

# The Church.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1843.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCXCII.]

VOLUME VI.—No. 32.]

## THE SUCCESSION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM THE APOSTLES.

(From the Church of England Magazine.)

"It is evident to all men diligently reading the holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church—bishops, priests, and deacons; which offices were evermore had in such reverence estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereto by lawful authority."—*Preface to the Ordination Services.*

### SERIES OF BISHOPS FROM THE APOSTLES TO THE PRESENT TIME.

St. Paul and St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome, having previously appointed Linus (a) the first bishop (Irenaeus iii. 3.).

#### BISHOPS OF ROME.

| A. D.                   | A. D.                     |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Linus.....66          | 42 Celestine.....422      |
| 2 Anacleus.....78       | 43 Sixtus III.....432     |
| 3 Clement (b).....91    | 44 Leo the Great.....440  |
| 4 Evaristus.....100     | 45 Hilary.....461         |
| 5 Alexander.....109     | 46 Simplicius.....467     |
| 6 Sixtus.....119        | 47 Felix II.....483       |
| 7 Telesphorus.....138   | 48 Gelasius.....492       |
| 8 Hyginus.....139       | 49 Anastasius II.....496  |
| 9 Pius.....142          | 50 Symmachus.....498      |
| 10 Anicetus.....157     | 51 Hormisdas.....514      |
| 11 Soter.....168        | 52 John.....523           |
| 12 Eleutherius.....176  | 53 Felix III.....526      |
| 13 Victor.....192       | 54 Boniface II.....530    |
| 14 Zephyrinus.....201   | 55 John II.....532        |
| 15 Callistus.....219    | 56 Agapetus.....535       |
| 16 Urbanus.....237      | 57 Silvester.....536      |
| 17 Pontianus.....230    | 58 Vigilius.....537       |
| 18 Anterus.....235      | 59 Pelagius.....555       |
| 19 Fabianus.....236     | 60 John III.....560       |
| 20 Cornelius.....251    | 61 Benedict.....574       |
| 21 Lucius.....252       | 62 Pelagius II.....578    |
| 22 Stephen.....253      | 63 Gregory (c).....590    |
| 23 Sixtus II.....257    | 64 Sabinius.....604       |
| 24 Dionysius.....258    | 65 Boniface III.....607   |
| 25 Felix.....269        | 66 Boniface IV.....608    |
| 26 Eutychianus.....275  | 67 Deusdedit.....615      |
| 27 Caius.....283        | 68 Boniface V.....619     |
| 28 Marcellinus.....296  | 69 Honorius.....625       |
| 29 Marcellus.....308    | 70 Severinus.....640      |
| 30 Eusebius.....310     | 71 John IV.....640        |
| 31 Melchisedech.....311 | 72 Theodor.....642        |
| 32 Silvester.....314    | 73 Martin.....649         |
| 33 Mark.....336         | 74 Eugenius.....654       |
| 34 Julius.....337       | 75 Vitalianus (d).....657 |
| 35 Liberius.....352     |                           |
| 36 Damasus.....366      |                           |
| 37 Sincerus.....384     |                           |
| 38 Anastasius.....398   |                           |
| 39 Innocent.....402     |                           |
| 40 Zosimus.....417      |                           |
| 41 Boniface.....419     |                           |

#### ARCHBISHOPS OF ARLIES.

| A. D.                    | A. D.                   |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Trophimus (e).....58   | 21 Constantinus.....392 |
| 2 Dionysius.....80       | 22 Heros.....410        |
| 3 Regulus.....85         | 23 Patroclus.....422    |
| 4 Felicitissimus.....106 | 24 Honoratus.....426    |
| 5 Gratianus.....120      | 25 Hilarius.....438     |
| 6 Ambrosius.....145      | 26 Ravennius.....449    |
| 7 Martinus.....170       | 27 Leontius.....463     |
| 8 Ingenus.....180        | 28 Eonius.....493       |
| 9 Augustinus.....200     | 29 Casarius.....502     |
| 10 Hieronymus.....220    | 30 Auxanius.....542     |
| 11 Soter.....230         | 31 Anolinus.....546     |
| 12 Marcianus.....245     | 32 Sabaudus.....556     |
| 13 Victor.....258        | 33 Licinius.....589     |
| 14 Marinus.....270       | 34 Virgilius.....591    |
| 15 Martinus II.....316   |                         |
| 16 Nicasius.....330      |                         |
| 17 Valentinus.....342    |                         |
| 18 Saturninus.....354    |                         |
| 19 Crescentinus.....365  |                         |
| 20 Concordius.....380    |                         |

