

CHAPTER XI.

The judgment of the adherents of Rome concerning the Culdees.

—Of the Synod of Streoneshalch.—Of Colman and Adomnan.—Government not the only ground of difference with the Romanists.—Charge brought by Richard of Hexham against the Scots.—Character given of the Culdees by Dr Henry.—Of the Synod of Cealhythe.—Their Character as given by Gibbon.—Of Clemens, Samson, and Virgilius.—Speech of Gilbert Murray.

THIS hostility between the Culdees and the Romanists was of a very ancient date. If, on some occasions, the warm adherents of Rome seemed unwilling to fraternize with the Culdees, they were only returning a compliment which had been paid to themselves several centuries before. The dislike was indeed mutual. Bede gives an extract of a letter from Laurence, who succeeded Augustine, as Bishop of Canterbury, A. 605, to the Scots, who inhabited Ireland, in which he says ; “ When the see apostolic—sent us to these western parts to

preach to the pagan nations, and we happened to come into this island, which is called Britain, we held both the Britons and Scots in great esteem for sanctity before we knew them ; believing that they conducted themselves according to the custom of the universal church. But becoming acquainted with the Britons, we thought that the Scots had been better. We have been, however, learned from Bishop Dagan, who came into this aforesaid island, and from the abbot Columban in France, that the Scots no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour. For Bishop Dagan, coming to us, *not only refused to eat with us*, but even to take his repast in the same house in which we were entertained."¹ This Dagan, it is said, came from the monastery of Bangor, in Ireland, to be Bishop to the Scots. It is evident, that he treated the votaries of Rome, not excepting the Bishop of Canterbury himself, as if they had been actually excommunicated. He viewed them as men, with whom he was not *so much as to eat* ; nay, as even communicating pollution to the place where they did eat.

¹ Dum nos sedes apostolica, more suo sicut in universo orbe terrarum, in his occiduis partibus ad prædicandum gentibus paganis dirigeret, atque in hanc insulam, quæ Britannia nuncupatur, contigit introisse antequam cognosceremus ; credentes quod juxta morem universalis ecclesiae ingrederentur, in magna reverentia sanctitatis tam Brittones, quam Scottos venerati sumus ; sed cognoscentes Brittones, Scottos meliores putavimus. Scottos vero per Daganum Episcopum in hanc, quam superius memoravimus, insulam, et Columbanum Abbatem in Gallis venientem, nihil discrepare a Brittonibus in eorum conversatione didicimus. Nam Daganus Episcopus ad nos veniens, non solum cibum nobiscum, sed nec in eodem hospitio quo vescebamur sumere voluit. Hist. lib. ii. 4.

Bede, afterwards speaking of Caedwal, King of the Britons, who “ bore the name and made a profession of Christianity,” when describing his hostility to the Angles, says ; “ Nor did he pay any respect to the christian religion, which had newly sprung up among them ; forasmuch as, *even to this day*, it is customary with the Britons to view the faith and religion of the Angles as of no account, and to hold no more communion with them than with the heathen.”¹

It is evident, that the pertinacity of the Culdees greatly piqued the Romanists, who deemed it the highest presumption in men, living in such distant regions, to pretend in any thing to differ from those who pleaded the transmission of the keys from the apostle Peter. At a synod, held at *Streoneshalch*, now Whitby in England, A. 662, called for the purpose of settling the controversy about Easter, the Roman clergy urged the authority of Peter : but Bishop Colman, and the Culdee presbyters, good simple men, reason as if the authority of John the apostle had been of as much weight as the other. Wilfrid, however, a Northumbrian abbot, who “ had gone to Rome to learn the ecclesiastical doctrine,” brought back with him, if he made no other acquirement, the lofty tone of the mistress of nations. Thus he replies to Colman : “ As for you and your companions, beyond a doubt

¹ At vero Caedualia, quamvis nomen et professionem haberet Christiani, &c. Sed nec religioni christianae, quae apud eos [Nordanhymbros] exorta est, aliquid impendebat honoris. Quippe cum *usque hodie* moris sit Brittonum, fidem religionemque Anglorum pro nihilo habere, neque in aliquo eis magis communicare quam paganis. Ibid. lib. ii. 20.

you sin, if, having heard the *decree* of the *apostolical sec*, yea of the catholic church, and the same confirmed from the holy scriptures, you refuse to obey it. For, although your fathers were holy, do you think that their small number, in a corner of the remotest island, is to be preferred to the catholic church of Christ throughout the world ?”

