

Dr. Loughurst, the well-known organist of Canterbury Cathedral, who has been celebrating his golden wedding, has been connected with the Cathedral since 1828. He was first admitted as a chorister, and in course of time became lay clerk and assistant organist, and finally organist and master of the choristers. His elder brother, John Alexander Loughurst, was early in the century a popular boy singer at Covent Garden when under the management of the Kembles.

The very interesting old pre-Reformation clergy or priest's house at Alfriston, near Eastbourne, is to be preserved to the nation, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners having consented to transfer the building for a nominal sum to the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty. The building, which is constructed of oak framing filled in with "wattle and dab," with a thatched roof, is believed to have been erected in the fourteenth century, and is one of the few existing relics of the old timber vicarages which were at one time common in rural England.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

Thanks.

SIR,—Allow me to acknowledge the response to my appeal in your paper of August 15, by Dr. Ogden Jones, Toronto, of \$2, for which I thank him most heartily. The church is now in process of erection, and we hope others will follow his good and kind example, that we may be enabled to get in before the wet weather sets in. We are still holding service in the barn. I trust and do not think I shall ask in vain.

ALFRED W. H. CHOWNE.

Emsdale, August 26th, 1895.

"Life in a Look."

SIR,—I do not know who the individual R. B. Waterman is, but I cannot let his sad letter, which appeared in your issue of the 29th ult., pass without a word of protest. To go step by step and discuss the letter, which is so very inconsistent with common sense, yes, even broad common-sense, I cannot find time, but I will merely direct the writer to take due heed of the latter part of the text he quotes, viz., "Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit" . . . etc. Born of the Spirit, aye, that is where we need to lay the stress; aye, it is the Holy Spirit we need, and let us all storm the gates of heaven until we have the clean heart created within us. I am very glad "Life in a Look" has such a wide circulation in your neighbourhood, and I should venture to say that I do not think it will prevent you from pinning down to the Prayer Book, and what is more, people won't be pinned down to anything in this age. In closing I would say that I have been in this diocese during the past year, and have so far failed to hear the "wail of loneliness" you describe; something very different I often have heard, viz., the exultant shout of soldiers fighting the good fight of faith.

ARTHUR J. HEWITT.

London, Ont., 29th August, 1895.

Lay-Readers.

SIR,—Last Sunday service was conducted in St. John's Church, Cambray, by a lay-reader from Lindsay. After service, this presumptuous young man, who lauded the great Protestant saints, John Wesley and Spurgeon, as our great examples, but forgot King William, was remonstrated with for using extemporary prayer after service and pronouncing the benediction. The writer was given to understand that this was the course pursued in England; that he held the Bishop's license and that he had the sanction of Rev. Mr. Marsh, and his curate, Rev. Mr. Smith, for what he did, and that "he was going to do these things whenever he pleased." It is time for the Canons of the Provincial Synod to strictly define the duties of lay readers and the style of service they are to conduct. Wycliffe men, as promoters of the so-called Protestant Churchman's Union, are constantly making the proud boast of their loyalty to the Church and its laws. In fact, so they assert, they are the Church, and we High Churchmen are but a band of dangerous conspirators introducing novelties into the Prayer Book, and that our logical tendency is to Rome, the mother of abominations.

Would the descendants of the promoters of the rebellion principles in England remember that the logical result of their principles was in spite of all their boasted love for the Church and king—the wreck of the one for a time and the sending of that loved king to the scaffold, and when the people of England sickened of the reign of cant and hypocrisy and restored the king to his throne and the Church to its proper place in the affections of the people, that the majority of those who separated from the Church soon denied the Lord Jesus Christ, while the forefathers of Wycliffe men stand in the Church because they loved the loaves and fishes. High Churchmen, as a body, do not approve of or sanction all the individual facts and fancies introduced from foreign ceremonial. The good sense of the majority of Church people will soon relegate what is objectionable in ritual to oblivion. But Wycliffe men object to all ritual on the ground of its support to the false teaching of its promoters, as the ritualists are but a small portion of that very insignificant body of High Churchmen, and according to their boast Wycliffe boasts that they and their promoters are the Church. Would it not be well for them to turn their artillery on their own ranks and compel them to obey the laws of Christ's Church?

