

**ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN
OR
THE ORIGIN OF BRITISH
AS
OPPOSED
TO PAPAL CHRISTIANITY**



By
The Rev. R. W. Morgan

1860

**ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN
OR,
THE ORIGIN OF BRITISH
AS
OPPOSED TO PAPAL CHRISTIANITY**

BY

THE REV. R. W. MORGAN,

Author of Verities of the Church, The Churches of
England and Rome, Christianity and Infidelity
Intellectually Contrasted, &c.

"Ecclesia Britannica ab incunabulis Regia et Apostolica."
Moncœus.

"The British Church was from its cradle Apostolical and
Royal."

TENTH EDITION

**LONDON:
COVENANT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,**

**6, BUCKINGHAM GATE, S.W.I.
1948.**

**TO
CONNOP, LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S,**

REPRESENTATIVE AND SUCCESSOR IN THE PRIMITIVE
METROPOLITAN SEE OF BRITAIN OF THE NATIONAL SAINT
OF THE CYMRY

The following pages

A SLIGHT HOMAGE TO
HIS VARIED AND PROFOUND ACCOMPLISHMENTS
AS A SCHOLAR,
HIS CATHOLICITY OF SPIRIT AS A CHRISTIAN,
HIS CONSCIENTIOUS MASTERY, AS A BISHOP OF
SOULS, OF THE LANGUAGE OF HIS PEOPLE,
ARE, BY PERMISSION, DEDICATED,
BY HIS VERY FAITHFUL SERVANT,

R. W. MORGAN

Made and printed in Great Britain

By

The Stanhope Press Ltd.
(A Staples Press Company)

Rochester
Kent

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

RICHARD WILLIAMS MORGAN (1814-1899), was educated at St. David's College, Lampeter. He was a Greek scholar; was ordained by the Bishop of St. David's, becoming a deacon in 1841, and a priest in 1842; curate of Yedingham near York, 1858-9; of Marholme near Peterborough, 1870-4; of Stapleton near Shrewsbury, 1882-3; he was a licensed preacher in the diocese of Bath and Wells, 1885. He was the author of several "distinctive varieties of the Christian church", and in 1853 published a three volume work entitled "A Legend of the Welsh Borders". He was the author of a classical tragedy published in 1867, and several other books. (Details from "Modern English Biography" by Frederick Boase, 1921.)

PREFACE

A FAITHFUL account of the origin of native British Christianity as opposed to the Papal system first introduced four hundred and fifty-six years subsequently by Augustine the monk, is here, in readable compass, presented to the public. The history of such origin is inseparably blended with the long-sustained resistance of our early fore-fathers to the invasions of their liberties by the greatest empire of antiquity, wielding against them the military forces of nearly three-quarters of the globe. The events thus recorded have left their moulding power to this day on our constitution in Church and State.

The most cursory glance at them sufficient to demonstrate the untenableness of the supposition that Britain is indebted to Germany— A country which has never itself been free—for its free institutions, or to Italy for its Gospel faith. The leading principles of her laws and liberties are of pure indigenous growth; and her evangelical faith was received by her directly from Jerusalem and the East, from the lips of the first disciples themselves of Christ. The struggles in after ages down to our own period for the restoration and preservation of these indigenous birthright liberties, this primitive apostolical faith, constitute the most stirring and ennobling portions of our annals; and we may rest assured that a long as in their modern developments of British Protestantism, British Patriotism, and British Loyalty, they continue to inspire the national heart, our island will continue to retain her position in the vanward of the march of Order, Liberty, and Progress.

Dec. 24, 1860.



CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD AT THE RISE OF CHRISTIANITY—THEIR ANTAGONISMS AND COMMON GROUND WITH THE NEW FAITH—GREECE AND ITS PHILOSOPHIES—THE JEWS—THE INFLUENCE OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA—THE EASTERN RELIGIONS—ROME **Page 6**

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGION OF BRITAIN AND WESTERN EUROPE—DRUIDISM—ITS PRINCIPLES AND INFLUENCES—THE GENTILE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY - **Page 24**

CHAPTER III

HISTORIC POSITIONS OF BRITAIN AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

CHAPTER IV

THE BRITISH ROYAL FAMILY AT ROME—THE ARIMATHÆAN, OR FIRST INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO BRITAIN—SIMON ZELOTES—ARISTOBULUS

CHAPTER V

THE TRACINGS-UP OF THE ANCIENT ROYAL CHURCH OF BRITAIN TO ITS APOSTOLIC FOUNDATIONS—ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN—HIS CONNECTION WITH THE ROYAL SILURIAN FAMILY OF BRITAIN—BURIED IN THEIR FAMILY SEPULCHRE

CONCLUSION



ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN

CHAPTER I

THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD AT THE RISE OF. CHRISTIANITY-THEIR ANTAGONISMS AND COMMON GROUND WITH THE NEW FAITH-GREECE AND ITS PHILOSOPHIES-THE JEWS-THE INFLUENCE OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA-THE EASTERN RELIGIONS-ROME.

THE MORAL SOILS OF THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES on which the first seed of Christianity fell differed materially in their state of preparation for its reception. The Gentile soil was more favourable than that of the Jew. The reason is obvious. Christianity is the divine idea of one mind, Jesus Christ. It existed in the Old Testament only as the ore in the mine. No Jewish interpreter of the ancient Scriptures deciphered them in the same sense as Jesus of Nazareth. His explication and application were declared subversive of Moses and the Prophets, and rejected with intense bitterness. The Law of Moses not only failed to bring the Hebrew race to Christ, but rabbis and laity took their stand upon it as the eternal covenant, the whole language and spirit of which disproved the exposition of the Nazarene. It is also obvious that if the Christian solution of the Mosaic revelation be unsound, such revelation is incapable of any consistent solution whatever. But this fact, now witnessed by history and chronology, was yet to be ascertained in the Messianic century.

Deeper proof of the sincerity of their faith in their own Messianic idea the Jews could not give than by rising upon it against the weight of the whole Gentile empire of Rome. As a nation they were destroyed, but the false idea which destroyed them remains indestructible. It still moulds the mind of the Dispersion. Practically, therefore, the Mosaic Law cannot be regarded as a successful preparation for the Gospel. Our Saviour's first ministerial act, in His Sermon on the Mount, was to repeal its most striking enactments, and to abolish its spirit of exclusiveness and sanguinary retaliation. Nothing in the Mosaic covenant not expressly re-imposed in the New Testament binds the Christian. The almost total rejection of His religion by the Jews, and its acceptance by the Gentiles, was repeatedly pre-signified by our Lord, especially in the remarkable parable of the lord of the vineyard and the husbandmen.

The prophets had similarly specified the lands of the Gentiles and "the isles afar off," and not Judæa, as the seats of the Messianic Church. Time has verified the predictions. The Gentile religions of Europe, with all their errors and defects, had that within them which constituted them fitter preparatives than the Mosaic for the Gospel, the nations trained by them fitter recipients of it than the Jew. The results corresponded with the antecedents. The Mosaic Jew has never become Christian; the Druidic and Gentile European soon became, and has never since ceased to be, Christian. It is the old Gentile populations of Europe and their descendants in the New World which now constitute Christendom, the rest of the world continuing Islamitic or Pagan. To attain an intelligent comprehension of the causes which led to the extension of primitive Christianity, it will thus be necessary to examine the prevalent religious systems which it found in operation, how far they held doctrines antagonistic to or identical with those it propounded as of divine sanction. We shall inquire first into those of Greece, Judæa, the East, Egypt, and Rome, then of Western Europe, more particularly of Britain. Having explored these various fields, we shall shew by what providential events, by what evangelists and apostles, the Gospel was first introduced into our then Druidic island.

And first of the Greek religions or philosophies.

Of the various philosophies prevalent among the Greeks, four only claim attention, the rest being affiliations of them—the Platonic, the Peripatetic, the Stoic, and the Epicurean.

The founder of the Platonic, or spiritual philosophy, was Plato, born at Athens 430 B.C., descended by his father's side from Codrus, by his mother's from Solon. He held that God was a pure Spirit, in whose nature existed three hypostases; the first the *τό εἶ* essential being, called also *τό ἀγαθόν* 'the good;' the second, emanating from the first, called *Νόος* or *λόγος* 'mind' or 'intelligence' and also *δημιουργός* 'the maker of the universe;' the third the *ψυχή τοῦ κόσμου* or 'soul of the world,' proceeding from the two former. The whole creation he regarded as the material body or organization of the *ψυχή*, or *anima*, therefore in a sense the body of God. This is the Platonic Triad or Trinity. The heathen philosophers maintained that the Christian Trinity was borrowed from it, and that St. John was a Platonist. From the *psyche* emanated also an infinity of inferior spirits, endowed with the *νοῦς*, who inhabited the stars, planets, and constellations. The soul in man was, Plato taught, a derivation from the same First Cause, and on its liberation from the body became re-united with it.

All created things pre-existed in the *λόγος* or mind of God: by an act of divine volition, creation leapt into being according to the pre-existent type of it in the *λόγος*. These types were co-eternal with the Deity. When their external creations responded fully to them, or, in other words, when the thing created was a complete realization of its pre-existent ideal, or form in the divine mind, its nature was perfect: when it fell short, it was imperfect and mutilated. This is the Platonic theory of divine ideas, for such pre-existent forms he termed "ideas". Thus, to use an illustration, God created man according to the pre-existent image in His own mind of a perfect man: human nature is in its perfect state when it answers to such image, in an imperfect when it fails to realize it. And so with every other material formation. Plato taught also the necessity of piety, and the immutability of Providence. Most of these tenets he derived from Pythagoras and non-Hellenic sources. His metaphysical researches extended to the utmost bounds of human reason. Some of the primitive Fathers considered the Platonic philosophy as Gentile Christianity, declining to treat it as heathenism. It was, in fact, the fragments of the traditionary religion of mankind remoulded into a system by a genius of the highest order. The extensive and influential sect which professed its principles formed an order pre-disposed to a favourable consideration of some of the most mysterious doctrines of Christianity.

The founder of the Peripatetics was Aristotle of Stagira, probably the clearest physical intellect that has ever existed, but either entirely destitute of, or deliberately ignoring as unphilosophical, the spiritual faculty. He held the First Cause to be a unity, but whether material or immaterial he declared there was no evidence. The material universe, he taught, was eternal and indestructible. On the nature of the soul he pronounced nothing dogmatic or definite, nor yet in providence. He is the most splendid instance on record of pure logical mind without soul. His literary labours were incredible; his knowledge of every human science accurate and profound; his treatment of several of them exhaustive. During the Middle Ages his supremacy in all the Academies of Europe was undisputed, but, with the exception of himself, his school has scarcely produced a great character. The Aristotelian philosophy may be said to put aside all religion as incapable of demonstration, to deal with morals on the coldest rules of logic, and to proceed throughout on the two principles of science and utilitarianism. As an exercise for the mind, no study can be more tentative or beneficial; but as a rule of life, no practice less productive of satisfaction or happiness.

The author of the Stoic philosophy was Zeno of Citium, A.C. 300. His leading maxim was that virtue required no reward but itself. He inculcated the absolute extinction of the passions and feelings; indifference to externals, such as fortune, rank, honours; the futility of prayer, the exercise of mutual forbearance and benevolence, the preservation of an unruffled and commanding serenity amongst all the pleasures, disasters, and vicissitudes of life. Superiority to fortune, pain, and passions, and perfect self-sufficiency in man for his own wants and happiness, were the chief objects of Stoicism. This was a high and severe but unnatural philosophy. The school produced many eminent men, and the life of the founder, which was prolonged to his 100th year, was distinguished for moderation, sobriety, and temperance.. The

Cynic philosophy was Stoicism bereft of its principle of benevolence, and corrupted into self-conceited misanthropy.

The Epicurean philosophy was founded by Epicurus, of Gargettus in Attica, 342 B.C. Its principal tenets were that virtue was the greatest pleasure, and pain the greatest evil. His followers, retaining the latter, reversed the former tenet into "Pleasure is the greatest good," and as Epicurus had taught that the senses were our best guides to happiness, sensual pleasure came to be regarded as the chief object of his philosophy. In this sense it would be absurd to term Epicurus its founder, for it is unfortunately the philosophy of unenlightened and undisciplined human nature everywhere and in all ages. His own life was exemplary, and his immediate followers lived in singular concord. He composed nearly 300 volumes, and died in his seventy-second year.

The two most directly opposed to the spirit of Christianity of these philosophies were the Aristotelian and Epicurean. The hard utilitarianism of the one reduced everything to a consideration of material causes and results, applied the tests of logical induction or scientific analogy to every new proposition, and threw out of court, as inadmissible by its physical code of laws, all appeals to spiritual motives and intangible conditions. Its rule of decision was, "*De non-apparentibus et non-existent-tibus eadem est ratio.*" It refused to admit any arguments based on the invisible, and such Christianity mainly advanced.

The other was the stronghold of animal indulgence, from the grossest criminality to the most delicate and refined forms of esthetic enjoyment. The opulent and highly educated Epicurean, with his taste fastidiously cultivated, a connoisseur in the works of Phidias, Polygnotus, Zeuxis, and Menander, in all the treasures of literature and *vertú*, and select to a nicety in his inferior gratifications, would acknowledge no community of feeling or ideas with the vulgar glutton, drunkard, or sensualist. Pleasure with him was a science, an art, a religion; the senses so many sacraments, and everything that blunted their exquisite sensibility a sin against the great end of life. Yet in the Roman Lucullus and the Syrian slave the difference would be one of tastes and means, the principle would be Epicureanism in both; in the poor and uneducated "the wallowing of the sow in the mire," in the polished patrician the cultivation of artistic or voluptuous sensations. The purity of heart required by Christianity struck no less at the leaves and flowers than at the earth-imbedded root of the tree of carnality. Hence in the Epicurean philosophy it encountered virulent and declared hostility.

The moral pride of the Stoic presented a difficulty of an opposite description. The all-sufficiency of man for his own virtue and reward was a sublime and captivating theory; the dignity of human nature was never so exalted or attempted to be practically exemplified. And in itself it was a noble and laudable effort, not void of generous fruits and magnanimous sacrifices; but as a religion, the experiment, being based on false premises, proved a total, and in the judgment of the world, a ridiculous failure. As Aristotelianism rejected faith, and Epicureanism polluted the fountain of moral life, so stoicism crushed the heart, with its natural affections of pity, mercy, and love. It reduced man to a state of stolid and repulsive insensibility: pretending to make him more than mortal, it made him less than human. St. Paul abounds in allusions to the hollowness and unreality of the Stoic principles.

But in its better parts, such as its contempt for external circumstances, its doctrines of manly resignation and composure, its practice of kindness and forbearance, there was much in Stoicism identical with Christianity; and the follower of Zeno could not but be struck by the infinite superiority of the example of Christ over all others in illustrating these cardinal virtues of his school, as well of the motives propounded for their imitation. The exhortation to cast himself wholly on Christ for strength and support would come with peculiar force to a sincere Stoic who had discovered how delusive it was to seek them in himself.

Unattached to any sect of philosophy or religion, were the Pyrrhonists, sceptics or rhetoricians, a large and important class, so called from their founder Pyrrho, who held that there was no such

thing as positive or abstract truth, no uniform or immutable standard of morality and immorality, right and wrong, virtue and vice, knowledge and ignorance; but that they were, under different circumstances and places, convertible terms. They regarded all opinions alike, treated all religions with equal indifference, would argue for either side on alternate days, stating, "The reasons opposed to those on which our assent was yesterday founded are entitled to equal belief, as we shall now demonstrate." "We enunciate," declared Pyrrho, "the doctrines of others to prove our perfect indifference; it is just as if we were to prove the same thing by simple signs. Every reason has a corresponding reason opposed to it; we state them mathematically, and not dogmatically." The Pyrrhonist denied first principles of any kind. Pilate by his question, "What is truth?" appears to have belonged to this pernicious and mercenary sect.

The absorption of these moral philosophies by Christianity was a tardy process, which during and after its continuance re-acted on its framework and leavened its doctrines. Rightly interpreted, there was a part in each of them, not excepting Epicureanism as taught by its founder, which might claim to be one with the new religion. Epicurus pointed to pleasure as the summum bonum, and to pain as the greatest evil; Christianity spoke of the pleasures at God's right hand for evermore as the strongest inducement to a holy life, and of the tremendous pains of hell as the most effectual dissuasive from the practice of sin. The depravation of the philosophy cannot with fairness be charged on its founder, but it was with such depravation, widely and deeply seated, that Christianity had to contend. Both appealed to the avoidance of pain and the attainment of happiness as solid grounds of persuasion, but when an Apostle preached the taking up of the Cross during the whole of the present life as the condition of the happiness promised in the future, the Epicurean recoiled. His faith did not penetrate the grave; it had its seat in and died with the body. The advantage possessed in this respect by Christianity told daily.

To escape the pains of hell, the Christian bore all earthly pains, every bodily torture, not only with a calmness more than Stoic, but with a joy which confounded all the reasoning of heathen sagacity. "These Christians are mad," was the despairing explanation on which they fell back. But meanwhile, neither the Academe, nor the Porch, nor the Garden produced martyrs. The Stoic might suffer unavoidable calamities with magnanimity, but a Paul voluntarily, for the sake of certain convictions, undergoing them, and exclaiming in his utmost necessities, "We are more than conquerors," impressed the Gentile with deeper sensations than admiration. Something there was, therefore, in each of these philosophies akin to Christianity, but there was that also in Christianity which none of them possessed, and in this consisted the secret of its superiority.

Turning from Greece and Rome to Judæa, we find three sects predominating, the Pharisee, the Sadducee, and the Essene. The Pharisees, so called either from their exclusive pretensions to sanctity, or from their founder Pharez, held the doctrines of fate and predestination; consistently, as they maintained, with the freedom of the will, the metempsychosis of virtuous souls and a future resurrection. They advocated celibacy, frequent fasts, punctual payment of tithes, rigid observation of prescribed rites and ceremonies, fixed hours for ablutions, publicity in bestowing alms, and long services or prayers. By the bare enumeration of these particulars we feel that we have stepped from heathendom into Jewry, from the boundless speculations of the untrammelled mind to the pale of a precise and ancient sacerdotal-ism.

The Pharisaic sect were strenuous assertors of the traditions of the Talmudists, or Elders, which in many instances nullified the positive commands of the Mosaic moral code, yet at the same time they exhibited ferocious jealousy on behalf of the Law, and laboured with incessant zeal to proselytise the heathen. Elements of great force existed in this sect, but it was at the commencement of Christianity tainted to the core with corruption, the more detestable because garbed in the gown and phylacteries of religion. Sanctimoniousness supplied the place of charity, and a bigoted observance of the rubrical Law was made the screen for unscrupulous oppression and the most sordid avarice. The Pharisees generally set the tone of public opinion among their countrymen, over whom, from the apparent austerity of their lives and their numerous colleges and schools, their influence was paramount. The priesthood consisted almost entirely of this sect.

Limited in number, but powerful from their wealth and enterprise, the Sadducees, or followers of Sadoc, the disciple of Antigonus Sochæus, supply us with the fullest representation in the annals of any nation of an organized school of infidels—infidels of the broadest profession. They held that there was no divine law; no providence in human affairs; no difference between good and evil; no state of future rewards and punishments; that there was neither angel, spirit, nor resurrection; that the soul was mortal and died with the body. They lived avowedly without God and without a hope, and squared their lives accordingly. Politically and morally sunk as were the Jewish people, it is still to their credit that such a sect, with which the lowest amongst the heathens would compare favourably, were never popular; they were feared and shunned. Their interest with the Roman Government, who wielded them, with their usual divisional policy, against the Pharisees, was considerable; they carried weight in the Sanhedrim, and some of the most sanguinary persecutors of the Christian Church belonged to this order of irreligious negatives. It is salutary to turn from such a picture to the wilderness of Judæa and the monasteries or colonies of the Essenes, the most estimable of the Jewish religionists.

They held the special providence of God, the immortality of the soul, its departure to a place of reward or punishment. The following particulars constituted their mode of life. They admitted none but grave or aged men into their society; had a community of goods and provisions; practised celibacy; lived an austere life, enduring much fatigue and using coarse food and clothing; they exercised no trade or art by which mankind could be injured or vice cherished; observed stated periods for prayers in a prescribed form; sanctified the Sabbath somewhat superstitiously; were eminently zealous in piety, beneficence, and hospitality; loved solitude and silence; required of their disciples a probation of four years; punished delinquents with severity; avoided law-suits, contentions, and disputations, and therefore never intruded with polemical questions upon our Lord. Their simplicity of life lengthened their days. With politics they never interfered. It is difficult to deny the name of Christians in most that concerns the practical discipline of life to these retired and interesting communities—they certainly had more right to the title than nine-tenths of the modern Christian world. Even the asceticism on which their piety borders appears free from the customary accompaniments of morosity and religious conceit. The historian feels delight in lingering awhile by the clear waters and unsullied verdure of this oasis in the desert.

The Essenes seemed to have gradually merged and disappeared as a distinct sect in the extension of the Christian Church, to which they undoubtedly brought that powerful eremitic element which some generations later peopled the Egyptian and Palestinian solitudes with tribes of recluses useless to their fellow-creatures, and disgusting by their filth, fanaticism, and self-torments. It is thus that folly is marked by excess, and institutions, in their limited and moderate form of signal benefit, are perverted by senseless exaggeration into evils of the first magnitude.

Beyond the Euphrates the religion of Zoroaster was maintained and established in the Parthian empire. Its priesthood was selected from the nobility. Fire was considered the most appropriate emblem of the deity, and the Sun, or Mithras, to be the deity. Fire-towers and altars distinguish the Mithraic towns and villages, especially in Irania, the Holy Land of this worship. Great obscurity surrounds the real teaching of Zoroaster, but it appears beyond doubt that he founded his system on the co-existence of two principles—the good and the evil—Oromasdes and Ahriman, symbolized by fire and cold, light and darkness, land and sea, in perpetual war against each other. Between these and matter existed various degrees of corporeal and incorporeal intelligences, each of which, by a fatal necessity, was obliged to attach itself to the fortunes of one of the two great opposites. Sometimes one, sometimes the other, was in the ascendant; but ultimately Oromasdes, or the principle of good, was destined to triumph, Ahriman himself and his legions being transformed into genii of light and benevolence.

The destinies of men were held to be regulated by the stars or planets of their nativities; and as some constellations and conjunctions were peculiarly felicitous, others peculiarly malignant, and as success or failure was believed to depend in trivial and momentous emergencies alike on the

ascendancy or depression of the natal star at the hour of action, star-fatalism became the profession of a distinct order of men, the astrologers. Known as Chaldæi, they swarmed in every court and city of the East. In Rome, where all superstitions found encouragement, they were termed also, from their calculations, Mathematici. The books which they carried with them, in which the rising, setting, conjunction, and other appearances of the stars were set down, were called Ephemerides, and the study itself "the Babylonian doctrine." Emperors, philosophers, and the people resorted to these impostors, some of whom amassed enormous wealth. For a Christian to consult them was matter of excommunication. The rites of Mithras, which were open to none but the initiated, were conducted with circumstances of such terrific impressions, that insanity was often the penalty paid by, the aspirant. Parseeism is the modern form of the religion of Zoroaster. Ahrimanism lingers as devil-worship among certain tribes of Kurdistan.

In Egypt, Fetishism, or the worship of the Deity in any animal, plant, or object, from the square block of black marble, the snake and the crocodile, to the statues of Isis, Osiris, and myriads of subordinate idols, was carried to such an excess that the gods outnumbered the human population. Important analogies connect the religions of ancient India and Egypt, one of the most striking resemblances being the common worship of the Ling, or Phallic Principle. In both, holiness and personal purity were absolutely unknown; the ideas which these words convey did not exist in the mind of the Egyptian idolator. His religion was a system of impurity not to be described, and its festivals were orgies of the vilest passions. The land of bondage was the pandemonium of vice in every unnatural form, and from it issued the chief stream which fed the collected moral sewerage of the mistress of the world. Into this "Serbonian Bog" the soldiers of the Cross did not, however, hesitate to advance; and at Alexandria rose a church, the furious zeal of whose multitudinous converts divided the attention of the first centuries with' the acumen and erudition of its teachers. The first in learning, it was the first also in turbulence without an aim, in asceticism without sense. There was no medium in the Egyptian character: "If they are not zealots," observed Cyril, "they are stones; if they are not ascetics, they are profligates."

Such were the religions east of Rome. In Rome they met as a common centre and reservoir. With one exception, no hostility existed between them. The Zoroastrian or Magian Cambyses had, it is true, many centuries previously, in a fit of iconoclasm, overthrown the altars of Osiris and wounded the sacred calf, even Apis itself, with his sacrilegious sword; but these acts were held those of an irresponsible being, the Persian despot being known at the time to be deranged in intellect. Absurd or untenable as these Gentile cults seem, for the most part, to us, there is one great point in which they shame Christians and Christianity—they lived in peace with each other. Unclean as was the cage, the tenants did not, because they preferred different foods, rend each other's limbs and destroy each other's lives. The philosopher regarded them all with equal outward respect, equal inward derision. The priesthoods of all were on terms of reciprocal recognition. To raise another altar was considered not an act of hostility, but of inauguration into the Pantheistic hierarchy. The Roman State indeed, since the accession of Tiberius, allowed not only unlimited licence of worship, but declined to interfere on behalf of one deity more than another. This dark but sagacious ruler proposed to the senate the solemn admission of Jesus of Nazareth among the tutelary gods of Italy. The senate reclaimed. Shortly afterwards it moved the Emperor to take cognizance of certain acts of sacrilege perpetrated against the temples of Jupiter and Apollo: "Let every god take care of himself," was the sarcastic reply—"Diis injuriæ, diis cure." The expression passed into a proverb.

The one exception of these Eastern religions to this universal toleration, or rather apathy, displayed by the government, was the Jewish. The Babylonian captivity had thoroughly effected its purpose, and not only cured the Hebrew people of their old sin of idolatry, but implanted in them a horror approaching to mania against connivance with it. So far the prophets had done their work; and- if the design of the Mosaic dispensation was to keep the Jews from amalgamating with other races, and to substantiate the prediction, "This people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nation," never has any constitution so answered its end. Compared to it, the institutions of other lawgivers have been destitute of moulding power. The seal of Moses

remains not alone on the ritual, but on the mind itself of the Jew. The stamp seems to sink deeper under the finger of time. No leniency, no bribery, no progress melts it; no sword, no rack obliterates it. A converted Jew is still a miracle. The Church of the Apostles themselves at Jerusalem was not Christian in the ordinary sense, it was Christo-Mosaic. Accepting Christ, it still clung to the horns of the Levitical altar; observing Baptism, it continued Circumcision; preaching the Gospel, it was yet "zealous for the Law;" and even a Paul within its walls to the Jews became as a Jew, shaving the head and keeping the customs.

The mythologies of Greece and Rome, derived from the same springs, united at a certain point, and flowed onwards in one broad current. In Gaul or the heart of Germany, the wilds of Scythia or the herbless Sahara of Africa, the Roman legionary found deities presenting so many resemblances to his own that he did not hesitate to pronounce them identical, and call them by the same names. But there was no confounding, no mistaking the Jew or Judaism wherever found, be it at the remotest bounds from Jerusalem. Everywhere they were undisguisable. The Roman could, in any city or waste, or amidst the dead bodies of a battle-field, point his javelin at once at the son of Abraham; he could detect him with the same infallibility as we do the same stereotyped physiognomy in the marble fragments of the Ninevitic triumph and the Egyptian procession. And everywhere the same impassable gulf surrounded him. Between him and his Gentile oppressor not a solitary point of fellow-feeling existed: but the causes of deep and rancorous antipathy were many. On the one hand, it mattered not to the Jew what the rank or virtues of a Gentile were. Cæsar on his throne and Socrates in his prison were alike to him abominations, "unclean things," "dogs." To eat with them was pollution; to pray with them, exclusion from the covenant.

The heel of the idolater trod heavily at present on the neck of the faithful, but it was firmly believed to be only for a permitted time. Writhing meanwhile under it, unable to rise, but throwing poison into his bite, the latter looked forward with unflinching fortitude to the approaching kingdom of the Messiah, when the sceptre would be restored to his grasp, and he in turn would bind kings in chains and smite them with a rod of iron. And the history of his race justified such faith. Every Sabbath he drank in, told in language of sublime force and impressiveness, the wondrous things God had done for his fathers and -in the old times before them. If the marvels of Egypt, the deliverance of the Judges, the conquests of David and the pacific magnificence of Solomon, were too remote to affect him, he might yet truly say he had heard from the preceding generation of the mighty deeds wrought against the Gentile powers by the hands of the Maccabees—deeds worthy to be compared with those of Joshua and Gideon, and which yet rung through the nations of the East.

Herod was but another Sisera, the viceroy of another Jabin, like him to fall before the sword of another Deliverer whom the Lord would raise. The kingdoms of those that had oppressed them had been removed from their places. The Assyrian, the Persian, the Greek had disappeared from the thrones, but the temple towered in more imposing splendour and magnificence than ever on Zion, and its doors were waiting to be lifted up for the Son of David, the King of Glory, to come in. For if history displayed the presence of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to them in every transaction of the past, prophecy in yet nobler strains called for unbounded faith in the future. Before we condemn the Jew we should place ourselves in his position. Every mother in Israel prayed to be the overshadowed one who was to bring forth the Prince Messiah.

Every infant drank from the breast the Messianic faith, and until Jesus of Nazareth opened the Scriptures, the whole Jewish race—priests, doctors, and people alike—had no conception that He would be other than temporal, subduing the utmost ends of the earth by divine prowess, and making every enemy their footstool. And the primary or literary expression of the prophecies cannot be denied to indicate a secular Saviour. The spiritual interpretation was hitherto unknown, and when pointed out by Him who was Himself the End of the Law and the Prophets, was wholly unintelligible to the masses, and only dimly discerned by His own disciples. The veil was on the whole nation; its folds indeed partially included the heathen. The expectation of a universal

Sovereign, whose nativity fate had fixed in the East, had radiated from Judæa as from a centre, to every country from the Euphrates to the Straits of Gadira. The Sybilline Books, depositories of religious traditions, which have never been satisfactorily demonstrated to be merely human, predicted His advent in such unambiguous terms that poets took up the strains and historians the application.[1] And here also an earthly court and dominion were pre-supposed, differing only so far, that under them war was to be annihilated, and the Saturnian reign of peace and justice restored.

Force and conquest were the dominant ideas in the Jewish, peace and equality in the ethnic millennium, but both were essentially temporal and terrestrial. And a spiritual Messiah was, for obvious reasons, antecedently rejected by the Jewish temper. Oppression is variously felt. There is an oppression a fool would not be stirred by, but which "maketh a wise man mad." There is an oppression also a wise man might by bearing obviate, but which, falling on a mind in a certain state of excitement and under the influence of a leading idea, is more intolerable than the most desperate war or death. The Roman exactions were heavy. The equites, or knightly order, who farmed the imperial revenues, were amongst the most influential and dignified of the aristocracy, but the local *publicani* employed by them were regarded with detestation everywhere, and by the Jews with fanatic horror. Each "Matthew at the receipt of custom" seemed to them both the monument and agent of their subjugation. Every tribute-penny paid to Cæsar was treason to the Messiah; the iron that pierced their souls was hammered in Gehenna and dipped in wormwood, of which the other provinces were happily insensible. In Babylon, where the Jewish population continued to be nearly a million; in Alexandria, where it was little inferior; in Palestine, Rome, Asia Minor, Greece, Libya, the mind of "the Circumcision" resembled a sea beginning to heave under the rising tempest. The prophetic weeks of Daniel, which had fixed the date of the Messiah's coming, were just expiring, and from the lips of every Jew the question was irrepressibly and ceaselessly asked., "Art thou He that should come?"

Whatever the demerits of a people are, it is impossible for a generous mind not to sympathize with their efforts against a tyranny of physical force. Honour, religion, and reason revolt from the practice of the theory which would regard men as so many wolves, to be kept in order by a stronger tiger. When the Jew, under the resistless impulsion of the Messianic idea, burst his bonds and defied the armed force of the immense Gentile empire' that swathed him on every side with its ribs of steel, he acted worthy of his history, worthy of his faith. It was a heroic act with which our heart beats in unison, fervently wishing it God speed. But, on the other hand, there were sad facts in the internal annals and constitution of this unfortunate race, which even now go very far to destroy this feeling, and with many to transmute it into scorn and hatred. A glance at their records in their most prosperous times, when Israel and Judah dwelt each under its own fig-tree, shews page after page steeped in civil blood—cruel and sanguinary to a degree that even Oriental courts and despotisms failed to parallel. Baasha, we read, smote the royal house of Jeroboam until he left not one breathing. Zimri similarly destroyed the whole family of Baasha, Jehu of Omri and Ahab, Shallum of Jehu.

