

I.

THE HOSPITAL OF ST GERMAINS IN EAST LOTHIAN AND THE
BETHLEHEMITES. BY EGERTON BECK, F.S.A. Scot.

The historians of Scottish monasticism have not been able to throw much light on the history of the hospital of St Germain in East Lothian. Spottiswood could only¹ give a reference to the Ragman Rolls showing that it was in existence in 1296,² and Walcott contents himself³ with a quotation from Chalmers to the effect that it was founded in the twelfth century⁴—a statement, by the way, for which no authority is given. There are, however, some fifteenth-century documents in the Vatican archives⁵ which add somewhat to our knowledge, showing, as they do, that the hospital was connected with the see of Bethlehem, and that it was served by an order of canons regular whose presence in Scotland has hitherto escaped notice.

The earliest of these documents is a petition of Robert, duke of Albany, addressed in 1410 to the antipope Benedict XIII.,⁶ “on behalf of Richard de Mariton, canon of Scone, for the hospital of St German in the diocese of St Andrews, value £50 old sterling, wont to be given by the bishop of Bethlehem to clerks bearing the red cross, void by reason that Roger de Edinburgh⁷ is a notorious schismatic, notwith-

¹ *Account of all the Religious Houses that were in Scotland*, at p. 290 (printed in Keith's *Catalogue of the Bishops*, Edinburgh, 1755).

² This will be found on p. 134 of the *Instrumenta Publica*, published by the Bannatyne Club (1834).

³ Walcott, *Scoti-Monasticon* (London, 1874), p. 390.

⁴ Chalmers, *Caledonia*, ii. 510 (new edition, iv. 510).

⁵ Six have been entered in the *Calendar of Papal Documents relating to Great Britain*, published by the Record Office: two of these are in the *Calendar of Petitions to the Pope*, the others in the *Calendar of Papal Letters*.

⁶ *Petitions*, vol. xcix. (13–16 Benedict XIII., antipope), f. 208d; in *Calendar of Petitions*, i. 639.

⁷ There are two entries in the *Calendar of Petitions* relating to a Roger de Edinburgh, presumably the same. In a roll of petitions presented in 1394, “on the

standing that Henry de Ramsay unlawfully holds it." This was granted ; but in the following year Benedict was asked to reverse his decision by Ramsay, who is described as " of noble birth, master and rector of the Augustinian hospital of St German of the Star of Bethlehem." His statement of facts sets out that " whereas the said hospital, then void by the death of John Rollok, papal chaplain, was given to him first by authority of the ordinary and then by papal authority, on the deprivation of Roger de Edinburg, a schismatic, and whereas Roger de Mariton, by virtue of a surreptitious grant, obtained by false statement, is maliciously litigating about the same before Thomas de Karnis, official of St Andrews, the pope is prayed to commit the cause to John Garsie, papal auditor, so that the hospital, whose value is £54, may be given to the said Henry." ¹ This petition also was granted ; but as to the result of the litigation I know nothing.

A quarter of a century later there was another dispute in regard to the hospital. This time the litigants were Dominic, bishop of Bethlehem, on the one hand, and, on the other, two clerks of the diocese of St Andrews, Patrick Rode and Archibald Laurencii by name. The bishop had obtained a decision in his favour ; but fearing that, while the cause had been pending, others might have intruded themselves, in 1435 he petitioned the pope to enforce his rights. In his petition he set out the facts which, in the *Calendar*,² are summarised as follows : (1) A dispute had arisen between him and the two clerks about the hospital. The bishop claimed that it belonged to his episcopal *mensa* ; the others that it belonged to them ; Patrick alleging that it was wont

part of the earl of Caithness, lord of Brechin and brother of the king of Scotland," is the entry : " Roger de Edynburch, priest, of noble birth, akin to the king of Scotland for a canonry of Rouen with expectation of a prebend. Granted 3 Id. Oct. an. 1. *Ad vacatura* post 10 Kal. Jul. an. 9" (*Cal. Pet.*, i. 620). And in 1403 he is found petitioning for a benefice in the gift of the bishop and chapter of Aberdeen. This too was granted (*Cal. Pet.*, i. 629).

