Vita Christiana, a second De Doctrina Spiritus, a third De Viduitate fervanda, a fourth, Admonitiones Piae. Pits keeps the same number, but left he should seem to take all out of Bale, he alters the Title of one of them; And because Gennadius faith 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 we can find,
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find, there is but one extant. (t) Dempfer hath found Faustidius to have been born upon the Mountains of the Western parts of Scotland; and he makes him Author of a fifth Book called Chronicon Scotorum, which is a Strain beyond Pits. He positively affirms that he lived An.Dom.440. Trithemius faith, about An.Dom.420.

As to Faustus, his Case is much harder. That he was originally a Britain I find not denied by any; For although (w) Facundus calls him a Gaul, yet that was because of his being a Bishop so long there, as Sirmundus observes; he being Ortu Britannus, habitaculo Regienis, as (w) Alcimus Avitus faith, in his Epistle to Gundobadus, King of the Burgundians, to whom, he faith, Faustus was known. In his (x) Epistles to Ruficius, Faustus speaks of his living in a State of Banishment, and the Comforts he found in it; This our Learned (y) Primate understood of his living out of his own Countrey; But (z) Hen. de Noris, of a Banishment by Euricius 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 Countrey; I see no cause to take them in any other sense. For Men do not use to call that their Countrey where they live as Strangers, and he speaks of the kindness of Ruficius fo to him, that he did Patriam in peregrinatione facere, which cannot well bear any other sense, than that he made the want of his own Countrey to him: (a) Sirmundus grants he was a Britain; but he adds, he was one of those Britains who dwelt upon the Loir, i.e. in the parts of Armorica. There is no question, but in the time of Faustus, there were great numbers of Britains there; for (b) Jornandes faith, That Riothamus, their King or General, went with 12000 Britains against Euricius, King of the Vifigoths. Which Riothamus (c) Sidonius Apollinaris writes to, and mentions the Britains with him; But it may be justly a question, whether there were any Colonies of Britains on the Continent, before Faustus his birth: For Faustus was made Abbat of Lerins, before the Saxons came first into Britain; For he was Abbat D d when
when St. Caprasius died, as the Author of his Life affirms, which was about Anno Domini 430. But their coming was not till Anno Domini 449. and it will be hard to make out any Settlement of the Britains on the Loir before. It is then most probable that Faustus went at first out of Britain into Gaul, where he attained to a wonderfull Reputation both for Piety and Learning. He was worshipped as a Saint, faith (d) Norris, in the Church of Riez, and his Name was preferred in the Calendar of the Gallican Church. Molanus was the first who durft adventure to strike out his name; Baronius follow'd him, but upon admonition restored it, as (e) Bollandus observes, who likewise takes notice, that he was called a Saint by Cl. Robertus, by Ferrarius, and by Pet. Galefinius, in his Martyrology, 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 Perfon in mighty esteem in his own time, as appears by the Passages of (f) Sidonius Apollinaris, of (g) 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: He was Bishop of Riez, Anno Domini 462. for at that time he was joined with Auxanius in determining the Controversie between Leontius of Arles and Mamertus of Vienna. 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 fence in the great Points then so much agitated about Predestination and Grace, as appears by his Preface to Leontius. At this Council thirty Bishops were present, and there Lucidus prefented his Recantation of the Errors he held about Predestination, and after this Faustus wrote his Books of Grace and Free-will, to which, he faith, another Council at Lyons caufed some things to be added. In these Books it is thought that, under a Pretence of confuting thofe Errors, he sets himself againft St. Augustines Doctrin, as seems clear by one Expression in his first Book; That if it be true, that some are predeftinated to Life, and others to Destruction,
It hath been a great Question among some Learned Men, whether there were any Persons who drew ill Consequences from Saint 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 Semi-pelagians did charge the Followers of St. Augustine with the same things which are made the Opinions of those who are called the Predestination Heretics by 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 Time, as appears by the Controversie 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 (2) St. 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 great Heats upon the Occasion of that Epistle. Some of them, as (3) St. Augustine himself faith, did so preach up the Grace of God, as to deny Free-will, and consequently to say, That God in the day of Judgment would not render to men according to their Works; Others said, That our Free-will was affiicted by the Grace of God, that we may know and doe 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, faith he, who judge thus do judge rightly. Therefore those who...
thought otherwise did mistake his Doctrine; For, as he faith, If there be no Grace, there can be no Salvation; If there be no Free-will, 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 (k) Eustochius, in his Answer to those Adrumetine Monks shews, That there is still Free-will in us, but wounded by the Fall, and only recoverable by the Grace of Christ. (l) Jansenius grants that they did misunderstand St. Augustine’s Doctrine, thinking that Free-will was wholly destroyed by it; And that no Man ought to be reproved when he doeth amiss, but that others ought to pray that he may have Grace to doe better. But the President (m) Mansin will not allow this; For he faith, That St. Augustine was at first falsely informed of the state of the Controversie among them by Cre-fconius and Felix; But after Florus his coming he found they were Semipelagians who misinterpreted his Doctrine. But to what purpose then doth (n) St. Augustine take such pains to prove even in the Book he wrote after the coming of Florus, That there is Free-will still left in Mankind? Liberus itaque arbitrium confitendum nos est habere, & ad malum, & 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 consiency with Divine Commands, and the just Reproof and Punishment of those who doe amiss. Which shews plainly, That he thought there were some still who misinterpreted his Doctrine, not barely to object against it, but to make ille use of it. Therefore (o) Noris had no Reafon 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 Predestination Herekicks at that time in Gaul; and thence in (p) Sirmondus was certainly mistaken, as he was likewise, when he faith, that the Epiftle of Celestine was against the latter, and not against the former. But it appears by Faustus his Epiftle to Lucidus that there were some who did so affect Predestination as to make all Mens Endeavours vain and useless; And this dan-
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crous Errour he renounced in his Recantation delivered to the Council of Arles, (q) de vita et moribus SS. Triphunis of Angers. But especially for a profound cunning, which (r) 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 (s) Nosis himself confesseth he can never affent 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 Britains, 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 Anno Domini 475. But they say, that the Bishops were partly Semipelagians, partly deceived by Faustus who was so; And Nosis doth not deny, that there were other Persons who were then charged with those Opinions which Lucidus held. But, he faith, they were not many nor considerable enough to make a Set; And that they did not willingly yield those Consequences. But not knowing how to answer the Semipelagians, they were forced to affect them; Which their Adversaries therefore charged them with as their own Opinions. Which seems no improbable Account of those called Predestinarians. It cannot be denied, that Faustus his Books were severely censured after his death, not only by the Scythian Monks at Constantinople, among whom Job. Maxentius was the chief; but by the African Bishops who were then Exiles in Sardinia, by whom Fulgentius was employ'd to write against them. But Possessor, one of the African exiled Bishops, being then at Constantinople, and finding great Hears about Faustus his Books, sends to Pope Hormisdas, to know his
his Judgment about them; Which he did at the request of Vitalianus and Justinianus two of the greatest Men in the Emperor's Court. He returns a cautious Answer as to Faustus; Which, by the way, shews how little Credit is to be given to the Decree of Gelafius about Apocryphal Books, for therein Faustus his Books are condemned. But if this had been done by Gelafius, is it probable that Hormifdas, his Successour, would have stuck so much at it as Maxentius faith that he did! But he refers them for the Sense of the Church to St. Auguftine, and Proper, and Hilary; And the Definitions of his Predecessours. Maxentius rails against this Answer, as unfaftisfactory and next to heretical, and fets St. Auguftine's Sayings againft thofe of Faustus. Afterwards, Caefarius, Bishop of Arles, not only wrote againft Faustus his Doctrine, but by his means chieffly it was condemned in the Second Council of Orange: Which afferted the Neceffity of Preventing Grace; The denying whereof was the main Error charg'd on Faustus, not fo much as to good Works (for Janfenius hath at large proved, That the Semipelagians did yield the Neceffity of Internal Grace as to them;) but Faustus and Caffian 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 Kindneffes to the Britifh Churches besides the confufing Pelagianifm, whereof two are most considerable. (1.) The Institution of Schools of Learning among the Britains. (2.) The Introduction of the Gallican Liturgy into the use of thofe Churches.

(1.) As to Schools of Learning; none were more famous among the Britains than thofe of Dubricius and Litus, who are both faid to have been the Disciples of St. German. The Anonymous Author of the Chronicle in (u) Leland faith, that St. Germanus and Lupus, having rooted out Pelagianifm, confeffed Bifhops in feveral parts of Britain, and among the reft they placed a Cathedral at Landaff, and made Dubricius Archbifhop, who difpofed of his Disciples to feveral Churches; He made Daniel Bifhop of Bangor, and fent Litus to a Place from him called Lan Ilitut, or the Church of Ilitutus.
Ilutus. (w) Camden faith, to this day it is called Lantuit, where the Foundations of many Houfes are still to be seen; Near the Place called Bovium in the Itinerary, now Boverton. But there is another Place near Nidum or Neath, whose name comes very near it Llanylled. The (x) old Register of Landaff, after it hath mention'd the frequent Messages the Britains sent to the neighbour Bishops of Gaul for assistance against the Pelagians, and the coming of Germanus and Lupus sent by them, it adds, that they consecrated Bishops in many Places, and made Dubricius Archbishop over all the Britains, 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; Archbishop (y) Uther takes it for South Wales; it being the custome of the Britains to call the South the Right hand side; so Afferius Menevientis calls Sussex the Region of the Right hand Saxons. But it is observable that (z) Afferius there makes Demetia, or South Wales, to be but a part of what he calls Dextralis pars Britanniae.

For when he faith 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 Gwent, by which North Wales is as much understood as South Wales is by the other. And therefore I rather think Dubricius was made Archbishop over all the Britains in those parts; For (a) Ranulfus Cefrens faith, The Bishop of Caerleon had seven suffragan Bishops under him: And (b) Matt. Westminister faith, That Dubricius was made Archbishop of Caerleon, (although he might have a Seat at Landaff, as the Register of that Church affirms, by the Gift of Mouricus.) But it appears that he had then Archiepiscopal Power; And possibly, upon the Disturbance of those times, the See might for a time be removed to Landaff; From whence it was again removed by St. David to the Town bearing his Name. But the Bishops of Landaff who succeeded were so unsatisfied with it; That the Register of that Church faith, That from Oudoceus the second, from Dubricius; (for he succeeded Telianus in that See) They chose rather to be consecrated
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separated by the Archbishops of Canterbury, than by their own Metropolitan of St. David's, as appears by the Protestation made by the Bishop of Landaff to Calixtus II. in the Council of Rheimes, Anno Dom. 1119. 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 British Archbishop, at Doli in Britannie, or that there was a Succession preferred for some time of the Archbishops of London among the Britains; after the retirement of Theonus and Theadiocus, the two other Metropolitans of London and York, who, as (c) Matt. Westminiter faith, 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 Ramulphus faith, That Province extended as far as the Severn, and so took in Chester, Hereford and Worcester; But before Dubricius was so much advanced, 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. Thelious, Samhon, Aidamus, 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 humane and divine Literature. And the other was at Moch-rhos, where he had a Place for Study and Devotion.

Ilutus by (d) Vincentius, and the (e) Author of the Life of Samhon is said positively to have been a Disciple of St. Germanus; And the (f) Author of the Life of Gildas faith, That in the School of Ilutus many Noblemen's Sons were brought up, among whom he reckons as the chief Samhon, afterwards Archbishop of the Britains, viz. at Doli in Britannie; Paulus, Bishop of

(c) Matt. Westminton, A. D. 388.
(d) Vincentius.
(e) Bildish.
Florin. p. 468.
(f) Vide Gild. H. c. 3.
of the Oxifmii, the most Northern of the Aremorici (which Biphoprick is since divided into three, Treguier, St. Pol de Leon and St. Brieu) and Gildas, called Sapiens, of whom afterwards: Leland to these adds David and Paulinus: And faith, his School flourished like an University among the Britains. (g) Bollandus and Henfechenius 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 Itutus to undertake the Education of the British Clergy; And that by these means, as Bede faith, these Churches continued afterwards pure and free from this Herefie. Which was a wise and seasonable Institution; And hereby we see the Britifh Churches were not defective in Learning in their lowest Condition, when the Britains were forced to leave their Habitations, and to fly into Corners.

Of which, besides these Nurseries of Dubricius and Itutus, we have a famous Instance in the Monastery of Banchor, which even (h) Bede faith, was furnished with learned Men at the coming of Augustine into England. This Banchor was distant but ten or twelve miles from Chester, as (i) Ramulphus Ceflrensis and Bradshaw, in his Life of St. Werburg, say. (k) 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.

(l) Camden supposes it to be the Bomium in Antonius, being ten miles distant from Deva, i.e. Chester. That which was most observable in this Britifh Monastery was, that Men there were bred up to Learning and Devotion together, and so more resembling our Colleges than the Egyptian Monasteries, where men were brought up to Ignorance and Labour as much as to Devotion. Wherein the Benediftines followed them according to their first Institution: For St. Benedift himself not onely decried Learning, as the Writers of his Life say; But he takes no care about it in the Rule of his Order; And when (m) Boniface gave an account to Zachary of his setting up a Benediftine Monastery at Fulda, he sets the Monks out by their Abstinence and
hard Labour with their own Hands, without Servants. It
is true that (n) Trithemius speaks much of the Schools of
Learning in the Benediction Monasteries, but not before
Amo Dom. 890. which was after the (o) Constitutions of
Charles the great; who appointed Schools for instructing
Youth both in Monasteries and Cathedrals; Which gave
the first Countenance and Encouragement to Learning
at that time; And (p) Lupus Ferrarensis faith, That
the reviving of Learning was then owing to him: But although these Constitutions extended no farther than to
Grammar Schools; yet from hence, those who were in-
clined to Learning in the Monasteries applied them-
selves more to it; and by degrees gained a great Re-
putation by it, as Rabanus Maurus at Fulda, whose
esteem drew Lupus thither, and many others; Which
example prevailing, and the Monks finding such re-
fort to increace their Wealth as well as Reputation,
as (q) Aub. Mireus observes; from that time the Mo-
nafteries were desirous to have some of their Number
be eminent for Learning, which had been before
so much neglected by them, as wholly besides the
Rule of their Order: But the Monasteries of the We-
ften Churches before St. Benedict's time, such as that
of St. Ambrofe, St. Eufebius of Verceilles, St. Augufline in
Africa, St. Martin in Gaul, were chiefly intended as
Monaftery to the Church, and the Persons educated
therein, were brought up with a design to doe 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 Monaf-
tery of Lerins, according to the Rule of Capafius,) St. Ger-
man 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,
St. Patrick, who carried over this Monafick Education
into Ireland, spent many years under the Discipline
of St. German, as (r) Probus and (s) Jocelin the Wri-
ters of his Life do agree. And thofe who have writ-
ten of St. German have mention'd him as one of his Disciples, as (t) Erricus of Auxerre. And (u) William
of Malmsbury faith, he was not onely a Disciple of Saint
German,
German, but being made Bishop by Celestine, he was sent by St. German into Ireland. And in the Irish Monasteries there were Schools like those of Dubricius and Ilitus for the breeding of Youth in Learning. For therein, as Rowe an Antiquary in Edward IV. time faith, "The Masters did teach, fccundum formam Studiorum antiquorum, according to the ancient method of Learning; Which our learned (w) Primate understands of joining the Studies of humane 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 Opus Tripartitum of the Life of St. Patrick faith, That he set up at Armagh Summum studium literae. 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, which the (x) Civilians tell us, None but the Supreme Authority of a Nation can doe. In this School at Armagh, Caradoc of Lancarvan in his Life of Gildas faith, That he was a 1. 2. Professour, Studium regens & prædicans in Civitate Armacæ. But the Anonymous Author of his Life published out of an ancient MS. by Job. à Bosco (y) faith; That Gildas, going over into Ireland in the time of Ammeric, i.e. about Anno Dom. 566. found both Religion and Learning much decay'd there, and that he built many Churches and Monasteries, and brought up many Noble Mens Sons therein. In his younger days, he faith, Gildas went to Iren, and visited the Schools of many Learned Men, and enquired their Opinions in Philosophical and Divine matters.

Some question hath been made by Learned Men, what this Author means by Iren; The most eafe and obvious senfe 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 (z) Diodorus Siculus for Ireland: And (a) Ierne in the Book de Mundo, and Apuleius; and the Inhabitants are called Irenes by (b) Ordericus Vitalis; and the Country is called Erin by the Inhabitants, as Archbishop 
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(c) Cf. Gug. (c) Ufher observes; But the marginal Note of Job.

\( \text{a} \) Boefo hath led some quite out of their way in see-

king for this Place; Which is, That Iren was an Uni-

versity then in Great Britain; And from hence they

have proceeded to prove our famous Univerfity of

Oxford to be meant by it; (d) Firft, Iren, fay they,

was mistaken for Icen, and that for Ychen, and Ychen

for Rydychen, and Rydychen in the British Tongue sig-

nifies the fame with Vadum Boun, and that is the fame

with Oxford. I cannot think Learned Men write these

things any otherwife, than as Sports of Wit, which are

intended for the diversion, and not for the conviction

of the Reader. As likewise, when the fame Authours

produce out of Constantinus his Life of St. German, Regi-

onis ilius Universitas, to prove the Antiquty of their Un-

iversity. But that Paflage in the Copy of Affierius,

printed by Camden is more material, viz. That St. Ger-

man ftaid half a year in Oxford, and approved the Or-

ders made by Gildas, Melkin, Nennius and Kentigern.

I know what Heats have been about this Paflage a-

mong very Learned Men. For my part, I fee no caufe to

caution the fincerity of Archbishop Parker in

the Edition of his very ancient Copy, where this Pafla-

gage was not to be found; And I do not question

Camden's Fidelity in publishing Affierius out of some o-

ther Copy; But it had been fair to have given an Ac-

count whence he had it, and for what Reafons he in-

ferted it in another Edition of Affierius; and why he

preferred the Savilian Copy before the other. But I

cannot but wonder that these Learned Men have ta-

taken no more notice of the Inconfiftency of this Pa-

flage with the Hiftory of thofe times. For thefe Per-

fons all lived a confiderable time after St. German, as it

were eafe to prove, if it were worth the pains. For

Gilllas was not born till at leaft forty four years were

paft after St. German's death: which thus appears; He

faith he was born the year of the Victory of Aurelius

Ambrofius over the Saxons at the Monis Badonicus, which

was forty four years after they came hither. Anno Dom.

449. And by comparing St. German's Embaffy to

Valentinian at Ravenna, where he died, we fhall find

that St. German was dead the year before the Saxons

arrival,
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arrived, Anno Dom. 448. As the (e) Samarthani flew. (c) Gall. Chrisi-
But against this there is a considerable Objection from
what (f) Bede faith, That the Saxons and Picts joined
together after St. Germans coming, which occasion’d 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 Constantius. But this may be
easily solved by those that consider the frequent In-
cursions the Saxons made on the Britains before they
were sent for over; as appears by the Comes Litoris Sax-
onici per Britanniam, appointed to secure the Coasts
from the Saxons; And that Gildas therefore wonders
the Britains should send for the Saxons, of whom they
were so much afraid before; And when the Roman For-
ces were withdrawn, no doubt they did more boldly
and frequently disturb them.

Besides, (g) Constantius faith 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 Anno Dom. 418. as our Learned (h) Primate hath
proved, because the Calends of May on which he died were
that year, as Constantius faith, the fourth day of the
Week, which agrees to 418. If it be said, That this
Page of Aslerius is meant of an Elder Gildas, called
Gildas Albanius whose Life the same excellent Antiquary
supposes to be written by Caradoc of Lancarvan; I an-
swer, that when he comes to fix the times in his Chron-
ological Index, he doth overthrow his own Suppositi-
on: For Caradoc, by his own confession, makes Gildas
contemporary with King Arthur, and he is said by him
to be born Anno Dom. 493. And therefore Caradoc’s
Gildas can be no elder than the Gildas Badonicus. Al-
though 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 Job. a
Bofco with the other by Caradoc, will find that they
were designed for the same Person. And therefore Le-
land, with far more judgment, mentions but one Gil-
das; but Bale and Pits make more; but it is their Va-
nity to multiply Authours as well as Books. St. Kenti-
gern was baptized asfoon as he was born, by Seruanus,
one of the Disciples of Palladius, whose Mission had
the
the same date with the first coming of St. Germanus
and Lupus: And therefore it is not very probable that
St. German should see the Orders of Gildas and Kenti-
gern, much less those of Melkin 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 wheretoever he came:
Both which were falling very much to decay upon the
irruption of the barbarous Nations. While the Roman
Empire flourished there was care taken for the encou-
ragement 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 entring their Names who came thither
out of the several Provinces by the Magister Census,
with the Testimonials from the Governors of Provi-
tces, 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 Cen-
tiales to make an Inspection into their Lives, that they
did avoid all Clubs called there Conclusions, or fre-
fquent appearing at the Sports, or affecting unsefa-
nable and publick 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 month-
ly, and given in to the Prefectus Urbis, and return'd to
the Emperour every year; as appears by the (i) Con-
stitution 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 Emperour thought it not below
his Cognizance to have notice sent him of the Num-
bers, Qualities and Behaviours of the Students; But
left the Splendour and Vanities of Rome should tempt
them to forsake the Service of their Countrey, they
were not permitted to stay there after twenty years of
Age; For then, not having the Difficulties of the

(i) C. Theod.
l. 14. vi. 5.
L. i. A. D. 379.
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Language to conquer which they were used to while Children, at fifteen they were thought fit to be instructed in other Studies, and five or fix years was all the time this Law allow'd them to prosecute them under the Masters at Rome. Where, beides an infinite number of private Teachers in that vast City, there were publick Professours appointed, who had their Schools within the Area of the Capitol, which were called Auditoria publica, as we may reasonably infer from the (k) Constitution of Theodorus; where the Exedra of the Portico's of the Capitol at Constantinople are appointed to make Auditoria for the publick Professours there: And Constantinople follow'd the Pattern at Rome. These Exedra were, as (l) Vitruvius describes them, Places of Capacity within the Portico's, with Seats round, in which the Rhetoricians, and others, were wont to discourse; Or, according to (m) Cicero, they were Cella's, ad colloquendum aut meridiandum, such as Crassius had at Tufculum, and Cotta at Rome, where those great Men were wont to fit for their diversion and discourse with each other: And the Greek Glossary renders Exedra, a School; such a one (n) 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 publick Allowance, under the Government of a Person appointed by their Kings, and after by the Ceesars. This Museum was adjoining to the Palace, and near it was the famous Library of Ptolemy Philadelphus: For that was in Bruchio, as (o) Epiphanius faith, and was distinct from the other Library afterwards in Serapeo mentioned by (p) Ammianus Marcellinus. This Bruchion was a Region of the City, as Epiphanius faith; And some will have its Name from the πεσεχείρ, the Granary of Alexandria being there, and by contraction it was called πεσεχείρ. So the MS. of (q) Eusebius mention'd by Valerius hath it. But (r) Salmofius would have the name taken from the Stores laid in there for the College of Learned Men in the Mufawm, which Ammianus Marcellinus calls Presumptium hominem domicilium; And this πεσεχείρ, he faith, is the same with πεσσεχείρ, and Euflathius faith, The one signified the same at Alexandria, which the
the other did at Athens; And, he observes, that it was accounted a great favour in the Emperours to grant any Learned Man 2 &c. to Misebe ornis, i.e. a Fellowship in the College. So (s) Athenæus mentions it as the kindnes 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. Aristonius 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 (t) Photius faith that Sophater borrow’d part of the twelfth Book of his Miscellanies. But this Book being lost, as likewise those of Callimachus and Alcidamas, no particular account can be given of the History of it. Onely 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 Ephesus, Eratosthenes, Apollonius, Aristonymus, Chæremon, Dionysius, &c. In this Musewm it was that (u) Hadrian proposed Questions to the Professours; and in it were Ἀγώνες institutéd, 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 (w) Horace mentions Metius Tarpa for one. These were sometimes performed in the Capitol, as (x) Ryequins observes, i.e. in the Portico’s where the Exedrae were like those at Constantinople. What the Number of publick Professours was at Alexandria and Rome is not certainly known, but at Constantinople their Number is determin’d by a (y) Constitution of Theodorus. In the Publick Schools called there Auditorium Capitolii and Auditorium nofrum, there were to be for the Latine Tongue.
Tongue three Oratours, and ten Grammarians; For the Greek five Sophists and ten Grammarians; One Professor of Philosophy and two of Law. These had their distinct Schools allotted them called Publicae Magistrati-ones and Cellæ in the Law; And all others were forbidden to teach in publick, either within the Capitol, or elsewhere, upon pain of Infamy for the Fact, and Banishment out of the City. The Emperor Valens, by another Constitution, appointed for the Publick Library at Constantinople seven Antiquaries to look after the Books, four Greek and three Latine, who were to have a publick 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 Joh. (z) Sarisburiensis faith, It was repor- ted that Gregory the great caused it to be destroyed, out of a fear, that Heathen Learning should abate Mens Love to the Scriptures; which was a very foolish and superflitious 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 faith, There were twenty seven more publick Libraries in Rome. If this Story be true, Gregory rather follow'd the Steps of Julian than of Constantin; for the one envied Learning to the Christians as much as the other promoted it, Victor's Epitome faith of Con- stantine, that he did, Natire artes bonas, præcipue flui- dia Literarum; And his (a) Constitutions still extant do shew the great kindness he had for Learning and Learned Men; granting great Privileges and publick Salaries to the Professours of Learning in the several Cities of the Empire. But Julian, finding that Christiani- ty did spread by the Learning of the Christians, he first drew the choice of publick Professours to himself, by making his Approbation necessary after the Judicium Ordinis and Decretum Curialium, and so excluded the Christians. Afterwards (b) he expressly declared, He would endure none to interpret Heathen Authours, who ar- gued against their Religion: But no Constitution appears

---

(a) C. Theod. 15. iii. 5. LL. 1. 25. 35.

(b) Julian. Ep. 42.
in the Code besides the former tending that Way. Upon this Prosephius, faith (c) St. Jerome, left the Chair at Athens, although he had a particular Indulgence by Julian. And (d) Orosius adds, That the Christian Professours of Learning almost universally forsook their Places: But both mention an express Edict of Julian's to that purpose. Some 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 Apostacy of Julian, under his Heathen Tu-
tours, Mardonius, 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 meaure due to Antoninus Pius, of whom (e) Jul. Capitolinus faith, That he appointed Honours and Penfions to Rhetoricians and Philosophers through all the Provinces; which were confirmed and enlarged by the feveral Edicts of Con-
fantine to that purpose, already mention'd. And (f) Fr. Baldwin takes particular notice of his Zeal to promote Learning. In Gaul (g) St. Jerome mentions the Florentifima Studia Galliarum; And Constantinus, in the Life of St. German, the Auditoria Galliarum; after which, he faith, he went to Rome as the chief Univerfity especially for Law; thence (h) Sido-
nius Apollinaris calls it Domicilium Legum, and Saint (i) Augustinian faith, he went thither to study the Laws. But other Professions flourished elsewhere; as at Car-
thage, (k) Salvian faith, There were Professours of all Arts and Sciences: And at Sicca Veneria in Africa, Arno-
bus was Professour of Rhetorick. Near Lyons in Gaul the 60 Cities had dedicated an Altar to Augustus, where the Rhofin and the Arar meet, there Caius Caligula ap-
pointed Prizes to be plaid both in Greek and Latine Eloquence; And not that onely, but Philosophy was there taught; Thence (l) Odilo, Abbat of Clugney, a-
about Anno Dom. 1020. calls Lyons of old the Mother and Nurfe of Philosophy. In the time of Diocefeian and Maximianus, the Nobility of Gaul were brought up to
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To Learning at Auguflovakium (Autun) and there Eumenius was both Reffour and Profefour, as appears by his Speech to Confantinus, where (m) he celebrates fo much the Schola Meniana, Quondam pulcherrimo operæ studiorum frequentia celebres; which having suffer’d 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 his time, (n) Tacitus faith, The Sons of the Nobility did there, Liberalibus studiis operari, improve themselves in Learning. (o) Eusebius mentions, in the time of Nero, Statius Ur, (o) la Chronic. Salus of Tholoufe, a famous Profefour of Rhetorick. And (p) Aufonius reckons up many of thoee who had been famous there and at Pauwzech, and other Places. But to spare our pains in particular Places, there is extant in the Theodosian Code an (q) Edict of Gratian, requiring all the chief Cities of thes Parts of the Roman Empire to settle and maintain in them Profefours of Learning, both of the Greek and Roman Languages. This Edict was directed to the Praefectus Prætorio Galliarum, and was commanded to be observed through all his Diocefe, which Gothofred restrains to the Provinces of Gaul, excluding Britſtan, for which I fee no reaſon; Since (r) Aufonius who was himſelf in that Office in Gratian’s time comprehends the Britſta under his Jurisdiction. And the Notitia Imperii places the Provinces of Britſtan under him after Gratian’s time. Which Notitia he thinks was made about Anno Dom. 426. By virtue of which Edict we are to search for the ancient Schools of Learning among the Britſtas, in the chief Cities of the Provinces at that time; especially at Lon- don, which was the Caput Gentis, being Augufalia or the Imperial City; and fo at York and Caerleon. So that the Britſh Churches, as long as the Roman Power continued here, had the fame advantages for Learning which they had in other Provinces; But when the Roman Forces were withdrawn, and nothing but Miferies and Defolation follow’d; then St. German’s Care proved a moft ſeaſonable Relief to them in providing fuch Schools as thoee of Dubricius and Ithica for the breeding up of Perfons qualified for the Service of the
Church; as far as the Miseries of those times would permit.

The last thing to be considered is, The Publick Service of the British Churches. And in an 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, Ordinum Cursus Gallorun. By which (s) Archbishop Usher understands the Gallican Liturgy. For Cursus in the Ecclesiastical use of the Word is the same with Officium Divinum, as Dominicus Macer, in his late Hierolexic shows; thence Cursum celebrare, is, to perform Divine Offices; And so the word Cursus is often used in (t) Fortunatus his Life of St. German, Bishop of Paris, and in our (u) Saxon Writers: But this Cursus Gallorun is there distinguished from the Cursus Orientalis, and the Cursus Ambrosii, and the Cursus Benediciti (which little differs, he faith, from the Cursus Romanus.) And this was that which Germanus and Lupus had learnt in the Monastery of Lerins, where it was used by Cassianus and Honoratus, as the Author of that Book affirms, which I find to have been the fame which (w) 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 Turonenfis wrote de Cursibus Ecclesiastieis, but for the quoting the (x) Life of Columbanus and Attala, which was not written till after his Death.

This will oblige us to enquire, what the Gallican Liturgy at this time was, and how far different from the Roman. 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 was consecrated by the Archbishop of Arles, one of the Questions, (y) Augustine proposed, was, since there was such difference between 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 still between them;
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And that the Pope did not oblige him to follow the Example of the Roman Church; chiefly, I fuppofe, because the Queen, being a Christian before, and using the Gallican Liturgy in the Publick Service, 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 Mufaeus mention’d by (z) Gennadius were extant, we should easily understand wherein the difference lay. For, he being a Presbyter of the Church of Marséilles, and a Man Learned in the Scriptures, was defir’d by Venerius, the Bishop there, to draw up a Form of Publick Service, consisting of two Parts, viz. The Morning Service, and the Communion Service. The first he finifhed in the time of Venerius, and is highly commend’d by Gennadius for its Order, Usefulness and Decency. The second, in the time of Euflathius his Successour, which he likewise commend’s for its great weight and exactness, and there was great Reason at that time, to bring the Church Service into Order, because Caffian and others endeavour’d to introduce the Monaflick Customs which he had observed in Egypt and elfewhere, as appears by the design of his Monaflick Institutions, especially the fecond and third Books, which he dedicated to Caffor, Bishop of Apta Julia, at the fame time that Venerius was Bishop of Marséilles, where Caffian lived. This Mufaeus was therefore employ’d to draw up the most convenient Order for the Publick Service, from whence we may be able to judge of the difference in both parts between the Gallican and Roman Offices.

I begin with the firft, viz. the Morning Service, which consisted of Leffons, Hymns and Pfalms agreeable to the Leffons, and short Collects after them.

In 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 Epifle and Go- fpel; then Celeftine appointed the Pfalms to be ufed; or as (a) Walafr. Strabo and Micrologus fay, cauf’d Antiphonaee to be made out of them and fung. The Epifle was constantly taken out of St. Paul, as Walafr. Strabo proves out of the Pontifical Book; But in pro-
cess of time, his faith, other Lessons were taken out of the Old and New Testament, agreeably to the time; Which might be borrow'd from the Gallican Church; as other Inlargements of their Offices by the Ritualists Confession were, and in probability the Distribution of the Lessons was first begun by Isidore, which we have digested according to the Roman Custome in the Lecturearii, published by Pamelius, by some attributed to St. Jerome. After the Lessons follow'd the Responsoria, or Proper Hymns, for so Isidore faith, they were called, because, one singing, the whole Choré did answer; and (c) Rabanus Maurus calls such an Anthem, Responsoriurn Cantus; and these differ'd from the Antiphonæ, because in them the whole Choré sung each Verse alternatin: But (d) Rupertus thinks, they had their Name because they answered to the Lessons, being sung immediately after them; for the refreshment of the Hearers mind, faith (e) Amalarus. But, besides the Lessons and Hymns, he methodiz'd the Psalms so as to be read agreeably to the times and the Lessons; and not in the Order wherein they stand: which seems to have been peculiar to the Gallican Church. The most ancient Custome of the Church, as (f) Menardus proves from Julian Martyr, and others, was to begin the publick Service with the Lessons. And (g) St. Ambrose, in one Place, seems to mention no more in his Church at Milan besides the Lessons and the Sermon, before his expounding the Creed to the Competentes; But in the fame Epistle he speaks of the Psalms that were read in the Morning Service: And (b) 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 custome of Singing the Psalms Veræ by Veræ in turns by both sides of the Choré; so (i) Isidore, (k) Rabanus, (l) Walafrius Strabo, and (m) Radolphus Tungrensis: And so Paulinus in his Life faith, he brought up the use of Antiphona in the Western Church. And (n) Sigebert adds, that he took it from the Greeks. And (o) St. Augulfine 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 employ'd he thought
thought upon this Custom of the Eastern Churches; Which not only continued there, but from thence spread into other Churches, not without opposition in some Places; as (p) St. Augustine confesses, it met with some at Carthage; But withall he faith, he wrote in Vindication of it. In the Eastern Church it was of ancient use, if (q) Socrates (s) Socr. l. 4. say true; for he faith, it begun upon a Divine Vision to Ignatius, at the Church of Antioch. But (r) Theodoret (z) Theod. l. 3. faith, Flavianus and Diodorus brought it up there; But the words of Theodorus Mopseustenus in (s) Nicetas (i) Nicetas. Tref. 2. §. 30. seem to intimate, that they took this Custom from the Syriack Churches; However Theodoret attributes the beginning of Singing the Psalms of David in that manner in the Greek Churches to them; From whence he faith it spread into other Parts. But we find by (t) St. Basil, (c) Basil. Ep. 65. it was very hardly received in the Church of Neocæfarœa, because it was not introduced by Gregory, who first settled the Church there. Neither, faith he, were the Litanies which they then used, brought in by him: And for that Custom of Singing, he faith, it was practisèd in the Churches of Egypt, Palaæstine and Syria, as far as Ephraïm. But it came later into the Western Church. (w) Card. Bona faith, That Damasus first commanded it to be used in all Churches by his Apostolical Authority; But (w) Card. Baronius faith, It is a plain falsehood which the Pontifical Book affirms of Damasus his appointing the Psalms to be sung in all Churches, and he adds, that the Epistles of St. Hierome & Damasus about it are counterfeit. Yet those are the Authorities which, as appears by (x) Pamælius, the ancient Ritualists rely upon. 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, (y) that (y) Gavant. in Brev. S. l. 5. 4. and 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 (z) Card. 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, That the People at Rome were so accustomed to it, that they would not learn the
the New Testament of St. Jerome; And the same Author (a) observes likewise, That the old Italick Version was not onely used in Rome, but in all the Suburbaric Churches, and other Churches, Gaul onely excepted. And from thence St. Jerome’s Translation was called Verfo Gallicana, because it was immediately received into the use of the Gallican Churches. So that I see not how Baronius can make good his own Assertion, That St. Jerome’s Translation of the Psalter was introduced by Damascus. But the use of Alleluja by St. Jerome’s means, as (b) St. Gregory faith, was brought from the Church of Jerusalem. Which Baronius thinks is rather to be understood of some particular manner of using it. But how he can justify the ancient use of the Sung Psalms at Rome, either before or after Damascus his time till Celestine was Pope, I cannot imagine, if the Pontifical Book say true, for that expressly affirms, that 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, Baronius Maurus, Walafridus Strabo, Berno Augiensis, and several other Ritualists and Historians, as may be seen in (c) Pamelius his Collection, and (d) Caffander’s, besides the Authors themselves; But (e) Baronius faith, in (f) St. Augulfine faith, 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 faith, The Customs of Churches were very different about this matter. In the Churches of Africa, he faith, They confined themselves to the Prophetical Hymns, for which they were upbraided by the Donatists, as too grave and formal; But he allows Singing to be one of the Solemn Parts of Divine Service, with which he joins Reading the Leffons, Preaching and Prayer; either aloud by the Bishop, or in common, by the (g) Deacon’s giving notice. (g) Justin Martyr mentions the Hymns of the Church, without declaring whether they were composed or inspired; And so do (h) Pliny and (i) Ter-
Chap. IV. the British Churches.

