

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE PAPAL BULLS FOR THE INVASIONS OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

THERE are many facts and circumstances common to William's invasion of England and Henry's entry into Ireland which serve to elucidate the latter. Neither of these men had any title by birth, bequest, inheritance or election to the countries they invaded and possessed as conquerors. Both of them claimed that their expedition was a holy crusade undertaken to restore to the Church of Rome a nation and a Church that had rebelled against the Pope. They both sent letters and envoys to the Pope misrepresenting the case of their opponents and setting forth with hypocritical subtlety their own pious intentions; and they both obtained from the occupant of the papal chair confirmatory letters or Bulls, with a ring as a sign of investiture in the holy office of a conquering reformer of the morals of a nation, whose chief fault in the eyes of that occupant was the independence of its Church and State. As Henry followed closely the steps taken by his predecessor, we shall consider first his invasion and the circumstances which led to the same. John of Salisbury, an adherent of Henry, and personal friend of Adrian, was sent by Henry to Rome to entreat his sanction for the King's projected invasion of Ireland (1155). Ussher (*Sylloge*, No. 46) summarised the account given of the invasion by Matthew of Westminster, Matthew of Paris and others in this manner: "Henry sent ambassadors to Rome and asked Pope Adrian to give him permission to enter Ireland in a hostile manner and subdue it for himself and *bring back that beastly people* (homines illos bestiales) to a more decent form of the faith of Christ and to persuade them to greater obedience to the Roman Church. The Pope consented and sent him a privilegium on the subject."

This statement throws a light upon the terms of the letter abusive of the Irish and fulsome to the Pope which John of Salisbury, a personal friend, presented to the Pope, and to which the Pope in his letter replied. The result was, to use John's own words, "It was at my request that Adrian *granted and gave* (concessit et dedit) Ireland to Henry the Second, King of England, to be possessed by inheritance, as his own letters testify unto this day. For all islands, of ancient right, are said to belong to the Church of Rome by the donation of Constantine." He also sent a gold ring set with an emerald, as a symbol of his investiture in the right of ruling Ireland.¹ Gerald of Wales also refers to this ring which Adrian sent by John of Salisbury to Henry in symbol of his investiture and which was deposited in the treasury at Winchester.²

¹ *Metalogicus*, lib. IV, last chapter; Giles, vol. V, p. 205: "*investitura juris in gerenda Hibernia.*"

² *Conquest of Ireland*, Rolls, v, 314: "*investituræ in signum.*"

John has represented his master's enterprise in the very best light, making him out as an enthusiast for the reformation of the lax moral and ecclesiastical condition of Ireland. It was a great opportunity for the Pope to follow up the work of 1152, when four palls had been given to the Irish Archbishops at the Synod of Kells. Hadrian's letter, which John speaks of, is undoubtedly the Bull *Laudabiliter*, commending Henry for "his purpose to extend the bounds of the Church and to proclaim to a rude and untaught (indocti et rudes) people the truth of the Christian faith, and to extirpate nurseries of vice from the field of the Lord, and for asking "apostolic counsel and favour." The Pope rings the changes on the pious Henry's alleged intention of "correcting morals and planting virtues for the increase of the Church," and emphasises "the right of the Roman Church to Ireland and all islands on which the sun of righteousness hath shone," in justification of his approval. This was the very point mentioned by John of Salisbury in his narrative. This letter was intended to be shown to the Irish. For it says, "let the people receive you with honour and respect you as Lord (Dominus), reserving the rights of the Church and the yearly payment of Peter's pence from each household." The Pope acquiesced in the King's project, but makes no feudal grant.¹

