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

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

harbours as part of their episcopal charge. The waterside clergy should overcome their official hydrophobia and board the shipping and barges in their parishes. And especial pains should be taken to make the captains and officers feel that they are looked upon as fellow-labourers with the clergy in conveying to their crews the ministrations of the Gospel of God. Sailors are missionaries for good or for evil to the whole world. Surely it is not a nautical question alone, but one for the whole Church of Christ, that their example, their influence, and their teachings should be that of the first sailor-apostles, and of their Lord.

W. DAWSON.

ART. II.—WILLIAM RUFUS.

The Reign of William Rufus. By E. A. FREEMAN, M.A., Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. Two vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1882.

OF the reign of William II. historical students who may be ranked in the "general reader" class know probably very little. Yet the years during which William Rufus reigned are of high importance in relation to constitutional history, while they supply a store of interesting narratives as regards both persons and places. Mr. Freeman's present work, promised in his "History of the Norman Conquest," is rather long, and in certain places rather dry. Of those who take it in hand some, at all events, will think that the smaller details are elaborated with unnecessary care. There are two volumes, each five or six hundred pages long, on the history of only thirteen years. Who can master our national annals at this rate? For the sake of the large number of persons who are fond of reading history, but whose disposable time is limited, books which give a clear, full view of a reign or period in small compass, so that it may be mastered with enjoyment, are much to be desired. The writer of such an historical book, no doubt, should go to first-hand authorities, should weigh and compare the various documents and books which throw light upon his subject, should be accurate, judicial, and laborious. The work should be thoroughly done. Yet the result of his investigations, surely, may be given in a handy octavo, readable all through. For the ordinary reader compression is certainly expedient. Mr. Freeman's style, however, is well known, and the volumes before us will not diminish his reputation. To the cause of historical study he has rendered great services. His command of a subject

which he takes in hand is such that he delights to expand, to illustrate, and to enforce; and if he too often forgets that few of those who go through his detailed narratives are likely to have an historical mind well furnished, he, at all events, supplies material from which other authors may borrow, and so readers in general may profit. An author who shall stand to Mr. Freeman in the same relation which Dr. Cumming held with regard to the author of the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, will find an extremely large circle of interested readers.

Of an eventful period, in the volumes before us, the story is admirably told. There is no lack of interesting incidents; battles and sieges, disputes among princes and barons, ecclesiastical revolts, social and domestic quarrels, are detailed with skill. The guiding thought of the work is easy to grasp. It is that William the Red, a Norman king, the son of the Norman Conqueror, was established on the English throne by English hands. The warfare waged during the first years of his reign was a victory won by Englishmen over Normans on English soil: in other words, the Norman conquest of England was completed by English hands. This important truth, set forth in its real bearings, is the key-note of Mr. Freeman's reflections. By the Norman conquest of England, as he points out, all that is implied in that name must be fully understood. "When Englishmen, by armed support of a Norman king, accepted the fact of the Norman Conquest, they in some measure changed its nature. In the act of completing the Conquest, they in some sort undid it. If we are told that the end of the Conquest came in the days of Rufus, in the days of Rufus came also the beginnings of the later effects of the Conquest." Thus, under William II. and Flambard,[1] the feudal side of the Conquest put on a systematic shape; but, on the other hand, during that period the anti-feudal tendencies of the Conquest grew and gained strength. On the Welsh marshes the power of England was extended; on the north-west[2] territory was won; in regard to Europe, England, now seen to be strong and wealthy, took a new place. In the company of the Red King, therefore, we are introduced to new lines of thought.

---

[1] Randolf Flambard, the chief minister ("Vizier") of William II. His astute devices for filling the king's coffers, particularly by the sale of bishoprics and by plundering Church property in general, are ably set forth in these volumes.