(i) Tertullian in some Places. But in his (k) Apology of his faith, both were used. (l) Eusebius mentions the hymns composed by Christians which proved the Divinity of Christ; And (m) the great esteem the Hymns of Nepos were in; and (n) the complaint against Paulus Samo"frenus for laying aside the Hymns made to the Honour of Christ. The Council of (o) Laodicea first restrained the use of Private Hymns in the Churches Service, the Greek Canonists understand this Canon of Apocryphal Psalms, such as Salomon's Psalter published by La Cerda out of the Anspurg MS. which he highly magnifies, and almost believes to be genuine; But if this Canon be extended to all humane Compositions; it was never received in the Western Church, wherein the 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 (p) Tours; And (q) Cassander observes, that not only those made by St. Ambrose, but others in imitation of him, were called by his name; Which (r) Walafiris Strabo confirms; But among those the Te Deum is not reckon'd by Cassander, neither 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. Augustin, at his Baptism, and to prove it, the Ritualists quote the Chronicle of Datus, Bishop of Milan. But (s) Gavantus observes, that the Learned Men of Milan deny that there is any such thing as a Chronicle of Datus among them. (t) Mabillon sent to them to enquire particularly about it; and they return'd Anfwer, 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 mention'd by (u) Archibishop 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 Auvergn, Anno Dom. 535, highly commended for his Eloquence and Sanctity by (w) Gregorius Taronensis, (x) Fortunatus and others; And the other of great fame

G g
fame too and Bishop of Lyons, who subscribed to the Council there Anno Dom. 567. But against this latter there is a strong Objection from the mention of this Hymn in the Rule of St. Benedict, c. 11. who died, according to Baronius, Anno Dom. 543. It is likewise mention’d in the Rule of (y) Caesarius, drawn up by Tetradius, c. 21. who died about the same time; And in the Rule of (z) Aurelianus, who was present in the Council of Lyons, Anno Dom. 549, in the time of Sacerdos, Predecessour to Nicetius. But I see no reason a-
gainst the former Nicetius, since (a) Menardus confi-
dently 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, (b) Caflian takes notice that in the Gallican Churches, Gloria Patri, &c. was said by the People at the end of every Psalm. But Walfridus 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, (c) Bellarmine, (d) Ba-
ronius and (e) Bona all conclude those Ritualists mistaken who make Damasus the Author of adding the Gloria Pa-
tri, &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 withall they say, that the other Ritualists are mistaken who attribute it to the Council of Nice; Be-
cause then there would not have been such difference in the use of it in several Churches. In the Ethiopia
pick Eucharistical Office of the 318 Fathers at the Council of Nice, bestow’d on me by my worthy Friend, Doc-
tour Caflle, this Hymn it self 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 (f) St. Ba-
fil’s Discourse concerning it, that the Hymn it self was of ancient use in the Eastern Church; but he doth not say in what part of the Churches Service it was used; But (g) Caflian faith, over all the East, it was used only to conclude the Antiphona. By which he understands a Hymn between the Psalms; Walfridus Strabo observes great diversity in the use of it in the Western Churches; Some put it, he faith, into all Offices; Some at the end of 

| y) Cod. Regal. Part. 2. p. 73. |
| (z) B. p. 112. |
| (a) N. in Sacr. Greg. p. 351. |
| (b) Cafl. Ioffis. Monarch. 1. 2. c. 8. |
| (c) Bellar. de Miss. l. 2. c. 16. |
| (d) Bar. A. D. 335. n. 175. |
| (e) Dom. de Psalm. c. 16. n. 6. |
| (f) Ad Ampliil. c. 7. & 27. |
| (g) Caflian. 1. 2. c. 28. |
every Psalm; Some at every breaking off the longer Psalms; Some after the Responphals; But the use in general was universally approved, only the Greeks found fault with the Latines for putting in the middle, Sicut erat in principio, but the use thereof was required in all the Gallican Churches in the time of (b) Caesarius, Archbishop of Arles (as (i) Uniformity was required by other Councils.) Cardinal Bona, following Baronius, makes that Council much elder which 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 Passa.ge of Ado Vienne.n-fis. 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. The Latine 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.) 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 (k) Caflian, 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. But, he faith, 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 allow'd in the Gallican Churches as well as Egyptian Monaasters, for private Devotions in the publick Assemblies. (l) Gregor. Taronenfis faith, That in the Gallican Churches the Deacon did Silentium indicere; and the Priest did it by the (m) Mozarabick Liturgy, which Eugenius Roblesius understands only of making the People attentive; Which I grant was part of the Deacon's Office and Design in
commanding Silence, as appears by several passages in the ancient Liturgies both Greek and Latine. But there was a farther 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.) Gregory Turonensis faith, 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 pray'd for him. (2.) Amongst the Heathens, when they were bidden favere Linguis, yet then (n) Brisonius faith, They made their private Prayers; And as the Deacons 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 publick Service, on the Lord’s-days, and the Stationary days; But 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 Collects of greatest Antiquity, being very few and short, it seems most probable, that a competent part of the time was spent in private Devotions. A remainder whereof is still preferred 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 (o) private Devotions; After which follow’d 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 Reafon of the Name: For


(p) Miscr. l. 2.

(q) Waldcr. 22.

(n) De Formula, p. 9. 10.

(p.) Micrologus-faith, The name Collecta was, because the Priest therein did Omnia Precescelligere, or, as Walafriedus Strabo faith, Necessarum omnium Petitiones compendiosa brevitate colligere. This was distinct from the Prayer made ad Collectam, before the People went to the Stationary
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Of which Onuphrius Panvinius and Fronto in his Calendarium Romanum have said enough. But as to the Gallican Churches, the (r) Council of Age-
de shews that after the other Offices were performed in the Morning and Evening Service, the People were to be dismissed by the Bishop Collected Oratione, i.e. With a concluding Collected.

(2.) As to the Communion Service (s) Gennadius faith, That Mufecus composed a large Volume of the Sacraments, with several Offices according to the Seasons, with a diversitv of Lessons, and Psalms, and Anthems, and Prayers and Thanksgivings. This Book is called, Liber Sacramentorum, and so is Gregory's, faith (t) Menardus in several MSS. and the old Missal published by Illyricus is called Ordo Sacramentorum; Which was the Name given to the Books of Liturgick Offices, which were called Sacramento, both by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, as Menardus shews. (u) Cardinal Bona confesses, That there is undoubted Evidence, that the old Gallican Liturgy, differ'd from the Roman; And (w) Charles the Great, not only faith, 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, Matthias Flacius Illyricus (not Flavins, 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 (x) Le Cointe, who hath printed it at large in his Annals; with an Epitome of it published by Menardus out of an ancient Copy. But (y) he shews that Illyricus his 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 Supplement to the Roman Missal for the Devotion of those that celebrate it, confitting chiefly of private Prayers to be used by them before Celebration, and during the Singing of the Several Hymns.
Hymnus: For the common parts of the Office, as the Introitus, Epistola, Graduale, Evangelium, Offertorium, Secreta, Prefatio, Communio, & 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. (z) Card. 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 Authours as Hilduinus must be relied on. It is true, 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 Missals for a thing notably false, viz. the Martyrdom of Dionysius Areopagita in Gaul. And he pretends, that Innocentius, Gelafius 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 (a) Berno Augiensis faith, 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. That the Creed was not said nor sung at Rome after the Gospel, of which he faith, They gave this Reason, because the Roman Church was never infected with Herefie; which, he faith, the Emperour Henry I. was so little satisfied with, that he never ceased, till they had introduced it at Rome; which, faith (b) Baronius, was done Anno Dom. 1014. but he seems not pleased that the former Custom was broken. 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 Constantinopolitane or Nicene Creed, as (c) Menardus well proves, because then Berno would have spoken more distinctly. And the Athanasian Creed,
as far as we can trace it, was first used in the Gallican Churches, and that first mention'd by Abbo Floriacensis in some Fragments sent by Nicolaus Faber to (d) Baronis. 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 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. Rufinus 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 Baronis and (e) Bona confess was so lately intro-
duced at Rome. So that here we have one con-
iderable difference of the Roman Offices from those of o-
ther Churches; For (f) Isidore faith, That the Nicene Creed was then used in the Gothic Churches in the time of Sacrifice; 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 Concil. Aurel. 3. can. 23. Where we find the name of Sacrifice applied to the Even- ing Service, Sacrificia Matutina Missarum, sacre Vep-
pertina; And so (g) Cassian useth Sacrificium Vesper- tina in allusion to the Catecume of Sacrificing among the Jews. And (h) Honoratus, in the Life of St. Hilarius of Arles, calls it Sacrificium Vesperinae Laudes. And Missa was then used for the publick Service, as (i) Cassander 0) Liturg. 15. and others shew. In the Rule of St. Benedict, Missæ are to be taken for the concluding Collects at the Cano-
nical Hours. (k) Cassian useth Missa for any publick meeting at Prayers, thence he speaks of Missa Nocturna and Missa Orationum, and Missa Canonica, for the No-
turnal Office among the Monks; And in the Concil. A-
gath. c. 30. We read of Missæ Vesperinae. But after-
wards the name was appropriated to the most solemn part of publick Worship, viz. the Communion Service. In which the Creed was appointed by the third Council of Toledo, c. 2. in all the Churches of Spain and Gal-
lacia; or, as some 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 Gothick Power; Where a (l) Council met under Reccaredus, about the same time. In which Gloria Patri was decreed to be used at the end of every Psalm; Which was observed by the other Gallican Churches in Caftian’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 Psalmage in the Epistle of Carolus Calvus produced by (m) Card. Bona, where speaking of the ancient Gallican Offices before the Introduction of the Roman; he faith, 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, unlefs the Gothick and Gallican Offices had then agreed. I do not say that the old Gallican Service can be gather’d from all the Parts of the Mozarabick Liturgy, as it was settled by (n) 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 (o) Mariana confesseth, by the length of time; although it did bear the Name of Leander and Isidore. For (p) Julianus Toledo Numerus is said to have review’d the whole Office, and to have alter’d and added many things, and Johannes Cesaraguflanus and Conantius, and after them Petrus Ilerdenfis, and Salvs Abbaielandis, besides such whose Names are not preseved; But so far as we can trace the ancient Customs of the Gothick 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 Prophetical Lessons were always to be read by the Rules of the Mozarabick Liturgy: and accordingly three Books were laid upon the Altar in the Gallican Churches, as (q) Gregorius Twonenfis observes, That of the Prophets, and of the Epistles, and of the Gospels. But nothing but the Epistle and Gospel were read at Rome,
as shew'd already; 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 Radulpus Tungenensis, which are the best (r) Pamelius could find, are not great enough against so plain Evidence in the contrary, to prove this Lectionarius to have been made by St. Jerome. And he confesses that Amalarius several times only mentions the Author Lectionarius 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 (s) Sulpicius Severus. And in the Greek Church, St. (t) Bafil faith, That Lessons out of the Old, as well as the New Testament were read. By the (u) Council of Laodi- cæa, all the Canonical Books were appointed to be read. Zonaras observes, on the 16. Canon of that Council, That before this Council there were nothing but Prayers before the Consecration: But therein he was certainly mistaken; For (w) Juflin Martyr shews, That the Lef- sons were read long before, and that out of the Prophets as well as Apostles. But Balfamon and Aristlenus restrain 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 (x) Domini- cus Macer, that at the Lessons of the Old Testament the Greeks do fit; But stand at those out of the New. (y) Soz. i. 17. (z) Niceph. i. 12. Apollonius reckons it as a peculiar Custome of Alexandria; That the Biosk did not rise up at the Gospels: And Nis- cephorus *Callitbus faith, It was contrary to the Prac- tice of all other Churches.

(3.) After the Gospel, the Sermon follow'd in other Churches; But in the old Roman Offices, there is no mention at all of any Sermon to the People. (z) Card. Bona faith, 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 he doth suffici-
ently prove the Antiquity of it from the Testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, and the general-practice of it in other Churches, especially the Galican; But he offers no proof, that it was observed in the Church

of Rome. But (a) Sozomen observes it as the peculiar Custome of that Church, That there was no Preaching in it; neither by the Bishop, nor by any one else. Valerius seems to wonder at it; But he faith, If it had not been true, Cassiodore, who certainly knew the Customs of that Church, would never have repeated it. In the Sacramentary of Gregory, The Offertory immediately follows after the Gospel; And Micrologus faith, Finito Evangeliis, flatim est offerendum, c. 10. And to the same purpose in the Ordo Romanus: But in the Ordo of the Western Churches, published by (b) Caflander 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 Custome the (c) Gemma Animae is to be understood when it faith, 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, faith (d) Queffel, if Sozomen may be believed. It is possible, That upon some extraordinary Occasions, the Bishops of Rome might speak to the People before his time, as Liberinus is said, by St. (e) 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 Galican Churches, as (f) Christianus Lupus observes, The Bishops called their Office Prædicationis Officium; as appears by the Profession both of Bishops and Archbishops, among (g) Sirmondus his Formula published out of ancient Copies. And in the Royal Confirmation they were charged to be diligent in Preaching. The same Author tells us, 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 Apostolical Canon 58. The Council in Trullo, c. 19. charges the Bishops to preach constantly. But especially on the Lord's-days: The want whereof was extremely
tremely lamented afterwards in the Greek Church by
(b) Barlaam, and (i) Gregorius Protosyncellus. And the
neglect of it in the Armenian Churches hath brought
the Episcopal Order into so great Contempt; as (k) Cle-
mens Galenius reports, (who was a long time among
them) that he faith, They use their Bishops for little else
but to give Orders; But the only Men in eftem are
their Vartabret (whom he renders Magiftri, their Pre-
chers;) Whom the People regard far beyond their Bi-
shops, because, they say, they represent Clirift himfelf, as
he was Rabbi, or the Teacher of his Church. But to re-
turn to the Western Churches. In the Church of Mi-
lan, (l) St. Augufline faith, He heard St. Ambrofe every
Lord's-day; And, he faith, (m) He accounted it the
proper Office of a Bishop to preach: Which he perfo-
med, as in other Churches (n) after the Gospel, before
the Difmiffion of the Carechumeni; But by the Mozara-
bick Liturgy, the Sermon was after their Difmiffion.
(4.) The Gallica Churches had peculiar Offices af-
ter the Sermon: So (o) Walafridus Strabo faith, That
fome of thofe Prayers were ftill in ufe among many. And
(p) Micrologus, That the Prayer, Veni Sanctificator, &c.
was taken out of the Gallica Ordo. But, to make this
more clear, we are to confider, that there were fome
parts of the Communion Service wherein all the Ancient
Offices agreed; as in the Surfum Corda, and Habemus
ad Dominum yfed in the Eastern, as well as Western Chur-
ches; and there are as plain Testimonials of their ufe in
the African and Gallica Churches as the Roman; before
the Roman Offices came to be imposed on other Chur-
ches. The Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro; and Vere
dignum & juftum est ejum & salutare, nos tibi semper
& ubique gratias agere, are mention'd by St. Cyril,
St. Chryfoline, St. Augufline, and other ancient Wri-
ters: This latter part in the Mozarabic Liturgy is cal-
led Inlatic. The Trifagion was generally ufed; I do not
mean that which was faid to have come by Revelati-
on in the time of Proclus at Conftantinople; But that
which the Greeks call 'Enwio%, and is called Trifagium
in the Ambrofan Miffal, and was ufed with a more
ample Paraphrafe in the Eastern Churches. All these
parts are retained in the excellent Office of our Church;
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not from the Church of Rome (as our Dissenters weakly imagine) but from the consent of all the ancient Churches in the use of them; Which it hath follow'd likewise in the putting them into a Language understood by the People (as (q) 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 (r) Apostolical Constitutions, and a Passage in (s) Athanasius his Works, and several Greek MSS. of it; this was called Hymnus Angelicus from the beginning of it, and Hymnus 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 ancient MS. in the beginning of this Discourse; And (t) Alcuinus makes St. Hilary of Poitiers to have been the Inlarger of it. The Prayer for the Church Militant; For Kings and Princes; And all Ranks and Orders of Men; The Commemoration of Saints departed; The Reading the Words of Institution; And using the Lord's-prayer; Were in all the ancient Liturgies as parts of the Communion Service: And therefore are not to be look'd 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 Confession of Sins made by the Priest; Which was called Apologia. A form whereof (u) 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 (w) Sacramentary of Gregory; But all different from the Gallican Form. In the old Missal of Rataldus, Abbat of Corvey, published by (x) Menardus, instead of the Apology, we read that Form, Sufcipe Confessionem meam, unica Spes Salutis

(q) Liturg. c. 28, 32.
(r) Confitm. Apol. L. 7. c. 47.
(s) Athanas. p. 1037.
(t) Alcuin. c. 42.
About the Britifh Churches.

litis mea, 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 (y) Menardus, out of another ancient Missal, which he calls the Codex Tilianus, and seems most agreeable to the old Gallican mention’d by Bona; And, There is a 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. Confiteor Deo Omnipotenti, B. Mar- rike semper Virginî, B. Michaeli Archangelo, &c. & om- nibus Sanétis, &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 1000 years after Chrift; About which time Menardus faith, The several ancient Missals before mention’d do bear Date. The Common Ritualists attribute the present Form to Pontianus, or Damafus, but without any Authority, faith (z) Card. (x) Rer. Liturg. Bona. The first mention I can find of Confession to Saints, is that which he sets down out of the Codex Chifii; Which being in the (a) Lombard Character, he ghesles to have been before the end of the tenth Cen- tury, and with this (b) Micrologus agrees; The Au- thor whereof lived towards the end of the eleventh Century. So that this part of the Roman Missal was nei- ther in the Gregorian nor Gallican Offices, being of a much later Original.

(2.) The Gallican Office had peculiar Prefaces, and Colleâls different from the Roman. By the Prefaces are understood that part of the Service which immediately goes before the Confebration, and is called in the Gal- lican Office, Contefratio, in the Gothick, Illatio, fhowing 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 Ro- man Church allow’d but nine, which were attributed to Pope Gelasius; But (c) Card. Bona faith, That number is to be found only in the Missals, after Anno Dom, 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, of which none
none of the Ritualists give any tolerable account. However this is enough to shew their Ignorance, when they so confidently attributed the proper Prefaces to Gelafius; As though Gregory would have sighted so much the Decree of his Predecessors, as to have appointed so many more, if Gelafius 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 (d) Card. Bona hath produced three remarkable Instances, two out of the former ancient MS. of Nine hundred Years old, which formerly belong'd 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 Britifh Churches, especially on Saint's-days. For no other Offices are preferred, or at least made known to the World. 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 pathetical manner; Which ended in the Tri- fagon; And was continued by another Collect to the Consecration; After which follow'd a devout Prayer for benefit by the Holy Sacrament; And after another Collect for the occasion follow'd the Lord's-prayer, with a Conclusion for the Day: And the whole Service was concluded with a Benediction of the People, a Collect after the Eucharift, and a short Thanksgiving. This is a just and true Account from these authentic Offices of the Publick Service then used in the Britifh Churches following the Gallican from the time of St. German, whose particular Office is one of those preferred by Card. Bona; And in the peculiar Preface his great Zeal is mention'd in Preaching and going up and down doing good in Gaul, Italy and Britain, for thirty years together.
Chap. IV. the British Churches.

(2.) 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, St. (e) 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 publick Use of the Church. Some small additions, they say, were made to it by several Popes, till Gregory's time, who, according to the Ritualists, but 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. For, setting aside the Eastern Churches, which had Forms of their own; The African Churches did not follow the Roman Form. For although (f) Optatus mentions illud legitimum in Sacramentorum mysterio; which implies, that there was a 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 (g) Marius Victorinus, and (h) 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 (i) 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 Paffage, which I hardly believe, those who are most zealous for the Roman Canon will say, was ever part of it. (k) Fac nobis hanc oblationem a Scrip- tum, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. And in the Gallican Church, the Form of Consecration, as appears by the Office of Saint German, was nothing else but repeating the Words of Institution, after the Conclusion of the Trisagion, and Gloria in Excelsis. After which follow’d a 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
with his own Right Hand defend those his Sacraments; And then follow'd the Lord's Prayer and other Collects: 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 turn'd 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 (l) 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 partaked of the Body of Christ, wherein this Expression is remarkable, Christe, Domine, qui & tuo velci corpore, & tuum corpus efficis fideles, fac nobis in remissionem Peccatorum esse quod superum, i.e. O Christ, our Lord, who wouldst 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 Christ in such a mystical sense as the Church is. But 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 (m) Card. Bona, that the Custome 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, Walafridus, Micrologus and others. The fame had been ingenuously confessed before by (n) Me-nardus, in the same Words: And although there may be Elevation, where there is no belief of Transubstantiation, yet, since the Custome of Elevation was lately intro-
introduced into the Western Churches, and in order to 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 differ'd from the Roman, and not wherein they agreed.

(4.) The last difference was as to the Church Musick, wherein the Romans were thought so far to excel other Western Churches, That the goodness of their Musick proved the great occasion of introducing their Offices: For (o) Charles the Great faith, That his Father Pepin (o) Dr Imag. I. brought the Roman way of Singing into the Gallican Churches, and their Offices along with it. And although he faith, many Churches stood out then, yet by his means they were brought to it. And he caused some of the best Matters of Musick in Rome to be brought into France, and there settled for the Instruction of the (p) French Churches: By which means the old Gallican Service was so soon forgotten, That in (q) Carolus Calvus his 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 Musick, 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 shew'd 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 differ'd, our Church hath not follow'd the Roman, but the other; And therefore our Dissenters do unreasonably charge us with taking our Offices from the Church of Rome.
Of the Declension of the British Churches.

Britain never totally subdued by the Romans.
That, the Occasion of the Miseries of the Britains in the Province, by the Incursions from beyond the Wall.
Of the Picts, and Scots their mortal Enemies.
The true Original of the Picts from Scandinavia.
That Name not given to the Old Britains, but to the New Colonies.
The Scotch Antiquities enquired into.
An Account of them from John Fordon compared with that given by Hector Boethius and Buchanan.
Of Hector's Authors, Veremundus, Cornelius Hibernicus and their ancient Annals.
An Account of the Antiquities of Ireland, and of the Authority of their Traditions and Annals, compared with the British Antiquities published by Geoffrey of Monmouth in point of Credibility.
A true Account of the Fabulous Antiquities of the Northern Nations. Of the first coming of the Scots into Britain.
The first Cause of the Declension and Ruine of the British Churches was, the laying them open to the fury of the Scots and Picts.
Of Maximus his withdrawing the Roman Forces; And the Emperor's sending numbers of Picts to draw them back.
The miserable Condition of the Britains thus forfaken; And supplies sent them for a time, and then taken away.
Of the Walls then built for their Security, and the Roman Legions then placed.
Of the great degeneracy of manners among the Britains.
Of Intefline Divisions, and calling in of Foreign Assistance.
The Saxons first coming hither.
Who they were, and whence they came.  

Bede's
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Bede's Account examin'd, and reconciled with the Circumstances of those times.
His fixing the time of their coming justified.
Of the Reasons of Vortigern's calling in the Saxons.
And the Dissatisfaction of the Britains upon their coming, and Vortigern's League with them.
Of the Valour of Vortimer and Aurelius Ambrosius against the Saxons.
The different Account of the Battles between the Britains and Saxons among our Historians.
The sad condition of the British Churches at that time.
The imperfect Account given by the British History.
Of King Arthur's Story and Success.
Of Person's of greatest Reputation then in the British Churches, and particularly of St. David.
Of the Britains passing over to Arémorica.
The beginning of that Colony stated.
Gildas there writes his Epistle; The Scope and Design of it.
The Independency of the British Churches proved from their carriage towards Augustine the Monk.
The Particulars of that Story cleared; And the whole concluded.

Being now to give an Account of the fatal Declension of the British Churches, it will be necessary to look back on the time when their Miseries first began. For which we are to consider, That the Romans having never made an entire Conquest of the whole Island; but contenting themselves with the better part, and excluding the rest by a Wall; They still left a backdoor open for the poor Provincial Britains to be disturbed, as often as the Roman Garrisons neglected their Duty or were overpowered by their Enemies. Who were now very much increased in those remoter parts of Britain; Which being abandon'd by the Romans, they became an easy Prey to the Scots and Picts; Who, from different parts, took Possession of those Coasts which lay nearest to the Place from whence they came. Thus, the Scots coming from Ireland; entred upon the Southern and Western Parts, as the Picts from Scandinavia had before
fore done on the Northern. Our Learned (a) Antiquary was of Opinion, That the Picts were no other than the ancient Britains, partly settled in those Parts, before the Roman Invasion, and partly retiring thither out of Impatience of the Roman Yoke, who by degrees grew up into a considerable number of People. It is not to be question’d, that there was a Stock of Old Britains in those Northern Parts, as appears by the Army under Galgacus, and the Actions against Urbicus, Agricola, Marcellus and Severus; But their continual Wars with the Roman Legions, who were placed about the Wall, on purpose to take all Advantages against them, must needs exhaust them by degrees, and lessen them so much as to leave room enough for new Recruits to come in and take up part of their Country. And although for their own Security, the Parts near the Wall might be well supplied on that side, yet when so much Blood retired to the Heart as was necessary to support Life, a great deal must be called off from the extreme parts for a fresh supply of it, and those parts must needs be left destitute of natural heat, and Strength enough to maintain themselves. For during the War, which continued for several Ages, the very Life of the British Nation, beyond the Wall, was in perpetual danger; And not onely the Duty and Service, but the many Diseases and Accidents of War, could not, in so long a tract of time, but very much impair the British Strength, and leave the remoter Parts, if not wholly void of Inhabitants, yet not in a Condition to withstand a foreign Invasion. I grant that Tacitus, Dio, Herodian, Vopiscus, &c. take no notice of any other Enemies the Romans had at that time in those Parts besides the Britains; But then, I think, the Argument may be thus turned upon Camden, What makes the latter Writers so expressly and distinctly mention the Picts, if they were no other than the Old Britains, so often spoken of by Roman Historians? I do not understand, why their continuing an old Custom should now give them a new Name? The Britains, however rude, were no more Picts then, than they were at Cæsar’s coming. What makes the Roman Writers so of a sudden alter their Style, and leave off a Name so famous among
among the Romans, for the name of Picts, which was not heard of before? The first mention we find of them is in (b) Eumenius his Panegyrick to Constantius, to Constantius his time: Then, faith he, they were a rude, half naked People, and so easily vanquished; But now the Britains were exercised by the Arms of the Picts and the Irish. Nothing can be plainer, than that Eumenius here distinguishes the Picts from the Britains, and supposes them to be Enemies to each other. Neither can we reasonably think this a Name then taken up to distinguish the barbarous Britains from the Provincial: For that distinction had now been of a very long standing, and if it had been applied to that purpose, we should have met with it in Tacitus, or Dio, or Herodian, or Zosimus, who speak of the Extra-provincial Britains, under no other Name but of Britains.

c) Dio is so exact as to set down the Names of distinction then used for those Britains, and he faith, they were of two sorts, the Meatae, and the Caledonii; If the name of Picts had then comprehended them all; no doubt he would have mention'd it on that occasion. (d) Zonaras likewise calls them all then by the name of Britains. But it is said, That the (e) Panegyrift himself calls the Caledonians, Picts, who were certainly Britains. His words are, Non dico Caledonum, alicrimumque Pictorum, Silvus & Paludes: where H. Valesius observes, it ought to be read, Non Dicaledonum alicrimumque Pictorum; For (f) Ammianus Marcellinus faith the Picts were divided into the Dicaledones and the Vectoriones. It is ingeniously conjectured by Mr. Camden, that these Names were taken from the Situation of the People, the first from Deheu and Caledones, or the Caledonians on the Right-hand, and the other from Chwthic, which signifies the Left-hand in the British Language; But Archbishops (g) other observes, that he is mistaken, in supposing the Right-hand among the Britains to be the West, and the Left-hand the East; for he plainly proves, that by the one is understood the South, and the other the North. And (b) Bede shews, that the Northern and Southern Picts were divided from each other.
other by a Ridge of Mountains; which (l) John Fotherdon faith, was Mount Grampius, which parted the Scots and the Picts. For the Scots came into that part of the Picts Countrey which lay next to Ireland; from whence they came thither under the conduct of Reuda, as (k) Bede faith. Who, as some think, was the Chief of the Six Sons of the King of Ulter, who, as Giraldus Cambrensis faith, with no small Fleet, came into the Northern Parts of Britain, and there settled themselves, from whom that Countrey was called Scotia. Which, if it happen'd in the time of Constantius, as Archbishop (l) Usher proves from the Anonymous Life of St. Patrick, it agrees very well with what (m) Ammianus Marcellinus faith, That in the latter end of his Reign, the Scots and the Picts were both joined against the Britains. The Scots, as (n) Gildas and (o) Bede say, coming from the West, and the Picts from the North; And so Fabius Ethewerd faith, the Picts came from the North, and the Scots from the West; who took possession of the Southwest parts of Caledonia beyond Glota, and Bodotria, or Dumbrinton, and Edenborough Frith. And so, the Mons Grampius, or the Dorium Britannicum, as some call it, parted the Picts and the Scots; the Old Britains still living between the Wall and the two Friths; For Bede expressly faith, That both the Scots and the Picts lived beyond them; and he likewise adds, That upon the remove of the Roman Legion they took in all the Countrey as far as Severus his Wall; where the Britains dwelt before. I confess, the Roman Province had different Bounds at several times, it sometimes extending as far as Antoninus his Wall, or Graban's Dike between the two Friths; Sometimes again it was brought within the Compas of Hadrian and Severus his Wall, id est, between the Tine and the Esk; And Bede thinks that the last Wall made by the Romans was where Severus his Wall stood. If so, that whole Countrey between the two Walls must be then abandon'd for 100 Miles; Which (p) some object against as an improbable thing, The Wall being so much longer, and consequently more indefensible by the Britains. But, in probability, the Britains were then willing to let their Enemies have the more room to prevent being disturbed by them; And this was the main Security
Chap. V. the British Churches.

rity they always had, the Linea Valli relating to this Wall from Hadrian's time; And although sometimes in a bravery the Roman Souldiers would march to Antonius his Wall, and drive the Britains before them, yet generally the Roman Province was bounded by Severus his Wall, and therefore Gallio Ravennas might at last choose rather to make up and fortifie this for the Britains, when the Roman Souldiers left them to defend themselves.

But, as to the several Inhabitants beyond the Wall, it will be necessary, in order to the following History, to set down a more particular Account in this Place of the different Original of them, which hath been so perplexed by the partial Conjectures of the Scottifh and Irish Antiquaries, that it is no easie matter to find out the plain Truth amongst them. But I shall endeavour to trace the Footsteps of it by the best Light which ancient or modern Authors afford. And I am so far from any pique or partiality in this matter, that I shall be glad to receive any better information from learned and ingenuous Men. For it will appear by this enquiry that the Antiquities of both Nations do yet stand much in need of being cleared to the satisfaction of inquisitive Men. But to the business.

It is certain that in the time of Tacitus, the Northern Parts of this Island were well inhabited, as appears by the following Account from him. The Brigantes, who extended as far as the Tine, were, as (q) he faith, subdued by Petilius Cerealis; The Silures, by Julius Frontinus; The Ordovices, the other People of Wales, by Julius Agricola in his first entry upon this Province. But in his third year he went as far as the Frith of Taus: By which Sir H. Savil faith, Some understand the Tweed; For that it cannot be understood of the Taus, which parts the Northern and the Southern parts of Scotland, seems evident from Tacitus, who faith, That the Romans had leasere to build Castles there: But this Taus is a great way beyond the two Friths; And Tacitus, in the fourth year of Agricola, makes the Roman Power to reach no farther than to Glota and Bodotria, where he thought the Romans might have conveniently fixed the Bounds of their Empire that way. But, I con-fes,
fefts, Tacitus his words may bear another meaning, viz. That although the Romans had made Excursions as far as the Taüs, and set up some Forts there; Yet when Agricola went about to settle the Province, he reduced it within the compass of the two Friths; There being the most convenient Place for the Garrifon to be fixed; There being so small a Neck of Land between the Armes of the two Seas, which was then very well fortified. But the boundless Ambition of the Romans, in the fifth year of Agricola, carried them beyond these Limits; And then he subdued Nations before that time unknown; And furnished with Forces that part of Britain which lieth against Ireland; Not out of fear of any Invasion from thence; But rather in hopes of subduing that Country by their means. Which shews that Ireland was then well peopled; and thought by Agricola very fit for the Roman Army to conquer;Because it lay so convenient for uniting the parts of the Empire together; And it would help much towards the total subduing of Britain, if there were no appearance of Liberty left within their view. And Tacitus insinuates that Agricola had it in his Design, if he had been suffer'd to continue longer after his Victory over Galgacus: Which Domitian's incurable Jealousie of Great Men would not permit. However, in order to it, Agricola had taken an account of the Ports, and condition of the People, whom he found not unlike the Britains; And he kept with him till Occasion served, one of the Princes of that Country, who was driven from thence by a domestick Sedition. But in the mean time, in his sixth year, he applied himself to the Conquest of the several Nations beyond Bodotria, among whom a general Insurrection was apprehended, and all Passages by Land were supposed to be beset; And therefore Agricola set out a Fleet for discovery of the Country; the sight whereof struck great Terrour into the Britains. And then he faith, the Caledonians armed themselves and set upon the Romans with all the Force they could make; and falling upon the ninth Legion unexpectedly, had like to have totally defeated them, if the rest of the Army had not come in to their timely rescue. By which good success, the Roman Army, being much
much encouraged, cried out to march into Caledonia; That they might at last come to the utmost Bounds of Britain. But the Britains attributed this not to the Valour of the Romans, but to the ill Conduct of their General; And therefore resolved to fight it out, and to that end they disposed of their Wives and Children in Places of Safety, and by frequent Meetings and solemn Sacrifices they entred into a strict Confederacy, to stand it out to the utmost against the Romans. And in this Case of common danger, all the Cities were united together, and raised an Army of 30000 Men, under the Command of Galgacus, who, in his brave Oration, so much commended by Lipsius, tells his Soldiers, they were the last of the Britains, there being no Nation beyond them; And he calls them, the most noble of the Britains, who had never beheld the Slavery of others; Upon this the fatal Battel was fought at the Foot of Mons Grampius, where 10000 Britains were killed, and the rest dispersed; After which Agricola was recalled. This is the Substance of Tacitus his Relation, wherein we may observe; (1.) That these Britains were not merely such as were driven thither by the Stress of War, but such as had long inhabited there, and had so little Communication with the other Britains, that they had never seen the Condition of Slavery which the Romans had brought them to. (2.) That they were not inconsiderable for their Numbers or Valour, who were able to oppose the whole Roman Army, and make their Victory so doubtfull. (3.) That these had a distinct Name from the rest, being in general called the Caledonian Britains: And Tacitus thinks they had a different Original from the Silures, and other Britains. Those who adjoined to Gaul, he concludes came at first from thence, and had several Colonies follow'd them afterwards, as appears by their Names, Customs and Language; the Silures he deduced from Spain, which he proves from their Complexion and Situation; And so probably enough, he thinks them a Colony of the old Iberi; some whereof went into Ireland, and peopled some part of it: But, besides these two, he makes a third Race of Men in Britain, whom he fetches out of Germany, and these were the Caledonian Britains; But
he takes Germany in a very large Sense, so as to extend as far as the Sarmate; And to comprehend under it, the Northern Nations of the Cimbric, and the Gothones, and the Sucones; From whom it seems very probable, that the Caledonian Britains descended; As the Southern Britains came from the Celtae; Whose Language and Religion were kept up among them. But the Caledonians came from the European Scythians, to whose Coasts they lay much nearer than to those of the Celtae, and their larger Proportions, which Tacitus observes agree very well with this Supposition.