DISCIPLINE.

Anglican Fallacies.

SIR,—Will you allow me to suggest, in view of Mr. Whatham's efforts to prove the idea of any connection between the ancient British Church and the Church of England an "Anglican Fallacy," the following was probably the position of affairs when Theodore arrived in England. If I am incorrect I shall be pleased if someone will point out my mistake.

ROMAN MISSIONS.

Kingdoms.	Sees.	Occupants.
Kent.....	Canterbury	Vacant by death of Deus-dedit, A.D. 664.
.....	Rochester	Vacant by death of Damian, A.D. 664.
Wessex.....	Winchester	Vacant by death of Wini, A.D. 668.
East Anglia...	Dunwich	Boniface (?)

CELTIC MISSIONS.

Northumbria...	Lindisfarne	Vacant by death of Tuda, A.D. 664.
.....	York	Chad
.....	Wilfred
Mercia.....	Lichfield	Jaruman
Essex.....	London	Vacant by death of Cedd, A.D. 664.

This agrees with Lane, who states that besides Chad and Wilfred, there were only two other bishops in charge of Anglo-Saxon Dioceses, one of whom died the same year. He does not say what their names were, but I have read elsewhere that it was Boniface who died shortly after Theodore's arrival. Theodore at once deprived Chad for being consecrated to York, already filled by Wilfred, and reinstated the latter. The Episcopate then stood thus: Theodore, who had Roman orders; Wilfred, who had Gallic orders, and Jaruman, who must certainly have had Celtic orders, and all their bishops had Celtic orders, except Wilfred, who positively refused consecration at their hands. How Theodore could have filled the vacant Sees without allowing a bishop with Celtic orders to take part in the consecrations, I cannot see, provided my chart is correct and he observed the Nicene rule. As regards the Welsh Church, Lane distinctly states that it was not the root from which English Christianity sprang, and, so far as I can see, does not say that, after its absorption into the Church of England, any of the then Welsh bishops took part in any consecrations. He suggests that in Theodore's time Chad or some Celtic prelate may have taken part in consecrations, but what he really does say about the succession is this: "And if it be fair to suppose that the coming of Augustine from Rome, when only a monk, was equivalent to the establishment of an Italian hierarchy here, it is no less reasonable to suggest that Theodore's selection of monks belonging to monasteries founded by the old British Church, to be bishops among the Anglo-Saxons, was equally a continuance of the ancient Christianity of Britain. Henceforth, then, there was a double line of Apostolic ministry in the Anglo-Saxon Church, and when by degrees the Scotch, Irish, and British (i. e. Welsh) Churches adopted the Continental ritual customs, and agreed to recognize the primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury . . . this double succession was still further assured." It seems to me to mean that the British priests who were ordained bishops by Theodore handed down the Celtic orders which they received when they were priested, and the Roman orders which they received when consecrated bishops by Theodore. It is only a succession such as this which we have from Augustine, for he only founded two Sees permanently, viz., Canterbury and Rochester, and both were vacant when Theodore arrived, so that, as far as the Episcopate

went, his succession had died out. The other Roman missions derived their orders elsewhere.

L. STONE.

Anglican Fallacies.

