

THE QUESTION

OF

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS

DISCUSSED.

BY

E. E. ESTCOURT, M.A. F.S.A.
CANON OF ST. CHAD'S CATHEDRAL, BIRMINGHAM.

12690

WITH AN APPENDIX OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS
AND FACSIMILES.

LIBRARY
UNIV OF
DURHAM

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES,
PORTMAN STREET AND PATERNOSTER ROW.

1873.

W. & A. B. S. & Co. Printers.

Consecration.
(see page 104)

MS. X. 5. 1. 4. 9
Ox 12
Library
201
2. 3. 4. 0

PREFACE.

THE present Work was commenced more than ten years ago, and is now published in deference to advice from those whose opinions not only ought to weigh with the Writer, but also promise safe guidance. The importance of the subject, affecting deeply the position of so considerable a body as that of the Anglican communion; the interest which for three centuries has been felt in it on both sides, and which is rather increasing than diminishing; the difficulties which confessedly surround it; the difference of opinion known to prevail among Catholic writers and theologians on more than one of the points at issue;—all lead to the belief that any attempt to contribute towards a solution of the question, if made in a spirit of fairness towards opponents and of submission to the Church, would not be unwelcome.

Perhaps an apology is due from the Writer to Catholic readers for having taken a course so different from that pursued by nearly all those who have preceded him. The difference, however, relates only to certain alleged facts of history, and the evidence commonly adduced for or against them, and does not affect any theological conclusions. And it would be generally agreed that the events connected with the commencement of the Anglican

hierarchy form an episode in the controversy which, whatever judgment is formed of those circumstances, or however engrossing may be the topics respecting them, must still leave several important questions to be dealt with quite independently of any inferences drawn from them. With regard to those events as alleged on the Anglican side; in the earlier stages of the controversy, the evidence produced in proof of their having taken place was all derived from sources accessible only to Anglican partisans; and it was therefore natural for Catholics to regard documents so produced with great suspicion, and to criticise them with extreme minuteness. In raising objections also, Catholic writers were obliged to content themselves with evidence at second-hand, not always trustworthy. And sometimes they objected to a class of documents *in globo*, on the ground of mere general assertions, without showing any—even the most remote—connection between the circumstances of suspicion and the documents in question. But now that the Public Records and the great Libraries are open to every one, it seems time to adopt a different style of argument,—to give up objections that are shown to be frivolous,—to admit evidence that would be received as sufficient in the discussion of any other subject,—and to avoid questioning the authenticity of documents without reasonable grounds, and such as attach in some special manner to the particular documents under review. Catholics have more to gain than to lose by historical investigation, as shown by the experience of the last fifty years, ever since Dr. Lingard led the way; and it is scarcely prudent to throw discredit on witnesses whom we may have occasion at another time to produce on our side. Whether the Writer has been successful in acting on such a view is left to be judged by the result; though

it must be acknowledged that he would not have ventured on taking so independent a course in public but for the advice and assistance of the Rev. W. Waterworth, S.J., and the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, to both of whom he is under the greatest obligations, for the patience with which they have read the manuscript, and the important information they supplied.

He has also to express his respectful acknowledgments to His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster for the use of two volumes of the Douay Diary; to the Right Rev. the Bishops of Newport and Shrewsbury for the loan of books and valuable information on theological points; to the Right Rev. the Bishop of Birmingham for constant encouragement and counsel throughout the work; to the Very Rev. Provost Neve, D.D., for obtaining the copy of the Abyssinian Decree and other important documents; to the Very Rev. Canon Northcote, D.D., for the use of several books and his assistance through the whole progress of the undertaking; to the Very Rev. Canon Hedley, O.S.B., for his advice in several difficult questions and extracts from theologians; to the Very Rev. H. O'Callaghan, D.D., for extracts from the Archives of the English College at Rome; to the Rev. J. Clare, S.J., for the loan of a valuable work; to the Very Rev. the Prior and Community of St. Edmund's College, Douai, for their great kindness in furthering researches in the Bibliothèque Publique of that town, and especially to the Rev. Austin O'Neill, O.S.B., for copying several documents and correcting the press; to the Rev. R. Palmer, Ord. Præd., for his kind assistance in making searches at the Public Record Office; to J. R. Hope Scott, Esq., Q.C., for his opinion on legal points; to David Lewis, Esq., for the loan of several works, and the use of his manuscript

notes; to G. D. Ryder, Esq., for valuable information; to J. V. Harting, Esq., F.S.A., for kindly revising several parts treating of legal questions; to the Rev. G. Porter, S.J., for a certified copy of the Decree of the S.C. of the Inquisition in Gordon's case; and to A. L. Philipps de Lisle, Esq., for the loan of Vivant's work.

There are two other persons whose names ought to be mentioned with grateful respect, though it is unhappily too late to offer them any tribute of acknowledgment for their kind assistance, as they are beyond the reach of controversy. One is the late Monsignor Bel, V.A. of Abyssinia; and the other, Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, only lately taken away from amongst us, to the great sorrow of all his friends. May their souls find in the Everlasting Light the fruition of all they believed and longed for on the earth!

During the time that the Work has been in preparation, publications on the subject have appeared from the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., and the Rev. T. J. Bailey. And as it was in great part written before their appearance, it is possible that sometimes they are not referred to in places where the points under discussion are treated of by them.

It would be a grave omission not to acknowledge the advantages derived from the London Library. In the prosecution of a work such as the present, where books of reference and of standard character are required, the ample stores to be found there in every department of literature, and the liberal terms on which the use of them is granted, afford assistance of the utmost value and importance.

APPROBATIO.

Ex commissione Illmi. et Rmi. Dni. D. GULIELMI BERNARDI Episcopi Birminghamien. librum cui titulus *The Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed, by E. E. Estcourt*, diligenter perlegimus, et nihil in eo deprehendimus, quod vel sanæ Theologie principis vel Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ regulis sit contrarium. Monumenta quædam historica, diu abscondita, nunc primum eruit; vulgata discutit, et vera a falsis decernit. Argumentis quoque theologicis, sanis quidem et solidis, conclusionem defendit. Omnia tamen summa modestia pertractat, ita ut charitatis jura omnino inviolata consistant. Quapropter librum istum dignum esse censemus, qui prelo committatur. Datum, die 9 Aprilis 1873.

J. S. CANONICUS NORTHCOTE.

GULIELMUS WATERWORTH, S.J.

J. C. CANONICUS HEDLEY, O.S.B.

Imprimatur.

✠ GULIELMUS BERNARDUS,

Ep. Birminghamien.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
Statement of the Question—Anglican claim for a recognition of their Orders by the Catholic Church—Present inquiry intended as an examination of such a claim—to be conducted on Catholic principles—The Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of Holy Order assumed as the basis of the inquiry—Essentials of Ordination—Discussion in the Council of Trent—General opinion of theologians—Principles of evidence by which the inquiry will be guided, as far as concerned with historical facts	1

CHAPTER II.

ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY.

Catholic doctrine of the priesthood—never questioned within the Church—Opposition arose from without—Manichees—Waldenses—Wickliffe and Lollards—John Huss—Luther and his followers—Summary of their teaching on the subject—Bucer and Zuinglius—Canons of the Council of Trent—English Reformers—Tyndall—Lambert—Questions on the Sacraments—Cranmer and Barlow—Compilation of Anglican rite—Queen Mary's Articles—Secret history of reconciliation of kingdom—Dispensations granted by Cardinal Pole—Bonner's testimonial in favour of Scory—Ordinations conferred in schism recognised, but pronounced <i>alias minus rite</i> —Cardinal Pole's Legatine Faculties—two classes mentioned therein with regard to Holy Orders—cases of Thomas Barlow, Roger Barlow, Matthew Carewe, and John Gwynne—ditto in diocese of Bath and Wells—ditto of George Aynsworth, and George Marsh—Bonner's Visitation Articles—Parkhurst's ditto—Hethe Archbishop of York—objections by Burnet and Eirington—Cases of Latimer, Ridley, Ferrar, Hooper, and Bradford—Testimony of Gardiner and Bonner	12
---	----

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY.

Queen Elizabeth's reign—the mere question of fact of comparatively little importance—William Barlow—his history—his embassies to Scotland—his election to St. Asaph—to St. David's—confirmation—assumed the episcopal style, though only 'elect'—Cromwell's warrant—Precedence in House of Lords—Premunire—opinions of Cramer and Barlow about consecration—whether favoured by the King—Discovery of Grant of Temporalities—published in a defective form by Mason and the important part suppressed—its form and effect discussed—Objections—Summary of the case—Parker—his opinions on consecration—nominated Archbishop—his election—First Commission—state of embarrassment—Minute with Cecil's and Parker's notes—Second Commission—Dispensing clause—Kitchen, Hodgekyn, &c.—Consecration at Lambeth—Machyn's Diary—Reasons for believing the fact—Bill for 'making of Bishops' in Parliament of 1559—The Register—grounds of suspicion—difference of form—Paper among Foxe's MSS.—Whether cause for suspicion that the present register is not the original—Theological discussion of effect of Barlow's non-consecration—Summary of facts proved, and of alleged facts not proved—Dr. Pusey's statement about Chichele—Story of Earl of Nottingham at the Privy Council—Catholic writers who refer to Parker's consecration—Bonner's case—Harding—Sanders—Stapleton—Anglican writers—Jewel—Fulke—Pilkington—Whitaker—Hooker—Inferences from them—Numerous converging probabilities—Testimonies as to Anglican Orders, how treated in Catholic Church—Process at Rome against Queen Elizabeth—Allen—Bristow—Parsons—Supplication to King James I.—List of Anglican clergy reconciled to the Church before 1704, and afterwards ordained—Cases alleged in opposition—William Rainolds—Cressy—Dr. Goffe—Sir H. Trelawney, &c.—Conclusion to be drawn from these facts 60

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY.

Anglican position—Ordination retained as a regulation, but not as essential—Thirty-nine Articles—Cases of Whittingham, Morrison, and Travers—Rise of High Church School—Opening of the controversy—Nag's Head story—The four Catholic priests inspecting the Register at Lambeth—First stage of the controversy—Kellison and Fitzsimons—Mason—Champneys—Cosin and Prior Robinson—Gordon's case—Second stage of controversy—Morinus—Talbot—Bramhall—Lewgat—Burnet and Pridcaux—Courayer—Condemnation of his works at Paris and Rome—Le Quien and Constable—Present stage of controversy—Archbishop Kenrick—Canon Reynal—Rev. A. W. Haddan—Canon Williams—Dr. Lee—Review of the whole 147

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT RITES OF ORDINATION.

How far parties agreed—Imposition of hands and prayer sole essentials—Question at issue, What is to be the prayer?—Ancient rites consulted—Greek and Oriental rites—Traces of connection between them in the similarity of prayers used in different rites—Evidence of antiquity and a common tradition therefrom—Antiquity of Latin rite—Points wherein all agree—The grace of Holy Order—Catholic doctrine of sacramental character—maintained also by Anglicans—Decree of S. C. of the Inquisition in the case of Abyssinian ordinations in 1704 and 1860—Effect of this Decree on the argument—Decision of S. C. of the Council as related by Pope Benedict XIV. 171

CHAPTER VI.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANGLICAN RITE IN REFERENCE TO THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDER.

Theological principles involved—Courayer's principle examined—Principles stated by various theologians with regard to the forms of sacraments—Doctrine of Book of Common Prayer on sacramental grace—Confirmation—Anglican rite of ordination—its Lutheranism—the preface—compared with the ancient rite, so as to show the alterations, with their effect and intention—Exclude the idea of sacramental grace—Catholic authorities—Gregory Martin—Broughton—Franciscus a Sancta Clara—Leander a Sancto Martino—Archbishop Kenrick—Objections answered—Anglican writers—Jewel—Whitgift—Hooker—Andrews—Jeremy Taylor—Bramhall—Rev. Mackenzie Walcott—Questions addressed to the Ordinandi and Bishop-elect—Objections answered—Summary of argument 194

CHAPTER VII.

THE ANGLICAN RITE IN REFERENCE TO THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST.

Importance of this question—Former modes of argument—Decisions of the Church in reference to the delivery of the chalice with the formula *Accipe potestatem*, &c.—Considered practically essential—Whether would this rule involve Anglican rite or not?—Lutheran objections to this formula—The Bishop of Brandenburg—Archbishop Herman of Cologne—Anglican rite—Alterations from the ancient rite on this point—Thirty-first Article—Meaning of word 'priest' in Book of Common Prayer—Examination of same Book with regard to doctrine of Holy Eucharist—Canon of the Mass—Luther's tenets as to Holy Sacrifice and Real Presence—English Reformers—their tenets derived from Wickliffe—Cramer—Laitmer—Coverdale—Ridley—Order of Communion—Book of 1549—Comparison of it with the Sarum Missal—Further changes—Bucer

Contents.

—Peter Martyr—Hooper—Grindall—Jewell—Catholic doctrines denied in the Book of Common Prayer—Objections on Anglican side—Mr. Haddan—Replies to them—Declaration of doctrine of Holy Sacrifice drawn up for the Council of Trent 260

CHAPTER VIII.

POPE PIUS IV. AND THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Anglican story of the Pope's offer to Queen Elizabeth—A parallel to the Nag's Head story—Evidence for it—Coke—Andrews—Abbot—Cafiden—Letter of the Pope—Fuller—Heylin—Twysden—Bartholomew Clerke—Bull—Evidence on the other side—Parsons—Fulke—Percivall Wyborne—The real facts as far as ascertained—Carne's despatches—John Sheres' information—Letter of the Abbate di San Salute (Vincenzio Pappaglia)—The Nuncio not admitted into the realm, and the Pope's letter never delivered—Reasons for disbelieving the alleged offer from the Pope—Catholics said to have frequented Protestant churches—Statement in Parliament proving the contrary 354

CHAPTER IX.

CONCLUSION.

Review of the argument—Conclusion arrived at—Summary of reasons for it—Objections answered—Dr. Newman's argument—The *uz quoque* replies to it inapplicable—Do Anglicans in general appreciate the real importance of the question?—Involves the whole doctrine of sacramental grace. 371

ADDITIONAL NOTES 380

ERRATA 382

APPENDIX.

no. I. Decision of S.C. of the Council respecting the Ordination of a priest, as related by Pope Benedict XIV. i

II. Lutheran manifestoes on the subject of Ordination ix

III. Opinion of Zuinglius on the subject of Holy Order xviii

IV. Letters Patent granting Barlow the temporalities of the see of St. David's, 26th April, 28 Henry VIII., 1536 xix

V. Letter from Barlow to Cromwell, 23d May 1536 xxiii

VI. Warrant from Sir Thomas Cromwell to Sir Bryan Tuke to pay Clarenceux King-at-Arms his 'dietts,' for attending the King's Ambassadors to Scotland, 12th June 1536 xxiv

Contents.

NO. *VI. Extracts from the Journals of the House of Lords xv

VII. Register of Ridley's consecration, 3d Sept. 1547 xxv

VIII. Register of Ferrar's consecration, 9th Sept. 1548 xxvi

IX. Note of an Inquisition as to the vacancies of the bishopric of St. David's, and the disposal of the temporalities during the same, 17th April 1550 xxviii

X. Minutes of Privy Council committing Hethe Bishop of Worcester to prison for refusing to subscribe the Book of making of Bishops, &c., 22d Sept. 1551 xxix

XI. Letter from Henry Pynning to Cardinal Pole, London, 19th Sept. 1553 xxxi

XII. Letter from Cardinal Pole to Pope Julius III., 30th Sept. 1553 xxxiv

XIII. Dispensation from Cardinal Pole to Robert Wharton, called Bishop of St. Asaph, White, Bourne, Brookes, Cotcs, Morgan, and Griffith, Bishops designate, 17th March 1554 xxxvi

XIV. Letter from Goldwell to Thornden Bishop of Dover, 16th June 1554 xxxviii

XV. Dispensations from Cardinal Pole to Thomas Thiriby, called Bishop of Norwich, 19th Aug. 1554, and to Tunstall and other Bishops xl

XVI. Extract from Gardiner's sermon, 2d Dec. 1554 xliii

XVII. Intelligence sent from England to Rome, 28th Jan. 1555 xlix

XVIII. Faculties granted to the Bishops by Cardinal Pole, 29th Jan. 1555 xli

*XVIII. Dispensation from Cardinal Pole to John Hodgekyn, of the Order of Preachers, 27th March 1555 li

XIX. Dispensation from Rome to Hethe Archbishop of York, 30th Oct. 1555 liii

XX. Confession of George Aynsworth, 2d Oct. 1555 lv

XXI. Dispensations from Cardinal Pole to Thomas Barlow, Roger Barlow, John Gwynne, and Mattheue Carewe, 31st May 1557, &c. lv

XXII. Letter from Vincenzo Pappaglia, Abbate di San Salute, to the Bishop of Vercelli, Nuncio at Venice, 8th Sept. 1560 lviii

XXIII. Extracts from the Process against Queen Elizabeth, and the Sentence of Pope Pius V. thereon decreed, 6th Feb. 1570 lix

XXIV. Extracts from the first and second volumes of the Diarium of the English College at Douay, 1577-1601 lxii

XXV. Examination of John Chapman, Seminary priest, 7th Aug. 1582 lxvi

XXVI. Confession of John Vyvyan, Seminary priest, 8th May 1585 lxxi

XXVII. Letter from Sir Francis Knollys to Sir Francis Walsingham, 20th March 1588 lxxii

XXVIII. Extracts from the Archives of the English College at Rome, 1606-1704 lxxiii

Contents.

NO.	PAGE
xxix. Mandate of the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris condemning Courayer's works, 21st August 1727	lxxv
xxx. Extracts from Censure of French Bishops on propositions extracted from Courayer's works, 22d Aug. 1727	lxxvii
xxxI. Extracts from Pastoral Instruction of the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris on the same, 31st Oct. 1727	lxxxv
xxxII. Brief of Pope Benedict XIII. condemning Courayer's works, 25th June 1728	xcv
xxxIII. Comparison of parallel passages in the Greek and Oriental forms of Ordination	xcviii
xxxIV. Decree of the S. C. of the Inquisition on the Ordinations of the Monophysites in Abyssinia, 9th May 1860, reciting a former Decree of 9th April 1704	cviii
xxxv. Rite of conferring Sacred Orders among the Monophysites in Abyssinia	cxi
xxxVI. Decree of S. C. of the Inquisition in the case of John Clement Gordon, 17th April 1704	cxy

FACSIMILES.

Minute of proceedings necessary for the Consecration of an Archbishop or Bishop; with Notes in Cecil's and Parker's handwriting, 1559	86
Part of the draft of the Letters Patent for Parker's Consecration, with the autograph signatures of the Civilians, 1559	88
Memorandum in a contemporary handwriting of Parker's Consecration	<i>Frontispiece</i>

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The subject of Anglican Orders is one on which not much can be said that has not been said before. The present undertaking aims less at bringing forward what is new, than at working up the materials already collected. The facts of the question are notorious, and the general principles have been laid down by former writers. A more detailed application of those principles is all that is aimed at or required. At the same time the present age affords facilities for historical investigation that are sure to bring to light matters of importance which have not been noticed before.

Anglican writers, from Mason and Cosin downwards, have for the most part taken up this question in a tone of personal offence, as if Catholics had singled out the Anglican Church for such an insult without reasonable grounds, and in an exceptional and invidious manner, contrary to the principles on which the Church deals in general with such a question. They have not hesitated to attribute the real causes of any objection having been raised to motives of policy or rival jealousy, and they consider themselves entitled to use a warmth of tone and indignation such as 'a prince of this world might express at

a doubt thrown on his legitimacy.¹ Certainly they may be excused for feeling strongly; but it is unfortunate for them that they should feel so secure in their position, like 'a prince of this world' whose rank and title have been publicly admitted without question. For this feeling of security leads them to rest on assumptions that will not bear examination, and blinds them to all that tells the other way. Thus they never approach the question as one bearing on the validity of a sacrament, in which the maxim of the Church is, that the *tutior pars* must be followed in preference to any other course.

But the Anglican advocates of the cause have lately taken a step in advance. The ground now assumed in defence of their ordinations is not merely a justification of themselves in their own position, but a claim for a recognition of their orders by the Catholic Church. It is boldly asserted that 'there can be no reasonable doubt that Anglican clergymen are validly ordained.'² And Dr. Pusey to the same effect has written: 'There is absolutely no doubt that our succession is valid, that our Bishops are the successors of those through whom God planted the gospel here; and so our Church is the appointed channel of God's gifts, and the instrument of salvation for us.'

It is true that several Anglican writers, as Cosin, Burnet, Prideaux, and Elrington, have based their arguments on what they profess and suppose to be Catholic principles. But Burnet, and Palmer following him, fall back upon the Protestant position of the Thirty-nine Articles, that 'Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority.' And the others, while they take up and use some one or more Catholic principles, disregard or even deny others of essential importance in the discussion.

¹ Dr. Irons, in the *Union Review*, Nov. 1868, p. 487.

² *Union Review*.

On the other hand, Catholic controversialists, as Champneys, Lewgar, and Constable, have argued the question partly on Protestant grounds, with the view of being more convincing to their opponents. But this method was scarcely fair either to their opponents or to themselves. For they endeavoured to hold the opposite side bound by the admissions made or arguments used by preceding writers. It is not fair to consider any one Protestant, either in the Anglican Church or out of it, as responsible for, or obliged to follow or agree with, the theological statements of any other. These writers therefore weaken their line of reasoning by leaving their own Catholic principles, without finding any other basis to take their stand on, and without ever coming to a ground common to them and their opponents.

The claim now advanced is for a recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church. Such a claim must of course rest on Catholic grounds alone, and must proceed on the principles by which the Church is accustomed to judge, and which are laid down in her Theologians. No other principles could be admitted.

It would be presumptuous in any one to say beforehand what the judgment of the Holy See on such a question might be. But it may be permitted to examine and discuss the grounds on which such pretensions are put forward. And thus the present work will be an attempt to answer the question: Are there good reasons for a petition to the Holy See to recognise the validity of Anglican Ordinations?

Although this question be discussed solely and entirely on Catholic principles, it does not follow that those principles are such as are admitted only by those in communion with the Church. The Holy See would be guided in its judgment by ordinary rules of Theology, and would apply to this question the same principles that would be used in any case that arose within the communion of the

Church itself. These principles are founded on Holy Scripture, on Apostolic Tradition, on the Decrees of Councils, on the Writings of ancient Fathers, on the most ancient Rituals, and on the practice of the Church through successive ages. The Church does not claim any other Priesthood or Episcopate than that which came down from the beginning. If the Priesthood and Episcopate asserted to exist among Anglicans can show a title to be considered such on these same principles, the Church would gladly recognise it. But if not, it is condemned, not merely as unlike the Catholic Priesthood of the present day, but as neither like, nor derived from the Priesthood which began with the Apostles, and which our Lord founded in His Church.

It will not, then, be necessary to advance any proof of the doctrine which the Church maintains *de fide* respecting the Sacrament of Holy Order, as the question is, what the judgment of the Church herself may be, and therefore the faith taught by the Church is taken for granted, so far as this, that Holy Order is a Sacrament, requiring a certain matter and form, and a right intention on the part of the Bishop administering it.

Here we come to a difficulty, because the Church has never defined what the matter and form of this Sacrament are. It is indeed sometimes maintained that the Council of Trent has decided this question by the Fourth Canon *De Sacramento Ordinis*, declaring, 'If any one saith that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given; and that vainly therefore do the Bishops say, *Receive the Holy Ghost*; let him be anathema.' But the history of the Council shows that this Canon was not intended for a definition as to the sacramental form, for it merely repeats one of the Articles which had been laid before the Theologians for examination as to whether they were heretical or not.³ And in the subsequent discussion of the Decrees

³ Le Plat. Mon. Concil. Trident. vol. v. p. 508.

proposed on the doctrine of Holy Order, the Cardinal of Lorraine delivered his opinion to the effect, 'that in treating of the essentials of this Sacrament, the matter and form ought not to be named; not that they are not there, but because the matter of this Sacrament cannot easily be determined.' And he desired to have introduced the mention of the imposition of hands, so frequently spoken of both in the Old and New Testament. In all these particulars his suggestions were followed; though, in order not to define that imposition of hands is a part of the Sacrament, terms of more general signification were selected, namely, 'words and signs,' as the component parts necessary for sacred ordination; yet not to pass over the imposition of hands in silence, the words of Paul to Timothy were introduced into the Decree: viz. *I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands.*⁴ The hesitation of the Council was no doubt owing to the various and conflicting opinions that have prevailed on the subject. But on examination it will be found that the difference is in theory merely, and has never affected the practice of the Church. Without going into a detailed history of the controversy, the question will here be simply stated, together with the conclusion which appears to be the general opinion of Theologians.

First, as to the Diaconate. In the present Roman Pontifical the rites of conferring the diaconate are as follows: The Bishop imposes hands on the Ordinand while saying a long prayer, commencing *Deus honorum dator*. In the middle of this prayer he stops and imposes his right hand on the head of each of the Ordinandi separately, saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for strength, and to resist the devil and his temptations. In the name of the Lord.' He then continues the prayer with the words, *Emitte in eos Spiritum Sanctum*. The prayer

⁴ Le Plat. p. 583. Waterworth's Council of Trent, p. ccc.

ended, he puts on them the sacred vestments, and then delivers to each the Book of the Gospels, saying the words, 'Receive power of reading the Gospel in the Church of God both for the living and the dead. In the name of the Lord.' The questions in debate are, whether the imposition of hands or the delivery of the Book of the Gospels, or both of these together, are to be considered as the essential matter of the Sacrament; and whether the prayer *Deus honorum dator*, or the latter part of it commencing *Emitte in eos Spiritum Sanctum*, or the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, or those *Accipe potestatem legendi*, or whether the whole of these taken together constitute the essential form of this Sacrament.

Secondly, as to the Priesthood. In ordaining a Priest the Bishop first imposes both hands on the head of each of the Ordinand; successively without saying anything, and all the priests present do the same. This is the first imposition of hands. He then says three prayers, during the first of which he and all the priests present hold their right hands extended over the Ordinand. And this is called by Theologians, the second imposition of hands—being in fact a continuation of the first. After this he puts on each the sacred vestments, and says the prayer *Deus sanctificationum*. Having then anointed the hands of each with the holy oil, he delivers to each the chalice containing wine and water, and the paten upon it with a host thereon, saying the words, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses as well for the living as for the dead. In the name of the Lord.' After this the Mass is continued, which, following a very ancient rite, the newly ordained priests repeat with the Bishop, thus joining with him in offering and consecrating. The priests receive communion from the Bishop in one kind only. After the Communion there is a third imposition of hands, when the Bishop places both hands on the head of each separately, saying,

'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose sins thou retainest, they are retained.' With regard then to this rite, Theologians have raised the following questions,—some maintaining that the imposition of hands with the prayers is the only essential matter of the sacrament,—others making the whole essence of it, as to both matter and form, consist in the delivery of the chalice and paten with the accompanying words; while a third opinion holds both these rites to belong to the substance of the Sacrament, although those who maintain it differ as to which imposition of hands is the essential one; some considering it to be the second, which is, as said before, a continuation of the first, and in this view the three prayers will be the form; others making the third imposition with the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* as essential.

Thirdly, in the consecration of Bishops, after the Book of the Gospels has been laid on the shoulders of the elect, the consecrating Bishop, together with the two assistant Bishops, as well as any others who are present, touch his head with both hands, all saying together, 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' The Consecrator then says two prayers, of which the latter is a long one, and is interrupted in the middle by anointing the head of the elect with the sacred chrism. Afterwards his hands are anointed also, the pastoral staff and ring are given to him, and then the Book of the Gospels is taken from his shoulders, and put into his hands with the words, 'Receive the Gospel, and go preach to the people committed unto thee; for God is mighty to increase His grace in thee, who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever.' Among Theologians, then, some make the imposition of hands the only essential matter, but differ as to whether the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* is the sole form, or whether the prayers following, and particularly the long prayer, are not also essential. But others consider the delivery of the Book of the Gospels with the

accompanying words to be the matter and form. And according to a third opinion both these rites together constitute the matter, and thus both the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* and the *Accipe Evangelium*, together with the prayers, would belong to the essence of the Sacrament.

But notwithstanding these differences, the general opinion is, that although it is more probable that the imposition of hands with the prayers is all that is really essential, yet in practice in ordaining a Deacon or Priest the delivery of the instruments is to be considered as essential also, so that if it were omitted, the Ordinandus ought to be ordained again *sub conditione*. But in the case of Priests, the third imposition of hands, with the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, is not considered essential, so that if omitted, it might be supplied afterwards, without repeating any other part of the rite. As to the Episcopate, the general opinion is, that the imposition of hands given with the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, which is continued by the Consecrator during the long prayer, is all that is essential, and that the delivery of the pastoral staff, the ring, and the Book of the Gospels are not essential, but merely show the effect of the Order conferred. Nor can the presence of two assistant Bishops be considered as essential, because a single Bishop possesses all the necessary power in himself.

It is very important to keep in mind these various opinions, because it will be seen that they had no little bearing on the formation of the Anglican rite; and also because several writers in the controversy, both Catholic and Anglican, have grounded their arguments on one or other of these opinions, ignoring all the rest; and thus have never really touched the points at issue. An historical sketch of these opinions will therefore be given in the Appendix, taken from Pope Benedict XIV.⁵ together with some authorities for the general opinion above stated.

⁵ Synodus Diocesana, lib. viii. cap. 10.

Notwithstanding that the general opinion described above is a sufficient guide with regard to ordinations celebrated according to the Roman Pontifical, yet in consequence of the decision in the case of the Abyssinian Ordinations, it does not seem as if it could be strictly and literally applied to those conducted after any other rite. This question we shall have to examine farther on.

As the present subject is so much concerned with questions of fact, and the facts alleged on either side have given rise to such acrimonious debates, without leading to any agreement as to the evidence to be accepted in proof of such facts, or establishing any authority that might decide between the parties, it will be well to state the principles which have governed the writer in determining the character of the evidence met with, and its claim to be either admitted as proving facts alleged, or rejected as worthless. In dealing with historical as with other questions, absolute proof is not always attainable; yet matter and facts and circumstances may oftentimes be found, which though not in themselves amounting to positive proof, still deserve attention, and cannot be passed over without due and careful examination.

Documents enrolled amongst the public records of the kingdom, or issuing from any government office, or from any government official in his official capacity, may be received without question, as evidence of the matters recorded, and also of other matters incidentally referred to therein, provided the authority under which the document is issued, either from official station or otherwise, is entitled to credit upon the point referred to.

Evidence is not to be rejected on account of mere verbal error or misnomer, where the identity of the person referred to is sufficiently made out, either from the context or from other sources.

In cases where original documents cannot be found, copies may be received in evidence, subject always to in-

quiry as to the custody from whence they come, and the purposes for which they were made.

Records of any office of which the principals or other officials have had any personal or party interest in the matter recorded will be liable to inquiry into all the circumstances connected with them.

Contemporary writers, such as annalists, speaking of public events or other matters, either of their own knowledge, or as of public notoriety, may be admitted as evidence, subject to inquiry as to their personal or party bias, and their means of information.

Historical writers relating or commenting upon events at a later time, and deriving their information from others, are not to be admitted.

Contemporary letters or other instruments may be received in evidence, particularly where the statements therein regard the writer himself or the person addressed; but statements respecting other persons, as to matters not within the writer's knowledge or competency, are no evidence whatever.

Statements made by partisan writers on either side, even contemporary, are to be received with caution, and cannot of themselves be used as proofs. But admissions made in reply on either side, especially when against the interest of the person making them, or of the party he represents, are to be treated as of the utmost importance.

Stories related on hearsay, without any authority being given, or any means furnished of tracing their authority, are to be considered as not worth notice.

If any person be referred to as authority, his means of information, and his personal or party interest, are to be inquired into, and credit given or withheld accordingly.

A story told on both sides, or related on one side and admitted on the other, may be looked upon as an undoubted truth.

A story that has passed from person to person merely by verbal tradition, even if names are quoted as authority, but without written testimony, cannot be accepted as evidence, nor allowed to have weight as an argument, even if considered probable as an historical fact.

Presumptions arising *a priori* in favour of certain things having been done or having taken place, because they were matters of course, or because the law so required, or because of certain consequences that followed or did not follow from them, are of very little weight; and if there are reasonable suspicions, arising from other circumstances, that the things alleged did not take place, all such presumptions are to be rejected.

Documents cited in Foxe, Strype, Burnet, Collier, and other historical writers, are to be received so far as they extend, subject to the foregoing conditions; but documents referred to by controversial writers are to be received with caution, and tested where practicable by comparison with the originals, or, if these are wanting, with other sufficient testimony.

Whether the heresy that arose in the twelfth century was originated by members of the Church, or was an offshoot from those earlier heresies, is a question quite beside our purpose. It is sufficient to mention that the Waldenses maintained that since the Priests of the Church did not practise apostolic poverty, they were not true ministers of our Lord, and could not validly absolve, or consecrate the Eucharist, or administer any Sacraments; and that laymen who followed voluntary poverty had a power more real and more lawful of performing those functions and of preaching the Gospel than the Priests of the Church.¹ These were the errors for which they were condemned by Pope Lucius III. in the year 1185, and the later followers of the sect seem to have carried their errors to yet greater lengths.

Whether Wicliffe had had communication with followers of this sect, it is not material to inquire. It is certain that he adopted some of their opinions, and this was pointed out in the first notice taken of him by the Holy See, when Pope Gregory XI., in requiring the Archbishop of Canterbury to institute proceedings against him, speaks of his errors as a revival of those already condemned by Pope John XXII.² in his Bull against the Fraticelli.

He had, however, begun with assailing only the jurisdiction of the Church, as follows: 'Every Priest rightly and duly ordered hath power to minister the Sacraments and absolve any man confessing his faults.'³ And this conclusion he defends in his Exposition of the Articles.⁴ But he afterwards went on to deny Transubstantiation and the Real Presence; and he maintained that a Bishop or Priest by mortal sin lost the power of his Order, and could neither ordain, consecrate, or baptise.⁵ These were among

¹ On this subject, see Dr. Newman's *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. ii. p. 117-9.

² Collier, vol. iii. p. 138; Bullarium Rom. ann. 1318.

³ Foxe, vol. iii. p. 11.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 21.

CHAPTER II.

ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY.

THE belief in a sacred gift of power conferred on the Priesthood of the Catholic Church has come down from the time of its institution by our Blessed Lord. That when He said to His Apostles, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, He gave them a power to do what none else could do; that when He breathed upon them with those words, 'Receive &c.' He did communicate to them a gift of the Holy Spirit; that when He said to them, *Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes*, He gave a divine mission to them and their successors;—this is the faith of the Church now, only because it has ever been so from the first. The authorities of all ages have borne witness to this belief, and the greatness of the gift has been enlarged upon by the chief Doctors of the Church, and especially by St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine.

The Christians in the East, who have formed bodies separated from the Church by schism or heresy, have retained this belief as strongly as Catholics. Before the twelfth century it had not been denied by any except the Manichees, and the heresies which descended from them, such as the Albigenses. These were bodies that had grown up external to the Church, and had not separated from her communion. Their denial therefore amounts to no more than an attempt to ignore a gift which they had never been partakers of, and could bring no claim to inherit.

the erroneous propositions extracted from his works, which were condemned.

After his death, his followers, and the Lollards who probably had an independent origin, made considerable advances on his teaching. Walter Brute denied the distinction between clergy and laity, or the difference of orders of clergy; and also denied the Sacrifice of the Mass.⁶ Among the articles held by the Lollards, and abjured by many of them, were the following: 'That any layman may teach and preach the Gospel by his own authority; that confession to a Priest is unnecessary; that every good man, though unlearned, is a Priest; that laymen have a like authority with a Bishop or Priest.'⁷ Again, John Purvey, a Priest, maintained, among other errors, which he afterwards recanted, 'that every layman, being holy and predestinated unto everlasting life, is a true Priest before God.'⁸ And in the year 1415, an unfortunate disciple of this Lollard sect, putting in practice the teaching he had received, appointed his son a Priest, and caused him to celebrate Mass in his own house. Being convicted, he suffered the punishment of heresy.⁹

This Lollard heresy continued to bear fruit down to the times of the Reformation, and was in fact the cause of the ready acceptance given to the new doctrine among the people in certain parts. Persons were from time to time found professing Lollardism, and among their other errors came that of denying the necessity and virtue of the Sacrament of Holy Order. Thus one of the articles on which John Browne and other heretics in Kent were condemned in 1511 was, 'that no power is given of God to Priests, of ministering Sacraments, saying Mass, or other divine service more than to laymen.'¹⁰ Again, in 1528, John Tyball, a Lollard, confessed before Tunstall Bishop

⁶ Foxe, vol. iii. p. 178.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 248-9.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 286.

⁹ Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.* vol. ii. p. 307, ed. 1864.

¹⁰ Foxe, vol. v. p. 648; and Maitland's *Letters on Feas.* p. 57.

of London, 'that he hathe thought that Pristhode was not necessary. For he thought that every Layman myght mynister the Sacraments of the Churche as well as any Priste.'¹¹ And in 1530 it was articulated against James Alger, Priest, 'that he had said, that every true Christian man, living after the laws of God, and observing his commandments, is a Priest as well as he.'¹² And in 1536 Sir John Gale, Clerk, Parson of Twaite, in Suffolk, was indicted by the grand jury for saying, 'that a temporal man may consecrate the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and hath as great power as any Priest, if he can speak the words, which the Priest speaketh.'¹³ These are mentioned among the errors protested against by the Convocation in that year.¹⁴

All the preceding seem to have been the direct home-growth of Lollardism or of Wicliffe's teaching, who may, indeed, be called the father of modern heresy. But his opinions were destined to bear their harvest in another country before they attained to such head as to subvert the ancient religion of this land. It is matter of ordinary history, that John Huss adopted Wicliffe's opinions. And it is equally well known that Luther studied the works of Huss, and approved many of his tenets, though he said they were not carried out to their legitimate issue. And the teaching of Luther, Melancthon, and others who adhered to the Augustan confession, embraced the following points:

That all the faithful are Priests, and can offer spiritual sacrifices to God, and there is no other Priesthood or sacrifice instituted by Christ in the Church; and that the office of Ministers in the Church is to preach and dispense Sacraments, not to offer sacrifice.

That Bishops and Presbyters are one and the same.

That it is matter of propriety, though not of necessity, that certain persons should be appointed to teach the Word of God,

¹¹ *Strype, Mem.* vol. i. app. p. 35.

¹² Foxe, vol. iv. p. 584.

¹³ *Strype, Mem.* vol. i. p. 286.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 246.

and administer the Sacraments; but that, though not ordinarily lawful, there is nothing to prevent any one of the faithful discharging those functions in case of necessity.

That there are two kinds of vocation to the Ministry—one internal and immediately from God, such as that of Apostles and Prophets; the other external by means of men placed in authority, as magistrates and communities of people. One or other ought to be had by one who is to teach in the Church. And as a matter of regulation, no one is to be suffered to preach without being called and ordained.

That the calling of Ministers should come from the people, or be made by princes or magistrates in the name of the people. And that this calling or appointment is sufficient without ordination or consecration.

That it is proper, though not of necessity, that one of the Pastors should be elected as Superintendent, and that the Ministers, when called and elected by the people or magistrates or patrons, should be presented to this Superintendent for trial and examination, and if approved, should be admitted to the ministry by prayer and imposition of hands.

That in such ordination, the charge given to those admitted to the ministry, ought not to be to sacrifice for the living and dead, but to teach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments.

That ordination is not a Sacrament, nor is any sacramental grace conferred in it, but is merely the public approval of persons as truly called, and possessed of the proper qualifications for the ministry, and admitting them to the lawful exercise of their functions.¹⁵

Bucer and the Strasburg Divines did not differ on this subject in any material point from the decided Lutherans. They admitted the imposition of hands in ordination, but declared that they did not consider that rite to be a true Sacrament.

Zuinglius also maintained that the sacramental character alleged to be given in Holy Order is a figment of men; that the ministry of the word is a function, and not a dignity; that the episcopate is the ministry of the word, and whoever administers the word is a Bishop;

¹⁵ In the Appendix No. II. extracts will be given from various works stating these opinions more at length.

but without so doing he is as far from being a Bishop as any one is from being a magistrate who does not discharge the functions.¹⁶

In the Council of Trent the errors current among the Reformers on the subject of Holy Order were condemned by the following Canons:

I. If any one saith, that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external Priesthood; or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all; let him be anathema.

II. If any one saith, that besides the Priesthood there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and minor, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made unto the Priesthood; let him be anathema.

III. If any one saith, that Order, or sacred ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord; or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the Word of God and of the Sacraments; let him be anathema.

IV. If any one saith, that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given; and that vainly therefore do the Bishops say, *Recivite ye the Holy Ghost*; or that a character is not imprinted by that ordination; or that he who has once been a priest, can again become a layman; let him be anathema.

V. If any one saith, that the sacred unction which the Church uses in holy ordination is not only not required, but is to be despised and even pernicious, as likewise are the other ceremonies of Order; let him be anathema.

VI. If any one saith, that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted, consisting of Bishops, Priests, and Ministers; let him be anathema.

VII. If any one saith, that Bishops are not superior to Priests; or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or that the power which they possess is common to them and to Priests; or that orders conferred by them, without the consent, or vocation of the people, or of the secular power, are invalid; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained, nor sent, by

¹⁶ Appendix, No. III.

ecclesiastical and canonical power, but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments; let him be anathema.

VIII. If any one saith, that the Bishops, who are assumed by authority of the Roman Pontiff, are not legitimate and true Bishops, but are a human figment; let him be anathema.

The effect of the opinions promulgated on the Continent on the minds of the English people is easily traced, for many of the leading Reformers, as Tyndall, Barnes, Lambert, Frith, Coverdale, Crammer, and Barlow travelled in foreign parts, and had communication with those on the Continent. And thus their opinions often present a mixture of the Lutheranism or Zuinglianism learnt abroad with the Wicliffite principles that had descended to them at home.

On the subject of the ministry Tyndall taught as follows: 'We choose temporal officers, and read their duty to them, and they promise to be faithful ministers, and then are admitted. Neither is there any other manner or ceremony at all required in making of our spiritual officers than to choose an able person, and then to rehearse him his duty, and give him his charge, and so to put him in his room.'¹⁷

In the Articles against John Lambert he was asked: 'ix. Whether thou dost believe Orders to be a Sacrament of the Church; . . . and whether the order of Priesthood were invented by man's imagination, or ordained by God? xxiii. Whether thou believest that it is lawful for laymen of both kinds, that is to wit, both men and women, to sacrifice and preach the Word of God?'¹⁸

To these he replied: 'As touching Priesthood in the primitive church, there were no more officers than Bishops and deacons, and those whom we call Priests were all one and none other but Bishops; and they were chosen not

only by the Bishop, but also with consent of the people, and the people ought to have power to choose Priests. It is meet for none to preach openly except they be chosen and elected to the same, either by God, or solemnly by men, or else by both. Notwithstanding, in time of great necessity, lay people may preach, both men and women. It is lawful for all men and women to do sacrifice, I mean not to say Mass as Priests used to do, but to offer spiritual sacrifices of their bodies and the sacrifice of praise.'¹⁹

These are indications of the opinions introduced into the country; and we must now compare them with the documents drawn up by authority.

The earliest document on the subject is given by Burnet,²⁰ and is entitled 'A Declaration of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests.' It commences: 'As touching the Sacrament of Holy Orders, we will that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct and teach our people, committed by us unto their spiritual charge.' There is nothing more to show that it was published by royal authority; but as a similar form is used in the Articles about religion set out by the Convocation in the year 1536,²¹ it seems to be a supplement to that other formulary, but has a different set of signatures. It bears no date, but it must have been signed after the 2d of June 1536, because Sampson signs it as Bishop of Chichester, who was elected on that day, and before Aug. 19, 1537, because Aldridge signs it as a simple priest, who was consecrated on the latter date Bishop of Carlisle. It declares that 'the Power of the Keys and whole authority of the Church is purely spiritual and formally distinct from the power of the sword. That this power is not absolute, but to be limited by the rules in Scripture, and is ordained only for the edification and good of the Church; and that

¹⁹ Foxe, vol. v. p. 190, 207, 208.

²⁰ Vol. i. *Records*, p. 321.

²¹ *Ibid.* p. 305.

¹⁷ *Obed. of a Christian Man*, vol. i. p. 259, ed. Park. Soc.

¹⁸ Foxe, vol. v. p. 182.

it is essentially necessary to be preserved, being the only means appointed by our Saviour for obtaining his grace and reconciling sinners to God. That Orders are a Sacrament, since they consist of an outward action instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and an inward grace conferred therein. That although other inferior Orders have been instituted in the Church, and other ceremonies devised to beautify and ornate the Church, yet the truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any distinctions in Orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Priests or Bishops: nor is there any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this Sacrament but only of prayer, and the imposition of the Bishop's hands.' The document is signed by Cromwell, and also by Cranmer, Goodrich Bishop of Ely, Shaxton Bishop of Sarum, Fox Bishop of Hereford, Latimer Bishop of Worcester, Hilsley Bishop of Rochester, Sampson Bishop of Chichester, Skip afterwards Bishop of Hereford, William Maye, Rich. Cox afterwards Protestant Bishop of Ely, and John Redman, all being favourers of the new learning; and also by Lee Archbishop of York, Stokesley Bishop of London, Tunstall Bishop of Durham, Longlands Bishop of Lincoln, Clerk Bishop of Bath, Salcot Bishop of Bangor, Aldridge afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, and Hethe afterwards Archbishop of York, who were more attached to the ancient faith. It is not signed by Repps, Barlow, or Wharton, who had all signed the Articles of Convocation.

The statement on the same subject in the 'Institution of a Christian Man,' which was published soon afterwards, is made nearly in the words of this Declaration; but the limitation of the power of the Church to spiritual things is there drawn out to conclusions against the authority of the Pope, and all spiritual jurisdiction is derived from the King.

In the year 1540 preparations were made for the pub-

lication of the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition,' though the work did not appear till two years later. On the subject of the Sacraments, the several opinions delivered by the Bishops and Divines appointed to examine the question are printed in Burnet.¹⁹ A summary of them touching on the question of Orders may be given. Lee Archbishop of York is the only one who maintained the Catholic doctrine throughout. Cranmer and Barlow were the most extreme in the opposite direction. Bonner's theology was very misty, and he sometimes avoids giving a direct answer. The others were much divided.

Cranmer held with regard to the seven Sacraments, that of four of them the nature and effect was found in Scripture; but of the other three—Confirmation, Order, and Extreme Unction—nothing is read in Scripture as taken for Sacraments. That Christian Princes have the whole care of their subjects as well in things spiritual as temporal, and that Ministers of God's Word are only officers appointed by them. Ceremonies used in the admission of ministers are not of necessity, but only for good order. There is no more promise of God's grace in committing of the Ecclesiastical office than of the Civil office. The Apostles appointed Ministers only because there were then no Christian Princes. Princes may make Priests as well as Bishops, and so may the people by their election. No consecration is needed, for election or appointing is sufficient.

Burnet²⁰ wishes to make it believed that Cranmer changed his opinion on these points because he subscribed the Book which was the result of this discussion, and which is directly contrary to these opinions. But as Lingard remarks,²¹ he was aware that it would be difficult to reconcile them with the declaration he had signed previously, or with such as he might be required to sign

¹⁹ *Hist. Ref.* vol. i. App. p. 214-236.

²⁰ Vol. i. p. 289.

²¹ Vol. vi. p. 319.

afterwards, and therefore he very prudently added, 'this is mine opinion and sentence at this present; which nevertheless I do not temerarily define, but refer the judgment thereof to your Majesty.'²¹

Barlow went full lengths with Crammer on all the points mentioned.

On the first point—as to the seven Sacraments—all the rest maintained that the nature and virtue of all the seven are contained in Scripture.

On other points the opinions may be divided generally into two classes as follows, omitting minor points of difference.

First. Those showing less departure from Catholic principles.

That the Apostles made Bishops and Priests by their own power given them by God, and had no need of any other authority. That Bishops are authorised by God to make Priests, and there is no example of any other having such power. That consecration is required for a Bishop or Priest as well as appointment. That in case of failure of all priests in a country, some might be brought from other countries, or else some extraordinary illumination or supernatural power would be supplied to the Prince, but that necessity has no law. These were maintained by Bonner of London, Aldridge of Carlisle, Dr. Edgeworth, Dr. Oglethorpe, and Dr. Coren;²² and by Tunstall of Durham, Day of Chichester, Thirlby elect of Westminster, and Drs. Tresham and Leighton as to the three first points.

Secondly. Those more advanced in the way of innovation.

That the Apostles ought to have asked license of their Christian governors before making priests, if then there had been any. That Bishops cannot use their

²¹ On the subject of the king's own opinions, see next chapter, in treating of Barlow's history.

²² Curwen.

authority to make priests without permission of the Prince. That consecration has been received from the Apostles' time. And that in case of necessity laymen may minister Sacraments and make priests. The adherents of these opinions were Hethe of Rochester, Robertson, Redmayne, Crayford, Cox, and Symmons; and also Tunstall, Day, Thirlby, Leighton, and Tresham as to the last point. Cox delivered an opinion similar to Luther's, that 'by Scripture there is no consecration of Bishops and Priests required, but only the appointing *cum impositione manuum*.' The remarkable thing in this division is, that Tunstall, Hethe, Day, Thirlby, and Tresham belonged to the party of the 'old learning,' and afterwards returned to the unity of the Church. Redmayne and Cox are the only noted followers of the new opinions, and both were among the moderate of the Protestant party.

When the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition' came to be published, it declared that 'Order is a sacrament given by consecration and imposition of the Bishop's hands; that this form is to be observed in giving orders; and that of these two orders only, viz. priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred of the Apostles by prayer and imposition of their hands.'²³ This, though declaring Order to be a sacrament, avoids the questions, whether it can be given by any other than a Bishop, and whether there is a distinction between Priests and Bishops. And even this result was probably owing to Gardiner's influence; for it seems that he had the upper hand in this Book, and Crammer could not get his own way with it.²⁴

It is attempted to be shown that Crammer afterwards adopted more sound opinions, by referring to the Catechism of Justus Jonas, published by his authority in 1548, where the doctrine is stated as follows:

²³ *Formularius of Faith*, p. 277.

²⁴ *Sturpe's Crammer*, bk. i. cap. 25.

'After Christ's ascension, the apostelles gave authoritie to other godly and holye men, to minyster Gods worde, and chiefly in those places, wher ther wer Christen men already, which lacked preachers, and the apostles them selves could not longer abide with them. For the apostles dyd walke abroad into diverse partes of the worlde, and did studie to plant the gospel into diverse partes Wherefore wher they found godly men, and mete to preache Gods worde, they layed their handes upon them, and gave them the Holy Gost, as they themselves received of Christ the same Holy Gost, to execute this office. And they that were so ordlyned, were in dede, and also were called, the ministers of God as the apostles themselves were, as Paule sayeth unto Tymothy. And so the ministracion of God's worde, (which our Lorde Jesus Christ hymselfe dyd first institute) was deriyed from the apostles unto other after them, by imposition of handes, and gyvinge the Holy Ghost, from the apostles tyme to our dayes. And this was the consecration, ordres, and unction of the apostles, wherby they, at the begynnyng, made byshopes and pryestes, and this shall continue in the church, even to the worldes ende. And what so ever rite or ceremonye hath ben added more than this cometh of mannes ordinaunce and policye, and is not commaunded by Goddes worde.'²⁵

This exposition was written by a Lutheran, and refers to the Lutheran superintendents and pastors, and not to the apostolic succession of Bishops and Priests. It does not state Order to be a Sacrament, or the conferring of a sacramental character, but only the giving of grace to execute an office. It is perfectly consistent with the Lutheran idea of ordination by imposition of hands and prayer being a matter of propriety, though not of necessity. And as Cranmer had stated his opinion, that 'ceremonies used in the admission of ministers are not of necessity, but only for good order,'²⁶ the publication of such doctrine as this Catechism contains does not imply any change whatever in his opinions.

It was amidst such a medley of varied opinions that Cranmer and his colleagues undertook to remodel the

²⁵ *Catechism* of Justus Jonas, called 'Cranmer's,' p. 196.
²⁶ See page 21.

ancient Forms of Ordination, and to substitute for them compilations of their own. In the Parliament at the close of the year 1549, an Act was passed that 'such form of consecrating and ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, as by six prelates and six other men of the realm learned in God's law to be appointed by the King shall be devised and set forth under the Great Seal, before the first of April then following, should be lawfully used and none other.' When the Act passed the House of Lords, five Bishops entered their protest against it, viz. Tunstall Bishop of Durham, Aldridge Bishop of Carlisle, Hethe Bishop of Worcester, Day Bishop of Chichester, and Thirlby Bishop of Westminster.²⁷

An Order was made in the Council on the 2d of February 1549-50, for the appointment of twelve persons to draw up the new forms;²⁸ but their names are not added, and Strype²⁹ says he cannot find them. Heylin³⁰ supposes that they were the same as those appointed to revise the Liturgy, but this is mere conjecture: all that is known is, that Hethe Bishop of Worcester was one of them. There was little for them to do, as the forms had been already prepared beforehand,³¹ and even used at an ordination by Cranmer and Ridley.³² Within a week after the appointment was made in the Council, the twelve Bishops and clergy were required to give their assent to the new form, and Hethe was 'convented before the lords' for refusing. On the 28th of the same month he was directed by the Council to 'set his hand to the book; and persisting in his refusal, he was on the 4th of March committed to the Fleet. And having remained in prison till September of the following year, he was again brought before the Council,³³ and persisting in his refusal, he was

²⁷ Lords' Journals.

²⁸ Pococke's *Burnet*, iii. 339.
²⁹ *Hist. Ref.* p. 82.

³⁰ *Cranmer*, p. 273.

³¹ Pococke's *Burnet*, vol. iii. p. 339.

³² Strype's *Cranmer*, p. 273.

³³ See Appendix, No. X.

returned to prison, and soon afterwards deprived of his bishopric.

From this narrative the authorship of these new forms may with almost certainty be attributed to Crammer and Ridley. At the time of their publication the former was still under the influence of his Lutheran opinions, and the forms derive some tincture from that source. In the Ordination of a Priest the delivery of the chalice was preserved, but in the sense and with the words recommended by the Lutheran divines.³⁴ These forms were not sent to Bucer for his revision when the Book of Common Prayer was sent to him, of which omission he complained. And he accordingly drew up a form of his own composing, which he sent to Crammer; but the latter did not receive it till after Bucer's death, and it seems to have met with no attention.³⁵ It was therefore owing not to Bucer, but probably to the general progress of Zuinglian opinions, in which Hooper's objections had some influence, that the farther change was made in the forms of Ordination; when the delivery of the chalice was abolished altogether, as well as giving the pastoral staff to the Bishop.

Burnet³⁶ writes of the proceedings about the preparation of the new forms as if he had some contemporary account of them before him, but he gives no reference. He says, 'As for the Forms of Ordination, they found that the Scripture mentioned only imposition of hands and prayer. There is no more in the Apostolic Constitutions or the Fourth Council of Carthage. Therefore the anointing and giving the vestments were later additions, as well as the delivering the vessels to the Priest with power to offer sacrifice.'

Collier³⁷ in the same strain says, 'The committee struck off the additions of later ages, and governed themselves by the forms of the ancient Church.'

³⁴ See Appendix, No. II.

³⁵ Vol. ii. p. 143.

³⁶ Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*.

³⁷ *Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 288.

It is therefore remarkable to find that, so far from going back to the ancient forms of Ordination, all the substantial parts of the new rite are drawn from the latest additions of the Middle Ages.

In the Ordination of Deacons the words accompanying the imposition of hands are quite new, but in the imperative form, like the 'Accipe' of the Pontifical, which was not used till the 14th century. Then the giving the New Testament is taken from the delivery of the Book of the Gospels, of which there is no trace before the 9th century.

In the Ordination of Priests the imposition of hands with the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' is taken from that imposing of hands for the third time in the ancient rite, which is not to be found in any Pontifical earlier than the 13th century. But more strange than this, the giving the Bible with the words, *Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments*, is come in direct descent from that rite of delivering the chalice and paten which Burnet calls 'a vain novelty,' and Mason stigmatises as 'blasphemy.' For in the first Book of King Edward the rubric stood as follows: *The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in the one hand, and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand, saying as above.* Then in the second Book in 1552 the words, *and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand*, were left out, and the rite changed to the state it remains in at present.

Lastly, in the Consecration of Bishops the words used with the imposition of hands were to be only the 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' with words of exhortation added from the Scripture. This formula was not brought into use before the 13th or 14th century. In the first Book the Archbishop was next directed to 'lay the Bible on the neck' of the Consecrated, and then to put the pastoral staff into his hand, accompanying each act with an ex-

hortation. The first of these rites is evidently taken from the primitive custom of laying the Book of the Gospels on the head of the Elect; and the second was in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church. But in the Second Book both are done away, and in substitution for them the Archbishop is to deliver the Bible to the Consecrated; a rite taken from that of delivering the Book of the Gospels into the hands of the newly Consecrated, which is shown not to have been in use before the 13th century.

So much for the pretensions of the Anglican rite to be a return to more ancient forms of Ordination. Mr. Palmer in his *Origines Liturgicæ* has shown his discretion in avoiding any such pretension. It is indeed true there are also prayers used in each Ordination, but they are not connected with the imposition of hands.

It is difficult to account for the new forms having taken this shape, after the general opinion expressed by the Bishops and Divines both in 1537 and 1549, that imposition of hands and prayer were the only ceremonies of Ordination used in Scripture. But it must be remembered that these men had been brought up in the theology of the Schoolmen, and probably could not divest themselves of the ideas thence acquired. And the Schoolmen generally taught that the imperative forms of Ordination and the delivery of the instruments were essential, and of more importance than the prayers from the ancient Sacramentaries. The Reformers therefore were misled, however strange to say it, by a blind adherence to their Popish Doctors. This seems like a retribution for their unauthorised and sacrilegious meddling with the sacred traditions of the Church.

We now enter on a period in which the question first arose with regard to the validity of the Orders given in the new form; but although a decision was then arrived at on the question, it has been rather the subject of con-

troversy than a settlement of it, owing to the scantiness of information hitherto obtained. This period comprehends the various proceedings taken on the question during the reign of Queen Mary. And the decision then given is important, in order to show, for the sake of consistency in the decisions of the Church, that the present practice is identical with and derived from the course adopted at the time when the question first came under review.

The first notice taken of the Edwardine ordinations was in the Articles issued by the Queen on the 4th of March 1554. These seem to have been issued somewhat prematurely; for the Bull granting the full legatine faculties to Cardinal Pole was not issued till the 8th of that month. No one had come to England by that time with power to reconcile even the Bishops to the Church, or to absolve them from the schism into which they had fallen. These articles therefore are not of authority, being issued before the directions of the Holy See were published.

The fifteenth, which relates to this subject, is as follows: 'Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any orders after the new sort and fashion of orders; considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the diocese finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before; and then according to his discretion, admit them to minister.' This can only relate to ordinations according to the Edwardine rite, and not to those conferred according to the Pontifical though in schism; for Bonner himself and most of the Bishops to whom these Articles were addressed had incurred censures for the latter offence. The words are ambiguous; because 'they were not ordered in very deed' would imply that the ordination was invalid; but the direction to 'supply' would in theological language mean to add something not

essential that had been omitted. It seems as if it was supposed by the Queen's advisers, that the Edwardine form was not absolutely invalid, but that the unction and the delivery of the chalice might be 'supplied' at a later time. This had been the teaching of various Theologians, as related by Natalis Alexander;³⁸ and perhaps Bonner and his colleagues may have followed them at first, though they were afterwards better informed.

The secret history of the proceedings by which the restoration of religion was accomplished has not as yet come to light. It is known that Pole was made Legate; that his journey to England was delayed for political reasons; that a new Brief, containing additional faculties, and empowering him to act as Legate while still out of the realm, was issued on March 8, 1554; that his journey was still delayed on account of the laws yet in force against the authority of the Holy See; and that thus the public reconciliation of the kingdom was not made till the 30th of November.

Nevertheless certain steps must have been taken before that time to bring the Church again into communion with the Holy See. It must be recollected that the Queen herself, and the whole of the Bishops and clergy, were in a state of schism. Gardiner, Tonstall, and Vowsy alone had been placed in canonical possession of their bishoprics, but they had committed themselves to various acts both of schism and heresy. And all the rest had received their sees from the lay authority alone, and had also made professions of heresy, or had even joined in rites contrary to the order and teaching of the Church. All of them were thus lying under censures of excommunication and suspension. But these censures must have been removed long before Pole's arrival, otherwise Gardiner could not have officiated in June at the marriage

³⁸ *Theol. de Sac. Ord.* cap. i. art. 7, § 2. quoted by Bened. xiv. Syn. Dioc. lib. viii. cap. ii. See Appendix. No. I.

of Philip and Mary; nor could Bonner have consecrated the new Bishops.

The difficulties in the way were immense, because the party in favour of the changes that had been made were vigorous, and how far their influence might prevail was uncertain. The complications arising from the marriages celebrated without the canonical dispensation, and from the church-lands in possession of the nobility and gentry, gave additional strength to this party; while at the same time the laws against the authority of the Holy See were still in force.

The Queen herself was fully aware of the difficulties which beset her, but was resolved on bringing the kingdom into the unity of the Church as soon as possible. She was also anxious to obtain absolution for herself before her coronation, although the laws enforcing the schism were not repealed. She had made a request to this effect through Commendone, the messenger from Dandino, the Papal Legate at Brussels, and repeated it by means of Henry Pynning, who carried the Cardinal Legate's first letter.³⁹ In the audience she granted to Pynning, the Queen told him, 'I hope my cousin will grant me the dispensation; as he may believe that my heart and mind only intend the greater benefit of this kingdom. And as for the oath to be taken on the day of coronation, I will take it in the same form my father took it. And the title (of Supreme Head of the Church) I will not take; not even if I could gain three other kingdoms by taking it.'⁴⁰ On the receipt of this news Pole wrote at once to the Sovereign Pontiff for the dispensation, adding that he would reply to the Queen, that she might be quite secure in her conscience, but that he would procure the absolution in writing with all possible secrecy,

³⁹ Canon Tierney seems to have supposed that Pynning accompanied Commendone, and to have been unacquainted with the letters here quoted.

⁴⁰ Marini transcripts. Letter in Appendix, No. XI.

and retain it in his own possession, only writing to inform her of it.⁴¹ It may be well to mention that the absolution here spoken of was not a sacramental absolution, but only the absolution from excommunication *in foro externo*, and a dispensation from irregularity incurred during the schism.

Pynning returned from his mission, bringing with him a letter from the Queen of the 10th of Oct., having been detained in order to witness the coronation.⁴² The Queen wrote to Pole again on the 28th of the same month, describing the difficulties that had arisen in the Parliament, owing to the disfavour with which the lower house regarded the restoration of the Papal authority, and asking his advice how to proceed in the face of such opposition.⁴³ This and the former letter were written in Latin; but Pole replied without delay in English, though unfortunately his letter has not been preserved. It was sent by Goldwell,⁴⁴ who received full instructions to speak the Card. Legate's mind upon the subject. Goldwell carried back with him a letter from the Queen of the 15th Nov., and also the two Acts of Parliament that had been passed in the mean time.⁴⁵ Neither of these satisfied the Cardinal, particularly the act for restoring the ancient worship; because, as he said, people were thereby admitted to the full use of the sacraments without being reconciled to the Church, or absolved from the schisms and heresies in which they were involved. He therefore gave his instructions to Goldwell, and sent him over again with a letter to the Queen of 1st Dec.⁴⁶ The Queen's reply is not extant; and an interval passes about which we have very little information. The Cardinal had about this time

⁴¹ Letter in Appendix, No. XII.

⁴² *Ibid.* p. 119.

⁴³ *Ibid.* p. 121.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* vol. v. p. 171, 'Maria R. ad me duo Parliamenti sui decreta transmissit, significaveritque et per te et per ejus literas.'

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 123.

left Dillinghen near Augsburg, and was on his way to the Emperor's court at Brussels. On his journey he received a letter from the Queen, requesting his advice how to proceed with regard to the vacant bishoprics, and asking whether he had authority to issue a decree of confirmation;⁴⁷ for neither the Queen herself, nor the persons she had nominated for Bishops, were willing to proceed without the Pope's authority in a canonical manner.⁴⁸ Not receiving a reply, the Queen wrote again on the 28th of January;⁴⁹ but as no answer came even by the 20th of the next month, the Queen became uneasy, and there were not wanting persons who suggested sinister motives for the Cardinal's silence.⁵⁰ But the reason of the delay was that Pole had written to Rome for instructions, and as the Pope was laid up with the gout, nothing could be done.⁵¹ However, Pole seems to have written before he got the answer from Rome, and dispatched Goldwell for the third time 'with a commission to expounde to her highness his hole mynde and sentence' on this subject; but he does not explain it in writing.⁵² The instructions are printed in Strype as if they were all given at one and the same time; and neither he, nor Collier, nor Phillips, nor Canon Tierney, has noticed that they belong to these three separate occasions. A copy of those given with the second letter of Dec. 1st is printed separately by Quirini,⁵³ but with some difference, being probably a Latin version sent to Rome.

At last the answer came from Rome; and the effect of Pole's letters seems to have been that the second Brief was issued. The Card. Legate had not made any use as yet of the faculties granted to him by the Brief of 3d

⁴⁷ Renard's Despatch in Tytler's *Ekta. VI. and Mary*, vol. ii. p. 393.

⁴⁸ *Quirini*, vol. iv. p. 127.

⁴⁹ Goldwell's *Instructions*, Strype's *Cramer*, App. No. lxxv.

⁵⁰ Renard in Tytler, *ut supra*.

⁵¹ *Quirini*, vol. iv. p. 130.

⁵² Goldwell's *Instructions*, Strype's *Cramer*, Append. No. lxxv.

⁵³ Vol. v. p. 171.

Aug. The second Brief gave him more extensive powers, enabling him to dispense with the Bishops who had obtained uncanonical possession of their sees, and also to give the canonical confirmation to those nominated by the Queen. It is dated on the 8th of March, and was despatched from Rome on the 9th.⁵⁴ Pole was at that time at Paris, and the despatches reached him there by the 17th. His letter to the Queen seems to have put matters into the proper track; and Henry Pynning had arrived with letters of procuration from the Bishops designate. These were seven: Parfew alias Wharton translated from St. Asaph to Hereford, Griffith nominated to Rochester, Brookes to Gloucester, Cotes to Chester, Bourne to Bath and Wells, Morgan to St. David's, and White to Lincoln. He at once proceeded to give them absolution and dispensation; and it is specially mentioned that they are allowed 'to minister in their orders, provided that if not ordained before their lapse into schism, they had been otherwise duly and lawfully promoted.'⁵⁵ By another instrument he dispensed with Parfew alias Wharton for his unlawful intrusion into the see of St. Asaph, and gave him liberty to use the gift of consecration received in schism.⁵⁶ The next day he issued the mandate of confirmation; but nothing is said of consecration, and it seems as if this was left to take its course. They were consecrated on the 1st April by Bonner, with Tonstall and Gardiner assisting, acting by commission of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.⁵⁷ It seems doubtful whether either of those three had been rehabilitated at that time. On the 7th of April the Queen addressed a letter with her own hands⁵⁸ to the Sovereign Pontiff, asking for his approbation of what his Legate had done; and in the Con-

⁵⁴ *Quirini*, vol. iv. p. 130. 'Alli ix. del presente scrissi a V. S. R. per via di Francia.' Letter of Card. Morone.

⁵⁵ Pole's *Registrum Expeditionum*, p. 1. See App. XIII.

⁵⁶ Raynaldus, *Annals*, vol. xiv. p. 527-8.

⁵⁷ Stubbs' *Registr. Sac. Angl.*

⁵⁸ *Quirini*, vol. iv. p. 139.

history, on the 6th July, his Holiness preconised these seven Bishops, though it is expressed that 'the gift of consecration had been otherwise duly and rightfully conferred,' as if there had been something amiss, and probably referring to the consecrating Bishops being still under censure. Afterwards, on the 10th of the same month, the Pope replied to the Queen's letter, congratulating her on the choice she had made of Bishops, and on her 'proposing them for the confirmation of the Apostolic See, according to the usual Catholic custom.'⁵⁹

In like manner Thirlby received his rehabilitation on being translated from Norwich to Ely, furnishing the only instance in which the clause of the second Brief was called into operation that relates to persons having received cathedral churches at the hands of Edward.⁶⁰ Afterwards three other priests—Hopton, Bayne, and Holyman—on being nominated to Norwich, Lichfield, and Bristol, received absolution and dispensation, followed by the mandate for their confirmation and consecration, which they are directed to receive from a Catholic Bishop.⁶¹ But these and the former were the only instances in which the absolution and dispensation were given in a public and formal manner. And in each case the recipients had to depute some one to appear as proctor on their behalf before the Cardinal Legate, and in their name to make on his knees a solemn renunciation of all errors and heresies, with a promise on oath of fidelity and obedience to the Holy See.

Yet it is certain that the others received a private absolution, and were confirmed in their sees. And the means taken seems to have been through Goldwell, on the last occasion of his being dispatched on a mission to the Queen. He then seems to have entered into communication with the Bishops, and to have carried back

⁵⁹ Raynaldus, *ut supra*.

⁶⁰ Pole's *Registr. Exp.* fol. 5. See Append. No. XV.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

their letters of submission, on which the Cardinal sent them their absolution from censures, and conferred on them some of his legatine faculties. For Pole, writing on the 25th of May, speaks of 'the letters of procuration of the Bishops' as among the facts passed.⁶² This cannot refer merely to the seven Bishops first nominated, because he goes on to say that 'nothing is wanting to conclude the entire reduction of the kingdom to the obedience of the Church, but the question of the church-property.'⁶³ The reconciliation was not as yet to be made public; for the Bishops were directed to use the faculties they received with caution, and only to 'publish them to such as would gladly receive them,' as mentioned in a letter from Goldwell to Thornden, suffragan Bishop of Dover, which describes the course of procedure. Goldwell had carried letters from him to the Cardinal, on which, after some difficulty, his absolution was sent to him, and certain faculties granted. And it is mentioned, that the other Bishops had also received faculties, as well as the Archdeacon of Canterbury.⁶⁴ But so great was the number of English people resorting to the Cardinal at Brussels, that he granted faculties to William Sparkman, an English priest residing in Flanders, to absolve them from excommunication, and reconcile them to the Church.⁶⁵

After Pole had arrived in England, and had pronounced the public reconciliation of the kingdom, he summoned all the Bishops to a meeting at Lambeth, on the 25th January, at which, after consulting with them on several questions, he admonished all those who had not entered on their office *per os*ium, to supply what was wanting by the authority of the Holy Sec.⁶⁶ This, however, can only refer to a public and formal absolution and dispensation; for Bonner and Tonsall had already acted in the consecration of the

⁶² *Quirini*, vol. iv. p. 139, 'le procure dei vescovi.'

⁶⁴ Foxe, vol. vii. p. 297. See App. No. XIV.

⁶⁵ The original grant is among the Charters in the Bodleian Library.

⁶⁶ Marini Transcripts. See App. No. XVIII.

new Bishops, whose mandate of consecration directed them to receive it from a Catholic Bishop; yet they, as well as the others, all obtained at once a formal document to this effect. The earliest of these documents is dated on the 26th January, and the latest on the 10th February. After this he gave them each a formal commission of legatine faculties; which commission was also granted in the same terms to the Official of the Chapter and the Archdeacon of Canterbury; to the Chapters of St. Asaph, Bangor, Exeter, and York in the vacancy of those Sees; and to the Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors of the two Universities.⁶⁷

The dispensation to Gardiner is not entered in the Register, but that to Tonsall recognises the fact of his having been confirmed in his bishopric by authority of the Holy See, and having in other respects duly received consecration. But in all the other cases, that is of Bishops consecrated during the reign of Henry VIII, the consecration is treated as irregular, although valid, on account of having been 'received from heretical and schismatical Bishops, and in other respects unduly, provided that the form and intention of the Church had been preserved' (ab episcopis hæreticis et schismaticis ac alias minus rite quorumcunque ordinum et muneris consecrationis susceptorum, dummodo in eorum collatione sit servata intentio et forma ecclesie).⁶⁸ In addition to the several diocesan Bishops and certain suffragans, the dispensation is also granted to Shaxton, Holgate, and Hodgekyn, but with different limitations. Shaxton is permitted to act as suffragan Bishop, and to exercise pontifical offices with leave of the Bishop of the diocese; Holgate is directed to abstain from pontifical offices; Hodgekyn is interdicted and suspended from them. On the same authority we are able to correct an error in Sanders,⁶⁹ who says

⁶⁷ *Registrum Expeditionum*, vol. i. fol. 32. See App. No. XVIII.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* See App. No. XV. ⁶⁹ *Hist. Schism. Angl.* p. 350. Rome, 1586.

that Kitchen alone did not apply for the dispensation. But it was granted to him in the same form as to the others. Very probably he had not applied for it privately, or before the restoration of religion had become law, as the others had done, and the Card. Legate's address seems to imply that there were some not yet in a canonical position.

The faculties granted to the Bishops extended only to giving absolution and dispensation to the clergy and laity in their dioceses, with power to grant these extraordinary faculties to the parish-priests and other proper persons, but did not include Bishops, even if residing within their jurisdiction. And it is clear that the faculties previously granted were not more extensive than those of which the copy is preserved; for Goldwell tells Thornden that his faculties only extended to absolving priests, and that no Bishop in England had more power. The Cardinal Legate thus reserved to himself the power of absolving Bishops; and it is the fact, that in every instance met with, it has come direct from him.

In view of these facts we are in a position to examine the effect of the testimonial letter given to Scory by Bonner,⁷⁰ which recites Scory's marriage, and suspension thereupon from the public exercise of his pastoral functions, with his subsequent penitence, and that Bonner had rehabilitated him and restored him to the public exercise of the ecclesiastical ministry within the diocese of London. Scory is described as 'our confrère lately Bishop of Chichester,' and therefore his pastoral office would naturally mean the office of a Bishop. But it is quite clear that Bonner had no power to restore him as a Bishop, and no jurisdiction over him, if he even claimed to be recognised as a Bishop; so that Scory must himself have acknowledged the nullity of his consecration, in order to

⁷⁰ Burnet, *Hist. Ref. Records*, book ii. No. 13. Printed also by Elrington and Dr. Lee.

enable Bonner to deal with him at all. In fact, the letter does no more than enable him to celebrate mass in churches within the diocese of London. Scory had been by law in possession of the see of Chichester, as fully as Bonner had been in possession of that of London; and Bonner may therefore have given him the honorary title. He would be sure not to have given more than this, for Day had a prior claim to be Bishop of Chichester. Scory had been put in possession there, as Ridley had been at London; but for Bonner to admit Scory's claim would have been weakening his own title at London. But, besides these objections, the form of the document gives ground of suspicion as to its authenticity. It mentions Scory's marriage as if that act constituted his only offence, and deprivation of the public exercise of his functions as if there were no graver censures that he had incurred. In does not mention his having been professed in a Religious Order,⁷¹ and having wilfully abandoned it, or having fallen into various heresies, and joined in heretical rites. These circumstances are detailed in the cases of Holgate and Hodgekyn, and Scory had taken a more prominent part than they had, in the evil courses of the day. He was therefore under suspension, excommunication, and interdict for these excesses, and 'insordescens' therein. But this is not stated, nor that he had been absolved from these censures. If the grant of absolution could be found, it might throw light on this document. But as it stands, it is no proof whatever of Bonner's having admitted Scory's episcopal character, and rather tells the other way.

It is then urged that the ordinations under Edw. VI. were allowed by the Cardinal Legate, and therefore the presumption is in favour of Anglican Orders at this day. 'King Edward's Form of Ordination,' says Bramhall, 'was judged valid in Queen Mary's days by all Catholics, and

⁷¹ He had been a Dominican friar at Cambridge (Athen. Cantab.).

particularly by Cardinal Pole, then Apostolic Legate in England; and by the then Pope, Paul IV.; and by all the Clergy and Parliament of England.⁷²

When Cardinal Pole reconciled the kingdom to the Holy See, it was in virtue of faculties granted to him for that purpose. His powers were therein carefully and fully defined, and there is no suspicion or reason alleged, that he did not observe his instructions. Neither is it pretended that he had secret instructions, or that he proceeded in any way but that which the Sovereign Pontiff had directed him to keep. The assertion of Bramhall must be tested by the Papal Brief, and not by the abstract of it, a portion of which he quotes, and on which he relies as evidence of his statement. The acts of the Cardinal must be judged by his commission; for if they were not what he was commanded to do, they could be nothing else than nullities. But in truth the Papal Brief and the Cardinal's acts furnish the clearest possible evidence that the Holy See regarded the Edwardine ordinations as utterly worthless.

Bramhall relies on the dispensation granted by the Cardinal, and recited in the statute 1 & 2 P. & M. c. 8. He there promises to receive in their orders and benefices those persons who should return to the unity of the Church. He admits that these orders and benefices may have been obtained not validly and only in the way of fact. From this Bramhall concludes that the Cardinal recognised not only the ordinations celebrated in the schism under Henry VIII., but those also under Edward VI.; and will not allow that there is any difference between them. But this is assuming what is not proved, and cannot be granted. Before men can be received in their orders, it must first be shown whether they have been ordained or not. It was notorious that they held benefices, but that could be done without holy orders; and

⁷² Consecr. of Prot. Bishops, c. iv. p. 60. ed. Oxon.

he might allow those to hold benefices even after their orders had been found null, provided they had at least received the tonsure, or intended to receive it.

We must therefore examine the Brief containing the legate faculties granted to Pole. The first Brief had given him power 'to absolve Bishops and other ecclesiastics for heresy, schism, and other offences, and from the censures incurred thereby, and to dispense with them, so that, the premises notwithstanding, they might minister in their orders even in the ministry of the altar, provided that before their lapse into heresy they had been duly and lawfully promoted and ordained; and might retain any benefices even with cure of souls, provided that no other claimed the right over them; and that if not promoted, they may be promoted by their ordinaries to all even sacred orders and the priesthood, if they are found worthy and fit, and may receive and retain ecclesiastical benefices, if in other respects canonically conferred upon them.'

It is obvious that the powers here granted to the Cardinal Legate do not extend to any questions relating to orders conferred during the schism. The Brief only contemplates two classes: those who had been duly ordained before the schism, and those who being merely clerics or in minor orders, or subdeacons, or deacons, might now be made priests.