Notwithstanding the supposition with respect to the sanctity of their predecessors, he seems not very willing to admit it. For he had previously reminded them, in reference to Columba and his followers, whose sanctity Colman had said was confirmed by signs from heaven, that many in the day of judgment should say to our Lord, that in his name they had prophesied, &c. to whom he should reply, that he never knew them. Although King Oswy decided in favour of Wilfrid, Colman was not convinced ; but, “ perceiving that his doctrine was rejected, and his *sect* (as Bede expresses it) despised, he left his bishopric at Lindisfarne, and, having carried his adherents with him, returned to Scotland. ¹

We learn that this Wilfrid, afterwards being made a bishop, “ by his doctrine introduced into the churches of the Angles a great many rules of the catholic observance. Whence it followed, that the catholic institution daily increasing, all the Scots, who had resided among the Angles, either conformed to these, or returned to their own country.” ²

¹ Hist. iii. 25, 26.

² Unde factum est ut crescente per dies institutione catholica, Scotti omnes qui inter Anglos morabantur, aut his manus darent, aut suam redirent ad patriam. Ibid. iii, 29.

About forty years after, another attempt was made to subject the Scots to the Roman authority with respect to Easter, by a person of such respectability and estimation among them, that, if any one could have prevailed, he must have done it. This was no other than the celebrated Adomnan, whose *conversion*, and attempts to proselyte his adherents, are thus narrated by Bede: "Adomnan, presbyter and abbot of the monks who were in the island of Hij, being sent ambassador by his nation to Aldfrid, King of the Angles, and having tarried for some time in that province, witnessed the canonical rites of the church. Being earnestly admonished by many, who were more learned, that he should not, with a handful of adherents, and those situated in an extreme corner of the world, *presume* to live in opposition to the universal custom of the church, either in relation to the observation of Easter, or any other decrees whatsoever; he changed his mind, so that he most willingly preferred those things which he had seen and heard in the churches of the Angles to the custom which he and his people had observed. Returning home, he was at pains to bring his own people who were in Hij, or who were subject to that monastery, into that *path of truth*, which he had himself become acquainted with, and embraced with his whole heart. But he could not prevail. He then sailed to Ireland, and preaching to the people there, and declaring, by modest exhortation, the lawful time of Easter, reduced many of them, almost all, indeed, who were free from the dominion of those of Hij, to the catholic unity."¹

¹ Hist. v. 15.

Bede then informs us, that, returning from Ireland, where he had canonically celebrated this festival, he made another attempt at Ilij ;—" most earnestly recommending to his own monastery the catholic observation of Easter ; not more successfully, however, than before." But the good abbot died before the return of this solemnity ; which the venerable historian views as a very happy circumstance ; " the divine goodness," he says, " so ordering it, that this man, who was a great lover of peace and unity, should be snatched away to eternal life, before he should be obliged, on the return of the time of Easter, to engage in a far hotter contention with those who were unwilling to follow him in the way of truth."

With what warmth does this candid and worthy writer express himself on a subject of so little importance ; as they differed only as to the particular day on which this festival should be celebrated ! But this trivial difference of the Scots swelled into a crime, being viewed as gross disobedience to the *holy apostolic* see.

" It appears," says Toland, " that as low as the 10th century, the famous contest about the celebration of Easter, a question in itself unnecessary and insignificant, was still kept on foot in these islands ; as Usher judiciously observes out of the anonymous writer of Chrysostom's Life."¹ This is not stated with sufficient accuracy : for the good archbishop seems to view the proof as extending only to the middle of the ninth century.²

¹ Nazarenus, Lett. ii. p. 5.

² Discourse of the Religion professed by the ancient Irish and British, chap. 10. p. 114.

The friends of episcopacy are anxious to have it believed, that whatever difference the adherents of Rome had with the Culdees, they had none with respect to the form of government. Bede, when giving an account of the ordination of Ceadda by Wini, with the assistance of two *British* bishops, says, that, “except Wini, there was not then any bishop canonically ordained in all Britain.” This the learned Selden understands, as referring to the mode of ordination at Hij by presbyters. I confess that I cannot go so far as Selden: for Bede seems especially to have in his eye what was denominated the *quartadeciman heresy*. But we are not hence to conclude, that the Romanists were satisfied with the ecclesiastical government of the Scots. We meet with several vestiges of the contrary. The fathers of the synod of Vernon in France, A. 755, speak of those “bishops who wandered about, having no parish; neither,” say they, “do we know what kind of ordination they had.”¹ This has been understood of the Scots bishops; especially as express mention is made of them in the second council of Cabilon, or Chalons, A. 813. “There are,” it is said in their Acts, “in certain places Scots, who call themselves bishops, and contemning many, without the licence of their lords or superiors, ordain presbyters and deacons; the ordination of whom, because, for the most part, it falls into the Simonian heresy, and is subject to many errors, we all, with one consent, decree, that it ought to be invalidated by all possible means.”²

¹ Binu. Concil. iii. 398. Seld. Pref. Dec. Script. xiii.