This Bull has been questioned by some Romanists and others, because it cannot be found in the Vatican. It is given by Gerald of Wales in the fifth chapter of the second book of the *Conquest of Ireland* (Rolls edition). Gerald came over as the secretary of Prince John and so had access to all the royal and state documents. He would hardly have forged a document in favour of a king he hated.² It is also to be found in the *Book of Leinster* (*facsimile*, p. 228), a twelfth-century compilation. Professor Stokes³ pointed out that according to Theiner no document earlier than 1215, relating to Ireland, is to be found in the Vatican, and demanded, if this is to be urged as proof that no Bull relating to Ireland was issued prior to that year, "what becomes of the papal claims to have ruled Ireland long before the English came at all? Such arguments are suicidal." Now Ussher's (*Sylloge*, No. 48) gives the text of a Bull sent to Laurence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin, 1179. "The truth is," as Dr. Stokes remarked, "we still possess many Bulls issued by popes about Ireland all through the reigns of Henry II and John, the originals of which have been lost from the Vatican." He refers to Mason's *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* and the *Chartae, Privilegia et Immunitates*, of the Irish Record Office, to Alan's *Register*, the *Crede Mihi*, the *Liber Albus* and the *Liber Niger* of Christ Church for numerous Bulls extant in Ireland. It can also be easily proved that the papacy was accessory both before and after to the invasion. The statement of John of Salisbury, a con-

¹ Henry had merely asked for his blessing and the sanction of his enterprise.

² Arthur Ua Clerigh, *History of Ireland*, p. 392, gives the Latin and a translation.

³ *Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church*, p. 46.

temporary writer, cannot be set aside. Bishop Creighton regarded it as alone sufficient to establish the case. The privilegium of Adrian was confirmed by a successor, Alexander III, in a letter the authority of which has been disputed. It is to be found in the *Conquest of Ireland* by Gerald of Wales (Book II, c. 5, also in his *De principis instructione*, ii, 19 (viii, 197, Rolls) where he says that "some deny its genuineness." He would hardly have said this had he forged it himself). There are, however, three letters from the same pope in the *Black Book* of the Exchequer,¹ addressed to the Irish prelates, Henry, and the Irish nobles, respectively, and written in 1172. The Pope harps on the vices of the Irish, who had "cast off the fear of God and the restraints of the Christian religion." He expresses his unbounded joy over Henry's "subjugation to his own sovereignty of that savage and uncivilised people, who know nothing of God's law." He commands the bishops to assist that noble prince in "keeping possession of the land and extirpating its filthy abominations," and to pronounce excommunication upon all obstinate rebels. In his letter to Henry he refers to the letter which Irish bishops (under the papal legate) had sent to him from the Synod of Cashel full of abuse of the Irish, because they married within the degrees, ate meat in Lent and paid no tithes, and did not give sufficient respect to the clergy. The third letter commends the prudence of the nobles in submitting to Henry—"such a devout son of the Church."

That they are not found in the papal archives, which do not contain any original document relating to Ireland before 1215, does not invalidate the worth of these documents, for there are in those archives² notices of the approval of subsequent pontiffs of the action of Adrian and Alexander. Sir J. H. Ramsay says there is an unmistakable reference in one instance to the terms of the Bull *Laudabiliter*.³ Dr. Stokes, *Ireland and Anglo-Norman Church*, p. 46, also draws attention to the fact that on the second page of Theiner's *Monumenta* there is a letter of Honorius III dated January 17, 1217, headed with the words "to the Archbishop of Dublin that he may compel the rebellious Irish to return to the obedience of the King of England" (ad obedientiam regis Angliæ redire), and on the previous page there are equally strong notices of letters from Innocent III, especially Nos. 136 and 137. It is also stated by Giraldus that Vivianus, the papal legate, held a Synod in 1177, in which he set sternly forth (protestatur) Henry's rights (jus) to Ireland and declared that they were confirmed by the Pope, and anathematised all rebels.⁴ In the letter of complaint from the Irish

¹ *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, pp. 42-8 (T. Hearne, Oxford, 1728); Rhymer's *Foedera*, i, p. 45 (London, 1816).

² See *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum*, A. Theiner (Rome, Vatican Press, 1864).

³ In *The Angevin Empire*, p. 6, he refers to Theiner's *Monumenta*, i, 151, a passage from a dispensation of the thirteenth century.