#### ARCHBISHOPS OF ENGLAND.

| Canterbury.          | York.                         | A. D. |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 1 Augustine.....     |                               | 597   |
| 2 Laurence (f).....  |                               | 604   |
| 3 Mellitus (g).....  |                               | 619   |
| 4 Justus (h).....    |                               | 624   |
|                      | 1 Paulinus (i).....           | 625   |
| 5 Honorius (k).....  |                               | 627   |
| 6 Adeodatus (l)..... |                               | 655   |
|                      | 2 Ceadda (m) or St. Chad..... | 664   |
| 7 Theodore.....      |                               | 668   |
|                      | 3 Wilfrid (n) (deposed).....  | 669   |
|                      | 4 Bosa (o).....               | 678   |
|                      | 5 Wilfred (p) (deposed).....  | 688   |
| 8 Bithwald.....      | 5 St. John of Beverley.....   | 693   |
| 9 Tatwin (q).....    | 6 Wilfrid II.....             | 718   |
| 10 Northelm.....     |                               | 731   |
| 11 Cutbert.....      |                               | 735   |
| 12 Bregwin.....      | 7 Egbert.....                 | 743   |
| 13 Lambert.....      |                               | 759   |
|                      | 8 Albert.....                 | 763   |
|                      | 9 Eanbald.....                | 767   |
| 14 Athelwold.....    |                               | 781   |
|                      | 10 Eanbald II.....            | 790   |
| 15 Wulfred.....      |                               | 796   |
|                      | 11 Wulfstan.....              | 812   |
| 16 Thegild.....      |                               | 830   |
| 17 Ceolnoth.....     |                               | 830   |
|                      | 12 Wimundus.....              | 831   |
|                      | 13 Wilfrus.....               | 854   |
| 18 Athelred.....     |                               | 871   |
| 19 Plegmund.....     |                               | 891   |
|                      | 14 Ethelbald.....             | 896   |
|                      | 15 Redeward.....              | 921   |
| 20 Athelm.....       |                               | 928   |
| 21 Wulfhelm.....     |                               | 928   |
| 22 Odo.....          | 16 Wulfstan.....              | 941   |
|                      | 17 Oskitel.....               | 956   |
| 23 Dunstan.....      |                               | 959   |
|                      | 18 Oswald.....                | 972   |

(a) This is confirmed by 2 Tim. iv. in which St. Paul mentions Linus as saluting Timothy (v. 21); and this epistle was written from Rome, when St. Paul was ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand (v. 6).  
(b) This is the person mentioned in Phil. iv. 3, as St. Paul's "fellow-labourer."  
(c) Gregory was ordained bp. of Rome, 3rd Sept. 590, and in 596 he sent Augustine to convert the Saxons. Augustine was consecrated archbp. of Canterbury, 16th Nov., 597, by Virgilius, archbp. of Arles.  
(d) Vitalianus was ordained bp. of Rome 30th July, 657.  
(e) Trophimus was sent by St. Paul about A.D. 58.  
(f) Laurence was consecrated by Augustine before his death.  
(g) Mellitus was consecrated bishop of London by Augustine in 604.  
(h) Justus was consecrated bishop of Rochester by Augustine in 604.  
(i) Paulinus was consecrated by Justus, 21st July, 625.  
(j) Honorius was consecrated by Paulinus, at Lincoln.  
(k) Adeodatus was consecrated 26th March, 655, by Ithamar, who had been consecrated bishop of Rochester, by Honorius.  
(l) Chad was consecrated by Wina, bp. of Winchester, and two British bishops.  
(m) Wilfrid was consecrated in France in 664, by Agilbert, archbp. of Paris, and eleven other bishops, but he did not come to his see till 669.  
(n) Bosa was consecrated by Theodore.  
(o) Tatwin was consecrated 10th June, 731, by bishops Daniel of Winchester, Ingwald of London, Aldulf of Rochester, and Aldwin of Lichfield.  
(p) Egbert was consecrated by Theodore.  
(q) Egbert was consecrated 10th June, 731, by bishops Daniel of Winchester, Ingwald of London, Aldulf of Rochester, and Aldwin of Lichfield.