The bitterness between Israel and Judah exceeded that between them and Egypt or Assyria. So desolating and ruinous were their internal and foreign hostilities, that all the valiant men of Judah at the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar did not exceed 10,000, whereas in David's time they numbered 500,000. The depopulation of Ephraim or Samaria was even more complete, Assyrian colonies being settled in it to prevent its becoming entirely a wilderness of lions and other savage animals. Within the bounds of Palestine civil and foreign carnage held common carnival. Our admiration of the exploits of the Maccabees is suffused with horror at their bloody and internecine character. The Book of Joshua is re-opened and its scenes re-enacted. Cities are stormed, and every living creature destroyed in the name of religion and the Lord. The Jew after the captivity looked upon an idol as upon a device of Beelzebub, fabricated for his express destruction, and upon every isolator as a Canaanite whose slaughter was the most acceptable of all offerings that could be made to Jehovah. Hence the heathen generally, the Romans especially, termed the Jew "the enemy of the human race," and his religion a "murderous superstition." The

Roman conqueror, penetrating into the holy of holies, encountered neither image, symbol, nor similitude from which he could draw some explanation of this unappeasable antagonism and intolerance of other religions. Tacitus and Suetonius, composing their Histories in a city abounding with Jews, do not deign to ask them a single question relative to their law or faith. And though general after general swept over Judæa and Jerusalem, the Jewish priesthood meets no pen of a ready writer among them to portray their order and tenets, as the first Cæsar had familiarized the Roman mind to the order and tenets of the great Druidic priesthood of the West. The version common among the heathen of their exodus from Egypt represented them as a race of lepers, obliged first to seek refuge in the Egyptian temples, then expelled as infectious by the Egyptians, and driven into the wilderness; when, at the suggestion of a priest of the Sun, Osarsiph, or Moses, they bound themselves and their descendants, by dire ceremonies, to a vow of eternal hatred to all mankind, in fulfilment of which they invaded Palestine and exterminated the whole population.[2]

These feelings of contempt and detestation on one hand, and of fanatic rancour and sense of oppression on the other, deepened the moat which his religion had already formed between the Jew and all other nations. That interchange of offices, alliances, literature, explanations; which would have modified prejudices, was sternly forbidden. If a Roman consul touched his dish, the pauper Jew plunged it thrice for purification in the passing stream, or dashed it clandestinely to fragments. Even when sunk in the depths of adversity, the waters of affliction rolling over their souls, the fetters of the heathen grinding their limbs, Jerusalem in ashes, and the face of the Lord hidden from them, the loathing of the promised seed for all the Gentile world had never been mitigated; they were still "dogs" and "swine"; and the prayer of Ezra at Babylon may be considered the type of the sentiments of all his people: "Thou hast made the world, O Lord, for us Thy chosen. As for the other nations which also came out of Adam, Thou hast said they are nothing, but are like unto spittle. Behold these heathen, which have ever been reputed as nothing, are now lords over us, Thy firstborn, Thy only-begotten, Thy fervent lover." This spirit was not only unchanged, but, under the persuasion that the Messiah was on the eve of manifesting Himself, and summoning Israel to assume the predestinated empire of the world, was intensified it was rapidly culminating.

The Messianic idea, as the Jews now held it, was six centuries subsequently, proclaimed and acted upon by their cousins, the Ishmaelitic or Arab lineage of Abraham, under Mohammed, and with what tremendous effect, history witnesses. The sword or circumcision was the only option allowed other nations, other religions. The Roman Government, therefore, estimated the force and danger of such an idea amongst a population of ten millions of possessed fanatics stationed all over the empire, with its usual accuracy, and took its precautions with its usual wisdom and inflexibility. Had it not done so, the career of Mohammed would surely have been anticipated by some lion of the tribe of Judah under the Cæsars. Events were steadily drawing on that collision between the dominant heathen powers and the dominant article of the Jewish faith, which found its solution in the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion, perpetuated to this day, of the Jewish people.

Christianity came before the ethnic world as a form of Judaism, and the followers of Christ as a sect of the Jews. The error was natural. The new religion originated in Judæa, its Founder was a Jew, its first apostles and missionaries were Jews, its first Church observed the Jewish sacrament of circumcision, it pointed to the Jewish Scriptures as its witness and attestor. The immediate attendants of Jesus of Nazareth were selected by Him from the political faction which formed the advanced guard of the Messianic confederacy—they were Galileans, imbued to the bone with faith in the approaching Liberator, arid with hatred of the Gentile and Samaritan. , Barnabas, in his Epistle Catholic, affirms the twelve to have been, at the time they were called, the most lawless and desperate adventurers in Israel,[3] sinners in the extreme degtee; and the Gospels exhibit them wholly impenetrable to spiritual conceptions, impatient to call down fire and smite with the edge of the sword; unable to connect the notion of suffering and crucifixion with the Saviour, and recurring instantly after the resurrection to the all-absorbing thought of the Jewish

mind, "Lord, wilt Thou now restore the kingdom?" And, in truth, when they fully comprehended the character of the religion with which they were commissioned, they were quite conscious that that commission was a declaration of war against all other religions, for which no parallel, except in the Jewish practice, could be found. Wherever an apostle made his appearance, he assumed the aggressive; he sowed broadcast the seeds of a mighty revolution. It followed as the inevitable corollary of his teaching, that Cæsar was not the authority to be first consulted, and that the state mythology and establishment could not, without perdition, be recognised by any convert to Christ.

In perusing the authenticated accounts of the trials of the primitive martyrs, we can readily enter into the mental perplexity, of the presiding Roman proconsul. "Who and where is Christ?" asked in despair the magistrate of Polycarp. "He is the Dweller within me," replied the venerable and simple-hearted old man; "and ye shall behold Him coming in the clouds of heaven to judge the world!" But such a reply only served to plunge the official heathen into deeper hopelessness of eliciting tangible information. Christianity seemed a mystic faith, with a mystic King; a mania, as Pliny styles it, which, except for its quiet and unceasing crusade against the State deities and priesthood, the authorities felt disposed to let run its natural course.

The eyes of the emperors and senate opened but tardily to the distinction between Moses and Christ, the Jew himself being the chief instrument in enlightening them. For in him, in every city, the Christian found the bitterest, the most unscrupulous and unrelenting of his persecutors. The Jew considered the Gentile an enemy, but the Christian he regarded as a traitor; one that had sold Moses, and the Law, and the hope of Israel, and the everlasting covenant, for the son of the carpenter, and diluted the true idea of the Messiah and His salvation into a misty, incomprehensible spiritualism. To the Christian, the Jew was a wild beast, caged in chains, but his nature unchanged, still panting to cool his tongue in blood. To the Jew, the Christian was a base, dastardly wretch, blessing where he ought to curse, and praying when he ought to kill. For centuries subsequent to the apostolic age, every persecutor of the Christian cause might safely register the Jews as ready to anticipate the execution of his orders. "Ye know," writes St. Chrysostom, "in our generation, when Julian, who surpassed all his predecessors in vindictiveness, gave way to his fury, the Jews ranged themselves with the heathen, they courted their party. If they appear to be somewhat subdued now, it is only because the fear of the Emperors keeps them so. Were it not for that, they are willing to be worse than ever." [4] The eye of the Jew was evil towards the Gentile, but towards the Nazarene it flashed with a spirit little less than infernal. But as yet the Gentile regarded both as sections of the same baneful superstition.

In estimating the heathen force of Rome, against which the infant faith of Christ was about to take the field, its hierarchic system arrests the attention first. It possessed advantages which, in despite of the immense defect of no fixed code of morals or authoritative appeal to the inner man, enabled it to prolong the struggle for centuries. As a distinct order, priesthood had no existence among the Romans. The father of each family was the priest of the family; the head of each gens, or clan, was the high priest of the clan, and in that capacity annually solemnized the *dies natalitia*, or clan birth-day. Both the *pater familial* and the *pontifex gentis* possessed the right of trying, conjointly with such members as they summoned on the jury, any one of the clan or family accused of apostasy from the ancestral religion. By this usage, Pomponia Grecina, the sister of Caractacus, was tried by her husband, Aulus Plautius.

The public ministers of religion were chosen from the most honourable men of the State. The college of pontiffs, (*collegium pontificum*), fifteen in number, which was the supreme court in all matters of religion, was entirely patrician; the national religion standing thus, like a statue of Jove, on the very apex of Roman society. Beyond the two exceptions, that the tribunes of the people could compel the due discharge of their functions, and that an appeal lay from their decree, as from all others, to the people in convention, the members of the college were not responsible to either senate or people. They regulated and controlled the inferior priests and their duties. The head of the college was called *Pontifex Maximus*, and whereas the other members were elected

by the college, he was created by the people, deriving his authority immediately from them. The office was of the highest dignity and widest sweep of authority. "Arbiter," states Festus, "est pontifex maximus atque iudex rerum divinarum atque humanarum."

Even their favourite officers, the tribunes, were obliged to be very guarded and reverential in their allusions to this head of the national religion. His presence was necessary at every solemn festival to offer up the benedictory prayer, at the comitia, at adoptions, at the consecration of temples, at acts of devotion or self-immolation by a general for his army or a patriot for his country. The guardianship of the vestal virgins rested in him. With the college he judged concerning marriages and wills, and settled the public calendar of law and religion. In the earlier times he composed brief narratives of the public transactions of every year, which were open for perusal to the people, and afterwards deposited in the Capitol; these were called *annales* and *commentarii*. The power of life and death was, in certain cases, vested in him and his college. The office of the Pontifex was for life. In Augustus Cæsar it became united to the person of the Emperor, and continued so till the time of Theodosius, when it was assumed by the bishop of Rome, and the Church of Rome took henceforth the pontifical organization. The Pontifex resided in a palace called *Regia*, next to the house of the vestal virgins. It was considered a pollution if he either touched or saw a dead body. His canonicals were a white robe bordered with purple, a woollen cap (*galerus*) in the shape of a cone, and a *virgula*, or small rod bound round with wool.

Next the college of pontiffs came the college of augurs, a body of priests of the greatest weight in the State, because nothing was done regarding the public in peace or war, nor indeed in affairs of moment by private families, without consulting them. They were generally consulars, that is, senators who had borne the consular office, and none were elected under fifty years of age. The oldest, or president, was termed *Magister Collegii*; they were fifteen in number. The augurs, or auspices, were the diviners or "prophets" of the Roman religion, their laws and rites of divination being derived from the Etrurians. All the branches of aruspicy were taught in sacerdotal schools esoterically from the sacred books of Tages, its founder.

The augurs being the depositaries of the secrets of the empire, could not, of whatever crime they were guilty, be deprived of their office. They alone and the vestals were entrusted with the true name of the city of Rome, the revealing of which was an offence of such magnitude, that a senator being once guilty of it, was summarily put to death. The omens, or tokens of futurity, were drawn from five sources: appearances of the heavens, such as thunder or lightning, the flight or song of birds, quadrupeds, the actions of the consecrated chickens, and unusual incidents, or *miracula*. The whole augurial system was an imposition no less flagrant than childish, and if we did not know that the superstition of "signs and omens" prevailed perhaps no less strongly amongst Christian populations, we might express surprise that a people of such strong practical sense as the Romans tolerated it. "I wonder, indeed," was the candid confession of Cicero, himself an augur, "that one augur does not laugh whenever he meets another." Wholly destitute of a basis in nature or truth, the art was a chaos of contradictions and uncertainties. Originally the invention of the Tuscan priesthood to increase its influence over the people, it was introduced and maintained for the same purpose at Rome.

In the act of celestial divination, however, or the observation of the heavens, there was something imposing. The augur in the dead of night, or about twilight, when profound silence reigned, took his station on some elevated place, called *arx*, *templum*, or *tabernaculum* where the view to the horizon was open on all sides. Here he built an altar, offered up sacrifices and a solemn prayer. He then sat down, either on a rock or solid seat, with his head covered and his face to the east, and marking a certain portion of the heavens out with his *lituus*, or crosier, for the field of observation, kept his eyes upon it till the omens or signs appeared. The expiation of evil omens formed no small part of the augur's functions.

The resemblance between the ceremonials of Roman augurism and those of the East as described in the instance of Balaam in the Book of Numbers, confirms the belief that both had a common

though remote origin. The canonicals of an augur were a robe of purple and scarlet in alternate stripes, a conical cap, and a lituus, or curved staff.

The third and lowest college was that of the *haruspices*, who drew their omens from, the entrails of victims, and circumstances attending the sacrifice. Their chief was called *summus aruspex*; their number was uncertain.

In addition to these colleges, which superintended the general circle of the State religion, each god and goddess had, his or her own *flamen*, or priest, with peculiar rites and privileges. The service of the twelve principal deities, or *dii majores*, was conducted with no less solemnity and impressiveness than magnificence. When, on the occasion of a public thanksgiving, all the temples were thrown open, and the Roman people, in the national costume of the toga, or white robe, flowing and full, attended the rites and sacrifices, the world could not present a more gorgeous or memorable spectacle. It realized the picture in the Roman mind of what they believed the city of their forefathers, Troy, had been—*domus divum*, the home of the gods. By the favour and protection of, these deities, it was firmly believed, the Roman city had attained the empire of the earth. Its retention was conditional on fidelity to them; "*Di quibus hoc imperium stat*," was the usual form of adjuration. The belief that the power and grandeur of a people depended upon, and was, as it were, the earthly reflection as well as demonstration of the power of its peculiar gods, was as deeply ingrained in the Roman as in the Jewish mind.

The Capitoline Jupiter, Optimus Maximus, had brought every nation under the feet of his Roman children. Many of them traced their lineage to Olympus: "By my mother's side I am descended," exclaimed Julius Cesar, in his funeral oration over his aunt Julia, "from the ancient kings of Italy, and by the father's from Troy and the immortal gods!" If the Jew drew back from the false prophet who whispered to him to forsake the altar of Jehovah, the Roman, on the other hand, was too haughty, too indissolubly bound by every tradition, every association in the mighty career of his race, to deign a hearing to the preacher who would separate between him and the gods of his fathers. There is something indeed touching, even to the Christian, in reading the lament of the stern pagan soldier gazing on the ruins of the temples, after the empire had fallen before the barbarian: "The Roman became a Christian, and Jupiter withdrew his aegis and Pallas her spear from him. If he had not forsaken his gods, his empire would, like them, have been eternal!"

The fact of the administration of religion in Rome being thus in a lay-priesthood was attended with one incalculable benefit to the State. A priest-party could not exist, nor any priest-interest, distinct from that of the secular weal. Up to the era of Augustus, the people, as we have seen, retained in their own hands the absolute appointment of the *Pontifex Maximus*, and the power of sitting themselves in appeal on every case of religion. This religion, on the other hand, was so interknit with the whole fabric of the State, that its fall dissolved both into anarchy. To the merely human eye, however, the sight of the Christian evangelist walking round the lofty walls and towers of the Gentile queen of nations, to see where the first breach on her strength was to be made, would have supplied no other emotions than those of unbounded pity or amazement. The union of the Church and State was incarnated in the divine person of the Cæsar, and every family possessed over its own Lares and Penates the ministering Levite in its own head. Yet this vast consolidation was doomed to disappear as a dream of the night before the approaches of twelve men without an earthly tool in their hands.

The State religion of Rome inculcated no code of morality strictly so called. It exacted from every citizen the observance of certain forms of worship, and the discharge of certain ceremonial duties. It left the conscience uninterfered with, and, as a consequence, also unregulated. But it would be a grave misapprehension to conceive that *Gentilism* rose in arms against the moral teaching of Christianity. So far was this from being the case, that there was scarcely a moral precept in the Christian code which had not been taught in the schools and exemplified in the lives of some of the philosophers. Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Democritus concurred with one voice in the great elementals of morality. The Gentiles, declares St. Paul, knew God as well as

the Jews; the moral law was written by nature on their hearts; they were a law unto themselves; otherwise sin could not have been charged upon them, for where there is no law there can be no sin, or transgression of the law, which is the Scriptural definition of sin. The Gentile guilt consisted in this, that possessing the knowledge of God they neglected to act upon it. They habitually in practice ignored the obligations of the moral code, with which they were as well acquainted as the chosen people themselves. But though all—Jew and Gentile alike—failed to act up to the standard required, in one by the light of nature, in the other by the additional enforcement of an express revelation, we must acknowledge that there were vast differences between the degrees of guilt in individuals. Goodness and wickedness, truth and error, piety and impiety, have their degrees. A Job, perfect and upright, one that fears God and eschews evil; a Noah, a just man and perfect in his generations; a Jeremiah, sanctified in the womb; and a John the Baptist, filled from his birth with the Holy Ghost, the intrepid assertors even unto death before kings and councils of equity and virtue, are not to be classed or confined in the same cell, though in the same prison, with the sanguinary Manasses and other monsters of Jewish history.

Nor are such philosophers as Plato, or such statesmen as Epaminondas, or such patriots as Leonidas and Cincinnatus, men who reflected the highest lustre on the contemplative and active life of humanity, to be chained in the same gangway of criminality and guilt as a Nero or Messalina, or the odious characters crucified to the execration of posterity in the pages of Tacitus or Juvenal. Our senses revolt from any law which acknowledges no degrees in demerit, nor exercises any discrimination in its awards. "Other sheep I have," said the Saviour during His lifetime, "which are not of the Jewish fold." And amongst those who shall sit down from all quarters, from the north, the south, the east, and the west, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, must surely be ranked those great and good men of the Gentile world whom their own and future ages consented to venerate as examples of fortitude or as benefactors of mankind. It was the contracted spirit which would have cooped up all worth and acceptability with God in the Jew only, that elicited from St. Paul the indignant remonstrance, "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is He not the God of the Gentiles also?" Admitting, therefore, the universality of the moral fall, discerning at the same time broad distinctions in the individual degrees of that fall, observing in the Gentile as full a mental appreciation of the moral code itself as in the Jew, the newness of the Christian religion, it is obvious, did not consist in any newness of morals. It could not even be said to bring stronger evidence in their support, for no divine sanction or evidence can exceed that which God has given us in the nature of man himself. Man's conscience, declares St. Paul, is the witness of God, and as such accuses or acquits him.

To this witness, this internal power of judging on all moral questions, Christianity of necessity appealed. If none such existed, independent of, and in one sense superior to, all forms of religion whatever, no man could on any rational grounds prefer Christianity to heathenism, or give "a reason" for the faith he professed. Such did exist, and its influence was so bright and powerful as in some remarkable particulars to give the Gentile a decided moral and spiritual superiority over the Jew. The institution of marriage, for instance, always sat very loose upon the Jew; on the faintest pretext the writ of divorce was placed in the woman's hand, and she was sent over the threshold. In Gentile Rome, on the contrary, no divorce occurred for 520 years.

Even then, Spurius Carvilius Ruga, who was the first, on the ground of sterility, to put away his wife, could never afterwards reinstate himself in the good graces of his fellow-citizens. Polygamy, again, during their patriarchal, regal, and self-supporting eras, disfigures the annals and taints the domestic life of the Jew. This pernicious Oriental usage, the fruitful mother of infanticide and female degradation, never took root in Gentile Greece or Rome. Fornication was, as in modern times in France and the Continental countries under government police, dealt with like other social evils, so as to diminish its injuriousness as far as possible to the public weal. But this inevitable recognition of impurity as a public evil did not prevent a line of insurmountable demarcation being drawn by the Gentile between it and female honour. Twice did attacks on the virtues of the matron and the virgin, the innermost sanctuaries of every healthy state, revolutionize the Roman constitution.

Neither monarchs nor popular decemviri could with impunity introduce the licence of the camp or of the baths into the private house, which was also the temple, of the Roman citizen. In even more corrupt eras, the wife of a Cæsar is dismissed, not because she is guilty, but because she should be above the suspicion of guilt. Between the licentious harems of Abraham, of David, and Solomon, and the modest homes of the Gentile consul and his wife, no similitude could be instituted. They were strong contrasts, containing no element of comparison. The Jews were not deterred from following Absalom in his unnatural rebellion by the horrible spectacle he exhibited of going in unto his father's concubines before all Israel, but the crime of a Tarquin on the person of his cousin's wife casts him and his family from the kingdom, and terminates the very institution of monarchy at Rome.

Further west, in Britain, the outrage of a proconsul on the person of a British queen costs Rome herself, at a later era, more than one of her legions, and the lives of 80,000 of her citizens. In the estimate of female worth and dignity, as in the depth of his feelings and capability of love for womanhood, the European Gentile stood far above the Jew. By the descendant of Japhet, that which forms the sanctity of woman has always been so regarded, that which forms her only true charm has always been so loved. To the descendants of Shem and Ham, woman, on the contrary, was simply a sex. To the poor a poorer, slave, to the rich a sensual property. And as the history of nations can only be correctly explained by the light of the domestic hearthstone, the difference in the results of the Roman and Jewish careers may in great measure be traced to the different position woman occupied among them in her own home.

The Gentile had worked out also a clearer conception of the immortality of the soul than the Jew. This opinion, we are aware, controverts the vulgar notion; it is, nevertheless, perfectly true. The Books of Moses contain no direct assurance that the soul is immortal, or that in any state, be it of happiness or misery, it survives the dissolution of the body. But setting apart the discussions of philosophy and philosophers, the belief in its immortality, in its being the subject of an after-judgment, the recipient of future joys or penalties, was universal in the Gentile world of Europe. The triad of the infernal judges, Æacus, Minos, and Rhadamanthus, the Elysian repose and happy isles of the blest, the Tartarean lakes burning with fire and brimstone of the impious and wicked, were substantial articles of faith in the mind of every Roman soldier and peasant. His mythology taught him and the Greek that men might become heroes, heroes demi-gods, and demigods gods.

From Hercules to Romulus his scriptures furnished him with a roll of brilliant instances in which men had ascended into heaven and been crowned with the immortality of its deities. If in Christianity he afterwards welcomed doctrines teaching under other forms the same truths, he failed in Judaism so-called to find them in any form at all before the Babylonian captivity, and then in a Chaldæan dress, being Chaldæan introductions; in other words, derived from Asiatic Gentile sources. Neither Moses nor the Prophets could supply the searcher after truth, in the century immediately before the Christian era, with declarations more positive on the existence and attributes of God, or so positive on the immortality of the soul and the existence of a heaven for virtuous souls, as the works of Cicero, to be found at every stall and pillar of the Eternal City. Passages such as the following, as lucid in their truths as magnificent in their native diction, arrest our eyes whenever we open at random their pages:

"Many persons entertain depraved ideas of the Deity, but all admit a divine force and nature.

"As we believe by nature that there is a God, and know by reasoning what He is, so we conclude from the consent of all nations that our souls remain after death, but where they remain, and what they are, we must learn by reasoning.

"I do not agree with those who have recently begun to assert that our souls are mortal, that they perish with the body, and that all things are annihilated by death.

"The Deity which rules within us forbids us to quit this life without His permission.

"My mind has always so looked forward as if it were then only to begin to live when it had left this life.

"What in human affairs can seem important to Him to whom all eternity is known?

"The gods of the people are many, of nature one.

"All nature is governed by the might, the reason, the power, the intelligence, the influence—or if there is any other word better expressive of my meaning—of the immortal gods.

"The whole universe is one city, common to gods and men.

"That is not life which is compromised in our mortal part, but that which eternity itself will protect. "If there is anything in the nature of things which the mind of man, which reason, which force, which human power could not produce, certainly the Being who produces it is greater than man. But the celestial bodies, and all that system whose arrangement is perpetual, cannot be framed by man. That, therefore, by which they are created must be superior to man, and by what name can we better designate such than God?

"God has given you a soul, than which nothing is more excellent, more divine; will you be so abject as to act as if there was no difference between you and the brutes?

"The soul of man, deduced from the mind of God, can be compared with nothing short of God.

"When we give happiness to man, we draw near the gods.

"There is nothing above God. It is a necessity, therefore, that the universe be governed by Him. God, then, is not subject to nature, but nature to God, and He Himself governs all nature.

"You see not the soul of man. Neither do you see God. Yet as you acknowledge God by His works, so acknowledge the divinity of the soul by its memory, its invention, its rapidity of thought, its whole beauty of virtue.

"For whose sakes will any one say this world was created? Certainly for those living creatures endowed with reason, and these are men.

"When we call corn Ceres, and wine Bacchus, we use a figure of speech, but do you think any one so mad as to believe that to be God which he feeds upon?

"Let us make our exit from life with joy, and submit, with thankfulness, as if we had received our discharge from prison and bonds, and were now about to return to our eternal and proper home. Let us consider the last day as the most auspicious, considering nothing evil which God or Nature, the mother of us all, has appointed. We are not created without a fixed purpose, but there has been a Power at work which, in creating us, designed our ultimate happiness. It did not produce a being which was intended after its labours to sink into death or misery, but let us believe it has prepared for us a haven and a refuge, whither I could wish to be borne with flowing sails, but if for a time the winds are contrary, thither finally a little later I must arrive.

"Whilst even among men we wish poverty to be on an equality with riches, why should we drive her away from approaching the gods by expense being introduced into religious rites? more particularly since nothing would be less pleasing to God Himself than that the way to appear and worship Him should not be accessible to all.

"Let this principle be the first impressed on our citizens, that the gods are the lords and rulers of all things, and that everything proceeds on their authority and power.

"For all who have conserved, benefited, or protected their country, there is a certain and definite place allotted in heaven, where they are happy in the enjoyment of eternal life. Your father Paullus and others, whom we speak of as dead, are still alive, while our present life compared to theirs is death.

"If there is in mankind intelligence, fidelity, virtue, friendship, whence could these qualities descend upon the earth but from God? They must not only exist as in their original font in God, but be used by Him for the best and most beneficent purposes.

"The souls of men seem to me, for very many reasons, divine; among others for this,' that the soul of every good man so looks forward into futurity as to regard nothing but what is eternal.

"The gods are the lords and sovereign arbiters of the universe; by their judgment and divinity all things are governed; to them mankind are indebted for all their blessings; at a glance they know what every man is, what he does, his inmost thoughts, the sincerity or insincerity of his religion, and they keep a strict account of both the righteous and the impious."[5]

Extracts to the same purport might be indefinitely multiplied. The Gentile of Rome, therefore, stood on the pedestal of a natural religion decidedly more spiritual than the Mosaic. Underneath the gorgeous formalism of his mythology, and quite apart from the *licentia amens* of the poets, ran the great principles which were about to receive in Christianity a divine seal to their truth. But now comes the question, "If it were not the mortality of the new religion, what was it that raised up in arms against it the philosophy and religion of Greece and Rome?" St. Paul supplies the answer—"The scandal of the Cross." A Cato and Antoninus might not only approve but practise the moral precepts of Christianity, but to accept a condemned "crucifer," the most odious and shameful term in their language, a Jew gibbeted for sedition, for their new God, shocked the ethnic sense of the great majority to such a degree that, having once listened to the "preaching of the Cross," they never condescended a second time to turn their attention to it. To them, such a religion carried with it its own refutation, and the philosophic classes contented themselves with regarding it as one more unit added to the chaos of existing superstitions.

St. Paul informs us that the Greeks "who sought after wisdom," considered the doctrine of the Cross irreconcilable with all reason, and named it *μωρία* 'nonsense' or 'folly.' Yet this was the very essence, the corner-stone of the Gospel. And the more the heathen mind rose against it, the more firmly the Apostle took his stand upon it. "I am determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." He looks, indeed, with grave suspicion on any ready acquiescence in or acceptance of the Gospel on the part of the natural man anywhere. "Hath the offence of the Cross ceased?" is his question, knowing that, if so, the Gospel, too, had either ceased or had not been truly preached. Angels and man had fallen by the sin of pride.

To human pride of every kind—moral, intellectual, social—the Cross was a death-blow for ever. And so Paul venerates wisdom, enjoins the most stringent morality, teaches the highest lessons of social progress by individual improvement and cultivation, but instantly his hearers betray a disposition to rely upon these or upon anything else instead of the Cross of Christ, he sweeps them by as "dross," as "dung," as the "beggarly elements of law." Such preaching admitted no compromise; it was not Christ-God, nor Christ the Saviour, nor Christ the moral ideal, nor Christ the comforter only nor principally—but Christ the crucified the apostles presented as the indispensable object of saving faith. Christ in His glory would appear in the great day of the Lord, but now they preached Christ in His humiliation, born in the flesh, a root out of the dry soil of Judah, with no form or comeliness, the man of sorrows, acquainted with grief, stricken, smitten, wounded for man's transgressions, bruised for man's iniquities, oppressed, afflicted, chastised, making His soul an offering for sin, cut off from the land of the living, pouring out

His soul unto death, numbered with the transgressors, drinking to the last drop of the dregs of shame and degradation the cup of divine wrath, abandoned by God and man, mocked, cursed, reviled, scourged, thorn-crowned, pierced with wounds, dying the most painful and ignominious of all deaths, that of the rebel and the runaway slave, between a robber and a murderer.

When the missionaries of the new faith held up such a Cross as this, displaying God the sufferer for sin nailed by Jew and Gentile hands upon it, when they proclaimed, "Behold the blood of the eternal Sacrifice; behold God Himself, the lamb, the priest, and the atonement," the heathen world, if it cried out *μωρία* felt, nevertheless, that in that 'folly' there was a consistency, a power of waking and shaking the dead conscience, a marvellous responding to and satisfying of the appetites of the soul, a giving of inward rest in recompense for outward war, a raising of the whole nature in Christ in return for the abasement of everything in man that it soon ceased to despise—it began to fear and to hate, and then to persecute. Whatever its wisdom was in words, in deeds it could not cope with the energy of the new life Christianity poured into its converts; it became silent or took to the sword. "It hath pleased God," states St. Paul, "by the foolishness of preaching to put to silence the wisdom of the world." Humility, never before a virtue, became the foundation of all virtues in the eyes and practice of Christians. They were nothing, Christ was everything; and of Christ, the cross of sufferance became everywhere the symbol.

But with the sacerdotal classes—for, as we have observed, there were no castes of priests—in Greece and Rome, Christianity came into conflict on especial ground, that of sacrifices. If Christianity, as preached by the Apostle and his co-adjutors, was true, there was an end, at once and for ever, of all priesthoods, all altars, all sacrifices. They were all finished, all consummated and come to their appointed close in Christ. Henceforth there was but one Priest, and He was exalted at the right hand of God, He had entered through the veil of the torn and crucified flesh into the holy of holies, even heaven, and there He ever presented the only, the one sacrifice for sin, such body itself, once for ever offered on Calvary, "the blood of the eternal redemption." There was but one true altar, the cross, and that, since the body so sacrificed of the Son of God had re-ascended into the glory of the Father, had ceased to be ought but a memorial of the great death and passion once thereon suffered. Henceforth there was no other altar than the spiritual altar of the regenerate heart burning with the light of Christ and the fire of the Holy Ghost.

Paul, Peter, John, the other apostles, were not priests, nor do they ever call themselves such, but ministers of the one Priest, administrators of the never-to-be-repeated sacrifice of the one Body and Blood broken and shed for the remission of all sin on the mount of the Lord. "This man," (preached St. Paul,) "even the Son, who is consecrated for evermore, and is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, hath, because He continueth for ever, an intransmissible priesthood, and He liveth for ever to make intercession."

The immense importance of such a declaration is obvious; it implies no less than the total abolition of all human priest-hoods, than the limitation of all priesthood to the sole person of Christ. As members of Christ, all baptized Christians, without distinction, were in a sense "priests unto God," the whole Church was "a royal priesthood"; but no particular member was a priest more than another, there was henceforth no clergy as distinct from a laity, no laity distinct from a clergy. Of those ordained and set apart to administer the ordinances of Christ externally, "servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries" were the titles: none were sacrificers, for all sacrifice had ceased; none were priests, gave as all were members in the one Priest, Christ.

Hence, as Christianity was the extinction of all priesthoods everywhere, or at least the transference of all priesthood to Christ alone, the priesthood of almost every religion either opposed its propagation with the most virulent hostility, or attempted to radically subvert its character by making Christ the founder of a new order of human priesthood, re-enacting the same sacrifice perpetually of Himself on innumerable material altars. This latter is the system which the Roman Catholic priesthood have accepted as, beyond doubt, the best adapted for sacerdotal power and aggrandizement, but it overthrows Christianity from its foundation. "God," declares St. Paul,

"took away sacrifice to establish Christ. We are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all. Every priest standeth daily offering the same sacrifices, but Christ, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God, by one offering having perfected for ever them that are sanctified[6]."

The yoke of sacerdotalism—the *dira religio* of Lucretius—the weight on the neck which, St. Paul declares, "neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear," was everywhere hewn in pieces by the Gospel-sword of Apostolic Christianity. The chain which bound the layman to the foot of the priest was sundered, and he stood forth a "freeman in Christ." It was not till after the era of Constantine that the "ministry of Christ" began to fall back again into the "beggarly elements" of a sacrificial priesthood, and that sacer-dotalism recovered its old heathen power under the adopted name of the papacy and pontifical system of papal Rome.

Notes to Chapter I

1) It is certain that the genuine Sybilline Oracles were in existence long anterior to the birth of Christianity. Virgil died 18 B.C. His Eclogues were composed 40 B.C.; the well-known fourth Eclogue, "Pollio," is stated by him to be a transcript of the Prophetic or Oracular Carmen of the Sybil of Cumæ. Let the dispassionate historian peruse the following portion of it, and say if any prophecy in Isaiah is more thoroughly Messianic; in the rest of the Jewish prophets it would be difficult to meet any of equal force and unambiguity. We consider ourselves justified in holding that the Gentile, no less than the Jew, possessed from the earliest period prophecies of divine emanation, declaring the future advent and incarnation of the Messiah, "the Desire of all nations." "The last, era, the subject of the Sybil song of Cumæ is arrived; the great series of ages begins anew. The Virgin returns, returns the reign of Saturn. The new Progeny from heaven now descends. Be thou propitious to the Infant Boy by whom first the Iron Age shall expire and the Golden Age over the whole world commence. Whilst thou, O Pollio, art consul, this glory of our age shall be made manifest, and the celestial months begin their revolutions. Under thy auspices whatever vestiges of our guilt remain shall, by being atoned for, redeem the earth from fear for ever. He shall partake the life of the gods. He shall see heroes mingled in social intercourse with gods. He shall Himself be seen by them, and shall reign over a world in peace with His Father's virtues. The earth, meanwhile, sweet Boy, as her first-fruits shall everywhere pour Thee forth spontaneous flowers. The serpent shall die; the poisonous and deceptive tree shall die. Bright offspring of the gods, illustrious progeny of Jove, set forward on Thy way to signal honours—all things, heaven and earth, and the regions of the sea, rejoice at the advent of this happy age. The time is now at hand." (Virgilio Eclog. IV. Pollio.) Had this prophecy been in Daniel, not in Virgil, infidelity would doubtless have insisted on its being a Christian interpolation after the event predicted.


