

## ANGLICAN ORDERS

### AN INTERESTING LETTER AND A COMMENT THEREON

To the Editor, N.Z. Tablet.

Reverend and Dear Sir,—Once more let me express my deep appreciation of the trouble Father Goggan has gone to in placing before your readers and myself the Roman Catholic position in respect to Anglican Orders. When Cranmer drew up the Edwardine Ordinal, no doubt he eviscerated the old Pontifical of many of the *res gravissimæ* which help to make a valid ordination and a valid consecration; especially in the omission of all reference to a Sacrifice, and a Sacrificial priesthood. Personally, I have no sympathy with the adventitious Protestantism that has overlaid and warped the meaning of the fundamentally Catholic character of the formularies of the Church of England, but if that Church has no valid Orders, if the Apostolic Succession is broken, if there is no Real Presence of our Blessed Lord in the Holy Eucharist, why is it that so many distinguished and learned ecclesiastics who have studied these matters adhere to her communion? An acquaintance of mine sent me last week the enclosed extract from the *Guardian* (which you can publish at your discretion) by which you will see it claimed that the Anglican hierarchy is derived rather from Archbishop Laud than from Parker. I did not press this point in my last letter because I more particularly wanted, in the first instance, the questions of 'Defect of Form, and Defect of Intention' in the Anglican rites explained. I presume, therefore, that the same arguments will apply to Laud and his successors as to Parker. I recognise the subject as one which could be enlarged upon to an almost illimitable extent, but which is hardly adapted to the popular taste. Although I can appreciate it, I am not quite prepared yet to accept the Roman Catholic point of view as the only absolutely correct one. I have, however, been given a good deal to think about, and I feel that I cannot be sufficiently grateful to Father Goggan for his kindness in enlightening me on many points where I have hitherto been in error, and to you, Sir, for placing your columns at disposal for the discussion of this (to me) very interesting subject.

Again thanking you for your fair and courteous treatment, I am, etc.,

Hamilton.

JOHN W. WARREN.

The extract from the *Guardian* (June 10, 1908) referred to above by our esteemed correspondent contains a lengthy report of a lecture delivered at Queen's Hall on Anglican Orders by Bishop Mathew, the newly consecrated Old Catholic Bishop for England. The extract in question is too long for insertion here. The following are the relevant parts of it:—Objections to the validity of Anglican Orders have been advanced on various grounds, both historical and theological. Of these, the historical objection might be reduced to one—the alleged uncertainty as to the Episcopate of Barlow, the consecrator of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury. Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, December 17, 1559, Barlow officiating, assisted by the Roman Catholic Bishop Hodgkins and the Edwardine Bishops Scory and Coverdale. Was Barlow a Bishop?

But granting Lingard and other fair-minded Roman Catholic authors to have been wrong in supposing Barlow not to have been consecrated, would that fact affect Barlow? Certainly not. It is impossible to deny that all the essential elements of a valid consecration were present when Parker received the Episcopate. Three Bishops—the validity of whose Orders were never questioned—prayed, imposed hands, and uttered a form—meagre, no doubt, but not more than the extemporaneous forms of the earliest times. Consequently Parker became a real Bishop, and those who derive their succession from him are indeed true bishops. From time to time other lines of succession have united with that of Parker. For instance, Antonio de Dominis, who was Roman Catholic Bishop of Segna in 1600, and Archbishop of Spalato in 1602, joined the Church of England, and was Dean of Windsor. He was one of the co-consecrators of George Montaigne, Bishop of London, and of Nicholas Felton, Bishop of Ely. These two Bishops were co-consecrators of Archbishop Laud, from whom the present Anglican hierarchy derives. Moreover, in Ireland, under Elizabeth, only two Roman bishops were deposed. Of these Hugh Curwen, Archbishop of Dublin, had been consecrated by Bonner, Thirlby, and Griffin during Mary's reign. Three of Laud's co-consecrators derived their succession from Curwen, and not from Parker, so that in Laud three lines of succession met, and the Anglican succession descends from this united succession.

