CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE LATIN CHRONICLES AND SAINTS' LIVES TO OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE LITERATURE AND LEARNING OF [illegible]-ROMAN AND ANGLO-SAXON TIMES

by

JOHN PATRICK NOONAN

B. S., Rockhurst College, 1947

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of English

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1948

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The history of England before the Norman conquest is frequently obscured by the fantastic tales about great men who appeared during the period between the time of Christ and the coming of the Normans to England. These men were rulers, missionaries, founders of monasteries, and various papal representatives who were sent to unite the two factions of the church in England currently separated by the Pelagian heresy. The folk tales which grew up around these men are characteristic products of the imaginative Celtic mind, and folk lore so far overshadows the facts that it is most difficult for the modern student to disengage the man from the myth. However, by consulting various contemporary chronicles, by fitting together those elements that seem to be consistent with known historical events, and by omitting factors that are obviously the product of the imaginative literary minds, it is possible to come to a conclusion concerning the real character and personality of the man. This object the present study attempts to accomplish for Arthur and for various relatively unknown saints and scholars who established schools and kept alive literature and learning during the extremely troublous period from 55 B.C. to 1066 A.D.

What the study attempts to do for the historical personages, saints, and scholars, it also attempts to do in establishing authenticity of books and traditions of relatively unknown

schools and monasteries of early Britain. That is, in these fields, this study attempts to separate fact from fiction.

With the chronicles as a basis--those of Gildas, Nennius, Ordericus Vitalis, Asser, Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Geraldus Cambrensis, William of Newburg, Florence of Worcester, and Ingulf--the following four topics are considered: (1) The possibility of an historical Arthur, (2) The question of whether Geoffrey's Historia Regum Brittaniae is authentic history or a prose romance, (3) The early traditions of four ancient schools--Exeter, Malmesbury, St. David's, and Bangor, (4) The tales which surrounded the lives of the early less well-known saints, among the Celts, Roman Britons, and Anglo-Saxons--Joseph of Arimathaea, Lucius, Fugatius, Duvanus (Damian), Illtyd, Neot, and Nothelm.

The [illegible]L ARTHUR

The stories of Arthur and his knights of the Round Table have enchanted the literati for centuries. This study does not propose to deal with the many miraculous and mystical exploits of Arthur which have been the center of many scholarly discussions; it intends rather to bring together bits of isolated material which may be used as a foil to make the problem of an historical Arthur stand out a little more clearly in relief. In considering the possibility of an historical person who came to be known as Arthur, this study proposes to focus attention on the historical sources extant and, of course, to take into account what interpretation authentic historians have placed upon the material.

The original sources upon which evidences of an historical Arthur are based are the following: (1) Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, the autobiographical inscription of Lucius Artorius Castus; (2) De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae, of Gildas, commonly known as Gildas' Epistle; (3) Historia Britonum, a compilation of chronicles, generally attributed to Nennius; (4) The Annales Cambriae; and (5) The Chronicle of Geraldus Cambrensis. Various interpretations of these data are found in the following works: (1) James D. Bruce, The Evolution of the Arthurian Romance; (2) Lucy Allen Paton, the introduction to her translation of Geoffrey of Monmouth's History of the Kings of Britain;

(3) R. G. Collingwood and J. N. L. Myres, Roman Britain and the English Settlements; (4) Howard Maynadier, The Arthur of the English Poets; (5) William Allen Nitze, Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music; (6) J. A. Giles' translations of various chronicles; (7) Charles Oman, England Before the Norman Conquest; (8) Robert H. Fletcher, Arthurian Material in the Chronicles; and (9) Sir Edmund Chambers, Arthur of Britain.

A few facts of the history of early Britain are known beyond a doubt, and any expansion of these can only be done by gathering meager bits of information from a variety of sources and putting them together in an attempt to accumulate a complete body of knowledge. It is known that the Romans were on the island of Britain from 55 B.C. until c. 410 A.D. Early in the fifth century invasions of Picts and Scots from the north and the German tribes from the east were a constant terror to the local people. After the Roman legions withdrew, the Germanic tribes-- Angles, Saxons, and Jutes-- were able to force their way throughout the land, except the mountainous areas of Scotland and Wales. This infiltration took a century to complete, but the Germanic peoples were dauntless in their effort and met with only occasional set backs and a steady but not serious resistence by the Celts.

It is true that the evidences to prove that there was an historical Arthur are few, but it is not unlikely that some great leader arose among the Britons in their battles against

the Angles and Saxons. Gildas[1], who wrote at the time Arthur is thought to have lived, makes no mention of a person by the name of Arthur. However, in section twenty-five (25) of his Epistle, he speaks of a man of Roman descent who was in command of the Briton forces:

> ...that they (Britons) might not be brought to utter destruction, they took arms under the conduct of Ambrosius Aurelianus, a modest man, who of all the Roman nation was then alone in the confusion of his troubled period by chance left alone.

Gildas goes on to state that the Briton forces met with more success from that time (c. 500 A.D.) until the battle of Mount-hill (Mons Badonicus), when the enemy was defeated in a bloody battle. Later chroniclers report that this was one of the battles fought by Arthur, and it was an historical battle which was fought sometime in the first decade of the sixth century.

The question now arises as to why Gildas did not make more mention of Aurelianus, if this person and Arthur are one and the same person. Of course, the first reason is that Gildas' Epistle is generally regarded as a jeremiad; in the Epistle

---

[1] Gildas, surnamed by some, Sapiens (the Wise), wrote his Epistle, De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae in the middle of the sixth century. He was a Welsh monk and the earliest of the British historians whose work is still extant. The translation used was that of J. A. Giles published in Six Old English Chronicles, (London, Geo. Bell and Sons, 1900). The validity of Gildas' history before 410 A.D. is questioned by some historians. Charles Oman in his England before the Conquest says: "His (Gildas') account of the events between 383 and 410 is entirely unhistorical". It seems that the work is valid as a source for material after 410, the period most pertinent to the present study.

itself, Gildas says that he writes "rather by way of lamentation than from display". His purpose is to show the evil that has befallen his people and their inability to rise to meet the onslaught of the invading tribes. Further, it must be remembered that although Arthur was able to prevent the conquest of Wales, the Celtic defense of the whole island against the invading Saxons was a failure. From Gildas' point of view, it would probably appear that Aurelianus, or Arthur, (if Aurelianus really is Arthur) won a number of battles, but the Celts lost the war. Bruce draws the conclusion that this person at least had some connection with Arthur:

> ...it seems wiser...to recognize in him a man of Roman descent or a Romanized Celt, who, in these times of stress, attained the leadership of the British hosts. There is no need, therefore, of regarding him simply as a creature of popular imagination or of vaporizing him into a hypothetical culture divinity, as various scholars have done.[2]

It is generally accepted that Gildas was a thoroughly Romanized Celt. He spoke of the Romans as "illustrious defenders" and of the Britons as "rebels". With such a Roman leaning, it would seem natural to expect him to devote considerable time to praising the exploits of Ambrosius Aurelianus, even if the victories were only temporary. According to James D. Bruce, one of the most outstanding of the moderns for his work on the Arthurian legend, Gildas wrote about 540 A.D.; therefore, he probably would not have known, at the time, of the complete overthrow of the island by the Angle and Saxon tribes, which was not complete until 552, when the Britons were defeated near Salisbury. How-

---

[2] James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance (Baltimore, 1923), Vol. I, p. 4.

ever, for nearly a century, the influx of the Anglo-Saxons had been apparent, the first permanent settlement having been made prior to 450 A.D.

Howard Maynadier notes another reason why Gildas did not mention Arthur.

> There is further notice of this about 440, when, according to Annales Cambriæ, there was war in Britain between two chieftains--one named Ambrosius, perhaps the Ambrosius of Gildas, and the other, Vuitolinus, from his name evidently a native Briton. The descendants of the two parties probably cherished something of the old hostile feeling in the sixth century; and it is possible that Arthur belonged to the party opposed to Gildas, that is, to the patriotic British party. At least a twelfth-century Welsh tradition argues such a state of affairs. In the Life of Gildas (Vita Gildae), attributed to a Welsh priest, Caradoc of Lancarvan, about 1150, we learn that Gildas' brother was at feud with Arthur and was slain by him. And towards the end of the same century Geraldus Cambrensis writes:
>
> 'With regard to Gildas, who inveighs so bitterly against his own nation, the Britons affirm that, highly irritated at the death of his brother, the Prince of Albania, whom King Arthur had slain, he wrote these invectives, and upon the same occasion threw into the sea many excellent books, in which he had described the actions of Arthur, and the celebrated deeds of his countrymen; from which cause it arises that no authentic account of so great a prince is anywhere to be found.'[3]

There is yet another possibility which explains why Gildas did not mention the famous Arthur. It is possible that at the time Gildas wrote, Arthur was already a legendary person. There was found in Dalmatia, an ornate coffin which bore the following inscription:

> Lucius Arterius, the Incorruptible, offers prayers to the Gods of the Lower World (his household deities),

---

3 Howard Maynadier, The Arthur of the English Poets (Boston and New York, 1907), p. 28.

> and while still living dedicates this tablet to himself and his family. He was centurion or captain in four Roman legions; to wit, the Third Gallica, the Sixth Ferrata, the Second Adjutrix, and the Fifth Macedonica. Likewise he was ranking centurion of the last-mentioned legion and became commander of the fleet lying off Misenum (Naples). Then he was colonel of the Sixth Victrix Legion (stationed at York in Britain) and as dux or 'leader' headed an expedition of British infantry and cavalry auxiliaries against the Armoricans (in Gaul). Finally, he became imperial collector of the province of Liburnia (Northern Dalmatia) with power of life and death.[4]

Some scholars believe that Artorius is the family name which was later to become Arthur and later still King Arthur. If this person, who fought with the Sixth Legion, is the source of the Arthurian legend, then there is little doubt that his legends were flourishing four centuries later, when Gildas broke the long silence of the island with his Epistle. Since Gildas mentioned very few persons, it is hardly likely that he would have gone to the trouble of narrating about characters in the popular folk lore.

Four reasons have been cited why Gildas would hardly be expected to mention Arthur, and because of the absence of any other authentic chronicles between 400 and 550 A.D., it is impossible to say exactly which theory is correct in attempting to establish the existence of an historical Arthur. In fact, it seems that Gildas' relationship with Arthur in his writings is only accidental and without a very substantial foundation in spite of the fact that Arthur, if historical, is of much concern in the history of the period. Because Gildas wrote at the time

---

[4] The inscription follows Malone's translation of Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, III, 303, No. 1919. See William A. Nitze, Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music.

Arthur allegedly lived, supposition would naturally demand that he speak of some of the incidents and some of the people who were later to be associated with the Arthurian tales. This is of course the difficulty in using Gildas as a source for the historical Arthur. It seems impossible to point to one historical person, be it Ambrosius Aurelianus, Artorius, or the person who killed Gildas' brother Prince of Albania as the historical Arthur, but rather it would seem that Arthur is a combination of these three persons. Lucius Artorius Castus, who may have become something of a hero for the work he did while with the Roman Sixth Legion in York, and when he led the British infantry against the Amoricans, could easily be the foundation upon which later legends of King Arthur are based.