[2] In 1092, William enlarged the actual kingdom of England by the addition of a new shire, a new earldom—in process of time a new bishopric. The ruling lord or earl of Carlisle land was Dolfin, the son of Gospatric, a scion of the old Northumbrian princely house, and sprung by female descent from the Imperial stock of Wessex. Rufus drove out Dolfin; restored the forsaken city of Carlisle, and built the castle. Moreover, he settled a colony in the conquered land.

The struggle which kept the crown for Rufus [says Mr. Freeman], the last armed struggle between Englishmen and Normans on English ground, the fight of Pevensey and the siege of Rochester, forms a stirring portion of our annals—a portion whose interest yields only to that of a few great days like the days of Senlac and of Lewes. But the really great tale is after all that which is more silent and hidden. This was, above all things, the time when the Norman Conquest took root, as something which at once established the Norman power in England, and which ruled that the Norman power should, step by step, change into an English power. The great fact of Rufus' day is that Englishmen won the crown of England for a Norman king in fight against rebellious Normans. On that day the fact of the Conquest was fully acknowledged; it became something which, as to its immediate outward effects, there was no longer any thought of undoing. The house of the Conqueror was to be the royal house; there were to be no more revolts on behalf of the heir of Cerdic, no more messages sent to invite the heir of Cnut. And with the kingship of the Norman all was accepted which was immediately implied in the kingship of the Norman. But on that day it was further ruled that the kingship of the Norman was to change into an English kingship. . . . . These years helped, too, in a more silent way, if not to change the Norman rule at home into an English rule, at least to make things ready for the coming of the king who was really to do the work.

William Rufus, nominated by his father, was elected or approved king by Archbishop Lanfranc. To Robert, according to modern notions of hereditary right, the kingly crown of England, as well as the ducal coronet of Normandy, should have passed. English feeling at the time, doubtless, would have chosen Henry, youngest son of the Conqueror, for he alone was the son of a crowned king and a man born in the land. But the last wish of "William the Great" was that his island crown should pass to William, his second surviving son. No orders were given for the coronation, but Lanfranc was requested to crown him, if he thought it right. As soon as the dying king had dictated a letter conveying his wishes, William Rufus started (September 8) for the haven of Touques; with him journeyed one of the king's chaplains, and also Morkere and Wulfnoth,[1] who represented the mightiest of the fallen houses of England. Before they left Norman ground the news came that all was over. From Winchester William hastened to the presence of Lanfranc, and with the least possible delay the new king was crowned (September 26). There was not the slightest

[1] Morkere, the son of Ælfgar, once the chosen Earl of the Northumbrians; Wolfnoth, the youngest son of Godwine and brother of Harold. Set free by the Conqueror in his fatal illness, they tasted the air of freedom for a few days only. They were put in prison at Winchester. The son of Godwine and the grandson of Leofric might either of them be dangerous to the son of the Norman William.

opposition. All parties, probably, were taken by surprise. "The crown which had passed to Eadward from a long line of kingly forefathers, the crown which Harold had worn by the free gift of the English people, the crown which the first William had won by his sword and had kept by his wisdom, now passed to the second of his name and house. And it passed, to all appearance, with the perfect goodwill of all the dwellers in the land, conquerors and conquered alike." From Westminster William went again to his capital, Winchester, and threw open the stores of his father's treasury for gifts and bribes, but mainly for the benefit of churches and for alms to the poor for the late king's soul.[1] The hoard at Winchester served his purposes well. At the Christmas feast and assembly in Westminster were present the two archbishops, and several bishops, including Odo of Bayeux, newly released from prison, who received again from his nephew the earldom of Kent.