And thefe, if I mistake not, were the Original Picts; but not called by that Name, till new Colonies came over to people the Countrey, after the terrible Devastation of it by the Continuance of the Roman Wars. For (s) Claudian makes Thule the Countrey of the Picts; And after all the Disputes which have been about it, (t) Olaus Rudbeck hath made it very probable, that Scandinavia is meant by it; Which he proves, not only from the Testimony of Procopius, who affirms it; but from the exact Agreement of the Relations of Pytheas, Isidorus, and others with that, and neither with Ifeland, nor any other Place. Besides, (u) Bede faith, The common Tradition was, that the Picts came out of Scythia; Which is affirmed by Matt. Weftminster, and many others: But they do not mean the Asian, but the European Scythia; Which comprehended under it all the moft Northern Nations, Ab extremo Aquilon, faith (w) Pliny; And elsewhere he faith, (x) That the Getae, the Daci and Sarmate, and even the Germans were called Scythians: (y) Herodotus mentions the Northern Scythians to whom there was no access by those who dwelt near the Palus Meotis without the help of seven Languages; And when Darius fought with them, they retired Northwards towards their own Countrey. (z) Ptolemy places the Royal Scythians near the Hyperborean Mountains; Which could never be found in the vast Plains of Poland and Muscovy; There being no Mountains there answering to their Description as (a) Heberflei- nius and (b) Matthias à Micou confefs; And therefore (c) Olaus Rudbeck hath undertaken to prove, not without great flew of Reafon, That thefe Mountains were
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no other than the Ridge of Mountains in Sweden, where the seat of the ancient Scythians was; And that Ptolemy was extremely mistaken in the Situation of the Northern Nations, removing them several Degrees more Eastward than they ought to have been, and so very much straining Scandinavia. Which (d) Jornandes calls the Workes of Nations; and the same Jornandes affirms from Josephus, That the Sueones were the true Scythians, whom (e) Xenophon takes to be the Governing People of Europe in his time; As the Persians were in Asia and the Carthaginians in Africa. And the old Greek (f) Geographers (as is said before) knew of but two Nations in Europe besides themselves, viz. the Scythian towards the North, and the Celt towards the West. These European Scythians did make frequent Expeditions by Sea, as appears by the old Gothic Histories; And (g) Olaus Rudbeck observes from them, That it was a (g) Atlantic, to Cufomne for them to go abroad by Sea, under the Conduct of one of their Princes, to see for Booty; And (h) Tacitus faith particularly of the Sueones, that they were well provided of Shipping, And therefore there can be no improbability that these Northern Nations should people that part of Britain which lay nearest to them. And (i) Sueon, the first Historian of Denmark, faith, That Helghi, the Son of Haldan, the Son of Skjold, the first Monarch there, was so powerfull at Sea, that he was called Rex Maris, the King of the Sea. And (k) Saxo Grammaticus faith, That, having subdued the King of the Scavi, he failed into divers Passages of the Sea. (l) Andreas Velleius gives this Reason why the Northern Nations were so soon and so much given to Expeditions by Sea, because their Kings having many Children, they thought them best employ'd abroad, in seeking other Countries and getting Spoils at Sea. And upon the old boast of the Scythians concerning their Antiquity and Nobility might be grounded that Saying of Galgacus, That the Caledonian Britains were the most noble of any of them.

Among these Scythians (m) Pliny reckons the Agathyris; Who had their Name, faith (n) Olaus Rudbeck, from Agathyris, one of the Gothick Names for Neptune: From Agga, signifying Power at Sea; and Tyr, Power.
at Land: These Agathyrsi, faith he, were a sort of People who lived near the Sea, in the Sinus Codanus, and were wont to prey upon the Spoils of the Sea. Jornandes places them in Scandia, and calls them Agantyrhos. They were remarkable in Antiquity for Painting their Bodies, as not onely appears from Virgil's Pictique Agathyrsi.

But from what (o) Solinus faith of them, That their Bodies were painted Colore caruleo, just as the old Picts were. (p) Tacitus observes of the Arii, a fierce Northern People, That they had Tincta Corpora, i.e. were Picts. And the same (q) Virgil faith of the Geloni, who were next Neighbours to the Agathyrsi: So that (r) Hector Boethius his Conjecture is not at all improbable, who deduces the Pidi from the Agathyrsi, i.e. from the Maritime Inhabitants of the Baltic Sea; or, as he expresses it, from those who came first out of Sarmatia into the Cimbrik Cherfonse, and from thence into Scotland.

This being to me the most probable Account of the Original of the Pidi, I now come to that of the Scots. And, to doe right to all Pretenders, I shall impartially set down the several Claims of the Scotish and Irish Antiquaries, and in passing make some Remarks upon them.

I begin with the Scotish Pretences, (s) Dempfier hath given a large Catalogue of the Scotish Antiquaries (whom he never saw) such as Marcervus, the first Writer of their History, whom he places Anno Dom. 53. From him, (t) he faith, Veremundus took his Materials, (whom Hector Boethius professes to follow) and Cornelius Hibernicus, another of Hector's great Authours, who is said by him to have lived Anno Dom. 1160. about 80 years after Veremundus, according to Dempfier's computation. Lastly (or Robert Turner, as some think) mentions some ancient Annals, which Hector takes no notice of in particular, but Dempfier doth, as those of Paflet and Scone, and other Monasteries. It would tend very much to the clearing of the Scotish Antiquities if some of these ancient Annals or Lieger Books were printed by some of their Learned Men, who have never been wanting in that Nation since Hector's time.
time. And it hath rendred their Credit the more suspicion, because they have been so long kept up, when all the old Annals which have been found among us have either been carefully published, or our Writers have on all Occasions appealed to their Authority, and made use of their own Words to justify their Affections. Whether this hath been done by Hector Buchanan or Leffly, as to these Annals, I leave the Reader to determine.

I omit Dempster's other ancient Authours, who were never heard of by any besides himself; But it is some what strange, that even such as Veremundus and Corneli-us should never fall into any hands (that I can find) but those of Hector Boethius; And that he should never so much as mention John Fordon’s Scoti-chronicon. Pits con fidns this Author with John de Fordam, Confessour to our King John, and so places him Anno Dom. 1216. Wherein he is follow'd by the Learned (w) Ger. Vossius. He was Abbat of Ford in Devonshire, faith Leland, and he mentions no Historical Writings of his. But it is certain that John Fordon, who wrote the Scoti-chronicon, lived after this time, by the Authors he quotes (such as the (w) Poly-chronicon of Ranulphus Higden, the Polycraticon of Roger of Chester, who both lived in the fourteenth Century.) And (x) Maculloch, who transcribed and enlarged it, lived, faith Dempster, Anno Dom. 1482. For it appears by the Preface, Debitor sum fatior, &c. That John Fordon (who is there called a Presbyter, and no Monk) finished no more than five Books of the Scoti-chronicon; But left the Materials to make up the rest; And that Fordon's own Work was but lately done, before Maculloch undertook to finish and enlarge it, who professes himself a Disciple of Fordon's; And distinguishes his own Additions from Fordon's Copy, by putting in the Margin Scriptor & Autor. But (y) Dempster makes Maculloch, Scoti-chronicon, and Fordon, three several Authors, which is a Sign he never saw them. Mr. (z) Camden takes notice how much the later Scotish Historians are beholding to Fordon's diligence. And therefore out of him I shall give a short Account of the Scotish Antiquities; And then shew how far Major Hector Boethius and Buchanan differ from him. For Leffly doth
doth very faithfully contract Helor where Buchanan was ashamed to follow him; as will appear by what follows.

There was, faith (a) Fordon, "One Gaithelos, Son of Neolus, one of the Kings of Greece, who, having displeased his Father, was banished his Countrey, and went into Egypt, where he was married to Scotia, the King's Daughter. But he quotes another Chronicle, which faith, that he was sent to the assistance of the King of Egypt, against the Ethiopians; Who gave him his only Daughter Scotia to Wife; And the Legend of St. Brendan to the same purpose; And another Chronicle, which makes him to be Grandchild to Nimrod, who was driven into Egypt, and there married this Scotia. However they differ in lesser Circumstances, they agree in the main Point; For Scotia he must have, or else the Name of Scotia would be quite lost. After the destruction of Pharaoh in the Red Sea, Gaithelos is chosen King; But, Discontents arising, he and his Wife Scotia, with their Company, put to Sea, and made Westward; But, after many Difficulties, they landed in Spain, where, after the Conquest of the Inhabitants, he built the City Brigantia; But, being wearied out with continual Wars, he sent some of his Company to Sea to find out an Island without Inhabitants; upon discovery whereof they returned to Gaithelos; Who soon after died, and charged his Children and Friends to go thither; And accordingly his Sons, Iber and Imec, went to take Possession of this Island, which from him was called Ibernia, and from his Mother Scotia; Which Name was after given to part of Britain; Because the Inhabitants of the other Island settled there (faith Maculloch, in his Additions to Fordon) as appears by the affinity of their Language and Customs, which, faith he, continues to this day. "In Spain some of that Race abode, faith Fordon, out of an old Chronicle, 240 years; Then arose a King, whom he calls Micelius, who had three Sons, Hermonius, Panholomus and Hibertus, whom he sent into Ireland with a great Army; The eldest returned to Spain; But the other two continued there. After-
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wards Simon Brex, with his Company made a third
defecent into Ireland, who sprang from Hermonius;
and carried along with him the Marble Chair in
which their Kings were wont to sit, and which Ga-
thelus brought out of Egypt, as some think; but o-
thers say, Simon drew it up from the bottom of the
Sea with an Anchor in a great Tempest, and therefore
was preferred as a precious Relic; And he took it as
a Prefage of his Kingdom, which was to continue
wherever that Stone was; as the Southfavers said.

From Ireland, Ethachius Rothlay, a Descendent from
Simon Brex, took possession of the Island Rothlay;
And many Scots associated with the Piets in the Nor-
thern parts of Britain; But being hardly used, and
having no Head; Fergus, the Son of Fercard, or Fe-
ward, being descended of the Royal Family, went
over, and took upon him the Government of them.

Which, he faith, was before Christ 330 years, in the
time of Alexander the Great; who carried the Fatal
Chair into Scotland, and was crowned in it. Some
time after him succeeded Rether, whom Bede calls
Renda, who endeavour'd to inlarge the Borders of
the Scots in those Parts, and fixed himself in that
which from him was called Retherdale, but since Ry-
disdale; And this he makes the Second coming of the
Scots out of Ireland. After this, he tells how the
Kings of the Britains, of the Scots, and the Piets lived
very lovingly together till Julius Caesar disturbed them
all, who, he faith, went to the very Borders of Scot-
land; And there sent Letters to the Kings, both of
the Scots and Piets, who both returned Anfwers in
Latin, although but the Chapter before he faith, The
very Britains had never heard of the Name of the Romans.

But it happen'd, That Caesar, hearing of the Revolt
of the Gauls, made a speedy return out of those
Parts. Then he relates the bloody Wars of the Scots
and Piets against the Britains; and how Fulgentius,
Head of the Britains, joined with the Piets and Scots
against Severus, and killed him at York: And so pro-
ceeds in the Story of Caracallus and Maximus, and
their Wars with the Scots and Piets, till he comes to
Fergus II. With whom he begins his Third Book; And
“between the two Fergusses he reckons Forty five Kings;”

But he confesses he cannot distinguish the times of
their Reign; as he can do those from Fergus II. And
he gives this considerable Reason for it, Nam ad plea-
num Scripta non reperimus, i.e. He could not find any
full Account of them in any ancient Annals or Records.
And therefore it ought to be considered from whence
Heitor, Buchanan and Lesly should be able to give such
a particular Account of the Reigns of those Kings
which were wholly unknown to Fordon. This is the
short Account of what Fordon delivers about these Re-
moter Antiquities of the Scots.

(6) Job. Major confesseth, That the Scots were derived
from the Irish, which, he faith, is plain by the Lan-
guage; For in his time, half the Nation spake Irish,
and before that time, more. And so he tells the Story
of their coming from Spain, of the City Braganza, of
Iberus and his Mother Scotia, and then repeats the
Tradition of Gathelus, as Fordon relates it: But very
honestly faith, That he looks on that part of it, about
coming out of Greece and Egypt as a Fiction; And
very probably conjectures it was done, because the
Britains derived themselves from the Trojans. Which
was subtly done of the Scots to claim Kindred rather
with the Conquering Greeks, than the subdued and ba-
nished Trojans. All that Major afferts is, That the Irish
came out of Spain, and the Scots out of Ireland: And
the Story of Simon Brek he rejects as a Fable: And he
makes the first settling of the Scots in Britain, to be that
under Reuda; But he mentions their Annals for Fergus,
the Son of Farchard, before Reuda; and Rether and
Ryddesdale, as it is in Fordon. But he makes the King-
doms of the Pitas, Scots and Britains to be distinct in
Caesar’s time; And that they all joined against him:
And so relates Fordon’s Story to the time of Fergus II.
But between the two Fergusses he makes but 15 Kings,
and 700 Years.

(c) Heitor Boethius; before he begins the Traditi-
on of Gathelus, very ingenuously confesses, that their
Nation follow’d the Custom of other Nations, therein ma-
king themselves the Offspring of the Greeks and Egyp-
tians; And so he tells all the Story from Gathelus, as
Fordon
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Fordon has done, onely here and there making Additions and Embellishments of his own; As when he derives the Brigantes from Brigantia in Spain; When he sets down the Deliberation about the Form of Government upon Fergus his coming to Scotland; And the Speeches of Fergus and the King of the Picts; The Death of Coillus King of the Britains; The enquiring the fundamental Contrad of the Scots, with the Posterity of Fergus in Marble Tables in the way of Hieroglyphicks; The Agrarian Law, and Partition made by Seven, and the Division of the Tribes; The bringing the Silures, Ordovices, Camelodunum, as well as the Brigantes, within in the Compafts of Scotland; These are the proper Inventions of Hector, unless he had them from his Spaniard Veremundus, which no one could tell but himself; Thence Leland and (d) Lloyd charge him with innumerable Faiths. (e) Dempfler confesses, that Buchanan frequently chastifie him; But he would have it rather on the Account of Religion than Learning; But it is plain, that he owns his Mistakes and (f) Vanity, one ly he charges Lloyd with as great on behalf of the Britains.

In the Second Book Hector inlarges more. For (g) For don paffeth on from Fergus to Rether, or Bede's Reuda, having nothing to say; But Hector acquaints us with the Contests about the Regency upon Fergus his Death, and the Law then made concerning it, the attempt of Resignation of Feritharis, to Ferlegus, the Son of Fergus, and his Imprisonment upon it; The Death of Feritharis after fifteen years Reign; The Flight of Ferlegus into Britain, with the Choice of Main, his younger Brother, to be King; His good Government and Annual Progress for Justice through all Places of his Dominions; His appointing Circles of great Stones for Temples, and one in the middle for the Altar; And the Monthly Worship of the New Stones; And several Egyptian Sacrifices (which one would have thought had been more proper for Gathelus himself) with the Succession of his Son Dornadil, his making the Laws of Hunting, which were still observed there; And of his Brother Notatus, his Son Rether being an Infant: Who came in by the Law of Regency, faith Hector; By L1
the Power of the People faith Buchanan; but in truth by
neither. For all this Succession seems to have been the
produce of Hector's fruitfull Invention, which Buchanan
follows without Authority; as he doth in all the
reft of the Succession of that Race of Kings from Reu-
ther to Fergus II.

To make way for Bede's Account of Renda's coming
into thofe Parts of Britain, This Reuther is forced back
into Ireland; from whence he is faid to return with
new Supplies after twelve years; From whom the Scots
were then called Dalreudini: But this return of Reu-
ther, Hector places in the year before Chrift 204. And
after him Reutha, his Kinman; In whole time, Hector
relates an Embafly from Ptolemy Philadelphus to him;
And the Account of Scotland which he began in a
large Volume for his satisfaction, which was after fini-
shed by Ptolemy the Colmographer. This Buchanan had
the Wit to leave out (and even (b) Dempfter himself,
though he mentions him for a Writer of their History)
and fo he doth the Voyage of the two Spanish
Philofophers in the time of Jofina, and their Preaching
againft the Egyptian Worhip in Scotland; (but Leffy
hath it.) And if Buchanan had believed it, he would
have fet it down, as well as Jofina's bringing Phyfick and
Chirurgery into fo much requeft, That there was not
a Noble Man that could not praftife the latter. And
yet Hector declares immediately after the Story of the
Philofophers, that hitherto he had followed Veremundus,
John Campbell and Cornelius Hibernicus, the moft ap-
proved Authours of their History. It would have
been some fatisfaction to the World, if any other
Perfon had seen these Authours besides; Fordon never
mentions them; And yet he used great diligence to
search their Antiquities; And, if (i) Dempfter may be
believed, had the Sight of their moft ancient MSS. Bu-
chanan passes them over; Dempfter names them, on the
authority of Hector: What became of these great Au-
thours after Hector's time? Did he destroy them, as
fome fay Polydore Virgil did fome of ours after he had
used them? But this were Madnefs, to quote their
Authority and destroy the Authours; For these were his
Vouchers, which ought moft carefully to have been pre-
fer-
preferred. And in truth Hector himself gives no very consistent Account of his Authours: For in his Epistle to James 5, he mentions Veremundus, Archdeacon of St. Andrew's, who deduced the Scotish History from the Original to Malcolm III. And Turgott, Bishop of St. Andrew's, and John Campbell, which were brought from the Island Iona; To whom he adds an Anon- 
mous Authour, and the imperfect History of William Elphinston, Bishop of Aberdeen. But, faith he, if any ask 
such a material Queftion, How came these Authours to be 
seen no where else? He answers, That Edw. I. deftroy'd 
all their Monuments of Antiquity; So that had not thofe 
been preferved in the Island Iona with the Chefs of Books 
which Fergus II. brought from the facking of Rome, in 
the time of Alaric, They had been able to give no account 
of their Antiquities. From whence it is evident that 
Hector never faw or heard of any ancient Authours of 
their History, but fuch as were conveyed to him from 
the Island Iona. But in his (k) Seventh Book; where 
he gives a more particular account of thofe Books 
which were brought to him from thence, he onely 
mentions fome broken Fragments of Latin Authours; 
But thofe they were, where Written, whence they 
came, he knew not; And, as to their own Histories, 
he names indeed Veremundus and Elphinston, and no 
more. The latter he faid before was imperfect, and 
lately done; So that the whole Credit of Hector's An-
tiquities refts entirely upon Veremundus; For here he 
ever takes notice of Campbell or Cornelius Hibernicus; 
But he faith, Edw. I. had deftroy'd all their Antiquities, 
but fuch as were preferved in the Island Iona or Hy. And 
is this now a good Foundation to build a History up-
on? For is it not very strange, that no one Copy of 
Veremundus should be heard of since that time; When 
there were feveral of Fordon, not onely there, but in 
our Libraries, fome with the Inlargements and fome 
without? But if our King Edw. I. deftroy'd all their an-
cient Histories, how came Turgott's to be preferved? 
He was Bishop of St. Andrew's in the time of Malcolm III. 
and Queen Margaret, whose Lives he wrote; And whose 
History, Hector faith, he had. So that not onely Tur-
gott's History of the Church of Durham is preferved in 
the
the Cotton Library, with his own Name written in an ancient Character (the same that is printed under the Name of Simeon Dunelmensis, with some Alterations, as (l) Mr. Selden hath shewed; But if Hoveden be so much to blame, as (m) Leland faith, for concealing what he borrow'd from Simeon Dunelmensis, Simeon himself is at least as much to blame for assuming to himself the proper work of Turgott.) But it seems Hector had seen what he wrote in relation to the Scotish History: And Bale and Pits fay, he wrote of the Kings of Scotland. But Dempfier faith, he wrote only the Annals of his own time, i.e. I suppofe, the Lives of Malcolm and Margaret: If fo, Hector mentions him to little purpose, with respect to the Scotish Antiquities. But however, from the formentioned Authours, Hector pretends to give an Account of the Institution of the Great Council by Finannus, of the Order of the Druids, and their Chief Seat in the Island Mona, (which he would have to be the Isle of Man, to the great regret of Humphrey Lloyd, who hath written a Book on purpose to disprove him and Polydore Virgil about it.) Of the Tyranny and violent Death of King Durflus; Of the choice of Euenus his Kinman to succeed him, and his first requiring an Oath of Allegiance; Of the Disturbances by Gillus his natural Son, and his flying into Ireland: And his Death by Cadalus; And Euenus his setting up Edecus, the Grandchild of Durflus; with which he ends his Second Book.

In his Third Book he gives an Account of the Troubles from Ireland by Bredius, a Kinman of Gillus; Of Caffibellani's Message to Ederus for Assiftence against Ju-

lius Caesar; And the Speech of Androgeus before the Council; and Ederus his Answer, and sending 10000 Men under the Command of Cadallanus, Son to Cadal-

lus; Who, with the British Forces, quite overthrew Cæsar, by the help of Tenantius, Duke of the Cambri and Corinei; for which, as we may easily conceive, there was wonderfull rejoicing in Scotland: And great Friendship upon it, between the Britains, the Picts and the Scots. But next Summer they hear the sad News of Cæsar's coming again; And then the Britains refu-

fed the Scots affiftence (and it is easie to imagine what
must follow) the poor Britains were miserably beaten; And Caffibellan yields himself to Caesar, and Caesar marches towards Scotland; but before he enters it, he sends a more Eloquent Letter to them than that in Fordon; And the Scots and Piets returned a refolute Answer. But it seems Caesar had so much good Nature in him as to send a Second Message to the Scots, which was deliver'd with great Eloquence, but it did not work upon them; For, faith Hector, had it not been for the Law of Nations, they had torn the Messengers to pieces. But it happen'd luckily, that while Caesar was making Preparations to enter Scotland, he received Letters from Labienus of the Revolt of the Gauls; upon which Caesar returns, having scarce so much as frightened the Piets and the Scots. And here again Hector vouchers the Authority of Veremundus and Campbell; But notwithstanding, Buchanan very wisely leaves all this out, which Lely, believing Veremundus, or rather Hector before Caesar, keeps in. But here Hector becomes very nice and critical, rejecting the vulgar Annals (which it seems were not destroy'd by Edw. I.) which say, that Caesar went as far as the Caledonian Wood, and besieg'd Camelodunum, and left there his Pretorian House which he used to travel with, called Julis Hoef. But for his part, he would write nothing that might be found fault with, and therefore he follows Veremundus again; That this was the Temple of Victory, built by Vespasian, not far from Camelodunum; Only the Inscription was defaced by Edw. I. Buchanan in the Life of King Donald faith, This was the Temple of the God Terminus: being near the Roman Wall. It was a round Building, made of square Stones, and open onely at the top 24 Cubits in height, 13 in breadth, as (n) Camden describes it. (o) Nemnus faith, It was built by Carausius, in token of his Triumph. But this looks no more like a Triumphal Arch, than Caesar's travelling Palace: And therefore Buchanan's opinion seems most probable, since Hector faith, That there was within it a Stone of great magnitude, which was the Representation of the God Terminus, especially, if the hole in the top were over the Stone, as it was in the Capitol at Rome. Then follow the wicked Life and tragical End of Euenus III. the good Reign of Metellanus, and
and his Friendship with Augustus, which he goes about
to prove from Strabo: But he had better kept to Veremundus. After him succeeded Caratacus, born at Caractaconium, a City of the Silures, faith Heitor, and that he might be sure to confound all, he faith, his Sifter Voada was married to Arviragus, King of the Britains; But he divorced her, and married Genuifa, a Noble Roman; upon which Caratacus joined the Britains against the Romans; and was at last beaten by them, and betrayed by Cartumandua, his Mother-in-law, who, after his Father’s death, was married to Venufus, and was by Offorius carried in Triumph to Rome, from whence, he faith, he returned to Scotland, and remained to his death a Friend to the Romans; After Caratacus, Corded his Brother was chosen King; who joined with Voada against the Romans; And partaking of her misfortune returned into Scotland, and there died. His Sons being under Age, Dardannus succeeded; Who designing to destroy the right Heirs of the Crown, was himself taken off: And thereby Way was made for Galdus the true Heir to succeed; Who was the fame, faith Heitor, with Tacitus his Galgacus; and, he confesses, was beaten by Petilius Cerealis. This King, Buchanan thinks, was the firt of their Kings who fought with the Romans. What becomes then of the Credit of Heitor and Veremundus, from whom we have fuch ample Narrations of their engaging with the Romans so long before? From hence it is plain that Veremundus his Authority signified nothing with him; And yet he follows Heitor where he professes to rely upon his Authority. For Buchanan evidently abridges Heitor as to the Scotifh Affairs, leaving out what he found inconsistent with the Roman History.

Heitor begins his Fifth Book with the short Reign and dolefull End of Lucatuc, Galdus his Son; who was succeeded by Mogallus, his Sifters Son; who continued for some time a brave Prince, but at laft degenerating, was killed by his Subjects. After him Conarus his Son, who was confined for ill management, and the Government committed to Argadus; Upon his death the Kingdom fell to Ethodius, Nephew to Mogallus, who was strangled in his Bed by an Irish Harper; And
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fo was Sarrael that succeeded him, by those of his Bed-chamber. These are sad Stories, if they were true, but the comfort is, there appears yet no better Authority than that of Hector for them. For Fordon hath nothing of all this; And Buchanan and Lefly take them upon Hector's Credit. They served Buchanan's purpose well enough, as appears by his Book De jure Regni a-pud Scotos; And therefore he was willing to let them stand in History, being none of his Invention, and knowing what use was to be made of them. Donaldus, Brother to Ethodius, was chosen in his room, and here Hector falls in with Fordon about Fulgentius, one of the Royal Britifh Race, who revolted from the Romans, which Fordon had from Geffrey of Monmouth, who calls him Fulgenius, and faith, he was driven with the Britains into Albany: But after, in a Fight with Severus at York, they were both killed. But in this Hector was ashamed to follow them; allowing Severus to die a natural death, and Fulgentius to survive him. As to Donald's embracing Christianity, he follows Fordon, but never quotes him; And here he never mentions Veremundus; As though so considerable a Point of History needed no Authority but his own. He concludes this Book with a brief Account of Ethodius, Son to the former, who for his ill Government was confined by his Nobles and killed by his Guards.

In the Sixth Book he begins with a Convention of the Estates for the choice of a new King. And they set up his Son Athirco, who gave great hopes at first, but falling into Debauchery, his Nobles combined against him, and finding no way to escape, he killed himself. Nathalacus, Head of the Conspiracy, succeeds, who was for a time Popular, afterwards Cruel; to that degree, as raised a general hatred of him, which ended in a Design to destroy him; Wherein they were prevented by one of his greatest Confidants, who stabbed him. Then Findocus, eldest Son to Athirco, recover'd the Crown, who proved an excellent Prince, but was at last murthered by two Villains, his Brother Carantius being privy to it: The Murthurers were executed, but Carantius fled, and was afterwards a great Souldier under Probus, Carus and Dioclefan. This Caran-
Carantius is the name whom the Roman Writers call Caranfius, as Hector afterwards confesses, who set up for himself in Britain. But, faith he, he purposely disguised himself abroad. Geffrey of Monmouth makes him a Britain, and calls him Caraffius. (p) Fordon tells the main of the Story of Caranfius well enough; only inlarging on the Leagues he made with the Scots and Piets; And Gothorius, Nephew to Fulgentius, who ruled over the Northern Britains. But whence had Hector this Information, That he was Carantius, Son to Athirco, and Brother to Findocm? Buchanan is not hammed to relate the Story of Carantius as far as to his parting into the Roman Army, and there stops. But afterwards he speaks of Caranfius his Actions in Britain, without any farther mention of Carantius; Which shews that Buchanan took, and left what he pleased out of Hector's History without being obliged by any Authority he produced to carry it on as he found it there.

After the Death of Findocus, his Brother Donald succeeded, who was soon killed by Donald of the Isles, who usurped the Kingdom, and was at last killed by a Conspiracy whereof Crathlintus, Son to Findocus was the chief; Who immediately took possession of the Crown: After him succeeded Fincormachus, both these died peaceably. Then arose a mighty Content about the Regency between the three Nephews of Crathlintus; At first Romachus prevailed, but Governing cruelly, he was taken off: Then follow'd Angufianus, who was killed in Battel by the Piets; After him Fethelmachus, killed in his Bed by his Harper; And last of all Eugenius, killed in Battel by the Romans: And soon after, by the Intigation of the Piets their mortal Enemies, the Scots were universally banished out of Britain by order of Maximus the Roman General; whither they returned not till about forty years after, under Fergus II. And in this, as to the main part of this last Tragedy, Fordon agrees with Hector, viz. That it was occasion'd by the Romans joining with the Piets against the Scots, in the time of Eugenius, who were not only beaten by them, but driven out of Britain into Ireland, and Norway, and other Countries.
This is the Substance of what these Scotifh Antiquaries deliver concerning their remotest Antiquities to the time of Fergus II.

But several Arguments are of late produced to justify the History of Scotland, as it is delivered by Hector Boethius out of Veremundus and his other Authors; which must be briefly considered, before I proceed to the Scotish Antiquities. And it is alleged, that the Scotish Antiquities, as delivered by him (for it is concerning Hector's Authority which I dispute) have been received with great Applause for many hundreds of years, by all Historians; Antiquaries and Criticks of other Nations, who had any occasion to mention their Affairs. It will go a great way with me, if it be made appear, that there was any such account received among Learned Antiquities in any part of the World before Hector's time. But I cannot find any one Antiquary, no not in Scotland, before his time, who gives the same Account that Hector doth. The Tradition of the Scots peopling that part of the Island long before Fergus II. I grant was a much elder Tradition, and is embraced by Fordon; and probably by others before him. But Fordon doth not own the Succession of the same number of Kings, and in such a manner as Hector delivers them. From whence then came Hector to know so much more than Fordon in these matters? I yield that there were some ancient Chronica before Fordon, which he often quotes. But still the Argument is the stronger against Hector. For if Fordon had all those Helps, and yet knew nothing of those particulars, it is a vehement Presumption against Hector, that he took too much Liberty in those many particulars, which Fordon passed over, as having nothing to say about them. The more Copies they have of Fordon in their Monasteries, the more easily they may be convinced, how little Hector and he agree about the first Succession between the two Ferguses. And if Fordon did agree with all their Annals, as is now pleaded, Hector Boethius could not, because they differ so much from each other; as will appear to any one that compares them. Why do we not read in Fordon the Authoritie of Veremundus and Cornelius Hibernicus, who were certainly before his time, if ever? For we are told;
that he was Archdeacon of St. Andrew's, A.D. 1076, and dedicated his Book to Malcolm Canmore; which was long enough before Fordon's time. But it is said, that he is cited in a particular part of Fordon's Book; which could not be copied from Boethius. It had been a much clearer Evidence, if that Place had been produced; for then we might have consider'd whether it was a Passage of Fordon, or of one of those several Writers who it seems wrote Additions and Continuations to him; such, as besides Maculloch, Arelat and Walter Bowmaker are said to have been, who continued the Histories to the Reign of James II. And yet I would be glad to see any Testimony of Veremundus of that Antiquity. As to the Testimony of Chambers, who faith, he had these principal Authors; Veremund, a Spaniard, Turgott, Swinton, Campbell, &c. till some farther Proof be produced, I have reason to suppose, it was the fame Case as to him with that of Sir R. Baker, which immediately follows; For we are told, that he likewise quotes this Veremund among the Authors out of whom he compiled his History, and likewise Campbell and Turgott. And if we have no more ground to believe that Chambers had them, than Sir R. Baker, the matter must remain in as much obscurity as before. For no one imagines that Sir R. Baker had all those Authors by him which he there mentions; but he sets down the Names of those whose Authorities he relied upon, although he found them quoted by others. And he is not the only person in the World who hath cited the Authority of Books which he never saw; The fame is to be said of Hollinshed. But if such kind of Proofs must pass for evident Demonstrations, that the Scots had such Historians as Veremundus and the others before mentioned; I wonder the fame Learned Author should shrink so much the Faith of History as to allow that despicable thing, called Moral Certainty, to be a sufficient Probation for it; For scarce any History can be mention'd, but may have such kind of evident Demonstrations to prove it. Well, but Baiaus, a Learned Englishman, and Gefner, and other famous Strangers, quote Veremundus. But fo do not Bofon of Bury, nor Le- land, who had written of the Britifh and other Wri-
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ters before the time of Hector Boethius. And those were Men who search'd all our Libraries for the ancient Books in them, and have digested them with great Care; and if Veremundus with other MSS. were brought into England by Edw. I. as is now suggested, it could hardly have escaped the diligence of those Men. But those who lived after Hector Boethius published his History, took his word for Veremundus, and entred him into their Catalogues; as Vossius hath done many whom he never saw. But Erasmus saith, that Hector was a Person who could not lie. That was more than Erasmus could know, unless he had been by when he wrote his History and compared it with the Authours he pretended to follow. As to Paulus Jovius, he was a fit Second to Boethius; but I am sure Erasmus would not have said of him, that he could not lie. For Hector's pretending to have his Books from the Island Iona, I have given an Account of it already, and shew'd how inconsistent his own relation thereof is. But all this while, Where is the great Applause of these Scotch Antiquities for many hundreds of years by all Historians, Antiques and Criticks of foreign Nations? When not so much as one is produced, who lived before Hector Boethius, and, I think, that was not many hundred years since.

But whatever becomes of Veremundus, we are told; That the Black-book of Scoon, containing the Scotch Histories from the beginning, was among President Spotwood's Books, and given to Lambert, and by him to Colonel Fairfax. All this, I am afraid, is a great mistake for a Black-book of Fords', which was brought out of Scotland and presented to the late King by a Gentleman of that Name, as some yet living can attest. But no such thing as the Black-book of Scoon was ever heard of here; and if any such could be found, we should be so far from suppressing any thing that tended to the Glory of the Scotch Nation, that some here would be very glad to publish it, with all other ancient Annals which themselves would think fit to be printed; whether it be the Black-book of Paflay, Pluscardin, or any others. We do not deny that they had any ancient Annals or Registers in their Monasteries; but we desire to be better acquainted with them; and it is no good
good Argument, they can tell us where to find them, that they are so careful to let us know how they came to lose them.

But, after all this Fencing, it is positively said, that the surest foundation of all History is the common belief and consent of the Natives. But what if the Natives of several Countries differ from each other? It may be reasonable to believe neither, but it is not possible to believe both. What if they had for a long time no certain way of conveying their Histories from one Age to another? It is possible Oral Tradition may preserve some general strokes of the ancient History of a Country; but it is hardly credible, that so many particulars as Boethius hath in the first Race of Kings could be kept so distinctly by the force of Tradition. The case of the old World is vastly different from any other People since the horning of Mens Lives; and whatever Nation wanted Records, could never make out the Credibility of their History to other People. We do not deny the Annals of the Jewish or Roman Priests; but we think Annals and Oral Tradition are two things; when Annals are produced, we must weigh and consider them, and compare the Annals of several Nations together, that we may better judge which are to be relied upon.

And yet we are told again, that when Histories are already formed out of ancient Records, there is no farther need to produce them; for Papers may be lost by accident, but the Histories taken out of them are to be believed, although the Records cannot be found; as it is in respect of the Histories of Rome and Greece, whose Authority remains, although the Testimonies on which they relied are not extant.

So that at last Geoffrey of Monmouth must be believed as to the British Antiquities, as well as Hector Boethius as to the Scotish. For Geoffrey doth no more pretend to invent his History than Hector; and Hunibaldus is as good an Author as either of them; and Keting as good as Hunibaldus. For they all equally pretend to derive their Histories from ancient Records and the Tradition of the Natives; and all these having formed their Histories out of these substantial Grounds, we are to search no farther; but to believe them all however improbable.
probable in themselves and contradictory to one another.

The case is very different as to the Learned Greek and Roman Histories, from those of the modern barbarous Nations; which were plainly made in imitation of them, as will appear afterwards. And as to the Greeks and Romans, there is a considerable difference to be made between the Histories that related to the times before they had written Annals and after. Can any Man imagine that there is as great reason to believe the first Accounts of Greece as those that were written after the Peloponnesian War? Or, that the first beginnings of the Roman Monarchy by Romulus are delivered with as much certainty as the Carthaginian War? The most judicious Writers among the Greeks and Romans did make allowance for the Obscurity of Ancient times, when many things were utterly lost, and others very imperfectly delivered: What Reproach is it to any modern Nations to suppose their Histories to have had the same Fate the Greeks and Romans had? Only in this respect they are liable to greater Dispute, because they pretend to give an exact Account of those times before they had any Annals or written Records; and in this Case, the more exact and particular, the more suspicious. And we have more certain Rules of trying their ancient Histories, than the Greeks and Romans had; because we have the Accounts of several Nations to compare together; and undoubted Testimonies of other Writers to examine them by. And if they be not found faulty by some of these ways, we are contented to let them pass.

But as to the Scotish Antiquities, we not only object the Want of sufficient Antiquity in their written Records, but their Inconsistency with approved Writers, in the most ancient Account they give of the first settling of the Scots so early in Britain. And which yet adds more to the suspicion, the Irish, from whom they descend, give a far more different Account of their first coming than themselves do; as will appear by what follows.

For, The Irish Antiquaries will by no means allow the Account given by Hector Boethius; And say, He had.
had not regard to Truth in the Writing of it; Particularly, as to Simon Breck's coming out of Spain, and bringing the fatal Chair with him, which they say are both false, and the main ground they insit upon is, That they are contrary to the Relation of the (q) Old Irish Antiquaries who deserve far more Credit.

I shall therefore set down the Account they give, and consider the Credit they deserve.

The best Account we have from (r) them is this;

(1.) That Ireland was first planted after the Flood, by one Giocal, with a Fleet, wherein every Vessel had fifty Men and fifty Women; And this, Keting faith, happen'd about 100 years after the Deluge. But since such remote Antiquities are very tender things, I shall not with a Befom sweep them all away at once, but gently take them in Pieces, and lay them open as I pass along. Now I desire to know what Foundation there is for our believing a thing so unlikely, as the Peopling of Ireland in this manner, with such a Fleet, so soon after the Flood? It was a long time after this before the Phœnicians had any skill in Shipping; to whom the Romans attributed the Invention of it. And certainly the Expedition of the Argonauts had not made such a noise among the Greeks so long after the Flood: but twenty years before the Defftruction of Troy, as (s) Scaliger faith, which happen'd in the time of the Judges; if the Skill in Shipping had been so great within 100 years after it? Yet, if that Expedition were such as (r) Olauus Rudbeck describes it, it was far more considerable than is commonly thought. For he faith, They not onely entred the Euxine Sea, but he proves from Orpheus and Diodorus Siculus, that they failed up the Tanais, from whence Horius in his Map faith, They went into the Mare Croniam, and so came round Egypt, passing between Britain and Ireland, and returning home by the Straits. But Rudbeck finds a Passage for them from the Tanais to the Volga, and so to the Lake of Fronoe, the Head of the Volga, and then by Rivers into the Baltic Sea, and so about the Scythian Promontory to Ierne (Ireland) and Peucefa (Britain) and to Aujonia (Italy) and Trinacria (Sicily) and so home to Iokos. If this were a mere Poetical Fancy, yet
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yet it was extraordinary, since it agrees with the exact Description of the Northern Countries, faith Rudbeck far more than Ptolemy doth. I will suppose this Orpheus, who wrote the Argonauticks, to be neither the Old Orpheus, nor Onomacritis, but Orpheus of Crotona, to whom Suidas attributes the Argonauticks, who lived in the time of Pisistratus; yet it is very much for him then to describe these Parts of the World, as he doth; and to mention Ireland as a Country then known to the Greeks. And Festus Avienus, describing the Voyage of Himilco the Carthaginian (spoken of by (u) Pliny) speaks of Ireland as then esteemed Sacred in these remarkable Verses:

Aft hinc duobus, in sacram, sic Insulam
Dixere prisci solibus cursus rati eft
Hec inter Undas multum cespitem jacit
Eamque latè Gens Hibernorum colit.
Propinqua rursus Insula Albionum pater.

