

citly mention the Order to be conferred (this is not done in the Edwardine Ordinal); (b) they contain a prayer for the grace proper to the specific Order (this is not done in the Edwardine Ordinal); and (c) the form of words is pronounced simultaneously with the imposition of hands (in the Edwardine Ordinal the form is insufficient and of no effect). These characteristics are found in the Roman Ordinal, the ancient Gallican Ordinal, the Greek, the Syro-Maronite, the Alexandrian Jacobite, the Syrian Jacobite, the Nestorian, the Armenian, the Liturgy of the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, etc., etc.

## II.—Laud and His Consecrators.

Our esteemed correspondent, Mr. Warren, is right in his surmise that 'the same arguments will apply to Laud and his successors as to Parker.' This will be readily seen from the following facts: (1) The (Calvinistic) Edwardine Ordinal, with which we are here concerned, was attached to the (Calvinistic) Second Book of Common Prayer when it was published in 1552. It contained the defective and invalid forms of ordination and consecration described above, under the figure (4) in the first part of our remarks on Mr. Warren's communication. On the accession of Queen Mary, the Catholic religion was for a time restored in England, and the Edwardine Ordinal was abolished. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the Edwardine Ordinal was again restored. It continued unaltered till the year 1662. (2) In that year (1662) Parliament somewhat improved the forms of ordination and consecration by adding clauses defining the nature of the Orders imparted. But (a) this improvement came too late, for, in the hundred and ten years during which the invalid forms of the Edwardine Ordinal had been in use (from 1552 to 1662), the true episcopate had died out completely, the apostolic succession was broken, and the ministry of the Anglican Church had become, in the Catholic sense, laymen only. And, as laymen, they could not, no matter under what form, transmit a spiritual power and jurisdiction which they did not possess. (b) Moreover (as already been pointed out in previous articles, by citing authorities), the terms 'priest' and 'bishop' have not, even in this amended form of 1662, their old Catholic meaning, nor was the amended Ordinal intended to create a sacrificing priesthood—on the contrary, this idea was as strongly repudiated as ever.

(3) Laud was made Bishop of St. David's on June 29, 1621. Be it noted (a) that he was consecrated under the defective and insufficient forms of the Edwardine Ordinal; (b) that no mention was made therein of the particular Order conferred upon him; (c) that this consecration took place forty-one years before Parliament, in 1662, defined the nature of the Orders imparted; and (d) that Laud had previously been ordained under the same Edwardine Ordinal, from which all reference to a Sacrifice and a Sacrificing priesthood had been cast aside by Cranmer and his Calvinistic fellow-Reformers. (4) With such a mutilated and defective form, even a whole bench of true bishops, or a General Council of bishops, with the Pope at their head, could not validly confer on Laud either the power of a sacrificing priesthood or an episcopate in the Catholic sense. (5) Moreover, we might quote at considerable length from the *Canones Ecclesiastici* of 1603; from *The Holy Table, Name and Thing* (1637); from *Wood's Annals*; from *The Booke of Common Prayer* (London, 1634); from the *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* of 1640; from Clarendon and Bramhall and Collier and numerous other works, to show, beyond yea or nay, that the Anglican Church of Laud's time, both in England and in Ireland, utterly repudiated and abhorred the idea of a Sacrifice and a Sacrificing priesthood. So that, even if Laud had been both ordained priest and consecrated bishop by true bishops, with a valid form of words, he would not have been a priest or a bishop in the Catholic sense, for lack of the proper intention in those who ordained and consecrated him. But he was both ordained and consecrated (a) with an invalid form, and (b) without the proper intention; and (c) his consecrators were not bishops but laymen. There was no true bishop at his consecration. All those present had been both ordained and consecrated under the defective and invalid Edwardine Ordinal. It in no way helps the case for Anglican Orders to state that Antonio De Dominis, the 'lapsed' Catholic Archbishop of Spalato, aided in the consecration of two of the Anglican bishops who were present at the consecration of Laud. For De Dominis was not their consecrator; he only assisted. But even if he had been their consecrating prelate, he could not have either validly ordained or validly consecrated with the defective form of the Edwardine Ordinal, even if he had the proper intention to do what the Church does. It only remains to add that De Dominis afterwards returned as a humble penitent to the Church, and died in the unity of the faith.