2) Josephus quotes the same account from Lysimachus. "The Jews were a caste of Egyptians who, in the time of Bocchoris, were eaten up with leprosy and other horrible disorders, and taking refuge in the temples, lived by beggary. They were finally banished by Bocchoris, the leprous among them drowned, the rest left to die in the wilderness; one Moses hereupon stood up as their leader, advised them to take heart, and advance into Arabia until they came to a cultivated country. He then bound them by a vow that from that time they would be the enemies of mankind, always preferring the evil to the good. Whereupon, after many difficulties, they emerged from the desert, murdered all the nations they could meet, plundered and burnt all their temples, and at last settled where they now are in Judæa."—Josephus in Apionem.

3) alirep rcitrav cihapTtav civabompovs—Barnabæ Epist.

4) Chrysost, Horn. xliii. in Matt. iv. 5

5). Works of Cicero: De Legibus, 1. II. n. 15; Tusculan Disput., 1. I. n. 5; De Amicitia ad finem; De Natura. Decorum; De Senectute; In verrem de Supplic., n. 186; Divin., 1. II. N

6) Hebrews X.



The Chichester inscription, Chichester stone or Pudens stone (RIB 91) is an inscription on a damaged slab of marble, found in Chichester in 1723 and datable to the late 1st century.



CHAPTER II

THE RELIGION OF BRITAIN AND WESTERN EUROPE-DRUIDISM-ITS PRINCIPLES AND INFLUENCES - THE GENTILE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY.

WESTWARD OF ITALY, embracing Hispania, Gallia, the Rhenish frontiers, portions of Germany and Scandinavia, with its head-quarters and great seats of learning fixed in Britain, extended the Druidic religion. There can be no question that this was the primitive religion of mankind, covering at one period in various forms the whole surface of the ancient world. It was, as distinguished from the Jewish dispensation, emphatically the great Gentile religion—as distinguished from the Semitic and Ammonitic, or Hametic faiths, the faith of the Japhetidæ, or nations descended from Japhet—as distinguished from religions of materialisms, the religion of the spirituality of the Deity and the immortality of the human soul. In the first ages of the world the primo-geniture and priesthood went together. The primo-geniti of Japhet were the Cymry, Cimbri, or Gomeridæ, the sons of Gomer the first-born of Japhet, the eldest branch of which were settled from the remotest times in Britain. In them, consequently, lodged the priesthood of all the nations of the Japhetidæ. Hence Britain bore the same relation to the above countries as Rome now does to Roman Catholic countries, or Tibet to the Buddhist population of Asia—it was the Holy Land of their religion and the Zion of their hierarchy.

The ramifications of Druidism penetrated, indeed, into Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor; nor did Plato hesitate to affirm that all the streams of Greek philosophy were to be traced, not to Egypt, but to the fountains of the West. The pre-historic poets of Greece anterior to the mythologic creations of Homer and Hesiod, were, as their names imply, Japhetic Druids—Musæus, Orpheus, Linus (knowledge, the harp, the white-robed). Such historians were necessarily poets, for with the Druids metre was the vehicle of instruction. The visit of the British Druid, Abaris, was long remembered at Athens. Greek fancy converted the magnetic needle by which he guided his travels into an arrow of Apollo which would transport him at wish whithersoever he pleased. A more celebrated Druid, Pythagoras, founded a school in Italy the effects of which, though he himself and many of his leading scholars perished in a popular commotion, were never wholly obliterated; the transmigration of souls, their pre-existence and immortality, the true theories of the heavenly bodies and their revolutions, the severity of the esoteric system with its silence and secrecy, being observed by various Italian sects down to the Christian era. In the Ægean Sea, Samothrace and Delos were Eastern cells of the same priesthood, the same rites being observed as in Britain, and embassies at stated periods-exchanging visitations.[1]

In earlier ages the City of Circles in Asia Minor—Troia (Troy)—and the Minoan Labyrinth in Crete were seats, of the same widely-extended religion, and in Egypt the name of the great mother-temple, Carnac, identifies its remote founders with those of the mother-temple of the same name in Bretagne, both meaning 'the high stones of worship.' In the East, however, the principles of Druidism could only be traced in its earliest records, whilst on the continent of Europe they bore in practice and development the same corrupt relation to primitive Druidism as at present the Roman Catholic religion in the same countries does to primitive Christianity. In Britain, on the contrary, it had, for many reasons—the inaccessibility of the island, its freedom from foreign invasion, its character of sanctity, its possession by Gomeridæ—retained in great degree its original purity. In the time of St. Paul it had been for a period of two thousand years the established religion; and the attachment of the people to its rule, with the desperate and well-sustained defence they made in its behalf and that of their country against the whole force of the Roman Empire in the meridian of its power, confirm the impression left by a dispassionate examination of the remains of its theology which have descended to us in the ancient British tongue, namely, that it was a highly moral, elevating, and beneficent religion, a superstructure not unworthy the principle on which it assumed to be built, and by which it offered itself to be judged, "The truth against the world," (*Y Gwir erbyn y Byd*).

It has been observed by the historian Hume, "that no religion has ever swayed the minds of men like the Druidic." The determined efforts of the Roman empire to overthrow its supremacy, and, if possible, suppress it altogether, prove that its rulers had been made practically aware of this fact. A Druidic triad familiar to the Greeks and Romans was, "Three duties of every man: Worship God; be just to all men; die for your country." [2] It was this last duty, impressed by a thousand examples and precepts, and not its religious tenets or philosophy, which caused Druidism to be marked for destruction by an empire which aspired to universal dominion and to merge all nationalities in one city.

The edicts of the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius proscribed it throughout their dominions, making the exercise of the functions of a Druidic priest, as those of the Roman priest in the reigns of the Tudor sovereigns in England, a treasonable offence. But nations cannot be proscribed. The Druidic colleges in Britain, the only free state in Europe at this period, continued to educate and send forth their alumni to all parts of the Continent not till A.D. 43, that is, fourteen years only before the arrival of St. Paul in Rome, did the second, or Claudian invasion of Britain take place. It took ten years of incessant warfare to establish a firm footing in the south of the island; nor was it till seven years after the fall of Caractacus that the Roman state ventured to give its legions orders to carry out the leading object of the invasion—the destruction by force of arms of the Druidic cori, or seminaries, in Britain. The Boadicean war and the death of 80,000 Roman citizens were the first results of this policy of religious "dragonnades."

A summary of the principal tenets of Druidism will enable the reader to compare or contrast them with those of Christianity, which had not yet set foot in Europe. It is interesting to observe no less where the primitive Gentile religion differs than where it agrees with Divine revelation. The summary is chiefly drawn from the Bardo-Druidic remains extant in the British language.

Summary of Druidic Theology

Druidism was founded by Gwyddon. Ganhébon, supposed to be the Seth of the Mosaic genealogy, in Asia, in the year when the equinox occurred in the first point of Taurus, or the constellation of the Bull. Every year the equinoctial year is completed about twenty minutes before the sun has made a complete revolution from a certain star to the same star again. This arises from the precession of the equinoxes, or from a slow revolution of the pole of the equator round that of the ecliptic. In 25,920 years the pole of the equator makes one entire revolution round that of the ecliptic: hence the equinoctial colure occurs before it did the preceding year. In 72 years the precession amounts to one degree. If therefore, we have the equinoctial or solstitial point given in the ecliptic at any unknown period, it is easy to discover, by comparing it with the present solstitial point, how long that period is past.

When the Druidic system was founded, the equinox, on the 1st of May, occurred in the first point of Taurus, which first point is now, on the 1st of May, 80 degrees from this solstitial point. It requires 72 years to recede one degree. Eighty degrees multiplied by 72 gives 5,760, the exact date when Druidism commenced, i.e., 3,903 years before the Christian era, 181 years after the creation of man, and 50 years after the birth of Seth. The astral bull of milk-white hue, its horns crowned with golden stars, became the symbol, or visible sacrament, of Druidism. In process of time the symbol, as usual, superseded in the East the thing signified, and Druidism became that tauric religion which gave the Crimea the appellation of the Tauric Chersonese.

Extending thence, this corruption became the religion of Mithras in Persia, of Baal in Assyria, of Brahma in India, of Astarte or the Dea Syria in Syria, of Apis in Egypt, and in later ages, transferred from Egypt, of the two "Apis" (or calves as they are rendered in our version of the Scriptures) of the kingdom of Israel. [3] In all these religions the bull, or Taurus, was the sacred animal, and the symbol was preserved free, as far as we can judge, from idolatry by the Gomeridæ of Britain. The bull was the sign and representant of the great Druidic isle, and the name still, in common parlance, continues to indicate a Briton of Britain as distinguished from the rest of the

world. From Asia Druidism was brought into Britain by Hu Gadarn, or the Mighty, its first colonizer, a contemporary of the Patriarch Abraham, and under his successors, Plennydd, Goron, Alawn, and Rhivon, it assumed its complete organization, becoming both the ecclesiastical and civil constitution of the island. About five centuries before the Christian era, its civil laws were codified by Dunwal Moelmud, the British Numa, and have since that period remained the common, unwritten, or native laws of the island, as distinguished from the Roman, the canon, and other codes of foreign introduction. These British or Druidic laws have been always justly regarded as the foundation and bulwark of British liberties.[4] The examination of them does not fall within our present purpose.

The civil code and the sciences were taught by the Druids—orally or in writing indifferently—to every citizen, but the Druidic system of divinity was never committed to writing, nor imparted except to the initiated, and then under obligations to secrecy of a very awful character. It is, however, to the infraction of these obligations, when their force had been impaired by the influences of Christianity, that we are indebted for such knowledge as we possess of the real principles of the primitive religion of our island. This is, especially in the higher departments, exceedingly imperfect, but we must be satisfied with it until the British manuscripts buried in the obscure recesses of the hills of Cambria be disinterred by Government, or given by their worthless and degenerate proprietors to the republic of letters.

Druidism taught as follows:

The universe is infinite, being the body of the being who out of himself evolved or created it, and now pervades and rules it, as the mind of man does his body. The essence of this being is pure, mental light, and therefore he is called Du-w, Duw (the one without any darkness). His real name is an ineffable mystery, and so also is his nature.[5] To the human mind, though not in himself, he necessarily represents a triple aspect in relation to the past, present, and future; the creator as to the past, the saviour or conserver as to the present, the renovator or re-creator as to the future. In the re-creator the idea of the destroyer was also involved. This was the Druidic trinity, the three aspects of which were known as Beli, Taran, Esu or Yesu. When Christianity preached Jesus as God, it preached the most familiar name of its own deity to Druidism; and in the ancient British tongue 'Jesus' has never assumed its Greek, Latin, or Hebrew form, but remains the pure Druidic 'Yesu.' It is singular thus that the ancient Briton has never changed the name of the God he and his forefathers worshipped, nor has ever worshipped but one God.[6]

The symbol of the ineffable name of the Deity were three rays or glories of light. Every Druid bore these in gold on the front of his mitre.

Other names of the deity were Deon, Dovydd, Celi, Tor, Perydd, Sol, Rhun, Ner.

In the infinite Deity exist in some incomprehensible mode, indivisible from himself, infinite germs, seeds, or atoms (manred, manredi), each in itself full and perfect deity, possessing the power of infinite creativeness. This branch of Druidic theism is involved in profound obscurity. It appears to have supplied Democritus with his theory of the atomic powers of nature, and Plato with his typical forms in the mind of the Deity. Matter was created and systematized simultaneously by the Creator, pronouncing His own name. It cannot exist without God. Nature is the action of God through the medium of matter. The laws of nature are, in the strictest sense, the laws of God, and that which is a violation of the laws of nature is necessarily a violation of the laws of God.[7]

The universe is in substance eternal and imperishable, but in form it is subject to successive cycles of dissolution and renovation. There is no such thing as annihilation in matter. Every particle of matter is capable of all forms of matter, and each form has its own laws of existence and action.

Around every separate existence, wherever it be, extends infinity; this is 'Ceugant,, (the infinite space, or all-of-being, ubiquity,) which God alone can fill, sustain, or uphold. There were originally but two states of sentient existence—God in 'Ceugant,' and the 'Gwynfy-dolion., (the beings of the happy, literally 'white,, state) in 'Gwynfyd., The only aberration to which the 'Gwynfydolion, were liable was 'balchder'. 'Balchder' consisted in trying to do that which God only can do, enter and sustain 'ceugant,, uphold and govern the infinite universe. Certain of the 'Gwynfydolion', whose numbers are known only to God, attempted to do so, and thus originated in themselves the state of 'Annwn.' Annwn, is the lowest possible point of conscious existence, in which the evil is wholly unmitigated by any particle of good. This result was the inevitable consequence of their act itself, not an external penalty imposed by God. To restore them to the state of gwynfyd. God in His goodness created the third state of 'Abred."Abred, includes all conditions of sentient life under 'gwynfyd., Its lowest point is 'annwn, its highest that immediately next to that of the 'Gwynfydolion,, the state of man, humanity. All 'abred, under humanity was termed 'byd maur, the great 'byd., Humanity itself was termed 'byd bychan, the little 'byd, (world), because as all the infinite was contained in God, so all the cycles of existence below man were contained and represented in man.[8]

'Abred, is a state of probation and suffering for the 'Abredolion,, that is, for the 'Gwynfydolion, in 'abred,, the reason being that, moral liberty of choice and action, or willingness, being the essence of 'gwynfydiaeth,, or the spirit-life, there is nothing per se to prevent the 'Gwynfydolion,, when they shall have re-attained heaven, from committing 'balchder, a second time, and thus re-incurring its consequences. God created 'abred, to be a state of suffering, that in the vivid recollection of its pains and degradations the 'Gwynfydolion' might possess in themselves the surest moral guarantee against a repetition of their folly. 'Abred, was therefore essentially the creation of God,s mercy, and its sufferings were indispensable to fulfil the object of such mercy towards the fallen beings for whom it had been so created.[9]

In the 'byd mawr' below man there was no responsibility, for there was no liberty of choice. Responsibility began with the 'byd bychan,' or man-state, because there began such liberty. Hence the essence of the soul, according to the Druids, was the will, and the essence of religion was willingness. Without freedom of will there was no 'humanity, in its distinguishing sense from animal life, nor any life or light in the soul which continued mares, void of living action and imbruted. Freedom of conscience was both the birth and breath of manhood, without which it was not manhood at all, but brutality—the soul resembling a fetus undeveloped in the womb.

Reason appears to have been regarded by the Druids as a faculty common to all sensitive creatures, the difference in their physical organization being the cause of the difference in its degrees.

Mankind are the fallen 'Gwynfydolion., Every human being has been in the angelic state in heaven (gwynfyd), fell thence to 'annwn,' rose thence through the various cycles of 'abred, probationary existence to his present state ('byd bychan,), in which he is again a free agent, master of his own spiritual destinies. If his soul willingly prefers good and abides by its choice, then at the dissolution of the body it re-enters 'gwynfyd,' from which it fell. This is the restoration. If his soul prefers evil, it again lapses back to some cycle in 'abred, best calculated to purify it from it. For 'abred, is the cycle of purification by suffering. 'Balchder' alone plunged the soul back to the lowest point, 'annwn,, and of this man could not be guilty; hence the proverb, "But once in 'annwn., " Inhumanity sunk the soul to the condition nearest 'annwn'.

In the 'byd mawr,, below man, evil and suffering preponderate. In the 'byd bychan,, or 'man-state,' good and evil are equiposed. With 'byd bychan' probation terminates. In 'gwynfyd' pure good and pure happiness commence.

A soul might relapse countless times from 'byd bychan, back to 'abred,' and again rise. Ultimately every soul would pass 'byd bychan,; and when the last of the 'Gwynfydolion, had regained

`gwynfyd,' then would be the end of 'abred, ('terfyn abred,[10]), the purpose for which it had been created being fulfilled. `Abred, being dissolved, there would remain only the two states which existed from the beginning, `Ceugant, and `Gwynfyd.' According to the Druidic system, the 'hell' of man was past before his birth, and hell itself was a temporary state. Gwynfyd' was re-attainable through `abred' only and its conditions, `abred' through `annwn' only and its conditions. `Annwn' and `abred' were the pre-conditions of the re-attainment of `gwynfyd.' The knowledge and suffering of evil was held the sine qua non to the understanding and appreciation of good, being the only means whereby their difference could be realized to ourselves. Suffering was regarded as the pre-essential of enjoyment.

The faculty of the soul which constituted more especially its eternity, or imperishable self-identity, is coy, or memory. The memory of all the evils and existences it has undergone in `abred,' forms or develops in the soul immediately it re-enters `gwynfyd,' and not before. For the end of such memory is to preserve such `Gwynfydolion' from a second fall. In the `abred' cycles there is a suspension of 'coy,' and of the consciousness of self-identity.

The doctrine of transmigration was certainly Druidic, but it is equally certain that it was held by the Druids in a sense the Greek and Italian schools of philosophy have failed to transmit to us. The following extract from the Coelbren Rhodd,[11] obscure as it is, may cast some light on the subject:

"Master. What art thou?

"Disciple. A man.

"M. How?

"D. By the will of God. What God wills must be.

"M. Why art thou not something else than man? "D. What God wills cannot be otherwise.

"M. Where art thou?

"D. In `byd bychan.'

"M. Whence art thou come?

"D. From `byd mawr.'

"M. What wert thou doing in `byd mawr'?

"D. Traversing the cycle of `abred.'

"M. Where wert thou before thou didst begin to traverse `cylch abred'?

"D. In `annwn.'

"M. What wert thou in `annwn'?

"D. The least of life that could be in itself, the nearest to the teeth of the dead. And in all forms and through all forms that are called body and life am I come hither into `byd bychan,' and misery and trouble have been my condition for ages and ages since I was delivered from `annwn' and separated therefrom through the hand of God and His love, endless and indestructible.

"M. Through how many `rhith' (forms of life) art thou come, and what has been thy `damwain' (character of life)?

"D. Through every `rhith' that can possess or be called life-in-itself, and my `damwain' has been all misery, all hardship, all evil, all suffering, and little of good or happiness has there been of me before I am man.

"M. Through the love of God thou sayest thou art come through all this and hast felt all this—how so, seeing there are so many signs of unlove?

"D. `Gwynfyd' cannot be regained without knowing everything, there cannot be knowing everything without feeling-in-self everything, there cannot be feeling everything without suffering-in-self every `rhith' of evil and of good, that one may be self-known from the other; and all this must be before `gwynfyd' can be regained, for `gwynfyd' is perfect liberty, choosing the good when all forms of good and evil have been self-suffered.

"M. Why cannot there be `gwynfyd' without traversing every `rhith' of life in `abred'?

"D. Because no two `rhiths' are identical, and every `rhith' has its own cause, suffering, means of knowledge, intelligence, `gwynfyd,' power, not to be found in any other `rhith'; and since there is special knowledge in every special `rhith' not to be found in any other, necessity ensues to suffer every `rhith' before `abred' be completely traversed.

"M. How many `rhiths' are there?

"D. As many as God saw necessary towards knowing all good and all evil in every kind and quality, so that there should be nothing conceivable by God which should not be experienced, and thence its `abred'-knowledge."—(Coelbren Rhodd, p. 1.)

The happiness of `gwynfyd' consisted in `nevoedd,' i.e., eternal progressions of new scenes with new faculties of happiness. Herein, as in its notion of the time and object of "hell," Druidism differed from Christianity, which represents heaven as an eternal sabbath or rest.[12]

A soul that had passed `byd bychan' might resume the morphosis of humanity for the good of mankind. The re-incarnation of such was always a blessing.

The lapse of a soul in `byd bychan' began at the moment when it voluntarily preferred vice to virtue, for the will is its essence.

A new form of life, or the entrance into another cycle of existence,[13]ensued simultaneously with death.

Man had the power by accepting every evil as his part of `abred' (or purification for `gwynfyd'), to turn it to good. Hence willing suffering for our own good or that of others was the test-virtue of humanity, or `byd bychan.'

Every soul guilty of crime, by voluntarily confessing it and embracing the penalty prescribed, expiated its guilt, and if in other respects good, re-entered `gwynfyd.'

Except by the laying down life for life there could be no expiation or atonement for certain kinds of guilt. Cæsar's words on this point are remarkable: "The Druids teach that by no other way than the ransoming of man's life by the life of man, is reconciliation with the divine justice of the immortal gods possible."—(Comment., lib. v.) The doctrine of vicarious atonement could not be expressed in clearer terms.

The value of an atonement, or expiatory sacrifice, was in proportion to the value of the life sacrificed.

In all the changes of the 'byd mawr,' until it assumed the morphosis of man, the soul was in occultation, or eclipse.

The temples of the Druids were hypæthral, circular, and obelistic, i.e., open above and on every side, representing in form the dome of heaven, and composed of monoliths, or immense single stones, on which metal was not allowed to come. The dracontic, or circular form, symbolized the eternal cycle of nature. The monolithic avenues leading to and from the temple, usually known as the dragon's head and dragon's tail, were in some instances seven miles long. The national religious processions moved through these on the three great festivals of the year.

All the prehistoric temples of Palestine, Persia, Italy, and Greece, commonly called Cyclopean or Pelasgic, were Druidic.

Stonehenge, the Gilgal of Britain, is the wreck of four thousand years' exposure to the elements. Its first founder was Hu Gadarn, c. 1800 B.C.

The above summary may suffice in a brief treatise of this description to give the reader a broad conception of the chief tenets of the antediluvian religion of the world. Of its temples, rites, and usages we may add the following particulars.

There were in Britain south of the Clyde and Forth forty Druidic universities, which were also the capitals of the forty tribes, the originals of our modern counties, which preserve for the most part the ancient tribal limits. Hence, for instance, Yorkshire retains the same disproportioned magnitude to our other counties as the territories of the Brigantes, its British tribe, did to those of the other tribes. Of these forty seats nine have disappeared, the remainder were as follow:

Three seats of the three Arch-Druids of Britain.¹⁴

Caer Troia, or Caer Lud, or Caer Llyndain (the city of the lake of the Tain (Thames), or of the beautiful lake, tain meaning fair or beautiful, hence the Tain so called in British, Tyne still in North Britain), London.

Caer Evroc, **York.**

Caer Lleon, **Caerleon.**

Seats of the Chief Druids of Britain:

Caer Caint, **Canterbury.**

Caer Wyn, **Winchester.**

Caer Werllan, afterwards Caer Municipium, **St. Alban's, or Verulam.**

Caer Salwg, **Old Sarum.**

Caer Leil, **Carlisle.**

Caer Grawnt, **Cambridge, or Granta.**

Caer Meini, **Manchester.**

Caer Gwrthegion, **Palmcaster.**

Caer Coel, **Colchester.**

Caer Gorangon, **Worcester.**

Caelon ar Dwy, **Chester.**

Caer Penis, **Porchester.**

Caer Don, **Doncaster.**

Caer Guoric, **Warwick.**

Caer Meivod, **Meivod.**

Caer Odor, **Bristol**.
 Caer Llyr, **Leicester**.
 Caer Urnach, **Uroxeter**.
 Caer Lleyrn, **Lincoln**.
 Caer Gloyw, **Gloucester**.
 Caer Cei, **Chichester**.
 Caer Ceri, **Cirencester**.
 Caer Dwr, **Dorchester**.
 Caer Merddin, **Caermarthen**.
 Caer Seiont, **Caernarvon**.
 Caer Wysc, **Exeter**.
 Caer Segont, **Silchester**.
 Caer Baddon, **Bath**.

The lapse of two thousand years has made but slight alteration in the names of these primitive cities of Britain. The Romans invariably fixed upon the chief caer of a British tribe, generally the strongest military position in its bounds, for their castra: hence the castra and chester superseded the caer or British citadel; but the British name itself survived the Roman. Llyndain is still London, not Augusta; Werllan, Verulam, not Municipium; Caer Col, Colchester, not Camalodunum, &c., &c.

The students at these universities numbered at times sixty thousand souls, among whom were included the young nobility of Britain and Gaul. It required twenty years to master the circle of Druidic knowledge; nor, when we consider the great range of acquirements which the system included, can we wonder at the length of such probation. Natural philosophy, astronomy, arithmetic, geometry, jurisprudence, medicine poetry, and oratory were all proposed and taught, the first two with severe exactitude. The system of astronomy inculcated had never varied, being the same as that taught by Pythagoras, now known as the Copernican or Newtonian.[15] The British words for 'star,' astronomer,'

'astronomy,' are seren, seronydd, seronyddiaeth; hence the usual Greek term for the Druids was Saronidæ, astronomers. Of the attainments of the Druids in all the Sciences, especially in this of astronomy, classic judges of eminence, Cicero and Cæsar, Pliny and Tacitus, Diodorus Siculus and Strabo, speak in high terms. In the Druidic order indeed centred, and from it radiated, the whole civil and ecclesiastical knowledge of the realm: they were its statesmen, legislators, priests, physicians, lawyers, teachers, poets; the depositaries of all human and divine knowledge; its Church and parliament; its courts of law; its colleges of physicians and surgeons; its magistrates, clergy and bishops. The number of Druids was regulated by very stringent laws in proportion to the population. None could be a candidate for the Order who could not, in the May congress of the tribe, prove his descent from nine successive generations of free forefathers. No slave could of course be a Druid; becoming one, he forfeited his Order and privileges and hence perhaps one of the reasons of the protracted, stubborn, and finally successful resistance of the Druidic island to the Roman arms; for it was not till the reign of Adrian, A.D. 120, that Britain was incorporated, and then by treaty, not conquest, with the Roman dominions, the Britons retaining their kings, land, laws and rights, and stipulating in return to raise and support three legions to be officered by the Emperor for the defence of the common empire.[16]

By common law every Briton was seized as his birthright of five acres (ten English) of land in the gweli cenedl, the 'bed' or hereditary county of his clan. If the clan land was exhausted, recourse was had to emigration or conquest, and for this purpose the superfluous population was draughted off as an army, or more generally as a colony. Hence the mother-tribe and daughter-tribes of the same name which so frequently occur in Britain, Gaul, Germany and Hibernia. In addition to these five acres, the Druid received five acres more and a certain fixed income from his tribe. The difficulty of admission into the Order was on a par with its privileges. The head of the clan possessed a veto on every ordination. Every candidate was obliged to find twelve head of families

as sureties for moral conduct and adequate maintenance; nor could he be ordained until he had passed three examinations three successive years before the Druid college of the tribe. These barriers to promiscuous admission threw the Order almost entirely into the hands of the blaenorion, or aristocracy, making it literally a "royal priesthood," kings, princes, and nobles entering largely into its composition. "All power," states Cæsar, speaking of Gaul, "is vested in the two orders of the Druids and aristocracy: the people are nothing."

This, however, was evidently not the case in Britain, where the primitive Druidic laws, unaffected hitherto by foreign innovations, referred the source of all power to the people in congress, and every congress was opened with the words Trech gwlad n' arglwydd, 'The country is above the king.' Nevertheless, the authority and influence of the Druids were very great, and, on the whole, as popular as they were great. The extreme penalty lodged in their hands, and the one most dreaded, was that of excommunication—*pæna gravissima*, states Cæsar—which was, in fact, a decree of expulsion from both worlds, the present and future. The terror it inspired is the best proof that it was not abused and but rarely resorted to; for the most terrific punishments, if abused, soon lose their effect and become despised. The Druidic excommunication was thus performed:[17]

Every tribe possessed a particular sword, termed the Sword of the Tribe. Neither this nor any other weapon could be unsheathed in the congress of the tribe, or any congress of Druids or Bards. But when an individual was about to be excommunicated, which was never done until after a year and a day's notice, to allow the offender time for voluntary atonement, he was brought into the congress of the tribe, the sword of the tribe was unsheathed by the head of the tribe, and proclaimed to be unsheathed against the offender by name; his name was then struck out of the roll of the book of the tribe, and out of the book of his own family; the badge of the tribe was torn from his arm, his sword broken in the ground and his wand over his head by the head of the tribe; his head was shaved, and the executioner of the tribe, with the point of the sword of the tribe, drew blood from his forehead, breast and loins, and pouring it on his head, exclaimed, "The blood of the man thus accursed be on his own head." His forehead was then branded, and he was led forth, the herald of the tribe going before and proclaiming—"This man hath no name, nor family, nor tribe, among the names and families and tribes of Britain; henceforth let no man's flesh touch his flesh, nor tongue speak to him, nor eye look upon him, nor hand of man bury him; and let the darkness of Annwn again receive him."

Death might well be considered a light penalty to an accumulation of such moral, social, and spiritual tortures. The sentence was read in the Druidic congresses throughout the tribes, and henceforth no door in the kingdom was open to the forlorn wretch; his forehead carried the curse everywhere with him; men threw food to him "as to a dog," turning their eyes away as they did so and never speaking. Neither body nor mind could sustain such horrors, and the excommunicated crawled away to become a blanched, unburied skeleton far from the haunts of his fellow-men.

The sacred animal of Druidism was the white astral bull; the sacred bird, the crested wren; the sacred tree, the oak; the sacred grain, wheat; the sacred plant, the mistletoe; the sacred herbs, the trefoil, vervain, and hyssop.

The great festivals of Druidism were three: the vernal, on the 1st of May; the autumnal; and the mid-winter, when the mistletoe was gathered by the arch-Druids. The mistletoe, with its three white berries, was the symbol of the Druidic Trinity, and its growth in the oak the type of the incarnation of the Deity in man.

The hypethral altar in the Druidic circle was called cromlech (stone of bowing, or adoration). Near it another stone received in a cavity water direct from heaven (holy water). This holy water and the waters of the river Dee, the Jordan of ancient Britain, were the only waters permitted to

be used in Druidic sacrifices. No Druid could wear arms of any description. None but a Druid could officiate at a sacrifice.

The canonicals of the Druid were white linen robes, no metal but gold being used in any part of the dress. The canonicals of the arch-Druids were extremely gorgeous, not very dissimilar from those of the high-priest of the Jewish religion. The Druidic cross was wrought in gold down the length of the back of his robe.

No Druidic service could be celebrated before sunrise or after sunset.

In its corrupted form of Buddhism, the Druidic religion is still the religion of nearly one-half of mankind.[18]

We have three distinct phases of faith in the Jewish Scriptures—the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Chaldæo-Mosaic, which came in after the Chaldæan captivity, and was in full force in our Saviour's time. The patriarchal was in many respects Druidic; the patriarchs planted and worshipped in oak-groves, building their altar in the midst on "some high place," a practice strictly prohibited by the Mosaic code. Asiatic Druidism was, on the other hand, in not a few particulars incorporated, as might be expected of the antediluvian religion, into the Mosaic dispensation. The canonicals, sacrifices, sacred order of a priesthood, three leading feasts, the unhewn stones for the Jehovah-altars, were Druidic institutes; but there remained two tremendous differences between the two faiths—one of omission, the other of hard, undeniable commission. The fundamental instruction of Druidism, the immortality of the soul, disappears, or at least is very faintly shadowed forth in the Mosaic religion. "The Druids," writes Cæsar, 54 B.C., "make the immortality of the soul the basis of all their teaching, holding it to be the principal incentive and reason for a virtuous life."

It is obvious that on this vital point the great Gentile religion possessed incalculable superiority over the Jewish; and I have never succeeded in satisfactorily accounting to myself for the little prominence given to this root-truth of all religion in the Mosaic code. The second fact is, that the Druidic was essentially a priesthood of peace, neither wearing arms nor permitting arms to be unsheathed in its presence; and though patriotism, or the defence of one's country in a just war, was a high virtue in its system, we have no instance of Druidism persecuting or using physical force against any other religion or set of opinions. Its whole theory, indeed, would have stultified itself in so doing; and herein consists no small part of its identity with Christianity.[19]

The Jewish priesthood, on the other hand, was one of the sword against all other religions; and Elijah on Mount Carmel and Jehu in Samaria are faithful reflectors of its spirit. When St. Paul said, "I turn henceforth to the Gentiles," he was about to turn to a religion possessing already much more in common than Judaism with Christianity. The saying of Taliesin, the prince-Bard and Druid, conveys a great historic truth, though over-strongly expressed: "Christ, the Word from the beginning; was from the beginning our teacher, and we never lost his teaching. Christianity was a new thing in Asia, but there never was a time when the Druids of Britain held not its doctrines."

Having thus passed in review the religious status of the world, and especially of our own country, in the apostolic era, we proceed to give an epitome of the events in British history which brought the royal family of Britain into contact with St. Paul at Rome.