² Sunt in quibusdam locis Scoti, qui se dicunt episcopos esse, et multos ne-

In like manner we find, among the works of Peter of Blois, a letter written about the year 1170, and attributed to Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he complains, that “in these days certain false bishops of Ireland, or pretending the barbarism of the Scottish language, although they have received from no one imposition of hands, discharge episcopal functions to the people.” He enjoins all his clergy that, throughout their dioceses, they should “take care to prohibit the episcopal ministrations of all belonging to a barbarous nation, or of uncertain ordination.”¹

Bede testifies, that the monastery at Rippon being given by King Aldfrid to those “who followed the Scots,” they, “being left to their choice, would rather quit the place than receive the catholic Easter, *and other canonical rites*, according to the custom of the Roman and apostolic church.”² It seems highly probable, that, among “the other canonical rites,” there might be a reference to their peculiar mode of ordination.

gligentes, absque licentia dominorum sive magistrorum presbyteros et diaconos ordinant, &c. Binn. Conc. iii. 193. ap. Seld. ut sup.

¹ Diebus istis quidem pseudoepiscopi Hibernienses aut Scoticae linguae simulantes barbariem, cum a nullo impositionem manus acceperint, episcopalia populis administrant, &c. Pet. Blesensis ap. Seld. ut sup. xv. This account seems descriptive of the Culdees.

² Donavit—non multo post monasterium triginta familiarum in eo qui vocatur *Inhrypum*; quem videlicet locum dederat pridem ad construendum inibi monasterium his qui Scottos sequebantur. Verum quia illi postmodum optione data maluerunt loco cedere, quam pascha catholicum ceterosque ritus canonicos juxta Romanae et apostolicae ecclesiae consuetudinem recipere, dedit hoc illi, quem melioribus imbutum disciplinis ac moribus vidit. Hist. lib. v. 19.

Notwithstanding all these marks of discrepancy between the Culdees and the church of Rome, it is surprising that any, who call themselves protestants, should not hesitate to assert, that the points, in which they differed, “ did not at all affect the faith.”¹ While the friends of the Reformation, in other countries, have manifested a laudable eagerness to shew, that, during the darkest ages of the antichristian dominion, there were still some to “ contend for the faith once delivered to the saints,” a *nubes testium*, in their successive generations refusing to join with others, who, according to the language of inspiration, “ wondered after the beast ;” it is affecting to observe, that, among a people so highly distinguished as we have been, any should be found, who are determined at all events to affirm, that all the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome were greedily and universally adopted, by their ancestors, as soon as they were introduced.

The account which we are able to give, of the points in which they differed, is indeed very imperfect. But when the extreme difficulty of discovering the genuine doctrines of those, who opposed the Romish innovations, is considered, as all the memorials of these passed through the hands of prejudiced writers ; when we reflect on the gross falsifications of history with respect to other witnesses for the truth, especially the Waldenses and Albigenses, who have been generally dressed up, by popish historians, like those prepared

¹ Gillan's Remarks, p. 105.

for an *Auto da Fe*; we rather have reason to wonder, that so many hints have escaped from these writers, which throw light on the true character of the Culdees.

It has been seen, that they agreed with the ancient Britons in faith. Now, from the testimony of Bede, which, in this instance, cannot reasonably be called in question, we learn that the controversy about Easter was by no means the only cause of discord between the Romans and them. For he says that Aldhelm, Abbot of Malmesbury, “by the order of a synod of his nation, wrote an excellent book against the error of the Britons, according to which error, as they do not celebrate Easter in the proper time, they hold *a great many other things* contrary to ecclesiastical purity and peace.”¹

A charge, somewhat of a similar nature, is exhibited against them in the Register of St Andrews. It is there said, that “those, who are called Culdees, lived more according to their own opinion and the tradition of men, than according to the statutes of the holy fathers.”² At first view, things might here seem to be opposed, which are in themselves virtually the same; “the tradition of men,” and “the statutes of the holy fathers.” But they are meant to be viewed as directly contrary. For by “the tradition of men” we are to under-

¹ — Scripsit, jubente synodo suae gentis, librum egregium contra errorem Brittonum, quo vel Pascha non suo tempore celebrant, vel alia perplura ecclesiasticae castitati et paci contraria gerunt, &c. Hist. lib. v. c. 18.

