

The Church Guardian

— EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: —

L. H. DAVIDSON, D.C.L., MONTREAL.

— ASSOCIATE EDITOR: —

REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, Winnipeg, Man.

Address Correspondence and Communications to the Editor, P.O. Box 504. Exchanges to P.O. Box 1968. For Business announcements See page 14.

Special Notice.

SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS are respectfully requested to remit at their earliest convenience. The LABEL gives the date of expiration.

CALENDAR FOR MAY.

MAY 1st—3rd Sunday after Easter.

St. Philip and St. James, A. & M.

" 8th—4th Sunday after Easter.

" 15th—5th Sunday after Easter.—(Notice of Rogation Days and Ascension Day).

" 16th }
" 17th } ROGATION DAYS.
" 18th }

" 19th—ASCENSION.

" 22nd—Sunday after Ascension.

" 29th—Whitsun-Day.

" 30th—Monday in Whitsun-Week.

" 31st—Tuesday in Whitsun-Week.

ROMAN CAVILS AS TO THE VALIDITY OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

BY THE REV. A. W. LITTLE.

The fact of Parker's consecration being incontrovertible, Romanists have tried to envelop the whole subject in a cloud of dust in order to obscure the validity of the act.

Their cavils are, for the most part, so silly and disingenuous, that I would fain have spared honest recusants the mortification of seeing them again in print.

I. Such frivolous objections as that some of Parker's consecrators were married Bishops (like St. Peter) may be passed over with a smile.

II. Equally disingenuous and unsound is the objection raised against the Ordinal, on the ground that the words used by Parker's consecrators, at the exact moment of the imposition of hands, did not clearly specify whether it was to the episcopate or to the priesthood that Parker was being ordained, although they certainly implied it by combining the words which our blessed Lord used when He ordained the Apostles and the words which St. Paul used with reference to St. Timothy's ordination as Bishop of Ephesus. The office of bishop was distinctly declared all through the service—in the presentation, the oath, and the prayers. The ordination could not possibly have been to the priesthood, for Parker was already a priest. The same objection would apply to all consecrations ever known to have been performed in England before the Reformation, and to all consecrations in the Roman Church even to this day. The actual words of consecration used were: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness." The

sentence was afterwards expanded to the form in our present Prayer-Book:

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and love, and soberness."

Apropos, the editor of the [English] *Church Times* recently observed: "The cavils against the Ordinal are frivolous, as you may see by reading it. And, in fact, the only Ordinal in the world, which meets the requirements for validity made by Roman controversialists is a heretical Nestorian one. The Roman rite itself does not. No such words occur in the Roman Office, which has only 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' and not another syllable, at the moment of laying-on hands. If the Romans could make a really strong case out against the Church of England, they would find truth a sufficient instrument, but they are never contented therewith."

III. Not much more reasonable is the charge that one of Parker's consecrators, Barlow, was not himself consecrated.

What if he were not? It is to provide for such contingencies that the Church requires three bishops to unite in every consecration. In the case of Parker, four bishops united in the laying on of hands, each one of them saying the words of consecration. Even if we waive Barlow's Orders, the Orders of the co-consecrators, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, cannot be impugned. Indeed, Scory and Hodgkins, were co-adjutors to the Romanizing Bishop of London during the reign of Queen Mary; and the records of the consecration of all three of them are extant.

But, as a matter of fact, there is not the faintest shadow of doubt that Barlow was consecrated. He was nominated Bishop of St. David's, by Henry VIII, elected by the Cathedral Chapter, April 10th, 1536, his election confirmed April 21st, and he himself formally enthroned in his cathedral soon after. By a common oversight the record of his consecration was omitted from Cranmer's carelessly kept register, as were the records of Fox, Latimer, Sampson, Rugg, Skipp, Bell and Day, of whose consecration there has never been any doubt. Barlow's own register, as Bishop of St. David's, which doubtless contained a full record of his consecration, is lost. It was probably destroyed by his successor, Bishop Farrar, who burned all the "Ecclesiastical Books, Martyrologies, Portiforians, Missals, and Calendars, of his See, wherein the names of the bishops, and the times of their admission, death and translation were wont to be recorded." (See Bailley's Def. of Holy Orders, p. 89.)

