PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SOMERSETSHIRE ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND
NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.
1872, PART II.

PAPERS, ETC.

King Ine.

BY EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L.

INE King of the West-Saxons, the conqueror, the lawgiver, the pilgrim to the threshold of the Apostles, stands out as one of the most famous names in the early history of the English people. In the history of his own West-Saxon Kingdom, above all in the history of our own shire, the place which he holds is naturally higher still. It was he, there can be little doubt, who put the last stroke to the work which Ceawlin had begun, and under whom the whole land of the Sumorsætas became

English. Four famous spots, within our own shire or on its immediate border, claim him as their first founder or as among the chiefest of their benefactors. His works in those four spots set him before us in various characters. He appears as a warrior extending the borders of his kingdom and providing for the security of his conquest by the erection of a border fortress. He appears also as a Christian ruler, not as a mere lavish giver to ecclesiastical bodies, but as an enlightened promoter of ecclesiastical changes which were clearly for the good of his people. He appears as the prince who divided an unwieldy bishoprick, and placed the worthiest man of his time and country as shepherd of the new flock which he called into being. If on this spot we are inclined to think first of him as the man who raised Taunton as a bulwark against the Briton, we must remember that he was also the man who first gave the western part of his dominions a Bishop of their own, and who placed the holy Ealdhelm in the chair of Sherborne which he had founded. And if Taunton and Sherborne, here the fortress, there the church, claim him without doubt as, in those characters, their first creator, two other famous spots claim him, with somewhat less of certainty, one as a founder, the other as a special benefactor. A King reigning over a people still divided in blood and speech, ruler alike of the conquering English and of the conquered Britons, he is set forth as the patron of the holy places of both alike. He spreads his bounty alike over the Church of the conquerors and the Church of the conquered; he is the second founder of British Glastonbury, the first founder of English Wells. And, as he appears in our local history or legend as the benefactor of the ecclesiastical foundations of both races, so he appears in the imperishable witness of his laws as the ruler and law-

giver of both alike. The Laws of Ine, in other respects among the most precious monuments of English antiquity, have yet a further and special value as the one authentic picture of the relations between English and Briton within the English dominion. Nor is it only in this more general way that the name of Ine is connected with the history of the Britons as well as with that of the English. The conquered race seems in some strange way to have laid hold of their conqueror and lawgiver; they have in some sort claimed him as their own, and have identified him with names that were renowned in their own history or tradition. And yet, famous as Ine is, there are few historical names of equal fame so much of whose history is puzzling and uncertain. The statements as to his descent are contradictory; the manner of his accession to the West-Saxon crown is unrecorded, but casual notices show that there must have been something unusual, if not irregular, about it. And much of the history of his reign is made up of casual, and not always very intelligible, notices of the same kind. We find him engaged in civil wars with men of his own nation and his own family, but as to the origin and object of their disputes we are left in the dark. It is to one of these casual notices that we owe the knowledge of that event of Ine's reign which most immediately interests us here, the first mention of the town in which we are now met. The earliest chapter in the history of Taunton is written backwards; its first building is recorded only to explain the more striking entry of its first burning.

Before we begin to comment on the particular actions of Ine himself, it may be well to take a general view of the state of things in which he was an actor. In the year 688, when Ine became King of the West-Saxons, 239 years had passed since the settlement of the first English

invaders in Britain; 193 had passed since the first landing of the West-Saxons. It was 111 years since the great conquests of Ceawlin westwards, 91 years since the mission of Augustine, and 54 years since Christianity had been first preached to the West-Saxons by Birinus. These dates should be borne in mind, the last of them especially. All that we read of the acts and legislation of Ine and our other English Kings from this time so completely takes Christianity for granted that we are apt to forget how new a thing English Christianity then was. It was only a very few years before Ine's time that heathenism had been stamped out—by very different means in the two cases—in its two last strongholds among the English race, Sussex and the Isle of Wight. In Ine's own Wessex the baptism of the first Christian King was, at the time of his accession, an event exactly as far distant as the birth of our present Queen is distant from the year in which we are now living. At Ine's accession he must have had many subjects who had worshipped Thunder and Woden in their youth; he may even have had some who secretly cherished the ancient worship in their hearts. His acts then, his laws, his foundations, his pilgrimage, must all be looked on as tinged with something of the zeal of recent conversion. As for the political state of Britain, the English Conquest had not yet by any means reached its fullest bounds; one powerful British kingdom still remained for Ine himself to do battle with; but destiny had long before decided against the Briton and in favour of the English invader. The great British power, which, a hundred and sixty years after the first English settlement, had still stretched in an unbroken mass from the Lands End to Dunbarton had been broken in pieces by the victories of Ceawlin and Æthelfrith. The territory which remained to the independent Briton now

lay in three fragments, each of which was now cut off from the others. There was the Northern Britain, Strathclyde, Cumberland, whatever we choose to call it, isolated from the other lands of the same race by the great victory of Æthelfrith under the walls of what was to be Chester. There was the central Britain, the North-Wales of our Chronicles, answering to the modern Principality, but with a far wider extent towards the east. This had been in the earlier campaigns of Ceawlin cut off from the third division, that with which we have most to do in the life of Ine and in the history of Wessex. The south-western Britain, the West-Wales of our Chronicles, the Kingdom of Cornwall, Damnonia, whatever name we may choose to give it, still remained powerful and independent. Cut off as it was in a corner, with no neighbour of its own race, with one neighbour only of the hostile race, its conquest by the advancing power of the English was only a question of time. But it was still strong enough to offer a stubborn resistance to the West-Saxon invader, strong enough to take advantage of any moments of weakness or of any diversions caused by warfare between Wessex and the other English powers themselves. Among those English powers, the precarious amount of union implied in the Bretwaldadom, whatever we may hold that amount to have been, was now in abeyance. The Bretwalda Oswiu of Northumberland had died in 670, and he had at any rate no acknowledged successor before Ecgberht. Three English states, Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex, stood forth beyond all dispute in front of all the others. There was no longer any chance of the renewal of that earlier state of things when we find South-Saxon, Kentish, and East-Anglian princes on the roll of Bretwaldas. And, of the three great states, Northumberland was now sinking from the great position which it had held

earlier in the century. Mercia and Wessex might pass for rival states of nearly equal power, against neither of which could the smaller kingdoms to the east of them contend with any hope of success.

The boundaries of Wessex itself, the kingdom over which Ine was called to rule, were at this time in an intermediate state. The conquests of Wessex in the sixth century had aimed northwards rather than westwards. After the taking of Old Sarum by Cynric in 552, which secured the safety of the West-Saxon dominion in Hampshire and Wiltshire, the conquests of Cuthwulf and Ceawlin had given Wessex a great dominion north of the Avon and Thames, while they had barely grazed the great western peninsula by the first English conquest in our own shire, that of the land between Axe and Avon. Ceawlin had failed in his attempt to reach the northern sea, and to isolate the central as well as the Western Britain; the conquest of Deva had been reserved for the Northumbrian Æthelfrith. But he had fought at Bedford and at Fethanleah; he had changed Bensington and Eynsham, Aylesbury and Buckingham, Bath, Cirencester, and Gloucester, the ruins of Uriconium and an undefined land along the Severn, into English ground. At the beginning of the seventh century the West-Saxon power stretched over at least as large a dominion to the north of the Thames as it did to the south, while the great region contained in modern Cornwall, Devonshire, and the greater part of Somerset remained still untouched in the hands of the Briton. The Wessex of the ninth century and onwards was a state which might establish an external supremacy more or less complete to the north of Thames and Avon, but whose own actual and immediate boundary was sharply marked by the general course of those rivers as a well

defined boundary. Wessex in her earlier stage aimed chiefly at power in central and northern England. Wessex in her later form fell back on her more natural position as the great state of southern England, conquering, incorporating, largely assimilating, all the powers British or English lying south of the mouths of the two great rivers of southern Britain. The seventh and eight centuries set Wessex before us in a stage intermediate between the two, and the reign of Ine may perhaps be taken as the central point of the whole period. The work of those two centuries, as far as England was concerned, was to show that the true destiny of Wessex was to be cut short to the North and to extend herself to the East and West. Her Kings might win an external supremacy over all the Teutonic powers within the Island, or over the whole Island itself. She might incorporate herself and her Teutonic dependencies into an English Kingdom in which she was content to merge her own name and national being. But Wessex, by that name, was to keep herself from the lands north of the two rivers in order that she might more fully reign over all the lands to the south of them; she was to give up reigning at Gloucester and Buckingham in order that she might reign at Exeter and Canterbury.

The dominion then to which Ine succeeded has an anomalous look on the map of England. The older West-Saxon possessions in the Southern mainland, Hampshire, Wiltshire, Dorset, Surrey which Ceawlin had wrested from Æthelberht at the fight of Wimbledon, had never been lost. Wight, the dependent realm of the Jutish nephews of Cerdic, had been added by Wulfhere of Mercia to the South-Saxon Kingdom; but it had been won back for Wessex—by what means every reader of Bæda knows—by Ine's immediate predecessor Ceadwalla, and a supremacy

over Sussex had been won for Wessex by the sword of the same irresistible warrior.* To the north-east, beyond the Thames, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire still remained West-Saxon ground; but to the north-west the conquests of Ceawlin in the Severn valley seem to have become Mercian under Penda, and the Avon was probably the boundary in a stricter sense than it was afterwards, as we hear long after of Bath being Mercian. But losses to the Mercian had been made up by gains from the Briton; the English frontier had been extended from the Axe to the Parret by the victories of Cenwealh in 652 and 658, and, a few years before Ine's accession, the frontier had probably been carried further still by the victory of Centwine in 682. These conquests, the first conquests of the Christian West-Saxons, the first in which the vanquished were neither enslaved nor swept from the face of the earth, were the part of his dominions which gave Ine the opportunity in his character of a legislator for two races under one government. He had no British subjects to legislate for in Hampshire or Oxfordshire. The legislation which fixed the relations within Ine's kingdom between the conquering Englishman and the conquered Briton must have been a legislation for the land of the Sumorsætas, and pretty well for the land of the Sumorsætas only.

Of the kingdom thus formed Ine took possession in

* Bæda IV. 15. "Interea superveniens cum exercitu Caedualla, juvenis strenuissimus de regio genere Geuissorum, quum exsularet a patria sua, interfecit regem Ædilualch, ac provinciam illam sæva cæde ac depopulatione attrivit: sed mox expulsus est a ducibus regis, Berethuno et Andhuno, qui deinceps regnum provinciæ tenuerunt: quorum prior postea ab eodem Caedualla, quum esset rex Geuissorum, occisus est, et provincia graviore servitio subacta."

688, and held it, as the Chronicles say, thirty-seven winters, till his abdication in 726. An examination of his reign naturally suggests four chief subjects for inquiry; his descent and succession to the Crown; his wars foreign and domestic; his legislation; his ecclesiastical foundations. I will go on to speak of each of these in order.

The succession of Ine to the West-Saxon Kingdom is not a little obscure. The Chronicles simply have the formal phrase that he "feng to Westseaxna rice," without any explanation of the circumstances. But they supply us with a pedigree which shows that, though Ine came of the royal stock of Ceawlin, Cerdic, and Woden, he was not the descendant of any of the Kings who reigned immediately before him, just as he was not the forefather of any of the Kings who reigned after him. Bæda too introduces him vaguely as one of the royal house; and, in recording his abdication, the only fact about Ine besides his accession which he does record, he adds, no less vaguely, that he gave over his kingdom to those who were younger than himself.* Ine thus in a manner stands by himself in the list of West-Saxon Kings. He has no direct predecessor and no direct successor. There can be no doubt that he came in by that mixture of election and hereditary right, that choice by the nation out of a particular family, which formed the general law of the old Teutonic communities, and to which the political condition of Wessex gave special scope. The West-Saxon state was far from being a centralized or in any way closely united body, but it was not, like Mercia and, in a less degree, Northumberland and East-Anglia, a mere collection of small principalities

* Hist. Eccl. v. 7. "Successit in regnum Ini de stirpe regia, qui quum triginta et septem annis imperium tenuisset gentis illius et, ipse, relicto regno ac juvenioribus commendato," &c., &c.

of various origin, gathered together, whether by conquest or persuasion, under one dominant chief. There was a national and a family unity in the West-Saxon state from the beginning. There were many Kings, but there was always —save perhaps during that strange time after the death of Sexburh—one head King. And the head King and the lesser Kings alike seem all to have come of the one line of Cerdic. Each district, as it was conquered from the Welsh, seems to have become a new principality, the apanage of some member of the royal house. That is to say, the West-Saxon policy in these earlier times, when we have to infer a policy from scattered and incidental notices, was much the same as it was in the better known times after the days of Ecgberht, when West-Saxon Æthelings were set to reign as subordinate Kings over Kent and Sussex. Thus, when Eadwine invaded Wessex to avenge his wrongs on Cwichelm, five Kings of the West-Saxons, fighting no doubt under the banner of their kinsman and superior King, died in the battle against him.* It marks perhaps a certain advance in the ideas at once of royal power and of national unity when, a little later, we find the subordinate princes no longer distinctly spoken of as Kings, but bearing the lowlier title of *Subregulus* or *Under-King*. I will not here, while specially examining the life of Ine, stop to discuss that strange period in our West-Saxon history, those twelve years between the death of Cenwealh and the accession of Ceadwalla, when, according to Bæda, the Under-Kings succeeded for a while in getting rid of the central monarchy altogether.† The Chronicles, it is well known, give a regular succession of sovereigns

* Chron. Petrib. 626. "And he tha for on West-Seaxam mid fyrde, and afylde thær v. ciningas."