Nothing can be plainer, than that he here speaks of Ireland and Britain, as then known by Himilco; For Festus Avienus faith, He took this Description from the Phoenician Annals, in which this Voyage was inserted. And it is very strange to me that (w) Olaus Rudbeck (w) Atlantic. should here change the Hiberni into Hyperborei, especially when he allows Albion to stand for Britain. But these are undoubted Testimonies of the ancient Peopling of Ireland: and of far greater Authority than those domestick Annals now so much extolled. But must we follow Keting, because he follows the old Annals in this Tradition of the first Peopling of Ireland? And why not then in the Story of Seth and three Daughters of Cain viewing Ireland? And of the three Fishermen of Spain being Wind-driven thither the year before the Flood? And of Keasar the Daughter of Bajoth, Son of Noah, coming thither with three Men and fifty Women, to save themselves from the Flood? Are not all these fine Stories in the same Irish Annals? But Keting rejects them; And what then? Doth this make for or against the Authority of these Annals, that even Keting looks on these as Poetical Fictions? But he faith, The best Irish Antiquaries did
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did of Old look on these as fabulous. Possibly the two former they might; But do they indeed reject the Story of Keafar and her Companions? (x) Giraldus Cambrensis quotes the most ancient Histories of Ireland for this Tradition; and they confirm it by the Names of the Place where she landed, and where she was buried. And (y) Gratianus Lucius confesses, that he had the fight of their ancient Annals; and he suspects that he made away many of them. If so, Keting had fewer advantages than Giraldus for the Old Irish Antiquities. But if these Old Annals be of so little Authority in this Story, What Credit do they deserve in this early Plantation after the Flood? But to proceed in the Irish Account, It is said,

(2.) That Bartholanus and his three Sons, about three hundred years after the Flood, landing in Ireland with a thousand fighting Men, had many doughty Battles with the Posterity of Giocal; And at the end of three hundred years they were all consumed by a Pestilence:

This Story, I confess, is in (z) Nennius, and (a) Giraldus Cambrensis; But it is a very obvious Question, if they all died, How their memory came to be prefered, and even the memory of that Pestilence which destroyed them all? But to this Giraldus gives a very substantial Answer out of the ancient Annals, viz. That only one Ruanus escaped, who lived to St. Patrick's days, and was baptized by him: (in a good old Age certainly, for he must be born within six hundred years after the Flood); And it was above four hundred and thirty years after Christ before St. Patrick was designated for Ireland.) This Ruanus, say the Irish in Giraldus, was the true Relator of the ancient History of Ireland to St. Patrick, and who can question the Testimony of such an authentick and truly ancient Witness? A late (b) Irish Antiquary faith, he continued so long by a Pythagorean Transmigration; but it was much he could retain these things in his Memory under all his Transmutations.

But as to this Bartholanus (who is called by Nennius Bartholomeus, but by Geoffrey, Partholomeus, by Fordon, Griffth Briton, &c. 20.) we read in the (c) Britifh History, That when Gurgunitus returned from Dacia, he found 30 Ships near the Orcades full of Men and Women, and, finding to enquire
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enquire who they were, their Commander, (c) Bartholomeus, (c) De Orig. & said, They were driven out of Spain to seek a Country to live in, and beg'd some part of Britain, for they had been a year and a half at Sea; But he sent them into Ireland, then void of Inhabitants, which they planted, and there continued to this day. It seems there was a Tradition in Nennius his time, Anno Domini 830. That Ireland was peopled from Spain; And that one Bartholonus, or Bartholomeus, was the Leader of them; But Geoffrey would not let them go thither without leave from the Britains; But Nennius hath nothing of it, and that part concerning being a year and a half at Sea, Nennius applies to Nimach, as he calls him, but the Irish, Nimead; and he faith, after his abode in Ireland, he returned to Spain. Then, Nennius faith, Three Sons of a Spaniard came with thirty Vessels, and thirty Women in each of them, who saw a Tower of Glass in the middle of the Sea, and Men upon it, who would give no Answer, wherefore they resolved to affault it with all their Vessels, except one, which was shipwreck'd, having thirty Men, and as many Women, in it, all the rest were sunk in the Attempt of the Castle, and from those thirty Men and thity Women, faith Nennius, all Ireland was peopled. Here we see how far Geoffrey differs from Nennius; and alters the old Traditions as he thought fit. But Nennius goes on, and faith, That more still came from Spain, and the last was one whom he calls Clamhochor, and his Company. But the Interpolator of Nennius (whether Samuel Beulanus or another) there observes, That there is no certain Account of the Original of the Scots; So the Irish were then called. But yet Nennius relates, from the Irish Antiquaries, the Story of the Noble Scythian, who was Son-in-law to Pharaoh, and his Expulsion out of Egypt, and coming at last to Spain, and thence to Ireland above a thousand years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea; And first settled in Dalrieta, which he understands of that Region in Ireland; But the Scotch Antiquaries apply it to the Country which had the same Name in Scotland. So that here we have very different Accounts, that were given so long since as the time of Nennius; and no way found then, to distinguish the true from the false, or the certain from the uncertain.
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But of that more afterwards. Now to go on to a farther Account from the Irish Authors who say,

(3.) That thirty years after, Nemidus, another Scythian, with his four Sons, arrived in Ireland with a good Fleet, and fought with the remainder of the Giants, but by another Pestilence were driven off, under the Conduct of three Captains, Simeon Breac, Ibaath, and Briotan, and the two former sailing to Greece; Briotan, with his Adherents, landed in the North of Britain, now called Scotland; and by these, and their Posterity remaining there, gave the Denomination of Britain to the whole Island. And this we are told is affirmed by the Holy Cormach, King of Munster and Bishop of Cashel, in the Psalter of Cashel. And all the Chronologers of Ireland agree with him. This Psalter of Cashel is one of the most authentick Histories among them, and so called because done in Verse; and (d) it is said, That the more remote Antiquities in it were taken from another Book made 1200 years since, collected out of all the former Chronicles of that Nation and allowed in a solemn Convention of the Estates at Tarach, under Laogerius, in the time of St. Patrick, who was one of the Committee appointed for the supervising of it. And this Book was called the Psalter of Tarach.

This I confess goes much beyond what can be said for Geffrey of Monmouth, or Hector Boethius. But yet methinks there seem to be some Reasons, why these Annals should not have such a mighty authority with us. For we cannot be certain that there ever were such Annals, or that these Annals, if they were so exactly drawn up, are still preferred. For not onely (e) Gratianus Lucius complains for the loss of their old Annals; But (f) Jocelin, in the Life of St. Patrick, concludes with saying, that many of their Writings relating to him were burnt by the fury of the Pagans while they governed in Ireland. By these Pagans the Danes are meant, and the Slavery under them is (g) said to be worse than Egyptian, Circassian, or any other mention'd in History. And particularly it is said, That the Clergy were banish'd into Bogs, Woods and Caves, where they were fain to lurk several years like wild Beasts; and that none were suffer'd to keep School, or to be taught any kind of Learning, not even in their own Houses: And which is yet more to the purpose,
poor, None were suffer'd to have any kind of Book; But all Books the Danes could light upon, were either burnt, or taken away from them. It is possible their Annals might escape such a Storm as this, but it doth not seem altogether probable; Especially considering that this first Slavery under the Danes continued Forty years, in which, they lay, all their famous Monasteries, Cells, Universities, Colleges were destroyed, not one being left in the Land. And it is withall said, That although other Losses might be recover'd, yet their Libraries were never recover'd. Only some few Religious Men preserved some of their Books. But we have no assurance that the old Annals were among them. Or if they were then, That they could escape the Second Danish Invasion, which continued for a hundred and fifty years. In which (b) Colganus saith, The Irish Antiquities had an irrecoverable Loss, at least, he faith, not yet recover'd.

And yet he had Cormach's Psalter, or the Psalter of Casbel, Tigernacus his Annals, or the Annales Chuanenfes; the Annales Infaulefes, compos'd by one Magraidin, in the Island of All-saints, in the County of Longford, which he deduces to Anno Domini 1405. The Annales of Ulter, by one Maguir, Canon of Armach, deduced to his own time, who died An. Dom. 1498. And the Annales of Dungall compos'd by four modern Authours out of all their former Annals; But among all these, there is nothing pretending to Antiquity, but the Psalter of Casbel and Tigernacus; yet the Psalter of Casbel falls short of the time of Nennius, for Cormach, King of Munster, the supposed Author of it, lived after the beginning of the tenth Century, being killed by Flann mbac Siona (called Flannus Siona by (t) Gratianus Lucius) who died An. Dom. 914. or as Sir James (k) Ware thinks, An. Dom. 916. And for Tigernacus his Annals, the four Magiftri, as Colganus calls them, or the Annals of Dungall are positive; that Tigernacus & Brathon, the Author of them, died (l) in the eleventh Century, An. Dom. 1088. There remaines only the Psaltuir Na-Ran, written by Aonhais Ceile de, or by Aengylus, one of the Culdees, who lived in the latter end of the eighth Century, as the same Irish Antiquary confes's, who withall faith, That all the Works contained therein relate

\[ \text{NN} \quad \text{only} \]
only to Matters of Piety and Devotion, which therefore can signify nothing to our purpose. So that nothing appears of the Irish Antiquities which can pretend to be written before the Danish Invasion; And although we are told, that these Annals were taken out of others more ancient; yet we have barely their Word for it; for those ancient Annals, whatever they were, are irrecoverably lost; So that there can be no comparison of one with the other. And how can they be so certain of the exactness used in the Parliament of Tarach to preserve their Annals, if there be no ancient Annals to preserve the Memory of the Proceedings at that time? It was a very extraordinary Care for the Estates of the whole Nation to preserve their Annals; if we could be assured of it: Which doth much exceed the Library of Antiquities which (m) Saffridus Petrus speaks of, set up, as he faith, by Friso, the Founder of the Frisians, at Stavera, near the Temple of Stavo, in which not only the ancient Records were preserved from time to time; But the Pictures of the several Princes, with the times of their Reigns, from An. 313. before Christ's coming, to Charlemagns time; The like whereof, he faith, no German Nation can boast of; But yet methinks the Posterity of Ga-thelus exceeds that of Friso's in the Care of Preserving their Antiquities; For the Wisdom of the whole Nation was concerned in it. But I never read of any who ever saw this Library of Antiquities at Stavera, but we must believe Cappidus Stäverenfsis and Oca Scar lenfsis, as to these things; And that they saw the Records, as Heflor did Veremundus, although none else ever did. But as to this Parliament of Tarach, which was carefull to preserve the Irish Antiquities; Whence have we this Information? Are the AIs of that Assembly preferred? Are any Copies of those Annals still in being? Yes, we (n) are told, that the keeping of the Original Book was entrusted by the Estates to the Prelates, and those Prelates, for its perpetual Preservation, caused several authentick Copies of it to be fairly engrossed, whereof some are extant to this day, and several more faithfully transcribed out of them; their Names being the Book of Ardmach, the Pfalter of Cashel, &c. It seems then, these are the Transcripts of the Original Authentick Book,
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allowed by all the Estates of the Kingdom. But the Book of Ardmach is a late thing, being the same with the Annals of Ulster composed by a Canon of Armach; So that the whole rests upon the Psalter of Casbel, which must be composed 500 years after the meeting of that famous Assembly. For St. Patrick was one of the number, and it was done in the time of Laogiusir, or Leogarius, King of Ireland, who died, faith (o) Gratianus Lucius, An. Dom. 458. But King Cormach lived in the tenth Century; And therefore an account must be given, how this Original Book or Authentick Copies were preferred for that 500 years and more, in the miserable Condition that Nation was in, a great part of that time.

So that the Difference is not so great between the Authority of Geffrey of Monmouth and these Annals, as is pretended. For I see no Reason why the Story of Brutus should be thought more incredible than that of Cical, Bartholanus and Nemedus, with his Son Briotan that gave the name to Britain; And especially the Story of Gathelus himself, his Marriage in Egypt to Scota, coming to Spain, and thence his Posterity to Ireland; which seems to me to be made in imitation of Geffrey's Brutus. For Brutus married Pandrafus his Daughter, the King of Greece, and then was forced to seek his Fortune at Sea, and passing by Mauritania, just as Gathelus did, the one landed in Gaul, and came for Albion; And the other in Spain, and scit his Son for Ireland. And I wonder to find (p) Brutus his Giants in Albion of so much larger Proportions than the Giants in Ireland, who are said not to exceed the tallest growth of Men; For I had thought Giants had been Giants in all Parts of the World. Suppose some Learned Men have question'd, Whether there were such a Person as Brute; I should think it no more Heresie, than to call in question, Whether there were such Perions as Cical, Bartholanus, Briotan or Gathelus; If the silence of good Authors, the distance of time, and want of Ancient Annals complained of, makes the History of Brutus so hard to be believed, I onely desire, that these Irish Traditions may be examined by the same Rules, and then, I believe, the Irish Antiquities will be reduced to the same Form.
Form with the British; Only Geffrey had not so lucky an Invention, as to have his History confirm'd by Parliament. For, if he had but thought of it, he could have made as general an Assembly of the Estates at Lad's Town, and as select a Committee of Nine, as ever was at Tarach. But all men's Inventions do not lie the same way; And in this, I confess, Reeting or his Authors have very much exceeded Geffrey and his British MS. And upon the whole matter I cannot see that the Irish Chronologers and Historians have so much more probability in their Story of Britan than the British Writers had in the Tradition of Brute. For it is certain, it was not originally the Invention of Geffrey, only he might use some art in setting it off, as he thought, with greater advantage than the Britains had done before him.

But still we are referred to the Authority of the Irish Monuments in the Psalter of Cashel written 800 years since by the holy Cormach, both King and Bishop of Munster. Let us then, for once, examine one part of the History taken from thence, and then leave the Reader to judge, whether it deserves so much more Credit than the British Antiquities; And that shall be concerning the Kingdom of the Piets, because we are told, (q) This is the way to end the vexatious Questions about them, being taken out of the most authentick Records of Ireland, which are of such irrefragable Authority, That some are persuaded, had they been known to Camden, he would never have disputed the matter. And so I think too. But this irrefragable Authority is that of the Psalter of Cashel; From whence we are instructed in these particulars: (1.) That the Piets served in Thracia, under one Policornus, a King of that Country; where their General Gud took away the King's Life, to prevent an Attempt on his Daughter. And did not Brutus serve King Pandrafas with his Army not far off in Greece? And methinks Pandrafas is as good a Name for a King of Greece as Policornus for the King of Thrace. But where are either of them to be met with elsewhere? (2.) That upon this the General and his Army fled the Country, roamed up and down at Sea till they came to Gaul, and there they founded the City of Pictavia. This is just Geffrey. For Brutus
Brutus came to Gaul too, and there fought with Grofsarix, King of the Piets, and founded the City of Tours, which had its Name from Turonius, Brutus his Nephew. (3.) That upon the same Occasion they were forced to leave Gaul, and to go for Ireland, (as Brutus did for Albion) where they were entertained, to fight with the Britains; who it seems made very early Invasions upon Ireland, which still agrees with Geffrey's History.

(4.) The Story of the Advice of Troldan, the Pictish Magician, for the Irish Army to bath in the Milk of White, Crumple-horned Cows, as an effectual Antidote against the envenom'd Arrows of the Britains, and the strange Success upon it, is hardly to be matched in Geffrey. (5.) That the Piets, growing insolent, were forced by Hermon to retire to the Northern Parts of Britain, Onely with three Irish Women, whatever Bede faith of more; or, how differently fcover he relates the whole Story of the Piets; For what is Bede's, a poor Monk's Authority, to King Cormach? (6.) That from Cathlian, Son to Gud, there was a constant Succession of Kings of the Piets in that Countrey. But not more exact than the Succession of Britib Kings from King Brutus. And now I leave the Reader to judge whether Geffrey be not hardly dealt with, when such Authours are prefer'd so much before him. We now return to the farther Account which the Irish Antiquaries give of their own Antiquities.

(4.) We are then to understand, that, besides the Race descended from Nemedus, there was another called Clanna Gaoidhel, or, Posterity of Cathelus; concerning whom these things are affirmed. (1.) That he was descended from Niul, a younger Son to Fcanufa Farfa, King of Scythia, who, travelling into Egypt, had a Countrey there given him by Pharaoh Cingers called Capacront (I suppose in the old Egyptian Language) who was married to Pharaoh's daughter called Scota. Whereas the Scotib Antiquaries do peremptorily affirm, it was Gathelus himself was married to her. But we ought not to forget, that this Scythian King had a celebrated School on the Plain of Sennaar, and one Gaodel, being there employ'd to compose or refine the Irish Language, called from him Gaodhelc or Gaodhlec. This is a Strain bey-
yond Geoffrey, who never thought of bringing the Brit-
ish Language from the Plain of Sennaar. (2.) That Gaodhel's Pole
vity continued in Egypt till the time of his Grandchild Struth, and then being forced thence, they
landed in Crete, where he died. And his Eldest Son Eib-
hir Scot went into Scythia; where one of his Descendants
killed Refloir, the King of that Country, and was forced
with his Company to the Caipian Sea, and landed in an
Island there (just like Geoffrey's Largecia, where Brutus
landed.) But they went from thence to Caronia, another
Island in the Pontick, and from thence to the North end of
the Riphean Mountains; (a pretty kind of Compafs!) And here, instead of Diana's Oracle to Brutus, an old
Draudy told them, they should never fix till they came to the
Western Island, and so they removed to Gothia, and
in the eighth Generation, they went to Spain. And doth
not this exceed the Story of Brute, in the great Prob-
ability of it, which their latest (r) Antiquary knows not
what to make of? It is certain whoever invented it, de-
signed to go beyond the Author of the former. But this
is not all; For we are told farther from the fame Authen-
tick Irish Annals. (3.) That Calamb (called Milead Espan,
or Milefius the Spaniard) great Grandchild to Bratha, who
brought them into Spain; went back into Scythia; and
there served as General under Refloir, King of the Scythi-
ans; From whence, upon Suspicious, he fled into Egypt,
and there married Pharaoh's Daughter called Scota; And
at last returned to Spain, and there founded Braganza:
And here the Scottish Antiquities fall in. But is it not a
little improbable to have the fame Scene acted twice
over? Two Gaodel's, two Refloir's, two Scota's, twice
passing to and fro after much the fame manner? We may
well lay, as our Author doth, enough of these profound
remote Antiquities. For I shall not need now to add an-
ything about the eight Sons of this Milefius coming to
Ireland; And how the rest being killed, the Countrey
was divided between Eibhir and Erinthou; and the
former being killed, the latter became the first Mon-
arch of Ireland, from whom descended 181 Monarchs
of this Mileesian Race: which must depend on the Cre-
dit of their Annals, of which I have already spoken.

But
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But, in short, to give the true Account of these Fabulous Antiquities. We are then to consider, That when the Northern Nations began to have some smattering of the Greek and Roman Learning, they were never satisfied, till by one means or other, they could deduce their Original from some of the Nations most celebrated in ancient Books; Such were the Trojans, the Greeks and the Egyptians. As to the Trojans, the Romans themselves had shewed the Way to other Nations. For there are considerable Arguments to prove that neither Aeneas, nor Ascanius, ever came into Italy; as may be seen in (s) Dionyfius Halycarnaffus, (t) Strabo and Feftus, in the Word Roma. Hellanicus, in Dionyfius, faith, That Ascanius (from whom Brutus is derived) never left Phrygia; But only withdrew for a time to Dacylites, near the Lake (from him called the Ascanian) and afterwards returned to Troy. Strabo faith, That Ascanius reigned at Scepsis, near the Ruins of Troy, and that his Poffertiy continued there a long time after, with a Royal Title. Feftus shews, that the old Authors were not agreeed where Aeneas was buried; Many were of Opinion, that he lay buried in the City Berecinthia. And some in Dionyfius lay, he died in Thrace, others in Arcadia. But the Romans making it to great a part of their Glory to be descended from the Trojans; Other Nations of Europe, upon the Difolution of the Roman Empire, would not seem to come behind them in this. So (u) Hunibaldus gives as formal an Account of the descent of the Franks from Antenor, and as good a Succession of their Kings down from him; with the particular Names of Persons, and the time of their Reigns, as either Geoffrey doth of the British Kings from Brutus; or Heclor of the Scots from Fergus; or the Irish Annals from Cathelus or Heremon. And that this is no late Invention appears from hence; That Aimoinus, Ado Vienensis, Abbas Unfergenfis, Rorico, Gauinus, Aeneas Silvius, and others, agree with Hunibaldus in the Substance of his Story. And (w) Vignier mentions several Diplomata of the ancient Kings of the Franks, to prove the Authentickness of this Tradition. And it is less to be wonder'd at, that the Britains should pretend to be derived from the Trojans because of the mixture of the Romans
Romans and them together, while Britain continued so long a Roman Province. From whence I suppose the first Occasion was taken, which continued as a Tradition among the Britains for a long time before it was brought into such a History as we find in Geoffrey. That the Tradition it self was elder than his time is certain; For even those who despised Geoffrey embraced it, as appears by (x) Giraldus Cambrensis; And in the Saxon times this Tradition was known, as is evident by the Saxon Poet, mention’d by (y) Abr. Whelock; But Nennius his MS. puts it out of dispute, That there was then a Tradition about the Britains coming from Brute; but he could not tell what to make of this Brute; sometimes he was Brito the Son of Yficion, the Son of Alan, of the Posterity of Japhet: And for this he quotes the (z) Tradition of his Anceflours; But this being uncapable of much Improvement or Evidence, he then runs to Brutus the Roman; and sometimes it is Brutus the Confal; But that, not suiting so well, he then produces the Story of Æneas, and Acanius, and Silvius, and the Prediction of the Magician, that his Son should kill his Father and Mother; he died in Labour, and his Father was killed by him by chance; However he was banished from Italy into Greece; And from thence again banished, and so came into Gaul, and there built Tours, having its Name from one of his Companions; And from thence he came for Britain, which took its Name from him, and he filled it with his Progeny, which continue to this day. So that here we have the Foundation of Geoffrey’s History laid long before his time; And Nennius his Account is mention’d by (a) William of Malmsbury, under the Name of Gela Britonum; And follow’d by Henry of Huntingdon, and Turgott, or Simeon Dunelmensis; But when Geoffrey’s Book came abroad, it was so improved and adorned with Particulars, not elsewhere to be found, that the generality of the Monkish Historians, not one by one, but admir’d it, and pitied those that had not seen it, (as they supposed) as (b) Ranulphus Cestrensis, doth William of Malmsbury; But there were some Cross-grained Writers who called it an Impositure, as Gul. Newburgenensis; or a Poetical Figment, as John Whethampsted. But these were but few in Compari-
fon with those who were better pleased with the Particulars of a Legend than the dryness of a true History.

But this humour was not peculiar to the Franks and Britains; For the Saxons derived (c) themselves from the Macedonian Army of Alexander, which had three Captains faith (d) Suididus Petrus, Saxo, Frifo and Bruno; From whom are descended the Saxons, Frisians and those of Brunswick. And (e) Abbas Staden—(c) A. D. 917. fis adds, That not only the Saxons, but those of Prussia, Rugia and Holstein came from them. (f) Gobelinus Perpina relates the Particulars as exactly as Geffrey, or Hector, or the Irish Annals do; how they were left on the Caflian Mountains, and wandered up and down just as Brutus and Gathelus did, till they settled in Prussia, Rugen and Saxony. The Danes, faith (g) Dido (g) Saxo Gram. S. Quintin derived themselves from the Danai; The (h) Prussians from Prussia, King of Bithymia, who brought the Greeks along with him. Only the Scots and Irish had the Wit to derive themselves from the Greeks and Egyptians together.

We are now to sit down and consider, what is to be said to all these glorious Pretences? Must they be all allowed for good and true History? If not, what marks of distinction can we set between them? They all pretend to such Founders as came afar off, wandered from place to place, consulted Oracles, built Cities, formed Kingdoms, and drew their Succession from many Ages; So that it seems unreasonable to allow none but our own. And yet these Antiquities will hardly pass anywhere, but with their own Nation; And hardly with those of any Judgment in any of them. But when all this is said, every one will believe as he pleases; But it is one thing to believe with the Will, and another with the Understanding.

To return now to the Irish Antiquities. And it only remains that we enquire, How the Irish Antiquaries give an Account of their Nations coming into the Northern Parts of Britain: And here is something which deserves Consideration, viz. That they (i) charge the Scotish Antiquaries with placing the time of Fergus I. 819 years before he landed in Britain. For, say they, the Irish Monuments fix on Anno Dom. 498, as the time when—
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in Fergus Mor the Son of Erch (whom the Scottifh Writers call the Son of Ferchard) with his five Brothers invaded the North of Britain. To this purpose they produce the Testimony of Tigernacus, who in his Annals faith, Fergus Mor mhac Ercha cum gente Dalraidia partem Britanniae tenuit, & ibi mortuus est. This he writes about the beginning of Pope Symmachus, which was about six years after the death of St. Patrick, and very near the end of the fifth Century. Besides another Irish Author who writes of the Kings of Albany who were contemporary with the Monarchs of Ireland, reckons twenty years between the Battel of Ocha, and the going of the six Sons of Erc into Albany: And the Annals of Ulster place the Battel of Ocha A.D. 483. so that Fergus his coming into Scotland could not be before the beginning of the sixth Century. (k) Gratianus Lucius faith, that the Battel of Ocha, wherein Oiliol Molt, the Irish Monarch, who succeeded Leogarius, was killed, was Anno Dom. 478. Which makes but five years difference. Farther, say they, The Scottifh Antiquaries make Reuda the sixth King after Fergus, Whereas it appears by their Annals, (l) That their Monarch Conair had three Sons, called the three Cairbres, and the third (m) was Cairbre Riada; from whom that part of Britain was called Dal Riada, or Dal Reuda; But Conair was killed An. Dom. 165. and therefore this (n) Reuda must be 300 years before Fergus. The Old MS. cited by (o) Camden, makes Fergus to be descended from Conair, with which as (p) Archibishop Usher observes the old Irish Genealogies agree: But he faith, Conair reign'd Anno Dom. 215. however, long enough before the time of Fergus. According to this supposition, that part of Scotland called Dalrieta, or Dalreuda, (the bounds whereof are described by the Learned Primate) was inhabited long before the coming of Fergus; and so agrees with what (q) Bede faith, That the Scots came first out of Ireland under the conduct of Reuda, and either by Force or Friendship found habitations for themselves there, which they still enjoy'd, and from their Leader to this time they were called Dalreudini; Daal signifying a share in their Language. This Reuda seems to be the same with Cairbre Riada, the third Son of Conair; And if Fer-
if Fergus were descended from the fame Conair, it gives a probable Account of Fergus his coming afterwards into those Parts; and taking the Government upon him. For (r) Keting faith, That Eochac Mumreamhar of the Progeny of Cairbre Redhfadac or Riada had two Sons Earcha and Elchon; And from the former the Families of Dal Riada in Scotland are descended; from the latter those of Dal Riada in Ulter. Which must be understood of that part of the Ulster Dal-riadans, which Fergus carried with him: For there were the Descendants from Riada in Scotland before, according to the former account. But the whole matter about the Reign of Fergus remains still very obscure. For (1.) It seems strange that Bede takes no notice at all of him, which in all probability he would have done, as well as of Reuda, who was less considerable. (2.) (s) Jocelin in the Life of St. Patrick faith, That Fergus was one of the twelve Sons of the King of Dalredia, and was excluded from his share by his Brethren; of whom St. Patrick prophesied, That from him Kings shoul'd rise, who should not only reign at home, but in a foreign Countrey; After which, faith he, Fergus in no long time came to be King in his own Countrey; And from him sprang Eanus, who subdued Albany, and other Islands, and whole Posterity still reigns there. So that if Jocelin's authority be good, Fergus himself never came into Scotland; But the mistake arofe, because he was King in Dalrieda; Which the Scots understood of their own, and thought they had Reason, because the Posterity of Fergus reigned there. (3.) (t) Giraldus Cambrensis, who had a Sight of the Irish Annals, never mentions Fergus, but only faith, That in the time of Nellus the Monarch of Ireland, six Sons of Mured King of Ulter sailed into the Northern Parts of Britain, and there planted themselves, from whom the Scottish Nation is derived. This Nellus, whom the Irish call Niall the Great, was killed, faith Gratianus Lucius, Anno Dom. 403. And if the Sons of the King of Ulter came then over to plant and settle in Scotland, this must be 100 years before the time of Fergus, and consequently he could be none of that Number: And yet the (u) Irish Annals make the two Fergusse, the two Aengusses, and the two Loarns, to be the six Sons of Mu-

---

(1) Prospect of Ireland, p. 92.
(2) Ph. s. Patil.
(3) Topogr. Hiberni.
(u) Camb. c.
of Muriedhach, King of Ulster, who came over to settle in Scotland. But if Giraldus his Authority be allow'd, the Scots came not to settle in Britain, till the beginning of the fifth Century; And the Monarchy in the Posterity of Fergus, according to Jocelin, could not be till towards the middle of the sixth Century. And if Edan, King of the Scots in Bede's History, be the same with that Edan in Jocelin, who descended from Fergus, then the Scottish Kingdom did not begin till the seventh Century, as appears by (w) Bede. But in matters of so much Obscurity I determine nothing.

But it is but Justice to consider on the other side, what the Scottish Antiquaries do now plead for themselves, to prove that they inhabited Scotland long before this time.

First, They say, (x) Bede mentions them as ancient Inhabitants of this Island before the coming of the Romans; and describes the Wars between the Picts, Scots and Britains before that of the Romans. It is very true, that Bede, in the beginning of his History, doth set down the several Nations which inhabited Britain, and he names five. English, Britains, Scots, Picts and Romans. And among these he reckons the Britains first, then the Picts, after them the Scots from Ireland under Reuda; and then adds, That Ireland was the true Countrey of the Scots, who coming hither made a third Nation in Britain, besides the Britains and Picts, and landed on the North part of the Frith, towards Ireland, and there settled themselves. But Bede faith nothing at all of the time when the Scots came first from Ireland, and it is of no force, that he reckons them here before the War with the Romans; for, so he doth the English as well as the Scots: his business being to give an Account of the present Inhabitants, and not merely of the Ancient, Hec in præsentis Gentium linguis, &c. But where doth Bede say, that the Scots were in Britain before the Romans coming hither? I cannot find so much as an Intimation that way: unless it be in the Title of the Chapter, Of the Situation of Britain and Ireland, and their ancient Inhabitants. And doth not Bede speak of the Britains as the ancient Inhabitants of this Island and the Scots of Ireland? But if all mention'd must be ancient Inhabitants,
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...tants, then so must the English and Romans be, as well as the Picts and Scots.

Well! But doth not (y) Bede afterwards say, That Severus his Wall was built against the unconquer’d Nations beyond it? I grant it, if he had said, the Scots and Picts beyond it, the Controversie had been ended. But doth not Dio explain Bede, who expressly tells us, these Nations were the Maeatae and the Caledonii? Why not the Picts and the Scots if then in Britain? The latter Roman Writers never forbear calling them by their own Names, when they knew them to be here; as appears by Eumenius, Claudian and Ammianus Marcellinus: but to say the Scots were called Maeatae, because they came from the Palus Meotis, will hardly go down in this Age. However it is confidently affirmed, the Caledonii were the Scots. Let this one thing be well proved, and I will yield the Scots were in Britain long before Severus his time; for Tacitus mentions the Caledonians. But it is to no more purpose to quote modern Writers, who call the Caledonians Scots, than Lipsius his calling Galgacus a Scotifh King: for we are not bound to follow any modern Writers in their Improurities. There is no Question the Caledonians were known to Flaccus and Martial, (who certainly lived not in Augustus his time, unless that Name be very improperly given by it self to Domitian or Trajan.) But do any of these Roman Authors ever tell us the Caledonians were Scots? If not, to what end are the Caledonians so much spoken of? As far as we can find by Tacitus, or Dio, or any others, they were the Northern Britains. And if Tacitus had known that they came out of Ireland, and were a distinct Nation, he would never have omitted the setting it down, when he gives so punctual an account of the Original of the several forts of Britains, according to his best Judgment and Information; and none could have better relating some things concerning Ireland, from Agricola’s own Mouth, who was then the Roman General against the Caledonians. And he faith, Agricola had one of the Kings of Ireland with him. Suppose we then the Caledonians to have been Scots come out of Ireland; Is it possible, that an Irish King...
King should not be able to inform Agricola who these Caledonians were? Or, ifTacitus had known any such thing, would he have said, the Caledonians, by the habit of their bodies seemed to be of German Extraction, when he derives the Situres from Spain? Had it not been as easy for him to have derived the Caledonians from Spain through Ireland, if any such thing had been heard by him, as that the Caledonians were of Ireland, and came first out of Spain thither? But nothing can be more plain than that Tacitus took the Caledonians for Britains, and so doth Galgacus, in his excellent Speech, wherein he calls them, the Noblest of the Britains, and excites them to recover the Liberty of the Britains; and tells them, they fought the same Canje with the other Britains; and now they were to shew what sort of Men: Caledonia had reserved for their common defence. Was Tacitus so inconsiderate a Writer to put such words into Galgacus his mouth, if he knew or suspected the Caledonians to be no Britains, but a different Nation come out of Ireland in the time that Alexander took Babylon? Had Tacitus known any thing of this, he would never have concealed it, when he values himself upon his Integrity, in relating what he could find about the Affairs of Britain. And therefore Tacitus his Judgment in this matter is to be much preffed before Scaliger’s Criticism about the Scoto-brigantes, or the Scoticae pruinae in Spartan’s Poet; or any such uncertain Conjectures. And yet the Scoto-brigantes might be Irifh; where both Scoti and Brigantes were, and so it proves nothing, as to Britain; for Claudius conquer’d Ireland as much as Scotland.

(2) E. c. 12. But it is more plausibly urged, That (z) Bede speaking of the Scots being a transmarine Nation, he explains himself by saying, that he means not that they were out of Britain, but beyond the two Friths; therefore the Scots then inhabited Britain. This was but a necessary Explanation, for Bede, who used these words, after he had confessed before, that the Scots under Reuda did settle in Britain. Therefore when he used Gildas his words, he thought it necessary to reconcile them with his own, and so declares that he used transmarine now in another sense. Just as if a Scotifh Writer in Bede’s time
time had spoken of the transmarine Saxons, using the words of an Author who lived before their coming into Britain; and then should explain himself, That he did not mean the German Saxons, but those who lived in Britain, beyond the two Friths; would this prove, that the Saxons lived here before Cæsar's time? And if this be an Argument clear to a Demonstration, some mens Demonstrations will hardly amount to the strength of a probable Argument. And I am apt to fear no Mens way of reasoning more than those who talk most of Demonstrations.

What if St. Jerome mentions the Scotti from Porphyrie, and the Attacotti as a British Nation, what doth this prove as to the Scots inhabiting Britain so long agon? Could there be no Scots but in Britain, when it is confessed they came originally out of Ireland? Sidonius Apollinaris doth mention the Scots and Piëls, in his Panegyric to (s) Authemius; but what then? who denies that the Scots and Piëls did then fight and were beaten in Britain? but could not they be beaten here then unless they came into Britain before Julius Cæsar? Is this clear to a Demonstration? But it is observable, that in the Verse before he calls the Caledonians Britains even then.

Vitricia Cæsar
Signa Caledonios transvexit ad usque Britannos.
Fuderit & quamquam Scotum, & cum Saxone Pictum.

Where it is evident he distinguisheth the Caledonian Britains from the Scots and Piëls.

But Claudian mentions the Scots as settled in Britain before his time. If it be granted; that falls very much short of Alexander or Julius Cæsar's time; yet there appears no Demonstration for it. His words are,

(t) Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Æræe.

But there is a certain Place in Scotland called by that Name. I will not dispute it; but are we sure that Claudian knew it by that Name? Was that so considerable to be taken such notice of by the Roman Writers?
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Writers? Was not Ireland then called Ierne by him? And doth he not mention the Scots moving all Ierne?

(u) Totam cum Scotus Iernen Movit, & infeslo spumavit remige Tethys?

And is not this very Poetical, to say, He moved all a certain little part of Scotland? From whence they might pass beyond the Wall, without so much as touching the Ocean? Must these things pass for Demonstrations too?