Notes to Chapter 2

1) Artemidorus, quoted by Strabo, the Orphic Hymns; Avienus de Britannia.

- 2) There is touching beauty in many of the Druidic triads, as in the following: "There are three men all should love: He that loves the face of his mother Nature; he that loves rational works of art; he that looks lovingly on the faces of little children."
- 3) The symbol of Druidism in Crete was the Menw-tarw, or Menw-bull and its chief temple the Labyrinth. Out of such simple elements the imaginative Greek mind forged the fable of Minos, the Minotaur, and Pasiphae, as it did that of the rape of Europa from the Astarte of Syria
- 4) Sir John Fortescue, *De Laudibus Legum Anglia*; Coke, Preface to third vol. of *Pleadings*; *Origin of the Common Law of England*.
- 5) There are now three states of existence; the cycle of 'Ceugant,' where there is nothing of living or dead but God, and God alone can traverse it; the cycle of 'Abred,' where all natural existence originates from death—this man has traversed; the cycle of 'Gwynfyd,' where all existence is from life—this man will traverse in the 'Nevoedd,' changes of life in heaven.) . . . The Druids, contrary to the Mosaic account, made the creation of man simultaneous with that of solar light. "Three things came into being at the same moment —light, man, and moral choice."—(Druidic Triads.)
- 6) So Procopius also testifies: "Hesus, Taranis, Belenus unus tantummodo Deus Unum Deum Dominum universi Druides Solum agnoscunt." *De Gothicis*, lib. Iii
- 7) The Druid regarded himself as the priest of the deity of nature, but in addition to this hierarchic character there appears to have been the following observances derived from one original family, language, and religion common to his with all the other forms of the primitive truth—libation, sacrifices, tradition of the Deluge, of the war of the Titanidæ against Heaven, metempsychosis, adoration towards the East, the division of the circle into 360 degrees, of the zodiac into twelve signs, of the week into seven days. Most of these we find in the Chaldæan faith, and it is certain the Chaldæans were highly civilised 2,000 years before the Christian era.
- 8) The three causes of man falling into 'Abred'—neglect of knowledge, aversion to good, love of evil. Occasioned by these three, man declines to his congenial state in 'abred', whence as before he re-ascends to humanity. (Druidic Triads.)
- 9) The three things God alone can do—endure the eternities of infinity, participate of all being without changing, renew everything without annihilating it. The three things wherein man necessarily differs from God—man is finite, God infinite; man had a beginning, God had none; man unable to sustain 'ceugant' (infinity of space and time), must have in 'gwynfyd, eternal change, cycles of existence; God sustains 'ceupan, unchanged. (Druidic Triads.)
- 10) Three things decrease continually, darkness, evil, and death. Three things increase continually, light, truth, and life. These will finally prevail over all; then 'abred' will end. (Druidic Triads.) The idea of the eternal progression of man and the universe which pervades the Triads is very fine.
- 11) A Druidic Catechism, of which fragments only are extant.
- 12) The three necessary essentials of God—infinite in Himself, finite to the finite, co-unity with every mode of existence in 'gwynfyd'. (Druidic Triads.)
- 13) There could in fact, according to the Druids, be no life at all in 'abred' except as proceeding from death. Above 'abred' death ceased, and the celestial innovations ran through eternity.
- 14) The Gildas MS. (Julius, D. xi.), Cottonian Library, calls these the three arch-flamens and twenty-eight flamens of Britain. Geoffrey of Monmouth appears to have found the same titles in the Armorican version of Tyssilio's History.


15) In our notice of the Zoroastrian religion we have alluded to the system of astrologic prophecy practised by its professors. The Hebrew prophet was inspired immediately by an afflatus of the Deity. The Druidic idea of prophecy differed from both, resolving it into a scientific knowledge of the natural connection and sequency of cause and effect. "He that will be a prophet of God," writes Gildas, "must never rest till he has traced everything to its cause and mode of operation. He will then know what God does, for God does nothing but what should be, in the manner it should be, at the time and in the order it should be. By understanding these laws of God, he will be able to see and foretell the future." (Principles of Prediction of Gildas the Prophet, Iolo MSS., p. 609.) Prophecy, then, was with the Druids nothing but the theological term for science, and Gildas supplies a useful commentary on Casar's words: "The Druids discuss many things concerning the stars and their revolutions, the magnitude of the globe and its various divisions, the nature of the universe, the energy and power of the immortal gods." (Cæsar's Com., lib. V.)

16) The accepting or circulating Roman coin in Britain was made a capital offence by Arviragus; for such an act, according to the Roman construction, inferred the right of levying tribute, as we see in the Scriptures: "Whose image and superscription is this? Cæsar's. Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Caesar's." From the reign of Claudius to that of Hadrian no coins, therefore, of the intervening Roman emperors have been found in Britain. From Hadrian onward there have been found a nearly complete series.

17) The excommunication of the Church of Rome is, on the face of it, the old Druidic excommunication, with none of its redeeming or justifying features. It stands in direct opposition to the whole genius of Christianity.

18) The style of the Bardo-Druidic remains is remarkable for its extreme but pregnant terseness, one word often expressing a finished idea.

19 "In the ancient world," observes Higgins (Celtic Re- searches, p. 196), "the Druids were the only priesthood of peace. Clad in his white canonicals, the Druidic herald presented himself between two armies, and every sword was instantly sheathed."



CHAPTER III

HISTORIC POSITIONS OF BRITAIN AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

JULIUS CÆSAR, in justification of his invasion of Britain, alleges the Britons to have been the aggressors, British levies taking the field against him in every Gallic campaign. Those singular collections of cardinal events known as the "Triads of the Isle of Britain," corroborate the statement. Prior to Cæsar's campaigns in Northern Gaul, a "British army of 50,000 men, termed in these Triads the "second silver host," under the command of the two nephews of Cassibelaunus, or Caswallon, invaded Aquitania, routed the Roman proconsul, Lucius Valerius Præconinus, at Tolosa, and compelled Lucius Manilius, the consul, to fly with the loss of all his commissariat. On receiving intelligence of these reverses, Cæsar turned his arms against the Veneti (Vendeans), who carried on a flourishing commerce with Britain, and whose navy supplied the transport for these auxiliaries. As long as the Venetian fleet, which from Cæsar's description of it would do no discredit to our present state of nautical architecture, remained mistress of the narrow seas, invasion was impracticable. Upon its destruction, Cæsar advanced by slow marches to Portus Itius (Witsand), near Calais, and on the 5th of August, 55 B.C., the Roman fleet crossed the Channel in two divisions. This first campaign lasted fifty-five days, during which Cæsar failed to advance beyond seven miles from the spot of disembarkation, lost one battle, and had his camp attempted by the victorious enemy, a thing unprecedented in his continental career.[1]

The second expedition embarked in above a thousand ships, and carrying the army which afterwards completed the conquest of the world on the fields of Pharsalia and Munda, set sail from Witsand, May 10, 54 B.C. The campaign lasted till September 10, when peace was concluded at Gwerddlan (Verulam, or St. Albans), the furthest point (70 miles) from the coast Cæsar had been able to attain. The conditions are not particularized in either the Triads or Commentaries. Hostages and a tribute are mentioned by Cæsar, but it is certain from numerous passages in the Augustan authors that no Briton of eminence left the island a hostage or prisoner. On the conclusion of the treaty, Cæsar moved from Verulam to London, where he was entertained at the Bryn Gwyn (white mount)[2] by Cassibelaunus, the British pendragon, or military dictator, with a magnificence which appears to have found great favour in the eyes of the ancient Bards, who record it with great exactness. Leaving not a Roman soldier behind, Cæsar disembarked his forces at Rutupium, at ten at night, and arrived at Witsand by daybreak the next morning, September 26, 54 BC.

The tests of the success or non-success of a campaign are its effects. The effects of the second Julian invasion demonstrate that both at Rome and in Gaul it was considered a more serious failure than the first. The line quoted by Lucan---

"Territa quæsitis ostendit terga Britannis,"[3]—

—as a common sarcasm in the mouths of the Pompeian party against Cæsar, may be thrown aside as the invidious exaggeration of the defeat on the Darent, and the loss of his sword to Nennius, the brother of Caswallon; but it is undeniable that the invasion cost Cæsar for a time the loss of all his continental acquisitions. Before he could dispose of his troops in winter quarters, the Treveri, Eburones, Senones, and Sicambri rose in arms, and the work of Gallic conquest had to be, reenacted.

Pr. Ed. Is it upon record, or else reported
Successively from age to age he built it?
Glo. Upon record, my gracious lord.
Pr: Ed. But say, my lord, it were not registered;
Methinks the truth should live from age to age,

As 'twere entailed to all posterity,
Even to the general all-ending day:
Glo. So wise, so young!
I say, without characters, fame lives long."
King Richard III., act iii. sc. I.

To estimate aright the military abilities of Caswallon, and the resources of the British people at this period of the first collision of our island with the Continent, it should be borne in mind that they were engaged against perhaps the ablest general of antiquity, heading an army to which, either before or after the invasion, France, Spain, Western Germany, Africa, Egypt, Asia, and finally Rome itself succumbed; the conquerors, in fact, of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the real founders of the imperial dynasty of the Cæsars. Contrasted with the success of the Norman invasion, effected by a comparatively rude race and king, the double repulsion of the Julian expedition by the ancient Britons has never received due weight or consideration. It yet remains unparalleled in British history.

Barbarism is a very indefinite term. To the Greeks and Romans all other nations were in common parlance "barbarians," by which was meant no more than "foreigners." If popular amusements are to be taken as the test, the Romans were them' selves the most barbarous of the nations of Europe. The Coliseum is the gigantic evidence of the race of human wolves which they not unaptly considered themselves to be. When the brutal sports of the gladiators were proposed to be introduced at Athens, even the Cynic philosopher cried out, "We must first pull down the statue to Mercy which our forefathers erected fifteen hundred years ago." A similar gulf separated the British from the Roman temper, and the accounts of the latter people with regard to the former must be received with much the same caution as those of the modern enemies of the same reserved and incommunicative insular race.

Boadicea, in her oration as given by Dion Cassius, observes, that though Britain had been for a century open to the Continent, yet its language, philosophy, and usages continued as great a mystery as ever to the Romans themselves; and the same remark, with little modification, applies still. All the evidences supplied by Cæsar refute the notion of material barbarism. Agriculture was universal, corn everywhere abundant, pasturage a distinct branch of national wealth, the population so thick as to excite his astonishment—"infinita multitudo hominum"—the surest and most satisfactory proof of a sound social state and ample means of sustenance.[4] The points which appear to have originated the idea of barbarism connected in some minds with the ancient Britons are, that they stripped to fight, which every Briton, every British schoolboy continues to do, and no other nation does; and, secondly, that they tattooed their bodies with various devices in deep blue lines, a practice which the British sailor cherishes in all its original freedom, and from which probably he will never be weaned, for these immemorial usages seem rooted in something much deeper than taste or imitation. Our soldiers also still retain the propensity of getting rid of every accoutrement and incumbrance in battle, and of charging as naked as military regulations will allow them. Yet it would

be ridiculous to term our sailors and soldiers barbarians in the modern sense of the word because they continue in these respects to be "true blue ancient Briton." In all the solid essentials of humanity our British ancestors will compare to great advantage with the best eras of Greece or Rome. In war the Briton, after the Julian invasions, walked the streets of Rome the only freeman in Europe, pointed at as the exception to the world:

"Invictus Romano Marte Britannus." [5]

For ninety-seven years no Roman again ventured to set hostile foot on the island, and when the eagle of Romulus once more expanded its pinions to the stormy winds of ocean, it was when no other enemy, unconquered, confronted its gaze from the Euphrates to Gibraltar, and the forces

of the whole empire were ready to follow its leading against the solitary free nationality of the West.

Caswallon, the able antagonist of Cæsar, reigned after the invasion seven years. Augustus Cæsar succeeded Julius 30 B.C. Henceforth Rome is to be regarded as the unity of the continent of Europe, Northern Africa, and Asia, in action from a central court under a series of autocrats rarely swerving from the imperial policy laid down by the Julian family. Augustus sent ambassadors to Britain demanding the restoration of the three Reguli of the Coritani, or Coraniaid, Dumno, Belaunus, and Jernian, to their estates, confiscated for treason. Ten-uantius, the son of Caswallon, a mild, pacific monarch, had sent his two sons, Cynvèlin and Llyr (Lear), to be educated at Rome, where they were brought up with his nephews in his palace by Augustus himself, who made a rule, as Suetonius informs us, of teaching the younger branches of his family in person. Cynvèlin subsequently served in the German campaigns under Germanicus. He had now succeeded his father, and received the Roman ambassadors with courtesy, but peremptorily rejected the interference of a foreign potentate in the affairs of the island. Augustus moved half the disposable forces of the empire to the Gallic harbours on the Channel, but he never entertained serious intentions of an invasion. Cynèlin concentrated his army at Dover.

A British fleet, as we learn from Dion Cassius, swept the Channel. The preparations of Augustus, tardily urged, indicated that prudential motives had already superseded the suggestions of pride. He had never conducted his campaigns in person, and where the genius of Julius had been baffled, inferior skill was likely to occur nought but disgrace and disaster. A reverse, as Horace had the courage to warn him (Ode 35, lib. v.), would be followed by a rising of the oligarchic faction in Italy. Cynvèlin was not slow to take advantage of this reluctance. A conference with the imperial friend and tutor of his youth was solicited. The result was the triumph of British diplomacy, a much rarer success than that of the British arms. Not only did the emperor abandon his demands, but the heavy duties previously levied on British goods were reduced to a very light tariff (Strabo, lib. iv. c. 5). Friendly relations were restored. British nobles again took up their residence at Rome, and were to be seen dedicating their offerings at the shrines of the Capitol.

Cymbeline, or Cynelin, after a reign of thirty-five years, was succeeded by his eldest son Cuiderius (Gwyddyr), his younger, Arviragus (Gweyrydd), receiving the dukedom of Cornwall (Cernyw), which by the British laws was a dukedom royal. The numerous coins of Cynvèlin (Cunobelinus) which remain in our days, are the only monuments we possess of a national mint in Western Europe apart from that of Rome. The horse, sometimes thought to be introduced as a national emblem by the Saxons, is one of the most common types upon them, Britain being long before the reign of Cymbeline famous for its breed of steeds, and the daring and accomplishments of its charioteers.

We now enter the times contemporary with St. Paul

As the central figure in the group of the historic characters we are about to pourtray is Caradoc, king of Siluria, we are called upon to notice somewhat at large his birth and character.[6]

It is a matter of wonder and indignation how few patriotic heroes the long annals of history present to our view. One in a century is not to be found. Turning over the pages which record the aggressions of the Romans on various nations, we inquire in vain for the most part for heroes to confront them. When we have named a Viriathus for Spain, a Hannibal for Carthage, an Arminius or Herman for Germany, a Mithridates for Asia, we have exhausted the catalogue of three continents. Britain is here also an exception to the world, for it shews an almost uninterrupted succession of patriots of the highest order, from Caswallon and Caradoc, through the Arthurs and Cadwallos, to the Wallaces and Glyn-dores of the Norman period. Nor have we any wars on record so long and stubborn as those which were waged, first between the Britons and the Romans, and secondly between the same Britons and the Saxons with other Teuton tribes, after the fall of the great empire. But Caradoc stands forth preeminently as the ideal of what a

patriot in the field should be. With Arminius the last spark of liberty had expired on the Continent. Northern 'Africa had finally been incorporated, by the arms of Sue-tonius, Paulinus, and Cneius Geta, into the Roman empire. Gaul, Spain, Southern Germany, Italy, Eastern Europe, and Asia as far as the Euphrates, enjoyed profound peace and no small amount of material prosperity under the enormous shadow of the Roman Capitol. The Cæsars were seated, firm as the seven hills themselves, on the throne. East and west, north and south, there was no enemy to be encountered; all was subjection and repose. The formidable armies of the imperial state hung up their shields for lack of a foe, or were employed in the formation of the numerous military roads which radiated like a network from Rome to Finisterre and Calais westward, and to the shores of the Persian Gulf eastward. It was in truth the grandest and most magnificent of empires, the extent of which, though embracing 1,600,000 sq. miles, and a population of 120,000,000 of Caucasian or semi-Caucasian blood, was its least glory. Nothing has risen like it since. Its mere fragments have sufficed for modern kingdoms. Countries ruled by proconsuls now term their rulers emperors. Fertile and well-cultivated, not only were these countries situated in the healthiest part of the temperate zone, but they teemed with all the materials of the finest soldiery, with all the resources of inexhaustible physical wealth. "*Urbs Roma orbs humana*" was no unfounded boast, for within the circumference of the empire were contained almost every land and race that had contributed to the civilization and progress of humanity. All the appliances of this vast unity of law and arms were at the command of one despot, and were now about to be moved towards the northern harbours of Gaul for the invasion of the only unconquered land of the ancient civilization.

One army and one general constituted the force which Caswallon was called upon to resist; but Caradoc was summoned by the voice of his country to take the field against an empire pouring forth a succession of armies in the highest state of discipline, under a succession of able and experienced commanders. This is the first time Britain was matched against the world in arms, and right nobly did the little island acquit herself.

Bran, or Brennus, the father of Caradoc, was the son of Llyr, brother of Cynvèlin, surnamed Llyr Llediaith, from the foreign accent imparted to the pronunciation of his native tongue by his education under Augustus at Rome. During threatened invasion of Augustus he commanded the British fleet in the Channel. Augustus was succeeded by Tiberius Cladius Cæsar, and Tiberius by Caligula, A.D. 37, a year marked by the births of Nero, Josephus the Jewish historian, and Julius Agricola the future commander of the Roman forces in Britain. The tranquillity pervading the empire instigated Caligula to renew the attempts at a conquest which the first and second Cæsars had either failed to achieve, or prudently bequeathed to their successors. The character, however, of this emperor, compounded of mania and vice, left a memorable stamp of ridicule upon the whole expedition. The armies of Gaul and the Rhine rendezvoused at Boulogne. A Roman flotilla collected from the Spanish ports was moored, ostensibly prepared to embark the troops, in the Seine.

The appearance, however, of a British fleet under Arviragus disconcerted and put an abrupt end to the enterprise, if indeed it was ever seriously meditated. Caligula, who felt a morbid gratification in burlesquing the most momentous measures of state, and scandalizing his subjects by the maddest freaks of imperial caprice, held a grand review of his splendid expeditionary force on the sands at Boulogne. At its termination, ascending the tribunal, he expiated on the glory which already encircled his brow as one who had led his troops like Bacchus, Hercules, and Sesostrius, to the confines of the earth-surrounding ocean. He asked if such renown ought to be jeopardized by an armed exploration of an island which nature itself had removed beyond the power and jurisdiction of the gods of Rome, and which the campaigns of the deified Cæsar himself had only succeeded in pointing out to the wonder of the continental world. "Let us, my comrades," he continued, adopting the well-known phrase of the great Julius (commilitones), "leave these Britons unmolested. To war beyond the bounds of nature is not courage, but impiety. Let us rather load ourselves with the bloodless spoils of the Atlantic ocean which the same beneficent goddess of nature pours on these sands so lavishly at our feet. Follow the example of

your emperor—behold," he added, suiting the action to the word, "I wreath for laurel this garland of green sea-weed around my immortal brow, and for *spolia optima* I fill my helm with these smooth and brilliant shells. Decorated with these we will return to Rome, and, instead of a British king, Neptune and Nereus, the gods of ocean themselves, shall follow captives to the Capitol behind our triumphal car. To each of you, my fellow soldiers in this arduous enterprise, I promise a gratuity of a year's extra stipend in merited acknowledgment of your services and fidelity to your emperor."

This singular harangue, which we are tempted to regard as the practical sarcasm of a despot not altogether insane on the ambition of the whole race of conquerors, was welcomed with thunders of acclamation. The projected expedition had been from the first viewed with extreme distaste by the soldiery, and despite the indignation openly expressed by the officers, they did not hesitate to give vent to their satisfaction, and, with military jests and peals of laughter, imitate the example of their imperial master. The British fleet gazed with astonishment on these bronzed and mail-clad veterans disporting themselves in the childish amusement of collecting shells on the sea-shore. The camp was broken up, and Caligula entered Rome in triumphal procession, with his army, on his birthday, August 31, A.D. 40. He was assassinated next year in the 29th year of his age (January 24th), and succeeded by Claudius, then in his 50th year.

The father of Tiberius Claudius Cæsar was Drusus Claudius Nero, elevated first to the quæstorship, then to the prætorship, subsequently appointed to conduct the Rhætian and German campaigns. He was the first Roman commander that navigated in force the German Ocean. He carried his arms to the centre of Germany, and is stated by Suetonius to have been deterred from further advance by the sudden apparition on his march of a female of more than mortal stature and beauty, bidding him halt the Roman banners where she appeared. He died suddenly, not without suspicion of foul play, in the *Castra Æstiva*, thence called *Scelerata*, whilst preparing to extend his conquests in another direction. His body was conveyed from town to town, and buried with state honours, Augustus himself pronouncing the funeral panegyric, in the *Campus Martius* at Rome.

Nearly connected as he was with the Cæsars, Drusus remained to the last a stern republican. He left three children, Germanicus, Livilla, and Claudius; the last born at Lyons. The infancy, childhood, and youth of the future emperor were spent under the strictest state surveillance. He was regarded as but one remove from an idiot. "He is as imbecile as my son Claudius" was an ordinary phrase in his mother Livia's mouth when she wished to imply an extraordinary degree of stupidity. His appearance did not belie his character. Tall and full in person, and possessed, when seated, of the external show of dignity, in motion his knees shook, his head perpetually trembled, his tongue stuttered, his laughter was outrageously violent, and his anger marked by profuse foaming at the mouth. Cruel and bloodthirsty by nature, as indeed every Roman was, he insisted on being present whenever any criminal was put to the torture. He never failed to give the sign of "no quarter" against disabled gladiators, and delighted with a horrible voracity to gloat over the dying expression of their faces. He sat from morning to night, neglecting the ordinary hours of refreshment, at the *bestiaria*, or combats of wild beasts, and yet personally was the rankest and most contemptible of cowards. He never attended an invitation except surrounded by guards, who searched every guest before he entered the apartment, a precaution exercised also on every citizen who accosted him. In many points there exists a strong resemblance between Claudius and our James the First—both were addicted to the lowest companions and buffoonery, both were poltroons, both coarse gourmands, and both were pedants of the deepest dye. Yet it must be confessed that the loss of the work of Claudius on the *Races and Antiquities of Primitive Italy* is one that can never be replaced, the few fragments we possess evincing it to have been a mine of undigested, but very valuable and authentic matter.

Let us with the Roman emperor contrast the British patriot. Caractacus was born at Trevran, the seat of his father Bran, within the present parish of Llanilid, in Glamorganshire. He received his education at the Druidic cor of Caerleon-on-Usk, where most of the Silurian nobility were trained

in the cycle of Celtic accomplishments. Of these, oratory was one of the chief, and we possess in the speech of the British king before Claudius a fair specimen of the bold, free, terse style inculcated in these ancient national colleges. Allusion is made in it to a long line of illustrious ancestors—"clari majores." It sounds strange to persons accustomed to think a Norman pedigree, dating from A.D. 1066, ancient, to hear this British king, a thousand years before, face to face with a Roman emperor, and in the heart of the Capitol deliver himself proudly of a royal lineage, the fount of which, like that of the Nile, was lost in its very remoteness. In the clan times, however, the preservation of a pedigree meant the preservation of all that was valuable in blood, station, and property. Without it a man was an outlaw; he had no clan, consequently no legal rights or status. Genealogies were guarded, therefore, with extreme jealousy, and recorded with painful exactitude by the herald-bards of each clan. On the public reception, at the age of fifteen, of a child into the clan, his family genealogy was proclaimed, and all challengers of it commanded to come forward. Pedigree and inheritance, indeed, were so identified in the ancient British code, that an heir even in the ninth descent could redeem at a jury valuation any portion of an hereditary estate from which necessity had compelled his forefathers to part. As the succession of these clari majores may be interesting to the antiquary, we extract it from the Pantliwydd Manuscripts of Llansannor:

"Genealogy of Careldoc. Caràdoc ab Bran Fendigaid, ab Llyr Llediaith, ab Baran, ab Ceri Hirlyn Gwyn, ab Caid, ab Arch, ab Meirion, ab Ceraint, ab Greidiol, ab Dingad, ab Anyn, ab Alafon, ab Brywlais, ab Ceraint Feddw, ab Berwyn, ab Morgan, ab Bleddyn, ab Rhun, ab Idwal, ab Llywarch, ab Calchwynydd, ab Enir Fardd, ab Ithel, ab Llarian, ab Teuged, ab Llyfeinydd, ab Peredur, ab Gwey-rydd, ab Ithon, ab Cymryw, ab Brwt, ab Selys Hen, ab Annyn Tro, ab Brydain, ab Aedd Mawr."

Reckoning thirty years for a generation, this pedigree carries us back 1,080 years, that is, 330 years before the foundation of Rome. Not all of these ancestors have escaped the reprobation of the blunt Bardic chroniclers--one of them especially, Ceraint Feddw, is stigmatized as an irreclaimable drunkard, deposed by his subjects for setting fire just before harvest to the corn lands of Siluria. In the year A.D. 36, Bran resigned the Silurian crown to Caràdoc, and became Arch-Druid of the college of Siluria, where he remained till called upon to be a hostage for his son. At the period of his accession Caràdoc had three sons, Cyllin or Cyllinus, Lleyon or Linus, and Cynon, and two daughters, Eurgain and Gladys, or Claudia.

In July, A.D. 42, a British embassy arrived at Rome from Guiderius, complaining of the encouragement extended by the Emperor to the intrigues of Beric and Adminius, two reguli of the Brigantes and Coritani, who, in consequence of being detected in a treasonable correspondence with Caligula during the late menaced invasion, had been banished Britain. Claudius had powerful reasons for declining to receive the ambassadors. The invasion of Britain had been already decided upon, and the Roman forces were collecting at the usual rendezvous at Boulogne.

Whatever the deficiencies of the Emperor himself might be, at no time were the great offices of state filled by men of higher administrative capacity, or better able to wield the vast military resources of the empire. Aulus Plautius, a general who emulated the Scipios in the rigour of his discipline and the rapidity of his marches, was appointed to the command of the army of invasion. The fleet and transports collected were too numerous and well appointed for the British naval force to cope with, and it accordingly returned to Torbay. This obstacle was no sooner removed, than another, quite unparalleled in the annals of Roman obedience, arose. The army refused to embark, and broke into open mutiny. Appeals to their sacraments, or military oaths of allegiance, failed to move them, the only response they elicited being, "We will march anywhere *in* the world, but not *out* of it." The lapse of ninety years had not extinguished the memory of the Julian campaigns, the sanguinary disembarkation on the Walmer beach, the stubborn battle-fields, and the terrible chariot-charges. Intelligence of this alarming state of things soon reached Rome, and Claudius at once dispatched his favourite freedman and minister, Narcissus, to the scene of

disaffection. Convening the army, Narcissus, whose failings were not those of moral or physical cowardice, mounted the general's tribune and commenced his harangue. It was the first time an eunuch had ever dared to address Roman soldiers. Stupefaction and indignation for a time kept the legions dumb, but when he exclaimed "He would himself lead them into Britain," a universal shout of execration arose, and rushing to the tent of Plautius, they called upon him to give the signal for embarkation. Taking instant advantage of this change of temper, Plautius embarked the army in three divisions, and landed two days afterwards at Rutupium, or Ynys Ruthin, between Thanet and Richborough.

From Dover to Holyhead ran the British causeway, constructed by Dyfnwal and his son, Beli the Great, 400 B.C. called Sam Wyddèlin, or the Irish Road, Wyddèlin being the British term for 'Irish.' The corruption into Watling Street is not great. Along the Sarn "Wyddèlin Cæsar had directed his march, and Plautius moved his forces on the same line. He found the British army drawn up under Guiderius and Caràdoc at Southfleet, across the Sarn on the flat between the Kentish hills and the Thames. The action terminated in the Britons falling back to Wimbledon Heath, where a second battle was fought, in which Guiderius fell. He was succeeded on the throne by his brother Arviragus, but the national emergency requiring the establishment of the pendragonate, or military dictatorship, Caràdoc was unanimously elected to that high office, Arviragus giving his vote first in his favour, and consenting to act under him. Caràdoc withdrew his forces across the Thames at Chertsey, Plautius following along the Sam, now called "The Devil's Causeway." In attempting to force the passage of the Thames at Kingston, the Roman general was thrice foiled. He then proceeded to Silchester, by means of his German cavalry defeated a British division at Nettlebed, in Oxfordshire, and returning by a forced march to Wallingford, crossed the Thames there, after a desperate resistance. Dion Cassius, the Greek historian, gives a vivid description of the action.

The Romans, led by Plautius, Flavius Vespasian, the future emperor, and his brother, entered the river in three columns, whilst the German cavalry swam it lower down, and assailed the British position in flank. But the British stupidity, which never knows when it is beaten, appears to be of very old date. Dion states the contest continued with slight intermissions for two whole days on the northern side, and that the defeat of Caràdoc was eventually effected by a daring manoeuvre on his flank and rear made by Cneius Geta, the conqueror of Mauritania, who was rewarded for it, though he had not yet attained the consular dignity, with the honours of a triumph. It tells well for the abilities of Caràdoc that in this first battle as pèndràngon he was able to hold his ground for two days of incessant fighting against three such generals as Plautius, Vespasian, and Geta.

Undismayed, he collected his forces again, and Plautius, on attempting to follow him, was so roughly handled that messages were sent to Rome for instructions and reinforcements. Claudius himself immediately quitted Rome, and passing through Gaul, landed at Richborough, with the second and fourteenth legions, their auxiliaries, and a cohort of elephants brought over for the express purpose of neutralizing the British chariot-charges. He effected a junction with Plautius at Verulam. Beric and Adminius had accompanied him, and, as had been previously arranged, the two states of the Iceni and Coritani, or Coraniaid, on their making their appearance among them, rose in arms and proclaimed their alliance with the invaders. Caràdoc had thus the Romans in front and an insurgent country in the rear. Dion terms Caer Col, or Colchester, the basileion or royal residence of Cynvèlin. It was known at this period as Camulodunum, the city of Camul, an Umbric or Cymric term for the God of War.[7] In its defence Caràdoc fought two more battles—the first at Coxall Knolls, and the second at Brandon camp, on the Teme. In this latter the horses of the British chariots, the odour of elephants being insupportable to this animal, gave way in all directions, and Caradoc suffered his first decisive defeat. Colchester in a few days surrendered. A treaty was concluded, known as the Claudian treaty, by which it was stipulated that the Coranidæ and Iceni, on the payment of a certain amount of tribute, should, under the Roman protectorate, be guaranteed their land, laws, and native government. Claudius is said to have promised also his natural daughter, Venus Julia, called in the British accounts Venissa, to

Arviragus. The alliance in after years took place, and. Arviragus built *Caer Gloyw*, or Gloucester, in honour of his imperial father-in-law. Claudius left the further prosecution of the war to his generals, and, returning to Rome, celebrated his triumph with signal magnificence—the more impressive from the humility displayed by himself in ascending the steps of the Capitol on his knees, supported on either side by his sons-in-law. But the war had in reality only just began. Caradoc, having carried fire and sword through the territories of the revolted tribes, transferred hostilities from the champaigns of the eastern counties to the hilly districts of the south-west. Here he proceeded to levy and arm fresh forces. It is instructive to study the movements on both sides, for never was war carried on with greater energy and laboriousness.

Plautius marched against the *pendrâgon* by land, whilst Vespasian was dispatched with the Roman fleet to effect a landing at Torbay. Geta was left at Colchester, his legions commencing the construction of that celebrated line of fortresses which extended from the head of the fens now forming the Isle of Ely, to Gloucester. This immense work, the object of which was to mark off southern Britain at once as a Roman province, was carried on day and night with the usual indefatigability and science of the Roman service. *Castra* after *castra* rose, each as completed being occupied by its appropriate garrison, and the British *pendrâgon* heard at the same time of the rising of the formidable circumvallation in his rear, of the advance of Plautius on his flank, and the disembarkation of Vespasian in his front. Devonshire (*Dyvnaint*, the deep vales), Dorset (the water land), and Somerset (*Gwlad yr hay*, summerland), were, however, admirably adapted for the display of British intrepidity and tactics.

The camps, Roman and British, pitched at almost regular intervals in hostile frontage of each other over the whole surface of these counties, bespeak better than any history the desperate and long-sustained character of the campaigns which now ensued. In the art of castrametation we fail to detect any evidence of scientific superiority on the part of the invaders, it appears to us to be, if anywhere, on the British side, especially in the ramparts and in the strength of the approaches. But it is certain that both the British and Roman soldier must have been in the highest condition of military discipline before earthworks necessitating such labour to construct and such vigilance to defend could have been carried out as part of the ordinary drill of the day. The 'navvy' power displayed in them is not unworthy the present century.

