

The British Church continued independent of the Anglo-Saxon Church till the reign of Henry the First, having a metropolitan of its own at St David's. And even the Anglo-Saxon Church differed from the Bishop of Rome, and refused to acknowledge his authority; an instance of which we have in the case of Bishop Willfrid, who, having been ejected from his see for some flagrant offence, applied to Rome and was sustained by the Bishop of that lordly city, who wrote to Ethelred and Alfred, to re-install him in his see. But Alfred, who reigned alone at the time of his arrival in Britain, scorned to receive him, and expressed in no measured terms his contempt for papal rescripts.*

The Church of England also shewed herself slow to embrace the innovations adopted from time to time by Rome. Of this I will mention but two instances out of many that might be given. In the year 792 a work was forwarded from the East to the Emperor Charlemagne, containing the decrees of a Greek council in favor of the religious adoration of images. Charlemagne sent this work to the Bishops of England, requesting their judgment upon it. All the Bishops concurred in condemning this new doctrine, which they declared "the Church of God holds accursed;" and they engaged Albinus to write to the Emperor against it. He did so: and writing in the name and with the authority of the English Church, and using the soundest scriptural arguments, notwithstanding Adrian, the Pope of that time, had approved of the idolatrous practice, he effectually engaged Charlemagne to use his influence to check it.† In 794 that monarch called together a council, at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in which three hundred Bishops solemnly condemned the doctrine of the Greek council and the Pope; and this prevented for a long time afterwards the progress of the error in Britain.‡

Although the idea of a physical change in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper had been broached by the heretic Eutyches as early as the fifth century, it was not till 831 that Paschasius Radbert, a French Monk, first reduced into a compact and well arranged system the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as it is now taught by the Church of Rome, viz.. that "after the bread and wine have been consecrated in the holy Eucharist, they become the *same* body and blood which our blessed Saviour took from the Virgin his mother: that their own substance is changed, and only their new remains;" for, says Cardinal Bellarmine, "Paschase, was the first who wrote seriously and copiously concerning the truth of Christ's body in the Eucharist."§

Erigena, an English writer, strongly opposed this new doctrine. The Church of England, and King Alfred, who

* Bede, Ecc. Hist. p. 447.

† Palmer, part iv. ch. x. § 4.

‡ Heueman Opus, Lib. v. c. 20.

§ Bellarm, as quoted by Faber in his "Difficulties of Romanism," chap. viii. § 4.

was the m
doctrine of
writers, ab
same doct
was the A
Archbisho
Reformati
his power
about the
arrived at
out occasi
which, if
sufficientl
fect and i
future pe
Early in
of the Chu
off the us
vations th
authority
dependen
of Rome,
of centuri

In doing
unquestio
the Chur
mission t
ries, long
She refus
make he
which, to
off at th
reformed
purity w
with Ro
Church
the same
joyed.
a true so
try estab
tical S
resumin
Catholic
ruption
Christ.

Roma
the Chu
Christ;
Church
reforme
tend, th