

THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1843.

"THE FOOLERIES OF POPEERY."—This compliment paid to the worship of our Church by a Yankee wisecracker, who can assert nothing without *guessing*—the reckless Editor of the *Presbyterian*, in Philadelphia—might pass unnoticed, were it not that this *ipse dixit* of a poor uninformed individual, of the John Knox cast, who sneers in his corner at what he knows nothing of, might pass current as a reasonable retort upon us for our frequent exposure of the *fooleries of Protestantism*. What this sectarian scribbler calls "fooleries of Popery" has, nevertheless, been admired and venerated for eighteen hundred and forty years, by millions of wiser, more educated, better and greater men, than any, or all the discordant sectaries of Protestantism put together from the beginning.—But why should not this snarler at religious ceremonies turn his sneer against what he may as justly call "the fooleries of Judaism," though imminently pre-cribbed, according to his bible, by God himself? and which, we are sure, it would puzzle him to explain. Why not mock at what, in Protestant slang, he might call the *nummeries, or fooleries*, of Jesus Christ himself, at his making clay with his spittle, anointing with it the eyes of the man born blind, and sending him to wash in the pool of Siloe?—at his touching with his spittle the tongue of the ore deaf and dumb, and putting his fingers into his ears?—at his breathing on his Apostles when he gave them the Holy Ghost. These, to him, must appear downright *fooleries*, because his homely kirk could never teach him to know and appreciate their meaning.

But when next he gives us occasion, and when we are less engaged, we shall show forth some of the *fooleries of Protestantism*,—the mad religious freaks and ravings of the benighted human mind.

We cannot help expressing our deep regret at the disbanding of that fine corps, the 1st Battalion of the Incorporated Militia, under the command of their worthy Colonel Gourley; whose excellent discipline and training had made them as efficient and exemplary a body of men as may be found in Her Majesty's service.

To the Editor of the Catholic.

PARKER'S CONSECRATION AGAIN.

REV. SIR,—Anglican ordinations, says Waterworth, (Hist. sect vi.) "have never been recognised in any portion of the Catholic Church, as conferring the priestly or Episcopal character. Whether from doubting the fact of Parker's consecration, or its validity, as contravening the canons, and administered according to an ordinal considered deficient in matters essential to the collation of Holy Orders,—a defect acknowledged and remedied, as far as it could be at a later period, by the established church,—or whether from these and other reasons united, there is no instance on record of the orders of the Anglican Church having been admitted as valid by the Catholic and Episcopal Church of Christendom; whilst there are sundry examples of orders having been

conferred on individuals previously ordained in the English Church, just as unconditionally as if that Church advanced no claims to Episcopal succession." The editor of the *Church*, then, may repeat as often as he pleases,—what he has stated in his reply to my former letter (*Church Journal*, April 7.) that the validity of English ordinations has been admitted by some learned persons in communion with the Catholic Church—as of this he may rest assured, that *the Catholic Church will never recognise such orders*; nevertheless, "whether Anglican orders be valid or not, does not involve any dogma or principle of Catholic faith. The Church recognizes the orders of the Greek and other schismatic Churches, which have been, for ages, separated from her communion; nor would she hesitate to admit those of the Anglican Church, were their validity sustained by the facts of the case."—He should remember therefore, what it seems he is determined not to remember, in the malicious enmity which he bears towards our Holy Mother, that it is not "from any principle she holds, or any apparent advantage the denial might be supposed to afford her, that the Catholic Church has constantly rejected the ordinations of the Anglican Church as invalid, but merely because the facts of the case do not warrant her coming to any other conclusion." (Bp. Kenrick on Angl. Ordin. p. 15.)

A good deal is asserted in the '*Church*' relative to the Nag's Head Consecration. This was to be expected, as it was necessary to make some amends for the miserable attempt to shew proof of the Lambeth consecration. We assure the editor we are quite open to conviction upon the latter point if he will but satisfy us that the 'documentary evidence' produced was never within arms-length of one Mason, who has been on his trial for *forgery* the last two hundred years and more. Unless he can do this;—we make no promise: we would remind him however, that if it was really established that Parker was *CERTAINLY* consecrated,—it must secondly be shewn that Barlow, his 'said' consecrator, was himself *CERTAINLY* consecrated,—which is as doubtful almost as the other: and thirdly, that the form used in Parker's consecration was *CERTAINLY* valid,—after which it must be shewn that such ordination was not only *valid* but *lawful*; all this and more must be established before the Anglican Church can lay any claim to apostolical succession. Thus again we further remind him, that though Barlow had really transmitted the spiritual orders of our Church, it was utterly impossible for him to transmit its jurisdiction—and that we maintain too the utter absurdity of any thing like apostolical succession, without identity of religious principles or uniformity of faith.