When the Romans withdrew from the island, they left the natives without a national tradition or background. They did not yet have a national hero, a person to lend prestige to their country. Of course, they had Caractus and Queen Boadicea; but their characters were well known and their place in history already fixed. The United States was in a very similar position after the revolution, and George Washington was chosen as the person in whom the pride of the nation could center; and what person does not know of some of the half-mythical tales of this famous man? It seems only natural then that the Britons would choose a man who had been their most successful leader in battle. But here arises the question of an anachronism when the battle of Bath-hill is attributed to Arthur or Artorius. It is well to

remember that Arthur was not associated with the battle until c. 800 A.D., when Nennius is said to have written his Historia Britonum, unless, of course, Nennius had access to some old records of which nothing is known today. In the first place, there were no known written records of the period to furnish an exact date; and, further, the chroniclers were not exact even when there were written records for them to use. Dates were unimportant to those ancient historians as long as they were able to continue their histories as they had heard them by oral tradition or as they were able to arrive at what seemed to be sound conclusions. As will be seen, the later chroniclers also fell into the same fallacies. Obviously, Arthur did not kill nine hundred and forty men by his own hand in one battle, certainly an indication that Nennius was liable to inaccurate history.

> The twelfth was a most severe contest, when Arthur penetrated the hill of Badon (Bath). In this engagement, nine hundred and forty fell by his hand alone, no one but the Lord affording him assistance. In all these engagements the Britons were successful. For no strength can avail the Almighty.[5]

Here the legends of Arthur are clearly seen; undoubtedly the killing of such a large number of persons single handed is inaccurate, but this does not exclude the fact that there was a battle of Bath-hill and that it was a great victory for the Celts. Both R. G. Collingwood and Charles Oman agree that,

---

[5] Nennius flourished about 796. He was a Welsh Monk and is given credit for having compiled Historia Britonum. The translation of his work which is used in this discussion is by J. A. Giles, (London, 1900).

in spite of the element of the fantastic, there is no reason to disbelieve the historical authenticity of the battle itself.

Nennius calls Arthur a leader of battles (dux bellorum), indicating that Arthur was not one of the high nobility. This trait fits exactly the Lucius Artorius of the Inscriptionum, who was also a leader in battles; in fact, Lucius Artorius refers to himself as "dux", the exact title used by Nennius. He certainly was not one of the conquerors of Rome, as some romancers allege.

The manner in which the stories of Arthur grew is comparable to a snowball rolling down a hill. The story grew and was added to slowly, at first, and picked up momentum and characteristics until it reached its climax with Geoffrey of Monmouth, who made Arthur the center of literary attraction and produced the real national hero which the Britons had been trying to build for centuries.

Geoffrey was very careful to portray King Arthur in a sense that would appeal to everyone, being careful to have no scar on his character. However, other sources indicate that Arthur was not the sterling hero he is represented as being throughout the romance. The unknown authors of the old manuscripts which Rees[6] published, note several instances which indicated that Arthur's character was little better than that of any other leader in Wales at the time. In the life of St. Gwynllu, Arthur and some of his men are said to have attempted to steal Gwynllu's wife because Arthur wanted to have the lady

---

[6] W. J. Rees, Cambro-British Saints (Llandovery, 1853), p. 480.

himself; although it was the first time he had seen her. At another time, Arthur and a group of thieves stole cattle from the hermit, St. Cadoc; however, the saint forgave him.

Theoretically new problems and new possibilities arise, concerning the name "Arthur". In chapter thirty-two (32) of his work, Gildas mentions Cuneglasus, whose dominion was North Cambria between Severn and the Western Sea, and by way of reprimand, calls him a bear. The old Celtic word for bear is artos. It is not inconceivable that the Celts may have referred to this ruler as a bear or artos. R. G. D. Nicholson regards the name as being composed of two Celtic words artos and viros (man), and identifies the person referred to in Gildas as Arthur.

The possibility that Arthur's name is derived from the "bear" root is entirely speculative. Since speculation to such an extent is possible, there seems to be the possibility that Arthur could be related in some remote way to his contemporary, Beowulf, ("bee wolf" or "bear"). After all, the Angles and Saxons had been present on the island for nearly a century when Gildas wrote, and were deeply rooted by the time of Nennius. It is best, perhaps, to minimize the importance of such an imaginative approach and place the emphasis on the few historical data which come out of this obscure period.

The Breton Lays of Marie de France is evidence that there was available in Brittany, a great body of Celtic folklore upon which Geoffrey of Monmouth might draw when he wrote his Historia Regum Britanniae, but whether he had a book on the ancient kings of Britain will probably never be known. The key to Geoffrey's authenticity as an historian lies in the mystery of the book in the ancient British tongue which Geoffrey said Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, had given him to translate. Geoffrey leaves little doubt in the reader's mind that he did have a book, as written in his history:

> Now, whilst I was thus thinking upon such matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, a man learned not only to the art of eloquence, but in the histories of foreign lands, offered me a certain most ancient book in the British language that did set forth the doings of them all in due succession and order from Brute, the first King of the Britons, onward to Cadwallador, the son of Cadwallo, all told in stories of exceeding beauty. At his request, therefore, albeit that never have I gathered gay flowers of speech in other men's little gardens, and am content with mine own rustic manner of speech and mine own writing-reeds, have I been at the pains to translate this volume into the Latin tongue.[7]

The problem which surrounds Geoffrey's work is most confusing when it is noted that, for the most part, his contemporaries did not doubt that he was telling the truth, and that he had a book to prove the statements which he made in tracing "the doings

---

[7] Geoffrey of Monmouth, Histories of the Kings of Britain, Tr. Lucy Allen Paton (London, 1912), p. 1

of them all (kings) in due succession and order". On the other hand, modern scientific scholarship refuses to accept Geoffrey's account of the British kings as authentic. The members of this modern school doubt that Geoffrey ever had a book in his possession as the basis of his Historia.

Existing documents to prove that Geoffrey did or did not have a book are very few. One must, therefore, proceed cautiously because much of the evidence is based on conjectures. However, he should be willing to accept the conjectures of a few well disciplined minds--minds which have studied the period thoroughly and are able to see the particulars in the case of Geoffrey. The danger of this speculation lies in the fact that the undisciplined mind will accept these few suppositions or generalities and arrive at a fallacious conclusion. When the door is once opened to generalizations, confusion will predominate the picture.

Perhaps a look into the life of Geoffrey and the environment which surrounded him and the various factors which influenced him would help determine the validity of his writings. He was born in Wales, probably in Monmouth, about 1100. At an early age, he was sent to live with his uncle Uchtyrd, who was then the Archdeacon of Llandaff. As early as 1129, he was under the influence of the scholars at Oxford, and by 1130 his first edition of the Historia appeared. In 1140, he was made Archdeacon of Llandaff to succeed his uncle, who had been consecrated bishop of that see. Geoffrey, himself, was not ordained priest until a few days before being consecrated bishop, in 1152, of the

small see of St. Asaph, which he had not visited at the time of his death three years later.

It is evident that Geoffrey's life was close to the church, and, in all probability, he was a member of a monastic order. Whether he took his religious position seriously is hard to say, because he was not ordained priest until so late in life. However, since he did live by the Rule, and since he did maintain ecclesiastical prestige--he was promoted to bishop--it seems very unlikely that he would have used the name of one of his superiors, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, in any hoax which he conjured up to pass off as a truth. It does not seem likely that a man would be promoted, even outside the church, if he had injured his superior, as he would have injured him if he lied. In addition, Walter was a man of high intellectual standing who certainly would not have been willing to have a shadow cast upon his own integrity. Of course, these are speculations, but they should not be overlooked.

Authors of the Middle Ages quoted their source in order to give their own work prestige. Geoffrey was living up to the customs of the time when he quoted a source for his material.

Examples of this are seen in the writings of Layamon[8], Henry

---

8 Layamon, Brute, p. 1. "...Layamon began to journey wide over this land, and procured the noble books which he took for pattern. He took in Latin, that Saint Albin made, and the fair Austin, who brought baptism in hither; the third book he took, and laid there in the midst, that a French clerk made, who was named Wace, who well could write; and he gave it to the noble Eleanor, who was the high King Henry's queen."

of Huntingdon[9], Chaucer[10], Lydgate[11], and many others.

It is well to draw together, first the people who accept Geoffrey's work as authentic or at least admit that he had that very special book which Walter was supposed to have given him; and, secondly, the material and the arguments which indicate that the Historia was a hoax.

In the first place, those who accept Geoffrey's work present some of the most convincing evidence in favor of Geoffrey. For the most part, writers and scholars who were contemporaries of Geoffrey accepted his work without equivocation. As Charles Lethridge Kingford states in The Cambridge History of English Literature:

> In England a long line of chroniclers, in both prose and verse, from Layamon and Robert of Gloucester down to Grafton and Hollinshed, accepted Geoffrey in all good faith as a revealer of the 'marvelous current of forgotten things', while a host of poets, great and small, have been constantly haunted by his fables.[12]

It is most difficult to by-pass this group of learned men who had no qualms about the honesty of Geoffrey, because some of these men knew him personally, and they knew the customs of the times better than any of our modern scholars can possibly know them.

---

[9] Henry of Huntingdon, History of the English, Tr. Thomas Forester (London, 1853), p. 1. "At your suggestion, also I have followed as far as possible, the Ecclesiastical History of the venerable Bede, making extracts, also from other authors, with compilations from the chronicles preserved in ancient libraries."

[10] Geoffrey Chaucer, The Legend of Women, Line 470. "...what so myn auctour mente...".

[11] In his Troy Book, John Lydgate frequently refers to his source, Guido della Colonne.

[12] Charles Lithridge Kingford, The Cambridge History of English Literature, Vol. I (New York, 1933), p. 139.

It does not seem just to throw out Geoffrey's work because of the criticism which was offered by William of Newbergh. In the first place, there is no known book from which Geoffrey is said to have taken his material, so he cannot be accused of presenting matter falsely. Secondly, if he were inexact in his presentations, he was only doing what all the chroniclers of the time made a practice of doing. To quote the Dictionary of National Biography, in speaking of William of Newbergh:

> He alone gives us not so much the facts, or what passed for facts, as the philosophy of history. His facts indeed are not always exact, and his dates are rarely so. Like William of Malmesbury, William of Newbergh purposed to write, not a chronicle but a history.[13]

William of Malmesbury, who wrote shortly before either Geoffrey or Newbergh falls into the school with Geoffrey and forms a background for the later chronicles. It may be that, since Robert Duke of Gloucester was his patron as well as Geoffrey's, their material would be much the same. In any event, Malmesbury usually followed his sources, Gildas and Nennius, but added his own ideas or chose only one when the two originals clashed. At least it can be seen that he has leanings toward the romance in the following passage:

> It was of this Arthur that the Britons fondly tell so many fables, even to the present day; a man worthy to be celebrated, not only by idle fictions but by authentic history.[14]

---

[13] Kate Norgate, Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. VII (London, 1922), p. 362.

