

ROMAN CATHOLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS OF ANGLICAN ORDERS AND JURISDICTION.

An Address delivered in St. Luke's Church, Baltimore, Md., Sunday, Sept. 9, 1894.

By THE REV. STUART CROCKETT, M.A., B.D.

[CONTINUED.]

It would seem that the above statements of Dr. Lingard ought to have convinced any reasonable man. But some Romanists in England began to question them, and Dr. Lingard wrote a long reply to the Birmingham [Roman] *Catholic Magazine* in regard to the reality of Dr. Parker's consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury, in the regular succession from St. Augustine, St. Virgilius and St. John. Dr. Lingard says: 'I have asserted that Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. . . . I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objections which can be brought against it.'

'In my judgment the comparison of these facts with those that preceded the 17th of December forms so strong a case that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favour of the consecration, even if all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished. But there exists such evidence in abundance. Now as to this mass of evidence, direct and indirect, what do your correspondents oppose?'

'I am not aware of any open denial of the facts till about fifty years afterwards, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag's Head was published.'

'With them [the Roman opponents of Anglican Orders] the great error of which I have been guilty, is that I state Barlow to have been a Catholic Bishop in the reign of Henry VIII., whereas they are positive that he never received episcopal consecration at all.' He then cites the most convincing proofs of Bishop Barlow's episcopal character according to the laws of the Church and State, and then he adds, 'Is there any positive proof that he was no Bishop? None in the world. . . . Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow and not that of Gardiner? I fear that the only reason is this: Gardiner did not consecrate Parker, but Barlow did.'

'The fact, however, is that Parker was consecrated on the next Sunday but one, by the four [Bishops] Commissioners, in the chapel of Lambeth, and according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. This appears from the archepiscopal register, from Parker's diary, from the 'Antiquitates,' and from indisputable facts which I mentioned in my former communication. What can be opposed to these authorities? Any direct testimony? No; but that the passages in the register, the diary and the printed books are fabrications. The charge of forgery is one easily made, and, therefore, requires proof to support it; it is the last refuge of the obstinate and dishonest; and, therefore, if it be disproved, recoils with double force against those who made it.'

I must pass over several other distinguished priests of the Roman Catholic Church who acknowledged the validity of Anglican Orders, and especially those clergy of the English Church who perverted to Rome; but many of them returned to the Church of England after they tasted 'the bitter waters of Babylon.' They soon found out that the internal workings of the Roman system do not correspond with her external appearance.

If you refer to the life of the late Dr. Tat, Archbishop of Canterbury, you will find that

the late Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, received a very important communication from some of the [Roman] Bishops who were attending the [Roman] Vatican Council of 1870, who apprehended the evil results from the promulgation of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility, that they would be very grateful for the moral support of the Anglican Episcopate. They acknowledged the validity of Anglican Orders, but they received no 'moral support' from the Bishops of England. The Council declined to discuss the subject of Anglican Orders; and no respectable Roman theologian to-day denies their validity.

I shall now make three quotations from the laity:

In 1826 Mr. Butler wrote that he was 'unable to understand those who maintain that the Protestant Bishops went through a mock consecration at a tavern in Cheapside. If there is one historical fact, for which the existing evidence should render it undisputed, it is the fact of the consecration of Dr. Parker at Lambeth on December 17, 1559.'

In 1844 Mr. DeLisle wrote a great deal on Anglican Orders. He said, among other good things, 'I never disputed their validity, and, on the contrary, was inclined to admit it, . . . for I saw no reason to dispute the validity of Anglican Orders.' You can find his letters on this subject in Dr. Lee's great work on the Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England.

Mr. Pugin says in his work on 'Church and State: or Christian Liberty,' which was highly approved by the late Cardinal Newman, who said: 'It has given me great pleasure to read it. It is an exposition of great and most important principles, and is written in a frank, straightforward and forcible style.'

I have selected a few passages from the edition of 1875: 'It is lamentable to consider the amount of ignorance that prevails respecting the real system of the Church of England, not only among the English [Roman] Catholic body, but among persons who profess to be members of its communion. . . . It is a sad and afflicting spectacle to see good and conscientious men, when really acting up to what they are bound to perform, exposed to all the persecutions of the State and the brutality of insolent and wealthy laymen, who, ignorant of any ecclesiastical principles or historical facts, assail the pastors of the Church to which they ostensibly belong if they carry out the very rubrics of the Ordinals and administer its rites in reverence and solemnity.'

