

The Chinese  
S. F. Lipscomb,  
J. Roberts have

F. WILSON.

vidence carried  
CHURCHMAN for  
angels, whether,  
le. Mr. Editor,  
ien country, yet  
us to the Church  
of the Church  
not help feeling  
as to whether  
re in every in-  
ale, is fruitless.  
rd and Master,  
of the 12th chap.  
in discussion of  
the Scriptural  
als, may we not  
t any thoughts  
this conception  
er while in the  
me to us by any  
in any concept of  
onal they always  
y will biography  
sion that angels  
Poetry tells us  
inded by angels,  
the will of Him  
ly and to vice.  
ne poetic license  
e dreams of the  
e thoughts that  
ow many of the  
stood exiles at  
from the fatal  
d guided in the  
by the inarticu-  
or sister whose  
h to heaven. Is  
ed imagination in  
ger of the Master,  
settled districts  
st Territories of  
se hardy pioneers  
om their native  
dued nature for  
orn, and getting  
y, many of them  
d sisters still in  
had been strug-  
ure to their own  
a mines, some of  
a in workshops,  
n, of hearing the  
who have long  
e now with their  
to do the will of  
ready when the  
e haven of the  
mes hear some  
ents, vainly try-  
eard the sweet  
come.

aterial progress  
e few, who have  
occasional visits  
ing angels, who  
seances, to tell  
f the life beyond  
elcome awaiting

GEO. LESLIE.

=

ighbouring dio-  
closes a tract,  
urhood by what  
ociety," and en-  
the clergy of the  
to answer it in  
es, and one in-  
time. For, to put  
make holes in a  
ve not had time,  
s request. I do  
the tract, not  
ery objection it  
many times. It  
whose hands it  
a large volume,  
y of them. This  
friend, who says,  
with the child-  
riesthood. It is  
sious of further

knowledge. I beg of you the benefits of your learn-  
ing and fatherly sympathy in answering it."

English orders are assailed in this tract on the  
ground, 1st, of Barlow's consecration; 2nd, laxity of  
teaching and practice regarding baptism; 3rd, omis-  
sion of the emblems of office; 4th, changes of doc-  
trine, &c.

I have prepared an answer to the first of these  
objections; and several of my friends to whom I  
have read it, urge me to send my reply to my young  
friend through the press. I enclose this, if you  
think fit to publish it. I will follow it by one or two  
replies to the other objections. Yours truly,

JOHN LANGTRY.

July 12th, 1893.

WAS BARLOW A BISHOP?

It is maintained in this tract that the claim of the  
Anglican clergy to a valid Priesthood must be re-  
jected: first, because there is no record of Barlow's  
consecration; and secondly, that considering the  
opinions said to have been held, both by Cranmer  
and Barlow, for a brief space, as to the sufficiency of  
election without consecration, he probably never was  
consecrated at all. Barlow was one of the conse-  
crators of Parker, and thus it is held the succession  
through Parker was broken.

We reply, first, that if it could be proved that  
Barlow was never consecrated at all, it would in no  
way invalidate the orders of the English Church.  
The fourth Canon of the Council of Nicea, referred  
to on page 8 of the tract, required three Bishops to  
take part in every consecration—not because one  
validly consecrated Bishop was not sufficient, but  
just to guard against any such possible defect as is  
here assumed in the case of Barlow. It was felt to be  
very unlikely that the consecration of all three would  
be invalid, while any one of the three being a true  
Bishop, whether he was the oral consecrator or was  
only acting through the oral consecrator, was sufficient  
to confer valid orders. Now, four Bishops took part  
in the consecration of Parker, of whom Barlow was  
one. There is no question about the consecration of  
the other three, so the argument about Barlow, if  
ever so conclusive, would amount to nothing.

Secondly, if the whole four of Parker's consecra-  
tors could be proved to have been invalidly conse-  
crated, as the unscrupulous writer of the tract  
wishes his readers to infer, though there is not a  
shadow of reason for such inference, still the orders  
of the existing English Church would have been  
restored and be properly valid, according to the  
requirements of the Canon of Nicea, for on the 14th  
of December, 1617, George Montaigne was conse-  
crated Bishop of Lincoln by George Abbot, Archbishop  
of Canterbury; Mark Anthony De Dominis, Arch-  
bishop of Spalato; John King, Bishop of London;  
Lancelot Andrews of Ely, Buckridge of Rochester,  
and Overall of Lichfield. Now if the orders of all  
the English consecrators of Montaigne were defective,  
so that they could not validly consecrate him, yet  
the consecration of the Archbishop of Spalato made  
him a true and lawful Bishop of the Catholic Church.  
And Montaigne consecrated Laud, and Laud, Wren,  
and Wren, Sheldon, and so in succession Compton,  
Sanicroft, Trelawney, Potter, Herring, Cornwallis,  
Moore Sutton, Howley, Sumner, down to our own  
day.

