





Studies in Romance



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

STUDIES IN THE
ROMAN CONTROVERSY



ABBOT ELFNOTH AND ST. AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY

(HARL : M.S. 2558)

See page 96.

STUDIES IN THE ROMAN CONTROVERSY

BY THE

REV. H. J. CLAYTON

SPECIAL LECTURER TO THE CENTRAL
CHURCH COMMITTEE

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MCMXIV

All rights reserved.

PREFACE

THE first four chapters of this book were, in substance, delivered as a course of lectures in Croydon during Lent 1913, as part of the year's programme of the local Church Defence Committee, the subject of the Papal Claims being selected at the request of a number of churchpeople who desired instruction on some of the details of the Roman controversy. The debt which the writer owes, especially in the first chapter, to Mr. Denny's *Papalism* will be more than evident to all who have studied that monumental exposure of the fallacies of the Roman claims as expressed in the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*. Chapter II has already appeared in the pages of *The National Church*, and Chapter V in the *English Church Review*, and are here reproduced by the kind permission of the editors. The last chapter, dealing with the question of the position of the assisting bishops at an episcopal consecration, is an

expansion of letters in the *Croydon Guardian* in 1910, written in view of the statement made by Bishop Mathew (of the old Catholic Church, now Archbishop of the old Roman Catholic Church) in a lecture in Croydon, that Anglican Orders were of questionable validity, on account of the doubt whether Barlow, the chief consecrator of Parker, had ever proceeded to episcopal consecration. This chapter owes much to the two important letters on this subject which were written by Father Puller to the *Guardian* on March 11 and 24, 1910, as also to his article on "Careless Baptisms and the Transmission of the Apostolic Ministry" in the *English Church Review* for November, 1910.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE PAPAL CLAIMS . . .	1
II. ENGLAND AND ROME . . .	29
III. ENGLAND AND ROME (<i>continued</i>).	46
IV. ANGLICAN ORDERS . . .	68
V. THE PALLIUM	89
VI. CO-CONSECRATORS	120
INDEX	143

STUDIES IN THE ROMAN CONTROVERSY

CHAPTER I

The Papal Claims

I

OVER against the present divided state of Christendom stands our Lord's prayer on the night before His Passion that His followers might be one. To-day men's minds and hearts are seriously considering the contrast between what is and what ought to be, and the reunion of Christendom is being increasingly prayed for and worked for. Regarding the matter even from the low ground of practical utility, men are learning the value of the presentation of an united front to the opponents of the Christian religion. At home, Christianity is faced, on the one side with materialism, and on the other side with apathy and

indifference, and the witness of our religion is seriously weakened by our unhappy divisions. Abroad, the active work of Christianity in casting down strongholds, and in attacking heathenism, is similarly impaired by the various and often rivalling manners in which the Christian religion is presented to the heathen for their acceptance.

Realizing these facts men are studying their differences, arriving at a better understanding of one another's positions, and learning not to throw emphasis upon matters which are neither vital nor fundamental. In Scotland the two great Presbyterian Churches, the Established and the Free, are actively at work endeavouring to effect reunion. The Lambeth Conference has laid down its "Quadrilateral," as the "basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion," viz., (a) the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (b) the Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol, and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (c) the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's

words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him; and (d) the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church. The Nonconformist denominations in England have bound themselves together into Federations of Free Church Councils, in order to minimize rivalry and overlapping. The Eastern Church is interested in the Church of England, studying and understanding it increasingly. The lectures on "The Continuity of the Church of England" delivered by Father Puller at St. Petersburg in 1912 are a striking illustration of this desire of the Russian Church to know more of the Church of this land; and as regards the Filioque clause of the Nicene Creed, it was agreed by the Russians that though the two Churches differ in the wording of their respective formulas, there is agreement as to the substance of the teaching concerning the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost.¹

One religious organization, however, cuts across the path, the Church of Rome. Rome, indeed, is just as keen as others for reunion, but for her reunion and submission are

¹ See Puller, *The Continuity of the Church of England*, p. xv.

synonymous terms. She refuses to regard any other religious organization as a sister Church, but treats its members as rebels, whose duty it is to return to the one fold, the Holy Catholic Church, which, she asserts, consists of those alone who are in communion with the bishop of the See of Rome. Here, then, is her primary claim. She refuses to hear of National Churches, and limits the Catholic Church to those who assent to the claims which are imposed on and accepted by those who are subject to Rome. Union with Rome is, she asserts, necessary for salvation. It is true that this has not always been her position, for even Innocent III, the Pope who raised the Papacy to such great heights, wrote in 1198 to a Latin Patriarch at Constantinople that "that is called the Church Universal which consists of all the Churches, and is named from the Greek word Catholic, and in this sense of the word the Roman Church is not the Church Universal, but a part of the Universal Church."¹

Accordingly Rome is active in England. Denying that the Church of England is a true part of the Holy Catholic Church, and maintaining that it is nothing but a protestant sect founded by the Tudors in the sixteenth century, she invites those who feel the

¹ Epis. ccix.

necessity of being in the one fold founded by Christ, and of possessing valid sacraments, to submit to the papal claims. Her strenuous efforts to make proselytes is explained by the position just set out, as also by the fact that she is compelled to recognize that hers is a declining cause, for the statistics given by Mr. McCabe in his *Decay of the Church of Rome* show that she has lost eighty millions of adherents in the last seventy years, two and a quarter millions being the loss in Great Britain. The figures of the annual reports of the Registrar-General clearly reveal the same fact, for whereas in 1866 the Roman Catholic marriages were forty-eight per thousand, they fell to forty-two per thousand in 1909 and 1910, and to forty-four per thousand in 1911. The Archbishop of Canterbury is therefore justified in remarking that "the cold and indisputable statistics of the Registrar-General in regard to marriages celebrated in England make it clear that such numerical change as is taking place is in the direction of a decline, not an advance."¹

II

The papal claims really resolve themselves into the papal claim, that our Lord founded a visible Church, of which St. Peter was the

¹ *The Character and Call of the Church of England*, p. 63.

divinely appointed head, and his successors in the See of Rome the inheritors of that privileged position, so that union with and submission to the occupier, for the time being, of that See, is necessary and vital.

This stupendous claim is made to rest, in the first place, upon a verse of Scripture, the famous Petrine text, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," (St. Matt. xvi. 18). Appealing as it does to Scripture and the primitive Church, the English Church has to take these words into account, and consider how they were interpreted by the early Fathers. Moreover, in this consideration it is all important to observe that if it can merely be shown that *some* of the Fathers interpreted the text in a non-papal manner, the Roman claim which is based on it is overthrown, for Rome is not satisfied with saying that some of the early Fathers regarded the words as signifying that an unique position had been granted to St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See, but claims that its interpretation is (in the words of the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*) "the venerable and constant belief of every age." Here, then, is a direct appeal to history, and the reply made by history to the challenge is unmistakable.

Before turning to individual writers of the early centuries, we note that the Roman Catholic who wrote under the name of "Janus" sums the matter up thus: "In the writings of the Greek doctors, Eusebius, St. Athanasius, St. Basil the Great, the two Gregories, and St. Epiphanius, there is not one word of any prerogatives of the Roman bishop. The most copious of the Greek Fathers, St. Chrysostom, is wholly silent on the subject, and so are the two Cyrils. Equally silent are the Latins, Hilary, Pacian, Zeno, Lucifer, Sulpicius, and St. Ambrose."¹ Similarly Mr. Denny points out that after reviewing the witness of the Fathers, "the interpretation which appears to be that which is most probably correct as being in accord with the usage of Holy Scripture, is that 'the Rock' is Christ Himself, and that even if the interpretation that 'the Rock' meant St. Peter does express the meaning intended by Christ, the words would simply signify that Peter should be a foundation of the Church as all the Apostles of the Lamb were to be, the promise that this should be the case being here made to them in Peter who had in his glorious confession just acted as their representative."²

¹ *The Pope and the Council*, pp. 87-88.

² *Papalism*, p. 51.

If we turn to the Fathers themselves what we discover is this, that far from the papal view being "the venerable and constant belief of every age," seventeen of them interpret it as meaning that the Church was built upon St. Peter, but eight say that it means all the Apostles represented by his confession, forty-four say that it means the *faith* of St. Peter, while sixteen say that it means Christ Himself.

It is true that in one place Origen says that the text means St. Peter, but in another place he remarks that "if you think that the whole Church was built by God upon Peter alone, what would you say about John the son of thunder, or each of the Apostles? Or shall we venture to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter, but shall prevail against the other Apostles and those that are perfect?"¹

In the same way there is the witness of St. Cyril, who in one place says: "He called him Peter, a name derived from Petros, a Rock, for on him He was going to lay the foundation of His Church,"² but elsewhere speaks of "calling, I imagine, nothing else the Rock, in allusion to his name, but the immovable and stable faith of the disciples on which the Church of Christ is founded and fixed, without

¹ Migne, *P.G.* xiii. 1,000. ² Migne, *P.G.* lxxiii, 219.

danger of falling, and remains for ever inexpugnable to the very gates of hell.”¹

Yet again, St. Hilary, a witness from the Western Church, regards it as a matter of indifference, giving two interpretations of the words. In one place he tells us that St. Peter “lay as a foundation for the building up of the Church,”² but he also says that “upon this rock of the confession is the building up of the Church,” and again: “this faith is the foundation of the Church, through the faith the gates of hell are powerless against it.”³

St. Augustine deliberately leaves it to his readers to make their own choice of interpretation, thereby showing quite plainly that the text cannot possibly be used as the foundation of the massive structure which Rome has attempted to build upon it: “I said in a certain place concerning the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded on him as on a rock, which meaning is also sung by the mouths of many in the words of the blessed Ambrose, where he says of the Rock, ‘at his song the rock of the Church wipes away his crime.’ But I know that I have afterwards most frequently so expounded the saying of the Lord, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,’ as to be under-

¹ *P.G.*, lxxxv. 865.

² *P.G.* ix. 750.

³ *P.G.* x. 186-187.

stood of Him Whom Peter confessed, saying, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' and so Peter named from this Rock would typify the person of the Church which is built upon the Rock, and hath received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, for it was not said to him, 'Thou art the Rock' (*Petra*), but 'Thou art Peter' (*Petros*). But Christ was the Rock Whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called Peter. But of these two meanings let the reader choose the more probable."¹

III

It has been pointed out that the Roman claim is, not merely that special privilege was bestowed upon St. Peter, but that that privilege belongs of right to his successors in the See of Rome. It is necessary, therefore, to inquire whether St. Peter ever was bishop of Rome, and it becomes clear that while it may be accepted as a fact that the Apostle did visit and work in Rome, and that he is rightly commemorated as one of the founders of the Church of Rome, he most certainly was not its first bishop. The Roman Missal is perfectly clear upon this point, for in the prayer "Communicantes," he is commemorated, not among the bishops of Rome, but among the

¹ *P.L.* xxxiii. 618.

twelve Apostles, after whom mention is made of the early Roman bishops, "Linus, Cletus, Clement," etc. The early lists of bishops are equally explicit in reckoning Linus as the first of the bishops of the Roman See. Thus Irenæus remarks that "the holy Apostles (Peter and Paul) founded the Church at Rome, and conferred the office of bishop upon Linus. He was followed by Anacletus, after whom, as third in descent from the Apostles, Clement received the See."¹ Similarly Eusebius says that "in the Church at Rome, after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first to receive the office of bishop"²; while, to quote one more early witness, Rufinus says that "Linus and Anacletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, but in the lifetime of Peter, in such a way that they discharged the episcopal office, while he carried out the duties of the Apostolate."³

It is important, moreover, in this connection to take notice of the fact that considerable study has been devoted, in recent years, to the question of the origins of the episcopate, and that there is much to say for the theory that the monarchical episcopate is a development from an earlier

¹ *P.G.* vii. 848-849.

