

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

We are invited to pray, but our prayer is to be addressed to the Virgin Mary. The prayer is partly to take the form of the Holy Rosary, a form of senseless prayer akin to the praying-wheels of Thibet. And if we pray to the Virgin in this way, we are promised three hundred days' indulgence. If it were not meant in all seriousness by the holy man who sits in the chair of St. Peter at Rome, I should characterize it as a jest, though a jest which approaches very nearly to an insult to the English people. But it is meant seriously, and we must so treat it. I refuse the Pope's indulgence and repudiate it with all my soul. I know that whatever punishment my Heavenly Father may see fit to impose on me for my sins, will be remedial chastisement intended to influence me for good and to fit me for the enjoyment of His presence; and I decline for my own good to have that remedial work shortened by one hour, let alone by three hundred days, here or hereafter; and especially when the indulgence is to be gained by such unspiritual means as the use of the Rosary. I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the understanding also, and my intellect revolts against any such mechanical means of prayer as that recommended by the Holy Father. And again, if I am to pray, I will pray to Him who has promised to hear me, and not to her, however great and exalted and blessed she may be, of whose power to hear I have no sure warrant in Holy Writ, and of whose power to answer, I venture to indulge in a strong scepticism. Such are not the means whereby reunion will be achieved. They involve tampering with truth and conscience; and, since fidelity to conscience was the watchword of the Reformation and has been the secret of all our progress ever since,¹ I call upon you to remember this and live by it, and, if necessary, to die for it. "Stand fast in the liberty for which your fathers were content to suffer and to die, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

FREDERIC RELTON.



ART. V.—ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

PART I.

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH (S.J.) has published a pamphlet by the Catholic Truth Society, 1895, entitled "The Doctrine of Intention." His main object appears to be to prove that the consecration of Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury under Queen Elizabeth, was invalid by reason of the want of

¹ Delivered, in substance, as one of the series of lectures in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on "The Leaders of the Reformation."

"intention" in Bishop Barlow, who consecrated Parker. This is a "new departure" from the usual reasons assigned for the alleged invalidity of that consecration, viz., that Barlow himself had not been duly consecrated as a bishop; but now the Rev. Sydney Smith adds the further objection that Barlow, when consecrating, had not a right intention to perform that ceremony according to the requirements of the Roman Church, and therefore did not convey to him sacramental and sacerdotal powers. It is this phase to which our attention is mainly drawn. If on either of these accounts Parker's consecration was invalid, then the same objections extend, with double force, to the valid consecration of Roman bishops and the ordination of their priests. Their title to "Apostolic Succession" is made dependent on precise forms and ceremonies.

Priests' "orders" were first declared to be one of their seven Sacraments by the Council of Florence in 1439. Cassander, an eminent divine of the Roman Church, after considerable research, came to the conclusion that, previous to the time of Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, in the twelfth century, the number of the Sacraments as being seven (including Orders) had not been proposed.¹ Dominicus Soto (Bishop), according to the testimony of Cardinal Bellarmin, said that "Episcopal ordination is not truly and properly a Sacrament."²

The so-called Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—

Every Sacrament consists of two things: *matter* which is called the element, and *form* which is commonly called the word. The *form* is so definite that any, *even a casual deviation* from it, renders the Sacrament null. These, then, are the parts which belong to the nature and substance of the Sacrament, and of which every Sacrament is necessarily composed.³

Wanting, therefore, either the prescribed *form* or *matter*, the ordination of a priest would be invalid, and such a priest could not be lawfully consecrated a bishop; and in that line, at least, Apostolic Succession would be broken.

The Council of Florence, in 1439, first authoritatively decreed the present *matter* in conferring ordination of a priest should be the delivery of the chalice with wine and water, and a paten with a host lying on it; and that the *form* should in future be:—

Receive thou the power to offer sacrifices to God and celebrate Masses both for the living and the dead.⁴

The Trent Catechism (p. 309) lays down the same *matter* and *form*:—

¹ Cassan. de Numer. Sacram., art. xiii., p. 951; Paris, 1616.

² Bellar., Dispt., tom. iii., p. 718; Paris, 1721.