¹ *Petitions*, vol. lxxviii. (13-25 Benedict XIII., antipope) 167d; *Cal. Petitions*, i. 599.

² *Lat. Reg.*, cccxxiii. f. 132d ; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 488, 489.

to be assigned as a perpetual benefice, and that it had been collated to him by the ordinary on its voidance by the death of Richard Langland. (2) The present pope [Eugenius IV.] committed the cause (although it had not by law devolved to the Roman court) to John [bishop] elect of Leon, then papal auditor. While the cause was pending, Patrick, then in possession, resigned all right to the pope. (3) The pope then ordered the auditor to surrogate the said bishop to, and to make collation and provision to him of, Patrick's said right, to admit him to the same possession as Patrick had, and moreover to grant him *in commendam* the hospital itself to hold as long as he should be bishop of Bethlehem. (4) Archibald had prevented the said mandate from taking effect. The said auditor by a definitive sentence declared the said mandate to be canonical, granting the said hospital *in commendam* to the said bishop, Archibald to have no right in or to it; inducted the said bishop; and imposed perpetual silence on Archibald, condemning him in costs, which he afterwards assessed at twenty-two gold florins, of the *camera*.

The pope issued his mandate to the officials of Mirepoix and Brechin and to John de Messane, canon of Glasgow, ordering them "to induct the said bishop or his proctor, removing unlawful detainer, and causing satisfaction to be made him in respect of the fruits and the costs, and to execute these presents against any intruders, as regards possession only of the said hospital, as if the said sentence had been delivered against them, invoking the aid of the secular arm, etc." ¹

This mandate was issued on 15th January 1435; on 23rd May, next following, the bishop, by his proctor Henry Rynde, canon of Caithness, resigned his claim to the hospital, the sentence given in his favour not having been executed. The pope thereupon issued two mandates to the official of Brechin in favour of Patrick Piote [? Rode]. By one he ordered that he should be received "as a canon and brother" of the

¹ *Lat. Reg.*, cccxxiii. f. 132d; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 488, 489.

hospital and that the official should receive his regular profession ;¹ by the other that, after Patrick had been received as a brother and had made his profession, the hospital should be collated to him.² But Archibald Laurencii would not abandon his claim. He prevented collation, and once more the cause was taken to Rome,³ to be again decided in Patrick's favour. On 5th November 1437 Eugenius IV. issued a mandate to the bishop of Moray, the abbot of Cupar, and the archdeacon of Hainault⁴ ordering them to induct Patrick and to cause satisfaction to be made him.⁵

Were no further evidence forthcoming, these documents would not leave much doubt as to there having been some connexion between St Germain's and the church of Bethlehem. There is more evidence ; but that it may be properly appreciated something must first be said of the bishops of Bethlehem and their chapter.

The cardinal James of Vitry,⁶ a thirteenth-century prelate, tells us⁷ that the see of Bethlehem was, with the consent of the pope, Paschal II., erected by Baldwin, the first Latin king of Jerusalem. The bishop was a suffragan of the patriarch of Jerusalem ; but in later times, when the patriarchate had become a titular dignity, he was immediately subject to the Roman see.⁸ The Latins were expelled from Bethlehem by the Saracens in 1266, but the bishops maintained a

¹ *Lat. Reg.*, cccxxxiv. f. 156 ; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 567.

² *Lat. Reg.*, cccxxxiv. f. 154d ; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 566.

³ *Lat. Reg.*, cccli. f. 47d ; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 638.

⁴ Diocese of Liège.

⁵ *Lat. Reg.*, cccli. f. 47d ; *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 638. This mandate was issued in answer to Patrick's petition, in which there is a curious error. He says that the hospital was granted to Dominic for life, and to himself on the death of that prelate. But, in the 1435 mandate, it is expressly stated that Dominic had resigned his claim, and that Patrick had thereupon been appointed.

⁶ Canon regular of Oignies in Hainault ; bishop of Acre from 1217 to 1229 ; afterwards cardinal-bishop of Tusculum and legate in the Holy Land.

⁷ *Historia Orientalis*, cap. 57.