² *P.G.* xx. 216.

³ *Praef.* in *Clement. Recognitiones.*

collegiate episcopate. So Mgr. Duchesne points out that " 'The Church of God which dwells at Rome ' could have inherited in a collegiate manner the superior authority of its apostolic founders ; this authority was concentrated in the body of its priest-bishops ; one of these embodied and administered it in a more special manner ; and between this president and the solitary bishop of the following ages, there is no specific difference." ¹ If this be the true account of the growth of the episcopate in Rome, then the Roman theory requires modification, for it really asserts that unique privileges were conferred by our Lord upon St. Peter, that these were handed on to a body of priest-bishops, and that finally the privileges were transferred from a corporation to an individual.

If, however, it be granted, for the sake of argument, that such special privileges were divinely bestowed upon St. Peter, it certainly does not follow that the Popes of Rome are the inheritors of these prerogatives. It was to the care of all the Apostles that the Church was committed by our Lord, and the true successors of the Apostolate are the whole body of the bishops of the Church, not one particular bishop of one particular See. The line laid down by St. Cyprian is undoubtedly

¹ *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, p. 95.

the correct one: "The other Apostles too were in fact what Peter was, endowed with the same share of honour and power, but the beginning starts from unity, in order that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one."¹ Elsewhere he says that "in the administration of His Church each ruler has free power to do his own will, but shall give account of his action to the Lord."² It is true that he interprets the Petrine text as applying to the person of the Apostle, but he goes on: "thence the ordination of bishops and the ordering of the Church runs down the course of time and line of succession, so that the Church is settled upon her bishops, and every act of the Church is regulated by her bishops."³ His famous description of the episcopate is "*episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*,"⁴ i.e. the authority of the whole episcopate is held by each bishop as "a tenure upon a totality, like that of a shareholder in some joint property."

IV

Once again, if the Divine Constitution of the Church is that the successors of St. Peter

¹ *De. Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, n. 4.

² *Ep. ad Stephanum*, Ep. lxxii. 3.

³ *Ep. ad Lapsos*, Ep. xxxiii. 1.

⁴ *De. Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, n. 4.

in the See of Rome are its divinely appointed heads, we should naturally expect that in the early ages, when the faith of the Church was being hammered out in the face of heresy, the Pope would have been regarded as the final court of appeal, and that his sentence would have been looked upon as absolutely conclusive. Yet this is the way in which things were *not* settled, for people did not say "ask the Pope" and then consider the matter as finished. On the contrary, matters were settled by General Councils, i.e. in the way laid down by St. Cyprian, the universal episcopate being looked upon as the appeal court. It is a plain historical fact that the early Councils were called together, not by the Pope, or even at his request, but by the Emperor; and when the Popes did begin to issue summons to Councils, the Eastern bishops refused to attend them. Nor, when the work for which they were summoned was completed, did the decrees of the Councils require confirmation by the Pope. This fact is so awkward for the papal claims that there has been forgery in the attempt to prove that the decrees of the first General Council (Nicea 325 A.D.) were papally ratified, but as Hefele has pointed out, the forgery is so very clumsy that "the Council asked the Holy See for its approval of its

work a few days after its commencement.”¹ Similarly the decrees of the second General Council (Constantinople 381 A.D.) were never ratified by Rome, for the Pope had no part in it from beginning to end, while the bishop who presided over it was out of communion with the Roman See. It is not the confirmation of the acts of a Council by the Pope, but the acceptance of its decrees by the whole Church (*ecclesia diffusa*) that renders it Œcumenical. For example, the Council of Ariminum in 359 A.D. was attended by more bishops than any previous Council, more than 400 bishops being present, yet it has never been accepted as a General Council—in fact it betrayed the Faith; while, on the other hand, there were none but Eastern bishops at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., yet East and West are both agreed in regarding it as a General Council of the Church Catholic.

It is, however, often pointed out that the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) said that “Peter is the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, and support of the Catholic Faith.” As a matter of fact this was not said by the Council, but by the Roman legates who represented the Pope at that Council. Each of the bishops present gave his own

¹ II. ii. 44.

judgment on the question at issue, Theodorus of Tarsus, e.g. saying: "he has been justly condemned by the greatest Sees, as well of great Rome as of new Rome, by Leo and Anatolius, archbishops of most holy Churches, with which I agree."¹ The members of the Council regarded the words used by the papal legates as the expression of their own vote, not as the final decree of one who was the divinely constituted master of the whole episcopate, from whom none dare differ under pain of being considered heretical.

Gradually the Popes succeeded in acquiring superiority over the whole Church, yet protests were made on behalf of the primitive idea that the final court of appeal was a General Council. What are usually known as the Reforming Councils (Pisa 1409, Constance 1414, and Basle 1431) have this in common, that they aimed at the assertion of the principle that the Council is above the Pope. They failed, it is true, but their witness is clear. It has been summarized thus: "The action of the Fathers of these Councils was, in fact, the outcome of the intolerable burden which the Papalist claims had fastened upon Western Christendom, a burden which made men realize that the then existing state of the Church was not in

¹ Mansi vi. 1,047 *et seq.*

accordance with its Divine Constitution. The "forgeries" and the *dicta* which had been based on them, regarded as they yet were, as genuine testimonies of the past ages of the Church's history, hampered the Fathers in their efforts. They did not know what the critical investigation of a later date has proved, that these writings which seemed to them to necessarily possess the highest possible authority were the corrupt inventions of later ages which the Papacy had boldly adopted in its own interests. Thus they were prevented from proceeding as they might have otherwise done, to effectually prevent the abuses which had resulted from the development of Papalism. Yet it is of the utmost significance that under these circumstances, even with their necessarily imperfect knowledge, and in face of the opinion with regard to the Papacy which had become firmly established in the West, they made so strenuous an attempt to return to a more Catholic state of affairs by proclaiming by decree the supremacy of the Church herself in General Council assembled, over all its members, whatever might be their dignity and rank." ¹

We find, accordingly, that the Council of Constance, in its fourth and fifth sessions,

¹ Denny, op. cit. p. 521.

decreed that "the synod duly met in the Holy Ghost, forming a General Council, and representing the Catholic Church militant, has its power directly from Christ, and every one, of whatever state or rank, even the Pope, is bound to obey it in things pertaining to faith, and the extinction of the schism";² while the Council of Basle reaffirmed this decree, telling the Pope that if he resisted, he was guilty of the sin of grieving the Holy Spirit of God.³

V

Reference has been made above to "forgeries," and the papal claims undoubtedly rest, to a large extent, on the forged decretals, the harm done by these being simply incalculable. They were produced about 850 A.D. by Pope Nicholas I, and they make the Popes exercise as from the earliest days of the Church, that authority which, it is clear from history, was only gradually usurped. That it was considered necessary to forge documents to bolster up the claims is significant, for if it had been possible to produce genuine evidence this would undoubtedly have been made public, for it would have been suicidal to resort to forgery if trustworthy documents had been

¹ Mansi xxvii. 585, 590.

² Ibid. xxix. 239.

available for reference. That the Decretals are actually forgeries is a fact of universal acceptance, and as "Janus" says: "in the middle of that century, about 845, arose the huge fabrication of the Isidorian decretals, which had results far beyond what its authors contemplated, and gradually, but surely, changed the whole constitution and government of the Church. It would be difficult to find in all history a second instance of so successful and yet so clumsy a forgery. For three centuries past it has been exposed, yet the principles it introduced and brought into practice have taken such deep root in the soil of the Church, and have so grown into her life, that the exposure of the fraud has produced no result in shaking the dominant system."¹

VI

Attention has been drawn above to the words of the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, which speak of the papal claims as "the venerable and constant belief of every age," and it has been shown that this position is proved inaccurate by the appeal to history. But is it worth while appealing to history at all? According to Cardinal Manning it is both treason and heresy so to do, for he says: "It was the charge of the Reformers that the

¹ Op. cit. p. 94.

Catholic doctrines were not primitive, and their pretension was to revert to antiquity. *But the appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy.* It is a treason because it rejects the Divine voice of the Church at this hour, and a heresy because it denies that voice to be Divine.”¹ Similarly Mgr. Hugh Benson, in his preface to Coxon’s *Roman Catholicism*, asserts that “no definition of doctrine uttered by the divine voice of the Church on earth is in any sense whatever an addition to the original deposit of truth committed to her at the beginning: no *apparent* modification or correction made by the same authority is a withdrawal of any definition previously made; both are alike nothing more or less than a more exact form of statement of the unchangeable Creed of the Church. The Apostolic Symbol and the Creed of Pope Pius IV are merely various assertions of the same facts.”

There is here no suggestion of development. The facts stated in the Apostles’ Creed and those set out in the Creed of Pius IV are said to be the same facts, the only difference being that of the manner of assertion. We, on the contrary, maintain that the appeal to history clearly shows that the papal claims are a growth and development, and this not merely in the sense that what had always been held

¹ *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, p. 238.

implicitly gradually obtained an explicit definition, but that there has been distinct addition to the contents of the corpus of doctrine accepted by the early Church. This has already been shown as regards the papal claim to supremacy, based on the Petrine text, but it remains to show that this is also true regarding the dogmas laid down as necessary to salvation (*de fide*) by Rome.

1. In the first place there is the belief in the Church. The Apostles' Creed expresses it plainly and simply—I believe in the Holy Catholic Church. Then we turn to the Creed of Pius IV and read—“I acknowledge the Holy, Apostolic, Roman Church for the Mother and mistress of all Churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ. I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things which the Sacred Canons, and General Councils, and particularly the holy Council of Trent has delivered, defined and declared. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected and anathematized.” Yet we are asked to believe that there is here “nothing more or less than a more exact form of statement of the unchangeable Creed of the

Church," and that these two statements are "merely various assertions of the same facts."