³ Donovan's Translation, pp. 145, 146; Dublin, 1829.

⁴ Decret. Unionis. Concil. Florent. Labb. et Coss., Concilia, tom. xviii., col. 550; Venet., 1728.

The Bishop, handing the candidate for priest's orders a chalice which contains wine and water, and a paten with bread, says: "Receive the power of offering sacrifices," etc., words which, according to the uniform interpretation of the Church, impart power, when the proper matter is supplied, of consecrating the Holy Eucharist, and impress a character on the soul. He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine with a paten with bread, saying: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the dead." By these words and ceremonies he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the priesthood.

He is not, therefore, ordained to preach the Gospel.

Peter Dens, in his "Theologia," (accepted as a text-book), of these alleged essentials said that:—

Neither Scripture nor tradition makes any mention of these ceremonies (*i.e.*, delivery of the cup and paten), nor is the use of them found at this day among the Greeks, nor was it even among the Latins for the first ten ages of the Church.¹

Morinus, a priest of the congregation of the Oratory, a learned author, wrote an exhaustive work entitled "Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiæ ordinationibus," etc., Antwerp, 1685. After examining all the ancient Greek forms of ordination, in none of which is found either of the above *form* or *matter*, he proceeds to enumerate the ancient Latin forms of ordination, commencing from that prescribed by the Fourth Council of Carthage, A.D. 398 (p. 211), and after giving that and other forms, including what is called "The Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius" (p. 217), he gives the English form, which he says was the same as the first Latin form of the Council of Carthage (p. 233), viz. :—

When a presbyter is ordained, the Bishop, blessing him, and holding his hand on his head, let all the presbyters also who are present hold their hands beside the hand of the Bishop on his head.²

After quoting other forms, in none of which are to be found the *form* and *matter* prescribed by the Council of Florence, 1439, he then mentions the first form of ordination, in which the present *form* and *matter* are named, and this was in the middle of the tenth century (p. 257). It was in the possession of Constantine, Abbot of Caeta; and here we find the words, "Receive power to offer sacrifice as well for the living as for the dead in the name of the Lord" (p. 262). If, therefore, the present form is essential to the ordination of a priest, all previous ordinations were irregular, and the Order of Roman Priests dates only from 1439. Roman priests pretend to derive their orders in direct succession from the Apostles. It is alleged that our Lord's words "Do this" constituted the

¹ Dens, "Theol. Moral. ad usum Seminarium," tom. iv., "De Ordine," p. 57; Dublin, 1832.

² For this form see Labb., Concil., tom. ii., col. 1199; Paris, 1671.

twelve sacrificing priests. But there was no "laying on of hands," which ceremony has always been deemed an essential in all the ancient forms, and these words are not used in the present form. The Greek word *ποιέω* occurs in the Septuagint translation thirty-nine times, and refers principally to *keeping* or *celebrating* the Passover, and is so translated in the Douay version, and six times in the New Testament as "Do this." The learned Roman Catholic Estius did not accept this theory. He said, "It does not appear at all solid or agreeable to ancient interpreters," and he adds, "Do this, *hoc facite*, belongs to the common people, eating and drinking of the Sacrament, and that St. Paul refers it to them."¹

There is not the slightest justification for rendering the words "sacrifice this," as sometimes pretended, since there was no sacrifice at the Last Supper, nor, indeed, in any part of the Mass service. The transmission of "Apostolic Succession," insisted on by the Rev. Sydney Smith, was not perpetuated by any such forms and ceremonies as now adopted by the Roman Church. The first transmission of "Apostolic Succession" occurred on the death of Judas, and the succession in that office was effected by the simple process of casting lots!

If, then, *matter* and *form* and *ceremonies* are deemed essentials in the case of Parker, then for one thousand years or more there was no such *matter*, *form*, or *ceremony* as now practised in the Roman Church, and deemed essential; and according to the *dictum* laid down by the Trent Catechism, all ordinations and consecrations previous to 1439 were "null and void," and the claim to Apostolic Succession in the Roman Church hopelessly forfeited. But God is "no respecter of persons," and the forms now insisted on have neither Scripture nor Tradition to support the claim. It is marvellous to find men, otherwise endowed with reason, in this latter end of the nineteenth century, making our salvation—for that is practically the outcome of the argument—depend on forms and ceremonies of man's invention. If Parker was not consecrated in the Roman form, what then? All they can allege is that he was not a Roman bishop, and this he did not pretend to be.