Again, the Irish succession has all along been  
wholly independent of the English, and is traceable  
back to St. Patrick, or at least to St. David, Gildas  
and Coluag. So that if any such breach as is now  
pretended had occurred in the English Church in  
connection with Barlow and Parker, it would have  
left the Irish succession intact. Now, in 1618,  
Hampton, Archbishop of Armagh, was one of the  
consecrators of Morton of Chichester, Morton of  
Houson, and Houson of Laud, from whom the suc-  
cession runs on as above.

The same thing happened in 1684, and often since,  
so that all this elaborate argument about Barlow's  
consecration is of no avail whatever for the purpose  
for which it is alleged, viz., to prove the invalidity  
of the orders of the Bishops and Priests of the exist-  
ing English Church.

But upon what does this assertion that Barlow was  
never consecrated rest? Upon the simple fact that  
the record of his consecration cannot now be found.  
But there are eight other consecrations out of a total  
of forty-five performed by the same Archbishop, to-  
gether with many translations omitted or lost by the  
same registrar. It is manifest, too, that this was  
done out of sheer carelessness and neglect, by the  
fact that he sometimes breaks off an entry in the  
middle, and in the middle of a sentence.

Nor is this carelessness peculiar to Cranmer's  
Registry. In the registry of Archbishop Warham,  
who immediately preceded him, and of Pole, who  
immediately succeeded him, precisely similar omis-  
sions occur. No one ever called in question the fact  
of the consecration of the Bishops concerned, because  
no record can now be found of it. The record of  
Barlow's election, confirmation, investiture, enthro-  
nement, and summons to Parliament as a Bish-  
op, are all there, but that of his consecration was  
either never made or it has been lost, together with

eight others of the same period. The records are  
not found in a book in which the different acts by  
which Barlow was made Bishop are entered, as the  
tract implies, but on separate sheets of parchment,  
which were afterwards found in a book, and several  
of them in misplaced order. Upon the defects of  
this registry, which were not discovered for 84 years  
after Barlow's consecration, the unscrupulous Roman  
controversialists of that day based the charge that  
he had never been consecrated, a charge which the  
unscrupulous tract writers of this day are not ashamed  
to reiterate. And yet look at the presumptive  
evidence against such a conclusion. The law of the  
Church imperatively enjoins consecration. The law  
of the land requires it under severe penalties. Henry  
VIII., not Edward VI., was king in 1536, and would  
have made short work with any man claiming to be  
a Bishop without having complied with the law.  
Consecration was not a thing practiced in a corner.  
It was a public function, just as it is now; hundreds  
of people would have witnessed it, and known of it.  
It would have been impossible for any one to pass  
himself off as a Bishop who had not been duly con-  
secrated; neither the House of Lords nor the Upper  
House of Convocation would ever have admitted him.  
Other Bishops would have demurred to his taking  
part in consecration with them. The dignitaries  
whom he deposed, e.g., the Dean of Wells would have  
successfully disputed his jurisdiction had there been  
any flaw in his consecration. Everybody of his own  
time, the Lords, the Bishops, his own clergy and  
people, believed him to be a duly consecrated Bishop.  
No Puritan or Romanist—not even Bonner, his bitter  
and watchful enemy, who hurled all sorts of invec-  
tives against him—no one at all, in fact, for 84 years  
after his consecration, and for 48 after his death,  
ever for a moment dreamed that Barlow had not  
been duly consecrated.

There was no conceivable motive to induce him to  
decline consecration. The Archbishop and others  
would have involved themselves in heavy penalties  
if they had connived at this illegal and unheard of  
evasion. It is not conceivable that either the one or  
the other, without the slightest discoverable motive,  
would have imperilled his whole worldly position.  
And it is not possible that he could have induced all  
the world to believe him consecrated when he was  
really not so; or that he could have persuaded  
others, who must have been parties to the conspiracy  
absolutely and throughout, to hold their tongues.  
And all this on the omission of a registry which  
omits five out of eleven translations, and eight out of  
forty-five consecrations of the same period. But it  
is said that Cranmer and Barlow in 1540, four years  
after the consecration of the latter, denied the neces-  
sity of ordination. It was a time of tremendous  
agitation and change and great uncertainty, and  
many foolish opinions were no doubt uttered and  
abandoned. The proof of Barlow's utterances is not  
conclusive. But if it were, the public formal state-  
ments to which both he and Cranmer subscribed dur-  
ing this very period leave no doubt as to their real  
convictions and the purely evanescent character of  
the opinions attributed to them. In 1539 they were  
both on the committee which issued "The Institu-  
tion of a Christian Man." In 1543 Cranmer endorsed  
"the Necessary Erudition," and signed the declara-  
tion of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops  
and Priests in 1536 or 1537. Now in all three of  
these solemnly authorized formularies, "Apostolical  
Succession," and the absolute need of ordination by epis-  
copal laying on of hands and the grace of orders, are ab-  
solutely and unhesitatingly asserted. Cranmer is  
mainly responsible at this very period for drawing up  
the preface to the ordinal which enforces apostolical  
succession, both doctrinally and practically; "so  
that both Cranmer and Barlow, judged by their for-  
mal public utterances, would certainly in 1526 have  
demanded and compelled consecration in any case of  
appointment to the episcopate, instead of conspiring  
like two madmen to evade it."