† See Norman Conquest, i. 580.

during this time—I must not say of Kings, for the first of them is the Queen Sexburh, the one recorded instance of a female ruler till we come to the Empress Matilda in the twelfth century. Florence of Worcester was puzzled at the contradiction in his time. I am no less puzzled now, and Dr. Guest has not carried on his discourses on early English history far enough to help me. But one thing is important for our purpose. Whether the Kings mentioned in the interval were really Kings over all Wessex, or only some of the Under-Kings spoken of by Bæda, it is certain that all the Kings of this period sprang from the one house of Cerdic, and yet that no two in succession sprang from the same branch of that house. Cenwealh, according to the story, was succeeded by his widow Sexburh ;* then came either Cenfus or his son Æscwine, sprung, like Cenwealh, from Cutha the son of Cynric, but not from the same son of Cutha.† Then the succession goes back to the former branch in the person of Centwine the brother of Cenwealh. Then came Ceadwalla, under whom at all events the national unity was restored.‡ In him the Crown passes from the line of Cutha back again to the line of Ceawlin, and under Ine we find it still in the line of Ceawlin, but in another branch of that

* All the Chronicles are distinct as to Sexburgh's reign of a year and they are followed by Florence, Henry of Huntingdon and all the later writers, but it is hard to force this and the story in Bæda into agreement.

† The Chronicles (674) give the pedigree. "Her feng Æscwine to rice on Westseaxum, se wæs Cenfusing; Cenfus Cenferthing; Cenferth Cuthgilsing; Cuthgils Ceolwulfing ; Ceolwulf Cynricing; Cynric Cerdicing." But Florence had evidently seen an account in which Cenfus himself and not his son was made to succeed ; "Deinde Cenfus duobus annis secundum dicta regis Ælfredi, juxta vero Chronicam Anglicam, filius ejus Æscwinus fere tribus annis regnavit."

‡ Bæda IV. 12. "Devictis atque amotis subregulis, Caedualla suscepit imperium."

line.* And so the changes go on through the eighth century, till, in the person of Ecgberht, the crown of Wessex, and all that the crown of Wessex was to grow into, was fixed for ever in the descendants, not of Ine himself but of his brother Ingild.† Of all the intermediate Kings, Æthelings, and pretenders whom we read of between Ine and Ecgberht, each is said to have been sprung of the line of Cerdic, and to have been a kinsman of the King who reigned before him. In several cases the King who succeeds is spoken of as an Under-King or the son of an Under-King,‡ but in no case does the son succeed to the father or even the brother to the brother. The inference to my mind at least is clear. Within the one West-Saxon kingdom there were several principalities held by Under-Kings of the royal house, any one of whom, or any other member of the royal house, it was open to the nation at large to choose to the central kingship. In some cases the language of our authorities might lead us to suspect that Kings were chosen during the lifetime of their fathers. In the most

* Chronicles 685. "Ceadwalla wæs Cenbrihting; Cenbriht Ceadding; Ceadda Cuthing; Cutha Ceawlining; Ceawlin Cynricing; Cynric Cerdicing." Cenbriht the father of Ceadwalla would seem to be the person whose death is recorded in the Chronicles in the year 661 with the title of Cyning. In Florence he appears distinctly as "Cenbryht subregulus, Ceaulini scilicet regis pronepos, et pater Ceadwallae regis."

† Chronicles, 855. Æthelwulf wæs Ecgbrihting; Ecgbriht Ealhmunding; Ealhmund Eafing; Eafa Eopping; Eoppa Ingilding; Ingild wæs Ines brothur Westseaxna cyninges."

‡ In the genealogy in Florence, Ine himself is "filius subreguli Cenredi, abnepotis Regis Ceaulini." Æthelheard is "de prosapia Cerdici Regis, cui propinquus suus Cuthredus successit." Sigeberht is "filius Sigerici subreguli;" his brother Cyneheard is "clito;" Cynewulf and Beorhtric are both "de prosapia Cerdici Regis oriundus," and Ecgberht is "filius Alhmundi subreguli." In the Chronicles we read of "mæge," and in Henry of Huntingdon of "cognatus," but I doubt whether the fact of several Kings being sons of "subreguli," "undercyningas," come out so clearly elsewhere.

illustrious case, and that which most nearly concerns us, we know that it was so. Ine, the son of the Under-King Cenred, was called to the head kingship during his father's life-time. And it is plain that such a choice in no way displaced or supplanted the elder prince, nor does it seem to have been contrary to his wishes. That Ine succeeded Ceadwalla, that Ine was the son of Cenred, we learn from all our Chronicles and genealogies ; but that Ine was chosen King in the life-time of his father, and that the King continued to trust and honour his father the Under-King as the first among his counsellors, we learn only from the preamble of Ine's own Laws. There we read how Ine King of the West-Saxons puts forth his Laws "with thought and with lore of Cenred his father and Hedde his Bishop and Eorcenwold his Bishop, with all his Ealdormen and the eldest Witan of his people and eke of a mickle coming together of God's servants."*

Ine then was, beyond all doubt, the son of an Under-King Cenred, who survived his son's election to the supreme kingship.† He was the son of Cenred, the son

* Laws of Ine, Thorpe, Laws and Institutes i. 152. Schmid. 20. "Ic Ine, mid Godes gife Westseaxena Kyning, mid getheahte and mid lare Cênrêdes mînes fæder and Heddes mînes biscepes and Eorcenwoldes mînes biscepes, mid eallum mînum ealdormonnum and thæm ieldstan witum minre theôde, and eâc micelre gesomnunge Godes theôwa." I hardly know what to make of the charter of Nothelm of Sussex in Cod. Dipl. v. 36, bearing date 692, where, among other signatures, we read "Ego Coenredus Rex West-Saxonum consensi et subscripsi. Ego Ine consensi et propria manu subscripsi." This seems very strange, but Mr. Kemble does not mark it as spurious. See also Palgrave, English Commonwealth, ii. cclxxiv. Mon. Ang. vi. 1163.

† Two pedigrees of Ine are given in the Chronicles, one in 688, when his accession is recorded. "Thonne wæs se Ine Cenreding ; Cenred Ceolwalding ; Ceolwald wæs Cynegilses brothur and tha wæron Cuthwines suna Ceaulinges ; Ceaulin Cynricing ; Cynric Cerdicing." The other is in 856 gives the descent of Æthelwulf from Adam. The two of course coincide in the generations between Ingild and Cerdic. Cutha however

of Ceolwald, the son of Cutha, the son of Cuthwine, the son of Ceawlin, the son of Cynric, the son of Cerdic. He had a brother Ingild, the forefather of Ecgberht, and thereby of all the later West-Saxon Kings.* His two sisters Cwenburh and Cuthburh, were, like so many daughters of Old-English Kings, enrolled among the saints.† Of these two Cuthburh has won for herself a high place in West-Saxon hagiology. After being for some while the wife of Ealdfrith King of the Northumbrians, she left

is inserted between Ceolwald and Cuthwine, and some of the manuscripts strangely insert Creoda between Cynric and Cerdic. William of Malmesbury (Gest. Reg. i. 35) describes Ine as "Chinegisli ex patre Cuthbaldo pronepos" which—the names Ceolwald and Cuthbald being evidently confounded—agrees with the entry under 688, only one cannot help fancying that William was thinking of the King Cynegils. But in the Gesta Pontificum (191) he gives Ine altogether a wrong father, Cissa; and again in 354, in quoting the charter of Baldred of which I shall have to speak again, he adds "Subscripserunt his duabus cartis Hedda episcopus Wintoniensis, Kentuuinus rex, Cissa pater Inæ postea regis." But the description of Cissa is an inference of his own, as in the Charter itself (Cod. Dipl. i. 32) the signature is simply "signum manus Cisi." All this shows that there was some obscurity about Ine's pedigree, and the whole falls in with the singular description of Ine given by his own friend and kinsman Ealdhelm;

> "Tertius accepit sceptrum regnator opimum
> Quem clamant In incerto cognomine gentes,
> Qui nunc imperium Saxonum jure gubernat."

* William of Malmesbury (Gest. Pont. v. 188) refutes the story which made Saint Ealdhelm a nephew of Ine through a brother Kenten, a name by which we may perhaps understand Centwine. "Ferunt quidam, incertum unde id assumpserint, fuisse nepotem Inæ regis West-Saxonum ex fratre Kenten. Nobis pro vero arrogare non libuit, quod videtur magis opinioni quadrare volaticæ quam veritati historicæ. Siquidem ex cronicis constet, quod Ina nullem fratrem praeter Inigildum habuerit, qui paucis ante ipsum annis decessit. . . . . Qui enim legit manualem librum regis Elfredi, repperiet Kenten, beati Aldhelmi patrem, non fuisse regis Inae germanum, sed arctissima necessitudine consanguineum."

† The two sisters are mentioned in the Chronicles when the death of Ingild is recorded in 717 or 718. "Her Ingild Ines brother forthferde, and heora swystor wæron Cwenburh and Cuthburh and seo Cuthburh arærde that lif æt Winburnan, and heo wæs forgifen Ealdferthe Nordanhymbra kinge, and hie be him lifgendum hie gedældan."

him and became Abbess at Wimborne, and, after her church had been changed to a foundation of secular canons, she still remained its patron saint, and her head, enclosed in silver, was the great object of local reverence down to the time of Henry the Eighth. The wife of Ine bore the name of Æthelburh. She was herself of the royal house, and her brother Æthelheard, who succeeded Ine in the kingdom,* is spoken of as a kinsman of his predecessor.† We have however no means of tracing the pedigree of Æthelheard and Æthelburh to the common stock. A guess however may perhaps be allowed. It is about this time that the element *Æthel*, which was to form part of some of the most famous names in West-Saxon genealogy, first begins to appear in the family nomenclature of the West-Saxon house. Æthelheard, after his accession, found a rival in an Ætheling named Oswald, who is described as the son of Æthelbald, the son of Cynebald, the son of Cuthwine, the son of Ceawlin.‡ We may be pretty sure that Æthelheard, and Æthelburh also, belonged to the branch of the family in which we can trace the beginning of this change in the family nomen-

* I know of no direct evidence for making Æthelheard and Æthelburh brother and sister, except the spurious Charter of Ine to Glastonbury where he is made to sign as "Æthilhard frater Reginae." Will. Malmes. de Antiq. Glaston. Gale. ii. 312. Cod. Dipl. i. 89. But for such a matter as this, a spurious Charter of early date—that is, earlier than William of Malmesbury—is some evidence, when it is not contradicted by anything better. Lappenberg accepts Æthelheard as Æthelburh's brother without hesitation.

† William of Malmesbury (Gesta Regum i. 38) calls Æthelheard "Inæ consanguineus" and, in those manuscripts which contain the story of Æthelburh and the pigs, she appears as "femina sane regii generis et animi," so in Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 725 A.) Æthelheard is Ine's "cognatus."

‡ Chronicles, 728. "Oswald wæs Æthelbalding; Æthelbald Cynebalding; Cynebald Cuthwining; Cuthwine Ceawlining."

clature. Of Queen Æthelburh, whose name very nearly concerns Taunton, we shall hear again in the course of our story. But it would seem that her marriage was childless; at least no sons or daughters of Ine and Æthelburh find their way into history or genealogy.

