

there still bears upon it a few remaining rags and tatters of the Penal Code, just as the blue-gum retains upon its limbs the fragments of last year's discarded bark. In the United Kingdom the chief disabilities that remain refer to certain restrictions as to public employments, the religious Orders, and the accession oath, which binds the Sovereign to single out, for calumny and insult, the Catholic faith alone of all the ten thousand creeds within the boundaries of his far-flung Empire. In Germany, or in any other civilised country, there exists nothing comparable to that 'relic of barbarism,' the accession oath that is still forced upon British royalty. Nor does the Fatherland make legal bound or bar in regard to the State positions which Catholics may hold. Nevertheless, the triumph of our German co-religionists over the Kulturkampf has left numerous religious disabilities to be overcome. So much was made clear by a paper read by Herr Marx, at the Düsseldorf Congress, on 'The Present Situation of German Catholics.' 'The Jesuits and kindred Orders,' says the *Catholic Times* summary, 'are yet excluded. In Prussia no religious Orders whatever can settle down without having first obtained the sanction of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Worship. The Orders cannot even receive a new member without a similar approbation. According to the Constitution of Saxony, no convent or monastery can be erected, and no religious Order admitted into the Kingdom. Members of religious communities who devote themselves to the care of the sick can engage in their work only as private individuals and by permission of the State authorities. There is not a single religious Order for men in Wurtemberg or Baden.' In Mecklenburg the Government determines where, and how often, Mass is to be celebrated. A priest who is not a native cannot say Mass in Brunswick unless he has obtained permission from the Ministry of State. In some parts of Germany attempts are regularly made to exclude Catholics from the highest public positions. But in course of time all these grievances will be redressed. The Centre Party are lessening them one by one.'

ANGLICAN ORDERS

SOME OBJECTIONS AND REPLIES

The following letter has been sent to us for publication by Mr. John W. Warren, architect, Hamilton:—

To the Editor, *N.Z. Tablet*.)

Sir,—My attention was drawn to your issue of the 24th September, wherein you quote a writer in the *Dominion*, who says, *inter alia* (referring to the Bishops who consecrated Parker): 'It is a matter of history that these men, not only did not themselves believe in Orders in the Catholic historic sense, but they used a new form of ordination, etc.' That Barlow expressed contempt for his own orders is admitted, but no such imputation can attach itself to Scory, Coverdale, or Hodgkins. As to the insufficiency of the Ordinal, was it in the words or the acts of the consecrating bishops? The form used was taken from the Latin Pontifical, where its intention is determined by the context, and to which is added in the English book a quotation from S. Paul to S. Timothy, which leaves no doubt as to what Order is intended to be conferred. With respect to the acts, there is no question as to the imposition of hands, and if the *porrectio instrumentorum* was not included—well, this ceremony had been unknown in the Church for 1000 years, was only introduced into Western Ordinals in the eleventh century, and is not found in Eastern rites. Again, if the Anglican Church lost valid Orders at the time alleged—viz., at the consecration of Parker—did she not recover them in the consecration of Laud and Williams, in whom converged the three lines of the Italian, Irish, and English succession? In conclusion, let me quote the opinion of Dr. Dollinger, expressed at the Bonn Reunion Conference in 1874: '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.—I am, etc.,

Hamilton.

JNO. W. WARREN.

COMMENTS AND REPLIES.

By the Rev. W. D. Goggan, S.M., St. Patrick's College, Wellington.

I.

'In which consecration, this memorable felicity came to him, that, being the seventieth Archbishop after Augustine, he was

nevertheless the only one and the first who, all that prolix and putrid papal superstition having been torn off, received consecration without the approbation of the Pope by Bull, and without those idle and more than Aaronical ornaments, gloves, rings, sandals, slippers, mitre, pallium, and such-like baubles. And much more simply did he make his beginning with prayers and invocation of the Holy Spirit, imposition of hands, pious stipulations being interposed by him; in garments, too, agreeing with the Archiepiscopal authority and gravity, and with the preaching of an admonition by a learned and pious theologian in place of a sermon, and at the end of that the receiving of the Eucharist by a crowd of most grave persons.'

