

All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. W. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1843.

The Clergy of the Diocese are requested to insert, in Art. VI. of the last Pastoral Address of the 2d Instant, page 3, line 6, after the words—"Circumcision of Our Lord," the following: "*Of the Purification, of the Annunciation,*" &c., which were inadvertently omitted in the printed copies sent to the different Missions of the Diocese.

J. J. HAY, Pst.

TORONTO, 25th February, 1843.

The Editor of the "*Church*" repeats, in an Editorial article of the 5d Instant, his original statement which appeared in that paper of the 10th December, that "*In Ireland only two of the Bishops rejected the Reformation.*" Our cotemporary finds fault with us because we did not deny the greater part of his editorial note, and accuses us of having excised the most unwelcome part, which he submits once more to his readers.

"Southey (Book of the Church p. 390,) states on the authority of Stryppe, that of 9,400 beneficed clergy, only 177 resigned their preferments, rather than acknowledge the Queen's supremacy and worship after the reformed manner. In England, all the Romish Bishops were recusants, save one: but in Ireland, only two of the Bishops rejected the reformation."

We confess that the only object we had in view was to deny the correctness of the last assertion concerning the Irish Bishops. It is true that there was certainly a surprising degree of tameness and servility among English Ecclesiastics in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. As one of our Historians very justly remarks, "they were under a continual restraint, and the conveniences of life were an overbalance to fidelity; it was rather a corruption of morals than an error in faith that occasioned their defections." But under Elizabeth the case was very different. We shall merely offer a few remarks on the subject, mostly drawn from Protestant Historians. We are informed by "Burnet, III. p. 625. Camden 47. Heylin 257," that of 9,400 beneficed men in England (under Elizabeth) there were 14 Bishops, 12 Deans, 12 Archdeacons, 6 Abbots and Abbesses, fifteen heads of houses of the universities 50 prebendaries, and 80 rectors, who left their benefices on account of religion." Collier adds three Bishops elect, and "about 20 doctors in several faculties." He also computes the Archdeacons at 14, the Prebendaries at 60, and the Rectors at 100. II. p. 431. If this be but a small number compared with the whole body of Ecclesiastics, we should remember that all the Bishops, save one, adhered to the ancient faith, and that the whole ecclesiastical convocation which met in the first year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, opposed the change of religion. Oxford gave the strongest proof of its attachment to the old religion—Wood's Antiquities of the Univer. of Oxford *passim*. "Of the two Universities, Oxford had become so strongly attached to the Romish side during the late reign, that after the desertion or expulsion of the most zealous of that party had almost emptied several Colleges, it still for many years abounded with adherents to the old Religion."—Hallam, Const. Hist. I. 249.

