

# 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 from issue of Jan. 30th.)

It may be fairly said that Cardinal Pole acknowledged Anglican Orders because, acting under Papal authority, he confirmed 'the gift of consecration already bestowed' on the Anglican Bishops who were consecrated during the reign of Edward VI. according to the Reformed Ordinal. The Roman Catholic historian, Sanders, says that Pole "confirmed all Bishops made in the previous schism as they were Catholic in their religion."

The distinguished Jesuit, Cardinal Archbishop Odescalchi, became convinced of the soundness of Anglican Orders through the arguments of the Rev. Sir Henry Trelawney. Cardinal Barberini said that 'nothing would be more agreeable to him than a union between the English and Roman Churches.' And Cardinal Wiseman would place the Anglican Church in the same position as the Donatists, thereby acknowledging her orders as valid.

Dr. Lingard [Roman] says that Bishop [Roman] Bonner admitted the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and that it was performed "by Bishops who had been restored after their deposition." He regarded them, however, as 'schismatical' but valid. Bonner also admitted the Episcopal character of Bishop Scory, and describes him as 'our beloved brother John, lately Bishop of Chichester.'

Archbishop De Dominis, of Spalato, not only acknowledged the validity of Anglican Orders, but he also joined in the Consecration, as Consecrator, of the Bishop of London and Ely, at Lambeth, on December 14, 1617. In 1699 Bishop [Roman] Bossuet, of Meaux, could say that if the English Clergy would submit to Rome they would only require to be 'reconciled' and 'rehabilitated'; and he 'had no difficulty about the ordinations made in the time of Edward and Elizabeth, notwithstanding the pretended suppression of the Sacrifice and Priesthood among the English. St. Liguori could call the Bishops who were consecrated in Edward VI's reign 'Catholic Bishops.' Bishop Strickland made an investigation of the subject of Anglican Orders, and he was satisfied that they were regular and valid. Bishop Stonar, who was one of those who held the sufficiency of the Ordination formularies of the Prayer Book of the Established Church, maintained in print that, as far as he had enquired, he was willing to believe that the Church of England Ordinations were sufficient and valid.

Bishop Milner could write of the Church of England that 'she teaches that the Order of her Ministers have descended from the Apostles and are appointed of God; and that the power given to them in the ceremony of Ordination is Divine and essentially necessary to her existence.'

'The Order of Priesthood is conferred in the following words of Scripture, agreeably to the Roman Pontifical, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' etc.

In 1839 Dr. Murray, Roman Archbishop of Dublin, wrote to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, stating that 'A Church, like the Established Church of England, which, having preserved all that is essential, possesses a succession of Bishops and Pastors, can occupy common ground with our [Roman] Churches, where dissenting bodies have but little hope for a better future.'

It is now time for me to make some quotations from the writings of the clergy and laity, but I shall only be able to notice a few of them.

Father Cudsemius says that 'there is a perpetual line of their [Anglican] Bishops, and the lawful succession of pastors received from the Church.' And Fathers Sanders and Davenport both admit and acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders.

Father Gough, who seceded to the Roman Church, was never reordained. The Archbishop of Paris acknowledged the validity of his Anglican Orders, as did the doctors of the Sorbonne. He was allowed to say Mass and to exercise all his functions as a Priest in the Arch-Diocese of Paris by the authority of the Archbishop. He did the same in England and Italy.

After admitting the validity and canonical character of Dr. Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, Father Walsh adds: 'Were I to deliver my opinion on this matter, or were it my purpose to speak thereof, I would certainly feel myself bound in conscience [for anything that I know yet] to concur with those who doubt not the ordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Protestant Church of England to be at least valid.' He 'did not reflect on Archbishop Parker's consecration' to the see of Canterbury.

Father Arnaud says that 'The fact, viz., that the Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's time were consecrated by true Bishops, appears to me undeniable.' And Father Du Pin, writing to Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, remarks: 'I was extremely pleased with what you were good enough to write to me so eloquently and accurately about the election and consecration of Bishops in England. . . . Would that Bishops were proved in the same way everywhere before they were consecrated.'

Father Courayer had a great respect for Anglican Orders, and he published two books in their defence. He says that 'these [Anglican] Ordinations, of which no reasonable divine can question the validity. We cannot hesitate, thus, as to the reception of their Orders. . . . There is no decree of the [Roman Catholic] Church that declares English Ordinations null. The establishing of the English Ordinations turns entirely to the advantage of the Catholic Church. The acknowledgement of their validity facilitates to us the means of our reunion with the English, and there is nothing for which we ought to wish with greater ardour.'