## III.—Talleyrand and the French Episcopate.

In the *Guardian* report of the Old Catholic Bishop Mathew's lecture on Anglican Orders, the facts of the episcopal consecrations by Talleyrand and others in France during the Revolution are grievously misstated. Talleyrand had many sins and follies to answer for, but no one can lay to his charge an avowal of atheism at the time that he consecrated the constitutional bishops. The facts, stated in the briefest terms, are these: (1) Talleyrand was made Bishop of Autun (France) in 1788. In 1790 he (improperly) accepted the (revolutionary) civil constitution of the clergy and resigned his See. In February, 1791, he, sacrilegiously and in defiance of papal briefs, but validly, consecrated the (schismatical) bishops of L'Aisne and Finisterre. But, so far from being an avowed atheist at that very time, Talleyrand was a believing, though perverse and rebellious, Catholic, and (says the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (publiée par MM. Firmin Didot Frères, Paris) he protesta hautement de son attachement au Saint Siège' (loudly protested his devotion to the Holy See'). In 1801 the unhappy man obtained from Pope Pius VII. the cancellation of the decree of excommunication pronounced against him in 1791. He (no longer, of course, acting as bishop) was also permitted by the Holy See to exercise lay functions—but was never allowed by the Holy See to marry. His consecration of the two constitutional bishops was irregular and sacrilegious, but there are absolutely no grounds whatever for supposing that these consecrations were invalid. On the contrary, we are bound to assume that Talleyrand intended to do what the Catholic Church intends, and to give Catholic Orders according to Catholic doctrine. He had, moreover, the power, and used the full and proper forms of the Church. And Catholic writers have ever maintained, and the Papal Bull of 1896 declares, that 'when anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the "form" and "matter" requisite for effecting and conferring the Sacrament, he is considered by that very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle,' continues the Bull, 'the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptised, provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed' [as in the case of the Edwardine Ordinal], 'with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of a Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to, and destructive of, the Sacrament.'

This disposes of the difficulty arising out of the two irregular and schismatical consecrations performed by Talleyrand. Of the 136 bishops in France in those terrible times, only four (of whom Talleyrand was one) proved faithless to their sacred trust. But although rebellious, and excommunicated as schismatics, they still were, as ordaining or consecrating prelates, Christian bishops using in their fulness the Church's established forms. It was, of course, a grave and (as Pius VI. said) 'execrable' scandal. But the Old Catholic Bishop is wholly in error in stating that French episcopal consecrations were performed at that time by 'avowed atheists,' and that 'the French ordinations of to-day' are derived from bishops so consecrated. Bishop Mathew's lecture is, throughout, marked by much inaccuracy and exaggeration, and by more than a reasonable share of bitterness. There is no evidence whatever that any one of the 'constitutional' bishops consecrated during the storm and stress of the French Revolution was invalidly consecrated. The whole presumption is quite the other way. For the rest, both the legitimate bishops (who were in exile) and the 'constitutional' intruders were compelled by the Pope and Napoleon, in the interests of peace, to resign their bishoprics into the hands of the Pope. Those who refused were excommunicated and deprived of their sees by the Pope. The bishoprics were then reorganised, with new boundaries, in accordance with the provisions of the Concordat, and they were filled (also by virtue of provisions in the Concordat) by ecclesiastics nominated by Napoleon, and canonically appointed and confirmed by the Holy See. These facts may be found in any history of modern France, or in any general history of the Church.

A final word on Talleyrand. This witty but unworthy ecclesiastic, with all his faults, makes, on the whole, a rather favorable contrast with many of Elizabeth's parliamentary or 'constitutional' prelates. His follies, and the scandals he caused, grievously afflicted the Church in France. But among his many follies, atheism was not one; and among his sins cannot be counted that of exercising episcopal functions while avowing a disbelief in God. His biographers tell how, in later years, he yearned for full reconciliation with the Holy See, how he engaged in pious conferences and devotional exercises with the Abbé

'I wish ye weel' A box of Hondai Lanka makes a splendid Christmas greeting. A substantial gift!

'Begin the New Year right!' Commence using 'Hondai Lanka' Pure Ceylon Tea—delicious and most economical.