I mention these Evidences, which the Weight of the Cause is laid upon, to shew how far these Antiquities are still from being cleared, to the satisfaction of impartial Men. For I had no Luddus my Kinsman, nor Buchanan my Enemy; I search for nothing but Truth in such Enquiries, it being as much to my satisfaction, that the Scots came into Britain in Alexander's time, as any time after, if it can be as well proved. But it doth not become the ingenuity of Learned Men, when all judicious Persons in the Nations about us have rejected their fabulous Antiquities, to adhere to them without producing better Proofs of them; and that with so much violence as if the Interest of the Nation, and the Succession of the Royal Family were concerned in them: Which hath far stronger grounds to stand upon than the Authority of Hector Boethius, or the Race of Kings between the two Ferguses, or the certain time when the Scots came first into Britain.

Having thus far given an Account of the Antiquities relating to the Picts and Scots, the mortal Enemies of the Britains; I now come to pursue my main Design, which relates to the Antiquities of the British Churches, whose declining State and Condition I am now arrived at.

And the first Occasion thereof was, the laying them open to the fury of their greatest Enemies, the Picts and the Scots. It is impossible for us to set down the punctual time when the Scots and the Picts first join'd their Forces together to give disturbance to the Britains, but it is clear that they did so towards the middle of the fourth Century. For (x) Ammianus Marcellinus, speaking
king of the Incursions they made in the time of Constan-
tius, when Julian was Cæsar, An. Dom. 360. he faith; That Julian, being then at Paris, durst not go over to the 
affilence of the Britains against the Scots and the Picts, 
as Constans bad done before. Which Expedition of his 
happen'd Anno Dom. 343. after his success over the 
Franks, and he passed an Edict, still extant in the 
(y) Theodosian Code, when he was at Bologna, in his Pas-
fage, which bears date that year; And a Coin of his 
is mention'd by (z) Du Cange and (a) Spanheim, where-
in the Effigies of Constans is on one Side, and on the Re-
verse, an armed Man on Shipboard, with the Image of Vic-
tory, and the Incription of Bononia Oceanèn; being Coin-
ned on purpose to preserve the memory of this Passage. 
And upon his coming over, things were quieted here; 
but not long after, they began to make new Incursi-
ons, within the Bounds of the Province, as is evident 
from the foregoing Passage of Anmiarius Marcellinus, 
when Lupicinus was sent over, who arrived at London, 
faith he, in the middle of Winter, to take Counsel how to 
proceed. In the time of Valentinian, the fame Historian 
(b) faith, That there seem'd to be a general disturbance 
through the whole Empire, by the barbarous Nations who 
lay near them; And, among the rest, he mentions the 
Picts (whom some render Redbanks) the Saxons, the 
Scots, and the Attacots, who were continually vexing and 
doing mischief to the Britains, so that in a little time, the 
(c) Britains were reduced to a miserable condition by a new 
Conspiracy of the Barbarians, wherein Nectaridus the 
Comes Maritimi Tractus, or Roman Admiral, and Fal-
lofaudes, the General, were both killed. And then Val-
entinian sent over Theodosius, a famous Captain (Fa-
ther to the first Emperour of that Name) with con-
derable Forces. For at that time, the Picts of both kinds, 
the Deucalidones and Vécturiones; the Attacotti, a 
fierce Nation, and the Scots, dispersing themselves up and 
down, did abundance of mischief; But Theodosius, lea-
ving London, dispersed his Forces likewise into several 
parts, who surprized the Enemies, and recover'd their Boot-
y, which they reforted to the Owners, only referring a small 
share for the Souldiers; And so in a short time, he put 
the City out of its fears and difficulties, and entred it as
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it were in Triumph: And then took care to have good Officers placed here; Civilis for Administration of Justice; and Dulcitius for Military Affairs.

Who these Attacotti were, who joyn’d with the Picts and Scots; our Antiquaries are not agreed; But because of their joining with the other, and yet being distinguished from them, it seems most probable, that they were the Wild Britains; For (d) St. Hierome doth say, they were a British People. But what the Reason of the Name was, is not yet underflood, and I doubt will not be, unless some happen to derive it from the Phenician Language. What great mischief had been done to the Britains, by this Combination of their Enemies, appears by the care taken by Theodosius, after his beating them out of the Countrey, to retore the Cities and Garrisons, and to settle the Guards upon the Frontiers; which being done, That part of the Countrey which he recover’d from them, he obtained leave to have it named a New Province. And it was called Valentia, from the Emperour’s Name. This was done Anno Domini 368. And the next year Theodosius returned to the Emperour’s Court. From that time we reade no more of their Incursions till Maximus, in the time of Gratian, Son to Valentinian, was fet up by the Souldiery in Britain, to be Emperour. Then (e) Prosper, set out by Pitheus, faith, Maximus overcame the Picts and Scots, making new Incursions. Which he thought he had done so effectually as to fear no disturbance on that Side; And therefore took away from hence all the Flower both of the Roman and Britifh Souldiery, to make good his Title against Gratian and Valentinian, and after, against Theodosius; So that there was no possibility of their return, to secure the Frontiers from their Enemies. And this proved the fatal Blow to the Britains. For the Empire being so divided, and Maximus forced to keep his Army together, those parts were left open to the Rage and Fury of their Merciless Enemies. And if the (f) Author of the Eulogium and Giraldus Cambrensis may be believed, Gratian and Valentinian entred into a League with the Gothick Picts, and helped them with Shipping to convey them into the Northern parts of Britain, on purpose to withdraw Maximus
mus his Army out of Gaul: Who coming thither in great Numbers, and finding the Country naked and without defence, settled themselves in those Parts. Not as though the Picts had not come hither before, but they never came over in so great Numbers and with so much encouragement as they did now. And it seems not improbable, that Gratian and Valentinian should at that time deal with the Gothick Nation to give a diversion to Maximus. For (g) Zosimus assigns that as one of (e) 200m. l. 4, the great Caues of Gratian's Ruine, that he seemed more fond of the barbarous Nations than of the Romans: And Maximus charged Valentinian, with making use of the Hunns and the Alani against him; Which is not denied by (b) St. Ambrose, who was sent by Valentinian on an (l) St. Ambrof. Embassy to him. These Hunni and Alani were, as is commonly said. Inhabitants of Sarmatia Europaea near to the Palus Maeotis. The Alani did live upon the Tanais, faith (i) Hadrianus Valesius; And the Hunni, faith he, were a Scythian People, between the Pontus and the (l) Rev. Frans. t. 3. p. 98. Palus Maeotis. (k) Am. Marcel. L 31. c. 2. Cappian Sea, upon the Northern Parts of the Caucasus, from whom the Abares, Turks and Hungarians are descended. But whosoever observes (k) Ammianus Marcellinus his Description of them, will find that the Hunni were the Asiatick Tarts; and the Alani the European. The Hunni in the time of Valens pasted over the Palus Maeotis in vast Numbers, and after, having killed many of the Alani, took the rest into Confederacy with them, and having conquer'd the Goths in those Parts, enlarged their Power as far as the Danube: Where they lay ready to come into the Roman Empire on any Occasion. And it is not to be wonder'd if Gratian should employ Persons into Scandinavia to draw out greater Forces from thence, thereby to make a Revolution, as to Maximus his Designs in the Northern Parts of Britain. However this were, Gildas from this time dates the miserable Condition of the Britains, as being in no Posture to defend themselves at Home. (l) Nennius faith, That Maximianus (as he calls him) (l) Nenn. c. 25. carried all the Forces out of Britain, and killed Gratian the Emperor; And would not let the Britifh Souldiers return to their Wives, Children or Possessions, but gave them another Country instead of it; In the Western parts of Gaul, faith
The
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of Nennim. And thefe, faith Nennim, are the Aremorican Britains, who never after returned to their own Countrey. And from hence he faith ,
Britain was feized upon by foreign Nations; and its own
Natives were driven out 5 and would fo continue till God
helped them.
But the Eritifh Hijtory , fet forth by
Mt
( m ^ Geffrey, hath improved the Story in many Particulars.
Firft, It makes this Maximianus to marry the
Daughter o/Qclavius, andfo to come to the Kingdom of
Britain ; Then, it adds, That Conanus retired into Albany and raifed an Army which was overthrown by Maximianus , who after five years -pafed into Gaul , and
fought firft aga'mft the Armoricans
whofe Countrey he
gave to Conanus and his Britains ; Who, refolving not to
marry any others than Britifh Women, he fent over Mefengers to Dionotus
King of Cornwall to whom Maximianus had committed the Government of Britain , to provide Wives for them ; And he fent with Urfula his own
Daughter Eleven thoufand of the better fort and of the
common fixty Thoufand. But thefe were unhappily , by
faith the lnterpolatour
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away such a Number of Virgins at once, without any Fleet to conduct or secure their Passage. But (r) Brown-erus hath overthrown this Legend at once, by proving that Aremorica was not in the Britain Possession till a good time after this; For, as he well observes, Maximus was kindly received in Gaul, and met with no considerable Opposition there, Gratian's own Soldiers revolving to him, and he passed on and settled himself at Triers, (then the Seat of this part of the Empire) as Gildas faith; And besides, in the time of Aetius, the Aremorici enjoy'd their own Country (as he proves from Constantius his Life of St. German) about Anno Dom. 434. After which time they stood up in their own defence, till they were reduced by Littorius, which he shews from Sidonius Apollinaris. And (s) Rutilius Claudius, in the beginning of the fifth Century, after Maximus his time, mentions the Aremorici, as still enjoying their Country, where Exuperantius was then Governor. Saying, that after the Troubles by the Goths they had Postliminium Pacis; which evidently proves, they were not then kept out of Possession.

Cujus Aremoricas Pater Exuperantius ora
Nunc Postliminium pacis amare docet
Leges restituit libertatemque reduct
Et Servos Famulis non finit esse suis.

And this was written after the Sacking of Rome by the Goths; So that there is no foundation for this Legend in the time of Maximus. Agid. Bucherius, although he approves of Geoffrey, as to the time, and some other Circumstances, yet he differs from him in others. For he goes upon these Grounds, that Maximus landed at the Mouth of the Rhine, as Zosimus faith, That there they left the Multitude of Women and Virgins which follow'd the Army out of Britain; where the Huns which Bauto sent against Maximus fell upon them and destroy'd them. This is no ill-contrived Story; but very different from the Legend in Geoffrey, in all the considerable parts of it: And yet after all, Bucherius thinks fit to yield up his Faith to the old Legend, as it is defended by Bebius and Crombachius; and so it is taken off from the time of Maximus.

Joh.
(c) State-chron. l. 2. c. 62.

(1) John, Fordon, agrees with Geoffrey about Maximus his giving the Countrey of Aremorica to Conanus and his Britains, Anno Dom. 386. but he is so far from mentioning the 1000 Virgins, That he supposes the Britains of both sexes to have settled there together. But he makes a more credible Relation of Conanus his going over to Aremorica, which is, That Maximus mistrusted he might set up for himself in his Absence, having the legal Title to Britain, and therefore he removed him and the Chief of the Britains, and settled them in those Parts of Gaul. This is no improbable Story; but yet the Aremoricans enjoying their Countrey after this time, is an effectual Confutatlon of it.

After the death of Maximus, more Troubles following in the Roman Empire, the Picts and the Scots, faith (u) Fordon, negotiate a mutual Peace and friendly Alliance, in order, faith he, to the recovering their Countrey again. For Maximus had made use of the Picts to drive out the Scots, and then put Garrisons among the Picts to keep them under. And upon this Agreement, An. D. 403. in the sixth of Arcadius and Honorius, Fergus the Son of Erk the Son of Ethadius the Brother of Eugenius, who was driven out by Maximus, came with his two Brothers (called there Loarri and Tenegus, in all probability Lorn and Angus, which were the Names, the Irish Annals give to the Brothers of Fergus, as is observed before) and great Supplies of Scots from the Islands of Ireland and Norwey, whither they were driven: And the Picts, to prevent all Suspicion of Treachery surrendered their Forts to Fergus. Who now became King of all Scotland, i.e. of that Part which is beyond Drum Albain, as well as on this other, which, he faith, it doth not appear how he came to, whether by the Sword or by any other Right, none of his Predecessors having any Power there. (w) Bede faith, The Romans had the Right of Dominion to the remotest part of the Island: Which is not easy to make out, unless the Possession and Conquest were better proved than appears by Bede's History. For although he mentions Claudius his Conquering the Orcades; yet it is hard to prove it by any Roman Authors; And if the Possession were after lost, for so long a time, it will be as hard to prove the Romans still enjoy'd the Right of Dominion.
Dominion upon so slender a Title. But the Picts and Scots being thus united, their first Work, faith Fordon, was to drive out the Romans and Britains from their Country; and then to invade Britain, which was then left desolate of any defence: And so by their Incursions they either killed the Common People, or made them Slaves.

Here Fordon transferes Bede's twelfth Chapter of his first Book; the Foundation whereof he took out of Gildas, concerning the departure of the British Forces without returning; the Invasion of the Scots and Picts; the Britains sending an Address to Rome for Assistance; a Roman Legion coming and driving out their Enemies; and persuading the Britains to build a Wall for their own Security. But it is observable, that Bede varies from Gildas without Reason; For what Gildas speaks of their departure with Maximus, he applies to the going of the Remainders of the British Forces under Constantinus and Contans, after Gratianus Municeps was killed in Britain having usurped the Empire here. But that Bede was herein mistaken will best appear by digesting the times wherein these things happen'd as well as we can.

(x) Zosimus faith, That Honorius VII. and Theodosius II. being Confuls, viz. A.D. 407, (nineteen years after the death of Maximus, as (y) Archbifhop Ufher observes; (z) Olympiodorus in Photius faith, the year before, Orosius and Sozomen the year after, viz. the year when Arcadius died;) the Britich Souldiers, in a Mutiny set up one Marcus to be Emperor, as a Man of great Power in these Parts; But he, not answering their expectation, they soon took him off, and then set up Gratianus, (who was a Native of Britain, for so much (a) Orosius his Words imply, when he faith, he was Municeps ejusdem Insulae;) and made him put on the Royal Purple and Crown, &c. but he not pleasing them, after four months they take away his life. (b) Of him Nennius faith nothing; But he mentions one Severus between Maximus and Conftantius, whom others omit; But (c) Geoffrey makes Gratianus to assume the Royal Authority as soon as he heard of the Death of Maximus; But he was so tyrannical, he faith, That the common People rose up and killed him; and after his death the Britains, according to him, sent to Rome, to beg
beg help against the Picts and Scots. But Zosimus and Orofius both say; That, upon the Death of Gratianus, they set up here Constantine, a mean person (for the good Omen of his Name faith Orofius) who immediately left Britain, and passed over into Gaul, where he gained the Army to him, and made his Son Conftans Cæfar, and sent him into Spain. Olympiodorus faith, That he sent a Message and Excuse to Honorius, for assuming the Imperial Dignity, that he was forced to it by the Army; And that Honorius allow'd the Excuse, and for a time admitted him into Partnership with him. But Gerontius a Britain, one of the Generals, finding himself slighted by Conflans, made a Revolt among his Souldiers and stir'd up the barbarous Nations in Gaul against Constantine; Upon which occasion, faith Zosimus, The British Islands, and some of the Celtick Nations renounced the Roman Empire; And took up Arms to defend themselves from the Incursions of their Enemies: And Honorius by his Letters gave them leave to take care of themselves. Not long after Conflans is killed by Gerontius, and Conflantine, after the Siege of Arles, had his Head cut off by (d) Honorius his Order. But (e) Nennius, against the confent of all the Greek and Latin Historians, both Heathen and Christian, faith, That this Constantine reigned 16 years in Britain, and in the seventeenth died at York. However he falls much short of (f) Geoffrey; for, he faith, That Constantine was Brother to Aldroenus, King of the Aremorican Britains; to whom Guithelin, Metropolitane of London was sent on an Embaffy to accept the Government, which he put off to Conftantine, who was cho'en King at Silcefter, and had a Roman Wife of Guithelin's education, by whom he had three Sons, Conflans a Monk at Winchefter, Aurelius Ambrofius, and Uther Pendragon, who were committed to Guithelin's care. After Conftantine's Death, who was killed by a Pict, there happen'd a great Content about the Succession; but by Vortigern's means Conflans is taken from the Monastery, and set on the Throne at London: But Guithelin was now dead, and Vortigern put the Diadem on his Head, who governed all things, and soon got himself rid of him by a Guard of Picts he had placed about him, and so took the Government upon himself.
But I shall set aside these Fictions or Traditions of Geoffrey and Nennius, and consider now what Bede faith, He makes Gratianus Municeps to be set up two years before the sacking of Rome by Alaric, King of the Goths, which happened Anno Dom. 410. And he follows Orosius, about Constantine and his Son Confrians, without ever imagining their continuing to govern, and losing their Lives in Britain: But then he applies the Passage in Gildas, concerning the lamentable Condition of the Britains, and their help from the Romans, to the times after the Death of Constantine; Whereas Gildas mentions both upon the Usurpation of Maximus, and his withdrawing the Forces from hence; And therefore this first cruel Invasion of the Picts and Scots must be between the Death of Maximus, and the setting up of Gratianus Municeps: And then the Britains so earnestly begging for Assistance, had Roman Governours and Forces sent to their Relief. Some think that (g) Claudius Rutilius mentions Victorinus as a Roman Governour here in that time, but this is uncertain, when he there speaks of the taking Tholoufe by the Goths, which was done by Ataulphus some time after the death of Alaric; And therefore could not be before the time of Gratian and Constantine; For Idatius faith, that this latter was killed before Ataulphus entred Narbon, which was before the taking of Tholoufe.

It is evident from many Passages in (h) Claudian, that Stilicho, took particular care of the Supplies of the Britains against the Scots and Picts: But Stilicho was killed by the Army when Bassus and Philippus were Consuls, Anno Dom. 408, before the first Siege of Rome by the Goths; And therefore the Roman Forces sent by him were before the Uprapatation of Gratianus and Constantine: Stilicho being killed the same year that these were set up in Britain, it is not possible he should doe it after their death; And it seems not probable that any Supplies should be sent through Gaul while Constantine remained there, the Army through which they were to pafs in Gaul taking part with Constantine against Honorius. And withall Gildas faith, That the Roman Legion, having driven out the Picts and Scots, returned in Triumph to Rome: And so much is confessed by
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by Bede. But at what time should we suppose, after the usurpation of Constantine, that a Roman Legion should return in so much triumph? For after Constantine's usurpation the Roman Empire began to decline extremely in those parts through which they were to pass: Gaul being upon composition (i) delivered up to the Goths by Honorius, and the Franks and Burgundians making continual impressions there. I conclude it therefore most probable, that the first supplies given to the Britains were not after Constantine's usurpation, but between the death of Maximus, and the setting up of Gratianus Municeps.

The second time the distressed Britains were forced to solicit the Romans for supplies, is placed by (k) Archbishops Úber, An. Dom. 426. when Gallio Ravennas was sent hither, as he supposes, because the next year Prosper, faith Gallio, was sent against Bonifacius in Africa. But then he makes the first supplies to have been in the latter end of Honorius; for which I can see no reason. For he grants, That after the death of Maximus, the Scots and the Picts did waste Britain; and that then Stilicho did send assistance to them. Why then should the first wasting of the country, spoken of by Gildas, and the Legion sent upon it, be that in the latter end of Honorius, and not rather that in the beginning? For the latter end of Honorius his reign was very perplexed and troublesome. The Alani, Suevi and Vandals were in Spain; The Franks, Burgundians and Goths in Gaul; Jovinus and Sebastian there, after Constantine's death; usurped the Empire; and although the Goths, going into Spain, did great service against the other Barbarians, yet such were the Straits of the Roman Empire in Gaul, That Constantius, who then managed the Affairs of the Empire, was forced to recall them, as both Prosper and Idatus say, Monaxius and Plinta being Consuls (which was the twenty fourth of Honorius,) and to give them all that part in Gaul from the Garonne to the Ocean. The year before Honorius his death, he was forced to fend his Forces under Caflinus into Spain against the Vandals, as Prosper affirms; and that proved the Occasion of new Troubles in Africa, by the difference between Caflinus and Bonifacius; who, for his own
own Security, conveyed over the Vandals thither. It is not therefore very probable, that the first Supplies of the Britains should be in the latter end of Honorius; especially since the Learned Primate confesseth that Honorius did not in his time recover the Province of Britain, and he proves it against Sabellicus from Procopius, Bede, the Saxon Annals and Ethelwerd. And the single Testimony of Sigebert, That Honorius, at the same time, sent assistance to the Britains, that he did to the Spaniards (when Proser, Idatius and Cassivola, who all mention the latter, say not a word of the former) cannot weigh down the Reasons on the other side.

But as to the second Supplies which were sent upon the mighty importance of the Britains; They were in probability in the beginning of the Reign of Valentinian III. after that Aetius had somewhat recover’d the Credit of the Roman Empire in Gaul: For after his Success there, both against the Goths and Franks he had liberty enough to send over a Legion to the Assistance of the Britains, who were again miserably harassed by the Scots and Picts. And at this time it was that Gildas faith, The Romans, upon the sad Representations the British Embassadors made of their pitiful condition, sent them speedy Supplies, who coming upon their Enemies on a sudden, like a violent Torrent, drove them all before them, and made them repaft the Seas: Which is an Argument, they did not then inhabit in Britain. But the Romans then plainly told the Britains, they were not at leisure to bring over Legions as often as their Enemies invaded them: But they must train up their own People to Arms to defend themselves and their Wives and Children against a sort of Men no ways stronger than themselves. And, to encourage them the more, they built a Wall of Stone from Sea to Sea, and Forts on the Shore, and exercised them in Arms, taking their leave of them, and telling them, they must expect their return no more. This is the Substance of Gildas’ his Relation, with whom Bede agrees; only inlarging the Description of the Wall, which, he faith, was eight Foot in breadth and twelve in height; and that it stood where the Wall of Severus stood, being all made of Stone, and not of Turf, as that unserviceable Wall was, which the Britains had before without skill and direction built for themselves.
It hath been much disputed among our Learned Antiquaries where this last Wall stood, whether in the place where the former of Tuff was raised by the Britains between the two Friths, or where Hadrian’s Wall was first built, between the Tine and the Esk. Bede puts a great distance between these two Walls, and makes the former to have been between the two Friths, beginning at a Place called Peneltun, two miles from Abercorney, and ending to the West, near Alcluid : which, faith he, signifies a Rock in the River Cluyd. But the latter Wall was from Sea to Sea, in a direct Line, between the Cities there built for Security against Incursions, and it stood in the Place of Severus his Wall. (1) Joh. Fordon distinguishes between the old Wall called Grimes-dike, from Grime, a Britain (whose Daughter Fergus was married, and after his death, ruled over the Scots during his Grand-child’s Minority: and which Wall, he faith, this Grime overthrew, and so recovered the ancient Possessions due to him as descended from Fulgenius) and the other Wall built where Severus his flood: And he gives very different descriptions of them. The former Wall, he faith, begins from the East, upon the South-side of the Scotish Shore, near a Village called Karedin, and then for twenty two miles crosses the Land, leaving Glasgow on the South; and ends on the Bank of the River Clyd, near Kirk-patrick. The other, he faith, begins on the East in the Southern Bank of the Tyne to Gaithedev, or Goat-head, where Severus, faith he, a long time before had made a Wall and a Trench over against New-castle; and so it is continued to the River Esk, called Scottishwhath, for sixty miles, and ends near Carlisle, on the West. But (m) Buchanan contends, that Severus his Wall was where Graham’s Dike, or Grimes-dike was; and at least eighty miles distant from Hadrian’s Wall; which he proves from the Antiquities there found, and the square Stones taken up; which do sufficiently prove an ancient Stone Wall to have been there, but not that of Severus: And the Roman Inscriptions in (n) Camden mention Antoninus, and not Severus. Joh. (o) Major places Severus his Wall as Fordon doth between the Tyne and the Esk. But Archbishop (p) Usber hath endeavoured to clear this matter, by yielding to Buchanan, that the Scotish Wall was made
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made of Stone, viz. by the Romans under Gallio Raven-
nas, and by proving that Bede was mistaken as to Severus
his Wall being made of Turf before, which was the Rea-
on he thought it turned into Stone at this time; it be-
ing not likely, that the Romans would bring the Britains
at least eighty miles back, and put them to defend a
Wall so very much longer than the other; But I rather
think Severus his Wall was now repaired, and a larger
Scope allow'd for the Picts and Scots; As, besides what
hath been said before, may appear by this one Argu-
ment from (q) Fordon. He faith, That when the Scots
made a new Incursion, they open'd Passages in the Wall,
from whence it was called Thirle-wall, i.e. faith he, Mu-
rus perforatus. Now the Learned (r) Primate grants,
that a Place called Thirle-wall stood on the Borders of
Cumberland and Northumberland: And that Fordon
faith, Thirle-wall was built by Severus on the Tyne.
And therefore Bede seems to have been in the right as
to Severus his Wall, but onely mistaken in thinking it
was made of Turf before, which was built of Stone by
Severus, and accounted one of the great Works of the
Roman Empire, which was impossible to be built of
Stone a new by one Legion and the help of the Coun-
try; But might very well be repaired, and made de-
fenfible against the Scots and Picts.

We might now think that the Britains were left by
the Romans in a tolerable Condition to defend them-
selves; But as soon as their old Enemies understood that
their old Friends had forsaken them, they came upon
them with a greater Force and Violence than ever.
And the Spirits of the poor Britains were so broken by
their former Miseries, that they were not able to with-
stand the Assualts of their Enemies: But they forsook
their Wall and Forts, and fled as far as they could,
and dispers'd themselves, which made them an easy
Prey to their barbarous Enemies, who now destroyed
them in a more cruel manner than they had done be-
fore; And those who escaped were driven from their
Habitations, and hardly left in a condition to subsist,
having no Provision left, but what they did get by
Hunting. This is the short account of what Gillas
more Tragically inlarges upon. And being thus redu-
ced
ced to the utmost Extremities, they resolve once more
to send to Aëtius their last Groans; and to let him un-
derstand how unable they were to stand out against
their Enemies. Seeing between them and the Sea they
were either drowned or butchered. But all farther as-
stance was now denied them; Aëtius being then, as
(s) Bede faith, deeply engaged in the War with Bleda and
Attila, Kings of the Hunns. This Message was sent,
faith Bede in the 23d. of Theodosius, Aëtius being then
third time Consul with Symmachus. But Bleda, according
to Proper and Cassiodore, was killed by Attila two years
before Aëtius and Symmachus were Consuls (but one
year before according to Marcellinus) but the year
following he makes the terrible Invasion of Europe by
Attila to be; And so Aëtius having then a Prospect of
that War, had just reason to deny Supplies to the Brit-
ains. And when Valentinian was VI. Consul, the year
before Aëtius and Symmachus, it appears by Valentini-
an's Letters to him, that he was then in Gaul, for then
he directed the famous Constitution De Episcoporum
Ordinatione to him there; wherein he interposeth his
Authority to ratifie Leo's Sentence against Hilary of Arles.
But this is sufficient to shew that the Britains Com-
plaints were then sent to Aëtius, and not to any Agi-
tius or Aequitius, as some imagine. (t) For don faith,
The Britains sent to Agitius and Litorius; But Litorius
some years before was beaten, and taken Prisoner by
the Goths, as appears by the Fasti Consularis both of
Proper and Cassiodore, and (w) Paulus Diaconus out of
them.

But the Miseries of the Britains were still increased
by a Famine which then raged; which was not peculiar
to Britain. (w) Bede faith, that there was then a Fa-
mine at Constantinople, and a great Plague which fol-
low'd it, which consumed abundance both of Men and Beast.
Which he borrows from Marcellinus who makes both
Famine and Plague to break out the very year Aeti-
us and Symmachus were Consuls. Both these are men-
tion'd by (x) Euagrinius in the Eastern Parts, and there-
fore are not to be looked on as a peculiar Judgment
on the Britains.
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Chap. V.  

the British Churches.

301

After this, as (y) Gildas and Bede tell us, finding their Cafe almost desperate, the Britains were resolved to sell their Lives and Liberties as dear as they could, and by making a fierce Assault upon their Enemies, they began to get the better of them; Which they impute to their trusting rather to Divine Assistance than to the help of Men, which they too much relied upon before. The Britains, as appears afterward, did not want Courage, but Exercise in Arms; being kept under so long by the Romans, they durst not so much as pretend to fighting, for fear of being destroyed; And now the Romans, when they had a mind, could not infuse new Spirits into them; But their own Miseries at last roused and awak’ed them to that degree, that they made their Enemies quiet for some time; And the Irish Robbers, faith Gildas, returned home, intending to return shortly: And the Picts in the farthest part of the Island lay still, onely sometimes making Excursions. This is a considerable passage in Gildas, which shews, that even then the Scots, whom he calls Irish Robbers, were not Inhabitants of any part of Britain. For he calls Ireland their home, as before he said upon the second Devastation (as the Margin of Jofelin’s Gildas hath it) that they came in their Curroghs over the Scythian Vale, so he calls the Irish Sea, as Nennius calls the Scots, Scytae. But if they had then inhabited in Britain, there had been no use of Curroghs to convey them over, and this had been their proper Home. (x) Fordon seems to have been aware of this Objection, and therefore faith, The Scots and Picts took the Irish in to their Assistance; But Gildas takes notice of no other Scots than those that came out of Ireland, and returned back again. (y) Buchanan faith, That upon the Succes of Grime against the Britains, many Strangers came in to the Scots Assistance, and had their shares allow’d them in the conquer’d Lands. But he takes no notice of Gildas or Bede’s saying, That those very People who fought with the Britains returned home to Ireland; And the Picts were quiet in the utmost parts of the Island; where there is no mention of any third sort of People called the Scots in Britain. But (z), Dempler undertakes from this place of Gildas to prove, That the Scots and Irish were then dis".
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flinguished,
stnguilbed, because Gildas, after he had mention'd the Scots and Picts, here names the Irish Robbers. It is true, that Gildas before doth mention the Scots and Picts; but in this Place he only speaks of the Irish and the Picts, which is an Argument on the other side. For either the Scots had no share in these last Incursions, or they must be comprehended under the Name of Irish, having then no settled Habitations elsewhere but in Ireland. But there is one Passage in (a) Gildas which seems to imply that it was their Custom to inhabit this Country, but Solito more being there used, and they being then supposed out of Britain, the word Inhabit can only imply making a longer stay here, as they were wont to do when they had Success. For their coming is described, like that of the Bucaniers in the West-Indies, and their Stay was as they liked their Entertainment.

From this time Gildas onely mentions the Vices and the Fears, and another great Plague among the Britains, before he comes to that pernicious Counsel, as he calls it, for sending for the Saxons by Vortigern.

But before I speak of that, while we are upon this Head of the Britains being thus expos'd to their Enemies, it will be needful to enquire what that Legionary Assistance was which is mention'd in the Notitia Imperii, and at what time that was made; For if the Common Opinion be true, that it was made after the time of Honorius, then Britain could not have been left so destitute of Roman Assistance as Gildas and Bede say. For by that Notitia, here in Britain, under the Dux Britanniarum (who seems to have swallow'd up the Power of the Comes Britanniarum, whose bare Title is still left in the Notitia) there was the Prefect of the sixt Legion at York, of the Dalmatian Horse at Praesidium, i.e. Warwick, probably first built in the time of Didius Gallus against the Silures, and so continued its Name after, as being a convenient Station to keep under the Provincial Britains; Of the Capian Horse at Danum, (Doncaster;) Of the Cataphractarii at Morbium, (Moresby in Cumberland;) and so of others, at Albeia (Jerby in the same County,) at Diflum (Diganwey in Carnarvonshire;) at Concangii Kendal in Westmoreland,) at Lavatrae (Bowes in Richmondshire,)
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Cheshire, at Verterae (Burgh in Welfmoreland,) at Bro-

voniacum (Brougham in the name County,) at Maglo-

na (Macleneth in Montgomery-shire,) at Magi (old Rad-

nor,) at Longovicum (Lanchester in the Bishoprick of

Durham,) at Derwentio (Aldby in Yorkshire;) And be-

sides these, there were many Cohorts disposed per line-

am Valli, along the Wall, as at Segedunum (Seton or

Seghill in Northumberland,) Pons Ælii (Ponteland in the

name County,) Condercum (Chesler in the street,) Vin-

dobila (Walls-end,) Humnum (Severshale,) Cilunum (Sil-

chester in Mayo,) Procolitia (Prudlow,) Borcovicus (Bor-

wick,) Vindolana (Wicinester,) Æsica (Netherby on the

Esk in Cumberland,) Magna (Chester in the Wall,) Amb-

boglan (Ambleside in Welfmoreland,) Petriæ (old Per-

th in Cumberland,) Aballaba (Appleby in Welfmoreland,

Congavata (near Caudebec in Cumberland,) Axellosum

(Hexam in Northumberland,) Gabrosentum (Gatehead by

Newcastle,) Tunnocelum (Timemouth,) Glanoventa (a Place

upon the Wensbeck,) faith our Learned (b) Antiquary,

(whose Judgment in the other I have follow'd) some

miles within the Wall; ) Alione (upon the River Alne in

Cumberland,) Bremensvarcum (Brampton in the name

County,) Olenacum (Elenborough in the name,) Virofi-

dum (Warwick on the Eden.) Now if all the Military

Forces lay here so near to the Wall, after the time of Ho-

noriaus, how came the Britains to have been in such
distress? But we have no certainty when this Notitia

was made. If it were, as Pancirol conjectures, in the

latter end of Theodofius the younger, about Anno Dom.

445. Then all these Roman Forces were certainly with-

drawn; and any new Supplies denied by Ætius in the

23th. of Theodofius; Therefore this Notitia must relate

to the Roman Settlement here, before the time that Ma-

ximus carried over the Roman Legions, which never re-
turned to that Station which they had before. And

although the Title seems to imply that it extended be-
yond the times of Arcadius and Honorius; yet it can-
not be understood of what then was, but of what had
been in former times. For that the Britains had then
no such Forces among them is apparent by what hath
been said already.

R x 2

I now
The Antiquities of

I now come to that fatal Counsel of sending for the Saxons to come to their Assistance. It appears by (c) Gildas, That the Britains could come to no Settlement among themselves. "For, faith he, They appointed Kings, not according to the Will of God, but such as were more fierce and cruel than others, and not long after they without Examination took them off, and set up worse than they. If any one was more gentle and a Lover of Truth, he was the most hated and malignèd, as a Betrayer of his Country, they minded not what was pleasing or displeasing to God; or rather the latter was more pleasing to them. They acted still contrary to their own Interest, and there was an universal Degeneracy of Manners in all sorts of men; And those who should have given the best Examples, their Priests and Teachers, were as bad as others; Excessive Drinking, Heats and Animofities, Contentions and Divisions, Envy and Oppression, were then so prevailing that they seemed to have lost all Judgment of Good and Evil; so that then, he faith, The Saying of the Psalmit was fulfilled, He poureth Contempt upon Princes, and caufeth them to wander in the Wildernefs, where there is no Way.

And when neither Fear of their Enemies nor the Judgments of God in a raging Pestilence would doe them good, then their Iniquities, faith he, growing full, like the Amorites, they fell into consultation, what was best for them to doe against their Enemies Incursions, and they all agreed to invite the Saxons over to affift them. Upon which he breaks out into a strange Admiration of that Stupidity and Infatuation which the Britains were then under, to call in a Nation to help them whom they dreaded worse than death.

For the Saxons had been terrible for some time before to the Britifh Nation; which was the Occasion of calling the Shore on both fides the Saxon Shore, and fettling up fuch an Admiral here by the Romans, who was called Comes Litoris Saxon per Britanniam. Which fhews that the Saxons were then very well known for their great Piracies, and had been fo from the time of Caesar:

(d) Eutropius, i.9.