In the spring of the next year a rebellion broke out. As the native Chronicler puts it, "the land was mightily stirred, and was filled with mickle treason, for all the richest Frenchmen (*riceste Frencisce men*) that were in this land would betray their lord the king, and would have his brother to king, Robert that was Earl in Normandy." The leader in this revolt was Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. Odo was dissatisfied because the chief place in the king's confidence was held by another bishop, William of Saint-Calais, who had succeeded the murdered Walcher in the See of Durham; but against the primate Lanfranc, Odo bore a bitter grudge. The chief Normans in England, then, plotted how the king might be killed or handed over alive to Robert. Bishop William, it seems clear, turned against his benefactor; being suspected, he escaped to his castle at Durham. At the Easter Gemót,[2] the great nobles did not appear; each in his castle was making ready for war. With two members of the ducal house of Normandy were Roger of Montgomery, Earl of Shrewsbury; Roger the Bigod, father of earls; Roger of Lacy, great in the shires from Berkshire to Shropshire; Hugh of Grantmesnil, with his nephew the Marquess Robert of Rhuddlan, the terror of the Northern Cymry; and other great lords. Hugh of Chester, however, clave to the king. At first the rebel lords were successful. Bristol Castle, occupied by the warrior Bishop of Coutances, Geoffrey of Mowbray, was turned into a den of robbers. Bath was burned, and Berkeley district laid waste. An attack on Worcester, however, signally failed; and the re-

[1] Robert, received as Duke of the Normans, did "the same pious work among the poor and the churches of his duchy."

[2] The Witenagemót was held three times a year. It gradually became less popular and less powerful.

pulse was mainly due to an English bishop. The Norman garrison in Worcester, by whom the virtues of the bishop were honoured, entreated Wulfstan to enter the fortress. Wulfstan, the one remaining bishop of English blood, was loyal to William; and the king's troops, with the citizens of Worcester, repulsed the rebels. The most exciting scenes of the struggle were in Kent and Sussex. The Bishop of Bayeux made the castle of Rochester his headquarters. Pevensey was occupied by a rebel lord. In the stronghold of Arundel, Earl Roger, not needed in Shrewsbury, was watching events; but William of Warren, faithful to the king, was in strength at Lewes, and the great earl kept quiet. After a time, indeed, William, a typical Norman—sometimes a fox and sometimes a lion—won over Earl Roger. The mass of the people, apparently, were against the Norman lords. By the advice of the bishops, or by his own discernment, the king saw that the course of safety was to throw himself on the people. As king of the English he sent forth a proclamation to the sons of the soil. He was lavish of promises. King William would reign over his people like Eadward, or Cnut, or Ælfred; they should have the best laws that ever before were in England; in particular, the hunting laws were to be relaxed, and oppressive unrighteous taxation should no longer be made. The English people, influenced perhaps by Lanfranc and Wulfstan, and hating Odo and the leading Norman lords,[1] took up the king's cause; his promises were credited. Thirty thousand of the true natives of the land came together of their own free will, and William the Red, at the head of a zealous host of horse and foot, Norman and English, set forth from London.[2] Tunbridge Castle was stormed; Pevensey Castle surrendered; Norman troops sent over by Duke Robert were hindered by the English from landing; and, finally, in Rochester, Odo and Robert of Bellême, after a sturdy defence, were compelled to crave for

[1] "If the Bishop of Bayeux and the Bishop of Coutances, if Robert of Mortain and Robert of Mowbray, if Eustace of Boulogne and the fierce Lord of Bellême, could all be smitten down by English axes or driven into banishment from the English shores; if their estates on English soil could be again parted out as the reward of English valour, the work of the Norman Conquest would indeed seem to be undone. And it would be undone none the less, although the king whose crown was made sure by English hands was himself the son of the Conqueror of England."

[2] The English exhorted William to win for himself the empire of the whole island. [Ord. Vit. 667A. "Passim per totum Albionem *impera*. . . . ."] The phrase, says Mr. Freeman, is worth noting, even if it be a mere flourish of the historian. It marks that the change of dynasty was fully accepted, that the son of the Conqueror was fully acknowledged as the heir of all the rights of Æthelstan the Glorious, and of Eadmund the Doer-of-great-deeds. A daughter of their race still sat on the Scottish throne, but for Malcolm, the savage devastator of northern England, Englishmen could not be expected to feel any love.

pardon at the hands of the victorious king. Odo left England and all that he had in England for ever. The rebellion was at an end. In the Whitsun assembly, June 4, 1088, the king, in a position to reward and punish, made some grants of confiscated lands. For the chief rebels there was an amnesty at once.