² Habebantur tamen in ecclesia Sti Andreae,—quos Keledeos appellant, qui secundum suam aestimationem, et hominum traditionem magis quam secundum sanctorum statuta patrum, vivebant. Excerpta Registr. V. Pinkerton's Enquiry, 1. 462.

stand that which was transmitted to them by their own predecessors, as adhering to the Culdean doctrines and mode of worship. To these they were so attached, because they accounted them scriptural, that they would not, like the votaries of Rome, implicitly receive what was imposed on them as the doctrine of unerring fathers, many of whom had been canonized as saints.

The crimination, brought by Richard of Hexham, against our ancestors, has been keenly argued by former writers on this subject. "The Scots," he says, "for a long time differing from the Cisalpine, nay, almost from the universal, church, seemed too much to favour the detestable memory of Peter of Lyons, and his apostasy: but, by the inspiration of divine grace, they all unanimously received, with great veneration, the mandate of Pope Innocent, and his legate."¹ Sir James Dalrymple had inferred from this passage, that the writer meant to charge the Scots with attachment to the doctrine of the Leonists or Waldenses, who strenuously opposed the errors of the church of Rome.² Gillan has asserted, that the ancient writer refers only to the adherence of the Scots, for about eight years, to the antipope Anacletus.³ But he does not seem to have invalidated Sir James's observation,

¹ Illi vero diu à Cisalpina imò fere ab universa ecclesia discordantes exosae memoriae Petroleoni et apostasiae ejus nimium favisse videbantur. Tunc vero divina gratia inspirati mandata Innocentii papae et legatum ejus omnes unanimiter cum magna veneratione susceperant. Ric. Hagustald. *De Bello Standardi*, p. 325.

² Collections, p. 258, 259. Vindication, p. 35, &c.

³ Life of Sage, p. 64. Remarks, p. 134, &c.

that it cannot easily be conceived, that, if Richard referred merely to their adherence to the antipope, he would not only have compared the Scots with the Leonists, condemned heretics, but exhibited this charge against them exclusively; as all the French and English were equally attached to the schismatical Anacletus. * Here the ancient writer undoubtedly takes the opportunity, afforded him by their present conduct, of giving vent to an old grudge.

Gillan seems to triumph in the proof of the complete subjection of the Scots, said to have been given by their cordial reception of the legate. I am far from saying, that they were no wise subjected to the papal authority, even before this time. But there are very different degrees of subjection: and it is well known, that it has been always considered as a strong proof of the extreme reluctance of our forefathers to submit to the claims of the Roman see, that we have not the slightest evidence that a legate had been ever received in Scotland, or even sent thither, before this time, A. 1125, when John of Crema appeared in this character. It cannot be denied, that, in a far earlier age, legates had been sent to countries of less note; because it was known that they would be made welcome.

But even the reception given to this deputy affords no great proof of the strength of papal authority in this country. He came no farther than to Roxburgh, which was long the very border of the Scottish territory. Had he reckoned him-

* Vindication, p. 36.

self a welcome visitor, especially considering the novelty of the thing, he would in all probability have ventured a little farther. Prudence must have dictated this, in order more firmly to establish that subjection which had hitherto been refused. But this very principle seems to have suggested a course directly the reverse. John of Crema was not certain as to the ground he was treading on. It was as really *debateable ground* to him, as ever it had been between the adverse kingdoms. He, therefore, acted like a man who wished to rest satisfied even with the semblance of subjection.

It is said, indeed, that "all unanimously received him with great veneration." But it plainly appears from the narrative, that we are to understand the *all* of the Scottish nation as acting merely by proxy. He was received, in the manner described, by the priest-ridden David, and by a few of the courtiers and bishops, who wished in all things to conform to Rome. The legate seems wisely to have judged, that it was not expedient to put the *unanimity* of the Scottish nation fairly to the test. "I am sure," says Gillan, "the style is high enough, *rogando mandamus*." ¹ But is this an argument of any weight, in judging of papal pretensions? Has it ever been doubted, that it was still the policy of Rome to talk in a lofty tone; or supposed, that we were to form an estimate of the real power of the Vatican from the noise made by its thunder?

Here it may not be improper to subjoin the character,

¹ Remarks, p. 138.

given of the Culdees, by two late historians, each of them celebrated in his line, both distinguished for industry and learning; and, although antipodes in their views with respect to religion, giving a similar testimony on this subject.