Of the circumstances of the election of Ine we know nothing. But the influence which a King undoubtedly possessed in recommending a successor to the choice of the Witan would have still greater force when the King into whose place that successor had to step was still living, and might perhaps make his abdication conditional on the choice of a successor whom he approved. We may therefore set it down as almost certain that Ine was chosen at the recommendation of Ceadwalla. And the zeal with which we shall see that Ine took up the blood-feud of Ceadwalla looks the same way. Again, the importance which Æthelburh holds throughout the reign of her husband, and the accession of her brother at his death, seem to point to a special connexion between Ine and that branch of the family to which his wife belonged. On the other hand, we find Ine opposed by Æthelings of uncertain descent, Cynewulf and Eadbriht. I throw it out as a conjecture for whatever it may be worth that the successive elections of Ceadwalla, Ine, and Æthelheard point to a combined effort of the descendants of Ceawlin permantly to win back the Crown for their branch of the family, which had been shut out from the succession ever since the successful rebellion of Ceol against Ceawlin himself in 592.* Ceadwalla had at one time been banished, and

* See the Chronicles, 592, which entries become more clear in the genealogy of Florence of Worcester. "Contra quem Ceol, filius fratris sui Cuthwlfi, quem ante biennium regem sub se fecerat, immerito rebellavit, regnoque expellens, loco ejus quinque annis regnavit."

yet during his banishment he had been powerful enough to wage war in Sussex and to overthrow and slay the King Æthelwealh.* And several of our accounts point to a belief that Ceadwalla came to the Crown during the lifetime of Centwine, through an abdication, whether willing or constrained.† And may I add yet another conjecture? It was under the other branch of the family, the descendants of Cutha, that Christianity had made its way into Wessex. Can we in this way account for the strange fact of the unbaptized state of Ceadwalla? Had the descendants of Ceawlin remained heathens, and was the religious zeal of Ine, like the fiercer religious zeal of Ceadwalla, preeminently the zeal of a new convert?

Some little light may perhaps be thrown on the election and marriage of Ine by a very wild legend, but a legend which plainly had its birth in our own part of England. I mean the story preserved in the "Historiola de Primordiis Episcopatûs Somersetensis," printed in Mr. Hunter's Ecclesiastical Documents. The whole condition of Wessex

* See the extract from Bæda above, p. 8.

† The passages on this subject are collected by Lappenberg, p. 253 of the original German, i. 258 of Thorpe's Translation. The most distinct passage is that in William of Malmsbury. Gest. Pont, v. 205, "Eodem tempore Kentuuinus rex Westsaxonum morbo et senio gravis, Ceduallam, regii generis juvenem, successorem decreverat. Is ergo. quamvis nec adhuc rex nec Christianus, spe tamen regnum anticipabat, baptismum creedulitate ambiebat." He quotes another passage from Ealdhelm, saying how Entwinus—which doubtless should be Centwinus—

"Rexit regnum plures feliciter annos,
Donec conversus cellam migravit in almam,
Juste petit superas merites splendentibus arces;
Post nunc successit bello famosus et armis
Rex Cædwalla potens regni possessor ut hæres."

This is indirectly confirmed by the words of the Chronicle, 685. "Her Ceadwalla ongann æfter rice winnan." On the other hand Henry of Huntingdon, M. H. B. 722 A., makes Caedwalla succeed on the death of Centwine; "Centwino igitur Occidentalium Saxonum rege defuncto, Cædwalla post eum regnans."

and of England, and of every person who plays a part in the story, is utterly misconceived. By an idea borrowed from the tenth or eleventh century, England is described as being under two Kings, one reigning to the south of the Humber, the other to the north of it. This latter, it may be hoped, to make the division at all equal, was able to make his supremacy felt as far as the Orkneys. The southern King dies, leaving no heir; an interregnum full of all evil follows. The Bishops and great men meet in London to choose a King; but first, like the Hebrews of old, they consult the Lord. By what means the divine oracle was given we are not told, but its purport was that they were to make him King who bore the name of *Ina*, the name being written according to the later corruption. Men are sent through all parts of the land to find some one called Ina. Some go as far as Devonshire and Cornwall, but all in vain; so, full of weariness, they turn their faces again towards London. But on the way they pass by Somerton. There they chance to hear a churl as he tills his field shout loudly for Ina to bring his father's oxen. They ask his meaning, and he explains that Ina is the son of his partner. The youth presently shows himself, a tall, strong, young man of a goodly countenance, in whom they at once hail the King for whom they were searching. They wish to take him with them at once; but his father and his neighbours will not let him go till they have received pledges that Ina shall suffer no harm. This done, Ina is led to London to the assembled great men of the realm. All men admire him; he is at once chosen King with one consent and is consecrated by the Bishops.

Presently the King of the North dies, leaving an only daughter Adelburh as his heiress. Ina conceives the idea of marrying her, and so joining the two kingdoms into one

state, to which is given the Imperial name of *Monarchy*. Mr. Hunter assigns the work to the time of Henry the Second; to me I confess that this part of the story suggests the time of Edward the First and the schemes for a peaceful union of England and Scotland by a marriage. Ina makes his proposals by messengers, but Adelburh scorns the son of a churl. He then goes himself, without revealing his rank, but passing himself off as a messenger from King Ina. His suit is again refused; but he tarries in the Queen's court, and one day, at a great feast, he acts as her cupbearer. His beauty, now displayed to advantage in his rich official robes, makes an impression, too deep an impression, on the heart of Adelburh. He now declares who he is, and he no longer meets with a refusal. He goes home and sends messengers in proper form to demand her; she comes; the two are married at Wells, and Adelburh procures that that town shall be given to Bishop Daniel, who removes his episcopal chair thither from Congresbury.

I need not stop to point out how wild all this is as a description of anything that happened in Britain in the seventh century. It is not hard to see the bits from the histories, real or legendary, of Saul and David and our own Ælfred and Godwine which have been worked up into the story. And I hope there is no need to point out that no faith is to be given to stories about Bishops of Congresbury, or even about Bishops of Wells at any time before Eadward the Elder. But, as usual, some grains of wheat may be picked up among the chaff. One point is perhaps trifling, but is none the less characteristic. The legend preserves the notion of Ine being a rare name, a name for the bearer of which men had to seek far and wide. Now the name is certainly very rare; as far as I can remember, it is unique. Then the story of Ine's lowly

birth is, as we know, utterly false; Ine was no churl's son, but an Ætheling; but the story that a King was a churl's son could have been spread abroad only about a King whose accession had something about it that was strange and unexpected, and who stood far away from the most obvious line of succession. This exactly fits the case of Ine. It chimes in with the remark of William of Malmesbury that, although Ine was of royal descent, yet he was chosen less on account of his birth than on account of his personal qualities.* Then the story of Ine being found near Somerton, though no doubt a creation of local vanity, is a creation not altogether without some groundwork. It fits in with the many other hints in history and tradition which connect Ine more closely with our shire than with any other part of his kingdom. All these hints taken together may perhaps suggest the conjecture that the land of the Sumorsætas was the part of Wessex which Ine's father Cenred governed as Under-King. Then the story of the marriage of Ine and Æthelburh, wild as it is, fits in well with the various hints which we have as to the great importance and authority held by Ine's Queen throughout his reign. Nothing is more likely than that her marriage won for Ine the support of her brother Æthelheard and of her branch of the royal house. Then, in an age when Ætheling and Under-Kings were forgotten, the abiding tradition that Ine's power was in some degree founded upon his marriage would take the form of marrying him to some royal heiress beyond the bounds of Wessex. And, except at the particular moment which I hinted, it would most likely have sought for his wife, not

* Gesta Regum. i. 35. "Magis pro insitivæ virtutis industria, quam successivæ sobolis prosapia." This must be the meaning of this strange and affected language.

only beyond the bounds of Wessex but beyond the bounds of Britain. I think that this story is no bad example of the way in which small fragments of historical truth still remain embedded in strange guises even in the wildest of legends.

The isolated facts which form our annals of the reign of Ine all fall in with the belief that his accession was the triumph of one branch of the stock of Cerdic over another. No saying was ever wider of the mark than that of William of Malmesbury, when he ventures to speak of the reign of Ine as a time of perfect domestic peace, undisturbed by rivals or enemies.* It is quite certain that Ine had, at several points of his reign, to strive against foes of his own household. Two Æthelings, of what degree of kindred to the reigning King we are not told, died either in battle or by the hand of the headsman. And it is to be noticed that these disturbances belong wholly to the latter years of Ine's reign, and that the narrative reads as if the two events were connected, as if the enterprises, whatever they were, of the two disaffected Æthelings were parts of one movement against Ine's government. The only one of the rebels who comes out at all personally before us is described as a youth, one therefore who must have grown up during Ine's long reign. This looks as if those who deemed themselves wronged by Ine's election had handed on their grievances to their children, and as if, as in later times, the young Pretender was found more dangerous than the elder. Our first mention of these matters comes in 721, thirty-three years after Ine's accession, four years after

* William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum i. 35. "Adeo annis duobus de quadraginta potestate functus, sine ullo insidiarum metu securus incanuit, sanctissimus publici amoris lenocinator."

the death of his brother Ingild. In that year we read that Ine slew the Ætheling Cynewulf.* Of this Ætheling, his descent, and the cause of his death, we know nothing more. But a revolt may be taken for granted, especially as what we read under the next year sounds like another act of the same drama. Now comes the entry which of all the events of Ine's reign concerns us most nearly in this place. In the Chronicles we read under the year 722, the year following the death of Cynewulf, that Queen Æthelburh threw down Taunton which Ine before had built, that Ealdbriht the exile sought shelter in Surrey and in Sussex, and that Ine fought with the South-Saxons.† The force of the passage as regards the history of Taunton I shall speak of presently. We are now concerned with it as a page in the history of the domestic quarrels of Ine's reign. From the entry of the Chronicles we suspect that the destruction of Taunton and the flight of Ealdbriht had something to do with one another, but we get no clear consecutive narrative. Florence simply translates the Chronicles, leaving out under this year all mention of Ealdbriht.‡ It is from Henry of Huntingdon, the preserver of so many ancient legends and fragments of ballads, that we get our connected account. Ine had, at some earlier time, built the fortress of Taunton. The fortress was now seized by the young Ealdbriht, an enemy of the King. But Queen Æthelburh marched against the

* Under 721 in three of the Chronicles we read "and thy ilcan geare Ine ofsloh Cynewulf." Two others add the title "thone ætheling."

† Chronicles, 722. "Her Æthelburh cwen towearp Tantun, the Ine ær timbrede, and Ealdbriht wræccea gewat on Suthrige and on Suthsexe, and Ine gefeaht with Suthsexan."

‡ Florence, 722. "Æthelburh regina castrum Tantun dictum penitus destruxit, quod prius rex Ine construxit, qui eodem anno cum Australibus Saxonibus pugnavit."

place, besieged and took it, and drove Ealdbriht to seek shelter in Surrey and Sussex.* Surrey was part of the West-Saxon dominions, and the fact of Ealdbriht seeking shelter there suggests that he was an Under-King, or the son of an Under-King, in that district, just as his seizing the border fortress of Taunton suggests that his insurrection was made in league with the Welsh. A prince of Surrey might not feel much scruple about giving back such distant conquests to the Britons as the price of their help. Anyhow the story of Ealdbriht at Taunton is very like the story of Æthelwald at Wimborne in 901, only the town of Wimborne escaped better than the town of Taunton. As Æthelwald escaped to the Northumbrian Danes,† so now Ealdbriht escaped to the South-Saxons, unwilling dependents no doubt of Wessex, much as the Northumbrians were afterwards. War of course followed, and we read that in 725 Ine slew the Ætheling Ealdbriht whom he had before driven out.‡ But whether Ealdbriht

* Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 724 DE. He tells the story backwards from the death of Ealdbriht; "Ine xxxvi. annoregni ejus exercitum suum in Sudsexe promovit, pugnavitque contra Sudsexas potenter et victoriose, et interfecit in eodem prœlio Ealdbriht, quem prius fugaverat a castro quod vocatur Tantune, quod quidem rex Ine construxerat; sed quia juvenis prædictus Ealdbriht castrum introierat, qui regius hostis erat, Edelburh regina, uxor Ine, castrum cepit armis, captumque destruxit, et eum fugere compulit in Sudrei et Sudsexe."

† See the Chronicles under 901, 905.