For then, (d) Eutropius faith, he was employ'd to scour the Seas from the Franks and Saxons who were very troublesome. It appears by (c) Tacitus, that Gannacus,
with the Chauci, did, in Claudius his time, infest the Gallican shore with Piracy. (f) Zosimus faith, That the Saxons, who were the stoutest of all the barbarous Nations, sent out the Quadi, a part of their own People, into the Roman Territories. By these Quadi (g) Chuerius and Bacherius understand the Cauchi. But (i) Archibishop Ufher shews, That these were neither the Quadi nor the Cauchi, but the Chamavi, from Eunapius, whom Zosimus transcribes, and from Julian himself: But from hence it appears, That the Chamavi were then accounted a part of the Saxons, who, according to (k) Chuerius, there lived near the River Amifsia, a great way on this side the Elb or the Weser; And Eunapius places them not far from the Rhine. However, this proves, that the Name of Saxons then comprehended Nations of other denominations. But, to make this out, we are to consider, that Zosimus faith, That in the time of Constantius, three German Nations brake forth as it were at once on the Roman Empire; The Franks, the Alemanni and the Saxons; and had taken and destroyed forty Cities on the Rhine. And Saint (l) Hierome mentions the Franks, as lying between the Alemanni and the Saxons. These three, as (m) Beatus Rhenanus observes, comprehended the several Nations of Germany; And, as the late Learned Bishop of (n) Mansfer faith, The Saxons was a Name belonging to different, but neighbour Nations, which joyned together upon a common Interest. And, not improbably, had their Name at first from the Short Swords they did commonly wear called Sachs; as the Quirites had their Name from Quiris, a fort of Spear; And the Scythians, from Scyten, to short with a Bow. (o) Witkindus first mentions this Etymology, which is follow'd by others; but (p) Reinerus Renecius and (q) Gryphian der do much more incline to another derivation, viz. from Saffen, which in the German Tongue is the same with Natives or Inhabitants; And which in the modern Saxon is Saten; as Gros is Grote; and so Holfati are the same with Holt-faten, Men that lived in Woods. But why this, which was common to other Germans, should give a particular denomination to one fort, is not so easy to apprehend: But Tacitus, speaking of some of the Northern Germans, faith, That the
common Badges of them are round Shields and short Swords: And the Arms of Saxony to this day, as (r) Pontanus observes, are two short Swords a-crofs. As to those who derive the Saxons from the Sace of Ajia, as though they were Sacafones; although there be Persons of great Name who embrace that Opinion (among whom our (s) Mr. Camden is one) yet I think it no more probable, than that the Germans are derived from the Plowmen of Peria, some whereof, Herodotus faith, were called Germanii. For a bare similitude of Names is no sufficient ground to judge of the Affinity of People; nor the agreement of some Words, as in the German and Persian Languages (which Mr. Camden insists on) to conclude the People of the same Original: Unless there be a probable account withall given, how they came to be propagated from each other, i.e. how the Persian Germans came into these Parts; And how the Sace left their own Countrey to people Saxony. But under this Name of Saxons, not onely those who originally had that Name, but all those who joined with them, were comprehended. And it is observablc, that not one of the three Names of the German Nations then in use was known in Tacitus his time. The Alemanni are first spoken of by (t) Spartanius, in the Life of Caracalla; and, as (u) Agathias faith from Asinius Quadratus, They were an Association of many People together under that Name, as the Word imports. The Name of Franks was first known in the time of (w) Aurelian, and took in several of the old German Names, the Scicambri, Chatti, Tencleri, and many others; Thence (x) St. Jerome faith, That France was that which Historians called Germany; And so the Saxons was a general Name for the Northern Germans, who chiefly liued upon the Sea-shore, from the Amas to the Weser and Elb, as far as the Eydor, unto the Cimbrick Chersonefe, that had peculiar Appellations. For although the Testimony of (y) Ptolemey be commonly produced for the Saxons living on the back of the Cimbrick Chersonefe, yet Mr. Selden's MS. in both places, leaves out the ɔ, and Capnio, as (z) Ciferus observes, contends, it ought to be read "Agoes." But I lay no weight upon this. But it is certain, that the People in Tacitus his time
time were called Fofi, who lived in the Place where the Saxons are supposed to have been. (a) Cluverius makes
a very unhappy Conjecture, that FOSI, in Tacitus, was corrupted, for SASONI; because they lived in Holstein, and about Slefwick; But it is far more probable, That the Name of Saxons was then generally affumed by the Northern Germans when they joined their Forces together, and resolved to make some Expeditions abroad, as the Franks and Alemanni had done. Which they did with so great Success, that (b) Zosimus faith, in the time of Julian they went down the Rhine, and drove out the Saxons, a Nation of the Franks, out of the Island of the Batavi. But it seems very probable, That the Saxons had placed themselves near the Sea-shore, from the time of Diocletian, when Carausius was employ'd against them. (c) Orosius describes them as a People living on the Sea-shore; and so do Isidore and Paulius Diaconus after him. Ammianus (d) Marcellinus mentions them, as bordering, in Valentinian's time, on the parts of Gaul as well as the Franks.

But about this Point our two Learned Antiquaries differ, (e) Camden faith, That the Saxons originally came from the Cimbrick Cherfonfcs, in the time of Diocletian; And after, passing the Elb, they partly went into those parts of the Suevi, which are since called Saxony, and partly into Frisia and Batavia; From whence, he faith, all the Inhabitants of the German shore, who used Piracy at Sea, were called Saxons; by which he understands the People from Jutland to Holland. For which he produces the Testimony of Fabius Ethelward, of the Royal Bloud of the Saxons; Who faith, That the Saxons lived upon the Sea Coafls, from the Rhine as far as Denmark. But Archbishop (f) Usher will not allow, that the Saxons had seated themselves upon those Coafls then; But only that they did exercise their Piracies along them. He grants, that before Bede's time, the Saxons took Possession of the Places quitted by the Franks, when they went into Gaul, and not only inhabited on the Coast between the Elb and the Rhine, but in the inner parts of the Country; But he denies, that this was before the Saxons coming into Britain. But then Fabius Ethelward did not understand where his Countreymen lived before they came.
came into Britain; And if the Saxons in Valentinian's time, were still only in the Cimbrick Chersonese, how comes Ammianus Marcellinus to make them to border upon the Parts of Gaul? Are either Jutland or Holstein, or Sleswick, or any of those Countries contiguous to Gaul? Yet his words are, Gallicanus Trajitus Franci & Saxones isdem confines, &c. Which, that it is not to be understood, that the Saxons were Neighbours to the Franks; but that the Franks and Saxons then bordered upon the Gauls, will appear from hence, The Franks were then in Taxandria, as is plain by (g) Ammianus his words, in the time of Julian, and in Batavia; and withall, Zosimus speaks of the Salii, who were undoubtedly Franks, being driven out of the Island of the Batavi by some of the Saxons. And this was no Incursion of the Franks, For Ammianus Marcellinus faith, They did there fix their Habitations: And the Chamavi, whom he makes a part of the Saxons, had that Command of the Rhine, that Julian made Peace with them, because without their leave, Corn could not be brought out of Britain, as (h) Eunapius Sardianus faith: And so (i) Libanius and (k) Zosimus say, that Julian took greater care for the transporting Corn out of Britain, as had been accustomed, by building more Ships on the Rhine for that Purpose; And (l) Ammianus Marcellinus faith, he built Granaries instead of those which were burnt. Such a one the Arx Britannica, in the mouth of the Rhine, was made from a Magazine, and thence it follows, that the Saxons so early as Julian's time, had the Command of the Rhine. For, whether these were the Chauci, the Quadi, or the Chamavi: yet Zosimus faith, That they were a People of the Saxons. But it may be said, That this was only a sudden Incursion, and that they were driven out again by the Roman Forces. So indeed Zosimus and Julian relate it, but how then come the Saxons in Valentinian's time to border still upon Gaul? So that, if they were driven out by Julian, they quickly returned, and fixed their Habitations by the Sea, as the Salii, who were Franks, did in Taxandria; which was more within Land: and where, as (n) Godfrey Wendelin hath endeavoured to prove,
prove, the Salick Law was first made. Which Taxandria, according to him, was bounded by the Maes on the East and North; by the Tamera on the South, and by the Scheld on the West; And here, upon Submission, the Franks were permitted to live; And this was thence forward called Francia Minor, and he mentions a place there still called Vranrjck, the Kingdom of France (but a very small one) and others called Seilberg, the Mountain of the Salii, Seelbendens, the Salian Meadows, Seleheim, the House of the Salii: But the other Franks being by Stilicho's means driven out of their Possessions beyond the Rhine, they came into the parts about Tongres near to Taxandria, and there joined in one Body; and set up Kings among themselves, as he shews from Gregory Turonenhis, and then they made that Body of Laws, called the Salick Laws. But to return to the Saxons.

(o) Ubbio Emmius, a learned and judicious Historian, gives this Account of the Saxons and their Neighbour Nations, who inhabited on the Northern Parts of Germany. The Frisii dwelt from the middle Stream of the Rhine, about Utrecht, to the River Amasus, (Eems;) From thence to the Elb lived the Chauci, divided into the greater and leffer by the Wefer; A great part of these, leaving their Native Soil, joined with the Sicambri on the Rhine, who, from their afflicting liberty, were called Franks; beyond the Elb were the Saxons and the Cimbr; These Saxons, being pressed by the more Northern People, or for their own conveniency, came Southwards, and took Possession first of those Places where the Chauci dwelt; And by degrees prevailing, all the other People, who joined with or submitted to the Saxons, were called by their Name: and among the rest the Frisii; From whose Coasts he supposeth the two Brothers, Hengifl and Horfa, to have gone into Britain; and, returning thither, carried over a far greater Number with them, not so much to fight, as to inhabit there. He thinks it most probable, that Hengifl and Horfa, by their Descent, were originally Saxons; But that the greatest part of the People who went over with them were rather Frisians than Saxons. Which he proves, not only from the greater facility of Passage from the Coasts of Friseland, and the Teffi-
mony of their own Annals; but from the greater agree-
ment of the English Language with theirs than with the
Saxon or any other German Dialect. And because
(p) Bede reckons the Frisians among those from whom the
English are derived; and Wilfrid, Wickbert, Willibrord
preach'd to the Frisians in their own Tongue, as he proves
from Marcellinus his Life of Suidbert: And Procopius
reckons the Frisians among the Inhabitants of Britain.
But he faith farther, That the Affinity of the Langu-
ges continues still so very great, that from thence he
concludes many more to have gon out of Friseland in-
to Britain, than either of the Saxons, Jutes or Angles.

But to all this our Learned (q) Primate answers,
That Hengist and Horfa might be true Frisians, there be-
ing a Frisfa in the Southern parts of Jutland, which
Saxo Grammaticus calls the leiffer Frisfa, and is parted by
the Eidore from the Country of the Angli on the East,
and of the Saxons on the South. But whatever Suffri-
dus Petrus, or such Authors contend for, as to Hen-
gift and Horfa being originally Frisians, Ubbo Emmins
quits that Point upon (r) Bede's Genealogy, and grants
they were Saxons: being the Sons of Viögilus, whose
Father was Vitta, the Son of Veöta, whose Father was
Voden, of whose Race the Kings of many Provinces are de-
sceded. It doth not seem at all probable, That these
lived in the leiffer Frisfa, which is hardly taken notice of
by any but by (s) Saxo Grammaticus; and (t) Pilotanus
tells us, is not above four German miles in length upon the
Sea-shore; But suppose that Saxo comprehended Dith-
mars under it; yet we have no certainty that the Colo-
ny of Frisians was removed thither before Hengist and
Horfa came for Britain; and Helmoldus seems to imply
that it was brought thither by Adolphus II. Count of
Holstein, about Anno Dom. 1137. But the Question is
not concerning Hengist and Horfa, but the greater
Number of the People, which might be still of the
greater Frisfa; For which the affinity of the Language is
a considerable Argument, which doth not depend merely
upon the Credit of Marcellinus his Life of Suidbert,
but upon the probability of the thing. For since se-
veral English went thither to Preach, and the Affinity
of the Language continues so great still, it is a good
Argument
Argument to prove, either that the Frisians came over hither, or that the Frisian and Saxon Languages were then the fame. And (u) Procopius his Testimony is (w) De both Gab. not to be slighted, who places the Frisians in Britain; for, although he calls it Brettia, it is certain he means great Britain, because he places the Angles together with the Frisians in it; So that he might as well question the Angles as the Frisians coming hither; if Procopius his Authority signify any thing.

I know that our most Learned (v) Primate takes (w) Prima. this Brettia for the Island of the Batavi, because Job. Leidensis faith, That, upon the Saxons Invasion, some of the Britains fled into Holland, and there, in the Mouth of the Rhine, built that famous Castle called Britton, and subdued the People thereabout. But this seems to be very improbable, for any one that looks into the Description of it, in (x) Scriberius his Antiquitates Batavicae, (x) Antig. Bat. will conclude it to have been a Roman Work; which a Person of his Judgment could not but discern; But he faith, it was posseffed then by the Britains: Which depends wholly on the Credit of this Job. Gerbrandus of Leyden, who was a late Writer, and of no great Esteem with him, as appears by many Passages in his Book: But how came the Angles to live here with the Frisians and Britains? For that the fame Gerbrandus is cited, who faith, That when part of Hengift's Army was driven out of Britain, they built the Castle of Leyden. And so we have the Britains dwelling there, being driven out by the Saxons; and the Saxons driven out by the Britains; only to make this to be the Island Brettia, in Procopius, distinct from Great Britain. But to proceed.

(y) Adamus Bremenfis, who lived near to Jutland, (y) Hist. Ecclef. faith, That the Saxons, who went over into Britain, lived near the Rhine. (z) Engelbifius, lately published out (z) Chron. I. II. of M.S. by Madenus, and who lived in the lower Saxony, faith, That Hengift and Horfa went out of Westphalia, from a Place called Enghere, and instead of Engerfchen, called themselves Engelschen. (a) Suffridus (a) De Orig. Fris. Petrus faith, Thofe People were called Angrivarii, and the Countrey Angria, which was subdued by Udolphus, Father to Hengift and Horfa, and Prince of Frisia; But their Sf 2 Mother's
Mother's Name was Suana, Daughter to Veclgiftus, a great Man about Hamburgh. If he suppose Hamburgh then built, he was extremely mistaken; for it was once a Caftle erected on the Elb, in the time of Charles the Great, for preventing the Incursion of the Sclavi, as appears by the Testimonies of (b) Eginhardus, and (c) Albertus Stadenfis: After which he built a City, and founded a Church there, as Adamus Bremenfis and Helmoldus agree; Which City had its Name from a Neighbour Wood, called in the Saxon, Hamme; as (d) Lambeceius faith, in Ditmarfe there are two Woods still called Suderhamme and Norderhamme. But to return to Suffridus; When, according to Custome, faith he, a Colony of Frifians was to be drawn out, Hengift and Horfa were their Captains; and so went for old England, or Anglen in Jutland, where they were kindly receiv'd, by means of Vetgifius; and from thence took the opportunity of coming into Britain. From hence he finds fault with Crantzius, for making Angria in Weftphalia to be Old Angler; and faith, That Bede only reckons the Mother's Line, and not the Father's. But his Occa Scarlenfis, on whom he chiefly relies, is much such another Authour as Hanibaldus, or Geffrey, or Hector's Veremundus; and therefore I shall say no more of him. For, I perceive, scarce any of the Northern Nations wanted such Authours who endeavour'd to supply the defect of their Histories by their own Inventions. So that it is necessary to lay open the pretended Antiquities in order to the setting forth the true.

The late Bishop of (e) Munfter, a Perfon of far greater Judgment and Learning than Suffridus Petrus, calls his Originals of the Saxons by no better a Title than of Canoae Nuge, Sounding Trifles, having no foundation in good Authority. The Account he gives of the Saxons is this, That they at first lived beyond the Elb, where they had the fame Situation with Tacitus his Angli, whom he makes the farthest of the Suevi, and therefore might well be the fame People; That in Bede's time they were come on this fide the Wefer, and were settled in Weftphalia; and so they made a threefold Saxony of the Olt-faxons by Bede and others: Not that these
these were all originally Saxons; But they bore the name Name, being united in one common League; So that, as all the Germans which went into Gaul were called Franks, so those who prevailed in Germany and went into Britain, were called Saxons.

But (f) Olaus Rudbeck, after all, hath found the (f) Atlant. Seat of the Saxons more North than Jutland, where, faith he, The Name of the Saxons could never yet be found; and where are no Mountains to be met with upon which Ptolemy places them on the back of the Cimbrick Chersonese; but in that part of Sweden which lies between Vermelandia and Angermannia he hath found Norfaxen, and Soderfaxen, and Saxehundari, and Saxewall, and Saxen, &c. And in Smaland he hath discovered many Places taken from the Angles, as Anglefled Hunderd, Angloridia, Anglodorpa, Engelbeck, &c.

But for our better understanding the Condition of that People who were called in by the Britains, it will be most material to consider what is said of them by those who descended from them, and lived here not long after their coming.

(g) Bede, who was himself a Saxon, and lived nearest the time of the Saxons coming hither, must be presumed to have understood best who they were, and whence they came. And although at the beginning he makes the Angles and Saxons all one; saying, the Angles or Saxons, being invited by King Vortigern, came hither in three Keels or long Boats at first; yet when he adds, that Numbers came afterwards, he then distinguished them into three distinct sorts of People, viz. the Saxons, Angles and Jutes. The Saxons, he faith, came from that Place which was then called Saxony; The Angles, from the Countrey called Angulus, which remained desert to this day, and lay between the Provinces of the Jutes and Saxons. And much to the same purpose (h) Fabius Ethelwurd; only he faith, that they came de Saxonia, Anglia atque Gioti. Saxony, he faith, was then called Ealdfoxæ; and for Anglia, he faith, it lay between the Saxons and the Gioti, whose chief Town in the Saxon Tongue was called Slefwic, and by the Danes, Haithaby. But, by this Account, all these People who came hither to assist the Britains, and after conquer’d them,
them, and possessed their Land, must come out of that Cherfonefæ called Jutland, taking it in the largest extent, not only to the Eidore, but from the Eidore to the Elb. For if the Angli came from about Sleswic, and lay between the Jutes and the Old Saxons; then the Jutes possessed all that part of the Cherfonefæ which is now called the Northern Jutland: and the Southern Jutland takes within it all that was possessed by the Angli, which reached no farther than between Sleswic and Flensburgh, which in the modern Maps is still called Angelen; And so the Country lying between the Elb and the Eidore, comprehending Heflein, Dithmars and Stormar, must be the Seat of the Old Saxons; which, by (i) Adamus Bremenfis and (k) Helmoldus, is called Nortalbingia; and, by (l) Eginhartus, Saxonia Tranfalbia; by (m) Albertus Stadenfis, Tranfalbia; where the Saxons remained in so great Numbers that Charles the Great could not totally subdue them, till after a War of above thirty years, as the foremention'd Authours affure us. And (n) Eginhartus, whose Authority is unquestionable, faith, That Charles had no War more tedious or more fierce than that which he had with the Saxons; And in the conclusion of it, he was forced to remove 10000 Saxons on both sides the River Elb, and to disperse them in several Parts of the Empire. And as to that part of Jutland which Bede faith was left desolate to his time upon the remove of the Angli; (o) Adamus Bremenfis gives another Reafon for it, saying, That Jutland was the most uncultivated part of all Germany, and the least fit for humane habitation, being so barren and unfruitfull, and so obnoxious to Pirates from both Seas. But since the Saxons, Angles and Jutes, coming into Britain, took Possession of so great a part of it, as our Historians tell us, viz. The Jutes, Kent, the Isle of Wight and part of Hampshire; The Saxons, Suffolk, Essex, Middlefex, the South part of Haitfordshire, Surrey, the other part of Hampshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Devonshire and part of Cornwall; The Angles, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, the Midland and Northern Counties; It deserves to be considered whether, since there were so few Inhabitants then in Jutland and so many Saxons left behind, there be not far greater pro-
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probability that these should come from all the Maritime Coasts from the Rhine to Jutland, than merely out of such an unpeopled Country as that was. I do not deny the distinction of People that Bede mentions, nor their coming originally out of Jutland, or rather through Jutland: But, I think, all Circumstances considered, it is more probable that the Saxons, before that time, were come nearer to the Rhine, and so had greater Conveniency of removing themselves over in such great Numbers into Britain, as they did upon Vortigern's Invitation, and the Discontents which soon happened between the Saxons and the Britains.

And it is observable, That those who inlarge the Bounds of the Saxons do take notice of a difference in their Situation agreeable to what Bedefaidth; For (p) Reinerus Reineccius, a Learned German Antiquary, De Orig. Sax. faith, The Saxons were divided into three forts, the Oftera-li, or the Eastern Saxons, whom the Old Saxon Poet calls Osterlingi, whose Limits extended, he faith, as far as the Slavi, i.e. beyond the River Elb: the Westsali, whose Bounds, he faith, came very near the Rhine; And between these, he faith, were the Angarii, just as Bede puts his Angli, between the Jutes and the Saxons.

Inter prædiços media Regione morantur
Angarii, Populus Saxonum tertius——

If this Division of the Saxons be allow'd, we have here scope enough for all those People to live in who came over into Britain, and number enough to come hither, and yet not to leave the Places defolate whence they came. And it is not improbable that the Northern Nations thrusting one another forwards, for a greater Conveniency of living, those Saxons who lived about Holstein might come into Westphalia, and so be nearest to the Rhine; The Angli came into the Place where the Angrivarii are seated; And the most remote Inhabitants of the Chersonese, would then be the Osterlings or the Eastern Saxons. This, upon the whole matter, seems to me the most probable way of reconciling what Bede faith with the Circumstances of those times, and with the Frisians coming in together with the Saxons,
Saxons, which he elsewhere expressly affirms, as is already shew'd.

As to the time of the Saxons coming into Britain, in the common printed Copies of Bede, it is said to have been Anno Dom. 409. and so it is in the late Edition by Chiffletius, out of the old MS. of S. Maximin at Trier; But that cannot be true, because Martianus is said to be Emperor at the same time. But in the Chronology, at the end of that Edition, it is said to have been Anno Dom. 449. to which Mr. Wheelock's MS. agrees; and Afferius Menevenfis, in his Annals; which is follow'd by Fabius Ethelwerd, the Old Saxon Annals, William of Malmsbury, Henry Huntingdon, Math. Westminſter, and others. Florentius Wigramenfis, who generally follows Marianus Scotus, places it in the following year; Valentinius and Avienus, Confuls; but, according to Marianus Scotus, in the Bajil Edition, they were Conſuls the year before Martianus was Emperor, and he makes their coming in to have been when Herculanus and Asperatius were Conſuls, Anno Dom. 453. But Archbifhop (q) Ufher faith, That appears by the Facts to have been Anno Dom. 452. or the second of Martianus, by Caffiodore. Two Characters of the time are certain; viz. that it was after the third Conſulship of Aetius, and the Death of Theodosius; And therefore it is to be wondred, Mr. (r) Camden should so confidently affirm that it was before Anno Dom. 449. But there are three things he goes upon which must be consider'd. First, That Vortigern's Death was before St. German's return; But St. German died Anno Dom. 435. And therefore the coming in of the Saxons must be some time before. As to Vortigern's Death, before St. German's return, he produces onely the Testimony of Nennius, who, in the Affairs of Vortigern, doth Romance so much, That even Geoffre of Monmouth was ashamed to follow him. But as to the time of St. German's Death, there are very convincing Arguments to prove Camden mistaken.

(s) Honoratus, in the Life of Hilary, Bishop of Arles, mentions St. German as present when Chelidonius was deposed by Hilary in his Vifitation; which (t) Sirmondus placeth not without Reaſon, Anno Dom. 444. as appears by the Epistle of Leo and the Reſcript of Valentian upon Chelido-
Chelidonius his Appeal, which bears date, Anno Dom. 445: But which is yet more considerable, (w) Bede faith, That (v) L. 1. c. 21: after his second return he went on an Embassy to Ravena; and was there kindly received by Valentinian and Placidia, and there died: And, not long after, Valentinian was killed in the sixth of Marianus: And therefore St. German’s Death could not be so soon as Mr. Camden supposeth. Add to this, that Constantius, in his Life of St. German faith, That he was thirty years after St. Amator in his See, who died Anno Dom. 418. But the Samaritani say, Anno Dom. 420.

As to the Testimony of Prosper Tiro, who faith, That Britain was brought under the Power of the Saxons, the 18th of Theodosius, it plainly contradicts Gildas: For this was before the third Consulship of Aetius, which was five years after; And in matters of the Britifh History, Gildas certainly deserves the greater Credit, supposing it were the true Prosper.

His last Argument is from the Calculation, at the end of Nennius, on which he lays the greatest Weight; which makes their coming in to be when Felix and Taurus were Consuls, which agrees with Anno Dom. 428. But this was near twenty years before the third Consulship of Aetius, when the Britains were not yet in danger of Afflanctence from the Romans; Before which they never fought for the Saxons. And I confefs the Authority of Gildas and Bede, with the Series of the Britifh and Roman Affairs at that time: it is very much more with me than such an Anonymous Calculation.

It is a strange mistake of (w) Hadrianus Valesius, to (y) Rel. Francia. l. 3. p. 143. make Vortigern, King of the Angles, who were hired to assist the Britains; But the Ambiguity of the words in (x) Paulus Diaconus seem to have been the occasion of it: which had been easily prevented by looking into Bede: And fo had another Mistake in the same place, viz. That only the Angles, and not the Saxons, were invited over: For Bede faith expressly, That the Britains, with their King Vortigern, agreed to send for the Saxons; But it is a third mistake, when he faith, That the Saxons before this time had a part of the Island near to the Picts: Which he proves from the Words of Constantius, as to their joining with the Picts in one of their Battles.

T t But
But the Saxons did frequently make Incursions before, and in one of them might join with the other Enemies of the Britains, which is a very different thing from Inhabiting in any Part of the Island, which we have no Evidence that they did, till they were called in by the Britains.

The Saxons having received such an Invitation from the Britains were unwilling to let slip so fair an Opportunity of coming into that Land, by the consent of Prince and People whose Shores they had so long infested. (y) Bede faith, There was a particular Providence of God in it, to make them the Scourges of the Peoples wickedness. (z) Gildas imputes it to mere Sottishness and Infatuation. (a) Nennius intimates some Domestick Fear that was the Occasion of Vortigern’s sending for the Saxons, as well as that of their common Enemies, i.e. he was very apprehensive of a sudden Rising of the Roman Party yet left in the Island, and of Ambrosius. But he leaves it wholly in the dark, who this Ambrosius was, and what Cause Vortigern had to be afraid of him.

(b) Gildas speaks of Ambrosius Aurelianus, as of a modest Man, and as almost the only person of the Roman Nation then surviving, whose Parents were killed enjoying the Purple, and whose Poesity was living in Gildas his time, but much degenerated from the Vertues of their Ancestours. This is the only Passage which gives us any light into this matter which is repeated by (c) Bede, who more plainly faith, That his Parents had Royal Authority, and were killed. Who these Parents of his were we are left only to conjecture. The (d) British History would clear the matter, if it deserved Credit, for there we reade, That Aurelius Ambrosius was one of the younger Sons of Constantine, King of Britain, who was forced to fly from Vortigern after the Murder of their Brother Conftans by his contrivance. But we know that Constantine and his Sons, Conflans and Julian, were killed abroad; and it is not probable the Romans would have permitted any one of his Sons to have remained here; or, if they did, this Ambrosius must have been of Ripe years for Government long before this time. For Constantine’s Life was taken away when Theodosius was IV. Conful, as Idatius and Marcellinus agree, Anno Dom. 411. So that

Ambrosius
Ambrosius could not be very young when Vortigern took the Government, in whose fourth year, they say, The Saxons were called in. But there is another Passage in Gildas which helps to explain this: For he faith, That after they found themselves deserted by the Romans, they set up Kings of their own, and soon after put them down again, and made choice of worse in their room; This setting up of Kings he expresses by their being anointed; whether that Custome were then used or not, it is plain, that he supposes that the Britains, in that Confusion they were in, took upon them, without regard to their Duty, to place and displace them. But that he takes anointing in a metaphorical Sense appears by what follows, That the Anointers were those who destroy’d them. Among these in all probability was the Father of Ambrosius, and the rather because, it is said, he was of Roman Defcent: For the Britains thought none then able to defend them that had not a Roman Spirit in him. At this time the Britains were left to their full Liberty by the Roman Empire, which, as (e) Bede reckons, had the Dominion here for 470 years; And then there was no Line remaining to succeed in the Government, nor so much as to determine their choice, which made them so easily to make and unmake their Kings, who lost their Purple and their Lives together. This must needs breed infinite Confusions among them; and every one who came to be King lived in perpetual fear of being serv’d as others had been before him; And the natural consequence of this Jealousie of their own Subjects was, looking out for Assistance from abroad, which I doubt not was one great Reafon of Vortigern’s sending for the Saxons, hoping to secure himself by their means against his own People: although it proved at last the Ruine both of himself and his People. But this Jealousie could not but increase upon them, while there was a Person descended from a former King, and of Roman Parentage in being; So that Nennius seems to have hit upon one of the main Reasons which fway’d Vortigern to send for the Saxons.

(f) Some have gone about to defend Vortigern so far as to say, That he took the most prudent Care he could for the benefit and security of his Subjects, by placing the

Tt 2 Saxons
Saxons upon the Picts Wall, and upon the Kentish Shores, which were thought fit to be secured by the Romans. But, against whom? Was it not against these very Saxons? And is it the best way to secure the Flock, to set the Wolves to watch them? If they had the Command of those Shores, could not they let in what Numbers they pleased of their own People to strengthen themselves against the Britains? And, was this for the Peoples Security? What Success had there been in that Age, in letting in the Barbarous Nations upon the several parts of the Roman Empire? And, what could be expected in such a Condition as the Britains were in, otherwise than what did happen when a fierce, ungovernable, military People were called in to defend a Nation so long kept under, and wholly almost unacquainted with the exercise of Brutish Valour, and unexperienced in the Arts of War? Especially when the Air, Situation, Fruitfulness and all forts of Conveniencies were so much above those of the Countrey which they came from? So that Gildas seems to have a great deal of Reason, when he attributes this Act of Vortiger's, with a respect to the Nation, to mere Sottishnes and Infatuation.

(g) De Gejli. Sax. P. 3.

Witikindus tells a formal Story of a Speech made by the British Ambassadors to the Saxons, wherein they magnifie the Saxons courage, and lament their own Miferies, and in short tell them, If they would come and help them, their Land and themselves would be at their Service, for they knew none more worthy to command them, since the Romans had left them. But neither Bede nor Ethelward, although both Saxons, mention the least Promise of Submission; And it is apparent by their Quarrel with the Britains afterwards, that they came as Mercenary Souldiers, upon promise of Pay. For (h) Gildas faith, The first Pretence of Quarrelling was for greater allowance, which he calls their Epimenia, and Bede, Annonae: Which shews upon what Terms they came. And Witikindus himself makes no other Pretence for their Rising against the Britains, but that the Countrey pleaded them, and they found they were able to subdue the Inhabitants. For after Hengist and his Company had tasted the Sweetness of it, they never left Weddling that weak and vitious King (as all de-
(scribe him) with fair Promises, and necessity of more Succours to secure himself and to defend his Countrey, till they had by degrees got over Strength enough to bid defiance to the Britains. At first they seem'd very zealous and hearty against their common Enemies, and did great Service in beating the Picts and Scots; insomuch that (i) Buchanan confesses, they were driven beyond Adrian's Wall; And some think their King Eugenus was then killed. (k) Fordon faith, They went in to Albany, and brought away great booty from thence; and confesses, that he found in a certain History, that he was killed South of Humber, by the Britains and the English. And it is easy to imagine how insolent such a Barbarous People would grow upon their Success, when they knew the Britains durst not oppose them. (l) Bede faith, That they entred into a secret League with the Picts and the Scots after they had beaten them, and then took occasion to quarrell with the Britains; Oney they fell endeavour'd to keep Vortigern firm to them. To this purpose (m) Nennius tells the Story of Hengift's fair Daughter Rovenia, and how Vortigern was inflinuated by her, to the great dissatisfaction of the Britains. Hector Boethius faith, That Vodinus, Bishop of London, was killed by Hengift, for reproving Vortigern for that Marriage; But we must not be too strict upon Hector to put him to produce his Vouchers. And the (n) Britifh History adds, that Hengift, being a subtile Man, insinuated still into Vortigern, That his own People did not love him, and that they would depose him, and set up Aurelius Ambrosius: and by such Arts they widen'd the Distance between him and his People, when they designd nothing less than the destruction of both.

It is certain, by what Gildas and Bede have left, that these heats soon brake out into open Flames, to the Ruine and Desolation of the Countrey: But how the War began, and by what means it was first managed on the British side is not so clear. But (o) Nennius faith, That when Vortigern's wickedness grew so great as to marry his own Daughter, he was condemned in solemn Council of the Britifh Nation both Clergy and Laity; and upon the Advice of his Nobles, he withdrew himself from Affairs to a private Castle. But the (p) Britifh History makes it
worfe, viz. That the Britains forsook him, and set up his Son Vortimer, who behaved himself with great Courage and Resolution against the Saxons; And then reckons up four Battels, which he fought with them; The first up on the Derwent, the second at Episford, or rather Altford, the third upon the Sea-shore, when he drove them into their Ships, and so home; but the fourth is not mention'd; After which Geoffrey relates Vortimer's being poison'd by his Mother-in-law, and the restoring of Vortigern, and his calling for the Saxons back again. (q) Nennius speaks of Vortimer's fighting with Hengist and Horsus, and adds his Success to have been so great, as to have driven them into the Isle of Thanet, and that there be besieged, and beat, and terrified them to that degree, That they sent into Germany for fresh Succours; by which they were enabled to manage the War with various Successes against the Britains. And then reckons up the three Battels, just as Geoffrey doth; Onely the last, he faith, was upon the Sea-shore, juxta lapidem tituli; a little after which, he faith, that Vortimer died without any mention of Poison; But, he faith, before his death he gave command to have his Body buried on the Sea-shore, where the Saxons fled; which was neglected, and to which Nennius imputes their Return, after which they could never be driven out. Because, as he faith, It was the Divine Pleasure more than their own Valour which made them settle here. And it is he that orders and rules the Nations of the Earth; And who can reftift his Will? It is plain by all this, that Nennius consulted the Honour of the Britifh Nation as much as it was poifible, and nowhere ufeth that freedom which Gildas doth, in fetting forth the great Sins among them which provoked God to punifh them in fo free a manner.

The Place where Vortimer defired to be buried is called by Nennius, Lapis Tituli; from whence (r) Camden and Archbishop (s) Other conceive it to be Stonar in the Isle of Thanet, near Richborrow; but Nennius faith only, It was upon the Shore of the French Sea; From whence Mr. (t) Somner rather concludes it to be Folkstone in Kent, because of its lofty Situation, whereas Stonar lies in a low and flat level, apt to Inundations; But then Nennius must have mistaken Lapis Tituli, for Lapis
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Lapis Populi; and, I dare say, Nennius was guilty of greater mistakes than that. But, he farther observes, that in the ancient Records, the name is not Stonar, but Eftonar, which signifies the Eastern Border, Shore or Coast.

(u) Matthew of Westminster gives this Account of thee Proceedings: That the British Nobility, forsaking Vortigern, set up Vortimer, who, with their Assistance, pursued the Saxons to Derwent, and there killed many of them. Which seems to have been Darton in Kent; thence Dartford, as (w) Camden observes, is the same with Da-(w) Brit. p. 232: renford. But he makes Vortigern to have fled away with the Saxon Army, and to have given them all the Assistance he could: And then, faith he, Vortimer began to restore the Britains Possessions to them, and to rebuild their Churches, and to shew kindness to the Churchmen. The next year, he faith, "The Saxons fought again with the Britains at Ailesford; and after a sharp Fight the Saxons fled, and great multitudes of them were slain; Not long after Vortimer, with his Brothers Catigern and Patcentius, and the whole Nation of the Britains made War with the Saxons, and in Battel Catigern was killed by Horsus, and Horsus by Vortimer, upon which the Saxon Army fled. The next year, he faith, Hengist fought three Battels with Vortimer; and at last he was forced to go back into Germany, and four years after, Vortimer, faith he, was poifon'd, Anno Dom. 460. and buried in London, and then Vortigern recalled the Saxons.

(x) William of Malmsbury faith, "That the Britains, and Saxons agreed for seven years after their Landing, and then Vortimer, finding their Deceit, incenfed his Father and the Britains against them, and so for twenty years there was continual War and light Skirmishes, and four pitched Battels. In the first he makes their Fortune equal, Horfa being killed on one side, and Catigis on the other. In the rest, the Saxons being always superiour, and Vortimer dead, a Peace was made; And so the Britains Affairs went ill, till Ambrosius recover'd them.

(y) Henry of Huntingdon relates this Story after a different manner: He tells us, "That Vortigern, after the
the Marriage of Hengist's Daughter was so hated, that he withdrew to the Mountains and Woods, and that he and his Castle were consumed together. After which Ambrosius Aurelianus, with Vortigern's two Sons, Vortimer and Catiger, fought the Saxons; And he makes the first Battel at Ailestreu or Elsfree, the next after Vortimer's Death at Creganford or Crayford, in which, he faith, the Britains were quite beaten out of Kent, and from thence he begins the Saxons Kingdom of Kent. The next, he faith, was at Wippenfield, which was so terrible on both Sides, That from thence he faith, That the Saxons and Britains did not disturb each other for a great while, they remaining within Kent, and the Britains quarrelling among themselves.

(2) Chronic. A. D. 455.
Florentius Wigorniensis therein differs from the rest, that he makes the Battel at Ægelstrep to have been between Vortigern and Hengist; But, he faith, after the Battel at Creccanford, the Britains fled to London, and left Kent to the Saxons: Wherein he follows the Saxon Annals, as he doth in the Account of the two other Battels; that at Wippenfield, and that which he calls the great Victory over the Britains by Hengist and Esca his Son; which he places Anno Dom. 473, when he faith, the Britains fled from the Saxons as from Fire.

(a) Fabius Esthelward agrees with the Saxon Annals and Florentius in these Particulars; And so doth Aelfricus in his MSS. Annals, as to Vortigern's fighting with Hengist. Wherein they very much differ from the Britsh Traditions; But after the Translation of the Britsh History by Geffrey, the Monkish Historians generally follow that, as to the Success of these Battels, and as to the Treachery used towards Vortigern by Hengist, upon Salisbury Plain, near Ambresbury; Where it is said by Geffrey, that the Saxons killed 470 of the Britsh Nobility, under a Pretence of a Treaty of Peace; (b) Nennius, faith but 300; and that Vortigern was then taken, and was forced to give Effex, Suthex and Middlesex for his Redemption.

This Story passes for current among the Monks and our late Collectors of English History; And that which seems to add most weight to it is, That William of Malmsbury
Malmesbury relates it, but he reports it much as he found it in Nennius, only enlarging on the drinking part, that went before the Massacre. But when I find the same Story in effect in (c) Witikindus, between the Saxons and the Thuringers, and the very same Word given N E M E T E O U R S E A X E S, I am apt to think one was borrowed from the other. But I cannot but take notice of the Disingenuity of (d) Verfiegan, who lays this to the Charge of the Thuringers, whereas Witikindus not only faith, the Saxons did it; but adds, That the Saxons struck terror into their Neighbours by it, and faith, They were thought to have their Name from it, as Verfiegan himself thinks; Which were ridiculous, unless the Seaxes belong'd to the Saxons.