The second Brief was therefore issued, which grants him permission to use all his faculties while still out of the kingdom, and confers on him the following additional powers:

'On behalf of bishops, prelates, and other inferior clerics, even with regard to orders which they have received either not at all or in ill manner, and the gift of consecration which has been conferred upon them by other bishops, even heretical and schismatical; or in other respects unduly, and without keeping the accustomed form of the Church, even if they have rashly exercised such orders and gift even about the ministry of the altar.

'Also in the case of the persons of any bishops or archbishops who have received metropolitan or other cathedral churches at the hands of laymen even schismatics, especially of King Henry and Edward his son, and intruded themselves into the government and administration thereof, rashly and de facto usurping the fruits and revenues thereof even for a length of time, as if true archbishops or bishops, and even if they have fallen into heresy, as aforesaid, or had been heretics beforehand;

'After that they have been restored by you to the unity of Holy Mother Church, and you deem it right to rehabilitate them, should they appear to you in other respects worthy and suitable, to appoint them afresh to the same metropolitan and other cathedral churches;

'Also by our authority to provide any other cathedral churches, even metropolitan, being vacant for the time by death or deprivation of the prelates thereof, or in any other way, with the fit and proper persons for whom the Q. Mary herself has supplicated you according to the customs of the realm, and to appoint such persons over the same churches as bishops or archbishops:

'And that you may freely and lawfully dispense with those who have received cathedral and metropolitan churches at the hands of laymen, even schismatics, as aforesaid, so that they may freely and lawfully preside as bishops or archbishops over such cathedral churches, even metropolitan, whether the same or other, to which they may be in other respects duly translated, and may rule and govern such churches in spirituals and temporals, and may use the gift of consecration heretofore conferred upon them, or in case it has not yet been conferred upon them, that they may receive it from Catholic bishops or archbishops to be nominated by you.

'Likewise with any having been for the time absolved and rehabilitated by you, as premised, that, their past errors and excesses notwithstanding, they may freely and lawfully be appointed and preside as bishops and archbishops over any cathedral churches, even metropolitan, and rule and govern them in spirituals and temporals, and be promoted to any even sacred orders and the priesthood, and minister in them, or in orders already received by them, although unduly, even in the ministry of the altar, and likewise receive the gift of consecration, and use the same; we grant you by these presents full and free apostolic authority, faculty, and power.'

It is, then, clear that these additional powers comprehend the ordinations celebrated during the whole time

of the schism; and that with reference to the questions that might arise therefrom, both Clergy and Bishops are divided into two classes: viz. of the Clergy, those who have not received orders at all, and those who have received them ill, that is to say, orders null and orders irregular: 'ordines quos nunquam aut male susceperunt.' The Bishops in like manner who have received cathedral churches from Henry or Edward, are divided into those on whom 'the gift of consecration has been heretofore conferred,' and 'those on whom it is not yet conferred;' 'munere consecrationis eis hactenus impenso, vel si illud eis nondum impensum extiterit.' The cases in which the ordination or consecration had been validly though irregularly conferred are also described as 'received from heretical or schismatic Bishops, or in other respects unduly;' 'quod iis ab episcopis hereticis et schismaticis aut alias minus rite et non servata forma ecclesie consueta impensum fuit,' and 'minus rite susceptis ordinibus.' And power is also given to the Legate by the words 'non servata forma Ecclesie consueta,' to consider cases in which the ancient form of the sacrament had not been observed, and if the form used was sufficient for validity, to admit it as such, and to permit a person ordained in such a manner to exercise the orders so received.

We have now to inquire in what manner the Cardinal Legate exercised the powers conferred upon him; how he dealt with the cases that came before him; and what interpretation he put upon the terms quoted above.

Before the Cardinal arrived in England he had to decide upon Thirby's case, who had been consecrated Bishop of Westminster in the reign of Henry VIII., and had so far complied with the changes in Edward's reign that he had been translated to Norwich. He thus came under the terms in the Brief, of having received a cathedral church from the hands of both Henry and Edward, and usurped the administration and revenues of it. On

the death of Goodrich, he was nominated by Queen Mary to Ely, and Pole was petitioned to confirm the nomination, and to grant him the necessary absolution and dispensation, which he does, absolving him from all censures, 'even on account of his undue detention of the church of Norwich and its revenues, and his receiving whatever orders and the gift of consecration from heretical and schismatic Bishops, and in other respects unduly' (alias minus rite); and he dispenses with him, that notwithstanding the irregularity thereupon incurred, he 'may exercise all the orders received as aforesaid even unduly, and may be appointed to any cathedral church as Bishop, and may use the gift of consecration so received as aforesaid.'⁷³

The dispensation to Thirlby was granted before Pole's arrival in England, on his sending over a Proctor to express his penitence and promise of obedience to the Holy See. After his arrival, the Cardinal Legate granted a formal dispensation to the other Bishops. That to Day Bishop of Chichester is in the following terms: 'By reason of the detention of the church of Chichester, and of whatever orders and gift of consecration received from heretical and schismatic Bishops and in other respects unduly, and because while entangled with such censures, you have celebrated masses and other divine offices, even possibly in opposition to the rites and ceremonies hitherto approved and used by the Catholic Church, or in other ways have mixed yourself up therein,' with a dispensation 'to exercise even the sacred orders and the priesthood even received as aforesaid from heretical and schismatic Bishops even unduly, provided that the form and intention of the Church had been preserved.'⁷⁴

The dispensation is granted in the same form to Aldridge Bishop of Carlisle, Chamber of Peterborough, Salcot of Sarum, Hethe of Worcester, Kitchen of Landaff, King of Oxford, and Bonner of London; all of whom had

⁷³ *Regist. Exped.* vol. i. p. 2. See Appendix. No. XV.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* fol. 47.

been appointed and consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII. And in all of these cases the orders and consecration are said to be 'received from heretical Bishops, and in other respects unduly.' We may therefore conclude that the class of Bishops and clergy described under the words 'alias minus rite' comprehends all those who had been ordained or consecrated after the schism had begun, although according to the ancient rite. And thus Dr. Elrington, Mr. Haddan, Dr. Lee, and other Anglican writers have been entirely mistaken in referring the words 'minus rite' to ordinations after the Edwardine form.

Cardinal Pole, having absolved and dispensed with the Bishops, proceeded then, as already stated, to grant them certain of the extraordinary faculties which he held as Legate. He grants powers of absolving persons of either sex, and also those in holy orders, and of dispensing with them on account of the irregularity they had incurred, so that they might be permitted to minister even at the altar in their orders, though received from heretical and schismatic Bishops even unduly, provided that the form and intention of the Church had been preserved, and to retain benefices they had received even from schismatic Bishops or lay authority, and in case of persons holding benefices without being in any orders, that they might be promoted to all, even the sacred orders and the priesthood, if found to be worthy and fit, and might retain their benefices, if in other respects canonically conferred.⁷⁵ He thus points out the same two classes that have been mentioned before, viz. one, those who had been ordained during the schism in some respects unduly, but according to the ancient Catholic rite; the other, persons who were holding ecclesiastical benefices without being ordained at all. The first class were to be allowed to exercise the orders they had received, and to retain their benefices; and the others might be ordained, if worthy, and also re-

⁷⁵ *Regist. Exped.* vol. i. fol. 32. Appendix. No. XVIII.

tain their benefices, if otherwise canonically conferred. It is also evident that though the Cardinal had power to recognise ordinations in which some departure had been made from the accustomed form of the Church, yet that on examination he found no other form in use which could be admitted by the Church as valid, and he therefore requires that only those ordinations should be recognised in which 'the form and intention of the Church had been preserved.' By this proviso he expressly limited the power given him from Rome; for though the Brief said 'non servata forma Ecclesie consueta,' his words are 'dummodo in eorum collatione ecclesie forma et intentio sit servata.' Thus the first class is limited to those who had been ordained while the ancient Pontifical was still in use. But we have still to inquire who are the persons described in the second class as possessed of benefices, but not ordained. Does it mean persons who had never had any ordination, or those whose ordination was considered invalid?

Now we do find instances recorded corresponding with the class here described. The Cardinal Legate empowered the Bishop of St. David's to treat the case of Thomas Barlow, who, without having received any clerical character, had obtained possession of the prebend of Nantgawlle, in the collegiate church of Llandewi Breyr, being only of the age of fifteen years. And as he had renounced the schism, and had been made a cleric, the Bishop may dispense with him, so that he may be ordained, and may then collate him afresh to the said prebend.⁷⁶ A dispensation of the same tenor was granted to Roger Barlow for the prebend of Llanorthven in the collegiate church of Brecon, obtained when he was twelve years old;⁷⁷ to Matthew Carewe for the archdeaconry of Norwich, obtained in his nineteenth year;⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *Regist. Exped.* vol. v. fol. 170. See Append. No. XXI.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* fol. 171. ⁷⁸ *Ibid.* fol. 179.

and to John Gwynne for the canony of Llanvaír in Bangor Cathedral,⁷⁹ in each case without receiving any clerical character. In the three first cases it is clear that ordination could not have been given in any way at the time the preferment was conferred; but in the case of John Gwynne it seems probable that he had received orders by the new rite, as he was first collated to the prebend of Llanvaír in 1550,⁸⁰ and having resigned it the following year, was collated to it again in 1555, at which time it is not likely that he would have obtained this favour unless he was supposed to be an ecclesiastic.

Again, in the visitation of the diocese of Lincoln by Bishop White, the late Rector of Wodhall in Bedfordshire was presented as guilty of habitual adultery. He had never been ordained Priest, and yet had administered the Sacraments during the schism.⁸¹ If this man had received Protestant orders, here is evidence of their disallowance. If, on the other hand, he had not been ordained at all, in this and the cases mentioned above there is evidence of the indifference and carelessness with which Holy Orders were treated.

We come, however, to a case in which it is implied that Anglican orders had been received.

In 1554 Bourne Bishop of Bath and Wells gave a commission to John Cottrel, his Vicar-general, to 'remove, deprive, reform, correct and punish those that were intruded into ecclesiastical benefices, and married clerics, and also to deal with married laics, who in pretence and under colour of priestly orders had rashly and unlawfully mingled themselves in ecclesiastical rights, in *juribus ecclesiasticis*, and had obtained *de facto* parochial churches with cure of souls and ecclesiastical dignities, against the sacred sanctions of the canons and ecclesiastical rites, and to de-

⁷⁹ *Regist. Exped.* vol. v. fol. 169.

⁸⁰ *Athene Cantabrigienses*, vol. i. p. 324.

⁸¹ *Strype's Mem.* vol. iii. App. li. p. 165.

prive and remove them from the said churches and dignities.⁸² These 'married laics,' then, were persons who professed to have received Holy Orders in some shape. It could not be merely that they had been ordained in schism, because in such case they were to be permitted to retain their benefices, provided that they renounced their pretended marriages, and that 'the form and intention of the Church had been observed in their ordination.' It can, then, only be that they had been ordained according to the Edwardine form, and therefore their orders are not admitted, and they are treated as mere laymen.

Again, on the 2d October 1556, George Aynsworth was examined before John Hopton Bishop of Norwich, and Sir Edward Waldegrave, and confessed on oath, that 'he had taken upon him ministracion under constraint, having been led unwarily to give bounds, his conscience always grieving him that he was no minister, and desiring to live as a layman, as his conscience bears him witness that he is.'⁸³ This appears to be the case of a person ordained by the Protestant rite, and reduced to the state of a layman. The 'bounds,' *i.e.* bonds, probably were given to the effect that he should pay part of the income of the benefice to the patron, as other contracts of this nature are mentioned and prohibited in the Synodal Statutes proposed by Cardinal Pole in 1557.⁸⁴

In the proceedings about George Marsh in the year 1555, as related by himself, in Foxe,⁸⁵ being brought before the Earl of Derby, he was asked, 'whether he was a Priest? I said, no. Then he asked me what had been my living. I answered, I was a minister, served a cure, and taught a school. Then said my lord to his council, This is a wonderful thing. Afore he said he was no Priest, and now he confesseth himself to be one.

⁸² Taken by Strype from Bourne's *Register. Memorials*, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 332.
⁸³ Harleian, 421, fol. 171. See Appendix, No. XX.

⁸⁴ Wilkins, vol. iv. p. 5.
⁸⁵ Vol. vii. p. 41.

I answered, By the laws now used in this realm, as far as I do know, I am none. Then they asked me who gave me orders, or whether I had taken any at all. I answered, I received orders of the Bishops of London and Lincoln. Then said they one to another, Those be of these new heretics; and asked me what acquaintance I had with them. I answered, I never saw them but when I received orders. I had been curate but one year, and ministered with a good conscience; and if the laws of the realm would have suffered me, I would have ministered still.'

A similar distinction of two classes is made in the Articles of Bonner's visitation, as follows:

'Article 12.

'*Item.* Whether there be any dwelling within any your parishes, or repairing thither any priest, or other, naming himself minister, which doth not come diligently to church to hear the divine service, &c.?

'Article 13.

'*Item.* Whether there be any married priests, or naming themselves ministers, that do keep any assemblies or conventicles, with such-like as they are, in office or sect, &c.?

'Article 25.

'*Item.* Whether there be any person that doth serve any cure, or minister any sacraments, not being priest; or if any do take upon them to use the room and office of the parson, or vicar, or curate, of any benefice or spiritual promotion, receiving the fruits thereof, not being admitted thereunto by the ordinary?

'Article 29.

'*Item.* Whether any such as were ordered schismatical, and contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church, or being unlawfully and schismatically married, after the late innovation and manner, being not yet reconciled nor admitted by the ordinary, have celebrated or said either mass or other divine service, within any cure or place of this city or diocese?⁸⁶

In the two first of these Articles there is mention of two classes of persons, one of 'priests,' the other of

⁸⁶ Pockocke's *Burnet*, vol. v. p. 396-9.

those 'naming themselves ministers.' The latter are therefore not acknowledged to be priests. And the third Article inquires as to the doings of any one 'not being priest;' which will include not only those 'naming themselves ministers,' but also any one who had the presumption to act as priest without even that pretence. And the fourth Article makes inquiry as to persons who had been ordained in the time of schism, and who therefore required to be reconciled to the Church before they could be 'admitted to say mass.' Not all of these had been ordained 'contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church;' but the inquiry is so framed as to include the cases of both kinds. It was highly necessary to make the inquiry; but it does not follow that those of the latter class, even if 'reconciled,' would thereupon be 'admitted by the ordinary' to say mass, without another ordination.

The inferences drawn from these various sources are confirmed by Protestant testimony given in the next reign; for in the Injunctions issued by Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, at his Visitation in 1561, the following interrogatory was made: '13. Whether any that took orders in King Edward's daies, not contented with that, were ordered agayne in Quene Marie's daies.'⁸⁷

It is urged on the other side by Bramhall and Had- dan, that there is no evidence of reordination, and that the Registers of Canterbury and several other dioceses have been searched, without producing a single instance of reordination. This is only the result that might be expected. The Church holds reordination to be a sacrilege, and forbids its perpetration. If any of the Edwardine clergy were led by Divine grace to renounce their errors, and were judged worthy of promotion to the priesthood, they would have been ordained as laymen, not reordained. There is no attempt to show that the Protestant orders

⁸⁷ Second Report of Ritual Commission, p. 401.

were ever allowed in a given case; or that any one ordained by the Edwardine form was allowed to celebrate mass, or to retain his benefice. On the other hand, Anglican writers do not allude to the number of persons who are stated to be in possession of benefices without orders. The fact is, that the Anglican orders were completely ignored, and those who had received them were looked upon to all intents and purposes as mere laymen.

But an argument is raised by Dr. Elrington, that the objection extended to all orders conferred in schism, and not merely to those according to the new form. This, however, is contrary to the whole tenor of Cardinal Pole's proceedings. And we have a remarkable instance to the point in the case of Hethe Bishop of Worcester, who, after having received his absolution and dispensation for that see, was translated to the archbishopric of York. When the Bull of his confirmation came from Rome, it was found to contain a license for his consecration, and that he was treated as a simple cleric,⁸⁸ instead of a Bishop. He therefore scrupled acting on it, and represented the facts again to the Holy See. Another Brief was issued, in which every step of his ordination is recited, viz. that he had been ordained and consecrated by one or more schismatic Bishops, but who had been themselves consecrated by the form of the Catholic Church, and that he had received orders and consecration from them according to the same form.⁸⁹ Thus the orders conferred in schism were fully recognised, and a dispensation was granted, allowing him to exercise them, notwithstanding the irregularity incurred by the mode of receiving them.

But, says Dr. Elrington, 'we have a complete proof, that even orders conferred during schism, which wanted but the confirmation of the Pope, were deemed invalid,

⁸⁸ See the *Acta Consistorialia* in Raynaldus, vol. xiv. p. 557.

⁸⁹ See Appendix, No. XIX.

for Latimer, Ridley, and Ferrar, though consecrated according to the Romish ritual, and by Bishops who had been confirmed by the Pope, were not degraded, previously to their martyrdom, from the order of Bishops, but only from that of priests.⁸⁹

Burnet also says,⁹⁰ 'They went upon the old notion that orders given in schism were not valid, so they did not esteem Hooper nor Ridley Bishops, and therefore degraded them only from priesthood, though they had been ordained by their own forms, saving only the oath to the Pope.'

He thus confines himself to Ridley, throwing in Hooper quite gratuitously; but Collier goes further and adds Latimer also, referring to Foxe as his authority.⁹¹ Later writers, as Dr. Pusey, Dr. Oldknow, and others, have followed the lead, and have taken it for granted that Latimer, Ridley, and Ferrar were all three in the same position as regards their consecration, and were all three treated in the same manner, viz. that they had all been consecrated by the rite of the Pontifical, and were all three degraded from priesthood only, and not from the episcopate; and Catholic writers have admitted the facts without question.⁹² Each of the three cases must, however, be considered separately.

First as to Latimer. There is no ground or pretence whatever for saying that his degradation was from priesthood only, or that his episcopal character was not fully acknowledged throughout the proceedings. It is simply an error of Collier's. The sentence in Foxe directs his degradation from the dignity of Bishop, but there is no account of this part of it being carried into execution, as the scene with Brooks relates to Ridley only.

Next as to Ridley. Ridley had been consecrated on the 5th of September 1547. And in the Register of

⁸⁹ *Validity* &c. p. 83.

⁹⁰ Vol. ii. p. 290.

⁹¹ Vol. vi. p. 121. Chambréy, Coistable, and Dodd.

his consecration it is expressly stated that 'the gift of consecration was conferred by the unction of the sacred Christ, and the imposition of hands;'⁹³ so that there is no doubt that the rite of the Pontifical was followed, and that he was really a Bishop.

Now let us see how the circumstances stand with regard to his degradation. It is true that we have an account of it in Foxe, on the evidence of a person stated to have been present, in which a dialogue is represented as taking place between Brooks acting as the delegate and Ridley; and Brooks is made to say,⁹⁴ 'We must proceed according to our commission to degrading, taking from you the dignity of priesthood. For we take you for no Bishop, and therefore we will the sooner have done with you.' This hearsay report, of which no one can say how much is original, and how much is Foxe's own addition, is the sole authority for any doubt having been raised as to Ridley being a Bishop.

On the other hand, we have, first the commission of the Cardinal Legate⁹⁵ to White Bishop of Lincoln, Brooks Bishop of Gloucester, and Holyman Bishop of Bristol, to cite, examine, and judge M. Hugh Latimer and M. Dr. Ridley, 'pretensed Bishops of Worcester and London, for divers erroneous opinions; with power, in case they would recant, to reconcile them to the Church; or otherwise, to proceed against them as heretics, degrading them from their promotion and dignity of Bishops, priests, and all other ecclesiastical orders.' This commission therefore directs their degradation as Bishops, the phrase 'pretensed Bishops' referring to their uncanonical and schismatical possession of their sees.

Next, the Bishop of Lincoln in his exhortation to Ridley, used the following terms: 'You were once one of

⁹³ Contarayer, *D'usage de la Dissertation*, tom. ii. pt. ii. App. p. xxxvi. See Appendix, No. VII.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 518.

⁹⁵ Vol. vii. p. 543.

us, you have taken degrees in the school; you were made a priest and became a preacher, setting forth the same doctrine that we do now. You were made a Bishop according to our laws.⁹⁶

Then comes the sentence, of which Foxe gives the effect, referring it to Ridley only, in these terms: 'They therefore (the said John of Lincoln, James of Gloucester, John of Bristol) did judge and condemn the said Nicholas Ridley as a heretic, and so adjudged him presently, both by word and deed, to be degraded from the degree of a Bishop, from priesthood, and all ecclesiastical order.'⁹⁷

Heylin has given the sentence in the same terms, with some verbal differences, but evidently taken from an independent source; and he makes it include Latimer as well as Ridley. Then he adds, 'According to which sentence they were both degraded on the 15th October.'⁹⁸ Therefore we have two formal documents, against which Foxe's hearsay narrative is of no weight whatever. And there can be no doubt that the sentence was carried out strictly according to its terms; for even in Foxe's narrative Brookes is made to say, 'We must proceed according to our commission.' Even supposing that Brookes' proceedings were such as described by Foxe, they would be of no theological importance, being simply done in error, contrary to his commission, and the joint sentence of himself and his colleagues.

Then as to Ferrar. There is no doubt that he was sentenced and degraded simply as 'presbyter';⁹⁹ but the question of his consecration stands on different ground from that of Ridley's. The Register of his consecration states¹⁰⁰ that 'on Sunday the 9th September 1548, the Archbishop in his pontificals, the Bishops of Lincoln and

⁹⁶ Vol. ii. p. 520.

⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 540.

⁹⁸ *Hist. Ref.* Q. Mary, p. 52-3.

⁹⁹ Foxe, vii. p. 25.

¹⁰⁰ Courayer, *Dif. de la Dissert.* vol. ii. pt. 2. App. p. xxxvii. See Appendix, No. VIII.

Rochester assisting, Robert Ferrar to the bishopric of St. David's;—there is, then, some error either in the Register itself, or in the printed copy, for there is no verb to follow the nominative case.¹⁰¹ The Register then goes on to state that, 'after common prayer had been read according to the usage of the English Church, the same Menevensis was consecrated and blessed by the imposition of the hands of the aforesaid Bishops.' *Idem Menevensis lectis publice communibus suffragiis de more Ecclesie Anglicane visitatis, consecratus et benedictus per impositionem manuum Episcoporum predict. fuit.* Then the Holy Eucharist was consecrated in the vernacular and communion given in English words. There is no mention of the sacred Christ being used, or of the episcopal insignia being put on. This is not a proof of the omission of those ceremonies, for they are not always mentioned in the Registers. But in a time of transition we might expect to find the exact details recorded of what was done. There is mention made of 'common prayer being said,' which term usually means the English Prayer Book; but it may here refer to the Litany which was ordered by the King's Injunctions the year before. And not merely was communion given in English, according to the 'Order' then lately come into use, but the consecration also of the Holy Eucharist was in the vernacular. Yet King Edward's First Book was then only in course of preparation, and if the rite of that Book was followed, it was altogether anticipating its public approval. If such an innovation was made without authority of Parliament, there may have been also some innovation in 'the making of' the new Bishop. Certainly the rubric of the Pontifical was not strictly followed, for the Sarum rite required the consecration to come just before the Gospel; and it seems to have been all done before the 'reading of the Psalms,

¹⁰¹ Probably in the printed copy; for in several other cases the verbal errors of the Register are corrected in notes.

Hymns and Prayers,' which appear to mean the Introit, Gloria, and Collects at the beginning of the Order of Communion. Yet King Edward's Ordinal also directed the consecration to come after the Gospel and Credo. The Pontifical was compiled with, in having the Epistle and Gospel for the Sunday, for 'the Gospel of Matthew' was read, which was the Gospel for the 15th Sunday after Trinity; whereas the new Ordinal appointed a special Gospel for a Bishop's consecration. While such inconsistencies with any known order of things appear on the face of the narrative, it is impossible to say with certainty what was the course of procedure. But there would have been such an incongruity between the ancient rite of the Pontifical (if it were used), and 'the common suffrages' that preceded, with a rite in the vernacular following, that it is far from improbable that some omissions were made, which may have led the authorities who condemned Ferrar to believe his consecration invalid. Perhaps the omissions were considered to show a defective and wrongful intention. Even if the parts of the rite omitted would not be judged essential by theologians of the present day, the decision arrived at was probably owing to those omissions, and not to the mere fact of the consecration being conferred in schism. At any rate, without more precise information, we ought not hastily to assume that the contemporary Bishops who were acquainted with the facts were wrong in their decision.

With regard to Hooper, the case is clear. He was consecrated according to the Edwardine rite; and this was not allowed as valid, for he was condemned and degraded simply as a presbyter.

Bradford also, who had been ordained deacon by Ridley according to the new book, was sentenced simply as a layman.

A great point is made by some Catholic writers of a

statement in Brooke's Law Reports,¹⁰² that certain leases were pronounced void because the Bishop who granted them was found not to be validly consecrated. But this is altogether an error. The question of the leases had nothing to do with the validity of the Bishop's consecration. The case is related in Strype¹⁰³ from Bulstrode's Reports. The sole question in dispute was, whether Bonner's deprivation under the Commission from the Crown in Edward VI.'s reign held good in law. For by ecclesiastical law, Bonner had no more canonical right to the see than Ridley. The common-law judges were inclined to be of opinion that Bonner had not been legally deprived; but the lessee who claimed under Ridley's lease obtained a decree in Chancery in his favour. No question was raised about the validity of the consecration. Leases and other legal acts depended on the restitution of the temporalities, and not upon consecration.

It is important to notice the opinions of the Bishops of Queen Mary's reign upon this question, so far as they were publicly declared.

Gardiner, while in prison in Edward's reign, was required by the Duke of Somerset to state his opinion upon the Book of Common Prayer and 'another book of the making of Bishops and Priests.' He replied, that in his 'judgment it touched the honour and dignity of the King's person and succession, who by this order should never after be anointed, having no Samuel left to execute it, and it is a terrible saying, *Cessabit unctio vestra.*'¹⁰⁴ This may show that Gardiner had his objections to the new form, though probably he would not state them in full on such an occasion, being unwilling to speak at all, for it was 'no matter to be answered in prison'; but he mentioned probably what he thought would strike a person in Somerset's position.

¹⁰² Brooke's *Novell Cases*, 463, p. 101.

¹⁰³ *Mem.* iii. 57.

¹⁰⁴ Foxe, vol. vi. p. 114.

On another occasion he expressed himself more decidedly, namely, in a sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on the First Sunday in Advent 1554, in the presence of King Philip and the Cardinal Legate. This was the first Sunday after the public reconciliation of the kingdom. Machyn's Diary records the solemn reception of the King and the Cardinal by the Lord Mayor, the Chancellor, and other Bishops and clergy, and the choirs of the royal chapels uniting with St. Paul's to sing the Mass, but he says nothing of the sermon. FOXE mentions the sermon, and gives extracts from it, and it was printed at Rome. In it we find the following passage: 'What sort of Head of the Church was that, which lost at once half the clergy?¹⁰⁵ And after the priesthood was abolished, laymen, and persons profane and married were made ministers; so that in the course of a few years, of the half remaining there would be no clergy left at all.'¹⁰⁶

We may gather hence Gardiner's idea of the nullity of the Edwardine rite of making Priests, but are still in the dark as to his reasons for this opinion. Bonner, however, has left us more light upon the subject. In his Homilies we read as follows:

'Priestes beinge amongst other thynges called to the mynystration of the sacramentes and the chieftest and most pretiouse of all sacramentes being the Sacramente of the Aultare, in mynystration whereof the prieste ought bothe to consecrate and to offer. Therefore the late made mynysters in the tyme of the scysme, in theyr newe devised ordination, havinge no authoritic at all given them to offer in the masse the body and bloude of our Saviour Chryste, but bothe they so ordered [or rather disordered], and theyr schysmaticall orderers also, utterlye dispising and impugninge not onely the oblation or sacrifice of the masse, but also the reall pre-

¹⁰⁵ Perhaps referring to the suppression of the Religious Orders.

¹⁰⁶ Concio Reveren. D. Stephani Episcopi Wintonien. Angliae Cancellarii, habita Dominica prima Adventus, presentibus Sereniss. Rege et Reverendiss. Legato Apost. in maxima populi frequentia. Romae, apud Antonium Bladum, Impressorem Cameralem, 1555. A copy is in the Grenville Library. See Appendix, No. XVI.

sence of y^e body and bloude of our Saviour Chryste in the Sacrament of y^e Aultare; therefore I say that all suche bothe dampnably and presumptuously dyd offende against Almightye God, and also most pitefullye begyled the people of thys realme, who by thys meanes were defrauded of the most blessed body and bloude of our Saviour Chryste, and the most comfortable fruyte thereof, and also of the sacrifice of the masse, and of the inestimable fruyte which commeth therby. And seeing that every man (be he never soo simple) maye sufficientlye hereby perceyve howe these late counterfeitd mynysters have in so weightie a matter deceyved the peple, concernyng eternal salvation, and greatly abused them and brought them into a most lamentable stat, you may thereby consider bothe what thanks you owe to Almightye God who hath restored unto you the right use of the sacramentes agayne, and also howe much you ought to esteeme the right priesthode, nowe brought home agayne, by which, as an ordinary meanes, God worketh hys graces amongst you.¹⁰⁷

Here, then, we learn not merely by the terms 'counterfeited ministers,' 'beguiled, deceived, and abused the people,' that Bonner denied the validity of the Edwardine ordering of priests, but we may also see the ground of this denial, namely, the omission of the delivery of the Chalice and Host to the ordained, with the words, *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium* &c. Not that he speaks of this as an absolutely essential part of the rite, but because the omission of it was made with the purpose and intention of denying the true priesthood and the true sacrifice of the altar, or in Cardinal Pole's words, because 'the form and intention of the Church' was not preserved; and this ground of objection we shall find subsequently taken throughout the controversy in one form or another.

¹⁰⁷ Bonner's *Profitable and necessary doctrine*. Fol. Aa 4. London, 1555, 40.

Quien and Constable question Scory's identity, and throw doubts on Hodgskin's consecration, and even on his existence. Canon Williams has contented himself with examining Rymer and other works in print, and thus has raised theories which, if he had carried his investigations farther, he would have found untenable. Dr. Lingard and Canon Tierney are the only two writers on that side who have pursued their inquiries among original documents, and both of them were in favour of believing the facts related of Parker's consecration on the Anglican side.

The present undertaking will not take part with the extreme view on either side. While disbelieving the Nag's-Head story, as utterly unsupported by contemporary evidence, it is by no means necessary to suppose it 'a putid fable,' deliberately invented; because it is easy to imagine the growth of such a legend, without any individual being directly responsible. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how the proceedings alleged to have taken place on the 9th and 17th December 1559, can be denied, without calling in question the authenticity of our national records, which form the very foundations of English history. Yet, even supposing that everything took place as alleged on the 17th of December, an entirely independent question will arise respecting the present Register.

An endeavour will now be made to trace the history from the materials that have come to hand. But before entering on the course of events, it is necessary to touch a little on the characters and opinions of those who figure most prominently on the scene.

There is one person of more importance than Parker himself, namely, Barlow. His history has lately been told so well, that we may recount the leading facts on the authority of an Anglican writer.¹ 'Of all the Bishops who were created from the date of 1533 to the end of

¹ *Saturday Review*, Nov. 28, 1868, p. 713.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY.

THE beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign is the battlefield of controversy on the subject of Anglican Orders; a controversy conducted perhaps with greater heat and imputations more virulent than any controversy of modern times; the Nag's-Head story having provoked charges of inventing 'a putid fable' on one side, reciprocated by charges of forgery of records on the other.

It is to be regretted that such a cloud has arisen about the mere question of fact; because it has absorbed most of the public attention, and withdrawn it from the more important issues at stake, and at the same time has thrown the controversy into a shape unnecessarily irritating to the Anglican side. Whatever may have been the real facts with regard to Barlow or Parker, Catholics have nothing to gain from the discussion. The principles for which they contend will remain untouched, even granting that Barlow was duly consecrated, and that the Lambeth Register is to be fully depended on as an authentic record.

The Catholic side have been at a disadvantage in the controversy, because they have had to take the data of evidence supplied by Anglican writers. Hence their arguments can seldom reach beyond pointing out defects of proofs; and thus perhaps it has arisen, that they are inclined to push them too far: for instance, when Le

Edward Sixth's reign, Barlow is perhaps entitled to the palm for abject servility. He seems to have been a mere weathercock, changing sides perpetually, and always using the most violent language against those who differed from him. He had been professed as an Augustinian Canon at St. Osith's Priory in Essex. Whether his career commenced with the work in which he attacked the men of the new learning in unsparing terms, or whether he had been previously a favourer of those opinions, is not very important. He was retained in the service of Anne Boleyn as early as 1530, and was soon employed as an agent whom she, the King, and Cromwell might be quite sure of to do their pleasure.' Under Queen Anne's favour he obtained several preferments, as Prior, first of Haverfordwest, and then of Bisham, which were houses of his Order. The latter he held *in commendam*, after his nomination to the see of St. David's, and surrendered it to the King on July 5, 1536.

In October 1534 he was sent as Ambassador into Scotland in conjunction with Thomas Holcroft, in order to persuade King James to renounce the Pope.² A paper printed in Strype,³ as the memorial presented to the King on this occasion, bears marks of Barlow's peculiar style; but the Diurnal tells us that 'the English Ambassador who came to infest the realm with heresy, by the grace of God came no speed, but departed with repulse.'⁴ He made his 'repaire agayne' on the same mission in the early part of the next year, writing a letter at Berwick on his road, dated 10th Feb. 1534-5,⁵ being then in company with Lord William Howard, who conveyed the garter to King James. He seems to have returned from this embassy, and to have started for a third time in January

² *State Papers*, vol. v. p. 7.

³ *Memo.*, vol. i. App. No. lxiiii.

⁴ *Diurnal*, p. 19. There is some confusion of dates here, as the passage in the *Diurnal* is under the date of Nov. 1535; though the circumstances took place the year before.

⁵ *State Papers*, vol. v. p. 18.

1535-6,⁶ on a joint embassy again with Lord William Howard. Previously to his starting on this embassy his election to the bishopric of St. Asaph had taken place; and we shall have to recur again to the circumstances connected with it, and his subsequent transfer to another see.

He joined with Crammer in arguing against the Act of the Six Articles, which seems to be the only instance of his opposing the King's inclination. And as the *Saturday Review* reminds us, he had a personal motive for taking this course in the marriage which he had *de facto* contracted in spite of his profession as a Religious. On Queen Mary's accession he sought to propitiate the ruling powers by a timely resignation of his see; but being apprehended while escaping to the Continent in the disguise of a merchant,⁷ and committed to the Fleet, and afterwards brought into the Star Chamber,⁸ he made a submission, which is in fact a recantation, in order to save his life.⁹ But on being released, he found means to escape into Germany.¹⁰

⁶ See Appendix, No. VI.

⁷ Machyn's *Diary*, p. 75.

⁸ *Star-Chamber Papers*, Harleian MSS. 2143, fol. 2b.

⁹ Strype's *Memo.* vol. ii. pt. 2, 168, iii. pt. 1, 241, &c.

¹⁰ Dr. Hook questions the fact of Barlow's recantation, but has unaccountably omitted to refer to Strype on the subject. The character he gives of Barlow (*Lives of Alops. of Cant.* vol. iv. p. 236-9) differs from that of the writer in the *Saturday Review*, and it may be fair to compare them together. Dr. Hook says, 'In selecting Bp. Barlow, Parker made choice of a man who held a high position in society. Barlow was a privy-councillor, and had been eminent as a statesman and diplomatist. . . . He declared himself on the side of the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII.; and when Cromwell had determined on the dissolution of the monasteries, that minister found an able, zealous, and generous supporter in Barlow, who not only resigned his own monastery, but procured several abbots and priors, his neighbours, to follow his example. . . . Besides being eminent as a statesman, he was respected by his brothers on the episcopal bench as a theologian and divine. Abp. Cranmer complained of him as being too jocosose, and apt to bring serious matters to the test of ridicule; but he could not have been a light-minded man who was consulted on the composition of one of the most important books of the age. Barlow was concerned in the authorship of the *Institution of a Christian Man*, called the Bishops' Book. In the translation of the Scriptures he was considered so good a scholar, that to him the Church was indebted for a revision

The circumstances that interest us at present are those concerning his election to and possession of the two sees which he successively occupied during Henry VIII.'s reign. There is the less difficulty now in recounting them, because the facts have been nearly all carefully collected and the dates accurately given by Mr. Haddan. On the death of Standish Bishop of St. Asaph, Barlow was elected to that see on the 16th January 1535-6,¹¹ in pursuance of a *congé d'élire* dated January 7.¹² But before his confirmation he departed, on the 22d of the same month, on his third embassy to Scotland,¹³ arriving at St. Andrew's on the 13th of February.¹⁴ The Royal Assent was issued on the 22d of February,¹⁵ and he was confirmed by proxy either on that day or the following, the Archbishop's commission being dated February 22d, and his certificate to the King of confirmation Feb. 23d, the date of the confirmation itself being omitted.¹⁶ Barlow remained in Scotland during February and March, writing a letter from thence signed 'Willm Barlo,' which is assigned to the latter month in the State Papers on internal evidence.¹⁷ He seems to have left Scotland in the beginning of April, and Lord William Howard, remaining behind, speaks of him in his absence in a letter dated 25th April, as 'my Lord of Saynt Davyd.'

of the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom. On the accession of Queen Mary he gave proof of his sincerity by resigning his bishopric of Bath and Wells.' If the *Saturday Reviewer* is to be depended on for historical fidelity and for original research among authentic documents, it will be difficult to characterise Dr. Hook's account; but, in fact, the rest of the volume, for a scrupulous adherence to authorities, for relevancy of the facts alleged, and for the cogency and justice of the deductions from them, appears to be quite on a par with the extracts quoted above.

¹¹ Bramhall's Works, ed. Haddan, vol. iii. p. 138, note.

¹² *Kymer*, vol. xiv. p. 558.

¹³ See Appendix, No. VI.

¹⁴ *Diurnal*, p. 20.

¹⁵ *Kymer*, vol. xiv. p. 559; also in Elrington, App. No. xxx.

¹⁶ Haddan, as above, from Crammer's Register.

¹⁷ *State Papers*, vol. v. p. 36.

Richard Rawlins, Bishop of St. David's, died on the 18th of February 1535-6,¹⁸ and on the 10th of April Barlow was elected Bishop.¹⁹ There is no mention of the date of the *congé d'élire*. The royal assent was given on the 20th of the same month, and the next day he was confirmed in person in Bow Church. The Acts of the confirmation are printed at full length by Courayer,²⁰ Elrington,²¹ and Dr. Lee, and in them he is described as '*in ordine sacerdotali constituto*.' But this description cannot be depended on as an absolute proof of his not being consecrated at that time, for the words seem to have formed part of the ordinary form used on occasion of the translation of a Bishop, even when certainly consecrated, of which several instances are referred to by Courayer.²² The Archbishop's certificate of the confirmation is dated on the same day, but makes no mention of his consecration; nor is the fact recited as usual in the grant of temporalities, which was issued on the 26th,²³ and obtained probably by a special favour on account of his having to return to Scotland on the King's affairs. He seems to have dispatched this instrument by a special messenger to St. David's, riding post at double speed, for he entered on possession of the bishopric on the 1st of May,²⁴ though ordinarily it was a seven days' journey from London to St. David's.²⁵ But after his arrival at St. David's he took care to be installed in person.²⁶

If he remained in London long enough to see his messenger off to St. David's, he must then have started at once on his return to Scotland, for he joins Lord William

¹⁸ Haddan, as above, from Crammer's Register.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Déf. de la Dissert.* tom. ii. pt. ii. *Preuves Justif.* p. cxxxvii.

²¹ *Valdetti*, &c. Appendix, No. xxxi.

²² Supplement, cap. iii. p. 63-4.

²³ Mason's *Vind. Ecol. Angl.* bk. iii. cap. 10, § 4, p. 365.

²⁴ See Appendix, No. IX.

²⁵ Foxe, vol. vii. p. 7, in the articles against Ferrar.

²⁶ *State Papers*, Dom. Henry VIII. No. 49. P. 73. Printed by Rev. T. J.

Bailey. *Defence of Holy Orders*, &c. p. 41.

Howard in two letters dated from Edinburgh, May 13th.²⁷ These letters, addressed to the King and Cromwell, are signed by him as 'Willm^{us} Menev', so that he certainly assumed the style and title of a Bishop, though without consecration. On or before the 23d following, Lord William Howard left Edinburgh on his return to England, but Barlow writes to Cromwell on that same day, that he 'has protracted his taryance somewhat after my lord's departure'—'for a daye or twayne,'²⁸ at the request of the Queen of Scots. It seems to be on this letter that Mr. Haddan has founded his argument, that Barlow would have been in London or the neighbourhood before the 11th of June, saying, 'he left Scotland immediately after 25th May for the English Court.' Again, 'on June 11th Barlow was certainly in the neighbourhood of London,' and 'it has been shown, that at the time to which the existing evidence limits the period of his consecration, he was actually on the spot, when one, if not two, other Bishops were certainly consecrated.'²⁹ Mr. Haddan has not referred to any other authority for these statements than the letter quoted above, and printed in the Appendix,³⁰ which seems but a slender thread to hang such positive assertions on. He was not aware that if he had crossed the Broad-street in Oxford to the Ashmolean he might have found another document which goes far to disprove his inferences with regard to Barlow's being in London on the 11th of June. But there it was.³¹ Howard and Barlow were attended in their embassy by Thomas Hawley, Norroy King-at-Arms, who went in their company from London, and did not return till the 12th of June, on which day he presented himself to Cromwell, and received a warrant from him for payment of his

²⁷ *State Papers*, vol. v. p. 46, 47.

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 52. See Appendix, No. V.

²⁹ Haddan's Preface to Bramhall.

³¹ Ashmole's MSS. No. 857, fol. 48, now in the Bodleian. See Appendix, No. VI.

'dyetts.' He would have left Scotland in company with Howard, because the embassy was then at an end, and therefore it seems probable that Barlow, who remained behind, could not have arrived so soon. But in addition to this, the same document, dated 12th June, describes Barlow as 'the Bishopp then elect of St. Asaph, now elect of St. Dayyes;' and therefore he could not have been consecrated on the day before, as such a circumstance would certainly have been known to Cromwell, the King's Vicar-general.

Although Barlow was called only 'elect' on the 12th of June, the style is changed on the 30th of that month, when he took his seat in the House of Lords, for which purpose he had only to present the writ of summons that had been issued on the 27th of April,³² in consequence of the grant of temporalities. He is then described in the Journals as 'Episcopus Menevensis.'³³ The place assigned to him was below Sampson and Reppis, who had been consecrated on the 11th of June, but he was contented to take the lowest place, as he thus avoided all question of his consecration. Had he been consecrated previously, he would have taken precedence of them, as occurred in the instance of Fox, Bishop of Hereford, who, having been consecrated in September of the year before, and returning from his embassy abroad in the course of next month, took his seat in the order of precedence according to his consecration above five Bishops who already had seats in the House.³⁴ It must not be overlooked, that if he had returned from Scotland in time, he might easily have been consecrated on either of the two Sundays that occurred in the interval between the 12th and 30th of June, viz. the 18th and 25th, as the

³² Close Rolls, in dorso. The error of 'T' for 'G' is on the Roll.

³³ Journals. Printed also by Elington, Appendix, No. xl. from Courayer's *Déf. de la Dissert.* vol. ii. pt. ii. App. p. cxliii. See Appendix, No. VII.

³⁴ Journals. See Appendix, No. VII.

Convocation was then sitting, and there were a number of Bishops in London. But there is no intimation of the ceremony having taken place. Besides, he had already obtained all he wanted—the temporalities—possession of the see—his seat in the House of Lords. Why should he trouble himself about so useless a formality, as he considered it, as consecration?

Barlow was also present in the Convocation which was opened on the 9th June 1536, and subscribed the Articles about Religion,³⁴ and the Protestation about General Councils,³⁵ signing his name to each of them as 'Wm. Menven.'; but no conclusion can be drawn from this circumstance, as these formularies were not subscribed till the close of the proceedings; the former on the 11th of July, and the latter on the 20th of the same month,³⁶ and they are also signed by Wharton, alias Parfew, who was consecrated Bishop of St. Asaph on the 2d of July.

The opinion imputed to Barlow, as delivered by him in a sermon at St. David's on Nov. 12th, 1536, has been claimed as an argument both for and against his consecration; one side affirming that it shows his utter disregard of the rite—the other, that the form in which the opinion is stated is in itself an assertion of the fact of consecration. The charge made against him is found in Strype,³⁷ viz. that he had said, 'If the King's gr., being supreme head of the Church of England, did chuse, denominate, and elect any lay man, being learned, to be a Bishop, that he so chosen, without mention made of any orders, should be as good a Bishop as he is, or the best in England.' Now of course he could not acknowledge that he only retained his position by a fraud; and therefore this declaration may have been intended as a justification of his conduct to be understood by those who were in the secret.

³⁴ *Tiemey's Death*, vol. i. Frontispiece.

³⁵ *Wilkins' Conc.* vol. iii. p. 803.

³⁷ *Acta*, vol. i. p. 184. *Records*, No. 77.

Besides, Barlow, at any rate, was a priest, and not a layman.

A great deal has been made of the Act 25 Henry VIII. cap. 20, by Bramhall, Elington, and other writers, who argue that the Archbishop and Bishop elect, who neglected to proceed to consecration, would incur the penalties of præmunire, and that neither Crammer nor Barlow would have run such a risk. But if we examine the Act, we find that its object was to provide a mode of election and consecration of Bishops without suing Bulls from Rome or payment of the first fruits. And after enacting the legal forms to be gone through for election and consecration, the Act declares that 'if any Archbishop shall refuse or do not confirm, invest, and consecrate, he shall incur a præmunire, which seems to require some overt act of refusal on the part of the Archbishop, or some proof of contumacy, to constitute a legal offence, and not merely premitting the consecration. Moreover, there is no special mention of the Bishop elect among the persons liable to penalties under the Act; for the clause imposes the penalty only in general words, if 'any person admit or execute any censures &c. or other process or act to the contrary, or let of due execution of the act.' This, again, points to some overt act of interfering with the proceedings on account of the want of the ancient canonical forms, or some actual contumacy, and does not seem to touch the case of a person who omitted the consecration because he considered the King's nomination sufficient.

The discussion of Barlow's case had been written thus far, when a discovery was made which gives a different complexion to it. It seems therefore best to leave the previous argument as it stands, and treat the case afresh under the new light thrown upon it.

First, however, it may be well to recur again to the opinions expressed by Crammer and Barlow in their answers

to the Questions on the Sacraments, in Henry VIII.'s reign, where they stated that for making a Bishop 'election or appointing thereto is sufficient.' But even then 'supposing they both esteemed the ceremony of consecration a needless trouble, and were likely enough to have omitted it, if the King were willing; the question will be, What were his sentiments? Now besides the papers containing the answers referred to in the preceding chapter,³⁸ there is another set of answers from some or one of these very men,³⁹ at least so it would seem at first sight; but as they appear to be of a wholly different doctrinal complexion, the document must receive a closer examination. 'This shows us that there is one additional name amongst the answers, and that the name of 'Winchester.' On turning to Strype's account of the matter,⁴⁰ we find that the commission as at first issued contained his name, but that the King, finding after a time that his presence was inconvenient, removed him. This paper therefore gives us the answers to the royal questions agreed upon by the commissioners, while Gardiner was with them; and that in Burnet, which is seven or eight times as long, those of each individual, after Gardiner had been dismissed. This paper, then, being such as here described, has remarks upon it in the King's handwriting; and in them we find him quarrelling with the Catholic answers of his bishops and divines, and educating them as to what they ought to have said. Thus, they having answered, 'Making of Bishops hath two partes, appointment and ordering,' his remark is, 'Where is this distinction fonde?' and they continuing, 'Appoyntment, whiche the Appostels by necessitye made by common election, and sometyne by their owne severall assignment, could not then be doon by Christen princes because at that tyme they were not; and nowe at these dayes apper-

³⁸ p. 21-3.

³⁹ Strype's *Cronner*, Appendix, Nos. xxvii. and xxviii.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* book i. cap. 20.

teyneth to Christen princes and rulers,' the King's note is, 'Now sins you confesse that the appostyllys did occypate the won part, whych now yow confesse belongyth to princes, how can you prove that orderyng is wonly committed to yow Bysshopes?' Henry therefore agreed with Cranmer and Barlow as to the all-sufficiency of the royal power to make a Bishop; and probably all three would have been willing, and more than willing, to omit consecration in Barlow's case, if only the general feeling of those who could not but become aware of what was or was not done in the case permitted the omission. Need we suppose that any great scandal would have been the consequence of such omission? If the secret were but tolerably well kept, and Gardiner and his friends not allowed to know it, what ground is there for thinking that Henry's courtiers would have felt shocked at it?⁴¹

The foregoing extract will serve as an introduction to the consideration of a document which shows, at least with some probability, how far the intervention of the King had gone in making Barlow a Bishop; and whether there is not some reason to suppose that Henry with the Archbishop and Barlow himself had really acted in the spirit described above, and that his ministers, the Lord Chancellor and Cromwell, in their official capacity, concurred in the transaction.

It struck the writer as worth while to examine the original document which was printed by Mason⁴² as the Restitution to Barlow of the Temporalities of St. David's, taken (as he states) 'out of the Rolls Chapel in Chancery.' It is printed from Mason under that title by Dr. Elrington⁴³ and Dr. Lee,⁴⁴ though Mr. Haddan has accurately noticed that it is not in the usual form.⁴⁵ Mason's refer-

⁴¹ From *Thoughts on some Questions of the Day*, p. 21-25; with the Author's kind permission.

⁴² *Vindiciæ Eccl. Angl.* lib. iii. cap. 10, p. 365.

⁴³ *Validity, &c.* App. No. xxxii.

⁴⁴ *Validity, &c.* p. 373.

⁴⁵ *Brenhall*, vol. iii. p. 156, note.

ence designates the Patent Rolls; but after a most careful search no such document could be found enrolled upon them. Its non-appearance on those Rolls of course stimulated curiosity to find it, and after some further search, it was found on the Memoranda Rolls of the Remembrancer of the Lord Treasurer of the Exchequer.⁴⁶ As these latter Rolls belonged to the Exchequer and not to the Chancery, and were not kept in the Rolls Chapel, Mason has given a wrong reference to the record.

An error in the reference would have been of little consequence, if he had given a correct description of the document, or if he had printed it so as to show its real nature and operation, instead of passing it off as the restitution usually made to a Bishop after consecration, and printing only so much as would not betray the deception he was practising.

So far from being the restitution in its usual form, it is a grant of the custody of temporalities on account of the vacancy of the see, but with the extraordinary addition of 'to hold to him and his assigns during his life.' So far from giving any evidence of his consecration, it rather implies the probability that he had not been consecrated, and that he was made and entitled Bishop without consecration. And the inrolment was made in the office of the Exchequer, as if the matter were purely secular, instead of on the Patent Rolls in Chancery. It is therefore necessary to compare it with other instances in which Bishops received a grant of custody of temporalities during a vacancy.

Before the separation from Rome, it was usual in the writ of restitution to recite only the appointment and provision by the Papal Bulls, the renunciation by the Bishop elect of all words in the Bulls considered prejudicial to the rights of the Crown, and the making the homage and fealty, whereupon the restitution was ordered. And

⁴⁶ See Appendix, No. IV.

there was never any mention of the consecration, whether it had or had not been already performed. But 'from 1534'—says Mr. Haddan,⁴⁷ from whose notes the information in this paragraph is taken—'in consequence of the Act 25 Henry VIII. cap. 20, a change took place, and thenceforward the writ recited all the acts required by the statute, viz. the *cogge d'élire*, election, royal assent, confirmation and consecration by the Archbishop, and the homage and fealty made.' Such was the regular course of proceeding all through the rest of Henry VIII.'s reign. The only exceptions were in the case of Bonner's two bishoprics of Hereford⁴⁸ and London,⁴⁹ of each of which he received the temporalities in the usual form, though not consecrated till some months after his translation to London; but in each case the writs recite the confirmation only, and the fealty having been taken by commission. In four other cases the writs run in the usual form, and recite the consecration as past, although it did not actually take place till some days or even a fortnight after the date of the writ.

But besides the usual restitution, a grant was sometimes made to a Bishop of the temporalities which had accrued during the vacancy, as in the following instances.

To Lee⁵⁰ of Lichfield and Coventry, and to Goodricke of Ely,⁵¹ the custody of the temporalities was granted during the vacancy; in each case 'to them, their executors, and assigns,' without account to be rendered, and followed by the restitution in the usual form after consecration. In Lee's the confirmation and investing with episcopal insignia are recited, but not the consecration.

To Day of Chichester,⁵² Hethe of Worcester,⁵³ and Holbeche of Rochester,⁵⁴ grants were made of the tem-

⁴⁷ *Bramhall*, vol. iii. p. 155, note.

⁴⁸ *Kymer*, vol. xiv. p. 601.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 650. ⁵⁰ *Ibid.* p. 481, 528.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 486-7.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 785. ⁵³ *Ibid.* vol. xv. p. 17, 18.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 32.

poralities then accrued on the same or nearly the same day as the usual restitution, but by a separate patent.

On the former occasion of his consecration to Rochester, Hethe had received a grant of the profits accrued up to the time of the restitution previously granted to him in the usual form.⁵⁵

Cranmer, however, had received a similar grant, and in his case the patent is much fuller, and is made the form from which Barlow's is taken, but with very material variations. It will, therefore, be well to compare them together in detail.

Cranmer had been consecrated on the 30th of March 1533, and on the 19th of April he received the restitution of temporalities in the usual form.⁵⁶ And on the 2d of May following he obtained a grant of all the profits that had accrued from the commencement of the vacancy to the said 19th of April, the day of restitution.⁵⁷ This grant having been made to him before the separation from Rome, the recitals take the form usual at that time, stating his election by the Chapter, and confirmation by the Pope, and that the Pope had preferred him so elect to be Archbishop and Pastor, as certified by the Papal Bulls.

Barlow's grant follows Cranmer's exactly in form, but puts the Archbishop in place of the Pope, reciting his election by the Chapter, and confirmation by the Archbishop, and that the Archbishop had preferred him *eo elect* to be Bishop and Pastor, as certified by his letters patent. And he is thenceforward styled simply 'Episcopus,' or 'ipsum hunc Episcopum,' all through the writ.

Cranmer's recites his fealty having been made, and the restitution of temporalities having been granted, in the usual manner, on the previous 19th of April.

⁵⁵ *Rymer*, vol. xiv. p. 656, 780.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* p. 456. The date is printed '29th' by error, for it not merely contradicts the following patent, but would make the writ of the 25th instead of the 24th year of the reign.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

Barlow's omits all allusion to these acts, and proceeds at once to the operating clauses. It seems, therefore, that he never made his homage or fealty in respect of this bishopric.

Cranmer's grant is expressly limited to the profits that had accrued during the vacancy up to the above-mentioned 19th of April inclusive.

Barlow's grant is made in the same words, but instead of being limited to any date, includes all temporal rights of the see arising during his life; and instead of being merely retrospective, its operation is made to run on for his whole life.

To Cranmer the grant is then made 'to have and to hold to him the same Archbishop personally and solely up to the 19th of April, as aforesaid, inclusive.' To Barlow it is granted 'to have and to hold to him the same Bishop and his assigns during his life;' thus being similar to Lee's and Goodricke's in the addition of 'assigns,' but extending beyond theirs to the whole term of his life.

Cranmer's contains a full pardon for all offences against the statutes of provisors and præmunire. But there are no such clauses in Barlow's. And it does not seem as if there could be any question involving præmunire after such a grant.

A grant of this nature may be supposed to have saved the necessity of obtaining either the Archbishop's mandate, or the Archdeacon of Canterbury's commission. If therefore Barlow sent it off to St. David's at once, he may have obtained full possession of the see from the 1st of May.

No theory suggests itself which will fully account for a grant having been made in this manner. Doubts may have been entertained as to the power of the Crown under the act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, to grant restitution before consecration. And the writ is inconsistent with consecration

having taken place previously; since, had it so done, the grant might have been made in the usual form; nor does the writ seem designed as a temporary measure or a grant of intermediate profits; for then it might have been given in the form of the custody of the temporalities as long as the vacancy continued, as in Lee's case, without extending it to his whole life; or as in the instances of Bonner's two successive sees, the restitution might have been given in the usual form 'to the said Elect and confirmed.' But the suspicious circumstances in Barlow's case are, that the writ, after reciting that the Chapter had elected him 'for Bishop and Pastor,' as in Bonner's, then states that 'the Archbishop had not only confirmed him, but had also 'preferred him to be Bishop and Pastor,' and proceeds to grant, not merely 'for the time of vacancy,'—not merely 'to the said Elect and confirmed,' but 'to the same now Bishop, for his life, all the profits in the King's hands by reason of the last vacancy of the bishopric and the custody of the temporalities;' thus in fact precluding the Crown from making restitution in the proper form without a surrender of the grant so made. And it does not appear that Barlow ever made such a surrender, or ever obtained the temporalities in the accustomed manner.

We may say at any rate that the form of this grant is altogether exceptional, and must have been framed with some special object. If Barlow were not consecrated, he could not of right sue out a Writ of Restitution, as the Act required, although the King might *ex gratia* have allowed it, but the form of instrument in such a case is well known, and is very different from that now in question. The latter course, however, was not taken, but a grant was made irrespective of the statute, which would hold good under all circumstances, and would secure to him the enjoyment of the temporalities of the see, whether his character of Bishop was perfected spiritually

by consecration or not. The words subjoined to the Letters Patent *De data auctoritate parliamenti* would seem with great probability to have reference not only to the Act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, but also to the various Acts establishing the Royal Supremacy, and to the large and novel powers thereby conferred upon the King. The issuing and acceptance of such a grant, with the concurrence of high officials both in Church and State, vastly magnified the King's authority, while it served Barlow's own purpose effectually, and therefore, without charging conspiracy on the King and others, it seems highly probable that this special and novel form was deliberately adopted as suiting the views of all parties, and being highly favourable to any ulterior designs which the King might have upon the temporalities of the Church at large. And if the proceeding was taken in virtue of the new claim of Supremacy, it serves to give a pointed meaning to Barlow's own words before mentioned, namely, 'If the King's Grace, being *supreme head of the Church of England*, did choose any layman to be a bishop,' &c.⁵²

The effect of the grant both in Barlow's own mind and in official quarters may be seen from what followed. The next day a writ of summons to the House of Lords was issued, and Barlow himself immediately assumed the style and title of a Bishop. But either Cromwell himself or one of his clerks seems to have been wanting in apprehension, and to have supposed that consecration was still to follow, and therefore gave him still the title of 'Bishop elect,' even on the 12th of June.

On the other side the strongest proof alleged⁵³ in favour of Barlow's consecration arises from the absence of objections made to his taking his place and acting as Bishop on the part of his contemporaries who still held

⁵² See p. 68. For the remarks in this and the preceding paragraph, the writer is indebted to J. R. Hope Scott, Esq., Q. C., and J. V. Harting, Esq.

⁵³ Courayer, *Déf. de la Dissert.* lib. iii. cap. 8.

to the Catholic faith with regard to the Sacraments, such as, Lee Archbishop of York, Stokesley, &c. Gardiner was absent as ambassador in Paris during the whole of the years 1536 and 1537,⁵⁴ and perhaps he may really have been unaware of the circumstances. And this may be the explanation of his acknowledging Barlow as Bishop, as he does in the letter to the Protector Somerset of 28th February 1546-7,⁵⁵ calling him 'my lord of St. David's,' and 'my brother of St. David's'; for, as he was charging Barlow with preaching unsound doctrine, he cannot have been prevented by motives of policy from bringing a still graver charge against him. It is also on record that Barlow acted as assistant Bishop in the consecration of Skyp as Bishop of Hereford in 1539, and Arthur Bulkeley as Bishop of Bangor in 1542; but as both those Bishops belonged at that time to the reforming party, the circumstance of their allowing Barlow to assist in their consecration is not much to be depended on as an argument in favour of his consecration. Besides one of the witnesses at Barlow's confirmation was 'Arthur Berkeley,' which rouses a suspicion of identity with the person who became Bishop, and of his being accessory to Barlow's proceedings.

It is, indeed, argued that Barlow was officially recognised as Bishop of Bath and Wells in Queen Mary's reign, by being so styled in the *congé d'élire* for his successor, where it is said that the see was vacant *per liberam et spontaneam resignationem ultimi episcopi*, and again *per deprivationem et amotionem*, in the writ of *significavit*.⁵⁶ And no adverse conclusion, it is said, can be drawn from the statement of his deprivation, because the vacancy is again referred to in the writ of restitution of temporalities as by resignation.⁵⁷ But the use of these

⁵⁴ Tierney's *Doubt*, vol. i. Appendix, p. 430, 435, and 440.

⁵⁵ Foxe's *Martyrs*, vol. vi. p. 24.

⁵⁷ Elrington, Appendix, p. lxiii.

words in the writs does not tell either way. Barlow was by the laws of the realm Bishop of Bath and Wells, as much as Bonner was of London. He escaped being deprived by a timely resignation, and by so doing admitted the case against him. But it would seem from the following quotation that his marriage was not his only crime. 'The xxviii. day of May Barlow, late Bishop of St. David's, and soon after of Chichester, preached . . . bisho]prycke of y^e by quen Mare [for that he had] a wyff, and odur maters that he was fain to . . .'.⁵⁸ It seems to have escaped the notice of the editor, Mr. Nichols, that the extract from the Diary made by Strype enables us to fill up the blank, and shows the entry to refer to Barlow. And in fact, whatever the 'odur maters' were, his case seems to have come so near a deprivation, that it might be described either way. Perhaps, as suggested by Strype, a legal sentence of deprivation was actually given.

To sum up the case respecting Barlow: all the *a priori* arguments used by Bramhall and Elrington, such as the præmunire, the grant of temporalities, the seat in the House of Lords, are shown to be either groundless, or contrary to the fact; all the dates assigned for his consecration, viz. the 22d of February by Godwin, the 23d of April by Dr. Lee, and the 11th of June by Mr. Hadan are contradicted by the testimony of records;—and the whole time left for him to be consecrated in is reduced to a period of seventeen days, viz. between the 12th and 30th of June exclusive.

It is remarkable that the question was first raised by Champneys, simply on the ground of Mason making no reference to the Register, from which he inferred that it was not to be found, as Mason afterwards admitted,⁵⁹ and this objection applies to other cases as well as Bar-

⁵⁸ Maghyn's *Diary*, p. 199, compared with Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. pt. i. p. 198.

⁵⁹ *Vindiciæ Eccl. Ang.* lib. iii. cap. x. p. 369.

low's; but when his history came to be examined, the doubt was considerably increased, and every additional research, instead of bringing to light any evidence in his favour, has only destroyed the presumptions raised in his defence. For it is observable that Professor Stubbs in every other case of a diocesan Bishop, where the Register is wanting, is able to supply some collateral evidence of consecration, either from the Diocesan Registers, from Rymer, or elsewhere; but in Barlow's case he can only refer to 'Haddan on Bramhall.'⁶⁰ And although up to the present time the evidence against Barlow has been mostly of a negative character, yet the two documents now produced, viz. the grant of temporalities and Cromwell's warrant, supply facts on that side that require more positive evidence to meet them; especially as one of them was in Mason's hands, yet he was not only afraid to produce it honestly, but gave a false description of it, and did all in his power to prevent the knowledge of the original coming to anyone else.

It is also remarkable that all the records of his own see should be wanting. This indeed is partly accounted for. Whether it was that there were no regular registers kept at St. David's, or whether from any other cause; it appears that the dates of the entrance and death of successive Bishops were entered in the Calendars of the church-books, and all the Missals, Breviaries, and Martyrologies of the Cathedral were burnt by Bishop Ferrar by the King's order, as superstitious.⁶¹ But this does not account for the loss of all the chapter-books, and Barlow's installation was entered among the Chapter acts.⁶² A 'Liber Computi' is still extant, reaching back to an early period, but this furnishes us with no light, for there is a break in it for several years before 1539.⁶³

⁶⁰ Stubbs' *Registrum Anglicanum*, p. 77.

⁶¹ See Appendix, No. IX.

⁶² *State Papers*, Dom. Hen. VIII., No. 49, p. 73. Printed by Rev. T. J.

Bailey. ⁶³ Haddan on *Bramhall*, Preface.

The case therefore remains a mystery. It is a mystery how he could have remained unconsecrated, or how he could have carried on his assumed character unchallenged, especially as he was involved in disputes with his Chapter.⁶⁴ But with so many circumstances of suspicion, arising from different quarters, yet pointing the same way, it is impossible to admit the fact of his consecration without more direct proof of it.

The personage next to be considered is Parker. Having attached himself to the reforming party, he was consistent in the course he adopted, and passed through Queen Mary's reign without submitting to any feigned recantation such as Barlow and Scory had made. He did not marry while the act of the Six Articles was in force, although in July 1547, when his marriage took place, the act legalising the marriage of the clergy had not passed. If his opinions were Zuinglian, they were moderate, and he was opposed to Calvinistic excesses, and inclined to the government and Erastian side in ecclesiastical matters. Together with Meye and Coxe he may be said to have occupied the most prominent and respectable position among the reforming divines.

A light is thrown upon his opinions on the subject of holy Orders by a letter written to him by Jewell, dated 26th April 1568, as follows: 'Whereas I wrote of late unto your grace touching this bearer M. Lancaster, now elect of Armagh, that it might please your grace to stay him from further ordering of ministers; it may now like the same to understand that I have sithence communed with the said M. Lancaster concerning the same, and find by his own confession that he hath already ordered divers, although not so many as it was reported; howbeit among the same he hath admitted and ordered one whom by the space of these eight years I for many good and just causes me moving evermore have refused. Your grace may fur-

⁶⁴ *State Papers*, as above.

ther advertise him hereof, as unto your wisdom shall seem good. Certainly in such cases his discretion is very small.⁶⁵ It thus appears that Thomas Lancaster, being then only Archbishop elect, and not consecrated till the 13th of June, after the date of this letter, had taken upon him to ordain sundry persons, and Jewell instead of treating the orders so conferred as altogether null and void, merely requests Parker to stay him from further ordering of ministers; moreover, that he takes it for granted that Parker will agree with him in considering these ordinations valid; and lastly, that notwithstanding the irregularity of this proceeding, Thomas Lancaster was still allowed to be consecrated Archbishop of Armagh. Hence the conclusion seems inevitable, that both Parker and Jewell maintained the doctrine that election and appointment is sufficient to confer the priesthood or episcopate without ordination or consecration; so that a Bishop elect can exercise the functions of a Bishop validly, though not lawfully, and thus that holy Order is not essential for the validity of sacraments, but only a matter of ecclesiastical regulation and propriety. This was exactly the Lutheran doctrine, and agrees with the opinion previously expressed by Craumer and Barlow, and not different from that of Coxe.⁶⁵

Parker was fixed on for the archbishopric almost immediately on the Queen's accession, for Bacon writes to him on the 9th December 1558, 'to repair to London for certain matters touching himself.'⁶⁶ He would have been acceptable to the Queen, as having been her mother's chaplain, and it was a stronger recommendation that he was already on terms of intimacy with her two chief advisers, Cecil and Bacon. He was very unwilling to accept the post, both on account of the state of his health, and as foreseeing the difficulties likely to arise, especially from

⁶⁵ Jewell's Works, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 1274, ed. Parker Society.

⁶⁶ See p. 23. ⁶⁷ Parker Correspondence, p. 49.

the Calvinistic party.⁶⁷ He appealed to Bacon to obtain his release, and also to the Queen herself; but the only answer he received was a peremptory command to come to London, where he arrived in the beginning of June. On the 18th of the next month the *cong e d' lire* was issued for his election. This delay was probably caused by the absence of the Dean, Nicholas Wotton, who was one of the embassy at Paris for concluding the treaty signed on the 30th of May, and was detained in France some time afterwards;⁶⁸ but by the end of July he had returned to England.⁶⁹ He had complied with every change in religion; and although he is said to have declined the Queen's offer of the archbishopric himself, he could be depended on to forward the election of her nominee. The election took place on the 1st of August. One stall was vacant; citations had been served on the other eleven Prebendaries, but only the Dean and four Prebendaries appeared. Thomas Wood and Nicholas Harpesfield were among the absentees, and were soon afterwards deprived, together with four others. According to previous arrangement the election was left by way of compromise to the Dean, who named Parker, and the Prebendaries present accepted his choice.⁷⁰

It was perhaps owing to their entertaining the notion before mentioned of the election being the most important part of the process, that Parker and the others began to use the episcopal style and title at once, as Barlow had done. Thus a letter to the Council dated 27th August is signed 'Matth. C.' And the same style is used in other even official documents addressed to them. This usage has given occasion to an argument of some Catholic writers that the ceremony of consecration (whatever it

⁶⁷ Parker Correspondence, p. 60-1.

⁶⁸ Calendar State Papers (Foreign), 1559, No. 826, 15.

⁶⁹ Ibid. No. 1111. ⁷⁰ Haddan's Bramhall, vol. iii. p. 190-7.

was) had taken place at an earlier period than the 17th December. Canon Williams has fallen into this error, because he found in Rymer⁷¹ a Commission dated Oct. 20, and addressed to Parker, Grindal, and Coxe, by their full titles as Bishops without the word 'elect.' They seem, however, to have found out their mistake, and after this time the style of 'Bishop elect' is carefully used. And it is evident that no inference can be drawn from the omission; for on the 26th October the Queen issued an order for completion of the exchanges of lands between the Crown and the different sees, by reason of which exchange not being finished, 'the Archbishop elect of Canterbury, and the other elect Bishops of London, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester remain unconsecrated.'⁷² It is curious that Scory and Barlow are put on the same footing as the new Bishops; but Scory being included with Barlow, and the Register of his consecration being extant, it cannot be taken for more than an error of the official who drew up the letter.

After the election, steps were taken for the consecration. The question then arose, who were to be the consecrating Bishops. The act 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 20, required that in case of the vacancy of the archbishopric, the royal mandate should be addressed to any other Archbishop and two Bishops, or else to 'four Bishops within this realm, or within any other the Queen's dominions.' At the present crisis, of the twenty-six sees within the realm, one archbishopric and nine bishoprics were vacant by death; the other Archbishop and ten Bishops had been already deprived. There were thus five still remaining in possession of their sees: Tonnall of Durham, Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pole of Peterborough, Turberville of Exeter, and Kitchen of Llandaff.⁷³ There

⁷¹ Vol. xv. p. 546.

⁷² *State Papers, Domestic*, vol. vii. p. 19; printed in *Parker's Correspondence*,
⁷³ *Haddan's Bramhall*, vol. iii. p. 232.

were also the returned refugees Barlow and Scory, who had been legally deprived under Queen Mary; and Bale, who had been Bishop of Ossory, but also deprived; besides several suffragans; but none of these answered to the description of 'Bishops within the realm.' It may have been hoped that some of the Catholic Bishops might be willing to comply with the Queen's command, and the commission of September 9th was therefore issued to Tonnall, Bourne, Pole, and Kitchen, but joining with them Barlow and Scory. The Letters Patent were sent to Parker by Bacon, with a letter of the same date.⁷⁴ It is difficult now to understand how any one could expect that a commission would be executed which bore so gross an insult on the face of it. Not merely to require them to consecrate a married priest, notoriously suspected of heresy, but to join with them two suspended, excommunicated ecclesiastics, calling themselves Bishops, relapsed heretics, and apostate Religious, was sufficient of itself to prevent the execution of the mandate. There is no record whether they were ever formally cited, nor in what manner their refusal was given. But Tonnall was deprived on the 28th of the same month of September;⁷⁵ Pole was deprived some time between the end of September and the 11th of November;⁷⁶ and for Bourne a commission was issued on the 18th of October to tender him the oath of supremacy, and directing the steps to be taken in case of his refusal.⁷⁷

Parker then found his difficulties begin. What those difficulties were, he and his two advisers, Cecil and Bacon, were well aware. A paper still remains in the State-Paper Office, in which the steps to be taken for the consecration are detailed, with notes in both Cecil's and Parker's handwriting upon it. In the following copy the

⁷⁴ *Parker's Correspondence*, p. 76.

⁷⁵ *Courayer, Dissert.* cap. ii.

⁷⁶ *Rymer*, vol. xv. p. 545.

⁷⁷ *Machyn's Diary*, p. 214.

words contracted are printed at full length, but a facsimile is also appended.

The Copy of this would be sent hither.

1. Sucte is to be made for the Quenes Letters Patents, called Significaverunt to be addressed to Tharchbushopp of the Province, for the confirmation of the Electe, and for his consecration.

2. When the See Archiepiscopall is vacant, then after election, lyke Letters Patents for the confirmation of the electe are to be directe to any other Archbushopp within the King's dominions. If all be vacant, to iiii. Bushops to be apoynted by the Quenes Letters Patents declaring her graces assent Royall with request for his consecration and Pall.

3. The fealtie for the Temporalities of the See is to be made to her Maiestie. The othe also to be geven. And thordinary fees to be payde to her Maiesties Officers.

4. The consecration is to be on suche a Sondaye as the Consecrators with the assent of the Consecrand. shall accorde. And in such place as shalbe thought most requisite.

5. Thorder of K. Edward's booke is to be observed, for that there is none other speciall made in this last session of Parliament.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ The notes on this side in Italics are in Cecil's handwriting.

⁷⁸ *State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth 1559.* The note on this side in brackets is in Parker's handwriting.

In the Calendar this paper has been placed in the month of July, on the supposition that all the Bishops had been deprived in that month. This date is evidently erroneous. The paper itself cannot have been drawn up till the election had passed, as the course of proceedings

an Archbishop:
writing.

(*in face page 86.*)

prescribed commences with the *Significavit*, and Cecil's note cannot have been written till at least two of the five Bishops were deprived; that is to say, not till after the 30th of September.

In this paper the ordinary course to be taken has first been set out, seemingly by an official hand; for none but an official would have thought of the 'fees to be paid to her Majesty's officers;' then Parker has added a note on one side, and Cecil has made his notes on the other. Two difficulties are pointed out by Cecil: the first, 'that there is no Archbishop nor four Bishops now to be had,' because, of those that were supposed to be willing to execute the commission, Kitchen was the only one who answered to the description of a 'Bishop within this realm or any other the Queen's dominions,' as required by the act 25th Hen. VIII.; Barlow, Scory, and Bale having been legally deprived of their sees, and the others being merely suffragans. The other difficulty was, that while the official minute proposes 'the order of King Edward's book to be observed, for that there is none other special made in this last session of Parliament,' Cecil remarks on this, that 'this book is not established by Parliament.'

These are the very objections often made, that Parker's consecration was not in accordance with the laws of the realm. Bramhall and Elrington have endeavoured to show that these objections will not stand, and that there was nothing contravening the law. Cecil's remarks save us from the necessity of any argument on the point. It does not indeed affect the question with which we are concerned, whether there were any legal flaws or not; but it is important to bear in mind that these objections on the score of illegality were made at the time, and by parties concerned, because it will throw light on the meaning of various proceedings, and of expressions used by contemporary writers.

'Wherefore Querendum, &c.' Such are Cecil's words in the above paper; and it is evident that he and Parker found themselves in considerable embarrassment. The most eminent canonists and civilians of their own party were therefore consulted, four being clergymen and two lawyers, viz. William May or Mey, who was then Dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards nominated as Archbishop of York; Robert Weston, afterwards one of the Lords Justices and Chancellor of Ireland; Edward Leedes, one of Parker's Chaplains and Master of Clare Hall, Cambridge; Henry Harvey, afterwards Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge; Thomas Yale, Parker's Chancellor; and Nicholas Bullingham, then Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln.⁸⁰ These six drew up a commission in the usual form for the confirmation and consecration, addressed to Kitchen, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale; Hodgkins the Suffragan of Bedford; Salisbury Suffragan of Thetford; and Bale, who had been Bishop of Ossory, but deprived under Queen Mary.⁸¹ To this commission they added a clause dispensing with any disabilities in the persons to whom it was addressed, or any illegalities in the acts done by them under it, as follows: 'Supplentes nihilominus suprema auctoritate nostra regia ex mero motu et certa scientia nostris, si quid aut in his quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris, ad præmissa perficienda desit, aut deerit, eorum quæ per statuta hujus nostri regni aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante.' The subjoined facsimile is taken from the original draft extant in the Public-Record Office⁸² with the autograph signatures of the civilians giving their opinion that the

⁸⁰ Haddan's *Bramhall*, vol. iii. p. 186, notes.

⁸¹ Strype's *Parker*, p. 61.

⁸² *State Papers*, Domestic, Elizabeth, vol. vii. Oct. Dec.

Commission 'in this forme pennyd' may be lawfully acted on. The name of Bale's see was left blank, but filled up with 'Osseriensi' in Cecil's hand, showing that it was submitted to his supervision. The mistake of 'Richard' for 'John' as Hodgkins' Christian name is in this draft, and so runs through all the copies, both that on the Roll, and that in the Register. It was on this error that an argument has been founded against the authenticity of the commission; but it is of no weight, for his identity is sufficiently indicated. It is remarkable that Bale is styled Bishop of Ossory, as if he had not been deprived, though the Queen would never restore him to his bishopric, and he was obliged to 'content himself with a prebend of Canterbury.'⁸³

We have now to consider, first, the force and meaning of the terms used in this dispensing clause, and then the persons to whom the commission was addressed.

It may be taken for granted that in a matter about which so much pains were taken, and so many legal heads at work, every word was used in a strict legal sense. Now with regard to the acts done in virtue of the commission, the words 'in his quæ juxta mandatum nostrum per vos fient' appear to refer to their use of a form that was without legal sanction, viz. King Edward's book, which was admitted by Cecil to be 'not established by Parliament.' And in the Register the mention of the book is carefully avoided, and it is only said, 'published by authority of Parliament.'

As regards the defects in persons, the important words are 'conditione, statu, facultate.'

'*Facultate*' may be understood to refer to jurisdiction, because even Kitchen had no canonical right to consecrate a Bishop, and none of the others had jurisdiction to perform any episcopal act whatever. The Queen therefore

⁸³ Strype's *Parker*, p. 65. Courayer says there was no legal sentence of deprivation.

undertakes to supply it from her supreme authority, as all the jurisdiction formerly possessed by the Pope had been vested in her by the Act of the session just passed.

'*Conditione*' appears to mean their legal position, as not answering to the description of 'Bishops within this realm or any other the Queen's dominions,' as required by the Act 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 20.