“ Ever since the violent disputes,” says Dr Henry, “ between the Scots, and English of the Roman communion, about the time of keeping Easter, and the retreat of the Scotch clergy out of England, there had been a violent animosity between the churches of England and Scotland. This animosity was very strong in this century, as appears from the fifth canon of the council of Ceal-hythe, A. D. 816; which decrees, that no Scotch priest shall be allowed to perform any duty of his function in England.’ The Scots and Picts were instructed and governed by their own clergy; who being educated at home, and having little intercourse with foreign nations, retained much of the plainness and simplicity of the primitive times in their forms of worship. These clergy were called *Kuldees*, both before and after this period: a name which some derive from the two Latin words *Cultores Dei*, and others from the *kills* or cells in which they lived.^{*} They were a kind of presbyters, who lived in small societics, and travelled over the neighbouring countries, preaching, and administering the sacraments. In each of these cells there was one who had some kind of superintendancy over the rest, managed their affairs, and directed their

^{*} Spelm. Concil. T. 1. p. 329.

² Boeth. Hist. Scot. L. 6. Camb. Brit. col. 1463.

missions ; but whether or not he enjoyed the title and authority of a bishop in this period is not certainly known. The council of Ceal-hythe seems to have suspected that he did not ; for the chief reasons assigned by that council for refusing to keep communion with these Scotch Kuldees were,—That they had no metropolitans amongst them,—paid little regard to other orders,—and that the council did not know by whom they were ordained, *i. e.* whether they were ordained by bishops or not. The rectors or bishops of the several cells of Kuldees were both chosen, and ordained, or consecrated, by the members of these societies ; *which was probably the very thing with which the council of Ceal-hythe was dissatisfied.*¹ When the cells or monasteries of Scotland came

¹ Spelm. Concil. T. 1. p. 329. That the reader may judge for himself, I shall transcribe the article referred to by the learned historian.

Cap. 5. *Ut Scoti non admittendi sacra ministrare.*

Quinto interdictum est : ut nullus permittatur de genere Scottorum in aliqujus Diocesi sibi ministerium usurpare, neque ei consentire liceat ex sacro ordine aliquod attingere, vel ab eis accipere in baptismo, aut in celebratione missarum, vel etiam Eucharistiam populo praeberere, quia incertum est nobis, unde, et an ab aliquo ordinentur. Scimus quomodo in canonibus praecipitur ut nullus Episcoporum [*vel*] Presbyterorum invadere temptaverit alius parochiam, nisi cum consensu proprii Episcopi. Tanto magis respuendum est ab alienis nationibus sacra ministeria percipere, cum quibus nullus ordo Metropolitanis, nec honor aliis habeatur.

The phrase, *nec honor aliis*, rendered, “ they paid little regard to other orders,” may in general denote, that, as they had no Metropolitans, they “ gave no honour to others,” to whom they gave the name of bishops.

Can any candid man, after reading this extract, venture to assert, that the ancient church of England made no objection to the church of Scotland on the head of government ? These fathers of the synod of Ceal-hythe seem to have been as doubtful of the validity of the ordinances dispensed by Scottish Bishops, as some of their more violent successors are with respect to those of

to be enlarged, better built, and better endowed, they were long after this possessed by these Kuldées, or secular clergy, who had the privilege of choosing the bishops in those places where bishops' sees were established." ¹

The other testimony referred to, is that of an elegant writer, who, although very sparing of his praise to ecclesiastics, could not withhold the following tribute from the Culdees. It is, indeed, given with that drawback which might be expected from a writer of his principles. "Iona," he says, "one of the Hebrides, which was planted by the Irish monks, diffused over the northern regions a doubtful ray of science and superstition. This small though not barren spot, Iona, Hy, or Columbkil, only two miles in length, and one mile in breadth, has been distinguished, 1. By the monastery of St Columba, founded A. D. 566; whose abbot *exercised an extraordinary jurisdiction over the Bishops of Caledonia*. 2. By a *classic* library, which afforded some hopes of an entire Livy; and, 3. By the tombs of sixty kings, Scots, Irish, and Norwegians, who reposed in holy ground." ²

Presbyterians. For they did not wish that any should even receive *baptism* from them; as it has been matter of debate, in our own times, whether those proselytes to episcopacy, who had received baptism from Presbyterians, should not be *rebaptized*. Nay, it is an unquestionable fact, that, in some instances, they have been rebaptized. As the old party-cry, *No Bishop, no King*, has been celebrated as a sound maxim, and been found at least a very useful one, in politics; many of its supporters have scarcely acknowledged any other ecclesiastical watch-word than this, slightly varied in accommodation to the present field of controversy,—*No Bishop, no Church*.

¹ History of Britain, vol. iii. p. 254, 255.

² Gibbon's Hist. vol. vi. p. 246.