All the certainty we have as to the matter of the Proceedings between the Britains and Saxons is, what (e) Gildas relates, which is very Tragical, viz. "That all the Cities and Churches were burnt to the Ground, from the East to the Western Ocean; The Inhabitants destroyed by the Sword or buried in the Ruines of Houtes and Altars which were defiled with the Bloud of the Slain, in which horrible Devastation, the Rulers of the Church and the Priefts sufFered together with the Common People. So that he applies to this Desolation the Words of the Psalmist, "They have cast Fire into thy Sanctuary, they have defiled by casting down the dwelling Place of thy Name to the Ground. And, O God, the Heathen are come into thine Inheritance, thy holy Temple have they defiled, &c."

And (f) Bede faith, A Fire was kindled by the hands of the Heathens which executed Vengeance on God's People for their Sins, not unlike that of the Chaldeans which burnt Jerusalem to the Ground: So here, faith he, the wicked Conquerour prevailing, or rather the just Judge so disposing, there seem'd to be one continued Flame from one Sea to another. All publick and private Buildings demolished, the Priefts Bloud spilt upon the Altars, the Prelates and People destroy'd together by Fire and Sword, and no Man durst to give them Burial. Many of those that escaped at present, as (g) Gildas faith, had their Throats cut, and were thrown on Heaps in the V
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Mountains, or delivered themselves up to Slavery, to
avoid being famished, and thought it a Favour to be
presently dispatched, and others hid themselves am-
ong Mountains and Rocks and Woods to escape
the Fury of their Enemies, where they lived in con-
tinual Fear; and others went over into foreign
parts: Which was the Foundation of the Areemo-
rican Colony of Britains; as will appear afterwards.

But that which prevented a total Destruction of the
Britains now was, that it seems both by (h) Gildas and
(i) Bede, the Saxons having burnt so many Cities and
Towns, and driven the Remainder of the Inhabitants into
inaccessible Places, did go home for some time, "And in
that Interval, the dispersed Britains gathered togeth-
er, and after mult earnest Supplications to God,
that they might not be utterly destroyed, they made
choice of Ambrosius Aurelianus, as their King; and,
under his Conduit, God was pleased to give them
Succes: And, from that time, faith Gildas, now
one Party prevailed, and then another (whereby
God made a farther Tryal of the Britains, whether
they would love him or not) to the Battel on Ba-
don Hill, wherein the Saxons suffer'd so great a Los;
Which was forty four years after their first coming hither, as appears more plainly by Bede. But Gildas
adds, "even at this time their Cities were far from
being inhabited as formerly; And when their En-
emies gave them repit, they desperately quarrel'd
among themselves. So that we have here a Conjunc-
tion of so much Severity and Patience, such Fears and
Hopes, and yet such Defeating of these Hopes, by
their own Follies and Divisions, as commonly for-
run a Churches Destruction and a Peoples Ruine.

This is the best and truest Account of the Britifh Af-
fairs from the Saxons coming till the Government of
Ambrofius, by which we are to judge of the probabili-
ty of Nenniun his Traditions.

As to the particular Conduct of the Britifh Affairs
under Ambrofius, we have little more light than what
Traditions and Conjectures give us. However, it may
not be amifs to lay together what we can find about
them.
(k) Nennius faith little more of him, than that Vortigern was afraid of him: and afterwards he confounds him with Merlin, when he tells Vortigern, after the Story of his being without a Father, that he concealed his Father's Name out of Fear, but that his Father was one of the Roman Consuls; and so Vortigern gave him the command of the Western parts of Britain.

But (l) Geoffrey gives a more ample account of him, not only that he was one of Constantine's Sons; but that he, understanding the condition of the Britains, came over from Aremorica with his Brother Uther Pendragon and considerable Forces, and after his Revenge upon Vortigern, burning him in his Castle, he makes the Saxons to retire beyond Humber, through the terror of his Name; Whither Aurelius purfued them, and overcame Hengist in a bat Battel, who fled to Caer Conan or Conisburgh, where they fought again, and Hengist was taken by Eldol, Duke of Gloucester, and beheaded by him, according to the Advice of Eldad, then Bishop of Gloucester.

(m) Matthew Westminister transcribes these Passages out of Geoffrey, and puts them to such years as he fancies; but it is observable that he makes Aurelius Ambrosius to have fought the Battel at Wippedsheat with Hengist and his Son Æsc, 16 years before this; which according to him was seven years after his coming into Britain: So that even Matthew Westminister durst not wholly rely on Geoffrey's Relation. But, as to the death of Hengist, Florentius faith, he died after he had reigned in Kent thirty four years, and Æsc succeeded him, Anno Dom. 488. The Saxon Annals take no notice of Hengist's death, but place Æsc's Reign Anno Dom. 487.

(n) Henry of Huntingdon faith, That Hengist died the fortieth year after his coming into Britain, the 39th faith William of Malmsbury. But neither of them mentions any violent Death by the hands of his Enemies, and that after a Victory by the Britains under Aurelius Ambrosius; which are such Circumstances they could not easily have omitted, if they had then heard of them. But if they had heard of them, and yet left them out, it is a shrewd Sign, they gave no Credit to them. We are then to consider, that Geoffrey of Monmouth, ac-
cording to Leland, flourished in the time of H. I. Of
King Stephen say Bale and Pits; but Leland observes,
That he dedicated his Translation of Merlin to Alexan-
der Bishop of Lincoln, the same that was Henry of Hun-
tingdon's Patron: And William of Malmsbury dedicates
his History to the same Robert of Gloucester, Son to
Henry I. to whom Geoffrey dedicates his Translation of
the British History, who died 12 of King Stephen. So
that in all probability Geoffrey's Book was seen by both
these Historians, and since they do not follow him
where they have occasion to mention the same matters,
They plainly discover they preferr'd Nennius be-
fore him, whom both of them follow; But it appears
by H. Huntingdon he then passed under the Name of
Gildas.

But these two Historians thought it best for them to
decline taking any publick notice of Geoffrey's History, it
being so great a Novelty then, and probably enough in
some esteem with Robert of Gloucester, whose Father,
as (o) Giraldus Cambrensis faith, had lately subdued the
Britains in Wales; and such a History seemed to add
to his Father's Glory. But after Robert's death, William
of Newborough very frankly delivers his Opinion of it,
charging the Original with Falshood, and the Translatour
with Infsincerity. Geoffrey, in the Conclusion of his Hi-
story, mentions William of Malmsbury and H. of Hun-
tingdon, as then Writing the English History; But he
bids them not to meddle with the British Kings, since
they had not the British MS. which Walter of Oxford
brought out of Britain. But they do not forbear to
make use of Nennius; and Huntingdon transcribes se-
veral things out of him; But they do not enlarge or af-
ter or adorn their History in one Point from the Brit-
ish MS. although in all likelyhood set forth before
their Death.

As to what he next adds, That after his Victory over
the Saxons, Aurelius Ambrosius called the Princes and
Great Men together at York, and gave order for repai-
ing the Churches which the Saxons destroyed, there is far
greater probability in it. For after the Battle at Wippe-
fleet, which was seventeen years after the Saxons co-
ming; H. Huntingdon faith, Things remained quiet for
...
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a good while between the Britains and Saxons; and in that time it is reasonable to presume that Ambrosius and the Nobles and People did their endeavour towards the recovering the honour of their Churches, as well as of the Kingdom. And after the care he took in other places, faith Geoffrey, he marched to London, which had suffered as well as other Cities; and having called the dispersed Citizens together, he went about the repairing of it; all his design being the restoring the Church and Kingdom. From thence he went to Winchester and to Salisbury. And in the passage thither Geoffrey launches out to purpose in his History of Stonehenge, translated, faith he, by Merlin out of Ireland, to make a Monument for the British Nobles; plain there by Hengist's Treachery: Which is such an Extravagancy that it is to be wondred any should follow him in it, and yet Matt. (p) Westminster transcribes the main of it; and (q) Walf-ter Coventry sets it down for authentick History. But he adds two circumstances which make it seem probable that Stonehenge had some Relation to Ambrosius; viz: That here Ambrosius was Crowned, and was not long after buried; from whom (r) Polydore Virgil makes it the Monument of Ambrosius; and John of Timouth in the Life of Dubricius calls it Mons Ambrofii: And the Name of Ambresbury near it doth much confirm the probability, That it had rather a respect to Ambrosius, than either to the Romans or the Danes. But I cannot now insift on this.

(s) Matthew Westminister confirms Geoffrey's Relation concerning the great Zeal of Ambrosius in repairing the British Churches every where, and setting up Divine Worship in them, and giving great encouragement to the Clergy to perform all Divine Offices, and particularly to pray for the Prosperity of the Church and Kingdom. But Geoffrey adds yet farther concerning him, that in a solemn Council of the Britains he appointed two Metropolitans for the two Vacant Sees at that time, viz. Sampfon one of eminent piety for York, and Dubricius for Caer-leon. This faith Matt. Westminster was done An. Dom. 496. and he makes them both to live and flourish An. Dom. 507. But he faith, That Samp- fon was afterwards driven over to Aremorica, and there
was Archbishop of Dole among the Britains. For Anno Dom. 561. he faith, Another Sampfon succeeded in that See, the former who came out of Great Britain to the Lefts. Sigebert of the old Edition, Anno Dom. 566. speaks of Sampfon then Archibishop of Dole, Kinman to Maglorius, who came from the Britain beyond the Sea to that on this Side. This second Sampfon's Life is extant in the Bibliotheca Floriacensis, where he is said to have been born in Britain, and the Scholar of Ithamus, and consecrated by Dubricius. But (i) Giralddus Cambrensif faith, The Pall was carried over from Wales to Dole, in the time of another Sampfon, who was the 25th. from St. David, and went over because of the Plague which discoloured People like the Jaundice, and therefore called Flava Peftis: Which is tranfcribed by (u) Roger Hoveden. But here are severall Miftakes in this Account. For there was no fuch thing as a Pall then known or used in the Western Church; And if this Sampfon went over on the occasion of that Plague, there could not be 25. between St. David and him: For in the Life of St. Teliaus, St. David's Sifter's Son, that Plague is described, and then Sampfon is said to be Archibishop of Dole, and to have received Teliaus and his Company with great joy, having been School-fellows under Dubricius, and Sampfon being consecrated by him. But still we have two Sampfons Archibishops of Dole, and in the time of the great Controversie about that Archibishoprick, (of which afterwards it was a Question from which the Title was derived. And Innocent III. as Giralddus relates, said it was from this Sampfon Archibishop of York: but the Sammarthani only mention him that came from St. Davids, when Maglorius succeeded among the American Britains; but we are not yet come to them.

It is observed by H. of (w) Huntingdon, that after the Britains had a little refpite from their Enemies, they fell into Civil diffentions among themselves, which is very agreeable to what Gildas had said. Of this the (x) British Hiftory gives no improbable account, when it relates that one of Vortigern's Sons called Passentius, raised a Rebellion in the North against Ambrofius among the Britains, who were overcome by him, and put to flight; but afterwards he hired a Saxon to poi-
Chap. V.  the British Churches.

fon Ambrosius at Winchelsea. This faith Matthew Westminister happen'd Anno Dom. 497. But we are not to pass over what he affirms of him, Anno Dom. 485. viz. That he commanded in the Battel at Mecredsburn against Aella and his Sons, in which they were so much worjled as to send bone for Supplies, as he faith. This Aella and his Sons Cymen, Plenting and Cifla came into Britain, Anno Dom. 477. and landed at a place from his eldest Son called Cymenbore, on the Coasts of Sussex. (y) Camden faith it hath lost its Name; But he proves from a Charter of Cedwella to the Church of Selsey it must be near Wittering. Here Aella and his Army fought the Britains at his first Landing, and forced them to retire to Andredeswald, say the Saxon Annals, and Matt. Westminister, Florentius and Huntingdon. The Saxon Annals and Huntingdon call it Andredesleyage; by that no question is meant the vast Wood which began in Kent, and ran through Sussex into Hampshire, called by the Britains Coid Andred, by the Saxons Andred, and Andredswald; from whence as Mr. Somner observes, that part of Kent where the Wood stood is still called the Weald; and (z) Lambard observes, that no Monuments of Antiquity are to be met with in the Weald either of Kent or p. 211. Sussex. The Saxons after this Battel continued to inhabit on the Shore, till at last the Britains finding them to incroach farther, resolved to fight them at a place called Mecredsburn. And a different account is given of the Success of this Battel: The Saxon Annals and Ethelward only mention it, boasting of no Victory; Florentius makes it a clear Victory on the Saxon side: Matt. Westminster faith Aella quitted the field, but confessed the Britains had great loss: H. of Huntingdon faith, It was a drawn Battel, both Armies having sustained great damage and avoiding each other. After this Aella and Cifla, say the Saxon Annals; besieged Andredescefter and killed all the Inhabitants, leaving not one Britains alive; and so Florentius and Matt. Westminster relate it. But he (a) faith, That the Britains came out of the Wood, and galled the Saxons so much, that they were forced to divide their Army; and the Inhabitants perished by Famine as well as by the Sword: And he observes that the Saxons utterly demolished the City; and the
The place where it stood was in his time floved to Travelers. Therefore the question among our Antiquaries, which was the Anderida of the Ancients, Newenden or Haftings or Pemfley is quite out of doors, unless one of thefe be proved to be built in the place of Anderida since Matt. Weftminfler's days; which were towards the end of Edw. 3. Thofe words (b) Camden applies onely to H. of Huntington, and he faith it was new built in Edw. 1. his time; and therefore called Newenden; but they are likewise Matt. Weftminfler's who lived after that time, and therefore it cannot be Newenden if it were rebuilt in the time of Edw. 1. for he faith, The defolate place was floved in his time; unlefs one tranfcribed the other, without any regard to the difference of their own times.

After Ambrosius his death, according to the (c) Britifh History, his Brother Uther Pendragon succeeded, who routed the Saxons in the North, relieved York besieged by them, took the Sons of Hengif Prisoners, marched to London, and there called a Parliament, and was solemnly Crowned, and fell out with Galaits Duke of Cornwall, about his Wife Igerua, and under his shape had King Arthur by her; but his Husband was killed at the Siege of his Castle. After which it is faid, that he overcame the Saxons at Verulam, where he was after poisoned by their means, and his Son Arthur succeeded.

This is the fumm of what is there more at large related; but taking it all together, it is a very blind and partial account of the proceedings between the Britains and Saxons of that time. For even Matt. Weftminfler, Anno Dom. 494. takes notice of Cerdic and Kenric his Son, Landing with new Forces at a place called from him Cerdicsbore, (near Yarmouth faith (d) Camden where the name Cerdigland still remains) and fought the Britains at their first Landing, till they were forced to withdraw and leave room for them, who after went into the Western parts, and laid the foundation of the Kingdom of the Weft Saxons. To the fame purfue Florentins, Ethelwerd and Huntingdon. Seven years after him came Port and his two Sons Bleda and Magla, and arrived at Portsmouth, which had its Name from him, as the fame Authours inform us from the

Saxon
Saxon Annals. Now how comes Geoffrey to think of none of these, but only of Hengil's two Sons in the North? Besides, he lets slip one of the greatest Battles that was fought between Cerdic and Nathanleod, and pretends to give no account at all of it. This the Saxon Annals, Florentius, Ethelward and Matt. Westminister all place Anno Dom. 508. But Huntingdon the sixtieth year after the first coming of the Saxons: This Nazaleod, as he calls him, was the greatest King of the Britains, one of great Fame and Pride, from whom the Country about Charford did take its Name. At this place the whole Forces of the Britains were gathered together, and Cerdic procured assistance from Æsc of Kent, from Ælla of Sussex, from Port and his Sons; so that there was a pitched Battle of the Strength of both sides; and Nazaleod behaved himself with so much Courage, that he drove Cerdic out of the Field, and pursued him; which his Son who commanded the other Wing perceiving, followed him close and cut him off, and 5000 of his Men who fled upon the death of their King. And from this memorable Battle, the Place was called Cerdicsford, and since Charford, upon the Aven between Salisbury and Ringwood. But who was this mighty King of the Britains, who lost his Life in this Battle? (e) Mr. Camden protests he cannot guess; unless it were Aurelius Ambrosius, whose Name he observes the Saxon Annalists never mention, nor the Battles wherein they were fought. And the British History is even with them for that, which takes no notice of this great Fight, wherein their King was slain. Matt. Westminister will not have him to be King, but only to be General under Uther, who was then sick, which contradicts Ethelward, and Huntingdon, and Florentius, who affirm him to have been then King, and as Huntingdon faith Rex Maximus Britannorum; which seems to imply, that there were more Kings then among the Britains; as there were among the Saxons; and that one was the Chief as in the Heptarchy. Archbishop (f) Uther thinks this King was the same whom the Britifh History calls Uther, and that Nathanleod was his true Name, and Uther was a Nickname to denote his fierceness, as the Annotatour on X X (g) Nennius
(g) Nennius calls Arthur Mab Uther in the Britifh Tongue for the fame reafon: And fo Arthuras in Latine, from the Britifh Arth, which signifies a Bear. This is an ingenious conjecture: But we are not fo fure there ever was fuch a King as Uther, as we are from Gildas, that there was fuch a one as Ambrofius; But Gildas faith, That fome of the Race of Ambrofius were living in his time; therefore he died not without iflue, as the Britifh History supposes, and this might probably be his Son, who was flain in this Battel.

But what then is to be faid to King Arthur, who was Son to Uther, and fucceeded him; whose mighty Feats are fo amply related by the Britifh History? I think both forts are to blame about him, I mean thofe who tell Incredible Tales of him, fuch as are utterly inconsistent with the Circumfiances of the Britifh Affairs at that time; and thofe who deny there was any fuch Perfon, or of any confiderable power among the Britains. William of Malmsbury takes notice of the Britifh Fables about him, (and if I mistake not makes a fevere reflexion upon Jeffrey's History without naming it, when he faith, Hic eft Arthuras de quo Britonum Nugee bodiæ; delirant) but he wishes a true Account had been given of him, for he was the fupport of his Countrey for a long time, who fharpened the broken Spirits of the Britains, and made them Warlike. But after all, he will not allow him to have been Monarch in Britain, but only the General under Ambrofius. And in all this William keeps clofe to Nennius; for Nennius speaking of the Wars between the Britifh Kings and the Saxons, faith of Arthur, Ipfe Dux erat Bellorum; although he exceeds the bounds of Truth in the next Words, & in omnibus Bellis Victor extitit, he came off always Conquerour. If this had been true, the Saxons could never have kept footing in England. I will allow the Saxon Annals to be partial in not recounting their Loofes; and on the other fide it is unreasonable to fuppofe, that the Saxons should be always beaten, and yet always get ground even in Arthur's days. For after the great Battel wherein Nathanleod was killed, (the only Britifh King mentioned in the Saxon Annals) Cerdic's two Nephews, Stuff and Witgar, landed upon
upon Cerdocbore, which (b) Matt. Westminister here places on the Western Coasts (and not on the Eastern as Camden doth, which seems more probable, because they came with supplies to Cerdic their Uncle) but all agree, that as they fought upon their Landing, they had the better of the Britains; Huntingdon faith, It was such a Victory as laid open the Country to them; the force of the Britains being scattered, God having cast them off. Where was Arthur at this time? Again, five Years after faith Ethelwerd, Cerdic and Cenric, came the second time to Cerdicsford, and there fought the Britains; the Saxon Annals say nothing of the Victory, but Florentius gives it to the Saxons, and so doth Huntingdon, who faith, the Britains had a terrible blow that day. And as an evidence of the Saxons Conquest, Ethelwerd faith, That year Cerdic began the Kingdom of the West Saxons: From that very day faith Huntingdon, Anno Dom. 519. Here Matt. Westminister is so hard put to it, that taking in King Arthur at Anno Dom. 516, he is forced to leave out this Battel, and to tell Geoffrey's Story of King Arthur's beating the Saxons in the North about Tork and Lincoln, and driving them as far as the Caledonian Wood, and takes no notice of Cerdoc's setting up a Kingdom in the West: But the following Year, Anno Dom. 520, he brings Colgrin, Baldulp and Cheldric to Totnes with new Forces, with which they besieged Bath; And then Arthur with his Caliborn did incredible execution, for he faith, he killed 840 with his own hands, and so totally routed the Saxons; and not a word of Kerdoc or Kenric, whereas Anno Dom. 528, he remembers them again, and tells what a mighty Army they had in the Isle of Wight, which H. Huntingdon calls Witland, and what slaughter they made at Wittgaresburgh, which had its Name from Wittgar, one of Kerdoc's Nephews, to whom he gave the Isle of Wight, and was buried at Witgar faith Huntingdon.

But before this there was another Battel between Kerdoc and the Britains at Cerdics Leage; which Huntingdon makes the same with Cerdicsford, in which there was great slaughter on both sides, and in that time, he faith, many Saxons came in out of Germany.
into Eastangle and Mercia, but they were not yet formed into Kingdoms; however innumerable Battels were fought in many places by Perfons whose Names are not recorded. And now Huntingdon mentions Arthur, as a moft valiant General on the British Side, who commanded in twelve Battels, in all which he had the better; and so reckons them up in order just as (i) Nennius had done, whom he transcribes, and when he hath set down the places of the twelve Battels he confesses they were then unknown, but he adds, that there was almost perpetual fighting, in which sometimes one Side had the better and sometimes the other; but still the Saxons poured in greater Numbers upon them: And (k) Nennius faith, They increafed here without intermiffion, and fetched new Kings out of Germany to Rule over them. And then sets down the foundation of the Northern Saxon Kingdom under Ida, who govern'd all beyond the Humber twelve years, which was branched into two, Deira and Bernicia. This Kingdom began, faith Huntingdon, in the thirteenth year of the Reign of Kenric (who succeeded Kerdic) Anno Dom. 547. and Ida descended from Woden was the first King. Kenric in his eighteenth year, faith the fame Authour, fought against the Britains, who came with a powerfull Army to Salisbury, where he dispersed them and made them fly. But this is supposed to have hapned after Arthur's death, which is placed by Matt. Westminfter and others Anno Dom. 542.

We must therefore look back to judge of Arthur's prowess. We have already feen several Saxon Kingdoms established, that of Kent, of South-Saxons, of Weft-Saxons and Saxons in other parts, not yet gather'd into Kingdoms; and besides thefe, before Kerdic had gained the Isle of Wight; H. Huntingdon faith, The Kingdom of Eaf! Saxons was founded by Erkinwin, whom Slede succeeded, who married the Daughter of Ermenerick, King of Kent, Sifer of Erhelbert, and Mother to Sibert the first Christian King there. Now, if Arthur were a King fo powerfull, fo irreffifible as the British History makes him, how came all thefe Kingdoms to grow up under him? Why did he not fend the Saxons all out of Britain? Nay, how came Cerdic and Kenric to
to grow so strong in the Western parts as they did? Cerdic, faith (l) William of Malmsbury, came hither eight years after the death of Hengist, Anno Dom. 495. 

He was here 24 years before he set up his Kingdom, and lived in it 16 years. This was in the midst of Arthur's fame and greatness. If it were such as Geoffrey describes, would he have suffered such a terror to the Britains to have been so near him? (m) Ranulfus (m) Polydore. 

Hidden faith, That Arthur was so tired out with fighting Cerdic (fo weary of overcoming) that 26 years after his coming he yielded part of the West to him: And to the fame purpose (n) Rudburn speaks. What is the meaning of all this? The plain truth is, they follow'd Geoffrey as far as they could, but they found at last they must give away Cerdic's Kingdom to him; and so they had better make it a free Asl of King Arthur. 

Let us now compare with this, the Account the Britifh History gives of him: which is this in short.

(o) "After the death of Uther Pendragon the Britifh Nobility met at Silcefler, where they desired Dubricius to consecrate Arthur: For the Saxons had conquer'd from Humber to Cathnes. (It seems all was clear on this side Humber). And fo he was no sooner Crown'd but away he marches for York," (leaving the Saxons here in quiet possession) where "Childeric came with 600 Ships to assist the two Brothers Colgrin and Baldulph (whose Names the Saxon Annals conceal.) Upon this dreadful conjunction Arthur repairs to London, and calls a Parliament: And they send over to Hot King of Little-Britain, his Nephew, and who brings 15000 to his assistance at Southampton; (notwithstanding Port and his Sons were so near) then away he marches for Lincoln; and there kills 6000 Saxons, and pursues the rest into Scotland: and there dismissed them home upon promise of Tribute; but they perfidiously returned to Toines, and so marched to besiege Bath: Where after he had done the execution Matt. Westminfler related; the Saxons get upon the Hill, which Arthur by the help of his Caliburn recover'd, killed the two Brothers, and made Childeric fly, whom Cador pursues to the Isle of Thanet, (although the Son of Hengist had all Kent as
as his Kingdom.) After this he drives Gillomarus and his Irish home; and determined to root out the Scots and Picts, but upon great submission he spared them. This being done he returns to York, where he rebuilds the Churches, and setteth Pyramus Archbishop in the place of Samson, and restores the British Nobility. Next Summer he goes for Ireland, and having subdued that, he fails for Iceland, (not then inhabited) but upon notice of his coming, the Kings of Seland and the Orcades yielded themselves. Then he returns home and settles the Nation in a firm peace for twelve years (although the Saxons were every where about them.) After which time, his Name was dreaded abroad, and away he fails for Norway, and there conquer'd Riculfus and the whole Countrye: from thence to Gaul, where he chopped in pieces the Head of Flolos the Gavernour in single Combat, and disposed the several Provinces to his Servants, and returning home resolved to keep a solemne Court at Caer-leon, (this was well thought upon, for we reade of no Saxons thereabouts) where besides several Kings the three Metropolitans met, of London, York and Caerleon, besides all his Nobility. But to pass over the great Solemnities there, the Emperour Lucius (not to be found elsewhere) fends to demand Tribute on the account of Julius Caesar's Conquest, upon which he makes great preparations to conquer Rome; and leaves Britain to Mordred his Nephew, who rebelled against him, and forced him to return home, when after he had conquer'd Lucius, he was marching for Rome: and here Mordred had asociated Saxons, Scots and Picts, all against Arthur; but upon his coming the other fled to Wincheffer, from thence to Cornwall, where near the River Camblan he waited for Arthur's coming, the issue of the Battel was, Mordred was killed, and Arthur mortally wounded, who was carried into the Island of Avalon, and there died and was buried.

This is the British Legend of King Arthur, which hath raised the laughter of some, and the indignation of
of others. William of Newburgh was the first who openly and in plain terms charged it with falsity and inconsistency; but against some parts of it he makes trifling objections; as about the Three Archbishops, denying that the Britains had any Archbishops, because the first Pall was given to Augustine the Monk. But this was a piece of Monkish ignorance in him, for there were Metropolitans before, and without Palls from Rome; and Archbishops or Metropolitans did assume the use of Palls to themselves, without asking the Pope's leave; and when he faith Archbishops came so late into the Western Churches, it is true the use of the word did; but the jurisdiction over Provinces was long before, as I have already shew'd.

Upon the reviving of Learning some were so offended at this ridiculous Legend, that they questioned whether ever there were such a Person as Arthur, against whom Leland undertook the defence of King Arthur. But some of his Authors will not be allow'd to bear witness in this cause, being partial followers of Geoffrey; such as Alfred of Beverley, Gray the Author of Scala-Chronicon, Job. Burgenfs, Job. Rosf, &c. Others do not speak home to the point, such are the Testimonies of Nennius, Malmesbury, Huntingdon, which make him onely General of the British Forces; others are too modern, as Trithemius, Valerianus, Philipus Bergomas, Naucerus, Hector Boethius, Pontius Vinarinus, &c. Others overthrew the main part of it, as to Arthur's Sovereign Dominion in Britain, as the Chronica Divitionensis, which faith, That after several Combats Cerdic had the possession of the West Saxon Kingdom by Arthur's consent: and as parts of this Kingdom he reckons Seven whole Provinces from Surry to Cornwall. But the Britifh History takes no notice of Cerdic, but supposes all under Arthur's command, and his Nephew Mordred's in his absence. If Cerdic had the West-Saxon Kingdom, then how comes no notice of him in the Battel at Camblan? how came the fight within his Territories? Again, the Author of the Life of Gildas cited by him, faith, That one Meluas had stolen his Wife Guenhere, and defiled her, and that Arthur a long time besieged him in the Marshes near Glasfenbury. Is this

(q) Auct. Art. thuri, p. 4, 5.
this agreeable to the mighty power of King Arthur, to have his Queen detained by force so long by such an inconsiderable Person as Meluas? Especially if it were as Caradoc of Luncarvan there faith, She was restored at last, more by the intreaty of Gildas than out of respect to Arthur’s Authority. As to Arthur’s Seal which he lays so much weight upon, it certainly belonged to the Diploma he gave to the University of Cambridge, in his time, mentioned by Leland; and the Church of Westminster, if they have it still, ought to restore it. But after all Leland hath sufficiently proved, That there was such a Person as King Arthur from the Cair-Arture in Wales, two Mountains so called; And Arthur’s Gate in Mongomery; and the abundant Testimony he brings about his Coffin in Lead found in Glassenbury, either in Henry the Second’s time, or at least in the beginning of Richard the First, with an Inscription set down often by him, and more exactly by (r) Camden. Where the Letters appear very rude, and the Inscription very plain, and therefore more likely to be true.

**HIC JACET SEPULTUS INCLITUS REX ARTU RIVS IN INSULA AVALONIA.**

Where are all the Noble Titles given him in the British History and contained in the Inscription about his Seal?

**PATRICIUS ARTU RIVS BRITANNIAE, GALLIÆ, GERMANIÆ, DACIÆ, IMPERATOR.**

So much greater a Man was Arthur living, when he used this Seal, than dead, when so mean an Inscription was put upon the lower part of his Leaden Coffin! How soon were all his great Titles forgotten!

But since Leland, Sir John (s) Price hath undertaken to vindicate the Story of King Arthur: and the first Argument he uses is from the Inscription on his Coffin, and
and the Antiquity of the Letters; but the mod.fty of the Inscription is a better Argument to me; for if the Monks designed a Cheat in Hen. II. his time, and laid this Coffin there on purpose to deceive, they might counterfeit such Letters, but they could never have held from speaking more glorious things of so great a Heroe. Then he produces the Testimonies of Nennius, Malmsbury and Huntingdon, and proves that these two could not take out of Geoffrey; that they did not I grant, but the other is not proved. The Verbes of Thaliescin (who he faith lived in the time of Maglocunus mentioned by Gildas) do prove That Arthur commanded in the Battel at Badon Hill, which I see no reason to question; but Polydore Virgil will have Aurelius Ambrosius to doe it, which I see no reason to believe. Besides, he quotes old Britifh Chronicles, which reckon from Vortigern to the Battel on Badon Hill, wherein Arthur beat the Saxons, 128 years; from that Battel to the Battel at Camblan wherein Arthur was killed, 22 years. And he finds the Name of Arthur in many ancient Britifh Poems; and in the old Register of Landaff: But that only proves, there was one Arthur, whose Son's Name was Noe; but what is more material, he finds some passages agreeing with Geoffrey in the old Chronicles of St. Davids and Caer-Mardin, as to his fighting against Lucius Hiberus in Burgundy, and the Battel at Camblan; but it doth not appear, that these Chronicles were before Geoffrey's time. As to King Arthur's Crown and Seal, they may go together. But as to Gildas his Silence, from whence some would prove that there was no such Person, he answers from Giraldus, that Arthur having killed his Brother Hoel, he purposely left him out, which is no clear Answer; For if Gildas did this in revenge, he would rather have mentioned his Cruelty, as we see he spares not the Kings of his own time. But his better Answer is, That Gildas design'd no History, but a serious exhortation to the Britains to repent of their Sins, and therefore passes over other things, onely by the by mentioning Ambrofius Aurelianus, and addresses himself to his main busines; which is reason enough why he never names King Arthur.
Job. (x) Forson follows Geoffrey, as far as he thinks consistent with the honour of his Country. This appears in the Story of King Arthur; for he faith, he was set up by a Faction against the lawfull Heirs, who were Mordred and Walwan, the Sons of Uther's Daughter by Loth, then a great Man in Scotland; but defended from Fulgentius; but he after excuses it, on the account of necessity, which Dubricius alledged, they being then under age so much, as not to be able to go into the Field. But he justifies Mordred's Rebellion afterwards against Arthur on this ground, that he had the right Title to the Crown. (v) He for Boethius faith, That Lothius put in his claim, according to the ancient Law of the Britains, and that he ought to have the Regency during the Minority of his Sons; But the Britains would by no means hear of Strangers coming to their Crown; and so Arthur took possession of it; who first conquer'd the Saxons 10 Miles from London, then took London (which it seems the Saxons had before) and so went towards Humber; and then he goes on with the Britifh History, only interfering some News of his own. Particularly he tells what a profane Christmas Arthur kept with his Nobles at York for thirteen days together; And that such Jollity and Feasting then had its original from him. (w) Buchanan is so pleased with this notable observation, that he sets it down for good History; saying upon it, that the old Saturnalia were renewed, only the Days increased; and Saturn's Name changed to Cæsar's, for, faith he, we call that Feat Julia. But why should the Name of Saturn be changed into Cæsar's? Was he worshipped for a God among the Britifh Christians, as Saturn was among the Old Pagans? But the Name Julia imports it: by no means. For Buchanan doth not prove that this Name was ever used for that Fesivial among the Britains; And the Saxons who brought in both the Feast and the Name give another reason for it. For (x) Bede faith, That December was called Giulü from the conversion of the Sun and the increas of the days. And Giul, as (y) Locceniuss observes, signified a Wheel, or any thing that turns round, in the Gothick Language. At which time among the Northern Nations, the Feast of the New Year was ob-
ferved with more than ordinary jollity; thence as \((z)\) O't (z) Edfi Danhi

Ianus Wornius and (a) Scheffer observe they reckon'd

their Age by so many Isla's, and Snorri Sturluson des-

cribes this New-years Feast, just as Buchanan sets out

the Britisht Saturnalia, by feasting and sending Presents

or New-years Gifts to one another: Thence some think

the Name of this Feast was taken from Isla, which in

the Gotbick Language signifies to make merry. But

(b) Olaus Rudbeck thinks the former more proper, not

only from Bede's Authority, but because in the old

Ronick Fafli a Wheel was used to denote that Festival:

And as he observes, this Festival continued twelve days

from their part of the Juul. The true reason whereof

was, as Olaus Rudbeck at large proves, from the Joy

they had at the hopes of the return of the Sun; at which

time they made Solemn Sacrifices to the Sun. But af-

ter Chrisitianity prevailed, all their Idolatrous Sacrifices

were laid aside, and this time of Feasting was joined

with the Religious Solemnities of that Season, which in

other parts of the World were observed by Chris-

tians. Which is certainly a very different thing from the

Roman Saturnalia, although Buchanan thought fit

to parallel them.

But to proceed with the Story of King Arthur, as it is

in Buchanan, who takes his Materials from Heceor, and

puts them into a finer dress. Arthur, he faith, made

a League with the Scots and Picts, and Lothius brought

his Sons to him: And then a resolution was taken to drive

out the Saxons, and to restore Chrisitianity; Then follow'd

the Battel against Colgrin, of which before: And the

rest of Arthur's Battels: But upon the whole, he con-

cludes that Geffrey's Relations have no colour of Truth; and

yet he makes use of no other, but where he follows

Hector's own Inventions. The remainder of his Story

is, "That things being quieted here, Arthur goes over

into Leffer Britain, and leaves the Government to his

Nephew Mordred; But while he was abroad, some

had prevailed with him to declare Constantin the Son

of Cador his Successflour being born in Britain; which

being done, Mordred set up for himself, and in a Bat-

tel about Humbre, faith he, Mordred was killed, and

Arthur mortally wounded. Thus Buchanan having

Y y 2 picked
picked what he thought fit out of *Hector*, concludes with a bitter *Inventive* against the fabulous Relations about *Arthur*; But he gives him an extraordinary Character, saying, he was certainly a great Man, of mighty Courage and wonderfull kindness to his Countrey; preserving them from Slavery, and keeping up or restoring the true Religion.

