

of Britain, thou hearest John declaring, 'It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.'"\*

That this was acknowledged by the other branches of the Christian Church as a true and independent branch, cannot be denied; for we find it represented in the Council of Arles, in France, by Restitutus, Bishop of London; Eborius, Bishop of York; and Adelfius, Bishop of Lincoln. This Council was held as early as the year of our Lord 314.†—Again, we find the British Bishops summoned, along with the Bishops of Gaul, to the Council of Sardica, in 347, by Constantine and Constantius.‡ They were likewise present at the Council of Ariminum.§

Now, from these indisputable facts, it must be evident to all, that, at this very early period, an independent branch of the Church existed in Britain, just as in St. Paul's time there were branches of the Church at Rome, at Corinth, &c.—The Church of Britain was then governed, as it is now, by its Bishops, who were in subjection to their Archbishops, as at present: of whom there were the three, of London, York, and Caerleon, on Usk. There was no Church in Christendom founded by the Apostles which had not from them a succession of Bishops; and these were in all provinces subject to a Primate of their own number. Thus the Bishop of Rome was at this period Primate of the middle and southern parts of Italy; the Bishop of Milan, of the northern part;|| and the Bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, had the same authority in some of the eastern provinces. There was no Bishop, whether at Rome or elsewhere, who, at this period, pretended to any authority beyond his own diocese or province.

The evidences of the Church's existence in Britain crowd

---

\* Chrys. Tom. iii. p. 696.

† Simond. Concil. Gallic. Tom. i. p. 9.

‡ Athanas. Apol. ii. p. 720.

§ Usher Brit. Ant. Eccl. 104 & 105.

|| Ruffin. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. Ch. 6. Fleury Hist. Eccl. Lib. viii. § 41.