‡ In some of the Chronicles we read under this year "And Ine gefeaht with Suthseaxums and thær ofsloh Ealdberht thone ætheling the he ær utflemde." But Worcester and Peterborough, which contain this entry, have not the entry "Ine gefeaht with Suthseaxam" under 722. Canterbury and Abingdon, which contain that entry, have no mention of Ealbriht's death. The Winchester Chronicle puts the South-Saxon war under both years; no version records any event in the two years between. The South-Saxon campaigns of Ine are also referred to by Bæda iv. 15; "Sed et Ini, qui post Cæduallam regnavit, simili provinciam illam afflictione plurimo annorum tempore mancipavit." This looks as if the war had gone on through the years under which the Chronicles have no entry.

died in battle like Æthelwald, or, like his probable accomplice Cynewulf, by the hand of the executioner, we are left to guess.

Here we have two cases—or one case, as we choose to reckon it—of revolts against Ine on the part of members of the royal house, men who doubtless thought themselves or their branch of the family wronged by Ine's possession of the Crown. And to these we may fairly add the revolt of Oswald against Æthelheard, as it was clearly a revolt against the arrangements made by Ine at his abdication. Ine had handed over the Crown to his kinsman, that is, he had recommended him to the Witan for election.* Hence, we can hardly doubt, the civil war in which Æthelheard fought with Oswald.† This revolt most likely was not of the same nature as the early revolts of Cynewulf and Ealdbriht. Oswald was a descendent of Ceawlin no less than Ine was, and, if my conjecture as to the origin of Æthelheard and Æthelburh be right, he was a nearer kinsman to Æthelheard than either of them was to Ine. Oswald's revolt would thus be a revolt, not on behalf of the other branch of the family, but only on behalf of Oswald himself. That he sought the Crown for himself we might have guessed even if we had not

* Bæda, in the passage already quoted, merely says that Ine went away "relicto regno ac juvenioribus commendato." That this vague phrase means Æthelheard would seem from the expressions of Florence 728; "Relicto imperio, ac Æthelhardo, de prosapia Cerdici regis oriundo, commendato," and of Henry of Huntingdon M. H. B. 725 A; "Relinquens Adelhardo cognato suo regnum." I know not whether any one will be tempted to make use of Bæda's plural form as the groundwork of a theory that Ine recommended Æthelheard and Oswald to a joint or divided kingship, and that Oswald was unfairly kept out of his share.

† Chron. 728. "And thy ilcan geare gefuhton Æthelheard and Oswald se ætheling." Florence translates; "Eodem anno prœliati sunt Rex Æthelhardus et Oswaldus clito, filius Æthelbaldi, filii Cynebaldi, filii Cuthwini, filii Ceaulini."

been distinctly told so by the same authority from which we get the more detailed account of Ealdbriht's doings at Taunton. He gathered supporters enough to meet Æthelheard in the field and to hold up for some time against him. But the forces of the King were the stronger; the rebellious Ætheling had, after a hard struggle, to take to flight.* Where Ealdbriht sought shelter we know not; but his death is recorded two years later.† We hear nothing of its circumstances, but one writer bestows on him an epithet of admiration, if not of sympathy.‡

All however of the kinsfolk of Ine were not his enemies. The old West-Saxon government by Under-Kings of the royal house went on during his reign, and the names of some of them can be recovered. One of them was Ine's kinsman, brother-in-law, and successor, Æthelheard.‖ Another was Nunna, his colleague in his war with the Welsh, who is, by a chronicler of his own house, not only adorned with the royal title, but actually placed before his

* Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 725 C. "Ædelhard rex Westsexe primo anno regni sui pugnavit contra Oswald juvenem de regia stirpe, regnum idem sibi acquirere conantem. Oswald namque filius fuit Ædelbald, filii Chinebald, filii Cudwine, filii Ceaulin, filii Cinric. Cum autem juvenis, impar numero regalibus turmis, pondus prœlii diu pertulisset, et ultra non posset, fuga regi regnum reliquit. Rex igitur praedictus in regno confortatus est." William of Malmesbury (Gesta Regum i. 38) gives a somewhat different account; "Successit principatui Edelardus, Inæ consanguineus, licet surgentes ejus primitias frequenter interpolaret Oswaldus regii sanguinis adolescens. Provincialibus enim in rebellionem excitatis, bello regem persequi conatus: sed non multo post, illo fatali sorte sublato, Edelardus per quatuordecim annos quietissime retentum regnum Cudredo cognato reliquit."

† Chronicles, 730.

‡ Florence, 730. "Oswaldus clito, vir strenuissimus, defunctus est."

‖ For this again I can quote only, with the same reservation as before, the spurious Charter to Glastonbury (Will. Malms. Ant. Glaston. 311) where we read of the "hortatus Baltdredi et Athelardi subregulorum."

overlord.* According to one account, Nunna appears, as is certainly quite possible, as one among several Under-Kings reigning in Sussex.† A third was Baldred, a man of whose acts nothing is recorded, but whose existence and importance is witnessed by divers signatures and other incidental notices, and who, we may suspect, was in possession of his dominions before Ine's accession.‡ Saint Ealdhelm also, though not the brother's son of Ine, seems certainly to have been a kinsman, and thus adds another to the loyal members of the kingly house.‖

From the domestic troubles of Ine's reign we turn to his wars with his neighbours. These fall under two heads, those waged with the other English powers in Britain

* Chronicles, 710. "Ine and Nun [al. Nunna] his mæg gefuhton with Gerente Wala cyninge." So Florence, "Ine et Nun suus propinquus." But Patricius Consul Fabius Quaestor Æthelwerdus (ii. 12) tells us how "Nunna et Ine reges bellum gesserunt."

† The Charter of "Nothelmus Rex Suthsaxonum" already quoted (Cod. Dipl. v. 36) is witnessed among others by "Nunna Rex Suthsaxonum." Could a forger have hit on so unlikely a state of things?

‡ There is a Charter of Baldred's in Cod. Dipl. i. 32, dated in 688, issued "cum consilio et confirmatione Kentuuini regis et omnium principum ac senatorum ejus," and witnessed by the "signum manus Ceduuallani regis." This Mr. Kemble naturally marks as doubtful. But in the charter at p. 83, which Mr. Kemble seems to accept, the grant of Brent Knoll—"in monte et circa montem qui dicitur Brente"—is made "consentiente Baldredo," and it is signed by "Baldredus rex" and Æthelbaldus rex," by which last can hardly be meant the King of the Mercians. But the document cannot be, as Mr. Kemble thinks, of 723, as it is signed by Bishop Hæddi who died in 705. I have already mentioned one reference to Baldred in the spurious Glastonbury Charter. Later on in the same charter Ine is made to speak of him as a predecessor, along with Cenwealh, Centwine, and Ceadwalla. He is also spoken of as his predecessor in a charter of Cuthred marked as spurious in Cod. Dipl. i. 112. In a letter of Saint Ealdhelm in William of Malmesbury (Gesta Pontificum, 355), he is spoken of as "venerandus patricius Baldredus."

‖ See the extract from William of Malmesbury, above p. 14.

and those waged against the common British enemy. His first war with the Kentishmen was the continuation of a family blood-feud inherited from his predecessor Ceadwalla. Ceadwalla and his brother Mul, besides the conquest of the Isle of Wight, which has been made more famous by the pathetic narrative of Bæda and its connexion with the history of Wilfrith,* made a series of incursions into the greater Jutish realm of Kent. The attack on Wight was at least the recovery of a lost dominion. But the words of the historian who tells the tale most at length, and who seems to have preserved to us the substance of a ballad in honour of Mul, might imply that the Kentish campaigns were waged without provocation, out of sheer love of fighting.† In the first inroad in 686 both the brothers, as yet unbaptized, took a part and harried the country without resistance. The next year Mul craved his brother's leave to make a second inroad, in the course of which, after committing pitiless havoc and destroying all things sacred and profane, he met with what even his panegyrist seems to look on as the just reward of his deeds. With twelve companions only, probably his own special *Gesithas*, he had gone into a house to plunder. A party of Kentishmen surrounded the house, set fire to it, and burned the West-Saxon Ætheling and all his comrades.‡

* See Bæda iv. 16.

† Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 722 A. Ceadwalla . . . auxilio Mul fratris sui, insulam Vectam suam viribus suis fecit ; namque frater ejus Mul, laudabilis et gratiosus, terribilis erat viribus et decorus aspectu : ideoque et omnibus amabilis erat, et famæ praerogativa clarissimus. Perrexerunt ergo fratres prædicti in Centensem provinciam, causa virium suarum exercitandarum et famæ ampliandæ."

‡ Chronicles, 687. "Her Mul wearth on Cent forbærned and othre xii. menn mid him." Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 722 DE. "Pergens igitur in Cent, non invenit qui ei resisteret, et terram prædando in solitudinem re-

Another fearful harrying of Kent by Ceadwalla himself was the immediate vengeance for the slaughter of Mul.* But this was not all. In the year after the death of Mul, Ceadwalla's crown passed to Ine. We are a little surprised to find Ine, six years later, demanding further satisfaction for the death of his kinsman. Did he merely

digens, et Christi servos immeritos affligens, maledicta eorum merita sensit. Nam cum hostes effeminatos duceret, et nihil sibi pro viribus prævideret, irruit in domum quamdam longe a suis, cum duodecim tantum militibus prædaturus ; ubi inopinata multitudine circumventus, cum hostes interficiendo non deficeret nec proficeret, qui armis cædi non poterat, in ipsa domo cum duodecim militibus suis igne combustus est. Periit ergo flos juvenum et juvenilis evanuit exercitus." William of Malmsbury (i. 14) gives a somewhat different account, making Ceadwalla himself share in the expedition and suffer a defeat. "Congressu superiores Kedwallam in terga vertunt [Cantuaritæ] fratreque in tugurium quoddam compulso, domunculam ipsam succendunt. Ita Mollo, dum erumpendi in hostem deesset audacia, et totis circa tectum habenis regnarent incendia, inter flammas halitum ructavit." It is plain that he confounded the first joint expedition of Ceadwalla and Mul, and the second expedition of Mul only. The late Kentish writer William Thorn, the historian of Saint Augustines (X Scriptt. 1770), tells us "Anno domini D.C. lxxxvij. Mulus rex alienigena moritur, et in ecclesia ista cum aliis regibus sepelitur." The church spoken of is Minster in Thanet. He goes on to tell the story much as it stands in Henry of Huntingdon, only adding that the death of Mul happened at Canterbury. He call him "rex intrusor" and "frater regis Sussexiae Cedwallii." Is this simply the confusion of a late writer for "Westsaxiae?" or may we take this remarkable description as a sign of the impression which the earlier dealings of Ceadwalla with Sussex had made on the Kentish mind? It is dangerous to make inferences from these late writers, but they do sometimes preserve fragments of trustworthy tradition or even of lost records. The recognition of Mul as a King, even though coupled with the epithets "alienigena" and "intrusor," is very remarkable. We might be tempted to infer that Mul was established by Ceadwalla as Under-King of Kent (722 E), so that the act of the Kentishmen might pass in the eyes of Ceadwalla and Ine for treason against their own King.

* So in all our authorities. Henry of Huntingdon, as usual, is the fullest. "Hac audiens Cedwalla, rursus ingressus est Cantiam, ubi mirabili cæde et innumera satiatus rapina, cum non inveniret quid cæderet vel raperet, ad sua magnus vindex et victor sævus rediit."

carry on a feud inherited from his predecessor, or had he some special ground of complaint of his own? What was the kindred between Ine and Mul? Both were Æthelings of the blood of Cerdic and Ceawlin. But according to some accounts their kindred was yet closer. One version of the Chronicle, certainly the latest and least trustworthy, calls Mul the brother of Ine, and this statement is supported by the further authority of Florence.* It is quite certain that Ine and Mul were not sons of the same father, but it has been suggested that they were sons of the same mother,† a suggestion which I shall have again to speak of from another side, and that Mul was thus half-brother at once to Ceadwalla and to Ine. However this may be, Ine exacted vengeance for the blood of Mul, but he exacted it in a somewhat different fashion from Ceadwalla. A few years before, when Ecgfrith of Northumberland was making ready to avenge the death of his brother Ælfwine, who had fallen in battle against Æthelred of Mercia, Archbishop Theodore had stepped in, and had persuaded Ecgfrith, instead of shedding more blood, to accept from the Mercians the legal price of blood for his slain brother.‡ We know not whether it was at the suggestion of Beorhtwald, the successor of Theodore and the

* The late Canterbury Chronicle, under 694, recording the settlement of the Kentishmen with Ine, says that it was "farthan the hi Mul his brother forbærndon;" but the words "his brother" are not in any of the older versions. So Florence, "quia, ut prælibavimus, Mul germanum suum combussere."