'If the truth be spoken, after the first race of Elizabethan Puritans, the Anglican Bishops have been respectable tenants of the Sees. . . . Indeed, if we can bring ourselves to regard the Anglican Church abstractedly from all acts of the State in connection with her, we shall find much to reverence and admire. . . . It is, indeed, remarkable that in no official act is the Church of England committed to the term Protestant; it does not occur in the Liturgy or any authoritative office, nor in the Articles or Canons, and in the bidding prayer she prays for the whole state of Christ's Catholic Church, and especially for that part of it established in this dominion—language which can only admit of one interpretation. Now, in opposition to this, the vulgar Protestant idea is that before the Reformation all the old clergy were turned out, and that Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were the fathers of the new system, to whom it owed its existence; and, to such an extent has this false idea prevailed, that a few years ago men filling high positions in the leading University got up a Cross to commemorate those arch-heretics as founders of the English Church. Such is the low and popular Protestant view. Now let us examine the ordinary [Roman] Catholic idea that prevails among our own body, and which is very little nearer to the truth than the one I

have described. All, anterior to the Reformation, is regarded and described as a sort of Utopia. . . . I once lived in Utopia myself, but when tested by stern facts and history, it all melts like a dream. . . . Let any reasonable man, then, reflect on the enormous difficulties that the Catholic religion had to contend with in preserving its position and maintaining the truth, and which will be evident to all who attentively study the chronicles of English Church history in all their bearings and details. After the Church became part of the State it was the regular means of enforcing religious observances, but that its clergy and its rites were created by act of Parliament is utterly untrue.' It may be added that, not long before his death, Mr. Pugin expressed his disgust at the Nag's Head fable about Anglican Orders. He said that 'slander is a poor substitute for argument.'

I have not made these selections for controversy, but to show what some distinguished Romanists have deliberately said about the Liturgy, Organization and Orders of the Anglican Church. It will be seen, on their own acknowledgment, that Anglican Orders are valid, and we know that they are regular and canonical. The modern Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England are the rightful successors and occupants of the old Sees and Parishes; and they minister in the same churches to the people committed to their care. Rome has sent an alien Ministry into England, but it is not recognized by the Ancient Church. It is not too much to say that the Roman system in England is intrusive and schismatical, according to the principles laid down by St. Paul and the Canons of the General Councils. It will be impossible to attain corporate unity in England unless those who have allied themselves to a foreign ecclesiastical power return to the Church of England.

One word more remains to be said. It is one for which the whole civilized world is 'ardently longing.' It must be dear to the hearts of all Christian people. It is Christian Unity. When will the Christian Church be restored to her pristine beauty? It can never be restored until all the Churches return to the first principles of the Gospel and the Primitive Church. It is as true now as it has ever been, that there may be 'no Church without a Bishop;' but it is also true that neither Holy Scripture, nor the Primitive Church, gave the Pope of Rome any authority over National Churches. He was required by 'the ancient Canons' to confine his jurisdiction to his own Roman Province. Some years ago it was said by a very pronounced Romanist that the English Church was 'very precious' on account of the great power which her position gives her to help on the great work of the Unity of Christendom. As she possesses the Ministry ordained by Christ, and as He promised to be with it unto the end of the world, she can meet the Churches of the East and the West on equal terms, and so be an instrument of restoring the unity of the Universal Church of God. When the 'Reunion of Churches' and 'Unity of Christendom' takes place, then will the Church of these latter days present to the world the beauty and strength of the Mystical Body of Christ. She will then put forth all her energies in 'preaching the Gospel to all nations.' The Captain of our Salvation will be in her midst leading her on to victory. And the whole world will then believe that 'Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of the World.'

Let us be faithful to the Church of the Anglican Communion. She is venerable and renowned for Apostolic Order and Scriptural Truth. She has been the 'beacon of light' of Evangelical piety and sound learning for many generations of Christianity. She has been preserved from the innovations and human vanity which may spring from the ingenuity or perverseness of men. She has a direct, unbroken