

of Baptism was regarded as a matter of disciplinary importance—but not of doctrinal necessity, even as a condition for receiving Orders. Thus the Reformed Church of England ceased to believe in priests and bishops in the Catholic sense. And this change of belief found ample expression in the new Ordinal of King Edward VI. Thus, every trace of the old Catholic teaching of Sacrifice, consecration, priesthood was utterly rejected and struck out. Catholic Orders were spoken and written about in terms of the bitterest hatred and contempt, and the innovators were, in fact, at great pains to make it as clear as the noonday sun that their idea of Holy Orders was essentially different from that of the Catholic Church, and that, in the new Ordinal, nothing was farther from their minds than the conferring of priestly or episcopal Orders in the Catholic sense.

There is ample proof in their life and acts that the beliefs regarding Catholic Orders referred to above were shared by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Parker (see, for instance, Article 25 of 1562, to which these three subscribed). With such beliefs, there could, of course, be no intention to confer or receive the Sacrament of Holy Orders, or the episcopal office, as instituted by Christ and taught by the Catholic Church; and, for defect of intention, as well as of form, any ordination or consecration so performed would be null and void.

VI.

Before resuming, it may not be out of place to say that Hodgkins (formerly suffragan of Bedford) was consecrated by John Stokesly, Bishop of London, in 1537. There is no doubt as to his consecration. He was a friend of Cranmer, joined the new faith, abjured Protestantism in Queen Mary's reign, and 'verted again to the new creed under Elizabeth. At the consecration ceremony of Archbishop Parker, he wore a surplice. After the ceremony both Barlow and Scory got bishoprics, but of Hodgkins nothing further is stated.

The various points raised by Mr. Warren in regard to the form used—the *porrectio instrumentorum* and the intention of the consecrators—have been already touched on. Let us now look back at the ceremony of Sunday, December 17, 1559, and at the person, Matthew Parker, who was then consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Matthew Parker was once chaplain to Anne Boleyn. Afterwards, as Dean of Lincoln, he sat on the commission that framed the Articles of Religion of 1552, and was the head of the commission for the Thirty-nine Articles in 1562. He was the man whom naturally Queen Elizabeth elected to be Archbishop of Canterbury and the chief instrument for propagating the new creed. In September, 1559, she issued a commission for his consecration. The bishops with Sees refused to act and were deprived of their Sees; fifteen other bishops with Sees resigned, and Kitchen of Llandaff was actually the only bishop in Great Britain at the time who had a See. Cecil (Secretary of State) then wrote (*State Papers, Domestic, Queen Eliz.*, vol. 5): 'There is no Archb. nor iij bishopps to be had.' But the law required these for the election of the Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury). The second difficulty was with regard to the Ordinal. The ancient Pontifical of Salisbury had just been set aside by Elizabeth; the Ordinal of Edward VI. had been formally abolished in Queen Mary's reign and had not been restored. 'This booke is not established by Parlement,' wrote Cecil, Secretary of State. These were the two difficulties to be overcome. Cecil consulted Parker and the canonists, and it was decided that 'the Queen, by virtue of her ecclesiastical supremacy, could supply every defect' (Styrpe's *Parker*, 40). The second commission was issued on December 6, 1559, and in the actual consecration the Lambeth Register tells us that the Ordinal used was the one '*juxta formam libri auctoritate parlamenti editi* (in accordance with the form contained in the book published by authority of Parliament). According to Canon 2 of the Fourth Council of Carthage, 'two bishops held a copy of the Gospels over the bent head and neck of the bishop to be consecrated, the consecrator pronounced the form, and the other bishops present imposed hands and touched his head.' In the consecration of Parker this was not done, but the whole four imposed hands and said these words as the form: 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness. Even F. G. Lee in his *Church Under Queen Elizabeth* (vol. i.) admits that 'in these records there was no specification of the office to be conferred.' There was no unction, no delivery of a pastoral staff (though the 1549 Ordinal of Edward VI. enjoins it as a rite). Be it noted though that the Lambeth Register informs us that, after the imposition of hands, a copy of the Bible was put in Parker's hands, 'as it is meete should of a *Gospellike pastor*' (*Histeriola*, 1574).