The Rev. Sydney Smith, in p. 7, says: "Our Lord gave to His priests the power of order over the Sacraments, attaching to it the employment of certain words and ceremonies, the character of which He Himself determined." When or where do we find this recorded? The word Sacrament does not appear in the New Testament, but he subsequently admits (p. 8) that our Lord did not impose any form of words in

¹ In lib. iv., Sent., tom. iv., p. 105, col. 2; Paris, 1638.

administering the Last Supper, which is now called the "Mass," when they celebrate it; and he adds: "The same must be said in reference to the other Sacraments, and inclusively to Holy Orders, the Sacrament with which we are primarily concerned." The objection as to *matter* and *form* and *precise ceremonies* on Parker's consecration is therefore practically abandoned. We come, then, to the objection insisted upon, namely, the want of intention in Barlow when he consecrated Parker as Archbishop.

"Intention" in administering a sacrament was first shadowed forth at the Council of Florence, 1439.

The origin of this theory is rather humiliating. It is attributed to the extreme ignorance of certain priests of the Latin tongue; hence the unintentional mutilation of the form of words now declared necessary in order to the administration of a valid baptism. This gave rise to a discussion among schoolmen whether a priest who corrupts the sacramental words celebrated a valid Sacrament. The opinion seemed to be that, though the priest knew nothing of what he was saying, if he had the *intention* of doing what the Church required, it was sufficient. But then they came foul of the modern requirement of the exact adoption of the prescribed *form*, as asserted by the Trent Catechism. This appears to have been the reasoning of Pope Zachary in his answer to Boniface¹ about the ignorance of a priest in Bavaria, who had baptized "*in nomine Patria, Filia et Spiritua Sancta*," although it is now asserted that the slightest deviation from the prescribed *form* would invalidate the Sacrament.

The necessity of *intention* of a priest in administering a Sacrament was not a doctrine of the Roman Church until the year 1547, at the seventh session of the Council of Trent, when the theory excited a hot debate. Catherino, Bishop of Minori, stood up in the Council, protesting vehemently against the theory; his protest is recorded by Father Paul Sarpi in his history of the Council,² in these words:—

But suppose the necessity of mental intention. If a priest charged with the care of four or five thousand souls was an unbeliever, a hypocrite who, whether in the baptism of children, or in the absolution of penitents, or in the consecration of the Eucharist, had no intention of doing what the Church does, we must say that all the children were damned, the penitents not absolved, and all those who have received the Communion have received no advantage from it.

. . . If any said these cases were rare, would to God that in this corrupt age there were no cause to think *that they are very frequent!* But even admitting them to be very rare, or even unique, yet suppose, for example,

¹ Avent., Annal., lib. iii., p. 297; Ingolst., 1554.

² Tom. i., lib. ii., cols. 432, 433; Amst., 1751. Translated by Cou-
rayer.

a bad priest who is a hypocrite, and who has no intention of administering true baptism to a child, and that afterwards this child should become a bishop of a great city, and during a long succession of years has ordained a great number of priests, we must admit that this child, not being baptized, will not have received ordination, and, consequently, all those whom he may have ordained will have received nothing; and that thus there will be in this great city neither sacrament, nor penance, nor Eucharist, since these cannot exist without ordination, nor ordination without a true bishop, nor any bishop, if he has not been previously baptized; and thus by the malice of a single minister a million of Sacraments will be rendered nugatory.

Notwithstanding this warning, the Council confirmed the theory *as a doctrine*, to be accepted under pain of anathema. The eleventh canon (Session VII.) declares:—

If any shall say that there is not required in the ministers while they perform and confer the Sacraments, at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed.