Father Le Giree wrote that 'Though the Sacred Sacrifice [the Holy Eucharist] is not offered as frequently as in the [Roman] Catholic Church, yet the services and rites of the English Church are like our own, and it is said, bear a great likeness to the services and rites of the Old Church [of England] before any changes were made.' And the services are rendered by 'clergy whose promotion to Sacred Orders, with care and preparation, is made by a manner perfectly in harmony with the respected customs of the Ancient Church.'

I suppose one of the best modern books on the Roman side of the controversy has been written by Father Estcourt. He admits that 'Dr. Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, on December 17, 1559, and that it is impossible to doubt it; and with regard to the Nag's Head argument, he has the moral honesty to say that 'It is very unfortunate that the Nag's Head story was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd on the face of it, that it has led to the suspicion of [Roman] Catholic theologians not being sincere in their objections they make to Anglican Orders.'

I come now to make the last clerical quotations. They are taken from the writings of that distinguished scholar and historian of the 'Italian Mission' in England, the late Dr. Lingard. He died July 13, 1851.

He says that 'Queen Elizabeth resolved to place, as Metropolitan, both through respect to the memory of her mother and in reward of his merit, Dr. Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain to Anne Boleyn. In obedience to a *conge d'elire* he was chosen by a portion of the Chapter—

the major part refusing to attend, but four months were suffered to elapse between his election and entrance on the Arch-episcopal office. . . . Four of the Commissioners, Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, and Hodgkins, once Suffragan of Bedford, who had both been consecrated according to the Catholic Pontifical, and Scory, the deprived Bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale, the deprived Bishop of Exeter, who had both been consecrated according to the reformed Ordinal, proceeded to confirm Parker, and then to consecrate him after the form adopted towards the close of the reign of Edward VI.'

The above quotation is taken from the new edition of his 'History of England,' in 13 volumes, 1844, Vol. VII., pp. 262-263. And in a supplementary note he makes the following remark: 'Before I conclude this note, I ought perhaps to mention a story which was once the subject of acrimonious controversy between the divines of the two communions. It was said that Kitchen and Scory, with Parker and other Bishops elect, met in a tavern called the Nag's Head; that Kitchen, on account of a prohibition of Bonner, refused to consecrate them; that Scory therefore, ordering them to kneel down, placed the Bible on the head of each, and told them to rise up Bishops. Of this tale, concerning which so much has been written, I can find no trace in any author or document of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'

(To be continued.)

## OUT OF THE WORLD.

There are people who think they could be better Christians if they were out of the world, and there are some who shut themselves up in a monastery or convent, with the idea that here only is there freedom rightly to serve the Master. And doubtless there is many a weary heart that would gladly lay down its cares and burdens and responsibilities, and get out of the noise and mad whirl and heartless grind of the big machine of modern civilization. The truth is we cannot get out of the world. And in our attempts to force ourselves out of it, we are going against our nature and the purpose for which we are placed here. It requires more nerve, and is more in accordance with our Master's teachings, to live a Christian life in the world than in a monastery, or in any ideal retreat of rest. "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world." The Christian ideal is not freedom from work, but strength to do the work that lies in our hands; not freedom from temptation, but power to resist and conquer temptation; not freedom from suffering, but the spirit to make suffering the means of shaping our souls for the Master's use; not absence from the world, but grace to make the world better for our presence; not holy lives shut away by themselves, but holy lives that carry goodness and comfort and strength to the wayward and weary and burdened. Not to speak of the sacred duty we owe to our brothers travelling along the same road with us, and the tremendous responsibility of our influence upon others, it is precisely the living in the world that brings out what is best in us, that makes character, that determines what we are, and what we are to be. The hardness of the world, the fires of the world, are the very things, in God's ways with man, which do much in fitting our weakened human nature for the after life. The Christian whose faith means any thing is not afraid of the world.—*The Church News*.

THE thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Church Congress will take place this year at Norwich, from October 8th to the 11th. It will be opened with an official reception by the Mayor of the city, and his Grace the Archbishop of York has kindly consented to preach the opening sermon at the Cathedral on Tuesday, October 8.