Here the war rolled backward and forward for seven years, absorbing during that time the almost undivided military interest of the Roman world; for, with the exception of the rebellion, soon crushed out by Corbulo, in Armenia, the British *pendrâgon* was bearing the whole brunt of the arms of the empire, under a series of its finest generals. In these seven years, according to Suetonius thirty, according to Eutropius thirty-two battles were fought. The central camp of Plautius was fixed between Silbury Hill and Amesbury, that of Vespasian and his son Titus on Hampden Hill, near Ilchester, the area of which was able to accommodate 200,000 men. On the ground now forming a farm called Conquest-farm, Bishops Lydiard, near a smaller camp of twenty acres, Arviragus sustained a total defeat by Vespasian, who proceeded to invest *Caer Usc* (Exeter). On the eighth day of the siege he was surprised in his in-trenchments by Caradoc and Arviragus, and routed with great slaughter. Titus had on this occasion the glory of saving his father's life. The British attack was so sudden that Vespasian was on the point of being slain in his tent, when Titus, divining his father's danger, charged his captors at the head of the first cohort of the fourteenth legion, and, rescued him from their hands.[8]

Plautius, Vespasian, Geta, and Titus were successively recalled. We cannot do better than use the significant language of Tacitus in describing the fluctuations of the war, victory hovering now over the Roman, now over the British standards: "The Silures reposed unbounded confidence in Caractacus, enumerating the many drawn battles he had fought with the Romans, the many victories he had obtained over them." [9] The passionate attachment, indeed, of his countrymen to their high-souled and incorruptible compatriot is abundantly evidenced by the fond allusions to him in their ancient Triads. "Three have been," declare these records, "our hero-kings—Cynvêlin, Caradoc, Arthur. Except by treachery they could not be overthrown." "Three have

been the chief battle-kings of the Isle of Britain—Caswallon, son of Beli; Arviragus, son of Cynvèlin; Caràdoc, son of Bran." "Caràdoc, son of Bran, whom every Briton, from the king to the peasant, followed when he lifted his spear to battle."

But we must draw his military career, which is but indirectly connected with this essay, to a close. On the recall of Plautius, who had married Gladys (Pomponia Græcina), the sister of Caractacus, a truce was concluded for six months, during which must be fixed the visit of the British chief to Rome. What credence to attach to the British story in the Iolo MSS., which represents him as appearing before the senate, and stating that he had ordered "every tree in Siluria to be felled, that the Romans might no longer allege it was the British forests, and not British valour, which baffled him," we hardly know. It is in accordance with his character, which we recognise also in the anecdote recorded by Dion. "When Caractacus," says that historian, "was shewn the public buildings of Rome, he observed, It is singular a people possessed of such magnificence at home should envy me my soldier's tent in Britain."

On the expiration of the truce and the return of Caràdoc to his command, Ostorius Scapula, with the Plautian line of fortresses for his base of operations, proceeded to carry the war westward. Supported by the Silures and Ordovicians, the fierce indomitable mountaineers, whom the Roman arms never succeeded in subduing, the Pendrâgon contested every advance of the invaders. Around Caer Essylt (the Hereford Beacon) a succession of encounters took place for six months. The winter did not interrupt hostilities. A Roman division which had penetrated as far as Caerlon was cut to pieces. Ostorius, in the next campaign, fixed his headquarters at Castra Ostorii, in Dinder, Herefordshire, now ludicrously corrupted into "Oyster Hill."

Towards the end of the campaign, in the autumn of A.D. 52, the battle which terminated the career of Caràdoc in the field was fought close to the confines of the Teme and the Clune in Shropshire. The Roman victory was complete." The wife of Caràdoc and his daughter Gladys fell into the hands of the conquerors, and were conveyed to the castra at Urechean (Ureconium, Wrekin). Caràdoc himself took refuge, at her repeated solicitations, at Caer Evroc (York), with Arêgwedd, or Aricia, the Cartis-mandua of Tacitus, queen of the Brigantes, and grand-niece of the infamous traitor in the Julian war, Mandubratius, or Avarwy. Here by her orders, with hereditary treachery, he was seized while asleep in her palace, loaded with fetters, and delivered to Ostorius Scapula. On intelligence of the event, Claudius ordered him and all the captive family to be sent to Rome.

The British Triads commemorate this captivity of the royal Silurian family in their quaint antique fashion. "There were three royal families that were conducted to prison, from the great-great-grandfather to the great-grandchildren, without permitting one of them to escape. First the family of Llyr Llediaith, who were carried to prison at Rome by the Cesaridæ. . . . Not one or another of these escaped. They were the most complete incarcerations known as to families." The great-great-grandfather on this occasion was Llyr, the father of Bran, who subsequently died at Rome. Bran voluntarily surrendered himself as a hostage. The approach and arrival of Caràdoc. at Rome are finely described by the ancient historians—"Roma catenatum tremuit spectare Britannum." [11]

Since the days of Hannibal and Mithridates, the only foe worthy the Roman arms entered the Eternal City amidst the excitement of three millions of inhabitants, who blocked up the line of the procession to obtain a view of the formidable and illustrious captive. The Senate was convened. The trial and speech of Caràdoc are familiar to every schoolboy. With an unaltered countenance, the hero of forty pitched fields, great in arms, greater in chains, took his position before the tribunal of the emperor, and thus delivered himself: "Had my government in Britain been directed solely with a view to the preservation of my hereditary domains, or the aggrandizement of my own family, I might long since have entered this city an ally, not a prisoner; nor would you have disdained for a friend a king descended from illustrious ancestors, and the dictator of many nations. My present condition, stripped of its former majesty, is as adverse to

myself as it is a cause of triumph to you. What then? I was lord of men, horses, arms, wealth: what wonder if at your dictation I refused to resign them? Does it follow, that because the Romans aspire to universal dominion, every nation is to accept the vassalage they would impose? I am now in your power—betrayed, not conquered. Had I, like others, yielded without resistance, where would have been the name of Caradoc? where your glory? Oblivion would have buried both in the same tomb. Bid me live, I shall survive for ever in history one example at least of Roman clemency."

Such an address as this, worthy a king, a soldier, and a freeman, had never before been delivered in the Senate. Tacitus thought it worthy to be reported and immortalized by his pen. Its spirit reminded him of the old republican times of the Camilli, the Cincinnati, the Catones; a spirit long since extinct. The custom at those revolting displays of Roman pride and bloodthirstiness called 'triumphs,' was that at a certain spot on the Sacra Via the captive kings and generals should be removed from the procession, cast into the Tarpeian dungeons, to be there starved to death, strangled, or decapitated, and their dead bodies dragged by hooks into the Tiber.[12]

Alas! for the chivalry of heathen warfare. The preservation of Caradoc forms a solitary exception in the long catalogue of victims to this dastardly and nefarious policy: nor can it be accounted for, considering the inflexibility of Roman military usage, in any other way than by an immediate and supernatural intervention of Providence, which was leading by the hand to the very palace of the British king at Rome the great Apostle of the Gentiles. The family of Aulus Plautius, indeed, was already connected with that of Caradoc, and an engagement existed between his daughter Gladys and Aulus Rufus Pudens Pudentinus, a young senator of large possessions in Samnium. But their united influences would never have sufficed to alter a fixed law of the Roman state in favour of an enemy that had tasked its utmost prowess and resources for so many years. The defeat at Caer Caradoc and the betrayal of their sovereign had, moreover, served not to intimidate but to infuriate and rouse to greater efforts, his subjects in Britain. The Silures elected his cousin Arviragus his successor in the penrhogonate. The Romans were beaten back across the Severn. Disaster followed disaster. Tacitus, loth to dilate on the misfortunes of the imperial arms, sums up the reverses of the war in a few expressive lines: "In Britain, after the captivity of Caractacus, the Romans were repeatedly conquered and put to the rout by the single state of the Silures alone." [13]

Perhaps this knowledge, that the execution of Caradoc might still further imperil the Roman states in Britain, and the consideration that clemency might be the wisest policy towards a high-spirited and loyal enemy, dictated the course of Claudius. Be this as it may, the life of Caradoc was spared, on condition of his never bearing arms against Rome again. A residence of seven years in free custody (*libera custodia*) at Rome was imposed upon him. His father Bran was accepted as one of the hostages, and he was allowed the full enjoyment of the revenues of the royal Silurian domains, forwarded to him by his subjects and council. Gladys, his daughter, was adopted by the Emperor Claudius, and assumed, of course, his family name—Claudia. Caradoc took up his residence in the Palatium Britannicum, on the side of the Mons Sacer, converted afterwards by his grand-daughter, Claudia Pudentiana, into the first Christian Church at Rome, known first as the "Titulus and now as St. Pudentiana Here the nuptials of Claudia and Rufus Pudens Pudentinus were celebrated A.D. Four children were the issue of this marriage—St. Timotheus, St. Novatus, St. Pudentiana, St. Praxedes. Of the sons of Caradoc, Cyllinus and Cynon returned to Britain, the former succeeding on his death to the Silurian throne. The second, Lleyrn, or Linus, remained with his father, and was, as we shall see subsequently, consecrated by St. Paul first bishop of the Roman Church.

Martial the epigrammatist was born A.D. 29: he went to Rome A.D. 49; he left Rome A.D. 86; and died at his native place, Bilbilis in Spain, A.D. 104, aged 75. As far as we can collect by collation, Claudia was born A.D. 36, and at her marriage with Rufus was in her 17th year. Martial was a familiar frequenter of the Pudentian house, and in the habit of submitting his verse for emendation to its heir, Rufus, We have an epigram extant in which the witty but licentious poet

complains of the severity of his young critic's castigations. It would have been well for his reputation, with no loss to his wit, had he allowed all his works to pass through the hands of Rufus before he had consigned them to the public ear. The epigram he addressed to the cousin of Rufus, Quintus Pomponius Rufus, then on military service in Dalmatia, on the nuptials of Claudia and Rufus, at which he appears to have been present, is subjoined in the note below.[14]

Four years afterwards, on the birth of Pudentiana, Martial addressed a second highly complimentary poem to the British princess, celebrating her beauty, grace, wit, and fascination. He represents her as uniting the separate accomplishments of the Roman and the Athenian ladies. Claudia, though the mother of three children, was only in her twenty-first year, and might with propriety be still termed "puella" by the poet. In the interval between the first and the present epigram, Pudens had been converted to Christianity, hence he is called Sancto Marito:

"Claudia Ceruleis quum sit Rufina Britannis
Edita quam Latiae pectora plebis habet!
Quale decus formae! Romanam credere matres
Italidum possunt Attides esse suam
Di bene quod sancto peperit fecunda marito
Quod sperat generos quodque puella nurus
Sic placeat superis ut conjuge gaudeat una
Et semper natis gaudeat ipsa tribus."

All the family of Caradoc were attached to literary pursuits. Bran introduced the use of vellum into Britain from Rome;" and by the younger members copies of the best Roman authors were circulated in Siluria, and deposited in the principal receptacles of Druidic learning. Martial was no exception, and his verses appear to have become popular:

"Dicitur et nostros cantare Britannia versus."—Lib xi.

Claudia wrote several volumes of odes and hymns. Her aunt, Pomponia Græcina, received her agnomen from her intimate acquaintance with Greek literature. The palace, indeed, of the British king formed a focus and rendezvous, and perhaps the safest they could frequent, for the poets and authors of Rome. Nor did it cease to be so on his return to his native country; it continued to be the residence of Pudens and Claudia and their children. Some conception may be formed of its size and magnificence from the number of servants who constituted its ordinary establishment. These, as we learn from the Roman Martyrology, were two hundred males and the same number of females, all born on the hereditary estates of Pudens, in Umbria.[14]


The attachment between Pudens and Claudia first grew up when the former was stationed by Aulus Plautius as prætor castrorum at Regnum, now Chichester. We still possess in the Chichester Museum a remarkably interesting monument of the residence of Pudens in this city. Cogidunus, regulus of the Regni, was one of the kings included as allies—in fact, tributaries—under the Roman protectorate in the Claudian treaty of Colchester. Their native dynasties, laws, and lands were guaranteed to such states—the kings themselves becoming and being titled Legati Augusti, Lieutenants of the Roman emperor, as the heads of our counties are now styled Lieutenants of the Queen. They were bound to permit the construction of a Roman castra, garrisoned by Roman legionaries with their usual staff of engineers, in their chief city. The prætor of the castra held the military command within

the allied territory. Such kings were considered and dealt with as traitors to the national cause by the Silurian and independent Britons, and their names either branded with the disgraceful stigma of bradwr (traitor), or consigned to oblivion by the Bardic chroniclers. Hence we find not a few commemorated in the pages of the Roman historians, of whose existence we can trace no vestige in the British. Of these Cogidunus is one. Tacitus remembered him, as he well might. For Tacitus was born A.D. 56, the year of the death of Claudius, and Cogidunus was alive A.D.

76, ten years after St. Paul's martyrdom, when Tacitus was in his twentieth year. In the year A.D. 1723, whilst excavating the foundations of some houses, the monument to which we refer, generally known as the Chichester stone, was discovered. The inscription, which was partly mutilated, and is cut in very bold characters, as restored by Horsley and Gale, is as follows:

**NEPTUNO ET MINERVÆ
 TEMPLUM
 PRO SALUTE DOMUS DIVINÆ
 EX AUCTORITATE TIB: CLAUDII
 COGIDUNI REGIS LEGATI AUGUSTI IN BRITANNIA
 COLLEGIUM FABRORUM ET QUI IN EO
 A SACRIS SUNT DE SUO DEDICAVERT
 DONANTE ABEAM PUDENTE PUDENTINI FILIO.**

"The College of Engineers, and ministers of religion attached to it, by permission of Tiberius Claudius Cogidunus, the king, legate of Augustus in Britain, have dictated at their own expense, in honour of the divine family [the imperial family], this temple to Neptune and Minerva. The site was given by Pudens, son of Pudentinus."



Chichester stone or Pudens stone

Apart from its value in other respects, the inscription is interesting as evidence of the naturally pious bent of the young Roman commander's disposition, and, secondly, of the fact that to every legion in the Roman service was attached a staff of ministers of religion—a part of moral discipline in which these iron-minded heathen put to the shame our own and other countries professing Christianity. The temple appears to have been erected about A.D. 50, before, of course, the conversion of Pudens or his marriage with Claudia.

We have now, A.D. 56, the royal Silurian family located at Rome on that part of the Mons Sacer called Scaurus, in the Palatium Britannicum, afterwards called the Titulus, or Hospitium Apostolorum, then St. Pudentiana, which name the building still retains. The minister of this church, and of the family of Pudens, was Hermas, mentioned by St. Paul,[17] surnamed, from his work bearing the title of Pastor, Hermas Pastor. The church was called also after him, Pastor. In front of this relic of eminent British and Apostolic times may still be seen, carved in characters corroded by age, the Latin inscription, attributed to the second century, of which the following is a translation:

"In this sacred and most ancient of churches, known as that of Pastor, dedicated by Sanctus Pius Papa, formerly the house of Sanctus Pudens, the senator, and the home of the holy apostles, repose the remains of three thousand blessed martyrs, which Pudentiana and Praxedes, virgins of Christ, with their own hands interred."[18]

Baronius[19] has the following note upon the Titulus: "It is delivered to us by the firm tradition of our forefathers that the house Pudens was the first that entertained St. Peter at Rome, and that there the Christians assembling formed the Church, and that of all our churches the oldest is that which is called after the name of Pudens."

Notes to Chapter 3

1) Dion Cassius states that Cæsar's original intention was to carry the war into the interior, but finding his forces inadequate to cope with the British in the field, he abruptly determined to close the campaign. (Lib. xxxix. p. 115, ed. 1606, fol.).

2) The old belief that part of the Tower of London was built by Julius Cæsar is known to every one; and the White Tower was pointed out as the part. "The White Tower" appears a version of the original British name Bryn Gwyn, but whether Cæsar was lodged therein, or laid its foundation-stone, or was never at all entertained in London, there seems to us to be so much good sense in the sentiments put by Shakespeare on this point in the mouth of the young King Edward V., that we make no apology for transcribing them: "Prince Edward. Did Julius Cæsar build the Tower my lord? Gloucester. He did, my gracious liege, begin that place; Which since succeeding ages have re-edified

3) Aulus Gellius wrote an account of Cæsar's invasion of Britain. He commemorates a British cry which seems to have produced a very lively impression on the Roman mind--"Horribilis ille Britannorum clamor, Tori pen i Caisar," ('Off with Cæsar's Head')

4) "Hominum infinita multitudo" is Cæsar's expression. Diodorus calls Britain πολυάθροπον νήσον In A.D. I to, Ptolemy enumerates fifty-six cities; later, Marcianus fifty-nine πόλας ἐπίόημονς. British architects were in great demand on the Continent. "Redundabat Britannia artificibus," states Eumenius in his era.

5) Tibullus. Horace implies that the Briton had scarcely been touched by Cæsar's campaigns: "Intactus aut Britannus ut descenderet Sacra catenatus via." In another Ode he writes, that nothing but the conquest of Britain was wanting to make Augustus "presens divus in terris," Od, lib. iii. 5.

6) The accent in the British language is invariably on the penult—Caradoc, Cynvelin, Talièsin, Llewèlyn, &c. The Romans latinized Carádoc by Caractacus, the Greeks hellenized it more correctly by Caratacos.

7) "Camulo Deo Sancto et Fortissimo."---Umbrian altar inscription.

8)"In Britannia circumdato a barbaris Vespasiano et in extremo, periculo versante Titus filius ejus patri metuens coronam hostium incredibili audacia disjecit."—Suetonius in Vita Vespas.; Dion Cass., lib. IX.

9) Taciti Annal., lib. ii. c. 24. The era of Tacitus was A.D. 80.

10) Taciti Annal., lib. Xii.

11) "Rome trembled when she saw the Briton, though fast in chains."

12) Jugurtha, king of Numidia, went mad during the procession, as he followed the car of his conqueror Marius.

[13] In Britannia Romanos post Caractaci captivitatem ab uná tantun Silurum civitate =æplus victos et profligatos."—Tac. Ann., lib. v. c. 28.

14) "Claudia, Rufe, meo nubit Peregrina Pudenti:
Macte esto 0 Hymenme, tuis.
Tam bene rara suo miscentur cinnama nardo,
Massica Theseis tam bene vina cadis,
Nec melius teneris junguntur vitibus ulmi,
Nec plus Lotus aquas, littora myrtus amat.
Candida perpetuo, reside, Concordia, lecto,
Tamque pari semper sit Venus aqua jugo.
Diligat illa senem quondam: sed et ipsa marito,
Tunc quoque quum fuerit, non videatur anus."

Lib. iv. p. 18.

15) Coelbren, p. 25.

16) Adjacent to the palace were baths on a corresponding scale, known subsequently as *Thermæ Timothinæ* and *Therm Novatianæ*. The palace baths and grounds were bequeathed by Timotheus to the Church at Rome. And these were the only buildings of any magnitude possessed by the Roman Church till the reign of Constantine. Hermas terms the Titulus "*amplissima Pudentes domus*." It was the hospitium for Christians from all parts of the world.

17) Rom. xvi. 14.

18) "*In hac sancta antiquissima ecclesia*," &c.,—Baronius ad Maii 19.

19) *Annales Ecclesias*, in *Notis ad 19 Maii*. Note on Pastor. Some authors affirm there were two distinct Hermas Pastors—one the above minister of the Titulus, so called because he belonged to the senatorian family of the name of Pastor; the second of later date, author of the treatise Pastor, and brother of Pius Papa. If this view is correct, both were ministers of the Titulus, for the letters of the latter from the Titulu to Timotheus in Britain are extant. Vide also Moncæus, *Syntagma de Claudia Britannica*, p. 18; *Pastoris Epistolæ ad Timotheum*; *Justini Martyris Apologia*; *Greek Menology*, ad dies *Pudentianæ et Praxedis*. That the palace of Claudia was the home of the apostles in Rome appears agreed upon by all ecclesiastical historians—even Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, admits it. "*Claudia was the first hostess or harbourer both of St. Peter and St. Paul at the time of their coming to Rome.*"—Parsons' *Three Conversions of England*, vol. i. p. 16.



CHAPTER IV

THE BRITISH ROYAL FAMILY AT ROME—THE ARIMATHÆAN, OR FIRST INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO BRITAIN.

HAVING THUS ESTABLISHED THE BRITISH KING AND HIS FAMILY IN THE TITULUS, we turn our attention to St. Paul, who arrived at Rome for the first time on his appeal to Cæsar, A.D. 58.¹ His previous history, as being familiar to every reader of the Scriptures, we omit, taking up its continuation where it becomes connected with that of our British ancestors.

A strong Christian Church, celebrated for its zeal and fidelity, existed in Rome before the visit of St. Paul or any other apostle to it. We know, from many passages in the Epistle to the Romans itself; that at the time of its composition and despatch St. Paul had not yet been to Rome. Amongst the members of the Church, however, were some not only the most intimate fellow-labourers and friends, but relatives of the Apostle. Some of the latter, such as Andronicus and Junia, had been converted before him. Herodion is mentioned as another kinsman. In connection with Rufus Pudens who is saluted by name, occurs another salutation which originates an interesting question, the right solution of which would throw a flood of light on this part of the history both of Paul and Pudens—"Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine." Does this mean natural or spiritual relationship? We are inclined to believe the former. A spiritual father or mother is, in Gospel phraseology, the person who converts another to Christ. St. Paul's conversion was effected by Christ Himself by a direct miracle. With respect to him the terms could not be applied to any human being. Was, then, the mother of Rufus the mother also of Paul?

Were Rufus and Paul half-brothers—the latter the elder, by a Hebrew, the former, the younger, by a second marriage with a Gentile, or proselyte Roman? This mother was a Christian,, living with Rufus, and is termed also his mother by St. Paul.

In the palace of Rufus, when at Rome, Paul spent most of his time, though he had also his own hired house.[2] The children of Claudia and Pudens, as we learn from the Roman Martyrologies, were brought up on his knees, and we find in the last scene of his life preceding his martyrdom, the only salutations sent by him to Timothy to be those of Eubulus, Claudia, Linus, and Pudens—the same family evidently ministering and attending to him to the last. There is, whichever way we decide, a closeness in the connection between the Apostle and the family of Pudens which has hitherto escaped observation, and remains to be explained. And this continued even after death, for the children of Pudens,

all of whom suffered martyrdom, were interred by the side of the Apostle, as in a common family cemetery, in the Via Ostiensis. Leaving the question of the nature of this affinity in abeyance, we now observe—That Pudens was converted before St. Paul came to Rome, and by some mother Christian than Paul.

That Hermas Pastor appears at this very early date to have been the pastor at the Titulus, which constituted the place of meeting for the Gentile Church, or Church of the unarcumcision. The Hebrew Church, or Church of the circumcision, met at the house of Aquila and Priscilla.[3]

That the household of Aristobulus is greeted, but Aristobulus himself is not, being absent at the time from Rome. Hence arise the questions—Who were the evangelisers of the family of Claudia Britannica and Pudens? Where the Aristobulus absent? Was it in Britain? Was Britain evangelised in any degree before St. Paul came to Rome? and if so, by whom?—An investigation of the utmost interest.

The fairest way of treating the subject of the first introduction of Christianity into Britain seems to be to lay down an affirmative statement, adduce what evidence there is in support of it, and leave the reader to draw the conclusion whether it makes good such statement or not. We write as investigators, not as dogmatists, but our propositions must of necessity often assume the affirmative form, or we should be mere negationists of history.

Our statement, then, will take the following form: Christianity was first introduced into Britain by Joseph of Arimathæa, A.D. 36-39; followed by Simon Zelotes, the apostle; then by Aristobulus, the first bishop of the Britons; then by St. Paul. Its first converts were members of the royal family of Siluria—that is, Gladys the sister of Caradoc, Gladys (Claudia) and Eurgan his daughters, Linus his son, converted in Britain before they were carried into captivity to Rome; then Caradoc, Bran, and the rest of the family, converted at Rome. The two cradles of Christianity in Britain were Ynys Wydrin, 'the Crystal Isle,' translated by the Saxons Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, where Joseph settled and taught, and Siluria, where the earliest churches and schools, next to Ynys Wydrin, were founded by the Silurian dynasty. Ynys Wydrin was also commonly known as Ynys Avàlon, and in Latin "*Domus Dei*," "*Secretum Dei*."

Now for the consecutive evidences of this statement. They have been collected at the cost of much research from various quarters, but the reader will remember that they are not presented as decisive. All historic evidence must be ruled by times and circumstances. If it be such as the times and circumstances of the era alone admit, it is entitled to be received in court, and if there is no contrary evidence which can be brought forward to cancel it, we must bring in, till such evidence be produced, a verdict of proven. The testimony in other historical cases may be stronger and more satisfactory, but we must be content in all cases to give judgment by such evidence as we can command. In ages when literature or written evidence had but very limited existence, tradition and general belief are the chief sources to which we can apply for the knowledge of broad facts, their details being a minor consideration.

The constant current of European tradition affirmed Britain to have been, the first country in Europe which received the Gospel, and the British Church to be the most ancient of the Churches of Christ therein. The universality of this opinion is readily demonstrated.

1. Polydore Vergil in the reign of Henry VII., and after him Cardinal Pole (A.D. 1555), both rigid Roman Catholics, affirmed in Parliament, the latter in his address to Philip and Mary, that "Britain was the first of all countries to receive the Christian faith." "The glory of Britain," remarks Genebrard, "consists not only in this, that she was the first country which in a national capacity publicly professed herself Christian, but that she made this confession when the Roman empire itself was Pagan and a cruel persecutor of Christianity."

2. This priority of antiquity was only once questioned, and that on political grounds, by the ambassadors of France and Spain, at the Council of Pisa, A.D. 1417. The Council, however, affirmed it. The ambassadors appealed to the Council of Constance, A.D. 1419, which confirmed the decision of that of Pisa, which was a third time confirmed by the Council of Sena, and then acquiesced in. This decision laid down that the Churches of France and Spain were bound to give way in the points of antiquity and precedency to the Church of Britain, which was founded by Joseph of Arimatha "immediately after the passion of Christ.[4]

We may therefore accept as the general opinion of Christendom, the priority in point of antiquity over all others of the British Church. This opinion is well expressed by Sabellius: "Christianity was privately confessed elsewhere, but the first nation that proclaimed it as their religion, and called itself Christian after the name of Christ, was Britain." [5]

It is certain that the primitive British, Irish, Scotch, and Gallic Churches formed one Church, one communion, and that on the assumption of the Papacy, A.D. 606, by Rome, this great Celtic Church, which had been previously in full communion with primitive Rome, refused in the most peremptory terms to acknowledge her novel pretensions. It is, of course, this primitive British Church, and not the Roman Church introduced by Augustine, A.D. 596, into Kent among the Pagan Saxons, of which such priority must be understood. That such a Church existed on a national scale, and was thoroughly antagonistic to the Roman Church in its new form and usurpations in the person of Augustine, is so notorious, that we may dispense with all but a few testimonies in proof of the fact. "Britons," declares Bede,⁶ "are contrary to the whole Roman world, and enemies to the Roman customs, not only in their Mass, but in their tonsure." The Britons refused to recognise Augustine, or to acquiesce in one of his demands. "We cannot," said the British bishops, "depart from our ancient customs without the consent and leave of our people." Laurentius, the successor of Augustine, speaks yet more bitterly of the antagonism of the Scotch Church:

"We have found the Scotch bishops worse even than the British. Dagon, who lately came here, being a bishop of the Scots, refused so much as to eat at the same table, or sleep one night under the same roof with us." [7]

And the protest of the British Church itself, signed on its behalf by the Archbishop of St. David's, six bishops, and the abbot of Bangor, who conducted the conference with Augustine at Augustine's Oak, A.D. 607, place in still clearer light the gulf which the change of the primitive Roman Church into the Papacy formed between the Churches hitherto in full communion. It ran as follows:

"Be it known and declared that we all, individually and collectively, are in all humility prepared to defer to the Church of God, and to the Bishop of Rome, and to every sincere and godly Christian, so far as to love every one according to his degree, in perfect charity, and to assist them all by word and in deed in becoming the children of God. But as for any other obedience, we know of none that he whom you term the Pope, or Bishop of Bishops, can demand. The deference we have mentioned we are ready to pay to him, as to every other Christian, but in all other respects our obedience is due to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon, who is alone under God, our ruler to keep us right in the way of salvation." [8]

It is plain from these and similar testimonies that Britain—

1. Was a distinct diocese of the empire.
2. That it was subject neither to the patriarch of Rome, nor to any foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction.
3. That it had its sovereignty within itself.
4. That it never consulted the see of Rome nor any foreign power in its rites, discipline, government, or consecration of bishops and archbishops.
5. That it recognised no superior but God to its archbishop of Caerleon, or St. David. [9]

As late as the twelfth century no instance could be produced of the British metropolitan receiving the pall from Rome.

The two British metropolitans of London and York, Theon and Tediac, had retired from their sees into Wales A.D. 586, ten years only before the arrival of Augustine.

In the Diocletian persecution the British Church supplied the following remarkable list of native martyrs: Amphibalus, Bishop of Llandaff; Alban of Verulam; Aaron and Julius, presbyters of Caerleon; Socrates, Archbishop of York; Stephen, Archbishop of London; Augulius, his successor; Nicholas, Bishop of Penrhyn (Glasgow); Melior, Bishop of Carlisle, and above 10,000 communicants in different grades of society.

Its religious institutions were on an immense scale. William of Malmesbury describes the ruins of Bangor Iscoed Abbey in his days as those of a city—the most extensive he had seen in the kingdom. Two other British foundations in England retained their superiority over all others of a later date, under every change of rulers till the Re-formation—St. Alban and Glastonbury. Of all the monasteries these continued the most popular and highly venerated."

Tracing our course back from the Diocletian era, a consensus of authorities fixes the national establishment of Christianity in Britain somewhere about the middle of the second century. From A.D. 33, then, to A.D. 150, we have in round numbers a space of 120 years left for the propagation of the faith and the gradual conversion of the nation.

All accounts concur in stating that the person who baptized Lucius, or Lleeuer Mawr, the monarch who thus established the Church, was his uncle, St. Timotheus, the son of Pudens and Claudia, who was brought up on the knees of the apostles.

The infancy of Timotheus carries us back to Paul himself, to Claudia, to Pudens, to Linus, 'Caractacus, Bran, and the other members of the Silurian house in their captivity at Rome. But we have seen that Pudens and others were Christians before Paul came to Rome, which carries the first British conversions to an earlier date than A.D. 58.

And thus we arrive within twenty-five years of the Crucifixion. In which of these years, then, was the Gospel first introduced into Britain?

Gildas, the British historian, who flourished A.D. 520-560, states expressly that it was introduced the last year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.[11]

The Crucifixion took place in the seventeenth year of Tiberius. The last year of Tiberius would be his twenty-second. Consequently, if we follow Gildas, Christianity was introduced into Britain five years after the Crucifixion, that is A.D. 38.

This is certainly an early period, but Gildas speaks positively—"ut scimus." It synchronizes with the first persecution of the Church by Saul of Tarsus, and its general dispersion. "They were all scattered abroad except the apostles." [12] If all, then Joseph of Arimathæa among them. Regarding Gildas' date as our starting-point, we have the following testimonies assigning the introduction of Christianity in or about the same year to Joseph of Arimathæa.

Gregory of Tours, in his History of the Franks:[13] He flourished circiter A.D. 544-595. This is Gallic testimony: The Pseudo-Gospel of Nicodemus,[14] supposed to be a composition of the fourth century. This is Oriental tradition.

Maelgwyn of Llandaff, the uncle of St. David. His era is circiter A.D. 450. His words being remarkable, we insert them at length: "Joseph of Arimathæa, the noble decurion, received his everlasting rest with his eleven associates in the Isle of Måkin. He lies in the southern angle of the bifurcated line of the Oratorium of the Adorable Virgin. He has with him the two white vessels of silver which were filled with the blood and the sweat of the great Prophet Jesus." [15]

This is British testimony, of one also personally acquainted with the interior of the church of Avalon, or Domus Dei, and the exact spot within it of the resting-place of Joseph. The greater

weight is due to Maelgwyn's evidence, as no fact is better established than the reconstruction of the Domus Dei on a cathedral scale by his nephew, St. David the Archbishop.[16]

4. The Vatican manuscript, quoted by Baronius in his "Ecclesiastical Annals," ad annum 35 (the same year in which the Acts of the Apostles state all, except the apostles, were scattered abroad from Judæa). The manuscript records that in this year Lazarus, Maria Magdalene, Martha, her handmaiden Marcella, Maximin a disciple, Joseph the Decurion of Arimathæa, against all of whom the Jewish people had special reasons of enmity, were exposed to the sea in a vessel without sails or oars. The vessel drifted finally to Marseilles, and they were saved. From Marseilles Joseph and his company passed into Britain, and after preaching the Gospel there, died.[17]

5. The Chronicon of Pseudo-Dexter, the Fragments of Haleca Archbishop of Saragossa, Freculphus and Forcatulus,[18] deliver the same statement professedly from primitive sources of unknown date. Cressy, Pitsæus, Sanders, Alford, the Roman Catholic historians, concur with Gildas in the year, and with the above authorities in holding Joseph of Arimathæa to have been the first who preached Christ in Britain.

6. We possess abundant proofs that Britain was studded with Christian churches before the end of the second century, and whatever direction our investigations take, we find authorities unanimous in the statement that the church of Joseph in Avalon, or Glastonbury, was the first and oldest of these churches, many affirming it to be the oldest or senior Christian church in the whole world. It will be useful to transcribe the conclusions arrived at by the historians who have treated on this subject before us.

"The church of Avalon in Britain no other hands than those of the disciples of the Lord themselves built."—Publius Discipulus.