And that is the Subject I am now to consider, *viz.* The *State of Religion* here in *King Arthur's* days. It was under great Persecution almoit wherever the Saxons came, who were cruel both to the Bodies and Souls of the poor Britains: Moft of the Southern and Western parts were under their *Tyranny*; and (c) *Brian Tywne* quotes a passage out of *Matt. Westminister*, which is not so full in the printed Copies, concerning the Persecution of the British Christians in the Eastern parts of the Land. For, *faith* he, *Anno Dom. 527. The Pagans came out of Germany, and took possession of the Countrey of the East-Angles, & omni crudelitatis genere Christianos affecerunt, They tormented the Christians with all sorts of Crueltie. Although this be wanting in other Copies, yet it may be reasonably presumed, The Saxons using the British Christians in such a manner in the most places where they prevailed. It is true that (d) *Malmesbury faith, many of the Britains submitted to Cerdic, and it is probable they were the better used for doing so. Tho. (e) *Rudburn faith, That Cerdic allow'd Liberty of professing the Christian Religion to the Cornish upon a certain Tribute. I rather think that Cerdic never went so far, but left that part to the Britains, who still continued there: For in *Gildas* his time Constantine is said to be King of the Danmonii: and (f) *Camden* observes out of *Marianus Scotus*, that *Anno Dom. 820. the Britains and Saxons had a terrible Fight at Camelford in Cornwall, which Leland thinks to have been Camlan, where King Arthur fought with Mordred, and near which is a Stone, faith Mr. (g) Carew, which bears Arthur's Name; but now called Ary. To prove what I have said, that the West-Saxon Kingdom did not extend to Cornwall, we may observe that (h) *William of Malmesbury faith, That Ceaulin, Granchild to Cerdic, was the first who took Gloucester, Circest
celter and Bath from the Britains, and drove them thence into the Rocky and Woody places: And in the time of Athel- 
flan, above 400 years after the coming of the Saxons; the Cornish Britains did inhabit in Exeter, and were 
driven thence by him beyond the River Tamar, and 
confined by that, as the other Britains were by the 
Wye. This shews that the Britains in Cornwall, and 
thereabouts, were free from the Toke of the West-Sa- 
xon Kingdom. As to the Northern Britains, they came 
to some agreement after a while with Occa and Ebusa, whom 
Hengift sent thither; and that they had their 
own Government, and the Christian Religion among 
them appears by the History of Ceadwalla, a Prince of 
thefe Britains in (i) Bede. But these were but small rem- 
nants in the Northern and Western parts. As to the 
Eastern, we have had the Testimony of Matt. Weftmin- 
sfer already. And although the Kingdom of the East-
Angles did not begin till afterwards, about Anno Dom. 575. 
yet in the ninth year of Cerdic, about Anno Dom. 517. 
Huntingdon observes, That many Angles or Saxons were 
come out of Germany, and took pooffeion of the Coun-
trey of the East-Angles and Mercia, and wherever they 
prevailed, the poor Britifh Christians sufered to the high-
cft extremity. Which is enough to considering Men 
to overthrow the credit of the supposed Diploma of 
King Arthur to the University of Cambridge, which bears 
date Anno Dom. 531. But Brian Twyne hath brought 
no fewer than 15 Arguments against it, which are far 
more than needed. For I cannot think that Dr. Cajus 
in earnest believed it, for he goes not about to prove 
the Diploma, but King Arthur; And I cannot think it 
any honour or Service to fo famous and ancient an 
University, to produce any such refpefted Diplomata 
or Monfih Legends to prove its Antiquity. It is not 
certain in whole pooffeion London was at that time; 
from whence the Charter is dated. For the Kingdom 
of the East-Saxons was then set up by Erkinwin, and 
London commonly was under that, and that Kingdom 
as (k) Malmsbury observes, had the fame limits which the 
Diocefe of London now hath, viz. Essex, Middle-
sex, and part of Hartfordshire: (i) Matt. Weftminster a-
grees, that Middlesex was under the Kingdom of the East-
Saxons.
Saxons, but he will not yield that Theonus Bishop of London did retire with his Clergy into Wales till Anno Dom. 586: and then he confesses that he and Thadio, Bishop of York, when they saw all their Churches demolished, or turned into Idol Temples, did for their security retire thither.

And there was the free Exercise of their Religion kept up, even in the Reign of King Arthur; There flourished the Schools of Literature set up by Dubricius and Illitus, and there were the Persons of greatest Reputation for Learning and Sanctity in the British Churches, such as Dubricius, Illitus, Paulinus, Guilleus, Cadocus, Sampson, Paternus, Daniel, and St. David above the rest, whose Reputation continues to this day, and was preferred in the Saxon Churches of Britain, as appears by the Breviary of Salisbury, where nine Leffons are appointed upon his day; And (m) Mathew observes that this was by a Provincial Constitution in the Province of Canterbury. But the nine Leffons were taken out of the first Chapter of the Legend of his Life, a little being added at the end concerning his Death. It is the just complaint of (n) Bollandus, that there is nothing extant concerning him, which was written near his own time; and what is extant hath many fabulous mixtures, so that it is hard to find out the Truth. The oldest MS. of his Life he faith is that of Utrechti, which he hath published; the next he accounts is that in Colganus, which he would have thought to be the Life written by Ricemarchus, quoted by Archbishop (o) Usher, whom he supposes to have lived before Giraldus Cambrensis, who transcribed much out of him. But Colganus withall intimates, That the Life was taken out of an old Book, wherein Augustin Macraidin, the Author of the Annals of Ulter, had written many things, and probably might write that too; and to confirm this Bollandus observes, only a little difference in Style between this and the Utrechti MS. But if we add to these, Giraldus his Life, with that of John of Timmouth, or Capgrave, we hall after all find, the Life of St. David, not much clearer than that of his Nephew Arthur, for he is supposed to have been Uncle to him by the Mother's side, whose Name is said to be

Nonita

\(m\) Trophae Congr. Bened. Th. i. p. 263.

\(n\) Acts Samp. Mar. i. § 16.5.

\(o\) Prim. p. 845, 844.
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Nonnita in Capgrave; Noma in the Utrecht MS. Nemata in Colganus, Melari in the Life of St. Kenna; fo Colganus and Bollandus say; But in Capgrave I find Melari said to be the Mother to the Father of St. David, i.e. to Xantus King of the Provincia Ceretica, i.e. Cardiganshire (fo called from Ceretus Father to Xantus fay fome; from Caracitus, who ruled here, as (p) Camden seems (q) Brip. p. 518. inclinable to believe) That Melari was one of the 12 Daughters of Brachanus King of Brecknock; from whom, (q) Giraldus faith, the County took its Name; (q) Lifer. Capt. And he faid from the British Histories that he had 24 Daughters; but Capgrave faith he had 12 Sons and 12 Daughters. D. Powell in his Notes on Giraldus faith, this Brachanus his Father was Haulaphus, King of Ireland, and his Mother a Britain, viz. Marcella Daughter to Theodoric Son of Tethwolfus King of Garthmalrin afterwards called Brecknock; Another Daughter of Brachanus, he faith, was Wife to Congenus Son to Cadel, King of Powifland, and Mother of Brochmiel, who killed Etheldred King of Northumberland, and routed his Army about Anno Dom. 602. By this we fee what a Number of Petty Princes there was about that time among the Britains; but whether St. David were Uncle by the Mother to King Arthur or not, we have not light enough to discover. I shall pafs over all the Legendary parts of his Life; and confider onely what relates to the Church-History of those times. His Domesflick Education is faid to have been under Paulenus or Paulinus a Disciple of St. German; with whom he continued ten years; in the Isle of Wight, faith Giraldus, but it faems more probable to have been White- land in Cermardenshife; the School of Ilutus being not far off in Glamorganfhirfe at Lantwitt, i.e. Fanum Iluti; and in his Life it is faid, that he came to the King of Glamorgan; and after, that Sampfon, Paulinus, Gildas and David were his Scholars. But Bollandus fhews, that there muft be a mistake as to David; and that instead of him it should be read Daniel, who was a Disciple of Ilutus, and confecrated firft Bishop of Bangor by Dubricius. After this it is faid, that David and Eliud, or Teliaus, and Paternus went to Jerusalem, and David was there confecrated Bishop by the Patriarch. And it
it is not to be wondred, that in such a distracted time
at home, they should go to Jerusalem, when (r) Saint
Jerome in his time mentions the Britains going thither;
especially such as were more inclined to Devotion;
which humour spread so much, that Gregory Nyffen
wrote against it, as a thing very much tending to Su-
perstition if not arising from it. But it was most ex-
cusable in such a troublesome time at home. Not
long after his return, the famous Synod at Brevy was
held at a place called Lbandewy-brevy, the Church of
Saint David at Brevy. Here the Utrecht MS. faith,
was a Synod assembled of all the Bishops of Britain upon
the account of the Pelagian Controversie then revived.
Giral dus faith, It was a general Convention of Clergy and
Laity. But the former MS. faith, there were present
118 Bishops, besides Abbats and others. One would
think it hard to find so many Bishops in Britain at that
time: And Bollandus startles at it, but Colganus under-
takes to defend it; having premised that Giral dus and
Capgrave leave it out; But he faith, there were more
Bishops at that time than afterwards; and more Bi-
sops than Bisbopricks, Dioceses not being then so limi-
ted as afterwards; And every Monastery almost having
a Bipsop its Superiour; By which means he justifies Saint
Patrick's consecrating, as Jocelin faith, 350 Bishops with
his own hands. But after all this, Giral dus did much
better to omit such a number in such a time, unless
there were better Testimony concerning it. Howe-
ver there was a considerable number there present,
yet St. David was absent, and first Paulinus was sent to
him, but he prevailed not, then Daniel and Dubricius
went, upon whose intreaty he came, and by his Au-
thority and Eloquence put an effectual stop to Pelagia-
nism: And before the end of the Synod it is said, That
by general Consent he was chosen Archbipsop of Caerleon,
Dubricius defiring to retire on the account of his Age.

But here we meet with a considerable difficulty con-
cerning the Succeffion to Dubricius, viz. That Telsias
is said to succeed Dubricius at Landaff, and to have
power over all the Churches of the Western parts of Bri-
tain; How can this be consistent with St. David's
succeeding Dubricius in the See of Caerleon, which
had
had the **Metropolitan Power** over those Churches? (s) Bishop Godwin out of Bale, and as he supposed, out of Leland faith, That St. Dubricius was first Bishop of Landaff being there consecrated by Germanus and Lupus, and that afterwards he was removed by a Synod to Caerleon, and Teliaus placed in Landaff. But this by no means clears the difficulty; for although Bale doth there exactly follow Leland, yet Leland himself did not seem to have consulted the Book of Landaff; Where it is said, That when Dubricius was made Archbishop, he had the See of Landaff conferred upon him, by the Gift of Mauritius then King, and the three Estates, i.e. the Nobles, Clergy and People, and all the Land between the Taff and Elei: And (t) Leland himself out of another Author faith, That when Dubricius was made Archbishop, Landaff was made his Cathedral Church. After Dubricius his time Teliaus is said to be Archbishop several times in the Book of Landaff; and after him Oudoceus is called Summus Episcopus; and the Bishop of Landaff in his Petition to Calixtus 2. Anno Dom.1109, faith, That it appears by the hand writing of St. Teliaus, That the Church of Landaff was superior in dignity to all other Churches in Wales. That which seems to me the most probable account of this matter is, That when Landaff was given to Dubricius then Archbishop, he fixed his See there, and so Landaff was the Seat of the Archbishop of Caerleon. But afterwards when St. David removed the Archiepiscopal See to Menevia, a remote, barren and inconvenient place, as Giraldus himself confesseth; The Bishops of Landaff assumed the Archiepiscopal Power, which had been in that See, and would not submit to the Bishops of St. Davids. This is apparent from that passage of Oudoceus (who succeeded Teliaus) in the Book of Landaff, that he would not receive Consecration from the Bishop of St. Davids; as his Metropolitan, but had it from the Archbishop of Canterbury. This is a very improbable thing at that time considering the hatred the Britains did bear to the Saxons, and their Bishops to Augustine the Monk: It is far more likely that they received it from the Archbishop of Dole in Britain; or from the Archbishop of London then resident in those parts; who probably kept up their Succession for some time, as long as there were any hopes of returning to their own See, as is before observed.

After this Giraldus speaks of another great Council held...
held by St. David, which he calls Victoria; in which he faith all the Clergy of Wales were present; And the Decrees of the former Council were confirmed, and new Canons made for the Government of the British Churches; But this Second Synod is not mentioned in the old Utrecht MS. nor in Capgrave, but it is in Colganus, and by the Expressions it appears to have been taken out of Giraldus, who confesseth, that no Copies of those Canons were to be seen in his time, that Coast being so often vifited by Pirts, (who no doubt came to steal MSS. and especially Church-Canons.) I will not deny that the British Churches at that time, and in those parts might be faid to be in a flourishing condition in comparison with other parts of Britain, and there might be more Christians there, because they had been driven out from other places; and their Brethrens afflictions might encrease their Devotion; But Gildas takes no more Notice of St. David than he doth of King Arthur. The Battel at Badon-hill according to Archbishop Uther, was the year after the Synod at Breby, and from that time the British Churches had some quiet from their Enemies: But then (u) Gildas faith, The Britains quarrelled among themselves, but yet so as that fome kind of Order and Government was then kept up among them, by the Remembrance of their late Calamities. And at this time he speaks the best of the Britains, that he doth in his whole Book; for he faith, That Kings and Publick and Private Persons, Bishops and other Churchmen (for Sacerdotes in that Age often signified Bishops, and Gildas calls it Sacerdotalem Episopatus Sedem) did all keep to the Duty of their places. But then he adds, when the Sense of these Calamities was worn out, and a new Generation arose, they fell into fuch a degeneracy as to cast off all the Reins of Truth and Justice, that no remainder of it appear'd in any sort of Men, except a few; a very few; whose number was fo small in comparison with the rest, that the Church could hardly difcern its genuine Children when they lay in her Bosome.

But before I come to this laft and faddest part of the History of the British Churches it will be necessary now to give some Account of those Britains, who being wearied out here went for Refuge to that Country in France, which from them is called Bretagne.
Chap. V. the British Churches.

It seems hard to determine when the first Colony of Britains was settled in the parts of Aremorica. For in the declining times of the Roman Empire, there was so frequent occasion of the British Soldiers removing into the Continent, and so little encouragement to return thither, that it is not improbable, that after the Troubles of Maximus and Constantine a Colony of Britains might settle themselves upon the Sea Coasts near to Britain, where they might be ready to receive or to go over to their Countrymen; as the Condition of affairs should happen. This I am very much induc'd to believe, not from the Authority of Nennius, or Geoffrey, or William of Malmsbury, or Radulphe Niger, &c. but from these Arguments;

First from Sidonius Apollinaris; and there are two passages in him which tend to the clearing this matter; the first is concerning Aruanus accused at Rome of Treason, in the time of Anthemius, for persuading the King of the Goths to make War upon the Greek Emperor, i.e. Anthemius, who came out of Greece, and upon the Britains on the Loir, as (w) Sidonius Apollinaris expressly affirms, who lived at that time, and pitied his case. This happened about Anno Dom. 467. before Anthemius was the second time Consul. From whence it appears, not only that there were Britains then settled on the Loir, but that their Strength and Forces were considerable, which cannot be supposed to consist of such miserable People as fled from hence for fear of the Saxons: And it is observable, that about this time Ambrosius had success against the Saxons, and by Vortimer's means, or his, the Britains were in great likelihood of driving them out of Britain; so that there is no probability that the Warlike Britains should at that time leave their Native Countrey. A second passage is concerning Rietamnus, a King of the Britains in the time of (x) Sidonius Apollinaris, and to whom he wrote, who went with 12000 Britains to assist the Romans against Euricus King of the Goths, but were intercepted by him, as (y) Fornandes relates the Story, and Sigeberti places it Anno Dom. 470. Now what clearer Evidence can be desired than this, to prove that a considerable Number of Britains were there settled, and
in a condition not only to defend themselves, but to allst the Romans; which cannot be imagined of such as merely fled thither after the Saxons coming into Britain. Besides we find in Sirmondus his Gallican Councils, Manuets a Bishop of the Britains subscrib- ing to the first Council at Tours, which was held Anno Dom. 461. By which we see the Britains had so full a settlement then, as not only to have Habitations, but a King and Bishops of their own; which was the great encouragement for other Britains to go over, when they found themselves so hard pressed by the Saxons at home. For a People frightened from hence, would hardly have ventured into a foreign Countrey, unless they had been secure before hand of a kind reception there. If they must have fought for a dwelling there, had they not far better have done it in their own Countrey? From whence I conclude, that there was a large Colony of Britains in Aremorica before those Numbers went over upon the Saxon Cruelties; of which (z) Eginhardus and other foreign Historians speak. Archbifhop Usher seems to think this Riotha- mus himself to have been the first Leader of them; But it is hard to think a Person of his Valour and Experience would leave his Countrey in that distressed Condi- tion it was brought into by the Saxons.

But (a) Florentius the Author of the Life of Jude- cus Son to a King of Bretagn faith, That his Name was Rioval, a Prince here in Britain, who gathered a good Army and Fleet together, and with that subdued the Peo- ple who lived on the Aremorican Coasts, being then left destitute and unable to defend themselves. For that was the effect of the Roman Government, which was kept up by the force of the Roman Legions in all parts of it, and so when these were broken, the Nations were fo unaccustomed to War, that they lay open to all Invad- ers. So that the Aggressors did generally succeed in their attempts where the Roman Legions were with- drawn: and next to the wise Providence of God which ordereth all things, there was no one cause which con- tributed so much to the miseries of those times, and the strange Revolutions which hapned in them, as the Natives being not trained up to Martial Discipline, but
but depending wholly on the Roman Legions for their Defence and security; thence, whatever People had the Courage to invade, did usually take possession of the Country where the Roman Legions were at a distance, or otherwise engaged against each other. Thus in France, the Goths, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Britains took possession of the several parts they attempted; and the Goths and Vandals in Spain: So Goths and Lombards in Italy itself. So that it is not to be wondered, if the Saxons prevailed here at first; but with as much difficulty, and after as many Battles, as were fought by any People of that time without foreign Assistance. But to return to the Aemorican Britains, whether they came over under Riwal in the beginning of the dispositions here, when the People were so Rebellious against their Princes, as Gildas relates, or whether they went over to assist Constantine and his Son, and so remained there, I shall not determin. But that the Britains were well settled there before Sampson Archbishop of York, and his Company passed the Seas, appears by what (b) Mat. Paris faith, That they (b) A.D. 1155 went to their fellow Citizens and Country Men, hoping to live more quietly there. And after the death of the Bishop of Dole, he was by the consent of the Britains put into his Place, and from thenceforwards exercised his Archiepiscopal power there; the Kings of that Province, not suffering his Successors there to pay any Obedience to the Archbishop of Tours. Which begot a Suit which held 300 years in the Court of Rome, and was this year manfully decided by Innocent III. as Mat. Paris there relates: Who states the Case very unskilfully, laying the weight of it upon the Archbishop’s bringing over his Pall from York, which the Pope had given him there. Suppose this were true (although the Popes gave no Palls then, nor a great while after) yet this were no reason to contest it in the Court of Rome so long together. But the difficulty of the Case lay upon another point, viz. according to the Old Canon of the Church, If a Province were divided into two, each Province was to have a Metropolitan; Now this Reason held much stronger when new Kingdoms were erected out of the Roman Provinces: For what Reason was
was there why the Bishop of Dole in the Kingdom of BreTAG should yield subjection to the Bishop of Tours in a distinct Kingdom? and there was the fairer Colour for this when one actually an Archbishop before came to be settled there; and from hence they infisted on a Prescription of a very long time, wherein no Subjection had been made to the Bishop of Tours, as appears by the account given of this Caufe by (c) Innocent III. in his Epifiles lately published by Baluzius. On the other side it was pleaded, that all Britain was under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Tours, but that the Britains conspiring against the King of France, and setting up a Kingdom of their own, they made use of Sampfon, Archbishop of York, coming to establish a Metropolitian power within that Kingdom: and upon Complaint made to Rome, the Popes had put it upon this issue, whether any of their Predecessors had granted the Pall to the Bishop of Dole, which not being proved, the Pope, as it was easie to imagine, gave Sentence against the Bishop of Dole. But it is certain, that they went upon a fable Suggestion, viz. That the Kingdom of Bretagn was set up in Rebellion to the Kingdom of France. For Childeric had not extended his Dominions in France as far as the Loir: and before his time, the Britains were in quiet possession of those parts of Aremorica; and the best (d) French Historians now grant that the Britains came thither in the time of Merovie, who obtained but little in Gaul, as (e) Hadrianus Valentinus confesseth. And the (f) Authour of the Life of Gildas observes, That the Power of the Kings of France was very inconsiderable in the time of Childeric, Son of Merovée, at what time Gildas went over into Aremorica, as his School-fellows under Iltutus, Sampfon and Paulus had done before him; whereof one succeeded the other Sampfon at Dole, and the other was made Bishop of the Oxilmii, the most Northern People of Bretagn; which Diocese is since divided into Three, Treguier, S. Pol de Leon, and S. Brieu.

Here Gildas at the request of his Brethren who came out of Britain, faith the Authour of his Life, wrote his Epifile, wherein he so sharply reproves the several Vices of the five Kings of Britain, whom he calls by,
by the Names of Constantine, Aurelius, Vortiporius, Cuneglafus and Maglocunus; and speaks to them all as then living. The (g) Britifh History makes them to succeed each other; Constantine, according to that, was killed in his third year by Aurelius Conanus. He died in his second year, and Vortiporius succeeding him Reigned four years. After him he places Malgo, and leaves Cuneglafus wholly out. But that they Reigned at the same time in several parts of Britain is evident from Gildas, because he faith, He knew that Constantine was then living; Now Constantine Reigning the first of these, how could he speak to the four Kings that succeeded him, if he were still living? For there is no colour, for imagining that Gildas still added his Reproof as one died and another succeeded; for any one may discern it was written in one continued style, and he writes to them all as then living without the least intimation that they succeeded each other: Besides, he calls Constantine the Jfue of the impure Damnonian Lionefs; and at this time the Britains in the remote Western parts were separated from the other by the West Saxon Kingdom; and therefore there is far less Probability that all the Britains at that time should be under one Monarch. And where they had greatest freedom of living together, they were divided into several Principalities. For he, whom Gildas calls Maglocunus, is by the Britifh Writers called Maelgwn Guineb, and Maiugnas mentioned by John of Tinmouth, in the Life of St. Paternus, and by Thalieffin in Sir John Price, from whom it appears that he was King of North-Wales. And as Gildas calls Vortiporius the Tyrant of the Demeta, by whom the Inhabitants of South-Wales are understood: Aurelius Conanus, Archbishop (b) Other thinks was King of Powisland; which was (c) Fam. p. 237: sometime a third Kingdom. And for Cuneglafus, it seems probable, he had the Command of the Northern Britains; for it is plain from Bede they had a distinct Principality there. All these Gildas doth very severely reprove for their several Vices; and then taxes the Judges and Clergy to the Conclusion of his Epifile; to the end they might repent of their Sins, and acquit the just and wise Providence of God in the judgments he brought upon
upon them, which were very terrible, and ended in the
desolation of the Countrey and the ruine of the Britifh
 Churches, excepting only those Remnants which were
confined to the Corners of the Land. For our (i) Hi-
storians say, That the Saxons left not the Face of Christi-
anity wherever they did prevail.

This is a very sad Subject, which ought not to be
passed over without that Reflexion which St. (k) Paul
made on the Church of the Jews and Gentiles.

Behold the goodness and severity of God; on them which
fell severity, but towards thee goodness; if thou continue
in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

It remains only, that we consider the Liberty or
Independency of the Britifh Churches; of which we can
have no greater Proof than from the Carriage of the
Britifh Bifhops towards Auguftin the Monk, when he
came with full power from the Pope to require Subjeftion
from them. And this material point relating to the
Britifh Churches I shall endeavour to clear from all the
Objections which have been made against it. In order
thereto, we are to understand, That (l) Auguftin the
Monk by virtue of the Pope's Authority, did challenge a
Superiority over the Bifhops of the Britifh Churches, which
appears not only by Gregory's Answer to his Interrogati-
ons, but by the Scheme of the Ecclefiaftical Government
here, which Gregory sent to him, after he had a fair pro-
spect of the Conversion of the Saxons, which was at the
same time that he sent Mellitus, Jufius, Paulinus and Ru-
finianus, with the Archiepifcopal Pall to him. There he
declares that there were to be two Archbifhops Sees,
one at London (which out of honour to Ethelbert or
Auguftin was fixed at Canterbury, or rather by Ethel-
bert's own Authority) and the other at York, which
had been a Metropolitan See in the Britifh times, and
both these Archbifhops were to have twelve Suffragan
Bifhops under them. The Bifhop of London was to
be consecrated by his own Synod, and to receive the
Pall from the Pope; But Auguftin was to appoint the
first Bifhop of York, who was to yield Subjeftion to
him for his time, but afterwards the Sees were to be
Independent on each other. But by all this, it should
seem, that he had Authority given him only over those
Bifhops.
Bishops who were consecrated by him, and the Archbishop of York; what then becomes of those Bishops in Britain who were consecrated by neither, and such they knew there were? Concerning these Gregory gives a plain Answer, that they were all to be subject to the Authority of Augustine, and to govern themselves in Life and Doctrine and Church Offices according to his Direction. Augustine being furnished with such full Powers, as he thought, desires a Meeting with the British Bishops, at a place called Auguslinac, as (m) Bede faith, in the confines of (m) L. 2. c. 5, the Wiccii and the West Saxons. Where this place was is very uncertain, and not at all material; Camden could find nothing like it, and the Conjectures of others since have no great probability, either as to Austrie, or Hauflake, or Ofsuntree, but at this place, the British Bishops gave Augustine a Meeting, where the first thing proposed by him was, that they would embrace the Unity of the Catholick Church, and then join with them in Preaching to the Gentiles; for, faith he, they did many things repugnant to the Unity of the Church; which was in plain terms to charge them with Schism, and the Terms of Communion offer'd, did imply Submission to the Church of Rome, and by consequence to his Authority over them. But the utmost that could be obtained from them, was only that they would take farther advice, and give another Meeting, with a greater Number. And then were present seven Bishops of the Britains, and many Learned Men, chiefly of the Monastery of Banchor, where Dinoth was then Abbat; and the Result of this Meeting was, that they utterly refused Submission to the Church of Rome, or to Augustine as Archbishop over them. And for the Account of this, we are beholding to Bede, whose Authority is liable to no exception in this matter.

But against this plain Matter of Fact, there have been three Objections made which must be removed.

(1.) That Augustine did not require Submission from the British Bishops, but only treated with them, about other matters in difference between them.

(2.) That their refusing Submission to the Bishop of Rome depends upon the Credit of a Spurious British MS.
lately invented and brought into light, as the Answer of Dinoth.

(3.) That if they did refuse Submission to the Pope, it was Schismatical Obligacy in them; and contrary to the former Sense of the British Church.

To all these I shall give a clear and full Answer.

(1.) As to the matter of their Conference, it cannot be denied that other things were started; as about the Paschal Controversie and some Rites of Baptism; &c. but this was the main point; which Augustine did not in plain Terms insist upon; because it would look too invidiously to require Submission to himself, but he cunningly insinuates it under the Name of Ecclesiastical Unity. For I dare appeal to any Man's common Sense, whether upon the Principles of the Church of Rome, the British Bishops complying in other things and rejecting the Pope's Authority would have been thought sufficient? If so, then Submission to the Pope is no necessary term of Communion; and Men may be in a very safe Condition without it. But if it were necessary, then Augustine must imply it within the terms of Catholic Peace and Ecclesiastical Unity. It is therefore ridiculous in (n) Alford and (o) Cressy, and such Writers to say, That Augustine did not insist upon it: For it is to charge him with Ignorance or Stupidity, that he should leave out so necessary an Article of Communion: And yet Gregory had so great an opinion of him, as to make him the Director of the British Churches. And therefore it cannot be supposed that he should offer terms of Communion without requiring Submission to the Pope's Authority; if those were in a state of Schism who denied it.

But it is said, That in the Conclusion of the second Meeting, Augustine did not insist upon, nor so much as mention any Submission to him from the British Churches, but only required Compliance in three Points, viz. the time of the Paschal Solemnity agreeable with the Church of Rome; following the Roman Customs in Baptism; and joining with them in Preaching to the Saxons; and upon these they brake up the Meeting.

To
Chap. V. the British Churchers.

To which I Answer.

That these things were required by Augustin, not as Conditions of Brotherly Communion, but as the Marks of Subjection to his Authority; which appears from Bede's own Words, _Si in tribus his mihi obtemperare vultis, &c._ Which Creffy very unfaithfully renders, _If they would conform in three points only:_ Whereas the meaning is, _If they would own his Authority in those three things;_ and therefore the British Bishops answered very appositely, when they said, _we will neither doe the things nor submit to you as Archbifhop over us._ Why should they deny Subjection if it had not been required of them? Which shews they very well understood his meaning, and gave Answer in short, to the main point. And upon this Account I suppose it was, that the Anchorer's advice was followed about observing _Whether he rose up to the British Bishops at their entrance;_ Not that they were so offended for want of a Complement, as Mr. Creffy suggests, but this was look'd on by them, as a Mark of that Superiority which he challenged over them; And therefore they had reason to take so great notice of it, and to infer harder usage from him, when they should be under his Authority. They could not be ignorant what Authority the Pope had given Augustin, and that made them more Observant of his whole Behaviour, and finding it so agreeing to the Character of an Archbifhop over the British Churches, They give him that Resolute Answer, _That they would not own any Authority he had, as Archbifhop over them._ Which is a sufficient proof, that this was really the main point contested between them.

(2.) As to the British MS. which contains Dinith's Answer more at large; I Answer:

1. (p) Leland observes, _That the British Writers give a more ample account of this Matter than is extant in Bede;_ who is very sparing in what concerns the British Affairs. But from them he finds, _That Dinith did at large dispute with great Learning and Gravity against receiving the authority of the Pope, or of Augustin; and defended the Power of the Archbifhop of St. Davids; and affirmed it not to be for the British Interest to own either the Roman Pride or the Saxon Tyranny._ And he finds
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fault
fault with Gregory, for not admonishing the Saxons of their gross Usurpations, against their Solemn Oaths; And adds, that it was their duty, if they would be good Christians to restore their unjust and Tyrannical Power to those from whom they had taken it. For Dinoth, out of his great Learning could not but know, that the Pope under a pretence of bringing in the true Faith could not confirm them in their unjust Usurpation. For if that should be admitted no Princes could be safe in their Dominions. And no doubt the British Bishops looked upon this attempt of Augustin upon them to be the adding one Usurpation to another: Which made them so adverse to any Communication with the Missionaries which otherwise had been inexcusable.

(2.) The certainty of the British Churches rejecting the Pope's Authority, and Augustin's jurisdiction doth not depend upon the Credit of this British MS. for this is sufficiently clear from Bede's own Words, wherein they declare, they would not own Augustin as Archbishop over them. But if they had owned the Pope's Authority, they ought to have Submitted to him, who acted by virtue of his Commission: And it was not possible for them at such a distance from Rome, to express their disowning his Authority more effectually than by rejecting him, whom he had sent to be Archbishop over them. And Nich. Trivet in his MS. History cited by Sir H. Spelman, faith expressly, that Augustin did demand Submission from the Britains to him, as the Pope's Legate, but they refused it. So that if this MS. had never been heard of, the Matter of Fact had been nevertheless fully attested.

(3.) The Objections against this MS. are not sufficient to destroy the Authority of it. Sir H. Spelman who sets it down at large in Welsh, English and Latin, tells from whom he had it, and exactly transcribed it, and that it appeared to him to have been an Old MS. taken out of an Older, but without Date or Author, and believes it to be still in the Cotton Library. Here is all the appearance of Ingenuity and faithfulness that can be expected; and he was a Person of too great Judgment and Sagacity to be easily imposed upon by a modern Invention, or a new found Schedule.
due, as Mr. Creffy Phrases it. The Substance of it is, That the Abbat of Banchor, in the Name of the Britifh Churches declares, That they owe the Subje&ion of Brotherly Kindness, and Charity to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to all Christians: But other obedience than that, they did not know to be due to him whom they called Pope; And for their parts they were under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon upon Usk, who was under God their Spiritual Overseer and Director. But, say the Objectors, There was then no Bishop of Caerleon upon Usk, and had not been since the time the Metropolitan Jurisdiction was by St. David transferred to Me-nevia. I grant that from the time of Dubricius the See was transferred first to Landaff, and then to St. Davids, but this latter Translation was not agreed to by all the Britifh Bishops: And it appears by the foregoing Discourse, That the Bishops of Landaff did at that time when Oudocenus lived, challenge the Metropolitical Power of Caerleon to themselves, and therefore would not be consecrated by the Bishop of St. Davids. And Caerleon having been the ancient Metropolitical See, it was no absurdity at all to mention that in a Dispute which depended upon ancient Right. For the Authority over the Britifh Churches was not upon the account of St. Davids or Landaff, but the Metropolitical Right which belonged to the See of Caerleon. As if in the Britifh times the Metropolitan See had been removed from London to Canterbury, what incongruity had it been in a dispute of Superiority to have alleged, that the Britifh Churches of these parts were under the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of London, although at that time the See were removed to another place? And if this be all to make it appear to be a Forgery, as Mr. Creffy pretends, for all that I can see, it may be a very ancient and genuine MS.

But Alford goes deeper, for he difproves it, because it contradicts the Sense of the Britifh Churches before, which profefled Subje&ion to the Roman See.

This is indeed to the purpose if it be well proved, which in the last place comes to be considered.

(3.) To this purpose he alleges, (1.) The Confirmation of St. David’s Synod by the Pope’s Authority. But
from whence hath he this? From no other Testi-
mony than that of Giraldus Cambrensis cited by Bishop
Ulfber, who in the same place confesses, *That there was
no Monument of those Synods at all remaining, nor of the
Pope's Confirmation of them;* and the other MSS. and
Legends of St. David's Life say not a Word of this.
How then came Giraldus to affirm it? We are to re-
member that Giraldus had a Cause depending in the
Court of Rome, about the Bishoprick of St. David's,
and he knew well enough what Doctrine was pleasing
there, and therefore the Testimony of such a one, hav-
ing no concurrent Evidence to support it is of very
little force in this matter. (2.) He mentions the Re-
spect Kentigern shew'd to the Church of Rome, going
seven times thither, and having at last his uncanonical
Ordination purged, or confirmed by the Pope; as the Au-
thor of his Legend relates. But this seems to me a
fenceless and ridiculous Legend: For as (r) Bollandus
observes, if Kentigern went seven times to Rome how
came he to put off the Error of his Consecration to the
last? If it were good before, why not then? If naught
before, then all the Acts performed by him by virtue
of his first Consecration were invalid. But there is no
more Error supposed in the Consecration of Kenti-
gern by one Bishop, than there was in that of Seruanus
by Palladius, which as (s) Job. Major faith, was good in
case of necessity. But the Writers of the Legends, living
long after the times of the Perfons, framed their Stor-
ies according to the Customs of their own times; and
because such a Consecration was not then held good,
therefore the Author of his Legend takes care to have
that defect supplied at Rome, and to make amendments he
faith, That Kentigern at his death recommended to his
Disciples the Decrees of the Fathers; and the Customs of
the Roman Church. But what is this to the necessity of
Subjection to the Roman See from the general sense of
the British Churches? What if Kentigern having been
often at Rome, were pleased more with the Customs of
that Church, than of the Britains? Doth it hence follow,
that those Britains who maintained Customs contrary to
the Romans, did think it necessary to conform to the
Church of Rome, when the plain Evidence of Fact is to
the
the contrary; and which hath far more authority than such Legends as these? (3.) Ninianus is (t) said to have learnt the Christian Doctrine at Rome, who converted the Southern Picts, and founded the Church ad Candidam Cafam; being the first built of Stone. But what follows from hence? Because Ninianus was made a Christian at Rome, therefore the British Churches always own'd the Pope's Supremacy. They are indeed to seek for Arguments who make use of such as these. (4.) He offers to prove the constant Submission of the British Churches to the Roman See from Gildas himself, and he makes use of two Arguments:

(1.) From his calling the British Churches Sedem Petri, the See of St. Peter. I confess Gildas hath these words, but quite in another Sense; for in the beginning of his Invidive against the Clergy, among other things he charges them, that they did Sedem Petri Apostoli immundus Pedibus usurpare. Doth he mean that they defiled St. Peter's Chair at Rome? No certainly, but he takes St. Peter's Chair for that which all the Clergy possessed, and implies no more than their Ecclesiastical Function; and so he opposes it to (u) the Chair of Judas, (w) Gild. p. 52, into which, he faith, such wicked Men fell. But if they will carry St. Peter's Chair to Rome, they must carry the Chair of Judas thither too.

(2.) (w) Alford insifts on this Passage in Gildas, That they were more ambitious of Degrees in the Church than of the Kingdom of Heaven; And after a bitter Invidive against their Symoniacal Contrasts, he adds, that where they were opposed they ran beyond Sea to compass their ends. Now faith Alford, whither should this be but to Rome? For as Leland observes in the Case of Giraldus Cambrensis, sunt enim omnia Venalia Roma: all things are bought and sold there; and therefore whither should such notorious Symoniacal Persons go, but to Rome? This is a very surprizing Argument, and is more wisely past over by Mr. Cressy than insifted on by Alford, as being a horrible Reflexion on the Court of Rome in those days. But to say Truth, there is not one Word of Rome in Gildas; but if they will apply it to Rome, how can we help it?
To conclude this Discourse, (x) Alford is much displeased with (y) Sir H. Spelman for paralleling the Case of the Britifh Bishops, and Augustine, with that of the Cyprian Bishops against the Patriarch of Antioch: But for what Reason? Why, faith he, The Council of Ephefus did not permit the Cyprian Bishops to decline the Judgment of their Patriarch, but declared the Bishop of Antioch not to be their Patriarch. Very well! And is not this the very cafe here? - The Bishop of Rome challenged a Patriarchal Power over the Britifh Churches, and appoints an Archbifhop over them, but they deny that he had fuch Authority over them, they being governed by their own Metropolitan, as the Cyprian Bishops were; and therefore by the Decree of the Council of Ephefus, they were bound to preserve their own Rights, and consequently to oppofe that foreign Jurifdiction, which Augustine endeavoured to fet up over them.

THE END.