## Canterbury. York. A. D.

|                              |                                |      |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| 24 Ethelgar.....             |                                | 988  |
| 25 Sircicus.....             |                                | 989  |
|                              | 19 Adulph.....                 | 993  |
| 26 Eilric.....               |                                | 995  |
|                              | 20 Wulfstan II.....            | 1003 |
| 27 Elpheg.....               |                                | 1005 |
| 28 Livingus.....             |                                | 1013 |
| 29 Agelnoth.....             |                                | 1020 |
|                              | 21 Alfric Puttock.....         | 1023 |
| 30 Eadsius.....              |                                | 1038 |
| 31 Robert of Gemersins.....  |                                | 1050 |
|                              | 22 Kinstus.....                | 1051 |
| 32 Stigand.....              |                                | 1052 |
|                              | 23 Aldred.....                 | 1060 |
| 33 Lanfranc (a).....         | 24 Thomas of Bayeux.....       | 1070 |
| 34 Anselm.....               |                                | 1093 |
|                              | 25 Gerard.....                 | 1101 |
|                              | 26 Thomas II.....              | 1109 |
| 35 Ralph of Secz.....        |                                | 1114 |
|                              | 27 Thurstan.....               | 1119 |
| 36 Wm. Corbel.....           |                                | 1123 |
| 37 Theobald.....             |                                | 1139 |
|                              | 28 Henry Murdac.....           | 1147 |
|                              | 29 St. William.....            | 1153 |
|                              | 30 Roger de Bishopsgate.....   | 1154 |
| 38 Thomas Becket.....        |                                | 1162 |
| 39 Richard.....              |                                | 1174 |
| 40 Baldwin.....              |                                | 1184 |
| 41 Reginald Fitzjocelin..... | 31 Geoffrey Plantagenet.....   | 1191 |
| 42 Hubert Walter.....        |                                | 1193 |
| 43 Stephen Langton.....      |                                | 1206 |
|                              | 32 Walter de Gray.....         | 1215 |
| 44 Rich Wethershed.....      |                                | 1229 |
| 45 St. Edmund.....           |                                | 1234 |
| 46 Boniface.....             |                                | 1245 |
|                              | 33 Sewall.....                 | 1256 |
|                              | 34 Godfreyde Kintre.....       | 1258 |
|                              | 35 Walter Giffard.....         | 1265 |
| 47 Robert Kilwardby.....     |                                | 1272 |
| 48 John Peckham.....         | 36 Wm. Wickwane.....           | 1279 |
|                              | 37 John Romane.....            | 1286 |
| 49 Robert Winchelsey.....    |                                | 1294 |
|                              | 38 Henry Newark.....           | 1298 |
|                              | 39 Thomas Corbridge.....       | 1300 |
|                              | 40 Wm. Greenfield.....         | 1305 |
| 50 Walter Raynold.....       |                                | 1313 |
|                              | 41 Wm. de Melton.....          | 1317 |
| 51 Simon Mepham.....         |                                | 1328 |
| 52 John Stratford.....       |                                | 1333 |
|                              | 42 William de Zoch.....        | 1342 |
| 53 Thom. Bradwardine.....    |                                | 1349 |
| 54 Simon Islip.....          |                                | 1349 |
|                              | 43 John Thorisby.....          | 1352 |
| 55 Simon Langham.....        |                                | 1366 |
| 56 Wm. Wittlesey.....        |                                | 1368 |
|                              | 44 Alexander Nevill.....       | 1374 |
| 57 Simon Subbury.....        |                                | 1375 |