[14] William of Malmesbury, History of the Kings of England, Tr. C. A. Giles (London, 1847), Introduction, p. xi.

Another of the chroniclers of the period, Henry of Huntingdon, may be considered to have accepted the same notion of Arthur as did Geoffrey. Henry describes the battles of Arthur in detail as though he were present to record the events. Henry later added material to his chronicle which he took from Geoffrey's work.

When Henry was on a journey to Rome, he wrote a letter to Serinus in the early part of 1139 stating that he found a copy of Geoffrey's Historia at the Monastery of Bec in Normandy. He noticed that the chronicle was more complete than his own, so he summarized the sections which he had not put into his work so someday he could complete it.

Contemporary with Geoffrey then, there seems to have been no antagonism toward his work. The scholar as well as the layman must have agreed with him even if the agreement was only by implication.

Since Robert Duke of Gloucester was a very powerful and prominent figure in England at the time of Geoffrey and at the same time Geoffrey's patron, it would not be to Geoffrey's credit were he to involve a man of the rank and dignity of Robert in a forgery.

Thus far, evidence has been presented which would indicate the possibility that Geoffrey had in his possession a book which Walter had given to him and which the other chroniclers never had. It is not possible to say that he did or did not have a book; the final answer will be drawn by conjecture and by balancing the

evidence which is at hand. As scientific scholarship hesitates to base an answer on conjectures, it is natural that it weighs the facts very delicately and must therefore, come out with the answer that Geoffrey was not an historian but an author of the first prose romance. As far as the more recent authorities are concerned, there is little reason to believe that Geoffrey had the book, the basis for discussion rests upon the motive for which Geoffrey wrote. Did he write to gain personal prestige, to impress the Normans who were in power at the time, to provide a hero for the people of the island, or was he merely writing down in detail the tales and folklore which were common? Any one of these motives or any combination of them may be the answer.

William of Newbergh is the person who is responsible for the first denunciation of Geoffrey's Historia. Because of his criticism of Geoffrey, Freeman has given William the title, "the father of historical criticism".[15]

Geraldus Cambrensis, on two occasions, offers the most striking proof that Geoffrey was not offering an authentic history. Geraldus was a Welshman, and since it is believed that Geoffrey also was Welsh, the likelihood is that Geraldus should have been in sympathy with Geoffrey. In the first instance, Geraldus makes a rather humorous allusion to Geoffrey's Historia:

> He said, that the spirit of gluttony and surfeit was in every respect sordid; but that the spirit of luxury and lust was more beautiful than others in appearance, though in fact most foul. If the evil spirits opposed him too much, the Gospel of St. John was placed on his bosom, when, like birds, they immediately vanished; but when that book

---

[15] Edward A. Freeman, The History of the Norman Conquest (New York, 1876), Vol. V, p. 506.

> was removed, and the History of the Britons, by Geoffrey Arthur was substituted in its place, they instantly reappeared in greater numbers, and remained a longer time than usual on his body and on the book.[16]

and again:

> The name of Wales was not derived from Wallo, a general of Wondolona, the queen as the fabulous history of Geoffroy Arthurius falsely maintains, because neither of these personages are to be found amongst the Welsh; but it arose from a barbarian appellation.[17]

To be sure, this denunciation of Geoffrey's scholarship and learning by a person who lived in the same country in which Geoffrey is supposed to have lived, is a most profound indication that Geoffrey's prestige was beginning to falter only 50 years after his death, when Geraldus wrote. And Geraldus was correct in his criticism of Geoffrey because the Welsh were looked upon as foreigners. The Saxon word for foreigner is weal, from which the name Wales is derived.

Modern scholars are quick to take a stand in sympathy with William and Geraldus. James Douglas Bruce readily agrees with Geoffrey's two contemporaries who criticised him. Bruce, like the rest of the moderns, proceeds very slowly and bases much of his material on the conjectures which must be drawn to arrive at a suitable answer to the problem which surrounds Geoffrey.

> To few works in the history of literature can the much-abused term, 'epoch-making' be justly applied as to Geoffrey's Historia. Under any supposition, it was indubitably the most notable production in the Arthurian field that had appeared to that date, and in all probability, it was owing to the influence of this book, direct

---

16 Geraldus Cambrensis, The Itinerary Through Wales, Tr. Sir Richard Colt Hoare, Ed. Thomas Wright (London, 1863), p. 409.

17 Ibid., p. 439.

> and indirect, that the Arthurian stories leapt into general literary popularity just at this time. The conception of Arthur as a great medieval monarch, the ideal representative of chivalry--not a merely fairy-tale king--originated we may say, entirely with Geoffrey of Monmouth.[18]

It seems incorrect to give the entire honor of originating the Arthurian legend to Geoffrey, even if Geoffrey is considered to be the one who caused the stories to gain such a wide popularity. As has been seen, William of Malmesbury, who wrote before Geoffrey, alluded to Arthur as being worthy of more than "idle fictions but of authentic history". Moreover, Henry of Huntingdon, who wrote his History of the English between 1125 and 1130, goes into detail in describing the battles in which Arthur participated. These two works prove that Geoffrey was not the first to attempt to make an historical person of Arthur, not to mention Nennius who wrote 800 years earlier. And, further, from William of Malmesbury's work it is seen that Arthur was accepted through tradition and folklore; perhaps then, Geoffrey was not merely writing down tales which were common to all the people, but he was at the same time giving a new life to the stories and coloring them from his imagination. It is not the purpose of this paper to dispute Mr. Bruce but to agree with him in his contention that Geoffrey's work was a piece of literature and not a work of authentic history except in so far as the document can be used to know of the customs of the times.

Bruce also believes that Geoffrey had no more than a super-

---

18 James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300 (Baltimore, 1923), p. 80.

ficial acquaintance with Welsh and therefore could not have translated a Welsh book into Latin. But history and philology show there was very little difference between Welsh and Breton languages until after the time of Henry I. Since the difference was so slight or none at all, it is apparent that Geoffrey could very well have been able to make the translation if he had the book.

Howard Maynadier has this to say about the probability that Geoffrey used a book which Walter had given him to translate:

> Nor were Geoffrey's own statements about the sources of his history calculated to allay doubt. His assertion in his first chapter was that Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, had given him 'a very important and very ancient book in the British tongue', from which he got his material. In his conclusion, he advised William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon not to mention the kings of Britain since they have not, 'the book in the British tongue', which Walter brought out of Britain (France). These references to his source, especially the latter, which is probably facetious, have not inspired belief in 'the book in the British tongue'".[19]

Professor Zimmer sees a connection between the incidents in Geoffrey's *Historia* and things and places which were especially interesting to the Normans. He sees a relation between the way Arthur divides the land of the countries which he conquered with the manner William the Conqueror did when he came to England. York, London, and Lincoln were important to Arthur and they were also important to the Normans.[20]

---

19 Howard Maynadier, *The Arthur of the English Poets* (Boston, 1907), p. 40.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

Lucy Allen Paton, a translator of Geoffrey's History of the Kings of Britain speaks in regard to the historical validity of Geoffrey:

> The Normans after their half-century's occupation of England were beginning to take a keen interest in the past history of their newly-acquired domain, and to turn with zest to the traditions of early Britain. But the taste of the Norman noble demanded something less mysterious, less fantastic, and less remote from his own world than Celtic myth afforded him, and also something more polished and entertaining than the bare chronicles at his disposal. Latin was still the recognized vehicle for serious literary productions, and ecclesiastics as well as nobles, were the patrons of letters. Geoffrey had a peculiarly facile nature, an eager intelligence, and a distinctly inventive turn of mind; he was a student, an accomplished Latin scholar, and the master of a finished style. Quickly he perceived the trend of men's thoughts, and saw an opportunity of winning distinction for himself, while catering to the taste of the time.[31]

William Henry Schofield flatly condemns the validity of Geoffrey as an historian but gives him his just due as an author of a great piece of literature:

> For the history of the early Britons, every English chronicler who treated that theme relied more or less confidently on the disclosures of one of the most brilliant of literary impostors, Geoffrey of Monmouth, whose Historia Regum Britanniae was by far the most permanently influential literary product of the time.[32]

With a cloud still hanging over the case of Geoffrey and only circumstantial evidence to prove that he did not have a book, with the sanction of Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, Robert,

---

31 Geoffrey of Monmouth, History of the Kings of Britain, Tr. Lucy Allen Paton (New York, 1913), p. xvi.

32 William Henry Schofield, Mythical Bards (Cambridge, 1920), p. 37.

Duke of Gloucester, and most of his contemporaries to prove that his work was valid, it is necessary to reach a conclusion based on another conjecture. It is so much easier for a person to see a thing the way he would like for it to be than the way it really is. Now if this same principle were applied to the people who lived when Geoffrey wrote, it is possible to see that they would have accepted him without a doubt. The natives of the island were only too glad to recognize that their race and government had descended from the noble beginnings of the great Greek and Roman world, and that Arthur had been their ruler. The Normans were happy to recognize that they had conquered a nation of such illustrious ancestry.

Since Geoffrey was a man of exceptional mental ability, it is not hard to believe that herein he saw his opportunity for fame and for the good will of the Normans, who were in power. It is easy to conjecture that he even saw an opportunity to draw the two peoples together into a unified country.

These conjectures are basically the reasons why modern scholars doubt Geoffrey's validity as an historian. Since human nature changes very little, there seems to be sufficient grounds for the doubt which prevails in the modern scientific mind, and for the assumption that Geoffrey was the author of a great prose romance and not an authentic history.

Other authors have done the same as Geoffrey. There is Shakespeare who wrote his historical plays which are based on history and they contain many exact historical facts, but one

would hesitate to use these plays as a source for authentic history. History has always been a fertile field for fiction. Various versions of Joan of Arc, The Civil War, Charlemagne, and many other events and people of history are known primarily through fiction.

By way of summary, it will be noted that there are two sides in the controversy of Geoffrey. For the most part, the contemporaries of Geoffrey, that is, Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, and Robert, Duke of Gloucester, accepted Geoffrey as authentic. Contrary to this, modern scholars seem to be of the opinion that Geoffrey was a teller of tales and had no liber upon which to base his Historia. Among these modern scholars are Charles Kingford, James Douglas Bruce, Howard Maynadier, Lucy Allen Paton, and William Henry Schofield.

ANCIENT BRITISH SCHOOLS

Our modern civilization owes no little amount of gratitude to the schools of early England. Out of these schools grew much of our literature, law, and history. For literature one looks to Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was one of the greatest contributors to the prose romance. Alfred the Great did much to lay a background for our modern system of law, and Bede and William of Newbergh were the precursors of modern scholarship in history. These men are all products of the ancient schools. And there are many other outstanding figures such as St. Aldhelm, AElfric, St. David, and St. Hilda who depended either directly or indirectly on monastic education.