2. Or there is the question of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Roman Church lays down the doctrine of transubstantiation as *de fide*, and in the Creed of Pius IV defines it thus: "In the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess that under each kind alone, Christ whole and entire, and a true Sacrament is received." Can any one assert that there has been no development here, and that in the sense of addition to the original deposit? If so, it is enough to point out that this particular doctrine was not defined as *de fide* till the year 1215. It binds men to the acceptance of a philosophy now generally discarded, and it is impossible to believe that our Lord made the salvation of men turn on their acceptance of metaphysics and philosophy. Over against the Roman definition, sharp and clear cut as it is, one places by way of contrast the wise reserve of

our English theologian, Richard Hooker :
“ What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not. It is enough that to me that take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ. His promise in witness thereof sufficeth ; His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this—O my God, Thou art true ; O my soul, thou art happy.”¹

3. Similarly, there is the position of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Calendar of the English Church commemorates her on certain days in the year, and we sing her “ Magnificat ” daily, but here again Rome has added to the faith. It is significant that, according to Mgr. Duchesne, the Church of Rome does not appear to have observed any festival of the Blessed Virgin before the seventh century, when it adopted from the Church of Byzantium the Purification, Annunciation, Nativity, and Sleep or Assumption.² Leaving on one side the language, often almost hysterical, of devotion, the following are the words of a letter of Pope Leo XIII, dated September 22, 1891, addressed to all bishops : “ Our Lord is to be dreaded as an inexorable Judge, and there-

¹ *Eccl. Pol.* V. lxvii. 13.

² *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 259 (E.T., p. 270.)

fore that those whose actions have disturbed their consciences need an intercessor mighty in favour with God, merciful enough not to reject the cause of the desperate, merciful enough to lift up again towards hope in divine mercy the afflicted and the broken-down. Mary is this glorious intermediary ; she is the mighty Mother of the Almighty, but what is still sweeter—she is gentle, extreme in tenderness, of a limitless loving-kindness.”

Moreover, the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception is now *de fide*, and the fact that this was not ordained until the year 1854 reveals at once the late date of this particular addition to the primitive faith. St. Thomas Aquinas denied it,¹ while St. Bernard opposed it as an innovation at variance with the custom of the Church, with reason, and with tradition. It certainly will not meet the canon of being “the venerable and constant belief of every age.”

4. Again, the Council of Trent has laid it down as *de fide* that Christ instituted precisely seven sacraments, seven and no more, conveying grace to the soul *ex opere operato* when received with the proper disposition. Leaving on one side the varying manner in which the word “sacrament” was employed by the

¹ “Caro Virginis concepta fuit in originali peccato, et ideo hos defectus contraxit.” Summa III. xiv. 3.

primitive Fathers, one notes that it was not until the sixteenth century that the belief in seven sacraments became binding ; while it was only in the twelfth century that Peter Lombard began to lay down their septenary number, such a person as Peter Damien, the friend of Pope Gregory VII, saying at the end of the eleventh century : “ and that I may briefly divulge the investigation of my little intelligence, I would say that there are twelve sacraments in the Church, which the piety of the one faith preserves.”¹

5. Lastly, there is the doctrine of papal infallibility, which was not decreed until the year 1870, when Pope Pius IX declared it to be “ the very fundamental principle of Catholic faith and doctrine.” Yet it is strange that if this really be “ the venerable and constant belief of every age,” every French bishop-elect in the eighteenth century was compelled to deny it as the necessary condition of being consecrated to the episcopate. It is impossible to put the position of the English Church in regard to papal infallibility more clearly than in the protest made by Convocation in 1871 :—

“ (1) That the Vatican Council has no just right to be termed an Œcumenical or General

¹ See Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick and Numbering of the Sacraments*, p. 246.

Council; and that none of its decrees have any claim for acceptance as Canons of a General Council.”

“(2) That the dogma of Papal infallibility now set forth by the Vatican Council is contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the judgment of the ancient Church universal.”

“(3) That the assumption of supremacy by the Bishop of Rome in convening the late Vatican Council contravenes Canons of the universal Church.”

“(4) That there is one true Catholic and Apostolic Church founded by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that of this true Catholic and Apostolic Church the Church of England, and the Churches in communion with her are living members; and that the Church of England earnestly desires to maintain firmly the Catholic Faith as set forth by the Œcumenical Councils of the universal Church, and to be united upon those principles of doctrine and discipline in the bonds of brotherly love with all Churches in Christendom.”

If for a moment we turn from doctrine to practice we find exactly the same thing. Clerical celibacy e.g. was not made obligatory until ordained by Pope Gregory VII in 1074, while in England it was not till the Synod of London held under Anselm in 1102 that this

practice became the rule of the English Church. Or there is communion in one kind. It is plainly contrary to the express words of Christ "Drink ye all of this," and it did not begin to be the rule of the Roman Church until the twelfth century. That this is not "the venerable and constant belief of every age" is made clear by Pope Gelasius, who wrote in 490 A.D. : "We have ascertained that certain persons having received a portion of the sacred Body alone, abstain from partaking of the chalice of the sacred Blood. Let such persons without any doubt, since they are said to feel themselves bound by some superstition, either receive the Sacrament in its entirety or be repelled from the entire Sacrament, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege."¹

Modern Romanists simply evade the point at issue when they say that "the question is merely one of ritual";² and while acknowledging that the "practice is not Catholic, but Latin, an incidental development of our rite, kept still, like many other things, from conservative instinct," give as an additional justification of the custom the assertion that "the Reformers who changed it did so from

¹ Hom. xli.

² Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 376.

heretical motives,"¹ as if the reversion to the clear order of Christ and the normal custom of the first twelve centuries could be described as heresy!

In short, the position of the English Church in face of the papal claims is clear. It denies that they are a part of the Divine Constitution of the Church as laid down by our Lord. Rome has forgotten that the lens is not wide enough to cover the whole plate, and has attempted to obtain sharp definition over the whole surface, and has not rested content with clearness of focus in the centre, with gradual shading off into mystery. It has loved clearness and sharp definition, and in the attempt to obtain these has been compelled to add to "the faith once delivered to the saints." The papal claims will not meet the canon of St. Vincent of Lerins, for they have not been accepted "always, everywhere, and by all men"; nor will they meet the test set up by the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, for they are not "the venerable and constant belief of every age."

¹ Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 377.

CHAPTER II

England and Rome

FROM a consideration of the papal claims in general it is natural to pass to those claims as they affect members of the Church of England, for Rome maintains that no matter what may be the attitude of others, at all events English churchmen ought to return to their allegiance to the Roman See, looking to the rock whence they were hewn and to the hole of the pit whence they were digged. It is urged that up to the time of the Reformation the Church in this country possessed no separate identity, but was merely a part of the Roman Church, and emphasis is thrown on the fact that in recent years new light has been shed on the subject through the publication in 1898 of the late Professor Maitland's book on *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, in which he maintained that this Canon Law was not merely accepted in this country, but was supremely authoritative and binding on all the faithful, so that to dare

to challenge it was to risk the pains of heresy.

It is somewhat extraordinary that Roman Catholics (and it may be added the eminent King's Counsel who, as Nonconformists, have seized upon this Roman weapon as an argument to justify the disendowment of the Church) should fail to perceive the fundamental fallacy which underlies it, for even if the contention of Maitland be accepted to the fullest extent, the claim of the English Church to an unbroken continuity through the Reformation period remains untouched, for the period "before the Reformation" is spoken of and written about as if it were a static condition, while in reality it was dynamic. An absolutely false equation is set up, as if "before the Reformation" was equivalent to "from Augustine to Cranmer," while the slightest knowledge of history suffices to show that the relationship between England and the papacy was a matter of gradual growth and development. If it be granted that during the 300 years before the Reformation (and the first of the Papal statute books dates from 1234), the Church in this country was in absolute subjection to the Papacy, becoming so merged in it as to lose its separate identity, the contention of our opponents is unproved, for they must be able to show that this subjection existed from the time when

the Church of England first came into being.

Some, indeed, would go further, and maintain that even if this impossible claim could be substantiated, the continuity of the Church of England would remain a firm and sure fact, for as Mr. Denny has pointed out, the fact of our foundation by Rome "obviously could not on Catholic principles impose on the English Church the obligation to accept or to continue to acknowledge for ever, if once accepted, claims which are contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church. The Catholic verity as to that Constitution, 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' on the subject, has been shown to be essentially different from the Papalist doctrine thereon, which indeed perverts the Divine Constitution of the Church by its unhistorical accretions and assumptions; the Roman 'argument' is thus a palpable absurdity bearing on its face its own refutation."¹

Leaving, however, that argument on one side, it can safely be asserted that the authority of the Roman See over the Church of England was practically non-existent before the Conquest, and as the central principle of the Reformation was the appeal to antiquity, as is shown by the sixth of the Canons of 1571, and a reversion to the condition of

¹ *Papalism*, pp. 695-696.

affairs which prevailed when the English Church was first established, and as we can prove that this subjection to Rome did not then exist, this undue emphasis on the existence of papal domination during the 300 years before the Reformation, is not, as some appear to imagine, a "new light" thrown on the continuity question, but a mere will o' the wisp.

Before examining in detail the status of the Anglo-Saxon Church it may be worth while recalling the opinions of prominent historians on the matter. Bishop Collins has written that "down to the Norman Conquest we are not practically concerned with the papacy at all"¹; while Bishop Stubbs says that "the interference of foreign churches was scarcely if at all felt"²; and again, that "England had before the Conquest troubled herself very little about the Pope . . . the relation was not one of supreme authority and abject dependence, but of very devout profession and very slight practical interest."³ Freeman adopts the same position, pointing out that England's "crime in the eyes of Rome—the crime to punish which William's crusade was approved

¹ *Church and State in England before the Conquest*, p. 8.

² *Const. Hist.*, i. p. 267.

³ *Lectures on Early English History*, p. 99.

and blessed—was the independence still retained by the island Church and nation ”; ¹ and while he acknowledges that “ no Church was more distinctly the child of the Roman Church than the English Church,” he continues that “ for that very reason the English Church kept more of distinctness and independence than any other,” and that it “ kept the position, dutiful but not servile, of a child who had reached full age.”²

It is quite true that from the first England showed great respect for Rome, and this was, at that time, valuable, since “ Rome stood for a larger civilization and a wider Christian unity.”³ The English Church adopted the Roman customs at the Synod of Whitby, Englishmen frequently went on pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles at Rome, Peter’s pence was paid, while Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop were keen imitators of everything Roman.

But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that the Roman was by no means the only Church concerned with our foundation, for to assert the opposite would be to lose sight of the valuable work done by the Celts. There is no need to strike a balance and say

¹ *The Norman Conquest*, iii. p. 204.

² *Ibid.* v. p. 340.

³ *Dictionary of English Church History*, p. 438.

which did the more, though Dom Cabrol acknowledges that in Kent "the conversion had only been an ephemeral work,"¹ for it is enough now to point out that the Celtic Church helped in the work, and no one would seriously maintain that that Church was subject to Rome.

Augustine received his mission from Pope Gregory who "touched the spring that launched the English Church,"² but it was a national and autonomous Church that he proceeded to set up. Take two points only. Gregory ordered that Bishops for England were to be appointed, not from Rome but by their own provincial synods. The Bishop of London should "be always consecrated by his own synod," and similarly the Bishop of York "shall so preside over the Bishops he shall ordain, as to be in no way subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London."³ This quotation reminds one that Gregory's plan was that the archbishopric for the South of England should be at London, but without any orders from Rome the plan was changed, Canterbury becoming the seat of the southern Archbishop. In the second place Augustine

¹ *L'Angleterre Chrétienne*, p. 96.