It is sometimes asserted that Henry VIII, considered his mandate as good as a consecration. This is absolutely false and unfounded. He regarded his mandate as good, not as a consecration, but as a warrant for the archbishop to see that the consecration was duly performed. Henry was very punctilious about the sacrament of Orders. So was Cranmer, who would have incurred the penalties of a *Premunire*, had he omitted the consecration of Barlow.

Barlow served as Bishop of St. David's for 13 years; was translated to Bath and Wells in 1249, and to Chichester in 1559. He had his seat in the House of Lords, which depended on the fact of his consecration, and required that he should be introduced to the House by two bishops as witnesses of his consecration. He also had his seat in the House of Bishops in the Convocation of Canterbury. He performed every episcopal function, even taking part in the consecration of two bishops. During the thirty years of his episcopate, no one ever doubted his Orders; and had there been a

shadow of doubt, his enemies would have made the most of it, especially the canons of St. David's, with whom he had a protracted lawsuit. Scores of official documents are still extant, showing his episcopal status and actions. It was only after he had been dead some fifty years that some wily Paptist, happening to discover that the actual record of his consecration was missing, started the lie that he had not been ordained. Let it suffice to quote the words of the scholarly and respectable Roman Catholic, Dr. Lingard:—

"For ten years Barlow performed all the sacred duties, and exercised all the civil rights of a consecrated bishop. He took his seat in Parliament as Lord Bishop of St. David's. He was styled by Gardiner his 'brother of St. David's.' He ordained priests; he was one of the officiating bishops at the consecration of Berkley; yet we are now called upon to believe that he was no bishop, and, consequently, that nobody objected to his orders, though they were known to be illegal; or to his ordinations, though they were known to be irregular; nor to his performance of episcopal functions, though it was well known that each such function was a sacrilege!" (Dr. Lingard in the "Catholic Magazine," 1834.)

FREQUENT COMMUNION.

Many Christians do not realize the necessity of receiving the Holy Communion oftener than a few times during the year. The notion that it should be looked upon as a semi-occasional service finds no shadow of authority in the New Testament. The time of its institution is at least insignificant; our Lord's command is—"do this"; St. Paul shows that the ascended Saviour thought it worthy of a special revelation to him; and it was undoubtedly a feature of Christian worship on the first day of the week in the Apostolic age. Earnest and devout souls ought not to esteem lightly any opportunity when it is possible for them to receive it. The absence of the weekly Eucharist was one of Wesley's points against the Church of England in his day. It is hard to believe that some are persuaded that frequent Communion is not only not a duty, but not even an advantage. How can this be, if it is a good thing at all? To receive it frequently is supposed to detract from its sanctity. If this be so, why did neither Christ nor the Apostles give us warning? Does this argument hold good concerning holy things? Does it hurt the soul to pray often to God—does it impair reverence to call upon His name "without ceasing?" Is it bad spiritual policy for us to read the Bible daily, or does such a rule make God's book common to us? Neither does frequent Communion ruin our regard for the blessed sacredness of the holy sacrament, but it nurses a love for it, for its refreshment, for the contemplation which it inspires, for the grace which it conveys. Let us all carefully weigh this solemn subject. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."—*Scranton Churchman*.

THE "IMPERFECT MEMBER."

Let it not be understood for a moment that we mean here to excuse or palliate evil living in any one, least of all in persons who have solemnly recognized and acknowledged the duty of living otherwise. Besides wrongness of action, the wicked Church-member exhibits inconsistency of conduct—not that he who is not of the Church can do wrong with any greater impunity—but there is in those of the Church an appearance of greater wrong in their wrong-doing and their inconsistency be-