"The mother church of the British Isles is the Church in Insula Avallonia, called by the Saxons Glaston."—Usher.

"If credit be given to ancient authors, this church of Glastonbury is the senior church of the world."—Fuller.

"It is certain that Britain received the faith in the first age from the first sowers of the Word. Of all the churches whose origin I have investigated in :n am, Glastonbury is the most ancient."—Sir Henry Spelman.

Had any doubt existed on this point of priority, it certainly would have- been contested by some other church in our island, for it was not a question of mere chronology, but one which drew with it enormous privileges and advantages. It never was disputed. It was universally conceded: and upon it the long series of the royal charters of the church and monastery, from that of King Arthur, the nephew of its second founder, St. David, to that of Edward -III., proceed. "The first church in the kingdom, built by the disciples of Chrst," says the charter of Edgar. "This is the city," states the charter of Ina, or Ivor, "which was the fountain and origin of Christ's religion in Britain, built by Christ's disciples."

The tombs of Saxon and British kings, saints, bishops, and abbots, buried in and around its confines, confirm the charters.

Of the general truth of the Arimathæan mission there have been numerous supporters. No author, indeed, who has taken due pains to examine its evidences, rejects its main facts. "We dare not deny," writes the caustic Fuller, "the substance of the story." Bishop Godwin, in, his quaint style, writes, "The testimonies of Joseph of Arimathæa's coming here are so many, so clear,, and so pregnant, as an indifferent man cannot but discern there is something in it."[19] Archbishop

Usher defends it with his usual display of erudition, and with unusual vehemency of manner, as if the honour of ecclesiastical Britain rested on its truth. The reader will form his own judgment.

For our part, we cast aside the addenda and crescenda, the legends, poems marvels which after ages, monk, troubadour, and historian piled high and gorgeously on the original foundation. That foundation must indeed have originally possessed no mean strength, depth, and solidity, to bear the immense superstructure which mediaeval superstition and literature emulated each other in erecting above the simple tomb of the Arimathæan senator, in the Avàlon isle.

This superstition was rising tide-high in the time of Augustine, A.D. 600. "In the western confines of Britain," he writes to the Pope, "there is a certain royal island of large extent, surrounded by water, abounding in all the beauties of nature and necessaries of life. In it the first neophytes of the catholic law, God beforehand acquainting them, found a Church constructed by no human art, but by the hands of Christ Himself; for the salvation of His people. The Almighty has made it manifest by many miracles and mysterious visitations that He continues to watch over it as sacred to Himself, and to Mary the mother of God." [20] The same edifice of figments has been built in all ages, more or less, on Christianity itself, but we do not therefore demur to the primitive facts of Christianity. Leaving details out of the question, the cardinal features of the first, or Arimathæan, mission of Christianity into Britain are, in our opinion, entitled to historic acceptance and registration.

These cardinal features we consider to be the following: Joseph and his company, including Lazarus, Mary, Martha, Marcella, and Maximin, came at the invitation of certain Druids of high rank, [21] from Marseilles into Britain, circiter A.D. 38, 39; were located at Ynys Avalon, the seat of a Druidic cor, which was subsequently made over to them in free gift by Arviragus. Here they built the first church, which became the centre and mother of Christianity in Britain. Here also they terminated their mortal career, the gentle and conciliatory character of Joseph securing the protection of the reigning family, and the conversion of many of its members. Joseph died and was interred A.D. 76.

The church was 60 ft. in length by 26 in breadth, built Gallico more of timber pillars and framework doubly wattled inside and out, and thatched with straw. [22] This simplicity might have been the effect of necessity or design. The Druidic faith required three essentials in every temple:

- 1. It must be circular;**
- 2. Hypæthral, or roofless at top, and open at the sides;**
- 3. Its materials must be monoliths, vast single stones unhewed, untouched by metal.**

The Arimathæan church rose in direct though humble antagonism to the old Cyclopean architecture—it was oblong, it was of wood, it was roofed and covered in. The Druidic mind could not, without a strong effort, connect such a building with the ideas of religion and worship. It carried with it no image, no symbolism of the One, the Infinite, and the Darkless. The Briton on his way to one of the great cors—Amesbury or Stonehenge, with their miles of obelisks—would smile with pity on the ecclesia, or, as he rendered this new word from the East, the eglwys of the Wyr Israel (men of Israel). But the Druidic religion knew of no such monstrous abortions as intolerance and persecution. There is no instance of Druidism persecuting conscience or knowledge. Such crime was left for Rome, for a religion of foreign importation. Casting his eye round the circle of the horizon, and then upwards to the vast open dome of heaven, the Briton saw the outer ring, as it were, the circumference of his own Druidic cor: he would resume his march, trying to discover some possible identification in nature between an oblong pitched roof and the temple of the universe.

The tomb of Joseph was inscribed with the following epitaph, touching from its spirit of faith, peace, and humility:[23]

"AD BRITANNOS VENI POST CHRISTUM SEPELIVI. DOCUI. QUIEVI"

Of the perpetual exemption of the twelve ploughs of land conferred by Arviragus on the Arimathan Church, the Domesday Survey of A.D. 1088 supplies curious confirmation. "The Domus Dei, in the great monastery of Glastingbury, called the Secret of the Lord. This Glastingbury church possesses, in its own villa, xii. hides of land which have never paid tax." [24]

After A.D. 35-36 Joseph disappears from the Scripture narrative.

The Greek and Roman menologies and Martyrologies commemorate with scrupulous jealousy the obituaries and death-places of all the earlier Christian characters of mark who died within the pale of the Roman empire. They nowhere record those of Joseph. Now we know from Tertullian that Britain was Christian before it was Roman. The Dove conquered where the Eagle could make no progress. "Regions in Britain which have never been penetrated by the Roman arms," are his words (A.D. 192) "have received the religion of Christ." If this statement were correct, after the war between Rome and Britain had raged for a century and a half, from A.D. 43 to A.D. 192—and in a national point of view it is impartial testimony, for Tertullian was an African—it is obvious that the Arimathæan mission must have been founded in the heart of independent Britain, quite out of the pale, therefore, of the Roman empire. And this inference tallies with the rest of the evidence. Joseph died in these loca inaccessa Romanis. His death, therefore, could not be chronicled by Greek or Roman Churches.

Lazarus is asserted to have accompanied Joseph. The only record we possess of him beyond the Scripture narrative [25] is in a very ancient British Triad: "The Triad of Lazarus, the three counsels of Lazarus: Believe in God who made thee; Love God who saved thee; Fear God who will judge thee. [26] It is difficult to explain how the name and counsel of Lazarus could find their way into these peculiarly British memorials except by his presence and teaching in Britain.

Finally, were there any other eminent converts, besides those of the Silurian family, made at this very early date in Britain? Three are particularly mentioned—Beatus, whose first name was Suetonius, Mansuetus, and Marcellus.

Beatus, born of noble parents in Britain, was there also converted and baptized. He became the founder of the Helvetian Church. He fixed his mission at Underseven, on the lake of Thun, disposing of all his property to ransom prisoners of war. His death occurred in the cell still shown at Underseven, A.D. 96. [27]

Mansuetus, born in Hibernia, converted and baptized in Britain, was sent afterwards from Rome with St. Clement, afterwards the second bishop of Rome, to preach the Gospel in Gaul. He founded the Lotharingian Church, fixing his mission at Toul, where, after extending his labours to Illyria, he suffered martyrdom, A.D. 110. [28]

Marcellus, a noble Briton, became bishop of Tongres, and afterwards founder-bishop of Treves—the diocese which for centuries exercised the chief influence in the Gallic Church. The conversion of Linus, the son of Caractacus, is attributed to him. [29]

Before, therefore, the incorporation of Britain with the Roman empire, whilst the war of invasion raged, we have before us these remarkable facts:

1. A young and vigorous Christian Church, direct from Jerusalem and the East, and which had never touched or passed through Rome, was in full and successful work

in the heart of independent Britain, under the protection of the very sovereign and family that conducted the war against Rome.

2. This native Church, though so young, does not limit its operations to Britain. It ramifies from Britain to the Continent,- and becomes, through native-born missionaries, the mother-Church of Gaul, Lotharingia, and Helvetia. Providence, for the most part, works in a very noiseless way, by natural means. Nothing could be more natural than that Joseph and his companions—for whom, as Christians, there was neither peace nor safety among their own countrymen; for whom, as Christians and Jews, there was no assurance of their lives in any Roman province—should seek refuge in the only independent kingdom of the West, whose national religion, like their own, was marked for destruction on the Continent; for, as we have seen, the decrees of Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius constituted Druidism a capital offence.[30] Nothing could be more natural than that Guiderius and Arviragus, on the intercession of influential Druids, should receive and protect such refugees, and in accordance with their own Druidic principles, leave whatever religion they professed to the voluntary acceptance or rejection of their subjects. All this, we repeat, was very natural, yet we may well affirm that Providence was working in the wheel of Nature. If the stoker was Nature, the engineer was Providence. Under this reflection lies another. Whatever the errors of Druidism were, it was, in its main truths, a grand religion, forming grand and truthful characters. Its foundation-maxim was, "Truth against the world"; literally, against "all being." [31]

Now, if we just cast our eye on Britain, on a Druidic Caractacus, Arviragus, or Claudia, listening from their thrones to a Christian missionary, because he professed to bring and to preach truth, and Christ as the Truth, the Way, and the Life; then cast the other on a Pilate, asking, in the profoundest disbelief in all virtue and goodness, "What is truth?" we shall see at a glance that Britain was prepared, and the Roman empire not prepared, for Christianity. The British and Roman minds were different. Druidism, therefore, dissolved by the natural action of its own principles into Christianity. No persecution until the tenth, under Diocletian, touched Britain, for Christianity had become nationality. And the Diocletian was stopped in two years, on his own responsibility, at the hazard of civil war, by Constantius. Then rose Constantine, with a British army sworn to put down the persecution of Christianity for ever. The clue is a national, a British one.

The next missionary after Joseph was Simon Zelotes the apostle. There can be little doubt, we think, on this point. One Menology assigns the martyrdom of Zelotes to Persis in Asia, but others agree in stating he suffered in Britain. Of these the principal authority is Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantius (A.D. 300). His testimony we consider decisive: "Simon Zelotes traversed all Mauritania, and the regions of the Africans, preaching Christ. He was at last crucified, slain, and buried in Britain." [32] Crucifixion was a Roman penalty for runaway slaves, deserters, and rebels: it was not known to the British laws. We conclude Simon Zelotes suffered in the east of Britain, perhaps, as tradition affirms, in the vicinity of Caistor, under the prefecture of Caius Decus, the officer whose atrocities were the immediate cause of the Boadicean war. Two things strike the investigator of early Christian history: the marvellous manner in which Christian seed is found growing and fructifying in unheard-of places; the indifference of the sowers to perpetuating their own name and labours. They seem to have been quite satisfied and blest in sowing Christ, and then resting. The epitaph of Joseph of Avalon would express the feelings of all: Docui, Quievi, I taught, I have entered on my rest. Beautiful as is this in fact and faith, it is very unsatisfactory in history. As Christians we feel its propriety; as writers we desiderate more of that yearning for immortality on earth which inspires the Greek and Latin authors, and inspires us also in reading

them. Yet the effects of the Christian principle are undoubtedly greater; for the principle it is which meets us face to face. It is Christ or self, We come on a field: the sower has inclosed it, built round it strongly, sowed proved seed in it, entrusted it to a few like-minded men, and he vanishes. He is crucified a thousand miles off, leaves no memoir of himself; no message to posterity, no foot-mark on the geology of the Church. In perusing the Apostolic Epistles we are struck by the maximum of censure, the minimum of approval conveyed to the Churches. We are apt to think they had little force or vitality. But when we extend our survey to the whole empire of Rome, we are almost terrified at the subterraneous shocks with which these Churches are everywhere bringing Pagan temple and tower to the ground. We try to calculate and value this power. We fail in doing it. The Roman Government failed also. It is an unknown power, the source of which is from above.

3. Next to Joseph and Simon Zelotes came Aristobulus. "It is perfectly certain," writes Alford,[33] "that before St. Paul had come to Rome Aristobulus was absent in Britain." We have seen he was not at Rome when Paul wrote his Epistle. Now Aristobulus must have been far advanced in years, for he was the father-in-law of St. Peter. His wife was the subject of the miracle recorded by St. Matthew. His daughter bore Peter a son and a daughter. We have the following evidences that he preached the Gospel and was martyred in Britain:

The Martyrologies of the Greek Churches: "Aristobulus was one of the seventy disciples, and a follower of St. Paul the Apostle, along with whom he preached the Gospel to the whole world, and ministered to him. He was chosen by St. Paul to be the missionary bishop to the land of Britain, inhabited by a very warlike and fierce race. By them he was often scourged, and repeatedly dragged as a criminal through their towns, yet he converted many of them to Christianity. He was there martyred, after he had built churches and ordained deacons and priests for the island."[34]

Haleca, Bishop of Augusta, to the same effect: "The memory of many martyrs is celebrated by the Britons, especially that of St. Aristobulus, one of the seventy disciples."[35]

Dorotheus, A.D. 303: "Aristobulus, who is mentioned by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans, was made bishop in Britain."[36]

Adonis Martyrologia: "Natal day of Aristobulus, Bishop of Britain, brother of St. Barnabas the Apostle, by whom he was ordained bishop. He was sent to Britain, where, after preaching the truth of Christ and forming a Church, he received martyrdom."[37]

The British Achau, or Genealogies of the Saints of Britain: "These came with Bran the Blessed from Rome to Britain—Arwystli Hen (Senex), Ilid, Cyndaw, men of Israel; Maw, or Manaw, son of Arwystli Hen."[38]

According to the genius of the British tongue, Aristobulus becomes Arwystli.

A district in Montgomeryshire, on the Severn, perpetuates by its name (Arwystli) the scene of his martyrdom.

The Britons must have had Arwystli in person among them; they must have been struck by the age of the venerable missionary, or the epithet Senex would not have become amongst them part of his name.

There are several points here to be noted. The first is, that Aristobulus was sent into Britain by St. Paul before St. Paul came himself to Rome, and even before the Epistle to the Romans was written, for Aristobulus, when St. Paul wrote it, had left for his mission. The large space given

by the Roman historians to the wars in Britain demonstrates the interest felt in them by the whole empire. Britain was a familiar term in every household. Upon it the whole military attention had for some years been concentrated. The name of Arviragus had by this time attained as great a celebrity as that of his cousin Caractacus—it was in every one's mouth; and Juvenal could suggest no news which would have been hailed by the Roman people with more intense satisfaction than that of his fall:

**"Hath our great enemy
Arviragus, the car-borne British king,
Dropped from his battle-throne?"**

It is certain, therefore, that St. Paul who travelled everywhere, mixing with every kind of society, must have been as well acquainted with Britain, and the events passing therein, as any other intelligent Roman citizen. There was everything to attract his eye to it as a field for Gospel labour and enterprise.

But have we any Scripture evidence that St. Paul at this time thought at all of Western Europe? Undoubtedly we have. Commentators and writers of his life generally refer to his visit to Spain as contemplated after his first imprisonment at Rome. A reference to the passage in the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle shows, on the contrary, that his journey to Spain was meditated not only before he came to Rome, but that it was his principal object in leaving the East, his call at Rome being simply by the way. "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you, for I trust to see you on my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you." [39]

He speaks of the journey as a thing decided upon, taking Rome by the way. Literally, in the original it is, hope in passing through to see you." It was the West of Europe, then, beyond Rome, not Rome itself; which was the Apostle's mark, even at this comparatively early date. All the incidents and delays which occurred between this date (A.D. 56), and the termination of his first imprisonment at Rome, were interruptions of his original plan of operations. His destination was the extreme West, and this was in accordance with the command of Christ, "I will send thee far hence to the Gentiles." According to the Scriptures, therefore, and the view we have therein of Paul's own mind, we think we are justified in concluding that having already sent Aristobulus into Britain, he intended to traverse Spain himself; and thence join his fellow-labourer in our island; for it is plain that Aristobulus acted as wholly under Paul's instructions in Britain as Titus in Crete or Timothy in Asia Minor. "He preached the Gospel with St. Paul to the whole world, and ministered to him." [40]

It appears that Bran left Rome with Aristobulus, his son Manaw, Ilid, and Cyndaw, before Caradoc. He was accompanied also by Eurgain, the eldest daughter of Caradoc, and her husband Salog, lord in her right of Caer Salog (Salisbury), a Roman patrician. Ilid established his mission under the protection of Bran, his grandson Cyllinus (eldest son of Caradoc), Salog and Eurgain, in the centre of Siluria, on the spot in Glamorganshire known from that period till the present as Llan-Ilid. At this Llan, or 'consecrated inclosure,' the Princess Eur-gain founded and endowed the first Christian cor, or choir, in Britain. From this Cor-Eurgain issued many of the most eminent teachers and missionaries of Christianity down to the tenth century. Of the saints of this cor, from Ilid in succession, there are catalogues in the "Genealogies of the Saints of Britain." [41]

Eastern' and Western testimonies concur in thus proving the Aristobulian mission to Britain under the Sanction of Brân and his family. We complete the chain with the two following, from historic sources:

"The three blessed sovereigns of the isle of Britain: I. Bran, son of Llyr Llediaith, who first brought the faith of Christ to the Cymry from Rome, where he had been seven years a hostage for his son Caradoc, whom the Romans put in prison, after being betrayed by the plotting, deceit and enticement of Arëddig. 2. Lleuver, or Leirwg (Lucius), son of Coel, son of St. Cyllin, son

of Caràdoc, son of Bran, son of Llyr Llediaith, called Lleuver the Great, who founded the first church of Llandaff, and first gave the privileges of the country and nation to all who professed the faith in Christ. 3. Cadwalladr the Blessed, who gave protection within all his lands to the Christians who fled from the pagan Saxons who wished to slay them."[42]

"The three priorities of the Cymry:

- 1. Priority as the first colonizers of Britain;**
- 2. Priority of government and civilization;**
- 3. Priority as the first Christians of Britain."**[43]

In an ancient collection of British proverbs we find certain sayings transmitted of Bran and the first Christians of Britain:

**"Hast thou heard the saying of Ilid,
The saint of the race of Israel?
`No folly but ends in misery.**

**Hast thou heard the saying of the noble Bran,
The blessed, to all the renowned?
`There is no good but God Himself.**

**Hast thou heard the saying of Caràdoc,
The exalted son of the noble Bran?
`Oppression persisted in brings on death' "**

We have at this stage of the enquiry two distinct cradles of Christianity in Britain—the mission of Joseph in Avalon, and the Lor-Eurgain at Llan-Ilid in Wales; the former protected by Arviragus, the latter fostered by the family of Caràdoc, his cousin. We can entertain no reasonable doubt that very intimate ties bound these two Christian missions together. St. Barnabas, Aristobulus his brother, and Joseph were members of the Jerusalem Church—they were of the one hundred and twenty which constituted it prior to the day of Pentecost—the same spiritual union, the same friendship, the same one faith, one heart, one mind, one baptism, one hope, one Lord, would join them together in Britain as in Jerusalem. Both establishments were out of the pale of Rome, both among the free states of Britain. Beyond Siluria, among the Ordovices, the protection of Bran did not avail Aristobulus: Joseph came direct from Jerusalem, and was therefore regarded with favour; Aristobulus came from Rome, from the metropolis of the national enemy, and fell, perhaps, rather a victim to this fact than a martyr to religion. In Siluria itself the royal family were hard pressed to reconcile their subjects to the presence of men in any way, however slightly, connected with Rome, so unappeasable was the hatred borne to the invaders, so easily misapprehended and confounded every embassy from their city. Every overture of peace made by the Roman Government to this ferox provincia was sternly rejected; rigour and mildness were alike thrown away. "The race of the Silures," observes Tacitus, "was not to be changed by clemency or severity." [44] Even after the treaty which incorporated Britain with Rome (A.D. 118), two-thirds of the whole military force of the island continued to be stationed on the frontiers of Wales; at Chester and Caerleon. The same dogged opposition to the foreigner characterised the same race in the West in the later Saxon eras. "It is certain," writes Kemble, "that neither Roman nor Saxon produced any effect worth mentioning on the Cymric race and language west of the Severn. We see indeed what little effect all the centuries since then, though but a river divides the two races, has produced upon the British language." [45]

Great caution, therefore, was called for in the exercise, under these circumstances, of the royal protection. Meanwhile however, the cor continued to strike roots. The royal family themselves

remained firm in the profession of Christianity. Cyllinus, who acted as regent in the absence of his father Caradoc, had all his children baptized. Converts increased, and more teachers arrived from Greece and Rome. The following notice of St. Cyllinus is extracted from the family records of Jestyn ap Gwrgant, Prince of Glamorgan, in the eleventh century:

"Cyllin ab Caradoc, a wise and just king. In his days many of the Cymry embraced the faith in Christ through the teaching of the saints of Cor-Eurgain, and many godly men from the countries of Greece and Rome were in Cambria. He first of the Cymry gave infants names; for before, names were not given except to adults, and then from something characteristic in their bodies, minds, or manners."[46]

Nero had succeeded Claudius Sept. 28, A.D. 53. He was in his seventeenth year, and for some time remained under the influence of Seneca, a Stoic philosopher 'in profession but in, practice a grinding usurer. The capital of this minister amounted to fifteen million pounds sterling of modern money. Two millions of this he advanced to the Iceni of Britain on the security of their public buildings. We doubt if Rothschild or any modern capitalist would advance half the sum on such buildings as may now be found in the old Icenic counties. The king of the Iceni was Prasutagus, his queen Victoria (in British, Vuddig or Boeddig—Boadicea). Tacitus speaks of him as a sovereign whose wealth was notorious at Rome—longd Glarus opulentid.

The commerce between Britain and the Continent continued to be vigorously conducted. Tacitus informs us that the great foreign emporium was London, a city the foundation of which the British annals carried back 270 years before that of Rome, i.e., 1020 B.C.[47] Above 80,000 Roman citizens, according to the Roman historians, perished in the Boadicean war, of whom the greater number resided in London. A Roman garrison stationed in the Prætorium—which extended along the Thames from the temple of Diana, where now stands St. Paul's, to the Bryn Gwyn, or White Mount, the site of the Tower—protected their property and interests. It was just as easy for an apostle to find his way into Britain as for any of these 80,000, amongst whom there must have been a fair proportion of Christians.

The Roman citizen could travel from Babylon to London along the great military itinera of the empire, more slowly indeed, but with fewer civil inconveniences in the shape of passports and stoppages, and no less security, than an Englishman can now. It was not in mediæval Europe, divided amongst a thousand independent marauding states and barons, nor in the pathless wilds of a new world, but over the length and breadth of an empire possessed of a system of roads laid down with consummate engineering skill, and remaining, until the invention of railroads, without rivals on a great scale, that the first preachers of the Gospel had to travel.

The Roman iter at Babylon would conduct them, under the protection of one law, one government, without a frontier, to Calais. The whole empire was a network, of connected arteries, along which a traveller might take his ease from anywhere to anywhere under the overshadowing protection of the Eagles of the Cæsars. It was not till he had crossed the British Channel that the din and terror of war assaulted his senses. So profound, indeed, until the brief civil commotion that resulted in placing the Vespasian family on the throne, was the peace which prevailed through Europe, that the Roman annalists are driven, for lack of national events, to fill page after page with court scandals, with the personal debaucheries and cruelties of the emperors. These emperors were despots created by the democracy against the oligarchy; they held the same position as the Tudors of later times in Britain. When a noble raised his head above his fellows, like Tarquin and the poppies, they cut it remorselessly and unscrupulously down.

A lover of the old oligarchic times, such as Tacitus, would—and no doubt in many cases justly—stigmatise such executions as judicial murders, and transmit their authors to the execration of posterity. The people at large were unaffected; the lightning passed over them; and, in return, it was the dagger of the oligarch in the chamber, not the popular tumult, which the Cæsar dreaded. He walked the streets a simple citizen without guards, but he went to the

Senate armed. Meanwhile, Ostorius Scapula in Britain suffered a defeat from Arviragus at Caervelin, near Caerleon. Exhausted in mind and body by the harassing vicissitudes of the war, he petitioned to be recalled. He was succeeded by Didius Gallus, who founded Cardiff, still called by the Welsh *Caer Dydd*, 'the Castle of Didius.' After a short command Didius gave way to Veranius, under whom the Roman armies were again driven behind the Plautian line of fortresses, and their headquarters fixed at Verulam. Veranius was superseded by Suetonius Paulinus, a second Fabius Cunctator, and regarded as the ablest tactician in the Roman service.[48] He had under him the ninth, fourteenth, twentieth (*Vicesima Valens Victrix*), and second (*Augusta*) legions.

The expression of Tacitus, that Britain had long been the field for the employment of the great generals and picked armies of the empire,[49] may be readily understood by merely reading over the names of the Roman commanders who were successively entrusted with the conduct of the war—Aulus Plautius, Geta, Vespasian and Titus, Ostorius Scapula, Suetonius Paulinus, Cerealis, Julius Frontinus, Julius Agricola, Sallustius, Lucullus, under whom the island was lost, and the Roman armies a second time withdrawn to the Continent, A.D. 86; from which time till A.D. 118 we have but one solitary Roman name occurring in British history, Neratius Marcellus. From A.D. 43 to A.D. 86 sixty pitched battles were fought. "The series of invasions and sanguinary conflicts," observes Smith in his "Ancient Religions,"[50] "between the Romans and Britons have no parallel in any age or country." "We are able to perceive," writes Richardson, "from the partial story furnished by the invaders themselves, that conquest was never more dearly attempted than in the case of Britain by the Romans.

By no people was every inch of country at any age contested with more bravery and surrendered more stubbornly than by the aboriginal fathers of this isle. They had become a very populous nation, so versed in military tactics as to meet the armies, which had been carrying the Roman banners over the most famed and intellectual quarters of the world, on such formidable terms, as to render victory, at every encounter little better than defeat. They had settled laws and institutions, were distinguished for an ardent love of liberty, in defence of which the highest degree of valour and self-devotion were on all occasions manifested. It is certain they revered the laws by which they had been long governed, and evinced profound homage for the memory of their forefathers: nor can we less credit their undaunted energy against the mercenary and implacable plunderers of the world, against whose experienced arms they had to contend. A man must be a barbarian himself to suppose that such a nation could be barbarous. The idea is simply ludicrous."[51]

This firm resistance to the Roman arms was mainly due to the national religion—to Druidism, which acted then much the same as Protestantism did on the British mind in the popish invasion of the Armada. Druidism had been persecuted by pagan Rome on the Continent as Protestantism in the Tudor era was by papal Rome: both had their headquarters and stronghold in Britain; both had common points admirably suited to the native bent and genius of the British race; both were religions of freedom; and both were thoroughly identified with British independence and grandeur. The Druid, indeed, regarded the Roman mythologic religion with much the same mixture of contempt and hatred that a strong Protestant does still the image system and inquisition practices of the Papacy. "When the Romans," observes Cleland, "effected a footing in Britain, they found in Druidism a constant and implacable enemy to their usurpation. They would have been glad to introduce their religion, but to that point there was an invincible obstacle in the horror and contempt of the natives for a religion formed by a corruption of their own allegories; which made the name of their heathen gods as familiar to them as Julius Cæsar states, but in a sense which excluded them from reception in a divine one."[52]

The Briton soon perceived the fact that Christianity and Druidism were the two religions persecuted by Rome. The gathering prejudice against the former, because the Aristobulean mission came from Rome, gave way to strong predilections in its favour. A large class of Britons, it is true, cared as little then, as now, for religion in itself, but they were ardent patriots, and

Druidic because patriots; they were indifferent what the national religion was, provided it was thoroughly anti-foreign, anti-Roman—that it was thoroughly British. Nothing, therefore, served so much to recommend Christianity and extend it in Britain, as its persecution by Rome. Common oppression drove the two religions into each other's arms, and finally united them in so indissoluble a union, that we cannot now separate in British Christianity the Druidic from the Christian element. Two events now occurred which crowned the national hatred towards both the arms and religion of Rome, and, in the same degree, disposed Druidism to identify its sufferings with those of Christianity—these were the Boadicean outrage and the Menai massacre. Orders were issued from Rome to Suetonius Paulinus to extirpate, at any cost, the chief seat of Druidism among the Cymry, or Western Britons. Seneca, who still, in some respects, acted as Nero's adviser, demanded repayment, at the same time, of his loan to the Iceni, charging exorbitant interest. The Icenic senate demurred; whereon Caius Decius, the Roman præfect at Caistor, was instructed to take possession of all the temples, castles, and palaces belonging to the state.

These orders were vigorously executed. Prasutagus, the king, dying in the midst of these measures, left Nero co-heir, with his two daughters, to his accumulated treasures. On the pretext that the whole of the royal hoard came under the denomination of public property, Decius proceeded to seize it. Resistance being made, the legionaries stormed the palace, perpetrated the most inhuman outrages on the persons of %teen Victoria and her daughters, and carried the treasures off to the Castra. Not content with these atrocities, Decius confiscated, in direct violation of the Claudian treaty, the estates of many of the Icenic blaenorion, or nobility. The Iceni sent Venusius to Arviragus, adjuring the Roman protectorate, and placing themselves and the Coraniaid at his disposal.

Suetonius, meanwhile, by forced marches along the Wyddelian road, had reached the banks of the Menai. On either side extended the myvyrion, or colleges and the cemeteries of the ancient religion, the tumuli of which are yet traceable. Here reposed, between the soaring ramparts of Snowdon, the sacred mountain, the Zion of Cymru, and the blue waters of the unexplored Atlantic, the fathers of the British Isle: chiefs whose ashes for fifteen hundred years had never, been desecrated by the tramp of a foreign foe; arch-druids, the depositaries of the hoary wisdom of the East; kings whose Cimbric names had carried terror over the continents of Europe and Asia. Through these sanctuaries of so many and such ancient memories, the regulated march of the mailed legions of Rome now resounded.

Anglesey was then known as Mîôn, 'and ecclesiastically, from the number of Druidic groves which covered it, sweeping down to the margin of the Menai, as Ynys Tywyll, the dark isle. The massacre of the Druidic priests and priestesses which ensued is graphically described by Tacitus. It was a complete surprise. Effecting the passage of the Menai, opposite the present seat of the Marquis of Anglesey (Plas Newydd), Suetonius gave the colleges to the flame and their inmates to the sword, the resistance attempted by the native force on the spot being easily overcome. The myvyrion were levelled with the soil, and for many nights and days the waters of the Menai were illuminated with the glare of the conflagrations of the sacred luci—the favourite haunts of Druidic meditation and philosophy. Tacitus endeavours to palliate this foul wholesale assassination of the ministers of religion, by stating that the Druids were in the habit of sacrificing the Roman prisoners of war on their altars.

The Romans themselves, we know, after exhibiting them in triumph, slaughtered every captive king and chief in the Tarpeian dungeons, whilst the privates were condemned in thousands to butcher each other on the the public altar, or the arena of the circus, in the gladiatorial games—even the vestal virgins smiling on the sanguinary holocausts. The immolation, on the other hand, of Roman prisoners by the Druids, rests on the solitary assertion of an enemy who, with a like scandalous indifference to truth, terms almost in the same page the Christian religion itself "a destructive superstition." [53] The news of the massacre was no sooner diffused through Britain than it excited the nation to frenzy. The war from this moment became a religious war;

a crusade accompanied with all the frightful and remorseless cruelties on either side which have in all ages distinguished such hostilities.[54] The Iceni and Coranidæ had entirely forfeited the name of Britons, and their oppression alone might have been regarded in the light of a just retribution, but the Menai massacre merged all other feelings in one torrent of universal indignation and horror. Boadicea soon found herself at the head of 120,000 men in arms. The Roman accounts impress us vividly with the profound gloom in which their forces were plunged, by the heavy shadows of the forthcoming disasters. Portent on portent is recorded. At Colchester the statue of Victory, like that of Dagon at Joppa, fell backward and was shattered to fragments.

A Pythoness, agitated, like Cassandra on the eve of the fall of Troy, with the insuppressible spirit of divination, caused the streets to re-echo with the cry—"Death is at hand." In the senate-house the British war-cry, uttered by invisible tongues, terrified and dispersed the councillors. The theatres resounded with the shocks and groans of a field of battle. In the waters of the Thames appeared the mirage of a Roman colony subverted and in ruins. The channel between Dover and Calais ran at high tide with blood. On the tide receding, the sands revealed, in long lines, the impressions of files of bodies laid out for burial. The Menai massacre had, in fact, terrified the consciences of its perpetrators, as it had roused to fury the passions of the whole Druidic population. The return of Caradoc also about this period to Siluria, though bound by solemn stipulations, which he faithfully observed, not to bear arms again against Rome, augmented the general commotion. The British army, assembled at Cær Llyr (Leicester) under Venusius, was harangued by Boadicea in person. Boadicea was a near relative of Claudia.

We have seen the latter princess cultivating the belles lettres, throwing her palace open to Martial and the literati of the capital of Europe, receiving apostles, establishing the first Christian Church in her own household, uniting the graces of religion with refined art and high personal accomplishments. This is the royal Christian lady, such as we should expect to find, presiding, surrounded by the elite of Roman society, over the household of a Roman senator of ample possessions and powerful connections. Dion Cassius gives us a sister picture of her cousin the Druidic queen, under very different circumstances during the same year in Britain. It is a grand and imposing composition, quite unique in history. Greece and Rome shew us nothing like it. The Maid of Orleans, in more modern times, is the only approach to it, but all the terrible features are supplanted by gentler ones.