'*Statu*.' What, then, does this word mean? Is it not intended to include the episcopal character? and to dispense with them in case they or any of them had not received episcopal consecration? *Statu* is the proper term to describe the ecclesiastical state, and it is so used at the present day; for when letters commendatory are given to an ecclesiastic, they are said to be concerning his state and moral character, '*litteræ commendatiæ de tuo statu et moribus*,' thus testifying in what order he is, and whether free from canonical impediments. The word is so used in the dispensation⁸³ granted to Hethe Archbishop of York from the Pope, where, having recited that Hethe had been duly ordained and consecrated, though by schismatical Bishops, and appointed to different cathedral churches and sees, the Bull proceeds, '*nos statui tuo in præmissis paterna charitate consulere . . . volentes*.' And it is also used in this sense in the Act 8 Eliz. cap. 1: as, 'the state of the clergy being one of the greatest states of this realm;' 'the state ecclesiastical;' 'the high state of prelacy.'

The writer having consulted a legal friend⁸⁴ on this point, received the following reply: 'I am not disposed to seek for separate and distinct meanings in the words "falculte, conditione, statu," as they are used in the Queen's commission. The object of the civilians who advised her evidently was to include in her dispensation, by the largest possible words, all the difficulties that might arise. Credit is claimed for this in the Act 8 Eliz. cap. 1, in

⁸³ See Appendix, No. XIX.

⁸⁴ J. R. Hope Scott, Esq., Q. C.

which it is recited that her Majesty had used "in her said Letters Patent divers other general words and sentences whereby her Highness by her supreme power and authority had dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability;" and I think there can be no question but that even the want of consecration in the consecrators would, in those times, have been held to have been cured by the language of the commission.'

It is certainly immaterial whether we judge by the special meanings of the words, or by their general effect, if the expressions are sufficiently large to give the Commissioners license to do something which by ecclesiastical law they were not qualified to do. We have seen already that both Barlow and Parker held the opinion that a Bishop elect could exercise the functions of a Bishop validly, though not lawfully. Is it, then, too much to suppose that the words, '*si quid in vobis . . . aut statu vestro . . . desit eorum quæ . . . per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt*,' were intended to cover the defect of non-consecration? The description exactly fits Barlow's state, in his own and Parker's opinion, supposing he had not been consecrated.

It is idle to pretend, as Mason,⁸⁵ Bramhall,⁸⁶ and Strype⁸⁷ have done, that this clause was used only *ad majorem cautelam*, and without any actual occasion. A proceeding so damaging to the character of the whole affair would never have been taken, and still less have been put on record, if it could possibly have been avoided. Equally idle is it to compare this clause with the dispensation and absolution from all censures and impediments usually inserted in Pontifical Bulls for the nomination of Bishops. The Queen did not profess to absolve from any censures, or to release from any mere canonical impediments. If she was supposed to have the power, she did not exercise it

⁸⁵ *Vind. Eccl. Angl.* lib. iii. cap. 7.

⁸⁶ Works, vol. iii. p. 77-83.

⁸⁷ Parker, p. 55.

here. She undertakes to supply all defects, but not to remove any existing burden. With what face could any of the parties concerned have pretended to think the necessity lay in that direction, when every step they took was in defiance of the censures of the Church? Or how could any one have ventured even to suggest the idea of censures, 'to the contrary or lett of due execution of' the commission, when his so doing would lay him open to a præmunire?

Bramhall also asserts,⁸⁹ even with the approval of his editor Mr. Haddan, that this dispensing clause was used in the confirmation and installation, but not in the consecration itself; the two former being political acts, and therefore requiring it. It is true that in the sentence of confirmation, and in the mandate of installation, the dispensing clause is specially referred to, or recited at full length; and even, by way of making it stronger, the word 'præsentium' is added;—the necessity of the present juncture. But it is in vain to say that it was not used in the consecration, when the mandate contains the order 'eundem consecrare,' followed by the clause dispensing 'for the things done according to our mandate aforesaid;' and when, as such, it was read as a part of the ceremony, and described as 'mandatum pro consecratione Archiepiscopi,' and the consecration was the religious act done in virtue of it, and the mandate of installation was only the result of that act, stating what the persons addressed had done with the powers committed to them.

Lastly, Bramhall maintains⁹⁰ that this dispensative clause doth not extend at all to the institution of Christ, or any essential of ordination, nor to the canons of the universal Church; but only to the statutes and ecclesiastical laws of England.' But he did not take into account that the parties to the dispensation did not consider consecration as 'any essential of ordination;' and he unfairly

⁸⁹ Act 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 20.

⁹⁰ p. 83.

confines the ecclesiastical laws intended to those of England; for the words are, 'by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws.' Had the motive of this dispensation arisen merely from the laws of this realm, whether statute law or ecclesiastical, it could have been set right in the next session of Parliament; but what other defect than that of the want of consecration could make the necessity for such a stretch of power, or could come up to the words 'temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante'?

Besides, the dispensation was inserted only in this commission, and not in any other.⁹¹ It therefore applied to something that affected Parker's consecration specially.

We must now pass on to the persons authorised to act under this commission. And first Kitchen. It is impossible to say whether they expected Kitchen to act or not; but it seems probable that he had some remains of conscience left, and therefore avoided coming to London. It is, indeed, currently stated that he took the oath of supremacy; but from the following declaration, signed by him, it would seem that this is not exactly in accordance with the facts:

'Whereas the Queenes Ma^{tie} of her bountifull grace tenderinge the quyet of my conscience hath differrd the renderinge of thothe of her supremacie to my further consideration within myself in the xpending of Goddes leamyng, I do assure her Grace by these presentes subscribed by my hand, that as a true and faithfull subiecte to her authoritie I shall for my power, connyng and habilitie set forthe in mine own person, and cause all other under my jurisdiction to accept and obey the whole course of religion now approved in the state of her Graces realme, and shall also require the said othe of others receyving office ecclesiastical or temporal, as in the statute thereof provyded. In witnes whereof I have subscribed with mine owne hande the xviiith day of Julye in the first yere of the rayne of our sayde Sovereigne Lady Elizabeth Queene of England, France and Irelande, defendor of the fayth &c.

⁹¹ Haddan, p. 82, note.

⁹² Lamb's *Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 11.

ANTHONY LANDAUFF.⁹²

As Kitchen died in October 1563,⁹³ it seems very probable that he never took the oath himself.

Next we come to Barlow. It is difficult to conjecture the reason why some one else was not chosen in his stead, if he really was not a consecrated Bishop. Perhaps because his name came next in the Commission, and it would have been an unpopular act to pass him over; perhaps because it would have cast such a slur on all the proceedings of the Reformation to acknowledge that he had acted so long as Bishop without consecration. Then, too, he gave the appearance of connection with the old hierarchy; and probably the real reason was that none of the parties concerned believed consecration to be absolutely essential.

Scory, Coverdale, and Bale were all made Bishops during King Edward's reign, and their consecrations will therefore depend on the validity of the rite used. Mr. Haddan has, however, drawn attention⁹⁴ to the registers relating to the two first, by which it appears that they were both consecrated the same day, Aug. 30, 1551, by the same Consecrator with the same assistants, and before the same witnesses; but one is said to have taken place at Lambeth, and the other at Croydon, which is highly improbable. But the error admits of explanation. It seems to have been the practice, if more than one Bishop was consecrated at the same time, to enter the Register of each in the full form separately, without referring to any other. Thus, that of Bonner's is entered at length without any mention of Hethe having been consecrated with him. The occasion above mentioned was the only one during King Edward's reign on which two were consecrated together, and the name of one of the places, either Croydon or Lambeth, seems to be written on an erasure,⁹⁵ and if so, it is probable that some too

⁹³ Haddan's *Bramhall*, p. 56 note, p. 229 note.

⁹⁵ From information of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis.

⁹⁴ Preface.

zealous official, struck with the apparent contradiction, and without referring to precedents, took upon himself to remedy the supposed blunder. If such an alteration was made, it does not tell for the credit of the Register.

Hodgkins, the Suffragan of Bedford, had really been consecrated on the 9th of December 1537 by Stokesley Bishop of London; Hilsey of Rochester and Wharton of St. Asaph being the assistants. If there were any doubt of the Catholic rite having been used, Stokesley's presence on the occasion would remove it. The consecration is regularly entered in Cramer's Register. We are tempted to ask, Why Hodgkins was not employed as the Consecrator instead of Barlow? and can supply no reason but the prevailing idea of the sufficiency of election without consecration, and the greater attention paid to secure compliance with the law than the validity of the rite; and Barlow having been already elected to a see, might be supposed to come nearer the requirements of the law. But for the same reason, Salisbury, the Suffragan of Thetford, who was consecrated in 1536, if willing, would have been more eligible than Barlow, Scory, or Coverdale.

The Queen's Commission having been issued on the 6th of December, and Kitchen not putting in an appearance; on the 9th following the four next named in the Commission, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, proceeded to Bow Church between eight and nine o'clock in the morning, and there went through the proceedings of the confirmation in the usual form; Parker not being present himself, but appearing by one of his proxies, Nicholas Bullingham, who took the oath of the Queen's supremacy in his name.

On Sunday the 17th the consecration was celebrated in the chapel of Lambeth Palace by the same parties in the presence of the officials, various ecclesiastics who had been elected to other bishoprics, and members of Parker's household. The ceremony commenced 'about five

or six o'clock in the morning? Notwithstanding all the arguments that have been brought against the fact of these occurrences, it is impossible to doubt that everything did take place that is recorded in the Register. It is impossible, as said before, to raise any question about the authenticity of the Queen's Commission of December 6th, being, as it is, enrolled on the Patent Rolls. What reason, then, was there to prevent its execution, when we know, under Cecil's and Parker's hands, that such was the intention previously, and when it was supposed that both legal and ecclesiastical validity had been provided for by the Queen's dispensation? Besides, corroborative evidence has lately come to light. Henry Machyn was a merchant-tailor in London, who kept a diary specially with regard to matters connected with his own business, such as funerals, but also relating to other public events. There is one entry relating probably to the confirmation which is imperfect; this is followed by a mention of the consecration on the 17th; and on the 20th of the confirmation of five Bishops at Bow Church. There were really six confirmed at that time, though by error he calls them five. The entries in the Diary are as follows:

... upper part of the page burnt away
'Park]er electyd bishope of Canturbere.'

'The xvii. day of Desember was the new byshope of [Canturbury] doctur Parker, was mad ther at Lambeth.'

'The xx. day of Desember afor non, was Sant Thomas evyn, my lord of Canturbere whent to Bow chyrche, and ther wher v. nuw byshopes mad.'⁸⁴

Some remarks have been made raising suspicions whether these entries have been entirely made by the diarist himself. But the present writer having examined the ms. in company with a friend,⁸⁵ who has very extensive acquaintance with ancient mss., they are both convinced that no doubt exists with regard to the genuine-

⁸⁴ p. 220.

⁸⁵ The Rev. Joseph Stevenson.

ness of the whole of the above extracts. Machyn certainly had opportunities of knowing all that was going on in the way of ceremonial; and it is quite possible that in his business of merchant-tailor, he may have had to furnish some of the cloth and carpeting used for the decoration of the chapel.

But it may be said, if it all took place as alleged in the Register, how could the Nag's-Head story ever have gained such credence? Now it should be remembered that the main point of the legend consists in Scory putting the Bible on the head of those who were to be consecrated. And the laying the book of the Gospels on the head and shoulders of the Elect is part of the Catholic rite, and the most conspicuous ceremony to a person at a distance. If, then, there was any Catholic among the spectators in Bow Church on the 9th December, he may have been on the look-out for this ceremony, and seeing the book of the Gospels produced for Parker's proxy to take the oath, he may have fancied this was all the consecration intended,—or when asked afterwards, he may have said, that he saw no more than this. And if such a story once got wind, on however slight a foundation, it was too piquant and too welcome to lose anything by repetition. There does seem also to have been some secrecy about the ceremony; for such an early hour on a December morning cannot have been chosen without a motive. And the suspicions entertained by Catholics about the Register inclined them to accept the account most damaging to the other side. Sir Charles Howard, afterwards Earl of Nottingham, is said to have been present on the occasion; but this statement depends on mere verbal tradition, and cannot be accepted as certain.

A summary of the reasons for giving credit to the facts of the Lambeth consecration will now be given, as those facts were not long ago disputed by the late Canon Williams, and the old charge of forgery revived.

1. The official minute with Cecil's and Parker's notes. This shows their intention of proceeding in the usual course, as nearly as they could considering the difficulties in the way. And this course comprised 'the order of King Edward's book to be observed.' This paper cannot be a forgery, because there is not only on it Cecil's and Parker's handwriting, each so peculiar and so well known; but no forgery would have been executed in so clumsy a manner as to leave evidence on the face of it of the legal flaws in the proceeding. This paper was not used at all in the controversy, till referred to by Dr. Lingard,⁹⁶ and afterwards by Mr. Haddan.⁹⁷ Though printed by Strype, he was not aware of its importance.

2. The Letters Patent of the sixth of December 1559. This is charged with being a forgery, on account of the non-appearance in the enrolment of the formula 'Per ipsam Reginam' or 'By writ of Privy Seal.' But the absence of these words is merely the omission of the clerk who engrossed the instrument, and does not in the least affect its genuineness. The test of authenticity is the enrolment in Chancery on the Patent Rolls. But not to insist on this as the sole argument; there is corroborative evidence in the original draft of the commission preserved in the State-Paper Office with Cecil's writing on it, and the autograph signatures of the civilians who were consulted. This cannot be a forgery, for no forger would have taken such useless trouble. And the paper has never been produced in the controversy, nor has any one noticed that the opinion of the civilians with the names is exactly copied, but with different spelling, in the Register, though, as Mr. Haddan states, in a different handwriting from the Register itself, and on the margin. A facsimile of the conclusion of the document is appended.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ *Catb. Mag.* vol. v. p. 707-8.

⁹⁸ Appendix, No. XXXVII.

⁹⁷ *Bramhall*, vol. iii. p. 82, note.

3. The entry in Machyn's Diary. If this had been written with a controversial purpose, it would have been quoted as an authority by some one or other. But Strype, who made extracts from the *ms.*, passed this over; and it remained unnoticed till sometime after the publication of the Diary by the Camden Society.

4. A memorandum of Parker's consecration in a contemporary handwriting preserved among Foxe's *ms.* in the British Museum, in part at least extracted from the Register. Foxe died in 1587, so that the paper must be at least of an earlier date than that year, and probably is nearly of the same age as the Register itself, perhaps even older. If this paper had been ever produced in the controversy, either by Mason, or Bramhall, or Courayer, it would be open to great suspicion. But having lain unnoticed till the present time, it becomes important even as evidence of the fact of the consecration. A facsimile forms the frontispiece of this work, and a fuller description of it will be given presently.

5. Stapleton's assertion that 'the Bishoppes were ordered, not according to the acte 28 (25) H. VIII., but according to an acte of Edw. VI., repealed by Queen Mary, and not revived in the first year of Q. Eliz.'⁹⁹ This is an assertion that there was a consecration according to a certain act of Parliament, described in a manner that will only apply to the Act 5 and 6 Edward VI.; and Stapleton's admission certainly disposes of the supposition that there was no consecration at all.

6. The Act 8 Eliz. cap. 1. If this Act were merely declaratory without certain conditions, it could not be accepted as evidence of any value. We must therefore, in considering the testimony it bears to facts, take into account its purpose and effect. And the enactment is to the effect, that all acts done about a confirmation or consecration in virtue of the Queen's Letters Patent were

⁹⁹ *Counterblast*, Preface.

declared good and perfect, and that all persons consecrated Bishops according to the order of 5 and 6 Edward VI. were declared to be rightly made and consecrated. Unless, then, there were certain Letters Patent to be acted on, and certain consecrations actually done in virtue thereof, and those consecrations conducted according to the order of 5 and 6 Edward VI., the Act would be useless, and Parker and his colleagues would derive no benefit from it. And the title of 'Parliament Bishops' would then have had no meaning. It is impossible to suppose that they would have stultified themselves in this manner. But it is important to observe, that while the Act imposes limitations and conditions on the things done, and on the manner of doing them, it makes no conditions whatever as to the persons by whom they were done. The words are, 'all acts heretofore done by any person or persons in or about any consecration,' and 'all persons consecrated Bishops after the form and order,' but without saying by whom,—without any proviso, that the persons doing the acts, or performing the consecrations, should have been themselves Bishops. It may also be observed, that, notwithstanding frequent assertions to the contrary, even by Mr. Haddan,¹ the Register is not referred to in the Act in any way, but only the public records, such as Letters Patent.

It seems strange, that nothing had been done in the Parliament of 1559 to obviate these legal difficulties. The attempt however was made, for a Bill was passed through the Lower House 'for collating of Bishops by the Queen's Highness, and with what Rites and Ceremonies.'² In the House of Lords it was also read a first time on the 22d of March,³ and described as a Bill 'for the admitting and consecrating of Archbishops and

¹ *Bramhall*, vol. iii. p. 174, note.

² *Commons Journals*, vol. i. p. 58. Printed in D'Ewes, 'without Rites and Ceremonies,' p. 52.

Bishops; but there is no other notice of it in the journals, though D'Ewes states that it was read a second and third time.⁴ Perhaps it was thought that sufficient violence had been done to the Catholic feeling in the House, without this further outrage. At any rate, we have here a plain confirmation of the fact, that the mode and order, by which Parker and the other Bishops were consecrated, was without legal sanction. And the want of legal competence in the consecrating Bishops, coupled with the absence of a legal Ordinal, is sufficient to account for the state of embarrassment among the party; while the 'over-much boldness of speech and talk' referred to in the Act 8 Eliz. c. 1 shows how strong a hold these objections had taken on the public mind.

We may indeed believe the alleged facts—viz. of the ceremony having taken place at Lambeth on the 17th of December; of Parker and the other persons named having taken their several parts in it; and of the rite in the Book of 1552 having been followed, except in one particular—to be as certain as any other facts in English history. But this belief will not lead us to accept the existing Register as an authentic and contemporaneous record of the facts as they occurred. On the contrary, there are circumstances of considerable suspicion attaching to it: first, its extreme minuteness, entering into details that have no bearing whatever on the real matter of record, but rather tend to draw off the attention from it. Next, the other copies, which are constantly referred to as evidence in support of the Register, so far from adding to its credit, rather detract from it. They are both spoken of as transcripts made from the Register at Lambeth; whereas the copy in the State-Paper Office⁵ appears rather to be a draft, for certain words are altered. One place has been first written 'qui eius consecrationis

⁴ D'Ewes' *Journals*, p. 26, ed. 1682.

⁵ Domestic, Elizth. vol. iii. Oct. Dec.

curam agerent,' then the termination 'tionis' is altered to 'tioni' and 'curam agerent' to 'inseruirent,' which agrees with the Register. Now no one transcribing the Register as it stands would have written 'curam agerent:' and in the passage 'Cicestrien, *quædam prefatus atq.* populum ad orationem hortatus,' the words in Italics are not given in the Register; and those accompanying the imposition of hands are stated to have been said in Latin instead of in English. Finding thus a draft among the Secretary's papers suggests the idea that it was sent to Cecil for his perusal and approval before being entered, which would not have been done, if the Register had been kept as a matter of course in the usual form and by the usual official, or unless some purpose of policy had to be answered. Of the copy in C. C. C. Cambridge Mr. Haddan gives the following account: 'This transcript (of which the first three words are elaborately ornamented on the original parchment, with Parker's arms emblazoned in the centre) is believed to have been given to the College by Parker himself.'³ 'It varies from the original Register only in a few insignificant points: e.g. 'olim' for 'quondam,' and the like, and two words written above the line by a later hand, and in giving the words of consecration in Latin instead of English.'⁴ 'On the same parchment immediately follows, apparently in the same hand, a commission from Parker to Walter Haddon to be Commissary of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, dated December 27, 1559.'⁵ The record here described containing, among others, such a material variation as to state that words were said in Latin which the so-called 'original' represents to have been said in English, cannot be considered as a transcript. Besides, as it contains an entry on an entirely different subject, it cannot have been written solely with a view to preserve the record of the consecration. This ms. agrees also with the S. P. O. copy

³ *Ibid.*, p. 216, note c.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ p. 213, note f.

in inserting 'quædam prefatus atque;' and thus the two agree with each other, but differ from the Register. And it therefore seems probable that this S. P. O. copy was the draft from which the Cambridge copy was made, and that the latter was intended to form part of the Register, but that after it had been written, it was considered that the statement of the persons engaged having said 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, &c.,' when they had actually said 'Take the hollie gost, &c.,' would make the whole thing a fiction, and therefore this parchment was laid aside, and another instrument made.

Thirdly. In the Register as it stands a remarkable departure has been made from the usual form. In all other instances the Register records the name either of the Archbishop or of some Bishop commissioned by him as taking the principal part, and two other Bishops assisting him. We have the Registers of Hodgkins, Salisbury, Holbeach, and Bonner during Henry VIII.'s reign; of Ridley, Farrar, Poynt, Hooper, Scory, and Coverdale during Edward VI.'s;⁶ and extracts from those of eighteen Bishops consecrated by Parker himself in Queen Elizabeth's reign.⁷ In all those of Henry's time, and also in Ridley's, the words used are, 'munus consecrationis impendebat, eumque benedixit.' In Edward's time the form is, 'rite et recte consecratus et benedictus fuit.' But in Elizabeth's reign the old form was resumed, for in Horne's Register we read 'munus consecrationis impendebat.'⁸ Now in Parker's case there is no mention of a consecrating Bishop and assistants; and though in the preliminary part the words 'consecratio' and 'consecratur' are introduced, yet in the act itself it is merely stated that all four imposed hands and said the words of the form; but it is not stated that they, or that any one of

⁶ Courayer, *D'Église de la Discrétion*; Preuves justificatives. See Appendix, Nos. VII. and VIII.

⁷ Haddan on *Bramhall*, p. 218-31.

⁸ Courayer, *ibid.*

them, did consecrate him, or that he was consecrated by them.⁹ Yet afterwards it is said 'qui eum consecraverant'; and when they come to the mandate of installation they use the form 'munus consecrationis impendimus.' There must have been some motive for this departure from the usual course.

Perhaps light may be thrown upon the question by the document already mentioned, which is preserved among Foxe's mss. in the British Museum.¹⁰ This is a paper written in a hand of the Elizabethan period, without a title, except that Strype has written the heading: 'The consecration of Bp. Boner, Abp. Parker, &c.' It contains first an abstract of the Register of Bonner's election and consecration, then notes of Parker's confirmation and consecration, followed by a note about Barlow, and notes of Scory's and Coverdale's consecration. That of Parker's confirmation is taken from the Register, and apparently those also relating to Scory and Coverdale. Where that of Parker's consecration comes from does not immediately appear. The extract referring to Bonner will be written first by itself, not having the Register to compare it with; but for Parker's it will be best to place the two in parallel columns; Foxe's ms. in one, and in the other those parts of the Register which afford grounds of comparison by touching on the same points, or by avoiding in one the expressions used in the other. Thus it will be seen that the ms. has 'nuper,' 'dudum,' and 'quondam' exactly in the places where the Register has them; but that, farther on, there are both additions and omissions in the former as compared with the latter.

Die martis xvij^{mo} Decembris A° Dni 1539 et R. R. H. viij^{to}

⁹ Mr. Haëddan himself has remarked that in other cases a distinction is made between the consecrating and assisting Bishops, which is not made here. p. 205, note c.

¹⁰ Harleian, 419, fol. 149. See the facsimile in the Frontispiece of this work.

trigesimo erat presentatum Electionis etc. Dⁿⁱ Edmundi Boner ad Episcopatum Heref.¹¹

Die dominica quarto, viz. die mensis Aprilis A° Dⁿⁱ 1540 et Regni Dⁿⁱ Regis H. vij^{to} anno xxxj^{mo} in quodam sacello inferiori juxta septentrionalem partem navis ecclesie cathedralis Divi Pauli London. infra palacium Episcopi London. notorie situate etc. Rdi in Christo patris Dⁿⁱ Dⁿⁱ Stephanus provid^{us} divina Winton. Episcopus Auctoritate etc. assistentibus sibi R^{di} patribus Dⁿⁱ Ric. Cicestrien.¹² et Johann. Hereforden.¹³ Episcopis munus consecrationis et sacre benedictionis more ecclesie Anglicane solito per sacre Chrysmatis unctionem et manuum suarum impositionem R^{di} P^{ri} et D^{no} Dⁿⁱ Ed^o Boner London. Episcopo electo et confirmato etc. Benedixit eumque consecravit et insigniis Pontificalibus rite et Religiose insignivit.

PARKER'S REGISTER.

FOXE'S MS.

In Consecratione Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis.

(See *below*, nono die Decembris Confirmatus fuit nono die mensis Decembris tunc proxime sequentis confirmatus.)
 per Reverendos Patres Dominos Willelmum Barlowe nuper Bathonien. et Wellen. Episcopum nunc electum Cicestren.
 Johannem Scory dudum Cicestren. Episcopum nunc electum Hereforden. Milonem Coverdale quondam Exonien. Episcopum et Joannem Hodgeskyn Episcopum suffraganeum Bedforden. vigore literarum commissionarium Regiarum Patentium eisdirectarum nono die Decembris tunc proxime sequentis confirmati
 necnon per ipsos Reverendos Patres auctoritate predicta

(See *above*.)

¹¹ The date should be 1538, being the day of Bonner's confirmation to Hereford. (See Godwin *De Pres. Angl.*)

¹² Sampson.

¹³ Skyp. These names agree with Stubbs (*Regist. Sac. Angl.*); but Godwin says 'Assaven,' in place of 'Cicestrien.'

decimo septimo die eiusdem mensis Decembris consecrati. Cicestren. electus capa serica

ad sacra peragenda paratus utebatur.

Hereforden. electus et Bedforden. suffraganeus linteis superpelliceis induebantur.

Milo vero Coverdallus non nisi toga lanea talari utebatur.

... post orationes et suffragia quedam iuxta formam libri auctoritate parlamenti editi apud deum habita

Cicestren. Hereforden. suffraganeus Bedforden. et Milo Coverdallus

manibus Archiepiscopo impositis dixerunt Anglice, viz. Take the hollie gost &c.

Postquam hec dixissent, ad reliqua Communions solemnia pergit Cicestren. nullum Archiepiscopo tradens pastorale bacculum . . .

decimo septimo die eiusdem mensis Decembris consecratus. Cicestren. electus capa serica indutus vices supplebat consecratoris.

Hereforden. electus et Bedforden. suffraganeus linteis superpellicis induiti. Milo Coverdall toga lanea talari solummodo ornatus.

Assistentes fuerunt.

(See below, libellum editum pro consecratione episcoporum per parliamentum anno v^o et vi^o Edw. VI^o)

Qui quidem Consecrator et assistentes.

manibus Archiepiscopo impositis dixerunt Anglice Take the Holy Ghost &c. ceteraque omnia descripta per quandam libellum editum pro consecratione episcoporum auctoritate¹⁴ per¹⁵ parliamentum anno v^o et vi^o Edwardi VI^o exercebantur.

praeterquam quod nullum tradebant illi baculum pastorale &c.

Willelmus Barlow consecratus fuit tempore Henr. VIII. Johannes Scory suffectus est Episcopus Koffen. per litteras patentis datas mandato regis ad

¹⁴ One of these two words seems redundant.

consecrandum eundem xxvii^{mo} Aprilis anno Regni Regis Edwardi sexti quinto.

Consecravit Tho. Cant. assistentibus Nicolao London. et Johanne Bedforden. xxx^{mo} Augusti et Regni Regis Edwardi VI^o quinto.

Consecratus Milo Coverdall in Episcopum Exoniens. xxx^o die mensis Augusti anno domini 1551^{mo} et Regni Regis predicti quinto eosdem consecratores.

Here, then, we find a ms. in the writing of a contemporary, and not an unfriendly hand, and preserved among contemporary papers, of which a part is taken exactly from the Register as it stands, and another part is widely different. How is this to be accounted for? There seem to be three, and only three, suppositions that can be entertained with regard to this paper.

One is, that it is the work of a person putting his own construction on what occurred, and relating the facts in his own language. This seems impossible, because it is certain that the writer had access to the Register, and carefully preserved the language of one part, and therefore would not have gone out of the track in another. Besides, where did he get the facts? There are two facts stated that are not in the Register, viz. that Barlow was Consecrator, and the others assistants; and that the Book of the 5th and 6th Edw. VI. was used. No one with the Register open before him would have entered on these topics of his own head.

Another hypothesis is, that these notes were made from the drafts prepared for the Register, or from some preliminary instrument, if there were any. This seems improbable; for how could any one have got hold of the drafts or of such an instrument? And the part taken

from the Register is only from the title, which, as we learn from Mr. Haddan,¹⁵ occupies the second page, engrossed in large capitals. If any one had seen the drafts, this title is not likely to have formed a part of them.

The third supposition is, that the whole of these notes were taken from the Register as it originally stood; that after the objections made by Catholics, and particularly after Bonner's case arose, the Anglican party found out what a mistake they had made in allowing Barlow to act as Consecrator, and that it would be dangerous to admit that King Edward's book had been used; that the Register was accordingly either wholly or partially rewritten, and the part in question altered so as to gloss over Barlow's being the principal in the function, and to describe the form used without specifying the source from which it was taken. And considering the notes about Bonner written on the same paper, it seems not improbable that the writer was some one who had been consulted about Bonner's case, and made his notes with that view. And this probability is increased by the fact of there being other papers about Bonner's case among Foxe's mss. And it seems clear, from the use of the word 'tunc,' that the Register was not engrossed during Anthony Huse's lifetime.

Besides, there is a reason apparent for the reference to Bonner's consecration. Bonner's plea against Horne was, that the Act 25 Henry VIII. c. 20 required at a consecration, either an Archbishop and two Bishops, or else four Bishops, and that Horne had neither. But from the time of the passing of the Act, the clause requiring four Bishops in the absence of an Archbishop had remained a dead letter till the question arose about Parker's consecration. No less than ten diocesan Bishops, and six suffragans, had been consecrated by commission from

¹⁵ p. 173, note a. See the Facsimile published by the Rev. T. J. Bailey.

Cranmer, in each case by three Bishops only,¹⁶ and among them was Bonner himself. It seems therefore that an answer was in preparation on Horne's side, which would have turned Bonner's plea against himself. Of course it would have been futile, for Bonner did not come into court as Bishop; and a defect proved against him would not have given Horne a legal title. But it is sufficient to show with great probability a connection between the paper in question and Bonner's case, that the facts would have allowed of such an argument, and that the evidence of them is here in process of being drawn out, and that there is reason to believe that the extracts were made with that view from the Register as it then stood.

Whichever of these three suppositions is correct, it makes but little difference in the end. We have it, at any rate, on the testimony of one of the party, sufficiently in Parker's confidence to have access to the Register, that Barlow was the Consecrator, and that the rite used was that of 1552; and that though these acts had been done with full knowledge and deliberation of all the parties concerned, yet that it was found to be too damaging and too dangerous to admit the facts on the record.

We must not pass over the note about Barlow himself. Here is a writer in the confidence of the parties, and collecting evidence in their favour, and writing probably in Barlow's own lifetime, but yet unable to tell the date of his consecration, or the names of the Bishops who consecrated him.

It is, however, time to consider what would be the effect, supposing that Barlow had not been consecrated, but that on this occasion they preferred following the rubric of the Pontifical instead of that they had before them in the Book of 1552, and that all four imposed their hands and said the words of the rite together. Anglican writers, as Mason and Bramhall, have hence

¹⁶ Stubbs' *Regist. Sac. Angl.*

argued, that all four were really Consecrators, and therefore it would be sufficient if only one of the four had been truly a Bishop. Mr. Haddan adds a note,¹⁷ that 'Barlow presided at Parker's consecration, but the position occupied by him does *not* answer to that of the consecrating Bishop, for all joined throughout and equally, both in the imposition of hands and the words. It follows, then, upon every theory, that the absence of Barlow's consecration, if it were so, would not invalidate that of Parker.' And he quotes¹⁸ Martène, *de Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. pt. iii. c. viii. art. 10, § 16, to the effect that 'omnes qui adsunt Episcopi non tantum testes sed etiam cooperatores esse citra omnem dubitationis aleam asserendum est.' Dr. Lee¹⁹ has argued to the same effect. Now we are not to suppose that, in acting as they did, Barlow and the others had devised something new and unknown before, and which therefore requires exceptional treatment. On the contrary, they were following the rubric of the Exeter Pontifical,²⁰ which in this point agrees with the present Roman rite. The case therefore may be solved in the same manner and on the same principles as if it had occurred within the Catholic Church itself. Only it is necessary to consider that one was Consecrator and the others assistants, because the Church knows of no other kind of consecration; and because it is not clear whether the narration in the Register does really represent the facts as they occurred, according to the intention of the parties at the time, or whether it was not an after-thought to represent the four as all equally and individually Consecrators.

In the passage quoted by Mr. Haddan, Martène simply asserts that the assisting Bishops cooperate with the

¹⁷ p. 136, note 1.

¹⁸ p. 145, note c.

¹⁹ cap. xxii.

²⁰ Bp. Lacy's Lib. Pontifical, p. 96, Maskell's *Monum. Rituel*, vol. iii. p. 238. In Archbishop Egbert's Pontifical, and some others of an early date, the Rubric directs all three Bishops to say the three preliminary prayers together, but the Consecrator alone is to say the long prayer called 'Consecratio.'

Consecrator, but he does not thereby imply that they actually consecrate either separately from him or equally with him. And the same principle is taught by other writers, who make a distinction between the Consecrator and assistants, in saying that the former effects and completes the whole consecration; while they speak of the latter only as 'aiding,' 'cooperating,' 'giving testimony and approval.' Thus Azor:²¹ 'verius est, quod Hostiensis et Goffredus docuerunt, unum (episcopum) totam consecrationem efficere, alios vero adjuutores esse.' Henricus de Segusia, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, called *Juris Splendor* among the Canonists of his age, composed his *Summa Aurca* by command of Pope Alexander IV. The following is the passage referred to by Azor: 'Item, numerus consecrantium, scilicet, quod (ad) minus sint tres, unus principaliter consecrans, et duo coadjutores, et cæteri consecrantes. Item, quod unus totam consecrationem perficiat, nam si unus partem unam faciat, et alius partem alteram, nihil agitur; vel si unus episcopus manum imponat, et simplex presbyter, vel etiam alter episcopus benedictionem infundat.'²² Fagnanus also to the same effect says: 'Unus tamen episcopus totam perficit, alii vero duo sunt assistentes.'²³ And Pope Benedict XIV.,²⁴ in maintaining the validity of a consecration conferred by a single Bishop, refers *potissimum* to Van Espen, from whom we learn as follows: 'By the canons of the Nicene and other Councils the discipline was established as well in the Greek as in the Latin Church, that besides the ordaining Bishop, two others ought to attend at the consecration of a Bishop, and personally assist him. The reason for this discipline was assigned by Pope Innocent I., writing in his Epistle to Victricius,

²¹ *Instit. Moral.* vol. ii. p. 475.

²² *Summa Aurca*, De Sac. Unctione, No. 5. Boich, quoting the passage, supplies the word *ad* (*De Sacram. non iterand.* cap. Presb. No. 2).

²³ *Comment. in Decret.* cap. Nec Episcopi, No. 7.

²⁴ Synod. Diocæsan. lib. xiii. cap. 13, § 4.

that "one Bishop singly should not presume to ordain a Bishop, lest the benefice seem to be conferred by stealth. For such was also the constitution defined in the Nicene Council." As if he would say, the Council would not have a Bishop to ascend *furtively or like a thief* into the fold of Christ, but *publicly*, that is to say, with the universal Church, represented by the Bishops of the province, approving and assenting. But neither by the Pope, nor by other authorities, is a consecration rejected as null and invalid if done without the right number of Bishops, but only censured as clandestine and performed without legitimate approval; for the presence of those Bishops is required not so much for the substance and validity of the consecration, as for having it well considered and jointly approved. And therefore, in case of necessity, the consecration can be given by a single Bishop, since the presence of three, or even of two, appears to belong to discipline, and not to the substance or essence of the consecration.¹⁷ Another argument in constant use on this subject is derived from the distinction made in the ancient *Ordo Romanus*, as well as in the present Roman Pontifical, between the three Bishops, describing one as the 'Consecrator,' and the others as 'assistentes'; and Billuart¹⁸ argues, that 'although the Consecrator might be called an assistant and a witness, yet, if all consecrate equally, there is no reason why one only should be called the Consecrator, and the others only assistants and witnesses.' Fillucius¹⁹ also speaks to the point in saying, 'Although there are three who consecrate, one of them alone completes the consecration, even though the others pronounce the words: for of one sacrament there is but one minister.' To these arguments replies are found in Hallier,²⁰ speaking not his own opinion, but

¹⁷ *Jus Eccles. Univ.* tit. xv. cap. 1, § 5-10.

¹⁸ *Theol. Moral.* De Sac. Ord. dissert. iv. art. 3.

¹⁹ Vol. i. p. 278, De Sac. Ord. Tract. 9.

²⁰ De Sac. Elect. et Ordina. pt. ii. sect. 5, art. 2, cap. 2, § 33.

on the part of those who maintain that the presence of three Bishops is essential for validity, to the effect that the name of Consecrator is given to one only, because the right and authority rests with one, viz. the Metropolitan, but that all might be called consecrators; and that the rule of there being but one minister of one sacrament does not apply in a case where all act together as if they were one, '*per modum unitis*.' Without, however, venturing to express an opinion on either side of these disputed points—that is to say, whether the assistant Bishops are only 'testes' or also 'coöperatores,' and if coöperators, in what sense they coöperate; or whether the Consecrator alone is the minister of the sacrament, and alone completes the consecration; or whether the others are joint consecrators with him; or whether it could be maintained that all the Bishops present are equally and separately and individually consecrators—it is obvious that in a point touching the administration of a sacrament, such a defect as the absence of the episcopal character on the part of the principal Consecrator would throw a very grave doubt on the validity of the consecration. It is quite sufficient to cause the doubt, that various authorities should have taught that 'one Bishop alone effects the whole consecration.' And in this view all the writers on the controversy of the Catholic side—Champneys,²¹ Talbot,²² Le Quien,²³ Constable,²⁴ Bishop Milner,²⁵ and Archbishop Kenrick²⁶—have maintained that the circumstance of Barlow not being a Bishop would be a fatal defect in Parker's consecration. On the other hand, Mason²⁷ and Bramhall,²⁸ in trying to explain away this defect, have admitted

²¹ *Treatise of Vocation &c.* p. 191, ed. Douay, 1616.

²² *Treatise of Cath. Faith and Heresie*, p. 17.

²³ *Adult. des Ord. Angl.* vol. i. cap. 9, p. 469.

²⁴ *Cleroph. Aethes*, p. 207.

²⁵ Letter to Dr. Etrington in Kenrick's Appendix, p. 209.

²⁶ *Validity &c.* p. 135.

²⁷ *Vind. Ecl. Angl.* lib. iii. cap. 10, p. 370.

²⁸ Vol. iii. p. 145.

the weakness of their case, by resting their argument on the ground that all four were principals on the occasion, because they all imposed hands and all said the words. But as in so acting they were only following the rubric of the Pontifical, they could not thereby become 'principals' in any other sense or mode than the assistants in the Catholic rite are principals. There is, in fact, in this circumstance nothing whatever that removes the case from the ordinary rules of theology, which have been here under discussion. Bramhall²⁹ indeed goes on to say, 'Who-soever do impose hands are joint consecrators, with us as well as with them.' But this assertion is merely adopting one side of a disputed question, and following a mere opinion of certain theologians, which has not sufficient weight, even of probability, to remove the very serious doubt that affects the consecration.

The doubts thus suggested would be rendered still more grave, if it be the fact, as seems probable, that the parties engaged felt themselves in such uncertainty on the subject that they avoided, or perhaps even altered, the usual form of Register, in order to make it appear that the assisting Bishops had taken a more direct and prominent part in the consecration than they had pur-ported and intended to do at the time.

We may now sum up the points in question, so as to say what may be considered as proved, and what facts alleged on either side cannot be admitted as proved. We may take it as proved, that the Queen's Commission of December 6 is a genuine and authentic instrument; that it was duly executed on the 9th of the same month as to the confirmation, and on the 17th as to the consecration; that Parker's consecration did take place in the manner described in the Register as far as it goes; that Barlow and Scory were not consecrated after Parker, but only confirmed; and that the other consecrations did take

²⁹ Vol. iii. p. 145.

place as alleged on the 21st of December and the 21st of January. Further, it may be admitted as proved, that the Nag's-Head story is a legend without foundation in fact, and that the charge sometimes made of Parker and the first Elizabethan Bishops assuming their place and discharging their functions without consecration of any kind is also unfounded. On the other hand, it is not proved that Barlow ever received any episcopal consecration whatever; it is not proved that the Register was drawn up at a time contemporaneous with the matters of record, or that it does faithfully record the facts as they took place, or place on record all the facts that did take place, and were usually recorded. At the same time the negative is not proved against Barlow. Although there are strong grounds of suspicion, they do not amount to an absolute proof of his not having been consecrated.

And here a statement of Dr. Pusey's³⁰ may be noticed, as follows: 'The form adopted at the consecration of Archbishop Parker was carefully framed on the old form used in the consecration of Archbishop Chichele, a century before (as I found by collation of the Registers in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, now many years ago). The form used in Chichele's time I could not trace farther back. Its use was exceptional, having been resorted to at a time when the English Church did not acknowledge either of the claimants to the Papacy. The tradition of that consecration was then only a century old. It was of the Providence of God that they had that precedent to fall back upon. But the selection of this one precedent (amidst the number of Archbishops consecrated in obedience to Papal Bulls, in which case the form was wholly different) shows how careful Parker and his Consecrators were to follow the ancient precedents.' The statement is very vague, but it is quoted by

³⁰ *Eirenicon*, p. 232.

Mr. Bailey as 'a very important fact.'¹⁷ Chichele, however, was not consecrated as Archbishop, but as Bishop of St. David's. And so far from the English Church not acknowledging the Pope at the time, Chichele was consecrated by Pope Gregory XII. himself at Siena in 1408, as recorded in the inscription on his monument, and having been elected Archbishop by the Chapter, notice was sent to the Pope by King Henry V.,¹⁸ and he was confirmed by a Bull of provision of Pope John XXIII. in 1414, who also consecrated Chichele's successor in the see of St. David's.¹⁹ It is true that there was a schism at the time, and that, although Gregory XII. and John XXIII. are recognised in the Bullarium Romanum, questions afterwards arose affecting both those Popes; but it is also clear that the English Church at both those periods did acknowledge a rightful Pope. Godwin refers to the Bull of provision as in Chichele's Register. It is therefore impossible to see in what manner any precedent can be found at this time for the proceedings at Parker's consecration; or even what meaning can be attached to Dr. Pusey's statement.

Another story is told in a letter printed by Mr. Pocke, which, according to Dr. Hook,²⁰ fully establishes the fact of the Earl of Nottingham's presence at the ceremony of December 17, 1559. 'In King James' reign the Nag's-Head story having caused some remarks at the Privy Council, the Earl of Nottingham declared he was present at Parker's consecration, and saw it conducted by the form in King Edward's book, having the book in his hand all the time, and there was an instrument drawn up of it, which he saw and read, and believed it to be at C. C. C. Cambridge. By the King's order this instru-

¹⁷ *English Orders and Papal Supremacy*, p. 28.

¹⁸ *Rymer*, vol. ix. p. 119.

¹⁹ *Godwin de Pras. Ang.* Collier, vol. iii. p. 301. Stubbs, *Regist. Sec.*

Ang. Hook's Lives of Allys. of Cant. vol. v. p. 27.

²⁰ *Lives of Allys. of Cant.* vol. iv. p. 244.

ment was sent for, and when produced, the Earl declared it to be the same.²¹ This story proves too much, and seems made to fit the circumstances, owing to its being a mere tradition, that confessedly had passed through several hands before it was committed to writing. If evidence of this character is to be admitted as the basis of an argument, the Catholic side would be equally entitled to draw a conclusion from the story that when the four priests were brought up to Lambeth to inspect the Register, Father Fairclough told the Archbishop that his father kept a shop in Cheapside, and had often assured him of his having been present at the consecration of the first Protestant Bishops at the Nag's Head.²² But the truth of the story about the Earl of Nottingham may be tested; for if any such proceeding took place in the Privy Council, it would appear in the Minutes, and there would be an order for the attendance of some one from the College to bring up the document. It is indeed a matter of surprise, that the Editor of Burnet should have published such a letter, without referring to some further evidence for the authenticity of the story.

It is much to be regretted that none of the Catholic writers of the time left a clear and plain statement of the facts as they occurred about Parker's consecration, and also of the reasons which guided the authorities of the Church in their dealings with those who received orders according to the Anglican rite. The statements that we meet with are not only rhetorical and strongly partisan, but the question of a legitimate and canonical ordination is so mixed up with that of the validity, that it is far from easy to determine whether the writers mean to include a denial of the latter in their denunciations.

To begin with those who reflect on the consecrations

²¹ Pocke's edition of Burnet, vol. v. p. 553.

²² *Cheroph. Atlas*, p. 106.

of the first Elizabethan Bishops, and starting with Bonner's case, as the pleas may be supposed to be drawn with legal precision, setting out the points that he was prepared to prove in his defence on being indicted by Horne Bishop of Winchester for refusing to take the oath of supremacy. The judges allowed the plea of Horne not being Bishop to be good; but the cause never came to trial. Among the reasons alleged for this plea are the following:

'Item. That the said Mr. Robert Horne not being lawful bishop of Winchester, but an usurper, intruder, and unlawful possessor thereof, for that according to the lawes of the catholike church, and the statutes and ordinances of this realme, the said Mr. Robert Horne was not elected, consecrated, or provided, etc.

'Item. That D. Horne foresaid ys no lawful Bysshoppe neither concerninge the tendingr of the said othe, nor exercise of other ecclesiastical office, for many causes, and speciallye for that the said D. Horne was not lawfully consecrated according to the lawes and statutes of this realme, and especiallie the statute of xxvth of Hen. VIII. cap. xx^o, where in effect is requyred that he that is to be consecrated must, amongst other thinges, have one archbishoppe and two byshoppes, or ells iiii byshoppes, at the consecration, which the said D. Horne had not.'²³

The grounds here alleged do not necessarily go beyond legal objections; for although Bonner denies that Horne had four Bishops to consecrate him, this need not mean more than denying them to be Bishops legally. And the not 'being consecrated according to the lawes of the Catholic Church,' would mean only so far as those laws were in accordance with the 'statutes and ordinances of the realm' then in force, otherwise the plea would have been of no avail in a Court of Law. But, at any rate, Bonner's plea seems to have caused considerable alarm and excitement among the Anglican party; for Randolph writes from Edinburgh to Cecil, March 30, 1565: 'The tale is; that Boner in his defence at his arraignment said that

²³ Harleian 421, and Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. pt. i. p. 5.

there was never a lawful Bishop in England; which so astonished a great number of the best learned that yet they know not what answer to give him; and where it was determined he should have suffered, he is remitted to the place from whence he came, and no more said unto him.'²⁴

Harding comes next; and it will be most convenient, after each quotation from Harding, to let Jewell's reply follow at once.

Harding. 'Ye say that the ministers ought lawfully to be called, and duly and orderly preferred to that office of the Church of God. Why do ye not so? Why is not this observed among you gospellers? Whatsoever ye mean by your minister and by that office, this are we assured of, that in this your new church, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, or any other inferior orders ye have none. . . . For whereas ye have abandoned the external sacrifice and priesthood of the New Testament, and have not in your sect consecrated bishops, and therefore being without priests made with lawful laying on of hands, . . . how can ye say that any among you can lawfully minister, or that ye have any lawful ministers at all?'²⁵

'You bear yourself as though you were Bishop of Salisbury. But how can you prove your vocation? By what authority usurp you the administration of doctrine and sacraments? What can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? Who hath called you? Who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it? How and by whom are you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Who hath committed to you the office you take upon you? Be you a priest, or be you not? If you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office of a Bishop? If you be, tell us who gave you orders? The institution of a priest was never yet but in the power of a Bishop. Bishops have always, after the apostles' times, according to the ecclesiastical canons, been consecrated by three other Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, and confirmation of the Bishop of Rome.'²⁶

Jewell. 'We deny not the consecration of three Bishops; we deny not the confirmation of the Metropolitan. We ourselves are so consecrated and so confirmed. The matter that lieth between us is this: whether through the whole Church of Christ no man

²⁴ State-Paper Office, Foreign, Scotland, x. 66.

²⁵ Constitution of the *Apology*, in Jewell's Works, vol. iii. p. 320; ed. Parker Society. ²⁶ p. 321.

may be allowed for a Bishop without the confirmation of the Pope.²⁷

Harding. 'If there be no Church where is no priest, where is your Church like to become, after that our apostates, that now be fled from us to you, shall be departed this life? . . . It remaineth, M. Jewel, you tell us whether your vocation be ordinary or extraordinary. If it be ordinary, show us the letters of your orders; at least show us that you have received power to do the office you presume to exercise, by due order of laying on of hands and consecration. But order and consecration you have not. For who could give that to you of all these new ministers, which he hath not himself?'²⁸

Jewell. 'Whereas it pleaseth you to call for my letters of orders, and to demand of me, as by some authority, whether I be a priest or no? what hands were laid over me? and by what order I was made? I answer you: I am a priest, made long sithence by the same order and ordinance, and I think also by the same man and the same hands, that you, M. Harding, were made priest by, in the late time of K. Edw. the sixth.

'Further, as if you were my metropolitan, ye demand of me, whether I be a Bishop or no? I answer you: I am a Bishop, and that by the free and accustomed canonical election of the whole chapter of Sarisbury, assembled solemnly together for that purpose.

'Our Bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever, by free election of the chapters, by consecration of the Archbishop and other three Bishops; and by the admission of the prince.'²⁹

Harding's rejoinder. 'Neither by the same ordinance, M. Jewel, nor by the same man, nor by the same hands, nor in the time of the same late king. . . . I aske as well of your bishoply vocation, and of your sending, as of your priesthood. You answer, neither by what example hands were laid on you, nor who sent you, but only you say, he made you priest that made me in King Edward's days. Verily I never had any name or title of priesthood given to me during the raigne of K. Edward. I only tooke the order of deaconship, as it was then ministered, farther I went not. . . . Truly I tooke myselve neither for a priest, nor yet for a lawful deacon in all respects, by those orders, which were taken in King Edward's days. . . . I esteemed not the title of any ministry, which I might seem to have received in King Edward's time, so much as I should have done, if I had received it of a Catholic Bishop, and

²⁷ Defence of the *Apology*, *ibid.* p. 330.

²⁸ p. 322.

²⁹ p. 334.

after the order of the Catholic Church, being well assured that those who gave them were out of order themselves, and ministered them not according to the rite and manner of the Catholic Church, as who had forsaken the whole succession of Bishops in all Christendom, and had erected a new congregation of their own planting, the form whereof was imagined only in their own brains, and had not been seen nor practised in the world before.³⁰

'Ye were made, you say, by the consecration of the Archbishop and other three Bishops. And how, I pray, was your Archbishop himself consecrated? What three Bishops in the realme were there to lay hands upon him? You have now uttered a worse case for yourselves, than was by me before named. For your Metropolitan himself had no lawful consecration.'³¹

To this Jewell makes no reply.

Harding. 'If ye allow not every man, yea and every woman, to be a priest, why drive ye not some of your fellows to recant that so have preached? Why allow ye the books of your new evangelists that so have written?'³²

Jewell. 'We neither have Bishops without Church, nor Church without Bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them whom you call apostates, as if our Church were no Church without them. They are no apostates, M. Harding, but for a great part learned, grave, and godly men. Notwithstanding, if there were not one of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Lovaine.'³³

'Ye tell us: "There is a priesthood internal, and a priesthood external, and there is a difference between laymen and priests." What needed this talk, M. Harding? There is not one of us that ever taught otherwise. We know that the priest or minister of the Church of God is divided from the rest of his brethren, as was the tribe of Levi from the children of Israel, and hath a special office over the people. Neither may any man force himself into that office without lawful calling. But as touching the inward priesthood, and the exercise of the soul, we say in this sense every faithful christian man is a priest, and offereth unto God spiritual sacrifices: in this only sense, I say, and none otherwise. Whosoever is a member of Christ's body, a child of the Church, is fully invested with this priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, though they be only laymen, yet have they a Church.'³⁴

³⁰ Harding's *Deduction*, p. 229-31.

³¹ *Ibid.* fol. 234.

³² p. 335.

³³ p. 335-6.

It is difficult to understand Harding's meaning. By the words 'your Metropolitan had no lawful consecration,' he certainly admits the fact of Parker's consecration, though he denies its being legitimate. And the question 'What three Bishops in the realm were there to lay hands upon him?' raises no farther objection than that Parker's consecrators were not 'Bishops of the realm,' in which he is perfectly correct. Not all the reasoning of Constable or other writers can extract more from his words than denying them to be real or true or lawful Bishops. And his strongest expressions admit of explanation, if he believed Barlow to be no Bishop, or if he denied the validity of the form, without supposing him to deny the fact of the Lambeth consecration.

Still it must be remarked, that whatever was Harding's meaning, Jewell's replies are far from satisfactory. He first speaks in mere general terms; then he mentions his election, as if that were the act that made him Bishop. And according to his doctrine, which we have had before us already, it was so. And this may account for his referring to it so emphatically. Then when Harding presses him again to say who consecrated him or his Metropolitan, he makes no answer, though he published another edition of his *Defence*, in which he replies to Harding's *Detection*. And he flies off from the subject to make a reply to the charge of not interfering with those who preached that every man was a priest, in which having first called it 'an odious untruth, we have not so preached nor written,'³⁵ he goes on to propound in effect the very doctrine he disclaims; first asserting the interior priesthood of all Christians; then denying all sacrifice but that is internal, thus involving the denial of any other than that interior priesthood of which he had spoken, and leaving his readers to draw the inference, that in case of the failure of the priestly succession, the

³⁵ In the margin, p. 322.

people have it in their own power to constitute the ministry anew.

Next Sanders.

'When Elizabeth restored the law for making Bishops, according to which the Queen's prelates were to be ordained, it was required that, besides the Metropolitan, or with his consent, two or three Bishops should assist and impose hands on them. But it fell out ridiculously, that when these superintendents were to be created, they could not prevail with the Catholic Bishops to impose hands on them; and among their own party they had not three nor even two Bishops, nor any Metropolitan at all, previously ordained by other Bishops, by whose hands or consent they might be ordained. . . . They were very pressing with an Irish Archbishop, whom they at the time were keeping in prison in London, to help them in this necessity; and offered him his liberty and other rewards, if he would be the principal in their ordination; but the good man could not for any consideration be induced to impose consecrated hands on heretics, or to be a partaker in other men's sins. And thus, as they were without any legitimate ordination, and were commonly said and proved even by English law to be no Bishops, they were obliged to call in the aid of the secular arm, and to obtain the confirmation of the lay government in a subsequent parliament, so that by that authority, whatever in the previous consecration had been improperly done or omitted, or otherwise than the statute prescribed, might be condoned them, although after they had filled the episcopal chair and discharged the office of Bishops for some years without any episcopal consecration. Hence the name was given them of *Parliamentary Bishops*.'³⁶

Mr. Haddan³⁷ has remarked that 'there are a great many untruths in Sanders' account.' It is certainly told in vague and general terms, and the events of seven years are put together in one paragraph, as if they followed each other immediately. But let us examine it in detail. It is literally true, that of the seven Bishops to whom the Queen's commission was addressed, only one was legally qualified to act, and thus the words 'aut tres duosve Episcopos' are fully borne out, and the addition of 'ab-

³⁶ Sanders, *De Schism. Angl.*; ed. Colon. 1585, fol. 165-7; ed. Rome, 1586, p. 392-401.

³⁷ Bramhall, vol. iii. p. 239, note.

allis Episcopis prius ordinatum' seems to indicate that the other six had not all been actually consecrated. The statement also of their having discharged the episcopal functions without any episcopal consecration is perfectly correct, if it is meant that Parker's consecrator was not a Bishop. And thus too there may be a foundation for the alleged application to an Irish Archbishop, although it cannot have occurred in the year 1559; for there was no Irish Bishop prisoner in London in that year. Robert Waucop, who, although blind, had been nominated by the Pope Archbishop of Armagh, died at Paris in 1551. The official returns of prisoners in London in the State-Paper Office contain no name answering the description, although several are mentioned for religious causes. Richard Craghe was nominated by the Pope Archbishop of Armagh, and consecrated at Rome. He arrived in Ireland in 1564, was arrested, sent to London, and placed in the Tower, but made his escape after three years' imprisonment. It is quite probable that some offer was made to him such as Sanders describes; and as the 'necessity' referred to extended to the year 1566, Sanders' word 'then' may come within the time. Thus, in the whole passage quoted from Sanders there is nothing whatever inconsistent with the known facts; while even his strongest expressions remarkably fall in with the suspicious raised by and the inferences drawn from other sources.

Lastly, Stapleton.

'The pretended Bishops of Protestants . . . by what authority do they governe the folde of Christes flocke? Who laied hands over them? Whither went they to be consecrated,—seeing that at home there was no number of such as might and would serve their turne? . . . I saie, by the verdit of holy Scripture and practise of the primitive Church, these men are no Bishops. I speak nothing of the laws of the realme. It hath ben of late sufficiently proved they are no Bishops, if they should be tried thereby. But let them be tried by Scripture. At the planting of our Christen faith,

Bishops of the realme were ordained by laying on of handes required in holy Scripture. . . . Your pretended Bishops have no such ordination, no such laying on of handes of other Bishops, no authorite to ordain true priestes or ministres; and therefore neyther ye are true mynistres, neither they any Bishops at all.³⁸

Again, in another work: 'Is it not notorious, that yee and your colleagues were not ordained no not according to the prescrite, I will not say of the Churche, but even of the very statutes? Howe then can yee challenge to yourselfe the name of the Lord Bishop of Winchester?'³⁹

'It is not the princes only pleasure that maketh a Bishop, but there must be both free election . . . and a due consecration, which in you and al your fellows doe lacke; and therefore are in deede no true Bisshoppes, neither by the lawe of the Churche, neyther yet by the lawes of the realme, for wante of due consecration, expressly required by an act of Parliament, renewed in this Queenes dayes in suffragane Bisshoppes, much more in you.'⁴⁰

'If I should aske M. Horn again, how he can goe for a Bishop, and write himself the B. of Winchester, being called to that function only by the letters patents of the prince, without due consecration or imposition of handes by any Bishop or Bishops living, . . . neither he nor al his fellowes, being all unordered prelates, shall ever be able to make any sufficient or reasonable answer (answering as Christian Catholike men), whereby it may appeare that they may goe for right Bishops of Christes Church; but that they must remain as they were before, or mere laymen, or simple priestes.'⁴¹

Yet, notwithstanding these strong assertions, in the very work last quoted we find the following:

'In the first yeare of our gracious Queene, the acte of Parliament for making and consecrating of Bisshoppes, made the 28th of kinge Henrye, was revived. And yet the Bisshoppes were ordered not according to the acte, but according to an acte made in kinge Edwarde his dayes, and repelled by Queene Marye, and not revived the sayde first yeare. And yf they will say, that that defecte is now supplied, let them yet remember that they are but parliament and no Churche Bisshoppes, and so no Catholike Bisshoppes, as being ordered in such manner and fasshon as no Catholike Church ever used.'⁴²

³⁸ *Fortresse of the Faith*; Antwerp, 1565, p. 141, 144.

³⁹ *A Counterblast to M. Horne's Vague Blast against M. Fidenham*; Louvain, 1567, fol. 96. 4to.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* p. 301.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* p. 458.

⁴² Apparently an error for '25.'

This is a clear assertion that the Elizabethan Bishops were consecrated according to the Act 5 and 6 Edward VI; and it is thus a proof that Stapleton in other places does not question the fact of the Lambeth consecration, but only its being regular, canonical, and valid.

The meaning of the foregoing passages, as well as others, has been hotly contested between the writers of each party in the controversy; but it cannot be said that the result is decisive on either side. The rhetorical style made use of, and the personal feeling apparent, throw doubts in the way of raising arguments upon particular expressions; for some of them if taken literally would seem to imply that no consecration of any kind had taken place; and the defenders of the Nag's-Head story have taken advantage of these and pushed them to the utmost. On the other hand, there are other expressions which admit the fact of the consecration, and seem only to question its being legitimate and canonical; and writers on the Anglican side have not been slow to turn these against their opponents. But taking them altogether, it may be granted that they admit the fact of the consecration having taken place as alleged; but it is also evident that they imply some serious difficulty respecting it, and apparently touching the persons acting therein; and further, that this difficulty extended so far as not merely to render the consecration uncanonical, unlawful, and irregular, but also to affect its validity.

If, however, it is strange that the contemporary Catholic writers have not left a more circumstantial narrative of the facts as they occurred, it is still more strange that the Anglican writers, who were themselves concerned in the transactions, and had such a personal interest in them, even when challenged by their Catholic opponents, never give a downright or straightforward reply. Jewell's evasions of Harding's questions have been already referred to; and Fulke replying to Stapleton writes as follows:

'Where he saith, that when all the popish Bishops were deposed, there was none to lay hands on the Bishops that should be newly consecrated, it is utterly false: for there was one of the popish Bishops that continued in his place; there were also divers that were consecrated Bishops in King Edward's time: . . . I speak not this, as though in planting of the Church where it hath been long exiled, an extraordinary form of ordaining were not sufficient.'⁴⁰

Let us next refer to Pilkington, who was made Bishop of Durham in 1561.⁴¹ On Wednesday the 4th of June 1561, St. Paul's Cathedral was set on fire by lightning, and the Sunday afterwards Pilkington preached a sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he enlarged upon certain abuses that might be thought to be the causes that had brought down such a judgment. On this a paper was printed and scattered about secretly at Chester, entitled 'An Addition to the Causes &c.:' of which Morwen, Bishop Bonner's chaplain, was said to be the author. Pilkington thereupon published a 'Confutation.' Morwen had said, 'they have invented a new way to make bishops and priests.' Pilkington replies; and after quoting Scripture examples, proceeds: 'In these places of Scripture there be these things to be noted in sending forth ministers. First, an assembly of the clergy and people to bear testimony of their honesty and aptness that be called. Secondly, I note they used exhortations, with fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands. These ceremonies we be sure are good and godly, because the apostles used them so oft; and these, except some great cause to the contrary, are to be used of all in calling of the ministers. All these things the order now appointed observes, and no more.'⁴²

Then Whitaker: Durey had taken him up on the

⁴⁰ Stapleton's *Fortress Overthrown*, p. 117, ed. Parker Society.

⁴¹ Haddan on Bramhall, p. 226.

⁴² Pilkington's Works, p. 578-81, ed. Parker Society.

point that, 'You say, "we permit none to exercise this ministry but those who are by due order called to that office." Tell us, if you can, who called Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the other preachers of your gospel to that office.'

Whitaker replies: 'Luther was a priest and doctor of your own, and could exercise that office in your churches. So too were Zuinglius, Bucer, and many others. And as presbyters, if presbyters are by divine right the same as Bishops, they could set other presbyters over the churches. Thus there is an easy answer to you as concerning our preachers even out of your own laws. But I would not have you think we make such account of your orders, as to consider no calling lawful without them. Therefore, keep your orders to yourselves. God is not so tied to orders but that He can, without order, when the good of the Church requires, constitute ministers in the churches. And the churches have the lawful power of choosing ministers; so that there is no need to take from you those who are to discharge the ministry among us.'⁴³

Lastly, Hooker: 'There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a Bishop. The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than Bishops alone to ordain. Howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways.'

'Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted into spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God Himself doth raise up any, ratifying their calling by manifest signs and tokens Himself from heaven. . . . Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the ex-

⁴³ *Defence of the Answer to Compton's Ten Reasons* in reply to Durey; London, 1583, p. 820.

gence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a Bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place.'⁴⁴

These four writers all agree in one point, and that is, as to a supposed case of necessity. Let us put their words together. Fulke says, 'where the Church hath been long exiled;' Pilkington, 'except some great cause to the contrary;' Whitaker, 'when the good of the Church requires;' Hooker, 'when the exigence of necessity doth constrain;' 'an extraordinary form of ordaining were sufficient,' proceeds Fulke; it may prevent the use of 'laying on of hands,' by Pilkington's admission; 'without order ministers may be constituted,' is Whitaker's principle; 'the ordinary institution of God may give place,' according to the exception made by Hooker. Where and when was the necessity? what was the great cause to the contrary? Let it be granted that Whitaker is speaking specially of the Geneva platform; this does but bring out in stronger relief the fact, that the other three are expressly describing and defending the circumstances of the Anglican Church. Whitaker, indeed, does but draw the conclusion, of which Jewell had laid down the premises in the passage: 'Laymen have a priesthood in themselves, and can constitute a church.' From this Whitaker's principle follows: 'The churches have the lawful power of choosing ministers.'

Bramhall tries to defend Whitaker and Fulke, 'as both contemplative men; cloistered up in St. John's College; better acquainted with polemic writers than with records.'⁴⁵ How little this description applied is easily shown. Whitaker being Regius Professor of Divinity,

⁴⁴ Hooker's Works, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 285.

⁴⁵ Vol. iii. p. 134.

was specially appointed by Aylmer, Bishop of London,⁴⁶ to answer Campion. And as for Fulke, he was the official controversialist of the time, always kept in harness. If any poor Popish prisoner was to be brow-beaten and confounded, Fulke was the man sent on the mission. If a Popish tract was picked up in the purlieus of the Court, Fulke was pitched upon as a suitable person to reply. He was the most prolific controversial writer of the day; and although hard terms and foul language were the fashion on both sides, Fulke is *facile princeps* on that score. Perhaps he wrote a good deal at random, for he could not recollect where he had called his opponent 'a proude hypocrite priest, of stinking, greasie, anti-christian, and execrable orders, except he should read over the whole booke.'⁴⁷ He seems, too, to think it necessary to give a flat contradiction to anything his adversary says, which may account for the first part of his reply to Stapleton in the passage quoted being so utterly irrelevant as it is. But no reason appears from hence why, after he had, by alluding to Kitchin and the Edwardine Bishops, excluded Barlow from the calculation, he should then volunteer his opinion as to 'an extraordinary form of ordaining being sufficient,' 'in planting of the Church where it hath been long exiled.' There is no country and no time to which these words would apply but England in the first years of Elizabeth.

Pilkington too is defending 'the order now appointed; and it was quite unnecessary to guard himself as he has done, unless there had been some occasion when 'exhortations, fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands' had not been 'observed,' owing to 'some great cause to the contrary.'

Hooker is still more remarkable than the others, be-

⁴⁶ Lansdowne Mss. no. 33.

⁴⁷ *A brief Confutation of sundry Cavils uttered by diverse Papists against the Writings of William Fulke.* Lond. 1583, p. 25.

cause he wrote at a time when higher ideas had begun to prevail, and he had himself laid down the Catholic principle of ordination by Bishops, and had taught the Catholic doctrine of the gift communicated in ordination; and because also he wrote under Lord Burghley's special inspection, having sent him the first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*⁴⁸ in manuscript a year before they were published. Hooker's words seem even to be an allusion to those used in the Queen's dispensing clause for Parker's consecration—'temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulant' in the one; 'when the exigence of necessity doth constrain' in the other. It cannot have been from any tenderness for foreign Protestants that he made this exception; for he was writing against the Puritans, who claimed to derive their orders from Geneva, and who would have been too glad to avail themselves of the exception, if it had been understood to include them. The circumstances which forced him to admit such a departure from the general principle he has laid down, can have occurred only in the history of those he is defending—the Anglican Church itself, and the occasion is pointed out by the words of the official record quoted above.

If we now look back to the history here given of Parker's consecration and the circumstances connected with it, it may be said that we have been wading through a great cloud of dust, but all thrown up by mere guesses and probabilities; that the objections made by former writers have been nearly all withdrawn; that the substantial truth of the facts alleged on the Anglican side has been admitted; and that, after all, there is no distinct proof of anything to be said against them. It is true that the story, as told on the Anglican side, has been taken for truth, as far as it goes; that no question has been raised touching the genuineness of any document produced on their side, except the surreptitious

⁴⁸ *Sturpe's Whitgift*, vol. ii. p. 148; *Kobler's Hooker*, Preface, p. v.

alteration of the principal record, which, however, was intended only to conceal, but not to invent, nor falsify, the facts; and that the suspicions here raised are founded on inferences drawn from the documents, and do not in general profess to be more than probable. But what a number of probabilities here unite, and point to one and the same conclusion! We hear a good deal said in the present day about the force of concentrated fire in a naval engagement. Is there not something of a like effect in the present controversy? The circumstances of Barlow's own history, and the reduction of the time left open for his consecration to the period between the 12th and 30th of June 1536 exclusive; the exceptional form of the grant of temporalities, being a solitary instance, without precedent, and without an imitator; the opinions entertained at the time, and by the parties concerned, as to the non-necessity of consecration; their evident state of embarrassment, and the submission of the case to the six civilians; the Queen's dispensation, worded sufficiently largely to cover the absence of consecration; the departure from the usual form of register, and the probability of a surreptitious alteration having been made in the original record; the finding a draft of the altered form in the Secretary's office; the Act 8 Eliz. c. 1. being drawn without condition or limitation as to persons; the strong assertions, the imputations, the challenges made on the part of the Catholic writers, all consistent with the same supposition; the shuffling and evasive replies of Jewell, and the plea of necessity put in by three, if not four, Anglican writers, as a saving clause, on behalf of ordinations within their own Church;—these circumstances, though if taken singly, or even if only two or three were known to have occurred, they might not tell for much, yet taken together, coming as they do from different sources, some Catholic, some Anglican; some printed, others from mss.; some from public records, others from private repositories;

some known and appealed to from the first, others brought to light during the course of the controversy, others again now made use of for the first time;—form an accumulation of probabilities all aiming at the same point, and have a force which nothing can resist; unless, indeed, some distinct and positive proof is found that Barlow was really and duly consecrated according to the rite of the Pontifical.

However ambiguous may be the statements of Catholic divines referring to Parker's consecration, there is no doubt with regard to either their opinions or their practice when they come to deal with ordinations given and received according to the form annexed to the Book of Common Prayer in 1552, and confirmed by the Act 8 Eliz. cap. 1. It is unfortunate that they do not give the reasons for their decision.

The first document bearing on the subject is not only the earliest in date, but also chief in importance. Before the final promulgation of the Bull against Queen Elizabeth, Pope St. Pius V. appointed a Process to be taken, in which several witnesses gave evidence as to the Queen's proceedings. Among the interrogatories administered to the witnesses was the following: Whether, by her authority any schismatics were constituted Bishops and rectors, not being priests? To this the reply is given only in general terms by Goldwell Bishop of St. Asaph, Henry Henshaw late Rector of Lincoln College, and Edmund Daniel late Dean of Hereford, to the effect that the persons appointed to succeed the deprived Catholic Bishops were heretics, and some of them not priests. But Nicholas Morton declares, that he knows some Bishops to be merely laymen, and among them Nicholas Bullingham Bishop of Lincoln. William Allott deposes, that he is well acquainted with Bullingham and on friendly terms with him, and knows that he is not a priest. And Thomas

Kirton also names Bullingham as not being a priest, and seems in addition to imply that Jewell was not a priest, but not clearly. In the Declaratory Sentence annexed to this Process it is affirmed that the Queen, by her own authority, had conferred bishoprics, benefices, and other dignities on schismatics and heretics, not being clerics.⁴⁹ Now in the Table of Consecrations in Parker's *De Antiq. Brit. Eccl.*,⁵⁰ while all the rest are described as priests, either secular or regular, Bullingham and Pilkington alone are called 'secular ministers.' Assuming this table to be a proof of Bullingham having received only Anglican ordination, there is here a clear denial of its validity. And the term 'non clerics' in the Papal sentence applied to persons on whom bishoprics and benefices had been conferred, coincides with that of 'sine ulla clericalis caracteris susceptione,' used in similar cases in Cardinal Pole's dispensations.

We next come to writers; and may begin with Allen, who states the practice pursued by him and his colleagues at the English College at Rheims, in a letter to Dr. Ven-deville, written at the request of the King of Spain's Council, and dated 16th September 1580:

'There have come also not a few openly heretics, and even ministers of heretical offices and preachers; all of whom, led to penitence by our instruction and conversation, have not only been reconciled to the Church in sincerity, but also after a year or two passed in collegiate discipline have desired to become priests, and have been so made, and have devoted themselves with great zeal to the work of the harvest in England, where one of them has since ended his life by a glorious martyrdom, and the rest are still pursuing their labours with abundant fruit.'⁵¹

⁴⁹ Laderchius, *Contiu. of Baronius*, vol. iii. p. 197-210. For extracts, see Appendix, No. XXIII.

⁵⁰ The original ms. of this Table is at C. C. C., dated A. D. 1561. It is printed also in Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. pt. i. p. 230; and it is referred to by Mr. Haddan as evidence for the several consecrations mentioned therein.

⁵¹ Ms. in the Archives of the English College at Rome.

Again :

'Because one special reproch given us pertaineth not to our persons, but to the whole order of priesthood, we may be bold to adde a worde or two for our defense specially concerning that terme, Massing Priests, whereby the new pulpits (the very chairs of the skornful) merily or mockingly call us and our brethren. Which name yet, given us also in publike writing of authorities, is not doubtles of skornfulness, which must needs be far from the enditers of such : but as we take it, for distinction and difference betwixt us Catholike and in deede onely priests, and the other of the new creation, whom the people, for some resemblance of their actions in the ministerie to the wonted celebration of divine things, often call priests, though the Protestants list not so to be called, as in deede the ministers cannot of right have any such calling, having no more power, right, or authoritie to minister any Sacrament (other then Baptisme, which in some cases women also may do) then they have to make a new moone or another sunne. The Church of God knoweth no other priests, neither hath Christ instituted any other order of priests, but of these whom contemptuously they call Masse Priests. It is that sort, and none other, to which our Saviour gave power to consecrate His body and blood, and offer the same, which is, to say Masse.'⁵²

In his *Defence of English Catholics*, in reply to Burleigh's *Execution of Justice* in 1584, he twice calls the new clergy 'unordered apostates.'⁵³

Next, Bristow, in his *Motives*, published in 1574 :

'Consider what Church is that, whose priests and Bishops come in by ordinary calling of other Bishops that were before them, of whose right ordering and lawfull power of ministry the Sectes themselves make so little doubt, that they esteeme one so called and ordered very fit even for their own ministry, yea much more requisite then one of their owne making. . . .

'Contrarily, what Church that is, whose ministers are but very lay-men, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, and therefore executing their pretended office without benefit or spiritual comfort of any man, . . . holding therefore amongst us, when they repent and come againe, none other place but the place of lay-men : in no

⁵² *An Apology and true Declaration of the Institution of the two English Colleges, the one in Rome, the other in Rheims*. Mounts in Henault, 1581, fol. 88b-89b. ⁵³ p. 41, 171.

case admitted, no, nor looking to minister in any office, unless they take our orders, which before they had not.⁵⁴

Fulke, in his *Retentive*, makes no other answer to Bristow than the following: 'With all our heart we abhorre, defie, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasie, anti-christian orders.'⁵⁵

Bristow again, in his *Demands*, published in 1575:

'Twelfth: I demaunde of the learned Protestant to knowe cause and reason, why their congregations do admit and receive all Bishops, priests, deacons, and other officers spiritual, ordered by our Catholike Church, as men lawfull and sufficient to preache the Worde of God, to minister the sacramentes, and to exercise al spiritual jurisdiction in no less wise, but rather more, then if they had bene ordered in their owne private congregations: whereas the Catholike Church of Christ doth not acknowledge any man of their ordering and calling to be any whit the more fit for any spiritual function in Christ his Church then other common lay men. . . .'⁵⁶

To this Fulke replies:

'Although all godly men wish more severity of discipline to be used in receiving them that come out of heresies to serve in the Church than is commonly practised in England; yet you are highly deceived if you think that we esteem your offices of Bishops, priests, deacons, any better than the state of laymen, but far worse; for we judge them to be nothing else but anti-christianity, heresy, and blasphemy. And therefore we receive none of them to minister in our Church, except they forswear your religion. And so their admission is not an allowing of your ordering, but a new calling unto the ministry.'⁵⁷

⁵⁴ *Motives*, p. 166-7.

⁵⁵ *A Retentive to stay good Christians in the true Faith and Religion, against the motives of Richard Bristow*. London, 1580, p. 69.

⁵⁶ *A Offer made by a Catholike to a learned Protestant*. Douay, 1575, 16mo. From the copy in the Bodleian at the end of Master John de Albine's Notable Discourse. This was published again next year as Bristow's *Demands*. The work was first drawn up by Allen in ms. only, and afterwards enlarged by Bristow. The copy printed in Fulke's *Reply* was taken from Allen's ms., which differs from that quoted above.

⁵⁷ *Answer of the Christian Protestant to the proud Challenge of a Popish Catholic*. Lond. 1577. 8vo.

Bristow replies:

'Yourselves confesse our orders to be good ynough, in that having been ordered by us, you seeke not to be reordered, as Crammer, Parker, Grindall, Sandes, Horne, &c. Whereas we (as you know) account your orders for no orders. To this you say, 'You are highly deceived, &c.'" as above. How true it is you alike receive none otherwise, I passe that over. But, sir, we also make your ministers to abjure, and yet after that they be but laymen still. And I would ask you, if two Catholics abjure with you, one a layman, the other a priest, are they both priests *ipso facto*? O your divinitie! O your scripture!⁵⁸

Parsons also says, 'ether all, or the moste parte, of mynisters of Englande be meere laye men, and noe preistes.'⁵⁹ But he gives two quite insufficient reasons, and in consequence Fulke,⁶⁰ and even Percivall Wyborne,⁶¹ in their replies have the advantage of him.

To the same effect the Petition presented to King James on his entering the kingdom, on behalf of the Catholics, has the following passage: 'A religion wherein refuse and revolted preistes are deemed lawfull and sufficiently ordered to preach the Word of God, to minister sacraments, and to exercise all spiritual jurisdiction in the Protestant and Puritane congregation. . . . Neither is the Protestant minister or Bishop coming to our Catholike fraternity (as many come of the first sort) reputed other than for meere laymen without orders.'⁶²

These extracts carry on the tradition of the invalidity of the Edwardine Ordinal, which had come down, as we have already seen, from the time of Cardinal Pole. And it is evident that the practice which they indicate is quite independent of the events connected with Parker's conse-

⁵⁸ Bristo's *Reply to Fulke in defence of M. D. Allen's Scroll of Articles and Booke of Purgatorie*. Lovaine, 1580, 4to, p. 319.

⁵⁹ *Reasons why Catholiques refuse to goe to Church*. Douay, 1580, fol. 41.