² Bishop Browne, *Augustine and his Companions*, p. 8.

³ Bede, i. 29.

was allowed to settle the form of service for the English Church, not being called upon to institute the Roman service in this country, Gregory granting him permission to select, as he chose, from the Church of Rome, the Church of Gaul, or any other Church, and making these things into a bundle, to instil them into the minds of the English.¹ It is true that the Roman type of service was adopted, but the independence of the English Church was shown by the fact that several features of the Gallican service were incorporated, especially the benediction given by the bishop in the Eucharist, between the Lord's Prayer and the act of communion, a feature which is absent from the Roman missals and sacramentaries, and so Mgr. Duchesne says that "the oldest Anglo-Saxon books by no means contain the Roman liturgy in an absolutely pure form; they abound, indeed, in Gallican details."²

Even when Rome was imitated, the imitation was not the result of papal coercion, but the act of an independent national synod. This is made plain by the action taken at Whitby in 664. The Roman custom regarding the date of the Easter festival was accepted

¹ Bede, i. 29.

² *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 93 (E.T. p. 99).

by the English Church, but the action was neither dictated or even influenced by Rome, but, as Bede says, "it was agreed that a synod should be held . . . and that there this controversy should be decided."¹

If one turns to the by-paths of history the same fact of independence is noticed. In later days the Popes claimed the sole right to canonize, but till the end of the tenth century the action of individual bishops was practically unfettered, and though from the tenth to the twelfth century the Pope's approval was generally, if not always, sought before adding a name to the Calendar, it was not till the end of the twelfth century that the papal claim to make all formal canonizations was definitely asserted and accepted.² The English Church acted, in Saxon days, independently of Rome. The Synod of Cloveshoo, in 747, fixed the veneration of St. Gregory for his birthday, March 12, and of St. Augustine for his burial day, May 26; while the name of Edward, King and Martyr, was inserted in the Calendar by a Witan held under Canute in 1017, and that of Dunstan by the same authority.³

¹ iii. 25.

² See Hutton, *The English Saints*, p. 23.

³ See Stubbs. *Historical Introduction to the Rolls Series*, p. 22.

Again, the second Council of Nicæa, 787, which Rome regards as the Seventh Œcumenical Council of the Church, forbade the consecration of altars without the inclusion of relics, ordering that any bishop who failed to secure the observance of this rule should be deposed. One finds, however, that the Council of Chelsea, in 816, allowed relics to be dispensed with,¹ while the pontifical ascribed to Dunstan adopts the same attitude, providing for consecration without relics, as the expressions "si reliquæ habeantur" and "si sunt autem reliquæ" plainly show, so that the Roman Catholic writer, Dr. Rock, adds the saving clause, "if they were to be had," to his statement that in Anglo-Saxon times consecration without relics was not thought of.²

To return to the main stream of history. There is no doubt that, in later times, bishops were constantly appointed and provided by Rome, but between 597 and 1050, though there were 404 bishops appointed for work in various parts of England, the Popes had no part in the appointment or consecration of any but one of them. That the Pope was responsible, through his legates, for the erection

¹ See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 580.

² See Wickham Legg, *Three Chapters in Recent Liturgical Research*, pp. 56-57.

of the See of Lichfield into an archbishopric in 673 is a fact, but the transaction has been rightly described as "money and blunders,"¹ while it might also be spoken of as a matter of meddle and muddle. For King Offa paid much money (*infinita pecunia*) to get the transaction carried through, while it was done by English authority, in conjunction with the Pope. It was a complete failure, so that during the lifetime of the first Archbishop of Lichfield the Pope had to recognize that his predecessor had made a mistake, and the act was annulled by English authority again in conjunction with the Pope. The Pope appears to have been somewhat afraid of Offa, for he wrote to Charles the Great regarding the rumour that the King intended to dethrone him,² while, as Oman says, the archbishopric was set up "merely to please the King; perhaps, however, because archbishops ruling over smaller areas were less likely to give trouble and assume an independent attitude than those whose spheres of influence were coterminous with a whole national or imperial unit."³ Anyhow, though the work was the result of a visit of

¹ See Bp. Browne, *What is the Catholic Church in England?* p. 187.

² See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 440.

³ *England before the Norman Conquest*, p. 342.

papal legates to England, it must be noted that no other legate came here until the year 1062,¹ and also that the Council was summoned by the King.

But was not Theodore appointed by the Pope? This is so, for it is the one exception, and even in this connexion it must be borne in mind that Wighard was sent to Rome by Kings Egbert and Oswy, "with a request that he might be ordained bishop of the Church of England."² After his death in Rome, Theodore was sent to England by Pope Vitalian, and it is quite possible that in the letters of the English Kings asking for the consecration of Wighard, the request was added that in the event of his death the Pope would make the selection, for in his letter to Oswy, he says, "We have not been able now to find, considering the length of the journey, a man, docile, and qualified in all respects to be a bishop, according to the tenour of your letters."³ At all events the work done in England by Theodore was that of the consolidation of an autonomous Church. Between 668 and 690 he consecrated, for various parts of England, no fewer than twenty-one bishops—an average

¹ Cabrol, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

² Bede, iv. i.

³ *Ibid.*, iii. 29.

of one a year—but there is no mention of any reference being made to Rome regarding any one appointment. Not only did he appoint bishops, but he divided dioceses, with the result that he was brought into sharp collision with the impetuous Wilfrid, and although the latter appealed to Rome, Theodore persisted in his line of action, Wilfrid's appeal being rejected by the authorities both of Church and State. Similarly the Penitential of Theodore is based on Greek rather than Roman customs, for in it "the regulations of the Greek Church and of the Roman Church are treated as precedents which are equal in authority, and Roman customs are set aside when they seem to be inferior to the Greek."¹

Mention has just been made of an appeal by Wilfrid to Rome. The rejection of the papal decision shows that Rome was not regarded as an infallible final court of appeal, while the next appeal to Rome was that made by an earl whom Dunstan excommunicated because of a breach of the marriage law. The decision of the Pope was in the earl's favour, advocating the withdrawal of the excommunication, but the archbishop refused and won, there being no further

¹ Plummer, *The Churches in Britain before A.D. 1000*, ii. p. 236.

appeal till 1052, when Robert of Jumièges appealed against his expulsion from Canterbury. The mention of Dunstan reminds one that the monastic revival with which his name is associated was a national movement independent of Rome; while in connection with appeals "there was no question of a tribunal with jurisdiction acknowledged on all sides, but rather of an appeal by one of the parties to a foreign power whose decisions and representations would not be recognized by the other."¹

It is, moreover, well to notice that the rule of the English Church was that no appeal might be made beyond the Provincial Synod. This was clearly laid down at the Council of Cloveshoo in 747, which ordered that "if there are difficult things, too difficult for the Bishop in his diocese, let him bring them to the Archbishop in the provincial synod, and let the Archbishop settle them." The true significance of this rule is only

¹ Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, p. 226; and cf. Smith, *Church and State in the Middle Ages*, p. 45: "In primitive law the idea of appeal to a higher court was strange. It was, therefore, not till after the Norman Conquest had opened the way for influences derived from Roman law that the idea of appealing to Rome developed rapidly."

observed when it is compared with that made in the same year for the Church in Germany by the great English missionary St. Boniface: "all Bishops ought to refer to the Metropolitan, and he to the Roman Pontiff, if there is any matter among his people which he finds it impossible to correct."

But, it is said, the Anglo-Saxon Church showed its subjection to Rome by the payment of Peter's pence. The origin of this tribute is disputed, some attributing it to Ina, others to Offa, others to Ethelwulf. Probably it originated with Offa, who, in gratitude to the Pope for doing what he wanted in regard to the archbishopric of Lichfield, promised to send each year to Rome 365 gold mancuses to be used for alms and for supplying lights in St. Peter's. There was, however, no question of a compulsory tribute as a sign of subjection, for the laws of Edward the Confessor speak of Peter's pence as alms ("quoniam denarius hic eleemosyna regis est"),¹ and Dom Cabrol says that one of the complaints of the papacy against the last representative of the Saxon dynasty, at the time when William the Conqueror was preparing his expedition, was the fact of the arrears in the payment of Peter's pence. William the Conqueror, he points out, "re-

¹ See Wilkins' *Concilia*, ii. p. 312.

fused to take the oath of allegiance to the Holy See, which would have been a recognition of the Pope's right over England, and would have transformed into a tribute that which was an alms."¹

In later days bishops were called upon to take an oath of allegiance to the papacy. This, however, cannot be traced back to Saxon days, for as Soames says, "a profession of canonical obedience to his metropolitan was also exacted from him. Of obedience to the Roman See . . . there appears no mention in our earliest pontificals."² In the oath taken by Rethun of Leicester to Wulfred Archbishop of Canterbury (814-816), there is, indeed, mention of Rome, for the bishop swears "to observe, always, to the end of my life, the constitutions of the sacred canons and the venerable decrees of the Popes (*pontificum*), so far as the seven fold Spirit shall have enlightened me,"³ but even if this is anything more than a general reference to the laws of the Church which had been adopted and received in England, it is noteworthy that in the oaths of Wigthegn of Winchester, Ethelnoth of London, Herewin of Lichfield, Hedbert of Worcester,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 335.

² *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 218.

³ Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 578.

Hunferth of Elmham, Ceolbert of London, Herefrith of Winchester, Humbert of Lichfield, and Eadwulf of Hereford, all of which were taken to the same primate, no such words occur.¹

Lastly, it is urged that as the Archbishops of Canterbury received the Pall they must have accepted the papal jurisdiction. The answer is that all the Saxon primates did not receive it, and that even if they did it does not matter, for though in later days the gift of the Pall was made to symbolize the conferring of jurisdiction upon its recipient, this was not the case in the days with which we are concerned.² The Pall granted to Augustine was merely the Pall of honour, and so Dom Baudot rightly says that what had been done in favour of St. Augustine of Canterbury by St. Gregory the Great was done by his successors in favour of SS. Willibrod and Boniface, for "to similar apostolic success was granted the same honorific insignia."³ Similarly, the Benedictine editors of the works of Pope Gregory admit that "the theory of [the necessity of the Pall had not up to that time been introduced ;

¹ See Haddan and Stubbs, *passim*.

² See *infra*, chapter v.

³ *Le Pallium*, p. 17.

ecclesiastical authority did not as yet depend on that article of external worship.”¹

The conclusion is plain. In Anglo-Saxon days the English Church showed respect and reverence to the Roman See, but reverence is one thing and authority another, and from respect to ecclesiastical domination is a very far cry.

¹ Migne, *P.L.*, lxxvii. 782.

CHAPTER III

England and Rome (*continued*)

I

HAVING considered the status of the English Church in Anglo-Saxon days in regard to the Papacy, it is necessary to pass on to a consideration of the relationship which existed between England and Rome from the time of the Norman Conquest to the breach with the Papacy in the sixteenth century. Did the Church, during this period, become so merged in the Papacy as to lose its separate identity, becoming nothing more than two outlying Provinces of the Church of Rome?