† Lappenberg, 256 of the German, i. 262 Thorpe.

‡ Bæda iv. 21. "Theodorus Deo dilectus antistes divino functus auxilio, salutifera exhortatione cœptum tanti periculi funditus exstinguit incendium; adeo ut, pacatis alterutrum regibus ac populis, nullius anima hominis pro interfecto regis fratre, sed debita solummodo multa pecuniæ regi ultori daretur."

first English Archbishop,* but it is certain that the Kentish King Wihtred, himself, like Ine, the lawgiver of his people, met the West-Saxon invader in a conference, and persuaded him, instead of harrying the divided land of Kent yet again, to accept, like Ecgfrith, the lawful price of his kinsman's blood.† Ine agreed, and thirty thousand coins were paid as the *wergild* of Mul. The entry which records this payment is well known as one of the most important in our early history, alike for the history of the coinage and for the immemorial practice of the *wergild*. On the numismatic point I will not venture to enter, or to try to decide questions on which Kemble and Schmid differ. But it is plain that the sum paid was thirty thousand pieces of some kind.‡ Now there doubtless was a wergild for the King in Wessex, though the sum is not mentioned, and in the table of Northum-

* He succeeded Theodore in 692, after a vacancy of three years. The Chronicles add the comment, "Ær thissan wæron Romanisce biscopas."

† Chronicles, 694. "Her Cantwara gethingedon with Ine and him gesealdon xxx thusenda, forthan tha hi ær Mul forbærndon." As usual, we get the fullest details from Henry of Huntingdon, M. H. B. 723 B.C. "Ine rex castrorum acies ordinatas et terribiles in Cantiam deduxit, vindicaturus combustionem Mul cognati sui. Rex autem Withred obviam ei affuit, non cum feroci arrogantia, sed pacifica supplicatione; non cum frendentibus minis sed rhetorici mellis dulcedine, qua regi fero persuasit ut, armis depositis, multam pecuniæ a Centensibus acciperet pro cæde juvenis, et sic lis finita ruit, pax confirmata revixit."

‡ See the whole passage discussed by Kemble, Saxons in England i. 281. He rules that the true text of the Chronicles is that which I have already quoted, where no coin is mentioned. The coins named in some versions of the Chronicles, as well as in Æthelheard, Florence, and William of Malmesbury, he holds to be conjectural fillings up. He himself determines the sum to be reckoned in Kentish *sceattas*, which Schmid, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, Glossary, Art. *Wergild*, rules to be too little.

brian and Mercian wergilds the price of the King is set at thirty thousand pieces, one half to his kinsfolk and one half to his people.* The price of the King is double the price of the Ætheling; that is to say, the family of the slain King receive the *wergild* of a man of princely rank, and his people receive an equal sum for the loss of the ruler whom they had set over them. Putting these two things together, it seems plain that the *wergild* paid for Mul was the *wergild* of a King, and from this two consequences may be held to follow; first that Mul, as we might almost have taken for granted, held the rank of Under-King, and secondly that an Under-King was entitled to the full royal wergild. The whole story is instructive, as showing, like that of Ecgfrith, that the principle of the wergild was held to be applicable to dealings between kingdom and kingdom, as well as between subjects of the same kingdom. But we are still left in the dark why, after a space of seven years, Ine should think it needful to exact the wergild from a people who, one might have thought, had already been punished enough by Ceadwalla's harrying. Anyhow there is something taking in the peaceful conference between the West-Saxon and the Kentish lawgiver, Ine, who in his laws strongly sets forth the principle of the old Italian commonwealths that force is in no case to be resorted to, till legal reparation has been refused,† would doubtless think it his duty to accept the

* Schmid. 396, 397. "Thæs cyninges wergyld sie mid Engla cynne on folcriht thryttig thusend thrimsa, and thæra xv. m. sien thæs wæres and other xv. m. thæs cynedômes, se wære belympath tô thâm mægthe thæs cyne-cynnes and thæt cyne-bôt tô thâm land-leôd." See Kemble i. 283.

† Ine's Laws 9, Schmid 24, "Gif hwâ wrace dô, ærthon he him ryhtes bidde, thæt he him onnime, âgife and forgielde, and gebete, mid xxx scill." Compare the story in Livy i. 22, 23.

wergild when it was offered. But the fact that it was offered probably points to the exhausted condition of the Kentish kingdom just at this time, at once torn by internal divisions* and still perhaps suffering from the ravages of Mul and of Ceadwalla. The language of most of our authorities would lead us to believe that the Kentishmen offered no resistance, but that, on Ine's entering the country, they at once sought to make peace by the offer of the wergild.† And it would almost seem as if Ine did more in Kent than simply accept the payment offered by Wihtred. From that time we are told that Wihtred reigned undisturbed in his kingdom, an improvement in his condition which may well have been owing to the powerful ally whose friendship he had purchased.‡

The Kentish campaigns of Ine must have virtually established the West-Saxon supremacy over all the English states south of the Thames. Save during the momentary

* This comes out forcibly in all our accounts, and two of the Chronicles remark pointedly under 692, "Da wæran ii. cingas on Cent, Wihtred and Webheard." Henry of Huntingdon (723 B) says pointedly "Eo tempore erant duo reges in Cent non tam secundum stirpem regiam quam secundum invasionem." So Bæda, v. 8, "regnantibus in Cantia Victredo et Suæbhardo," but these might after all be only the Kings of East and West Kent.

† See the extracts above in p. 30. William of Malmesbury alone (i. 35) suggests anything like warfare; "Provinciales paulisper resistere ausi, mox, omnibus tentatis et viribus in ventum effusis, cum nihil in pectore Inæ quod ignaviæ conduceret reperissent, dispendiorum suorum intuitu deditioni consuluere: tentant regium animum muneribus, solicitant promissis, nundinantur pacem triginta millibus auri mancis ut pretio mollitus bellum solveret, metallo præstrictus receptui caneret."

‡ The word "friendship" occurs only in the latest version of the Chronicles; "Hig giban him xxx thusenda to freondscipe." But they all immediately speak of Wihtred as taking to the Kentish Kingdom, whereas he had before been spoken of as one King taken out of two. Henry of Huntingdon (723 C) says pointedly "Rex Centensis abhinc semper in pace regnavit."

Mercian domination which, in the course of the eighth century, for a while overthrew Wessex itself, Kent and Sussex henceforth appear as West-Saxon dependencies. And, if we can venture to accept the notice of Nunna as a South-Saxon King,* we see that the policy which prevailed a little later of putting those dependencies under West-Saxon Æthelings as Under-Kings was already beginning. This extension of power to the south was, as we have seen, to be presently counterbalanced by loss of power to the north, but it does not appear that the northern dominion of Wessex went back during the reign of Ine. Indeed from one or two incidental notices we may infer that it advanced. William of Malmesbury speaks, in somewhat obscure language, of a triumphant campaign of Ine against the East-Angles, of which I can find no mention in any other writer.† But wars and victories of Ine on that side of England seem to be implied in the fact that, in the preamble to his Laws, he could speak of the Bishop of London as "my Bishop."‡ The great city placed at the point of meeting of so many kingdoms, perhaps indeed the whole of the East-Saxon kingdom and diocese, must, in the seventeenth year of Ine's reign, have acknowledged at least his supremacy.

* See above p. 26

† Will. Malmes. i, 35. "Nec solum Cantuaritæ, sed et Orientales Angli hæreditarium exceperunt odium, omni nobilitate primo pulsa, post etiam bello fusa."

‡ Earcenwold, "my Bishop," whom we have seen as one of Ine's counsellors in putting forth his Laws, was Bishop of London from 675 to 693. See Bæda iv. 6. Flor. Wig. 675. Will. Malms. Gest. Pont. 142. London was therefore in Ine's possession before 693. This bears out the remark of Lingard i. 158, that "Essex (by what means is unknown) had already been annexed to his crown." But I do not understand his reference to William of Malmesbury, who speaks, not of the East-Saxons but of the East-Angles.

Of wars with Mercia, which, in the next reign, become the main subject of West-Saxon history, we hear only once under Ine. But that single notice is one which makes us eagerly wish to learn something more as to the relations between the two rival kingdoms. A battle, said to have been attended with unusual and equal slaughter on both sides, was fought in 715 between Ine and Ceolred of Mercia "æt Wodnesbeorge" or "æt Woddesbeorge."* This is most likely Wanborough in Wiltshire, a place on the heights near Swindon, conspicuous for the singular outline of its church with a western tower and a central spirelet. A fight at such a point implies an invasion of the West-Saxon territory by the Mercian King. The description of the battle itself, and the absence of any recorded results, would lead us to think that, after a drawn battle—for the victory is not assigned to either side —Ceolred found that the better part of valour prompted him to go home again.

We now come to the wars of Ine with the Welsh. And these suggest an earlier question, namely as to Ine's personal relations to the British nation. It has been hinted that he was something more than the conqueror and lawgiver of the Britons, that he was one of themselves, at least through one of his parents. There exists, in the form of Welsh history, a burlesque of the true history of Centwine, Ceadwalla, and Ine, which really

* The Chronicles, 715, simply say "Her Ine and Ceolred gefuhton æt Wodnesbeorge." So Florence. William of Malmesbury does not mention the Mercian warfare. It is in Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 724 C.) that we read "Ine xxvi. anno regni sui pugnavit contra Ceolred regem Merce, filium Edelredi regis, apud Wonebirih; adeo autem horribiliter pugnatum est utrinque, ut nesciatur cui clades detestabilior contigerit."

goes further away from the truth than the Somerton romance about Ine's election and marriage. The English heroes are turned into Britons and are made to win victories over the English, while the one Welsh prince whose existence is really ascertained, the one who plays a real part in the history of the time, is wholly left out of the story. Of the existence of Gerent King of West-Wales there is no doubt; he was the adversary of Ine and the correspondent of Ealdhelm; but he does not figure in the Welsh legend. Instead of him we get Cadwalader and Ivor, and the chief actions attributed to them are simply borrowed from the real actions of Ceadwalla and Ine. The chances are that they are real persons, and that the likeness of their names to those of the English princes suggested the bold step of attributing their deeds to them also. In the Latin text of the *Annales Cambriæ* we read that in 682 Catgualart the son of Catguolaum died of a general mortality which seems to have affected all Britain.* This entry we might pass by without notice. But, if we stop to think about it at all, we can have no manner of doubt that it means that Catgualart died in Britain of the plague under which the country was suffering. One cannot doubt that the Catgualart of the Annals is the same person as the Kadwaladyr of the legend, and we may pretty safely set down that the authentic history of Cadwalader—or whatever the right name is—is about as long as the authentic history of Roland; that is to say, it consists of the date and manner of his death. If we turn from the simple entry of the Annals to the version of the *Brut y Tywysogion* published by the Master of the

* Ann. Camb. 682. "Mortalitas magna fuit in Britannia, in qua Catgualart filius Catguolaum obiit."

Rolls, we shall find that our hero has grown a good deal. We now hear that in 681, the year of the great mortality, "Cadwalader the Blessed, the son of Cadwallon, the son of Cadvan, King of the Britons, died at Rome, on the twelfth day of May, ... and henceforth the Britons lost the crown of the kingdom and the Saxons gained it."* This is the first form of the legend, a form most likely arising out of a not very difficult mistake. Annals and inscriptions at Rome recorded how a King from Britain with a name not unlike that of Cadwalader had come to Rome and had died there.† Ceadwalla the King from Britain would be easily mistaken for Cadwalader the British King, and the prilgrimage and death of the Englishman would be transferred to the Briton. The year is shoved back seven years to the date of the real death of Cadwalader, but the day of the month is kept, with a most curious mistake. Ceadwalla died on the twentieth of April, that is, according to the Latin reckoning, on the twelfth day before the Kalends of May.‡ The Welsh writer, not under-

* I copy the English version of the Master of the Rolls' Brut (London, 1860), 681. It seems needless to copy the Welsh texts, of which I at least understand only a word here and there. On this matter of Cadwalader see Haddan, Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, i. 202.

† Take for instance the metrical inscription quoted by Bæda (v. 7) and Paul Warnefrid (vi. 15), in which there is nothing about Angles or Saxons, but Ceadwalla is spoken of as "sospes veniens supremo ex orbe Britanni." The prose inscription in which Ceadwalla is called "Rex Saxonum," perhaps not without a reference to the relations of his house with Sussex and Essex—which is given in Bæda, is not given by Paul. Paul, we may add, speaks of Caedwalla as "Cedoaldus Rex Anglorum Saxonum." Later on (vi. 28) he says "His etiam diebus duo reges Saxonum, ad vestigia Apostolorum Romam venientes, sub velocitate ut optabant defuncti sunt." This can hardly mean Ceadwalla and Ine; the two Kings are most likely Cenred of Mercia and Offa of Essex. See Bæda v. 19, Chronicles, 709.