⁶⁰ *Briefe Confutation of a Popish Discourse by John Howlet, or some other Birde of the Night*. London, 1581, 4to, fol. 37-8.

⁶¹ *Checke of M. Howlet's untimely Shreaching*. Lond. 1581, 4to, fol. 160-3.

⁶² *Supplication to the King's most excellent Majestie by true affected Subjects*, sect. 19. 1604.

cration; for Allen expressly refers to the distinction between 'priests' and the 'new ministers' as connected with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

To illustrate the statements in the foregoing extracts, some pains have been taken to make out a list of Anglican ministers who were reconciled to the Catholic Church before the year 1704, and afterwards were ordained, showing the dates and places of ordination as far as they can be ascertained, and giving the authorities for the history in each instance.

NAME.	BEFORE CONVERSION.	IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
Edmund Campian	Ordained deacon by Cheney Bishop of Gloucester. Arrived at Douay in 1570. <i>Douay Diary</i> .	Wrote a letter to Cheney him for the 'spurious orders' given by him. S. J. at Rome. Ordained Priest by the Archbishop of Prague. <i>Bombini in Vit. Campiani</i> , p. 61.
Cuthbert Mayne	In priest's orders of Anglican Church. <i>Dodd, Challoner</i> .	Ordained Priest 24th April 1576. <i>Douay Diary</i> . ⁶²
Thomas Blewett	A minister of the Church of England. Arrived at Douay 19th March 1577. <i>Dodd, Douay Diary</i> .	Subdeacon, 19th Sept. Deacon, 19th Dec. 1577. Priest, 24th Feb. 1578. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
Richard Sympson	A minister of the Church of England. Arrived at Douay 19th May 1577. <i>Douay Diary</i> .	Ordained Priest in 1577. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
John Lowe	A Protestant minister. Arrived at Douay 19th May 1577. <i>Douay Diary</i> .	Subdeacon, 14th of March 1579. Priest, 18th of April 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> .

⁶² For extracts from the Douay Diaries, see Appendix, No. XXIV.

NAME.	BEFORE CONVERSION.	IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
William Rainolds	Took holy orders about 1566. <i>Wood's Athena</i> . An earnest professor and preacher of the Protestant religion. <i>Parsons</i> . Arrived at Rheims April 1578: described as a layman. <i>Douay Diary</i> .	Subdeacon at Laon, 20th Sep. 1579. Deacon at Chalons, 24th Feb. 1580. Priest at Chalons, 31st March 1580. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
John Vivian	A beneficed preacher. Arrived at Rheims of Feb. 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> . S. P. O. See Appendix, No. XXVI.	Deacon, 18th April 1579. Priest at Laon, 15th June 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> . S. P. O.
Thomas Huberley	A beneficed minister of the Calvinistic sect. Arrived at Rheims Nov. 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> .	Subdeacon at Chalons, 24th Feb. 1580. Deacon at Rheims, 19th March 1580. Priest at Chalons, 31 March 1580. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
John Adams	A minister beneficed at Martinston ⁶³ in Dorsetshire. Arrived at Rheims 7th Dec. 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> . S. P. O. <i>Examination of John Chapman</i> . See Appendix, No. XXV.	Subdeacon at Chalons, 31st March 1580. Deacon at Rheims, 25th May 1580. Priest at Soissons, 15th Dec. 1580. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
John Chapman	A minister made by the Bishop of Wells; had benefice called Langton Herring in Dorsetshire. Arrived at Rheims Dec. 1579. <i>Douay Diary</i> . S. P. O. <i>His own examination</i> . Appendix, No. XXV. <i>Hutchins' Dorsetshire</i> .	Subdeacon at Soissons, 15th Dec. 1580. Deacon, 21st Feb. 1581. Priest at Chalons, 4th March 1581. <i>Douay Diary</i> .
Everard Hanse	A beneficed minister at Winterborne St. Martin's. <i>Hutchins' Dorsetshire</i> . The list of incumbents is imperfect.	Ordained Priest by <i>Douay Diary</i> .

NAME.	BEFORE CONVERSION.	IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
Stephen Rousham	preacher. Arrived at the Bishop of Chalons Rheims 11th June 1580. at Rheims, 25th Mar. <i>Doway Diary. Concer- 1581. Doway Diary. tatio Eccl. Cath. Dodd. Challoner.</i>	Arrived at Chalons Rheims, 25th Mar. 1581. <i>Doway Diary.</i>
John Sugar	Ordained by heretics. Deacon at Soissons, Minister of St. Mary's 21st Sept. 1581. at Oxford. Arrived at Priest at Soissons, Rheims 23d April 1581. 27th Sept. 1581. <i>Doway Diary, Challoner. Doway Diary.</i>	Deacon at Soissons, Sept. 1581. <i>Doway Diary.</i>
Francis Walsingham	Minister at Cannock in Priest, 1601. <i>Doway Staffordshire. Challoner. Catalogue.</i>	at Soissons, Sept. 1581. <i>Doway Diary.</i>
Humphrey Leach	Ordained Deacon by Subdeacon at Rome, Heton, Bishop of Ely, 30th March 1608. in 1603. <i>His own ac- Deacon at Rome, 5th count of his conversion</i> April, 1608. Priest in 'Search made into at Rome, 12th April Matters of Religion,' 1608. <i>Archives of p. xxiv. Received into English College at Eng. Coll. at Rome 27th Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives. No. XXVIII.</i>	at Rome, 1608. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives. No. XXVIII.</i>
John Goodman	Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Subdeacon at Rome, Shrewsbury, and after- 17th March 1612. wards chaplain of Ch. Deacon at Rome, 6th Ch. Oxford. <i>Wood's April 1612. Priest at Athenae Oxon. Received Rome, 21st April into Eng. Coll. Rome in 1612. Archives of 1609. Archives.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, No. XXVIII.</i>
Hugh Paulinus Cressy	A minister of the Church Tried and condemned of England. <i>Challoner, as a seminary Priest and so styled in the Re- in 1640. Challoner. monstrance of Parliamen- 29th Jan. 1639-40.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, No. XXVIII.</i>
	Prebendary of Windsor O. S. B. at Paris. A and dean of Leighlin in missionary Priest in Ireland. <i>Wood's Athenae England, and chaplain to Queen Catharine of Braganza. Dodd.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, No. XXVIII.</i>

NAME.	BEFORE CONVERSION.	IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
Stephen Goffe	An Anglican clergyman Ordained at Paris. and chaplain to Abp. <i>Dodd. Le Quien. Laud. Pridaux, Dodd, Le Quien.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives.</i>
John Massey	In deacon's orders of Reordained by the the Anglican Church and Bishop of Arras. <i>Con- dean of Ch. Ch. Oxford. stable. Dodd. Wood's Athenae. Constable, p. 369.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives.</i>
John Placidus Adelham	A Protestant minister. O. S. B. at Paris. <i>Challoner. Oliver's Col- Tried and con- demned as a semi- nary Priest, 17th Jan. 1678-9. Challoner.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives.</i>
James Clifton	A minister of the Gospel Died at Rome, 2d —had a parochial bene- Jan. 1704. <i>Archives fice. Received at the of English College. See English College at Rome Ap. No. XXVIII. as a layman 16th Oct. 1702. Archives.</i>	at Rome, 1612. <i>Archives of English College at Rome. See Appendix, Oct. 1606. Archives.</i>

Dr. Lee⁶⁴ has given an account of several Anglican clergymen who, after being received into the Church, declined being ordained, because they believed themselves to be true priests. But among the twelve persons named, the earliest is William Rainolds. Dr. Lee does not quote any authority for attributing such an opinion to him, and the facts are all the other way. He is called a layman on arriving at Rheims; he is ordained; and after spending several years in the College, he ends his days as Chaplain to the Beguines at Antwerp. The dates on which, and the places where, he received minor orders, subdeaconship, deaconship, and priesthood, are all known.⁶⁵

The statement about Cressy not being ordained depends on mere rumour. On the other hand, it is well

⁶⁴ *Validity*, p. 246-52, 271 and 292-307.

⁶⁵ See page 139.

known that, though the time and place of his ordination have not been ascertained, he was sent as a missionary priest into England, and became Chaplain to the Queen at Somerset House.⁶⁵ Dr. Lee does not specify the post he occupied in the Royal household, nor does he venture to hint that he acted as priest without re-ordination. Besides, in the title-page of the second edition of his *Exomologesis* he is described as 'Lately Deane of Loughlin &c. in Ireland, and Prebend of Windsor in England. . . . who now calls himself B. Serenus Cressy, Religious Priest of the holy Order of S. Benedict, in the Convent of S. Gregory in Doway.'⁶⁶

The case of Dr. Stephen Goffe is related with more details. It is said that on his objection to be re-ordained, the Archbishop of Paris allowed him to minister at the altar without re-ordination; that the Doctors of the Sorbonne had his case under consideration, and delivered a report in which they allowed the validity of the Anglican rite of ordination, though they objected to the manner in which it had been drawn up; that a controversy arose on the subject, and the case was referred to Rome, from whence directions were received for his re-ordination.⁶⁷ On the other hand, it does not appear why any question should have arisen, as the French Bishops had often re-ordained English subjects who had been Anglican ministers; besides that Dodd states⁶⁸ he never heard of such a decision, though he studied at the Sorbonne; Le Quien⁶⁹ relates the case without mention of any discussion on the subject, or of any difficulty raised on the part of Goffe; and lastly, Courayer himself, in the *Défence*⁷⁰ in which he replied to Le Quien, relates the story simply as a rumour quoted from an English writer, viz. Pricieux, and does not refer to any French authority, although he was

⁶⁵ Dodd; Wood's *Athens*.

⁶⁶ Printed at Paris, 1653.

⁶⁷ Lee's *Validity*, p. 293.

⁶⁸ Vol. ii. p. 316.

⁶⁹ *Défense de la Dissertation*, vol. i. cap. i.

⁷⁰ *Défense de la Dissertation*, vol. i. cap. i.

in communication with more than one of the Doctors of the Sorbonne,⁷¹ and the fact, if true, would have been of great importance for his cause. Whether there was such a discussion or not, and whether a reference was made to Rome or not, the fact stands, that Goffe was re-ordained, and the tradition on the subject remains unbroken. It seems clear, however, on the testimony of Franciscus a Sta Clara, that some discussion did take place; for he tells us: 'This business (of orders) hath been always ventilated even from the beginning of the schism, and of late renewed in the case of Dr. Goffe at Paris, who was re-ordained, as all others have been.'⁷²

The next case is that of Sir Harry Trelawney, who for many years objected to being re-ordained, from a conviction of his being really a priest by his Anglican orders. Cardinal Odescalchi is said to have told him that he 'was prepared to re-ordain him with a tacit condition, the sacramental form, of course, remaining untouched.'⁷³ But the fact was, that Cardinal Odescalchi explained to Sir Harry, that he might consider the ordination conditional, if he chose to do so; but, as Dr. Lee's account admits, there was no condition expressed or implied on the part of the ordaining Bishop.

Dr. Lee's list includes the names of nine other persons, converts to the Church, having previously been Anglican ministers, who are said to have objected to be re-ordained on the ground of their believing the validity of their Anglican orders. Now it is of very little importance what opinions these persons may have entertained on the subject. Having been bred up in heresy, and not having studied a course of Catholic theology, nor having even imbibed Catholic instincts, they were not qualified to form a sound judgment on the question. Yet

⁷¹ *Relation de la Conduite de P. le Courayer*, vol. ii. p. 2, 115, 229.

⁷² *Evêché de Fécamp*, 2d ed. Douay, 1655.

⁷³ Lee's *Validity*, p. 307.

it is worth while to consider the history of each in detail, so far as it is ascertained.

Dr. Benjamin Carrier had a considerable reputation for learning, and appears by his letters to have been fully conscious of it.⁷⁴ As, however, he died within twelve months of his being received into the Church, he had unfortunately but little opportunity of learning how to deal with such questions in a Catholic spirit.

Very little is known of the history of Dr. Thomas Vane; but in the work he published he left a testimony quite inconsistent with the idea of his entertaining a belief in Anglican orders, as follows: 'The succession of the English Bishops and ministers was interrupted upon their pretended Reformation. . . . If they were at first consecrated by lawful Bishops of the Church of Rome, as for their credit they pretend, yet they had not thereby commission to preach their new doctrine. . . . But it is worth the observation, that the Bishops and ministers of England, to maintain the lawfulness of their succession, do affirm that they were consecrated by Catholiclike Bishops, their predecessors, which while they do not prove, it shows the interruption of their succession, and while they affirm, it shows that they believe their succession and calling insufficient, unless they derive it from the Church of Rome.'⁷⁵ Again, 'Catholiclike do not allow their' (Protestants) 'ordination and consecration of Bishops and Priests for good, which appears in that if a Priest of the Roman Church revolt to the Protestant party, he is allowed by them to be a lawful Priest, but not so if a Protestant minister returne to the Romane Church.'⁷⁶

Of Abraham Woodhead, Dr. Lee states, on the authority of Hearne and Dr. Bliss, that 'he ever looked upon himself as a priest; that he frequently declined re-

⁷⁴ Dodd, vol. ii. *Records*.

⁷⁵ *A Lost Sheep returned Home*, p. 245-6. Paris, 1649. 4th edition.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 252.

ordination; and that he ministered in a private oratory or chapel.'⁷⁷ But it seems to be a more authentic account, that 'we don't find he ever took any orders in the Catholic Church, though he had in the Church of England; but behaved as a layman, after his conversion.'⁷⁸ As to his opinions on the present question, it looks as if he did entertain the belief in Anglican ministers being real bishops and priests. The second part of his work on *Ancient Church Government*, published anonymously at Oxford in 1688, ten years after his death, appears to be written in this spirit. A ms. note in the copy in the British Museum, taken apparently from Dr. Hickes, says, 'From various expressions the author appears to be a Roman Catholic;' but various other expressions, in which he speaks of the Anglican Bishops and clergy, look as if written by an Anglican. As this work was not published by the author himself, nor in his lifetime, it is not clear whether it contains his matured opinions as a Catholic.

James Wadsworth,⁷⁹ Thomas Gawen,⁸⁰ James Shirley,⁸¹ and Timothy Nourse,⁸² were all married either before or after their conversion, so that their opinions about their ordination, whatever they were, can have no bearing on the controversy.

William Rowland⁸³ seems to have been of a character little suited to a vocation to the priesthood.

Of Ambrose Wilson no particulars can be met with. On review of these several cases, it may be confidently asserted that there is an unbroken tradition from the year 1554 to the present time, confirmed by constant practice in France and Rome, as well as in this country, in accordance with which Anglican ordinations are looked upon as absolutely null and void; and Anglican ministers

⁷⁷ *Validity*, p. 271-2.

⁷⁸ *Brief Account of the Writings and Life of the Author*, p. 62, prefixed to Woodhead's *Ancient Church Government*, part iii.

⁷⁹ Dodd. ⁸⁰ Wood's *Athenæ*.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* ⁸² *Ibid.* ⁸³ *Ibid.*

are treated simply as laymen, so that those who wish to become priests have to be ordained unconditionally. Not a single instance to the contrary can be alleged. The only case in which any discussion appears to have arisen, is referred to by a contemporary writer as an illustration of the accustomed rule. And the statements made of objections having been raised by various converts to being ordained in the Catholic Church are shown—either to be contradicted by the facts, or to have no theological importance, on account of the persons named being unknown, or married, or of an unsuitable character, or only recently converted, or from our possessing no clear and certain testimony as to their opinions on the subject.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY.

WE have seen the new vessel of the Anglican Hierarchy launched and put to sea, though loudly denounced from the old bark of St. Peter as unsound in her build, and manned by a crew who were not true seamen.

But Catholics and Anglicans throughout the greater part of Elizabeth's reign had too little in common to join issue on such a subject as that of Ordination. The three orders of the sacred ministry were retained, and were given by imposition of hands and prayer. And in controversy with Catholics this fact is put forward as if all was in harmony with the ancient Church.¹ But the Orders themselves and the rite used in conferring them were retained as matter of regulation only and not as essential. 'No man shall execute any of them except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted according to the form following,' says the Preface to the Ordination services. And this rule seems to have been enforced, at least in general; for several of the Articles of Visitation contain some such question as, 'Whether there be any persons that intrude themselves and presume to exercise any kynde of ministerie in the Churche of God, without imposition of hands and ordinarie auctoritie.'²

The Elizabethan Reformers seem generally on the subject of the ministry to have adopted the opinions cur-

¹ By Jewell and Pilkington.

² *Ritual Commission, Second Report*, p. 403, 407, 408, 415, 419, 422.

rent among both Lutherans and Zuinglians on the Continent, viz. that ministers should be called before they enter on their functions, and that this calling may come either from the people, or from patrons, or from the magistrate or prince. That after such a calling, it is requisite for propriety that the person called should be admitted to the exercise of his office by imposition of hands and prayer. Hence the 'calling' came to be considered as the main thing, and the term came into general use, so much so that even the Catholics use it.

This may seem an unfair representation of the early Anglican doctrine; but no writer has been met with during the first five-and-twenty years of Elizabeth's reign who gives a different idea. And the 39 Articles themselves bear out the statement; for the 23d, which was the 24th of those of 1552, runs as follows: 'No man may minister in the congregation except he be called. It is not lawful for any man to take upon hym the office of publique preaching or ministryng the sacramentes in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this worke by men who have publike authoritie geven unto them in the congregation to call and sende mynysters into the Lordes vyneyarde.'³ This is so framed as not to contradict the doctrine of any of the continental reforms. 'It is not lawful to minister without being called;' but it does not say that 'if any man do take upon him the office without calling,' the sacraments he pretends to minister will be void. Calling is treated as of propriety, but not of necessity. And the mode of calling here denoted is consistent with the same views. The proper persons to call and send ministers are those 'who have public authority given them in the congregation.' This recognises the right of the Lutheran superintendents, of

³ Lamb's *Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles.*

the Zuinglian pastors, and of the Calvinist elders, as fully as that of Anglican Bishops. Nothing whatever is said or implied of the necessity of a Bishop as the minister of holy orders, or of a true succession from other Bishops.

This is only 'the literal and grammatical sense' of the words; but as to the mode in which it was generally understood at the time, the Article received several practical illustrations, and particularly from the cases of Whittingham, Morrison, and Travers.

Whittingham had been called to the ministry by the congregation of English at Geneva during Queen Mary's reign.⁴ On his return to England he was made Dean of Durham; and after filling that post for some years without question, a complaint was made against him, that 'he was neyther deacon nor minister according to the lawes of this realme, but a mere lay man.'⁵ In the discussion which ensued, the question of episcopal ordination was not touched on at all. The sole point at issue was, whether 'he was orderly made minister at Geneva, according to the order of Geneva, by public authority established there,'⁶ and by imposition of hands;⁷ or whether he had been merely elected 'by lote and election,' and 'suffrages' of the English congregation.⁸ And the conclusion is, that 'unless Mr. Whittingham prove that he was made minister at Geneva, according to the law ther, if hit were "aut contra aut præter formam specificam jure Genevensi stabilitam," he was neyther minister ther, nor here now is.'⁹ But it is clear that imposition of hands by the Calvinist elders would have been considered sufficient.

It was in accordance with the same principle that Aubrey, Vicar-general to Archbishop Grindal, gave a formal license in the year 1582 to John Morrison to preach and administer sacraments throughout the province

⁴ Whittingham's *Life*, Camden Society, p. 9 and 42.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 41.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ p. 44.

⁸ p. 42.

⁹ p. 46.

of Canterbury. The document states that Morrison had been admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry by imposition of hands by the general Synod of the county Lothian of the Reformed Church of Scotland; that the orthodox faith and sincere religion of the said Synod were conformable with that received and established in England; and that he approving and ratifying the form of ordination so done gave the license.¹⁰ Thus the ordination among Calvinistic Presbyterians was considered valid, because it was done 'by those who had authority given them in the congregation.' It makes the case all the stronger that this was done during Grindal's sequestration by his Vicar-general; for Aubrey, having but delegated authority, would only have acted in accordance with the strict and ordinary acceptance of the law.

The illustration from Travers' case is still more striking. Travers had been called to the ministry after the Calvinistic manner in Holland, and after being allowed to preach at the Temple for some years had at last been inhibited by Whitgift. He then alleged Whittingham's example, and reasons as follows: 'Afore Mr. Whittingham's case there was never any question moved in this Church to the contrary. The question being moved about him, yet was neither the Word of God nor the law of the land found to be against him. But notwithstanding that exception, he continued in his place and ministry after, to his death.' On this Whitgift remarks: 'This is untrue. For if Mr. Whittingham had lived, he had been deprived, without special grace and dispensation. Altho' his case and Mr. Travers' are nothing like. For he in time of persecution was ordained minister by those which had authority in the Church persecuted. But Mr. Travers in the time of peace, refusing to be made minister at home, gaddeth into other countries to be ordained by

¹⁰ Strype's *Life of Grindal*, App. p. 596.

such as had no authority: condemning thereby the kind of ordering ministers at home.'¹¹

Yet before this time a change of tone had been introduced, in which Whitgift himself had had a principal hand. To this indeed the Anglican Bishops were forced by the Puritans, who claimed a divine right for their ministers and presbyteries. In opposition to this the counter-claim was at last boldly asserted¹² on behalf of the former by Bancroft in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross on Jan. 12, 1588-9, in which he maintained 'that the Bishops of England had superiority over their inferior brethren *jure divino* and directly from God.'¹³ Sir Francis Knollis at once took the alarm, being the chief supporter of the Puritan party at court. He addressed a letter to Sir F. Walsingham, complaining that the Bishops were 'taking a dangerous course against her Majesty's supreme government' by this claim of *jure divino*, and referring even to Whitgift's book against Cartwright in proof of his charge.¹⁴ A statement from such a partisan on the other side is no evidence of what was really taught, but the letter is sufficient proof how great a change had come about. Neither Keble in the Preface to Hooker, nor the *Catena Patrum* in the *Tracts for the Times*, refers to anything earlier than this sermon of Bancroft's as teaching the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church. Soon afterwards Bilson's work appeared, and Hooker's first four books, followed by the fifth in 1597. In the latter he delivered very much of the Catholic doctrine respecting the grace of Holy Order, as follows: 'To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is himself for the knitting of both in one (a work which antiquity doth call the making of Christ's body); the

¹¹ Strype's *Whitgift*, Appendix, book iii. no. xxx.

¹² Maskell, *Hist. of Marprelate Controversy*, p. 162.

¹³ Strype's *Whitgift*, vol. i. p. 559.

¹⁴ *S. P. O.*, Domestic, vol. cccxiii. no. 23. See Appendix, No. XXVII.

same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character and acknowledged to be indelible.¹⁵ A claim so new—the asserted possession of a divine gift, which had been relinquished as a human and popish fragment, and had been left for the inheritance of the Catholic Church alone—could not fail to arouse the controversialists on that side. Kellison¹⁶ began; and was followed by the Jesuit Fathers Holywood¹⁷ or Sacrobosco, Fitzherbert,¹⁸ and Fitzsimons.¹⁹ These were the first to publish the Nag's-Head story, which was afterwards told in a more detailed though somewhat different version by Champneys. The story probably arose from gossiping rumours among Catholics, exaggerating the statements of Sanders and Harding about there being no Bishop to consecrate Parker, coupled with a distorted account of what took place in Bow Church at the confirmation, and with suspicions of there being something to conceal in the affair; and aided too, no doubt, by the withdrawal of the indictment against Bonner, the passing of the Act 8 Elizabeth, and the indecisive replies of Protestant writers. Champneys in his Latin edition refers to a ms. of Henry Constable; but as this ms. has never been produced, and is not referred to by Dodd, and as there is no such person mentioned either in Dodd's biographies or in the Douay Diaries, this reference does not carry the evidence any farther.²⁰

These various works, and particularly Fitzherbert's,

¹⁵ Hooker's Works, vol. ii. p. 581, ed. Keble.

¹⁶ *Survey of the New Religion*, Douay, 1603; and *Reply to Statistick*, Rhemes, 1608, fol. 316.

¹⁷ *De Investiganda Vera et Visibili Christi Ecclesia*, Antwerp, 1604; ed. 1619, p. 41.

¹⁸ *Supplement to the Discussion of Barlow's Answer*, St. Omer, 1613, p. 208; and Adjoiner to the Supplement.

¹⁹ *Britannomachia*, Douay, 1614, p. 303-24.

²⁰ There was a person named Henry Constable living at Liège, with whom Champneys had communication. He appears to have been a layman. But nothing of his writing on the present subject has been met with.

induced Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury to take a remarkable step. He sent for four Catholic priests, who were at the time prisoners for their religion, and produced the Register before them. It was the 12th of May 1614.²⁰ The priests were John Colleton, who was afterwards made Dean of the Chapter by Dr. Bishopp; Leake, also a secular priest; Fairclough and Laithwaite, Jesuits. They were brought to Lambeth Palace, and inspected the Register in the presence of the Archbishop, King Bishop of London, James Bishop of Durham, Andrews Bishop of Ely, Montague Bishop of Bath and Wells, Neile Bishop of Lincoln, and Buckeridge Bishop of Rochester. We may receive this story as certain, because it is told by contemporary writers, both Protestant²¹ and Catholic;²² but as to the opinions expressed by the Reverend Fathers the narratives differ considerably. And it is difficult to see what their testimony would have been worth, even supposing it was in favour of the authenticity of the Register. Four poor prisoners brought up before my Lords—seven of their bitterest enemies, who had a direct interest in the documents produced for inspection—and asked to examine the Register in their presence; all their motions and gestures keenly watched, and knowing that whatever criticisms they made would be a confession of faith, that perhaps might lead them to the scaffold;—whether it was the fact that they spoke doubtfully, or whether they expressed themselves satisfied, or whether on returning to their prisons they retracted the opinions they had given, it really seems unnecessary to inquire. But if Fairclough did express his belief in the Nag's-Head story, all honour to him for his courage and constancy.

²⁰ *Citroph. Althes*, p. 104, quoting Juveney. Lindsay's *Mason*, p. 361.

²¹ Richardson's *Godain de Præsentibus Anglicæ*, in *Vit. Parker*. The first edition was published in 1616.

²² *A Demonstration by English Protestant pretended Bishops and Ministers against those their came pretended Bishops and Ministry*. Dedication. Douay, 1616.

It is, however, very unfortunate that the Nag's-Head story was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd on the face of it, that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders. The irritation too caused to the Anglican side has perhaps served to prevent the real facts from becoming known; while, on the other hand, it has so occupied the attention on both sides, that the other parts of the case have never been fully considered.

It is to these other points that we must now turn, as they are treated on either side in the controversy. Kellison and Fitzsimons both take the delivery of the chalice and host, with the words *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium* &c. as the sole essential matter and form of the Sacrament, and therefore they say that in the Anglican rite neither matter nor form are used. They do not refer at all to the imposition of hands, or to the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. Fitzsimons indeed goes on to speak of the disbelief of the holy Sacrifice among Anglicans, as Bonner and Harding had done before him, but he does not connect this disbelief with the form of ordination; so that his argument misses its full force. Champneys, however, speaks much more doubtfully on the subject of the form, and does not insist on more than that the whole essential matter and form do not consist in imposition of hands and the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*.

The writings of Kellison, Holywood, and Fitzsimons, drew out the first systematic defence of the Anglican Church in regard to the ministry, its orders and jurisdiction. This work was by Francis Mason, and was published in the year 1613, under the special favour of Archbishop Abbot, and printed by the King's printer. Champneys replied to it in the year 1616. An enlarged but posthumous edition of Mason's work was published in 1625 in Latin, in which he replied to Champneys. This was reprinted in 1638. As Champneys had spoken

so doubtfully about the matter and form, and as there was a well-known difference of opinion between Catholic theologians on the subject, Mason is able to make a considerable show of authority for his defence of the Anglican form. But, on the whole, his book is very disappointing. Having written it in the form of a dialogue, he puts into the mouth of the Catholic disputant the weakest and most worthless arguments, often also grossly misstated, and then, after easily overthrowing them, he plumes himself in the consciousness of triumph. His suppressing a part of the grant of Barlow's temporalities is only an instance how little dependence is to be placed on his statements and authorities.

A similar style of argument runs through the controversial letters which passed in 1645 between Dean Cosin, then in exile in France, and Father Robinson, Prior of the English Benedictines in Paris.²³ The Prior stands by the delivery of the chalice and host as being alone essential. Cosin takes up the third imposition of hands with the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* as the real matter and form used in the Roman Pontifical. Thus they never fairly meet each other's arguments, and neither of them is in the right.

The same opinion as applied to the Anglican rite of ordination, together with the Nag's-Head story, formed the groundwork of the case laid before the Holy See in the year 1704. Why it was thought necessary to have the case discussed remains a mystery, because the question had arisen before, and the decision then given had been acted on more than once. Nearly a century before this time, Humphrey Leach a beneficed minister, and Francis Walsingham in deacon's orders of the Anglican Church, had been received as laymen at the English College, and afterwards promoted to all the orders in suc-

²³ Cosin's Works, vol. iv.

cession and the priesthood.²⁴ And that such was the rule followed in their case was by no means forgotten; for on the 16th of October 1702, James Clifton, who had been an Anglican minister in possession of a parochial benefice, had been received at the English College as a layman. It is mentioned in the official report, that 'he has received confirmation, but no sacred Orders.'²⁵

This, however, was at the English College, and John Clement Gordon, being a Scotchman, would have gone to the Scotch College, where perhaps the former cases were not known, or perhaps the Superiors there might wish to have an independent decision. Besides, Gordon had been a Bishop in the Scotch communion, and there had been no previous instance of a converted Bishop. He seems also to have been himself a scrupulous person, for he never advanced beyond minor orders. The question therefore was referred to the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition. The case with the decision is printed by Le Quien, and from him by Elrington. Gordon's petition states first several circumstances on the authority of Sanders and Harding, and then relates the Nag's-Head story. Afterwards it asserts that the only matter and form in the Anglican rite of the priesthood is the delivery of the Bible, with the words 'Accipe potestatem prædicandi verbum Dei, et administrandi sancta ejus Sacramenta.' This whole relation, including the delivery of the Bible, is taken from Fitzsimons' *Britannomachia*.²⁶ All the quotations and all the peculiar phrases are found there, with the same version of the Nag's-Head story. Whether any reference was made to the Book of Common Prayer does not appear quite clearly; and of course if any weight was attached to the Nag's-Head story, such a reference was quite unnecessary. Whoever drew it up did verify the quotations from Sanders, for the num-

²⁴ *Archives of the English College.* See Appendix, No. XXVIII.

²⁵ *Ibid.* p. 301-22.

bers of the pages show that he used the Roman edition of 1586, while Fitzsimons quotes the first edition. But he was unacquainted with Harding's work, and calls it 'Confutatio Apologetica.' Dr. Elrington²⁷ uses some severe terms about Gordon, as if he had been laying statements he knew to be false before the Sacred Congregation. But any one presenting a memorial to such a tribunal as the Inquisition, particularly a convert and a stranger to the official ways of Rome, would have been completely in the hands of his advisers. There is no reason to suppose that he was personally responsible for a single statement in the petition. It would seem from the official record, that though the petition was read *loco Casus* before a general Congregation of the Holy Office, yet other information was taken besides. For the record commences with an account of Gordon's consecration as Bishop, 19th September 1688, in which the imposition of hands by the pseudo-Archbishop and three pseudo-Bishops with the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, &c., is mentioned. This statement seems added by the Notary, and as the *instantia* so far as extracted agrees word for word with the Memorial in Le Quien, it is not clear whether the Sacred Congregation had under their consideration the question of the 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' as the Anglican form of the Priesthood.²⁸

But it is a very remarkable circumstance, that on Wednesday the 9th of April 1704, being therefore in the very week before Gordon's case, the same Sacred Congregation had given their decision in the case of the Abyssinian ordinations, resolving that the priesthood was validly conferred by imposition of hands and the words 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' alone. Further on we shall have to bring the Anglican rite before the tribunal of this decision.

We have been following the course of certain subjects, which hang together by some connection, although

²⁷ p. 147.

²⁸ See the Decree in Appendix, No. XXXVI.

it leads us to break the chronological order of events. We must now go back to the year 1655, at which time Morinus published his work, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*. This work began immediately to exercise an influence on the controversy. For only two years afterwards, Peter Talbot, then a Jesuit Father, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, published his *Treatise of the Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresie*.²⁸ In this work it is no longer maintained that the delivery of the chalice and host is essential, but that 'the forme whereby men are made priests must express authority and power to consecrate or make present Christ's Body and Blood.'²⁹ To this, however, Anglican writers had an easy reply: that the rite of Ordination in the early Sacramentaries and the Ordo Romanus contained no such expression, the only prayer in the Roman Pontifical which does contain it, viz. 'Deus sanctificationum,' being of much later origin. Talbot's other argument is, that the form, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' is used both for the priesthood and the episcopate, without any word to express either of them in particular.³⁰ This seems a plausible argument; but it cannot be held good after the decision referred to above, as given in the Abyssinian case.

Bramhall replied to Talbot in the following year; but seems to have supposed that 'two Ignatian Fathers' were concerned in the work. He appears to admit the force of Talbot's argument, but denies its applicability; for, he says, 'if the words, Receive the Holy Ghost,' in the Anglican rite, 'be considered conjointly in a compounded sense'³¹ with the prayers and other parts of the rite, the difference between the priesthood and the episcopate is sufficiently expressed. Bramhall's treatise has been frequently referred to in the course of the present work, and it is due to Mr. Haddan, who edited it for the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, to bear testimony to the very

²⁸ By N.N.: Rouen, 1657.

²⁹ p. 23.

³⁰ p. 22.

³¹ p. 163.

careful and accurate manner in which he accomplished his task. He has withdrawn or explained away several of the slipshod arguments of his author, and has brought to light with perfect honesty all that bore upon the question, whether it told for or against him, though it may be he has not seen the full force of all the facts he relates. Only four documents have come to hand touching on the points treated of in his notes, which seem to have escaped his notice, as he has not referred to them.³²

Lewgar³³ replied to Bramhall, but only repeated Talbot's arguments. And the same were used by the disputants to whom Burnet and Prideaux replied, whose pamphlets are the most considerable among many that appeared upon the subject during the reigns of Charles and James the Second.

In the early part of the next century the controversy assumed a new phase from an unexpected quarter. The Abbé Renaudot, author of the celebrated work *La Pépétuité de la Foi de l'Eglise Catholique sur les Sacramens*, wrote a *Mémoire*³⁴ on the subject of Anglican Ordinations for a work of the Abbé Gould's, entitled *La véritable Croyance de l'Eglise Catholique*, which was published at Paris in the year 1720. Besides relating the Nag's-Head story, the only arguments in it are that the form for consecrating Bishops, viz. 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember &c.,' does not express any difference between Bishops and priests, thus repeating Talbot's and Lewgar's argument; and besides, that 'a form unknown to the whole Latin Church, ancient as well as modern, and of which there is no vestige in the Pontifical of any Christian nation, cannot be regarded as legitimate.'

The Père Le Courayer, a Canon Regular of St. Gene-

³² These are Barlow's Grant of Temporalities, p. 72; Cromwell's Warrant for Clarendon, 12 June 1536, p. 66; Memorandum of Parker's Consecration from Harleian mss. 419, p. 104; Jewell's Letter to Parker, p. 81.

³³ Erastus senior, 1662.

³⁴ Printed in Courayer's *Dissertation*.

of Oxford conferred on him the degree of D.D. by diploma; the King granted him a pension; and all Anglican writers who have touched on the subject speak of the great boon conferred on their Church by Courayer's books. Dr. Elrington says: 'Courayer wrote ably in support of our ordinations.'³⁶ Sir Wm. Palmer also: 'It would be difficult to overrate the value of Courayer's three works on the question of English ordinations';³⁷ and: 'The storm of persecution fell on a candid and learned priest of the Roman communion, who had ventured to defend, and irresistibly establish, the validity of our ordinations.'³⁸ Yet it would seem as if it was only the name of a Roman Catholic Divine advocating their cause that they value; for though Dr. Elrington has taken the historical part of his work entirely from Courayer, he has carefully avoided referring to his argument about the form. Palmer has avoided it likewise. This silence is in itself a condemnation; although by their general acceptance and approval of Courayer's defence, Anglican writers have shown how little they really enter into the questions at issue, and how unaware they are, that never was a heavier blow given to their cause than by Courayer's argument before quoted.³⁹ And this is all they have gained from the advocacy received from, or the patronage given in return to one who, commencing with the support of Jansenism, ended his days denying some of the articles of the Creed.⁴⁰

If his adopted friends were only tacit in their condemnation, there were not wanting among those, whom he had left, some to speak loudly against the errors he had promulgated in these two works. Vivant wrote a book to point out numerous errors of doctrine respecting the

³⁶ p. 9.

³⁷ *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 458, note.

³⁸ *Episcopacy vindicated*, p. 6.

³⁹ The Rev. T. J. Bailey has adopted Courayer's argument, apparently in ignorance of its unsoundness,—*English Orders and Papal Supremacy*, p. 25.

⁴⁰ *Biographia Britannica*.

viève at Paris, and also Librarian, who had already distinguished himself by his opposition to the Bull *Unigenitus*, seems to have promised himself an easy task in refuting a *Mémoire*, which, although attributed to the pen of so celebrated an author, did not appear to rest on very strong grounds either of history or theology. He therefore published his *Dissertation*, which was soon followed by the *Defence of the Dissertation*. As these works could not obtain the royal license to be published in Paris, they were printed at Nancy, though made to appear as if printed at Brussels—one in 1723, the other in 1726; and both were very soon translated into English by Williams.

The historical part of these books has been already referred to frequently, and we need only notice the argument about the form. Courayer maintains that the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.' cannot be the form of giving ordination, for reasons which he takes from Morinus. Then he states what he considers to be the essential parts of the Sacrament in the following words: 'Imposition of hands and prayer in general: that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the Bishop-elect all the graces of which he has need for the worthy discharge of the functions of his ministry.'³⁵ By this rule he proceeds to examine the Anglican rite of ordination, and pronounces in favour of its validity.

It is surprising that all parties in the Anglican Church should have accepted this defence without seeing that it cuts away from under their feet the only ground on which the validity of their ordinations could be maintained. Not only did Archbishop Wake correspond with Courayer and assist him in his work, but when, in consequence of the heretical tenets he had advanced, the author thought proper to leave France, he was received in England with every demonstration of gratitude, as one who had rendered a public service to the Anglican Church. The University

³⁵ *Dissertation*, p. 111.

Sacraments, adding that the validity of Anglican ordinations was still an open question; that the Church had not decided it further than by directing that Anglican ministers when converted should be reordained unconditionally; and that therefore Courayer was at liberty to maintain their validity if he saw fit, but that he might have found arguments for his purpose without running into heresy on the subject of the Sacrament of Holy Order.⁴¹

This, however, was not all. Various propositions were extracted from Courayer's works and denounced as heretical,⁴² while the author did not want friends who defended and sided with him. He himself published an explanation of the propositions, which, so far from removing the suspicions excited by them, only reiterates the erroneous language.⁴³ At last the controversy thus excited reached to a notoriety too great, the scandal became too grievous, and the errors broached were too serious to escape any longer the notice and censure of the Church. Cardinal de Noailles, then Archbishop of Paris, endeavoured by various means to induce Courayer to retract his errors, but in vain. At last he issued a 'Mandement' condemning the two works as 'containing doctrine or expressions contrary to what the Church teaches as to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, the Priesthood, the Form of the Sacraments, &c.' He goes on to say, 'We do not pronounce upon the ground of the question about the validity of the ordinations of the English, and the succession of their Bishops.'⁴⁴ This 'Mandement' was published on the 18th of August 1727; and it was followed in a few months by a Pastoral Instruction,⁴⁵ in which several of Courayer's errors are pointed out.

⁴¹ Vivanti, *Sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglicannes*, c. 51, 56.

⁴² *Rélation Historique &c. de P. le Courayer*, vol. ii. art. 18. See Appendix, No. XXX.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ See Appendix, No. XXX.

⁴⁵ See Appendix, No. XXXI.

The two works having been afterwards denounced to Rome, and there examined, on the 25th of June 1728 Pope Benedict XIII. issued a Brief in condemnation of them both, as containing propositions false, rash, scandalous, erroneous, heretical, &c. And in addition to these, it is not surprising to find the terms, 'subversive of Sacred Orders, and other Sacraments of the Church.'⁴⁶

Nothing, then, can be more groundless than the statement made by Sir William Palmer,⁴⁷ and other English writers, that Courayer was persecuted on account of his taking up the defence of English Ordinations. Not one of the erroneous statements of doctrine attributed to him touches on that question. Nor does the condemnation of his works in any way affect the controversy. On the contrary, it leaves it precisely where it was before. The condemnation only attaches to the errors in the nature of the arguments which Courayer had adopted; and which Anglican writers themselves, whether or no they had detected the errors, have thought proper to pass over in a discreet silence.

The principal writer in reply to Courayer was Le Quien, from whom Father John Constable, S.J., under the name of Clerophilus Alethes, has taken the greater part of his work. They both adopt the Nag's-Head story, and push it to an extreme, using several arguments that cannot be called otherwise than frivolous.

As to the rite of ordination, Le Quien agrees so far with Courayer, that the matter and form of the sacrament are imposition of hands and prayer. Then he continues: 'The prayer which is to determine the imposition of hands ought to express the effect of the Sacrament of Order. And the first and principal effect of that sacrament is to make sacrificers, and ministers whose principal function it is to serve at the sacrifice of the new law. It is necessary, then, that the prayer which forms the sub-

⁴⁶ See Appendix, No. XXXII.

⁴⁷ See above, p. 161.

stance of the ordination should express what the Faith teaches of the Order conferred, and make mention of the priesthood in relation to the sacrifice which is its principal object.⁴⁷ This he illustrates from the Roman Pontifical. But this is only Talbot's and Lewgar's argument put into another form, and it cannot be maintained in the face of the Abyssinian decision.

Since Courayer's time there have been various writers on the subject, and from Archbishop Kenrick's work a valuable extract will be taken in a future chapter. Canon Raynal has treated the subject of the essential matter and form with considerable force, entering into the theological questions more deeply than lies within the scope of the present work. On the other side no new argument has been advanced in favour of the Anglican view of the question, except by Mr. Haddan. His edition of Bramhall has been already noticed, and he has lately published a work in which he has 'put into an accessible form the information then (in part for the first time) accumulated, adding what has seemed to him expedient upon the doctrine under present circumstances.'⁴⁸ He has spoken plainly and forcibly on the great importance of the subject. And he has rendered another service to the discussion of the question. It is very difficult to learn from Anglican writers what they understand by Holy Orders. The controversialists do not inform us; and if we were to refer to others, it is by no means certain that their views are shared by those who treat of the points at issue. We cannot use Pearson and Hickee to illustrate Burnet and Prideaux; nor bind down Bishop Elrington by what Bishop Tomline may have stated. Hence it is that so many Catholic writers, such as the author of *Protestant Demonstrations*, or Dr. Fletcher, fail to carry conviction with them, because their 'Demonstrations,' piercing and vivid as they are, come to an end with

⁴⁷ Part ii. p. 16, 17.

⁴⁸ Haddan on *Apostolical Succession*, Pref.

those they represent, like the figures of a magic lantern. But Mr. Haddan has stated what he considers to be involved in the belief in the Apostolical Succession. Liberty is therefore taken to give a summary of this statement as follows: 'Belief in an apostolic ministry implies belief in the grace of God as a supernatural dealing with the souls of men and a gift of spiritual life; that these gifts of grace are intrusted to a corporate body, divinely constituted and visible, as the appointed channel of grace, viz. the Church; that in the Church there is a divinely-constituted ministry, an order of men to whom God has intrusted certain authority and powers, and who possess exclusively the commission of Christ both to teach and administer sacraments, deriving their appointment from God Himself, through those who have received authority to transmit such a supernatural gift, that is, *the grace of orders*; which office of ministering the outward call and appointment is limited to Bishops, through whom the gift of orders so transmitted has descended from the Apostles by an unbroken line, that is to say, the Apostolical Succession.'⁴⁹ Although this may fall short of the definitions of Catholic theology, yet it is a great thing in the discussion of this question to have a statement so carefully prepared, that no one who believes in an apostolic ministry can take exception to it, as far as it goes.

There are two other works which may require some notice. One is that of Canon Williams. It is much to be regretted that he should have undertaken to write on the subject without better acquaintance with the nature of historical evidence. He uses evidence at second-hand, and even at third-hand, to establish a point he wishes to prove, but rejects proofs of the same character when they tell against him. The consequence is, that his book cannot be relied on for a single statement. Even when he has a good argument in his hands, he spoils it by pushing

⁴⁹ Haddan on *Apostolical Succession*, p. 9-14

it too far. It will be sufficient to give two instances of gross mistakes he has made.

He says: 'In the "Citation to Opposers" Barlow is made to say that the Queen's letter-patent is "sealed with the great seal of England." This was not the fact; it was not sealed at all. I of course contend that it was altogether a forgery; but even as printed by Rymer there is no seal, nor mark of authenticity; which, if it existed, Rymer would have given. The commission to Tunstall and others, Sept. 9, was quite different. Rymer tells us it was sealed.'⁵⁰ The good Canon seems to suppose that the instrument which was produced before the Commissioners, and that of which the copy is printed in Rymer, are one and the same. He was not aware that the instrument produced was the original Letters Patent, which, as a matter of course, bore the Great Seal, and would have been of no avail without it. But that printed is only the copy as enrolled upon the Patent Roll, in which the mere formal parts are omitted, and there is no mention of the Great Seal, because all the documents on the Roll must have passed under it, and could not be enrolled otherwise. The commission of Sept. 9 is stated in Rymer to be 'per breve de privato sigillo'; that is, 'by writ of Privy Seal.' The Canon seems to suppose that these words indicate that the instrument itself was sealed. This is another mistake. Those words relate to a different instrument from the Letters Patent, and to the Privy Seal, not the Great Seal. The usual process was, that the Queen put her Sign-manual to an instrument, which was then called a 'Signed Bill,' on which the Lord Privy Seal issued a writ with the Privy Seal attached to it; and this writ being delivered to the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Keeper, was his authority for issuing the Letters Patent and affixing the Great Seal to them. The Letters Patent were then delivered to the person in whose favour

⁵⁰ *Letters on Anglican Orders*, p. 212.

they were granted, and were generally, but not always, enrolled upon the Rolls in Chancery.

The other passage is as follows: 'I come now to another most important and decisive proof of the spuriousness of the register. . . Nicholas Bullingham is repeatedly mentioned in these documents: at the confirmation, as simply Doctor of Laws and as Proctor for the Archbishop elect; and in the "Rituum Ordo," as Archdeacon of Lincoln.'⁵¹ . . . I will prove on the clearest evidence that at that date *he was not archdeacon at all*, and that no one writing at that time could possibly give him that title. He formerly *had been* Archdeacon of Lincoln, but at the accession of Mary retired beyond sea, and was succeeded by Thomas Marshall, to whom succeeded Owen Hodgson Jan. 14, 1558; Bullingham not being restored. Therefore five years had elapsed since his possession of the archdeaconry. Now for a still more indubitable proof. The Queen grants to the said N. Bullingham, Bishop elect of Lincoln, the archdeaconry of Lincoln *in commendam*, for three years, Jan. 18, 1560. Now observe this extract: "*predictum archidiaconatum, nunc certo et legitime modo vacantem.*"—the aforesaid archdeaconry now certainly and legitimately vacant. Is not this a demonstration?⁵²

Is it not a pity to see a worthy man assuming this peremptory tone, while unconscious of the blunders he is perpetrating? At the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Owen Hodgson was deprived of the archdeaconry,⁵³ and Bullingham was restored without a fresh appointment. By his acceptance of the bishopric, the post became vacant, and it is properly described in the grant as 'vacant in a certain and legitimate manner.' The grant *in commendam* is made to take effect from the date of his accepting the bishopric; that is to say, from the time of the vacancy occurring.⁵⁴

⁵¹ *Letters on Anglican Orders*, p. 216.

⁵² p. 218.

⁵³ *Concordatio Ecl. Cath.* ⁵⁴ See the grant, printed in Williams' App.

Dr. Lee's work has been already referred to, and it is not necessary to notice it at greater length, as he does not produce any fresh evidence with regard to Barlow or Parker. He has quoted at length several examples of ancient rites both of the East and West, and he considers that the Anglican Reformed Ordinal is perfectly in harmony with them on all essential points; but he fails to observe a difference between the modern order he defends and the ancient rites he refers to of no little importance. The principal feature in his book is the reference to a number of Catholic authorities, who are supposed to have pronounced in favour of the validity of Anglican ordinations. But the opinion attributed to Bossuet rests on the merest rumour; and some other references have no better ground: the extract from Franciscus a Sancta Clara has been explained by himself in another work in a sense quite opposed to the purpose for which Dr. Lee alleges it;⁵⁵ and the passage quoted from Bishop Milner does not bear on the question, while there is a letter from him on the subject in reply to Dr. Elrington, in which he makes quite evident his own disbelief in the Anglican High-Church claims, though he declares his preference for leaving those claims uncontroverted, and opposing rather the Latitudinarian school.⁵⁶

We may now take a review of the whole controversy. When the public attention was roused and drawn to the subject in James the First's reign, Catholics found a certain tradition existing, and a certain practice in use, viz. that Anglican Orders were null and void, and were to be so regarded in practice. They also found certain rumours current on the subject of the first beginnings of Anglican Episcopacy, and out of these rumours, coupled with the ideas of the scholastic theology, they have formed a theory to account for this tradition, and have endeavoured to strain the facts so as to square with their theory. Angli-

⁵⁵ See chapter vi.

⁵⁶ Printed in Kenrick's Appendix, p. 207.

cans, on the other hand, find themselves in a position they conscientiously believe to be right, with a hierarchy possessing the ancient names of Bishop and Priest, which they have been taught to revere, and to see therein the true successors of St. Augustine and St. Dunstan; and they are too willing to accept without question any defence that offers itself. Putting it briefly: the Anglicans draw their facts from a priori arguments, while the Catholics rest their arguments on a preconceived theory of facts. The result is not satisfactory on either side. Each is able to point out the weakness of his adversary's case, but neither of them to establish his own. In one way certainly the Catholics have the advantage—that they know what they mean, and what they are contending for; that it is the sacrament of Holy Order, the Priesthood, the Holy Sacrifice, and the faith of the Church on these points, that they are defending. But it is difficult to learn what Anglican writers mean by the terms they use. They use Catholic phrases and Catholic arguments; but when their words come to be examined, it is doubtful whether they use them in a Catholic sense. Sometimes they distinctly repudiate the doctrines which Catholics believe to be involved in the terms employed. Thus their arguments do not belong to them, and they do not belong to the arguments. Their course of proceeding reminds us of boys in the street getting up behind a gentleman's carriage. Hence the importance of a statement such as Mr. Haddan's, by means of which we may know the meaning of the terms when we come to discuss the principles. Even Mr. Haddan seems afraid to face the facts. He complains that Barlow's consecration should be questioned; when it would have been assumed as a matter of course, had he not been Parker's consecrator. He tries to throw the burden of proof on those who maintain that there is any doubt about it, wishing to forget the fact, that the more his case is investigated, the

worse it looks for him, and that he himself has done more to damage it than any preceding writer.

If the present work takes a different course from those that have preceded it, it is not meant to depreciate their labours. The researches of Champneys, Lewgus, Le Quien, and Constable have been most valuable, because they have laid down principles and made suggestions that we can now work upon with better information than they possessed. If their arguments are given up as untenable, it is because that, at the time when they wrote, the two decisions of the Holy See bearing on the subject had not been made known; one of which has been the guide of the theology of the Church ever since Pope Benedict XIV. published it in his *Synodus Dioecesana*; and the other, though mentioned in one edition of *Artoine*, has been very little known up to the present time.

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT RITES OF ORDINATION.

FROM the preceding chapters we learn that on certain points the parties to the controversy may come to a mutual consent, so far as this: that imposition of hands and prayer are essential in Ordination, and the only essentials, that is to say, in theory, for the valid administration of the holy Orders of the diaconate, the priesthood, and the episcopate, which are called the hierarchical Orders. This is taught and maintained as the general opinion among Catholic theologians.¹ And it has also been maintained by all writers on the Anglican side from the beginning of the controversy.

There is also a general consent as to the minister of the rite, namely, that it must be a Bishop. Some Anglican writers have made an exception in the case of necessity, and have said that an extraordinary means might be allowed; but all those who profess to believe the Apostolical Succession consider that without a Bishop duly consecrated by other Bishops there is no ordination or consecration.

But there is no agreement as to the prayers which are to accompany the imposition of hands. The question has not been much discussed, and it is not determined what should be the nature of the prayers, and what is to be the end and object of the petitions in them. Courayer stated the proposition, that it is to be 'prayer in general,

¹ See Appendix, No. I.

that is to say, to obtain for the person ordained all the graces necessary for the worthy discharge of his functions.' But this seems to be an incomplete description, and is not admitted as correct either by Catholics or Anglicans.² Le Quien, on the other hand, laid down a principle which seems not to be borne out by the facts. Thus we have no positive guidance on the subject.

In such a case we can only have recourse to the practice of the Church; and in so doing we are not to confine ourselves to the rite of the Roman Pontifical, but to make inquiry as to what the Church approves in all the rites used within her communion, and also what she has required in the rites of separated bodies whose Orders she has admitted as valid.

For the purposes of this inquiry, Morinus has given us the rite from the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, which is considered to be as ancient as the fourth century, though it cannot be traced to belong to any particular Church;³ the Greek rite from a ms. of the ninth century; the Latin rite from a ms. of the sixth century, and also from the Sacramentaries of St. Gregory and St. Gelasius, to which Muratori has added that of St. Leo; and likewise the rites of the Nestorian Syrians and Coptic Jacobites. In addition to these, we may find in Assemani and Denzinger the rites both of the Maronite and Jacobite Syrians, as well as that of the Armenians; and also the Nestorian and Coptic rites more fully detailed than by Morinus.⁴ And a Latin version of all that is contained in the Abyssinian sacred books on the subject of holy Orders has been obtained through the kindness of the late Monsignor Bel, Vicar Apostolic of Abyssinia.

The Greek and Oriental rites vary considerably from

² See, however, the quotations from St. René, Juenin, and Catalani, in the next chapter.

³ Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. p. 37.

⁴ It does not appear whether the rites used by the United Syrians, or the United Syrian Chaldeans, agree with any of those here referred to.

each other, and yet between them all there are certain points of similarity, which seem to show that they are all derived from a common origin, and embody in a fragmentary form the tradition of a more venerable antiquity. The prayers for ordination in the Apostolic Constitutions may be taken to represent one part of this tradition; for there are certain terms of petition used in them which are repeated in nearly all the other rites. And the ancient Greek rite will represent another part, because the well-known form commencing 'Divina gratia' contained therein is found with some variations in several other rites; which also follow the Greek rite in the use of certain expressions in the prayers, while differing in both respects from the Apostolic Constitutions. Thus there are two channels of tradition independent of each other, and betokening sources more remote, because they are found so widely spread among different bodies; and yet these sources would seem to have been originally one and the same, since both traditions are now sometimes to be found in union, mingled together not merely in the same rite, but even in the very same prayer. The Nestorians and Jacobites separated from the Church after the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Maronites and Armenians were reunited to the Church only after a long separation. Hence if their several rituals present any points of agreement with that of the ancient Greek Catholic books, such a fact testifies to an origin earlier than that of the time of separation; and even indicates a time of still higher antiquity, when perhaps there was but one rite of ordination common to all the Churches of the East. It is not therefore too much to believe, that in whatever is common to them all, comparing rite with rite, and the present rituals with ancient mss., we behold a witness of the primitive Catholic faith, and are imbibing the very spirit of apostolic tradition.

To enter more into details. In the prayer said by the

Bishop according to the Apostolic Constitutions for the Ordination of a Deacon are the following words: 'O Lord, show Thy countenance upon Thy servant elected for Thee to the ministry, and fill him with the Holy Spirit and power, as Thou didst fill Stephen the Martyr and imitator of the Passion of Thy Christ.' These words, or words similar to them, at least in part, are found in the Greek and all the Oriental rites, except the Abyssinian, in which the prayer is entirely different. Again, in the ancient Greek rite published by Morinus from a ms. of the ninth century,⁵ the second prayer said by the Bishop in the Ordination of a Deacon contains the following words: 'For not in imposition of our hands, but in the visitation of Thy abundant mercies, is grace given to those worthy of Thee.' Words similar to these are found also in the rites of the Coptic Jacobites, the Syrian Jacobites, and the Syrian Maronites.

In the Ordination of Priests the various rites seem to divide themselves into two families, two agreeing with the Apostolic Constitutions, and the other five varying altogether from that ancient form, but yet agreeing among themselves. The former runs as follows: 'Look now upon this Thy servant, added to the presbytery by the suffrage and judgment of the whole clergy; and fill him with the spirit of grace and counsel to help and govern Thy people with a pure heart, as Thou didst look upon Thy chosen people, and didst command Moses to choose elders whom Thou didst fill with the Spirit.' The Coptic and Abyssinian rites both contain a prayer which is evidently derived from the same original as this; but none of the others.

The ancient Greek rite before quoted contains in the second prayer said by the Bishop the following petitions: 'Him whom Thou, O Lord, hast chosen to undertake the degree of the presbyterate, fill with the gift of Thy Holy

⁵ *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, pt. ii.

Spirit, that he may be worthy to stand before Thy altar, to preach the Gospel of Thy salvation, to administer in sacred rites the word of Thy truth, to offer to Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, to renew Thy people through the laver of regeneration.' The Jacobite and Maronite Syrians, the Nestorian Syrians, and the Armenians all have expressions similar to these, seeming to indicate that their rites were derived from a common tradition, yet not so like as to point to any one of the number as the original of the rest. And it is to be remembered, that except in the case of the Greek, the similarity, such as it is, is transmitted through a Latin version of the original language.

In the Consecration of Bishops there is a similar division into two families, but the members of the separate branches are not entirely the same. The Maronites and Jacobites belong to the apostolic family instead of to the Greek; and the Coptic rite has two prayers, one similar to the former, and the other to the latter; while the Nestorians mix up the two together in the same prayer. The prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions is as follows: 'Pour forth through us the power of Thy guiding Spirit,⁶ which by Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ was bestowed on Thy Apostles: give in Thy name, O God that knowest the heart, to this Thy servant, whom Thou hast elected for Bishop, to feed Thy holy flock, and to be a high-priest to Thee without blame, ministering night and day, and propitiating Thy face, to gather together the number of the saved, and to offer to Thee the gifts of Thy holy Church: give unto him, O Lord Almighty, through Thy Christ, the participation of Thy Holy Spirit, so as to have power to remit sins according to Thy command, to give clergy after Thy appointment, to loose every bond according to the power Thou didst give to Thy Apostles,

⁶ This phrase, τὸ πνεῦμα σου ἡγούμενον, so frequently used in these prayers, is derived from the Septuagint version of the Psalm *Miserere*, and in the Vulgate it is rendered *spiritu principali*.

to please Thee in meekness and a pure heart without wavering, or blame, or reproach, offering to Thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice which through Christ Thou hast constituted the mystery of the New Testament for an odour of sweetness.' The Coptic rite, as in the former cases, and the Abyssinian, as in the case of the priesthood, contain a prayer closely agreeing with this, being the only prayer in the latter rite, and the first of the two in the former. The Nestorian prayer is also in part similar to this. According to Assemani the prayer in the Jacobite rite agrees neither with this nor with the Greek rite; but in Renaudot's version the prayer used by the Syrian Jacobites is very similar to that here translated. And the same prayer is used by the Maronites; but it is only one among the six or seven prayers of that rite, and does not come in the principal place, although it is the single prayer of the former rite.

The Greek rite stands at the head of the other division, and contains two prayers, the first of which runs as follows: 'O Lord of all, do Thou confirm this elect through my hand . . . and those of the present ministers and fellow Bishops, to undertake the gospel yoke and the high-priestly dignity, by the coming and power and grace of Thy Holy Spirit.' And the second: 'Do Thou, O Lord, make him who is declared steward of high-priestly grace to be an imitator of Thee the true Shepherd, laying down his life for Thy sheep, a guide of the blind, the light of those in darkness, an instructor of the unwise, a luminary in the world; that having prepared the souls intrusted to him during the present life, he may stand before Thy tribunal without shame, and receive the great reward which Thou hast prepared for those who contend for the preaching of Thy gospel.' The two prayers in the Armenian rite appear to correspond to the two here quoted; and the second prayer of the Coptic rite is similar to the second of the Greek; while the second prayer of

the Nestorians contains some expressions agreeing with the same, intermixed with others like the Apostolic Constitutions.⁷

There is also another point on which all the various rites agree, except the Abyssinian, and which deserves consideration. The Greek rite of conferring each of the orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, commences by the Bishop announcing the election in the following terms: 'The Divine Grace, which is ever healing the weak things, and filling up the things that are wanting, promotes N., this most religious presbyter, to be Bishop. Let us pray for him, that the grace of the Holy Ghost may come upon him; (or 'this deacon to be priest; or 'this subdeacon to be deacon,' as the case may be.) A form to the same effect as this, and commencing with the same words, is found in the Coptic, all the Syrian, and the Armenian rites. It is not expressly mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions, but there is prescribed in them a very solemn mode of asking the judgment of the Bishops and clergy, and the testimony of the people, to the worthiness of the Bishop-elect; and therefore, when the Metropolitan had given his approbation, there must have been some mode of announcing the election to the people. Thus the consent of all these rites, used as they are among nations differing in language and separated in faith, naturally leads us to suppose an origin more ancient than any documents with which we are now acquainted.

And the view here taken seems to be confirmed by some other circumstances. It has been mentioned already that the prayers in the Jacobite rite are used also in the Maronite rite. And the Jacobites form a branch of the Eutychean heresy, which separated from the Church after the Council of Chalcedon, in the year 451. But the Mar-

⁷ In the Appendix, No. XXXIII, the prayers referred to are arranged in parallel columns, in order that the similarity between them may be more easily traced.

onites remained Catholic till they were led astray by Maro, a follower of the Monothelite heresy, which was condemned by the third Council of Constantinople, in the year 680;⁸ and they returned to the unity of the Church after a separation of five hundred years. In the rites therefore that these two bodies have retained, so far as one is identical with the other, we may probably look for relics of the ancient Catholic rite of the Syrian Church. For the Jacobites would not have carried it away with them, if it had not been earlier than A. D. 451; and the Maronites would not have retained it, if it had not been Catholic.

The Nestorians, again, form a more ancient sect than any others, having separated from the Church after the Council of Ephesus in the year 431, in order to follow the errors of Nestorius, the deposed Bishop of Constantinople. Since that time they have held no communion with Catholics, nor with the other bodies who separated from the Church at a later time. And the feelings of partisan enmity engendered at the time of separation, which continue to the present day as deep and intense as ever, would have prevented their adopting either usages or language from any other body. Yet we find in the prayers of their ordination rites peculiar expressions, some like the Apostolic Constitutions, and others agreeing with the Greek rite. It is difficult to see how such expressions could have found their way among the Nestorians, unless the forms from which they were taken were more ancient than the year 431.

Possibly some light may be thrown on this subject from liturgical history. We learn from Sir W. Palmer, that 'the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions is generally considered to have been written in the 4th century, but that it cannot be considered as an authentic copy of the liturgy of any particular Church, for there is no evidence of its use in any place. Yet it agrees more closely

⁸ Morinus, *De Sac. Ord.* pt. ii.

with the liturgy of Antioch than with any other.'⁹ And the origin of the present Greek Liturgy is traced to St. Basil, though it may be believed that the liturgy which he composed was founded upon that anciently in use in the Church of Cæsarea, but corrected in diction, enriched, and added to by him. And the ancient liturgy of Cæsarea agreed at least in order and substance with that of Antioch.¹⁰ The Armenians had received their liturgy from Cæsarea at the first conversion of that country.¹¹ And the liturgy of St. Basil, in its revised form, soon came into use not only throughout Greece and Asia Minor,¹² but it is also used in Egypt by the Copts,¹³ in addition to another liturgy which is ascribed to St. Cyril, and which is supposed to represent the ancient liturgy of Alexandria.¹⁴ The connexion so far traced serves to explain how the Greek and Syriac rites of ordination should differ from that in the Apostolic Constitutions and from each other, and yet be in some respects similar; and it also accounts for the Armenian rite bearing a closer resemblance to the Greek than is found in any other. But if the author of the liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions founded it upon that of the Syrian Church, it is remarkable that the Coptic liturgy should contain all the ordination prayers from those Constitutions, almost word for word, while the other rites have only certain of those prayers or sentences, or expressions similar to them; and the parts of the Coptic rite which are similar to the Greek are all in the way of addition, and not of substitution. If the Constitutions have a Syrian connexion, whence comes their closer affinity with the Coptic? unless, indeed, we may be again led to the idea that there was one original rite of ordination in use both at Antioch and Alexandria, and that the author of the Apostolic Constitutions may have copied this ancient rite.

⁹ *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. p. 38.

¹⁰ p. 66.

¹¹ p. 67-3.

¹² p. 66-62.

¹³ p. 194.

¹⁴ p. 85.

This sketch, however imperfect, has been drawn out with the intention of showing that these rites, if viewed together in the parts in which they agree, possess a claim to our respect and attention quite above any to which they may be entitled as independent witnesses to ecclesiastical usage; because in their consent they embody a tradition derived from the earliest ages of the Church.

If, however, we were to attempt to discuss the question, What in each of these rites is the essential form of the sacrament? we should find ourselves at once involved in difficulties. For instance, the Jacobites in conferring the several orders of Deacon, Priest, and Bishop, use in each case one or two prayers, which are also retained and used by the Maronites. There is nothing else in the Jacobite rite that accompanies the imposition of hands, or that takes the position of a sacramental form. The Maronites, however, not only use these same prayers in conjunction with the imposition of hands, but have added to them five or six other prayers to be said by the Bishop, with a fresh imposition of hands at each prayer. And the ordination seems not to be complete till the last, because in the last prayer but one the person ordained is spoken of as still expecting the sacred gift. Thus the very same form which is used by the Jacobites, as adequate and sufficient, is used also by the Maronites, but treated as inadequate and incomplete.

Again, the words *Divina Gratia* &c., which, as we have seen, are used in all the Oriental rites, have been taken by Anglican writers—for instance, Burnet¹⁵ and Mr. Haddan¹⁶—as the form of the sacrament, following Arcudius and other theologians. Morinus has a chapter to show that these words are not the form, but only the announcement of the decree of election. And though used in all the Oriental rites, they cannot be everywhere the essential

¹⁵ *Vindication of Ordinations* &c. p. 36.

¹⁶ *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*, p. 263.

form, for in the Coptic and Jacobite rites they are said by the Archdeacon or one of the assisting Bishops; in the Nestorian and the ancient Greek rite they are said by the Bishop, but without imposing his hand; and only in the modern Greek, the Maronite, and the Armenian are they united with the imposition of hands. Notwithstanding this, in the last-mentioned rite, the Armenian, they do seem to be considered as the operative form. For up to that time, the subdeacon, deacon, or priest, who is to be made deacon, priest, or bishop, is described as 'ordinandus,' 'accepturus,' or 'electus;' but after these words have been pronounced by the Bishop, he is called in the prayer following them 'ordinatus' or 'episcopus.'

These are some of the difficulties which would meet us in entering on such an inquiry; and which would require a professed theologian to attempt their solution. But it is quite unnecessary to open such a question for the purpose of the present work. All that we need look for is the general effect of these rites, and the end and the object of the prayers contained in them.

To turn now to the Latin rite. The authority constantly referred to as the earliest on this subject is the Fourth Council of Carthage, held in the year 398. Yet it does not seem quite certain that the Canons which bear the name of that Council were really decreed by it; at least Hardouin does not admit them without some qualification.¹⁷ But they are quoted in Muratori's *Gelasian Sacramentary*;¹⁸ in the ancient ms. which Morinus believes to have been written for the Church of Poitiers between the years 511 and 560;¹⁹ and in the York Pontifical of Archbishop Egbert.²⁰ Pope Benedict XIV. also cites them as genuine.²¹ The indications given in those decrees of the ordination rites agree with the Latin

¹⁷ *Concili.* vol. i. col. 675.

¹⁸ col. 619.

¹⁹ *De Sac. Ord.* p. 212.

²⁰ *Surtrees Society*, p. 10, &c.

²¹ *Synod. Diocessan.* lib. viii. cap. 9, § 9; cap. 15, § 5.

rite, as we find it afterwards detailed. If therefore we take the Sacramentary of St. Leo, together with the other Sacramentaries of St. Gelasius and St. Gregory, and also the *Poitiers ms.*, and Archbishop Egbert's Pontifical, we may believe that in what they all alike contain we see the ancient Latin rite of the early part of the fifth century, that is to say, certainly of the time of St. Leo, and probably as early as that of St. Augustine. Now we do find in all these books, with some verbal discrepancies, the prayers which are still said according to the Roman Pontifical in the ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and which are also prescribed in the other Pontificals of this country, whether of Sarum, Winchester, Bangor, or Exeter. There is no need to discuss the question, What is now, or what may have been formerly, according to any or each of these rites, the essential form of the Sacrament. It will be sufficient if we confine our attention to these prayers, and consider what is proposed in them as the end and object of the petitions they contain.

We have already carried back the Eastern rites to a common origin at least as early as the fourth century, and those of the Western Church to a date not much later. If, then, we find that both East and West bear witness to one common principle running through all their rites, we cannot but confess that such is the faith and tradition of the Church with regard to Holy Orders. Now what is the case? We find certainly that in all the prayers there are petitions for sanctifying graces, that the person ordained or consecrated may lead a christian and holy life; and for other graces, that he may discharge the functions of the Order he receives worthily, with wisdom and other virtues; but there is something more than this. In every one of these rites there are petitions to the effect, either that Almighty God would elect the person on whom the Bishop's hands are imposed to be Bishop, Priest, or Deacon; or that God would fill with the Holy Ghost

him whom He has elected to such an Order; or that He would fill him with the Holy Spirit for the special function of the Order, as to feed the flock of Christ, or to govern the people; or to bestow on him the grace of the Order: thus in each case expressing the belief that each Order is a special gift of grace, and that the person ordained is consecrated to that Order by an interior sacramental consecration.

Now to confirm this assertion by examples. The prayers of the Greek rite and those of the Apostolic Constitutions have been already referred to, with the mention of the other rites that contain the same petitions. It is therefore unnecessary to quote these again, and we may take other instances.

The Abyssinian rite is derived either from the Coptic or from the Apostolic Constitutions, but is much abridged, and in some parts altogether different.²² The prayer in the ordination of Deacons does not correspond with any other rite, but contains the following petition: 'Send forth the Spirit of goodness and vigilance on this Thy servant, whom Thou hast elected to be a Deacon in Thy Church.' The prayer in the ordination of Priests is like the Coptic, but omits the important words, 'who is promoted to the Presbyterate by the suffrage and judgment of those who present him.'²³ The prayer, therefore, runs as follows: 'Look upon this Thy servant, and bestow on him the spirit of grace (or spiritual grace) and counsel of sanctity, that he may rule Thy people in a pure heart, as Thou didst command Moses to choose leaders over Thy chosen people, and fill him with the Holy Spirit, which Thou didst give to Moses.' Now even in this, the shortest and most meagre form of all, we find the prayer for a special grace of the Holy Spirit to rule the people of God, and

²² See Appendix, No. XXXV.

²³ Denzinger, *Syllabus Orient.* vol. ii. p. 12. See page 174 for the prayer from the Apost. Const.

the gift of grace so sought is compared to the extraordinary gift of the Spirit bestowed upon the seventy elders of Israel. The prayer in the Abyssinian book for the consecration of Bishops differs little from that in the Coptic; but as the Bishop is consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch, it is probable that the Coptic rite itself is used. The prayer is as follows: 'Send forth Thy Holy Spirit on this Thy servant, whom Thou hast assumed to the Episcopate, that he may keep and govern Thy flock without reproach.'

In the Jacobite and Maronite rites the prayer for Deacons is very similar to that in the Greek rites already quoted. For Priests it is as follows: 'Elect, O Lord, this Thy servant to the Presbyterate, and grant him with manners irreproachable and faith unwavering to receive the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, to be worthy to exercise the priesthood of the Gospel of Thy kingdom.' And for Bishops: 'This Thy servant, whom Thou hast made worthy to receive the high order of Bishops, adorn with all virtues, and stability and peace; sustain and fill him with all properties of faith, charity, virtue, and sanctity, by the illumination of Thy holy, living, and life-giving Spirit.'²⁴ The above, however, is not used in the Jacobite rite according to Renaudot, whose version contains a prayer very similar to that of the Apostolic Constitutions.²⁵ Both one and the other are used by the Maronites.

The Nestorian rite has very little in it similar to the others. In the case of each order the Bishop gives a first imposition of hands while saying, 'Behold, we present before Thee these Thy servants, that they may be elected Deacons in Thy holy Church, that on them may come the grace of the Holy Spirit, and may perfect and consummate them for the work of this ministry.' The same is said for Priests and Bishops, altering the title of the order. Then the Bishop, again imposing his right hand,

²⁴ Denzinger, p. 75.

²⁵ *Ibid.* p. 97.

says the following prayers: for Deacons, 'Give to these Thy servants the grace of the Holy Spirit, that they may be elected Deacons in Thy holy Church;' for Priests, 'Look now on these Thy servants, and elect them with holy election, by the descent of the Holy Spirit, . . . and elect them to the priesthood;' for Bishops, 'Show the light of Thy countenance upon this Thy servant, and elect him with holy election by the unction of the Holy Spirit, that he may be a perfect priest to Thee.'

We must now turn to the Latin rite; and may confine ourselves to those parts of the rite only which have been in general use as well in the ancient books before mentioned as in the old English and the present Roman Pontificals. In the Ordination of Deacons the Bishop commends them to the prayers of the clergy and people, 'that on these His servants, whom He has vouchsafed to assume to the office of the Diaconate, He would pour out the grace of His benediction, and preserve in them the gifts of the consecration bestowed.' Then, in the prayer following, which is now divided into two parts by the imposition of hands, 'Send forth on them, O Lord, the Holy Spirit, by which, with the gift of Thy sevenfold grace, they may be confirmed for the work of faithfully executing their ministry.' Then for Priests, at the time of the imposition of hands, the Bishop says, 'Let us pray to God that on these His servants, whom He hath elected to the function of the Presbyterate, He would multiply heavenly gifts.' And afterwards, 'on these Thy servants pour the benediction of the Holy Spirit and the power of sacerdotal grace;' and 'give them the dignity of the Presbyterate.' Lastly, for Bishops, the consecrating Bishop says, 'Turning on this Thy servant the horn of sacerdotal grace, pour forth on him the power of Thy benediction;' and, 'this Thy servant, whom Thou hast elected to the ministry of the high priesthood.' 'Complete in Thy Priest the sum of Thy ministry.'

Thus, then, these several rites, both East and West, though varying in expression, yet all speak one and the same language, all teach one and the same doctrine, and are all framed with one and the same end in view in their petitions; all imploring the grace of the Order to be conferred as a peculiar grace, a Divine gift in the soul, a special gift of the Holy Ghost, and an interior sacramental consecration. The expressions quoted have been very brief; but if any one will take the trouble to examine the rites himself, he will see how the same idea of the sacramental efficacy of the rite pervades the whole.

Similar to this is the teaching which may be found in the Fathers. Thus St. Augustine, in passages which are often quoted: 'How,' says he, 'is not He God who gives the Holy Spirit? Yes, how great a God who gives God? For none of His disciples gave the Holy Ghost. They prayed that He might come on those on whom they imposed hands; they did not themselves give Him. Which practice the Church even now observes in her Prelates.' And again: 'We indeed are capable of receiving this gift according to our little measure, but by no means can we pour it out upon others; but, to obtain this end for them, we invoke God, by whom the same is effected.'²⁵

To find the same idea fully expressed, we have only to look to the doctrine of the Church as to the effects of the Sacrament of Holy Order. These, we are taught, are twofold. First, the spiritual power for the functions and ministrations proper to each Order, which *power is also called the spiritual character*, as said in the Catechismus Romanus,²⁷ because it is impressed on the soul as an indelible mark or character, and thereby the ordained are distinguished from other faithful, and dedicated to the divine ministry. And therefore the Sacrament cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. Secondly, the grace of the Holy Spirit, both habitual or sanctifying, which, unless

²⁵ *De Trinitate*, lib. xv. cap. 26.

²⁷ *De Ordine*, 34.

a bar is caused by sin, is conferred at the time of receiving the Sacrament in a greater or less abundance according to the disposition of the ordained; and also actual graces, which by virtue of the Sacrament are conferred for the right and due execution of the proper functions, unless the ordained should afterwards show himself unworthy of them, or cause a bar to the receiving of them.²⁸

The same doctrine, in great measure, is maintained by some divines in the Anglican communion. 'Ordination,' says one of their latest writers, 'is a sanctification of the person to do certain offices of religion, and also the imparting of grace to make the person meet to perform the same. . . . The distinction between clergy and lay persons rests upon the impression of the indelible ecclesiastical mark or character, the "charisma certum veritatis," as Irenæus terms it (*cont. Hær.* l. iv. c. xxvi. § 2), or as St. Augustine, "Sacramentum Ordinationis sue" (*de Bonis Conj.* c. xxviii.; *contr. Donatist.* l. i. c. i. § 2; *cont. Ep. Parmen.* l. ii. c. xiii.). The same doctrine is stated by Bishop Jeremy Taylor (*Episc. Assert.* s. xii. xxxi. 3), Archbishop Potter (*Ch. Gov.* ch. v.), Prideaux (*Validity*, &c. p. 25), Hooker (*Eccl. Pol.* b. v. c. lxxvii. § 3), Mason (*de Min. Angl.* l. ii. c. xix. § 6), and Bingham (*Orig. Eccl.* b. xvii. c. ii. § 5).'²⁹

Although we miss here the fulness and distinctness of the Catholic doctrine as stated in the preceding paragraphs, yet it is much to be wished that all who approach this question had the same belief in the sacredness of holy orders, and in the Divine gift of grace communicated therein. But there are other Anglican writers, such as Burnet,³⁰ who deny altogether that a character is conferred in Ordination. And according to the principle laid down

²⁸ *Institutiones Ordinand.* Romæ, 1769, p. 57.

²⁹ Preface to the Ordinal, by Rev. Mackenzie Walcot, in Blunt's *Annnotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 539-40. The references are Mr. Walcot's.

³⁰ On Article xxxv.

at first, no argument is intended to be founded on either of these opinions. But it might not have seemed fair to pass by without some recognition the profession of a belief so far Catholic within the Anglican Church.