We see a queen, stung to madness by the wrongs which most nearly affect womanhood, leading a whole nation to battle; the sense of injury has changed her whole nature into that of a Bellona, an incarnate goddess of war, and she lives only for revenge. In her eyes every Roman is a monster already doomed. She would have been less than woman not to have felt her dishonour, more than human not to have panted for the hour of retribution. "Boadicea," writes Dion, "ascended the general's tribunal; her stature exceeded the ordinary height of woman; her appearance itself carried terror; her aspect was calm and collected, but her voice had become deep and pitiless. Her hair falling in long golden tresses as low as her hips, was collected round her forehead by a golden coronet; she wore a tartan dress fitting closely to the bosom, but below the waist expanding in loose folds as a gown; over it was a chlamys, or military cloak. In her hand she bore a spear. She addressed the Britons as follows"—We give only her peroration:

"I thank thee! I worship thee! I appeal to thee a woman to a woman, O Andraste! I rule not, like Nitocris, over beasts of burden, as are the effeminate nations of the East, nor, like Semiramis, over tradesmen and traffickers, nor, like the man-woman Nero, over slaves and eunuchs—:such is the precious knowledge these foreigners introduce amongst us—but I rule over Britons, little versed indeed in craft and diplomacy, but born and trained to the game of war: men who, in the cause of liberty, stake down their lives, the lives of their wives and children, their lands and property. Queen of such a race, I implore thine aid for freedom, for victory over enemies infamous for the wantonness of the wrongs they inflict, for their perversion of justice, for their contempt of religion, for their insatiable greed; a people that revel in unmanly pleasures, whose affections are more to be dreaded and abhorred than their enmity. Never let a foreigner bear rule over me

or these my countrymen: never let slavery reign in this island. Be thou for ever, O goddess of manhood and of victory, sovereign and queen in Britain.!" [55]

Colchester was carried on the first assault by the British army. The temple garrisoned by the veterans, held out for two days, then shared the same fate. Petilius Cerealis, the Roman lieutenant, was defeated, with the loss of the ninth legion, at Coggeshall (Cocci Collis). Cerealis himself, with a few horsemen, escaped into camp. The municipal town of Verulam was then stormed, gutted, and burnt. London had received a Roman garrison, under the name of a colony, within its walls. Against it the British army, now swelled to 230,000 men, directed its vengeance. A battle was fought and lost in its defence, at Ambresbury, between Waltham and Epping.[56] Such of the inhabitants as possessed the means fled, at the approach of the British Queen, to Regnum and Rutupium. The rest, including the Roman citizens and foreign merchants, took refuge with the garrison in the fortifications of the Prætorium, extending from the temple of Diana to the White Mount.

The ramparts were escalated, the city fired, public and private, edifices reduced indiscriminately to ashes, the walls levelled, and above 40,000 residents put to the sword. Leaving behind this terrible example of a metropolis in conflagration, quenched with blood, Victoria swept westward to intercept Paulinus.' Tacitus records but two, Dion many engagements, between her and the Roman forces. Her British epithet, Buddig, or Vuddig (the Victorians), implies that in more than one battle success followed her standard. Tacitus localizes the last battle on the margin of Epping forest—a plain error. The British traditions place it on the Wyddelian road, near the modern town of Newmarket, in Flintshire. The names still attached to the various sites of the field confirm this statement. Here are "Cop Paulinus," the "Hill of Arrows," the "Hill of Carnage," the "Hollow of Woe," the "Knoll of the Melee," the "Hollow of Execution," the "Field of the Tribunal," the "Hollow of No Quarter." Half a mile further is a monolith, the "Stone of Lamentation," and on the road to Caerwys was formerly—now removed to Downing—the "Stone of the Grave of Vuddig."

Turning to the pages of Dion, we read the description of a conflict such as these names suggest—a deadly melee of legionaries, auxiliaries, archers, cavalry, 'charioteers, mingled together and swaying to and fro in all the heady currents of a long-sustained and desperate combat. Towards sunset the fortune of the day was decided in favour of the Romans. The Britons, driven back on their entrenchments, left a large number dead on the field, or prisoners in the hands of the enemy. They prepared, however, to renew the conflict, but in the interim, Victoria died, by poison according to Tacitus—in the course of nature according to the Greek historian, who adds that her obsequies were celebrated with extraordinary magnificence. Her death little affected the spirit or resources of the western and northern Britons, who continued hostilities with unabated vigour under Arviragus, Venusius, and Gwallog, or Galgacus.[57] Harassed by the same anxieties that had undermined the constitution of Ostorius Scapula, Paulinus, at the expiration of the year A.D. 61, resigned his command to Petronius Turpilianus. The whole of the Roman empire elsewhere continued to enjoy tranquillity, Syria alone excepted, the disturbances in which were pacified in a few months by Corbulo. Whatever emperor occupied the throne, the military service was never deficient in generals of the highest order of ability. The war had now lasted eighteen years, and the Roman province was still limited by the Exe and Severn westward and the Humber on the north. Even within these lines its bounds fluctuated with the success or reverses of the imperial arms.[58]

In ferrum mens prona vivis animæque capaces Mortis et ignavum redituræ parcere
Cicero had noted the fact before—"In prelio morituri exultant Cimbri."—Tuscal. Disp.,
lib. Ii.

Notes to Chapter 4

1) Jerome states St. Paul was sent to Rome in the second year of Nero, i.e. A.D. 56, in which date agree Bede, Ivo, Freculphus Platina, Scaliger, Capellus, Cave, Stillingfleet, Alford, Godwin

De Præsulibus, Rapin, Bingham, Stanhope, Warner, Trapp. We believe this to be the true date, and its assumption would be more favourable to the tenor of this essay, as it would allow three years instead of one for the interview at Rome between St. Paul and Caractacus. We prefer, however, not to insist upon it.

2) That the apostles having once been received into the Palatium Pudentinum, should continue to make it their home in Rome, is in conformity with our Lord's instructions, "Into whatsoever city or town ye enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye, go thence."—Matthew x. II . At the same hospitium Justin Martyr was received. "Nobili revera atque præcipua in urbe Christi familia."—Baron, vol. i. p. 228.

3) Rom. xvi. 5.

4) "Statim post passionem Christi." An account of the pleadings at the Council of Constance will be found in a thin quarto, *Disceptatio super Dignitatem Angliæ et Gallia'* in Concilio Constantiano, Theod. Martin (Lovar. 1517). Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, in his "Three Conversions of England," admits, in common with the great majority of Roman Catholic writers, that Christianity came into Britain direct from Jerusalem. "It seems nearest the truth that the British Church was originally planted by Grecian teachers, such as came from the East, and not by Romans."—Vol. i. p. 15. The Eastern usages of the British Church would alone attest the fact.

5) Sabell. Enno., lib. vii. c. 5.

6) Bede's Hist. Frag., quoted by Usher, "Ancient Irish Church," c. 4, Hist., lib. ii. c. 2. One demand of Augustine was that the British Church should recognise him as Archbishop. "At illi," says Bede, lib. ii. p. 112, "*nihil horum se facturos neque ilium pro Archiepiscopo habituros esse re-spondebant.*" Bede must himself, one would suppose, from his own testimony in favour of the British Church, and his knowledge of its extent and institutions, have felt some astonishment at this demand of an emissary whose only religious establishment in Britain was a solitary church among the Pagans of Kent. "The Britons," he writes, lib. i. c. 4, "preserved the faith which they had received under King Lucius uncorrupted and entire in peace and tranquillity, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian." Nicholas Trivet says, "Abbot Dionothus, of Bangor, treated Augustine with contempt."

7) Laurentii Epist. ad Papam; Bede, Eccles. Hist., ii. c. 4.

8) Hengwrt MSS.; Humphry Llwyd; Sebright MSS.; Cottonian Library (British Museum), Cleopatra, E. i. 1.

9) Spelmani Concillia; Sir Roger Twysden, Historical Vindication; Brerewood, p. 113; Collier, vol. i. p. 6, &c.; Bishop Lloyd's Government, &c.8) Hengwrt MSS.; Humphry Llwyd; Sebright MSS.; Cottonian Library (British Museum), Cleopatra, E. i. 1.

10) It is certain, states Spelman (p. 18), that the people of that province held no oath so sacred as that "by the old church" (Glastonbury), fearing nothing so much as to incur the guilt of perjury in taking it. "The church of Glastonbury, from its antiquity called by the Angles *Ealde Church*,' savoured of sanctity from its very foundation. Here arrive whole tribes of the lower orders, thronging every path. Here, divested of their pomp, assemble the opulent. It has become the crowded residence of the literary and religious. There is no corner of the church in which the ashes of some saint do not repose. The very floor inlaid with polished stones, and the sides of the altar, and even the altar itself, above and beneath, are laden with the multitude of relics. The antiquity, and multitude of saints, have endowed the place with such sanctity that at night scarcely any one presumes to keep vigil there, or during the day to spit upon the floor. St. Patrick is buried by the right side of the altar in the 'old church.' The men of Ireland frequent it to kiss the relics. St. David, that celebrated and incomparable man, built and dedicated the second church here.

He sleeps by St. Patrick."—William of Malmesbury, b. i. c. 2. St. Aidan was buried by the side of St. David.

11) "We know that Christ, the true Sun, afforded His light to our island in the last year of Tiberius Cæsar"—"Tempore ut scimus, summo Tiberii Cæsaris."—Histor. Briton. Usher terms Gildas "auctor vera cissmus."

12) Acts viii. 1.

13) P. /33.

14) Ad finem.

15) "Joseph ab Arimathea nobilis decurio in insula Avaloniâ cum xi. -Sociis suis somnum cepit perpetuum et jacet in meridiano angulo liner bifurcatæ Oratorii Adorandæ Virginis. Habet enim secum duovacula argentea alba cruore et sudore magni prophetæ Jesu perimpleta"—Thick vellum Cottonian MS., quoted also by Usher, Melchini Fragmentum. Joseph of Arimathæa is by Eastern tradition said to have been the younger brother of the father of the Virgin Mary. The records of Glastonbury, as cited by Malmesbury and others, preserved the genealogy of his descendants in Britain:—"Helias nepos Joseph genuit Josua genuit Amminadab, Amminadab Castellor," &c.—Historia de Glastonbury.

16) In the two "vascula argentea alba," full of the Saviour's blood and sweat shed on the cross and at Gethsemane, we have the first nucleus of the celebrated legenda and quest of the Sant-Greal. They gave the name of the Crystal Isle to Glastonbury. The Britons commemorate (writes Forcatulus) that Joseph brought with him the pledge and testimony of the sacred Eucharist, namely, the chalice which was used by the Saviour and placed before His most holy guests the apostles, and which is preserved by them (the Britons) as the pledge of the safety of Britain, as the palladium was of that of Troy—Forcatulus de Gallor. Imperio et Philos., lib. vii. p. 989. Greal in British is a collection of elements; Sant-Greal, the holy elements.

17) The respective dates of A.D. 35 and 38 allow three years between the expulsion of Joseph from Judæa and his settlement in Britain—an undesigned harmony which goes far chronologically to confirm the common record.

18) Lib. vii. p. 989

19) Godwin's "Catalogue of Bishops," Præsul., p. i 1.

20) Epistolæ ad Gregorium Papam.

21) "Negotium habuit cum Druidis quorum primi precipuique doctores erant in Britannia"—Freculphus, spud God, p. 10.

22) And such also was the primitive Capitol of Rome: "Quæ fuerat nostri si quæras Regia nati, Adspice de Canna straminibusque Domum." Ovid, Foist. ad Fest. Roma.

23) Hearne's Antiquities of Glastonbury; Leland, *ibid.*; John of Tynemouth, Ad Josephtun Arimath.

24) "Domus Dei in magno Glaston. monasterio quod secretum Domini vocatur, Ecclesia Glaston. habet in ipsa villa xii. hydæ guæ nunquam geldaverunt"—Domesday Survey, fol., P. 449.

25) The tradition of the Church of Lyons makes him return with Martha and Mary to Marseilles, of which town he became the first bishop, and there died.

- 26) Triads of Primitive Britain.
- 27) *Theatr. Magn. Britan.*, lib. vi. p. 9. Pantaleon, *De Viris Illus. Germaniæ*, pars. I.; Guliel. Eisengren, cent. 3, p.
- 28) Petrus Mersæus, *De Santis German.*; Franciscus Guilliman, *Helvetiorum Historia*, lib. i. c. 15; Petrus de Natalibus, *Episcop. Regal. Tallensis*.
- 29) Marcellus Britannus, *Tungrorum episcopus postea Trevirorum Archiepiscopus*, &c.—Mersæus, *De Archiepiscopis Trevirensium*.
- 30) "Penitus religionem Druidarum abolevit Claudius"—Suetonius, in *Vita Claud.*
- 31) St. Paul's maxim, "We can do nothing against the truth," breathes a kindred spirit, and would at once conciliate a Druidic hearer.
- 32) Dorotheus, *Synod. de Apostol.*; *Synopsis ad Sim Zelot.*
- 33) Alford's *Regia Fides*, vol. i. p. 83. Alford, whose proper name was Griffiths, and who assumed the name of Alford on entering the Society of Jesuits, is, next to Baronius, the most learned of the Roman Catholic historians. His *Regia Fides* is a wonderful monument of erudition and research.
- 34) *Greek Men.*, ad 15 March.
- 35) *Halecæ Fragments in Martyr.*
- 36) *Synopsis ad Aristobulum.*
- 37) *In Diem Martii* 17.
- 38) *Achau Saint Prydain.*
- 39) *Rom. xv.* 24.
- 40) *Greek Menology*, ad *Diem Martii* 17.
- 41) *Achau Saint Prydain.* In these *Achau*, or genealogies, Eurgain is commemorated as the first female saint of the isle of Britain. Her conversion, therefore, preceded that of her sister Claudia. Ilid was a Hebrew:
 "Halt thou heard the saying. of Ilid,
 One come of the race of Israel?
 'There is no mania like passion.' " *British Proverbs.*
- 42) *Triads of the isle of Britain.*
- 43) *Triads of the Cymry.*
- 44) "*Silurum gees non atrocitate, non clementia mutabatur*" —*Taciti Annal*, lib. ii. c. 24.
- 45) *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, vol. i. Tacitus, in his *Life of Agricola* (c. 21), takes occasion to notice the stubborn attachment of the Briton to his native tongue. And it is one of the most remarkable, facts connected with the occupation of Britain by the Romans, that though they entirely recast the languages of the Continent through the medium of their own, they did not

leave probably a hundred Latin words behind them in Britain: within twenty years of their departure Latin had ceased to be spoken in the Island.

46) Gwehelyth Iestyn ap Gwrgant.

47) "Londinum vetus oppidum quod Augustam posteritas appellavit"—Ammianus Mareclinus, lib. xxvii. C. 8, 9. If London was not a pæ-Roman city, Ammianus could not term it "an ancient city:" for supposing it founded the first year of the Claudian invasion, A.D. 43, it would still, in A.D. 350, be quite a new town; and as the Boadicean war broke out A.D. 60, it would be absurd to affirm that it rose in seventeen years to the condition described by Tacitus: "Copia negotia-torum et comœtuum maxime celebre"—Tacit. Annal., lib. i.; and lib. xiv. c. 27-30.

48) "Cunctator naturá, nemo rei militaris callidior habebatur"—Taciti Hist., lib. xiv. c. 20.

49) "Magni duces, egregii exercitus"—Tacitus, Annal., lib. ii. c. 24.

50) P. 457.

51) Richardson's Historian, p

52) Cleland's Ancient Celtica, p. 13.

53) Suppose we knew nothing more of the Jewish dispensation and of the Levitical priesthood than we find in Greek and Latin authors, it must be confessed we should have either to remain in total ignorance, or to embrace very absurd misconceptions. It may, however, be added, that the Greeks were equally unjust towards the Romans, for no Greek writer deigns to mention the name of any of their authors, or, indeed, to suppose that they had any literature at all.

54) In the Boadicean war, states Tacitus, no quarter was given or asked on either side: "Neque enim capere aut venumdare aliudve quod Belli commercium sit," &c.—Annal., lib. xiv. c. 29-39

55) Dion Cassius, *Xi philini Excerpta*, printed in the government *Monumenta Britannica*, ad an. 58, 59.

56) The spot of Boadicea's camp is approached across the old Ermine Street by the Camlet (Battle-way). Its figure is described in Cromwell's "Colchester," vol. i. p. 32, as irregular, containing twelve acres, surrounded by moats and high ramparts, overgrown with oaks and hornbeams.

57) We have elsewhere observed that the gallant and successful resistance of Britain to the Roman invasions was mainly due to the patriotic spirit and exalted doctrines with regard to the indestructibility of the soul breathed by their Druidic religion. Seneca was the indirect cause of the Boadicean war. His nephew Lucan, in the first book of *Pharsalia*, attributes the British fearlessness of death to Druidic teaching in the following fine lines: "Certe populi quos despicit Arctus, Felices errore suo, quos ille timorum Maximus haud urget, lethi metus. Inde ruendi

58) "Non poterant Britanni sub Romana ditioni teneri," is the frank admission of the *Augustini Scriptures*, p. 68.



CHAPTER V

THE TRACINGS-UP OF THE ANCIENT ROYAL CHURCH OF BRITAIN TO ITS APOSTOLIC FOUNDATIONS—ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN—HIS CONNECTION WITH THE ROYAL SILURIAN FAMILY OF BRITAIN—BURIED IN THEIR FAMILY SEPULCHRE.

TWO CARDINAL REASONS, we have seen, each of national weight and extent, inclined the British mind to accept Christianity—the first, its identity in many important points with Druidism; the second, its uncompromising antagonism to the whole system of the Roman state mythology. The Roman persecution of both religions identified them still further in the popular mind. Nowhere, then, in Asia, Africa, or Europe, could the apostles find richer or a better-prepared soil for the Gospel. If we add that Britain was the only country in these ages where the Christian could profess and practise his religion free from persecution, we reasonably and antecedently conclude that a strong Christian current must have set in from both Jerusalem and Rome to this island from the first or pentecostal days of the Church. We have already propounded the evidence for the missions of Joseph of Arimathæa, Simon Zelotes, and Aristobulus. We now present the reader with a chain of attestations concurring in this very early apostolic evangelisation. We shall, as in the prior instances, ask for no dogmatic verdict, satisfied with the fact that all the written and circumstantial evidence we possess, or can at this lapse of time hope to collect, point to the presence of St. Paul in Britain.

We shall better estimate the force of the following testimonies if we keep steadily in mind the fact that the great British Church which Augustine found A.D. 596 established in Britain and Ireland, was essentially Eastern, proclaiming by every usage in which she differed from Rome her direct and independent birth from Jerusalem and the apostles themselves in the first throes of Christianity. It is, indeed, an absurdity to go about explaining the existence of such a Church, abounding in all the characteristics of an ancient institution, deeply fixed in the native mind and soil, in any other way than by a frank acceptance of its apostolic origin. Every other attempt at solution fails us. How came these archbishoprics, bishoprics, dioceses, Christian colleges, parochial churches and endowments, royal Christian houses, genealogies of saints, immense and opulent monasteries, a whole nation of believers, to be in Britain? How came they, on their first meeting with the missionary of the Bishop of Rome, to proclaim with one voice, "We have nothing to do with Rome; we know nothing of the Bishop of Rome in his new character of the Pope; we are the British Church, the Archbishop of which is accountable to God alone, having no superior on earth.[1]"

This is one of those tremendous facts which rise before us like a huge mountain in the plain of history. Rome found here a Church older than herself, ramifications of which struck into the very heart of the Continent, the missionary triumphs of which in Italy itself in the life of Augustine were greater than his own among the British Saxons; for Columba and his associates from the primitive colleges in Ireland were the evangelizers of the barbarian conquerors, the Lombards, of Northern Italy. The Gallican Church was entirely one with the British in this opposition to Roman assumptions. The archbishops of Treves were, as we learn from the Tungrenian Chronicles, always supplied from Britain. Treves and Rheims became the headquarters of Gallic liberties, and here rose, under Hincmar, as powerful a resistance as in Britain to Italian supremacy. The Briton could never understand why, because Rome professed certain truths, she should arrogate spiritual despotism over all who held the same. He does not appear to have troubled himself about her errors and corruptions; these he regarded as her own matters, with which, as not belonging to him, he did not interfere. Cadvan, Prince of Wales, expresses himself thus to the Abbot of Bangor:

"All men may hold the same truths, yet no man thereby be drawn into slavery to another. If the Cymry believed all that Rome believes, that would be as strong reason for Rome obeying us as for us to obey Rome. It suffices for us that we obey the truth. If other men obey the truth, are

they therefore to become subject to us? Then were the truth of Christ made slavery unto men, and not freedom."

The soldier who interrogated Augustine at the oak of Conference seems, in like manner, to treat the question between them as one quite apart from doctrine.

"Does Rome possess all the truth?"

"All."

"And you say we do—our usages only differ. Now of two men, if both have all their limbs and senses complete, both are equal. Because the Romans have noses and we have noses, must we either cut off our noses to be Romans? must all who have noses be subject to the Romans? Why, then, should all who hold the faith be subject to Rome because she holds the faith?"

This rough, broad reasoning allowed almost identity in doctrine and practices to be maintained by any Christian with Rome, or any other Church, without in the most remote degree admitting any claim Rome might advance on the ground of such identity. The Briton thus had his festivals, processions, floral decorations, antiphonal choirs, cathedrals—an immense deal in common with Rome—but he had had them for centuries before Papal Rome was ever heard of. And he would have ridiculed the notion that he was to give up a good thing because Rome also had it, as he scorned the idea that a community in such things constituted the shadow of a title on the part of Rome to his allegiance. His position, in fact, was a very strong one—thoroughly Catholic, thoroughly anti-fanatical, and at the same time thoroughly anti-papal: and he knew its strength, resting on historical monuments which could neither be ignored nor destroyed: around him rose hoary cathedrals, churches, abbeys, colleges, "imperishable stones of witness" that his Church was the primitive apostolical Church of Britain—that the Papacy, with all its claims, was a novelty, an intrusion, an invention, a fable; that there never was a time when the eyes of the Christian pilgrim did not rest on this island on vast evidences bespeaking a Church subject to no other Church on earth, built on its own apostolic foundations, and recognising the apostolic Scriptures alone for its rule of faith. [2]

The general conclusion arrived at by the writers who have previously investigated this final part of our question may be given in the words of Capellus: "I scarcely know of one author, from the times of the Fathers downwards, who does not maintain that St. Paul, after his liberation, preached in every country in Western Europe, Britain Included." [3] "Of Paul's journey to Britain," writes Bishop Burgess, "we have as satisfactory proof as any historical question can demand." [4] The same view is substantially maintained by Baronius, the Centuriators of Magdeburg, Alford or Griffith, next to Baronius the most erudite of the Roman Catholic historians; Archbishops Parker and Usher, Stilling-fleet, Camden, Gibson, Cave, Nelson, Allix, &c.

Let us preface the catena autoritatum on this point with a few general testimonies from widely different quarters.

"The cradle of the ancient, British Church was a royal one, herein being distinguished from all other Churches: for it proceeded from the daughter of the British king, Caractacus, Claudia Rufina, a royal virgin, the same who was afterwards the wife of Aulus Rufus Pudens, the Roman senator, and the mother of a family of saints and martyrs." [5]

"We have abundant evidence that this Britain of ours received the Faith, and that from the disciples of Christ Himself, soon after the crucifixion of Christ." [6]

"Britain in the reign of Constantine had become the seat of a flourishing and extensive Church." [7]

"Our forefathers, you will bear in mind, were not generally converted, as many would fain represent, by Roman missionaries. The heralds of salvation who planted Christianity in most parts of England were trained in British schools of theology, and were firmly attached to those national usages which had descended to them from the most venerable antiquity."[8]

"The Christian religion began in Britain within fifty years of Christ's ascension."[9]

Britain, partly through Joseph of Arimathea, partly through Fugatus and Damianus, was of all kingdoms the first that received the Gospel."[10]

"We can have no doubt that Christianity had taken root and flourished in Britain in the middle of the second century."[11]

"It is perfectly certain, that before St. Paul had come to Rome Aristobulus was absent in Britain, and it is confessed by all that Claudia was a British lady."[12]

"The faith which was adopted by the nation of the Britons in the year of our Lord 165; was preserved inviolate, and in the enjoyment of peace, to the time of the Emperor Diocletian."[13]

Let us now trace our way back from the time of Venerable Bede, A.D. 740, step by step, to the apostolic era and the apostles themselves.

In the seventh century we have a galaxy of Christian bishops in England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland, whose names alone would make a considerable catalogue.

In the year A.D. 596 we have the Augustine mission landing in Kent, followed by three conferences with the bishops of the British Church. In A.D. 600, Venantius Fortunatus, in his Christian Hymns, speaks of Britain as having been evangelized by St. Paul.[14]

In A.D. 542, Gildas writes: "We certainly know that Christ, the True Sun, afforded His light, the knowledge of His precepts, to our island in the last year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar."[15]

In A.D. 500-540, we have various productions of Christian bards, such as Taliessin and Aneurin, emanating from the courts of the Christian sovereigns of Britain—one of the latter, "The Crowned Babe" (i.e., Christ), interesting as the earliest European specimen, of any length, of rhyme in poetry: it is composed in the ancient British tongue.

In A.D. 400-450, we have the Pelagian heresy originated by Morgan, Abbot of Bangor, being in truth nothing else than a revival of Druidism, and of the old Druidic ideas with regard to the nature and free will of man. The beauty of Morgan's or Pelagius' Latin compositions, his extensive learning and reproachless life, spread the heresy everywhere, and Europe was in danger of relapsing into its old faith. The heresy was suppressed in Britain by the two visitations and zealous preaching of St. Germanus or Garmon, Gallic Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, brother of Vincentius Lirinensis. We are indebted to Pelagianism for the most valuable part of the productions of St. Augustine of Hippo, its opposer—the Coryphaeus of theological authors.[16]

In the year A.D. 408 this Augustine asks, "How many churches are there not erected in the British isles which lie in the ocean?"[17] And about the same time Arnobius writes: "So swiftly runs the word of God that though in several thousand years God was not known, except among the Jews, now, within the space of a few years, His word is concealed neither from the Indians in the East nor from the Britons in the West."[18]

Theodoretus in A.D. 435 testifies: "Paul, liberated from his first captivity at Rome, preached the Gospel to the Britons and others in the West. Our fishermen and publicans not only persuaded

the Romans and their tributaries to acknowledge the Crucified and His laws, but the Britons also and the Cimbri (Cymry)."[19]

To the same purport in this commentary on 2 Timothy iv. 16: "When Paul was sent by Festus on his appeal to Rome, he travelled, after being acquitted, into Spain, and thence extended his excursions into other countries, and to the islands surrounded by the sea."

More express testimony to Paul's preaching in Britain could not be delivered, nor from a more unexceptionable quarter. Theodoret was Bishop of Cyropolis, attended both the General Councils of Ephesus (A.D. 431) against the Nestorians, and of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, consisting of 600 bishops. As an excellent interpreter of Scripture, and a writer of ecclesiastical history, he deservedly ranks high.

Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, supplies (A.D. 402) cumulative evidence of the existence of pure British Christianity. "The British Isles," he writes, "which are beyond the sea, and which lie in the ocean, have received the virtue of the Word. Churches are there founded • and altars erected. Though thou shouldst go to the ocean, to the British Isles, there thou shouldst hear all men everywhere discoursing matters out of the Scriptures, with another voice, indeed, but not another faith, with a different tongue but the same judgment." [20]

"From India to Britain," writes St. Jerome (A.D. 378), "all nations resound with the death and resurrection of Christ." [21]

In A.D. 320, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, speaks of apostolic missions to Britain as matter of notoriety: "The apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles." [22]

The first part of the fourth century is the era of Constantine the Great and his mother Helena. Gibbon, with that perversity which beset him as a mania in dealing with the leading facts of Christianity, strives to persuade himself that Constantine and Helen were not Britons, but natives of some obscure village in the East; [23] his sole support for such a supposition being the fragment of an anonymous author, appended to Ammianus Marcellinus. "The man must be mad," states Baronius, "who, in the face of universal antiquity, refuses to believe that Constantine and his mother were Britons, born in Britain. [24] Archbishop Usher delivers a catalogue of twenty continental authorities in the affirmative—not one to the contrary. The Panegyrics of the Emperors, the genealogy of his own family, as recited by one of his descendants, Constantine Palæologus, native records and traditions, all the circumstances of his career, demonstrate Constantine a Briton bred in the strongest British ideas. "It is well known," states Sozomen, "the great Constantine received his Christian education in Britain." [25] "Helen was unquestionably a British princess," writes Melancthon. [26] "Christ," declares Pope Urban in his Brief, Britannia, "shewed to Constantine the Briton the victory of the cross for his sceptre."

"Constantine," writes Polydore Vergil, "'born in Britain, of a British mother, proclaimed Emperor in Britain beyond doubt, made his natal soil a participator in his glory." [27] Constantine was all this and more—by his mother's side he was the heir and representative of the royal Christian dynasty of Britain, as a glance at the table on the next page will serve to shew.

The policy of Constantine, in carrying out which for twenty years with admirable wisdom and inflexible purpose he was supported by armies levied for the most part of his native British dominions, consisted in extending to the whole Roman world the system of constitutional Christianity which had long been established in Britain. But his religious sympathies, as well as those of his mother, were wholly Eastern, not Roman. They were those of the British Church. They revolved round Jerusalem, and the Holy Land, and not Rome. Constantine made but two brief visits, during his long reign, to the Italian capital. Helen spent all her declining years in restoring the churches and sacred sites of Palestine. The objects of Constantine's life are well explained by him in one of his edicts: "We call God to witness, the Saviour of all men, that in

assuming the government we are influenced solely by these two considerations—the uniting of the empire in one faith, and the restoration of peace to a world rent to pieces by the insanity of religious persecution." Regarded in his threefold character of general, statesman, and legislator, the British founder of secular Christendom may justly be considered the greatest of the Roman emperors. The British Church was represented during his reign by native bishops at the Councils of Arles, A.D. 308, and Nice, A.D. 325.[28]

In A.D. 300 the Diocletian persecution raged in Britain, but was stopped in one year by Constantius Chlorus, continuing to ravage the rest of the empire for eighteen years. We have elsewhere given a list of the British martyrs who perished in it. We cannot doubt that we stand, during these centuries, in the midst of a Church as broad and thoroughly national as the present Protestant establishment; indeed, in one chief respect more so, for the present national Church of England is not that of the people of Scotland, Wales, or Ireland, whereas the ancient British Church embraced all these populations in its fold. Their very names indicate the broader national character of the ancient and primitive Church, one being the British Church, or Church of Britain, the other the Church of England.

Continuing to trace the British Church back, we find Origen, A.D. 230, alluding thus to its existence: "The divine goodness of our Lord and Saviour is equally diffused among the Britons, the Africans, and other nations of the world.[29]


In A.D. 230, however, Britain had been reincorporated in the Roman empire. What was the case in A.D. 192-198, in the reign of Commodus, when it proclaimed its independence, and the British legions elected Albinus Caesar? Was the Church confined to the Roman province then insurgent, or were the, stubborn British tribes—the Cymri, the Caledonfi, the Picts, whom no efforts of peace or war could succeed in bringing to acknowledge the right of a foreigner to plant hostile foot in Britain—within its pale? Tertullian, who flourished during the war of Commodus in Britain, which Dion Cassius terms "the most dangerous in which the empire during his time had been engaged," says expressly "that the regions in Britain which the Roman arms had failed to penetrate professed Christianity for their religion." "The extremities of Spain, the various parts of Gaul, the regions of Britain which have never been penetrated by the Roman arms, have received the religion of Christ." [30] We have seen that the British Church had, long before Tertullian's age, founded the Churches of Gaul, Lorraine, and Switzerland, and that its missionaries had made their way into Pannonia. Coming nearer Rome itself, we find that in Tertullian's own age a missionary of the British Church founded, A.D. 170, the Church of Tarentum. This was St. Cadval, after whom the cathedral at Tarento is still named.[31] Not only, therefore, did the British Church, A.D. 170, embrace Roman and independent Britain, but it had struck its roots in France, Switzerland, Germany, and the extremities of Italy.

We now come to A.D. 120-150, within the era of the disciples of the apostles. It is certain from St. Paul's own letters to the Romans and to Timothy, that he was on the most intimate and affectionate terms with the mother of Rufus Pudens, with Pudens himself, with Claudia his wife and Linus. The children of Claudia and Pudens were instructed in the faith by St. Paul himself. The eldest was baptized Timotheus, after Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus, the Apostle's "beloved son in Christ," The four, Timotheus, Novatus, Praxedes, Pudentiana, with their father Pudens, sealed at different times their faith with their blood in Rome, and were, with Linus, the first Britons who were added to the glorious army of martyrs. And, Pudens excepted, they were not only martyrs, but royal martyrs; not only royal martyrs, but martyrs of the most patriotic and heroic blood in Britain. Let us confirm these statements by the evidences of primitive antiquity. The reader will recollect the "natal day" of a martyr is the day of his martyrdom.

