

## EXTRACTS FROM THE SYBILLIAN PROPHECIES OF CHRIST.

BY RICHARD VERSTIGAN, 1601.

*Sybilla Perseta.*

Thou serpent fraught with craft and cruelty  
Shall by a mightier Strength be trodden low,  
And on base Earth, the High God born shall  
be.  
And from a Maid the Branch of Bliss shall  
grow;  
And that True Word, unseen before of all,  
Shall now be seen, and shall be felt withal.

*Sybilla Libya.*

In obscure darkness Light shall glistening  
shine,  
The Synagogue's straight bands unbound  
shall be;  
The King of Life be seen of mortal eyes,  
And in a Maiden's Lap shall nourished be;  
And high above the Gentiles He shall reign,  
And shall in mercy His state maintain.

*Sybilla Delphica.*

Attend, O Earth, thy Sovereign Lord to see,  
And know thy God, which is God's only  
Son;  
Child of the Highest, and Most High is he,  
Who by being by no earthly might began;  
He shall the great Expect d Prophet be  
Of worthy greatness, and great dignity.

*Sybilla Canea.*

A Maid exceeding all in Sanctity,  
And whose clear beauty shall the stars ex-  
ceed,  
Of old, in future time, conceived shall be,  
And in the time sacred Blood shall seed;  
And from the heavens the sweet dew down  
shall fall  
Into her breasts to nourish him withal.

*Sybilla Eritrea.*

In later age, High God will him phase,  
And on a low star, thence thence the time,  
Mingling His Nature with our human race,  
He shall be adored in manifold assemblage;  
And, O, the little Lamb, in straw he'd,  
Shall of a Maid be nourished and fed.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## ANGLICAN ORDERS AND OTHER IMPORTANT QUESTIONS DISCUSSED.

To the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS:

DEAR SIR,—This seems to be an age of progress and ambition. Everyone who thinks himself of some importance, seems to be anxious for notoriety, and to come to the front in the battle of life, some even at the sacrifice of truth, sometimes of honor. Not to be behind the age, I notice of late a strong determination on the part of certain members of the Anglican body, to attempt to resurrect from the past, proofs for the validity of Anglican Orders and on the strength of these proofs they come forward as claimants to the honors of the Catholic priesthood and ask to be recognized as true priests, who have inherited the priesthood by unbroken succession. When taken to task, as they have been time and again, and confronted by the cold and stern facts of history, they recede a step, and say "We are satisfied that our Orders are valid." It is one thing to give satisfaction, another thing to give proof. A man, for instance, may be quite satisfied that he has a right to plead as a lawyer, but does this private conviction confer the right upon him to go before the bar. Certainly not. He must prove his claim by producing proofs that he has a legal right to wear the gown and practise law to the satisfaction of those amongst whom he aspires to rank. If everyone who would be a lord, is to be acknowledged such because he is *satisfied* that he is one, the House of Lords, bad as it is now, would then present a far worse spectacle to all concerned. They have a tribunal to pronounce upon all such pretentious claims, and no amount of satisfaction, on the part of individuals can supply the defect if there is sufficient reason for withholding its recognition.

So it is with the priesthood. Facts are very stubborn things, and when sought for in the light of history, unfortunately for the Anglican claims, facts don't bear them out. From the one great fact of the old Catholic rite for administering sacraments being mutilated, and, for doctrinal purposes, almost destroyed by the so-called Reformers, on them lies the *onus probandi* to show that this mutilation has not invalidated the sacraments. For the last three hundred years they have been making feeble attempts to hold their ground; but I think it must be granted, so far they have hopelessly failed. The fact of their claims being practically rejected by the combined voice of the Eastern and Western churches, who are acknowledged to have a valid priesthood, should have sufficient weight with the Anglicans to suggest a practical doubt as regards the validity of their orders. Putting the case squarely before the mind of every conscientious person, it seems hard to consider it short of a sacrilege to exercise a ministry when there