It would be impossible, in the limited space and time available, to give a detailed account of all the early English schools represented in the chronicles. Only four of the schools of which very little is known at the present, but which seem to have played a very important part in the early history of England shall be considered here. These four are Malmesbury, Bangor, St. David's, and Exeter. Such important and well known schools as Jarrow, Canterbury, Durham, Winchester, Glastonbury, and St. Alban's will not be treated here, because the history of these schools is already well known.

Malmesbury

Malmesbury grew from the hermitage of a poor Irish monk named Maildubh, who, becoming tired of dissension and strife in his native Ireland, found Malmesbury a peaceful place to retire from the rest of the world. This was about 637 when there were few Saxon Christians but enough British Christians in the vicinity for him to carry on his work as a teacher. Because of his teachings Maildubh gradually drew a group of persons about him and the colony eventually became a monastery.[23]

Malmesbury's fame spread and soon it was recognized as a seat of learning under the brilliant Irish scholar. When the West Saxons invaded and conquered Malmesbury, they did no damage to the school, but rather, the conquering king sent a relative of his there for education. Aldhelm was his name, the person who was later to become abbot and guide the school out of the dregs of poverty in which it existed. William of Malmesbury mentions the difficult time this young school had to support itself:

> This circumstance I have thought proper to mention, because Bede had left no account of the duration of his (Aldhelm) episcopacy, and to disguise a fact which I learn from the chroniclers, would be against my conscience; besides, it affords an opportunity for making mention of a distinguished man, who by a mind clear, and almost divinely

---

[23] George F. Brown, St. Aldhelm, His Life and Times (London, 1903), p. 44.

> inspired, advanced the monastery of Malmesbury, where I carry on my earthly warfare, to the highest pitch. This monastery was so splendidly endowed by Maildulph[24], a Scot[25], as they say, by nation, a philosopher by erudition, a monk by profession, that its members could scarcely procure their daily subsistence; but Leutherius, after long and due deliberation, gave it to Aldhelm, a monk of the same place, to be governed by him with the authority then possessed by bishops.[26]

This appointment was made about 672; from then on Malmesbury grew in fame and wealth under the able leadership of Aldhelm, until 705, when he was made bishop of Sherborne. During this period he built a church which was still in use at the time of the Norman invasion four hundred years later.

Malmesbury eventually became a favorite with the Saxon kings, because generous donations were made to it at various times. Perhaps much of this favor was because of the favorable geographic position of the monastery. It was inland and therefore free from the assaults of the Danes, who constantly ravaged the coasts. Further, it was situated on one of the important highways connecting London with the west, and many of the traveling government officials and nobility were constantly passing through and found safety and rest at Malmesbury. In c. 978 Athelstane honored the school.

> He accordingly restored monasteries, built churches, and made offerings on the holy altars of the most costly decorations. Malmesbury, in especial, (at which place he had with due honor entombed his two kinsmen, Elwin and Athelston, the sons of his uncle Athelward, who had been slain by the Danes, at the battle of Brunesford), he

---

24 Maildulph is also spelled Maildulf and Maildubh.
25 The Scots at this time were the people whom we today call Irish.
26 William of Malmesbury, History of the Kings of England, Tr. J. A. Giles (London, 1847), p. 33.

> favored and exalted with a singular degree of attention, and magnified and honored the place beyond all other monasteries with numerous privileges; and at last, when Atropos prematurely cutting short his thread, he departed this life, he was interred there, and there he now reposes.[27]

Again in 970 Malmesbury is honored in having received the aid of King Edgar:

> At this period also, having expelled clerks from the monastery at Malmesbury, who his brother Edwin, after ejecting the monks, had iniquitously intruded therein, he recalled the monks, and appointed Elfric abbot over them, a man at that time most celebrated for his attention to ecclesiastical duties.[28]

These bits of information which appear in the chronicles do not give us much information about the school except that it was held in high esteem down through the years by the royalty and that it grew and prospered from a very meager and humble beginning, having been one of the few places to escape plunder at the hands of the Saxons and later of the Danes. It produced great men in diverse fields, such as Aethelm, first bishop of Whithorn; Athelhard, Bishop of Winchester and Archbishop of Canterbury; Aelfric, Bishop of Crediton; Faricius of Arrezzo, physician and monk, later abbot of Abingdon; Oliver or Elmer, mechanician, astronomer and aeronaut; and the famous chronicler, William Somerset or William of Malmesbury.[29]

---

[27] Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers, Tr. Henry T. Riley (London, 1854), p. 77.

[28] Ib'd., p. 85.

[29] Catholic Encyclopedia, passim, Vol. IX, p. 572.

Bangor

The school at Bangor thrusts a great deal of confusion into the picture of early British schools, simply because there were four places known by the same name. There was a monastery of Bangor in Flintshire, another in Ireland, a bishopric in Caernarvonshire, and in Scotland a place called Bangour in Linlithgow. The chroniclers manage to confuse the four places, especially those of Flint and Caernarvon. Perhaps some of the reason for the confusion is because of the name Bangor. Montelembert attempts to explain the reason for the several places which were named Bangor in the British islands. He interprets Bangor to mean magnus circulus, which was a generic name for monastery congregations or enclosures. This seems a very logical deduction because of the influence of the Druids. The Christian monks were encouraged to make use of the Druid religious shrines which were always built in a circle. Thomas Wright notes another possibility for the etymological interpretation of the word:

> But the historian Cressy places the date of its (Bangor's) foundation in 516, and adds, "In the same place Medgo Conan not long after built a city which for the beauty of its situation he called Ban-cor, i.e. the high or conspicuous choir."[30]

Because of the number of places called Bangor, it seems most

---

30 Geraldus Cambrensis, The Itinerary Through Wales, Tr. Sir Richard Colt Hoare, Ed. Thomas Wright (London, 1863), p. 445.

probable that it was a Celtic generic word for circle or enclosure, having some connection, perhaps, with Druid shrines.

The college in Caernarvonshire never grew to the greatness that was enjoyed by the Flintshire school, which at one time had more than two thousand monks within its walls. There seems to be no proof that there was a cathedral school at Bangor in Caernarvonshire, but it is fairly safe to assume that there was, because it was the general rule of the time that a bishopric supported a cathedral school. The Bangor bishopric in Caernarvonshire grew and was one of the most important of the seven sees in Wales.

Confusion also reigns as regards the founders of the two institutions. Wright in his edition of Geraldus Cambrensis has this to say of the founding of the two Bangors:

> The cathedral church must not be confused with the celebrated college of the same name, in Flintshire, founded by Dunod Vawr, son of Pabo, a chieftain who lived about the beginning of the sixth century, and from him called Bangor Dunod. The Bangor, i.e. the college, in Caernarvonshire is properly called Bangor Deiniol, Bangor Vawr yn Arllechwedh, and Bangor Vawr uch Conwy. It owes its origin to Deiniol, son of Dunod ap Pabo, a saint who lived in the early part of the sixth century, and in the year 525 founded this college at Bangor in Caernarvonshire, over which he presided as abbot.[31]

Here Wright speaks of the cathedral in Caernarvonshire and again calls it a college; he is justified in so doing because it had been a school and was raised to the dignity of a bishopric, and Deiniol was elected the first bishop in about 550. Montalembert gives the credit of the founding of the school to Illtyd or Iltut,

---

31 Ibid., p. 443.

but some allowance here must be made for the French partiality, because Illtyd was an American.

The explanation given here by Count de Montelombert is a mixture of tradition and folklore. Illtyd was a disciple of St. Germanus of Auxerre, and is said to have come to Wales to feast on the glory of his cousin, King Arthur. Now, as has been seen, it is possible that there was no such person as Arthur existing at this time (c. 500), and there seems to be little reason for believing that Illtyd was the founder of Bangor.

Illtyd was supposed to have been a brigand and to have been converted by a miracle. He and his companion robbed the monastery of Llandeavan of food, and the earth opened up and swallowed the loot. Because of this, Illtyd devoted his life to God in solitude and even left his young wife whom he is said to have founded Bangor--which one, is not known.

If Illtyd were the real founder of the monastery, it is not necessary to believe he had any relationship to the person called King Arthur. It was the practice to connect as many incidents of the early sixth century as possible with Arthur because of the prestige which the association would lend. Glastonbury certainly profited by its association with Arthur; there was no reason why later historians would not try to borrow prestige by association with this well known personage.[32]

The belief that Illtyd established some monastery in north-

---

32 Count de Montelombert, The Monk of the West, passim, Vol. I (New York, 1905), pp. 669-670.

ern Wales is well founded, but whether this was one of the Bangors it is impossible to say.

In any case, the monastery was founded near the first of the sixth century; it grew steadily and was the center of monastic life in North Wales. In 603 A.D.[33] when St. Augustine was on the island, Bangor greatly resented his teachings. When Augustus called a meeting of the bishops, he also summoned a delegation of theologians from Bangor. The monks refused to teach the gospel to the Saxons, and they further refused to be under an archbishop, an office set up by St. Augustine at Canterbury. When Augustine heard the monks, he prophesied that one day the monastery would undergo a severe punishment for its reluctance to serve as it should. Dinooth was at this time their abbot.

It was only a short time later that the prophesy was fulfilled. Henry of Huntingdon describes the massacre as follows:

> 603. For afterwards Ethelfrid, the formidable king of the English, of whom we have spoken, having assembled a vast army, made an immense slaughter of the perfidious nation at the city of the legions which is called by the English people Lege-ceaster[34], but by the Britains, more correctly Caer-legion. When about to give battle, observing their priests, who had gathered to offer prayers to God on behalf of the soldiers engaged in the conflict, standing in a place of some safety, he inquired who they were, and for what purpose they were thus assembled? Most of them belonged to the monastery of Bangor, in which it is reported the number of monks was such, that when the monastery was divided into seven parts, with a superinten-

---

33 Roger of Wendover, Henry of Huntingdon, and Florence of Worchester set the date of this meeting as 603 A.D. while Geoffrey of Monmouth puts the date at 607 A.D.

34 Lege-ceaster is a city not far from the site of the Flintshire abbey. It must not be confused with Caerleon which is located in the southern part of Wales.

dent for each, none of these divisions contained less than 300 men who all lived by manual labor. Many of these having completed three-days' fast, had now among others joined the army to offer their prayers, having one named Bromail as their companion to protect them while they were thus engaged from the swords of the barbarians. When King Ethelfrid was informed of the occasion of their coming he said, "If, then, they invoke their God against us, they are armed as though they oppose us with their hostile imprecations." He therefore commanded that the first attack should be made on them, and then destroyed the remainder of the impious army, not without great loss of his own troops. Of those who came to pray, it is said that about 1200 were slain, and 50 only escaped by flight.[35]

Saint David's

With the Ethelfrid massacre, the history of Bangor in Flintshire faded gradually, but the popularity of another school in Wales came to the fore; this was St. David's, earlier known as Menevia. It may be said that St. David is the St. Patrick of Wales. On St. David's Day, the Welsh wear a leek in honor of the great battle which St. David is supposed to have fought with the Saxons.