⁸ *Registres de Nicholas IV.* (edited by E. Langlois), p. 410 ; published in the "Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," série 2, tome 5.

more or less close connexion with the Holy Land for long after this : eventually, however, they took up their residence in France, in a hospital at Clamecy, in the Nivernais, which had been bequeathed to them by William, count of Nevers, a crusader.¹ They were then appointed by the pope on the nomination of the counts of Nevers ;² and, till the French Revolution, they exercised jurisdiction over the hospital of Clamecy as part of the church of Bethlehem—a position, it may be said, which was not readily accepted by the bishops of Auxerre.

Two bishops of Bethlehem were Englishmen. The first of these, Ralph,³ a canon regular, chancellor of Baldwin III., king of Jerusalem, was appointed by Adrian IV., and ruled the see from 1156 to 1174. The other, William of Bottisham,⁴ a Dominican, was appointed in 1384 and translated to Llandaff in the following year.⁵ Another of them, Godfrey de' Prefetti, then bishop-elect, was sent by Innocent IV. as legate to Scotland in 1247—a legation which excited the curiosity and the sarcasm of Matthew Paris.⁶

The church of Bethlehem was served by a prior and chapter of Austin canons, both before and after its erection into a cathedral.⁷ Its canons were still found in the Holy Land for some years after their church had a second time fallen into the hands of the unbeliever ; but it seems that no notice is found of them of a later date than 1284.

The bishop and chapter had considerable possessions ; some of these were in the Holy Land, but for the most part they were situated in

¹ *Gallia Christiana* (2nd edition), xii., Instr., col. 372 (foundation charter).

² Guy Coquille, *Histoire du Pays et Duché de Nivernais* (Paris, 1612), p. 92.

³ Fisquet, *La France Pontificale*, Metropole de Sens, Nevers Bethlehem, p. 146 (Paris, 1864–1871).

⁴ Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevii*, i. 304 (Munster, 1898, etc.).

⁵ This was during the great schism. Bishop William was appointed by the Italian pope, Urban VI., and had no connexion with Clamecy.

⁶ *Chron. Maj.* ad an. 1247 ; Rolls edition, iv. 602.

⁷ Jac. de Vitriaco, *Hist. Orient.*, cap. 57 ; and *Registres de Nicholas IV.* (Langlois), p. 410.

Europe. As to these, no little information was collected by the late Count Riant, the eruditè author of *Exuvie Constantinopolitaneæ*, and published by him in the seventeenth volume of the *Atti* of the Società Ligure di Storia Patria.¹ Amongst other documents, he gives two bulls in which the churches, lands, and hospitals held by the church of Bethlehem are detailed. One of these bulls was granted by Gregory IX. in 1227, and the other by Clement IV. in 1266; but it must be said that neither is found in the published registers of these popes,² and that Riant relied upon copies.³ The greater number of their possessions were in Italy,⁴ but churches, hospitals, or estates are also noted in France, in Spain, in Germany, and in Great Britain. Neither England nor Scotland is mentioned in the earlier bull, but in that of 1266 under Scotland there are two entries—the church of St Germain in the diocese of St Andrews, and the oratory of New Bethlehem in London!⁵ St Germain was not a parish, and there can be no doubt

¹ The title of the paper was “L’Église de Bethléem et Varazze en Ligurie”; it was published in 1885, and republished at a later date, with additions, under the title *Études sur l’histoire de l’Église de Bethléem*, the second volume of which was published in 1896, after the death of the author, from his notes by Mr C. Kohler. I must acknowledge my indebtedness to this learned work for references to works and documents which I have in consequence been able to consult for myself.

² *Les Registres de Grégoire IX.*, edited by L. Auvray, and *Les Registres de Clement IV.*, edited by E. Jordan, have been published in the “Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome,” série 2, tomes 9 et 11. Neither of these bulls is entered in Potthast’s *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*.

³ For the bull of Gregory IX. he relies on a fourteenth-century *vidimus* of Stephen Aldobrandini, archbishop of Toulouse, in the state archives at Bologna (S. Cristina, bust. 0, 44); and for that of Clement IV. on a copy found in a collection of documents belonging to the archipresbyteral prebend of the cathedral of Savona and deposited in the chapter archives.

⁴ They were scattered over from thirty to forty Italian dioceses, and included some twenty hospitals, and the patronage of from forty to fifty churches. Riant says (*Études*, i. 55, 56) that at a later date their Italian possessions were even more extensive.