The story of Bishop William of Durham is a puzzling one. His own version—written by himself or by some local admirer—cannot be trusted; yet it agrees in the main with the narratives of the southern writers. He protested that he was wholly innocent of any crime against the king. A safe-conduct was sent to Durham, that the accused might with confidence journey to the king's court. In November, at Salisbury, the debate was held. At the outset, the bishop raised the question whether he ought not to be judged and the other bishops to judge him, in full episcopal dress; but Lanfranc replied, "We can judge very well clothed as we are, for garments do not hinder truth." After some legal discussion, the bishop flatly refused to do right to the king,[1] that is, to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Court. Lanfranc and the lay-members of the Court pressed their demand with firmness, but in vain. Bishop William's words, says Mr. Freeman, "amounted to a casting aside of all the earlier jurisprudence of England," but they were "only a natural inference from that act of the Conqueror which had severed the jurisdictions which ancient English custom had joined together." The bishop at all events was outspoken. He told the barons of the realm and the other laymen present that with them he had nothing to do. In vain his own Metropolitan, Thomas of York, appealed to him. The wrath of the laymen waxed hot; and angry words flew forth; but finally the bishop, declaring that he had not been canonically summoned, and was not tried according to the canons, appealed to "the Apostolic See of Rome:"—

> Such an appeal as this [says Mr. Freeman] was indeed going to the root of the matter. It was laying down the rule against which Englishmen had yet to strive for more than four hundred years. William of Saint-Calais not only declared that there were causes with which no English tribunal was competent to deal, but he laid down that among such causes were to be reckoned all judgments where any bishop—if not every priest—was an accused party. Bishop William could not even claim that, as one charged with an ecclesiastical offence, he had a right to appeal to the highest ecclesiastical judge. Even such a claim as this was a novelty, either in Normandy or in England, but Bishop William was not charged with any ecclesiastical offence. . . . William the Great . . . . was indeed in all causes and over all persons ecclesiastical and temporal within his dominions supreme. But

[1] *Rectitudinem facere* is the technical phrase.

the moment he was gone, that great supremacy seems to have fallen in pieces.

The king's patience had borne a good deal, but it was now beginning to give way. In short, sharp sentences, spoken with a fierce look, he rebuked the bishop's revolt. Taking a very practical view of the case (a reading of the Church and State question, however, which Ritualists of Queen Victoria's reign refuse to accept), he said:—"My will is that you give me up your castle, as you will not abide by the sentence of my court." But the bishop was wily and stubborn: he kept on protesting; he talked of his conscience as obedient to the *Christian* law.[1] The end of it was that he was allowed to leave England; and on Nov. 19, the king's officers entered the castle of Durham and disseized the bishop of his church and castle and all his land. By the sentence of forfeiture pronounced by the Court, all his goods had become the property of the crown.

Of this Bishop William, in connection with ecclesiastical revolt, we hear again, but no longer as a suppliant at the Court of Rome. Honourably received by Duke Robert, this "spiritual" person was placed in charge of the Duchy of Normandy; and when, in the year 1095, Anselm taught the doctrine that the King of the English had a superior on earth, that the decrees of the Witan of England could be rightly appealed from to a foreign power, William of Saint-Calais, the convicted traitor who had posed as a persecuted confessor,[2] came forward to maintain the royal supremacy.