The history of St. David is mixed with folklore and with the Arthurian legend. A brief look at the life of the noted Saint is a necessity here to see how the name of St. David should find a place so near the heart of the Welsh people. To them, he was another St. Benedict, founder of the Benedictine Order, as can be seen from the tradition which has come down about him.

---

35 Henry of Huntingdon, History of the English, Tr. Thomas Forester (London, 1853), pp. 81-82.

St. David founded twelve monasteries as did St. Benedict; he was exposed to the danger of being poisoned by his own monks, as was Benedict; and lastly he ruled his house much as did St. Benedict. The monks under David lived close to the land and even did the work with their own hands, such as pulling a plough, which was work usually set aside for the oxen.

The monastery was under a continual danger of attack from the few remaining Druids who had not been destroyed in Britain, having been spared the persecution which their ranks had suffered in Gaul.

The earlier life of David is mixed with the Arthurian romance. Geoffrey of Monmouth says that David was King Arthur's uncle. Geraldus, whose history is probably more reliable, says that Arthur was David's great uncle. In the words of Geraldus:

> He was the son of a nun whom the king of the country--a nephew of great Arthur met upon the public road, and whom, struck by her beauty, he instantly made the victim of his passion.[36]

David received his education from a scribe named Paulinus and emerged from this learning a priest devoted to a monastic existence. However, he traveled widely even to the Continent and was influenced wherever he went. He built the monastery of Menevia, which was later called St. David's, and which grew to be a national shrine after the famous Saint was buried there. Many monasteries, churches, and cathedrals were placed under the

---

[36] Count de Montelambert, The Monks of the West (New York, 1905), p. 617.

patronage of St. David, and confusion resulted as in the case of Bangor. The early historians had reason for confusion in the case of St. David's monastery, because all the early churches so named in the chronicles were located in Wales and the geographic proximity of the churches makes it hard to distinguish exactly which church is meant in each case.

Even Glastonbury entered into this confusion through St. David's connection with it. As is seen in the chronicle of William of Malmesbury:

> He (St. David) established the antiquity and sanctity of the church by a divine oracle; for purposing to dedicate it, he came to the spot with his seven suffragan bishops, and everything being prepared for due celebration of the solemnity, on the night, as he purposed preceding it, he gave way to profound repose. When all his senses were steeped in rest, he beheld the Lord Jesus standing near, and mildly inquiring the cause of this arrival; and on his immediately disclosing it, the Lord diverted him from his purpose by saying, That the church had been already dedicated by himself in honour of his Mother, and that the ceremony was not to be profaned by human repetition."[37]

Because of this vision, St. David did not re-dedicate the school, but at once built another so it would not appear that he had done nothing.

St. David then returned to his own school at Menevia, where he died of old age. Because St. David was a man of such great prestige and because he was so dear to the hearts of all the Welsh, St. David's monastery grew and became one of the most lasting shrines of England. The school itself became over-

---

37 William of Malmesbury, History of the Kings of England, Tr. J. A. Giles (London, 1847), p. 20.

shadowed by the popularity of the shrine and, as was the case in those early times, the monastery was often the victim of attack. Asser notes a devastating seige which took place in about 884:

> For my friends hoped that they should sustain less tribulation and harm from King Hemeid, who often plundered that monastery and the parish of St. Regus[38], and sometimes expelled the prelates, as they expelled archbishop Novis[39], my relation, and myself; if in any manner I could secure the notice and friendship of the king.[40]

The chronicles give only sketchy information on the history of St. David's following this raid, but that it existed at least as an important bishopric is evident. Florence of Worcester mentions three different people who became bishops of St. David's in the eleventh and twelfth century. In 1006, Tremerin, bishop of St. David's died. In 1115, another bishop of St. David's died, Wolfrid by name, and at his death Bernard, the Queen's chancellor, was chosen bishop.[41]

In the time of Geraldus Cambrensis, (c. 1200), St. David's for the first time recognized its subjection to the see of Canterbury. At this time, also, the first Norman bishop was appointed to St. David's. The venerable shrine was in a state of poor repair when Geraldus made his visit there as he tells in his Itinerary Through Wales:

> The spot where the church of St. David's stands, and was founded in honour of the apostle St. Andrew,

---

38 St. Regus is St. David's.
39 Novis was the archbishop of St. David's in Asser's time.
40 Asser, The Six Old English Chronicles, Tr. J. A. Giles (London, 1900), p. 72.
41 Florence of Worcester, Chronicle, passim, Tr. Thomas Forester (London, 1854), pp. 150, 130, 127.

> is called the Vale of Roses; which ought rather to be named vale of marble, since it abounds with one, and by no means with the other. The river Alun, a muddy and unproductive rivulet, bounding the churchyard on the northern side, flows over a marble stone, called Lechlaver, which has been polished by continual threading of passengers, and concerning the name, size, and quality of which we have treated in our Vaticinal History.42

Exeter

It is difficult to say why the school at Exeter appears again and again in the early English history. Perhaps it was a center of learning during this early age; there seems to be no proof that it was. It is again possible that it was noted because it was a great traffic center; the city of Exeter being very accessible to the sea, and the terminus of the Roman highway, made it rather well known to the natives. Then again, Exeter was vulnerable to attack and was plundered often; this may be another reason why the school is frequently mentioned in the chronicles.

It is never a bad supposition to assume that the city was originally built around a monastic school, because that was the natural way of development for the cities at that time. A holy monk would find a place to pray and eventually would gather a group of converts around him which would form the nucleus of a monastery. A church was then built, and the Christians would

---

42 Geraldus Cambrensis, The Itinerary Through Wales, Tr. Richard Colt Hoare, Ed. Thomas Wright (London, 1863), p. 419.

tend to center around the church until a city was formed. The monastic school was [illegible] for the instruction which the people received, and often the abbot was their leader in secular as well as ecclesiastic affairs. Whether Exeter followed this formula in its growth and development is not known, but it is known that the city had a cathedral and hence was an episcopal see.

The founding of Exeter is as obscure as the founding of Christianity on the island, probably because these two events were contemporary, or nearly so. It will be remembered that St. Lucius, a chieftain of South Wales, asked Pope Eleutherius to send missionaries to Britain as early as 130 A.D. In reply to this request, the Pope sent a band of missionaries among whom were Dervan, Fugatius, and Duvian (Damian). These men founded institutions in Britain; and it is possible that Exeter was among them, because it was one of the very earliest schools, and the missionary saints did much of their work in the kingdom of Lucius in South Wales.

The belief that Exeter was founded so early arises primarily out of the fact that there seems to be no definite record as to a date or a person credited with its founding. The name appears from time to time in literature and history; and because it is mentioned, it must be assumed that it was a school of some importance. The importance of Exeter may be magnified by looking into the early name which it had. One of the very early saints to have come to the Island was St. Damian who was sent

by Pope Eleutherius to convert the Celts. Exeter was known as Danmiorum. Now if these two names can be justly compared, it can be seen that Exeter rather than Glastonbury was the early center of Christianity in Britain, or at least that Exeter should share the honor with Glastonbury, the assumption being that Lanien was the founder of the institution which bore his name and later was known as Exeter. William of Malmesbury omits all reference to Joseph of Arimithaea in his revised Gesta Regum, and the tradition of Joseph was the principle source of the assumption that Glastonbury was the earliest center of Christianity. One of the earliest acknowledgements of the name Exeter is found in the life of St. Boniface; the famous missionary to Germany in 716 A.D. received his preliminary education at Exeter.[43]

As regards the later history of Exeter, its existence is known primarily by its connection with wars because, as mentioned previously, it was so vulnerable especially from the sea. In 877 A.D., Alfred the Great laid siege to the city because the pagans were wintering there; apparently the siege was costly both in the loss of lives and the loss of property. In 1001 A.D., the attacks from the Danes were still causing disturbance at Exeter, but by this time the people were able to defend themselves, and they warded off a great army of Danes which had moved over from Normandy. Two years later, 1003, the Danes were

---

43 The Book of Saints, Third Edition (London, 1934), p. 49. A Dictionary of Servants of God Canonized by the Catholic Church: Extracted from the Roman and other Martyrologies. Compiled by the Benedictine Monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.

able to lay siege to the city and carry away a great amount of loot.[44]

When the Normans came to England in 1066, Exeter was one of the last places to submit to the new rulers. The people, being used to attack and wars, were able to hold off the Norman invaders until 1068, when the French finally laid siege to the city for eighteen days.[45]

These four schools, although not of such lasting importance as some of the other schools of Britain, were very important in the early history of Ireland and Britain. They sent missionaries to the Continent during the sixth and seventh centuries, and these missionaries were in a large part responsible for the establishment of Christianity in Germany and its survival in France. Through St. David's and possibly Exeter, Christianity was made permanent in Britain. This study has endeavored to bring together some information which it is hoped will make the importance of these institutions a little more clear and throw some light on the early struggles of the people of Britain in becoming christianized and educated.

---

44 Florence of Worcester, The Chronicle, Tr. Thomas Forester (London, 1854), pp. 113-114.

45 Ordericus Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, Tr. Thomas Forester (London, 1854), Vol. II, p. 115.

[illegible]-ROMAN AND ANGLO-SAXON SAINTS

Any mention of the early history of Britain is not complete without consideration of the saints of the country. Rulers and bishops, scholars and peasants were listed among the chosen to be venerated at least locally, by the faithful. The names of Bede, David, Illtyd, and Cadwalla are important for the parts they played in early history of England and are venerated as saints.

In the early days of the Church, the canonization of a person was accomplished by the joint action of one or several bishops and their people. The unfortunate thing about this was the fact that there was no record made of the saint's life; and, instead of writing some record, a church was dedicated to the saint, and he lived from that time only in name and in the tradition which the people of that particular parish handed down from one generation to the next until an authentic version of the saint's life gradually faded into fable. The modern historian has, therefore, the problem of separating the myth from fact in placing the saint in his proper environment.

The practice of canonizing local saints by the bishops and the people gave away to a systemized and centralized procedure, in about the eleventh century. At that time, the responsibility of canonization was reserved entirely for the Holy See in

Rome, and this method has been followed ever since. When Rome took the responsibility for canonization, an accurate record was kept and proof of the person's sanctity recorded.

Because there is no definite proof of the sanctity of many of the early saints, they are not entered in the official church rolls as saints. This does not mean that the church repudiates the persons, but only that she does not have the proof, and, consequently, she does not order universal veneration.

The case of England is especially affected by this practice. Most of the outstanding saints of the early centuries have not found a place in the official records at Rome because the Celts had very little facility for perpetuating actual history, very fertile imaginations, and a love of the fantastic in perpetuating the fabulous portions of the person's life. There can be no doubt that there is some historical basis for these fabulous tales, but to say that there was anything more than a remote historical setting is pure folly.