With regard to the 'Nag's Head' consecration which the Church takes up so sharply,—Mason himself is witness that the story was generally believed long before his time;—thus the very tale of his work promises to clear the Bishops of the Church of England "from the slanders and odious imputations of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Herding, Allen, Sta-

pleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Beccanus, and other Romanists." In the dedication of his book, speaking of the English orders he says he long wished "from the bottom of his heart that some learned men would have vouchsafed.... to scatter those popish mists, and to set the truth in a clearer light." Here, by the way, we have evidence of the *silence* of the Protestant Clergy upon the subject.—Again, continues Mason, "If any have formerly made scruple to enter our orders, out of ignorance, how the odious and scandalous imputations, blazed in Popish books, might be truly answered, and the point cleared by record, [Oh that mysterious record! which now for the first time, was publicly referred to].... who knoweth what effect God may work in them, when they shall plainly see how they have been deluded with Popish stratagems."

"It is now a century of years," says the author of 'the Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy of England,' "since the Nag's Head story happened. It has *constantly* been related and credited by wise men, as a certain truth ever since the year 1539: [the year it was acted in:] it was never contradicted by any, until it was imagined by our adversaries that the new Registers [Mason's] might contest with our ancient tradition, and make the Nag's Head story seem improbable in the year 1613, of which no man doubted for the space of fifty-two years before."

In the year 1604, Hollivood published an answer made by Bishop Bancroft to Mr. Wm. Alabaster, who asked him "how Parker and his colleagues were consecrated Bishops?" Bancroft replied: "I hope that in case of necessity, a priest may ordain bishops." "The allusion," says Hollivood, "was evidently intended for Scory, the consecrator at the Nag's Head." The work was published during Bancroft's life: but not a word of denial or disclaimer ever proceeded from him. (Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy.—Roven, 1637.)

"Upon occasion of a certain book brought into the Parliament by some Presbyterian lords, proving that the Protestant bishops had no succession or consecration, and therefore were no bishops, and consequently had no right to sit in Parliament, Dr. Morton, bishop of Durham, made a speech against the said book in behalf of himself and all the bishops then present. In which speech he endeavoured to prove their succession from the last catholic bishops, who, says he, by imposition of hands, ordained the first Protestant bishops at the Nag's-head, in Cheapside, as was notorious to all the world. This was reported by an ancient Peer, then present in the house" (id. ch. 2 p. 9.)

According to Fuller, "Sanders (who died in 1583) lewdly lies, that these new elected bishops, out of good fellowship, mutually consecrated each other." (Fuller lib. 9. p. 60.)

"Not only," says Champrey, "the Catholics.... are witnesses of this solemn meeting at the Nag's Head, but also John Stowe, that most famous chronographer of England, a professor of the reformed religion, bore witness to it; not,

indeed, in his writings, for he dared not, but by his word, to some of his acquaintances, men of the most undoubted faith, some of whom are yet living, and attest the same."

That the principal witness, Mr. Neal, was a competent one, will be seen from the sketch of his life given by the learned historiographer of Oxford, Anthony Wood, (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. 1, p. 149). Besides the testimony of Mr. Neal, we have the declaration made by Faircloth, one of the priests to whom the Lambeth Registry was submitted who objected to it, because he had often heard from his father, who was a Calvinist, that the first bishops of the established "church had been consecrated at the Nag's-Head tavern in Cheapside, of which fact he asserted that his father had been witness" (Kenrick p. 103:—(Lo Quen T. 1, p. 201)

With respect to the Royal Commission of 20th Oct. 1559; wherein Parker is called "Archbishop of Canterbury," the only way, says Bishop Kenrick, "of eluding the testimony it affords, that Parker, Grindal and Coxo were then considered to be bishops, is, that this word 'bishop' is taken in a vague sense, and only indicates 'bishops elect.' This plea is inadmissible. Firstly, because such an assumption is contrary to the general rule for interpreting official documents.... and if once admitted, would render nugatory all arguments derived from the language of documentary evidence. Bishops *elect* are styled such until they are consecrated; and do not receive the absolute title of the Sees for which they have been elected, until they are in actual possession of them, besides, 'the title of most Reverend Father in Christ, given to Parker, and that of Reverend Fathers in Christ,' supposes them to have been consecrated, or regarded as consecrated, otherwise it could not have been applied to them, in an official document, without departing from the received custom of speech."

And "secondly; the object of the commission proves, that Parker and the other bishops named in it were considered as bishops, or at least were to be considered as such." This is evident from the case of Bishop Bonner, which shews that "none but a bishop could validly tender the oath of supremacy to a bishop in his purely spiritual character." Thus, as Mr. Ward narrates the matter: "By the first session of that parliament, (5 Eliz. 1.) power was given to any bishop in the realm, to tender the oath of supremacy, enacted 1st Eliz., to any ecclesiastical person within his diocese; and the refuser was to incur a *premunire*. By virtue of this statute, Mr. Robert Horn, pretended bishop of Winchester, tenders the oath to Dr. Bonner; bishop of London, but deprived by Queen Elizabeth, and then a prisoner in the Marshalsea, which was within the diocese of Winchester. Bonner refuses to take it. Horn certifies his refusal to the king's Bench: whereupon Bonner was indicted upon the statute. He prays judgment, whether he might not give in evidence on this issue: that he was not culpable, because the said Horn, called bishop of Winchester, was not bishop when he tendered the oath." And it was resolved by all the