It would not, as I have already pointed out, in the  
least imperil our position if it could be proved that  
Barlow was never consecrated at all. The argument,  
however, is an absolutely suicidal one for Roman  
Catholics to use. For, if because the registration of  
a Bishop's consecration is not to be found, we are  
bound to infer that he was not a Bishop at all, and  
that all consecrations in which he took part are null  
and void, and the whole succession of Bishops out  
off, then what becomes of the Roman Church? Car-  
dinal Baronius, one of her most learned and loyal  
theologians, states explicitly that there are fourteen  
of her Popes in succession, of whose election and con-  
secration there is no record whatever; and no scrap  
of proof that they were Bishops at all, except only  
that they occupied the papal see. These, he says,  
"were not apostles, but apostates." They did not  
merely disparage ordination, they threw scorn upon  
the very faith of the gospel. Archbishop of Aix says  
there were fifty Popes of that time of whom this was  
true. Men who have this record to rectify had bet-  
ter hold their tongues about the validity of English  
orders because of Barlow's passing opinions, or of  
the careless omissions of Cranmer's registrar.

## Notes and Queries.

SIR,—Has there been any attempt to improve the  
Prayer Book since 1661, and how did it prove abor-  
tive? Is there any present desire for it?

X. O.

Ans.—When William and Mary succeeded James  
II. at the Revolution, a commission was appointed  
to consider what changes could be made upon the  
Prayer Book, in order to satisfy and comprehend the  
Dissenters. The commissioners consisted of ten  
Bishops and twenty other divines, and the altera-  
tions they proposed alarmed at once the whole Eng-  
lish Church. The Lower House of Convocation  
saved the Prayer Book from becoming a diluted Pres-  
byterian hand-book, and the English Church from  
being lost among the sects. The action of the Lower  
House was truly providential, and we can never  
credit Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick and others,  
whose names are great in religious circles, with wis-  
dom or love of their Church. The whole matter is  
given account of by Proctor, *History of the Prayer  
Book*, pp. 144 sq., and you will find the Proposed Re-  
vision printed in a Parliamentary Blue book that  
was ordered in June, 1854. But you can hardly  
imagine anything more unlike the tone and teaching  
of the Prayer Book, and at present there is no desire  
of renewing the attempt to revise, beyond the chronic  
dissatisfaction of the Puritan section in the Church:  
even of this party the leaders know that revision  
would probably bring the Book only nearer to the  
Elizabethan and Caroline norm, which would take  
them "out of the frying pan into the fire." They  
see the American Prayer Book rising at every revision,  
and this by popular suffrage.

## Sunday School Lesson.

8th Sunday after Trinity. July 23rd, 1893.

VISITATION OF THE SICK. I.

The Church is a faithful mother to her children,  
provides for them in every period of life. Nor does  
she forsake them in the time of sickness and suffer-  
ing, but has a special office in her Book of Com-  
mon Prayer, which she intends her clergy to use in  
ministering to the sick. Our Blessed Lord cared  
for the sick and the whole, He rejoiced with those  
who did rejoice, He wept with them that wept. It  
is certainly the duty of the Church to follow her  
Divine Lord in His loving sympathy for those in  
sickness, even as she follows Him in blessing the  
union of those who come to be united in holy  
matrimony.

The officers of the Church to whom the special  
care of the sick belongs are the clergy. They are  
only men, they cannot therefore know of the ill-  
ness of their parishioners unless some one tells  
them; the first direction of the Church therefore is  
"when any person is sick, notice," etc. (See Ru-  
bric). This direction is in accordance with the  
words of St. James (v. 14). Were this direction  
carried out, a good deal of heart-burning would be  
avoided from the supposed neglect of the clergy  
who have had no means of knowing of the illness  
of their parishioners.

### I. THE CHURCH'S MESSAGE.

The message which the Church commissions her  
clergy to bring to the sick man and his house is  
"peace." "Peace be to this house," etc.

How is this peace to be attained? See Phil.  
iv. 6, 7. Lay aside all anxiety, engage in cheer-  
ful prayer with thanksgiving, even for the pain and  
suffering, as being the means in God's hands for  
working out your great benefit, "and the peace of  
God, which passeth," etc. Consequently having  
delivered his message of "peace," the minister is  
directed on coming into the sick man's presence to  
kneel down and pray.

### II. THE CHURCH'S PRAYER.

Sickness is the consequence of sin. Had there  
been no sin, sickness and sorrow would not have  
come. The first prayer is therefore that God will  
not remember sin, "Remember not Lord," etc.  
And the ground upon which we base this petition  
for mercy is our "redemption" through Christ.  
His redemption is the ground work of our peace  
(Rom. v. i).

Having cried for mercy, because Christ has "re-  
deemed us with His precious blood," we next and  
most fittingly use the Lord's prayer. How ap-  
propriately can we now say "Our Father."