⁵ IN SCOCIA :

In diocesi S. Andreae Ecclesiam S. Germani.

In Londenis oratoria novem [*sic*] Bethlehem.

that "church" should be "hospital"—the misdescription, which is not the only one in the document,¹ being due to carelessness on the part of the copyist, or perhaps of the original draftsman. Assuming the authenticity of these bulls, we have two dates, 1227 and 1266, between which the hospital of St Germain's must have been founded, or, if founded before 1227, granted to the church of Bethlehem. The actual date was not improbably midway between the two, in 1247, when the bishop of Bethlehem was legate in Scotland.²

The hospitals were, to all intents and purposes, cells of the cathedral priory of Bethlehem,³ and they were under the jurisdiction of the bishop. As the other possessions of his church, so they were sources of revenue: New Bethlehem in London, for instance, paid the bishop a mark annually.⁴ The collection of revenue, however, as time went on, became a matter of difficulty. So early as 1332 the bishop had to invoke the assistance of the pope for the recovery of money "due to him from certain benefices and other sources in Scotland," with which object in view letters were written by John XXII. to David II., to Joan his queen, to Edward III. of England, to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and to the bishop of St Andrews.⁵ Eventually they lost all but the hospital of Clamecy, and it could hardly have

¹ The next line contains a similar one, for New Bethlehem was a hospital. So in the bull of Gregory IX. we find "extra civitatem Papie *Ecclesiam* S. Marie"; this, too, was a hospital.

² It was in this year, 1247, that land was given for the London hospital of New Bethlehem: livery of seisin was made to the bishop as he passed through London.—*Monast. Angl.*, vi. 622 (foundation charter).

³ The London hospital was styled "a member or cell" of the monastery of Bethlehem long after its connection with the bishop of Bethlehem had come to an end: so late in fact as 1518 in a "letter of confraternity" of which there is a copy in the British Museum library. That it was a cell is also suggested by its being seized into the king's hands as an alien priory, 48 Edw. III.—*Charity Commission Report*, xxxii., part 6, p. 471.

⁴ See foundation charter; and *Report* xxxii. of Charity Commission, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Cal. Papal Lett.*, ii. 504.

been otherwise. Given the ideas of the age, it was natural that lands, houses, and churches should have been lavished on a church built, as was that of Bethlehem, on a spot, or at least in a place, sacred to every Christian; but when the revenues intended for the maintenance of worship in that church became the apanage of a French prelate, nominated by the feudal lord of a French district, living in an obscure French provincial town, and having only a nominal connexion with the church to which the faithful had devoted their possessions, it was no less natural that lands, houses, and churches should revert to those whom they would in the ordinary course have advantaged—to the natives, that is, of the places in which they were situated. This is what actually happened; and the process of reversion was not improbably hastened by the animosity of the local ordinaries, caused by the exemption from their jurisdiction of every establishment subject to the bishop of Bethlehem.¹ By the middle of the fifteenth century the chief, at anyrate, of the Italian possessions had passed into other hands.² At an even earlier date the mastership of the London hospital had become a crown appointment;³ and by the beginning of the fifteenth century the control of the hospital of St Germain had certainly been lost by the bishop of Bethlehem. One hospital, and one only, remained under his jurisdiction to the end, that of Clamecy.

Connected with these hospitals there was a religious order which we find called, at one time or another, "the order of Bethlehem,"⁴ "the order of St Mary of Bethlehem,"⁵ "the order of the

¹ The London hospital was exempt to the end: in the letter of confraternity it is described as "ad Romanam curiam nullo medio pertinentis."

² Riant, *Études*, i. 102 (note) and documents in the appendix.

³ See *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1 Hen. VI., p. 5, m. 6, for such an appointment.

⁴ *Regesta Honorii III.*, vol. ii. No. 5523 (ed. P. Pressutti, Rome, 1888-1895); and *Cal. Close Rolls*, 31 Edw. I., m. 4d. Cf. Matt. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* ad an. 1257, Rolls edition, v. 631 (there called "*fratres Bethleemiti*").

⁵ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 20 Edw. I., m. 22.

