

This morning the members again assembled in the Council-hall.

The Rev. J. R. GREEN gave a notice of two bishops of Wells—

Giso and Savaric.

The notice of Giso is printed in Part II. Savaric (Mr. Green observed) seemed to have been a relation of the Emperor Henry VI., and was undoubtedly archdeacon of Northampton and treasurer of Salisbury. When Reginald was about to be translated from Bath and Wells to the see of Canterbury, which he did not live to fill, he took particular pains that the archdeacon of Northampton should be promoted to the see he was about to vacate, and Savaric accordingly gained the preferment. Soon after his consecration, Richard I., King of England, returning from his crusade in the Holy Land, was made prisoner by the Emperor of Germany. The value of the royal prize was fixed at 100,000 marks as a ransom, and hostages were detained till the money was paid, one of whom was Savaric. Savaric, being a man of an avaricious and ambitious disposition, solicited the Emperor to obtain from the captive King the abbacy of Glastonbury, to be annexed to the see of Wells. As there was no vacancy, the scheme seemed impracticable. The crafty bishop soon found out a plan for effecting his purpose, in the following manner. The

see of Worcester was vacant. Henry de Suliaco, then abbot, was sent for by the King; on his arrival at the royal residence, he was informed of the King's pleasure to appoint him bishop of Worcester, and that resignation of his abbey was immediately required. This arrangement being acceded to on the part of the abbot, Savaric (who had ceded to the King the city of Bath, worth one hundred marks a-year) hastened to Glastonbury to take possession of his new dignity, having been confirmed therein by the Pope. The prior and monks, suspecting some private arrangement, stoutly resisted the union of the two dignities, and violent proceedings immediately followed. The monks were supported in their opposition by Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, and for four years Hubert kept Savaric at bay. Savaric had great influence with the Pope, Hubert was compelled to give way, and the bishop was ultimately inducted. The monks then tried another method: they sent one of their number, William de Pica, to Richard, in France, with a large sum of money. Richard, who was always in want of money, then found that he had conferred the abbacy when in captivity, and on this excuse retracted the gift, and nominated William de Pica to the post. Hubert inhibited the proceeding, and Richard conveniently kept the abbey in his own hands. King John, bribed by Savaric, issued orders for that prelate's induction, and Savaric thereupon took with him to Glastonbury a great band of canons and lay people. The doors of the abbey were forced open, and the canons, clothed in the robes of the monastery, formed the procession of induction. The bulk of the monks had retired to the refectory, were there locked in, and were so imprisoned a day and a night without food. They were then brought down to the chapter-house and compelled to submit; but they did not escape without

a public whipping. The monks lodged another appeal at Rome, and Savaric sent an embassy of canons to them to compel them to withdraw their appeal. The monks sought refuge in their church, put on their albs, one took the crucifix, and another the pyx. The canons and lay people forced their way into the church, seized the monks, dragged them out by the hair of their heads, and took them off to Wells in carts amid the scoffs of the populace. The monks thus captured were scattered among different monasteries. Savaric ordered the gates of the Glastonbury monastery to be closed, and no letters to be let out or in. Some who were left got away, and were pursued—the parson of Monkton was caught and thrashed to death. Martin de Summis escaped, and having connections at the court of Rome and being possessed of money, he quickly set his cash and his relations in motion. Innocent III granted an audience to Martin and William de Pica: it was recorded that they burst into tears and told him all, and thereupon Innocent burst out crying too, and promised them justice. Innocent did not care much about the Benedictines, but he cited Savaric to appear at Rome. Savaric received the letter in Flanders, pronounced it a forgery, and would not go; but at last had to comply. He had plenty of money also, and after considerable contention, Innocent, fettered with the grant of Celestine, decided that William de Pica's election must be quashed, that the whole thing should be put on a new footing,—Glastonbury to be merged into a new see, the bishopric of Bath and Glastonbury,—and the costs incurred to be paid out of Savaric's fourth share of the property. Savaric was ordered to persecute monks no longer, nor to prevent them appealing to the Pope. Soon after Savaric died, and Joceline succeeded to the see. Joceline gave up the joint bishopric, and the monks were allowed to choose their own abbot.

Mr. SEREL produced Savaric's original charter to the city for inspection, in which he is designated Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury.

The Rev. W. STUBBS observed that so many of the Bishops of Bath and Wells occupied important positions, that it would require a great deal of time to go through even the most salient points of their history. The custom of his own country which Giso said he introduced here, related to the canonical order. The canonical order was never received in its integrity in England. This country was converted principally by means of small mission stations, established by a certain number of the clergy, some of whom were under monastic vows, and some were not. As soon as they had done their work they began quarrelling, as they naturally would,—the monks wishing to make all the secular clergy monks, and the secular clergy wishing to make the monks of their order. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, anxious to make the chapters of cathedral churches live in communities, turned out the canons of most of the cathedrals, and replaced them by monks. That change was never imposed on Wells. With regard to Savaric, several theories might be supported: his (Mr. Stubbs') opinion was that he might have been a German by extraction, but he belonged to a family settled in England for some time.

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Freeman was a great admirer of Harold's, and wished to know how he would get him out of this scrape.

Mr. FREEMAN at once quoted the contemporary character of Harold: "*Virtute corporis et animi præstabat in populo, sicut alter Judas Maccabæus.*" It was clear however that there was some grudge, on whatever ground, between the men of Somersetshire and the house of

Godwine. Everywhere else they were received as deliverers; in the Isle of Wight, in Sussex, in Kent, men were ready "to live and die with Earl Godwine:" in Somersetshire, both before and after the conquest, his sons and grandsons were repulsed as enemies. There was no direct explanation given of this difference of feeling, but it was to be remembered that Somersetshire formed part of the government of Swegen; what his administration was in Herefordshire was well known, and it probably was no better elsewhere. As to the alleged spoliation of Wells Cathedral by Harold, two or three points were to be considered. The popular account drawn from Bishop Godwin was an exaggeration of the narrative given by Giso himself: for instance, it was clear that Giso did not, as Godwin states, fly from the country and return only after the conquest. There was a charter of Harold's as King addressed to Giso, a charter of reconciliation, which of course implied the existence of some earlier quarrel, but which also distinctly set aside this part of the common story. It was not to be forgotten that these alleged robberies of churches were often done by the underlings of great men without any authority from their masters. Sir Henry Ellis had treated this subject at length in a note in his Introduction to Domesday, where several instances were collected, and where he gave a distinct warning that the complicity of the King or other principal was not to be taken for granted. There was no counter-statement on Harold's side, and there could be no doubt that the most legal transaction on his part would be represented by his Norman enemies as fraudulent or violent. At any rate, if he was looked on as a robber at Wells, he was looked on as a founder, and almost as a saint, at Waltham.