It is not without sufficient grounds, that David Buchanan has given the following testimony to the noble resistance made by the Culdees to the Roman corruptions. “ About the end of the seventh age, men from Scotland, given to ambition and avarice, went frequently to Rome for preferment in the church ; and seeing it lay much that way then, they did their best to advance the design of the Romish party, wherein all the skill of worldly men was employed, both in Rome, and among the Scots of that party. Many men went to and fro, between Rome and Scotland, to bring the Scots to a full obedience unto Rome, and conformity. By name, there was one Boniface sent from Rome to Scotland, a main agent for Rome in these affairs ; but he was opposed openly by several of the Scots Culdees, or divines, namely, by Clemens and Samson, who told him freely, ‘ That he, and those of his party, studied to bring men to the subjection of the pope, and slavery of Rome, withdrawing them from obedience to Christ ;’ and so, in plain terms, they reproached to him and to his assistants, ‘ That they were corrupters of Christ’s doctrine, establishing a sovereignty in the Bishop of Rome, as the only successor of the apostles, excluding other bishops ; that they used and commanded clerical tonsure ; that they forbad priests’ marriage, extolling celibat ; that they caused prayers to be made for the dead, and erected images in the churches ;’ to be short, ‘ That they had introduced in the church many tenets, rites, and ceremonies, unknown to the ancient and pure times, yea, contrary to them.’ For the which and the like, the said Clemens, and those that were constant to the truth with him, were excom-

municated at Rome as heretics, as you have in the third volume of the *Concels*, although the true reasons of their excommunication be not there set down.”¹

Petrie gives materially the same account. “Many did preach and write against him [Pope Zachary] and his superstitions; as Adelbert, a French bishop, Samson, a Scot, Bishop of Auxerre, and Virgilius, an Irishman, Bishop of Juavia; as Naucerus and Aventine do record. Boniface dilateth them unto Pope Zachary; and as *Bern. Lutzenburg in Catal.* writeth, the pope, in a synod at Rome, condemneth them, depriveth them of their priesthood, and excommunicateth them before they were heard; and when they sought to be heard, and plead their cause in a synod, Boniface denied access unto them, and said, ‘Excommunicated men should not be admitted into a synod, nor have the benefit of the law.’—One Clemens did reprove Boniface, 1. That he did so advance the authority of the Roman bishop, seeing all teachers are equally successors of the apostles. 2. That he condemned the marriage of priests. 3. That he did speak too much for the monkish life.—4. That he appointed masses for the dead, and the other new rites unknown in the church heretotore. *Avintin. Annal. lib. 3. et Epist. Zachar. ad Bonifac. in tom. 2. Concil.*”²

Usher, in his *Sylloge*, has given a letter written by Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, to Pope Zachary, concerning Adelbert and Clement. Of the latter he says; “But ano-

¹ Pref. to Knox’s Hist. Sign. d. 2, b.

² Hist. of the Catholic Church, p. 100.

ther heretic, named Clement, contends against the catholic church, denies the canons, and reproves the proceedings of the churches of Christ, and refuses the explanations given by the holy fathers, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory. Contemning the rights of synods, he expressly affirms, that he can be a lawful Christian bishop, after having two sons born to him in adultery." ¹ He is also charged with heretical doctrine as to the descent of Christ into hell, and predestination. But it is evident, that his great heresy was, that he did not submit to the absolute authority of the church, and the infallible decisions of the fathers. When he is accused of having had sons born to him in adultery, all that can be meant is, that they were born to him in marriage, a state *not lawful* for one in holy orders. He acknowledged them as his *sons*, and vindicated his conduct. Had he called them only *nephews*, and his wife a spiritual sister, he might probably have escaped without any accusation.

Flacius Illyricus, in like manner, assigns the opposition of Clement to the corruptions of Rome as the real reason of his condemnation. Nor did his enemies stop here. He was given over to the secular power, and devoted to the flames. ²

¹ Alter autem haereticus, qui dicitur Clemens, contra catholicam contendit ecclesiam; canones ecclesiarum Christi abnegat, et refutat tractatus; et intellectus sanctorum patrum, Hieronymi, Augustini, Gregorii recusat. Synodalia jura spernens, proprio sensu affirmat, se, post duos filios sibi in adulterio natos [sub nomine Episcopi] esse posse legis christianae Episcopum. Usserij Sylloge Epist. p. 46, 47.

² Nubes Testium, tom. i. p. 633.

* An ecclesiastical historian, who has been generally celebrated, both for industry and for impartiality, gives the following eulogy of him. "As to Clement, his character and sentiments were maliciously misrepresented, since it appears, by the best and most authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the doctrines and true principles of Christianity than Boniface himself; and hence he is considered by many as a confessor and sufferer for the truth in this barbarous age." ¹ His learned translator adds this note. "The great heresy of Clement seems to have been his preferring the decisions of scripture to decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God."