| 58 Wm. Courtney.....         |                                | 1381 |
|                              | 45 Thomas Arundell.....        | 1388 |
| 59 Thomas Arundell (b).....  | 46 Robert Waldby.....          | 1396 |
|                              | 47 Rich. Scroope.....          | 1398 |
|                              | 48 Henry Bowett.....           | 1407 |
| 60 Henry Chicheley.....      |                                | 1414 |
|                              | 49 John Kemp.....              | 1426 |
| 61 John Stafford.....        |                                | 1443 |
| 62 John Kemp.....            | 50 Wm. Booth.....              | 1452 |
| 63 Thomas Bourchier.....     |                                | 1454 |
|                              | 51 George Nevill.....          | 1464 |
|                              | 52 Law. Boleyn.....            | 1470 |
|                              | 53 Thomas Scott Rotherham..... | 1480 |
| 64 John Morton.....          |                                | 1486 |
| 65 Henry Dean.....           | 54 Thos. Savage.....           | 1501 |
| 66 William Warham.....       |                                | 1503 |
|                              | 55 Chris. Bambridge.....       | 1508 |
|                              | 56 Thos. Wolsey.....           | 1514 |
|                              | 57 Edward Lee.....             | 1531 |
| 67 Thomas Cranmer (c).....   | 58 Robt. Holgate (d).....      | 1545 |
|                              | 59 Nicholas Heath.....         | 1555 |
| 68 Reginald Pole.....        |                                | 1559 |
| 69 Matthew Parker (e).....   | 60 Thos. Young (f).....        | 1561 |
|                              | 61 Edm. Grindall.....          | 1570 |
| 70 Edmund Grindall.....      | 62 Edw. Sandys.....            | 1576 |
| 71 John Whitgift.....        |                                | 1583 |
|                              | 63 John Piers.....             | 1589 |
| 72 Richard Bancroft.....     | 64 Matt. Hutton.....           | 1595 |
|                              | 65 Tobias Matthews.....        | 1606 |
| 73 George Abbott.....        |                                | 1611 |
|                              | 66 Geo. Montaigne.....         | 1628 |
|                              | 67 Saml. Harsnet.....          | 1628 |
|                              | 68 Richard Nettle.....         | 1632 |
| 74 William Laud (g).....     |                                | 1633 |
|                              | 69 J. Williams (h).....        | 1641 |
|                              | 70 Accepted Fru-ment (i).....  | 1660 |
| 75 Gilbert Sheldon.....      |                                | 1663 |
|                              | 71 Rich. Sterne.....           | 1664 |
| 76 William Sancroft (j)..... |                                | 1678 |
|                              | 72 John Dolben.....            | 1683 |
|                              | 73 Thos. Lamplugh.....         | 1688 |
| 77 John Tillotson (m).....   | 74 John Sharp.....             | 1691 |
| 78 Thomas Tenison.....       |                                | 1694 |
|                              | 75 Sir Wm. Dawes.....          | 1714 |
| 80 William Wake.....         |                                | 1716 |
|                              | 76 Lancelot Blackburn.....     | 1724 |
| 81 John Potter.....          |                                | 1737 |
|                              | 77 Thos. Herring.....          | 1743 |
| 82 Thomas Herring.....       | 78 Matt. Hutton.....           | 1747 |
| 83 Matthew Hutton.....       | 79 John Gilbert.....           | 1757 |

### THE JUDGMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE VALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS.

(From the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, October, 1842.)

Sir,—Will you allow me space for a few words on a subject, to which, of late, attention has been turned, viz., the validity of Presbyterian Orders. Under the word Presbyterian, I include Lutheran, and indeed, all orders not episcopal.

In the discussions on this subject, two very distinct questions seem to me not unfrequently to be mixed up; namely, how the matter is in itself, and what the judgment of the Church of England respecting it is.