At the outset one question requires attention, for it is sometimes urged that it is unnecessary to go into details, for if it can be shown that at any time the Church in England did act in any way contrary to Rome, such action was in opposition to the Divine Constitution of the Church, for there

cannot be such things as National Churches. It may be replied in the words of Dom Leclereq that "without doubt the Catholic religion is Catholic, it is universal ; however, that does not prevent it from being in a sense Spanish in Spain or Italian in Italy. A religion, even if it is cosmopolitan in its institution, is held, in each country, to have a national character and spirit."¹ The true historical position has been thus stated : "The English Church does indeed consist of so many dioceses within the unity of the Church Catholic, and in consequence it partakes of that life which is common to the whole Catholic Church. But it is not merely so many dioceses of the Catholic Church ; it is this and something more. It is a local, particular, or national Church, by which I mean that it is bound together by a common life peculiar to itself. . . . The English Church does indeed consist of a certain number of dioceses of the Catholic Church, and these dioceses do indeed make up two provinces ; but it is something more than a mere *congeries* of dioceses, or two ecclesiastical provinces : it is a real living entity. It has a real life and character of its own, which has left its record in every page of its history. The man who is unable

¹ *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, p. xxxi.

to discern and recognize this may understand many things : he may be able to study logic ; he may be able to understand mechanics ; in a perfunctory and wooden sort of way he may even be able to study law ; but at least let him keep his profane hands off the study of history, and Church history above all, for he has shown himself incapable of understanding what it means." ¹

II

One point, at least, is agreed on, that the English Church continued to possess its own name from the time of its creation to the Reformation period. Gregory himself spoke of it "as the Church of the English," ² and by that name, or by such names as "the English Church" (*Ecclesia Anglicana*), and "The Holy Church of England" it continued to be described. During the Anglo-Saxon period we find the Venerable Bede speaking of Archbishop Theodore as "the first archbishop whom all the English Church consented to obey." ³ After the Norman Conquest, Anselm wrote in the same style,

¹ Bishop Collins, *The Rights of a Particular Church in Matters of Practice*, pp. 5-7.

² Bede, i. 29.

³ iv. 2.

asserting that the position of legate was attached to the see of Canterbury, and that "it could not be otherwise except to the injury of both Roman and English Churches."¹ The "Articuli Cleri" of 1316 say "whereas of late in the times of our progenitors, sometimes Kings of England, in divers their Parliaments, and likewise after that we had undertaken the governance of our realm, in our Parliaments, many articles containing divers grievances (committed, as therein was said, against the Church of England, the prelates and clergy) were propounded by the prelates and clerks of our realm."

From 1372 to 1872 the Royal Summons to Parliament announced that it was to be held "upon arduous and pressing matters . . . affecting the state and defence of our realm of England and the Church of England." When Thomas Walsingham, a monk of St. Albans and the writer of a history of England, narrates the death of Archbishop Arundel in 1414, he says, "in this year fell the most eminent tower of the Church of England and undefeated fighter, Lord Thomas de Arundel."² Archbishop Chichele issued his Constitutions in 1416, and in them spoke of "the sacred name of the

¹ Migne, *P.L.*, clix. 201.

² *Historia Anglicana*, ii. p. 300.

English Church whom all the world extols beyond the Churches of other countries and provinces for her devout veneration of God and His Saints." When Tyndale was translating the New Testament into English in 1525 Edward Lee (afterwards Archbishop of York) wrote to the King informing him of the matter, and remarking that "all our forefathers, governors of the Church of England, hath [*sic*] with all diligence forbid and eschued publication of English Bibles, as appeareth in Constitutions Provincial of the Church of England."¹ Of greater importance is the evidence which comes from the period of the Reformation. The most important of the acts of the Reformation Parliament which began in 1529 was the passing in 1533 of the statute forbidding appeals to Rome. This Act speaks of "that part of the said body politic, called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which hath always been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this hour, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of an exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such offices and

¹ See Pollard, *Records of the English Bible*, p. 109.

duties as to their rooms spiritual shall appertain." The Book of Common Prayer was first issued in English in 1549, and the writer of its preface did not consider that any breach had been made in the Church's existence, for he wrote thus of the Middle Ages : " Whereas St. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the church, as they might understand, and have profit by hearing the same ; the service in this Church of England (these many years) hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understood not." Lastly, when Mary came to the throne she proceeded to undo the Reformation, and by her first Act of Repeal, 1553, abolished nine Acts of Parliament passed in the reign of Edward VI, thus restoring matters to their status in 1547. The Repeal Act opens with these words : " Forasmuch as by divers and several Acts hereafter mentioned, as well the divine service and good administration of the sacraments, as divers other matters of religion, which we and our forefathers found in this Church of England, to us left by the authority of the Catholic Church, be partly altered, and in some part taken from us. . . ."

III

It must, without doubt, be acknowledged that during the later Middle Ages, as contrasted with Anglo-Saxon times, Rome did obtain great power, and as certainly exercised it. Many causes brought this about, such as the influence of the Forged Decretals, the base surrender of King John, and the weakness of a King like Henry III over against the strength of a Pope like Innocent III. Yet formal protests were made by England against the tyranny and exaction of Rome, such statutes as Provisors and Præmunire being placed upon the statute book. Romanists, however, sometimes reply that such evidence is valueless because the protests were made by the State, not by the Church. The answer is clear, that to speak of Church and State, in the Middle Ages, as if they were separate institutions is an anachronism, for (with the exception of the Jews in England) Church and State were coterminous, all the members of the one being also members of the other: "The Middle Ages knew of only one Institution, and it embraced the totality of mediæval life. It was the universe of Christian society, organized on Christian principles, informed by Christian ideals, governed by Christian laws, with

specialized jurisdictions, with accordant, or casually discordant, powers, but without acknowledged cleavage or fissure, a sumptuous and splendid, or slashed and ragged, but in either case an entire and seamless robe, 'woven from the top throughout.' The mediæval mind distinguished, not between Church and State, but between a spiritual and a temporal power consenting in the governance of one great Catholic community."¹

The Roman Catholic controversialist goes on to assert with confidence, and even with triumph, that it is impossible to find any pre-Reformation protests against the *spiritual* claims of the Papacy. We are reminded that every bishop took an oath of allegiance to the Papacy, but we reply that this was of late origin, for it was not invented till the year 1073 for the Archbishop of Ravenna, and was only gradually imposed on other archbishops, and later still on bishops. Similarly the Popes interfered in the election of bishops to English Sees, but just as certainly they did not so interfere in the early days of the Church's history. It is true that they often sent legates to this country, thus claiming universal jurisdiction, but the King reserved to himself

¹ *The Canon Law in Mediæval England*, pp. 64-65.

the right of allowing such legates to land, and of transacting any business in the country if given entry. So, too, the Roman Canon Law was accepted in England, save in some few cases where it came into collision with national law or custom, but here, again, we are dealing with the later Middle Ages, not with a thing which existed from the earliest days of the English Church, for it must be remembered that Maitland only contended that "during the later Middle Ages" did the English ecclesiastical courts regard themselves as bound by the papal statute books.

Or, finally, we are informed that every Archbishop received the Pall from Rome, and only acted as Metropolitan after its reception. This matter is dealt with in detail elsewhere, and therefore it is enough to point out now that such Primate as Lanfranc and Anselm exercised metropolitanical functions before its reception, and even if it be true that every mediæval Archbishop regarded it as a sign that jurisdiction had been conferred upon him by Rome, it is significant that in the English mediæval service used at its reception there is not one word about jurisdiction, as there is in the corresponding Roman service.¹

¹ See *infra*, chapter v.

If, however, it be acknowledged to the full that Rome exercised control over the English Church in the Middle Ages, and the protests made by England be completely ignored, the question of the continuity of the Church of England is untouched. For everything turns on the question whether the spiritual claims of the Roman See to supremacy are scriptural and primitive, whether they are, or are not, part of the Divine Constitution of the Church. If they are this, and if they were accepted by the English Church from the commencement of its existence, then its pretensions to continuity disappear. But if they are a growth and a development, it does not in the least matter to what extent they were recognized, for any part of the Church would be more than justified in repudiating them, and making its appeal to the earlier and purer idea of the Divine Constitution of the Church Catholic. This is put clearly by Mr. Denny: "Hence it follows that if any portion of the Church has, at any period of its history, submitted to the supremacy of the Pope, recognizing and admitting all that is involved in the papal position, paying the lowliest submission to the monarchical authority of the Roman Pontiff, such portion of the Church has obviously the full right

to reject Papalism as being contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church without in any way forfeiting the position it holds as an integral part of the Catholic Church. Consequently, if it be granted, for instance, that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* was in absolute subjection to the Roman Pontiff prior to the breach with Rome in the sixteenth century, nevertheless, when that Church, by the Acts of the Convocation of the two Provinces of Canterbury and York, of which it is comprised, rejected the papal supremacy, it did not by the action thus taken cease to be what it had ever been, since the first moment of its foundation, viz. an integral part of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.”¹

To put the same thing in another manner, what the English Church did was to appeal back to her early days before the papal claims had been developed and imposed on her. So Cranmer made, in 1556, his appeal to a General Council: “As touching my doctrine, it was never in my mind to teach contrary to the Word of God and the Catholic Church of Christ, according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs. I only mean and judge as they have meant and judged. I may err, but

¹ Op. cit., p. 594.

heretic I cannot be, inasmuch as I am ready to follow the judgment of the Word of God and of the Holy Catholic Church, using the words that they used, and none other, and keeping their interpretation.”¹ Similarly the sixth of the Canons of 1571 orders that preachers shall “teach nothing in the way of a sermon, which they would have religiously held and believed by the people, save what is agreeable to the teaching of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from this selfsame doctrine.” Yet once more, the bishops of the Anglican Communion when assembled at the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 adopted the same attitude: “We do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted, by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils.”

The English Church has, accordingly, always maintained that there has been no violent disruption in its history, but that its life remained unbroken all through the Reformation changes. This assertion

¹ See Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, iv. p. 502.

of continuity is not, as is at times imagined, an invention of the Tractarians in the early part of the nineteenth century, brought about by their emphasis on the doctrine of the Catholic Church, but, on the contrary, it has been maintained from the time of the Reformation itself. In the reign of Henry VIII we find Tunstall, the Bishop of Durham, writing to Cardinal Pole in this manner: "You suppose . . . the King's grace to be swerved from the unity of Christ's Church, and that . . . he intendeth to separate his Church of England from the unity of the whole body of Christendom . . . wherein surely both you and all others so thinking of him do err. His full purpose and intent is, to see the laws of Almighty God purely and sincerely practised and taught, and Christ's faith without blot kept and observed in his realm; and not to separate himself or his realm any wise from the unity of Christ's Catholic Church, but inviolably, at all times, to keep and observe the same, and to reduce his Church of England out of all captivity of foreign powers heretofore usurped therein, into the pristine state that all Churches of all realms were in at the beginning." ¹

¹ See Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, l. p. 446.

