

The invasion of the Pagan Saxons, fatal though it was to the early Christianity of most of what we now call "England," did not destroy either the Welsh, or the Scottish, or the Irish Church. The establishment of the national Church of Wales may be said to date from this age. St. David, the patron of Wales, was a Briton, so were most of the saints of old Wales. The establishment of the Church in Wales dates from a period long before St. Gregory saw the fair English boys in the Roman slave market, or St. Augustine, the Prior of St. Andrew, landed in Kent. It is one of the oldest established Churches in Europe, and is older far than the establishment of the Church of England; and many centuries older than the monarchy of England, and some eight hundred years older than the Parliaments of England. It is one of the most wonderful hallucinations of our age (which, ridiculous though it is, does exist, we believe, among some of the ignorant in Wales), that the "English Parliament established the Church in England and Wales," when the Church was established in both countries centuries before the first House of Commons was summoned. In the recent "Folk-lore Congress" in London many very queer survivals of fairy beliefs and quaint superstitions in modern Europe were mentioned, but none was so utterly groundless as this comical superstition that the Church was founded by Parliament.

But there is one other question opened by the Archbishop's speech. Did the Welsh Church spring from the Church of England, or the Church of England from that of Wales? As for the former notion, it may easily be dismissed as an hallucination unworthy of acceptance by intelligent people. The Welsh dioceses are older in continuous existence than those of England. It is true that York, London, and Lincoln existed in the fourth century, but they were suppressed for a time by the Saxon Conquest. The Welsh sees (as the successor of St. Augustine, of Canterbury, honestly and modestly owned) are senior to the metropolitan see itself, and practically to the other dioceses of England. Truro (or the Cornish bishopric rather) alone can claim to be compeer with the Welsh sees; but Truro was practically absorbed for eight centuries into Exeter. The fact is that the Celts in Britain were Christians, while the Saxons were Pagans, and the Christianity of Wales is older than that of England.

But the other question is not so easily answered. We are inclined to think that the Archbishop, however, is right, and that much of the Christianity of England was derived from the Brito-Celtic Church. The worst is that evidence is not overwhelming on either side, from the limited number of contemporary authorities. The Britain of the age of the Heptarchy was not a literary country. There is a strong probability, however, as the Archbishop suggests, that the Brito-Celtic descent in Apostolic succession actually mingled with the foreign in the consecration of the Saxon bishops in Archbishop Theodore's times; and certainly the missionaries of Iona had much to do in the conversion of Saxon England to Christianity. The line of evidence tends to prove that we owe more of our Christianity to Wales, and to Celtic missionaries, than to Italy, though, doubtless, Christian Gauls had a good deal to do in spreading the Gospel in

this island. The subject is most interesting, if obscure, but whatever conclusions we may come to as a matter of historical research, it is irrefragably proved that the Welsh Church is not an alien Church, and has not been so for over a thousand years.—*Church Review, London.*

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND "FOREIGN" MISSIONS.