‡ Bæda v. 7. "In albis adhuc positus languore correptus, duodecimo Kalendarum Maiarum die solutus a carne, et beatorum est regno sociatus in cœlis." From the prose inscription it would seem that he was buried the same day.

standing the backward fashion of the Roman almanack, mistook this for the twelfth of May, a mistake which Geoffrey of Monmouth set right.* What is meant by the crown of the kingdom being lost by the Britons and gained by the Saxons I do not profess to know. The time of Ceadwalla and Ine is a time of English victory, but there is no such marked conquest or overthrow of any Welsh kingdom just at this time as to account for so remarkable an expression as this.

When we turn from this version of the Brut to the fuller one published by the Cambrian Archæological Association† we see how legends grow. The acts of Ceadwalla had, in the first instance most likely by an honest confusion, become the acts of Cadwalader. The next stage was to trick them out with new and imaginary detail. In the first version Cadwalader simply takes the place of Ceadwalla ; now a great deal is told of Cadwalader which certainly never was told of Ceadwalla. The plague begins in 674 ; for fear of it Cadwalader and many of the best men of the Britons seek shelter with their kindred in Armorica. There they stay eleven years, till 685, when the plague ceases, and Cadwalader "places the isle of Britain and its crown under the protection of, and in pledge with, Alan, King of Armorica." He then, by the

* Galf. Mon. Lib. ix. "Tunc Cadualladrus abjectis mundialibus propter Deum regnumque perpetuum venit Romam : et a Sergio papa confirmatus, inopino etiam languore correptus, duodecima autem die Kalendarum Maiarum, anno ab incarnatione dominica sexcentesimo octogesimo nono, a contagione carnis solutus cœlestis regni aulam ingressus est." Here Geoffrey evidently follows Bæda, and takes the date of the death of Ceadwalla, while the Brut keeps to the real date of the death of Cadwalader.

† Brut y Tywysogion : The Gwentian Chronicle of Caradoc of Llancarvan, with a translation by the late Aneurin Owen, Esq. London, 1863.

bidding of an angel, goes to Rome, stays five years, and dies. Geoffrey of Monmouth adds further details still.

Now in the Annales Cambriæ the entry of the death of Catgualart in his own island by the plague is all. We have not a word about going to Rome or going to Armorica. In two manuscripts indeed the Armorican story is stuck in ;* no one, I think, who has any sort of habit of criticism will doubt that it simply is stuck in, and that the other text is the older and the genuine one. And again, we have, in the genuine text, no mention of Catgualart's successor. We have no entry at all that concerns us during the whole of Ine's reign, except some battles in 722 of which I shall speak presently. But in the older Brut we read under 683.

"And after Cadwalader, Ivor, son of Alan, King of Armorica, which is called Little Britain, reigned; not as a King, but as a chief or prince. And he exercised government over the British for forty-eight years, and then died. And after him Rhodri Molwynog reigned."

This does not greatly concern us; we have only to ask in what relation this somewhat shadowy Ivor from Britanny, who was no King, but only a chief or prince, stood to King Gerent of Cornwall, whose existence and whose kingship are as certain as those of Ine himself. But in the other Brut, under the same year 683, we find something quite different.

"Alan, King of Armorica, sent his son Ivor, and his nephew Ynyr, and two strong fleets, to the island of Britain; and war ensued between them and the Saxons, in which they partly succeeded. Then Ivor took upon him the sovereignty of the Britons. After that the Saxons came against him with

* "Pro quâ [mortalitate] Catwaladir filius Catwallaun in Minorem Britanniam aufugit." "Et Cadwallader rex Britanniam dereliquit et ad Armoricam regionem perrexit."

a powerful army; and in a pitched battle Ivor and the Britons put them to flight after a bloody battle, and acquired Cornwall, the Summer Country, and Devonshire completely. And then Ivor erected the great monastery in Ynys Avallen, in thanksgiving to God for his assistance against the Saxons."

The next entry in 698 contains an account of certain physical marvels which in the elder Brut are placed in the years 688 and 690, and then it tells us;

"Ivor went to Rome, where he died, after maintaining the sovereignty of the Britons twenty-eight years with great praise and wisdom. He gave many lands to churches in Wales and England."

What is all this but simply to take the actions of Ine and attribute them to Ivor? Ine was a benefactor of Glastonbury; Ine went to Rome and died; so these actions are assigned to Ivor. Nay more, the victories of the English over the Welsh are turned about into victories of the Welsh over the English. The great victory of Ivor in 683, in which he acquired Cornwall, the Summer Country, and Devonshire, is simply the victory the other way, when, in 682 or 683, Centwine drove the Britons to the sea. Of this victory I shall speak presently; as yet it is enough to say that, as Ivor takes the place of Ine and does his deeds, the fact that the imaginary Welsh victory of 683 is attributed to Ivor may lead us to believe that Ine had a hand in the real English victory of that time. All here will doubtless recognize the land spoken of by the Welsh writer as "the Summer Country," the land of the Sumorsætas, the "æstiva regio" of the Life of Gildas.* But I trust that there is no need for me to stop

* We read in the Vita Sancti Gildæ, 10 (p. xxxix. Stevenson) how Gildas "reliquit insulam [the Steep Holm], ascendit naviculam, et ingressus est Glastoniam cum magno dolore, Meluas rege regnante in *æstivâ regione.*

to show the utterly mythical nature of a story which makes the Britons in 683 have any need to "acquire Cornwall and Devonshire." Instead of having to acquire them, they had never lost them; whatever we make of Ivor, King Gerent, the glorious lord of the western realm, was undoubtedly reigning over them.

Such is the growth of the story of Ivor. In the genuine Latin Annals he does not appear at all. In the earlier Welsh Brut, he appears as a prince from the Lesser Britain reigning in the Greater, an account which may possibly be true. In this version no actions are attributed to him, but this lack is filled up in the later Brut, where he does many of the real deeds of Ine. So myths grow and prosper. But later interpolators are sometimes less lucky. The interpolator of the Annales Cambriæ thought he was bound to stick in the great name of Ivor somewhere. But he did not stick it in at 683, but at 722, a year of which we have spoken already and shall speak again, and he makes Ivor the British leader in the battles of that year. And again in 734 he sticks in the words "Ivor filius Cadwallader." This is probably meant for the date of his death, which the reckoning of the earlier Brut would put in the year 731. But the entry should at any rate be noticed, as making Ivor the son, not of any Armorican Alan, but of Cadwalader himself.

Such are the fables, from which, as from most other fables, we may, by carefully turning them inside out, pick up a hint or two for the true history. To the meagre sources of that true history we will now turn. I take the history of the conquest of Somerset for granted as far as Dr. Guest has made it out. Ceawlin in 577 won the land between the Avon and the Axe at the battle of Deorham.

Bath, or its ruins, then became English ; so did the site of Bristol. But the Britons still held a long strip of land running up towards Malmesbury. This Cenwealh won by the battle of Bradford in 652. His later victory at the Pens in 658 advanced the West-Saxon frontier to the Parret, and made Glastonbury and the site of Wells English. Then, exactly as before, the progress of the West-Saxon arms stopped for a while. As no advance was made between the victory of Ceawlin in 577 and the victory of Cenwealh in 652, so no advance was made between the victory of Cenwealh in 658 and the victory of Centwine in 683. The interval is not so long, but it is equally well marked, and another equally marked interval comes between the victory of Centwine in 683 and the other recorded victory of Ine in 710. The truth seems to be that the several English powers were so constantly occupied in warfare with one another that warfare with the Welsh was carried on only now and then in intervals of special leisure. A great part of the interval, the first ten years at all events, between 683 and 710 is filled up with the Kentish warfare of Ceadwalla and Ine, and the victory of 710 comes immediately after the abdication of the Mercian King Cenred in 709, as if that were a safe moment for warfare at the other end of the kingdom. However this may be, these two entries contain the whole of our authentic knowledge as to the Welsh warfare of this time. The entry of 683 tells us only that Centwine drove the Britons to the sea.* That of 710 tells us that

* Chronicles, 682, 683. "On thissum geare Centwine gefliemde Bretwalas [al Bryttas] oth sæ." Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 718 D.) gives no fresh detail. "Centwine rex vii. anno regni sui congressus est Brittannos, eosque male resistentes victoriosus et vehemens cæde et incendiis usque ad mare fugavit."

Ine and Nunna fought with Gerent the Welsh King.* Henry of Huntingdon is, as usual, somewhat fuller. He describes the battle, as often happened, as at first favourable to the Welsh, who slew the Ealdorman Higbald; but in the end the English, he tells us, gained a complete victory.† I hope that this entry does not throw much suspicion on Henry of Huntingdon's accounts generally. I have always looked on the fuller details which we find in his history as coming from old ballads and traditions which he Latinized, just as he Latinized the song of Brunanburh. But this account of Higbald certainly reads as if it came, not from a ballad, but from a misunderstanding of the words of the Chronicles. Two of these record under this year the violent death of one Higbald or Sigbald, but they do not say who he was, how he was killed, or who killed him.‡ His death need not have been a West-Saxon event at all, and the words of the entry would certainly not lead us to think that he died in the battle against Gerent.

Here then are our only two direct accounts as to the warfare with the Welsh between the victory of Cenwealh at the Pens in 658 and the destruction of Taunton by Æthelburh in 722. Their result evidently was such an extension of the West-Saxon territory that, whereas in 658 it stopped at the Parret, in 722 it took in Taunton. But

* Chronicles, 710. "Ine and Nun [al. Nunna] his mæg gefuhton with Gerente Wala cyninge," or, as it stands in Canterbury and Abingdon, "with Gerente tham cinge."

† Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 724 B. "Cujus pugnæ principio occisus est dux Higebald; ad ultimum vero Gerente cum suis faciem ab Anglis avertit, et fugiens arma et spolia sequentibus reliquit."

‡ Chronn. Wig. Petrib. 710. "And tham ilcan geare man ofsloh Hygbald," or, as it stands in Worcester, "Sigbald."

there are expressions in the Chronicles which may perhaps help us a little further. In recording the victory of Centwine in 682 it is specially marked that the Welsh were driven to the sea, just as it was marked in 658 that they were driven to the Parret. I should infer from this that Centwine's victory gained for the West-Saxons the sea-coast west of the mouth of the Parret, the coast of Watchet, which afterwards figures in the Danish invasions. In short, Centwine's victory made the English masters of Quantock, as Ceawlin's victory, a hundred years before, had made them masters of Mendip. How far west towards Dunster, Minehead, Porlock, and Linton the frontier may have reached I do not profess to say. We might expect that the hills of Exmoor would be one of the districts in which the Britons would hold longest; but the English may very well have made settlements on the coast long before the mountain tribes were wholly subdued or driven out. In this campaign then I conceive that the West-Saxons won the sites of Bridgewater and Watchet; and we may, I think, venture to picture Centwine as forcing the gate, the *Lydiard*, so well known to this Society by other associations, and driving the Welsh up the valley where in after days Crowcombe was given for the repose of the soul of Godwine. In this victory of Centwine we may, I think, set down Ine as taking a part. In the Welsh legend this defeat is turned into a victory, a victory of Ivor, which suggests the presence of Ine. And another legend has led us to fix the government of his father the Under-King Cenred in the land of the Sumorsætas, that is, before 682, the land between Avon and Parret only. Nothing is more likely than that the victory should be won by the head King of all Wessex, supported by the son of the Under-King of the district

bordering on the seat of war. It is not unlikely that the valour of Ine shown at the foot of Quantock may have had much to do with placing him on the throne of Cerdic at Winchester.