Having now sought for all the light we could gain from the practice of the Church as declared in various Liturgies, we must proceed to the decisions which the Church herself has given on questions raised with regard to the validity of Ordination in certain cases.

The first is the Abyssinian case. The Abyssinians were originally converted by Frumentius, a missionary who was sent among them by St. Athanasius. After the great schism which followed on the Council of Chalcedon, and which carried nearly the whole of the Oriental Church into the Monophysite heresy, the Abyssinians too were led away to adhere to the Jacobites. Their ancient liturgy appears to have become corrupted, and what they now use is said to be derived partly from the Coptic and partly from the Greek.³¹ As far as the Ordination rites are concerned, that for Bishops and Priests seems to be an abbreviated form of that in the Apostolic Constitutions, while that for Deacons is unlike any other rite that has been met with. There is an account of the rite for Ordination of Priests in Ludolf's *History of Ethiopia*,³² but as the circumstances there related seemed rather doubtful, application was made to Monsignor Bel, then the Vicar-apostolic, who very kindly furnished the writer with a copy of the directions for Ordination in the canonical books, together with a Latin version, which will be found in the Appendix.³³ This confirms the account in Ludolf; but as there is some difference between the two, it will be well to put them in parallel columns, as follows:

³¹ From Mgr. Bel, in Appendix, No. XXXV.

³² p. 327.

³³ No. XXXV.

MONSIGNOR BEL.

Mandatam. Episcopus super ordinandi caput manum suam imponat . . . sacerdotes omnes illum tangant, et stantes super illum orent, sicut dictum est. . . Episcopus oret super illum, dicens: Deus meus et pater Domini ac Salvatoris nostri, respice super hunc famulum tuum, fac ut spiritualem gratiam et consilium sanctitatis recipiat, ut in corde puro populum tuum dirigat, sicut populum tuum ducet eligentem Moysi iussisti super electum quem Moysi dedisti: et nunc, Domine, concede huic famulo tuo spiritus gratie plenitudinem, de largitate manus tue in vita, ut te glorificet per Filium tuum Jesum Christum, qui tecum &c.

LUDOLF.

Cum voluerit Episcopus ordinare Presbyterum, imponat manum suam super caput ejus, Presbyteri vero universi attingant illum. Ille autem orat super illum quemadmodum diximus, dicens: Deus mi et Pater Salvatoris nostri J. C. respice hunc servum tuum, et largire illi spiritum gratie et consilium sanctitatis, ut possit regere populum tuum in integritate cordis; sicut respexisti populum electum, et mandasti Moysi ut eligeret seniores, quos replevisti eodem spiritu, quo donaveras servum tuum et famulum tuum Moisen. Nunc autem, Domine mi, da isti servo tuo gratiam que nunquam deficit: conservans nobis gratiam Spiritus tui, et competentem portionem nostram, supplens in nobis cultum tuum in corde, ut celebremus te sincere. Per Filium tuum &c.

The authority referred to by Monsignor Bel is the Fertha-Nagast, and probably Ludolf's statement was taken from the same. There is a copy of this work in the Bodleian Library, which is described in the Catalogue as a compilation made by Abu Isaac Benassal, a native of Egypt, and of the sect of Jacobites, who flourished in the early part of the thirteenth century.³⁴ It is stated to be a collection of Canons; and among the sources from which it was compiled are mentioned the Apostolic Canons and Constitutions. This seems to explain the origin of this form of Ordination, viz. that it was taken by the compiler

³⁴ Catal. Cod. Mss. Æthiop. No. xvi. p. 25, note.

direct from the Apostolic Constitutions, and not from the Coptic rite; although, being an Egyptian Jacobite, he must have been acquainted with the latter rite.

Such seems to be nominally the liturgical authority of the Abyssinian schismatic Church for the Ordination of Priests. In practice, however, even this rite, meagre as it is, has been laid aside; and, at least since the beginning of the last century, the priests in Abyssinia appear to have been ordained without any other form than an imposition of the Bishop's hands, with the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, although those words are not to be found in their books, and it is not known how they came into use. In consequence of this practice, the case was laid before the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition in the year 1704. And as the Vicar-apostolic of the Copts lately found himself involved in the same difficulties, the case was sent again to Rome in the year 1860; when the decision in the former case was appended to the resolution of the Sacred Congregation as a reply to the new statement of the case by the Vicar-apostolic. From the earlier case the following extract is made; but the whole will be printed in the Appendix:³⁵

'Resolution of the S.C. of the Holy Office, given on Fer. iv., being the 9th of April 1704.—In Ethiopia, as it is necessary that the persons to be ordained should assemble for their ordination from distant parts at the city where the schismatic Archbishop resides, and as he will only hold an ordination when persons to receive orders are collected together to the number of eight or ten thousand in the said city, he has therefore at such a time to ordain three or four thousand, or even more, in one day. In short, when those that are to receive the priesthood are arranged in ranks in the church, the Archbishop passing hastily in front of them, imposes his hands on the head of each, saying *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. And for those to be ordained deacons he simply imposes the patriarchal cross on the head of each. And in consequence of the great multitude and the confusion and the haste with which he proceeds, it follows that the Archbishop on some does not im-

³⁵ No. XXXIV.

pose his hands at all; and in other cases does not pronounce the words of the form; and not a few even are passed over without either one or the other. Hence the question is asked, whether priests and deacons in such a mode and form are validly ordained; and consequently whether such a priest on becoming a Catholic ought to be admitted to the exercise of his orders; and by what rule in such circumstances ought a missionary to be guided?

'Resolution of the S.C. The ordination of a priest with imposition of hands and pronouncement of the form as stated in the case is valid; but the ordination of a deacon simply with imposition of the patriarchal cross is altogether invalid. Hence in admitting presbyters and deacons to the exercise of their orders after they have received the Catholic faith, the following rules are to be observed:

'If a priest should say absolutely, that he was ordained with imposition of hands and pronouncement of the form, and if there should be no other impediment, the missionary, after giving him a dispensation from irregularity, and absolution from excommunication, may admit him to the exercise of his orders according to the rite, approved and expurgated, in which he was ordained.

'But if such a priest should ingenuously acknowledge that he has not a clear remembrance about the matter and form of his ordination, or if he has a doubt concerning either one or the other, he cannot be admitted to the exercise of his orders till he has been ordained conditionally. And if he should absolutely assert that the imposition of hands and pronouncement of the form had been omitted, or either of them, he must be reordained absolutely, before he can be admitted to the exercise of his orders.

'But since it may happen that a person may have been validly ordained priest, though his ordination as deacon was invalid; in such a case, before he can exercise his orders, he ought, if it please the Sovereign Pontiff to grant faculties to the missionaries for that purpose, to receive a dispensation from irregularity, not only as having been ordained *per saltum*, but also as under suspension on account of the subsequent exercise of sacred orders,—at least for the time, until he can be validly promoted to the diaconate by a Catholic Bishop.

Such is this most important decision. And it will be seen at once that nothing could be more favourable to the Anglican side of the question. For it establishes the principle that the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* are sufficient as a form of ordination to the priesthood; it ren-

ders nugatory the argument raised by Talbot and Lewgar, that the distinctive order must be named in the form; it makes it clear that, even if the Anglican form of the diaconate is invalid, this need not prevent the priesthood being validly conferred; it removes any doubt whether the uncanonical mode of altering the Anglican form would of itself have made it invalid; and it puts aside, as irrelevant, any questions whether the alteration was made by the Church or by the secular power; for no one can trace the origin of the use of this form among the Abyssinians, or find any authority for it beyond a mere custom that has crept in without any record of its introduction.

The decision, indeed, refers only to the priesthood. But in the face of such an indication of the mind of the Church, it would be unbecoming to raise the question whether those same words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, are insufficient as a form for the Episcopate also.

Here, however, we must call to remembrance that the Abyssinian decision was given in reference to a case of the Oriental Church; and that another decision has been given with regard to a case that arose within the Western Church. This decision has been related by Pope Benedict XIV. himself, as follows: 'A certain deacon, while being ordained priest, although he had received all the customary impositions of hands from the Bishop, yet, through some mistake, did not go up to the Bishop for the chalice and paten, with the host on one and the wine in the other, to be delivered into his hands with the customary words. The question was therefore referred to Rome, and directions asked as to what was to be done. It came before the Sacred Congregation of the Council, of which the Pope, being then Card. Lambertini, was at the time a member. The subject having been fully discussed, although the S.C. seemed to be inclined to the opinion that the ordination had been fully completed by the imposition of hands, yet, consider-

ing that the contrary opinion ought to have some weight in a question of such importance, they decided that the ordination should be reiterated *sub conditione*.³⁶

It would be presumptuous in an individual writer to undertake to say for certain whether the Abyssinian decision does or does not apply to the case of Anglican ordinations. And it will therefore be most proper to consider the question in the light of each of these two decisions separately: first, supposing that the Abyssinian decision does apply to it in its full force; and secondly, taking into consideration that the Anglican rite was derived from the ancient Latin rite; and then inquiring what bearing the case related by Benedict XIV. may have upon the question.

³⁶ *Synodus Diocæsana*, lib. viii. cap. 10. Translated in App. No. I.

laid open the position, towards which the attack and defence are now to be directed.

It has been already mentioned, that when Courayer undertook the defence of English ordinations, he explained what he considered to be the essentials of ordination, supporting his proposition by various arguments. His principle was as follows: 'The imposition of hands, and prayer in general, that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, to obtain for the Bishop-elect the graces of which he has need to acquit himself worthily of the functions of his ministry, alone make the matter and the essential form of the Sacrament of Order. . . . Now the English, in their new Formula of Ordination, have preserved the imposition of hands and prayer. Nothing, then, essential, either on the side of the matter or on the side of the form, was wanting in the ordination of Parker.'³ And in the next page: 'In that ritual, such as it was published under Edward VI., or with the changes made under Charles II., we find both the imposition of hands, and prayer or the invocation of the Holy Spirit, to obtain for the Bishop-elect all the graces of which he has need.'⁴ Again: 'By the comparison which we may make between the prayers and formulas of the Roman Pontifical and those of the ritual of Edward VI., it is easy to convince oneself that the formula of the Anglican Church has altered in no respect the substance of the true form of ordination. The essence of that prayer, as we have already remarked, consists in an invocation of the Holy Spirit, to obtain for the Bishop-elect the graces of which he has need to acquit himself worthily of his ministry. Now they have preserved in the Anglican ritual all the sense of this prayer.'⁵ Then he proceeds to illustrate his assertion by quotations from the Anglican Form of Ordination, and comparing it with the Pontifical.⁶

³ *Dissertation*, vol. i. c. vi. p. 111.

⁵ p. 118.

⁴ p. 112.

⁶ p. 118-21.

CHAPTER VI.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANGLICAN RITE IN REFERENCE TO THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDER.

THE decision in this Abyssinian case may lead a reader to exclaim, What more need be said? There is no further room to doubt of the validity of the Anglican form of Holy Orders. But in giving this decision, the Sacred Congregation did not mean to settle the long-disputed question concerning the full and complete form of the Sacrament of Holy Order. We may be sure that they did not undertake to decide this question, when the Council of Trent had expressly declined to define it.¹ Had the decree been considered as decisive on this point, it would have been unnecessary for another Sacred Congregation, namely that of the Council, to open the question again, and debate it afresh, within a few years afterwards, as just mentioned from Bened. XIV.² The effect of the decision is, that in a particular case, and under certain circumstances, the conferring of the priesthood with only the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* is to be considered valid. But the meaning of it does not extend so far as to say, that in any case, and under all conceivable circumstances, the use of these words would constitute a full and adequate form of the sacrament. Thus the contest is not yet over, although the first shot does not come from this side of the field of battle. It is the bursting of a gun among the allied forces on the other side that has

¹ See in Chap. I. p. 5.

² *Syn. Diac.* lib. viii. c. 10.

On reading these statements of Courayer's, we are prompted at once to ask, Is there no more than this in Episcopal Consecration? Is there no power conferred, nor a sacramental character? And is it true that the Anglican form of ordination contains no mention of the power conferred in the Order, or at least is there nothing to imply it? Of course we cannot take what Courayer has said for granted. As he was in error on the subject of Holy Order, he may have carried his error into the examination of the Anglican form. If he failed to see the belief in such sacramental grace expressed in the Pontifical, he may also have overlooked the indications of it in the Book of Common Prayer. But then the Anglican writers have accepted his defence without raising any protest against the mode of argument referred to, and have even asserted that Courayer was persecuted and condemned, not on account of the unsound doctrines he advanced, but merely for taking up the defence of English ordinations.

Indeed, St. René in his reply to Courayer, and Catalani in his work on the Pontifical, as well as Juenin, have stated the principle almost in the same words as Courayer; but yet between their way of putting it and his, there is all the difference between truth and error. The former says: 'The prayers which the Church makes in the ordination of a Bishop are made to invoke the Holy Spirit, and to demand of Him the graces necessary for the new Bishop, in order to fulfil the essential duties of the episcopate.'⁷ But in these words he does imply the power of the Order. And the two latter: 'Effectum Ordinis Episcopalis esse collationem Spiritus Sancti seu gratiarum necessarierum Episcopo, ut digne imposito sibi onere perfungatur.'⁸ But here these writers do indicate the conferring

⁷ St. René sur la *Kérâmination des Anglois Episcopatus*, vol. ii. p. 20.

⁸ In *Pontificale Romanum*, vol. i. p. 198. Juenin, *De Sacram.* Dissert. ix. cap. 3.

of a sacramental grace. Courayer, on the other hand, by the use of such a phrase as 'to acquit himself worthily of his functions,' raises no further idea than the sanctifying and coöperating graces; and in the illustrations he takes from the English form he brings forward nothing more than petitions for those graces; thus ignoring the sacramental character.

How serious this omission is, may easily be seen by comparison with other rites of the Church. In the benediction of an abbot or an abess, the Bishop gives the imposition of hands with prayers to invoke the Holy Spirit for the graces of which the new abbot has need to acquit himself worthily of the dignity he receives. But there is no sacrament conferred. The words of the prayer, as used both in the Roman and the ancient English Pontifical,⁹ are as follows: 'Graciously pour forth, at our prayer, upon this Thy servant the overflowing spirit of Thy benediction, that he who is to-day constituted abbot by imposition of our hands, being worthy of Thy sanctification, may remain constant to Thy election, and never hereafter by unworthiness be separated from Thy grace.' Thus the imposition of hands is given to constitute the abbot in his office, not to confer an Order; and the prayers are made for his sanctification and perseverance in grace, not for a sacramental consecration. Yet Courayer's principle would apply to this as fully as to the consecration of a Bishop.

It is therefore necessary to inquire whether he has been correct in his description of the Anglican rite of Ordination; and whether there really is nothing more in it than he has mentioned, that is to say, 'an invocation of the Holy Spirit to obtain for the Bishop-elect the graces of which he has need to acquit himself worthily of the functions of his ministry.' With this view we must examine the Anglican forms of ordination and con-

⁹ Bp. Lacy's *Exeter Pontifical*, p. 106.

secration, comparing them with the rites of the ancient Pontificals in use in this country, so as to see what has been retained and what has been omitted, and what has been the reason and effect of such omissions, and whatever novel additions there may be, to endeavour to trace the origin, sense, and meaning of them, and their effect upon the whole rite.

There is no need, as has been already remarked, to open the question, by what authority such changes were made, or whether they were brought about in a regular and canonical manner. All we have to look to is the effect of the changes on the substantial parts of the rite. And to judge of this, we are guided by the usual principles of theology, of which a clear statement is quoted by Courayer,¹⁰ and admitted as of authority by St. René.¹¹ The addition of words which corrupt the due sense of the sacramental form destroys the truth of the sacrament; . . . but if such an addition be made as not to take away the due sense, the truth of the sacrament is not destroyed.¹² The like principle of course applies to alterations made in the way of omission, namely, that if words pertaining to the substance of the sacramental form were omitted, the sacrament would be rendered null and void; and such would be the effect, if the alterations went to deprive the words of their due sense and meaning. This is the common principle of Theologians, as taught by St. Thomas. Collet gives a further illustration of it, by adding, that the form must be so expressed as not to exclude a due and proper intention on the part of the minister of the sacrament.¹³

It will, however, be requisite to carry this principle somewhat further, in order to ascertain what in the way of addition or omission would exclude a due and proper

¹⁰ *Dissertation*, pt. i. p. 229.

¹¹ Natal. Alexander, *Theol. Dogmat. Moral.* lib. ii. c. 3, reg. 5, 6.

¹² *De Ordine*, cap. vi. dissert. ii. art. 2, § 191.

¹⁴ Knoll. pt. iv. § 2, Tract. i. art. 4.

¹⁵ Tom. vii. lib. xxxvi. cap. 15, no. 5.

intention on the part of the minister of the sacrament. The intention requisite for the valid administration of a sacrament is the *intentio generalis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*. Hence a sacrament conferred with the correct matter and form by a heretic, or even an atheist, is valid, if he intends to do that rite which the Church does,—and not specially the Roman Church, but the Church *in confuso*; even though he might not believe in the reality of the sacrament. And supposing the form be clear and genuine, and the sense of the words is preserved in its integrity, even if the form were changed with an erroneous or heretical intent, the sacrament would still be valid. For no amount of heretical intention would invalidate it, provided that he intended in a general way to do what the Church does, and that he does not overthrow or destroy the legitimate sense of the words.¹⁴

But supposing the form used is ambiguous, and that the words spoken are not by common use appropriated to the administration of a sacrament, or do not clearly express that the minister is conferring a sacrament, or do not indicate the particular sacrament which he is then purporting to administer; in such a case, alterations, either by way of addition or omission, which express the sense and intention of the minister, become of great importance. Berti says: 'Jam statutum a nobis est, in formis sacramentorum, quæ sensum patiuntur ambiguum, et quæ verborum vi neque sacramenti effectum neque communem Ecclesie intelligentiam significant, attendendum esse positum animamque proferentium.'¹⁵ Franzelin also speaks to the same effect: 'Si verba adhibita in forma non sint ambiguae significationis, sed ex usu communi sensum tantum unum habere possunt, eumque genuinum ab institute sacramenti præscriptum, nullus error ministri potest efficere ut forma illa non sit sufficiens. Sed si verba cor-

rumpantur ita ut sensum habere possint vel genuinum formæ sacramentalis, vel alium diversum, tum sane forma legitima non erit, si a ministro adhibeantur ad hunc diversum a significatione formæ sacramentalis et erroneum sensum exprimentum.¹⁶

We have now to apply these principles to the examination of the Anglican forms of Ordination; but it will be necessary first to go some steps further back, in order to ascertain what is understood in the Anglican Church respecting the sacraments and sacramental grace. However doubtful may be the language of the Thirty-nine Articles, yet the Common Prayer Book in the two sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist does certainly recognise an interior gift of grace communicated by virtue of the sacrament. In Baptism not only is the true form preserved, but in the accompanying prayers the following petitions are used: 'Look upon this child, wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost.' Again, 'that this infant may enjoy the everlasting benediction of Thy heavenly washing.' And again, 'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again;' and 'sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.' So too in the administration of Holy Communion, in one prayer are the words, 'beseeching Thee, that all we, who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction;' words taken partly from the Canon of the Mass. But then in the prayer next following we find: 'and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us,' words which imply the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies, both that grace is only an external change in the favour of God, instead of an internal gift and power planted in the soul; and that the sacraments are only pledges and assurances of persons being in an acceptable state, instead of instrumental means of infusing grace into the soul.

¹⁶ *De Sacram. in generis*, cap. ii. p. 48.

In Penance also there is preserved a valid form of absolution in the office for Visitation of the Sick; though it is very doubtful how it is intended to be understood, as we shall see hereafter. And in Matrimony the nuptial blessing is taken from the old Catholic rite, and does imply an interior 'benediction and grace' received in the sacrament.

It is remarkable that these four—Baptism, Holy Eucharist, Penance, and Matrimony—are those with regard to which Cranmer and Barlow maintained, in 1541, that 'the nature and effect thereof was found in Scripture, while of the other three nothing is read in Scripture as taken for sacraments.'¹⁷ The twenty-fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles declares that 'those five commonly called sacraments—that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction—are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.'

As all these five, except Extreme Unction, are retained in some form or other in the Anglican Church, we must charitably suppose that they are so far altered and reformed as to be no longer open to the censure of 'having grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles.' Yet it is difficult to divide the five into the two classes described in the article, viz. those grown of such 'corrupt following,' and 'the states of life allowed in Scripture.' Extreme Unction, having been disused, doubtless belonged to the former class; and Matrimony is certainly a state of life; but something more is wanted to answer to the plural number used in the article. Penance perhaps belonged to the former class only under the Popish form of auricular

¹⁷ Burnet, *Hist. Ref.* vol. i. p. 214-8. See page 21.

confession, and may be taken to be no longer 'corrupt' as found in the Book of Common Prayer. But we are still in the dark as to Confirmation and Order. The words did not occur in the Forty-two Articles of 1552, but made their first appearance in those of 1562. We must therefore go to contemporary writers to throw light on this ambiguous point. And in the Catechism published in 1560 by Thomas Becon, a member of the Convocation of 1562, we find the following account of the five sacraments: 'Matrimony and the ministry concerning the preaching of God's Word and the administration of the sacraments, are holy orders of life, instituted and ordained of God to be used in His Church. Confirmation and extreme unction are ceremonies brought into the Church by man, and not worthy to be numbered among sacraments; and penance, more justly termed repentance, is a continual exercise of a true Christian, and may more justly be reckoned among the fruits of the Holy Ghost than among sacraments.'¹⁸ And in another work, entitled *Demands of Holy Scripture*, there is the following question and answer: 'What is order? Order hath been wrongfully taken both for a sacrament and for the anointed order of priesthood, which Christ took away. But indeed a godly, holy, and reverend state of ministers, preachers, pastors, or apostles, is of Christ allowed in the New Testament to be lovingly and reverently received of us as shepherds of the flock.'¹⁹ These passages so completely fall in with the language of the Article before quoted, that it seems clear that the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles really intended to include Holy Order among 'the states of life allowed in Scripture.'

In these two rites, Confirmation and Order, as used in the Anglican Church, three points seem to be aimed at, viz. a public profession on the part of the candidate; a

¹⁸ Becon's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 199, ed. Parker Society.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 618.

recognition and admission on the part of the Church through the Bishop as its chief minister; and prayers that the candidate may conduct himself in a manner worthy of the profession he has made, and the calling and office to which he is admitted. But the language of each seems to be carefully framed with the view of avoiding the idea of any special grace being conferred through the rite.

To speak first of Confirmation. The rite begins with a renewal of baptismal vows, and this renewal is spoken of in the Preface as the chief end of the rite. Such a renewal might be made at any time, either alone, or before any person whatever, and has nothing sacramental in it. The rite then proceeds with a prayer taken from the ancient Pontificals, but with the omission of the words 'consigna eos signo crucis Christi in vitam propitius aeternam.' These words are in use in all the ancient Pontificals and in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries. Sir Wm. Palmer²⁰ omits them in comparing the Anglican with the ancient rite, and refers to the Gelasian Sacramentary, but without remarking that the prayer occurs there twice, once with, and once without, these words.²¹ In the Annotated Book of Common Prayer they are properly given.

When we come to the form used with the imposition of hands, we find an entire change. The form in use according to the Exeter and Sarum Pontificals, as well as in the present Roman, is as follows: 'I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, and confirm thee with the Christ of salvation.' In Archbishop Egbert's Pontifical the form is: 'By the Christ of salvation, receive the sign of the holy Cross in Christ Jesus to eternal life.'²² In the Greek Church the form is: 'The seal of the gift of the Holy

²⁰ *Orig. Liturg.* vol. ii. p. 204.

²¹ Muratori, *Liturg. Rom. Vit.* vol. i. p. 571 and 595.

²² Surtees Society, p. 7.

Spirit.' All these bear reference to an outward sign, and to actions done by the Bishop. Nor was such a reference entirely removed when the change was first made in the Prayer Book of 1549; for then the rite stood as follows: 'The Bishop shall cross them in the forehead, and lay his hand upon their heads, saying, "N., I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, and lay my hand upon thee: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."' And thus shall he do to every child, one after another.²³ Now even if the opinion of those divines could be followed, who have maintained that the imposition of hands is the sole essential matter of this sacrament, yet with such a form as this the validity of it would be rendered doubtful. For the words 'I confirm thee' are omitted, and there is nothing to express necessarily the conferring of a sacrament: for a Bishop might sign with the sign of the cross, and lay his hand upon a person's head, and say that he is so doing without any idea of administering a sacrament. It might be a simple blessing. If, therefore, these words constituted a sacramental form, the efficacy of them would depend on their being used in a sacramental sense—on the sign of the Cross being made, and professed to be made, and the imposition of hands being given, and professed to be given, in the sense and with the intention of conferring the sacrament of confirmation. The sacramental sense of the words, and their sacramental efficacy along with it, would depend on the understanding, the faith, the mere opinion of the ministering Bishop at the time. Perilous to faith, indeed, and to the salvation of souls, would it be, if the sacraments of the Church were left under such conditions. In this case, however, of confirmation, according to the Prayer Book of 1549, the meaning of the words was not left to the Bishop's individual judgment or inward intention. He was to make a public profession of the sense in which

²³ *Liturgies of King Edward VI.* p. 125, ed. Parker Society.

they were used, and to declare the effect that might be attributed to the rite he had ministered. For in the prayer following the imposition of hands, he says, 'these children, upon whom . . . we have laid our hands, to certify them (by this sign) of Thy favour and gracious goodness towards them.' This is taken from Archbishop Herman's reformed Prayer Book,²⁴ and expresses the Lutheran doctrine of grace being only the favour of God, and not an interior inherent gift. If the old Catholic form had been retained, such a profession of heresy preceding or following might not have interfered with its validity. But when the form is changed in such a manner as to leave its sacramental meaning dependent on the use of it by the minister, the profession of such a sense attached to the rite renders a sacramental sense impossible, and converts the doubt of its efficacy into a denial. If the Bishop, by making the sign of the cross, and imposing his hand on a person's head, merely certifies such a one of God's favour and goodness towards him, he does not confer a sacrament. Thus, as in other cases in the Prayer Book of 1549, the shadow of a Catholic rite was left, but the spirit and substance were departed.

Even the shadow was not allowed long to rest upon the English Prayer Book. The form quoted above was soon done away with, and the following inserted in its place: 'The Bishop shall lay his hand upon every child severally, saying: Defend, O Lord, this child with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine for ever, and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting kingdom. Amen.'²⁵ Though this is a prayer for the divine grace, yet it has no sacramental meaning, for it does not refer to any outward sign, nor to any action done by the Bishop, nor does it invoke the

²⁴ *Simple and Religious Consultation.*

²⁵ *Liturg. K. Edw. VI.* p. 300.

grace as given through the rite. And the sense in which it is said is afterwards explained by the use of the same prayer as quoted from the earlier book, namely, that the imposition of hands is given merely as a sign of the Divine favour and goodness.

With the view of showing that this explanation of 'the Order of Confirmation' is not overdrawn, some Anglican writers may be quoted, specially those contemporary with the final change of religion.

Becon, in the work last quoted, has the following question and answer: 'What is confirmation? A godly allowance by the Bishop or preacher of the children when they come to age into the congregation of Christ, after a due examination or trial of their continuance in the same faith which their godfathers or sureties in their name professed and promised for them at their baptism to keep.'²⁶

Calfhill, who was also a member of the Convocation of 1562, says: 'Then, after baptism, if ye will have them confirmed, I allow it well; retaining that order, which in the primitive Church was, and in the English Church is, used; that children, after certain years, be presented to the Bishop, and rendering an account of that faith of theirs (which by their sureties in baptism they professed), have hands laid on them, which is nothing else but prayer made for them. *Quid enim est aliud* (saith St. Augustine) *manuum impositio, quam oratio super hominem?*'²⁷ Then he proceeds to deny that the Holy Ghost is given in confirmation, but in terms too impious to be quoted.

Also Rogers: 'The ancient confirmation was nothing else than an examination of such as in their infancy had received the sacrament of baptism, and were then, being of good discretion, able to yield an account of their belief and to testify with their own mouths what their sureties

²⁶ Vol. iii. p. 618.

²⁷ *Answer to Treatise of the Cross*, p. 215, ed. Parker Society.

in their names had promised at their baptism; which confession being made, and a promise of perseverance in the faith by them given, the Bishop, by sound doctrine, grave advice, and godly exhortations, confirmed them in that good profession, and laying his hands upon them, prayed for the increase of God his gifts and graces in their minds.'²⁸

Hooker evidently had a higher and more Catholic idea of confirmation, but he does not explain it definitely.

We may now turn to the Anglican rite of Ordination; but before entering on the examination of it, it would be well to refer again to the principles taught by Luther and other reformers on the subject of the ministry. Among them were the following:

That there are two kinds of vocation to the ministry; one internal and immediately from God, such as that of Apostles and Prophets; the other external, by election of the people, or by means of men placed in authority and representing the people, as magistrates. One or the other calling ought to be had by one who is to teach in the Church. And, as a matter of regulation, none is to be suffered to preach without being called and ordained.

That it is proper, though not of necessity, that one of the pastors should be elected as superintendent; and that the ministers, when called and elected by the people, or the magistrates, or patrons, should be presented to this superintendent for trial and examination, and if approved, should be admitted to the ministry by prayer and imposition of hands.

That the notion of a sacramental character conferred in ordination is a figment; for it is not a sacrament, nor is any sacramental grace conferred therein; but it is merely the public approval of persons as truly called, and pos-

²⁸ *On xxxix. Articles*, p. 154.

essed of the proper qualifications for the ministry, and admitting them to the lawful exercise of their functions.²⁸

The Zuinglian partisans did not differ from the Lutherans on the subject of the ministry. Zuinglius himself had taught that the sacramental character given in ordination is a figment, and that the episcopate and priesthood are each of them merely an office and function.²⁹ Bullinger also says: 'Calling is no other thing than the lawful appointing of a meet minister. The same may also be called both election and ordination, though one word be more large in signification than the other.'

The Lutheran doctrine was recognised and expressed in the Articles of 1552 in the following terms: 'Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.' This is still retained in the twenty-third of the Thirty-nine Articles. And we have already seen how this was officially interpreted by Archbishops Grindall and Whitgift. The former, or rather his vicar-general for him, gave a license to Morrison, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, to preach and administer sacraments, because he had been duly called by those who had authority in that country. The latter excused Whittingham for his Genevan ordination, because being resident in that country in time of persecution, he was called by those who had authority there; but he objected to Travers for having gone abroad to seek for calling without necessity, forsaking the order at home.

We have now to examine the three 'Forms of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,' by comparing them as well with the ancient Pontificals in use in this country, as with these newly-invented doctrines of the Continental reformers, having in

²⁸ See Appendix, No. II.

²⁹ See Appendix, No. III.

view to ascertain, whether the spirit and sacramental idea of the ancient rite have been preserved; or whether the alterations, omissions, and novel additions have been made in order to introduce the Lutheran doctrines; whether they contain anything further than Courayer has attributed to them; whether, in fact, they recognise a divine gift of grace and power as communicated through the rite, or have been purposely framed with the view of excluding the idea of sacramental efficacy, or of a consecrated character impressed upon the soul.

To begin with the Preface as it stood down to 1662. It does not assert the necessity of ordination in order for a person to become a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon; it does not say that without the rite validly administered the Order is not given or received; it merely says that these offices had been so esteemed, that 'no man might execute them without being called, tried, and found qualified; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved, and admitted thereunto. And therefore in the Church of England it is requisite that no man shall execute them except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted according to the form following.' This is exactly the Lutheran doctrine. It is only a matter of regulation and propriety that a person should be ordained; and ordination is only the public testimony of approval, and not the conferring of a sacrament. In 1662 the following words were added: 'No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or suffered to execute them, except, &c. as before. But here the word 'lawful' does not mean 'real,' and it leaves as much room for 'necessity, or extraordinary occasion,' as before.

Four words are used to describe the steps which are requisite before a person shall execute the office of the ministry. He is to be 'called, tried, examined, and admitted.' Each of these words must be examined separately.

'Called.' This does not mean 'vocation' in the Catholic sense, which is the interior attraction by which a person, moved by Divine grace and the signs of God's will, is led to embrace the ecclesiastical state for the motives of promoting the glory of God and his own and others' sanctification. The Lutherans taught that there were two callings; one immediately from God, as that of Apostles and Prophets; the other from the people or magistrates in the name of the people. And they denied that the Bishops and Priests of the Catholic Church were truly called, because they did not preach, and had not been called by the people. In the Anglican rite the interior vocation is alluded to in the first question put to the candidate for deaconship, whether 'he is moved by the Holy Ghost.' Then comes a question about the external call, which is to be 'according to the will of our Lord, and the due order of this realm.' Thus the call is not to come directly from the people, but in the mode provided by the order of the realm. And for the purpose of making it appear that the people give their consent, the call is announced to them by the Bishop saying: 'Good people, these be they whom we purpose . . . to receive unto the holy office of priesthood. For after due examination we find not the contrary, but that they be lawfully called to their function and ministry, and be persons meet for the same.'

'Tried.' This word so applied is not known to the Church. There is a probation and examination required by the Canons, but the Reformers considered them as insufficient, and, in fact, denounced them as a mere sham. And they maintained, that as in ancient times the right of electing ministers had belonged to the people, so now they were driven to resume that right, as well by the laxity of the Bishops in admitting unworthy persons, as by their tyranny in refusing ordination to the professors of the Gospel. And when persons had been elected to

the ministry, either by the people or by certain of the congregation in the name of the people, there was then to be a strict inquiry into, and a trial of, the life, doctrine, and learning of the persons so elected, which was called 'exploratio.' This trial was to be conducted by the neighbouring ministers, and according to the Lutheran mode before the magistrates or other electors, but in the Zuinglian and Calvinist reforms in the presence of the people. Thus all the Continental reformers were agreed about the necessity of this trial of ministers. The Lutherans, Bucer and the Strasburg divines, Bullinger and the Zuinglians, all insisted on it quite as strongly as the Calvinists. In the Anglican reform, the name of Episcopal Ordination was retained, and it was not convenient to have a real popular election. Hence the 'call' is simply announced to the people, and certain questions are put to those who are to be ordered, which are to serve for the trial. Thus, by the Rubric the Bishop is directed to examine those to be ordered deacons 'in the presence of the people.' And in the ordering of Priests, the Bishop tells the candidates, that 'in order that this present congregation of Christ, here assembled, may understand your minds and wills in these things,' they are to answer the questions which he, 'in the name of the congregation,' demands of them. In 1662 this was altered to 'in the name of God and of His Church.' So too the Bishop-elect is to be examined 'in certain articles, to the end the congregation present may have a trial and bear witness.' Here the Lutheran word is used, but without its full effect being given to it. And even this bare use of the word became a source of embarrassment to the Elizabethan Bishops, for the Puritans insisted on the necessity of a real 'trial of ministers.' Whitgift replies to Cartwright: 'I think it necessary that such as be admitted into the ministry (unless they be very well known) should be tried

power. The use of the word 'admitted' was so common that Catholics in the sixteenth century sometimes use it.³¹

Now to enter on the rite itself, which commences with the presentation of the candidates to the Bishop by the Archdeacon, the form of which is derived from that in use in the ancient English Pontifical, but with some difference, as will be seen by comparing them.

SARUM PONTIFICAL. PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.
Archid. alloq. Postulat hæc *The Archdeacon.* Reverend sancta Ecclesia, Reverende Pater in God, I present unto Pater, hos viros ordinibus aptos you these persons present, to be consecrari a vestra paternitate. admitted Deacons (or, to the order of Priesthood).

Resp. Episc. Vide ut natura, *The Bishop.* Take heed that scientia, et moribus, tales per te the persons whom ye present introducuntur, immo tales per into us be apt and meet, for nos in domo Domini ordinentur their learning and godly conversation, per quos diabolus procul pellatur, et clerus Deo nostro multiplicitur. istry duly, to the honour of God, and edifying of His Church.

Resp. Archid. Quantum ad *The Archdeacon.* I have in humanum spectat examen, natura, scientia, et moribus digni quired of them, and also examined them, and think them habentur, ut probi cooperatores effici in his, Deo volente, possint. so to be.

The change is defended³² on the ground that to say 'Postulat Ecclesia' was too bold a presumption, and that the reference to human frailty was too vague, and offered a shelter for prevarication. But it indicates the loss of the sacramental idea, and brings down the rite to the level of an appointment to an office on mere human responsibility. It is no longer Almighty God who makes the election in the person of the Bishop; it is no longer the Church who postulates the ordination. The Archdeacon does not profess his testimony to rest on mere human

³¹ In the *Downy Diary*, as in Appendix, No. XXIII.
³² *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 547.

both in learning and life.' And, 'such as be well known need no farther trial.'²⁹

'Examined.' This word is used in the same sense in the Catholic Church.

'Admitted.' This is a perfectly novel word, that came in with the Lutheran doctrines. It made its first appearance in this country in the Declaration concerning Bishops and Priests, published in 1537.³⁰ And throughout the ordination of Priests and Deacons it is made use of to express the administration of the rite, as follows: The Bishop knowing a fit person, 'may admit him a deacon.' The Archdeacon presents 'these persons to be admitted Deacons,' or 'to the order of priesthood.' The Litany prays for 'Thy servants now to be admitted to the order of Deacons or Priests.' And in the consecration of a Bishop, the Archbishop moves the congregation to pray 'before we admit and send forth this person.' Once the phrase occurs, 'receiving unto the order of priesthood;' and in the Rubric, at the end, we find, 'If the order of deacons be given to some, and the order of priesthood to others.' But this is the only expression intimating that anything whatever is given in the rite. There is no such phrase as conferring the deaconship or priesthood on any one.

It may be said, that the Church constantly uses the phrase, 'promoting to sacred Orders.' This is true; but there is a great difference between the two expressions. A person is admitted to an office, or privilege, or degree, to the practice of a profession, as of law or medicine, or to the tenancy of an estate: all matters either temporary or external in their nature, or attained by a person of his own will. Promotion involves the idea of a person being raised to a rank, which is a personal thing, and attaches to him for life, and is conferred by a superior

²⁹ *Wright's*, vol. i. p. 297-9.
³⁰ Burnet, vol. i. App. p. 323.

examination; nor does he refer to his human frailty, as in the Roman Pontifical, as well as in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory; whereby he showed that he believed himself to be speaking in the presence of his Judge. And further on, the Bishop, when charging the people to speak, if any one knows of anything to be alleged against the candidates, does not bid them be mindful of their own condition,³³ nor does he commend those to be ordained to the prayers of the people, that God would 'vouchsafe to elect them each in his order, and consecrate them through our hands.'

Then we come to the Litany, and find that the words 'sanctify and consecrate' are left out, and the prayer is only that they may duly execute their office.

THE PONTIFICAL.

The Bishop rises, and standing turned towards the Ordinandi with his mitre on, and his pastoral staff in his hand, says:

That these elect Thou wouldst vouchsafe to ✠ bless.

Resp. We beseech Thee, hear us.

The second time.

That these elect Thou wouldst vouchsafe to ✠ bless and sanctify.

Resp. We beseech Thee, hear us.

The third time.

That these elect Thou wouldst vouchsafe to ✠ bless, sanctify, and consecrate.

Resp. We beseech Thee, hear us.

In the 'Form and manner of making of Deacons,' the Collect prays that they may be 'replenished with the

³³ Or 'communion,' as in the Sarum.

truth of doctrine and adorned with innocency of life, that they may faithfully serve in this office.' As an introductory prayer, there is nothing to be said against it as far as it goes. But then this is all. It mentions St. Stephen, and prays 'Mercifully behold these Thy servants now called to the like office and administration; so far going with the Apostolic Constitutions, but then it does not pray, like them, 'that they may be filled with the Holy Ghost and power.'

The examination will be considered later on.

The imposition of hands is given with the words, 'Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee.' This form is entirely novel. Sir W. Palmer has not even ventured to bring it into comparison with any ancient form. Mr. Blunt³⁴ puts it as parallel with 'Accipe stolam immortalitatis, imple ministerium tuum,' which is very different.

This is followed by the delivery of the New Testament, with the words, 'Take thou authority to read the Gospel, &c.' taken from the 'Accipe potestatem,' &c. of the Pontifical.

After the Communion another prayer is to be said, in which several expressions are taken from the Pontifical, as will be seen by comparison.

SARUM PONTIFICAL.

PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

Almighty God, Giver of all good things, which of Thy great goodness hast vouchsafed to accept and take these Thy servants unto the office of Deacons in Thy Church:

Abundet in eis . . . auctoritas make them, we beseech thee, modesta, pudor constans . . . O Lord, to be modest, humble, (ministerii fideliter exequendi) and constant in their ministrations,

³⁴ *Annotated Prayer Book*, p. 551.

³⁵ Maskell's *Mon. Ritual*, vol. iii. p. 195.

et spiritualis observantia discipline. . . .
 et bonum conscientie testimonium præferentes,
 in Christo firmi et stabiles perseverent,
 dignisque successibus de inferiori gradu per gratiam tuam capere potiora mereantur.

Per eundem &c.³⁶

This prayer, while it clearly points to the ancient form as the original from which it is derived, also shows with what spirit the alterations and omissions were made. The words 'to accept and take these Thy servants unto the office of Deacons' form the only expression throughout the rite which imply any Divine intervention in the action, and these seem, from the frequent use of the word 'office,' to be retained because the deaconship is described by that term. The ancient rite treats the order as a special grace to which persons are chosen by Divine election, as a sacramental gift, and an interior consecration; but every expression implying this belief is omitted; such as, in addition to those already mentioned, 'that He would pour forth the grace of His benediction, and preserve the gifts of the consecration bestowed,'—'on these Thy servants send forth the spirit of Thy benediction,'—'send forth on them the Holy Ghost, by whom they may be strengthened for the work of faithfully executing their ministry with the gift of Thy sevenfold grace.' Thus only the sanctifying graces are mentioned,—that they may faithfully execute their office, and live a becoming life. The Order is treated as an office to which persons are chosen by human appointment, and not by Divine election; and the rite seems to be framed with the view of

³⁶ Maskell's *Mon. Ritual*, vol. iii, p. 197.

purposely excluding the idea of a sacramental character. It does not therefore appear how the Church could recognise a form which excludes both the sense that she attaches to the conferring of the sacrament, and the intention of doing what she does.

We now come to the 'Form of ordering of Priests.' This rite is much the same with that for Deacons to the end of the Litany. Then there is an exhortation and an examination, which, except in the promise to obey the Ordinary, are entirely novel. Even Sir W. Palmer says, 'The questions which follow the address in our ordinal seem to be in some degree peculiar to it.'³⁷ After the questions the Bishop prays that God, who hath given them the will, may grant also power and strength to perform, 'that He may accomplish His work which He hath begun in them.'

Then the people are recommended to pray 'for all these things;' and a pause is to be made for that purpose. But 'all these things' mean only strength and power to act up to their profession, and that the Divine work begun in them may be accomplished. Here is no idea of the gift of sacramental grace.

The *Veni Creator* is then said according to the present book, though in the first book it came at the beginning of the ceremony; and the imposition of hands is not given altogether without a preparatory prayer, as in the case of Deacons. A prayer is said by the Bishop, after the following sort: First, mention is made of the mission of 'Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors, by whose ministry our Lord's flock throughout the world was gathered together.' So far the example of ancient forms, including the Roman Pontifical, is followed in some measure. Then, apparently because the Consecration Prayer in the Pontifical, running in the mode of a Preface, begins with giving thanks, this prayer has more of

³⁷ *Orig. Liturg.*, vol. ii, p. 303.

thanks than of petition. It proceeds: 'For these so great benefits, and for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call these Thy servants to the same office and ministry, we render thanks.' And there is no more petition than that 'we may continue to show ourselves thankful, and daily increase in knowledge and faith. So that as well by these Thy ministers as by them over whom they are appointed ministers, Thy name may be glorified and Thy kingdom enlarged.' This is all. Almighty God is thanked for having called them to the ministry, but He is not supplicated to accept them, or to make them priests or ministers, or to bestow upon them any grace whatever. This prayer therefore has nothing sacramental in it. The sole end of it is, that the persons ordained may be worthy of and fruitful in their ministry. It is taken as a matter of course, that being 'admitted priests,' they become priests without any Divine gift of grace or power.

So far is preparatory; then comes the imposition of hands with the words accompanying it. These are the only mystical words used throughout the rite, and if there be any sacramental form in the rite, it would seem to be found in these words.

We know by the decision of the Church, that as far as words go, this form is adequate and sufficient. But there arises a farther question, on the principles previously referred to, whether they are used in the sense in which the Church intends the sacrament to be given, or whether such a sense is excluded from them. They must, then, be considered in two ways; first, as they stood formerly down to the revision of 1662; and secondly, with the words then added.

The words in the Prayer Book of 1549, and down to 1662, were as follows: 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacra-

ments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' This form is ambiguous; for there is no mention of the order to be conferred, nor of the special end for which the words are used.

We know that the same is the case with the words 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' as used in the Pontifical for the consecration of Bishops. And Catholic theologians teach that the end for which the words are said is defined by their use in connection with the rest of the rite. Bramhall and other Anglican writers argue in the same way, that the sense of the words in the ordination of Priests is sufficiently defined by the previous rite, with which they are to be taken in conjunction. What, then, is the sense which the rest of the rite leads us to attach to them?

There is a Collect similar to that in the Ordination of Deacons, praying, 'replenish them so with truth of doctrine and innocency of life, that by word and example they may faithfully serve Thee in this office;' there is an exhortation reminding them 'to how high a dignity, and how chargeable an office they be called, to be messengers, watchmen, pastors, and stewards of the Lord, to teach, premonish, feed, and provide for the Lord's family;' there is a prayer, that 'by these Thy ministers, Thy name may be glorified and Thy kingdom enlarged;' and there is a prayer at the end of all, 'to send upon these Thy servants Thy heavenly blessing, that they may be clad with justice, and that Thy word spoken by them may have success.' Thus the priesthood is represented solely as an office, and that office is only for teaching, preaching, and dispensing sacraments; and the graces asked for are no more than those of fidelity in discharging the duties of this office, and goodness of life. This is all that can be gathered from the rite itself as to what the priesthood is; and as the compilers of the rite have deliberately omitted all such expressions as 'quos ad presbyterii

munus elegit; 'benedictionem Sancti Spiritus, et gratiam sacerdotalis (or spiritualis)³⁶ effunde virtutem; 'quos tua pietatis aspectibus offerimus consecrandos; 'da in hos famulos tuos presbyterii dignitatem; every idea is excluded of the Divine election to the function of the presbyterate; of the dignity of the presbyterate being a gift of God; of the power of sacerdotal or spiritual grace being bestowed with the benediction of the Holy Ghost; of the ordaining Bishop offering the candidates to be consecrated in the sight of God. Thus all the meaning that can be attached to the words in question is as follows: 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the faithful discharge of your duties, and for making your lives conformable to the same.' All other meaning was, from the first, excluded from the words.

But then other words were added in 1662, as follows: 'for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.' This, then, is the interpretation of the words given and accepted by the Anglican Church itself. The additional words have fixed and limited the meaning of the formula, and have confirmed that which attaches to it from the rest of the rite. The Holy Ghost is to be received 'for the office and work of a Priest committed unto thee.' The words require consideration separately. It is 'for the office and work; that is, to enable thee to fulfil the office and work; it is 'an office and work,' but no more, —that is the highest idea; it is 'committed unto thee,' but no more than committed. The words do not convey such a meaning as that the Holy Ghost is received as the spiritual power or sacramental character of the priesthood. It is all external—an office and work committed unto thee; but there is nothing internal; nothing of a power and grace conferred upon thee; nothing of a dedication of

³⁶ *sacerdotalis* in Winton, Exon, and Roman Pontificals; *spiritualis* in the Sarum.

thymself to God, or receiving a consecration from Him. The words do not and cannot mean nor include such a sense as 'the character conferred.' No such sense as this was intended to be given to the words by the divines of 1662; no such idea entered their minds. The word 'committed' is not a sacramental word, and excludes the idea of sacramental grace. The Church *gives* or *confers* her sacraments, but does not *commit* them. 'To commit' implies that something is to be rendered back again in the shape of a trust, or deposit, or function, but not that anything is given to the receiver as his own possession.

It is true that there are other words following these, viz. 'whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.' These words, it may be said, imply the exercise of priestly power, and taken with the preceding, they must be intended to confer the power they express, and must be sufficient to express the gift of sacerdotal grace. If indeed such an idea as this had not been so carefully excluded from the rest of the rite, these words would naturally appear to be used in the Catholic sense. But as the Reformers distorted the words of Scripture to their own purposes, it is necessary to inquire in what sense these words are used. The Lutherans maintained that the power of absolution in the Church is only that of declaring that God does forgive the penitent and receive him into favour, but not that of conveying the grace of the Divine pardon to the soul. And while the Anglican Prayer Book has retained two ancient forms of absolution, it has introduced another which simply expresses the Lutheran doctrine above mentioned; so that it is left quite an open question in which of the two senses these words are to be understood. The use of these words cannot therefore clear up the ambiguity of the form.

It may also be said, that the grace and power of the priesthood are sufficiently expressed in the words next

following those last mentioned, namely, 'be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy sacraments.' But these words were not part of the ancient rite; they are the very form of expression which the Lutherans used, to deny that there was any other function, or power, or action of the priesthood than to preach the word of God and to dispense the sacraments. The words come from Luther, invented by him to deny that the priests of the Church can consecrate, or offer, or bless, or absolve. And as to the sacraments, Luther taught that they are not instrumental means of grace, but only assurances of God's promises, and of the receiver's being in His favour. This is the doctrine taught, not only in the twenty-fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles, but also twice expressed in the Book of Common Prayer.³⁷ Thus, then, these words by no means serve to express the power of the priesthood; and so far from helping to give a Catholic sense to the formula to which they are attached, they do but confirm the meaning which has been attributed to it, namely, that it is only grace for the faithful discharge of the duties of an office which is there indicated, and not a gift of power implanted in the soul. They, therefore, appear to exclude the idea of such a priesthood as the Church understands.

Thus, then, we have come back to Courayer's description of the rite, namely, that the prayers contain 'an invocation of the Holy Spirit to obtain all the graces necessary for the worthy discharge of the functions.' And we find that it does contain prayers to the end that he describes, but no more. There is no indication of looking for a gift of grace special to the order, nor for any interior sacramental consecration, nor for any special power of the priesthood; such a gift of grace as communicated through the imposition of hands is unasked for, unrecognised, unknown; it is completely ignored. Those parts of the

³⁷ See in this Chapter before, p. 209, 205.

ancient Catholic rite which expressly indicated such a grace are omitted, and the portions of the ceremony still retained are so changed as to exclude any such idea. The forms and phrases used are either new, or else applied in a sense quite different from that understood by the Catholic Church.

There is, therefore, very grave doubt thrown upon the validity of an ordination conferred by such a rite.

We are then brought to 'the Form of consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop,' which commences with the presentation of the elect to the Archbishop by two other Bishops. The rubric in the ancient English Pontificals directs that the elect should be led by the hand before the Archbishop for examination by two provincial Bishops, but no form of words to be used in the presentation is mentioned. In the Anglican rite a form similar to that for Priests and Deacons is prescribed, but no inquiry as to worthiness is made, because the Royal mandate for the consecration is taken as sufficient guarantee of the merits of the elect, in the same manner as the Apostolic mandate is received according to the Roman Pontifical.

The Archbishop then, before commencing the Litany, commends the elect to the prayers of the congregation, saying, 'Let us . . . first fall to prayer before we admit and send forth this person presented to us, to the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him.' But he does not tell them what they are to pray for, although in the Sarum Pontifical the recommendation was to pray 'that the goodness of God would bestow the abundance of His grace.' There is a reference here to a Divine call, 'the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him'; as there is in the exhortation to the candidates for priesthood, — 'this office whereunto it hath pleased God to call you.' But there is nothing to show that this call means more than the answer in the Catechism,

that we should not be hasty in laying on hands, and admitting of any person to the government of the congregation of Christ, which he hath purchased with no less price than the effusion of his own blood;

afore that I admit you to this administration whereunto ye are called, I will examine you in certain articles, to the end the congregation present may have a trial and bear witness how ye be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God.

Thus there is an appearance of preserving the ancient form, but it has been so contrived as to give it an entirely Lutheran turn. In the Pontifical the Elect is described as one 'who is elected to the order of the Episcopate,' or 'who is to be ordained;' while the Prayer Book has no such phrases, but speaks of 'admitting to the government of the congregation of Christ' (in the present book, 'to government in the Church of Christ'), or 'I admit you to this administration, whereunto ye are called,' the last four words being omitted in the present book. Again, in the Pontifical the purpose with which the profession of faith and of right intentions is to be made is stated to be partly for the instruction of the Elect, and partly to free the consciences of the consecrating Bishops. But in the Prayer Book all this is omitted, and there is brought in instead, 'to the end the congregation present may have a trial and bear witness.' Thus the few slight phrases that are preserved show that the compilers had the ancient form before them, and that, while keeping up a pretence

secundum Apostoli dictum, manus cito nemini imposueris;

et ut etiam is qui ordinandus est, antea erudiat, qualiter sub hoc regimine constitutum oportet

conversari in ecclesia Dei,

et ut irprehensibiles sint etiam qui ei manus ordinationis imponunt.

namely, 'the state of life unto which it shall please God to call me,'—that is to say, it means either the interior vocation, or the exterior calling, 'according to the order of the realm;' but it does not mean the Divine election conveyed through the sacrament.

In the Litany the 'sanctificare' and the 'consecrare' are omitted, and the suffrage is similar to that for Deacons and Priests, namely, 'that it may please Thee to bless this our brother elected, and to send Thy grace upon him, that he may duly execute the office whereunto he is called.' Thus the grace asked for is only for the due execution of an office, and not for any interior sanctification, or sacramental consecration. At the end of the Litany a prayer is said similar to the collect in the 'ordering of Deacons and Priests,' namely, 'for truth of doctrine and innocency of life, that he may faithfully serve Thee in this office.' Thus the sole idea still runs upon goodness of life, and the faithful discharge of the duties of an office.

The introduction to the examination is partly taken from the Sarum Pontifical,³⁸ as will appear by comparing the two.

SARUM PONTIFICAL.

Antiqua sanctorum patrum institutio docet et præcipit, ut is qui ad ordinem episcopatus eligitur, antea diligentissime examinetur cum omni caritate, de fide Sanctæ Trinitatis, et interrogetur de diversis causis vel moribus, que huic regimini congruunt, et necessaria sunt retineri,

PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

Brother, forasmuch as holy Scripture and the old Canons commandeth

³⁸ Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* vol. iii. p. 244. It is added in a note that 'the whole of this part of the office is now inserted into the Roman Pontifical, but according to Martène it was anciently peculiar to France and England, and not earlier than the eleventh century.' But it is also found in the ancient Roman Pontifical published by Muratori (col. 434) which seems to be not much later than that century.

of the same thing, they deliberately altered it, in order to reduce it to the Lutheran and Zuinglian notions of a mere admission to an office, and a trial before the congregation.

The examination itself will be considered later on, together with that for Deacons and Priests.

After the examination, a prayer is said similar to that in the Ordering of Priests, though it seems partly taken from this place of the Pontifical. It is, however, only a prayer that the Elect may have grace to act up to the professions he has made.

There is no such mention of the functions of a Bishop as in the Pontifical: 'Episcopum oportet judicare, interpretari, consecrare, confirmare, ordinare, offerre, et baptizare.' The functions alluded to in the examination are, 'to govern, to instruct, to teach and exhort, to convince gainsayers, to drive away erroneous doctrine, to correct and punish;' and to these was added in 1662, 'to ordain.' But as it stood at first there was no allusion to administering any sacrament, or to anything requiring the power of Order.

The *Veni Creator* is then said, after which comes a prayer. The new form has passed over entirely those two prayers of the Pontifical which contain the petitions for the grace of the Order, namely, 'turning over on this Thy servant the horn of sacerdotal grace, pour forth on him the power of Thy benediction;' 'this Thy servant, whom Thou hast elected to the ministry of High Priesthood;' 'complete, O Lord, in Thy priest the sum of Thy ministry.' But certain expressions are retained and taken from the latter part of the long prayer anciently called 'Consecratio,' which is now divided into two by the rite of unction, both according to the Sarum and the present Roman Pontifical. The Anglican prayer begins in a manner similar to that in the 'Ordering of Priests,' mentioning the making of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors,

and doctors; and when it comes to the petition, it may be compared with the Pontifical, as follows:

SARUM PONTIFICAL.

PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

Sint speciosi, munere tuo, pedes
ejus
ad evangelizandum pacem

Grant, we beseech thee, to this
thy servant such grace,
that he may be evermore ready
to spread abroad thy gospel,
and glad tidings

ad evangelizandum bona tua.
Da ei, Domine, ministerium
reconciliationis

of reconciliation to God,

in verbis et in factis, in virtute
signorum et prodigiorum. Sit
sermo ejus, et prædicatio, non
in persuasibilibus humane sapi-
entiae verbis, sed in ostensione
spiritus et virtutis. Da ei, Domi-
ne, claves regni cælorum,
ut utatur, non glorietur, potestate
quam tribuisti,
in ædificationem, non in destruc-
tionem.

and to use the authority
given unto him,
not to destroy, but to save, not
to hurt, but to help,

Quodcumque ligaverit super
terram, sit ligatum et in cælis,
et quodcumque solverit super
terram, sit solutum et in cælis.
Quorum detinuerit peccata, de-
tenta sint, et quorum dimiserit,
tu dimittas. Qui maledixerit ei,
sit ille maledictus; qui benedix-
erit ei, benedictionibus replea-
tur.

Sit fidelis servus et prudens,
so that he as a faithful and wise
servant,

quem constituas tu, Domine,
super familiam tuam,
ut det illis cibum in tempore op-
portuno,

giving to thy family meat in due
season,
may at the last day be received
into joy.

et exhibeat omnem hominem
perfectum. Sit sollicitudine im-
piger, sit spiritu fervens. Oderit

superbiam, humilitatem diligat, nec eam unquam deserat, aut laudibus aut timore superatus. Non ponat lucem tenebras, nec tenebras lucem : non dicat malum bonum, nec bonum malum. Sit sapientibus et insipientibus debitor, ut fructum de profectu omnium consequatur. Tribuas ei, Domine, cathedram episcopalem, ad regendam ecclesiam tuam et plebem sibi commissam. Sit ei auctoritas, sit ei potestas, sit ei firmitas. Multiplices super eum benedictionem et gratiam tuam ; ut ad exorandam semper misericordiam tuam tuo munere idoneus, et tua gratia possit esse devotus.

Per Dominum &c. Amen.

Through &c. Amen.

From this prayer then there has been selected just so much as to ask for the Elect the grace of zeal in preaching, and of fidelity and discretion in the use of his authority ; but every phrase that expresses a Divine power, an authority coming from God, a sacramental efficacy, is studiously omitted. There is no prayer for the gift of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, nor of the power of binding and loosing, nor of the episcopal chair to rule the Church and people committed to him. Almighty God is not asked to be his authority, his power, his firmness. He is to be ready to preach the Gospel and glad tidings of reconciliation ; but the ministry of reconciliation is not given to him. He is to be the faithful and wise servant, giving the Lord's family meat in due season, but not one whom God himself sets over His family. Even 'the power which Thou dost bestow' is changed into 'the authority given unto him,' leaving the source of the authority untold. And when we look back, in order to know what the authority is, we find only 'such authority as ye have

by God's word, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of this realm.' Thus the prayer is only for grace to fulfil certain duties, and it does not ask for, nor recognise any sacramental gift whatever.

This prayer is followed by the imposition of hands, with the form, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, &c.* These are the only words in the rite capable of being used in a mystical or sacramental sense. In King Edward's First Book, and down to the revision in 1662, the words stood as follows: 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands ; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness.' These words, as it has been observed by former controversialists, do not contain any mention of the special end for which they are used, or of the particular grace they are intended to convey ; and therefore, just as in the Roman Pontifical, they must be taken in connection with the rest of the rite preceding and following. We know that the Pontifical does express the Divine election, and the grace of the episcopal Order. But on going through the Anglican rite, we have seen that there is no intimation of anything more than the Divine grace and blessing in the performance of the duties of a certain office. What is there, then, to give any further sense to this form? The words taken from St. Paul cannot do so, for they are only an exhortation referring to grace already in possession, and do not indicate the communication of the episcopal character.

But in the revision of 1662 the words received a similar alteration with the form for priests, and they now stand as follows: 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of

God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.' The remarks which were made with regard to the form for priests are equally applicable here. The additional words do not express in any way the power and character of the episcopal order, but only grace for an office and work committed. They thus fix upon the original words the sense which is implied through all the rest of the rite, and they exclude any sacramental sense from being attached to them. The grace that is asked and looked for is such as is invoked with the imposition of hands in the benediction of an Abbot, and no more.

The rite is not concluded with the imposition of hands. In the book of 1549 some further relics of the ancient rite were preserved. The Archbishop was 'to lay the Bible upon his neck, with an exhortation,' and then to 'put into his hand the pastoral staff,' with another exhortation. By the change in 1552 the two exhortations were thrown into one, the pastoral staff was disused, and the Bible was to be given into the hand of the newly-consecrated instead of being laid on his neck. Certain expressions in the exhortation seem to be taken from the ancient rite; but with an occasional diversion of the sense from the original meaning, such as we have met with before: for instance, the increase of grace in the Bishop himself is turned to the increase of fruit of his preaching among the people.

SARUM PONTIFICAL.

Accipe evangelium, et vade,
prædica populo tibi commissio:

potens est enim Deus augere tibi
gratiam suam, qui vivit &c.

PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine; think upon those things contained in this book, be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. . . .

Præcipe, Domine, huic pastore oves tuas, ac tribue ut in comissa gregis custodia sollicitus pastor vigilet. (*From the prayer, Pater sancte.*)

Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf; feed them, devour them not.

Sustentator humane imbecillitatis Deus, benedic baculum istum, et quod in eo exterius designatur, interius in moribus famuli tui propitiationis clementia operetur.

Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind together the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost.

Accipe baculum pastoralis officii: et sit in corrigendis vitiis pie severiens, iudicium sine iratenens,³⁶ in fovendis virtutibus auditorum animos demulcens, in tranquillitate severitatis censuram non deserens.

Be so merciful, that you be not too remiss; so minister discipline, that ye forget not mercy; that when the Chief Shepherd shall come, ye may receive the immarcescible crown of glory, through, &c.

The rite ends with a prayer which seems to be partly taken from the *Pater sancte*; a prayer probably peculiar to the English Church, and as ancient as the tenth century. It presents features more closely agreeing with this prayer than with the Benediction referred to by Mr. Blunt.³⁷

SARUM PONTIFICAL.

Pater sancte, omnipotens Deus,
presta ut hic famulus tuus sit tuis ministeris cunctisque fideliter gerendis officiis dignus, ut antiquitus instituta sacramentorum possit mysteria celebrare, et per te in summum ad quod assumitur sacerdotium consecratur.
Sit super eum benedictio tua,

PRAYER BOOK OF 1549.

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee,

to send down upon this thy servant thy heavenly blessing.

³⁶ In the Winchester Pontifical, 'cum iratus fueris, misericordie reminiscens.' Maskell's *Mon. Rit.* vol. iii. p. 266.

³⁷ *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 577.

licet manu nostra sit porrecta.
 Præcipe, Domine, huic pascere
 oves tuas, ac tribue ut in com-
 missa gregis custodia sollicitus
 pastor vigilet.

Spiritus huic sanctus tuus coeles-
 tium charismatum divisor assis-
 tat, ut sicut electus gentium doc-
 tor instituit, sit justitia non in-
 digens, benignitate pollens, hos-
 pitalitate diffusus ;
 servet in exhortationibus alacri-
 tatem, in persecutionibus fidem,
 in caritate patientiam, in veritate
 constantiam, in hæresibus ac-
 mulationibus nesciat, in judicis
 gratiosum esse sinas, et gratum
 esse concedas.

Postremo, omnia a te largiter
 discat, quæ salubriter tuos do-
 ceat.

Sacerdotium ipsum opus esse
 existimet, non dignitatem.
 Proficiant ei honoris augmenta,
 etiam ad incrementa meritorum :
 ut per hæc, sicut apud nos nunc
 asciscitur in sacerdotium, ita
 apud te postea asciscatur in reg-
 num.

Here, as usual, the petition that the new Bishop may obtain the Divine consecration to the high priesthood for which he is chosen, is omitted ; and the meagre adaptation, such as it is, retains only petition for grace to be zealous in preaching, and an example of virtue 'to such as believe.'

After this full examination of the Anglican rite, we are driven to the conclusion, that it contains and is founded upon the Lutheran doctrine, namely, that Ordination is

and so endue him with thy Holy Spirit,

that he, preaching thy word, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke, with all patience and doctrine,

but also may be to such as believe an wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity, and purity,

that faithfully fulfilling his course at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness, laid up by the Lord, the righteous Judge, who, &c.

only the public recognition and admission of a person to an office, with prayers that he may have grace to be faithful to the duty imposed upon him, and to live in a manner consistent with the same ; and thus that it excludes the idea of a sacrament, or of any sacramental grace being conferred therein. Hence arises the very grave doubt, whether the sacrament of Holy Order can be validly administered with such a form ?

The view here taken of the Anglican rite is not new among Catholic writers. It has before this time been pointed out that in the imposition of hands in making ministers no Protestant writers 'acknowledge any grace given withal,' but 'make it a bare ceremony ;' that in the Anglican form of admitting deacons 'there is no true consecration of a deacon ;' and in that of Bishops there is nothing 'that may by probable or possible means give episcopal order.'

Thus in an early controversialist :

'Now concerning imposition or laying on of hands in making their ministers . . . none of them all make more of it than of the like Judaical ceremony in the old law ; not acknowledging that there is any grace given withal, though the Apostle says there is, in express terms. But they will answer this text (as they are wont) with a favourable translation, turning grace into gift. As when the Apostle saith thus : "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which is given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of priesthood ;" they translate, "Neglect not the gift ;" and Beza, most impudently, for "by prophecy" translateth "to prophecy ;" making that only to be this gift, and withal adding this goodly exposition, that he had the gift of prophecy before, and now by imposition of hands was chosen only to execute that function. But because it might be objected that the Apostle saith, "which was given thee" with the imposition of hands ; or, as he speaketh in another place, "by imposition of hands," making this imposition of hands an instrumental cause of giving this grace, he saith that it did only confirm the grace or gift before given.

Thus it is evident, that though the Apostle speak never so plain for the dignity of holy orders, that it giveth grace, and consequently is a sacrament ; they pervert all to the contrary,

making it a bare ceremony, suppressing the word "grace," which is much more significant to express the Greek word than "gift" is, because it is not every gift, but a gracious gift, or a gift proceeding of marvellous and mere grace.³⁸

Fulke replies, admitting in fact the justice of Martin's criticism:

'Though we find that by or with imposition of hands many rare and extraordinary gifts, of prophecy, of tongues, and such-like, were given in the Apostles' time, yet we find nowhere that grace is ordinarily given by that ceremony, used always in the Church for ordination of the ministers thereof. . .

'Here is no evidence at all that the order of priesthood is a sacrament, or giveth grace; but that God, by the ceremony of laying on of hands, did give wonderful and extraordinary gifts of tongues and prophesying in the beginning and first planting of the Church. But that grace should always follow that ceremony, there is no proof to be made out of the Holy Scriptures. And experience showeth that he which was void of gifts before he was ordained priest, is as very an ass and dogbolt as he was before, for any increase of grace or gracious gifts, although he have authority committed unto him.'³⁹

A Catholic writer upon the Thirty-nine Articles speaks as follows:

'Howsoever we expound this pretended Protestant making or admitting deacons . . . here is no true consecration of a deacon. For giving the New Testament and power to read the Gospel cannot be the full and lawful manner to make deacons. . . Nor can the taking authority to execute the office of a deacon be the manner; for no man can truly and lawfully execute that wherein he hath no power, and here is no power of a deacon given in all this their form and order.'⁴⁰

'And these Protestants' form of making their pretended Bishops is also utterly overthrown. . . For there is not any one singular or privileged thing, sign, ceremony, word, or act, that may

³⁸ *Discoverie of the manifold Corruptions of the Scriptures by the Hereticks of our daies, specially the English Sectaries.* By Gregory Martin. Rhemes, 1582, 8vo, p. 227.

³⁹ *Fulke's Defence of the sincere and true Translations of the holy Scriptures.* Ed. Parker Society, p. 468-9.

⁴⁰ *Judgment of the Apostles &c. in points of Doctrine set downe in the XXXIX. Articles.* By Richard Broughton. Douay, 1632, 8vo, p. 358.

by probable or possible means give episcopal order . . . for here is no more done or said than was in their making of pretended priests or ministers before; for these the same were their ceremony and words: Receive the Holy Ghost.'⁴¹

'Here is no material difference; a Bishop is pretended consecrator in both alike; the ceremony of laying on of hands is the same; the words spoken do not differ; in both there is the same sentence and sense. . . In the pretended ordination of Bishops there is no power at all given, but the party only put in mind or admonished to stir up that grace which was in him before,—the very same words which St. Paul, absent, wrote to St. Timothy long after he had consecrated him priest.'⁴²

A third authority is the celebrated Franciscus a Sancta Clara, who has drawn out an elaborate argument on the subject;⁴³ and the fact is the more remarkable from his having been by Dr. Lee and others alleged as an authority in favour of the validity of Anglican orders, on account of his remarks on the 36th Article. And in the work now referred to he is at some pains to show that his later argument is not inconsistent with that in his earlier publication. It will be worth while to quote the whole passage, although it runs to considerable length. For brevity's sake the spelling is modernised; some evident errors of the press are also corrected; and some passages are omitted, including one from Bishop Bonner's Homilies, already quoted in this work.

'Whether ordination and jurisdiction are extinct in Protestants, according to faith?

Disciple. A main point remains, namely, concerning the ordination and jurisdiction of the Protestant clergy, whether it is matter of faith with you, that they are not really Bishops and Priests. You know, they strongly, and of late with more heat than ordinary, urge their succession from you, as appears in Mr. Mason, my Lord of Canterbury, my Lord of Londonderry, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Ferne, Dr. Hammond, and other present writers.

⁴¹ *Judgment of the Apostles &c.* p. 370-2.

⁴² *Ibid.* p. 372-3.

⁴³ *An Enchiridion of Faith.* By Francis Coventry. 2d edition, Douay, 1655. The above was one of the author's assumed names, and the book is placed in the list of his works by Ant. a Wood and Dodd.

Master. This business hath been always ventilated even from the beginning of the schism, and of late renewed in the case of D. Goffe at Paris, who was reordained, as all others have been; and therefore it is worthy our searching the common sense of Catholic Doctors in it.

First, as to what concerns the forms which I find in their Articles: it is not anywhere declared heresy in our Councils to hold them valid, as never having been declared invalid; insomuch that, according to the principles of Innocent IV. and other Doctors, we can only condemn them as unlawful, being different from the forms prescribed by holy Church; all which S. Clement⁴⁴ shows largely.

Secondly, as to their succession; it being matter of fact, and depending upon records, I do not see grounds for matter of faith; so that for what concerns their forms used in ordination, and their succession of valid ordinarors, being both simply looked into without any further relations, I shall not have occasion to intermeddle with as to faith.

Neither is it necessary to examine, much less to deny, St. Clement's Paraphrase upon the 36th Article—the title is, *De Episcoporum et Ministrorum consecratione*—where he concludes that, *si nihil aliud obstat*, their ordination, forasmuch as concerns their form and matter, will be valid, *if there is nothing else to hinder it*. Notwithstanding all which, after a serious and sincere examination, I must put this final resolution as a most indubitable conclusion of your question:

Conclusion. According to the clear sense of the ancient and present Universal Church, their ordinations are ipso jure invalid; which I shall with modesty and truth endeavour to declare.

The holy Council indeed of Nice, in Canon 19, defineth the Baptism of the Paulianists and Cataphrygians to be invalid, and consequently all their ordinations, as is there also declared, which doth appear in these words: *Si quis confugit ad ecclesiam Catholicam de Paulianistis et Cataphrygis, statutum est rebaptizari eos esse debere; si qui vero clericæ erunt apud eos, siquidem inculpatis fuerint et irreprehensibiles, rursus etiam ordinentur ab Episcopo Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, &c.*

And in like manner touching the Photinians is decreed in two Synods of Arles, Can. 16. I know some bring the 7th Canon of Laodiceæ for the contrary; but it was adjectitious as to the Pho-

⁴⁴ Here, and in two other places, 'S. Clement' is printed, meaning S^{ca} Clara; whether by error, or (to use the author's own phrase) *de industria*, in order to conceal himself more closely, it is not easy to say.

tinians, as it appears, being not found in many copies, and evidently was against the sense of holy Church declared at Arles out of Nice.

It is true, these come not home to our case, by reason, as Zonaras and our other histories witness, they wholly changed the forms in substantial; but the Arians did either not change the form of Baptism at all, as to the order of words, which is intimated in the Council of Arles, Can. 17 (where, you know, the passages of Nice are recorded), which I think evident as to the generality of them, or at the most, some Arians changed it thus: *In the name of the Father, by the Son, and in the Holy Ghost*; as Baronius holds out of Sozomen, which I also think; because, as appears in the History of the Council of Nice by Sozomen (l. iii. c. 19 *in fine*), in the end of the Psalms they did change the Doxology, *Gloria Patri, per Filium, in Spiritu Sancto &c.*, which the Council reformed to the form before and since in the Universal Church of *Gloria. Patri et Filio &c.*, which change of theirs seems not so important as to annul Baptism, except depraved by some impious interpretation of introducing a minority or nonconstantly in the Son with the Father; as in the like manner touching the procession of the Holy Ghost a *Patre per Filium*, as some orthodox Fathers speak; as is also recorded in the Council of Florence, and rightly understood was not rejected.

Yet the judgment of the whole Catholic Church was and is, that Baptism administered by an Arian intending to oppose the Church's sense, that is, not to do what the Church doth, by that their imperfect form, would be invalid, and by consequence his ordination, though not differing essentially from the Catholic form, provided that he should hereby sufficiently manifest his depraved sense to be against the truth of Christ's institution as always admitted and understood by holy Church, as in their case this very change of the form being done upon design and pursuit of their heresy, was esteemed by holy Church to have declared them enough; and therefore St. Athanasius, *Serm. cont. Arianos*, shows they destroyed Baptism, because they gave it not *In Patre et Filio, but Creatore et creatura*: his words are these, *Ipsam quoque baptismum de Ecclesia tollent, cum negantes Filium cum Patre consubstantialitatem, non in Patre et Filio illum tribuerent, sed in Creatore et creatura.*

That these words are to be understood of those second sort of Arians we mentioned is clear. First, because he saith they did not baptise *in Patre et Filio*; which is true only of them.

Secondly, because, as I said before, the Baptism of the Arians,

as to the general, was declared valid in the 2d Council of Arles, universally received, by reason that they baptised *in nomine Trinitatis*; so that he cannot be thought to condemn their Baptism, which holy Church approved, especially considering that he himself was approved by all.

Thirdly, the first Synod of Arles, Can. 8, intimates that there were two sorts of Arians, whereof some baptised *in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto*, who were not to be rebaptised, others were to be baptised again by our priests, as is there decreed: the words are these: *De Arianis, qui propria lege sua utuntur, ut rebaptizentur, placuit, si ad Ecclesiam aliqui de hac hæreset venerint, interrogent eos et Spiritu Sancto eos baptizatos, manus iis tantum imponantur, ut accipiant Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogati non respondent hanc Trinitatem, baptizentur.* Which twofold sort of Arians, whereof one were baptised in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the other were not so, confirms clearly what we have asserted.

Hence you see also the reason why the Baptism of our old Protestants is adjudged valid by us and all Catholics who know truly the grounds of religion, and also both Baptism and Ordination of old in the Donatists, and now in the Greeks, though they somewhat differ from us in the forms, but not substantially, nor in a depraved sense.

I told you before, that if the ministers of sacraments should betray a want of due intention by their exterior manner of administration of them, that then in the judgment of the whole Church declared in the general Councils of Florence and Trent, the sacraments would undoubtedly be invalid. I touch not inferior intentions nor ways by outward acts expressed, of which holy Church taketh no cognisance.

It may be objected, that those Arians who baptised *in Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto* clearly indicated their depraved intentions by their public writings and actions to be contrary to holy Church, and yet their Baptism was valid. And by the same reason the ordination of Protestant clergy, differing not substantially in the form, though in their Articles they demonstrate their depraved intentions.

I answer, that those Arians did indeed declare by their other actions an *habitual* intention of baptising contrary to holy Church, which was not sufficient to invalidate the sacraments; and therefore the holy Church never used in matters of such heavy consequence to proceed upon such remote principles: but if they had sufficiently manifested an *actual* or even *virtual* intention opposite

to holy Church, it was also adjudged sufficient, as in the case of the second sort of Arians, who therefore are presumed to have changed the form, as the Protestants have done; it must in consequence to the sense of the universal Church declared in her Councils, irrefragably be concluded, all sacramental attempts grounded upon such forms to be invalid, being they clearly speak an *actual* contrary intention, at least in the first contrivers, being that the forms were therefore changed, which, as you know, sufficiently destroys all these successory attempts; and truly the continuance of the same forms speaketh at least a *virtual* depraved intention in their followers, which of itself is sufficient to the end we treat; as, on the contrary, a virtual intention to proceed according to the sense of the holy Church is by all judged sufficient for the force of any or all the sacraments; it being sufficient even according to philosophy, for the guidance of all human actions.

The application of this, or this explication given, is easy to the question of Ordination ministered by our Protestant Bishops; for though we should suppose, with St. Clement,⁴⁵ these forms not to be substantially changed, or their derivation of Episcopacy to have been originally and indeed from ours, as they seriously pretend; yet since they have changed the Church forms *de industria*, as the second sort of Arians did, to declare that they do not what the Church intends, and in pursuit thereof have solemnly decreed against the power of sacrificing and consecrating, that is, in the sense of the old and present Catholic Church, of changing the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ our Lord, as appears in the 28th and 31st Articles, it evidently concludes that they never did or could validly ordain priests, and consequently Bishops, having, as I say, expressed clearly the depravation of their intentions in order to the first and principal part of Ordination, which consisteth in the power *super corpus Christi* *verum* of sacrificing and consecrating his true body, by them professedly denied, and the sacrifice declared a *pernicious imposture* (a strange expression) in their Articles, never repealed or mitigated in any synod.

