

But the visit or pilgrimage of the Archbishop of Canterbury and 108 of his brother bishops to the ruins of Glastonbury Abbey serves to bring into prominence the ancient British Church. This visit was proposed last year, and in December last the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Dr. Kennion) began his preparations. It was a unique service within the ruins of a famous abbey, imposing even in its decay. Above blue sky, beneath green grass. The more than a hundred bishops, some 600 clergy, 150 choristers, and a band of students from Warminster College wended their way in procession to a position in the sometime choir, whilst thousands of the people waited to join in the service by adding their voices to the strains of the processional hymn and Litany.

An address by the Bishop of Stepney followed (whose acceptance of the revived See of Bristol was that day announced). Dr. Browne is one of the foremost historical and antiquarian authorities in England and his address is full of meat. We wish we could hope that it would be digested by every Churchman. It is high praise to be referred to as the best hated man by the Romanists in London—a character acquired by the Bishop of Stepney because of his learned and manly defence of the Church of England against the attacks of "The Italian Mission."

Here is appended some of the words uttered by the Bishop at Glastonbury, on August 3rd:

Those who look to pre-Norman history for any blending of the British with the English Church, or any descent of the English Church from the British, can only see it by shutting their eyes very tight. Whatever else is merely legendary, this is not—that the earliest oratory or church here was built of wattle-work, and that this *Vetusta Ecclesia* was for many centuries preserved. Gildas we are told, and the younger Patrick were buried in it. To the east of it a British saint built a little church of stone dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Later still, but still before the Saxon time, some visitors from North Britain built a third church to the east of the other two. Then Aldhelm, the Saxon Abbot of Malmesbury, and afterwards for four years (705-709) first Bishop of Sherborne, advised Ine, King of Wessex, to build a considerable basilica of stone to the east of the other three, and he dedicated it to St. Peter and St. Paul, about the year 680. The four churches were all enclosed within one wall, reminding us of the group of churches within one enclosure in Ireland, as at Glendalough, or at that renowned ecclesiastical settlement where the Shannon sweeps around Clonmacnois. The Normans appear to have found standing the *Vetusta Ecclesia* of the Celtic time and the *Major Ecclesia* of Ine as rebuilt by Dunstan. They preserved the wicker-work

church, no doubt by that time cased in wood and covered with lead, and they built a new *Major Ecclesia*. They lost the whole of both churches by fire in 1184. They rebuilt the *Vetusta Ecclesia* in stone on its own site, and dedicated it in 1186, and there it stands to-day. They laid out the plans for a great church eastward of it 400ft. long and 80ft. broad, and this was built in the Early English style and joined on to the Norman *Vetusta Ecclesia* by an Early English building, which served as an extension of the *Vetusta Ecclesia*, and afforded an entrance to the great church still to be seen. And thus, about the year 1350, the mighty temple was completed among whose ruins we are gathered now.

The dedication of a church here to St. Peter and St. Paul by Ine, King of Wessex, is a fact which I must not pass by without special mention. It bears in an important manner upon a document issued four years ago, signed by all the Bishops of the Roman communion in England with Cardinal Vaughan at their head. The document claimed that England was dedicated in the earliest times of the English Church to St. Peter. In support of this they declared that "the second monastery at Canterbury was dedicated to St. Peter himself." Unfortunately for them it is not true: it was dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul and the emphatic "himself," "was dedicated to St. Peter himself," is a serious aggravation of the error of the statement. "To the west," they continue, bringing us into Wessex, "the Royal Cathedral of Winchester . . . bore the same patronal title." It is quite true that it did, but the patronal title was "St. Peter and St. Paul," not "St. Peter." Bede makes this quite clear, and the passages in the *Saxon Chronicle* which name St. Peter are interpolations of late date. Then to come to Ine himself, they say that Ine gave up his crown and went to Rome "to visit the Blessed Apostle"; and they continue, "about this time," says the Venerable Bede, "the same thing was done through the zeal of many of the English nation, noble and ignoble, laity and clergy, men and women." But Bede says that Ine went that he might visit the thresholds of "the Blessed Apostles"—that is, St. Peter and St. Paul—"which thing was done through the zeal of many," etc. This throws into special prominence and importance, in regard to claims made to-day in the name of history, the fact that when Ine built a large church here, he dedicated it to St. Peter and St. Paul. We should, indeed, have expected that it would be so, for early dedications to St. Peter alone are rare. I may add that beyond all possibility of question the earliest dedications in England to single Apostles were dedications to St. Andrew and to St. Paul, not to St. Peter.