The historical objection therefore fails, and the liturgical one is absurd inasmuch as it would render all primitive ordinations null. The *Guardian* extract concludes with a reference to the episcopal consecrations performed in France by Talleyrand, who is described as 'an avowed atheist.' He is described as 'the chosen starter of the new episcopal system' in France during the Revolution, and, with others, is alleged by the Old Catholic Bishop Mathew to be the source of 'the French ordinations of today.'

### A COMMENT.

I.

The 'Old Catholic Bishop for England' displays a bountiful unacquaintance with the history of the controversy on Anglican Orders. He misstates both the historical and the theological objections to the validity of Anglican Orders and substantially misrepresents the grounds of the constant denial of that validity by the Catholic Church from the days of the first publication and use of the Edwardine Ordinal down to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* of Pope Leo XIII., issued on September 18, 1896. (1) It has been repeatedly stated that the Catholic Church denies the validity of Anglican Orders (in the Catholic sense), and re-ordains absolutely those of the Anglican clergy who 'go over to Rome' and are accepted as candidates for the sacred ministry. It has also been frequently pointed out that this action is based upon the following well known Catholic doctrine: That it is necessary for validity that the person who administers a Sacrament (including, of course, the Sacrament of Holy Orders) should not alone employ a proper form of words, but that he should also have a proper intention. But—as Cardinal Legate Pole declared in Queen Mary's day, and as Leo XIII. declared in 1896—the form and intention of the Church were 'not observed' in the ordinations and consecrations performed under the Ordinal of Edward VI., which was drawn up by Cranmer and his English fellow-reformers for the direct purpose of emphasising and perpetuating their denial of, and deadly hostility to, a Sacrifice and a Sacrificing priesthood and an episcopate as the sole channel of Holy Orders. All this has been amply demonstrated in previous articles by our learned contributor, Father Goggan. (2) These defects are of the most fundamental kind. They are wholly independent of any defects that may have arisen out of the doubt (which still exists) as to Barlow's consecration as bishop, or out of the omission of the Edwardine Ordinal to provide for the handing of the insignia or instruments of office to the priest at his ordination or to the bishop at his consecration. The Bull of 1896 made no pronouncement upon these doubtful defects in the Anglican succession. It left these doubts precisely where it found them. (3) Bishop Mathew is wrong in assuming that the validity of the consecration of three of the four bishops present at Parker's consecration was 'never questioned.' Barlow's consecration was and is questioned; and Scory and Coverdale, consecrated by the Edwardine Ordinal of 1552, cannot be admitted by the Catholic Church to be bishops. (4) Even if Barlow (Parker's consecrator) were beyond all doubt a bishop, he could not (as has been already amply shown) have conveyed the office of bishop to another by a form that had been so substantially mutilated as that of the Edwardine Ordinal. For the form for the ordination of a priest contained no reference whatever to the sacrificial power, which is the primary and essential function of the priesthood—this had been thrown aside 'with heretical intent'; and the form for the consecration of a bishop contained no reference whatever to the office of a bishop. So much so, that Lingard could suggest that this latter form was as suitable for the appointment of a parish clerk as for the consecration of a bishop. A whole General Council of bishops, with the Pope at their head, could not confer either deaconship or priesthood or the episcopate by the form contained in the Edwardine Ordinal. (5) In all the circumstances, it seems passing strange to read, in the report of Bishop Mathew's lecture, the statement that 'it is impossible to deny that all the essential elements of a valid consecration were present when Parker received the episcopate.' Not only is such a denial possible; it is actually well known, dating back for centuries—ever since the consecration of Parker in 1559, as Elizabethan archbishop of Canterbury, by the invalid Edwardine form from which Anglican Orders are derived. Nay, more: the denial of the validity of Anglican ordinations and consecrations, in the Catholic sense, is common, not alone to Catholics, but to the Eastern Churches, and even to the great body of Anglicans themselves. (6) Bishop Mathew's reference to the 'meagre' forms of the earlier times has been already amply anticipated and answered in previous comments. Here we may merely remark that every rite of ordination and consecration of sacred ministers acknowledged by the Church, both in East and West, has the following characteristics: (a) They all clearly and expli-

'It's selling well, because it's satisfying well.' Hondai Lanka Tea represents 'the most for the money.'

'Be kind tae auld Grannie.' Ladies appreciate a box of Hondai Lanka as a Christmas present.