The result of the victory of Ine himself as head King, the victory of Ine and Nunna over Gerent in 710, is less clearly marked, but a process of exhaustion would lead us to think that the land which was won by it was the south-western part of Somerset, Crewkerne, Ilminster, and that district. The Tone may not unlikely have been the frontier from 682 to 710. How far either conquest reached westward, whether either of them took in any part of Devonshire, we can only guess. In default of direct evidence either way, we may assume that the boundary of the shires, which must mark something, answers pretty well to the extent of the conquests of Centwine and Ine. We thus find the conquest of Somerset spread over a space of one hundred and thirty-three years, from the overthrow of the three Kings by Ceawlin at Deorham to the overthrow of Gerent by Ine and Nunna—I wish I could more distinctly say where. And mark further that the conquest was made at three different times, and that the land won at each of these times of conquest answers pretty well to one of our latest political divisions. The first conquest of Ceawlin south of the Avon answers nearly to that division of the county which, in obedience to the law, we speak of as East, though its position on the map would rather lead us to call it North. The conquests of Cenwealh made Mid-Somerset an English land. And the victories of Centwine and Ine extended the West-Saxon rule over the Western division, and made the whole land of the Sumorsætas English. Whether the memory of the ancient conquerors was present to the minds of those who last mapped out our

shire is one of those deep questions into which it does not become us to search; but that the earliest and the latest divisions of Somerset will be commonly found to answer to each other within a mile or two is a fact which allows of no doubt.

Ine then, in partnership with Centwine and Nunna, may be set down as the conqueror of West-Somerset. But he was more than the conqueror of the land; he was also the founder of the chief town of the land, of this Taunton where we are now met. It is only in exceptional cases that an English town can point with absolute certainty to a known man as its personal founder. Constantly as our towns and villages bear the names of particular men, it is comparatively rare that the names which they bear are those of perfectly ascertained persons within the historic age. The name is most commonly the name of a God, of a hero, or of a person who is probably real but of whom we know nothing, and, when the name is that of a known historical person, we have often to infer the foundation from the name without any further record. We cannot reasonably doubt that Roman Regnum changed its name to English Cissanceaster, in the honour, perhaps at the bidding, of Cissa the son of Ælle, but I do not know that there is any distinct record of the fact. Still less is it easy to trace out the foundations of towns which do not bear the name of their founder. Ine was not one of those who call the lands after their own names. He gave to his foundation, not his own name, but the name of the river on which he placed it. It is not in *Inesborough* that we are met, but in Taunton. Of the fact of the foundation of Taunton by Ine there is no doubt; we are left to guess at its exact date and object, but they are not very hard to find out. Taunton was founded by Ine at some time

before 722;* we can hardly doubt that it was founded as a new border-fortress for the defence of his conquests: its almost certain date therefore will be in or soon after the year 710, the year when those conquests were completed. Placed on the borders of the last conquest and of the last conquest but one, and at no great distance from the frontier of the still independent Britons, the position was an important one, and one which fully accounts for the part which Taunton played in the next war or rebellion of Ine's time.

Another point to be mentioned is the distinct, and almost respectful, way in which the Welsh King Gerent is spoken of in the English Chronicles. It is not often that a Welsh prince finds his way by name into our national history. Our Chroniclers at this time commonly thought it enough to record a fight with the Welsh, without preserving the name of any particular Welshman. No British prince has been mentioned by name since the three Kings who were overthrown by Ceawlin in 577. But the adversary of Ine and Nunna is spoken of in a marked way as "Gerent the King." His personality had clearly, from some cause or other, made a deeper impression on the minds of Englishmen than that of most of his countrymen. This is not wonderful when we find Saint Ealdhelm corresponding with him on ecclesiastical matters, exhorting him to the right keeping of Easter, and addressing him as "the glorious lord of the western realm."† The importance of Gerent has been clearly and strongly pointed out by Dr. Guest.‡ In fact a

* The entry in 722 is "Her Æthelburh cwen towærp Tantun thone Ine ær tymbrade."

† Jaffé, Monumenta Moguntina, 24. "Domino gloriosissimo occidentalis regni sceptra gubernanti . . . . . Geruntio regi simulque cunctis Dei sacerdotibus per Domnoniam conversantibus Althelmus."

‡ Archæological Journal, xvi. (1859) 130.

potentate who reigned from the Lands End to the Parret reigned over what, in the then divided state of Britain, was no inconsiderable kingdom. Gerent must have stood in the first rank of the princes of the island, Welsh and English; he was probably quite the first among the princes of his own nation. He could not have held his own against Wessex, had Wessex always been able to bring its full force against him. But to Wessex disturbed and divided by open enemies in Mercia, by unwilling vassals in Kent and Sussex, and by discontented Æthelings at home, the King of Damnonia or West-Wales was no contemptible adversary. The strength of the Damnonia kingdom is witnessed by the slow steps by which Wessex advanced at its expense. Even after Ceawlin had cut off West-Wales from North-Wales, it took the English, as we have seen, 133 years to make their way from the Avon to Blackdown. The site of Taunton remained Welsh for four generations after the ruins of Bath, for two generations after the site of Wells, had become English possessions. And moreover, besides this great dominion south of the Bristol Channel, we find hints, to say the least, that the Damnonian King exercised some kind of supremacy over the smaller princes of Gwent, Morganwg, and Dyfed. Saint Ealdhelm, in the letter to which I have already referred, calls on Gerent to reform certain abuses in the church of Dyfed,* and we shall find other hints to the same effect as we go on.

In my view then Ine completed the conquest of Somerset, but he did not carry his arms further west, into the proper Damnonia, still less into the further parts of

* The offenders are described (Jaffé 28) as "Ultra Sabrinæ fluminis fretum Demetarum sacerdotes."

Cornwall. I have had only one source of difficulty or hesitation in coming to this conclusion. This is that, in the usual accounts, the West-Saxon Winfrith, more famous as Saint Boniface, Archbishop of Mainz and Apostle of Germany, is always said to have been born at Crediton in 680 and to have been brought up in a monastery at Exeter, under an Abbot Wulfhard. If we believe this, it follows that, not only all Somerset, but at least a great part of Devonshire must have been English long before the time when I conceive Ine to have been still fighting on the Tone and Parret. The state of things implied in the story would involve a conquest of Exeter by Cenwealh at the latest. It would need some very strong evidence indeed to make us believe an account so inconsistent with every inference to which all our other authorities lead us as to the course of English conquest in western Britain. We are asked to believe that Damnonia, which the contemporary Ealdhelm looked on as a fearful land, a visit to which was a wonderful exploit,* was already an English possession in which Englishmen were quietly born at Crediton and brought up at Exeter. We know that Exeter was still half Welsh in the days of Æthelstan;† it is hard

* In the poem of Saint Ealdhelm in Jaffé, Monumenta Moguntina, 38,

"Sicut pridem pepigeram,
Quando profectus fueram
Usque diram Domnoniam,
Per carentem Cornubiam
Florulentis cespitibus
Et fœcundis grammibus."

† Will. Malms. Gest. Reg. ii. 134. "Illos [Cornewalenses] quoque impigre adorsus, ab Excestra, quam ad id temporis æquo cum Anglis jure inhabitarant, cedere compulit; terminum provinciæ suæ citra Tambram fluvium constituens, sicut Aquilonalibus Britannis amnem Waiam limitem posuerat. Urbem igitur illam, quam contaminatæ gentis repurgio defæcaverat, turribus munivit, muro ex quadratis lapidibus cinxit.

to believe that any part of it was English in the days of Centwine. What then is the evidence with regard to the birth and education of Winfrith, otherwise Boniface? I have not as yet been able to light on any evidence which fixes his birth at Crediton or in any particular part of Britain. I can find nothing about it in the Lives and Letters published by Pertz and Jaffé. But he certainly went to school at a place which, if there were no reason to the contrary, I believe we should all take to be Exeter. He was sent to a monastery at a place which his biographer Willibald calls *Adescancastre*.* There seem to be several readings in the manuscripts, but all give that name or something not very far from it.† And *Adescancastre* we should certainly take to be *Exanceaster* or Exeter. The *ad* is of course simply the *æt* or *at* which so constantly gets attached to names. It was long ago objected by Mabillon that no Abbots of Exeter are spoken of anywhere else.‡ This is no doubt something, but it hardly amounts to proof. There was a monastery of nuns at Exeter before the removal thither of the Damnonian Bishoprick,‖ and the sex of monastic houses was so fluctuating in early times that it is quite possible that there may have been Abbots there at some time or other. The real question is whether we ought to look upon the reading of

* Willibald, Jaffé 433. Pertz. ii. 335. He is sent "ad monasterium, quod priscorum nuncupatur vocabulo Adescancastre," where he is received by the "fidelis vir Wolfhardus, qui et abbas illius exstitit monasterii."

† Ad escan castre, Adestcancastre, Adescancastre, Adestancastre.

‡ Jaffé quotes from Mabillon the interpretation of Adescancastre as Exeter, adding "tametsi monasterium apud Exoniam tum fuisse nullum prodit monumentum."

‖ Will. Malms. Gest. Pont. 201. "Lefricus, ejectis sanctimonialibus a Sancti Petri monasterio, episcopatum et canonicos statuit."

this single passage as so certain, or its authority as so decisive, as to upset all the conclusions to which we are led by every other line of argument. Our other few notices of Boniface's life in England connect him with districts like Hampshire and Wiltshire, which had long formed part of the West-Saxon kingdom.* Indeed our own shire may also claim some share in him. Among the holy men by whom Winfrith was brought to the notice of Ine was Beornwald, Abbot of Glastonbury.† This may encourage us to go a step further. A slight change in the letters of the name given as *Adescancastre*, a name, be it remembered, which must have been copied by scribes who were not likely to know much of English geography, would change it from Exeter into our own great Roman city. What if Winfrith, after all, got his first schooling within the bounds of the conquest of Ceawlin, in the old borough *Acemannesceaster*, which by another name men Bath call? ‡

So far we have dealt with the Welsh wars of Centwine and Ine as they are directly recorded in our own

* "Nhutscelle," said to be Nursling in Hampshire ; (Willibald, Jaffé 435). "Dyssesburg," said to be Tisbury in Wiltshire. (Willibald, Jaffé 439).

† Along with Wynberch (Wineberht) of Nursling and Wintra of Tisbury, we find "Beorwald, qui divina coenobium gubernatione quod antiquorum nuncupatur vocabulo Glestingaburg regebat," appears among the holy men who "sanctum hunc virum accitum adduxerunt ad regem." All this, we must remember, is done "regnante Ine Westsaxonum rege." The names of "Wintra Abbas" and Beorwald Abbas" appear among the signatures to the doubtful Charter of Ine dated in 704 (Cod. Dipl. i. 57) referred to by Jaffé, but in the Charter just before (i. 56) is Beorhtwald.

‡ Chronicles, 972.

"On thære ealdan byrig
Acemannes ceastre
Eac hie egbuend ;
Othre worde
Beornas Bathan nemnath."

Chronicles. But, by the combined help of Welsh and English writers, I think I can discern a later Welsh war in which Ine was less lucky. I come back once more to the entry in 722 about Taunton. That entry says nothing about Welsh matters, but it tells everything in a disconnected, backward, way. We gather, bit by bit, that Ine had built a fortress, that the rebel Ealdbriht got hold of it, that Æthelburh destroyed the fortress and drove out the rebel. Now in the same year the one trustworthy British authority, the Annales Cambriæ, places three battles, one in Cornwall, the other two in the modern South Wales, in all of which the Britons had the victory. No name of the Welsh leader is given in the genuine text, but the interpolator has rather unluckily stuck in the name of Ivor, whom, it will be remembered, he does not mention where he appears in the other accounts.* But in the two Bruts, the latter of which, by the way, leaves out the Cornish battle, the Welsh leader is Rhodri Molwynawc who had just succeeded Ivor in the kingdom. I do not profess to know the site of the Cornish battle described as Hehil or Heilin;† but I conceive that we need not rigidly confine the name Cornwall‡ to the modern county. Any part of the kingdom of Gerent or Rhodri might be called Cornwall as opposed to Morganwg or Glamorgan, where one of the other battles was placed.

* Ann. Camb. 722. "Beli filius Elfin moritur, et bellum Hehil apud Cornuenses; gueith Gartmailauc, cat Pencon apud dextrales Brittones; et Brittones victores fuerunt in istis tribus bellis." The interpolator reads "Bellum Pentun inter Britones et Saxones; sed Britones victores in hiis omnibus fuerunt, Iwor existente duce eorum."

† The name is Heilin in the elder Brut. The name of Rhodri does not seem to be found in all the MSS.

‡ "Cornuenses" in the Annales, "Ygkernyb" in the elder Brut.