The local veneration of these people always had a reason behind it; perhaps the sainted man was a benevolent king, a pious hermit, an outstanding prelate, or the founder of a monastery. At least it can be seen that the person was venerated after his death because he was close to the hearts of a group of people, called a cultus, who perpetuated the tales--some true, some imaginary--of the person whom they venerated. From the beginnings until the Norman invasion, the people of Britain

had recognized some 360 persons as saints.[46]

It seems strange that such a thoroughly Christian country as England would have preserved so little information of the early saints. The name and usually the date of the saint's death are recorded; but as soon as anything further is said of the saint, the door is open for any speculation. The geneologies of these persons are strikingly similar, usually dating back to the Holy Family. Frequently the saint is presented as having descended from St. Ann, the Virgin's cousin. Of course, these geneologies were worked out long after the person lived, and there seems to be little reason to believe they are true or even have any basis in truth.

The geneology of St. Beino as presented in Rees' The Cambro-British Saints is typical of the geneologies of this time:

> Beino was the son of Bugi, the son of Gwinllwi, the son of Tegil, the son of Cedeli Deyrnllwg, the son of Cortegyn, the son of Gorthgeyrow, the son of Rutegyn, the son of Dehewynt, the son of Eudegan, the son of Eudegern, the son of Elud, the son of Endos, the son of Eudoln, the son of Avalled, the son of Amalech, the son of Belin, the son of Anna, who was cousin of the Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ.[47]

Another characteristic which prevailed in the lives of the early saints was the idea of punishment for any indignity against the holy men; vengeance was accomplished by some

46 See appendix. A compiled list of the saints who lived before the Norman invasion is included in the appendix. This list of saints is divided into three periods: The Roman period, beginnings to 410 A.D.; the period from 410 A.D. until 664 A.D., the Council of Whitby when the northern and southern churches were united; and 664 to 1066, the final period, ending with the coming of the Normans.

47 W. J. Rees, Lives of the Cambro-British Saints (Llandovery, 1853), p. 308.

miracle which usually brought destruction on the offenders. St. Cadoc caused the ground to swallow the robbers who were followers of Illtyd. St. Illtyd caused the governor Cyflyn to be melted like wax near a fire. St. Germanus caused the castle of an unfriendly ruler to burn while Germanus and his followers watched from a distance. In the later period, Gildas got his revenge by writing his De Excidio, which excoriated the kings for their shortcomings. Examples of these revenges, usually on an unfriendly ruler, were common in the tales which have survived and show the superior position which the church maintained over the state in the minds of the people before church and state were combined.

Beginnings to 410

The first and most doubtful bit of Celtic religious speculation consists of the story of Joseph of Arimathaea, who is supposed to have come to the island in the first century A.D. and brought the Holy Grail with him. According to one account, he has also been given credit for founding the monastery at Glastonbury. There is no evidence to prove that he did or did not spend some time among the people of Britain, but there was a church at Glastonbury under his patronage. The name has been known there since before any recorded history. The traditions of Joseph are popular in several other countries, and anyone of these stories is as apt to be true as the tradition that he came

to the island. It was necessary for the people to have a device to explain the presence of the Holy Grail, and the tradition of Joseph certainly provides an adequate reason for the Grail's presence in England.

The first native of Britain to be considered a saint was Claudia, a daughter of Caractacus, who was taken prisoner to Rome with her father. She is said to have married a Roman senator and to have been the mother of St. Praxedes and St. Prudentia. The reason for her Latin name is that she took the name when she was baptized.

Still there is the lack of any historical evidence to show that Christianity had made its way to Britain until Lucius, a British King of South Wales, asked Pope Eleutherius, (c. 180 A.D.) to send missionaries to the island. Nennius refers to this pope as Pope Evaristus, who governed the Holy See much earlier, in 79 A.D. There seems no reason to doubt that Lucius did request the missionaries to come or at least that he became a Christian, because his name is found in the Roman Martyrology. Under Lucius, great numbers of the people were called together and were converted. This is perhaps an explanation of why an organized church existed on the island during the Roman period.

St. Fugatius and Duvanus were the missionaries whom Pope Eleutherius sent to convert Lucius and his people in the second century. Geoffrey of Monmouth gives this bit of information in his Historia, and he also conveys a fact previously mentioned, that the Christians used the temples of the old pagans as churches.

> Coillus had but one son, named Lucius, who, obtaining the crown after his father's decease, imitated all his acts of goodness, and seemed to his people to be no other than Coillus himself revived. As he had made so good a beginning, he was willing to make a better end: for which purpose he sent letters to Pope Eleutherius, desiring to be instructed by him in the Christian religion. For the miracles which Christ's disciples performed in several nations wrought a conviction in his mind; so that being inflamed with an ardent love of the true faith, he obtained the accomplishment of his pious request. For that holy pope, upon receipt of this devout petition, sent to him two most religious doctors, Fugatius and Duvanus, who, after they had preached concerning the incarnation of the Word of God, administered baptism to him, a proselyte to the Christian faith.
>
> The holy doctors, after they had almost extinguished paganism over the whole island, dedicated the temples, that had been founded in honour of many gods, to the only God and his saints, and filled them with congregations of Christians.[48]

Other chroniclers seemed to prefer not to mention the tradition of Lucius, and even William of Malmesbury admitted that the facts about the man were too doubtful to mention him in detail. Undoubtedly, William never had access to the Roman Martyrology, or he would have been less dubious about Lucius, because Lucius was one of the limited number of Britons to be registered in the Martyrology before the Norman conquest. The reason he did appear in the Martyrology in Rome is that he gave up his crown after he became a Christian and went to Switzerland as a missionary, where he died.

From these bits of information and from that which is seen of the events to follow on the island, it seems safe to say

---

48 Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Regum Britanniae, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1900), p. 155.

that these saints were responsible for the introduction and organization of a strong church in England by the time the Romans called their forces back to Rome. Christianity certainly had to be strong to withstand the force of the pagan Saxons who started their movement into Britain only a few years after the Romans left.

Period from 410 to 664

The onslaught of the Saxons and the controversy over the proper time for the celebration of Easter during this period of history caused many great and noble men to rise and meet the problems which became magnified. Many of these men were missionaries who came over from the Christian portion of the continent. It is not feasible to relate the deeds of any great number of these people who came to be locally venerated as saints, but rather to mention only a few of the saints of the period from the time the Romans departed from Britain until the time of the Council of Whitby in 664 A.D., when the church in Britain was united. Many of these holy persons such as Gildas the Wise, Augustine, and Columba are commonly known, and the extent material on their lives has been exhausted and the chronicles add nothing that is not known to the person who is interested in the early history of Britain. There are several others, however, who were overshadowed by these popular saints, and yet, who played important parts during this particular period.

Saint Germanus. It is impossible to look at the great saints of this period without noting the famous St. Germanus who appeared in Wales in 429 A.D. and started his work as a missionary. He was Bishop of Auxerre on the continent; and, because he was a bishop, tradition has it that he ordained both Illtyd and Dubricius. Nennius related some fantastic tales of the happenings between St. Germanus and Vortigern at a synod, and at another time, he admonished Vortigern for having married his own daughter and bringing forth a son by the union.

Because of these arguments, St. Germanus was chosen to lead the army against the Saxons. His fame lives because of the battle in which he led the Britons to a victory over the Saxons. The victory is known as the "Alleluia victory", so called because St. Germanus had instructed the soldiers to cry out the word as they marched to meet the enemy. The resounding of the word among the troops had a frightening effect on the Saxons and seemed to put new zest into the hearts of the Britons, and they soon put the Saxons to flight. After this, St. Germanus converted great numbers to Christianity, then he went to Italy, where he died.

Saint Illtyd. The next saint who is to be considered is St. Illtyd (d. 470), the person mentioned in connection with the founding of one of the Bangor Monasteries. Illtyd was by birth an American and a descendent from royal persons. After being educated on the Continent, he chose to become a soldier and to marry a beautiful maid named Trinihid.

Illtyd is said to have been a relative of King Arthur. Because of this relationship, Illtyd proceeded with his wife to attend the court of Arthur, where he was received with the dignity proper to royalty. After a short stay in the court of Arthur, he and his wife went to the court of Paulinus, the king of Glamorgan. According to the tradition, Illtyd was here chosen to rule the people, and this proved to be the turning point in his life.

The Welsh rulers of this period could hardly be considered just especially as regards the neighboring provinces. Gildas' admonishment is perhaps justified when he calls the kings "tyrants", miserable governors, and a variety of other names, none of which are complimentary to a royal household. Illtyd maintained a group of bandits as was the custom, and he used the group for plundering and stealing wherever he chose. His conversion was brought about because of the doings of his band of thieves who plundered the dwelling quarters of St. Cadoc and his followers. The group was in search of food at the time, and after they had forced Cadoc to produce enough food to feed the mob, Cadoc prayed for a miracle, and the ground opened up and swallowed all but St. Illtyd. St. Illtyd was at a distance at the time of the miracle; but he saw what had happened, and he at once took the clerical habit and left his wife, who later became a nun.

St. Illtyd became a very holy man and went to the north part of Wales where he founded at least one monastery. If

Illtyd was responsible for the founding of Bangor, it was during this period. There seems to be no positive proof that he did found Bangor, but the monastery for which he was responsible was founded at the time Dubricius was bishop of Llandaff in the latter half of the fifth century. The most popular product of the school of Illtyd was Gildas the Wise, who is one of the leading figures of his time. Throughout the material in this field, there is a confusion between Gildas the Wise and Gildas the Elder, who was a companion of St. Cadoc at Llancarvan. Sts. Samson, Pol-de Leon, and possibly St. David also were educated by St. Illtyd or at least attended the school which he founded. Tradition associates Illtyd with many miracles and works of hardships in his life among the Welsh; how much of this is true cannot be known, but that he was an outstanding figure of his time cannot be doubted. He died (c. 500 A.D.) in his home country of America, where his remains are still held in reverence.

It is strange to note the close relationship among the saints of this period; there seems to be some bond joining them together. In some cases the tie was one of family relationships, in other cases they were bound by the confines of a monastery, or possibly those of an equal official rank were canonized at the same time.