SIR,—That the primitive British, Irish and Scotch Churches formed one Celtic communion; that such a Church existed; that this Church was founded by St. Augustine, and was thoroughly antagonistic to the claims and usurpations of the Roman Church, in the person of Augustine, on his arrival in Britain in A.D. 596—is so notorious that we only need quote Bede to illustrate the fact. "The Britons," declared Bede, "are contrary to the whole Roman world and enemies to the Roman customs, not only in their Mass but in their tonsure." Laurentius, the successor of Augustine in the See of Canterbury, is reported by Bede to have spoken yet more bitterly of the antagonism of the Scotch branch of the Celtic communion: "We have found the Scotch bishops worse even than the British. Dagon, who lately came here, being a bishop of the Scots, refused so much as to eat at the same table, or sleep one night under the same roof with us" (Bede Eccles., Hist. ii., c. 4). If it be a fallacy to imagine that this Celtic Church had an Eastern rather than a Western origin, then certainly it is a Roman no less than an Anglican fallacy. Robert Parsons, the Jesuit father, in his "Three Conversions of England," says that "it seems nearest to the truth that the British Church was originally planted by Grecian teachers, such as came from the East, and not by Romans" (vol. i., page 15). He must have come to this conclusion from the difference in the service of the Mass, between the Roman and Celtic Churches, and the undoubted fact (however it may be explained) that the British clergy used the Eastern and not the Roman tonsure. In a sense, Augustine was the founder of the Anglo-Saxon Church, because he was the founder of that See which eventually became the centre of authority in things spiritual, in what afterwards became the United Kingdom of England—but he was not the founder of the Christian Church in East Anglia, nor in the North of England; the Anglo-Saxons of these districts owe their conversion to the Celtic Church. Gradually, indeed, the Celtic churches in Cornwall and Wales submitted to Canterbury. Canterbury also claimed in after ages jurisdiction, to some extent, over the Irish and Scotch Churches. And from the landing of Augustine down to the Reformation, we have a history of the gradual victory and growth of the power of the Roman Church in the British Isles. I presume no member of the Anglican communion would contend that the Church of Rome, at the time of the introduction of the Christian religion into Britain, or at the time of the introduction of the Episcopate, claimed to be mistress of all Churches; therefore we cannot wonder that the long isolated Celtic Church should have refused submission to Augustine's claim. "At illi" (says Bede, lib. ii., page 112) "nihil horum se facturos neque illum pro Archiepiscopo habituros esse respondabant." Surely our modern Anglican communion as containing the Welsh, and Irish, and Cornish Churches, is the inheritrix of the old Celtic traditions—and as the Roman party in Bede's day never breathed a word against Celtic orders, we cannot for a moment doubt that as the Celtic Church submitted to Canterbury, their bishops would act with the bishops of the Anglo-Saxon Church, so that we have in the Anglican communion of to-day an Episcopate with a succession in which mingles a thread of the old Celtic Episcopate. While the Anglo-Saxon Church, with the exception of Northumbria and East Anglia, was the daughter of the Roman mission of Augustine, the Anglican communion of to-day inherits not only the law and order introduced by the Roman element, but also all that is glorious in the history and traditions, and the absorbed life and succession of orders, of the Celtic Church.

WM. BEVAN.

Mount Forest, 24th August, 1895.

P.S.—At the present moment it seems to me—as I am looking into the matter (my present opinion may be modified hereafter)—that sixty-three years after the landing of Augustine—that is, in A.D. 660, when all the Heptarchy, except Sussex, had been converted, Wini, Bishop of Winchester, was the only bishop of the Roman obedience—the Augustinian succession—in Britain; all the rest were British: Maelwyn or Patrick, of Ireland; Ninian, of the Southern Picts; Aidan, of the Northumbrians; Paul Hen, his successor, Columba of the Scots; Finan, of the East Angles; Chad, of the Mercians, were all British. The Christian Church in Britain has paid dearly for the complete victory of the See of Canterbury, and the suppression of the old Celtic feelings and traditions. The Anglicizing of the Church in Ireland, in Wales, and even in Scotland, has left our communion very weak all over the area of the Islands, where the old Celtic Church was so completely beaten into line. Everything is now being done to try and convince the old Celts that the Church in their midst is not an alien or Anglo-Saxon institution.

W.B.