I said it is against the sense of the Catholic Church to deny the power of sacrificing, that is, by way of propitiation offering our blessed Lord's true Body and Blood; which I therefore said, because all general Councils inclusively from the first of Nice to the last of Trent, either occasionally or of set purpose, have declared the constant sense of the universal Church herein, as also all ancient Greek, Arabic, and Latin Liturgies fully speak it.

⁴⁵ i. e. S^u Clara.

I deny not but that eminent persons and Protestant prelates have in later years endeavoured to induce a more easy sense of the Articles touching the point of sacrifice; but that doth not at all change the state of the question touching the invalidity of their Ordination. For if once their Ordination was invalid by reason of their noncompliance with the Church's sense, which according to faith is required, and the first composers of the Articles had not; it is now too late to revalidate what from the beginning was null, according to the known rule of the law, the posterior ordainers, as you know, herein wholly depending on the first; so that there is no way now of invalidation, except by being anew ordained by holy Church, which would imply, if generally admitted, a happy business of reunion of all breaches: otherwise, if we should put the case, that they were now to be ordained according to the more temperate sense given of the later Doctors, yet neither would that serve the turn; first, because it is too late, as I have said, their former Ordinations being invalid, upon which their validity now depends, except they could derive a succession *per saltum* as from a great-grandfather without a father. Secondly, because even they who are most temperate, unanimously deny, with the contrivers of the Articles, according to the 31st Article, *sacerdotem offerre Christum*, that the priest doth offer Christ, which destroys the very life of our Christian sacrifice. All which ingeniously considered, I do not find any real or possible title (which I would gladly do, as being indeed a great enemy to multiplication of unnecessary differences, as true christian charity instructeth me) for their Ordination in the sense of the universal Church. Neither have any of their Doctors hitherto observed, much less infringed these grounds which I have laid out of Church monuments.

Though the Councils conclude not in formal terms the point here discussed of their Ordination, yet learned and temperate persons will judge how nearly it is concerned in their Acts, whereunto this syllogism will conduce:

All Ordinations celebrated in a form different from the Church, with an intention sufficiently expressed of opposition to her sense, are invalid, according to the definitions of the general Councils cited.

But their Ordinations are such as are already declared. Ergo:
Where you see my sense, or rather the sense of the whole Church, in what concerns your question touching faith as to this point of Ordination.'

From this long extract it appears that the author, Franciscus a S^{ta} Clara, was of opinion that, although the

forms of Ordination in the Anglican Church may be sufficient in themselves, yet as they have been changed *de industria* to declare that the ordainers do not intend what the Church intends, the Ordinations cannot be valid. The same has been the exact argument of this chapter; but S^{ta} Clara has spoken of the depraved intention as directed only against the power of sacrificing and consecrating, and has not drawn it out also as against the sacramental character of Holy Order.

This subject had, however, previously been touched on by a contemporary of S^{ta} Clara, who, like him, had been inclined to favour the idea of the return of the Anglican Church as a body to the Catholic faith. Fr. Leander a S^{to} Martino, O.S.B., was in frequent communication with King Charles's ministers, and was asked by Sir Francis Windebank to state what was absolutely necessary for making a Bishop. The following are extracts from the question and reply:

Question. What is absolutely necessary to Bishopdom or the ordination of a Bishop; without which the Ordination were frustrate, and with which it were substantially and essentially valid?

I. First, that the party to be consecrated be a christian man, for women are incapable of holy Orders, and *baptismus est janua sacramentorum*; so that whosoever is not baptised truly is incapable of any other sacrament, much more of this excellent Order.

II. The Consecrator must also be a true Bishop, and have intention to perform what holy Church intendeth by this rite, and use the matter and form which is received in the Church; otherwise he conferreth nothing valid. This intention is to be conformable to the acception or signification of the name of Bishop, received among Catholics: that is, he must intend to confer that power which the Catholic Church always understood to belong to the name and office of a Bishop.

III. Both Consecrator and he that is to be consecrated must first have received the power of Priesthood; that is, of sacrificing the sacrifice of the altar and of absolving penitents from their sins.

IV. These above-mentioned things are required necessarily to the substance of this sacrament, because without them the essence

of the sacrament cannot be validly introduced into the subject. Now the essence consisteth in the imposition of the hands of one or more Bishops; . . . which imposition of hands or χειροτονία, is the material sign or ceremony, accompanied for more expression with other signs, *traditio baculi pastoralis, mitre* &c., and in the words wherewith the Consecrator expresseth that he giveth power of Bishopdom to the party consecrated; and these words are called the form of the sacrament, which in the Greek Church are simply, That God's grace, by the Consecrator's ministry and consent of his fellow Bishops, promoteth such a venerable Priest N. to the dignity of Bishop: in which is sufficiently expressed the power of Bishopdom; which, according to the signification received in all the Greek Church, and understood so by all, containeth power of sacrificing, absolving from sins, confirming, ordering, jurisdiction over his church and flock, &c. But the form of the Latin Church is more expressive, setting down particularly in the form itself, or in the precedent instruction or following prayers, all the powers and functions of a Bishop.⁴⁵

Fr Leander had said that he answered Windbank's questions 'not without fear and trembling, since the first of them [viz. the question answered above] is a point that may give distaste, and I am wonderful loathe to give any.' It is evident that his reluctance arose from the conviction that his answer must be a condemnation of the Anglican Church. And in fact the principles he has laid down are quite opposed to the pretensions of Anglicans with regard to an episcopal succession. For he says that 'the essence of the sacrament consists as to the form in the words wherewith the Consecrator expresses his giving power of Bishopdom,' and that 'he must intend to confer that power which the Catholic Church always understood to belong to the name and office of a Bishop.' Now at the time he wrote, the words used in the Anglican rite did not express anything of 'Bishopdom,' and it has been shown from the rest of the rite that the Consecrator who uses it does not

⁴⁵ *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. i. p. 252, fol. Oxford, 1767. Printed also in *Lee's Validity of Orders of Church of England*, p. 84-7.

intend to confer the power which the Church understands to belong to a Bishop. Dr. Lee has quoted the document apparently without perceiving how far it tells against his argument.

To these earlier authorities may be added that of Archbishop Kenrick, who speaks as follows, though, like Franciscus a S^{ta} Clara, he has not carried out his principle beyond the doctrine of the holy Sacrifice: 'It is a settled principle with Catholics that no error about the nature or efficacy of a sacrament, no positive disbelief of its divine institution, or any other personal unworthiness on the part of him who administers it, can deprive such a sacrament of its effect, provided sufficient matter, valid form, and the due intention, concur in its administration. But if the matter be omitted, or curtailed of any essential part; if the form be vitiated, or if ambiguity be introduced, for the purpose of introducing error, it is no longer a valid means of producing sacramental effects.'⁴⁶

But, in reply to the previous line of argument, it may be urged that no difficulties of this sort have been raised with regard to the Abyssinian Ordinations; that in the case laid before the Sacred Congregation it is not stated that any prayers whatever are said, or any other words than the mere *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*; that if these words are sufficient in the Abyssinian case, they are also sufficient in the Anglican; and that it is unnecessary to make any further inquiries, when the Sacred Congregation was satisfied with the mere pronouncement of these words.

The facts so stated are correct; but then it is perfectly well known that even if the prayers prescribed by the Abyssinian sacred books are not said, yet that the faith and doctrine of the Abyssinian Church is expressed by those prayers, and that it is the same with the faith and doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding Holy Order and the Priesthood. There is no addition made to the

⁴⁶ *Validity of Ang. Ord.* p. 175.

words which excludes the due and proper sense from them, and therefore no doubt can exist about the sense in which the words are used in an Abyssinian ordination, though the practice is so far short of the theory.

There is also a certain faith and doctrine expressed in the Anglican forms of Ordination; and it is not the faith and doctrine of the Catholic Church, but that of Luther and other reformers. It is impossible to take the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* separately from the context in which they are found. And the context does exclude a due and proper sense, and fixes and determines the sense to be contrary to that of the Church Catholic.

Thus the Abyssinian Abuna, though he repeats no more than those three words, yet, following the traditions of his Church, expresses his faith with respect to the sacramental grace and power of the Order conferred in a manner agreeable with that of the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, the Bishop who uses the Anglican form in ordaining is not only prevented from attaching a right sense to those words, but openly declares and professes that he does not repeat them according to the sense in which the Catholic Church receives and uses them.

In the examination of the Anglican form the language throughout has been taken in its simple and natural meaning. But in order to show that the interpretation here given is not forced, it may be well to quote some writers contemporary with the formation of the rite.

First Jewell :

'Now are we to speak of the ministry of the Church, which some have called Holy Orders. Shall we account it a sacrament? there is no reason so to do. It is a heavenly office, a holy ministry or service. By such as have this office God lighteneth our darkness, He declareth His mind to us, He gathereth together His scattered sheep, and publisheth unto the world the glad tidings of salvation. The patriarchs did bear this office. This was the office of the prophets. . . .

'No doubt the ministry of the Gospel is highly to be esteemed, seeing our Saviour was not ashamed to publish the will of His Father in His own person; yet it appeareth not wherever He did ordain it to be a sacrament.'⁴⁷

Then Whitgift :

'To use these words : "Receive the Holy Ghost," in ordering of ministers, which Christ Himself used in appointing His Apostles, is no more ridiculous and blasphemous than it is to use the words that He used in the supper; but it is blasphemy thus outrageously to speak of the words of Christ. The Bishop by speaking these words doth not take upon him to give the Holy Ghost, no more than he doth to remit sins when he pronounceth the remission of sins; but by speaking these words of Christ, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted &c." he doth show the principal duty of a minister, and assureth him of the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, if he labour in the same accordingly.'⁴⁸

'Christ used these words : "This is my body," in the celebration of His supper; but there is no special commandment that the minister should use the same, and yet must he use them because Christ used them; even so, when Christ did ordain His Apostles ministers of the Gospel, He said unto them, "Receive the Holy Ghost &c.," which words, because they contain the principal duty of a minister, and do signify that God doth pour His Spirit upon those whom He calleth to that function, are most aptly also used of the Bishop (who is God's instrument in that business) in the ordaining of ministers. St. Paul, speaking to Timothy, saith : "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given unto thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the eldership." In which words the Apostle signifieth that God doth bestow His gifts and Spirit upon such as be called to the ministry of the word; whereof imposition of hands is a token, or rather a confirmation; and therefore saith M. Calvin that "it was not a vain ceremony, because God did fulfil with His Spirit that consecration which men did signify by imposition of hands." And surely, as that is no vain ceremony, though it be done by men, so these be no vain words, though they be spoken by men.'⁴⁹

Of course it is to be remembered, and has been

⁴⁷ A Treatise of the Sacraments, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 1129.

⁴⁸ Answer to the Admonition, *Works*, vol. i. p. 489.

⁴⁹ Defence of the Answer, p. 490.

already described, how great a change came over the theology of the Anglican Church after the books just quoted had been published, especially with regard to the doctrine of the sacred ministry. Hooker has propounded a doctrine very nearly Catholic in that solemn and beautiful language of which he is so great a master. He teaches that 'ministerial power is a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible, making them that have it a special order consecrated unto the service of the Most High;' ⁵⁰ and that 'the power and authority delivered with the words is itself *χρησµα*, a gracious donation which the Spirit of God doth bestow.'⁵¹ But though there is an elevation in his language above that of a dry theological treatise, yet we miss the definiteness which is to be looked for in a guide to our faith. You may read him through, and be fascinated with his style, yet in the end not be able to tell what he means you to believe. Thus, he avoids calling Holy Order a sacrament; and it is impossible to say whether he means that sacramental grace is conferred therein, or that the indelible character he speaks of is really a spiritual power impressed upon the soul. And then, after laying down the Catholic principles so far, and after saying that Bishops alone have the power of ordination, he makes the exception mentioned in a former chapter,⁵² to provide for the case, 'when the exigence of necessity doth constrain,' and allowing in such a case 'Ordination made without a Bishop; thus striking at the root of the doctrine of sacramental grace, and pulling down with one hand what he has built up with the other.'⁵³

Again Andrews:

'By these words are holy orders given, "Receive the Holy Ghost &c."... For these are the very operative words for the conferring this power, for the performing this act. Which act is here

⁵⁰ Keble's *Hooker*, vol. ii. p. 581.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 588.

⁵² p. 128. ⁵³ Vol. iii. pt. i. p. 285.

performed somewhat after the manner of a sacrament. For here is an outward ceremony, of breathing *instar elementi*; and here is a word coming to it, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." That some have therefore yielded to give that name or title to holy orders, as indeed the word sacrament hath been sometime drawn out wider, and so orders taken in. . . And if the grace here given had been *gratum factum*, as in a sacrament it should, and not, as it is, *gratis data*, but in office or sacrament: and again, if the outward ceremony of breathing had not been changed, as it hath plainly, it had been somewhat. But being changed after into laying on of hands, it may well be questioned.⁵⁴

Then Jeremy Taylor:

'In all orders there is the impress of a distinct character; that is, the person is qualified with a new capacity to do certain offices, which before his ordination he had no power to do. . . For "ordo" is defined by the schools to be "traditio potestatis spiritualis, et collatio gratiæ, ad obeunda ministeria ecclesiastica;" a giving a spiritual power, and a conferring grace for the performance of ecclesiastical ministrations.'⁵⁵

And lastly: Bramhall has explained the words of the Form of Ordination in the very sense which has been here attributed to them, as follows: 'The words of our Ordinal are clear enough: "Receive the Holy Ghost;" that is, the grace of the Holy Ghost to exercise and discharge the office of Priesthood, to which thou hast been now presented, to which thou hast been now accepted, and for which we have prayed to God, that in it thou mayest discharge thy duty faithfully and acceptably.'⁵⁶ There is nothing here that teaches the conferring of a sacramental grace in Holy Order, or anything more than that prayers are said for grace duly to discharge an office, which description applies as fully to the blessing of an Abbot, or the coronation of a King.

Mr. Mackenzie Walcott has summed up the general

⁵⁴ *Serm.* ix. On the Sending of the Holy Ghost, p. 263, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.

⁵⁵ *Episcopacy Asserted, Works*, vol. vii. p. 122.

⁵⁶ Bramhall's *Works*, vol. iii. p. 167.

teaching of Anglican Divines on this subject in the following section on—

'The effect of Ordination. The laying on of hands and prayer, with the delegation of ministerial order, constituting the essential and necessary form and matter of ordination, it remains to consider the Divine vocation, and the results of ordination. It is a sanctification of the person to do certain offices of religion, as in the case of Jeremiah (Jer. i. 5) and St. John Baptist (Luke i. 15), and also the imparting of grace to make the person meet to perform the same. The change of name adopted by St. Paul and St. Peter after their ordination expresses significantly the change of condition, the new honour sanctified by God. But as St. Jerome says, "Let every one prove himself, and so come; ecclesiastical order does not make a Christian" (*ad Heliod.* Ep. v. al. i.). The candidate is to be called to a high dignity and a weighty office and charge, to be a messenger, watchman, and steward of the Lord. He is to be a worker together with God (2 Cor. vi. 11), and giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed; approving himself in all things as the minister of God. He is to be one of that order of whom it is said that "he that heareth them heareth Christ" (Luke x. 16); he is to be God's witness (Luke xxiv. 47-8), to have power over all the power of the enemy (Luke x. 19), and to exercise a most solemn delegation (John

xx. 23). . . . The distinction between clergy and lay persons is asserted by several of the Fathers. . . . This distinction rests on the impression of the indelible ecclesiastical mark or character, the charisma certum veritatis, as Irenaeus terms it (*contr. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xxvi. § 2), or as St. Augustine's 'Sacramentum Ordinationis suae' (*de Bono Conji.* c. xxviii. and elsewhere). The same doctrine is stated by Bp. Jer. Taylor (*Episc. Assert.* s. xii. xxxi. 3), Abp. Potter (*Ch. Gov.* ch. v.), Prideaux (*Validity* &c. p. 25), Hooker (*Ecccl. Pol.* v. 77. § 3), Mason (*de Min. Angl.* l. ii. c. xi. § 6), and Bingham (*Orig. Ecclæs.* b. xvii. c. ii. § 5). It is that of the Canon Law, 'Si quis clericus relicto officii sui ordine laicam voluerit agere vitam vel se militie tradiderit, excommunicationis poena feratur' (Conc. Turon. A. D. 461. c. v.). 'Sanctorum decus honorum qualibet fuerit occasione perceptum manebit omnibus inconculsum' (viii. Conc. Tolet. A. D. 653. c. vii.). 'Ordo characterem, i. e. spirituale quoddam signum a ceteris distincturum imprimunt in anima indelibile' (Decretum Eugen. ad Armen. Conc. Flor. A. D. 1439. Compare Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. c. iv.). The Canonists use similar expres-

sions, . . . and our own Canons, 'Semel receptus in sacrum ministerium ab eo imposterum non discedet, nec se aut vestitum habitu aut in ulla vite parte geret pro laico' (Articuli, A. D. 1571); with which Canon 76 of 1604 concurs. This principle is grounded on the analogy of the perpetuity of the priesthood, both of Melchisedec and the Jews, and the Apostles and the clergy of the Primitive Church; on the enduring grace of holy baptism; on the self-dedication for life to God; on the fact that God has nowhere signified that the character will expire before death; on the actual unbroken tradition that re-ordination was a sacrilegious and heretical act, and that in cases even of deposition the exercise of sacred functions was only suspended.

'Holy orders are not denied, in a large sense of the word and in another nature, the name of a sacrament by the 9th Homily of the English Church, but, as being restricted to a class in the community, as lacking the promise of remission of sins, and not having any visible sign or ceremony ordained of Christ (Art. xxv.), and not being generally necessary to salvation, they are so called in an inferior sense to the two Sacraments of the Gospel. With this reservation, the Church of England regards Orders as a Sacrament, or rather as sacramental. . . . The Homilies say, "Neither Orders nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are" (p. 316). Melancthon included ordination among sacraments (*Loc. Theol.* t. i. p. 233-4). The greatest English Theologians, however, cautiously guard against any misapprehension of the term Sacrament, on the safe ground that the outward ceremony of breathing has been changed into laying-on of hands; that the form of words is given "as in the person of Christ," and not from ourselves; and that the grace given is "gratis data," not "gratum faciens;" but they still do not withhold the designation of Sacrament, provided that it be not understood as a true or necessary sacrament.' With references to Bp. Andrews, Bp. Jewell, Archbp. Wake; Calphill, Ans. to Martiall; Bp. Burnet, Vind. of Ord.; Archbp. Bramhall, Crakeanthorp, Bp. Beveridge.⁵⁷

The language of these writers, as well as of those referred to, is far from expressing the Catholic belief. Some of the expressions are Catholic, and so are the quotations from the Fathers and Councils; but these are accompanied with reservations that throw an ambiguity

⁵⁷ Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 539-40.

over the whole. Hence it is impossible to conclude whether any of them mean that Holy Order is a real Sacrament, conferring grace on the soul of the receiver as well as a spiritual power for the benefit of others; whether the grace of Ordination is conferred instrumentally through the imposition of hands with the form; or whether there is only a promise of grace, of which the imposition of hands is an effectual sign and an assurance; or whether the character is a real spiritual gift impressed upon the soul for all eternity, or only an external distinction, expressing the permanency of the gift of power, and the canonical regulation that a person once ordained cannot put off his character and become a layman again.

These references have been made in order that it should not be thought that the fact is overlooked of there being a school in the Anglican Church who approach nearer than others to Catholic doctrine. But, after giving all possible weight to this fact, the truth will remain the same, as Cressy stated it: 'Being assured that the main thing, and to me the most considerable advantage, which the English Church had above all others pretending to a Reformation, namely, a succession and authority of Bishops and other ecclesiastical Orders received from the Roman Church, was never confidently and generally taught in England to be of *Divine right*, and by consequence took no firm rooting in the consciences of English subjects.'⁵⁸ And indeed his statement may be extended so as to comprehend the whole dignity and sacramental efficacy of Holy Order; and thus it is the fact that there was no claim made to any power or authority conferred through the means of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, *jure divino*, for the first five-and-twenty years after the establishment of the Anglican Church, nor any profession of belief in such a power;

⁵⁸ Cressy's *Exomologesis, or Motives of Conversion*, p. 37.

that there is no indication of such a belief in the Formularies of the Anglican Church; that the claim and belief, when made and professed, were only maintained by a particular school or party, and were as vigorously denied and repudiated by another school or party; that those who have professed this belief have only declared it in vague, indistinct, and general terms; and that their strongest assertions are accompanied with such limitations and exceptions as destroy the effect of their previous professions, and are subversive of the nature of a Sacrament, and entirely opposed to the faith, the teaching, and the practice of the Catholic Church.

But, for the purpose of this inquiry, we have nothing to do with any opinions held or maintained within the Anglican Church. Our concern is only with the language of the Book of Common Prayer in its plain and obvious meaning, and the reasons that led its framers to adopt it. Those who came after them, whether of the school of Hooker and Laud or not, adopted the same language, and whatever their opinions were, they could not alter the original meaning of the words. But so far from wishing to alter it, the revisers of 1662 confirmed the first meaning by their additions.

Looking back now to these three Forms as a whole, we may see that they bear the outward resemblance of a Catholic rite, but with the thorough spirit that animated both the Lutheran and Calvinistic Reforms. The names of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; the Ember-days as the times of Ordination; the giving Orders during the celebration purporting to be the Holy Eucharist, and coming therein before the Gospel; the presentation to the Bishop by the Archdeacon, or to the Archbishop by the assistant Bishops; the notice and admonition to the people; the Litany; the giving an exhortation; the imposition of hands by the Bishop; the Priests joining in it for the Priesthood, and the assistant Bishops for the Episcopate;

In the English Reformation the usages of the ancient Canon Law were retained with regard to benefices, and the nomination and institution of ministers; and there is no open popular election. But an endeavour is made to engraft the Lutheran spirit upon the adaptation made of the ancient Catholic rite. The day of ordination was changed from Saturday in Ember-week to the Sunday, in order that the congregation might be present. So we learn from Bishop Pilkington, who says: 'The time of giving Orders now is the holy day, when the people be assembled, that they may see who be called: and if they know any notable fault in any of them that are to be appointed ministers or bishops, they may declare it, that they may be rejected as unworthy. The Popish prelates give their Orders on the Saturday, when the people is not present, and commonly at home in their chapels, where few resort to see.'⁶⁰

Then an examination is to be made, not only of Bishops, as in the ancient Church, but also of Priests and Deacons. This examination is not derived from the ancient Catholic Pontificals, but is intended to correspond to the Lutheran 'trial of ministers,' and to fulfil the direction of the Preface, as to being 'called and tried.' For in the 'Ordering' of Deacons, the Rubric directs the Bishop to 'examine every one of them in the presence of the people;' and in that of Priests, the Bishop says to them, 'And now, that this present congregation of Christ here assembled may understand your minds and wills in these things;' and to the Bishop-elect the Archbishop says, 'I will examine you in certain articles, to the end that the congregation present may have a *trial*, and bear

⁶⁰ Trent (Le Plat, *Mon. Concil. Trid.* vol. iv. p. 336), and condemned in the following Canon: 'If any one saith that orders conferred by bishops without the consent or vocation of the people, or of the secular power, are invalid; anathema.'

⁶¹ *Works*, p. 579, ed. Parker Society.

the words used, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.' are all Catholic. Giving the Bible or New Testament is derived from the Catholic rite. But these things are Catholic only in appearance. Each of them has undergone a change, and the ancient signification is lost or perverted. Not only is the sacramental efficacy destroyed, but a prominence is apparently given to the presence and action of the people, though practically not more than in the Pontifical; and a public profession is required from the ordained, even as to their interior motives, that savours strongly of the ideas propagated by Luther, and adopted by all the Continental Reformers.

The various schemes of Reformation among the Lutherans generally preserved the rights of patrons where they existed; but in other places the calling and election of ministers was to come from the people, or was to be made by the magistrates, or principal persons, in the name of the people. The Zuinglian Reform also allowed of nomination by the magistrates. Among the Calvinists, the ministers were to be elected by the people. But they all agreed in requiring a strict trial either before the congregation, or before some principal persons as representing it, of the life, doctrine, and learning of the candidates. And it was pretended that this discipline was in accordance with the usage of Scripture and of the primitive Church.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ The Reformers grounded their practice on the ancient discipline, which gave the people a voice at the time of ordination. 'Quoad inferiores Episcopatu ordine, certum est illos multo magis in arbitrio et potestate Episcoporum fuisse; quamquam ne ipsi quidem inconsulto Clero populoque, aut sine eorum suffragatione et testificatione cuiquam conferrentur' (Thomassinus, *Œtus et Nova Eccl. Discipl.* pars ii. lib. ii. cap. 1, § 8). Such a reference to the people is still made in the Pontifical; but the Reformers maintained, that, as the old discipline was practically disused, the people were robbed of their right, and that the clergy of the Church were not rightly or truly called. Propositions extracted from Luther *de Cælestitate Babylonica* and Calvin's *Institutes* to the effect that 'there is no ecclesiastical hierarchy, but all Christians are equally priests, and for use or execution the calling of the magistrates, and consent of the people are required,' were laid before the Theologians at the Council of

witness how you be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God.' Thus in each case the examination is expressly said to be for the people; and in that of the Bishop, the word 'trial' carries us back at once to the Preface, in which one of the qualifications for a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, is that 'he be tried.'

Then we come to the questions proposed. The Deacon is first required to make a public profession before the people as to his interior motives, in reply to the question, 'Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost?' Here is a trial indeed. No such burden is laid on the conscience of a Catholic before receiving the sacrament of Holy Order. If it were, no one would be ordained at all. It is true that in the Catholic Church in certain cases, such as that of a profession in a Religious Order, questions are asked as to interior motives, because in such a case making the profession constitutes the whole act. Luther, and the Reformers who followed him, wished to reduce Ordination to the level of a profession and public reception, and to show that it is only the public approval of persons as truly called and possessed of the proper qualifications for the ministry. And the Anglican rite seems to be framed with the same view. But the Church does not ask questions as to interior dispositions of a person receiving a Sacrament, except in confession; and only requires in public a profession of faith and obedience. A Catholic opens the state of his interior dispositions to his director under the sacramental seal, and is guided by his advice. Then he submits to the decision of the Bishop and other ecclesiastical superiors as to his ordination. But although acceptance at their hands comes to him as the Divine election, he might easily feel a scruple in professing publicly that he was 'moved by the Holy Ghost.'

The next question is common to Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. 'Do ye think that ye truly be called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due

order of this realm, to the ministry of the Church?' (for Priests, 'the order of this Church of England to the ministry of Priesthood?' and for Bishops, 'to this ministration').⁶¹ The explanation of this question has been a difficulty to Anglican writers, who say that it is an inquiry whether the candidate is conscious of any defect or other impediment that would be a bar to his ordination.⁶² But this explanation evidently does not account for the use of such a phrase, nor does it give the meaning of it as originally intended.

Luther taught that the Catholic priests had no true vocation, because they were ordained as sacrificers (*sacrificuli*), and not to preach the Gospel, and had not been called by the people. Zuinglius taught the same; and the idea was further developed by Bullinger,⁶³ the disciple and successor of Zuinglius; and also adopted by Calvin.⁶⁴ In their view, like that of Luther, there is an outward call and an inward call. The outward call may be lawful or unlawful—unlawful when made through favour, ambition, or covetousness; the lawful call may be extraordinary or ordinary; and the latter is that 'wherein indeed God calleth, bestowing necessary gifts upon His ministers, and appointing laws to those that do elect; and they following those laws, do ordinarily elect him whom they by signs conjecture to be first called of God.'⁶⁵ But not without the consent and approbation of the people; wherefore they sin not, that shaking off the yoke and tyranny of the Bishops of Rome, do recover that ancient right granted by Christ to the Churches.⁶⁶

In the question, as it is put in the Anglican rite, we see, first, the inward call—'truly called according to the

⁶¹ King Edward's Liturgies.

⁶² Bp. Wilson's *Parochialia*; Seecket's Address to Candidates for Ordination, *Works*, vol. iv.

⁶³ *Decades*, vol. iv. p. 128-34. ed. Parker Society.

⁶⁴ *Instit. lib.* iv. c. 19.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* p. 133.

⁶⁶ Bullinger, vol. iv. p. 129.

will of our Lord; then the outward call, and the due order of this realm.' But the outward call has already been given, for the Bishop has accepted the candidates, and in the case of priests has pronounced that they be lawfully called to their function and ministry, and be persons meet for the same.' The question seems, therefore, to be intended only as a trial before the people; thus bringing in the spirit of the Lutheran discipline.

Another question, which is used in the case of Bishops only, points out the kind of office which they were expected to fill. The Archbishop asks, 'Will you . . . such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within your diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's Word, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of the realm?'

The practical response to this question is abundantly supplied by Strype and the correspondence of Archbishop Parker⁶⁷ and Bishop Chaderton.⁶⁸ There it may be seen that the Anglican Bishops evidently filled the post of spiritual Lords-Lieutenant of the Crown. A certain class of offences were placed under their cognisance. The old Canon Law was not sufficient for the purpose for various reasons, and because the ecclesiastical jurisdiction which administered it was not derived from the Crown. A new style of authority was required immediately dependent on the Sovereign. The High Commission was therefore issued, and became an engine of terror to Papist and Puritan alike. The Privy Council took it in hand to direct Bishops in the administration of their dioceses. If any Bishop appeared less energetic in hunting out priests and recusants, or suppressing conventicles, the Council were down upon him with a letter of admonition. In most cases the Bishops were willing instruments of the government persecution. They made their regular reports of the state of their dioceses, and often applied for

⁶⁷ Parker Society.

⁶⁸ Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*.

additional powers to put the laws in force, when they found it necessary. The parochial clergy represented the same system in their own lesser sphere.

Such were the Anglican Bishops and clergy of the Elizabethan period—officers of the Crown, and nothing more. And as such, the Anglican rite of ordination fitly corresponds with this ideal, being a rite of admission to an office, and nothing more.

It may, however, be argued in reply, that the words *munus, officium*, and *opus*, are frequently used in the Pontifical with regard to all the sacred Orders. No doubt they are so used. But the objection to the Anglican form is not the use of such words in themselves, but their being used in such a manner and in such a sense as to exclude every other. In the Pontifical, the Diaconate, the Priesthood, and the Episcopate are certainly each an office, a function, and a work; but they are something more: a Divine gift of spiritual power, and a sacramental character imprinted on the soul. In the Anglican form the words are so used as to limit the sense to the co-operation of Divine grace for the due discharge of functions and duties, and to exclude the idea of the special grace and power of the Order.

It will have been seen, that the questions involved in the argument of the present and preceding chapters are of the highest importance. It is not merely a question whether words may have been used constituting a sufficient form of the Sacrament, because the Anglican rite does contain words which under certain circumstances have been accepted as sufficient by the Church. But the questions at issue regard the truth of the doctrine of the Church on the Sacrament of Holy Order; the reality of the grace conveyed therein; the very existence of that grace in the Church; and the power of transmitting it as an inheritance from her Divine Founder;—all this is

involved in the present discussion. It will therefore be well to give the result in a summary.

From the very beginning, the Church has believed a special gift of grace to be given in sacred Ordination. The Holy Scriptures, and the writings of the Fathers, attest the truth of this belief. All the ancient rites of Ordination, including those which have been continued in use to the present day, contain petitions for such a grace. And the belief has been drawn out by theologians into the doctrine of the spiritual character impressed upon the soul for all eternity. This belief had never been questioned within the Church before the heresies of Luther and Zuinglius came to a head in the sixteenth century. And in condemnation of those errors, the doctrine was declared to be of faith by the Council of Trent. Such errors, however, were adopted by the Reformers in England, and under the influence of those opinions they proceeded to remodel the rites and forms of Ordination. Though they retained the old names of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, they were careful to frame their statements of doctrine in a sense perfectly consistent with their Lutheran ideas, and also so to frame the language of their new forms as to avoid any expression that might imply any special gift of sacramental grace to be looked for or communicated through the rite. Some scanty portions of the ancient rite still appear; but in adaptations, mutilated and broken, robbed of their very spirit and life; for every word expressive of an interior sanctification, of a sacramental consecration, or of a gift of spiritual power, is studiously omitted; or else the sense is perverted, and no higher idea left than that of grace for the faithful discharge of the duties of an office. The imposition of hands is retained, and is given with words taken from the ancient rite, viz. 'Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.,' both for the Priesthood and the Episcopate: but these words in themselves are ambiguous

and do not clearly show that they are used in the sense of conferring a sacrament, and if judged by the context, such a sense is excluded from them. And to these words is added a formula invented by Luther to deny the grace of Holy Order and the power of the Priesthood. Then to this ambiguous form, so clogged and fettered already with mutilations and additions made in a depraved sense, and for the purpose of introducing error, the revision of 1662 made another addition, which tied and limited the meaning to that of receiving the grace of the Holy Ghost solely for the discharge of the office and work of a priest or bishop, but not as a sacramental character, or a spiritual power. Thus the due sense and right intention are absolutely excluded from the rite, and no one can be the minister or recipient thereof with the intention of conferring or receiving the Sacrament of Holy Order such as the Catholic Church believes and understands.

When it was thus shown that this argument would not stand, succeeding writers took up a new position. Lewgar¹ and Le Quien maintained that it was necessary that the prayers used in the ordination of a priest should mention the principal function of the priesthood, namely, the power of consecrating the most precious Body and Blood of our Lord; and in proof of this assertion they referred to the prayer for ordination of priests in the Roman Pontifical, beginning, 'Deus sanctificationum,' quoting from it the words, 'that they may, by immaculate benediction, transform bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Thy Son.' But it was shown, in reply, that this prayer is not to be found in many early Latin Pontificals, or in the Ordo Romanus; and that in fact the ancient Latin rite does not express the power of consecrating or offering. And in face of these facts this argument must also fall to the ground.

But there is another way of looking at this part of the subject. Although in theological teaching it is generally considered that the imposition of hands is the sole essential matter, and the prayers which accompany it are the sole essential form of the priesthood, yet in the Latin Church, in practice, the delivery of the chalice is to be considered as essential also, as well as the words, 'Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium &c.' which accompany it. And being thus essential, if this rite should from any cause be omitted, the ordination is to be given over again *sub conditione*, according to various decisions emanating from the Holy See—one in 1697 in a decree of the S. Congregation of the Holy Office,² and another of the S. Congregation of the Council, in a case related by Pope Benedict XIV. as having occurred whilst he was himself one of the Cardinals of the S. Congregation.³ A third case occurred

¹ *Evactus Senior*, cap. vi. and vii.

² Le Quien, vol. ii. p. 393; and *Picæ Justif.* No. vi.

³ *Synod. Diacæsan.* lib. viii. cap. 10. See Appendix No. I.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ANGLICAN RITE IN REFERENCE TO THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST.

THE argument in the preceding chapter was confined to the point of the Sacrament of Holy Order, and the grace and character conferred therein, being denied in the Anglican rite of Ordination. But there is another argument, which from the first has had great weight with Catholics; namely, that the Holy Sacrifice and the real external Priesthood of the Church are ignored in the Anglican rite.

This argument has taken two shapes. The early controversialists maintained that the delivery of the chalice containing wine, and the paten with a host upon it, was the sole essential matter of the Sacrament in ordaining a priest, and that the essential form consisted in the words which accompany this rite, namely, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses as well for the living as the dead. In the name of the Lord.' This doctrine as to the matter and form of the Sacrament was conclusively disproved by Morinus, who showed that no such rite and no such words had been used or known in the Church before the eleventh century; that the Greek and Oriental Churches have never adopted it, except the Armenians; and that, in fact, in the early Sacramentaries of the Western Church there are no other matter and form than the imposition of hands, and the prayers which accompany it.

delivery of the chalice was not an accidental error, but arose from a deliberate intention on the part of the Bishop, moved by some heterodox objection to the rite, or any other reason? And, not to deal merely with a hypothetical case, let us instance the course of procedure attributed to the Bishop of Brandenburg at the time of the Reformation.

Matthias à Jagou, Bishop of Brandenburg, adhered to the Lutheran party, and adopted some at least of their principles and practices, of which he made a public profession on 1st Nov. 1539, at the celebration of Mass in the Collegiate Church at Köln-on-the-Spree (now one of the divisions of Berlin), when he gave communion in both kinds to the Elector and several of the nobility.⁵ In the course of the next year Joachim II, Elector of Brandenburg, published his Ecclesiastical Constitution,⁶ in which, having announced the appointment of Jacob Stadner as Superintendent, he goes on to say: "As our singular friend the Bishop of Brandenburg agrees in every respect with the Evangelical doctrine, we wish all those who are called to office in the Church to receive ordination at his hands. And our said friend will not impose improper burdens on those to be ordained, such as the restriction of marriage. Likewise, for the future, abuses are to be suppressed, especially the saying "Accipe potestatem le-gendi Evangelium pro vivis et defunctis,"⁷ as the Gospel was written for the instruction of the living; and also the saying "Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis," which is contrary to the main article of our Christian faith.⁸ It is added in a note in Daniel's work,⁹ that, according to the Agenda of Brandenburg, the use of the Roman Pontifical is retained for ordination,

⁵ Seckendorf, *Hist. Luth.* lib. iii. § 75.

⁶ Kirchenordnung in Kurfürstenthum der Marken zu Brandenburg 1540, quoted by Seckendorf and Daniel.

⁷ In the Ordination of Deacons.

⁸ Seckendorf, lib. iii. § 75. Add. ii. t. and Daniel's *Cod. Liturg. Eccl. Lutheran.* p. 526.

⁹ p. 526.

Anglican Ordinations.

262

lately at Paris. Cardinal Morlot, the Archbishop, while ordaining upwards of a hundred priests, was suddenly taken ill and unable to proceed, being at the time engaged in this very rite. Some of the ordinandi had received the unction, and had been presented with the chalice, as usual; others were waiting their turn for the same ceremony. What was to be done? A message was sent to Rome; and an answer came, that those to whom the chalice had been presented should have the remainder of the rite supplied in addition; but those who had not had it delivered to them should be ordained again *sub conditione*.

Such is the rule and practice of the Church in the case of an accidental omission of this rite. But it may be said that this does not affect the question in the case of Anglicans, because this formula is not, and never was, in their rite; and the Greeks and other Orientals have never used it, yet their Ordinations are admitted as valid; and the Armenians only adopted it at the suggestion of Pope Eugenius IV. at the Council of Florence, their previous ordinations, which were celebrated without it, having been fully admitted.

It is not for a work such as the present to attempt to resolve the abstract question, whether the use of this formula is absolutely indispensable in the case of Anglicans.⁴ But it is impossible to take up the consideration of this question in the abstract, or without looking to all the circumstances of the case, and the history of the formation of the Anglican rite, and inquiring how it comes to pass that this formula is not to be found there. And having ascertained these points, we may be able to say whether Anglicans would be entitled to make a claim in respect of their rite similar to that which was admitted in the case of the Armenians.

We must, then, commence with an inquiry: What would be the effect, supposing that the omission of the

⁴ On this subject see Canon Raynal's *Ordinal of Edeu. VI.*

hood; considering that the omission was made on the express ground of objecting to the faith and doctrine signified by these words; it would seem that neither the Bishop nor the persons ordained could have an intention of conferring or receiving such a priesthood as the Catholic Church understands and believes, and that therefore they would neither of them intend to do what the Church does. In this view the validity of the Ordination would be extremely doubtful. Hence we come to the following principle: that the omission of the delivery of the chalice, or of the accustomed formula which accompanies it, if done purposely with the motive of denying the doctrine of the Church regarding the Holy Sacrifice, even if a rite otherwise Catholic and valid be used, renders the Ordination at least of doubtful validity.

We shall have to consider, further on, the doctrines taught by Luther with regard to the Holy Sacrifice; but we must now inquire into those points which specially touched on Ordination in connection with that subject. In the year 1533 Luther published his work *De Missa angulari et Consecratione Sacerdotum*, the scope of which is to show, that, as the Bishops had refused their offers of reconciliation, it was necessary that ministers should be ordained in places that adhered to the Augustan Confession, not for sacrificial Masses, but for preaching the Word and dispensing Sacraments.¹¹

For the Mass-sayers and Bishops too arrogantly extol their power and the dignity of their Christ. For they arrogate to themselves the power of consecrating, ex opere operato, and boast that by the efficacy of their Christ and ordination, an anointed priest by pronouncing the words, yet through the Divine operation, forthwith makes the Body and blood of Christ to be present.¹² . . . This is the doctrine of abomination, that an anointed priest, by force of his unction, should ex opere operato and by pronouncing the words consecrate and make the Body of Christ. . . . The

¹¹ Seckendorf, lib. iii. § xxii. p. 60.

¹² Luther's Works, ed. Wittenburg, vol. vii. fol. 242b.

Anglican Ordinations.

264

cutting off everything repugnant to the Lutheran doctrine.

Now, we are not concerned to ascertain whether these statements are certainly correct, or whether the Bishop did actually follow the extraordinary course here assigned to him. It is quite sufficient for our present purpose to suppose that, in ordaining priests according to the rite of the Roman Pontifical, he omitted the delivery of the chalice, as well as the words 'Receive power to offer sacrifice &c.,' or even that he continued to use the rite without saying the words; and that he made this omission on the ground that these words assert the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, which the Lutherans denied. Let it be taken into account that he would thus have used a form which for a thousand years was considered perfectly valid; that the words omitted were introduced solely on the authority of individual Bishops; that Bishops had been accustomed to make ritual changes on their own authority; that no General Council had then directed the revision of the Pontifical, and no regulation on the subject had been issued from the Holy See. Giving full weight to these circumstances, what judgment are we to pass on Ordinations conferred in this manner?

The right answer to this question would seem to be as follows: Considering that these words had been introduced into the rite with the view of impressing on the mind of the ordained that he did receive a power of offering propitiatory sacrifice,¹⁰ considering that the practice had been in use nearly five hundred years, and had been generally adopted throughout the Western Church; considering that the delivery of the chalice with these words had thus become an integral part of the rite of Ordination; considering that the Lutherans denied the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice and of the external Priest-

¹⁰ Bened. XIV. *De Syn. Diac.* lib. viii. cap. 10, § 6, quoting Hugo a S. Victore and Peter Lombard. See Appendix No. I.

in terms reminding us of the Thirty-nine Articles, as follows:

'Before al things the pastours must labour to take out of mennes myndes that false and wicked opinion, wheribi men thincke commonly, that the prieste in masses offreth up Christe our Lorde to God the Father, after that sorte, that wyth hys intention and prayer he causeth Christe to become a newe and acceptable sacrifice to the Father for the salvacion of men, applyeth and communicath the merite of the passion of Christe and of the savinge sacrifice, wheribi the Lord hymselfe offred hymselfe to the father a sacrifice (on) the crosse to them that receive not the same with theyr owne fayth. For to make men partakers in the supper of the Lorde, of the sacrifice and merite of oure Lord Jesu Christe, the minister canne helpe no more, than that frste he exhibit and ministrte the holye supper as the Lord instituted, and than faythfully declare, and celebratē religiously the ministerie of it, the redemption and communion of oure Lord Jesus Christe, and furthermore dispense the sacramentes, whereby he may stirre up, and confirme in them: that be present, tru fayth in Christe, by which faith everye man maie hymselfe apprehend and receive the merite and sacrifice of Christe as gyven unto hym.'

Afterwards the following directions are given for the trial and ordination of ministers:

'We command that no man be admitted to the cure of any congregation, whiche is not diligently tried and allowed by those examiners, whom we shall appointe to this office, and bryngeth from the examiners a testimony of his probacion, to those to whom it shal pertainē to invest, and to our suffragane. . . . Which suffragane shall use nothinge in the ceremonies of ordination, nor enjoyne anie thyngē in ordeynynge, that agreeth not wyth this same doctrine of Christe, sette forth in this boke.'

It is evident that the suffragan Bishop is here directed, in conferring orders, to omit from the Pontifical whatever contravenes the protest against the Sacrifice of the Mass quoted above, and that among the things to be omitted the most prominent would be the 'Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium'; thus following the example of the Bishop of Brandenburg.

¹⁷ *A simple and religious Consultation of us, Herman Archbishop of Colone,* 1547, fol. Cc 7-8.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* fol. Hh 5-6.

wholesome and pious doctrine in the true Church of Christ sounds thus: that no priest, and no christian, makes any Sacrament, nor even the whole Church. We in the Church in these sacred things neither effect nor make anything of ourselves, but are stewards of the mysteries of God, and it is not ours to make, to effect, &c., but to administer and dispense to the Church.¹³

In the year 1544, by command of the Elector of Saxony, a plan of Reformation was drawn up and subscribed by Luther, Pomeranus, Cruciger, Major, and Melancthon. It is called the Wittenberg Reformation, and the Latin version was made by Melancthon.¹⁴ In this manifesto, the subject of Ordination is treated as follows:

'The whole Church, and specially its chief members, ought to give their pains to this end, that many may be prepared for the functions of teaching, and that when instructed, and tried by learned examiners, they may be admitted to the ministry or rejected. This duty, formerly, was committed to Bishops. But they, for the most part, exercise severity over those who teach rightly, and neglect their Dioceses. . . . If, then, Bishops are to have authority to ordain, they must declare their minds as to doctrine. For if they remain enemies of the Gospel, and will admit no one to ordination without the obligation of impious doctrine and denying the truth, ordination cannot be sought from them. . . . But there are known to be manifest abuses, with which ordination has been for many ages polluted. There is a persuasion prevailing, that priests are ordained for sacrifice, not for teaching the Gospel. . . . Now, if concord is to be established, and the authority of ordination is to be committed to Bishops, it is necessary that there should first be a consent as to doctrine, as said before. And then the charge given in ordination should be to teach the Gospel, and administer the Sacraments, not of other works, as to sacrifice for the living and dead.'

The same ideas prevail in the scheme of Reformation published by Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, which was drawn up by Bucer. It is well known that this work exercised a direct influence on the formation of the Anglican Liturgical Offices.¹⁵ It speaks of the Holy Sacrifice

¹³ Fol. 243. Some words are omitted as too offensive to be quoted.

¹⁴ Seckendorf, lib. iii. § cxix. p. 521-2.

¹⁵ See Appendix, No. II. ¹⁶ *Liturgical Services of Q. Eliz.*, Pref. p. xxix. Parker Society; Proctor's *Hist. of Book of Com. Prayer*, p. 337-9.

268 *Anglican Ordinations.*

Thus, then, we find two remarkable principles laid down by Luther and his partisans:

First, that there is no power given in ordination to consecrate or to offer; and that the sole function of the ministry is to teach, and to administer and dispense the Sacraments.

Secondly, that as there is no real and proper Sacrifice, the formula used in ordination to express the power of sacrifice conferred on priests ought to be done away with; and that there should be substituted for it a charge to teach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments.

Now let us turn to our own country, and see how things stood there with regard to the Priesthood and the Holy Sacrifice before the unhappy schism. In the Ordination of Priests, the custom of delivering the chalice, with the appropriate formula, was in general use. It is found in the Sarum, Winchester, Bangor, and Exeter Pontificals,¹⁹ and the faith professed in the country was in accordance with the same.

It is the fact, as Melancthon said, that 'the persuasion did prevail, that priests are ordained for sacrifice.' In every church and on every altar (to use the well-known words) were celebrated 'the sacrifices of masses, wherein it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt.'²⁰

But the change came. 'The continual sacrifice was taken away';²¹ and thenceforward a change was made in the rite of Ordination of Priests, by removing everything that expressed the power of sacrifice, and substituting instead thereof simply the duty of teaching and administering Sacraments.

To see the mode in which this change was carried out, we will compare the ancient Pontificals in use in this country with the Ordination rite of 1549, as follows:

¹⁹ Maskell's *Monumenta Rituala*, vol. iii. and *Liber Pontificalis* of Lacy, Bp. of Exeter.

²⁰ XXXIX. Articles. ²¹ Daniel xi. 31.

SARUM AND EXETER
PONTIFICALS.

Episcopus dicit eis,

Sacerdotem oportet offerre, benedicere, præsesse,²² predicare, conficere, et baptizare.

FORM OF ORDERING PRIESTS,
1549.

The Bishop shall say unto them,

We exhort you to have in remembrance . . . to how charge-able an office ye be called, that is to say, to be the messengers, the watchmen, the pastors, and the stewards of the Lord, to teach, to premonish, to feed, and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that be dispersed abroad, &c.

SARUM, EXETER, AND BANGOR
PONTIFICALS.

Episcopus ponat manum dextram super caput iustitibet sacerdotis dicens,

Accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remisit peccata remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueris retenta erunt.

The Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth orders, saying:

Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

SARUM, EXETER, BANGOR, AND
WINCHESTER PONTIFICALS.

Episcopus tradet calicem calicem cum vino et aqua, et patenam superpositam cum hostia, dicens calicem,

Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque cele-

The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in the one hand, and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand, and say,

Take thou authority to preach the word of God and to minis-

²² precare, Exon.

brare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis. In nomine Domini, Amen.

SARUM, EXETER, BANGOR, AND WINCHESTER PONTIFICALS.

Super ordinatos sacerdotes dicitur benedictionem.

Benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos; ut sitis benedicti in ordine sacerdotali, et offeratis placabiles hostias pro peccatis, atque offensibus populi, omnipotenti Deo, cui est honor et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

ter the holy sacraments in this congregation.

Immediately before the benediction shall be said this Collect:

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee so to send upon these thy servants thy heavenly blessing, that they may be clad about with all justice, and that thy word spoken by their mouths may have such success, that it may never be spoken in vain. Grant also that we may have grace to hear and receive the same as thy most holy word and the mean of our salvation, that in all our words and deeds we may seek thy glory and the increase of thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

In 1552 the delivery of the chalice was omitted, and the Bible only was to be given, with the same words as before; and so the rite remains to the present day, with only a verbal alteration of the words, viz. 'in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.'

Thus, then, there is no mention of 'offering and consecrating' among the functions of a priest; but his duty is described under a variety of terms, which go no further than the idea of teaching in one form or another.

Then the compilers of the English form took the formula, 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, &c.', exactly as they found it in use, but they added to it the words, 'dispenser of the Word and Sacraments,' which just express the Lutheran idea that the priest does nothing

more than dispense, and does not offer, nor consecrate, nor bless.

The Bishop is still to deliver the chalice, but instead of saying, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice,' he is to say, 'Take authority to preach and minister the Sacraments.' This is the very alteration recommended by the Lutheran divines, and specially intended and directed against the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist.

Lastly, in the Pontifical the Bishop blesses the newly-ordained priests with the prayer that they may be blessed in the sacerdotal order, and may offer acceptable sacrifices to Almighty God for the sins and offences of the people; but in the new rite a prayer is said, in the place corresponding with this blessing, to the effect that they may be clad with justice, and may preach with success.

In this manner everything that expresses sacrifice or sacerdotal functions is expunged, and the Priesthood is reduced to the state described in the heretical propositions condemned by the Council of Trent, viz. 'That in the New Testament there is not a visible and external priesthood, nor any spiritual power, either to consecrate or offer the Body and Blood of our Lord, or to absolve from sins in the sight of God, but only an office and ministry of preaching the Gospel,' extracted from Bucer on St. John, cap. 6, Luther de Captiv. Babylon., and Calvin's Institutes.²³

It is not meant that the parts of the rite here quoted from the Pontifical are absolutely essential (and this has been explained before),²⁴ nor that they formed part of the earliest rite; on the contrary, they are among the latest mediæval additions. The argument here intended is this: that such expressions and ceremonies were introduced into the rite with the view of signifying the powers conferred upon a priest at his ordination, as believed in the

²³ Le Plat, *Mon. Concil. Trident.* vol. iv. p. 336, Concil. Trid. Sess. xxiii. Can. i.

²⁴ See the beginning of this chapter.

the Anglican Church, even were it possible, to do away with the effect of the alteration of the rite.

Even supposing that some of the Anglican Bishops and clergy at present entertain more Catholic ideas, and have adopted certain Catholic practices, how could this make up for the notorious wrongs of the intermediate time? 'Esau sold his birthright, and found no *locus penitentiæ*, though he sought it with tears.'²⁵ But it is by their own acts that they may be judged. What may be the practice of Anglican Bishops at this precise time, it is not perhaps safe to say, but certainly, till within the last few years, it was the custom for Bishops at the time of ordination to require subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. There is thus a solemn declaration of the intention with which the ordaining Bishop and the persons ordained engage in this rite. And in the 31st Article are the words: 'The Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.' It is in this spirit, with these impious words in their mouths, and this profession in their hearts, that the Anglican Bishops, and those that they purport to ordain Priests, undertake the ceremony which stands in substitution for the Catholic rite. The Catholic Bishop puts the chalice into the hands of the Priest, and says, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses for the living and dead.' The Anglican Bishop and his Priests profess that 'the sacrifices of Masses for the quick and dead are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits;' and then the Bishop delivers the Bible instead of the chalice, and instead of 'Offer sacrifice and celebrate Masses,' says, 'Take authority to preach and administer Sacraments.' If it were this heretical profession that was alone in question, it would be a different

²⁵ Hebrews xiii. 17.

Catholic Church; that they were in use in the English Church up to the time of the Reformation, and were generally received and understood in that sense; that the Reformers took these very parts of the ancient rite as the groundwork or model from which they adapted and modified a form made to suit their own novel conceptions; that thus they deliberately and intentionally altered the approved and accustomed usages in a manner contrary to the sense of the Church; that the form thus drawn up by them (whether as it stood originally, or as it stands at present) does necessarily exclude a right and proper intention on the part of any one using it; and therefore that any one undertaking to confer Orders by this form, or any one submitting to receive them by it, does wilfully and purposely declare that he does not intend to confer or receive such a Priesthood as the Catholic Church understands and acknowledges. Historically the present Anglican rite of Ordination of Priests is derived from the ancient Catholic rite, but mutilated and perverted with an heretical intention. And the later change has only been a further departure from the way of truth than the earlier. The change of 1549 preserved the outward sign, but altered the words which gave it expression; the progress of reform in 1552 swept away the sign also.

Nor will it avail for Anglicans to say that they are not bound by the intentions of the framers of the rite; that they do not follow their errors, nor adopt their opinions; that they believe and profess the Catholic faith of the Priesthood and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and have been ordained with the right intention. Whatever be their belief and intention, they have followed the course of the opponents of the faith, and have adopted the symbol of error. They received and adopted the perverted rite in direct descent from Cranmer, as Cranmer received the spirit of it from Luther. Nothing has ever been done, or attempted to be done, on the part of

thing; if it were a real Bishop who, notwithstanding such a profession, went on and dared to celebrate an ordination in the accustomed manner of the Pontifical, the heretical opinions entertained might not invalidate the Sacrament, because a general intention is sufficient. But what renders the circumstances so grave, and the consequences so serious, in the case of the Anglican Ordination is this: that the profession of misbelief is coupled with the mutilation and omission of an integral part of the rite anciently in use. Those who use the Anglican rite do not merely give their tacit consent to the alteration, but also openly declare that they agree with the spirit, and entertain the opinions, of those who made the change, and are animated with the same intentions as they were. If they did not make this declaration, the effect would be the same—the mutilation would be a fatal defect. But by their making it they deprive themselves of excuse; they cannot plead after such an act that their intentions are now so right—that their sentiments and belief are so truly Catholic. If the Bishop of Brandenburg, ordaining his Lutheran pastors according to the Roman Pontifical, invalidated or rendered doubtful the Sacrament, because he omitted the words 'Accipe potestatem, &c.' with an heretical intention, how much more Crammer and Ridley, who, guided by the same pernicious influences, devised a new rite of their own, altering and omitting the same and other parts? And what is to save their successors who adopted their work, one after another, from falling into the same ruin, and causing the destruction of that edifice of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which St. Augustine and his followers had built up at the cost of so much toil and so many prayers and mortifications?

To this it may be replied, that the Thirty-first Article does not deny the true Eucharistic Sacrifice. By the use of the plural number, 'Sacrifices of Masses,' the doctrine there condemned is represented as quite distinguished

from the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is asserted that the Article was intended to reject a heresy that prevailed amongst Roman Catholics in the sixteenth century, teaching that every Mass was a new and independent immolation, instead of being, as it is said in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, one and the same Sacrifice with that offered on the Cross.²⁶ But where is the evidence for the existence of this heresy? Who were the people that professed it, or the writers that maintained it? Gardiner and Harding both argue that the Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross. The same truth is taught us by the Council of Trent: 'In this Divine Sacrifice, which is celebrated in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross. . . . For the Victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner alone of offering being different.'²⁷ The fact is, that there was no such heresy. The Reformers chose to represent the Catholic doctrine as if it were taught that the Mass is a new and separate sacrifice from that of our Lord on the Cross; or as if such were necessarily the conclusion that followed from the Catholic belief. An instance of this misrepresentation may be found in the passage quoted from Abp. Herman's book.²⁸ The Reformers maintained that our Lord's oblation on the Cross was the only Sacrifice, and that He Himself is the only Priest in the Church; and that to say that the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice, and can be offered for sins, or for the relief of pains or other necessities, either of the living or the dead, is derogatory to the virtue of our Lord's all-sufficient Sacrifice, and blas-

²⁶ *Unity and the Receipt*: a Reply to Bp. Ullathorne's Pastoral against the A.P.U.C, by F. Littledale, L.S.D. p. 11.

²⁷ *Sess.* xxiii. c. 2.

²⁸ In p. 267.

suffragia; missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et elemosinas, ac alia pietatis officia que a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt secundum ecclesie instituta.³¹

Hence it is clear that it is not any mere popular superstition, nor any special heresy, that is opposed by this condemnation, but the Profession of Faith expressly defined by a General Council; and thus that any one taking upon him to subscribe the declaration of the Article does absolutely deny the Catholic Faith as regards the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Another circumstance illustrates the feeling against there being any real sacrifice in the Christian Church, with which the Reformers were animated, and that is, their dislike to the title of Priest. Those on the Continent chose to drop the name altogether, and to adopt that of 'minister' or 'pastor.' The English Reformers attempted to follow their usual course by retaining the name, and doing away with the signification. Thus in King Edward's First Book the name is used in places where it was afterwards changed to 'minister,' and the word 'priest' was in certain cases restored in 1662. It always remained in the 'Ordering of Priests.' But the Reformers endeavoured to show that 'priest' being etymologically derived from 'presbyter,' the word does not mean a sacrificing priest.³² Under this view in the New Testament 'presbyter' is translated 'elder,' as often objected by Catholics,³³ and the translation so remains in the present Authorised Version. In Aless' translation of the Book of Common Prayer the words 'sacerdos' and

³¹ Harlequin, Concil. ix. 957, 985.

³² Latimer's *Remains*, p. 264; Hutchinson's *Works*, p. 49; Whitgift, vol. iii. 350.

³³ Martin's *Discoverie of manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures*, chap. vi.

Anglican Ordinations.

276

pheny. This is the doctrine set forth in the Thirty-first Article; and it is expressly condemned by the Council of Trent.

The use of the plural number in the Article raises no distinction whatever. There is no difference between 'the Sacrifice of the Mass' and 'the Sacrifices of Masses.' Each is a correct and legitimate term. It is not merely 'commonly said;' it is a theological truth; it is a matter of faith, that 'in the Sacrifices of Masses the Priest does offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt.' 'These are the very words that the Church has used at various times to profess the Catholic faith upon the subject of the Holy Sacrifice. In the Confession of Faith proposed to the Emperor Michael Palologus by Pope Clement IV. in the year 1267, and again by Gregory X. in 1272, and accepted and presented by the Emperor to the Pope at the Council of Lyons, there are these very words. The Greek terms for "the Sacrifices of Masses" are *λατρουγιῶν ἱερωλεστίαι*. Afterwards, in the Council of Florence in 1439, the terms of the Confession of Faith just mentioned were embodied in the Definition of Faith then decreed. The original words of the Council may therefore be compared with those of Article xxxi., as the Latin version of the Articles possesses equal authority with the English.'²⁹

DECREE OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

'Si vere penitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam arum sacrificia, quibus, vulgo dignis penitentiae fructibus dicebatur, sacerdotem offere commissis satisfecerint et omnis, eorum animas poenis purgatoris post mortem purgari; et ut a poenis hujusmodi releventur, prodesse eis fidelium vivorum

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

'Art. xxxi. . . . Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus, vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offere Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpe, pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciose imposturae.'³⁰

²⁹ Bishop Ullathorne's *Anglican Theory of Union*, p. 50-2.

³⁰ Burnet on the Articles.

'minister' are used indifferently,³⁴ and from thence 'sacerdos' is adopted into the translation published at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign.³⁵ But it is very doubtful whether this translation has been recognised as an authorised version of the Anglican Prayer Book. The word 'sacerdos' is also used in the title of one of the Thirty-nine Articles—the thirty-second, 'De Coniugio Sacerdotum'; but in this place it does not refer to Anglican ministers. The word was not used in the Forty-two Articles of 1552, but appeared first in those of 1562. Now, Parker and his associates, who had been ordained priests by the Catholic rite, were perfectly conscious that they were priests in the Catholic sense, and that with many persons there still remained a strong feeling against their marrying, and particularly on the part of the Queen herself. Parker had already written or edited a work on this subject, and there are treatises among his MSS.³⁶ with this exact title, 'De Coniugio Sacerdotum'; and it was necessary for them to publish some justification of themselves, and to declare that, whether as ministers or as really priests, they were not debarred from lawful matrimony. With these two exceptions, there is no formulary of the Anglican Church in which the word 'sacerdos' is used. A cloud of ambiguity is thus thrown over the meaning of the word 'priest' as used in the Book of Common Prayer, including the Forms of Ordination. And the sense in which it is used in the latter will depend on the intention and theological tenets and personal opinion of each ordaining Bishop. Now, considering that the Holy Sacrifice has been ignored and even denied in the rite in the manner already described; considering that the rite has been drawn up in contravention of the very idea of a true and proper sacrifice; considering that there is nothing else to give its proper force to the word, and that what

³⁴ Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*.

³⁵ Nasmyth's *Catalogue*, cix. 8 and cxiii. 21.

³⁶ Liturg. Eliz.

indications there are rather look the other way,—there does seem to be reason to fear that in the Anglican rite the word 'priest' does not mean, and cannot even be used so as to mean, a priest in the Catholic sense.

However, something may depend on the rest of the Prayer Book. If in that book the true Sacrifice is preserved, and there are words which express it, and directions for its being offered, it would seem to be intended to have true priests to offer it. It will therefore be necessary to examine the Book of Common Prayer, and to inquire what is the teaching it contains on these points, and with regard to the Holy Eucharist in general.³⁷

There is no question here about the validity of the Sacrament. As the common and received opinion among divines is, that the reciting our Lord's words from the Gospel is sufficient for validity, it is clear that Anglican clergymen, if they are truly priests, and have a right intention, do really say Mass. There is no question, then, but that if they have the priesthood, they have the Sacrament and the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist. The question is, whether the dogmatic phrases and statements in the Common Prayer Book with regard to the Holy Eucharist, considered either as a sacrament or as a sacrifice, are such as the Catholic Church approves or condemns?

We must therefore go back to the original position of things in this country. The Catholic faith had been planted here, and the Church was in communion with the Apostolic See, and with the Catholic Church throughout the world. A ritual order peculiar to the country was in use; but, whatever varieties there might be in the Ordinary or Proper of the Mass, the Canon was the same as that of Rome and of the whole Western Church.

What, then, is the Canon of the Mass? and what

³⁷ The following examination of the Prayer Book for the most part was published in the form of a pamphlet some years ago.

claims has it on our respect? Let us hear Sir William Palmer, as a writer whose testimony is beyond suspicion. After stating various facts and arguments on the subject, he says: 'Combining these circumstances together, there seems nothing unreasonable in thinking that the Roman liturgy, as used in the time of Gregory the Great, may have existed from a period of the most remote antiquity; and perhaps there are nearly as good reasons for referring its original composition to the Apostolic age, as there are in the case of the great Oriental liturgy.'³⁸

The care taken to preserve the Canon in its original authentic form we learn from other writers. 'In ancient times,' says Muratori, 'although the liturgy of the Roman Mass was observed generally in the churches of Italy, France, Germany, Britain, and other countries, yet there was no small variety in their Missals; but this did not affect the substance of the mystery, or the chief and essential rites of the Mass. The difference ran in adding collects, sequences, and special feasts, which each Bishop might insert in his own missal. But to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime.'³⁹ By the laws of Charlemagne it was ordered that only men of full age should be employed to transcribe it; and the Councils of York and Oxford in the twelfth century decreed that the Archdeacon should examine in every church whether there were errors or defects in the Canon, either by the faults of transcribers or the books being old. Always too the Canon was written in different and larger characters than the rest, and sometimes in gold letters throughout, as an offering of reverence.⁴⁰

It was against this treasure of the Church—so sacred, so venerable, so ancient, so religiously preserved, so pure from every error, so elevating the mind to piety and devotion,⁴¹—that the Reformers of the sixteenth century

³⁸ *Orig. Liturg.* vol. i. p. 121.

³⁹ *Liturg. Rom. Vtd.* vol. i. col. 85.

⁴⁰ Pellicci, vol. i. p. 158.

⁴¹ Decree of Council of Trent, sess. 22.

dared to raise their destroying hands, and to pour out their impious ribaldry.

Luther led the attack. He denied the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass in any other sense than as the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the sacrifice of justice, and the sacrifice of soul and body as a 'reasonable service.' He denied the priesthood in any other sense than as all Christians are priests to offer spiritual sacrifices; and he denied the real presence in the sense of the Church, and invented a sense of his own. It will be necessary to quote passages from his works in which he has stated his doctrine on these points.

In the treatise 'De abroganda Missa Privata' we read as follows:

'In the New Testament there is no visible and external priesthood except that which is erected by Satan through lies of men. Our one and only priesthood is that of Christ, by the which He offered Himself for us, and all of us with Him. This priesthood is spiritual, and common to all Christians. For with the same priesthood that Christ hath are we all priests, that is, sons of Christ the High Priest. Nor have we need of any other Priest and Mediator than Christ.'⁴²

'We will adduce testimonies concerning the priesthood of the New Testament, and its office:

'Thus from Rom. xii.: *I beseech you, by the mercy of God, that you present your bodies a holy sacrifice, living, pleasing to God, your reasonable service.* Here no one can deny that he describes the priestly office, which is, to offer or present a sacrifice and reasonable worship, not unreasoning beasts, as the Priests of the Law did, but to offer themselves. Wherefore this place makes priests, and is said to all Christians in common, for all ought to offer their bodies to God for a holy victim and reasonable sacrifice.

'Again, from 1 Peter ii.: *Be ye also as living stones built up, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ.* Is not this too said to all Christians in common? Are not all as living stones built upon Christ? And so built upon Him as to be priests, offering not cattle and sheep corporally, but themselves, by the example of Christ, as spiritual sacrifices, while they in spirit mortify the deeds of the flesh.'⁴³

⁴² Op. vol. ii. p. 259, ed. Wittenberg, 1546.

⁴³ p. 261.

'There is another kind of sacrifice, equally common to all, treated of in the Psalms, viz. the sacrifice of praise and of justice. These are the testimonies concerning the sacrifice or worship of the new priesthood under Christ. Nor has the whole of Scripture another sacrifice of this priesthood.

'Wherefore this we triumphantly urge upon the Papists, that they also should bring forward for the sacrifice of their priesthood one point or one iota out of the Scriptures. Christ offered Himself once, but willed not to be offered over again by any one, but willed a memorial of His sacrifice to be made.⁴⁴

In the same work he condemns the Canon of the Mass,⁴⁵ and denies the priesthood again, asserting the spiritual priesthood of the people as the only one.⁴⁶

In the treatise 'De Abominacione Missæ Privata quam Canonem vocant' there is an attack on the Canon, specifying as blasphemy every expression implying the real sacrifice.⁴⁷

In the Formula of Mass or Communion for Wittenberg he speaks of 'the abomination called the Offertory, after which almost everything sounds and smells of oblation.' . . . 'Wherefore,' he continues, 'repudiating everything that sounds of oblation, with the whole Canon, let us retain what is pure and holy, and so let us order our Mass.'⁴⁸ And in this form there is not only no oblation, but no prayer or benediction before the consecration, and only the bare narrative of the institution from the Gospel is recited. Yet, in the Communion the words, 'Corpus Domini &c. custodiat animam meam vel tuam,' are retained.⁴⁹

From the work 'De Usu Sacram. Euch. salutari' the Mass may be called a sacrifice, if it be understood as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, not of a work, nor propitiatory, but common to the priest who ministers and receives, and to those to whom he distributes. . . . The fruit of the sacrament is to be a remembrance of the

⁴⁴ p. 261.

⁴⁵ p. 272-3.

⁴⁶ p. 419-24.

⁴⁷ p. 277.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

death and merits of Christ, a strengthening of faith, an exciting of charity and good works and prayers, and thus a sacrifice of praise and prayer.⁵⁰

When the Council of Trent came to consider the subject of the Holy Eucharist, various propositions were laid before the theologians to be examined, in order to determine whether they were heretical or not. They had been extracted with great care from the works of Luther and other Reformers.⁵¹ The result was, that the errors of Luther were condemned in the following Canons on the subject of the Sacrifice of the Mass:

'1. If any one saith, that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema.

2. If any one saith, that by those words, *Do this for the commemoration of me*, Christ did not institute the Apostles priests; or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His own body and blood; let him be anathema.

3. If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it profits him only who receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema.

4. If any one saith, that by the sacrifice of the Mass a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross; or that it is thereby derogated from; let him be anathema.

5. If any one saith, that the Canon of the Mass contains errors, and is therefore to be abrogated; let him be anathema.

6. If any one saith, that Masses wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and are therefore to be abrogated; let him be anathema.⁵²

In England the soil had been prepared for the seeds of heresy before the time of Luther; and the fruits produced at last were not wholly Lutheran nor wholly

⁵⁰ Seckendorf, lib. ii. p. 217.

⁵¹ Those de Eucharistia are in Le Plat, *Alou. Conc. Trid.* vol. iv. p. 258; those de Sacrificio Missæ and de Sacram. Ordinis, p. 334. ⁵² Session 22.

Zuinglian. Many other influences were at work. There was a party even on the reforming side who retained considerable Catholic leanings. The general Erastianism was also a drag upon the downhill course. But with regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, Lutheran opinions made their way into the country, and were generally followed. Thus Crammer :

'Christ did not ordain His sacraments to this use, that one should receive them for another, or the priest for all the lay people; but He ordained them for this intent, that every man should receive them for himself, to ratify, confirm, and stablish his own faith and everlasting salvation. Therefore, as one man may not be baptised for another, and if he be, it availeth nothing, so ought not one to receive the holy communion for another.⁵³

'The adversaries of Christ gather together a great heap of authors, which, as they say, call the Mass or holy communion a sacrifice. But all those authors be answered unto in this one sentence, that they call it not a sacrifice for sin, because that it taketh away our sin, which is taken away only by the death of Christ, but because the holy communion was ordained of Christ to put us in remembrance of the sacrifice made by Him upon the Cross: for that cause it beareth the name of that sacrifice.⁵⁴

'Christ never gave this honour to any creature, that he should make a sacrifice of Him, nor did not ordain the sacrament of His holy supper to the intent that either the priest or the people should sacrifice Christ again, or that the priests should make a sacrifice of Him for the people: but His holy supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man, eating and drinking thereof, should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits, and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks, and give himself also clearely unto Him.⁵⁵

'When the old fathers called the mass or supper of the Lord a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving (and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice), or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead.⁵⁶

⁵³ *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 359, ed. Parker Society.

⁵⁴ p. 351.

⁵⁵ p. 352.

⁵⁶ p. 353.

And Ridley in the same strain. In the disputation at Oxford, after quoting sentences of Scripture :

'I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtle shifts: the one is by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a showing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice offered up once for all. The other is by depraving and wresting the sayings of the ancient fathers unto such a strange kind of sense as the fathers themselves indeed never meant. For what the meaning of the fathers was, it is evident . . . that the whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice once sacrificed upon the altar of the Cross; that the same sacrifice may continually be had in reverence by mystery, which once only, and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption.⁵⁷

While the English Reformers went along with Luther as regards the Holy Sacrifice, they did not follow him as to the Real Presence. 'There was already, at the time, a mass of heresy fermenting throughout the country, and it was too strong for the mere Lutherans, who seemed for a moment to be masters of it in the reign of Edward VI. Wicliffe's doctrines were widely prevalent in the land, and had in great measure ruined the people already. The Anglican notions of the Eucharist are his; for he said, among other things, that the "consecrated Host is not the Body of Christ, but an effectual sign thereof"—*efficax ejus signum*. Even the extreme language of the present day is wholly Wicliffe's, not excepting the gross and shameless buffoonery with which the most Holy Sacrament is sometimes assailed. He objected to and denounced the elevation and adoration of the Host, though he practised both externally. It was he who applied the term idolatry to the worship of God, and

⁵⁷ *Works*, p. 210, ed. Parker Society.

who maintained that "This is my Body" is a figurative expression. It was from him that the Anglicans learnt to make their communion a mere commemoration. "All the Sacraments that He left here on earth," said Wicliffe, "be but minds [memorials] of the Body of Christ; for a Sacrament is no more to say, but a sign or mind [memorial] of a thing past or a thing to come."—Wicliffe's *Wicket*, § 15.⁵⁸

This heresiarch also anticipated another doctrine of the Anglicans: that of the "spiritual eating," and of the consecrating power being the faith of the recipient, which is laid down in the Thirty-nine Articles in these words: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." These are Wicliffe's words: "Panis sacramentalis a fidelibus sparsim recipitur, consequenter irroratus fide evangelica in corde pinsatur, et igne charitatis induratus spiritualiter manducatur." *Dial.* iv. c. vii. fol. 110. This "spiritual eating" is the doctrine of Zuinglians and Calvinists also, but they learnt it out of Wicliffe's books; for it was those books, carried to Bohemia, that supplied John Huss and Jerome of Prague with the principles they held, and which their disciples transmitted to Zuinglius.⁵⁹

The English Reformers, while forsaking Luther, did not go the lengths of Zuinglius the other way, but endeavoured to steer the middle course that they had learnt from Wicliffe. They would not say that the bread and wine are mere signs; but that, though signs, they are effectual signs; that though there be no real or local or corporal or substantial presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the consecrated species, yet that the species are signs that effect their presence to the receiver; and thus

⁵⁸ *Dublin Review*, new series, vol. x. p. 535, with some verbal alterations and omissions.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

that the Body and Blood are received and eaten spiritually and sacramentally by the worthy receiver; and they seem to wish to add, really, but so as by faith.

The Fathers of the Council of Trent do not seem to have had the question laid before them exactly in this form, but only in the statements of Zuinglius and the Sacramentaries, as follows:

'1. That in the Eucharist there is not really the Body and Blood nor the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, but only as in a sign. This is the error of Zuinglius, (Ecolampadius, and the Sacramentaries.

'2. That in the Eucharist Christ is given (*exhiber*), but to be eaten spiritually only by faith, and not sacramentally. This article is of the above-named heretics, especially Ecolampadius, in his book on the Sacrament of the Eucharist, cap. xiii. and other places; for when they deny that Christ is really in the Eucharist, they assert that Christ cannot be eaten except by faith, and that sacramentally a piece of bread is received.⁶⁰

The Canon in which this error was condemned is therefore put in the following terms: 'If any one saith, that Christ given in the Eucharist is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema.' This Canon does not expressly notice the idea of eating spiritually only *as well as* sacramentally, because it seems to treat it as impossible. And whether the English Reformers could keep their Wicliffite dogma from coming under the anathema, will be seen by taking the statements of it from their works.

Thus Cranmer:

'Although Christ be not corporally in the bread and wine, yet Christ used not so many words, in the mystery of His holy Supper, without effectual signification. For He is effectually present, and effectually worketh, not in the bread and wine, but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst.'⁶¹

⁶⁰ Le Plat, *Mon. Conc. Trid.* vol. iv. p. 258.

⁶¹ *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 34.

'When the true believing man cometh to the Lord's Supper . . . to him the words of our Saviour Christ be effectuous and operatory. . . . For the effect of his godly eating is the communication of Christ's body and blood, but to the faithful receiver, and not to the dumb creatures of bread and wine, under whose forms the Catholic faith teacheth not the body and blood of Christ invisibly to be hidden.'⁶²

And Latimer:

'So likewise go to the Lord's Supper: when the bread is consecrated, when the words are spoken over it, then it is such an office that it beareth the name of the body and blood of Christ. Like as the magistrates because of their office are called *Jurats*, "gods;" so the bread presenteth His body, so that we go unto it worthily, and receive it with a good faith. Then we be assured that we feed upon Him spiritually. And like as the bread nourisheth the body, so the soul feedeth upon the very body and blood of Christ by faith, by believing Him to be a Saviour which delivered man from his sin.'⁶³

Coverdale also, after stating wherein Luther erred, and also wherein Zuinglius and Cœcolampadius did err, proceeds:

'This do I understand, that whilst they (the latter) gave themselves studiously and diligently to affirm that the bread and wine were called the body and blood of Christ, because they be the signs thereof, they thought not that they ought in the mean time to do this thing also—to add to that, that they are the signs after such sort that the verity is nevertheless joined unto them. Neither did they declare that they went not about to deface the true communion which the Lord giveth us in His body and blood.

'With one voice we all confess that when we do, according to the institution of the Lord, receive the Sacrament with faith, we are undoubtedly made partakers of the substance of the body and blood of Christ. How this thing should be done, some men can better define and more plainly expound than some. But this thing is chiefly to be remembered, that we exclude all carnal imagination, and that the mind ought to be erected up into Heaven, and that we think not our Lord Jesus Christ to be so vile that He may be contained in corruptible elements. Again, lest the force

⁶² P. 36.