The evidence of how the fantastic element crept into the lives of the saints of Britain may be seen in the miracles which were attached to St. Illtyd. A certain King Meirchion was supposed to be swallowed by the earth because he plotted against the life of St. Illtyd. The governor of Gyfin melted like wax because

he offended the Saint. In another instance, while the Saint was dwelling in a cave, he heard the sound of a beautiful bell as some servants were carrying it by. He asked them to give it to him, but they had orders from their master, Gildas, to deliver the bell to St. David. Upon hearing how the bell had miraculously sounded just as it was passing St. Illtyd's cave, Gildas ordered it sent back to Illtyd. Connected with the lives of most of the saints is a miracle where the saint caused water to flow from the ground, and St. Illtyd was no exception to this, for on one occasion tradition gives him credit for striking the ground and causing a spring to flow from that spot.[40]

It is a striking characteristic of the lives of these persons, that they seemed to maintain a society of their own over and above their associations with the laymen of Britain. St. Illtyd had won his reputation early so that in reading accounts of any of the young holy persons of the age, one can usually expect that a particular person's life is to be somehow associated with Illtyd, if it is for nothing more than a visit. Paulinus, Cadoc, David, Gildas, Samson, Teilo, Dubricius, and a host of other popular men were connected with Illtyd. Even King Arthur is brought into the picture as having some relationship to Illtyd. Many of these associations must be false, because Gildas the Wise was not born until after 500 A.D. and Illtyd died in about 470 A.D. Gildas the Elder may have been the person referred to,

---

40 J. J. Rees, Lives of the Cambro British Saints, passim (Llandovery, 1853), pp. 502-514.

but he spent the greater part of his life on an island off the coast of Wales, so it is not likely that he would have been on the main island very often if he did live as early as did Illtyd. Tradition says that St. David lived to be something over a hundred years old, and since he died in 601 A.D. he would have been very young indeed when he attended the school of Illtyd or sent a bell to him. It is obvious, therefore, that one great name was used as a foil to show the merits of another person who was held in high esteem by one particular cultus.

Most of these men were in a continuous battle against the Pelagian heresy which started in Ireland or Britain.

> Pelagianism was named after Pelagius, a monk from Ireland or Britain, who shared in formulating its theories early in the fifth century. Denying original sin and the necessity of baptism, Pelagianism taught that man has no need of God's grace, and that he can do good and be good of his own will primarily.[50]

The heresy was condemned by the church several times in the fifth century, and was finally stamped out.

Period from 664 to 1066

In the first two periods, the ground work was prepared which allowed the great era from the council of Whitby to the Norman conquest to follow. The preceding period (410 to 664) was one of great missionary work, of martyrdom, and of building; the next was one of scholarship and great learning. The

---

[50] Jeremiah O'Sullivan and John J. Burns, Medieval Europe (New York, 1948), p. 239.

monks of the preceding period built the monasteries in which the monks of the following period stayed and wrote and gave the literature of the land its first start. Ellwood P. Cubberley sums up the early part of the period as follows:

> In 670, Theodore of Tarsus and Abbot Hadrian, whom Bede, the scholar and historian of the Early English Church, describes as men instructed in secular and divine literature both Greek and Latin, arrived in England from Southern Italy and began their work of instructing pupils in Greek and Latin. Both taught at Canterbury, and raised the cathedral school there to high rank. In 674 the monastery at Wearmouth was founded, and in 682 its companion at Yarrow (Jarrow). These were endowed with books from Rome and Vienne, and soon became famous for the instruction they provided. It was at the twin monasteries of Wearmouth and Yarrow (sic) that the Venerable Bede (673-735), whose Ecclesiastical History of England gives us our chief picture of education in Britain in his time, was educated and remained a lifelong student. As a result of all these efforts a number of northern monasteries, as well as a few of the cathedral schools, early became famous for their libraries, scholars, and learning. This culture in Ireland and Britain was of a much higher standard than that obtaining on the Continent at the time, because the classical inheritance there had been less corrupted.[51]

It is true that there was a great deal of corruption in the learning and scholarship on the Continent, but, in spite of this, there was a great deal of association on a higher level between the mainland and Britain. There was continual influx of scholars to the mainland and these people prove that the dark ages must have been somewhat alive in spite of the apparent darkness. These men of the church were responsible for the intellectual well being of the people of the island so their sojourns on

---

51 Ellwood P. Cubberley, The History of Education (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 130-132.

the Continent were frequent, and, in some cases, they spent the greater part of their lives there. In the case of relationships between Ireland and Britain, there is hardly any distinction. The church leaders of the time commuted between the two countries almost as frequently as they commuted between the north and the south of Britain.

Benedict Biscop. Benedict Biscop was educated in a monastery on the Isle of Lerins off the coast of France, and, on the order of Pope Vitalian, he went to Britain where he founded the two famous monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow. Something of the importance of Benedict's period on the Continent may be seen in Browne's Life of St. Aldhelm:

> It was to Benedict Biscop that Northumbria owed its early preeminence, more than to any one else or than to all others put together. He it was who built the churches of St. Peter, St. Mary, St. Paul, at Wearmouth and Jarrow. He it was who brought the noble manuscripts from Italy which formed the unrivaled library at Wearmouth: one of them is now one of the greatest pandects or codices of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament still in existence, the famous Codex Amiatinus in the Laurensiana at Florence, with the inscription of Abbot Ceolfrid, of Aldhelm's time, presenting it to the pope.[52]

This and much more was brought to Britain by Biscop who passed the knowledge he possessed to his great scholar Bede.

Hothelm. But Bede was not satisfied even with the information which Benedict brought to the island, because he had a special representative in Rome gathering data for his Ecclesiastical History. Hothelm was the name of the saint who spent

---

52 C. F. Browne, St. Aldhelm: His Life and Times (London, 1903), pp. 134-135.

much time in Rome, where he "searched the registers of the Roman see, and copied several letters of Gregory the Great and other popes, which by the advice of Albinus, he gave to Bede..."[53]. When Nothelm was archbishop of Canterbury, after he returned from Rome, he answered by correspondence questions of St. Boniface, who was doing his great missionary work in Germany. Boniface wrote asking information on the correspondence between St. Augustine and Gregory the Great, and another time he asked Nothelm's opinion on a case of a man's marriage with the widowed mother of his godson.

Ceolfrid. Living at the same time was Ceolfrid, who succeeded Biscop as abbot of Jarrow and Wearmouth. When he became abbot, he ordered that a copy of the scriptures be made from the copy which Biscop had brought to Wearmouth. When he grew old, he wanted to die in Rome, so he took a copy of the scripture with him that he might present it to the pope. Death came upon the old man at Langres in 716 A.D. before he completed the last of his many trips to the holy city. The manuscript which he carried is probably the same one as mentioned previously called Codex Amiatinus.

Boniface and Alcuin. There are two names which stand out for their international work at this period, they are Boniface and Alcuin. St. Boniface, the person who christianized nearly all of Germany, and Alcuin, who built the school system for

---

53 Walter Hepworth, The Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1921-22), Vol. XIV, p. 670.

Charlemagne, are saints whose duties on the Continent need only to be mentioned here to illustrate the intercourse which was carried on between the nations during the eighth and ninth centuries, and to complete the cycle of learning from the Continent to the islands and back once more to the Continent.

The latter part of the ninth century is dominated by Alfred the Great, who, although not recognized as a saint himself, was greatly influenced by the holy men of England. St. Neot (d.c. 877) was an advisor to Alfred when he first became king. Asser tells that Alfred refused to listen to those who petitioned him for wrongs that had been done. Neot advised Alfred that he would sometime suffer for his deeds. Alfred was after that often subjected to much misery for long periods of time, during which, his subjects did not know where he was or why he was absent. Later Alfred made trips to Neot's grave in Cornwall to show how he respected this holy person.[84] It is peculiar to note that Neot was one of the very few saints of the time who did not leave England and journey to Rome or any other foreign country.

Plegmund. Plegmund, another of Alfred's advisors, did journey to Italy where he was made Archbishop. St. Plegmund was important for his contribution to Alfred's knowledge of the Cura Pastoralis. In the preface of his translation of this work, Alfred acknowledges Plegmund as being one of the people who helped him learn the Latin, from which he translated Cura Pastoralis

---

84 Asser's Life of Alfred, passim, J. A. Giles, Six Old English Chronicles (London, 1900), p. 60.

or in English, The Care of Shepherds (Ministers).

These bits of information on some of the lesser known saints will perhaps show how they helped influence the learning of later years. Such great names as Columchille, Adamnan, Aldhelm, Cuthbert, Hilda, Caedmon, and Bede are not here mentioned in any great detail, because they are so commonly known and their influence is recognized. Neither are the names of a host of saints who spent their lives copying manuscripts and doing other works which were necessary to keep learning alive. The ones mentioned are important because of the direct aid they gave to important men like Alfred and Bede.

The chronicles, which form the largest single body of information on the period from 55 B.C. to A.D. 1066, are confusing because they contradict one another and oftentimes even contradict themselves. In addition, the chroniclers sometimes were more interested in reflecting glory upon their particular houses than in presenting authentic history.

The Historical Arthur

Gildas the Wise (fl. 547), the earliest of the Celtic chroniclers, never mentioned Arthur, although, Nennius, who wrote c. 800 A.D., assumes that Arthur and Gildas were practically contemporary. Gildas did mention a certain Ambrosius Aurelianus, who was a leader of the Britons when they won a victory against the Saxons at the Battle of Bath-Hill (Mons Badonicus) about 500 A.D. This is the only place he mentions the man and gives no further treatment of the matter. Nennius says that this person, whom he calls dux bellorum, was Arthur or at least he says that Arthur won the battle of Bath.

The other possibility that Arthur was mentioned in the works of Gildas is in the case of a certain King Cunaglasse whom he called a bear. The Celtic word for bear is artos. Some

scholars are of the opinion that this is the beginning of the name Arthur, and that in the name Cuneglasse, Gildas refers to Arthur, although he did not mention him specifically by name. These two statements by Gildas are not sufficient proof that he made an intentional effort to say anything of the exploits of Arthur. Despite numerous efforts to establish the contrary, it can hardly be said that Gildas is unquestionably the first to mention the great hero of English romance.

The other possibility of an historical Arthur consists of a reference in the Inscriptionum of a Roman leader of the second century who led the Britons in battle against the Armoricans. This man's name was Lucius Artorius Castus. It would seem that this Artorius was the most logical person about whom to center interest in the creation of a national Celtic hero.

Geoffrey of Monmouth

The tales of Arthur grew until they were finally set down by Geoffrey in 1139, when he wrote his Historia. There is no reason to believe that any one man could be associated with all of the adventures that Geoffrey accredits to Arthur.

Modern scholars are almost unanimous in the belief that Geoffrey did not attempt to write an authentic history. On the other hand, the contemporaries of Geoffrey accepted him as authentic. Only in the cases of William of Newburg and Geraldus Cambrensis, among the early chroniclers, was there any apparent

antagonism to the work of Geoffrey. William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon both were contemporaries of Geoffrey, and both wrote their own chronicles in the same romantic vein as Geoffrey. James Bruce's assertion that Geoffrey was the originator of the fairy-tale element in the life of Arthur can hardly be accepted; however, the belief that Geoffrey was the first writer of a prose romance in Northland is entirely tenable. Geoffrey did use authentic history in his writings, and in some respects his quasi-historical works may be placed in the same category as Shakespeare's; that is, he used history only in so far as it helped to create a general effect but with no effort to present it as entirely authentic.

Ancient British Schools

Throughout the chronicles, there is frequent mention of ancient schools. It seemed to have been the practice for most of the missionaries who arrived from Ireland or the Continent, or who gained a reputation on the island, to gather a group of people around themselves and out of this group of followers to found a monastic school. Some of the schools--Jarrow, Wearmouth, York, Durham, Glastonbury, and others--are so well known that any further mention of them would be a mere repetition. Others, especially Malmesbury, Exeter, St. David's, and Bangor, are mentioned frequently in the chronicles, but nothing seems to be known of their early history.