In the same reign the Act for the Conditional Restraint of Appeals, 1532 (23 Henry VIII cap. 20), says that "our said sovereign the king, and all his natural subjects, as well spiritual as temporal, be as obedient, devout, catholic, and humble children of God and Holy Church, as any people be within any realm christened." For the pre-Tractarian period it is sufficient to quote the words of Sir Roger Twysden (1597-1672): "The Church of England having with great deliberation reformed itself in a lawful synod, with a care as much as possible of reducing all things to the pattern of the first and best times, was interpreted by such as would have it so, to desert from the Church Catholic: though for the *manner* they did nothing but warranted by the continued practice of their predecessors: and in *the things amended* had antiquity to justify their actions: so that nothing is further off truth than to say that such as reformed this Church made a new religion; they having retained only that which is truly old and catholic, as Articles of their faith."¹

Nor must it be imagined that since the Oxford Movement continuity has been maintained solely by men of one particular school

¹ See Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biographies*, iv.

of thought in the Church, for divines, lawyers, historians and statesmen of varying views are in agreement on the matter. We may take the opinion of Mr. Beard, an Unitarian historian, and author of the Hibbert Lectures (for 1883) on "The Reformation" as expressing the views of one who cannot possibly be accused of bias, either Roman or Anglican. "At the same time, in order that we may not lay too much stress on these circumstances, we must take some pains to understand a fact which more than any other differentiates the English Reformation—I mean the continuity of the Anglican Church. There is no point at which it can be said, here the old Church ends, here the new begins. . . . But it is an obvious historical fact that Parker was the successor of Augustine, just as clearly as Lanfranc and Becket. Warham, Cranmer, Pole, Parker—there is no break in the line, though the first and third are claimed as Catholic, the second and fourth as Protestant. The succession, from the spiritual point of view, was most carefully provided for when Parker was consecrated; not even the most ignorant controversialist now believes in the *Nag's Head* fable. The canons of the pre-Reformation Church, the statutes of the Plantagenets, are binding upon the

Church of England to-day, except where they have been formally repealed. There has been no break, unless by what we may call private circumstances, in the devolution of Church property. The Church may be Protestant now, as it undoubtedly was Catholic once; but it is impossible to fix the point at which the transition was legally and publicly made.”¹

Equally without Anglican bias is the view of the Reformation expressed in such a French journal as *Le Bulletin de la Semaine*, which, in the course of a notice of *The English Church Review*, said (June 8, 1910): “At a moment when in France one is so occupied in studying the books placed in the hands of school children, and when the historical and religious errors which these books contain are so bitterly criticized, could one not take advantage of this movement of interest in historical text-books to dispel the gross error, which every French child learns in both Church and secular schools—viz. ‘that the English Church is a Protestant sect founded by the Tudors in the sixteenth century’? Every publication which helps . . . to destroy this absurd legend renders a true service to the cause of reunion . . . but this union

¹ Pp. 311, 312.

will only be possible when the Church of England is thoroughly understood, when her continuity and her catholicity are facts accepted by the Churches of Rome and of the East.”¹

One more witness from outside the communion of the English Church is worth quoting, viz. the address of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the Lambeth Conference of Bishops when met together in 1897 under Archbishop Benson: “We recognize that you have special cause for commemorating the work of Augustine in the conversion of the King and Kingdom of Kent, inasmuch as to this work must be attributed the organization of the Church, which ultimately comprehended the entire realm of England. The distinguished prelate who will preside over your deliberations is the successor in an unbroken line of the first Archbishop of Canterbury: and notwithstanding many dynastic and social changes, the Anglican Church has continuously ministered the word and sacraments of Christ to the English nation and to English-speaking people throughout the world.”

Such, then, is the answer of the English

¹This Journal was placed upon the *Index* in the early part of 1913,

Church to the Roman attack on her position as a national Church independent of Rome. She replies by showing that the papal claims are neither scriptural nor primitive, and not therefore a part of the Divine Constitution of the Church. She maintains, accordingly, that she was fully justified in repudiating those claims in the sixteenth century, and asserts, too, that by so doing she in no way forfeited her position as a true part of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. The Pope was imposing impossible terms, and the English Church refused any longer to accept them. As a result, England and Rome have been out of communion with one another since the reign of Henry VIII. But the fault is not ours, for we did not wilfully and deliberately break off communion with Rome, the breach of communion being brought about by her refusal to accept the new condition of affairs, Paul III, issuing, in December, 1538, a Bull in which he deposed the King from his throne, and excommunicated all Englishmen who remained loyal in their allegiance to their Sovereign. It was, therefore, the Church of Rome which separated itself from England, not the Church of England which separated itself from Rome.

IV

This leads on to an interesting question. What is the position of Roman Catholics in England? The Church of England, as we have seen, carefully preserved its continuity during the Reformation period, and the English Roman Catholics separated from its communion in 1570, after the Pope had issued his Bull "Regnans in Excelsis." In this he called upon all who were of the Roman way of thinking to come out of the English Church. This they did, with the result that altar was set up against altar, and accordingly Romanists are, in England, separatists from the National Church, like any other Nonconformist body. English Churchmen have consistently maintained that this is the true account of the matter. Thus in the course of a funeral sermon for Compton, Bishop of London from 1675 to 1714, Dr. John Cockburn said that "as became a wise and a good man, he withstood all other Dissenters as well as Papists."¹ Similarly the printed statement of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, circulated in its early years, classes English Romanists among the Dissenting bodies. More important is the fact that in 1789 a

¹ *The Blessedness of Christians after Death*, p. 19.

committee of Roman Catholic laymen described themselves as "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" in a petition to Parliament, and were even prepared to take an oath in which they called themselves by the same title.¹ It is true that this came to nothing, on account of the opposition of the Roman Catholic vicars-apostolic, but as Bishop Henry Phillpotts wrote to Charles Butler: "so little was your exclusive assumption of the title of Catholics then admitted, that you were afraid of so calling yourselves in your petition to Parliament, lest your petition should on that account be refused admission. You therefore were designated by your own committee as 'Protesting Catholic Dissenters.'" ²

Roman Catholics themselves acknowledge that they are in no sense a continuation of the pre-Reformation Church of England, and while denying our continuity they do not assert their own. They say, on the contrary, that the Catholic Church in England came to an end in the reign of Elizabeth, and was not revived till the middle of the nineteenth century, when a new Roman Catholic hierarchy was set up

¹ See Amherst, *History of Catholic Emancipation*, i. 149-186.

² *Letters to Charles Butler*, p. 7.

by Pope Pius IX, in 1850. Thus when Cardinal Newman was preaching at Birmingham on October 7, 1866, he said: "Twenty years ago we were a mere collection of individuals: but Pope Pius has brought us together, has given us bishops, and created out of us a body politic."¹ Cardinal Manning was even clearer: "The religion survived, and a number of priests, but the Church was gone. It was long without a Bishop. Then it had a Vicar-Apostolic for England and Scotland: then for long years no Bishop at all. Then a Vicar-Apostolic or two, then four, and in this century eight; then at last the Hierarchy of Pius IX. From that Michaelmas Day, 1850, dates the Catholic Church in England after three hundred years of ruin."²

The late Father Humphrey, S.J., while denying our continuity also denied that of the Roman Catholic Church in England, and even rejoiced in the fact that the Roman Catholic is a new Church in this country: "I do not believe it to be true that we represent the pre-Reformation Church of England, in the sense of our being a continuation of that body. . . . We are a new mission, straight from Rome—the centre,

¹ *The Pope and the Revolution*, p. 14.

² Purcell's *Life of Manning*, ii. p. 773.

and source, and ever-living well-spring of Christianity. . . . In this fact of our not being lineally descended from the pre-Reformation Church, but derived straight from Rome, I see the finger of God.”¹

Rome thus rules herself out of court in England, so far as continuity is concerned, and we can legitimately say with the late Bishop Collins: “There is no Church in Christendom which has so unbroken a history as we have”²; and with the late Archbishop Benson: “Continuity belongs in England to us alone.”³

¹ *The Divine Teacher*, pp. 53, 54.

² *The English Reformation*, p. 35.

³ *The Seven Gifts*, p. 172.

CHAPTER IV

Anglican Orders

I

ONE of the principal charges brought by Rome against the Church of England is that it has failed to preserve the succession of the three Orders of the ministry—bishops, priests and deacons. Not having valid Orders it possesses no valid Sacraments, and accordingly English churchmen are invited to change their allegiance, entering into communion with the see of Rome where they can be certain that the Sacraments which are “necessary to salvation” are validly administered. While we know that God is not tied by His sacraments, and that He both can and does work outside their sphere, yet we believe with Richard Hooker that “neither is it *ordinarily* His will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments.”¹ It behoves

¹ *Eccl. Pol.*, v. 57, 4.

us, therefore, carefully to consider this question, and discover whether the Roman attack upon the ministry of the Church of England does, or does not, invalidate our claim to be a part of the Holy Catholic Church, possessing the Catholic Orders of bishop, priest and deacon.

The attack centres round the consecration of Archbishop Parker in December, 1559, but before considering that a word must be said regarding the succession of the ministry during the reign of Mary, 1553-1558. Mary "put the clock back," reversing what had been done during the reign of her brother, Edward VI, and restoring the Papal Supremacy which had been abolished by her father, Henry VIII. Cardinal Pole reconciled England to the Papacy, and a number of clergy were deprived of their positions. Was this because they had been ordained by the Ordinals of 1550 or 1552, or was it because they had taken advantage of the Act of 1549 (2 & 3 Edward VI cap. 21) allowing priests to marry, which Act was now repealed by the Queen? Of the answer to this question there can be no doubt. Dr. Frere has carefully examined the records, and his conclusion is: "There is no shadow of a hint that invalidity of Orders had anything to do with it. On

the contrary, in the case of Nowell and Ashton, the Deacon's Order conferred under the English Ordinal is clearly if tacitly recognized. Indeed, if the Edwardine Orders had been regarded as an absolute disqualification, it would have been far simpler to get rid of Edwardine clergy on that ground, rather than on the ground of marriage. But all the evidence so far goes to show that they were not so regarded; on the contrary, the very fact that an Edwardine priest was deprived for marriage shows that so far his Orders were recognized, otherwise he would have been deprived as a layman, and there is no instance of any Edwardine clergy being so described at their deprivation; they are classed with the rest of the married clergy. So that in this part of the inquiry both positive and negative evidence leads to the conclusion that the Edwardine Orders were recognized; further inquiries will partly modify, but partly confirm that conclusion."¹

With this may be compared the words of the reply of the two Archbishops (Canterbury and York) to the Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" in which Anglican Orders were condemned: "While many Edwardine priests are found to have been deprived for various reasons,

¹ *The Marian Reaction*, pp. 109, 110.

and particularly on account of entering into wedlock, none are so found, as far as we know, on account of defect of Order. Some were voluntarily re-ordained. Some received anointing as a supplement to their previous Ordination, a ceremony to which some of our Bishops at that time attached great importance. Some, and perhaps the majority, remained in their benefices without re-ordination—nay, were promoted in some cases to new cures. Pole did not return to England after his exile until November, 1554, and brought the reconciliation to a conclusion in the fifteen months that followed. The principle of his work appears to have been to recognize the state of things which he found in existence on his arrival, and to direct all his powers towards the restoration of papal supremacy as easily as possible. In this period one man, and perhaps a second (for more have not yet been discovered) received new orders under Pole, in the years 1554 and 1557; but it is uncertain in what year each of them began the process of being re-ordained. At any rate, very few were re-ordained after Pole's arrival. Others perhaps received some kind of supplement or other to their orders, a record of which is not to be found in our Registers.”¹

¹ P. 16, edit. 1912.