⁴ Giraldus, *Conquest*, II, c. 19: "tam clero quam populo sub anathematis interminatione injungens ne ab ejus aliquatenus fidelitate, ausu temerario resilire praesumant."

chiefs to John XXII, 1318, the miseries of Ireland are emphatically derived from Adrian's Bull, the articles of which are referred to, and passages of which are cited. Adrian is censured for presenting Henry *de facto* with what he had no right to bestow and for his obsequiousness to an evil king. This letter sets out in dignified language the case of the Celtic chiefs against their Norman oppressors, and is an important piece of evidence for the Bull. The Pope in his letter to Edward II referred to the grant Adrian made to Henry II, saying that he encloses a copy of his letter from the Irish, with a copy of the grant Adrian made to Henry.¹ In the Parliament Roll, 7th E. IV. (1467) a statute is to be found which refers in its preamble to this donation. "As our holy father Adrian was possessed of all the sovereignty of Ireland in his demesne of fee, in right of his Church of Rome, and with the intent that vice should be subdued, had alienated the said land to the King of England for a certain rent . . ." ² The Bull is referred to by contemporary annalists such as Dean Diceto (*Imagines*, x, 529).

Another reference is made to this donation of Adrian in a consistorial decree of 1555, erecting Ireland into a kingdom of which the Kings of England, since they had secured the dominion of it through the Apostolic See, had merely been called lords ³ (*dominū*). Adrian's Bull had charged the Irish to regard Henry as their *dominus*.

The instructions of Innocent X to Rinuccini, the papal nuncio, who came to Ireland in 1645, refer to the grant of Ireland made by Adrian to Henry.⁴ There was evidently a strong papal tradition ⁵ about this grant and letter to Henry which cannot be easily set aside, especially when confirmed by contemporary statements like those of Gerald of Wales, John of Salisbury, and the *Book of Leinster*. The fact that the Bull was given seventeen years before it was acted upon is explained by R. de Monte as due to the queen-mother's objection to her son's undertaking so dangerous an enterprise, so "the strange crusade was dropped for the time."

There are striking parallels to the circumstances that led to and the steps that were taken in this invasion in the previous invasion of England. Stigand, Harold's Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1058 had received the *pallium* from Benedict X (antipope) who was shortly afterwards deposed. This acknowledgment of an anti-

¹ The words are: "We send your majesty enclosed in these presents the above-mentioned letter directed to the Cardinals above mentioned with a copy of the letter of grant which our predecessor Adrian addressed to Henry King of England."—Theiner, *Monumenta*, p. 201.

² Hardiman, *Statutes of Kilkenny*, p. 3.

³ Lingard, vol. V, p. 227 (Duffy); *History of England*. Bullarium R. Part V, p. 315.

⁴ *Embassy in Ireland*, xxvii, A. Hutton (1873).

⁵ Cardinal Baronius found a copy in the Vatican Archives which he transcribed. Dr. Gasquet (*Irish Catholic*, Feb. 12, 1909) withdrew his previous objections to the Bull. He said: "We shall here copy out of the Vatican codex the diploma given to Henry, King of the English."—*Eccles. Annal.*, xii, p. 418 (Antwerp, 1634).