The judgment of the Church of England (if she has pronounced any) is doubtless an important element in the consideration of the other question: or perhaps it would be more proper to say, that with her faithful sons, it ought to conclude the other question. But still, the two questions, whether Presbyterian orders are valid, and whether the Church of England thinks them to be valid, are, in themselves, quite distinct, and, in determining the one, we ought to be careful not to rely on arguments applicable (with whatever degree of force) only to the other.

What, then, is the judgment of the Church of England in this matter? Or has she pronounced any? Does she admit the validity of Presbyterian orders, or does she reject them as invalid? Or is she silent on the point, thus leaving it, as far as her authority is concerned, an open question?

The references which have been made by the advocates of the Lutheran and Presbyterian communions to Bancroft, Bramhall, Hooker, and others of our great divines, I set aside, as irrelevant to the question now in hand. The opinions expressed by these great men, were but their private opinions, and as such, available, so far as they are available at all, in reference to the other question; but they do not advance us one step towards determining the judgment of the Church of England, because they do not even profess to be founded on, or deduced from, her authoritative decisions.

How, then, is the Church's judgment to be ascertained? There is but one way, by an appeal to her formularies. But, in making this appeal, a difficulty meets us at the outset, and one arising from a curious source, namely, the perfect clearness with which the Church has declared her mind upon the point; for, being at a loss to imagine on what grounds the question could ever have been raised, one is perplexed how to shape one's answer. Were I asked whether the present Bishop of Barbadoes was a bishop, in the view of the Church of England, on the first of last August, I should conceive that I had conclusively answered the question by saying, "No, for he was consecrated on the 24th." But, if my interrogator were to rejoin, "that is no proof, because the Church of England considers every man in priest's orders to be a bishop," I confess I should be puzzled for a reply; for what is to convince a man who could advance such a proposition? A similar difficulty embarrasses the present question. To ask whether the Church of England admits the validity of Presbyterian orders, is the same as to ask whether she considers a Presbyterian minister to be an ordained man. The simple answer is this: to require a man to be ordained before he can officiate as a minister, is to decide that he has not yet been ordained; but the Church of England requires Presbyterian ministers to be ordained before she allows them to officiate; therefore, she decides, that as yet, they have not been ordained; i.e. she rejects their so-called ordination as invalid. If the mind were divested of all prejudice, I cannot conceive how the cogency of this argument could be resisted. A Roman Catholic priest and a layman seek for office in the Church of England. She receives them both, but first ordains the former, and already ordained, the latter is not. I suppose this will not be disputed. Well, then, along with these two there is a third, a Presbyterian minister. How does the Church treat him? As the priest or as the layman? She treats him as the layman in every particular, and ordains him. Why? A plain man would be apt to say, that the treatment itself shows the reason on which it is founded; that if the Church considered him a priest, she would treat him as a priest; and therefore since she treats him as a layman, it is because she considers him one. If this is not the reason, the onus surely lies on the Presbyterian advocates to state what the reason is; and to explain why the Church, if she considers the Presbyterian minister to be on the same footing as one of his companions, yet treats him as if on the same footing as the other.

Some, indeed, do undertake to reconcile this unbecoming rule of the Church with the notion that she recognizes, or, at least, does not reject, the validity of Presbyterian orders. But I confess I have not heard anything on this side of the question that does not seem to betray an internal consciousness that the case is an untenable one. There is a vagueness, a shyness of coming fairly to the point, in the arguments used, which look very much as if those who use them feel, that clear, dogmatic assertions would entangle them in difficulties that they do not well see the way out of.

For instance, it is said that the Church of England having adopted the episcopal polity, she requires, for the sake of order and regularity, that none shall officiate within her pale, but such as are episcopally ordained. But this is only mystifying a simple question, it is not arguing. On what principle should her preference of episcopacy lead her to ordain men that are already ordained? In short, the ceremony to which she requires Presbyterian ministers to submit, is either ordination, or it is not. If it is, my argument is left untouched; it is an *ipso facto* declaration that they were not previously ordained. If it is not ordination, then it must be re-ordination; and then we shall have the Church of England perpetrating an act denounced by the universal Church as schismatical, in violation of the ancient canons to which she herself appeals, as binding her in the very matter of ordinations, and that for no reason whatsoever; for the reason alleged, namely, that it is for the sake of order and regularity that she thus sets order and regularity at defiance, has really no meaning.