are weighty reasons for thinking that the exercise of such is a mere travesty on the most solemn acts of Christian worship. Can our Anglican friends be ever convinced that to attempt to administer sacraments, to take upon themselves the charge of souls without examining the stability of their claims to valid orders, which they must know do not stand the test of reliable history, is a responsibility of the greatest importance to themselves and maybe followed by fatal results to others? So far the only means we have of forming an opinion and coming to a practical conclusion on this important subject, is by appealing to history. These means are open to all. But one must be careful to distinguish between true and false history. What does history say in this matter, even in the mouth of Protestant historians. The following are a few historical facts which are pertinent to the subject. As the validity of Anglican claims is based upon the valid consecration of Parker, the first Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, by Barlow, until they clear away the doubts that hang over the latter's consecration, and establish their claim fully beyond question, the validity of the Anglican priesthood must be disallowed. When Queen Elizabeth appeared on the scene, she immediately set to work to draw up a new rule of faith under the title of the Thirty-nine Articles, and a new liturgy under the name of the Book of Common Prayer, both of which were made compulsory by law, the Sacrifice of the Mass being forbidden under fine and imprisonment, and looked upon as a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." A new rule also for consecrating bishops and ministers was devised by Cranmer and adopted, which had to be changed again in 1662, because, even according to the Anglicans, it was considered insufficient to make a bishop. To show their disapproval of the Queen's interference with their sacred rights, the clergy in council, 1559, drew up an act of faith in which they declared their belief (1) in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist; (2) Transubstantiation; (3) Sacrifice of the Mass; (4) Divinely appointed supremacy of Peter and his successors over the Church; (5) the authority to deal with matters of faith and discipline belonged to the pastors of the church and not to laymen. (Stryes Annals, p. 56) Archbishop Meath, almost in the words of the valiant Bishop Fisher, before him, spoke strongly in the name of the whole episcopacy against the act of supremacy they were asked to take by the Queen. They all refused with the exception of Kitchen, of Llandaff, and were summoned before the council and imprisoned and deposed by the civil power. "The whole number of the clergy deposed stands thus: fourteen bishops already mentioned, three bishops elect, one abbot, four friars and one abbess, twelve deans, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons or prebendaries, one hundred priests well-preferred, fifteen heads of colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, to which may be added about twenty doctors in different faculties." (Collier Eccl. Hist. vol. VI., p. 24) The Queen had successfully pulled down, now she began to build up. But how was a new Primate to be installed into the vacant see of Canterbury? Let us see. According to the laws of the land an archbishop and two bishops, or, at the very least, four bishops were required to make the consecration of a bishop legal. According to the law of the Church, at least three consecrated bishops were required for valid consecration and for a lawful appointment three English bishops acting in accord with the whole bench. Martene says "a bishop is ordained not by one but by all the bishops of the province." It is acknowledged that this rule is laid down upon account of heresies, *lest the tyrannical authority of a single ordained bishop should attempt something against the faith of the Church.*" (Eccl. Hist. III. c. 1. ar.) Now it is on record in the handwriting of Cecil, the Queen's minister, that "there is no archbishop and no four bishops, therefore what is to be done?" What was done, or what could be done under existing circumstances? As not one single bishop from the ranks of the old English bishops could be induced to lay consecrated hands upon Parker, the Queen was forced to have recourse to another expedient, fall back upon her supremacy and seek her way out of the difficulty as best she could. She deposed all the Catholic bishops, with the exception of Kitchen, who also refused to have anything to do with Parker. There were scattered over the country a certain

number of ecclesiastics, suspended, and bishops, excommunicated, mostly on the grounds of immorality. Four of this class named Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, she induced to come to her assistance to hand down to Parker apostolic succession. Not one of those men had charge of a bishopric at the time, for all four had incurred excommunication according to the law of the old English Church, for their immoral life. (Members of religious orders who attempt to marry incur excommunication by the 16th Can. Gen. Coun. Chalcedon. These four had been members of religious orders.) That Barlow was bishop elect there seems to be sufficient proof, but was he ever consecrated; if so, by whom? From that day to this not a fragment of documentary evidence turned up to show the day, the place, or the fact of his consecration; but, on the contrary, the more research is made, the stronger the evidence becomes against the supposition that he was ever a consecrated bishop. Scory and Coverdale, beyond all doubt, had never been consecrated according to the rite of the old English Church, but according to Cranmer's Calvinistic rite which, later on, Anglicans themselves thought well to have recanted. Hodgkins was a real Bishop, but was only an assistant at Parker's consecration. History tells us that Barlow was elected Bishop of St. David's, in April, 1536, and on the 21st of the same month his election was confirmed by Cranmer. On the 27th he was summoned to the House of Peers as bishop, and on May the 1st was enthroned in his see. Not a word here about his consecration. That he was not consecrated before his instalment is further proved by the fact of his being styled Bishop elect of St. David's on the 12th of June in an official document by Cromwell, the King's vicar general, who was in a position to know Barlow's official address. It was never the custom to style a consecrated bishop in possession of his see as Barlow was, Bishop elect. In the Register is found an entry of Barlow's confirmation by Cranmer with a blank space left for the entry of his consecration. That blank space has never been filled up. What reason can be assigned for the omission of such an important entry, if the consecration took place? According to the entry made in the Lambeth Register, Parker had four full-fledged bishops consecrating him instead of being consecrated by Barlow alone, which goes to prove that an attempt was made to dispense with Barlow as the connecting link in the Anglican succession.