These words are precise, and do not admit of private interpretation or evasion. Father Sydney Smith, as we shall presently see, attempts to minimize the risk incurred by a wicked priest not exercising a right intention. That there is a risk, and a very considerable risk, is evident, for they now tell us that the officiating priest, though himself in mortal sin, without sanctity or faith, effects a valid Sacrament, provided the forms are retained; and, as Father Smith asserts, "that the vast majority of pastors to whom we have recourse renders them absolutely incapable of thus deceiving us." Why, then, was it necessary for the Council of Trent to pass the following canons? The twelfth canon of the seventh session of the Council of Trent, on "Transubstantiation," declares: "If anyone shall say that a minister in mortal sin cannot perform or confer a Sacrament, provided he observes all the essentials which appertain to the performance of a Sacrament, let him be accursed." And in cap. vi. of the fourteenth session we read: "The synod teaches that even priests who are bound in mortal sin exercise, as the ministers of Christ, the power of remitting sins, by the power of the Holy Ghost conveyed to them in ordination, and those err in their opinion who contend that wicked priests have not this power." And Peter Dens tells us that "Every priest can validly consecrate, should he be even wicked, degraded, or excommunicated."¹

And in "The Handbook of the Christian Religion for the use of the Educated Laity," by the Rev. W. Wilmers, S.J., edited by the Rev. T. Conway, S.J., p. 34, 1891: "For the valid administration of a Sacrament, neither *sanctity* nor *virtue*, nor even *faith*, is necessary," and the contrary opinions "were condemned by the Church as heretical."

¹ "Theol.," tom. v., No. 28, "De Ministro," p. 293; Dublin, 1832.

Intention is thus defined in Ogilvie's Dictionary: "Act of stretching or bending the mind towards an object, hence uncommon exertion of the intellectual faculties, closeness of application, fixedness of attention, and earnestness." I would ask whether any of such wicked priests, without faith, could have such an earnest and right intention? Indeed, the divines assembled at the Trent Council seemed quite alive to this moral defect in the priesthood, for they earnestly enjoined a penitent seeking absolution in the confessional, unless he should be negligent of his own salvation, that he should select a priest who would not absolve him in a joke, and who would act seriously, and would not carefully seek a priest who would act seriously.¹

It is rather "hard lines" to throw the responsibility on a lay penitent to ascertain, at the risk of his salvation, whether the priest has a right intention or is only joking. But the laxity in this requirement of *intention* in the priest is very remarkable, and gives a wide margin for infidel priests. In the "Catholic Dictionary," edited by the priests Addis and Arnold, in the edition sanctioned by the late Cardinals Manning and Newman, p. 738, we are seriously told: "It is enough (for the validity of a Sacrament) if a minister merely performs the external rite in a serious manner, even if internally he withholds his intention, *i.e.*, even if he say to himself, 'I don't intend to consecrate.'" This is repeated, in the same words, in the edition of 1893, p. 811, bearing the imprimatur of Dr. Vaughan (Cardinal). Is not, then, the whole theory a solemn farce?

The Cardinal Archbishop Bellarmin felt the force of these objections, which he thus states:—

None can be certain, by the certainty of faith, that he receives a true Sacrament, since a Sacrament cannot be celebrated without the minister's intention; and no one can see the intention of another.²

Andreas Vega, another illustrious divine of the Roman Church, lays down the following:—

It cannot be through faith assured to anyone that he has received the least Sacrament, and this is certain from faith as it is manifest that we are living. For, except through the medium of a direct revelation, there is no way by which either evidently or through certain faith we can know the intention of him who ministers.³

Further, "Orders" depend on the validity of the *intention* of the Bishop, as well as the validity of his own consecration.

¹ "Nec si esset, nisi salutis suæ negligentissimus, qui sacerdotem joco se absolventem cognosceret, et non alium serio agentem, sedulo requireret." (Sess. xiv., c. vi., "De Ministro.")

² "De Justific.," lib. iii., cap. viii., col. 846, tom. iv.; Paris, 1608.

³ Opuscula, "De Justific.," lib. ix., cxvii.; Compl., 1564.