Flacius gives a similar testimony concerning Samson. "The intimate companion of Clement," he says, "Samson, a Scotsman, was among those bishops who accused Boniface of being the fabricator of falsehoods, the troubler of peace, and of the christian religion, and the corrupter of it both by word and by writing. Although prepared to demonstrate his assertions from the word of God, he was not admitted to a fair trial, but excommunicated without being heard, &c. John of Mailros, a Scotsman, and Claudius Clement, sprung from the same nation, flourished at the same time. Concerning John of Mailros, Antoninus relates that he displeased the Romans, because, adhering to the Greeks, he impugned the papal dogmas." ²

¹ Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. ii. 273.

² Nubes Testium, tom. i. p. 634.

Sir James Dalrymple has referred to a speech made by Gilbert Murray, a young Scottish clerk, in the presence of a cardinal, who acted as the pope's legate, A. 1176.* It is given, by Petrie, from an old MS. Register of Dunkeld; and deserves our attention, not only because of the honourable allusion made to the clergy of Iona, and the proof which it affords of the general reception, in that early period, of the account given of them by Bede, as perfectly authentic; but also, as demonstrating the high sense of independence that the church of Scotland has always retained, and the conviction, which then generally prevailed of the obligations that the church of England lay under to her sister-church, how much soever she might wish to forget them.

Malcolm, surnamed *the Maiden*, and his brother William, having given homage to Henry I. for the lands which they held in England, he thought of extending the claim of subjection to the church. With this view, he and William, King of Scotland, having met at Norham, with some of the clergy, he urged that they should acknowledge the Archbishop of York as their metropolitan. But at this time they prevailed to get the business delayed. Next year, however, he renewed his attempt. Hugo, Cardinal of St Angelo, having been sent from Rome, summoned all the Scotch bishops to appear before him in Northampton. When they were assembled there, with many of their clergy, he used a great deal of art in order to cajole them into a compliance with the

* Collections, p. 245.

claims of the Archbishop of York. The bishops, it is said, were silent, lest they should offend the legate. But young Gilbert rose up, and made the following address, as recorded in the register formerly referred to.

“ It is true, English nation, thou mightest have been noble, and more noble than some other nations, if thou hadst not craftily turned the power of thy nobility, and the strength of thy fearful might, into the presumption of tyranny, and thy knowledge of liberal science into the shifting glosses of sophistry; but thou disposest not thy purposes as if thou wert led with reason, and being puffed up with thy strong armies, and trusting in thy great wealth, thou attemptest, in thy wretched ambition and lust of domineering, to bring under thy jurisdiction thy neighbour provinces and nations, more noble, I will not say, in multitude or power, but in lineage and antiquity; unto whom, if thou wilt consider ancient records, thou shouldst rather have been humbly obedient, or at least, laying aside thy rancour, have reigned together in perpetual love; and now with all wickedness of pride that thou shewest, without any reason or law, but in thy ambitious power, thou seekest to oppress *thy mother the church of Scotland*, which from the beginning hath been catholique and free, and which brought thee, when thou wast straying in the wilderness of heathenism, into the safe-guard of the true faith, and way unto life, even unto Jesus Christ, the author of eternal rest. She did wash thy kings, and princes, and people, in the laver of holy baptism; she taught thee the commandments of God, and instructed thee in moral du-

ties ; she did accept many of thy nobles, and others of meaner rank, when they were desirous to learn to read, and gladly gave them daily entertainment without price, books also to read, and instruction freely ; she did also *appoint, ordain, and consecrate thy bishops and priests* ; by the space of thirty years and above, she maintained the primacy and pontifical dignity within thee *on the north side of Thames*, as Beda witnesseth.

“ And now, I pray, what recompence renderest thou now unto her, that hath bestowed so many benefits on thee ? is it bondage ? or such as Judea rendered unto Christ, evil for good ? It seemeth no other thing. Thou unkinde vine, how art thou turned into bitterness ? We looked for grapes, and thou bringest forth wilde grapes ; for judgment, and behold iniquity and crying. If thou couldest do as thou wouldest, thou wouldest draw *thy mother* the church of Scotland, whom thou shouldest honour with all reverence, into the basest and most wretchedst bondage. Fie for shame ! what is more base, when thou wilt do no good, to continue in doing wrong ? Even the serpents will not do harm to their own, albeit they cast forth to the hurt of others ; the vice of ingratitude hath not so much moderation ; an ungrateful man doth wrack and massacre himself, and he dispiseth and minceth the benefits for which he should be thankful, but multiplieth and enlargeth injuries. It was a true saying of Seneca, (I see) The more some doe owe, they hate the more ; a small debt maketh a grievous enemy. What sayest thou, David ? it is true, They rendered me evil for good, and hatred for my love. It

is a wretched thing, (saith Gregory) to serve a lord, who cannot be appeased with whatsoever obeysance.