Haddan, Barlow's great defender, fixes the 11th of June, 1536, as the latest date that his consecration could have taken place, but we have seen Cromwell alluding to him on the following day as Bishop elect. Why were he not referred to by his proper title, by this worthy sire, if he were consecrated Bishop the day before? Stubbs, in his *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, who has produced documentary evidence in a number of difficult cases, Bonner's included, supplies none in favor of Barlow. He refers to "Haddan on Bramhall," who makes the gratuitous assumption that Barlow must have been consecrated on the 11th of June with the Bishop of Norwich, and took their seats together in the House of Lords, Barlow taking the lower place. But if both were consecrated together, would Barlow not take the higher place by virtue of his senior appointment? But Cromwell's document, dated June 12th, to the Garter King at Arms, in which Barlow is described as Bishop elect, has since been discovered, which clearly proves that the consecration of Parker could not have taken place on the 11th, and that Haddan's assumption is without foundation. We know, furthermore, that Lancaster, another reformer, conferred orders on the strength of his election without being consecrated, and they were not called into question. Cranmer, Barlow's Primate, whose duty it was to see that he was consecrated, has laid down the following rules as valid for consecration, and upon which, no doubt, he was prepared to act. "In the New Testament he that is appointed to be bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." (Collier, vol. ii. p. 49) But we have seen that in 1662 the Anglicans considered these rules insufficient for the consecration of a bishop, and had them altered. Therefore, if Barlow ever consecrated according to Cranmer's Calvinistic rite, even from an Anglican point of view the

consecration would, to say the least, be questionable. Recognizing the fact, then, that there were not three real bishops to consecrate, and that the old English rite for consecration was not used, but that in its stead Cranmer's Calvinistic rite, which afterwards the Anglicans rejected on the ground of insufficiency for valid consecration, our Anglican friends must not be surprised if those who have retained the Apostolic succession, the Greeks, the Russians, as well as the Roman Catholics, look upon the Parkerite succession as open to reproach and as not having the true and inviolable seal of the priesthood stamped upon it in the beginning. Dr. Stapleton, a contemporary writer, remarks: "Now the pretended bishops of Protestantism, whereas the whole number of our learned and reverend pastors for confessions of the truth were displace of their rooms, none being left in the realm having authority to consecrate bishops or make priests, that being the office of only bishops, by what authority do they govern Christ's flock. Who laid hands upon them?"

Whither were they to be consecrated, into France, Spain, or Germany, seeing at home there was no number of those that might and would serve their turn?

I say, therefore, by the verdict of Holy Scripture, and practice of the Primitive Church, these men are no bishops. I speak nothing of the laws of the realm, it had been of late sufficiently proved they are no bishops if they be tried thereby. But let them be tried by Scripture. . . . Your pretended bishops have no such ordination as the ancient bishops had, no authority to make true priests or ministers, and, therefore, neither are ye true ministers, neither are they any bishops at all."

Great as the historical difficulties are, the theological ones are more glaring; to touch upon them now would occupy too much of your valuable space, which I fear, dear sir, I have already trespassed upon too much. I may turn to them another time.

JOSEPHUS.

## ST. PATRICK'S CATECHISM CLASS.

REV. FATHER MARTIN CALLAGHAN ON BAPTISM.

Rev. Martin Callaghan delivered an instruction on Sunday afternoon to seven hundred children who attended the catechism classes at St. Patrick's Church. The subject was baptism by water and how it may be administered. This Sacrament, said the rev. father, may be administered by aspersion, immersion and ablution. Each of these methods was regarded by the Catholic Church as being valid. He dwelt at length upon baptism by ablution, which is the method adopted by the priests of the Catholic Church.

Before the instruction, J. P. Rowan, accompanied by Professor Fowler, sang in faultless style the "Angel's Serenade," and Professor M. Sullivan and J. Shea, one of his pupils, gave a well-executed violin duet.

Father Callaghan announced that on December 9th, the day after the feast of the Immaculate Conception, he would entertain the children of the catechism classes at a sacred concert, in honor of the great feast.

## THE DIVISION OF THE PARISHES.

Mr. S. Baudin, Q.C., of Baudin & Cardinal, left for England yesterday to plead the St. Blaise parish case before the Privy Council. The trouble arises out of the proposed gerrymander of three parishes, corners of which it is intended to cut off in order to form a new one. The rights of the Protestant minority are also at issue in the case. Mr. Baudin was escorted to the Central Vermont train for New York by a number of friends, among whom being Dr. Lachapelle, M.P.; Mr. Pelletier, M.P.; Mr. P. Leclair, M.P.; Dr. Rodier, and Mr. E. Marquette. Mr. Baudin sails for Southampton on the steamship Paris.

## A REQUIEM MASS.

At 7 45 to-morrow morning a grand requiem Mass and commemoration service will be held in Notre Dame Church for the repose of the souls of those who are buried in the Cote des Neiges cemetery. The clergy extend not only an invitation to the worshippers of Notre Dame, but to every one, and especially to those who have friends buried in the Catholic cemetery. The whole of the seats in the sacred edifice will be free.