Star,"¹ "the order of St Mary of the Star,"² and "*cruciferi cum stella*" (crossbearers with the star). It was as "*cruciferi cum stella*" that Eugenius IV. described the canons of St Germain; ³ just as Henry Ramsay, in his petition to Benedict XIII., spoke of the hospital itself as "St Germain of the Star of Bethlehem."⁴ Not much is known of the Bethlehemites; but more than enough to show how inadequate and misleading in their regard are the standard works on English monasticism. Even Abbot Gasquet, whose name for many years past has been associated with English monastic history, contents himself with saying ⁵ that "the origin of these friars is uncertain, and they were apparently only known in England, so may perhaps be considered to have had their beginning in this country," only adding to this the passage from Matthew Paris ⁶ stating that a community of Bethlehemites was established at Cambridge in 1257, and describing their dress. As to this, one is compelled to say that they were not friars; that they were found not only in England but in Scotland, in France, and in Italy; and that they were most certainly not of English origin, being found elsewhere some seventy years before they made their appearance in Great Britain. This popular writer probably relied on earlier English historians, whose works were produced before Riant's had seen the light; though it must in truth be said that there has never been wanting sufficient matter to more than suggest a connexion

¹ So the bishop of Bethlehem (Arnold William), in a document dated 1441—Lagenissière, *Histoire de l'évêché de Bethléem*, p. 156 (Nevers, 1872). This work is full of documents, for most of which (including this one) the author, an advocate, gives no authority. Riant, however, seems to accept them as authentic: in the second volume of the *Études* a chapter is devoted to "la source du livre du M. Chevalier Lagenissière."

² Lagenissière, *op. cit.*, p. 170—the provenance of this document is given.

³ *Cal. Papal Lett.*, viii. 488, 566, 567.

⁴ *Cal. Pet. to Pope*, i. 599.

⁵ *English Monastic Life* (2nd edition), p. 246 (London, 1904)—one of the Antiquary Series edited by the Rev. J. C. Cox, LL.D.

⁶ *Rolls edition*, v. 631. He makes no mention of the London house: nothing is known of the one he says was founded at Cambridge.

with the see of Bethlehem. But the English Benedictine does not stand alone; the French author¹ of the article on the Bethlehemites in the *American Catholic Encyclopædia* (a work of very unequal merit now in course of publication) is no better informed.

It was only in the middle of the thirteenth century that the Bethlehemite hospitallers were established in London and at St Germain; but they were found at Pavia before the end of the twelfth,² and at the beginning of the thirteenth are mentioned in a charter of privileges granted to the hospital of St Mary of Bethlehem of that place by the emperor Otho IV.³ They were, then or at a later date, also found at other places in Italy—at Verona,⁴ at Padua,⁵ at Siena,⁶ at Varazze,⁷ and in the diocese of Alba;⁸ and in France they are heard of not only at Clamecy,⁹ but in the dioceses of Condon¹⁰ and Lectoure.¹¹ The order was a double one:¹² but it does not necessarily follow that sisters were attached to every hospital. There is, however, evidence that they were established in those of London,¹³ Clamecy,¹⁴ and, Riant says,¹⁵ Pavia.

As regards the men, the order was one of canons regular of St

¹ Dom J. M. Besse, O.S.B., director of *La Revue Mabillon*.

² Riant, *op. cit.*, i. 97: he refers to the communal archives of Piacenza, *Reg. med.*, f. 119, and *Reg. mag.*, f. 166b.

³ Boehmer, *Acta Imperii Selecta*, pp. 223, 224 (Innsbruck, 1870).

⁴ Riant, as above, *Reg. med.*, 91b, and *Reg. mag.*, 134b.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Riant, p. 97.

⁷ *Ibid.*, App. iv., doct. viii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁹ They were established at Clamecy not later than 1211; cf. *Gallia Christiana* (2nd edition), xii., Instrum., col. 150.

¹⁰ Riant, i. 97: he refers to a bull of John XXII., dated 1332 (*Reg. Vat.*, ciii. ep. 1549).

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² See *Registres de Clément IV.*, ed. Jordan, No. 524.

¹³ Foundation charter (*Monast. Angl.*, vii. 622).