All the facts, or at least the leading ones, are placed before your readers and will, I trust, convince them, and perhaps also Mr. Warren, that the Church's attitude towards Anglican Orders is not one of mere antagonism, but is founded on fact.

There is little need to add anything further in regard to the attempt made by Laud and Williams, a century after the consecration of Parker, to revalidate Anglican Orders. In the first place, even if the additions they made to the Ordinal had made the form of ordination and consecration right in itself, that alteration came too late; for a century had elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal, the Hierarchy had become extinct, and there remained no power of ordaining or consecrating, since the courtesy bishops of the time could not pass on to others a power which they themselves had not received. In the second place, it cannot (as stated above) be admitted that the words 'priest' and 'bishop' introduced into the Ordinal in the days of Laud and Williams are to be understood in the same sense in which they are understood in the Catholic rite of ordination and consecration. Of this we have already spoken. And in the third place, the question of the validity of the Baptism of persons in Anglican Orders has to be deeply considered. Reference has already been made to this subject. Baptism is the gate of the other Sacraments, that of Holy Orders included. We will merely add here that an Anglican clergyman, when received into the Catholic Church, receives Baptism conditionally—that is, the 'certainty' of his baptism is not conceded' (*Protestant Orders*, p. 105).

Mr. Warren states that the historian, Dr. Dollinger, at the Bonn Conference, 1874, said: 'The result of my investigation is that I have no manner of doubt as to the validity of the Episcopal succession in the English Church.' But, in the first place, this is a question of theology as much as it is a question of history, and theology was not a subject in which the noted German shone. In the second place, Dollinger was then not alone in an advanced old age, and with intellectual powers on the wane; but he was just at that time at the height of his hostility to the Church which he had abandoned; and it is to be feared that his desire to bring adherents to the 'Old Catholic Party' (of which he was the leader) may have turned topsyturvy his well-garnered storehouse of historical lore. He lived long enough to see the error of his ways. We were told that his eyes were yearningly turning to the Mother Church, which pride of intellect had led him to forsake, when death suddenly claimed him.

VII.

Many of your readers will, no doubt, remember the commission set up by Pope Leo XIII., in 1896, to consider the question of Anglican Orders and their validity. This inquiry was made by the late Pontiff at the request of a section of Anglicans. The whole Anglican case was stated in a work written in Latin (*De Re Anglicana*, with a preface by the Anglican Bishop of Salisbury) with a view to its use by Latin theologians. Copies of it were distributed gratis to a number of the Roman authorities. The Rev. Mr. Puller and the Rev. Mr. Lacy were sent to Rome to interview members of the commission. They remained for some months in the Eternal City endeavoring to influence those Cardinals who had any say in the expected decision; and (we are told) 'the Anglican leaders most identified with the movement have repeatedly expressed their entire satisfaction with the way in which the commission was composed, and with the way in which the eminent Catholics who represented their claims acquitted themselves of their task' (*London Tablet*, September 26, 1896).

That Commission sifted every fact, scanned every Ordinal, and laid their finding at the feet of the Vicar of Christ. It was then (September 13, 1896) that Leo XIII., in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, declared Anglican Orders to be invalid on account of defect of form and defect of intention. For us, Catholics, the question of the validity of Anglican Orders remains finally settled. The *Apostolicæ Curæ* did not make them invalid—they were invalid always, on account of the above-stated defects. Some ill-informed persons think that once the Church has made a pronouncement, we Catholics are forbidden all freedom of research. The above jottings will, I trust, convince them of the fallacy of their opinion, and enable them to realise that we live in a time when it becometh every Catholic to be ready to 'give an account of the faith that is in him.'

Messrs. Smith and Smith, Ltd., Dunedin, and also at Wellington and Christchurch, are designers and makers of stained glass windows for ecclesiastical and domestic purposes, also leaded lights. They are agents for the Metallic Roofing Company's Metallic steel ceilings and walls, and importers of artists' materials, brushes, plaques, and all requisites suitable for convent schools.