The case of Anselm is full of interest. But within the limits of this review we cannot at all discuss it. For Anselm's appeal to Rome, and his subsequent action as between Pope and King, a laboured apology is made in these volumes. Referring to Dean Church's "Life of Anselm," Mr. Freeman says:—"The Dean had not been led to notice that earlier action of William of Saint-Calais which from my point of view is all-important for the story of Anselm." This piece of history—the appeal to Rome by Bishop William—he adds, "has never been told at length by any writer, though Dr. Stubbs has shown full appreciation of its constitutional bearings." That it was not Anselm who took the first step towards the "establishment of foreign and usurped jurisdictions within the realm," he repeats again and again; and he remarks,

---

[1] He seems to have pointed to a volume in his own hand. "Christianam legem quam hic scriptam habeo, testem invoco." The remark, says Mr. Freeman, most likely refers to the False Decretals.

[2] Mr. Freeman justly remarks that in the debate at Salisbury the bishop "was simply availing himself of every legal subtlety, of every pretended ecclesiastical privilege, in order to escape a real trial, in which he knew that he would have no safe ground on the merits of the case."

as in support of his own view, that Dean Hook's estimate of Anselm became more favourable.

In May, 1089, Lanfranc died. One of the abettors of the Conquest, the righthand man of the Conqueror, the Lombard prelate had found the way to the goodwill of the conquered people, with whom and with whose land either his feelings or his policy led him to identify himself. Up to the time of his death the worst features of the character of William Rufus had not shown themselves in their fulness. He had been a dutiful son, and there was something of dutiful submission to Lanfranc, the guardian to whose care his father had entrusted him. As soon as the Archbishop died, William[1] burst all bounds. The man had been either corrupted by prosperity, or else, like Tiberius,[2] his natural character was now for the first time able to show itself. His pride was boundless; he was wasteful, capricious, and cruel. What makes him stand out in so specially hateful a light is indulgence in the foulest forms of vice, combined with a shocking form of irreligion and blasphemy.[3] There was in him something of a chivalrous spirit; and when he pledged his word, he kept to it; but his treaties with other princes and his promises to his people went for nothing. The land was bowed down with *ungeld*—money, that is, wrung from the people by unrede, unright, and unlaw:—"in his days ilk right fell away, and ilk unright for God and for world uprose." He had promised the English good laws and freedom from unrighteous taxes, but the promises with which he had bought their help in the day of his danger were utterly trampled under foot. Never was a king more hated.[4]

---

[1] At that time probably about thirty years of age. William II. was a man of no great stature, of a thick square frame, with a projecting stomach. His bodily strength was great. He had the yellow hair of his race, and the ruddiness of his countenance gave him the surname which has stuck to him so closely.

[2] Ann. vi. 51. But an English Tacitus could not make many stages in the downfall of the Red King.

[3] In the long roll-call of evil kings, not one, perhaps, has so evil a place. He stands well-nigh alone, says Mr. Freeman, "in bringing back the foulest vices of heathendom into a Christian land, and at the same time openly proclaiming himself the personal enemy of his Maker." It seems probable that in taking the part of the Jew and annoying the Christian, he found a malicious satisfaction. He is charged with a sort of personal defiance of the Almighty. When he recovered from the sickness, in 1093, he said, "God shall never see me a good man; I have suffered too much at His hands."

[4] The distinguished historian gives an interesting sketch of the warrior-companion of the king, Robert of Bellême, afterwards of Shrewsbury, of Bridgnorth, and of both Montgomeries. "Restless ambition, reckless contempt of the rights of others, were common to him with many of his neighbours and contemporaries. But he stands almost alone

He was "in hunting from his own men with an arrow offshot." This is the statement of the Chronicle as to William's death, and according to our author, it is the only safe one. Nothing more is certainly known.