pope affected not only Stigand's position, who was in consequence looked upon askance by many churchmen, but also the Church of England, which the reigning Pope regarded as schismatical. The position was aggravated by the hostility of the monks to the Godwin family, who were on good terms with the secular canons. The monks were a great help to William in consequence. Again in 1061, Earl Tostig led a party to Rome to procure the pallium for Ealdred of York. This was refused by the Pope, and on leaving Rome the party was attacked and robbed. Tostig went back to the Pope and complained so fiercely that the Pope gave the pallium, but did not forgive the insult.¹ Freeman declared that the real crime of England was its independence of Rome, and it was to punish that crime that the crusade of William was approved and blessed. "A land where the church and the nation were but different names for the same body, a land where priests and prelates were subject to the laws like other men, a land where the King and his Witan gave and took away the staff of the bishop, was a land which, in the eyes of Rome, was more dangerous than a land of Jews or Saracens."² Accordingly, when William's ambassador, Gilbert, Archdeacon of Lisieux, presented himself, and laid his master's complaints against Harold and his claim to England before Alexander II, it was too good an opportunity for the extension of the powers of the papacy to be missed. The story of Harold's oath of fealty to William made over a tub in which were concealed the relics of Saints, was told; William's pious desire to teach the English obedience to the Pope and to secure the punctual payment of his dues was set forth, and his offer to hold of God and St. Peter the kingdom he hoped to win was emphasised; as the *Roman de Rou*, 11446, has it, "if God willed that he should conquer England, he would receive it from St. Peter."³ Such was the argument conceived by the subtle brains of William and his adviser, Lanfranc, which made it appear that William was really standing as the champion of the Roman Church, only desirous of reforming the evil lives and ecclesiastical abuses of ungodly islanders. So William of Poitiers⁴ (124) declares that "he intended not so much to increase his own dominion and glory as to reform Christian rites in those parts." It is certain, however, for all his specious pleas and protestations, backed up by the eloquence and determination of Hildebrand, that there was strong opposition in the Papal Court to William's projected enterprise. Hildebrand stresses this point in a letter he afterwards wrote as Gregory VII to William.⁵ "I endured great infamy almost from some of the brethren, who murmured against me that I was exerting myself with so much partisanship for the perpetration

¹ William of Malmesbury, *Gest. pont.*, 154.

² Freeman, E. A., *History of the Norman Conquest*, iii, 284.

³ K'il Engleterre conquésist.

De Saint Pierre la recevrait.

⁴ "Non tantum ditionem suam et gloriam augere, quantum ritus Christianos partibus in illis corrigere intendit."

⁵ Ep. Gregory, VII, c. xxxvi (Freeman, III, 320).

of so much slaughter." ¹ This shows that there were some honest Cardinals in the papal Court, who would not sanction the shedding of so much blood in the name of religion. But the horrors of an unprovoked war were not to be set against the interests of the papal see. Alexander issued a Bull declaring Harold usurper and William rightful claimant of the English throne. He also gave him a ring with a hair of St. Peter, and a consecrated banner.

un gonfannon e un ancl
Mult precios e riche e bel. (*Roman de Rou*, 11452.)

It would also seem that the Bull declared that the English were excommunicated from the apostle and the church. ² It was a triumph of an unrighteous conspiracy when William invaded England with the papal blessing as the champion of the Roman see. Myriads of valiant men were slain in order that the Roman treasury should be replenished.

The same story can be told of Roman ruthlessness among other peoples, for example, the massacres of the Waldenses, of the Huguenots, of the Irish, to say nothing of the Inquisition in Spain, and the tortures and slaughter of the Knights Templars in France, for which the Pope was responsible. The Irish nobles complained to the Pope that more than 50,000 men on both sides had perished by the sword because of Adrian's Bull. Perish humanity provided Rome prevails.

STORIES AND LESSONS. THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR HOME AND SCHOOL. Part I, Genesis. By Marion Power. *S.P.C.K.* 2s.

It is all to the good that teachers should be acquainted with modern thought in its application to the Old Testament. But it does not follow that modern views are necessarily true. This lesson book assumes that the modern critical position as to the structure of the Old Testament is fully established and seems to imagine that children from eight to ten need to be taught on that basis. It is not difficult by distortion or disproportion to make a contrast between God in the Old Testament and in the New much to the disadvantage of the former. But we believe that there is a more excellent way, and that is to take the narratives in a much more natural and simple way than that of the highly skilled analysts of to-day, who fail to realise that they are creating in the minds of many quite as many difficulties as those which they seek to remove. And we certainly do not think that children of tender years are helped by the fashion now in vogue. This is not to say that reasonable Biblical criticism is to be despised, or that everything old is sacrosanct.

¹ A quibusdam fratribus magnam pene infamiam pertuli submurmurantibus quod ad tanta homicidia perpetranda tanto favore meam operam impendissem.

² Wace makes William say, after he landed, of the English :

ke cil sunt escumengié
De l' Apostole e del clegié.