The same Cardinal Bellarmin puts the question in its proper light when he says:—

If we consider in bishops, their power of ordination and jurisdiction, we have no more than a moral certainty that they are true bishops.¹

So that had Parker been consecrated by Roman bishops, according to Roman forms and requirements, his consecration would have been equally doubtful as when consecrated by Barlow, who, by the way, was not trammelled by the now stringent rules required by the Roman Church. But how does Father Sydney Smith meet these dangers? In pp. 8-10 he labours to show that "the risk, the possession of such a power (of conferring a Sacrament) by an unworthy priest, exposes us; the general character of the majority of pastors to whom we have recourse renders them incapable of thus deceiving us." Why, then, warn a penitent, at the risk of his own salvation, carefully to seek a priest who would not absolve him in a joke? Then he tells us "to bear in mind the lynx-eyed watchfulness with which the Church guards her Sacraments as have a far-reaching effect," and that "it is the very spirit of intense anxiety to be secure against any risk which makes us intolerable to risk the chance of maladministration by those over whom the Church has control; and the same spirit would cause us to refuse baptism or ordination from the hands of one whom there were *overt reasons* for distrusting." And yet we are also told that if priests in mortal sin, without faith or sanctity, suspended or excommunicated, who mentally do not intend to consecrate or validly administer a Sacrament, only adopt the prescribed forms and appear serious, such consecrations are valid! And he adds: "Thus we are brought to the conclusion previously announced, that although there may be some risk through the possibility of bad priests, it is not very large;" and he admits that such cases of "malpractices may have occurred, but rarely." How does Father Sydney Smith know that his own claim to Apostolic Succession may not, during the long series of years, be derived through such a priest? One break in the chain would be fatal. As to this "minority," he bridges over the difficulty that his Church "has discovered in our Lord's promise to sustain the Apostolic Succession in His Church" (p. 14), and that "we must infer that He meant to sustain it, in virtue of the Lord's promise to work through the instrumentality of His ministers" (p. 16). This is a slender reed to rely upon, that a priest in mortal sin and without faith is recognised by our Lord as "His minister."

Though our immediate subject is the alleged want of inten-

¹ "De Eccl. Milit.," lib. iii., c. x., tom. ii., cols. 139, 140; Paris, 1608.

tion in Barlow in his act of consecration of Parker, I may mention that the Roman priest and historian, Dr. Lingard, fully admitted that Parker's consecration was perfectly valid. Referring to the appointment of bishops under Queen Elizabeth, he admits :—

The consecration (of Parker) was performed, though with little variation, according to the Ritual of Edward VI.

Which, by the way, was according to the ancient practice. He continues to say :—

Two of the consecrators, Barlow and Hodkins, had been ordained bishops according to the Roman Pontifical, the other two (Scory and Coverdale) according to the reformed ordinal (Wilkins' "Concilia," iv., p. 193). Of this consecration there can be no doubt; perhaps in the interval, between the refusal of the Catholic prelates and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag's Head, which gave rise to the story.¹

In the edition of 1855, vol. vi., appendix D.D., the Nag's Head incident Dr. Lingard pronounces to be "a fable." The story made its first appearance in 1604, that is, forty-five years after Parker's consecration, published at Antwerp, the work of an exiled Roman priest, John Holywood. In Dr. Lingard's letter to the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine* (vol. v., p. 712), he says, "No such ceremony (as the Nag's Head fable) had ever taken place." And in p. 782 he wrote, "Of the consecration of Parker I never entertained a doubt." Courayer, the editor of Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent," said: "Everything occurs to set the truth in so great a light, that if the fact of the Lambeth ordination is not above all doubt, one must renounce acknowledging anything contained in history."² Dr. Döllinger (and modern Rome has not produced a more learned writer), said :—

The fact that Parker was consecrated by four rightly consecrated bishops, *rite et legitime*, with imposition of hands and the necessary words, is so well attested that, if one chooses to doubt this fact, one could doubt ten thousand facts. . . . The fact is as well established as a fact can be required to be. Bossuet has acknowledged the validity of Parker's consecration, and no critical historian can dispute it. The Orders of the Roman Church could be disputed with more appearance of reason.³

The Council of Trent was by Pius IV. asked to declare the Elizabethan bishops unlawful, but they expressly refused to do so; they declared that the Anglican bishops "had due vocation, election, consecration and mission." The Irish Bishop, Fitzmaurice of Aghadoc, discussed the question at that Council,

¹ "History of England," vol. vii., p. 500; London, 1823.