In this connexion it is interesting to notice the date of Pole's own consecration to the episcopate. It was not, for one moment, imagined that a new Church had been set up in the reign of Henry VIII or Edward VI, and that the old Church was now being restored, for though Cranmer was degraded, Pole was careful not to be consecrated to the episcopate until Cranmer had been burnt at Oxford. When, as Bonner puts it in his register: "the said Cranmer was reduced to ashes," then, and not till then, did Pole succeed him as Archbishop of Canterbury.

II

We can now pass on to a consideration of the consecration of Matthew Parker, which Rome has condemned in the Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" of 1896. The consecration took place on December 17, 1559, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, Parker being "elected Archbishop of Canterbury in the place of Reginald Pole, the late holder of that see, now vacant by the death of the said Reginald," the consecration being performed by Bishops Barlow, Coverdale, Hodgkyns and Scory, all of whom joined in the laying

on of hands and in the saying of the words
“Take the Holy Ghost.”

The first objection made by Romanists is that the consecration never took place at all, but that there was a mock ceremony in the *Nag's Head*, a Cheapside public-house. This story was not heard of till invented by Holywood forty-five years after the event, and may now be summarily dismissed, for it is absolutely discredited, and abandoned by all respectable controversialists. As the Roman Catholic, Estcourt, says in his book on Anglican Orders: “It is . . . 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.”¹

Granting, then, that the consecration did take place, Romanists proceed to argue that it was invalid because Barlow the chief consecrator was not himself a bishop, and therefore was unable to hand on to another that which he did not himself possess. When we seek for proof for this assertion, we are at once met with the fact that there is no direct evidence at all of the non-consecration of Barlow, the whole charge

¹ P. 154.

being built up upon negative evidence, viz. that there is no record at Lambeth of his ever having been consecrated. This is perfectly true, and it is true of others besides Barlow, for there is a similar lack of the record of the consecration of other bishops. Yet no objection has yet been made to their Orders, probably because they did not, like Barlow, take part in the consecration of Parker. Dixon, moreover, points out that among the papers which, according to the statute of Henry VIII dealing with the consecration of bishops, were necessary, "a certificate of the consecration was not among the documents required. Perhaps such a certificate was regarded as optional or superfluons."¹

The evidence, however, for the consecration of Barlow is overwhelming, and has been summarized thus: "Barlow, who was appointed in 1536, acted as undisputed Bishop for the last ten years of Henry VIII's reign, and we must remember that the King, to the end of his life, strongly upheld the old doctrinal system. He had, moreover, a lawsuit with his Dean and Chapter at St. Davids, who would at once have won their case if they could have proved him no true Bishop. It is incredible that a man, elected

¹ *Op. cit.*, v. 225.

to one bishopric after another, never proceeded to consecration, and yet was accepted as a consecrated Bishop by every one, either deceiving the King, the Primate, the Bishops, and all concerned, or having them all as his accomplices. This point is well put by the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard: 'When we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated with the other consecrated Bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated Bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to seniority, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body.'"¹

Even, however, if it could be proved that Barlow was no true bishop, our position would not be overthrown, for it has been pointed out above that all four bishops, Barlow, Coverdale, Hodgkyns and Scory, joined in the laying on of hands and in the repetition of the words, "Take the Holy Ghost." What then, is the position of these

¹ *Church Historical Society's Papers*, i. p. 2.

assisting bishops at a consecration? Are they merely witnesses or are they co-consecrators? The answer is that they are co-consecrators. As this matter will be dealt with in detail in another place,¹ it is sufficient now to summarize the evidence. In the eighteenth century Martene asks the question: "Whether all the bishops who are present are co-operators, or merely witnesses of the consecration?" and answers: "That certainly they are not only witnesses, but also co-operators, is to be asserted beyond all chance of doubt."² Gasparri may be quoted, as a modern witness, to the purport that "the bishops assisting are probably co-ministers with the bishop consecrating," while he maintains that if the laying on of hands should be omitted by the chief consecrator only, but not by the assistants, then, if these latter be bishops, there is no need for the sacrament to be repeated, i.e. they make up for his defect, which they can only do if they are independent channels of grace.³

The Sarum Pontifical is explicit on the point, for it orders that "while the examination is being said or read, the arch-

¹ See *infra*, chapter vi.

² *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, i. 8, 10.

³ *Tract. Canonic. de Sac. Ord.*, ii. p. 280. § 1112.

bishop and other consecrating bishops ought to have mitres upon their heads, but the one to be consecrated not so."

Lastly the witness of one of the Acts of Parliament of the Reformation period is of interest in its bearing on this subject. The Suffragan Bishops Act of 1534 (26 Henry VIII cap. 14) speaks thus: "Provided always, that the bishop that shall nominate the suffragan to the king's highness, or the suffragan himself that shall be nominated, shall provide two bishops or suffragans to consecrate him with the archbishop."

III

Objection is also made, at times, that the "Form" used in the English Ordinal is insufficient. It is enough to answer that there is no such thing as a Catholic "Form" for ordination, for the "Form" has varied considerably, one part of the Church Catholic using a "Form" different from that used in another part of the Church; while particular Churches have, in the course of their history changed their "Form." It is clear that the laying on of hands by itself would not suffice, for it is used for other purposes, such as Confirmation. With it there must be prayer, and the prayer must

make it clear that it is Ordination, not Confirmation, that is taking place; and must, in some way, indicate the position to which the candidate is being raised. This can be, and has been, done in many ways. The prayer may briefly mention the Order which is to be conferred. This is the method of the Canons of Hippolytus, in which the prayer is exactly the same for bishops and priests, save that in the one case the word "episcopate" is employed, and in the other case the word "priesthood." Or the Order itself need not be named, provided that the real meaning is made clear without it, and so we find that in these same Canons of Hippolytus the word "diaconate" is not employed in the ordination of deacons, but the "Form" is sufficient, because the prayer speaks about St. Stephen, thereby making it plain that the candidate is being ordained to the office held by that saint. Or, again, the prayer may enumerate the powers and functions belonging to the Order to which the candidate is to be raised, speaking, in the case of a bishop, of the power of ordaining others, or in the case of a priest of the powers of absolving, of blessing, and of consecrating the Eucharist.

No objection, therefore, can be made to

the English "Form" on the ground that it differs from that of the Roman Church. But there is something more to be said regarding this attack on the English "Form." Is the ordination, then, performed by the saying of a solitary prayer, or group of prayers, or is it not, rather, performed by the service considered as a whole? This is certainly the case in regard to the Holy Eucharist, and accordingly Bishop Gore has pointed out that "whatever was done in the Eucharist in His name, He was believed to be present and the doer of it. He was there to speak the words and consecrate the gifts. This belief in Christ already present as unseen minister anticipated and so weakened the emotion following upon the consecration. What that brought about was not the presence of Christ—He was already there—but His adoption of the Church's gifts to become His body and His blood. . . . If the ancients associated His "coming" with any moment in the service, it was with the first solemn entrance of the elements, and the whole order and ritual of the service fell in with this conception."¹

Writing of the Sacraments in general a Roman Catholic, Dr. Fortescue, says: "The

¹ *The Body of Christ*, p. 105.

Christians of the first centuries certainly did not ask very closely at what exact instant the grace of any Sacrament was given. They obeyed Christ's commands, said the prayers, and did the actions He had appointed, and they believed that God in answer would most certainly do His part. But they did not discuss the exact instant at which all conditions were fulfilled." ¹ Speaking of the question with which we are mainly concerned he points out that "in the case of Holy Orders the question is still more uncertain. No one can say at what instant the subject becomes a priest. Of course the bishop does everything scrupulously; the subject is certainly not a priest when the service begins, he certainly is one when it ends." ² The same writer returns to the subject in a later book: "So the Ordination rite dramatically separates the elements of the priesthood (power of sacrificing, of forgiving sins) which, presumably, are really conferred at one moment, when the man becomes a priest. In all such cases we say that at whatever moment of our time God gives the Sacramental grace, He gives it in answer to the whole prayer or group of prayers, which, of course, take time to say." ³

¹ *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 387.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Mass*, p. 353.

One objection to the "form" used in the English Ordinal is that, till 1662, it did not contain any direct mention of the episcopate; the consecrating bishop merely saying "Take the Holy Ghost," and not, as now, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God." In view of the facts mentioned above, the answer is clear, that other parts of the service make it perfectly plain that it is to the episcopate, not to the priesthood or diaconate, that the candidate is being raised. The service itself is headed "the Form of Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop," while "the elected bishop" is presented by "two bishops" unto the Archbishop, as a "godly and well learned man to be consecrated Bishop."

If, however, it be a defect that the word "bishop" was not in the Ordinal until 1662, the modern Roman Church suffers from the same defect, for as the Archbishops pointed out in their Reply to the Bull "*Apostolicæ Curæ*": "In the Roman Pontifical, when a Bishop is consecrated by the laying on of the hands of the consecrating Bishop and assisting Bishops, the only form is 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' In our later Pontificals, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit was invoked by the hymn 'Come, Holy Ghost,'

with the exception of the Exeter book, in which the Roman form is added. Then came the prayer about the 'horn of priestly grace.' As we have already said, the words 'Bishop' or 'Episcopate' do not appear in any prayer of the Pontifical until *after* the Consecration; so that if, according to the Pope's suggestion, our Fathers of the year 1550 and after went wrong in the form of omitting the name of Bishop, they must have gone wrong in company with the modern Roman Church."¹

If it be asked why the direct mention of the office of bishop to which the candidate was being raised was added in 1662, it may be replied that it was done, not to strengthen the Ordinal against any possible Roman Catholic attack, but to make the position of the Church clearer against the Presbyterians, who were at that time attempting to find grounds for their opinions in the Book of Common Prayer.

IV

Another objection which must be noticed is that connected with the "intention" of Barlow in consecrating Parker, and, more broadly, the intention of the Church in

¹ P. 27.

preserving the threefold ministry. It is quite true that Barlow held loose views on ordination, at one time irreverently saying that "a layman should be as good a bishop as himself, or the best in England, if the King chose to make him a bishop." But we are not concerned with the private views of Barlow, any more than the Roman Catholic Church is concerned with the views of Talleyrand, through whom many of the French bishops derive their Orders. As Barlow did not express these opinions when consecrating Parker we have only to consider the intention of the Church. This is clearly laid down by Richard Hooker: "What every man's private mind is, as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine; therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth work, hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God."¹ St. Thomas Aquinas teaches the same, for he says that the minister "acts in the person of the whole Church of which he is a minister; in the words which he utters, the intention of the Church is expressed, which suffices for the perfection of the Sacrament, unless the contrary is

¹ *Eccl. Pol.*, v, 58, 3.

openly expressed by the minister or the receiver of the Sacrament.”¹

We ask, accordingly, what is the intention of the Church of England? and we find the answer in the Preface to the Ordinal, which distinctly states that the intention was to continue the kind of bishops, priests and deacons which have been in the Church from the time of the Apostles: “It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . . And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England. . . .”