¹⁴ Riant, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Augustine; and of this evidence is furnished by some fifteenth-century documents. The earliest of these is the papal mandate requiring Patrick Piote to make his profession as a canon of the hospital before being installed as master of St Germain: this was in 1435. Six years later the bishop, Arnold William, of Bethlehem, in the document which has been referred to, stated that the order of the Star was composed of canons regular.¹ And lastly, in a *cahier de minutes* of a Clamecy notary, there is an entry relating to the year 1485, in which they are spoken of as "the order of canons regular of St Mary of the Star."²

It may perhaps be suggested that this was a development, and that originally the Bethlehemites, like the canons of St Anthony of the Viennois, were simple hospitallers. This may have been the case; but, as the London house is known to have been founded for a prior and canons, it looks as if the change, if there were one, was made before the middle of the thirteenth century. The London charter, however, suggests that there were two classes, for it mentions not only a "prior and canons," but "brethren and sisters": probably the canons were for the service of the church, the "brethren," subordinate to them, for that of the hospital.³

Dom Besse speaks of these Bethlehemites as an order of chivalry; ⁴ though for what reason is not clear, as he says that nothing is known of them beyond what can be gathered from Matthew Paris, who certainly makes no suggestion of the kind. It is, however, a fact that in the middle of the fourteenth century the community of

¹ Lagenissière, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

² *Ibid.*, p. 170.

³ The neighbouring community of St Mary Spital was composed of "prior et canonici et fratres"; see the agreement made, early in the thirteenth century, between the convent and the rector of the parish, *Mon. Angl.*, vi. 625.

⁴ *The Catholic Encyclopædia* (s.r. "Bethlehemites"). There was a short-lived order of knights of St Mary of Bethlehem founded by Pius II. in 1459: but there does not appear to be any record of an earlier order of chivalry under this title.

the London hospital were styled, in some official documents,¹ "the master and brethren of the house and order of the knighthood of St Mary of Bethlehem"; and in the sixteenth-century "letter of confraternity" of that house it is styled "*ordinis militiæ stellarum.*" Of this I am unable to hazard any explanation.

That the Bethlehemites, as would be expected of them, actually observed the rule and constitutions of the church of Bethlehem is suggested by the foundation charter of the London house, for which this observance² is prescribed in terms. But their dress was, for some unknown reason, like that of the Dominicans, with the addition of a star on the black mantle.³ This star, the peculiar badge of the order, was red, with a blue centre. Matthew Paris says that it had five rays: Riant that he was misinformed, as in reality it had seven.⁴ The truth probably is that the number varied. For though a star with seven rays is found on the counter-seal of a thirteenth-century bishop,⁵ and was the badge directed to be worn by a fourteenth-century rector or administrator of one of the Italian hospitals,⁶ yet in the London letter of confraternity we find one with eight.

A more interesting point is one suggested by the name given to the canons of St Germain's in the letters of Eugenius IV.—*cruciferi cum stella*. Must it be inferred from this that they bore a cross as well as a star? As a cross was assumed by all who took part in the crusades, the various religious bodies and chapters in the Holy Land would certainly have conformed to the general practice. And bearing in mind the conservatism of the ecclesiastic in such matters, we should

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 21 Edw. III., p. 2, m. 14; 22 Edw. III., p. 2, m. 3, and p. 3, m. 38; 30 Edw. III., p. 2, m. 11.

² "*Regulam et ordinem dictæ ecclesiæ Bethleemitanæ.*"

³ *Matth. Paris*, *Rolls edition*, v. 631.

⁴ Riant, *op. cit.*, i. 97, note I.

⁵ Hugh de Curcis (1279-1292). The seal is reproduced on the frontispiece of Lagenissière's history.

⁶ Riant, *op. cit.*, App. iv. doct. 32.

expect that the badge would be retained after its significance had been lost ; just as the cross is still retained as an essential part of the habit of the various orders of chivalry founded during, and in connexion with, the crusades, and of the orders founded for the redemption of Christian captives. And, as a matter of fact, we know that a cross was worn by one such body, the canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre, for centuries after the Holy Land was lost. Further, a cross has been very commonly worn by those connected with hospitals ; the hospital *par excellence*, that of St John of Jerusalem, having probably served as a model in this as in other matters.