² "A Defence of the Dissertation on the Validity of the English Ordinations," vol. i., p. 285, English translation, 1728.

³ "Report of Conference at Bonn, 1875," p. 96; London, 1876.

asserting that the recognition by the Pope constituted the only distinction between Roman and Anglican ordination, and this was universally accepted.¹

During Edward's reign bishops were consecrated and priests ordained under the Edwardian Ordinal. On Mary's accession the breach with Rome was temporarily healed. Cardinal Pole was sent by the Pope, as his Legate, to reconcile the Anglican Church with Rome. The question was how these bishops and priests were to be regarded. Mr. Haddon on this observes:—

It may not be clear what precisely were the conditions imposed, but it is clear that under conditions certainly short of re-ordination, both Julius III. and Paul IV., and Cardinal Pole acting with their sanction, did accept English orders under Mary's reign, by whatever ordinal conferred, wherever the persons so ordained submitted and were reconciled to the Pope.²

In fact, no new ordination or consecration was required.

Again, on two occasions in the seventeenth century, when a reunion was sought to be effected between the Anglican and Gallican Churches, the question of Anglican Orders was closely examined, and on both occasions it was admitted that they were perfectly regular, in which the illustrious Bossuet agreed.

Barlow's consecration was never disputed until eighty years after the event.

Now as to the *intention* of Parker's consecrators. We read in the Preface of the Edwardian Ordinal:

It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostolic time there hath been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church: bishops, priests, and deacons. . . . Therefore, *to the intent* these orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, etc.

The intent, therefore, was that the order of Bishop as a "minister in Christ's Church" should be continued in Parker, though he was ordained priest under Roman forms, and consecrated under the Edwardian Ordinal, which was the ancient form. The question then remains, What is a sufficient intention on the part of the officiating Bishop as consecrator, not being a member of the Roman Church? This is answered by "the Angelic Doctor," St. Thomas Aquinas:³

The minister of a Sacrament acts as the representative (*in personâ*) of the whole Church of which he is a member; in the words which he utters the intention of the Church is expressed, which suffices to the perfection of a Sacrament, unless the contrary is expressed outwardly on the part of the minister or the recipient of the Sacrament.

¹ "Quæ sententia omnibus placere maximè visa est" ("Le Plat. Mon. Concil. Trid.," tom v., p. 578).

² "Apostolic Succession in the Church of England," 1883, pp. 240, 201.

³ "Summa," pars iii., qu. lxiv., art. viii., vol. vi., p. 545; edit. London, 1875.

Nay, the modern Roman Church goes farther than this: as we have seen, the consecration would be valid although the consecrator may say to himself that he does not intend to consecrate. But Cardinal Bellarmin's testimony is more to our point. He said:—

It is not necessary to intend to do what the true Church does, whatever it may be, or what Christ instituted. You ask, What if anyone intend to do what some particular false Church, as that of Geneva does, and intends not to do that which the Roman Church does? I answer, Even that suffices. For he who intends to do what the Church of Geneva does, intends to do what the Church Universal does. For he intends, therefore, to do what such Church does who thinks it to be part of the Church Universal, although he is mistaken in his opinion of the true Church; but the error of the minister as to the Church does not take away the efficacy of the Sacrament.¹

If this theory is good for a so-called heretical Church—Geneva—why not extend the same principle to the consecration of bishops in the Anglican Church, and to the orders of the ministry of Christ's Universal Church? And with reference to the allusion to the "Universal Church," it was Pope Innocent III. who furnishes us with this definition:—

The Church, indeed, is called Universal, which consists of all churches everywhere, which by a Greek word is denominated Catholic; thus the *Roman Church* is not the Universal Church, but a part of the Universal Church.²

And Tostatus of Avila, the learned Salamanca doctor, wrote:

The Church of the Latins is not the Universal Church, but a certain part of it; thus, even if the whole of that Church erred, the Universal Church would not have erred, because the Universal Church would have remained in those parts which have not erred, whether those parts are many or few.³

And as to the title "Catholic," the Roman Canon Law quotes the law of the Emperor Justinian⁴:—

We order that all who follow this rule (that is, who believe in the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in their co-equal majesty and Triune Godhead, according to the Apostolic teaching and Gospel doctrine), shall adopt the name of Catholic Christian.