The English and Welsh entries, though they record quite different facts, seem to me to hang very well together. The West-Saxons lose a battle in a Damnonian war, and the fortress which had been lately built as a bulwark on the Damnonian frontier is occupied by an English rebel in a strife so serious that the fortress is destroyed in order to dislodge him. This looks very much as if the partisans of Ealdbriht had made common cause with the Welsh King who had just come to his crown, and who was naturally eager for some exploit against the old enemy. The forces of Ine then were defeated, and his fortress of Taunton was occupied by a combined body of British enemies and West-Saxon rebels. More serious losses were probably hindered by the vigorous action of the Queen, and her prominence in the war would also seem to imply that Ine was either disabled by age or sickness, or else that he was engaged elsewhere against some other division of the enemy. That the enemy, both foreign and domestic, were at last overcome is plain from Ine's being able to pursue Ealdbriht to his South-Saxon shelter. When Taunton was rebuilt I do not know. The place is mentioned in a charter of Æthelheard in 737* as having been granted by his Queen Frithgith to the Church of Winchester, but this charter is marked as spurious. The earliest charter in which Taunton is mentioned which Mr. Kemble accepts is one of Bishop Denewulf in 904, where Taunton appears as already possessed of a monastery, or at least a church of some kind.†

* Cod. Dipl. v. 45.

† Cod. Dipl. v. 155. Bishop Denewulf and the Church of Winchester had granted certain lands to King Eadward the Elder "pro perpetua libertate illius monasterii quae dicitur Tantun, in quo antea multa regalium tributorum jura consistebant, quo et illud monasterium æqualiter ab omnibus regalibus et commitialibus tributis liberum et inmune perpetualiter permaneat."

Another question starts itself. The war in Cornwall could only have been a war between Britons and West-Saxons. But the war in Cornwall and the war in Morganwg are spoken of as if they were parts of the same enterprise, carried on under the same leader. This is one of the passages which I have already spoken of as leading to the belief that the Kings of Damnonia exercised some kind of supremacy over the princes on the opposite coast of the Bristol Channel. Who then were their English adversaries in those parts? The Mercian frontier can hardly have come very near Morganwg so soon as this. It looks as if Ine was trying to extend his power over the Britons on both sides of the Channel, and as if, largely perhaps through the traitorous union of Ealdbriht with the Welsh, these schemes were shattered by a triple defeat in both regions.

All this is an example of the way in which secondary authorities should be used and should not be used. We should not accept the fables of the later Welsh Chronicles as true history, especially when we can trace back the way in which they grew out of the accounts of earlier and more trustworthy writers of their own nation. But even out of these later versions we may pick hints now and then, while we learn to look on the original Welsh Annals as a trustworthy, though a very meagre, document. We do not accept tales of British victories which are not to be found in the earliest British authority, and which are plainly tales of English victories turned backwards. But we may accept tales of British victories which are found in the earliest British authority, and which do not contradict our own Annals, but fill up gaps in them. The victories of the Welsh under their legendary Ivor are really their defeats at the hands of Centwine and Ine. But their victories under

Rhodri in 722 I accept as historical. They fill up a void in our own Chronicles; they explain a passage where our own annalists speak with stammering lips; they make us better understand a state of thing on which English writers would naturally have no great desire to dwell, and they set before us more clearly the combination of foes against which Wessex had to struggle when its newly raised bulwark was sacrificed by the unsparing vigour of Ine's Queen.

Thus, I think, we get very fairly at the true relations of Ine towards the Welsh. He was a conqueror who won from them a considerable district, which completed the formation of our own shire and was secured by the foundation of one of its chief towns as a border fortress. The later years of his reign were less successful. He suffered defeats at the hands of British enemies, and at most he maintained his new frontier instead of extending it further. But the general glory of his name was so great that he became a subject of romance; his exploits were laid hold of by the other side, and Ine was turned into a hero of the Bret-Welsh, much as Charles the Great has been turned into a hero of the Gal-Welsh. This, I think, is enough; but any one who chooses may explain the fancy of the Welsh for making Ine their own, by the theory that he was really so far their own that Ine and Mul were sons of a Welsh mother. He may also go on to believe that Mul bears the witness of his mixed origin in his name, that he was in fact, like Cyrus, the mule-King, the ἡμίονος βασιλεύς of the Delphic Oracle.* This I have no evidence either

* We have seen (see above p. 28) that he appears in a Kentish writer as "Mulus," though the more common Latin form of his name is "Mollo." I am sure that I have somewhere or other seen this inference as to his half British origin founded on the name Mul. In Brompton (X Scriptt. 742) he is changed into a more dangerous beast, and appears as Wolf. For the oracle, see Herodotus i. 55 and the explanation in c. 56.

to confirm or to confute. I do not know who Ine's mother was, and she may have been a Welshwoman. The attempt of the Britons to annex Ine is at least happier than the attempt of their continental kinsfolk to annex Charles. Ine may have been half a Welshman, because there certainly were Welshmen and Welshwomen in his time, and one of them may have been his parent. But the other Teutonic hero cannot have been even half a Frenchman, seeing that in his day Frenchmen, as a distinct type of the human family, did not exist.

I have thus gone through all that, as far as I know, can be made out about the parentage of Ine, about his wars, about his dealings with his British neighbours, about his relations to the town in which we are now met. I had purposed to go on further, and to deal with him in the two characters which have given him his greatest claim to lasting remembrance, as a lawgiver and as an ecclesiastical founder. But I find that the other aspect of him has supplied me with more than matter enough for consideration at a single meeting. I therefore keep back the examination of his laws and foundations for another year. Some day doubtless we shall again meet, as we did thirteen years ago, under the shadow of the sacred mount of Glastonbury. Some day, I trust, we shall, as we have already once done in the case of Bristol, overleap our strict geographical border, and come together on a spot which has so close a connexion with the history of our own shire as Sherborne and its minster. Both at Glastonbury and at Sherborne Ine is as much entitled to the honours of a founder as he is at Taunton. Only at Sherborne and Glastonbury his works were ecclesiastical, while at Taunton

they were military, perhaps municipal. In either place an examination of those aspects of his reign which I have now left untouched will be thoroughly in place. And I trust that some such opportunity will one day give me the excuse of again taking up the subject of the reign and acts of one who not only fills so high a place in the general annals of old English kingship, but who has a special claim to honour at our own hands. The name of Ine is perhaps the very earliest name which stands out as having a right to a place among the local worthies of Somerset.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since our Meeting at Taunton I have lighted on one or two things bearing on that part of Ine's life which I have dealt with in the foreging paper. In page 14 I mentioned a mistaken statement of William of Malmesbury, according to which the father of Ine was, not Cenred but Cissa. Now, though there is no doubt that Cenred was the father of Ine, yet there seems some reason to think that there was an Under-King named Cissa in the generation before Ine. This is the Cissa who figures in the Abingdon History (ii. 268), who is claimed as one of the founders or early benefactors of that Abbey, and who is described as an Under-King reigning at Bedwin, over Wiltshire and part of Berkshire. He is placed in the time of Centwine; and his nephew Hean is described as the immediate founder, and first founder of Abingdon, the description of him runs thus:—

"Regnante Kinuino rege West-Saxonum erat quidam nobilis vir Cyssa nomine, et hic erat regulus, in cujus dominio erat Wiltesire, et pars maxima de Berksire. Et quia habebat in dominio suo episcopalem sedem in Malmesbiria, regulus ap-

pellabatur. Metropolis vero urbis regni ipsius erat Bedeuuinde. In australi etiam parte urbis illius construxit castellum, quod ex nomine suo Cyssebui vocabatur."

In p. 271 his death is thus recorded :—

"Illo tempore defunctus est avunculus Heane, gloriosus regulus Cysse, et super montem praedictum Abbendoniae sepultus; sed postea corpus ejus usque ad Sevekesham translatum est."

The writer then records the reign of Ceadwalla, and adds an entry which concerns us more nearly :—

"Glorioso regi Cedwallae successit Ine. Hic universas possessiones quas Cyssa et Cedwalla Abbendoniae contulerunt, abstulit et diripuit; sed postea pœnitens eadem quæ abstulit, et multo plura, eidem ecclesiae reddidit et confirmavit. Nam ad construendam ecclesiam Abbendoniae et Glastoniæ tria millia librarum et dcc. et l. libras argenti contulit."

It would be undutiful to believe that Ine, whom we honour as a founder at Wells, Glastonbury, and Sherborne, was a spoiler at Abingdon. And we must always remember that we hardly ever have in these cases the means of hearing the story from the side of the King or other laymen. But there seems no reason to doubt the existence of the Under-King Cissa, as the story in no way contradicts any higher authority. But no one must be led astray by the wonderful comments of Mr. Stevenson in his Preface to the Abingdon History, either into making him head King of the West-Saxons, of which the Abingdon writer does not give the slightest hint, or into confounding him, as I fancy that some writers have done, with the more famous Cissa of Sussex.

There are a good many places in Wessex which seem to be called after some Cissa or other, as Cissethebeorg (Cod. Dipl. ii. 5), Cissanham (iii. 229), Cissan Anstigo (vi. 41.) Cissanbeorg (v. 179), besides Kissantun in Ælfred's will (v. 130), which is there coupled with places in our own shire, but which does not appear in the English copy of the will in ii. 114. Some of the these places may possibly be called from the Under-King Cissa, though there is always at least an equal chance of any name of the kind being really that of some legendary person.

An account of Ine at least as mythical as the Somerton story is to be found in the Liber Custumarum of the City of London, (vol. ii. pt. 2, page 638, of Mr. Riley's edition). For once he keeps his proper vowel. The passage comes in a strange addition to the so-called laws of Eadward the Confessor, which is put into the mouth of William the Conqueror himself. Amongst other things, there is an account of the privileges which, on the strength of ancient kindred, are to be given in England to the Jutes, (Guti) and to the continental Saxons, and these privileges, we are told, were granted by Ine, who was elected King over England, and who was the first to hold monarchy of English and Britons throughout the island. He was twice married, and his second wife was called Wala, after whom Cambria changed its name to Wallia. With her he received Cambria and Cornwall, and the blessed crown of Britain which had belonged to Cadwallader the last King of Britain. From his time Englishmen and Britons and Scots began to intermarry with one another, so that the two nations became one flesh. Also Ine practised every virtue in war and peace which became a King, and he was specially famous for being the first founder of what we suppose we may call the United Kingdom. I give the passage at length with some omissions :—

"Ita constituit optimus Yne, Rex Anglorum, qui electus fuit in regem per Angliam, et qui primo obtinuit monarchiam totius regni hujus post adventum Anglorum in Britanniam. Fuit enim primus rex coronatus Anglorum et Britonum simul in Britanniâ, post adventum Saxonum Germanniae in Britannia, scilicet post acceptam fidem a Beato Gregorio per Sanctum Augustinum. Cepit enim praedictus Ina uxorem suam demum, 'Walam' nomine; propter quam vocata est 'Wallia,' quæ quondam vocabatur 'Cambria.' Bigamus enim fuit.

Cepit enim cum ista, ultima sua uxore, Cambriam et Cornubiam, et coronam benedictam Britanniae, quae fuit ultimo Cadwalladrio, Regi Britanniae; et universi Angli, qui tunc temporis in Britanniam extiterunt, uxores suas ceperunt de Britonum genere, et Britones uxores suas de illustri sanguine et genere Anglorum, scilicet de genere Saxonum. Hoc enim factum fuit per commune consilium et assensum omnium Episcoporum et Principum, Procerum, Comitum, et omnium

sapientum, seniorum, et populorum totius regni, et per præceptum Regis prædicti."

He then goes on to speak of the intermarriages of the different nations, and adds:—

"Et tali modo effecti fuerunt gens una et populus unus, per universum regnum Britanniae, miseratione divina. Deinde universi vocaverunt 'Regnum Anglorum' quod ante vocatum fuit 'Regnum Britanniae.'"

He then goes on to say how the united nations withstood the invasions of Danes and Norwegians, and winds up with a panegyric on Ine:—

"Erat enim prædictus rex Ine optimus, largus, sapiens, et prudens et moderatus, strenuus, justus et animosus, bellicosus, pro loco et tempore; et in divinis legibus et sæcularibus institutis, scriptis et bonorum operum exhibitionibus irradiat. Gloriosus rexit, quia regnum et confœderavit et consolidavit, et in unum pacificavit, sapientia et prudentia magna, et, ubi locus adfuit, vi et manu armata."

Strange as all this stuff is, it has its value, as showing the abiding belief that Ine stood in some special relation to the British portion of his subjects, as well as the memory of Ine's general merits as a ruler. The imaginary British wife may possibly spring from some confused tradition of a real British mother.

I ought to mention that the passage in the Abingdon History was suggested to me by some unpublished remarks of Professor Stubbs, and the reference to the Liber Custumarum by Mr. Haddan's reference, Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, i. 202.