⁶³ *Remains*, p. 127.

of this most sacred mystery should be diminished, we must think that it is wrought by the secret and wonderful power of God, and that His Spirit is the bond of this partaking, which is for that cause called spiritual.'⁶⁴

So too Ridley, in the disputation at Oxford, in reply to Smith:

'I grant that Christ did both; that is, both took up His flesh with Him ascending up, and also did leave the same behind Him with us, but after a diverse manner and respect. For He took His flesh with Him, after the true and corporal substance of His body and flesh; again, He left the same in mystery to the faithful in the Supper, to be received after a spiritual communication, and by grace. Neither is the same received in the Supper only, but also at other times, by hearing the Gospel, and by faith. For the bread which we break is the communication of the body of Christ; and generally, "unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you."⁶⁵

Smith having objected Chrysoptom's words, 'He that sitteth above with the Father is handled with the hands of men,' Ridley replies:

'He that sitteth there is *vere* present in mystery and by grace; and is holden of the godly, such as communicate Him, not only sacramentally with the hand of the body, but much more wholesomely with the hand of the heart, and by inward drinking is received; but by the sacramental signification He is holden of all men.'⁶⁶

It must, however, be remembered that Cranmer and Latimer had previously entertained tenets more nearly Lutheran, and the works from which these extracts are made were written after their opinions had become more advanced; and the first change made in religion with reference to the Mass was carried into effect while their opinions were still doubtful, or, at least, before their giving up Lutheranism had become publicly known. These innovations began with the 'Order of Communion,' in the year 1548. By this 'Order' there was to be no 'vary-

⁶⁴ Treatise on the Sacraments, *Works*, p. 464-6.
⁶⁵ *Works*, p. 222.

ing in any other ceremony in the Mass,' but only to prepare for giving Communion to the people in both kinds. In the Exhortations the following passages are met with:

'For us He hath not only given His body to death and shed His blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a sacrament and mystery to give us His said body and blood spiritually, to feed and drink upon.'⁶⁶

'As the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive this holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us).'⁶⁷

'To the end we should always remember . . . the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us, He hath left in these holy mysteries as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us spiritually to feed upon, to our endless comfort and consolation.'⁶⁸

These are quite the Lutheran forms of expression, were it not for the word 'spiritually,' by which it seems that the Wicliffite doctrine is here introduced.

At the end of the 'Order' came the following rubric:

'If it doth so chance that the wine, hallowed and consecrated, doth not suffice, or be enough for them that do take the communion, the Priest, after the first cup or chalice be emptied, may go again to the altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another, and so the third, or more, likewise beginning at these words, "*Sicut modo*," &c., and without any levation or lifting up.'⁶⁹

By this the Priest who has already celebrated is directed to consecrate again in one kind only, and without communicating himself. It is impossible not to see in this rubric a denial both of the Holy Sacrifice and of the Real Presence. The strange thing is, that the very authors of it were fond of alleging⁷⁰ as an authority for the ne-

⁶⁶ Liturg. K. Edw. VI. p. 3.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Strype's *Grammar*: Answer to Devon Rebels, Records.

⁶⁷ p. 5.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* p. 8.

cessity of communion in both kinds, the Decree of Pope St. Gelasius against those who, out of superstition, refused to receive the chalice, 'for there cannot be a division of one and the same mystery without great sacrilege;' and did not see that they were pronouncing their own condemnation.

During the next year, 1549, the Book of Common Prayer first appeared, and contained 'The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.' This incorporated the 'Order of the Communion' promulgated the year before with very little alteration. It did not by any means satisfy the Zuinglian party, who looked on it as too Lutheran. Thus Hilles writes to Bullinger in June 1549, that 'Traheron had endeavoured (being one of the burgesses in the last Parliament) that there should be no ambiguity in the reformation of the Lord's Supper, but could not bring over his old fellow-citizens to his views. Therefore we have a uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg churches, and some of those in Saxony; for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments.'⁷¹

The book, indeed, preserved in a great degree the order and semblance of the Mass. With the view, therefore, to show what the changes were, it will be best to arrange the two in parallel columns, putting in one column the whole Ordinary, Proper, and Canon of the Mass from the Sarum Missal for a single day, and the Communion, with the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the same day from the Prayer Book of 1549 in the other, and selecting one of the Sundays after Trinity as a day on which they most nearly agree; and for brevity's sake the rubrics of the Missal are generally omitted.

⁷¹ *Orig. Letters*, p. 266.

Altar of God, to God who giveth joy to my youth.

Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father, &c. Hail, Mary, &c.

When these are ended, the Office of the Mass is sung by the choir, and when the Gloria Patri is begun, the Priest approaches the altar-step and says the Confession.

Confess ye to the Lord that he is good, for his mercy is for ever.

I confess to God, the Blessed Mary, all Saints, and you ; that I have sinned grievously in thought, word, and deed, by my fault : I pray holy Mary, all the Saints of God, and you, to pray for me.

The Ministers respond. Almighty God have mercy upon you, and forgive you all your sins, deliver you from all evil, preserve and strengthen you in good, and bring you to life everlasting. R. Amen.

The Confiteor is then repeated by the Ministers, and the Misereatur by the Priest.

Then the Priest says: May the Almighty and merciful Lord

⁷⁴ When there is anything to be said or done according to the Prayer Book which corresponds with the Missal, but not in the same order, it seems proper to repeat it in the Prayer Book column in brackets opposite the place of the Missal.

Ordinarium Missæ. The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.

Preparation. While putting on the vestments, the Priest is to say the hymn Veni Creator Spiritus, with the versicle and response.

V. Send forth thy spirit, and they shall be created. R. And thou shalt renew the face of the earth.

The Priest shall put on him the vesture appointed. Then shall the Clerks sing in English for the Office or Introit (as they call it) a Psalm appointed for that day. The Priest, standing humbly afore the midst of the altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect :

Prayer. O God, to whom every heart is open, and every will speaketh; and from whom no secret is hid; purify by the infusion of the Holy Spirit the thoughts of our heart; that we may attain perfectly to love and worthily to praise thee. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Antiph. I will go in to the altar of God. Psalm xlii. Judge me, O God, &c.; with Gloria Patri. Antiph. I will go in to the

⁷² Ed. Byrckman, Paris, 1515; and Paris, 1516; and Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England. ⁷³ Ed. Parker Society.

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, and all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid : cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit ; that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name : through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, time for true penance, and amendment of life, grace and consolation of the Holy Ghost. R. Amen.

Then the Priest says: Our help is in the name of the Lord, who hath made heaven and earth. Blessed be the name of the Lord. Let us pray.

Then the Priest goes up to the altar, and says: Take away from us, O Lord, we beseech thee, all our iniquities, that we may attain to enter into the Holy of Holies with pure minds. Through Christ our Lord.

The Priest, making the sign of the Cross, says: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Priest then says the Office or Introit.

Eighth Sunday after Trinity.⁷⁵
Office.

We have received thy mercy, O God, in the midst of thy Temple; according to thy name, O God, so also is thy praise unto the ends of the earth: thy right hand is full of justice. Ps. Great is the Lord and exceedingly to be praised, in the city of our God, in his holy mountain. Glory be, &c.

⁷⁵ In the Sarum rite, the Sundays are not reckoned from Pentecost, as in the Roman Calendar, but from the Feast of the Holy Trinity.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.*The Kyrie follows.*

Which Psalm ended, the Priest shall say, or else the Clerks shall sing:

- iii. Lord, have mercy upon us.
- iii. Christ, have mercy upon us.
- iii. Lord, have mercy upon us.

Then the Priest, standing at God's board, shall begin: Glory be to God on high. And in earth peace, &c.

Then the Priest shall turn him to the people, and say: The Lord be with you.

The Answer. And with thy spirit.

The Priest. Let us pray.

Then shall follow the Collect of the Day.

O God, whose providence is never deceived, we humbly beseech thee that thou wilt put away from us all hurtful things, and give those things that be profitable for us. Through, &c.

Second Collect of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Grant to us thy servants, we beseech thee, O Lord God, to enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to be delivered from present sorrow, and to enjoy eternal gladness.

Third Collect of All Saints.

Grant we beseech thee, Almighty God, that by the inter-

Priest. The Lord be with you.

Resp. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Let us pray.

THE COLLECT.

O God, whose providence in the disposal of itself is not deceived, we humbly beseech thee that thou wilt put away from us all hurtful things, and give us all things that be profitable for us. Through, &c.

Second Collect of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Grant to us thy servants, we beseech thee, O Lord God, to enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and by the glorious intercession of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to be delivered from present sorrow, and to enjoy eternal gladness.

Third Collect of All Saints.

Grant we beseech thee, Al-

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

cession of holy Mary, Mother of God, and of all the holy Powers of heaven, and the blessed Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, and Virgins, and all thine elect, we may everywhere have cause to rejoice; and while recalling their merits, may be sensible of their protection.

Fourth Collect for the Universal Church.

We beseech thee, O Lord, in thy clemency admit the prayers of thy Church; that all errors and adversities being destroyed, she may serve thee with secure liberty.

Fifth Collect for Peace.

O God, from whom are holy desires, right counsels, and just works; give unto thy servants that peace which the world cannot give; that both our hearts may be set to obey thy commandments; and also that by thee we, being defended from the fear of our enemies, may pass our time in rest and quietness. Through our Lord, &c.

The Sub-deacon reads the Epistle in the pulpit.

The Lesson of the Epistle of blessed Paul the Apostle to the Romans.

With one of these two Collects following for the King.

Priest. Let us pray.

Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting, and power infinite, have mercy upon the whole congregation, and so rule the heart of thy chosen servant Edward the Sixth, our king and governor, that he (knowing whose minister he is) may above all things seek thy honour and glory, and that we his subjects (duly considering whose authority he hath) may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him, in thee and for thee, according to thy blessed word and ordinance. Through Jesus Christ our Lord, &c.

The Collects ended, the Priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the Epistle in a place assigned for the purpose, saying:

The Epistle of Saint Paul written in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

Brethren, we are debtors not to the flesh, &c.

The Gradual is sung by the choir.

Grad. Be thou to me, O God, a protector and a place of refuge to save me.

Vers. In thee, O God, have I hoped, let me never be confounded. Alleluia.

Vers. Hearken, my people, to my law.

Before singing the Gospel, the Deacon asks the blessing of the Priest.

Deacon. Give me thy blessing.

Priest. The Lord be in thy heart and in thy mouth to announce the holy gospel of God. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Deacon. The Lord be with you.

Resp. And with thy spirit.

The Gospel according to Matthew.

The holy Gospel, written in the seventh chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew.

The Clerks and people shall answer:

Glory be to thee, O Lord.⁷⁶

Beware of false prophets, &c.

At that time Jesus said to his disciples, Beware of false prophets, &c.

⁷⁶ There is no direction to this effect in the Sarum Missal, but it was the custom from the ninth century for the people to make this answer. Pelliccia, vol. i. p. 201.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

The Gospel ended, the Priest intones the beginning of the Credo, and recites the remainder while the choir are singing it.

Priest. I believe in one God,
&c.

I believe in one God.

[*The Clerks shall sing the rest.*]

After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or Exhortation.

Dearly beloved in the Lord,
&c.

Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these sentences of Holy Scripture, to be sung whilst the people do offer, or else one of them to be said by the Minister immediately afore the offering:

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven, &c.
&c.

Then shall the Minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion.

After the Offertory the Deacon presents the chalice with the paten and the host to the Priest, kissing his hand each time; and the Priest, taking the chalice, places it in the middle of the altar, and, elevating it with both hands, offers the sacrifice to the Lord, saying this prayer:

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which I, unworthy sinner, offer in honour of thee and of blessed Mary and all thy Saints, for my sins and offences, and for the salvation of the liv-

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

ing, and rest of all the faithful departed. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost be this new sacrifice accepted of Almighty God.⁷⁷

This said, he replaces the chalice, and covers it with the corporals, and places the bread decently upon the corporals, in front of the chalice with the wine and water therein, and kisses the paten and replaces it on the altar on his right hand under the corporals, partly covering it.

Then the Priest goes to the right-hand corner of the altar, and washes his hands, saying:

Cleanse me, O Lord, from all defilement of body and soul, that I may be able in cleanness to fulfil the holy work of the Lord.

After washing the hands the Priest returns, and standing before the altar, with his head and body inclined and his hands joined, says the prayer:

In the spirit of humility and in a contrite heart, may we be accepted of thee, O Lord, and so be our sacrifice in thy sight, that it may be accepted of thee to-day, and please thee, O Lord God.

⁷⁷ The words 'acceptum sit omnipotenti Deo hoc sacrificium novum' are not in Maskell; but they are found in both the editions of 1515 and 1516, and in the Sarum Mass in Martene.

Laying the bread upon the corporals, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose; and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean water; and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

Then standing erect he kisses the altar on the right-hand side of the host, and blesses first the host and then himself with the sign of the cross, saying:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Then he turns to the people, and says with a low voice:

Pray ye for me, brethren and sisters, that my sacrifice and yours likewise may be accepted of the Lord our God.

Answer of the Clerks privately:

May the grace of the Holy Ghost illuminate thy heart and thy lips, and may the Lord deign to accept this sacrifice of praise at thy hands, for our sins and offences.

And the Priest, turning again towards the altar, says the secret prayers, which are to be the same in number as the Collects.

Let us pray.

O God, who by the perfection of one sacrifice hast fulfilled the variety of sacrifices of the law: accept the sacrifice offered to thee by thy devoted servants, and sanctify it with thy benediction like the offerings of just Abel; that what they severally have offered in honour of thy Majesty, may profit them all together to salvation. Through our Lord, &c.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

By thy propitiation, O Lord, and the intercession of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, may this oblation profit us to our perpetual and present prosperity and peace.

Be graciously pleased, O Lord, with the gifts offered unto thee; the blessed and glorious Mary, ever Virgin and Mother of God, interceding with all thy Saints.

Protect us, O Lord, we beseech thee, in the service of thy mysteries; that by cleaving to divine things we may serve thee in body and soul.

O God, who wilt permit no terrors to overwhelm the people that believe in thee, vouchsafe to accept the prayers and sacrifices of the people dedicated unto thee, that in the peace which in thy pity thou dost grant, Christian lands may be made secure from all enemies. Through our Lord, &c.

Then the Priest says aloud:

For ever and ever.

Ans. Amen.

The Lord be with you.

Ans. And with thy spirit.

Raise up your hearts.

Ans. We have them raised up to the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

Ans. It is meet and just.

Preface. It is truly meet and just, right and salutary, that we

Then the Priest shall say:

The Lord be with you.

Ans. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Lift up your hearts.

Ans. We lift them up unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.

Ans. It is meet and right so to do.

Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

should at all times, and in all places, give thanks to thee, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God. Through Christ our Lord. Through whom the Angels praise thy Majesty, the Dominations adore, the Powers tremble. The heavens and the heavenly Virtues, and the blessed Seraphim join together with exultation to celebrate the same. With whom we pray thee to grant admittance to our voices, with suppliant confession saying,—

[And^s therefore with Angels and Archangels, with Thrones and Dominations, and with all the army of the heavenly host, we sing a hymn to thy glory, repeating without end:]

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts. The heavens and the earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

[The Sanctus was also sung by the Choir.]

Then at once the Priest is to begin the Canon, with his hands

⁷⁸ This conclusion is not used in the common Preface, either in the Sarum or Roman Missals, but only in some of the proper Prefaces.

1549.

should at all times, and in all places, give thanks to thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee, and saying:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Osannah in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Glory to thee, O Lord, in the highest.

This the Clerks shall also sing. When the Clerks have done singing, then shall the Priest or Deacon turn him to the people, and say:

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.

Then the Priest, turning him to the altar, shall say or sing,

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

joined, his eyes raised, and his body inclined.

plainly and distinctly, this prayer following:

Almighty and ever-living God, which by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men:

The Canon.

Therefore, we humbly beg and beseech thee, O most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, to accept and bless

these gifts, these offerings, these holy undefiled sacrifices, which we offer to thee especially for thy holy Catholic Church which vouchsafe to keep in peace, to guard, unite, and govern throughout the world,

together with thy servant our Pope N., and our Bishop N., and our King N.

these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty, beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord. And grant that all they that do confess thy holy name may agree in the truth of thy holy word and live in unity and godly love.

[All Bishops, Pastors, and Curates.]

Specially we beseech thee to save and defend thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of thy true religion and virtue. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops, Pastors, and Curates, that they may both

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments; and to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.

And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.

And especially we commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son.

And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all thy Saints, from the beginning of the world:

and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs,

and all who are orthodox and profess the Catholic and Apostolic faith.

Remember, O Lord, thy servants men and women, N. and N.
A pause for a moment is here made to pray for those whom he wishes specially to recommend to God.

And all here present, whose faith and devotion are known to thee, for whom we offer to thee, or who offer unto thee this sacrifice of praise, for themselves, and all that belong to them: for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety: and render their vows to thee, the everlasting, true, and living God.
Communicating, and venerating the memory

in the first place of the glorious Mary ever Virgin, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ: as also of thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs Peter and Paul,

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

Andrew, &c. &c., and all thy Saints; by whose merits and prayers mayest thou grant, that in all things we may be defended by the help of thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

whose examples, O Lord, and steadfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow.

[*The commemoration of the dead⁷⁰ follows here, but for the sake of brevity is transposed to the place corresponding with the Canon of the Mass.*]

O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again:

Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless

and sanctify these thy gifts

This oblation therefore of our service, as also of all thy family, we beseech thee, O Lord, favourably to accept, and to dispose our days in thy peace, and eternal damnation, and to be numbered in the flock of thine elect. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Which oblation do thou, O God, we beseech thee, in all things vouchsafe to make blessed, ratified, rati-
fied, acceptable,

and acceptable,

⁷⁰ The revisers of our Liturgy transposed this prayer, placing it before the oblation, perhaps for fear that it should give any countenance to the Romish error, 'that Christ was offered for the quick and dead.' (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, p. 11.)

THE SARUM MISSAL.

that it may be made
to us the Body and Blood
of thy most beloved Son, our
Lord Jesus Christ,
who the day before he suffered,
took bread

into his holy and venerable
hands, and with eyes lifted up
to thee, O God, his Father Al-
mighty [*here he inclines himself
a little*], giving thanks to thee,
he blessed, brake [*here he
touches the host*], and gave to his
disciples, saying, Take, and eat
ye all of this :

For this is my Body

[*here he inclines himself to the
Host and elevates it, so that it
may be seen by the people*].

Likewise after supper, taking
also this excellent chalice

into his holy and venerable
hands,
also giving thanks to thee, he
blessed it, and gave it to his
disciples, saying,

Take, and
drink ye all of it ; for this is

the Chalice of
My Blood of the New and eternal
Testament,
the Mystery of Faith ;

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

and creatures of bread and
wine
that they may be

unto us the body and blood of
thy most dearly-beloved Son
Jesus Christ,
who, in the same night that he
was betrayed, took bread [*here
the Priest must take the bread
into his hands*],

and when he had blessed, and
given thanks, he brake it, and
gave it to his disciples, saying,
Take, eat,

this is my Body,

which is given for you : do this
in remembrance of me.

Likewise after supper, he took
the cup [*here the Priest shall take
the cup into his hands*],

and when he had given thanks,
he gave it to them, saying,

Drink ye all of this ; for this is

My Blood of the New
Testament,

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

which shall be shed for you, and
for many, unto the remission of
sins.

As often as you shall do these
things, you shall do them
in remembrance of me
[*here he elevates the chalice*].

Do this, as oft as you shall
drink it,
in remembrance of me.

*The words before rehearsed are
to be said, turning still to the
altar without any elevation, or
showing the Sacrament to the
people.*

Wherefore, O Lord,

and heavenly Father, according
to the Institution of thy dearly-
beloved Son, our Saviour, Jesu
Christ,

we thy servants

and likewise thy holy people,

do offer to

thy excellent Majesty
of thy gifts and bounties, a pure
victim, a holy victim, an imma-
culate victim, the holy bread of
eternal life, and the chalice of
everlasting salvation ;

having in remembrance as well
the blessed passion of Christ thy
Son our Lord, as also his resur-
rection from the dead, and like-
wise his glorious ascension into
heaven.

do celebrate and make here
before thy divine Majesty,
with these thy holy gifts, the
memorial which thy Son hath
willed us to make :

Upon which vouchsafe to look
with a propitious and serene
countenance ;

rendering unto thee most hearty
thanks, for the innumerable
benefits procured unto us by

THE SARUM MISSAL,

and accept them as thou didst vouchsafe to accept the offerings of thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which thy high priest Melchisedec offered to thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate victim.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

the same, entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this

our sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving: most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee:

Humbly beseeching thee,

[command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy Divine Majesty];

that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily

receive
the most holy Body and Blood
of thy Son,
may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction and grace,

receive
the most precious body and blood
of thy Son Jesus Christ,
and be fulfilled with thy grace
and heavenly benediction,

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

and made one body with thy Son Jesus Christ, that he may dwell in them, and they in him.

[We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace; Grant unto them, we beseech thee,

thy mercy and everlasting peace,

and that, at the day of general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world; grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.]⁸⁰

And although we be unworthy through our manifold sins

Remember also, O Lord, thy servants, men and women, N. and N., who are gone before us,

with the sign of faith, and do rest in the sleep of peace: We beseech thee to grant unto them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light, and

peace.

Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

To us sinners also thy servants, hoping in the multitude of thy mercies,

vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with thy holy Apostles and Martyrs: with John, Stephen, &c., and with all thy Saints, into whose com-

⁸⁰ Transposed from the place previously noted in p. 305.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

pany do thou, we beseech thee, admit us,

to offer up to thee any Sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord:

not as in consideration of merit, but in the bestowal of pardon, through Christ our Lord.

Through whom, O Lord, thou dost always create, sanctify, give life to, bless, and bestow on us all these good things.

By him, and with him, and in him, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory is unto thee, O God the Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray. Admonished by salutary precepts, and formed by divine instruction, we are bold to say,

Our Father, &c.

Ans. But deliver us from evil.

The Priest says privately, A-

men.
Deliver us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come; and the blessed and glorious Mary, ever Virgin and Mother of God interceding, with the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and Andrew and all the Saints; graciously

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

ously bestow peace in our days; that, aided by the support of thy mercy, we may be both ever free from sin, and secure from all disturbance. Through the same our Lord, &c.

Then he says aloud: World without end. *Ans.* Amen.

The Priest. The peace of ✠ the Lord be ✠ always with ✠ you.

Ans. And with thy spirit.

The Priest with the Deacon and Sub-deacon says: Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us peace.

The Priest says: May this sacred ✠ commixture of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me and all who receive it salvation of soul and body; and a wholesome preparation for deserving and obtaining life eternal. Through, &c. Amen.

O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, grant me so worthily to receive this sacred Body and Blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ; that I may deserve thereby to receive remission of all my sins; and to be filled with thy Holy Spirit

Then shall the Priest say: The peace of the Lord be always with you.

The Clerks. And with thy spirit.

The Priest. Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all, when he bare our sins on his body upon the cross; for he is the very Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world: wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

and to have thy peace; for thou art God alone, and besides thee there is none other; whose glorious kingdom and dominion abides for ever without end. Amen.

Then the Priest gives the pax to the Deacon, saying: Peace to thee and the Church of God.
Answer. And with thy spirit.

Then the Priest, holding the Host in both hands, says privately before the Communion:

O God the Father, fountain and origin of all goodness; who moved with mercy didst will thine Only-begotten to descend for us to the lower world and to take flesh; the which I unworthy here hold in my hands:

Here he inclines himself to the Host, saying:

I adore thee; I glorify thee; I praise thee with all the intention of my heart and mind; and pray that thou desert not us thy servants; but pardon our sins; that with a pure heart and a chaste body, we may serve thee the only true and living God. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who, by the will of the Father and the cooperation of the Holy Ghost, didst by thy death give life to the world; deliver me, I beseech thee, by this thy most holy Body and this thy Blood, from all my iniquities and from all evils: and make

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

me ever to obey thy commandments, and never permit me to be separated from thee, O Saviour of the world, who with God the Father and the same Holy Ghost livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

May the sacrament of thy Body and Blood, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I, though unworthy, receive, be not to me for judgment and condemnation; but in thy pity may it avail to the health of my body and soul. Amen.

Before receiving, he says, inclining himself: Hail for ever, Most Holy Flesh of Christ; to me before all and above all things sovereign sweetness. The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me a sinner the way and the life. In the name ✠ of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Here he receives the Host, and then says: Hail for ever, Heavenly Drink, to me before all and above all things sovereign sweetness. The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ avail to me a sinner for an everlasting remedy to life eternal. Amen. In the name ✠ of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Here he receives the chalice, and then says: I give thee thanks, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God; who hast refreshed me with the most holy

THE SARUM MISSAL.

Body and Blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and pray that this sacrament of our salvation which I an unworthy sinner have received may not come to me to judgment and condemnation for my deserts; but to the advancement of the salvation^{s1} of my body and soul to eternal life. Amen.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

Here the Priest shall turn him toward those that come to the Holy Communion, and shall say:

You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins to Almighty God, and be in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; draw near and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to Almighty God, and to his holy Church here gathered together in his name, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

When any are to be communicated, a white cloth is to be held before them by the Acolytes, and the communicants are to repeat the Confiteor.

I confess to God, to the Blessed Mary, to all Saints, and to you, father, that I have sinned

^{s1} The word *salutis* is given here in the old editions, but is not in Maskell.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

grievously, in thought, word, and deed, by my own fault; I beseech Holy Mary, all the Saints of God, and you, father, to pray for me.

knowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us; we do earnestly repent and be heartily sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable: have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father, for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, forgive us all that is past, and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the honour and glory of thy name: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Then shall the Priest stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him:

have mercy upon you, and pardon you all your sins, deliver you from all evil, preserve and confirm you in good, and bring you to everlasting life.

Ans. Amen.

The Priest. The Almighty and merciful Lord grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, time for true penance and

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

amendment of life, the grace and
consolation of the Holy Ghost.
Ans. Amen.

Then shall the Priest also say:

Hear what comfortable words
our Saviour Christ saith to all
that truly turn to him. [Three
passages of Scripture recited.]

*Then shall the Priest, turning
him to God's board, kneel down,
and say in the name of all them
that shall receive the Commu-
nion, this prayer following:*

We do not presume to come
to this thy table (O merciful
Lord) trusting in our own right-
eousness, but in thy manifold
and great mercies: we be not
worthy to gather up the crumbs
under thy table: but thou art
the same Lord whose property
is always to have mercy. Grant
us therefore (gracious Lord) so
to eat the flesh of thy dear Son
Jesus Christ, and to drink his
blood in these holy Mysteries,
that we may continually dwell
in him, and he in us, that our
sinful bodies may be made clean
by his body, and our souls wash-
ed through his most precious
blood. Amen.

*Then the Priest giving Commu-
nion, says:*

*Then shall the Priest first receive
the Communion in both kinds
himself, and next deliver it to
other Ministers, if any be there
present (that they may be ready
to help the chief Minister), and
offer to the people. And when
he delivereth the Sacrament of*

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

*the body of Christ, he shall say
to every one these words:*

The Body of our Lord Jesus
Christ, which was given for thee,
preserve thy body and soul unto
everlasting life. Amen.⁸²

*And the Minister delivering the
Sacrament of the Blood, and
saying every one to drink once
and no more, shall say:*

The Blood of our Lord Jesus
Christ, which was shed for thee,
preserve thy body and soul unto
everlasting life.

At receiving the oblations the

⁸² There is no form of giving Communion in the Sarum Missal, nor in the
Manuale, or in any other of the liturgical books.

The form used seems to have depended on tradition, like several other
usages regarding the Mass. But there is no doubt of its being correctly de-
scribed in the text. For the ceremony of the King's offering and receiving
communion at his coronation is described as follows: 'The King shall be laid
to the high altar, the Queene following, and the King shall offer an obley of
bread laid vpon the patent of Saynt Edward his chalice, with the which obley
after consecrate the King shalbe houselled; also he shall offre, in a cruet of
gold, wyne, which he shall vse in the said chalice after he is houselled.' 'When
the King and Queene have kissed the pax, they shall goo to the high altar,
and after the Cardinal hath commoned hysselfe, he having betwene his hands
the same chalice wheruppon the holy sacrament shalbe laid, shall urne hym-
self to the King and to the Queene, and thei, lying prostrate before hym, shall
saye their *Confiteor*, all the prelates answering *Miserere* and the Cardinal
saying *absolucioun*; that doon, the King and the Queene shall somewhat arise
kneeling, and with great humylytie and deuotion receyue the sacrament by
hands of the said Cardinal, ij of the greatest estate then present holding befor
the King and the Queene a long towell of sylke. This so done, the King and
the Queene shall stand vpp and take wyne of the boue rehersed chalice by
handes of thalbot of Westmynster.' [*Ritland Papers*, Camden Society,
p. 21, 22.]

The words of giving Communion are taken from the Visitation of the Sick,
in the Manuale, as it is probable that the same form would be used. Two
illuminations in a ms. in the British Museum of the fourteenth century (Royal 2,
B. vii.) exhibit the rite of giving Communion during Mass, in one case by
a Bishop attended by his Deacon, in the other by a priest. The latter is
engraved in Dr. Rock's *Hierurgia*, p. 456.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

Priest says: May we receive with a pure mind, O Lord, what we have consumed with the mouth; and of a temporal gift may it become to us an eternal remedy.

May this communion, O Lord, purify us from crime, and make us to be partakers of a heavenly remedy.

Let us adore the sign of the cross, through which we have received the Sacrament of Salvation.

Then the Priest with the Minister says the Communion, which is sung also by the Choir.

Taste and see that the Lord is sweet: blessed is the man that hopeth in him.

Then the Priest says the Post-communion, first turning to the people and saying:

The Lord be with you. *Ans.*
And with thy spirit. *Priest.* Let us pray.

May thy healing power, O Lord, mercifully free us from our evil inclinations, and lead us to those things that are right. Through, &c.

Having received, O Lord, these helps to our salvation, grant, we beseech thee, that we may be ever protected by the patronage

Then shall the Clerk sing the Post-communion. Sentences of Holy Scripture, to be said or sung, every day one, after the Holy Communion, called the Post-communion.

If any man will follow me, let him forsake himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

Then the Priest shall give thanks to God, in the name of all them that have communicated, turning him first to the people, and saying:

The Lord be with you. *Ans.*
And with thy spirit. *Priest.* Let us pray.

Almighty and ever-living God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy fa-

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
1549.

of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, in veneration of whom we have made these offerings to thy Majesty.

Heavenly Sacraments have we received, O Lord, while celebrating the memory of Blessed Mary, ever Virgin and Mother of God, and of all thy Saints; grant, we beseech thee, that what engages us in time, we may, by the aid of their prayers, obtain in the joys of eternity.

We beseech thee, O Lord our God, that thou wouldst not permit us to be subject to human perils, to whom thou givest to rejoice in the partaking of Divine Mysteries.

O God, Author and Lover of peace, to know whom is to live, to serve whom is to reign; protect thy supplicants from all assaults, that we who confide in thy defence may fear no hostile weapons. Through, &c.

Priest. The Lord be with you. *Ans.* And with thy spirit. *Deacon.* Go, you are dismissed. *Ans.* Thanks be to God. *Priest.* Let the homage of my service be pleasing to thee, O holy Trinity, and grant that the sacrifice which I, unworthy as I am, have offered to the eyes of thy Majesty, may be acceptable to thee, and by thy mercy, be a propitiation for me, and for all for whom I have offered it. Who livest, &c. Amen.

The Priest. In the name ✠ of

your and goodness toward us, and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful-people, and heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the death and passion of thy dear Son. We therefore most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in: through, &c.

THE SARUM MISSAL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

1549.

the Father, and of the Son, and
of the Holy Ghost. Amen,

*Then the Priest, turning him to
the people, shall tell them de-
part with this blessing:*

The peace of God (which
passeth all understanding) keep
your hearts and minds in the
knowledge and love of God, and
of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.
And the blessing of God Al-
mighty, the Father, the Son, and
the Holy Ghost, be amongst
you and remain with you always.

Then the people shall answer:
Amen.

Confining our attention to points bearing on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, we find, from the preceding comparison, that what may be called the framework of the Mass remained nearly as before, for the new book retained the Sign of the Cross, the Introit, Kyrie Eleison, the Gloria and Credo, both of them to be commenced by the Priest and continued by the Choir; the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel (the two latter to be sung by assistants); the Preface and Sanctus; a long prayer in the form and place of the Canon, containing prayers for the Church, the King, and the congregation, and a commemoration of Saints and of the faithful departed; the Pater noster, and Agnus Dei; a Confitour before Communion, with the prayer Misereatur, and the words Corpus Domini, &c. in giving communion.

But, then, every expression which implies a real and proper sacrifice had been carefully weeded out. The Offertory Prayers are omitted altogether, with the Secret Prayers, which generally contain a petition in reference

to the sacrifice. The Canon is so mutilated that only here and there do the words in the two books agree.

Thus, at the beginning, in place of the words, 'to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy, undefiled sacrifices which we offer to thee,' we find, 'to receive these our prayers which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty.'

In place of 'for whom we offer to thee, or who offer unto thee this sacrifice of praise . . . for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety,' there is substituted, 'this congregation which is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son.' Thus, though 'sacrifice of praise' is the favourite term with the Reformers, they will not admit it when coupled with other words making it propitiatory and impetratory.

Again, where the Canon has, 'This oblation of our service we beseech thee favourably to accept,' the Prayer Book of 1549 enters on the following dogmatic declaration: 'who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.' Here, then, by such an alteration of the ancient words it is maintained that the Holy Eucharist is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; and that by the sacrifice of the Mass the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross is derogated from.

But further on, when we come in the Canon to the words, 'We do offer to thy excellent Majesty, of thy gifts and bounties, a pure victim, a holy victim, an immaculate victim, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation,' instead of these, we read, 'We do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with

these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make,'—being a repetition of the dogma of the bare commemoration.

Just afterwards, 'and accept them as . . . a holy sacrifice, an immaculate victim,'⁸³ we find instead, 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our self, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee:' thus adding to the condemned doctrine of the Mass being only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the other idea of the Christian sacrifice consisting in the offering of ourselves as a reasonable service. Now these ideas, be it observed, were advocated by Luther, for the very purpose of denying that there is any priesthood under the Gospel besides that common to all Christians.

The words 'command these,' *i.e.* the sacrifice of the host and chalice, 'to be carried by the hands of thy holy angels to thine altar on high, in sight of thy Divine Majesty,' have nothing immediately corresponding to them in King Edward's book; but some way further on we read, 'Command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of thy holy angels to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle, before the sight of thy Divine Majesty; prayer being again put in the place of sacrifice.'

The foregoing passages have all had reference to the holy Sacrifice, and the following relate to the Real Presence :

⁸³ The words 'sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam' are referred by some commentators to the sacrifice of Melchisedec, and by others to the sacrifice of Christ; and, says Pope Benedict XIV., 'either sense may be considered good.' But it is obvious that if applied to Melchisedec, it is in a typical sense, and that they are to be referred also to the 'super quæ,' as the reality which fulfils the type.

Corresponding with the prayer preceding the Consecration, in which the priest prays God 'to make the oblation blessed, admitted, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be made for us the body and blood' of our Lord, the Book of 1549 has also a prayer that God would vouchsafe, 'with his Holy Spirit and Word, to bless and sanctify these his creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood' of our Lord. The difference here appears but slight, viz. between 'may be made' and 'may be,' and the latter is sometimes a fair translation of *fiat*; but *fiat* does express a change in whatever it refers to, and this sense the compilers managed to evade by not adding the word 'made.'

It is, however, remarkable that in Aless's translation the word *fiat* is used.⁸⁴ Yet the intention with which the words were introduced is clearly shown by Cranmer's own explanation. Gardiner having argued that 'the body of Christ is made present to us, as the Church prays, which Prayer is ordered to be made in the Book of Common Prayer now set forth,' Cranmer replies, 'The bread and wine be made unto us the body and blood of Christ (as it is in the Book of Common Prayer), but not by changing the substance, &c. . . . but that in the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ's body and blood. . . . Therefore, in the book of the Holy Communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy Mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished.'⁸⁵

Coupling, then, this passage with those quoted before from the 'Order of Communion,' which were retained in 1549, and in which the Wickliffite expressions are introduced along with Lutheran, there does seem some founda-

⁸⁴ Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*. ⁸⁵ *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 79.

tion for the complaint of Bullinger's correspondent 'as to the ambiguity in the reformation of the Lord's Supper.' It is also remarkable that while the book seemed sometimes to lean on one side to the Zuinglian doctrine, it appeared in other points to be nearer the Catholic Church than the Lutheran formularies, retaining the Sign of the Cross, the prayer answering to the Canon, a prayer before the Consecration, and the Commemoration of the Saints and of the faithful departed.

Whatever ambiguity there may have been in this book with regard to the Real Presence, it was not suffered to continue very long. The advocates of a further reformation received an accession of strength in Bucer and Fagius, who arrived in England in April 1549. Peter Martyr had been at Oxford for some months previously.

Martin Bucer had been a Dominican friar, and having adopted the reformed doctrines, distinguished himself by endeavouring to bring about a reconciliation between the Lutheran and Zuinglian parties. To effect this he studied to use ambiguous terms regarding 'the Lord's Supper,' which, without satisfying the Lutheran divines, gave great offence to those of Zurich. In the course of his proceedings he showed such vacillation from one side to the other that he was trusted by neither.⁸⁶ His arrival in England gave anything but pleasure to the advanced Reformers, who expected him to oppose further changes in religion.⁸⁷ He had been employed some years before by Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, in drawing up a scheme of Reformation, which comes nearer to the Anglican Prayer Book than any other of the 'Church Orders' of the Continental Reformers; and this was one of the motives that led to his being invited to England.

Peter Martyr had been a Prior of Augustinian Canons at Lucca, and had for some years embraced opinions favourable to Zuinglianism. At last, being obliged to make his

⁸⁶ Melchior Adam in *Vita Buceri*.

⁸⁷ *Orig. Letters*.

escape, he came to Zurich; but there being no place open for him in the College, he went on to Strasburg, where he was kindly received by Bucer, and by his means made a lecturer in the college.⁸⁸ Hence there arose a friendship between these two, which does not seem to have been interrupted by their partisans being in such opposition.

King Edward's first book had not actually appeared when Bucer arrived in London, but the Archbishop had ordered it to be translated into Latin, by Aless, for his perusal.⁸⁹ Bucer drew up a 'Censure' upon it, which was not finished till the beginning of the year 1551, scarcely a month before his death. In this 'Censure' he objects to the use of vestments, as tending to superstition, and causing dissension. He recommends the omission of praying for the dead, as encouraging superstition. He then enters on an elaborate argument about the prayer before the Consecration, objecting to the words, 'With thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of our Lord.' These words, he says, favour the abomination of transubstantiation, and there is no authority in the example of Christ or the Apostles for 'bless and sanctify.' Moreover, some priests continue to make an inclination in saying our Lord's words from the Gospel, and whisper them, as if addressing the bread and wine instead of the people. Though we receive really and substantially the body and blood of Christ with his Divinity, and his whole self, that presence is merely in the receiving, and not in the bread and wine, which are in no way changed in their nature, being but symbols, and having no virtue in them either before or after the receiving. Therefore he suggests an alteration of the prayer, and hopes that the 'little black crosses' will be omitted,

⁸⁸ Melchior Adam in *Vita Martyris*.

⁸⁹ *Orig. Letters*, vol. ii. p. 535; Strype's *Craumer*, vol. ii. p. 300.

as well as the rubrics directing the priest to 'take the bread and the cup into his hands.'

He also objected to the words 'by the ministry of thy holy angels,' and hoped they would be omitted.

He then commends highly all the terms used implying the Real Presence in the receiving communion, which he earnestly hopes will be retained just as they are.⁸⁰

There is another objection which we will notice further on. If, indeed, Bucer's recommendations had been strictly adhered to, the rite would have been made simply Lutheran; but the ambiguity that there was already in the book would have been largely increased.

According to Strype, Peter Martyr wrote to Bucer that he agreed with all his objections; but he appears to express himself somewhat cautiously, and does not say that he approves all that Bucer commended.⁸¹

Bucer's 'Censure' having been received, the revision of the book was proceeded with. The new book appeared in 1552, and was received as favourable to the Zuinglian views; for Cox writes to Bullinger, Oct. 5, 1552, 'We have now for the second time altered the administration of the public prayers, and even of the Sacraments themselves, and have framed them according to the rule of God's Word.'⁸²

In the 'Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper,' the omissions recommended by Bucer were carried into effect; but the alteration he proposed in the prayer was not adopted, and the parts that he hoped would be left as they stood were considerably altered. The Sign of the Cross, the Introit, and Kyrice Eleison were omitted; the Gloria in Excelsis was transposed to the end instead of the beginning; of the prayer answering to the Canon, great part was omitted, and the remainder was divided into three portions and placed in

⁸⁰ Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana* p. 456-76.

⁸¹ *Cramer*, vol. i. p. 304.

⁸² *Orig. Letters*, p. 123.

different parts of the rite; the Commemoration of Saints and the faithful departed omitted entirely; the Prayer before Consecration altered; in place of the ancient words of giving communion a Zuinglian form was substituted; and the whole arrangement so changed as no longer to present any resemblance to the Mass. After Queen Mary's reign, when the book was revived again in 1559, the ancient words of giving communion were restored, but united to the Zuinglian form; otherwise the rite remained very nearly the same up to 1662, when a sort of commemoration of the departed was added, but without praying for them, and the rubrics directing the priest to take the 'bread and cup' into his hand were restored. But substantially the present Book of Common Prayer is the same with that of 1552.

The differences between the two books on the subject of the Real Presence we must now proceed to notice. Having already shown what was the doctrine maintained by the earlier Reformers, we will now take those who succeeded them; and having ascertained their views, we will try to see whether there is ground to suppose that the same doctrine is expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and then whether it is such as to come under the condemnation of the Council of Trent.

The same idea that prevailed among the earlier divines seems to be carried on by those who succeeded them, namely, that the bread and wine in the Communion are signs of the body and blood of Christ, and that the faithful, in corporally receiving the former, receive also the latter spiritually, but really; but that the unfaithful receive only the signs. Beyond this, it is not easy to tell what their precise belief was. Some writers seem to attribute more efficacy to the sacramental receiving. Others appear to go greater lengths in placing the hearing of the word read or preached, or the mere faith of the receiver, on a level with the Sacrament itself.

Hooper's influence in England did not commence till after the publication of the first Prayer Book ; hence we place him with the later divines, and find, in a letter to Bucer, dated June 19, 1548, the following passage :

'You write word that you cannot believe the Sacraments to be bare signs. Far be such a belief from the most unlearned Christian ! The Holy Supper is not a bare sign ; neither in it is the true and natural body of Christ exhibited to me in any supernatural or heavenly manner ; nevertheless, I religiously, and with all honour, venerate and reverence the institution of Christ upon other grounds, because it is a sign of the goodwill of God towards me, and an outward testimony added to the promise of grace. Not that this promise is applied to me by means of any sacrament, but because the promise previously applied to me by faith is thereby confirmed. . . . Thus the Holy Supper is a testimony of grace, and a mystery of our redemption in which God bears witness to the benefits bestowed upon us by Christ : not that the remission of sins, which in believers ought to precede all use of sacraments, is there applied ; nor that the true body of Christ, which is in heaven and not on earth, is exhibited together with the bread, but that it may confirm that faith which I have in the death and passion of that body which was alive, died, and rose again. And the minister gives what is in his power, namely, the bread and wine, and not the body of Christ ; nor is it exhibited by the minister, and eaten by the communicant, otherwise than in the word preached, read, or meditated upon. And to eat the body of Christ is nothing else than to believe, as he himself teaches in the sixth of John.⁸²

Then Grindall, in the Dialogue between Custom and Verity :

'Christ, speaking of the eating of his body, nameth himself the bread, not for the body, but of life for the soul ; and saith, "He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." Wherefore, whoso will be relieved by the body of Christ must receive him as he will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto, not with his teeth or mouth. And, whereas I say that Christ's body must be received and taken with faith, I mean not that you shall pluck down Christ from heaven, and put him in your faith, as in a visible place ; but that you must with your faith rise and spring up to him, and, leaving

⁸² *Orig. Letters*, p. 47.

this world, dwell above in heaven ; putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in him, which suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty and to make you free ; creeping into his wounds, which were so cruelly pierced and dented for your sake. So shall you feed on the body of Christ ; so shall you suck the blood that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, the very true, the only eating of Christ's body.⁸⁴

And Jewell :

'M. Harding unjustly reporteth of us, that we maintain a naked figure and a bare sign and token only, and nothing else. . . . He knoweth well we feed not the people of God with bare signs and figures, but teach them that the Sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministrations thereof Christ is set before us, even as he was crucified upon the cross, and that therein we may behold the remission of our sins, and our reconciliation unto God. . . . Herein we teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us ; that we verily eat it ; that we verily drink it ; that we verily be relieved and live by it ; that we are bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh ; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him. Yet we say not either that the substance of the bread or wine is done away ; or that Christ's body is let down from heaven, or made really or fleshly present in the Sacrament. We are taught, according to the doctrine of the old fathers, to lift up our hearts to heaven, and there to feed upon the Lamb of God. . . . Thus, spiritually, and with the mouth of our faith, we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, even as verily as his body was verily broken, and his blood verily shed upon the cross. . . . The bread that we receive with our bodily mouths is an earthly thing, and therefore a figure, as the water in baptism is likewise a figure ; but the body of Christ that thereby is represented and there is offered unto our faith, is the thing itself, and no figure. . . .

'Three things herein we must consider : first that we put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified.

'Secondly, that we seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine not him to be present bodily upon the earth.

'Thirdly, that the body of Christ is to be eaten by faith only, and none otherwise.

'And in this last point appeareth a notable difference between us and M. Harding. For we place Christ in the heart, according

⁸⁴ *Remains*, p. 46.

to the doctrine of St. Paul; M. Harding placeth him in the mouth. We say, Christ is eaten only by faith; M. Harding saith, He is eaten with the mouth and teeth.⁹⁵

Beacon also:

'Christ is eaten or received two manner of ways; that is to say, sacramentally and spiritually. He is received or eaten sacramentally when we eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine, according to the institution of Christ, which thing is done not only of the faithful, but also of the unfaithful. He is also eaten or received spiritually when we believe in Christ, embrace him as our alone Saviour, put our whole hope, trust, and confidence of our redemption and salvation in that one and alone sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, having his body there broken, and his blood there shed, for the remission of our sins. . . And after this manner the godly and faithful only eat and receive Christ. Other eating or receiving of Christ there is none.

'Father. Why? Is not the very natural body of Christ eaten of by the communicants, both faithful and unfaithful, at the Lord's Supper.

'Son. Christ is only received and eaten of the faithful communicants: the unfaithful receive not the body and blood of Christ, but the sacraments of the same only, and that unto their damnation.¹⁰⁶

It is not meant that members of the Anglican Church are bound by the opinions of the writers we have quoted, or that such writers are to be taken as representatives of Anglican theology. They are referred to merely as writers contemporary with the formation of the Common Prayer Book, in order to judge of the meaning, effect, and intention of phrases used in that book.

We must, then, now compare the passages in the Book of 1549, relating to the doctrine of the Real Presence, with the same places as altered in the Book of 1552, but quoting from the Common Prayer Book as it stands at present, there being only verbal differences between these latter, except in two places.

⁹⁵ *Harding*, p. 448.

⁹⁶ *Catechism*, p. 294.

1549.

I intend to offer, to all such as shall be godly disposed, the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ:

he hath not only given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and mystery to give us his said body and blood to feed upon them spiritually;

[As it is declared unto us, as well by God's word, as by the holy Sacraments of his blessed body and blood. 1552, 1559, and 1604.] [In the Scotch Prayer Book, 'Sacrament.']

then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; then we dwell with Christ, and Christ with us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us:

he hath left in these holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually to our great and endless comfort.

Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood in these holy mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him and he in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us;

grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy insti-

1552, 1559, 1604, and 1662.

[This was omitted in the three first; but restored in 1662.]

he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance [in that holy Sacrament. 1662.]

[As it is declared unto us, as well by God's word, as by the holy Sacraments of his blessed body and blood. 1552, 1559, and 1604.] [In the Scotch Prayer Book, 'Sacrament.']

[This is the same in all editions.]

he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.

Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us;

grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy insti-

1549.

be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ.

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

1552, 1559, 1604, and 1662. tution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. [Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving. 1552.]

Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son.

Hence it appears that the divines of 1552 declare that conditionally on faith and penitence the receivers do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; but they decline to add 'in those holy mysteries'; that God vouchsafes to feed those who duly receive these holy mysteries—but not *in* them—with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Christ. And those of 1662 consent both to the declaration and the omission.

Those of 1662 were willing to say that God has given his Son our Saviour to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament; and they objected to putting the declaration of this gift by the Word of God on a level with the Holy Eucharist; but they declined to say that our Lord has left us in those holy mysteries, or that he gives us in a Sacrament or mystery, his blessed body and blood to feed upon spiritually.

Those of 1552, followed by their successors in 1662, were willing to pray that 'we, receiving the creatures of bread and wine, according to Christ's institution, may be partakers of his body and blood;' but not that 'God

would bless and sanctify the creatures of bread and wine, that they may be to us the body and blood of Christ;' thus declaring, by their admission of the former and refusal of the latter, that what is received is only bread and wine; and that the presence of Christ's body and blood is only in the partaking.

The Reformers of 1552 had struck out the ancient form of giving communion, and inserted words of their own, implying that the 'bread and wine' are to be received only in remembrance of our Lord's death, and that his presence is only in the receiver's own soul by faith. The ancient words were restored in 1559, but with the Zuinglian form added to them. And as the ancient words are not so distinct but that they may be explained away, the revisers of 1559, followed by those of 1662, have allowed without repudiation the Zuinglian sense to be put upon the Catholic form.

Let us, then, see what is the present position. It is this: the Book of Common Prayer teaches and professes by implication that the body and blood of Christ are given and received in the Communion only in a spiritual manner, and by faith; that our Lord is not present in the consecrated species, but only in the soul of the receiver; that he is received only by the faithful, and not by the unfaithful and impenitent; and thus that he is not given, or received, or eaten in the Holy Eucharist sacramentally and really in the sense which the Catholic Church believes and teaches.

This is the doctrine which was condemned as Zuinglian in the Council of Trent. The deductions are made solely and entirely from the Prayer Book; but, if we compare them with the extracts given before, we shall find the doctrine is just the same. Jewell especially uses the very words of the Prayer Book, and says, 'We teach that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us; that we verily eat it and drink it; that Christ

dwelleth in us, and we in him. Yet we say not that his body is made really or fleshly present in the Sacrament. *Spiritually and by faith we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood.* The bread we receive is an earthly thing and a figure, and the body of Christ is represented thereby. We imagine not Christ to be present bodily upon the earth. The body of Christ is *to be eaten by faith only*, and none otherwise. We place Christ *in the heart*; M. Harding placeth him in the mouth.

We must also notice the changes in the 'Order of Administration' as directed by the Rubrics. It was mentioned⁹⁷ that, in the 'Order of Communion' in 1548, a direction is given that, in case the wine consecrated was not sufficient, the priest might consecrate more. In the First Book of King Edward care was taken to avoid the necessity for this sacrilege by directing that 'so many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning;' and also that 'then shall the Minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion.' In Bucer's 'Censure' he remarked upon this, that 'hence some conceive the superstition, that they think it wrong if any of the bread or wine of the Communion remains over, to suffer it to come into common use; as if there were anything divine or sacred inherent in this bread and wine, even out of the use of them in Communion. Wherefore some think that, however much remains from Communion, they are to consume the whole. Men are therefore to be taught that Christ the Lord is offered to the mind of pious receivers by the Lord's words and these symbols, and not to the bread and wine.'⁹⁸ And thus, beyond the

⁹⁷ p. 5.

⁹⁸ *Non panis et vino sed fidei, mentibus offerri.* Compare Jewell's phrase 'the body of Christ offered unto our faith;' and Cranmer's, 'the communication of Christ's body and blood to the faithful receiver, and not to the dumb creatures of bread and wine.'

use of the communion which the Lord instituted, the bread and wine, even if they have been placed on the Lord's table, have in themselves no more sanctity than other bread and wine. . . . Whatever appears to favour the bread-worship, or to be used by anti-Christ to retain the same in the hearts of simple men, we ought to abolish as far and as purely as possible from the churches.'⁹⁹

He also objected to the Rubrics directing the priest to take the bread and the cup into his hands in the Consecration, because the words from the Gospel are to be addressed to the people present as an exhortation to them, and not to the bread and wine, as if a change was to be wrought in them by pronouncing those words.¹

His recommendations in these respects were entirely carried out. In the Book of 1552 there is no direction whatever about preparing the bread and wine before Communion; the table is no longer to be left altarwise, but to be placed in the middle; the words from the Gospel are to be said without taking notice of the bread and wine, and merely in the way of a lesson—'the bread is no longer to be unleavened,' but 'such as is usual to be eaten;' and 'if any of the bread or wine remains, the Curate shall have it to his own use.' It must be remembered that at the time these Rubrics were first put in force, the persons acting on them were in general priests truly ordained by the Catholic rite. Hence, if the words from the Gospel recited in such a manner were really a consecration, the profanation that ensued is beyond conception. But it is very doubtful whether the words of the Gospel recited in such a manner by persons who had renounced the faith, and made no sacramental intention, could be a valid consecration, as was remarked at the time by Scot, Bishop of Chester, in his speech in the House of Lords against the Bill for the Prayer Book, saying, 'Christ's bodye is not there in very dede to be

⁹⁹ *Scriptura Anglicana*, p. 464.

¹ p. 472.

received. For th'only way whereby it is present is by consecration, which this booke hathe not at all. . . . Nowe by the order of this booke, neyther dothe the preste take the bread in his handes, blesse it, nor breake it, neyther yet hathe any regard or respect to the bread, when he rehearsithe the wordes of Christe, but dothe passe them over as they were tellinge a tale, or rehearsing a storye.²

This state of things continued till the last revision in 1662. Archbishop Laud had had the table restored to its place at the east end, and such a restoration seems to have been generally carried into effect throughout the kingdom; but the Rubric has remained unaltered.³ In 1662 the Rubric was restored, directing 'the Priest beforehand to place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.' And, by way of preventing the profanation described above, it is directed that, 'if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the Priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall reverently eat and drink the same.' With this we find revived the sacrilegious Rubric of 1548, directing a second consecration in one kind, if required. Both Rubrics had, indeed, found their way into the Scotch Prayer Book previously.

The practice of consuming the remains did not originate in this country, but was ordered in the Book of Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, drawn up by Bucer. And it is remarkable that he should have approved there

² *Stypp's Annals*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 445.

³ The present writer has seen a parish church in a country village where the table retained its position according to the Rubric of 1552, being placed in the middle of the chancel east and west, with seats all round it. Possibly, as he is speaking of thirty years ago, church restoration may have altered the arrangement.

what he condemned in his 'Censure' of the English Book. The words are: 'The pastours shall endeavour that they compute the nombre of them which shall communicate, that according to the same, they may receive pieces of bread and measure of wyne. As for the remnauntes, after the Communion, let the pastours themselves receive them forthwith, and not keep nor lay them up, nor cary them away, or set them forth to be behoulded.'⁴

This practice was brought before the Fathers of the Council of Trent among the 'Articles concerning the Eucharist proposed to the Theologians,' as follows: 'That the Eucharist is not to be reserved in the sacrament, but is to be at once given to those present and eaten, and that those who do otherwise abuse this sacrament. This is contained in the Book of Reformation addressed to the people of Cologne.'⁵ And the following sentence was decreed upon it: 'If any one saith that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the sacrament; but that, immediately after consecration, it must necessarily be distributed amongst those present; or that it is not lawful that it be carried with honour to the sick; let him be anathema.'⁶

What may have been the view with which the divines of 1662 directed this practice, whether believing the consecrated species to be really the Body and Blood of our Lord, they still considered it right that persons who have already communicated should receive again; or whether, merely looking upon them as sacred things, they wished to prevent their being put to common use, we will not undertake to say. Nor will we inquire whether even this measure of reverence is constantly maintained in Anglican churches. But it is remarkable that those divines, in endeavouring to escape from the profanation of the previous usage, should have fallen into the

⁴ Simple and Religious Consultation.

⁵ Le Plat, *Mon. Conc. Trid.* vol. iv. p. 259.

⁶ Sess. xiii. can. 7.

sacrilege of consecration in one kind. It only shows that they had no idea whatever of the true Eucharistic Sacrifice. And it may be now respectfully put to any Anglican clergyman professing Catholic tendencies, whether he has ever acted on that Rubric. If he has, and if he should hereafter obtain the grace to be reconciled to the Church, he will see cause to thank God that at least, when he did such things, he was not a priest.

What, then, is the actual position? The present Book of Common Prayer is less in direct opposition to the Canon of the Mass than the Book of 1549, because it is further removed away. Of the six passages in which Lutheran expressions were substituted for the words of the Canon relating to the Holy Sacrifice, three have been omitted altogether, two are retained as they were, and the other has been altered. For the Book of 1549 having altered the words 'to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy undefiled sacrifices, which we offer to thee,' to 'receive these our prayers, which we offer;' the Book of 1552 inserted other words, and made it, 'to accept our alms and to receive these our prayers.' Then in 1662 was added, after 'alms,' 'and oblations,' bearing reference, it may be supposed, to the bread and wine which the minister is then directed to place upon the table. On this we may remark that 'oblations' very feebly represents '*hæc munera, hæc sacrificia*;' and by joining it with 'alms,' it is made to look as if the two were offered in the same sense. Besides the other passages remain; one, that 'our Lord, by his one oblation on the Cross, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and oblation for the sins of the world, and instituted in the Gospel a perpetual memory of his death;' which is all perfectly true in itself, but having been substituted in place of the '*Hanc oblationem servitutis nostræ placatus accipias*,' it can only mean that the Sacrifice of the Mass is derogatory to Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross,

and that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a bare commemoration of his death, but not a propitiatory sacrifice. The other passage is, 'we entirely desire thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' which, though now transposed from its original place, was brought in instead of '*supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, et accepta habere . . . sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam;*' and therefore it must be held to mean that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And as to this passage is joined, 'we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee;' which, in conjunction with the former, is the phrase that Luther employed to signify that there is no priesthood under the Gospel other than that which is common to all Christians; there does seem to be in these words an assertion of the Lutheran tenet of there being no visible and external priesthood, which was condemned by the Council of Trent. And thus according to this Book, there is no sacrifice and no priest, for all the offering there is, is made equally by the people as by the minister, in Luther's sense of all Christians having an interior spiritual priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices. And a sacrifice without a priest is no real sacrifice.

Having thus traced the origin and history of various dogmatic statements and phrases in the Book of Common Prayer and of practices involving doctrine; having shown the sentences and phrases of the ancient Catholic rite for which they have been substituted; having compared them with the dogmatic teaching of the Reformers, both of foreign countries and our own; we come to a conclusion, not without pain, because it will appear to be severe on persons who are honestly acting according to the lights of their own conscience. This conclusion is, that those who receive and use the Book of Common Prayer,

whether as ministering or as communicating, do by that their formal act make a denial of the Catholic faith in several points, and a profession of various opinions condemned as heresy.

They deny the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

They deny the Priesthood of the Church.

They deny the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist.

They profess and assert that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; that it is a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice consummated on the Cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, nor impetratory; that the Sacrifice of the Mass is derogatory to the most holy Sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross; that the Canon of the Mass does contain errors, and therefore it was right and necessary to abrogate it; and that Christ our Lord in the Eucharist is given, received, and eaten spiritually only, and not sacramentally or really.

On all this the Catholic Church has pronounced her anathema.

To return now to the question with which this ex-amination was commenced—Are there any such indications in the Prayer Book of a real sacrifice, as to show that a real priest is required to offer it? And the answer is found to be—None, but the contrary.

It now remains to consider what answer has been given to this objection on the Anglican side. And Mr. Haddan's statement of the argument may be taken, because he has summed up the arguments of those preceding him, and put them even in a more forcible way than they have done; and because also, wide as the interval is that unhappily separates us, a Catholic can still sympathise with his mode of treating the subject more than with that adopted by Dr. Elrington,⁷ or Sir William Palmer.⁸

⁷ *Validity of English Ordinations*, p. 135.

⁸ *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 462.

'The change in our form of priestly Ordination,' says Mr. Haddan, 'undoubtedly gives room for the question, whether in such change of words is involved also any essential, and if essential, whether any fatally erroneous, change in the conception of the priestly office; and this, whether by the alteration of the words in itself or as ruled authoritatively elsewhere. The Church of England confers the office of priesthood by name. She specifies, in conferring it, the function of absolving from sin, that of preaching the Word of God, and that of dispensing or ministering the Sacraments: all these in the plainest of words, so that they who deny any one of them contradict express and solemn declarations, made, as none can seriously doubt, by the Church herself. But she not only does not specify the "power of offering sacrifice;" but first of all desists from expressly conferring such a power, in the sense attached to it at the time of the Reformation, by omitting the words which were previously in use to specify it in that sense, and next shows that the omission was intentional, while at the same time limiting its meaning, by the 31st of the 39 Articles. Although, none the less, the power of "ministering Sacraments," and inclusively the Holy Eucharist, does still imply also the power of "offering sacrifice," in whatever sense the Eucharist is a sacrifice; since that sense only of the term is denied, wherein other words elsewhere, *e. g.* in the 31st Article, rule it to be not so. . . . Here, as in most points of controversy between Rome and herself, the Church of England claims to have abolished a mediæval error, while retaining the primitive truth out of which the error had grown. She claims to have simply abolished a doctrine of the school, elevated by the Council of Trent, as time went on, into a necessary dogma, but which in reality was nothing more than a corrupt development of a truth, or rather of a combination of truths, that had been carried at length to the point of encroaching upon and contradicting, materially if not formally, a plainly scriptural and essential doctrine of the faith itself. And, in order to this, words were dropped from the ordination service which had grown into use in mediæval times, and which enshrined this purely mediæval doctrine; words which, without explanation, by their natural force and by their historical origin, expressed that doctrine; while the Thirty-first Article specifies the ground upon which, and therefore the purpose with which, the change (with other corresponding changes elsewhere) was made. . . . Our Ordinal shows that what we have really substituted, or, more correctly speaking, retained under a change of words, are "Priests," with the power of absolution, who are indeed "preachers of the Word," but

are also "ministers of the Holy Sacraments." What we have done in this point, so far as Church acts go (and for these alone is the Church answerable), is precisely this and no more,—that we have merged the special office of "sacricing" under the general terms of "ministering Sacraments," instead of stating it by itself in words both dangerously unqualified and actually mischievous. And if we look outside the Ordinal for the ground and limit of the change, we find it embodied in what is now our Thirty-first Article: *i. e.* we find it, not in a denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but in a denial of the Sacrifices of Masses, *i. e.* of a particular view of that Sacrifice which trenches upon a fundamental doctrine of the faith. Certainly the tenet of Transubstantiation, combined with the assertion of a "true and proper" sacrifice of the transubstantiated elements (and that a sacrifice disjoined from the Sacrament, as in the crucial case of private masses), does at least seem to imply, by an apparently inevitable inference, a repetition of that Sacrifice which Scripture tells us was offered once for all upon the Cross.⁹

It is painful in a work professing to maintain the 'Apostolical Succession' to read a description of the development of a truth, encroaching on and contradicting the faith itself; and a defence of the change made in the Ordination rite as the omission of 'words dangerously unqualified and actually mischievous;' and still more painful to find the words of the Thirty-first Article accepted and justified by the alleged fact of there being a belief and a practice in vogue at the time to which they were justly applied. To this no reply would be needed, because the present work set out with professing to rest on Catholic grounds alone, and simply to answer the claim for recognition of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church;¹⁰ and Mr. Haddan's argument is an admission, as much as Dr. Elrington's or Sir William Palmer's has

⁹ Haddan's *Apostolical Succession*, p. 269-74. While these sheets were passing through the press, an announcement appeared of the death of the Rev. A. W. Haddan, B.D. Though opposed in principle and faith, we may all feel regret at the loss of one who has written in a spirit of reverence, and with general fairness and candour as to facts.

¹⁰ See esp. i. p. 3.

been before, that the sacrifice as understood by him is not that which the Catholic Church believes.

But it is not usual among Catholics to stand simply upon the decision of the Church, without giving some consideration to the reasons alleged against it by opponents. And there is the more cause for such a concession in that the admissions made, or the view taken, or the arguments advanced by one writer among Anglicans, are not necessarily concurred in by others. And in the present case, although Mr. Haddan himself and others profess to see a distinction between the mediæval doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, and that taught in the Scriptures and the Fathers, and maintain that the Anglican Church has only cut off additions erroneously made to the faith and practice of the Church in earlier ages; yet there are others who now approach much nearer, perhaps even the writer in the *Tracts for the Times* himself, to the belief and usages of the Church on these points.¹²

Now Mr. Haddan's argument resolves itself into three points; namely: 1. That the special office of sacrificing is included under the general terms of ministering Sacraments. 2. That the omission in the Ordination rite is limited by the terms of the Thirty-first Article. 3. That the Article is opposed only to such a doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice as encroaches on and contradicts the Oneness of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

In considering these points, as we have for the moment descended from the heights of the practice of the Church, so it may be conceded that we waive the question how far the formula omitted is essential, and rest the argument solely on other grounds. And first, to consider whether sacrificing is included in ministering Sacraments. If the latter were a term that had descended from ancient times, and had been generally understood to

¹¹ *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, Introduction.

¹² *Directorium Anglicanum*, and *First Report of Ritual Commission*, p. 72.

mean all the functions of the priesthood, there would be something in favour of such a view. Thus there is no doubt that the phrases, 'power of sacerdotal grace' and 'dignity of the presbyterate,' which have come down from the early Sacramentaries, do include the power of sacrifice. But the term 'ministering Sacraments' is a new term in the ordination of a priest, and had not been used in any of the old Pontificals. It is necessary therefore to ask, With what object was it introduced? Who suggested it? What reasons were given? Did its first proposers mean to include sacrificing in it? We have already heard this history. It has been shown that this term was suggested by Luther in order to exclude the idea of offering or consecrating; and that not many years after he made the suggestion, it was adopted in the Anglican Ordination rite of 1549. If it be said that the Anglican Church is not bound by Luther's acts or opinions, it is quite true; but when the compilers of the rite adopted his proposals, did they take any step to show that they received it in a different sense from his? Did any one ever profess that these words included sacrifice, until it was forced upon Anglican writers as an afterthought in reply to Catholic objections, and so maintained by Burnet¹³ perhaps the first, and this being more than a century after the words came into use?

2. With regard to the omission of the power to sacrifice, Catholics would willingly admit that it is limited by the Thirty-first Article, if it were of any avail to do so, or if such a limitation were possible. But as the 'Forms of Ordering' were published in 1549, and the Articles did not appear till 1552, it is difficult to see how such a limitation could take effect. The practice was in vogue, and therefore must stand on its own grounds, independently of a statement of doctrine made afterwards; even if the acceptance of the doctrine by those who come

¹³ *Vindication of Orders of Ch. of Engl.* p. 22-6.

afterwards shows in what sense they adopt and understand the practice. And this practice—viz. the substitution of the present formula for that anciently in use—is the very change described above, and originated by the Lutherans with the intention of denying that priests are ordained to sacrifice in any sense of a visible external priesthood.

3. But the fact is, the Thirty-first Article does not limit the meaning of the omission. The Article falsely accuses the Catholic doctrine of being derogatory to the One Sacrifice of Our Lord upon the Cross, as shown before. But not to insist now on the definitions of the Councils of Florence and Trent, let us take the defenders of the Article on their own grounds. Mr. Haddan says: 'The Church of England abolished a mediæval error; 'a doctrine of the school; 'a corrupt development; 'a purely mediæval doctrine; 'while retaining the primitive truth.'¹⁴ It has not condemned the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but simply one particular view thereof.¹⁵ Dr. Littledale says: 'The Article was intended to reject a heresy that prevailed in the sixteenth century.' But if this were the case, if the error and corruption and heresy were of such recent growth, why did the compilers of the Prayer Book cast out from their work the Canon of the Mass? Why did they at first alter its language into the expression of their own views, and then afterwards, contemporaneously with the publication of this Article, sweep it away altogether? Did the Canon contain the mediæval error, or did it encourage a heresy of the sixteenth century? We know very well that when Anglicans began to return to more Catholic principles, they took shelter under this very Canon of the Mass; they undertook to assert that the Canon does not express nor authorise the Romish doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice. This is not the place to

¹⁴ p. 271.

¹⁵ p. 272.

argue on such a question; only if this assertion were in any degree true, why was the Canon abolished in the Anglican Church? Was it not that the whole doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was rejected in the Anglican formularies, as much as by Luther, or Zuinglius, or Calvin? Even supposing it were true, as alleged, that some private doctors had broached extravagant opinions about the Mass; is that any excuse for destroying or tampering with that inestimable gift, that sacred deposit, that had come down from the Apostolic age?

There are three essential points in the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, namely, that the priest does offer Christ Himself; that the Sacrifice is propitiatory; and that it is offered for the living and dead. All these three points the Thirty-first Article expressly denies and condemns. The two latter—perhaps even the first—are now admitted by some Anglicans. How they are to reconcile their belief with the Article is for them to consider.

As so much has been said of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, this chapter may be suitably closed with a declaration on the subject, drawn up for the definition of the Council of Trent, and more full than the Decree afterwards adopted by the Council. Of course it does not possess the same authority, and it is here much abridged:

'Since in the Church of God it was ever believed that abrogating the old law did not leave Christians altogether without law, but rather brought them to live under a new and more excellent law, such as the New Testament in its far greater excellence required; so was it never doubted in the Church that Christians have with the new law a new priesthood succeeding to the old; and that the abolishing of the old sacrifices did not take away from them all manner of sacrifice, but rather that a new and divine sacrifice was left for Christian priests to offer

daily, not only in thanksgiving, but also for sins. The Mass, then, has the nature of a true and proper sacrifice, as shown by the solemn oath of God the Eternal Father, "Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." The functions of this priesthood were discharged by Christ our Lord, when He offered Himself to His Father in the Last Supper under the sensible signs of bread and wine, and they are likewise discharged by Him while, by priests who fulfil His ministry, He ceases not to offer Himself even till the time of judgment, as Melchisedech himself offered bread and wine in sacrifice to God.' This is confirmed by Malachias, in the prophecy of the clean oblation, which, after the rejection of the former people and their function, the Lord foretold should be sacrificed and offered to His Name in every place, for His Name would be great among the gentiles. And certainly it is a *clean oblation*, and so clean, that it cannot be defiled by malice or impiety on the part of those who offer it; for He is offered thereby Who is able to cleanse the minds of men from every pollution of sins. In every place likewise, as far as the true faith of Christ our Redeemer is spread, it is constantly offered by Christian priests, so that it is well called by Daniel *the continual sacrifice*.

Since under the name of sacrifice is properly understood an external thing consecrated and offered to God by the mystical operation of a priest, no reason can be shown to the contrary but that the Eucharist, which the priests of Christ by sacred benediction, pronounced in words appointed by the Catholic Church for the sacramental form, make and consecrate and offer to God, ought to be called a true and proper sacrifice.

The institution of this admirable sacrifice was made by Christ our Lord in His divine wisdom, at the time when He Himself at the Last Supper, as the true Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, changing bread

and wine into His own Body and Blood, offered Himself to His Eternal Father under the appearances of bread and wine, and under the same symbols communicated Himself to His disciples, giving them the command, *Do ye for the commemoration of Me*: by which words the Holy Church of God hath understood that a command is laid upon priests to offer sacrifice for the commemoration of Christ. Whence in the sacred Canon of the Mass she has appointed for them to say: *Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants having in remembrance etc. do offer to Thee excellent Majesty a pure Victim etc.*

At the same time when our Lord Himself conferred the new priesthood on His Apostles, He also instituted those three parts of the Sacrifice of the Mass which make it up in its perfection and completion; that is to say, the consecration, the oblation, and the communion, as the old Fathers of the Church have handed down with a wide consent of tradition. For though this argument is sometimes raised, that the Eucharist is a gift of God, and as such is received and consumed, and likewise that it is appointed as the commemoration and sign of that salutary sacrifice which once for all was offered by Christ our Lord upon the Cross, yet it is not thereby deprived of the true nature of a sacrifice. For in like manner it is true of the Paschal Lamb immolated by the Jews, that it was a gift of God, eaten and consumed, and that by the custom of the Jews it was offered and immolated in memory of their passage out of Egypt.

Although it never was doubted in the Church of Christ, that the power of eternal purgation was placed in that one bloody sacrifice of the Cross, by which alone access to salvation and reconciliation is open to us; yet since there is a twofold means, shown to men by the divine law, of seeking through external worship the fruit and application of that sacrifice,—one, namely, in Sacraments, which profit only those who receive them,—and

another in sacrifices, which are of avail not only to those who offer them, but to others also, and likewise to the whole Church; therefore it has always been believed in the Church that it was appropriate and necessary for this clean and salutary sacrifice of the Eucharist in Christ our Lord to be left to us, that thereby the merit of His Passion might be applied not only to individual persons, but even to the Church at large. Nor would it have been beseeching for the new law, absolute as it is in all the numbers of perfection, to have been left without all and any external and visible sacrifice, whereby Christians might explore the help and grace of God in all their affairs and circumstances, and by their prayers might obtain for themselves and others the application of that chief and greatest remedy of our reconciliation which is open and ready for all in the death of Christ. As, then, before the coming of Christ there were sacrifices among the Patriarchs of old, by which they raised in their minds the hope of that great Sacrifice to come, which was to be offered by the Saviour of the world Himself, and fixing their confidence in Him by faith, looked forward with longing aspirations, and drew down on themselves the fruit thereof, even before it was offered; so too was this the faith of all the holy Fathers, that Christians have in the Mass a sacrifice far more efficacious and sublime than any of those victims of old—a sacrifice that is not confined to raising the expectation of a sacrifice of Christ to come, but renews the memory of it as now past and complete, and not in figure merely, as they did, but that comprehends the very reality in itself. For it is one and the same victim of the Body and Blood of Christ that is offered in the Mass, and that was immolated on the Cross; it is one and the same Lamb, and not another, and one and the same Christ, that is everywhere sacrificed; and it is one and the same High Priest in every place, Who is at the same time both Priest and Victim.

For Christian priests are only the ministers of Christ; and it is His person that they assume and represent when they consecrate and offer the Eucharist; and it is only in the difference of the manner of offering that there is a distinction made. For on the Cross, without the ministry of man, Christ immolated Himself once for all, according to the mode of corporal existence, and with death intervening; but in the Mass, by the ministry of priests, He offers Himself daily according to sacramental existence for the commemoration of His death. Wherefore, although it is most true, as the Apostle said, that Christ our Lord by one oblation—that is to say, one bloody oblation—made perfect for ever those that are sanctified; it was necessary, notwithstanding, that the same oblation should be continually offered in the Church in an unbloody manner, that we, recalling daily, in this the unbloody, the memory of that the bloody, oblation, and rendering thanks for the benefits which thereby our Redeemer merited and obtained for all men and conferred upon them, might have those benefits applied to and conferred on ourselves and others also; for those greatest gifts which God daily bestows on us through this most holy sacrifice are nothing else than the fruits and reward which our Redeemer now obtains from that sovereign obedience which He rendered to the Father in undergoing death for us. For so saith Paul, that He, though He were the Son of God, learnt obedience, and being made perfect, became to all who obey Him the cause of eternal salvation, being called by God a High Priest according to the Order of Melchisedech. Hence follows a reason that strongly commends the necessity and advantage of the most holy sacrifice of the Mass, in that our Redeemer thereby makes Himself known to all to be Priest according to the Order of Melchisedech, since He daily exercises the function of this priesthood through the priests of the Church, who, although many in num-

ber and encompassed with infirmity, yet far surpass the priests of the old law, in that, constituted under One immortal High Priest, they offer ever the same victim, and all make the same propitiation. And so far are their oblations from detracting from the excellence and dignity of the death of Christ, that there is no other way by which they could more exalt and commend it. For as our prayers do not detract from the intercession of Christ, through which they are sanctified and made available; and as the sufferings of martyrs derogate nothing from His Passion, through which their holocaust receives its dignity and merit; so without doubt the oblation of the Mass does not tend to obscure the force and excellence of the Passion of Christ, but to display its lustre more and more: wherefore it is a most grievous sin on the part of those who falsely allege that the Mass is derogatory to the Sacrifice of His Passion, and even blasphemy against It.

Great and varied as were the advantages of those sacrifices which the people of God used in old time, in uniting men with their only good and Supreme Lord, in confirming the covenants of God, in imploring His help, and obtaining the remission of sins, and many others, yet all these benefits, in a most plentiful and excellent manner, are now bestowed on Christians through the single sacrifice of the Mass, wherein the same sacrifice is offered that our Lord offered in the Last Supper.

‘No greater commerce with God can there be for man, than that He should be ever present with us even to the end of the world through this most Divine Victim, which we offer to the Father as our own, so that we can now say, with a better right than the Jews of old: “Is there another nation so great that hath their gods so near to them as our God is present with us?” It is not the covenants of the Old but of the New Testament,

not of a temporal but of an eternal inheritance, that are confirmed as with an earnest by this sacred oblation.

'As there are no better means to be found of rendering thanks to God for the highest mystery of our redemption than by offering to the Father His only-begotten Son, in Whom He is well-pleased, and His Blood shed for us, saying with the Prophet: "What shall I render to the Lord for all that He hath rendered unto me? I will receive the chalice of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord"—so there is no way more direct that we can use, to ask for and obtain all gifts from Him, than this through which our forefathers were wont to ask not only for grace and eternal life, but whatever besides might be of utility to body or soul; for there are no gifts descending from the Father of lights on the faithful of Christ, either through the Sacraments, or in any other way, that cannot also be sought and obtained from Him through the Victim of this salutary sacrifice; and its constant celebration affords so holy an exercise to all the faithful, and not to priests only, withdrawing them from the world and its ways, while it occupies them with prayers, praises and hymns, pious meditations, or other useful acts of Christian life, with so much spiritual fruit, that were it taken away from Christendom, the consequence of necessity would be, that faith would totter, hope would halt, charity would grow cold, and the mouths of those who praise the Lord would be closed or rendered dumb.

'But of all the fruits of this sacred oblation, by far the greatest consists in this,—since it verily contains our Lord Jesus Christ, who is Himself the Propitiator, the Propitiation, the propitiatory and expiatory sacrifice, that therefore by it the anger of the Lord is appeased, not only so as to pardon venial sins and remit temporal punishments; but that He is also sometimes moved to so great mercy, as to have pity even on those burdened with grievous crimes, bestowing on them through this holy

sacrifice preventing grace and other aids, whereby they are drawn to approach the Sacraments of the Church, in which the immediate remedies of salvation are to be found. For the Catholic Church has never taught that this sacrifice would avail for the expiation of mortal sins in such a way, as to lose sight of the necessity of movements of the mind for good, and of the Sacrament of Penance, without which, either actually received, or desired, no mortal sin is remitted.

'But while this holy Sacrifice is called expiatory, this propitiatory virtue is attributed to it, not only for the living, but is also extended to all the dead in Christ, who are bound by any penalty of guilt; as the Church, by perpetual and constant tradition learnt from the Apostles, has been accustomed to offer this sacrifice also for the dead. For since all the faithful living and dead constitute one body in Christ, and have a communion in other spiritual goods, so have they also in this sacrifice, by the benefit whereof they may the sooner obtain the rewards of eternal glory. And this participation of fruits is promoted by the particular application, which is made by the priest, the legitimate minister of Christ and the Church, in offering the sacrifice, according to the rules of justice and charity known to God Himself. For if there is no doubt of the special application of prayer being of benefit to him for whom it is offered; and if the sacrifices of old were applied for certain causes, there is no reason for denying the same of this most excellent sacrifice, which, as it has taken the place of all those of old, so it contains the virtue of them all in an eminent degree.'¹⁶

¹⁶ Le Plat, *Mon. Concil. Trident.* vol. iv. p. 386.

facts,¹ although no one else has even ventured to take credit for more than one.