On August 1, 1100, the king was in the New Forest, with his head-quarters at Brockenhurst. He had with him Gilbert of Laigle, Walter Tirel, and other men. Henry, Ætheling and Count, if not one of the party, was not far off; like his brother William, he had, say the stories, had his omens, if not his visions. Walter Tirel, a baron of France, who had been attracted to the Red King's service by the fame of his liberality, was chief among the hunting company, and as on other days, William's special comrade. They held that discourse which is called in the Old-French tongue by the expressive words *gaber* and *gab*. Walter began to jeer at the king, and, as it seems, his mocking vein turned to anger. The king boasted what he would do in France before Christmas; whereupon the Frenchman burst forth in wrathful words.[1] How far this story is correct, and whether or no there was a plot on Tirel's part, we cannot tell.

"Thereafter on the morrow after Lammas-day [August 2nd], was the King William in hunting from his own men with an arrow offshot, and then to Winchester brought, and in the bishopric buried." These words of our own Chronicler suggest treason, but they do not directly assert it; they name no one man as the doer. In most versions Walter Tirel is mentioned; but his act is made chance-medley, and not wilful murder. It is certain that Walter himself, long after, when he had nothing either to hope or fear one way or the other, denied in the most solemn way that he had any share in the deed or any knowledge of it. The number of men who must have felt that they would be the better if an arrow could be brought to light on the Red King, must have been great. Indeed, the wonder is, not

---

in his habitual delight in the infliction of human suffering. . . . . The received forms of cruelty, blinding, and mutilation, were not enough for him; he brought the horrors of the East into Western Europe. . . . ." It is even said that the monster tore out the eyes of a little boy, his own godchild. When King Henry sent him to spend his days in prison, it was in a prison so strait and darksome that the outer world knew not whether he was dead or alive. Called Robert of Bellême, as the son of his mother, Robert of Montgomery, lord of Arundel and of Shrewsbury, and also a Norman potentate, had joined in his own person three princely inheritances. He was a great builder of castles. It was his father, Earl Roger, who built Wenlock Abbey.

[1] Geoffrey Gaimar ("Chroniques Anglo-Normandes," 1. 52)—

> De male mort pussent morir
> Li Burgoinon et li François,
> Si souzget soient as Englois!

that the shaft struck him in the 13th year of his reign, but that no hand had stricken him long before. The arrow, by whomsoever shot, set England free from oppression such as she never felt before or after, at the hand of a single man.

In taking our leave of these volumes we should say that they are beautifully printed, and contain valuable appendices, and interesting maps. Those who know the ruins of Wenlock, Rhuddlan, Arundel, Bridgnorth, and other historical places of William and Henry's reign, will enjoy Mr. Freeman's accurate descriptions. As to the spelling, we have followed the distinguished author, though, as regards many names, with reluctance. We are old-fashioned enough to prefer Alfred to Ælfred, and Edward to Eadward. Mr. Brewer protested against this fad, and Dr. Stubbs ignores it.

ART. III.—EPISCOPACY IN ENGLAND AND WALES; ITS GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT TO THE PRESENT TIME.

PART III.—GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.

THUS far, we have glanced at Christianity in England during two great periods. The British Church existed alone, or with aid from the missionaries of Hibernic origin, for 416 years—that is to say, from A.D. 180 to 596. The Saxon Church, mainly of Latin origin, but not exclusively so for the first half century, has a history of 470 years, or from 596 to 1066. The former was slow and gradual in its development, but this was inevitable from the method of its introduction,—chiefly by individuals, and at various times and places. The latter took possession of the country systematically and with great rapidity, as both in its introduction and its extension it was more authoritative and formal. In the Latin Church, a bishop was usually the chaplain of the king; and when the latter became a "nursing father" in his little domain, his subjects were naturally predisposed to follow his example.[1] Thus the Church and the State worked together in harmony, and though civil discord might change the area of kingdoms or the power of their rulers, the Church maintained its hold, in alliance with

[1] Hence, a bishop-*ric* is literally a bishop's kingdom; the Anglo-Saxon *ric* or *rice* being the equivalent of *regnum*.—"Alfric's Vocabulary," 10th century; and "Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary," 11th century. ["Mayer's Vocabularies."]