Thus does Mason (ed. 1625, *Matthaeus*, with the marginal note, *Author vitae Matthaei Parker*) describe what took place between five and six in the morning, at Lambeth Chapel (London), on December 17, 1559. In Lambeth Chapel on that morning there was no altar, but a table necessary for transacting sacred things—*mensa quoque sacris peragendis necessaria, tapeto pulvinarique ornata, ad orientem sita erit* (Lambeth Register). There is to be no Mass—no Holy Sacrifice—and yet an Archbishop of Canterbury is to be consecrated. By Royal Letters Patent, dated December 6, 1559, Queen Elizabeth (as Supreme Head of the newly-established Protestant Church in England) 'commissioned Kitchin of Llandaff, Barlow (sometime of Bath), Hodgkins (sometime Suffragan of Bedford), Scory, and Coverdale (Bishops), John Salisbury (Suffragan Bishop of Thetford), and John Beale (Bishop, by Letters Patent, of Ossory in Ireland), and that the whole of them, or any four of them, were to proceed to the confirmation of the election and the consecration of Matthew Parker, Archbishop-Elect.' Kitchin, Beale, and Salisbury refused to act, and the royal mandate was complied with by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins—four men without Sees. Of these, Barlow was chosen by the Archbishop-Elect to be his consecrator. The ceremonies of consecration were carried out, not according to the old Catholic rite, but according to the new Protestant Ordinal devised by the reformer Cranmer and brought into force by Act of Parliament in 1549 in the reign of the boy-king, Edward VI. From this consecration Anglican Orders are derived.

II.

According to the law of the Catholic Church, then and now, the election and consecration of Parker were irregular anduncanonical. The question arises: Was his consecration also invalid—null and void and of no effect?

The invalidity of a consecration may arise from the impotency of the consecrators, the lack of essentials, in the form of consecration used, the defect of matter used, and the non-intention of the consecrators.

Barlow (Parker's consecrator) was in 1536 appointed to the bishopric of St. Asaph, then to that of St. David's. There was only one consecration of bishops in that year—namely, on June 11—and Barlow's name does not appear among them; 'nay,' says the Rev. M. Fillingham, Anglican vicar of Hexton (in *London Echo*, quoted in full in *London Tablet*, December 19, 1896) 'we may be almost certain that he was not consecrated then, for, the very next day, Cromwell, the Vicar-General, styles him "Bishop-Elect." . . . Apparently Barlow was never a bishop at all. Barlow consecrated Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop. There are, therefore, no Orders, no bishops, no priests in the Reformed Church of England.' In Edward's reign Barlow was transferred to Bath and Wells; in Mary's reign 'he was ejected,' and it is only known that the See was declared to be vacant by his 'deprivation and removal' (Rymer, xv., 376). In that sixth year of Queen Elizabeth—at the time he 'consecrated' Parker—he had not even yet got a See. In fact, no register of his consecration has ever been found. Barlow's statement—'that a layman should be as good a bishop as himself.

... if the King chose to make him a bishop—may, in the light of history, be a declaration of the fact that he himself was only a layman with the perquisites of a bishop—said perquisites being the gift of the Crown.

So much for Barlow. As to Scory and Coverdale: they were both consecrated in 1551 by the Edwardine Ordinal (of which more in due time), and were not acknowledged to be bishops even in Queen Mary's reign. Scory then acted as chaplain to Bonner, and was no bishop. Coverdale considered all ecclesiastical robes as 'heathen and Babylonish garments.' Even at what we shall call, for form's sake, the consecration of Parker, he donned not even a surplice, but was vested in a woollen gown—*Milo vero Coverdallus non nisi toga lanea talari utebatur* (Lambeth Register). Were Scory and Coverdale recognised as bishops in the Catholic sense of the word? No. For, in the first and chiefest place, Popes Julius III. and Paul IV. refused,

'Best for the money!' Hondai Lanka Tea is full of Quality and Delightful Flavor. It goes furthest,

'Here's where you can save!' Hondai Lanka Tea goes a third further than common blends—it's so pure!