Let, then, no man be a judge in his own cause. Surely we may hence gather the need of adopting some such principles or rules of evidence, as were laid down at the beginning of this work, in order to have a common test or tribunal by which we may know what facts and circumstances are worth being alleged as arguments. Even supposing that it was the fact that an offer such as described was made to Queen Elizabeth, there is no argument to be drawn from it in the present question; for there is nothing said, or pretended, which can show how far the offer was to extend,—and whether it was meant to include the Forms of Ordination under the name of Book of Common Prayer.

Let us now turn to the evidence alleged for the story. There are four authorities for it which may be called original, because they are the first to publish the tradition, viz. Sir Edward Coke, Bishop Andrews, Bishop Abbot, and Camden, who are here placed in chronological order.

The earliest is Coke, Lord Chief Justice, who in a Charge at the Norwich Assizes, 4th August 1606, delivered himself as follows:

'That Pius Quintus whome those of their side doe account to have bene a good Pope (though by false persuasions too much misled) before the time of his excommunication against Queene Elizabeth denounced, sent his letter unto her Maiestie, in which hee did allow the Bible, and Booke of divine service, as it is now used amongst us, to bee authenticke, and not repugnant to truth. But that therein was contayned enough necessary to salvation (though there was not in it so much as might conveniently bee), and that hee would also allow it unto us without changing any parte; so as her Maiestie would acknowledge to receive it from him the Pope (and by his allowance), which her Maiestie denying to do, she was then presently excommunicated. And this is the truth concerning Pope Pius Quintus, as I have faith to God and

¹ Vindication, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 204-8.

CHAPTER VIII.

POPE PIUS IV. AND THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

If the argument on the Catholic side has gained a certain advantage by the currency given to so telling a story as that of the Nag's Head, Anglicans on the other side have availed themselves of a similar opportunity in stating the legend of the Pope having made an offer to Queen Elizabeth of confirming the Book of Common Prayer. It is strange that after the indignation excited in them by the former tale, they should put forward, as a matter of importance, a story resting on no better foundation than the other, and with no authority quoted for it but mere verbal tradition. The evidence in each case is precisely of the same character: if the names of certain persons are quoted in one case as the authorities from whom the story was derived, names are given with equal confidence in the other. The current of tradition in each case runs equally clearly. If the Nag's Head story was not heard of for upwards of forty years after the date of the alleged transaction, no more was that of the Pope's offer. If the one was not published during the lifetime of those said to be actors in it, neither was the other. If the difference in the three or four versions of the Nag's Head is fatal to its credibility, there are at least three versions of the Pope and Queen. Notwithstanding all this, Bishop Bull, after calling the Nag's Head story 'a puitid fable,' within three pages coolly and unblushingly relates two versions of the other story both as undoubted

men, as I have oftentimes heard it avowed by the late Queene her owne wordes; and I have conferred with some Lordes that were of greatest reckoning in the state, who had seene and read the letter, which the Pope sent to that effect, as have bene by me specified. And this upon my credit, as I am an honest man, is most true.²

Whether Coke knew anything of the subject he was speaking of, or whether he made a wilful misstatement, it is impossible to say; but he has certainly shaken all credit out of his story, not only by his error in the name of the Pope, but also by asserting that the offer was made in a letter. Twysden and Courayer pretend that the name Pius V. was an accidental slip or a misprint for Pius IV., but neither of them mentions the reference to the communication, which precludes the idea of accident. And even if he had heard it 'avowed' by the Queen herself, it may be left to any one who considers the character of the two parties to say whether the Queen's assertions or Coke's own asseverations, 'as an honest man,' add the smallest credit to the story.

The next in order is Andrews, then Bishop of Chester, who, in replying to Bellarmine, in 1609, made the following assertion:

'Was she (Q. Eliz.) to establish religion as it is at present, and yet acknowledge the Pope's supremacy? That such an attempt was made is a certain fact; and that the proposal was made by Paul the Fourth, and even brought to the Queen herself, that on condition of her consenting to his supremacy, he would give grace for the rest, if she petitioned for it from him, and acknowledged it as done by his authority, so that all things sacred here should be arranged in the manner in which we have them at the present time. So that the supremacy is the assuaging of wrath, and the Pope had no thought nor care what became of the rest, if only this one point could be obtained.'³

Like Coke, the author shows by mentioning the wrong Pope that he had no certain information on the subject,

² The Lord Coke's Charge, London, 1607, 4to, fol. F 26.
³ *Tortura Torii*, p. 165, ed. Angl. Cath. Lib. The Editor has inserted the name '[Pio]' in brackets after 'Paulo.'

although he founds on his statement a gratuitous insinuation against the Pope.

After him comes Robert Abbot, at the time Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, but afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, who, in his reply to the Defence of Garnet, refers to the present subject in the following manner:

'I come to the letter from Pius V. to Q. Eliz. mentioned by Coke in his Charge at Norwich, in which the Pope promised to approve with his authority our English Liturgy and the Formula of the Reformed religion, provided that she would receive them as from him, and submit herself to the Roman See. . . . As to that letter, Coke was mistaken in saying Pius V. when he ought to have said Paul IV., who was Pope at the time of Q. Eliz. commencing her reign. But the letter itself is well known among us as a subject often brought forward in Parliament, and mentioned by the Queen herself, and even acknowledged by some of your party, who, having no other pretence for finding fault with our Liturgy, have alleged, as the reason of their recusancy, that it had not been approved by the Church of Rome. A name well known is that of Sir Thomas Tresham, being father of Francis Tresham the traitor, who at the time of the Spanish Armada, being questioned for his recusancy, openly acknowledged that letter, but remained refractory for no other cause than that I have mentioned. It was mentioned also in sermons in the Queen's presence, with an appeal to her as vouching for it, and yet no one on your side, either privately or publicly, has ventured to mutter a word in contradiction.'

This author also shows that he was writing from mere rumour without any certain knowledge; for, while undertaking to correct Coke, he falls into the opposite error of naming Paul IV., and also that of asserting a letter to have been written on the subject. This mistake disposes of Sir Thomas Tresham's evidence, because there being no letter he could not have acknowledged any. And as for references to the subject in Parliament, in Queen's Speeches, and sermons, if there ever were any, we may wait till they are produced to discuss them.

The latest of the four is Camden, who has given the following account of the affair:

'Pius Quartus, Bishop of Rome new elect . . . (upon what hope I know not), sent unto Q. Eliz. Vincentio Parpalia, Abbot of St. Saviour's, with secret instructions and letters full of flattery, which I will here set down wholly as they are.'⁴ "To our most dear daughter in Christ, Elizabeth, Queen of England. Dear daughter in Christ, greeting and Apostolic benediction. How greatly we desire (our pastoral charge requiring it) to procure the salvation of your soul, and to provide likewise for your honour, and the establishment of your kingdom withal, God, the searcher of all hearts, knoweth; and you may understand by what we have given in charge to this our beloved son Vincentius Parpalia, Abbot of St. Saviour's, a man well known to you and well approved by us. Wherefore we do again and again exhort your highness, most dear daughter, that rejecting evil counsellors, which love not you, but themselves, and serve their own lusts, you would take the fear of God in counsel with you, and acknowledging the time of your visitation, show yourself obedient to our fatherly persuasions and wholesome counsels, and promise to yourself from us all things that may make not only to the salvation of your soul, but also whatsoever you shall desire from us for the establishing and confirming of your princely dignity, according to the authority, place, and office committed unto us by God. And if so be, as we desire and hope, you shall return into the bosom of the Church, we shall be ready to receive you with the same love, honour, and rejoicing, that the father in the Gospel did his son returning to him; although our joy is like to be the greater, in that he was joyful for the salvation of one son, but you, drawing along with you all the people of England, shall not only by your own salvation, but also by that of the whole nation, replenish us and all our brethren, who will be shortly (as you shall hear) assembled in a General Council for abolishing of heresies, and the whole Church with joy and gladness; yea, you shall make glad heaven itself with such a memorable fact, and achieve admirable renown to your name, much more glorious than the crown you wear. But, concerning this matter, the same Vincentius shall deal with you more largely, and shall declare our fatherly affection toward you; and we entreat your Majesty to receive him graciously, to hear him diligently, and to give the same credit to his speeches as to ourselves. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, &c. the fifth day of May 1566, in our first year."⁵

'What matters Parpalia propounded I find not, for I do not

⁴ Camden's *Annals of Q. Eliz.* p. 35, ed. 1635.
⁵ Partly from Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 308, and partly from Camden.

think his instructions were put in writing,⁶ and to rove at them with the common sort of historians I list not. That Q. Elizabeth still persisted like herself, *semper eadem*, always the same, and that the matter succeeded not to the Pope's desire, all men know. The report goeth, that the Pope gave his faith that he would disannul the sentence against her mother's marriage as unjust, confirm the English Liturgy by his authority, and grant the use of the sacrament to the English under both kinds, so as she would join herself to the Romish Church, and acknowledge the Primacy of the Chair of Rome; yea, and that certain thousand crowns were promised to those that should procure the same.⁷

Here Camden, contrary to those quoted before, shows that the story has no better foundation than mere rumour; that the letter from the Pope contained nothing of the sort asserted by them; and that the offer, if made at all, was not made in writing.

Fuller gives the same account as Camden, but adds that the rumour proceeds from 'some (not more knowing of councils, but more daring in conjectures than others) who love to feign what they cannot find, that they may never appear to be at a loss.'⁸

Heylin professes to follow Camden, but speaks positively that Parpaglia was instructed to make the offer, but that he came no nearer than Brussels, not being suffered to set foot on English ground.⁹

Upon no better foundation than the statements above quoted, Sir Roger Twysden has raised the following fabric:

'Upon this (the Pope's letter to Q. Eliz.) and their relations who then lived, and had part in the action, the English affirm Pius IV. would have confirmed the Liturgy of the Church of England. And, indeed, how can any imagine other? For doubtless nothing could have been more to her dishonour than so suddenly to have

⁶ This is evidently a mistranslation: the meaning is, that Parpaglia's proposals were not put in writing, instead of his instructions, as will appear by the Latin original: 'Quare Parpaglia propositum non comperit, nec enim Scriptis mandata crederet; comminisci vero cum vulgo Historiarum minime lubet.' Camden's *Annals*, p. 48, ed. 8vo, Lugd. Bat. 1625.

⁷ Camden's *Annals*, p. 34.
⁸ Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 309.
⁹ *Hist. of Reform.* vol. ii. p. 333.

changed what she had with so great consideration established; and the Pope assuring her she might promise herself from him all he could do, I know not what less or other he could expect she could ask. But where Sir Edw. Coke, in his Charge at Norwich, as it is now printed, says this offer came from Pius V., I conceive it a mistake, and should have been Pius IV. . . . And in this I take Dr. Heylin to be likewise out, who says this Pargaglia set not his foot on English ground, not permitted to come nearer than Brussels. Which is altogether improbable; for how could he propound anything to the Queen (which Camden says he did) if he saw her not? Would he be so negligent of the papal honour as to send a letter he was to deliver himself? If we are to credit tradition, he not only spake with her Majesty, but passed from her not without a gratitude. . . . They that make a difficulty in believing this relation, object it to have been first divulged 1606, forty-six years after the proffer of it; that Sir Edw. Coke averred to have received it from the Queen herself, not then alive to contradict him. But, for my part, I confess I find no scruple in it. . . . for that is not so long a time but many might remember; and I myself have received it from such as I cannot doubt of it, they having had it from persons of high relation unto them who were actors in the managing of the business. . . . And assuredly some who have convenience and leisure may find more of it than hath been yet divulged; for I no way believe the Bishop of Winchester (Andrews) would have been induced to write, it did *consciare* of Paulus IV.; nor the Queen herself, and divers others of those times, persons of honour and worth — with some of which I myself have spoken — have confirmed it for an undoubted truth, did not somewhat more remain — or at least, had formerly been — than a single letter of Pius IV., which apparently had reference to matters then of greater privacy.¹⁰

Twysden also asserts 'that the thing itself was in effect printed many years before, for he that made the answer to Sanders his seventh book *De Visibili Monarchia*, relates it thus:¹¹

'I beg you to take into account along with me what passed seven years ago between Pius IV. late Pope, and an English nobleman who happened to be at the Court of Rome; and an English acknowledge yourself either to have made a slip through want of knowledge of the facts, or else to have told a shameless falsehood. With this nobleman the Pope fell into a long discourse, asking

¹⁰ *Historical Vindication*, p. 199-202.

¹¹ p. 200.

for what reason Q. Eliz. had thrown off his authority, and even cast the title of Supremacy out of the realm. The nobleman, being a person of wisdom and learning, replied that the Queen was persuaded that, as well by Scripture as by the laws of the realm, he had no jurisdiction in a foreign country. I can scarcely come to believe that, said the Pope, of a wise and learned person such as your Queen, and I rather suspect that she keeps up a hostile feeling against the Apostolic See for the sentence pronounced against her mother's marriage. And if that be the reason, I would give my faith that I would not only rescind that sentence as unjust, but would further do whatever lay in my power in her favour, provided she would return to our Church, and render me the due title of supremacy. If you think that I am putting forward a mere invention, as you are wont to do, there are still extant the Articles under the Abbot de San Salute's own hand; there is the letter from Card. Morone to that nobleman, urging him earnestly to use all his influence in pressing forward that negotiation with our Queen. There are now living several of our nobility to whom the Pope promised many thousand gold crowns if they would be the means of bringing about a reconciliation between the See of Rome and her Majesty. These being certain facts, how would it be derogatory to her honour to acknowledge the primacy of the Roman See? Would it not rather be a loss of dignity to that See for the decree of one Pope to be rescinded by another? What was there for the Queen to fear, either for her own or her mother's honour, when there was no more that the Pope could do than he had done already; and even if there were, yet would there be any greater danger in dissenting than consenting? But she neither considered the passing of the sentence of any weight, nor its being rescinded of any value. For there is nothing in it but the empty sound of words, which we have long learnt to disregard.¹²

Twysden gravely quotes this story as if it gave confirmation to the rumour of the Pope's offer. If such a conversation did take place, which is not impossible, for the date assigned would be 1566, and in that year the Earl of Arundel was in Italy,¹³ and may have been the

¹² *Fidelis servi, subdito infideli Responso, una cum errorum et calumniarum quarundam examine que continentur in 7mo libro De Visibili Ecclesie Monarchia* a Nich. Sanderio conscripto. Lond. Ap. Joh. Day, Typog. 1573 4to, fol. K. 16.

¹³ S. P. O. Foreign: Spain, Man to Cecil, 22 Jan. 1566-7.

nobleman referred to; there is nothing more in it than in the authentic letter of the Pope. The author of the work quoted was Bartholomew Clerke,¹⁴ specially deputed to answer Sanders by Archbishop Parker and Cecil, and the work was revised by Cecil himself. Now if there were any 'articles in writing' from the Abbate di San Salute, why were they never produced? and how came Camden never to have heard of them, when he derived his information from Sir Robert Cecil? Twysden himself discredits his own witnesses—he corrects Coke, contradicts Heylin, and disputes Camden; and then ventures to mention two circumstances, viz. that 'Pargaglia not only spake with her Majesty, but passed from her not without a gratitude,' for which he has no authority whatever.

We cannot pass over Bishop Bull, because he has raised an additional superstructure on Twysden's unsubstantial basis:

'It is transmitted to us by the testimony of persons greater than all exception, that Paulus Quartus, Pope of Rome, in his private intercourses and letters to Queen Elizabeth, did offer to confirm and establish the Common Prayer Book if she would acknowledge the primacy and authority of the Pope, and the reformation derivative from him. And this method was pursued by his successor, Pius Quartus, who assured her she should have anything from him, not only pertaining to her soul, but what might conduce to the establishment and confirmation of her royal dignity; amongst which, that the Liturgy, newly established by her authority, should not be rescinded by the Pope's power, was not the least considerable. I beseech your ladyship to make a little pause here. Our Liturgy contains the whole religion of the Church of England. This the Popes and Bishops of Rome themselves offer to confirm and establish. Then &c.'¹⁵

Thus he not only goes beyond any authority he can find in making the offer come from two Popes instead of one, but without troubling himself to ascertain the truth

¹⁴ Strype's *Parker*, ii. 177-81.

¹⁵ Bp. Bull, *Vindication of Ch. of Engl.*, Works, vol. ii. p. 207.

of his story, he draws a dilemma highly satisfactory to himself, and to the discredit of the Pope.

It comes naturally to ask, if the story is correct, how is it that it was never brought forward and made use of by any controversial writer during Elizabeth's reign? If Bartholomew Clerke thought proper to pass it over, why did it not appear in Burleigh's *Execution of Justice*,¹⁶ or in Bilson's Reply to Allen,¹⁷ when it would have been so apposite to their purpose, and when they had been provoked to publish it? How is it that neither Surcliffe nor Brydges, nor any other authority, is referred to for it till forty-six years after the event? If it had been often mentioned in Parliament, how comes it that it has escaped the notice of the compilers of the Parliamentary History?

But is it really the case that no writer whatever during that period has alluded to the story? On the contrary, it is mentioned by at least one writer, and that writer no other than

FATHER PARSONS THE JESUIT.

Let us hear what he says. After arguing that

'going to the Protestant churches is forbidden *jure divino*, and that no power on earth can dispense with the same, he proceeds:

'Wherefore that which hath bene geven out (as is sayde by some great men) that the Pope, by his letters to her Maestie, did offer to confirme the service of England, uppon condition that the title of Supremacie might be restored him againe, is impos-

¹⁶ *The Execution of Justice in England for maintenance of publique and Christian peace, against certaine stirrers of sedition and adherents to the traytors and enemies of the Realme, without any persécution of them for questions of Religion, as is falsly reported and published by the factors and festerers of their treasons*; xvii. Decemb. 1583. Imprinted at London 1513, 4to; and, Secondly, imprinted at London mense Jan. 1583. An. Reg. Eliz. 26. With some small alterations of things mistaken or omitted in the transcript of the first Originall. Reprinted in the *Harleian Miscellany* (vol. ii. p. 137), with an Introduction in which the Pope's offer is mentioned; but this Introduction is not in either impression of the original work.

¹⁷ *The True Difference betwene Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion*, by Thomas Bilson. London, 1586.

sible to be soe: soe that, if anye such letters came to hir Majesties handes, they must needes be fayned and false.¹⁸

And against this statement he adds in the margin, 'A notable devise.' This was in 1580, and he repeats it in the edition of 1601.

What becomes, then, of Abbot's boast that 'no one on your (the Catholic) side either privately or publicly has ventured to mutter a word in contradiction'? Here was a positive contradiction, published on two separate occasions, long before Abbot's work was written. And yet Andrewes was not ashamed, though he had read Parson's book, and refers to it in the same work, *Tortura Tori*, to say *Constat*, it is a certain fact that the proposal was made.

However, it may be said that Parson was a partisan writer; and by the principles of evidence laid down at the beginning of this work, statements from such a quarter are to be received with caution, and cannot of themselves be used as evidence. But Parson's book was not left without reply, for both Fulke and Wyborne took it in hand. Let us, then, turn to them, and see what they have to say on the subject. And first Fulke:

'What the Pope did offer by his letters to her Majesty, I never heard it reported whiche he saith is geven out by some greatescene the Popish dispensation, that for time of schisme a priest might go to church, and more then that.¹⁹

Then Wyborne:

'For the rest whether it bee impossible to bee so, that your Pope shoulde offer too her Majestye to confirme the Englishe service uppon condition to recover his Supremacie heere in Englande, whiche hee is farr from, and God so keepe him still:

¹⁸ *A Brief Discourse containing certayne Reasons why Catholiques refuse to see to Church*, by J. H. (John Howlet). Downey, 1580, p. 59, and 1601, fol. F. 12b.

¹⁹ *A Briefe Confutation of a Popish Discourse lately set forth*, by John Howlet, or some other Bird of the Night, by D. Fulke. London, 1581, fol. 56b.

and whether his authoritie be above the Scriptures, so as hee may dispense with things agaynst God his Lawe or no, I leave to the authours that first invented such brabbles to occupie mens heades with all.²⁰

They both admit Parson's contradiction—one directly, the other by implication. Fulke declares he never heard of the report; Wyborne, if he had heard of it and knew any good grounds for it, would have been only too glad to contradict Parson, not to have asserted it. It is clear how the matter stood, by the rumour having reached Parson, while they were both in complete ignorance. It was 'a notable device,' as Parson said, invented and used by Cecil and Walsingham, to persuade and entrap the unwary and timorous Catholics; but they would have ridiculed or utterly disavowed it in presence of a thorough-paced Protestant like Fulke, or a Puritan such as Wyborne.

On now reviewing the evidence for the story of the Pope having made an offer to confirm the Book of Common Prayer, we find it stands thus: three witnesses, Coke, Andrewes, and Abbot, assert it as an undoubted fact, but they are all partisans, do not agree with each other, and are all in error as to the Pope who addressed a letter to the Queen; while the fourth, Camden, writing as an historian, treats the story as a mere rumour. Clerke, writing in 1573, gives no support to the story, though he speaks of certain 'Articles' in writing having been delivered by the Nuncio.

We may now endeavour to get to the real facts of the case, as told in contemporary documents. And perhaps the reader will be surprised to hear that, as Parpaglia did not land in England, the letter from the Pope, of which there is a translation in Camden and Fuller, was never delivered to the Queen; and therefore the Nuncio,

²⁰ *A Checke or reproofe of M. Hoole's untimely stretchings in her Majesties eares*, London, 1581. By P. W. (Percivall Wyborne). Append. fol. Y. y. 2.

not having presented his credentials, it is impossible that he could have made any proposals or delivered any 'Articles.'

In February 1560, Sir Edw. Carne wrote from Rome, that the Pope was thinking of dispatching a Nuncio to the Queen, and that probably the Abbate di San Salute would be the person selected.²¹ But nothing came of it at that time, and Carne wrote again on the 6th of May. His dispatch has not been found; but a month later Sir Thomas Parry wrote to Cecil as follows: 'I have no newes hens to write to yow but that her Majeste hath received lettres from Mr. Carne of the vi. of May that ymportes that Abbate de Salute hathe his dispathe. And comes by france into the low parts to the Regent, to pray her to send hither for a licence for him to com to do his message. As ye have hard partly before this Mr. Englefield hathe also wreten to my lord keeper of the great Seal therof.'²² This letter of Carne's seems to be the only official communication that reached the Queen and her Council on the subject. And if the Abbate was empowered to offer any terms, that despatch would have been the channel by which an intimation would have been given to that effect. Or Sir Francis Englefield might have been able, in his private letter to Bacon, to convey the like information. But nothing of the sort is hinted at.

Before the Abbate could leave Rome, his mission was known to, and his movements tracked by, one of Cecil's spies, named John Sheres, quartered at Venice, who was even able by a bribe to read and take copies of the Abbate's private correspondence, under a promise of secrecy, which he kept by immediately transmitting the copies to Cecil.²³ According to Sheres' information, the mission of the Nuncio was undertaken because 'the Pope is persuaded that England may yet be won again to the obedience of the Church';²⁴ and the same motive is alleged in

²¹ Haynes' *Burghley Papers*.

²² S. P. O. Foreign, 1560, Nos. 74 and 893.

²³ S. P. O. Dom. 6 June 1560.

²⁴ *Ibid.* No. 74.

His Holiness's letters to the Kings of Spain and Hungary. And it was also from him that the Queen and her ministers gained the idea of the chief object of the Nuncio's mission being to communicate with the Catholic party in England, which seems to have influenced them in prohibiting his entering the country. But there is not a hint in Sheres' letters of the Abbate having any offer to make of a compromise.

The Abbate's journey seems to have been delayed for some time;²⁵ and our next intelligence about him is derived from one of his own letters, dated Sept. 8th, of which Sheres obtained the copy.²⁶ The Abbate had arrived in Brussels by the middle of June, and was cordially received by the Duchess of Parma and the Bishop of Arras. But he had received commands from the Pope not to proceed in his legation till further instructions, for which he had been waiting three months. And he had then little hope that any success would attend his negotiation, even if he went to England; for the Queen had imprisoned all the Catholic Bishops, and seemed to have some suspicion of his embassy, that it might encourage the Catholics, perhaps even to attempt an insurrection. 'Notwithstanding, the Queen says that she has a very good opinion of the disposition of the present Pope, and would not refuse to listen to what he might propose to her, hoping that he would not wish anything but what was just, and for the good of herself and her kingdom. He is therefore waiting for further orders.' It is evident from this letter that the Abbate had had some communication with England; but whether it was that he had written himself, or whether the Duchess of Parma had written and received an ans-

²⁵ S. P. O. Foreign, 1560, Nos. 108 and 128.

²⁶ *Ibid.* No. 507. See Appendix No. XXII. There are two errors in the *Calendar of State Papers*. This letter is described as addressed to the Queen instead of to the Nuncio at Venice. And in the Preface it is said that the copies of the two letters obtained by Sheres are lost. They are Nos. 507 and 879. Compare No. 893.

wer, or whether the English refugees in Flanders had had letters from their friends in the English court, there is no document to show. In the case of the Abbate Martino in the next year, the Spanish ambassador applied and received the refusal.²⁷

It is even quite uncertain whether the Nuncio ever applied for permission to enter the kingdom. All that can be ascertained is, that he could not be admitted, and was recalled without having delivered the Pope's letters. And he left Flanders on his return, about a month after the date of the letter quoted above. The authority for these facts is, first, a letter from Guido Giannetti to the Queen, dated at Venice, 21st Dec., stating, 'the Abbot of San Salute, when recalled, set out from Flanders in October, having distributed amongst the English 500 ducats of papal alms, which was perhaps thought a small sum amongst so many.'²⁸ And next, Throckmorton, writing from Orleans, 31st Dec., says: 'The Spanish ambassador has of late visited him, who said, that though the Abbot of San Salute could not be admitted to come into England, yet the Emperor and the King of Spain have persuaded the Pope to send thither again to solicit her to send to the Council.'²⁹

But it may be asked, how could it be that the Pope's letter was not delivered, when it still remains among the Public Records of this country,³⁰ and Camden found and published it before it had been published by Raynaldus? But the copy in the British Museum is only a transcript of much later date; and it is known that Chamberlain obtained and sent home a copy while ambassador in Spain,³¹ which would have been an unnecessary proceeding, if the letter itself had been delivered.

It is difficult to prove a negative; and, indeed, history

²⁷ S.P.O. 1561, Nos. 170 and 172.

²⁸ S.P.O. Foreign, 1560, No. 815.7.

²⁹ In the British M., Titus. c. vii. fol. 1r.

³¹ S.P.O. Foreign, 1560, No. 762.

ought to be written under an impression that, unless facts are clearly proved, some discovery may be made which will upset a view founded on present knowledge. Twysden supplies an example of the danger of writing history on theory. And in the present case there still remains some mystery. Although it is clear that Pargaglia had no audience of the Queen, and never set foot on English ground, and therefore could not have made any proposals; yet it is not proved for certain that the Queen received no intimation of what proposals he was instructed to make. This cannot be proved, unless Carné's despatch can be found, or Englefield's letter; or unless we come to know what communications passed between Brussels and London on the subject. It is possible that these documents may all be preserved among the Cecil mss. at Hatfield House; and that the labours of the Historical mss. Commission may bring them to light. But still we are in a position to say, that it is extremely improbable that any intimation of a proposal from the Pope went to the extent of approving the Book of Common Prayer; and this for the following reasons:

Because, had there been any such matter afloat, John Sheres would have come to know it, and would have informed Cecil.

Because Bartholomew Clerke would not have made so much of a mere report of a conversation with the Pope, if he had had any better ground to work upon; nor confined himself to a mere general assertion about 'Articles,' if there had really been any document that bore upon the subject.

Because Parsons would not have hazarded so positive a contradiction, unless he knew that there was no proof existing of 'what some great men gave out.'

Because Burleigh, Bilson, and others would have used an argument so much to their purpose, if they had had any proof to support the statement.

Because Coke, Andrewes, and Abbot would not have gone so wide of the mark, nor fallen into such inconsistencies with each other, if there was a real historical foundation for their random and reckless assertions.

It will here be opportune to notice another statement often made, and commonly believed, that for the first eleven years of Queen Elizabeth's reign the Catholics generally frequented the Protestant churches without scruple. This is so stated by Burleigh and Coke; but by both of them on occasions when it served their purpose to make such a representation. But at an earlier time the interest of the party lay the other way; and then they suffered the truth to escape, 'that there were those which from the beginning have refused to obey.' For Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech in Parliament, upon a motion for securing the kingdom against the Pope, in 1581, said: 'How these practices of the Pope have wrought in the disobedient subjects of this land is both evident and lamentable to consider. For such impression hath the estimation of the Pope's authority made in them, as not only those which from the beginning have refused to obey, but many, yea, very many of those which divers years together did yield and conform themselves in their open actions, sithence the decrees of that unholy Council of Trent, and sithence the publishing and denouncing of that blasphemous Bull against her Majesty, and sithence those secret absolutions and reconciliations, and the swarming hither of a number of popish priests and monkish Jesuits, have and do utterly refuse to be of our Church, or to resort unto our preaching and prayers.'³²

³² *Parl. Hist.* vol. i. col. 816.

CHAPTER IX.

CONCLUSION.

THE discussion of the difficult question proposed in this work is now come to an end; and we may take a review of the position that has been attained.

With regard to the historical questions involved, we have found that ordinations conducted according to the Anglican rite have from the first been treated as absolutely void, and the persons receiving them have been considered as mere laymen; that this was the practice both of the authorities in Queen Mary's reign, under Cardinal Pole's direction, and of those who succeeded them in later times; that no instance—not even Dr. Goffé's—has been proved to the contrary; and that Gordon's case was by no means the first, even in Rome, since the tradition has been constant and unvaried for three centuries.

With regard to Parker's consecration, we have found, that as an historical fact, it is most certain that it took place on the 17th of December 1559, according to the description in the Register; but that there are grave doubts with regard to the authenticity of the Register itself as an original and contemporaneous document, specially on account of the omission of material circumstances usually made matter of record.

We have found also, with regard to Barlow, that there are strong probabilities against the fact of his having ever received episcopal consecration; that fresh evidence has been brought forward on the subject, specially from the

grant of his temporalities; and that previous suspicions have been very much strengthened by the fact of Mason's having professed to publish this instrument, but having suppressed the most material and operative part of it.

On reviewing the general course of the controversy, it appeared that both parties were agreed in theory on imposition of hands and prayer being the sole essentials of Ordination for Deacons, Priests, and Bishops; and therefore that the theological question might start from this point, with inquiring, What ought to be the nature of the prayer that accompanies the imposition of hands? To answer this we went back to the ancient rites of Ordination, and found that they all agree in treating Ordination as a supernatural gift or grace, and as the communication of a certain spiritual power; that they look upon the person ordained as elected by God Himself to do certain functions, which otherwise he would have no power to do; and that the prayers are offered with the view of asking for this gift and for the Divine election. This idea is in harmony with Catholic belief, and is expressed in the doctrine of the sacramental character as a gift of spiritual power impressed on the soul of the receiver.

We had then to inquire whether the Anglican forms had followed in this track, specially with reference to the theological principle that the forms of Sacraments would be rendered invalid if they underwent such changes as to prevent their being used in the sense of the Church, or to exclude a due intention of doing what the Church does on the part of persons administering or receiving them.

And the result of the examination was this—that the idea of any Divine gift being conveyed in Ordination is utterly ignored in the Anglican rite; that the changes are so made as to exclude the notion of the grace of sacerdotal or episcopal power being conferred; and that no person using them can have the intention of doing what

the Church does in conferring the Sacrament of Holy Order.

Besides this the Anglican forms have been altered from those anciently in use, with the express purpose of excluding all idea of the power of sacrifice being conferred on a priest, or of there being any real and distinct sacrifice offered by priests in the Christian Church.

In view of all these circumstances, the inevitable conclusion follows, that Anglican Ordinations must be considered as altogether invalid, and that there is neither Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon in the Anglican communion. And the reasons for this conclusion may be stated in a summary way as follows:

1. Because from the year 1554 it has been the unvarying practice of the Catholic Church so to consider and treat them.
2. Because there are grave doubts whether Barlow, the consecrator of Parker, had ever himself received episcopal consecration; and, in fact, the probabilities of the case incline more strongly against than in favour of it.
3. Because the Anglican forms of Ordination have been altered from the ancient forms, both by way of mutilation and addition, in such a manner as to exclude, on the part of those participating in the acts enjoined, any intention of conferring or receiving a Sacrament, or sacramental grace, or a spiritual character, or any sacerdotal or episcopal power.
4. Because the same forms have been also altered purposely with the view of excluding the idea of the priest at his Ordination receiving power to offer sacrifice.
5. Because Anglican Bishops and Priests at the time of Ordination join in a profession contrary to the Catholic faith in the Holy Sacrifice; thus assuming on themselves, by their own act, the spirit and erroneous intentions with which the alterations were made.

6. Because the meaning here attributed to the Anglican forms receives confirmation from the fact of its being doubtful whether the word 'priest' in the Anglican forms of Ordination means a priest in the sense of the Catholic Church, that is to say, *sacerdos*, 'a sacrificing priest.'

7. Because the meaning of the same forms is further illustrated from the 'Order of Administration of Holy Communion' in the Book of Common Prayer, which is found to be contrary to the Catholic faith in the doctrines of the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Real Presence.

This conclusion, however, may be considered as open to an answer. It may be said, in reply, that the reasons now given are entirely different from those that have been given before for the same conclusion; and that a decision which has shifted its ground so often is not entitled to respect. For it may be urged that the old argument upon the fact has been repudiated; that the defects alleged against the form by the first controversialists were not insisted on by those who succeeded; and that the points maintained by Lewgar and Le Quien are now in their turn withdrawn, and that the reasons now given are quite new, and different from any that have been alleged before. And thus, that there will be ground for the complaint, that in spite of argument and reason there is a determination on this—*i.e.* the Catholic—side to find a verdict against the validity of Anglican Ordinations.

If indeed the case were now actually on its trial, or if the verdict had depended on the arguments used and the defence made, say between Champneys and Mason, or between Talbot and Bramhall, or between Courayer and Le Quien, there would be a more specious appearance in the complaint that the case had been tried so many separate times, and that a new line of accusation had been adopted on each occasion by the prosecution. But, in fact, the decision is not in our hands at all, nor has

it ever rested with any of the parties who have argued the case. The case was tried and the verdict was given long before the controversy began. When the controversy opened in 1604, the Catholic side had only to account for and explain an existing tradition and an accustomed practice, which they had learnt and received from those before them. If there has been a difference in the mode of explaining this practice,—even if some of the facts alleged have been of a legendary character, which would not bear examination,—this does not affect the question; the main fact still remains the same, that there was at the time a long-standing custom of treating Anglican orders as null and void. Even the Nag's Head story bears witness to this tradition, for it never could have gained currency if the fact had been otherwise.

But the arguments now brought forward are not new, although they may be put in a new form. The absence of the sacramental character is a defect which was pointed out from an early period. The defect of excluding the power of sacrifice is the principal ground taken from the first. The first writers maintained the antecedent necessity of the delivery of the chalice, and of the formula *Accipe potestatem offerre*, &c. Talbot, Lewgar, and Le Quien insisted on an antecedent necessity for words expressive of the power to consecrate the Eucharist. It is shown that both points are an error in fact. 'Therefore,' exclaim the Anglicans, from Mason to Elrington, with Dr. Lee and Mr. Haddan reëchoing the cry, 'therefore our orders are clearly valid.' 'Not so fast,' replies the Catholic; 'it may be true that there is no antecedent necessity for the use of such words; but you cannot deny the doctrine, nor exclude the gift, nor ignore the power expressed in those words, without overthrowing the validity you are so anxious to establish. And this exclusion is the effect of the mode in which your Anglican form was changed from the ancient rite.' Here it is that Dr. Newman's argument comes in with

so much force, namely, that the Apostolic Succession, the sacramental gift of Holy Order, the Holy Sacrifice, are not traditions among Anglicans: 'There is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have.'¹

It is in vain to reply with the *tu quoque* argument that at a certain time or times in mediæval ages, and throughout whole countries, the clergy are said to have forgotten their Divine mission, to have fallen into a lamentable state of corruption and unbelief, to have neglected the Sacraments, and to have been ignorant of the proper mode of administering them.² Even admitting the worst of such statements to be not overdrawn, the whole Church was a witness against ecclesiastics so lost to a sense of what they were; the faith, which they were bound to profess, the books of divine offices, the Sacraments themselves, though neglected, the sacramental forms, and the solemn rites with which the priestly character had been conferred upon them,—all would rise up in judgment against such a generation and condemn it.

But the Anglican clergyman who disbelieves the Apostolic Succession has no such witness against him. The view that he takes is only the legitimate inference and the practical effect of the forms with which he was 'admitted to priest's orders.' If he considers himself to have been merely admitted to an office without any special grace connected with it, those same forms of Ordination bear him out. If he treats even with scorn the idea of any peculiar power belonging to a Bishop or a Priest, there is no condemnation for him in the Book of Common Prayer, or the Forms of Ordination, or the Thirty-nine Articles. And if he calls the Sacrifice of the Altar a delusion and blasphemy, he may there find authority to justify him.

¹ Dr. Newman's *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 110.

² Letter from the Rev. T. W. Mossman in *The Month*, vol. ix. p. 418.

Thus the Anglican tradition, 'the urgency of visible facts,' to which Dr. Newman has appealed, and the view taken in this work of the Anglican forms, mutually confirm each other. Each has been arrived at by a separate and independent process. The absence of a living general traditional belief shows that the view here worked out in detail is not overdrawn. The inferences here deduced from the forms themselves are in harmony with the views of a large body of Anglicans, adopted by them on convictions and reasonings of their own.

The doubt about the administration of baptism is a very serious point, though not mentioned in this work because Dr. Newman has already stated it. An allusion to it is now made in order to notice the nature of replies that have been given. They take again the form of *tu quoque*; it is suggested that there may be uncertainties about baptisms among Catholics; and an anecdote is told of a Catholic priest who inquired of an old nurse how she baptised him, and finding that she had made a grievous error in the form, he was baptised and ordained again. What does this show, but that in the true Church such an error was corrected? By Divine providence, and the light of his own conscience and prudence such a priest was led to have the defects repaired. An exception proves the rule. But who ever heard of an Anglican clergyman having any misgiving on the subject, or ever making inquiry of the minister who baptised him how he did it? Or if he did inquire, would he be likely to get any reliable information? Is it not taken as a matter of course? Catholics would have more confidence in Anglican baptisms if Anglicans themselves had less.

And this indeed goes further, for Anglicans seem to take all matters involved in their ordinations as a matter of course. Nor can the feeling be altogether blamed, for it arises from loyalty towards the institution in which they were brought up, and which they have learnt from infancy

to revere; if only it were directed towards her who holds the Divine promises, instead of merely regarding a creation of state policy, it would deserve admiration. Thus they feel so secure in their position, that to question it is like harbouring a suspicion of a mother's honour. Hence they believe, without proof, that everything on their side must be right; that their forms must somehow be sufficient; that Barlow must have been consecrated at some time or other; and they cling to shadows—to the opinions of certain Catholic theologians, however wide of the mark, or however little in repute, and to the name of a Roman Catholic writer, as they call Courayer, heretic as he was; and these appeals are thrown forward by them as if a sound and adequate defence; while the legend of Pope Pius' letter is to them an anchor of hope.

How few comparatively out of the large body of Anglicans see the real importance of the question! Some indeed say, 'that the question of holy orders is the ecclesiastical question of the day.'³ But even of those who take up the defence of their orders, how few see the real bearing of the points, perhaps scarcely enough to admit the premises on which the whole argument turns! Not those who, like Burnet and Palmer, shelter themselves in the position of the Thirty-nine Articles—that 'each national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority'; a principle that strikes at the root of sacramental grace. Not those either who suppress evidence that tells against their side, like Mason; nor who collect their facts and reason on them in the style of Andrewes, Twysden, and Bull: writers whom it is impossible to consider as honest either to themselves or their cause; and it is to be feared that there are some who shut their eyes to the evidence forced upon them, and are afraid to follow

³ *Union Review*, vol. vi. p. 500.

the leading of principles they profess. Still it may be hoped that there are not wanting those who really believe in sacramental grace, and in the Church and Priesthood as the channels of it, and who would be inclined to give the arguments on the Catholic side a fair consideration.

The controversy has been sometimes conducted with too much rancour, and imputations have been freely made which might well have been spared.⁴ Imputations of sinister motives are quite out of place. If Anglicans claim credit for a single-minded reverence towards the episcopal succession and the priesthood which they claim to possess, and allege this as their motive for defending it; surely Catholics are equally entitled to respect for their desire to preserve the safety of sacraments, and to adhere to the theological principles which they have received as a sacred tradition.

The present work commenced with an allusion to the claim made by Anglicans for a recognition of their Orders by the Catholic Church; and of course, as it was then said, such a claim implies an admission on the part of those who make it of the principles by which the Church would be guided in her judgment. What, then, Anglicans have to consider—the questions they have to ask themselves—are these: What do they really believe about the grace of Holy Order? and even about the grace of the Sacraments in general? and next, What are the conditions on which that grace is ordinarily given?—and then to look whether those conditions are fulfilled within the Anglican communion. If they would seriously, as in the sight of God, consider these points; we might hope to attain to Truth, which is before all things, and after Truth to see Peace following in her train, and union, not based on vague terms and unharmonious professions, but in '*one Body and one Spirit, as called in one Hope of our vocation, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.*'

⁴ Palmer's *Episcopacy Vindicated*, p. 5-6.

gested in a Table in the *British Antiquities*, with their countries; &c. And in the column of their Orders, as some of them are said to be *Priests Regular*, as having belonged to some Religious Order, some *Secular*, as not, so Pilkington (with one more) is set down *Minister Secular*, meaning no doubt the same Order of Priesthood. But the using of that term was to distinguish him from the Popish Massing Priests; and probably, to imply his receiving his Holy Orders from some Protestant Bishop or Bishops in King Edward's days. Which word *Minister* became usual in these times for distinction from the idolatrous Priests of the Romish Church.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

p. 96. 'An English Catholic,' writing in the *Tablet* of March 15, questions the value of Machyn's testimony, because he uses the term 'made' with regard to the confirmation of several Bishops at Bow Church, on the 20th of December, as well as to Parker's consecration at Lambeth on the 17th, while he always speaks of 'consecration' in the case of Cardinal Pole, and other Catholic Bishops. Machyn's testimony goes to show that a certain ceremony of 'making of an Archbishop' took place at Lambeth, on the 17th of December; and no suggestion has ever been offered of anything else having been done at that place on that day than according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. If Machyn means, that in his belief the ceremony at Bow Church on the 20th was as good a consecration as that at Lambeth on the 17th, he was not very far wrong.

p. 115. A possible explanation of Dr. Pusey's statement may be suggested. As Chichele was consecrated by the Pope in the year 1408, the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* may have been introduced into the Roman Pontifical, and have been said by the Pope. And such a fact may be recorded in the Register on account of the difference from the Sarum rite in the use of those words. If this be the case, it is merely stating that the rite of the Roman Pontifical was used instead of the Sarum, and it does not in any way affect the argument.

p. 116. Dr. Lee states that the Earl of Nottingham, in his *place in Parliament*, asserted that he had been present at Parker's consecration (*Validity*, p. 180, note). He has given no authority, and it is not so stated by Mason or Bramhall. Is there any authority that can be produced?

p. 134. The same inference with that in the text with regard to Bullingham's and Pilkington's ordination is drawn by Strype from the 'Table of Consecrations' in the following passage (Parker, book ii. cap. 2, p. 64): 'All these Bishops are conveniently di-

APPENDIX.

ERRATA.

- p. 5, line 6, transpose () to line 17, *after* hands.
" 28, " 11, *for* Mr. Palmer, *read* Sir W. Palmer.
" 34, " 18, *omit* not.
" 36, in note 66, *for* xviii. *read* xvii.
" 37, line 5, *to* 10th February, *add* note, See Appendix No. XV.
" " 28, *to* Hodgekyn, *add* note, See Appendix No. XVIII.*
" 39, " 21, *to* Hodgekyn, *add* note, See Appendix No. XVIII.*
" 54, in note 86, *for* II. *read* VII.
" 67, notes 33, 34, *for* App. No. VII. *read* No. VI.*
" 95, line 1, *to* The Official Minute, *add* note, See p. 86.
" " in note 98, *for* See Appendix No. XXXVII *read*. See page 88.
" 363, " 16, line 5, *for* 1513, *read* 1583.

APPENDIX.

I. *Decision of the S. Congregation of the Council.*

From Bened. XIV. De Syn. Diocesana. lib. viii. cap. 10.

A CERTAIN deacon, who was to be ordained priest, received the imposition of hands from the Bishop at all the usual times, but through some distraction, did not go up to the Bishop for the customary delivery of the instruments of the chalice and paten with the Host and wine. And a question arising, What ought to be done? the decision of the S. Cong. was sought. The solution of the difficulty depends on the grave controversy among Theologians, respecting the matter and form of the order of the presbyterate.

The older Schoolmen, followed by Sotus (in 4 Dist. 24, quest. 1, art. 3) and, according to Gonetus (in Clymp. disp. 2, art. 3), most other Thomists, recognised no other matter of ordination than the delivery of the instruments, and no other form than the words which accompany it. Their chief ground rests on the Decree of Eugenius IV. published in the Council of Florence for the instruction of the Armenians, where, in describing the matter and form of the several Orders, he mentions only the delivery of the instruments, and the words which accompany it; as follows (Hardouin, vol. ix. col. 440): 'The sixth Sacrament is Order, whereof the matter is that, by delivery of which the Order is conferred; as the priesthood is conferred by the delivery of the chalice with wine, and of the paten with bread; and the diaconate by giving the Book of the Gospels; and the subdiaconate likewise by delivery of an empty chalice with an empty paten upon it; and in like manner with regard to the others by presenting the things pertaining to their ministry. The form of the priesthood is this: Receive power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and dead. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And so of the form of the other Orders, as fully contained in the Roman Pontifical.'

Others, while they have regard on one side to the above-mentioned Decree of Eugenius, on the other hand look to the Sacred Scriptures, in which, wherever Ordination is mentioned, it is not explained in any other way than by imposition of hands; as for instance in Acts vi., when the Apostles had deliberated on appointing deacons, and committed the election to the multitude of disciples, on the seven nominated by them, *they praying imposed hands*; and in cap. xiii. it is said of the ordination of Paul and Barnabas: *then fasting and praying and imposing hands on them, they sent them away*. St. Paul also in 1 Tim. iv. writes, *neglect not the grace, which was given unto thee, with imposition of the hands of the presbytery*; and 2 Tim. i., *I admonish thee, to arouse the grace of God, which is in thee by imposition of my hands*. In order, then, to reconcile these testimonies with the Decree, these authors have taught that the delivery of the instruments, as well as the imposition of hands, is the adequate matter of the episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate; and that the form consists in the words pronounced by the ordaining Bishop at the time of each separate action. But out of the three impositions of hands presently to be described, which are used in the Ordination of a Priest, these authors assert that the third only, which is given with the formula, *Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost remit, &c.* belongs to the essence of the Sacrament. So Bellarmine (de Sacram. Ord. cap. ix.); Maldonatus (de Sacram. Ord. quæst. iii. part. 2. prop. 1 and 4), where he says that this doctrine, as to the imposition of hands is of faith, and as to the delivery of the instruments is very nearly of faith; Vasquez (iii. part. of disputat. 239, cap. 2, 3, and 4); Hallier (de Sacris Elect. et Ord. part. ii. § 2, cap. 2, art. 1 and 10, &c.); Estius (iv. dist. 24, § 24); Isambert (de Sac. Ord. disp. 3, art. 6); Piette (de Sac. Ord. quæst. 9); Vanroy (de Sac. Ord. cap. iii. quæst. 1); Simonet (tract. 17 de Ord. disp. 3, art. 1); and numerous others.

Lastly, there are others who consider that the three hierarchical Orders, namely, the episcopate, the priesthood, and the diaconate, have their adequate matter and form consisting only in the imposition of hands, with the words corresponding thereto; and they further consider that the delivery of the instruments is a rite merely accessory and integral, added by the Church only for the fuller signification and expression of the power conferred. But since in the Ordination of a Priest there are three times when the Bishop imposes hands on the ordained; for the first time, after

the litanies are finished, when he imposes hands together with the Priests present, without saying any words; the second time, immediately after the first, while he invokes the grace and gifts of the Holy Ghost upon the elect; and for the third time, after the communion, while he pronounces the words, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*; the advocates of this opinion contend that neither the first nor the third, but the second alone, with the accompanying prayers, complete the whole essence of the Sacrament. Martène, however, well observes that the second imposition of hands is not distinct from the first, but only a continuation of it; as indeed is plain on inspection. Wherefore these authors willingly concede that the other Orders, below the diaconate, are conferred by delivery of the instruments alone; since, in their opinion, they were not instituted by Christ our Lord, but added by the Church; and therefore, as they do not partake of the true nature of a Sacrament, and do not confer grace *ex opere operato*, they might be instituted and conferred in any other manner, at the pleasure of the Church. This opinion is defended by Hugo Menard (in notes to Sacram. of St. Gregory); Joan. Morinus (de Sac. Ord. pt. iii. exerc. 7, cap. 1); Martin Becan (de Sac. Ord. cap. 26, quæst. 4, concl. 3); Goar (in notes to the Euchol. Grec. p. 256, no. 11); Arcadius (Concord. lib. vi. cap. 7), in which places the two last-named Doctors speak expressly of the Latin Church, as well as of the Greek; Juenin (de Sac. diss. 9, quæst. 3, cap. 2, &c.); Van Espen (Jur. Eccl. univ. pt. 2, tit. 9, cap. 1, no. 9, &c.); Martène (de Antiq. Eccl. Rit. lib. i. cap. 8, art. 9, no. 11, &c.); Tournely (de Sac. Ord. quæst. 3, concl. 1 and 2), and other more recent writers; St. Bonaventura and Peter Soto having led the way for them, the first of whom expressly taught this opinion (in 4 dist. 24, pt. 2, art. 1, quæst. 4), and the latter is very much inclined to it, as acknowledged by Vasquez.

There are two arguments by which Morinus considers that this assertion is clearly proved, even to demonstration. The first is derived from the fact, that for at least nine hundred years throughout the Church at large the Hierarchical orders were conferred by imposition of hands alone, without the delivery of any instrument; as indeed the Doctors of the contrary opinion, for instance, Bellarmine and Hallier, are obliged to admit; for there is no mention of delivery of instruments in the ancient Rituals and Sacramentaries, which have been produced by Menard, Morinus, and Martène, after diligent researches; besides that in the Fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 398, at which 214 Bishops, including St. Augustine, were

present, the subdiaconate is distinguished from the Hierarchical orders by that very fact, that it is conferred by delivery of the instruments, while they are given by imposition of hands: and we find the same distinction made in the ancient Roman Sacramentary published by Card. Thomasius (p. 229). Nor is there any mention of delivery of instruments by Amalarius Fortunatus, or Rabanus Maurus, or Walafrid Strabo, although they treat professionally and at length of the rites of conferring Sacred Orders. In like manner there is an entire silence among the same writers, and in the most ancient Ritual books concerning the third imposition of hands, which it is now customary to give in the Ordination of a Priest, with the words, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*; since there is no monument thereof to be found more ancient than the fact related in the Life of Lietbert, Bishop of Cambrai, who lived in the tenth century, according to Martène, who infers from thence that this rite, through the whole Latin Church, is still more recent than the other of delivering the instruments, since it is clearly evident from the same Ritual books that the latter has not been introduced into the Latin Church more than 700 or at the most 800 years. Wherefore, these Doctors proceed to argue, in order to avoid the inference, either that the substance of Sacraments has undergone a change, which would be erroneous, or else that the ancient Church was without a true priesthood or legitimate ministers, which would be glaringly heretical; it is necessary to say, that even at present the Hierarchical Orders are conferred by imposition of hands alone, and that distinct from the third imposition just mentioned, which is of a more recent age.

It follows from hence (as the same Doctors proceed to argue) that we must believe that the Church, in directing the use in Ordination of the additions described above, meant only to express more clearly the power conferred on a Priest at his ordination, which power is conveyed in all its fulness by the second imposition of hands. And this meaning was acknowledged, before the opinion of the Schoolmen had fixed itself so deeply in general acceptance, by Hugo à S. Victor (lib. 2, de Sac. Fid. pt. 3, cap. 12), who says: 'They receive the Chalice with wine and the Paten with the Host from the Bishop's hand, in order that by these instruments they may be made conscious of their having received the power of offering propitiatory sacrifices to God;' and in almost the same words by Peter Lombard (lib. iv. dist. 24): 'They receive also the Chalice with the Host, that by this they may know

that they have received the power of offering propitiatory sacrifice to God:' and therewith agrees the ancient Roman Pontifical, a us. in the Colbertine Library, where we read, 'Let him take the Paten with the oblations, and the Chalice with wine, and place them together in the hands of each ordained by himself;' for by saying *ordained* (ordinati), and not *to be ordained* (ordinandi), he plainly denotes that the Ordination is already finished and complete before the delivery of the instruments.

Another argument not less strong for the support of this opinion is supplied by the Greek Church, which in giving sacred Ordination has never used, nor does at present use, any other matter than imposition of hands, as we may read in the Greek Euchologium, and may learn by the testimony of Arcadius. Yet the Roman Church has never held such ordinations of the Greeks invalid, or made any objection to them; moreover not only was there no question raised in the Councils of Lyons and Florence, at which Greeks were present with the Latins, but Clement VIII. had no hesitation, when he admitted the Russian Bishops, Priests, and Deacons to Catholic unity with the Orders they had received in their schism, according to the Greek rite; as treated at length by Natalis Alexander (Theol. Dogm. et Moral. lib. ii. de Sac. Ord. art. vii. § 2); Mornius (de Sac. Ord. pt. iii. exerc. 7, cap. i. no. 8); Cabassut. (Notit. Eccles. Sec. iv. Append. Cone. iv. Carthag. no. 4 and 5); Tournely (Prælect. Theol. de Sac. Ord.); Card. de Lugo (de Sacram. disp. ii. § 5, no. 85); Card. Albitius (de Inconst. in Fide, cap. 30, no. 374); Vericell. (de Apostol. Mission. Tit. xi. quæst. 168, § 3, no. 22).

By this same argument, derived from the Greek usage, the authors whose opinion we are now explaining overturn the contrary opinion in its very foundation, resting as it does on the decree of Eugenius; for how, they ask, could Eugenius IV. define that the essence of sacred Ordination consists in the delivery of instruments, and the words corresponding thereto, after he had in the same Council admitted to communion the Greek Bishops, priests, and deacons, who had been ordained with imposition of hands alone? It is necessary therefore to acknowledge that Eugenius spoke of an integral and accessory matter and form, which he wished the Armenians to add to the imposition of hands, already in use among them, in order that they might fully accommodate themselves to the usages of the Latin Church, and by an uniformity of rites adhere to it more firmly: which explanation is

well considered by Menard, Becan, and Morinus. Nor can the authors of the contrary side reject it; since the Decree makes no mention of the third imposition of hands, which notwithstanding they affirm to belong to the essence of Ordination of a priest; and hence they are obliged to acknowledge that it was not the mind of the Pontiff on that occasion to explain what completes the substance of Ordination.

The aforesaid Doctors have attempted various modes of escaping the inference from these arguments. And they say, that though it be true that the Latins at one time conferred the hierarchical orders by imposition of hands, as the Greeks do at present; yet notwithstanding that the delivery of instruments is necessary at this day in the Latin Church, because Christ our Lord did not institute nor determine the matter and form of Ordination in every minute particular, as they say, but permitted the Church at her pleasure to determine and for just causes to change them, so long as she ever makes use of both things and words, which are apt to signify the effect of sacred Ordination. Then they consider that the Church, having in former times designated imposition of hands alone, with the words accompanying it; yet afterwards, under a change of circumstances, left it to the Greeks, and appointed a different matter to be used by the Latins. But this doctrine stumbles on two most grave difficulties. First, it is not sufficiently proved that Christ our Lord did give such a power to the Church; and the opposite seems even to be shown for certain from the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. cap. 2), where it declares that the Church has power left to her by Christ of changing things respecting the dispensation of Sacraments, *if their substance be preserved untouched*; but the change of matter and form belongs not to the rite and dispensation, but to the substance. And then, if the power described has been granted to the Church, it is altogether a gratuitous and arbitrary supposition, that the Church has made use of it. For at least let them say where, and when, in what age, and in what Council, or by what Pope, such a change was ever made. Indeed, if the Church had removed from the rite of Ordination what had been done in ancient times, we should then be obliged to affirm, that the matter and form of Ordination had been changed by the authority of the Church, and a new matter and form substituted for the ancient. But since all things which are contained in the ancient Rituals still remain intact, and are even now performed in their integrity and sacredness, no one will readily believe that

those very things, which once were sufficient to complete the Sacrament of Order, now no longer suffice.

It seemed well to explain all this on the present occasion; not to give our adhesion to this last opinion, but only with the view of making it clear, that though it may have nearly the whole host of schoolmen opposed to it, yet it has nothing to fear from their attacks, but is even provided with weapons of its own to retort upon them.

Wherefore, to return to the proposition, since it is very uncertain whether the person in question would have been duly ordained by the second imposition of hands, the course to be taken was that prescribed by Gregory IX. (cap. *Presbyter, de Sacram. non iterand.*), where, in a case not very dissimilar, he decreed that nothing should be reiterated, but that what had been omitted by error should be cautiously supplied; and this is especially to be observed in a state of things where the Sacrament, being considered, according to the opinion of many theologians, to be already complete, would be subject to the peril of reiteration, as indeed it is well and appositely remarked by Natalis Alexander (*Theol. Dogm. et Mor. de Sac. Ord.* cap. i. arb. 7, § 2), saying, 'Whence, if any of the rites which belong to the matter or form according to various opinions of theologians, should be omitted in Ordination,—for instance, the first imposition of hands, or the accompanying prayer, or the delivery of the chalice with wine and water, and of the paten with the host, or the formula of words adjoined thereto, or the unction, or the last imposition of hands, or the words which accompany it, namely, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*—the Bishop ought to supply what had been unintentionally omitted in the Ordination, as may be collected from the Canon law (cap. *Pastoralis, &c.*).

But since some theologians of no mean repute have said that the imposition of hands, which precedes the delivery of the instruments, coalesces therewith so as to form one matter, by which, with the words pronounced by the Bishop in delivering the instruments, the first part of sacerdotal power is conferred, namely, that of consecrating the Body of Christ; therefore the Sacred Congregation, wisely considering that the previous imposition of hands, already given so long before, could have no moral conjunction with a delivery of instruments to be made on a later occasion, in order to allow some weight to this opinion in a matter of so much importance, wrote for answer that the whole Ordination should be repeated conditionally.

Extracts from Theologians.

St. Alphonsus Liguori (lib. vi. tract. 5. *de Ordine*), relating the above-mentioned three opinions, continues: 'Sententia vero probabilior dicitur utramque potestatem sacerdoti sacrificandi et absolvendi per solam secundam manuum impositionem. . . . Juxta autem hanc sententiam, que ex extrinsecis fundamentis (speculative tamen loquendo) probabilior mihi videtur. . . . Morinus et Tournely forte probabilius dicunt formam esse orationem, que in ipsa impositione dicitur ab Episcopo; verba autem, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* &c. que dicuntur in tertia impositione, inquitur esse tantum declarativa et confirmativa rei peractæ, nempe Spiritus Sancti jam collati in secunda impositione. Dixi autem *speculative loquendo*, hanc sententiam esse probabiliorum; nam cum secunda sententia sit etiam probabilis, hæc in praxi omnino sequenda sit. Quapropter bene advertit Croix, n. 1245, quod ordinatio facta sine secunda manuum impositione tota rependa sit.

Perrone (Tract. *de Ordine*, cap. iv.). Magna lis viget circa materiam et formam essentialem ordinum hierarchicorum, veteres enim scholastici fere omnes non ambigunt eam in instrumentorum pariter porrectione, et comitantibus eam verbis constituendam esse; at postquam sanior critica rimas omnes antiquitatis perscrutata est; communior jam evasit sententia quæ in sola manuum impositione et oratione, sitam esse materiam et formam horum ordinum tuetur.

. . . Hæc quidem disseruimus, spectantes questionem hanc in abstracto, ut dicitur, seu speculative; ceterum, cum in praxi tutior pars in administratione Sacramentorum teneri debeat, ac optime notæ theologi diversas sententias tueantur, hinc absque piaculo alterutra non posset omitti, scilicet, aut manuum impositio, aut instrumentorum porrectio, ex quibus juxta plures theologos in Ecclesia Latina materia totalis et adequata sacre ordinationis coalescit. Quod si traditio instrumentorum omissa esset, deberet omnino suppleri; imo, tota esset sub conditione ordinationis iteranda, prout a S. Cong. sancitum est apud Bened. XIV.

II. *Lutheran Manifestoes on the subject of Ordination.*

Part of the Declaration annexed to the Confession of Smaalcaid (from Melancthon's Works, vol. iii. col. 282). This Declaration was written by Melancthon, but was subscribed with a special approbation by all the Lutheran Divines assembled at Smaalcaid in 1537 (Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran. lib. iii. § 56).

De Potestate et Jurisdictione Episcoporum.

In confessione et apologia recitavimus ea, quæ in genere de potestate ecclesiastica dici proderat. Evangelium enim tribuit his, qui præsentur Ecclesiis, mandatum docendi Evangelium, remittendi peccata, administrandi Sacramenta: præterea jurisdictionem, videlicet mandatum excommunicandi eos, quorum nota sunt crimina, et respicientem rursus absolvendi. Ac omnium confessione, etiam adversariorum, liquet, hanc potestatem jure divino communem esse omnibus, qui præsentur Ecclesiis, sive vocentur Pastores sive presbyteri sive Episcopi. Ideoque Hieronymus aperte docet: *In literis Apostolicis omnes, quæ præsentur Ecclesiis, et Episcopos et presbyteros esse, et citat ex Tito: Propterea te relinqui in Creta, ut constituas presbyteros per civitates.* Et deinde addit: *Oportet Episcopum esse unius uxoris virum.* Item Petrus et Johannes vocant se presbyteros. Et deinde addit: *Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in remedium schismatis factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Ecclesiam Christi unitatem rumpere.* *Nam et Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysiam Episcopos, presbyteri sæpeper ex se unum eligebant, et in excelso loco collocabant, quem Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si ecclesius Imperatorem sibi faciat. Diaconi autem eligant ex se, quem industriam noverint, et Archidiaconum nuncupent. Quid enim facit Episcopus, excepta ordinatione, quæ presbyter non facit? Docet igitur Hieronymus, humana autoritate distinctos gradus esse Episcopi et presbyteri seu Pastoris. Idque res ipsa loquitur, quia potestas est eadem, quam supra dixi.*

Sed una res postea fecit discrimen Episcoporum et Pastorum, videlicet ordinatio, quia institutum est, ut unus Episcopus ordinaret ministros in pluribus Ecclesiis. Sed cum jure divino non sint diversi gradus Episcopi et Pastoris, manifestum est, ordinationem a Pastore, in sua Ecclesia factam, jure divino ratam esse. Itaque cum Episcopi ordinari fiunt hostes Ecclesie aut nolunt impetire ordinationem, Ecclesie retinent jus suum. Nam ubicunque est

Ecclesia, ibi est jus administrandi Evangelii; quare necesse est Ecclesiam retinere jus vocandi, eligendi, et ordinandi ministros. Et hoc jus est donum proprie datum Ecclesiae, quod nulla humana autoritas Ecclesiae eripere potest, sicut et Paulus testatur ad Ephesios, cum ait: *Ascendit, dedit dona hominibus*; et numerat inter dona propria Ecclesiae Pastores et Doctores. Et addit: *larvales ad ministerium, ad adjunctionem corporis Christi*. Ubi est igitur vera Ecclesia, ibi necesse est esse jus eligendi et ordinandi ministros. sicut in casu necessitatis absolvit etiam laicus, et fit minister ac Pastor alterius, sicut narrat Augustinus historiam de duobus Christianis in navi, quorum alter baptizaverit *καρτοβάσιον*, et is baptizatus deinde absolvit alterum. Huc pertinent sententiae Christi, quae testantur claves Ecclesiae datas esse non tantum certis personis: *Utique erant duo, sed tres congregati in nomine meo, &c.*

Postremo, etiam hoc confirmat sententia Petri: *Vos estis regale sacerdotium*, quae verba ad veram Ecclesiam pertinent, quae cum sola habeat sacerdotium, certe habet jus eligendi et ordinandi ministros. Idque etiam communissima Ecclesiae consuetudo testatur. Nam olim populus eligebat Pastores et Episcopos. Deinde debeat Episcopus, seu ejus Ecclesiae, seu vicinus, qui confirmabat electum impositione manuum, nec aliud fuit ordinatio, nisi talis comprobatio. Postea accesserunt novae ceremoniae, quales multas describit Dionysius: sed est autor novus et ficticius, quibus est, sicut et Clementis Romani scripta sunt suppositicia. Deinde recentiores addiderunt: *Do tibi potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis*. Sed ne illud quidem apud Dionysium est.

Ex his omnibus liquet, Ecclesiam retinere jus eligendi et ordinandi ministros. Quare cum Episcopi aut sunt heretici, aut nolunt impertire ordinationem, jure divino coguntur Ecclesiae adhibitis suis Pastoribus ordinare Pastores et ministros; et caussam adhibitis matii et discordiae præbeant impietas et tyrannus Episcoporum, quia Paulus præcipit, *ad Episcopos docentes et defendentes impiam doctrinam et impios cultus habeantur tanquam anathemata*.

Diximus de ordinatione, quae una, ut Hieronymus ait, *disscernetur Episcopos a reliquis presbyteris*. Itaque nulla disputatione opus est de ceteris Episcoporum officiis. Nec vero opus est dicere de confirmatione, item de campanarum consecratione, quae prope modum sola retinuerunt.

Judicium de Impositione Manuum.

From Melancthon's Works, vol. v. col. 209.
anno 1540.

Scriptum Philippi de impositione manuum. Ad Vitum Theodorum,

anno 1540.

In Historia Ecclesiastica Eusebii lib. vi. pag. 144 recitatur epistola Episcopi Hierosolymorum, in qua multis exemplis defenditur Origenes, qui concionabatur, cum non esset consecratus more sacerdotum, ut sic loquar. Et in libro juris canonici, cui titulus est Liber Decretorum, dist. 24, scribitur, *Laicos rogatos posse publice docere*. Verba canonis sumta sunt ex Synodo Carthaginensi.

Sed de administranda coena Domini major est questio. Irrepsit enim opinio de mutatione panis. Hanc potestatem dicunt certo ordini commendatam esse. Sed opponi potest manifestum testimonium, et satis grave Synodi Nicaenae, quae constituit, ut diaconi, absentibus presbyteris, coenam Domini administrarent. Nondum igitur erat persuasio, de potestate mutandi panem tradita certo gradui.

Hæc historica mihi quidem grata sunt, et me interduum confirmant disputantem in tanta temporum confusione de veteri ordinatione, sive electione ministrorum.

Nunc persuasio receptissima est Pontificie parisi: *Ecclesiam autem vultiam esse, in qua nemo potestatem habeat docendi publice, aut administrandi coenam Domini, nisi consecratus sit ab Episcopo tenente titulum, et quidem a Pontifice Romano acceptum*. Hunc ordinem vocant successionem ordinariam et pene Levitici sacerdotii *zavozhita* est.

Quid velit tuus collega, nescio: sed tamen non opinor, eum defendere illas opiniones pontificias, quas si tuebitur, nova erunt et majora certamina.

Dicam autem ordine, quæ in ministris constituendis necessaria sint: Vocatio seu electio necessaria est. Hanc Paulus mandat Tito: *Constituere presbyteros*. Postea vides in probatissimis historicis fuisse universalem morem prima Ecclesiae eligi, id est, vocari Episcopos per populum, id est, honestissimos homines in singulis ordinibus. Et adhuc vestigium moris manet, quod Episcopi a collegiis eliguntur.

Sic nunc vocantur ministri in nostris Ecclesiis, vel per Principes, vel per Senatum in Rebuspub: Et est pia et justa vocatio. Principes et Senatores dupliciter habent jus vocandi; primum, quia præ-

Appendix II.

sunt, et vult Deus gubernatores curare ministerium Evangelii: deinde quia sunt precipua membra Ecclesiae.

Ut igitur Athanasium Ecclesia Alexandrina vocavit: sic te, sic collegas tuos, vestri Senatores, qui sunt precipua membra, quos esse, nec referit, quam multis in Senatu placeat, satis est alimembra sunt, ad quam docendam vocati estis.

Hæc verissima et simplicissima sunt: nec dubium est, vos iuste vocatos, et legitimos ministros esse, et non esse ἀλλοτριους ἀδέσους.

Post vocationem seu electionem olim accedebat comprobatio, quæ fiebat per vicinos Episcopos, duos, aut tres, ut recitant mltæ historiæ. Hi manus imponebant electo. Hunc morem et nos servamus, ut scis, ac detector ritu. Nam impositio manus celebratur in Genesi, in historia Jacob, cum benedicitur filiis Joseph, et deinceps Aaroni et filiis. Item hostiis manus imponebantur, et Christus manus imponebat infantibus: ἐπίθεσις ἀνθρώποις χερίσιν, inquit Mat-

thæus. Præterea magna ministerii vis est, magna dignitas. Ideo honestissimum est, electum ministerium sisti coram Ecclesia, commendari Deo publica precatone, confirmari collegii testimonio. Hæc olim summa cum gravitate fiebant, ut adhuc fieri optarim.

Sed vides, quæ sit disciplinæ dissipatio. Vix ab illo collega tuo impetrari posset, ut ad talem ritum in templum veniret. Si hunc morem amat, ut amare eum decet, cur non renovat? Et instaurari in Ecclesiis frequentioribus certe utile esset.

Sed tamen et hoc dico: Vocatum seu electum voce eorum, penes quos est jus vocationis fungentem ministerio Evangelii, etiam sine altero ritu impositionis manuum, vere ministerium Evangelii esse, posse docere, ac administrare Sacramenta.

Nihil enim addit juris aut potestatis impositio manuum: sed est declaratio et comprobatio vocationis, de qua constare necesse est. Et valent, etiam Sacramenta propter ordinationem divinam, sicut vox Evangelii: *Evangelium est potentia Dei ad salutem*. Nec differunt veri pastores et mercenarii hoc ritu, sed differunt genere doctrinæ et voluntate.

Quod autem ne quidem liceat nobis petere ritum ordinationis ab Episcopis, qui nunc titulum tenent, et profitentur se improbare doctrinam Ecclesiarum nostrarum, manifesta ratio est: quia neminem sine impiis vinculis ordinant. Et Paulus inquit: *Si quis aliud Evangelium docuerit, anathema sit*.

Nec propterea extinguitur universa Ecclesia, sed manet Ecclesia

Lutheran Manifestoes on Ordination. xiii

apud nos; ubi sonat vox Evangelii, ibi est ministerium, et jus electionis, et comprobationis manet, juxta illud: *Ascendit, dedit dona hominibus, alios prophetas, alios pastores, alios doctores*. Certum est enim hæc sententia affirmari, quod in Ecclesia, in qua recte sonat Evangelium, sint hæc dona, sit ministerium verum. Hæc me consolatione sustentant.

Scio oportere perpetuum esse Ecclesiam, et eam non pendere ex titulis Episcoporum, sed vere eum esse cetum, qui sonat vocem Evangelii. Ergo et ministerium in eo cœtu est.

Doleo quidem divelli nos ab illis, qui tenent ordinariam potestatem: sed ipsi nos sine nostra culpa abiciunt. Foveo igitur quantum possum, et omnibus sum hortator fovendi hoc nostrum corpus, quod Ecclesiam Dei sentio, et dissipari nollem: et ne dissipationes exortirentur, multas injurias perferendas esse semper censo.

Habes quæ de impositione manuum ego sæpe cogitare soleo: et a te expecto, quid tibi videatur.

Part of the Reformatio Wittebergensis.

From Melancthon's Works, vol. v. col. 612. This scheme of Church government was drawn up by the Lutheran divines at Wittenberg, by order of the Elector of Saxony in 1545; and subscribed by Luther, Bugenhagen alias Pomeranus, Cruciger, Major, and Melancthon. The Latin version was made by Melancthon (Seckendorf, Hist. Luther. lib. iii. § 119).

Confirmatio.

Valde necesse est in omnibus Ecclesiis tradi certis diebus Catechismum, ut pueri assuefiant ad verum et nativum intellectum omnium articulorum et partium doctrinæ Christianæ. Ad hæc consuetudinem sancendam profertes ritus confirmationis, cum vide licet exacta pueritia jam firmiter ætas seu adolescentia accederet, palam in Ecclesia audienda esset integra doctrinæ confessio, et eum interrogatus promitteret constantiam in hac ipsa sententia recitata et in hujus Ecclesiæ sue confessione, manus Pastoris ei imponendæ essent, et publica precatone petenda mentis et cordis in hoc confitente confirmatio et gubernatio. Hæc ceremonia non esset inane spectaculum, ut nunc Episcoporum ritus, sed profutura esset ad retinendam doctrinæ puritatem et propagationem sententiæ ecclesiasticæ ad concordiam et disciplinam.

Etsi postea de ordinatione rursus dicendum est in ea parte, in qua de servando ministerio Evangelii dicitur: tamen hic necessariam admonitionem breviter inserendam esse duximus. Magna res est et necessaria Ecclesiae, cura recte exercendae ordinationis. Etsi enim Deus propria sua potentia et gubernatione ministerium Evangelicum servat, et excitat ipse pastores et doctores, et facit idoneos, ut Ephes. iv. scriptum est: tamen et tota Ecclesia, et maxime praecipua membra Ecclesiae etiam suum studium et operam ad hanc rem conferre debent, ut preparentur multi ad munus docendi, et ut instituti ac certis locis a doctis examinatoribus explorati admitantur ad ministerium, aut rejiciantur.

Hic labor mandatus fuit olim Episcopis. Sed plurimi diu jam magnam severitatem exercent in recte docentes, et non solum doctores suas non curant, sed ne suarum quidem ditionum Ecclesiis pastores praeficiunt, et pene ethnicae vastitates efficiunt. Ideo necesse est deliberari, quomodo universae Ecclesiae consulendum sit.

Etsi Episcopis auctoritas ordinationis tribuenda est, necesse est ut suam mentem de doctrina declarent. Nam si erunt et manebunt Evangelii hostes, nec volent ullos ad ordinationem admittere, sine obligatione ad impiam doctrinam, et ad delendam veritatem, non poterit ab eis ordinatio peti. Sed si veram doctrinam amplecti et tueri vellent, et idoneis hominibus examen commendare, praclare de Ecclesia mereri possent. Plurimum enim refert ordinationem recte instaurari.

Et si gubernatores vere considerarent ingentia beneficia Dei, quae per ministerium Evangelicum dantur: quod videlicet Deus hac voce et non aliter sibi colligit aeternam Ecclesiam, et nobis miseris hominibus mandavit vocare homines, qui didicerunt doctrinam Christi, per quorum functionem in docendo et administratione Sacramentorum vere est efficacax, et facit nos haeredes vitae aeternae, majore diligentia curarent, ut ordinatio rectius administraretur, et non pateret hic gradus sanctissimus hominibus prorsus ignavis Evangelii, aut hostibus, aut Epicureis. Populus etiam de ministerii Evangelici dignitate, et de ordinatione doceendus est, ut hoc ingens beneficium Dei intelligere discat (quod Deus certo per hos vocatos, et hanc functionem efficacax est) et ipsum ministerium magis amet, et majore cura servare studeat: sicut singuli suo loco debent ornare, et tueri hoc ministerium recte do-

centium, sicut saepe scriptum est et Christus inquit: *Qui vos spernit, me spernit.*

Noti sunt autem manifesti abusus, quibus ordinatio multis jam saeculis polluitur. Valet persuasio, sacerdotes ordinari propter sacrificium, non docendi Evangelii causa. Et haec opinio auxit numerum sacrificulorum: quia putant homines, cumulare haec sacrificia, praecipuum cultum Dei esse. Quare ii, qui ordinationi praefuerunt, admiserunt indoctos sine discrimine, cum soli illi fuisent admittendi, qui mediocriter docere populum de vera doctrina possent.

Jam si concordia constituenda est, et Episcopis commendanda ordinationis auctoritas, necesse est prius doctrinae consensum esse, ut dictum est. Deinde et mandata ordinationis dentur de docendo Evangelio, et administratione Sacramentorum, non de aliis operibus, ut sacrificent pro vivis et mortuis. Nec onerande erunt cultus scientiae impia lege celibatus, quae omnibus temporibus causa fuit multorum tristissimorum scelerum, et perpetui exitii multis hominibus. Et in universo sacerdotum ordine lex illa peperit ethnicae obscenitatem et profanitatem. Quorum peccatorum contagio se polluant omnes, qui hanc legem de celibatu defendunt et stabiliunt.

Sententia de Ordinatione Ecclesiae Ministrorum subscriptioe Bagenhagii approbata et recepta.

From Melancthon's Works, vol. vii. col. 740.

Nihil in alterutra parte exaggerabo. Nihil ullius factionis studio aut odio dicam, sed simpliciter recitabo meam sententiam, et iudicium permitto omnibus viris doctis et piis in Academiae Rostochiana et Gripswaldensi, et in Ecclesiis Hamburgensi, Lubecensi, Lüneburgensi et Brunsvicensi. Filius Dei, sedens ad dextram aeterni Patris, dat dona hominibus, alios quidem prophetas, alios apostolos, alios evangelistas, alios pastores, alios doctores, &c. Hunc agnoscimus servare Ecclesiam, et ei gratias agamus, et ejus beneficiis reverenter fruamur. Hic protulit ex sinu aeterni Patris Evangelium, hic ministerium Evangelicum instituit, et doctores misit et mittit. Rom. x.: Quomodo praedicabunt nisi missi fuerint? Mittit autem vel vocatos sua voce immediate, vel vocatos per Ecclesiam aut personas certas nomine Ecclesiae. De illa missione seu vocatione, qua immediate mittit doctores, sicut prophetae et apostoli