This is the language of the so-called Athanasian Creed, which is equally clear and explicit: "This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." And if the voice of antiquity is to be heard, Roman Catholics cannot deny the title of Catholic, or members of the

¹ Bell, "Disp. de Controv.," "De Sacram. in Gen.," lib. i., cap. xxvii., tom. iii., p. 27; Colonizæ, 1628. For further examples, see Denny's "Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction," 1893, S.P.C.K., p. 95.

² Lib. ii., Ep. 209, tom. i., p. 474; edit. Paris, 1682.

³ Quæst. vi. in Matt. ad Prolog. 2; Venice, 1596.

⁴ Vide "Cod. Just.," lib. i., tit. i.

Universal Church, to all those who hold, with the Church of England, that doctrine of the Trinity.

But Father Sydney Smith oversteps his mark. He says :—

With regard to the consecration of Archbishop Parker, Barlow had no intention when consecrating Parker to impart to him any such Sacramental power as according to Catholic doctrine is the distinctive possession of a Catholic bishop, and for this reason alone he could not have imparted any such power (p. 1).

Parker was consecrated in 1559. He was ordained a priest June 15, 1527, according to the Roman form, as a sacrificing priest, the form prescribed by the Council of Florence, and therefore a sacrificing priest. He received the title of Doctor of Divinity in 1535, when he was made Chaplain to Henry VIII.¹ In doctrine Henry VIII. was a thorough Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic paper, the *Tablet*, of February, 1895, p. 203, states :—

Henry VIII.'s attitude towards religion was a combination of Conservatism and laxity. On one hand, while vehemently rejecting the Pope's supremacy, and relentlessly enforcing his own, he maintained the observance of the chief points of Catholic doctrine and discipline, and *preserved the use of the Catholic Liturgy*.

And in a note the same paper adds :—

This is shown in the King's Book of "the Articles" (July, 1536), and the publication of the "Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man." Also (June 16, 1539), by the Act of the Six Articles (31 Henry VIII., c. 14), maintaining, 1. Transubstantiation; 2. Communion under one kind; 3. Celibacy of the clergy; 4. Observance of vows of chastity; 5. Private Masses; 6. Auricular confession.

Once a priest, always a priest, the character is said to be indelible; even, as Peter Dens assures us, though he be suspended or excommunicated, he can confer a valid Sacrament. In the present "Pontificale Romanum," the ceremony of consecrating a bishop-elect, the details of the whole process, are most minutely described, and cover several folio pages. The office of bishop is not specified in the words of consecration, neither is it in the Roman Pontifical. After administering the Pontifical oath, we read these remarkable passages :—

Dearest Brother, we ask thee with unfeigned charity if thou wilt accommodate all thy skill, to the utmost of thy natural abilities, to the sense of the Divine Scriptures.

The elect answers: So I will with all my heart consent thereto in all things, and obey the same.

Interrog.—Wilt thou, both by word and example, teach the people, for whom thou art to be ordained, those things which thou dost understand out of the Divine Scriptures?

Answer.—I will.

This is remarkable, for the Roman Church now declares that

¹ See Rev. F. G. Lee's "Validity of Anglican Orders," p. 147.
VOL. X.—NEW SERIES, NO. LXXXV. 4

the Holy Scriptures are an incomplete and insufficient rule of faith, and I quote here the remarks of our Bishop Burnet on this declaration :—

This alone, were there no more, may serve to justify those bishops who got orders in the Church of Rome and afterwards received the Reformation ; since by the very sponsions given in their ordination, they had engaged themselves to instruct their flocks according to the Scriptures.¹

The functions of a bishop are stated to be “ to judge, to consecrate, to ordain, to offer to baptize, and to confirm.”

But throughout the service there is no “ imparting ” to the “ bishop-elect ” any or additional “ Sacramental powers,” for these Parker had already received at his ordination, thirty-two years before, as a priest in the Roman Church.