To avoid this unpleasant dilemma, the ordination of Presbyterian ministers is frequently represented

## Canterbury. York. A. D.

|                                  |                                  |      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| 84 Thomas Secker(a).....         |                                  | 1758 |
|                                  | 80 Robert Hay Drummond.....      | 1761 |
| 85 Frederick Cornwallis.....     | 81 Wm. Markham.....              | 1768 |
|                                  | 82 Edw. Harcourt, (b) D.C.L..... | 1783 |
| 86 John Moore.....               |                                  | 1805 |
| 87 Chas. Manners Sutton.....     |                                  | 1805 |
|                                  | 82 Edw. Harcourt, (b) D.C.L..... | 1808 |
| 88 William Howley, D.D. (c)..... |                                  | 1828 |

### THE JUDGMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE VALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS.

(From the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, October, 1842.)

Sir,—Will you allow me space for a few words on a subject, to which, of late, attention has been turned, viz., the validity of Presbyterian Orders. Under the word Presbyterian, I include Lutheran, and indeed, all orders not episcopal.

In the discussions on this subject, two very distinct questions seem to me not unfrequently to be mixed up; namely, how the matter is in itself, and what the judgment of the Church of England respecting it is.

The judgment of the Church of England (if she has pronounced any) is doubtless an important element in the consideration of the other question: or perhaps it would be more proper to say, that with her faithful sons, it ought to conclude the other question. But still, the two questions, whether Presbyterian orders are valid, and whether the Church of England thinks them to be valid, are, in themselves, quite distinct, and, in determining the one, we ought to be careful not to rely on arguments applicable (with whatever degree of force) only to the other.

What, then, is the judgment of the Church of England in this matter? Or has she pronounced any? Does she admit the validity of Presbyterian orders, or does she reject them as invalid? Or is she silent on the point, thus leaving it, as far as her authority is concerned, an open question?

The references which have been made by the advocates of the Lutheran and Presbyterian communions to Bancroft, Bramhall, Hooker, and others of our great divines, I set aside, as irrelevant to the question now in hand. The opinions expressed by these great men, were but their private opinions, and as such, available, so far as they are available at all, in reference to the other question; but they do not advance us one step towards determining the judgment of the Church of England, because they do not even profess to be founded on, or deduced from, her authoritative decisions.

How, then, is the Church's judgment to be ascertained? There is but one way, by an appeal to her formularies. But, in making this appeal, a difficulty meets us at the outset, and one arising from a curious source, namely, the perfect clearness with which the Church has declared her mind upon the point; for, being at a loss to imagine on what grounds the question could ever have been raised, one is perplexed how to shape one's answer. Were I asked whether the present Bishop of Barbadoes was a bishop, in the view of the Church of England, on the first of last August, I should conceive that I had conclusively answered the question by saying, "No, for he was consecrated on the 24th." But, if my interrogator were to rejoin, "that is no proof, because the Church of England considers every man in priest's orders to be a bishop," I confess I should be puzzled for a reply; for what is to convince a man who could advance such a proposition? A similar difficulty embarrasses the present question. To ask whether the Church of England admits the validity of Presbyterian orders, is the same as to ask whether she considers a Presbyterian minister to be an ordained man. The simple answer is this: to require a man to be ordained before he can officiate as a minister, is to decide that he has not yet been ordained; but the Church of England requires Presbyterian ministers to be ordained before she allows them to officiate; therefore, she decides, that as yet, they have not been ordained; i.e. she rejects their so-called ordination as invalid. If the mind were divested of all prejudice, I cannot conceive how the cogency of this argument could be resisted. A Roman Catholic priest and a layman seek for office in the Church of England. She receives them both, but first ordains the former, and already ordained, the latter is not. I suppose this will not be disputed. Well, then, along with these two there is a third, a Presbyterian minister. How does the Church treat him? As the priest or as the layman? She treats him as the layman in every particular, and ordains him. Why? A plain man would be apt to say, that the treatment itself shows the reason on which it is founded; that if the Church considered him a priest, she would treat him as a priest; and therefore since she treats him as a layman, it is because she considers him one. If this is not the reason, the onus surely lies on the Presbyterian advocates to state what the reason is; and to explain why the Church, if she considers the Presbyterian minister to be on the same footing as one of his companions, yet treats him as if on the same footing as the other.