Bishop Jewell complained [Letter 22, Mai, 1559, apud Collier n. 492.] that there were not two in Oxford of the reformed opinions."—MacIntosh, Hist. of England, II. p. 14. For several years those educated in either of the Universities, were refused ordination on account of their attachment to the Catholic Faith. Stryppe, life of Grindal, p. 50. In Exeter College, as late as 1578, there were not above four Protestants out of eighty, "all the rest secret or open affectionaries." Amals II. p. 539. So that after the Catholics had left the University of Oxford in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it was so empty that there was very seldom a sermon preached in the University Church. Wood, Athen: Oxon. I. 161. 429. Moreover, Heylin informs us, p. 257, that many who were cordially affected to the interest of the Church of Rome, dispensed with themselves in their outward conformities, which some of them are said to do, upon a hope of seeing the like revolution by the death of the Queen, as had before happened by the death of King Edward. And "it was strongly believed, that the greatest part complied against their conscience, and would have been ready for another turn, if the Queen had died while that race of incumbents lived." Eclard. I. 794. The reformation under Elizabeth was certainly contrary to the inclinations of the governing part of the clergy: many eminent men went abroad to Flanders, France, or Italy; others stopped in England hoping that the Queen would relent; but their hopes vanishing, they forsook their benefices and followed their Countrymen beyond the seas. The thing was carried so far that the reformed were left unprovided with teachers and persons proper for that function, to that extent, "that upon the Catholic Clergy throwing up their preferments, the necessities of the Church required the admitting some mechanics into orders. Collier II. 265. See also Stryppe Annals. I. 178. 179. It would certainly appear from these accounts, that whatever might have been the number who outwardly conformed to the new order of things, most of the Clergy of character, either on account of their learning or of their morals, stood firm with their Bishops in the belief of the old Faith; and that even the inferior clergy were always disposed to return back to the mother Church, had not a superior power over-awed them to compliance. The learned professions, like the Prelates, the Convocation and the Universities were well known to adhere most devotedly to the ancient faith: "the Inns of Courts were more than once purified of popery by examining their members on articles of faith." Hallam, Const. Hist. I. p. 191. A great many of the justices of the peace were secretly attached to the same interest, though it was not easy to exclude them from the commission on account of their wealth and respectability." Hallam p. 139: "and the lawyers in the most eminent situations are represented as Catholics." Stryppe, Annals I. p. 259. In the western parts of England the gentry and people were principally adherents of the old faith; and in 1569, in the northern Counties, "there were not two Gentlemen who favoured and allowed of her Majesty's proceedings in the cause of Religion." Waterworth's Histor. Lect. VI. It is evident that the people in general were desirous of returning to the old faith, and the fact is even acknowledged by Boss, Bishop of Carlisle in a letter to Secretary Cecil dated January 14 1564. We might cite many other authorities, but we have written enough to convince the Editor of the "*Church*" that there was no *evanion* on our part in not noticing the first part of the paragraph in question.

Our cotemporary of the "*Church*" thinks it advisable to mention that Parker, the first

Archbishop of Canterbury in Elizabeth's reign, was duly consecrated by four Bishops, viz:—Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Hodgskins.—He cites Dr. Lingard's opinion on the subject, "Two of the consecrators, Barlow, and Hodgskins, had been ordained Bishops according to the Roman Pontifical; the other two, according to the reformed ordinal."—We shall merely observe, that Lingard's opinion is entirely opposed to that which Catholic writers, with a very few exceptions, have always held on the subject. We shall only remind our readers, that when called upon thro' the pages of the "*Birmingham Catholic Magazine*," for his proofs, the learned author acknowledged that in the discussion of this question—he had confined himself to the mere historical fact of Parker's consecration: but "whether it was valid or invalid, according to Catholic doctrine, was a theological question with which, as a mere writer of history, he had no concern."

We still maintain that the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, with the exception of Curwin, remained true to the Holy See. In Ireland the Queen proceeded with great caution and prudence: in some dioceses, protestant Bishops were only appointed several years after her accession to the throne: and Bishop Mant's assertion, that "even the popish prelates, so long as any of them survived, who were in their sees before the reformation, were ready to assist at the consecration of Protestant Bishops," is altogether unfounded. The true Episcopal character of the Irish Protestant Bishops has always been denied by the Church, not for want of power on the part of Curwin, but on the insufficiency of the form used by him in the consecration of Loftus. Dr. Mant refers to this consecration, and traces what he is pleased to call the unbroken succession of the protestant hierarchy thro' this prelate.—We pass over the pretended line of succession thro' Archbishops Brown and Goodacre, Archbishops of Armagh. Brown was expelled from his See for his errors, and as being a married man in 1554, and died as it is thought in 1556. Goodacre either abandoned his See, or was dismissed on Mary's accession in 1553; and so little was he known as Archbishop of Armagh, that even Protestant Historians consider Loftus as the immediate successor of Dowdall, who was appointed by royal authority as early as 1543, and who, after successfully opposing the innovations of Henry and Edward, died in London, on the 15th August, 1555. We know of no line of succession thro' these prelates; and altho' it might answer Bishop Mant's purpose to mention this as one of the lines of connexion, we believe it would be impossible to prove that any of the Irish Protestant Bishops in the reign of Elizabeth, had received Episcopal Consecration from either one or the other. Harris remarks, leaving aside Browne and Goodacre, "that the Irish Protestant Bishops derive their succession through Loftus, without any pretence, or open favour, for he was consecrated by Curwin, who had been consecrated in England, according to the forms of the Roman Pontifical, in the third year of Mary." Ware's Bishops, p. 94. But Harris very naturally omits the fact, that Loftus was consecrated in 1562 according to the ordinal of Edward VI., introduced into Ireland, by the act of uniformity, in 1560, and that he made use of the same form in attempting to convey in 1568 the Episcopal character to Lancaster, his successor in the primacy. Now all the Catholic Bishops of England unanimously condemned the form that had been introduced under Edward VI., and their decision was confirmed by the judgment of the Catholic World. We read in Dodd's Church History, quoted by the Editor of Collin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 5. p. 501., that "when