The fact is, the whole of the Roman system, when we come to examine its parts critically, will be found to be a mass of inconsistencies, if not contradictions.

But what does it signify if Roman priests deny the validity of the consecration of Parker, or of any of our bishops, or that Anglican orders are invalid? Were it worth the time, we might with much more reason question the validity of their own orders and consecrations, since the ancient forms have been abandoned. And as to the succession of their Popes, not to mention three infant Popes, the succession has been repeatedly broken by numerous schisms, and the chair occupied by so-called Anti-popes ; and, as Dr. Newman remarked, no one at the present day can say which was the legitimate Pope. These rival claimants had their supporters, and they cursed and anathematized each other, and their respective adherents, with that particular force and unction which appears to have been the special privilege of Popes. To take one notable example, the “ Great Western Schism.” In a popular work, “ The Church and the Sovereign Pontiff,” by two Jesuit priests, Antonio Maurel and Patrick Costello (1879), which we are told “ has passed through twenty editions,” and has the approbation of eighteen archbishops and bishops, in p. 238, we read :—

The Great Western Schism is the division which took place in the fourteenth century in the Roman Church, when there were two, or even three, Popes placed at one time in the Holy See, without it being possible to distinguish which of the two or three Popes was the most canonically elected. It commenced after the death of Gregory XI., in 1378, and lasted for forty years. At this sad epoch, Christianity was divided into three obediences, that of John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and that of Gregory XII. Now, on the one hand, it was very difficult, or even impossible, to discern the true and legitimate Pope ; on the other, the three competitors, at least John XXIII. and Benedict XIII., were not disposed to abdicate.

¹ See Gibson's “ Preservative,” etc, vol. ii., p. 209.

The schism, in fact, lasted nearly seventy years.

The moral to be drawn from this episode is summed up by Coluccio Salutato, Papal secretary, writing to Jodocus, Margrave of Brandenburg and Moravia:—

After the death of Gregory XI., of happy memory, no person belonging to the party of the invalidly elected Pontiff has obtained the priestly dignity, seeing that the jurisdiction for conferring priestly orders has failed. Consequently, those who are in the obedience of a false Pontiff, though in good faith and a pure conscience, if they fall in with anyone ordained by the new bishops, if they adore the Host and Chalice, will not adore the Body and Blood of Christ, but the mere substance of bread and of wine mingled with water, as it were an idol.¹

Therefore all ordinations of priests, or consecration of bishops, by such bishops, would be equally invalid, and the consequences, according to Roman theory, disastrous.

C. H. COLLETTE.

Short Notices.

Principles of Biblical Criticism. By Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. Eyre and Spottiswoode.

FOR intelligent readers who are not experts in the science of Biblical Criticism and who are too busy to study the *opera majora* of the critics themselves, the present work will prove of real and lasting service. "The object of this volume," says the writer in his preface, "is to place before the reader the principles on which the criticism of the Bible has been carried on, as well as the results which are supposed to have been attained." With the reckless and revolutionary spirit manifested in recent Biblical criticism Mr. Lias has no sympathy; he adheres, in the main, to the traditional view, modified, however, in the light of research, and corrected in accordance with the just demands of temperate criticism. Negative criticism, says Mr. Lias, is arbitrary as resting largely on conjecture instead of proof; and he concludes that, far from the history of Israel being a thing of shreds and patches, it forms a coherent whole; while, as for the sacred records in which that great history is embalmed, it stands before us a "consistent whole, the product of One Divine Mind, inspired by one Spirit, teaching one and the same truth throughout, though with ever-increasing clearness as the years roll on." Besides the fact that the volume Mr. Lias has given us is written in an interesting manner, it is full of sound learning, as the scholarlike footnotes—of which there are a considerable number—abundantly show. We hope it will be very widely circulated, as it deserves to be.

The Biblical Doctrine of Sin. By Prof. J. S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

We wish to call attention—though all too late, for the book now noticed has been out some time—to the admirable series of "Handbooks for Bible-classes and private students" issued by the enterprising firm of

¹ Apud Martone, "Thea. Anecd.," ii. 1160. Quoted by Dr. Littledale, in his "Petrine Claims," cap. viii., p. 335. S.P.C.K.