The canons of St Germain's may be said to have belonged to both these classes : they were not only hospitallers, but hospitallers who legally formed part of the church of Bethlehem. That they actually wore the cross is clear not only from the fact that they were called "*cruciferi*," but from the statement of the duke of Albany that the hospital was ordinarily given to "clerks bearing the red cross." If indeed they bore the double badge of cross and star, they were not singular in so doing, for there still exists in Bohemia an order of hospitallers, founded in the thirteenth century, whose members wear as a badge a red star under a red cross, and, like the Scottish canons, are styled "*cruciferi cum stella*."¹

That the master and general of the order was the bishop of Bethlehem is abundantly proved by documentary evidence. There is a bull of Honorius III., dated 1225, in which it is distinctly stated that the bishop had houses in various dioceses, *ad se pleno jure spectantes*, and that in these houses were brethren of the order of Bethlehem, some of whom had proved rebellious, for which reason the bishop was granted full coercive powers.² About the same time, in the course of a dispute

¹ Helyot, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux* (ed. Badiche, in Migne's series), i. col. 1164 ss. In the official *Gerarchia Cattolica* they are called *Crociferi della Stella Rossa*.

² *Reg. Hon. III.*, ed. Pressutti, No. 5523.

between the bishop of Savona and the clergy of a church in Varazze, which belonged to the Bethlehemites, it was alleged that the bishop of Bethlehem had a privilege which precluded any other bishop, under pain of excommunication, from inflicting censures on, or demanding procurations from, members of the order.¹ At the beginning of the fourteenth century the bishop, Wulfran, wrote to the archbishop of York on the subject of the misdeeds of some English Bethlehemites whom he spoke of as his subjects :² and towards the middle of the fifteenth, in the course of a dispute with the bishop of Auxerre as to jurisdiction, the bishop of Bethlehem stated categorically in an official document that he was master and general of the whole order of the Star, and that every Bethlehemite looked upon him, and him alone, as his bishop.³ And lastly, at the end of the same century, in 1485, the notary Berthier Montenat speaks of the bishop in his *cahier de minutes* as "master and perpetual administrator of the whole order of canons regular of St Mary of the Star."⁴

Whatever may be the case now, in earlier times it was not an easy matter to keep an international order together, and there is good reason for thinking that the bishops of Bethlehem did not find their position a less difficult one than that of other central authorities. We have seen that, so early as 1225, troubles had arisen with rebellious subjects. A few years later there were difficulties with the collectors for the church of Bethlehem in England ; and, in 1248, Innocent IV. issued his mandate to the prior of Holy Trinity, London, to compel such of them as detained alms to make restitution.⁵ There is nothing to show that these persons were members of the order ; but it is more than likely that such was the case. At the beginning of the

¹ Riant, *op. cit.*, i. App. iv. doct. 8.

² Raine, *Historical Papers and Letters from Northern Registers* (Rolls Series), pp. 187, 188.

³ Lagenissière, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁵ *Cal. Papal Lett.*, i. 247.

next century, the bishop had to deal with the operations of certain English members of his order who, against his wish and in spite of his inhibition, were going about England begging.¹ And it may be gathered from the papal letters to David II. and others that a few years later the canons of St Germain's were in arrear with their payments. By the middle of the fifteenth century, the bishops of Bethlehem had lost not only St Germain's, but the English and Italian hospitals. The order lived on for some time longer in France; at Clamecy, indeed, it was not formally brought to an end till 1555, when a secular chapter was erected in the hospital church. But for some years before this, its existence hardly seems to have been a reality.² By the end of the first quarter of the seventeenth century its very memory had so completely passed away that the Bethlehemites are not even mentioned by the canon regular Pennotti in his history of his order.

¹ Raine, *loc. cit.*

² See Lagenissière, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

P.S.—After this paper had been set up in type, Dr Anderson kindly called my attention to an article on the "Order of the Star of Bethlehem" by Dr Wallace-James in *The Scottish Historical Review* for October 1911. This article contains some interesting facts relating to various persons mentioned in this paper and to the later history of the hospital which were unknown to me. But I must say that the evidence adduced by Dr Wallace-James for the date of the foundation of the hospital seems inadequate; and I must further point out that his description of the star, which was the badge of the order, does not tally with that given by Matthew Paris whom he cites as his authority.

E. B.