

square miles, and its two hundred and fifty millions of inhabitants, must be regarded as an empire in itself. These magnificent possessions, together with some sixty smaller territories lying on the scattered fringe of many oceans, irresistibly lead us to see that the boast of the brave Spanish soldier that the sun never set on the immense empire of Charles V., receives its most forcible application when applied to the dominions of our beloved Queen. The powerful world-kingsdoms of Assyria and Persia fade into insignificance as compared with the British dominions. The imprint of Rome's empire is indelibly fixed on all the most civilized nations of Europe. The dominions of Rome extended from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Euphrates, from the mountains of Caledonia, the banks of the Rhine and the Danube, to the border of the Great African Desert, and to the first cataracts of the Nile. But the British dominions exceed four-fold those of ancient Rome."

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

Sir,—A young clergyman of a neighbouring Diocese wrote to me some time ago enclosing a Tract, sedulously circulated in his neighbourhood by what calls itself "The Catholic Truth Society," and entitled "Are they Priests?" meaning the clergy of the Church of England. He begged me to answer it in detail, "a large request," as he states, and one involving a considerable expenditure of time. For, to put it briefly, it takes much less time to make holes in a man's coat than to mend them. I have not had time, heretofore, to give attention to this request. I do not think there is anything new in the Tract, not even its unscrupulous spirit. Every objection it urges has been completely answered many times. It will, of course, be new to many into whose hands it may fall; and as the answers are in large volumes, for the most part, they will not know of them. This is evidently the case with my young friend, who says, "One is often very much dissatisfied with the childish training we receive for the Priesthood. It is mere sop. At present I am very desirous of further knowledge. I beg of you the benefits of your learning 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, omission of the emblems of office; 4th, changes of doctrine; &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 12, 1893.

WAS BARLOW A BISHOP?

It is maintained in this Tract that the claim of the Anglican clergy to a valid Priesthood must be rejected: 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 consecrators 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 throughout 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 consecrators could be proved to have been invalidly consecrated, 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 consecrated Bishop of Lincoln by George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury; Mark Anthony De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato; John King, Bishop of London; Lancelot Andrews of Ely, Buekridge 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, Sanerost, 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. 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, Hlumpton, Archbishop of Armagh, was one of the consecrators of Morton of Chichester, Morton of Houson, and Houson of Laud, from whom the succession runs on as above.

The same thing appeared 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 existing 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, together 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 omissions 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, Enthronement, and Summons to Parliament as a Bishop, are all there, but that of his consecration was either never made or it has been lost, together with eight other 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 bound in a book, and several of them in misplaced order. Upon the defects of this Regis-

try, 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 practised 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 consecrated; 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 invectives 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 necessity 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 statements to which both he and Cranmer subscribed during 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 Institution of a Christian Man." In 1543 Cranmer endorsed "the Necessary Erudition," and signed the declaration 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 episcopal laying on of hands and the grace of orders," are absolutely 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 formal 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