By collecting a considerable body of data that have never been brought together before, the present study not only brings the four schools into a little sharper relief, but clears up some of the questions relative to the possible origin of the word Bangor, and eliminates considerable of the confusion relative to the Caernarvon cathedral school and the Flintshire monastery of the same name. It may be that this study establishes a little more clearly the idea that Exeter rather than Glastonbury should be considered the original seat of Christianity in the British Isles.

Cambro-Roman and Anglo-Saxon Saints

In the survey of Cambro-Roman and Anglo-Saxon saints, it is hoped that this study will have accomplished five objectives: (1) The coordination of a great deal of scattered material concerning lives and activities of the saints, (2) The confirmation of the generally held opinion of the evolution of ecclesiastical institutions from missionaries and converts to monasteries, to schools, to episcopal sees, (3) The amalgamation of closely related Druidical and Christian practices, (4) The representation of St. Illtyd as a man rather than a myth and his possible connection with one of the Bangors of North Wales, (5) The presentation of the international character of ecclesiastics especially of the relatively unfamiliar names of Neot, Nothelm, and Ceolfrid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible to mention all of those to whom the author is indebted for suggestions and recommendations in preparation of this thesis, but he is glad to acknowledge the great kindness of Father William Van Roo, S.J., of St. Mary's College for the special assistance he offered, and also that of Dr. R. F. Hickey, formerly of Rockhurst College. Doctor Hickey did not have any direct connection with this study, but to him in particular does the author owe the beginning of his interest in English studies. The author is very glad to acknowledge his indebtedness to Doctor Hickey and to the other members of the faculty of Rockhurst College.

Greatest obligations are due teachers and friends of Kansas State College. Professor C. W. Matthews in particular has given most generously of his time in the preparation of this study. It would have been impossible to have completed this work without the private library of Professor Matthews, which contained nearly all the source material used. His generosity in granting permission to use his library at will is very deeply appreciated.

The author is indebted in a very unusual way to the staff of the Kansas State College Library for their real efforts to get the necessary publications to complete this study. In addition, the librarians of the University of Chicago and the University of Kansas were most kind in their prompt replies upon request for books.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benedictine Monks of St. Augustine Abbey, Ramsgate, The Book of Saints. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1934.

Brinkley, Roberta Florence, Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1932.

Browne, G. F., St. Aldhelm: His Life and Times. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1903.

Bruce, James Douglas, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1928.

Chambers, E. K., Arthur of Britain. Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd. 44, Museum Street, W. C., 1927.

Collingwood, R. G. and J. N. Myers, Roman Britain and the English Settlements. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1937.

Cubberley, Ellwood P., The History of Education. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, The Riverside Press Cambridge, 1920.

Florence of Worcester, The Chronicle, tr. Thomas Forester. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1854.

Freeman, Edward A., The History of the Norman Conquest of England. The Clarendon Press for Macmillan and Co., New York, 1870

Geoffrey of Monmouth, Histories of the Kings of Britain, tr. Lucy Allen Paton. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, 1912.

Geraldus Cambrensis, The Itinerary Through Wales, tr. Sir Richard Colt Hoare, ed. Thomas Wright. H. G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1863.

Giles, J. A., The Six Old English Chronicles. George Bell and Sons, 1900.

Henry of Huntingdon, History of the English, tr. Thomas Forester. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1853.

Hopkins, Annette Brown, The Influence of Wace on the Arthurian Romances of Crestien De Troies. The Collegiate Press, George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wisconsin, 1913.

Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers, tr. Henry T. Riley. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1854.

Matthew Paris, English History, tr. J. A. Giles. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1852.

Maynadier, Howard, The Arthur of the English Poets. Houghton, Mifflin and Co., Boston and New York, 1907.

Montelembert, The Count, The Monks of the West. P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, 1905.

Mitze, William Albert, Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry and Music. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1940.

Owen, Charles, England Before the Norman Conquest. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1910.

Ordericus Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, tr. Thomas Forester. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1854.

O'Sullivan, Jeremiah and John F. Burns, Medieval Europe. F. S. Crofts and Co., New York, 1946.

Paton, Lucy Allen, Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance. Ginn and Co., Boston, 1903.

Rees, W. J., Lives of the Cambro British Saints. William Rees, Llandovery, 1853.

Rhys, John, Studies in the Arthurian Legend. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1891

The Annals of Roger de Hovenden, tr. Henry T. Riley. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1853.

Roger of Hendover, Flowers of History, tr. J. A. Giles. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1849.

Schofield, William Henry, English Literature From the Norman Conquest to Chaucer. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1906.

Schofield, William Henry, Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1920.

Seat, Andrew Fleming, Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1951.

William of Malmesbury, History of the Kings of England, tr. J. A. Giles. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, 1847.

William of Malmesbury, De Gestis Regum Anglorum, ed. William Stubbs. Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode Printers to the Queen's most excellent Majesty, London, 1889.

William of Malmesbury, Glastonbury Abbey Before the Norman Conquest, tr. N. E. Stokes. Central Somerset Gazette, 27, High Street, Glastonbury, 1932.

APPENDIX

A [illegible]-LIST OF [illegible] AND [illegible]

Beginnings to End of Roman Period

Damian
Lucius
Fugatius
Julius
Aaron

End of Roman Period to Council of Whitby

5th Century

Beandan (Breandan)
Diblig
Bryneach
Canog - 492
Corentin - 460
Crewenna
Cynfran
Cynlio
Dingad
Dogfan
Dyfnan
Elian ap Erbin
Erbin
Fingar
Germanus of Auxerre
Gladys
Gowen
Illtyd - 470
Intract
Jacut and Guethenoc
Keyne
Kigwe
Kingsmark
Madrun
Maidoc
Melorius
Morwenna
Nennoc - 467
Pancras
Paulinus (Polin)
Primael
Rasyphus
Ravennus
Ruan
Tathai
Tudy
Tydfil

6th Century

Aaron
Afan
Almedha
Armagillus - 562
Asaph
Austell
Baithin - 598
Brannock
Brendan - 578
Brendan of Birr
Briach - 570
Cadfan
Cadfarch
Cadoc - 580
Cawrdaf - 560
Cewydd
Columba - 597
Constantine - 576
Corbmac
Cuby (cyby)
Cungar
Curig
Cynwl
Deniol - 545
Deifer
Derfel or Gadarn

6th Century (Continued)

Cogmael
Dubricius - 550
Edeyrn
Figrel
Gingen - 590
Gleeth
Glerius
Gloth
Glian
Glwyn
Gnoder
Gnodoch - 580
Grth
Fintan
Finten
Gildas the Elder
Gildas the Wise - 570
Gistilian
Gluvias
Goneri
Goran
Guenhael - 580
Gundleus
Hervaeus
Hywyn - 516
Iswael
Ivo (1st)
Kenten
Kea
Kenneth
Keverne
Llandeid
Llewellyn
Maethlin
Mawes
Melangell
Melanius - 550
Merinus
Meugant
Nonnita
Oudoceus - 564
Pabo - 510
Paternus (Padarn) - 550
Petrock - 564
Piran
Sadwen
Salomon - 550
Sampson - 557
Sawyl
Seifiol
Sezin - 529
Teilo - 560
Tigernach - 550
Tenorus
Trillo
Tudo
Tydecho
Tysilio
Winwaloe

7th Century

Aedan
Almoth
Augustine of Canterbury - 604
Beuno
Birinus - 650
Botulph
Cadell
Cedd - 664
Cristiolus
Cummian Fada - 662
David (1st) - 601
Deyniolen - 621
Dyfnog
Eanswith - 640
Edburga
Edburga - 680
Edwin - 633
Egelwine
Enghenedl
Eochod - 601
Ethbin - 625
Ethelbert - 616
Ethelburga - 647
Ethelburga - 664
Finan - 661
Fulk
Gollen
Golvinus
Gredifael
Hereswitha
Irchard
Kentigern - 600
Laurence of Canterbury - 640
Machudd
Maine - 617
Malo
Marnanus - 620
Mellitus - 624

<u>7th Century</u> (Continued)

Aidan
Osith
Oswald - 652
Oswin - 651
Paulinus of York - 644
Peter (1st) - 607
Rudlac
Rumwold
Senan
Sigbert - 635
Silin - 610
Sillan - 610
Tuda - 664
Virgilius
Wilgis
Winebride
Ywy

Council of Whitby to Norman Conquest

<u>7th Century</u>

Adamnan - 679
Benedict Biscop - 690
Bertuin - 698
Cadwallader - 682
Caedmon - 680
Caedwalla - 689
Colman of Lindisfarne - 676
Cuthbert - 687
Eadbert - 698
Eadred - 675
Eata - 685
Ebba the Elder - 683
Effelm - 699
Eosterwine - 686
Ethelburga - 670
Etheldreda - 679
Ethelred - 670
Ethelwald - 699
Failbhe - 679
Goesnoveus - 675
Hilda - 680
Maildulf - 673
Nilling - 697
Sexburga - 699
Wigfrid - 683

<u>8th Century</u>

Acca - 740
Adamnan - 704
Adalbert - 740
Adrian - 710
Aidan
Aldhelm
Bede - 735
Berthwald - 709
Bettelin
Bilfrid - 740
Boniface - 715
Bosa - 705
Brithwald - 731
Brithwin
Ceolfrid - 716
Ceolwulph - 764
Cuthburga - 724
Cuthman
Decuman - 716
Dorbhene - 713
Dritholm - 700
Dunchadh - 717
Eanfleda - 700
Edbert - 768
Egbert - 729

8th Century (Continued)

Erwin - 717
Ethelmund
Ethelbert - 793
Ethelwin
Ethelwold - 740
Eman
Guthlac the Little - 745
Hedda - 705
Intrect
John of Beverley - 721
Jurmin
Lullus - 787
Milburga - 722
Nothelm - 740
Pega - 720
Richard - 722
Tatwin - 734
Tota
Tyrcla - 799
Tibert - 799
Trumwin
Vitalis
Walburga
Wilfrid the Younger - 709
Wilfrid
Willibord
Winebald
Winoc
Wiora

9th Century

Aethelheard - 805
Agmund - 870
Alcuin - 804
Alfthryd
Berthnoc (Berchan) - 840
Blaithmaic - 825
Convoyon - 868
Edith
Edmund - 870
Edwold
Egelred - 870
Ethelhard - 805
Fremund
Humbert - 870
John the Saxon - 895
Lewis - 841
Modwenna
Neot - c. 877
Paulinus of Capua - 838

Tristan

10th Century

Athelm - 923
Dunstan - 988
Elburga - 960
Edward - 978
Elfleda
Elgiva - 971
Elphage - 951
Ethelwald - 984
Odo - 959
Plegmund - 914
Wulfida
Wulsin

11th Century

Radnothus - 1016
Radsin - 1050
Edward the Confessor - 1066
Ethelnoth - 1000
Ethelnoth - 1038
Osburga - 1016