“ Therefore, thou church of England, doest as becomes thee not ; thou thinkest to carry what thou cravest, and to take what is not granted. Seek what is just, if thou wilt have pleasure in what thou seekest. And to the end I do not weary others with my words, albeit I have no charge to speak for the liberty of the church of Scotland, and albeit all the clergy of Scotland would think otherwise, yet I dissent from subjecting her, and I do appeal unto the Apostolical Lord, unto whom immediately she is subject ; and if it were needful for me to die in the cause, here I am ready to lay down my neck unto the sword. Nor do I think it expedient to advise any more with my lords the prelates ; nor, if they will do otherwise, do I consent unto them : for it is more honest to deny quickly what is demanded unjustly, then [*i. e. than*] to drive off time by delays, seeing he is the less deceived, who is refused betimes.”

The historian adds ; “ When Gilbert had so made an end, some English, both prelates and nobles, commend the yong clerk, that he had spoken so boldly for his nation, without flattering, and not abashed at the gravity of such authority ; but others, because he spoke contrary unto their minde, said, A Scot is naturally violent, and *In naso Scoti piper*. But Roger, Archbishop of York, which principally had moved this business, to bring the church of Scotland unto his sec, uttered a groan, and then with a merry countenance laid his hand on Gilbert’s head, saying, *Ex tua pharetra non exiit illa sagit-*

ta; as if he had said, When ye stand in a good cause, do not forethink what ye shall say, for in that hour it shall be given unto you. This Gilbert was much respected at home after that. And Pope Celestin put an end unto this debate; for he sent his bull unto King William, granting that, neither in ecclesiastical nor civil affairs, the nation should answer unto any forain judge whatsoever, except onely unto the pope, or his legate specially constituted. So far in that Register of Dunkel.”¹

Archbishop Spotswood has certainly given a more natural interpretation of these words, *Ex tua pharetra*, &c. “Meaning,” he says, “that he was set on to speak by some others of greater note.”² Mackenzie, however, seems to be mistaken in ascribing the other interpretation to the translator. “But Mr Petrie,” he says, “the ecclesiastical historian of the *Presbyterian party*, thinks, that by this expression the Archbishop of York was against all *set-forms*.”³ Petrie undoubtedly gives this as the gloss of the chronicler. For he subjoins; “So far in that Register.”

The appeal made, by Murray, to the pope, may perhaps be viewed as a proof, that the church of Scotland acknowledged complete subjection to Rome. But this seems to have been the first instance of an appeal being formally made to the papal see. As it was the act of a single person, it is to be observed, that even he had the highest sense of the liberty

¹ Petrie's History, p. 378, 379.

² History Church of Scotl. p. 38.

³ Lives of Writers, i. 391

and independence of his mother-church. He doubtless thought that they were shut up to it, and considered it as the least of two evils. From the power of England, from the partiality of the papal legate, and, perhaps, from the disposition of others to submit, he saw that the only question was, as to the form of their dependence ; and that it was better to submit to a distant authority, than to one at hand, that would intermeddle in every ecclesiastical matter ; to an authority by this time almost universally recognised, than to the newly-invented claim of a sister-church, nay, of a see, that had originally been supplied by missionaries from Scotland. He must also have seen, that, by submitting to the see of York, the church of Scotland would inevitably be subjected to a double yoke ; that see being itself completely under the papal dominion.

This appeal, however reluctantly made, seems to have had its full effect. For, although the legate was previously devoted to the English interest, it is evident, that both he and his master were so well pleased to have a formal recognition of the papal authority in Scotland, that they paid no further regard to the vamped-up pretensions of the church of England.

This Gilbert, it is said, was a son of the family of Moray, or Murray, afterwards designed of Bothwell. His conduct was so generally approved, that he was soon after made Dean of Murray, and great Chamberlain of Scotland.* On

* Crawford's *Lives of Officers of State*, p. 254.

the death of Adam of Mailros, he was promoted to the bishopric of Caithness. ¹ He died A. 1245, and was afterwards canonized. ²

² Spotswood's Hist. p. 38, 39. Keith's Catalogue, p. 123, 124.

¹ Camerar. De Scot. Pietate, p. 121.