Some, indeed, do undertake to reconcile this unbecoming rule of the Church with the notion that she recognizes, or, at least, does not reject, the validity of Presbyterian orders. But I confess I have not heard anything on this side of the question that does not seem to betray an internal consciousness that the case is an untenable one. There is a vagueness, a shyness of coming fairly to the point, in the arguments used, which look very much as if those who use them feel, that clear, dogmatic assertions would entangle them in difficulties that they do not well see the way out of.

For instance, it is said that the Church of England having adopted the episcopal polity, she requires, for the sake of order and regularity, that none shall officiate within her pale, but such as are episcopally ordained. But this is only mystifying a simple question, it is not arguing. On what principle should her preference of episcopacy lead her to ordain men that are already ordained? In short, the ceremony to which she requires Presbyterian ministers to submit, is either ordination, or it is not. If it is, my argument is left untouched; it is an *ipso facto* declaration that they were not previously ordained. If it is not ordination, then it must be re-ordination; and then we shall have the Church of England perpetrating an act denounced by the universal Church as schismatical, in violation of the ancient canons to which she herself appeals, as binding her in the very matter of ordinations, and that for no reason whatsoever; for the reason alleged, namely, that it is for the sake of order and regularity that she thus sets order and regularity at defiance, has really no meaning.

To avoid this unpleasant dilemma, the ordination of Presbyterian ministers is frequently represented

## Canterbury. York. A. D.

|                                  |                                  |      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| 84 Thomas Secker(a).....         |                                  | 1758 |
|                                  | 80 Robert Hay Drummond.....      | 1761 |
| 85 Frederick Cornwallis.....     | 81 Wm. Markham.....              | 1768 |
|                                  | 82 Edw. Harcourt, (b) D.C.L..... | 1783 |
| 86 John Moore.....               |                                  | 1805 |
| 87 Chas. Manners Sutton.....     |                                  | 1805 |
|                                  | 82 Edw. Harcourt, (b) D.C.L..... | 1808 |
| 88 William Howley, D.D. (c)..... |                                  | 1828 |

### THE JUDGMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE VALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS.

(From the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, October, 1842.)

Sir,—Will you allow me space for a few words on a subject, to which, of late, attention has been turned, viz., the validity of Presbyterian Orders. Under the word Presbyterian, I include Lutheran, and indeed, all orders not episcopal.

In the discussions on this subject, two very distinct questions seem to me not unfrequently to be mixed up; namely, how the matter is in itself, and what the judgment of the Church of England respecting it is.

The judgment of the Church of England (if she has pronounced any) is doubtless an important element in the consideration of the other question: or perhaps it would be more proper to say, that with her faithful sons, it ought to conclude the other question. But still, the two questions, whether Presbyterian orders are valid, and whether the Church of England thinks them to be valid, are, in themselves, quite distinct, and, in determining the one, we ought to be careful not to rely on arguments applicable (with whatever degree of force) only to the other.

What, then, is the judgment of the Church of England in this matter? Or has she pronounced any? Does she admit the validity of Presbyterian orders, or does she reject them as invalid? Or is she silent on the point, thus leaving it, as far as her authority is concerned, an open question?

The references which have been made by the advocates of the Lutheran and Presbyterian communions to Bancroft, Bramhall, Hooker, and others of our great divines, I set aside, as irrelevant to the question now in hand. The opinions expressed by these great men, were but their private opinions, and as such, available, so far as they are available at all, in reference to the other question; but they do not advance us one step towards determining the judgment of the Church of England, because they do not even profess to be founded on, or deduced from, her authoritative decisions.