With us in Canada "foreign missions" mean missions to pagan lands, such as India, China, Africa, etc. In England, all missions are considered "foreign" when the field of operation lies outside of Great Britain. In no other sense can they be any longer called so, in view of the increased and ever-increasing interest taken in them by the Mother Church. Indeed, in this direction we find one of the best indications of the revived energy of the Church of England, as well as one of the truest standards for the measurement of her deepening spiritual life. The question of foreign missionary work is no longer one that occupies the attention only of great societies, such as the S.P.G. and C.M.S., or of individual Christian men and women interested, each of them, in their special field. The collective Church in her corporate capacity is rapidly realizing that her responsibility here is very weighty, and that she cannot any longer delegate a sacred trust which her Head *laid on her as His "body"* to any voluntary organization, however energetic or progressive it be in its methods of work and administration. How effectively these organizations have occupied the mission field, every colonial diocese, our own among the number, bears grateful witness. Still, they are none of them the *Church's authorized representatives*. They can none of them claim that they go forth with the Church's official imprimature. Good men have banded themselves together voluntarily in this sacred war, and God's benison be on them for the noble work they have done, and the offerings of time and thought and service they have made in Christ's behalf. Still the Church is feeling her way more and more steadily towards even a better, because more orderly, method of work, and so various movements are on foot. The Convocation of Canterbury and York have discussed the question, and both, if we mistake not, have organized "boards of missions." One of the happiest memories connected with the Lambeth Conference three years ago was a gathering of bishops in Zion College, under the presidency of the Archbishops of Canterbury, when the writer was privileged, at his Grace's request, to give some information as to his field; taking the opportunity while doing so of expressing the hope that both provinces, Northern and Southern, would decide, if possible, on the organization of one common mission board, which could speak and act with the maximum of force and weight as the authorized exponent and representative of the English Church. So, again, scarcely one among the bishops addresses his clergy officially without giving the subject of missions a prominent place in his public utterances. One, recently elevated to the archiepiscopal throne of the Northern province, strongly recommended the young clergy to begin their ministry in the missionary field, and spend three or five years there for the sake of the

knowledge of human nature and interest in missionary work it would bring them, anticipating possible objections and difficulties by suggesting that the years so spent abroad should count to them as though they had been spent in England, and, indeed, should be considered as good ground for special consideration at the hands of the bishops in the question of promotion. The good bishop's recommendation and suggestion have not, it is to be feared, fallen on very good ground, judging by the results, so far as Canadian missionary dioceses are concerned. Still, seeds must germinate before they bear fruit. Quite recently another move has been made in the direction of increased missionary interest in a northern English diocese which cannot but be productive of good. "Missionary facts," it has been said, "are the fuel which feed and fire missionary fervor." Acting on this principle, the present learned and scholarly Bishop of Durham, the successor, so fittingly, of the great Lightfoot, has inaugurated a series of public lectures or addresses, at various points in his diocese, on the subject of the colonial Church, and, in order to insure thoroughness and variety in the treatment, has assigned different dioceses to the clergy selected, so giving each speaker the opportunity of getting himself up thoroughly in his allotted subjects. Our readers will be glad to know that Algoma, though she be "little among the thousands," has been honoured with a place in the series, having been assigned to the charge of the Rev. W. Proctor Swaby, Rector of St. Mark's, Millfield, Sunderland, Durham, who, with the assistance of the documents now on their way across the Atlantic, will doubtless do full justice to his theme, and present our claims and needs so forcibly as to call forth, not only the interest of his hearers, but, what is sorely needed just now, the *principal* as well. Dr. Swaby's address is given in full for the guidance of any of the clergy or laity who may have it in their power to forward him any material which might possibly be helpful in the discharge of the duty which he has so kindly undertaken.—*Algoma News.*

PARTY SPIRIT.

If there was one thing more than another which in the e days was weakening the Church of England, it was the party spirit which too much prevailed on both of the great sides of theological thought, and which made men into adversaries of one another who ought to be standing side by side against the common foe. It was perhaps an evil inseparable from an age of great activity, energy and intelligence, but it was an evil against which they were bound to contend, for it must be as hindering to the progress of their spiritual life as it must be hateful to their Lord and Master. This was no day for Churchmen, for Christians to be quarrelling amongst themselves, and to be ranging themselves as members of antagonistic societies or associations, when there rose up before them that seething mass of vice, ignorance and corruption which were a scandal to their Christian country, and when infidelity and scepticism were every day more boldly raising their heads and challenging the very foundations of the Christian faith. He knew of few things which were more hindering to the progress of the Church, and he was sure they were as hindering to the spiritual life of the individual, than these contentions—whether in newspapers, in societies, or on platforms—of which they heard far too much, when they ought to be standing shoulder to shoulder against the three great enemies of their faith—the world, the flesh and the devil.—*The Arch. bishop of York.*