Pudens suffered A.D. 96, Linus A.D. 90; Pudentiana suffered on the anniversary of her father's martyrdom, in the third persecution, A.D. 107; Novatus in the fifth persecution, A.D. 139, when his brother Timotheus was absent in Britain, baptizing his nephew, King Lucius.[32] Shortly after his return from Britain, and in extreme old age, about his ninetieth year, Timotheus suffered

ROYAL CHRISTIAN DYNASTY OF ANCIENT BRITAIN

Beli the Great, 100 B.C.



with his fellow-soldier Marcus in the same city of Rome, "drunk with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Praxedes, the surviving sister, received her crown within the same year. Claudia alone died a natural death, in Samnium, before any of her children, A.D. 97, surviving Pudens one year. They were all interred by the side of St. Paul in the Via Ostiensis.

May 17. Natal day of the blessed Pudens, father of Praxedes and Pudentiana. He was clothed with baptism by the apostles, and watched and kept his robe pure and without wrinkle to the crown of a blameless life.[33]

November 26. Natal day of St. Linus, Bishop of Rome.[34]

May 17. Natal day of St. Pudentiana, the virgin, of the most illustrious descent, daughter of Pudens, and disciple of the holy apostle St. Paul.[35]

June 20. Natal day of St. Novatus, son of the blessed Pudens, brother of St. Timotheus the elder, and the virgins of Christ Pudentiana and Praxedes. All these were instructed in the faith by the apostles.

August 22. Natal day of St. Timotheus, son of St. Pudens, in the Via Ostiensis.[36]

September 21. Natal day of St. Praxedes, virgin of Christ, in Rome.[37]

Have we, again, any direct contemporary evidence that Linus, the first bishop of Rome, was the son of Caractacus, and brother of Claudia Britannica? Putting aside, for a moment, British genealogies and tradition, does any contemporary of St. Paul and Linus, in Rome itself; assert the fact? Undoubtedly. Clemens Romanus, who is mentioned by St. Paul, states in his epistle, the genuineness of which has never been questioned, that Linus was the brother of Claudia—"Sanctissimus Linus, frater Claudix." [38] Clemens succeeded Cletus within twelve years of the death of Linus, as third bishop of Rome. He had also been associated with the British missionary Mansuetus, in evangelizing Illyria. His sources of information are, therefore, unquestionable.

St. Paul lived, according to all evidence, whenever he was at Rome, whether in custody at large (libera custodid) or free, in the bosom of the Claudian family. There is no dispute that Claudia herself was purely British, and whether Linus was her son or brother, the British character of the family, and the close, the domestic ties of affection between such family and St. Paul, are equally manifest. The relationship is, in many important regards, more intimate between St. Paul and the British mind—that mind being the leading, because the royal, influence in Britain—in the domestic circle and family worship of the Claudian palace at Rome, than when he addressed the British people themselves in Britain.

But Clemens Romanus not only proves to us that the family which the Apostle thus honoured with his constant residence and instruction was British, that the first bishop appointed by him over the Church at Rome was of this British family, but that St. Paul himself preached in Britain, for no other interpretation can be assigned his words, *bri To 1-44,ta. r;-js Avc4(os---*"the extremity of the West." "Paul, after he had been to the extremity of the West, underwent his martyrdom before the rulers of mankind; and thus delivered from this world, went to his holy place." [39]

It may be suggested that Linus, the first bishop of Rome, was, however, some other than the brother of Claudia, mentioned by St. Paul. Not so; for if the above authorities permitted a doubt to remain, the evidence of Irenæus as to their identity is conclusive. "The apostles," writes Irenæus, A.D. 180, "having founded and built up the Church at-Rome, committed the ministry of its supervision to Linus. This is the Linus mentioned by Paul in his Epistles to Timothy." [40]

We are not aware we should be stating anything improbable if we regarded St. Paul's domiciliation at the house of Pudens, or his being ministered to immediately before his martyrdom by Pudens, Claudia, and Linus, as additional presumptive evidence of his sojourn in Britain. At any rate, we observe that all the sympathies with which he was surrounded, after his arrival at Rome, in the Claudian family, all the influences of that family in their native country, would lead him to Britain in preference to any other land of the West. This was the great isle of the Gentiles, the centre and source of their religion, and, through his royal converts, a "mighty door and an effectual" for its conversion was opened to him.

Caractacus meanwhile continued to reside at Aber Gweryd, now St. Donat's Major (Llan Ddunwyd), in Glamorganshire, where he had built a palace, more Romano. Everything invited Paul to Britain, to follow the bishop he had already commissioned for the work of the Gospel therein, and to be the guest of the royal parent of Claudia. Considering the combination of circumstances which now favoured the execution of his long-cherished design of visiting the West of Europe, we should regard it much more extraordinary if the Apostle had not come to Britain than we do his coming here. When to this circumstantial evidence we add the written testimonies we have adduced of Eusebius, Theodoret, Clemens, and others, that he positively did preach in Britain, we see fair reason for concurring in Bishop Burgess's conclusion, though the bishop had but a part of the evidence we have collected before him, "That we possess as substantial evidence, as any historical fact can require, of St. Paul's journey to Britain." [41]

There are six years of St. Paul's life to be accounted for, between his liberation from his first imprisonment and his martyrdom at Aqua Salviæ in the Ostian Road near Rome. Part certainly, the greater part perhaps of this period, was spent in Britain Siluria or Cambria, beyond the bounds of the Roman empire; and hence the silence of the Greek and Latin writers upon it.

Has any portion of his doctrine or teaching in Britain come down to us? Any such would be sure to be transmitted in a British form, and most probably in that triadic form in which the Druids, the religious teachers of Britain, delivered their teaching. Now we find in the ancient British language certain triads which have never been known otherwise than as "the Triads of Paul the Apostle." They are not found *totidem verbis*, either whole or fragmentally, in his epistles, but the morality inculcated is, of course, quite in unison with the rest of his Gospel preaching.

Triads of Paul the Apostle

"There are three sorts of men: The man of God, who renders good for evil; the man of men, who renders good for good and evil for evil; and the man of the devil, who renders evil for good.

"Three kinds of men are the delights of God: the meek; the lovers of peace; the lovers of mercy.

"There are three marks of the children of God: Gentle deportment; a pure conscience; patient suffering of injuries.

"There are three chief duties demanded by God: Justice to every man; love; humility.

"In three places will be found the most of God: Where He is mostly sought; where He is mostly loved; where there is least of self.

"There are three things following faith in God: A conscience at peace; union with heaven; what is necessary for life.

"Three ways a Christian punishes an enemy: By forgiving him; by not divulging his wickedness; by doing him all the good in his power.

"The three chief considerations of a Christian: Lest he should displease God; lest he should be a stumbling-block to man; lest his love to all that is good should wax cold.

"The three luxuries of a Christian feast: What God has prepared; what can be obtained with justice to all; what love to all may venture to use.

"Three persons have the claims and privileges of brother and sisters: The widow; the orphan; the strangers." [42]

The evangelical simplicity of these precepts, contrasting so forcibly with monkish and mediæval inventions and superstitions, favours the traditional acceptance of their Pauline origin. Their preservation is due to the Cor of Ilid.

The foundation of the great abbey of Bangor Iscoed is assigned by tradition to St: Paul. Its discipline and doctrine were certainly known as "the Rule of Paul" (Pauli Regula) and over each of the four gates was engraved his precept, "If a man will not work, neither let him eat." Its abbots regarded themselves as his successors; they were always men of the highest grade in society, and generally of the blood royal. Bede and other authors state the number of monks in it at 2,100. The scholars amounted to many thousands. Pela-gius was its twentieth abbot. St. Hilary. and St. Benedict term it "Mater omnium monasteriorum," the mother of all monasteries. The first Egyptian monastery was founded by Pachomius, A.D. 360 [43]

In what language did St. Paul preach in Britain? This question, if pursued, would open an interesting but difficult investigation. Every apostle, by the Pentecostal inspiration, possessed the command of every known tongue then in the world. This supernatural faculty was part of the "power from on high" with which they were endowed, and the lingual credential of their divine mission. Of the fact that Paul preached in the British tongue we have no evidence; neither have we any that he ever preached in Latin; yet with both languages he must, as an apostle, have been familiar. We infer he often preached in both. The Druids in their sacred writings used the Bardic alphabet, of forty-two characters; but in their civil transactions, as Cæsar informs us, the Greek alphabet. St. Paul wrote all his Epistles in Greek and Greek continued some time after the apostolic age the language of the Church at Rome. The royal family of Britain were, as we have seen, ardently attached to both Greek and Latin literature. Cymbeline and Llyr the old generation, had received their education, Which must necessarily have been the highest Rome could impart, from Augustus Cæsar himself. Caractacus must, unless we have recourse to the rather violent supposition that Claudius, who heard, and Tacitus, who has recorded, his oration, were proficient in British, have delivered himself in Latin. [44] Paul, it is certain, used the tongue of the people in preaching to the people. The canon he laid down for the Corinthian Church was that which he practised himself: "If I know not the meaning of the voice; I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be to me a barbarian. . . . I would rather in the church speak five words with my understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." [45] He must, therefore, according to this rule, have preached to the Britons in their vernacular tongue.

By the conversion of the British dynasty in its various members, a very important class of prophecies were fulfilled. Isaiah especially abounds in predictions that the infant Church should have the kings and queens of the Gentiles for its nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers. In the infant or cradle days of the Christian Church there were no Gentile kings or queens, except the British, converted to Christianity. Isaiah again pointedly refers to the "isles afar off" as supplying these kings, and it is to the "brightness of the rising of the Church" they are represented as coming. "The isles of the Gentiles afar off," and their glory, their kings and queens, ministering to the Church in its infancy, forms indeed a most striking portion of the evangelical predictions. In none other than the British royal family could they be fulfilled, for no other royalties in such days, nor long after, were to be found within the pale of the Church. The expressions, also, "the ends of the earth," "the uttermost parts of the earth," "the isles afar off," used by Isaiah, are precisely those which the Roman authors also used to designate Britain. These prophecies must

have experienced realization—"for the Scriptures must needs be fulfilled"—in the precise times to which they definitely refer. And the historical evidence we have adduced, proves that in these early kings and queens of our island—"the far-off island of the Gentiles"—they were literally and to a title substantiated. Bran, or Brennus, Caractacus, Linus, Cyllinus, Claudia, Eurgain, were members of even then perhaps the oldest Gentile sovereignty in the world.

This sovereignty was that of the great Gentile isle: to these various members of it were sent those disciples that escaped from the first persecution of the infant Church at Jerusalem; some of these members were converted within five years of the Crucifixion; they came literally to the brightness of the rising of the Church, when the glory of Christ and of the Pentecostal descent was yet resting upon it; they became its nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers, both at Rome, through the Claudian family, and in Britain, through the elder reigning branch. In the next century the same Silurian family established Christianity, under Lucius, as the national religion, and in the commencement of the fourth century its direct heir in blood and succession, Constantine the Great, made such Christianity the religion of the whole Roman world, his mother Helen being at the same time the benefactress of all the Eastern Churches, especially that "which is the mother of us all"—Jerusalem. From the captivity of Caractacus and the life of St. Paul in the family of his daughter Claudia at Rome, to the turning of the Roman empire into Christendom, the history of the royal dynasty of Britain in connection with the Church of Christ is indeed one long, continuous, and exact verification of Scriptural prophecy.[46]

Against the British Church itself Am charge of heretical doctrine has at any time been advanced, though the heresiarch, the very prince of heretics—Pelagius, was nursed in her bosom. Bede's reluctant testimony is, on this point, decisive. Whilst the Christian Churches in Asia, Africa, and on the continent of Europe were overrun with false doctrines, the British Church grew up and covered with its shade the whole nation, untroubled for the space of four centuries by any root of bitterness. It is reasonable to infer that the foundations of such a Church were very deeply and faithfully laid by the hands of wise master-builders. According to the foundation rose the superstructure, resting on these four pillars—St. Paul, Simon Zelotes, Joseph, Aristobulus. Its great evangelist in the second century, St. Timotheus, the baptizer of his nephew King Lucius and of his nobility at Winchester, had also received the faith from the mouth of Paul himself. This unanimity of faith in the founders impressed itself on the Church they founded, which "continued in the things it had learned and been assured of; knowing from whom it had learned them."

Having thus first surveyed the religions of the ancient world at the birth of Christianity, and next traced the introduction of the latter, and its progress in Britain, a bird's-eye view will shew us the following Churches, making up the Catholic Church sixty-six years after the Incarnation: In Palestine—Jerusalem, Samaria, Cæsarea, Lydda; in Assyria—Babylon; in Syria—Antioch, Damascus; in Asia-Minor—Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis, Thyatira, Pergamos, Cæsarea in Cappadocia; Laodicea, Colosse, Galatia; in Greece—Athens, Corinth, Thessalonica, Beræa, Philippi, Crete; in Egypt, Alexandria; in Italy, Rome; in Gaul, Lyons; in Britain—Cor Avalon (Glastonbury), Cor Salog (Old Sarum), Cor Ilid (Llan Ilid) in Siluria.

The force of the testimony for St. Paul's residence in Britain may be more clearly estimated by comparing it with that for St. Peter's at Rome. The earliest testimony in favour of the latter is that of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 180,[47] prior to which we find no indication in the Scriptures or ecclesiastical authors that St. Peter ever visited or ever intended to visit Rome, which, as a Gentile Church over which St. Paul in the most pointed manner claimed jurisdiction,[48] was certainly not within the province of the apostle of the circumcision. Britain, on the contrary, was within Paul's province, placed already, as Ephesus and Crete had been, by Paul himself under one of his bishops, Aristobulus. If we are to concede that St. Peter founded the Roman Church in person, much more are we compelled by infinitely stronger evidence to acknowledge that St. Paul in person founded the British Church.[49]

Of St. Paul's life after quitting Britain no particulars have descended to us. After visiting Asia we find him in the last scene of his life returned to the bosom of the British royal family at Rome. In his farewell charge to Timothy he sends him the greetings of Pudens, Linus, and Claudia. These, with that of Eubulus, the cousin of Claudia, are the only names of the brethren mentioned by him; these ministered to him on the eve of his martyrdom, these attended him when he was on the block of the state lictor at Aqua Salviæ, a little out of Rome, and these consigned his remains with their own hands to the Pudentinian family tomb on the Ostian Road. Like his Divine Master, "he made his grave with the rich in his death." Linus, Claudia and Pudens and their four children, when God in His appointed time called them to receive the same crown of the Cross, were buried by his side: the other royal converts, Bran, Caractacus, Cyllinus, and Eurgain died peaceably in Britain, and were interred in the cor of Ilid in Siluria. All—kings, heroes, apostles, martyrs, saints—were united in the kingdom of light, in the joy of their Lord.[50]

4) Bede was a very earnest adherent of the novel papal Church, introduced A.D. 596, by Augustine into Britain, but the honesty and simplicity of his character has rendered his history in many respects a very inconvenient and obnoxious record to the said Church. What became of the remains of St. Peter and St. Paul? At Rome they still pretend to exhibit them, but Bede—and it must be remembered he is a canonized saint in the Roman calendar—expressly states that the remains of the bodies of the apostles Peter and Paul, the martyrs St. Lawrence, St. John, St. Gregory, and St. Pancras, were, at the solicitation of King Oswy to Pope Vitalian, removed from Rome to England, and deposited at Canterbury A.D. 656, Pope Vitalian's letter to Oswy being extant—(Bedæ Hist., lib. iii. c. 29). Their remains, then, if any, repose in British soil.

Notes to Chapter 5

1) The continental Churches admitted, for the most part, a Primacy when they rejected the Supremacy of the Bishop of, Rome. The British Church admitted neither; it knew nothing' of the Bishop of Rome, except on an equality with any of its own British bishops, or any other bishop in the Christian Church. The further we go back into British history, the clearer shines forth in all our laws the entire independence of the British crown, Church, and people, of all foreign authority. All our great legal authorities concur on this point. "The ancient British Church," writes Blackstone, vol. iv. p. 105, "by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome and all his pretended authorities." "The Britons told Augustine," writes Bacon "Government of England," "they would not be subject to him, nor let him pervert the ancient laws of their Church. This was their resolution, and they were as good as their word, for they maintained the liberty of their Church five hundred years after his time, and were the last of all the Churches of Europe that gave up their power to the Roman Beast, and in the person of Henry. VIII, that came of their blood by Owen Tudor, the first that took that power away again."

2) Bede's testimony as to the pure scriptural character of the teaching of the British Church is full and explicit, and he contrasts, with feelings of shame and reluctance, the apostolic lives of the British missionaries with those of his own Papal Church. Of Columba he writes, "He taught only what was contained in the prophetic, evangelic, and apostolic writings, all works of piety and charity being at the same time diligently observed"—Lib. iii. c. 41. Of Aidan: "All who resorted to him applied themselves either to reading the Scriptures or to learning Psalms"—Lib. iii. c. 5. Of Adamnan: "He was most admirably versed in the knowledge of the Scriptures"—Lib. iii. c. 15. How entirely the British Church rejected human authority in matters of faith may be collected from the saying of Columba, "Except what has been declared by the Law, the prophets, the evangelists, and apostles, a profound silence ought to be observed by all others on the subject of the Trinity." Lib. iii. c. 4.

3) Hist. of the Apostles.

4) Independence of the British Church.

5) Moncæus Atrebas, the learned Gallican divine, In Syntagma, P. 38.

6) Sir Henry Spelman's Concilia, fol., p. 1.

7) Soames' Anglo-Saxon Church, Introd., p. 29.

8) Soames' Bampton Lectures, pp. 112-257. This statement is so true, that sixty-three years after the landing of Augustine, that is, A.D. 660, when all the Heptarchy, except Sussex, had been converted, Wini, Bishop of Winchester, was the only bishop of the Romish communion in Britain, and he had purchased his first bishopric of London from Wulfhere, King of Mercia: all the rest were British. And the cause is patent: Maelwyn or Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, Ninian, the apostle of the southern Picts, Aidan of the Northumbrian, Paul Hen his successor, Columba of the Scotch, Finan of the East Angles, Cad or Chad of the Mercian were all native Britons educated in the native colleges. The Romish succession had died down to one prelate, and Saxon Christianity was kept alive or refounded by British Christians. The succession of Augustine in Canterbury and Rochester expired in Damianus, A.D. 666.

9) Robert Parsons the Jesuit's Three Conversions of England,

10) vol. i. p. 26. 10 Polydore Vergil, lib. ii.

11) Cardwell's (Camden Prof.) Ancient History, p. 18. 1837.

12) Alford's Regia Fides, vol. i. p. 19.

13) Bede, lib. i. c. 4.

14) "Transit et oceanum vel qua facit insula portum. Quasque Britannus habet terras atque ultima Thule."

15) De Excidio Britanniaë, .p. 25.

16) Pelagius was born the same day as his opponent, Augustine of Hippo, Nov. 13, A.D. -354. Vortigern or Gwrtheyrn, the British king, on being excommunicated by Vodin, Archbishop of London, for his incestuous connection with his own daughter, became a Pelagian and invited the Pagan Saxons rather against his own Christian subjects than against the Picts. He soon abandoned Pelagianism for the open Paganism of his young wife Ronixa (Rowena), the daughter of Hengist. It is memorable that Pelagius, when Abbot of Bangor, on receiving an admonition from the bishops of Gaul and Italy—the Bishop of Rome included—on the latitudinarian nature of his principles, returned it with the observation: "Sofa in Britannia Ecolesia Britannica judex." He was deposed next year by a synod at Winchester, resigned Bangor, and went abroad to Rome, Africa, Jerusalem, and died finally in his native land. Of all heretics he was the largest-minded, the most learned, and the most elegant. The caution of one of his opponents—"Speak not to Pelagius, or he will convert you," is a very high compliment to the fascination of the man and his address. But the rapid progress of his tenets is attributable also to his commanding eloquence in the British language, of which he was a perfect master—it is, indeed, to this fact that Prosper attributes his success in Britain: "Dogma quod antiqui satiatum felle Draconis, Pestifer vomuit coluber sermone Britanno." Carmine, lib. ii.

17) Opera, fol., Paris Edit., p. 676.

18) Arnobius, Ad Psalm cxlvii.

- 19) Theodoret, De Civ. Grec. Of., lib. ix. Nicephorus seems to have followed Theodoretus (Niceph., lib. ii. c. 40;) and Eusebius Pamphilus, lib. iv.
- 20) Chrysostomi, Orat.
- 21) Jerome, In Isaiam, c. liv.; also, Epistol., xiii. ad Paulinum.
- 22) Eusebius, De Demonstration Evangelii, lib. Iii.
- 23) Naissus. Colchester, the birth-place of Helen of the Cross, has, from time immemorial, borne the cross with three crowns for its arms.
- 24) Baronius, ad ann. 306: "Non nisi extremæ dementiæ hominis." Until the reign of Constantine the Roman Christians had no other church than the Titulus to worship in: "Ante Constantini imperium templa Rom non habuerint Christiani," observes Bale (Scriptores Britan., p. 57.) The Pope, it is well known, claims the sovereignty of the States of the Church by right of the decree of the British Emperor Constantine making them over in free gift to the Bishop of Rome. That this decree was a forgery no one doubts; it was, however, confirmed by Pepin. By the papal Church's own shewing, it is infinitely more indebted to the ancient British. Church and sovereigns than they ever were to it. Without the benefactions of the Claudian, family and Constantine, it would never have risen above the character given it by Pius the First, the brother of Hermas Pastor—"Pauper Senatus Christi." For its earthly aggrandisement it is mainly indebted to ancient British liberality.
- 25) Sozomen, Eccles. Hist., lib. i. c. v. So Eumenius, in his Panegyric on Constantius to Constantine: "He begot thee in the very flower of his age."—Pan. 9.
- 26) Epistola, p. 189
- 27) Historia Brit., p. 385.
- 28) The archbishopric of York was founded, at the request of Helen, by Constantius the Emperor, A.D. 290. Its second archbishop, Socrates, was martyred in the Diocletian persecution.
- 29) Origen, In Psalm cxlix.
- 30) Tertullian, Def. Fidei, p. 179.
- 31) MS. Vellum of the Church of Tarentum; Catalogue of Saints in the Vatican, published A.D. 1641; Moronus, De Ecclesia Tarentina.
- 32) All authors concur in this fact, though all do not see how naturally it followed the relationship between the royal house of Britain and its branch settled in Rome.
- 33) Martyr. Romana, ad diem Maii 17. To the same effect the Martyrologies of Ado, Usuard, and Esquilinus.
- 34) Martyr, Rom., ad diem; Martyrologies of Ado; Greek Menologies; Usuard, &c.
- 35) Martyr. Rom., ad diem; Ado, &c.
- 36) Martyr. Rom., Ado, Asuard, Greek Menol.
- 37) Matyr. Rom., Ado, &c.

38) In the Oxford edition of Junius, published A.D. 1633, "The son of Claudia:: Apostolici Patres, lib. vii. c. 47; Apostolici Constitutions, c. 46. The Apostolic Constitutions may or may not be what their present title infers; but no scholar who peruses the opinions pro et contra, collected by Iltigius (*De Patribus Apostolicis*), Buddæus (*Isagoge in Theologian*), and Baratier (*De Successione Primorum Episcoporum*), will assign them a later date than A.D. 150. The mention of Linus in them runs thus: "Concerning those bishops who have been ordained in our lifetime, we make known to you that they are these: Of Antioch, Eudius, ordained by me, Peter; of the Church of Rome, Linus, the (son) of Claudia, was first ordained by Paul, and after Linus' death, Clemens the second, ordained by me, Peter." Lib. i. c. 46. In the original Analogy requires to be supplied, but the relationship might have been so well known as to render it superfluous.

39) *Clement. Rom., Epistola ad Corinthios, c. 5.* The passage in extenso runs thus: "To leave the examples of antiquity, and to come to the most recent, let us take the noble examples of our own times. Let us place before our eyes the good apostles. Peter, through unjust odium, underwent not one or two, but many sufferings; and having undergone his martyrdom, he went to the place of glory to which he was entitled. Paul, also, having seven times worn chains, and been hunted and stoned, received the prize of such endurance. For he was the herald of the Gospel in the West as well as in the East, and enjoyed the illustrious reputation of the faith in teaching the whole world to be righteous. And after he had been to the extremity of the West, he suffered martyrdom before the sovereigns of mankind; and thus delivered from this world, he went to his holy place, the most brilliant example of steadfastness that we possess."

40) *Irenæi Opera, lib. iii. c. 1.* Irenæus was born in Asia, became a disciple of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, afterwards a presbyter of Lyons, whence he was sent as a delegate to the Asiatic Churches. He succeeded Photinus in the bishopric, and suffered under Severus.

41) The ancient MS. in Merton College, Oxford, which purports to contain a series of letters between St. Paul and Seneca, has more than one allusion to St. Paul's residence in Siluria. Had the large collection of British archives and MSS. deposited at Verulam as late as A.D. 860, descended to our times, invaluable light would have been thrown on this as on many other subjects of native interest. Amongst these works were the poems and Hymns of Claudia. Vide Matthew of Westminster, William of Malmesbury, "Life of Eadmer."

42) Ancient British Triads; Triads of Paul the Apostle.

43) "Pelagius heresiarchus ex Britannia oriundus famati illius collegii Bangorensis præpositus erat in quo Christianorum philosophorum 2,100 militabant suarum manuum laboribus juxta Pauli doctrinam vicitantes"—*Vita Pelagii, p. 3*

44) Claudia herself was the authoress of a volume of epigrams, a volume of elegies, and a volume of sacred poems or hymns. Copies of these were preserved in the library at Verulam as late as the thirteenth century.

45) *Cor. Xiv: 19.* It was the uniform practice of Christians, from the earliest times, to read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and it was not till the period of Charlemagne that Latin became the language of the Church services. Vide Usher's *Historia Dogmatica*. No two causes contributed so much to the declension of Christianity and the progress of Mahometanism, as the suppression by the Church of Rome of the vernacular Scriptures, and her adoption of image-worship.

46) A few of these prophecies we subjoin: "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the outcasts of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation unto the ends of the earth. Kings shall see and arise; princes also shall worship. Behold they shall come from the north and from the west. Kings shall be thy nursing-fathers and queens thy nursing-mothers. Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to


the brightness of thy rising. Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and kings shall minister unto thee. Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings. I will set My sign among them, and send them that escape of them unto the nations, unto the isles afar off, and they shall declare My glory unto the Gentiles. They shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of My planting"—Isaiah xlix., lx., Lxvi.

47) Irenæi Opera, lib. iii. c. 1: "Matthew published his Gospel among the Hebrews in his own language while Peter and Paul were engaged in evangelising and founding the Christian Church at Rome."

48) "My apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations, among whom are ye also . . . that I might have some fruit among you also, as among other Gentiles"—Rom. 1, 5, 13.

49) If we desired to strengthen from Roman Catholic evidence the apostolical foundations of the British Church, or to insist that it can with equal justice, at least, as the Roman Church, claim St. Peter amongst its founders, it would not be difficult to adduce the affirmative evidence of Roman Catholic authorities upon the point. Cornelius a Lapide, in answering the question "How came St. Paul not to salute St. Peter in his Epistle to the Romans," states, "Peter, banished with the rest of the Jews from Rome by the edict of Claudius, was absent in Britain." (Cornelius a Lapide, in Argumentum Epistolic St. Pauli ad Romans, c. xvi.) Eusebius Pamphilus, if we can credit the quotation of him by a very untrustworthy author, Simeon Metaphrastes, states St. Peter to have been in Britain as well as Rome—(Metaphrastes ad 29 Junii). The vision to which St. Peter refers, 2 Pet. i. 14, "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me," is said to. have appeared to him in Britain on the spot where once stood the British Church of Lambedr (St. Peter), and now stands the Abbey of St. Peter's, Westminster. Lambeth may be a corruption of Lambedr. But this question lies between Roman Catholic authors and their own Church, which will scarcely put the seal of its infallibility on a position that places the British Church on its own special appropriated Rock.

50) Bede was a very earnest adherent of the novel papal Church, introduced A.D. 596, by Augustine into Britain, but the honesty and simplicity of his character has rendered his history in many respects a very inconvenient and obnoxious record to the said Church. What became of the remains of St. Peter and St. Paul? At Rome they still pretend to exhibit them, but Bede—and it must be remembered he is a canonized saint in the Roman calendar—expressly states that the remains of the bodies of the apostles Peter and Paul, the martyrs St. Lawrence, St. John, St. Gregory, and St. Pancras, were, at the solicitation of King Oswy to Pope Vitalian, removed from Rome to England, and deposited at Canterbury A.D. 656, Pope Vitalian's letter to Oswy being extant—(Bedæ Hist., lib. iii. c. 29). Their remains, then, if any, repose in British soil.



CONCLUSION

FROM the preceding investigation ensue the following conclusions:

1. Before Christianity originated in Judæa, there had existed from the remotest period in Britain a religion known as the Druidic, of which the two leading doctrines were identical with those of Christianity, viz., the immortality of the soul and vicarious atonement.
2. That this identity pointed out Britain as of all Gentile countries the one best prepared for the reception of Christianity.
3. That the only religions persecuted by the Roman Government were the Druidic and the Christian.
4. That this common persecution by the great military empire with which Britain was engaged in incessant hostilities from A.D. 43 to A.D. 118, materially aided in pre-disposing the British mind in favour of Christianity.
5. That Britain, being the only free state of Europe, was the only country which afforded a secure asylum to the Christians persecuted by the Roman Government.
6. That a current of Christianity flowed into Britain from the East contemporaneously with the first dispersion of the Church at Jerusalem, A.D. 35-38.
7. That the first planters of the Gospel in Britain never were in Rome at all, but came hither from the mother Church at Jerusalem.
8. That these first planters were Joseph of Arimathæa and his associates, who settled under the protection of the British king Arviragus, in the Isle of Avalon, Glastonbury—one of the Druidic cors of Somerset.
9. That among the earliest converts of Joseph and his fraternity were Gladys (Pomponia Gracina) the sister, Gladys or Claudia, and Eurgain, the daughters, and Linus the son of Caractacus, prince of Siluria, and military dictator of the national forces against the Romans.
10. That the second planter of the word was Simon Zelotes the apostle, who was martyred and buried in the Roman province, probably near Caistor, in Lincolnshire.
11. That the third planter was Aristobulus, one of the seventy, brother of St. Barnabas and father-in-law of St. Peter; commissioned first bishop of Britain by St. Paul, and consecrated by St. Barnabas, the two apostles to the Gentiles. That Aristobulus was engaged in his mission in Britain when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, some years before his first visit, or the visit of any other apostle, to Rome.
12. That Pudens, the husband of Claudia, herself, her sister Eurgri, her brother Linus, and aunt Pomponia, being converted prior St. Paul's visit to Rome, the rest of the British royal family, Bran, Caractacus, Cyllinus and Cynon, were converted and baptized by St. Paul himself during his detention in that city preceding his first trial. That the palace of Pudens and Claudia was the home of St. Paul and the other apostles; that their four children, Timotheus, Novatus, Pudentiana and Praxedes, were instructed in the faith by St. Paul; and that Linus, the brother of Claudia and second son of Caractacus, was appointed by the same apostle first bishop of the Church of

Rome, such Church meeting at that time, and till the reign of Constantine, in the aforesaid palace, called indifferently "Domus Pudentis, Palatium Britannicum, Domus Apostolorum, Titulus, Pastor, St. Pudentiana."

13) That after the return of Caractacus to Siluria, St. Paul himself, following the footsteps -of his bishop and forerunner, Aristobulus, visited Britain, and confirmed the British Churches in the faith.

14) That the last days of St. Paul, preceding his martyrdom at Rome, were attended by Pudens, Claudia, Linus, Eubulus, whose salutations he sends in his dying charge to Timothy, and that his remains were interred by them in their family sepulchre.


15) That the foundations of the British Church were Apostolical, being coeval, within a few years, with those of the Pentecostal Church at Jerusalem—preceding those of the primitive Church of Rome, so far as they were laid by either an apostle or apostolic bishop, by seven years—preceding the arrival of St. Peter at Rome, as fixed by the great majority of Roman Catholic historians (thirteenth year of Nero), by thirty years—preceding the first arrival of the papal Church of Rome in Britain, under Augustine, by 456 years.

16) That the British Church has from its origin been a royal one; the royal family of ancient Britain—of whom our present sovereign is, through the Tudors, the lineal blood representative—being 1. the first British converts to Christianity; 2. the founders of the first Christian institutions in Britain; 3. the chief instruments, in the second century, in the establishment of Christianity as the state religion; and in the fourth century, in the persons of Helen and Constantine the Great, the chief instrument in the abolition of Paganism, and the substitution, in its place, of Christianity over the whole Roman Empire.

17) That the spiritual or ecclesiastical head of the British Church was always a Briton, resident in Britain, amenable to British laws, and British laws only, and having no superior in the Church but Christ.

18) That whatever may be the religious advantages or disadvantages of the union of the ecclesiastical and civil governments in the person of the Sovereign, such union has been, from the first colonization of our Island, first in Druidic and then in Christian times, the native British, as opposed to the foreign papal—and, in later times, dissenting—principle of their separation.





The above PowerPoint presentation is available at Pastor Eli's website:

www.anglo-saxonisrael.com

Parts 1 - 6 plus a short introduction can now be viewed or downloaded - the latest addition part 6 covers the German people in relation to the migrations of the Tribes of Israel.

**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

**"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the
Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
(Isaiah 2:3)."**