this ordinal of Edward VI., was examined in the next ensuing reign of Mary, it was declared to be insufficient and invalid, as to the purposes of consecrating a true ministry, both the Bishops and Parliament being of that opinion. The reasons, in general, of its insufficiency, were an essential defect both as to the matter and form of the Episcopal and Sacerdotal orders." Bishop Mant could not be ignorant of all these proceedings, and we are rather surprized that the Editor of the "*Church*" should gravely remark, taking this prelate for his guide, "that the true Episcopal character of the hierarchy of the Irish Church is unquestioned and unquestionable and *protected against all exception even from the papists themselves.*"*

If as Bishop Mant observes, Severus of Kildare and Walsh of Meath, were the only two Bishops formally deprived of their Sees, it was merely an act of prudence on the part of the Government: it was found inexpedient to attempt to remove at once all the Bishops from these Sees, as in England: the Government preferred waiting until the Catholic Prelates had been removed by death, or compelled to conceal themselves, or to leave the kingdom. If other Bishops, besides the Archbishops of Dublin had taken the oath of supremacy and conformed to the new religion, it certainly would not have escaped the notice of the Ecclesiastical Historians of the time and their names would have been blazoned forth as worthy to rank with those of Curwin and Kitchen.

However, we are willing to be corrected by our cotemporary, for after all, this is a *new* matter of historical fact: but we suspect that his sources of information on this point are rather limited: his assertion would be better supported by History, if conceived as follows. "In England, under Elizabeth, all the Bishops adhered to the Catholic faith; (Kitchen of Landall alone took the oath of supremacy,) and in Ireland, the Irish Catholic Prelates, with the exception of Curwin of Dublin, rejected the new mode of worship." If the

*The Protestant Bishop of Montreal, in his last Episcopal address to the members of the Church of England, in the Diocese of Quebec, expresses himself in the following manner, when speaking of the Anglican Church of this Province: "A Church who when she freed herself from the usurped and superinduced power under which she groaned with the other churches of the west, recovered her independence without breaking the Apostolic line of her ministry or losing the integrity of her constitution.....who..... in all the changes and convulsions of the world, dispenses to you the word and sacraments which nothing but ignorance and wilfulness can call in question, received down from the beginning and acknowledged, nay maintained.....by learned writers who have sified her claim in this point among the reformationists themselves." We are rather astonished at the positiveness of Dr. Mountain, for there is not a difference of opinion, on the subject among Catholics: all unanimously deny the existence of the apostolical line of the Anglican ministry, on account of the insufficiency of the form used by the first Protestant Bishops. This alone invalidates the whole act, no matter by whom performed. Even the fact of Parker's consecration was denied at the time it was first announced and has always been called in question by Catholic divines with the exception of perhaps four, "two of whom says, Dr. Milner, were excommunicated by the Church for their errors, and the third was Courayer an apostate Monk. The learned Doctor Lingard, as we observed, has given to the fact of Parker's consecration the sanction of his authority: his opinion has not been followed because his proofs have not been considered sufficient. Catholics have no inducement to deny the validity of the Anglican ordinations, they acknowledge the validity of the orders of the Greek and other schismatic churches, and if they reject the ordinations of the Anglican Church as invalid, it is because the facts of the case do not allow them to come to any other conclusion.