

## ANGLICAN ORDERS.

## Questions as to Their Validity.

## The Historical Aspect.

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 times 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 those 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 feel 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 first prove his claim by producing proofs that he has a right to wear the gown and practice law to the satisfaction of those amongst whom he aspires to rank. If everyone who would be a Lord, is to be acknowledged as 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 do not bear them out. From the one great fact of the old English rite for administering sacraments being mutilated, and for doctrinal purposes, almost destroyed by the so-called Reformers, on them lies the *onus pro-oundingi* 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 admitted, 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 true and 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 such exercise 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 may be followed by fatal consequences 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, which is open to all. But care must be taken 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 sub-

ject. 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 claims fully beyond all doubt, 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 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 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 venerable 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, 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 priors 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." (Collin, Eccl. History, vol. vi.) 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 law 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., Rit. ii., c. i., art.) Now is it 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 consecrating hands upon Parker, the Queen was forced to have recourse to another expedient, fall back upon her Supremacy and seek her way out of difficulty as best she could. She had already deposed all the Catholic bishops, Kitchen excepted, 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, Covordale and Hodgkyns, who induced to come to her assistance to hand down to Parker apostolic succession. Not one of those men be it known, 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 attempted to marry incur excommunication by the 10th 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 has 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 Covordale beyond all question, 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 recast. Hodgkyns was a real bishop, but was only an assistant at Parker's consecration. History tells us that Barlow was elected Bishop of St. Davids 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 installation is further proved by the fact of his being styled Bishop *elect* of St. Davids 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 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.

Hadden, 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 was he not referred to by his proper title by the 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 for Barlow. He refers to "Hadden on Branshall," who makes the gratuitous assertion that Barlow must have been consecrated on the 11th of June with the Bishop of Norwich, and that they took their seats together in the House of Lords, *Barlow taking the lower place*. But if both were consecrated together would Barlow not be entitled to take the *higher* place by virtue of his senior appointment. Cromwell's document, dated June 12th, to the Garter King at Arms, in which he described Barlow 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 Hadden'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 Pri-

mato, 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 to be appointed 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 were 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 grounds 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 not having the true and inviolable seal of the priesthood stamped upon it in the beginning.

Dr. Stapleton, a contemporary writer, sums up the case with the following trenchant remarks; "Now the pretended Bishops of Protestantism, whereas the whole number of our learned and reverend Pastors for confession of the truth were displaced 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 went 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 'those men are no Bishops. I speak nothing of the laws of the realm; it hath 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 space. I may turn to them another time.

JOSEPHUS.

Mr. G. H. Jenkins, brother of the late Louis J. Jenkins, the well-known member of Parliament, is dead.

One of the most remarkable bets that were made in the result of the recent election in New York state was that between two citizens of Binghamton. The wager was offered \$100 to one cent, that Morton would defeat Hill, with this proviso, that for every Morton received in excess of Hill, the Democrat should pay one cent to the Republican. Thus; if Morton were elected by 10,000 plurality, the loser would pay \$100, but as Morton's plurality is now over 150,000 there is due \$1,500. The \$100 and the one cent were put up, and the winner insists upon exacting the full conditions of the wager.

So rapidly does lung irritation spread and deepen, that often in a few weeks a simple cough culminates in tubercular consumption. Give heed to a cough, there is always danger in delay, get a bottle of Buckle's Anti-Consumptive Syrup, and cure yourself. It is a medicine unsurpassed for all throat and lung troubles. It is compounded from several herbs, each one of which stands at the head of the list as exerting a wonderful influence in curing consumption and all lung diseases.