As with continuity, so with the question of Orders, it is well to see ourselves as others, with no bias, either Roman or Anglican, see us, and therefore the opinion of a Russian theologian, Sokoloff, is of interest. After examining the question in detail he concludes thus: “The extracts we have now given will, we think, suffice; they prove sufficiently convincingly that the Anglican divines of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, down to the present time, have clearly proclaimed, and are still proclaiming,

¹ iii. 64, 8.

the same doctrine of the Divine institution and grace-giving significance of the hierarchy, that their Church has also always expressed in her religious formularies.”¹

V

One last objection remains for consideration. In the Roman Pontifical words are used conferring upon the person to be ordained to the priesthood the power of offering sacrifice, as well for the living as the dead. As no such words occur in the English Ordinal it is said that our priests are no true priests, since this power is not bestowed upon them. The first answer which we make is that in many early forms of Ordination no such words are to be found. The reply of the Archbishops puts it thus: “In the most ancient Roman formulary used, as it seems, at the beginning of the third century after Christ (seeing that exactly the same form is employed both for a Bishop and a Presbyter, except the name) nothing whatever is said about ‘high priesthood’ or ‘priesthood,’ nor about the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. ‘The prayers and oblations which he will

¹ See Puller, *The Continuity of the Church of England*, p. 87.

offer by day and by night' are alone mentioned, and the power of remitting sins is touched upon."¹ Secondly, it must be remembered that a priest is commissioned in the English Church to minister the Word and Sacraments, which clearly covers the offering of the Eucharist, so that, as the Archbishops say: "we make provision with the greatest reverence for the consecration of the Holy Eucharist, and commit it only to properly ordained Priests and to no other ministers of the Church."²

If it be asked whether the English Church does or does not teach the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, again we may turn to the Archbishops for the answer: "We truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice, and do not believe it to be a nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross; an opinion which seems to be attributed to us. . . . But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist . . . to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father and the Propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer

¹ Pp. 23, 24.

² P. 21.

the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice." ¹

This answer of the Archbishops, addressed to the whole body of bishops of the Catholic Church, was replied to by Cardinal Vaughan, who practically made the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation the one sure test of the validity of Holy Orders. The Archbishops, in a reply to Cardinal Vaughan, pointed out that "it is, for us, simply impossible to believe it to be the will of our Lord that admission to the ministry of the Church of Christ should depend on the acceptance of a metaphysical definition, expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy, of the mysterious gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist; above all, when we remember that such a definition was unknown to the

¹ Pp. 21, 22.

Church in the early ages of its history, and only publicly affirmed by the Church of Rome in the thirteenth century.”¹

With this quotation we are brought round once again to that which has already been shown to be the position of the Church of England against Rome, the appeal to the primitive Church. Tested by any canon of the early centuries the Orders of the English Church stand secure, and her children need have no fear that the sacraments administered to them are invalid, because the ministry has not been rightly handed down.

¹ P. 12.

CHAPTER V

The Pallium

I

ONE of the arguments frequently employed by Roman Catholic controversialists to prove that the Church of England, as it exists to-day, does not possess continuity with the pre-Reformation Church in England is concerned with the reception of the Pall by the Archbishops of Canterbury up to the time of Cardinal Pole. Each Primate, it is maintained, received the Pall from the Pope, taking, at the same time, an oath of allegiance to the Papacy, and regarding his Pall as the symbol and proof that he had received the power of jurisdiction from the successor of St. Peter in the Roman See, so that no Archbishop would dream of attempting to perform any metropolitanical function until the Pall had actually been bestowed upon him. In such a statement truth and

error are strangely mixed, while the present and the past are badly confused.

The question of the oath of allegiance to the Papacy may be summarily dismissed. It can have no possible bearing on the continuity of the English Church, for the simple reason that it is of late origin, having come into existence in A.D. 1073, when it was invented by Pope Gregory VII for use by the Archbishop of Ravenna. In course of time it was imposed on other Archbishops, and at a still later date on Bishops as well, but as it was not taken by such famous Archbishops of Canterbury as Augustine, Theodore, Elfege, and Lanfranc, it simply does not matter, the Church being fully justified in abrogating a custom which was unheard of for centuries after our National Church came into existence.

Nor is it accurate to speak of the Pall having been "received by" or "given to" the Archbishops of Canterbury, for a much more accurate word would be "bought." As early as the sixth century one finds that a tribute was paid at the time of its reception, and while this custom was cancelled by Pope Gregory the Great at the Roman Synod of A.D. 595, it was afterwards re-introduced by his successors, and subsequently became one of the means by which the Roman *curia* was

supported. Father Braun says that "these Pallium contributions have often been, since the Middle Ages, the subject of embittered controversies, the attitude of many critics being indefensibly extreme and unjustifiable."¹ Whether such criticisms were, or were not, indefensible and unjustifiable, they certainly have been made, and that not only "since the Middle Ages." Canute, when on pilgrimage to Rome, complained of the large sums exacted from English Archbishops for the Pall, and obtained a promise of abatement for the future. When Walter Grey was translated from the See of Winchester to that of York in A.D. 1215, he was compelled to pay a sum equal to £10,000 of our money for his Pall; while the German Archbishops, when assembled at Ems in A.D. 1786, resolved that if the Pall were not, for the future, granted to them free of charge, they would act without it.²

Nor, again, is it strictly accurate to say that the Pall was received or purchased by *every* Archbishop of Canterbury from Augustine to Pole, for there is positive evidence that some of the early Primates never possessed it, while there is negative evidence to the

¹ *Catholic Encyclopædia*, vol. xi. p. 428.

² See Bp. Collins, *What was the Position of the Pope in the Middle Ages?*, p. 47.

same purport regarding others. It does not appear to have been received by Lawrence and Mellitus; Justus received it, being ordered to use it only when celebrating the Holy Mysteries; while Honorius was consecrated as Archbishop of Canterbury by Paulinus of York at Lincoln, years before Paulinus received a Pall from Rome, and when he did receive one, he had ceased to be Primate at York, having fled to Kent and become Bishop of Rochester, where it is evident that he continued to wear it, as Bede records: "in which Church at his death he left the Pall which he had received from the Pope of Rome."¹

It is undoubtedly true that at the present time the Pall does, in the Roman Church, symbolize the conferring of jurisdiction on its recipient by the Pope, but this is by no means primitive. The present situation is described by Father Braun when he says that "an Archbishop, therefore, who has not received the Pallium, may not exercise any of his functions as metropolitan, nor any metropolitan function whatever; he is even forbidden to perform any episcopal act until invested with the Pallium. Similarly, after his resignation, he may not use the Pallium; should he be transferred to another

¹ Bede, iii. xx.

archdiocese, he must again petition the Holy Father for the Pallium.”¹ At the same time, Father Braun acknowledges that this is not primitive, for “the use of the Pallium among metropolitans did not become general until the ninth century, when the obligation was laid upon all the metropolitans of forwarding a petition for the Pallium accompanied by a solemn profession of Faith, all consecrations being forbidden them before the reception of the Pallium. The object of this rule was to bring the metropolitans into more intimate connexion with the seat of unity, and the source of all metropolitan prerogatives, the Holy See, to counteract the aspirations of various autonomy-seeking metropolitans, which were incompatible with the Constitution of the Church, and to counteract the evil influences arising therefrom; the rule was intended, not to kill, but to revivify metropolitan jurisdiction.”²

It is clear, then, that there has been a considerable amount of development in the meaning attached to the grant of the Pall. Little by little it acquired a symbolical meaning. “It was regarded as a relic, that is, as a sort of replica of the mantle of St. Peter. Before despatching it to its destination, it was deposited for the whole of the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 427.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 428.

previous night in the sanctuary of the *Confessio*, immediately above the tomb of the Apostle. St. Peter was regarded as having slept a night under this mantle, and it thus became his own. By a very slight extension of ideas it came to connote a kind of transmission of power, like that symbolized by the mantle of Elijah, passed on to his successor, Elisha. The *Pallium* thus became the natural sign of a superior jurisdiction, that is, of a species of participation in the *Pasce oves meas.*"¹ This attachment of a symbolical character to the Pall dates from the time when it was made compulsory for all metropolitans to petition the Papal See for permission to assume it; and, as Father Braun says, "the evolution of this character was complete about the end of the eleventh century; thenceforth the Pallium is always designated in the Papal Bulls as the symbol of *plenitudo pontificalis officii.*"²

II

At the present time the Pall is a circular band, some two inches in width, worn round the neck, with a pendant hanging down in

¹ Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 371 (E.T., pp. 385, 386).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 428.

front, and another behind. These are about twelve inches long, and are weighted with lead, covered with black silk. It is marked with six small black crosses, one on the breast, and one on the back, one on each shoulder, and one on each pendant, though in former days the number of crosses varied, four being shown in the arms of the See of Dublin, five in those of Armagh. It is worn over the chasuble, and is ornamented with three golden pins, which, however, are no longer used to attach it to the chasuble. It is made of wool, part of which is supplied from the two lambs which the Lateran Canons Regular present as an annual tribute to the Chapter of St. John's on the Festival of St. Agnes. These are solemnly blessed on the high altar after Mass, and then offered to the Pope. After the second Vespers on the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul, the Palls are solemnly blessed, and then kept till required for transmission to their future wearers. As the meaning of the Pall has developed, so has its appearance, illustrations of its growth being given by Father Braun in his *Die Liturgische Gewandung*. John the Deacon describes a contemporary portrait of Pope Gregory the Great, and says that "a narrow Pallium falls from the right shoulder and passes to the left, drooping below the breast

in a semicircle. One end is thrown back over the left shoulder, the other hangs straight down from the same shoulder, not in the middle of the body, but on the side";¹ while an ivory tablet in the Cathedral of Treves, representing, it is believed, the bringing of the relics of the Passion to that city at the instance of St. Helena, shows its appearance in the sixth or seventh century. Probably the earliest representation of an English Archbishop wearing the Pall is in Abbot Elfnoth's *Book of Prayers* (Harleian MS., No. 2908), an Anglo-Saxon MS. of the tenth or eleventh century in the British Museum, the Abbot being represented as offering a book to St. Augustine.²

The Pall may be worn by the Pope at any time, but by others only in their own dioceses, and there only on special days and occasions, such as Christmas and the Circumcision, at Ordinations and the consecration of Abbots, a list of the specified occasions being set out in detail in the *Pontificale*, p. 1, s. 16, "De Pallio."³ It was regarding this question

¹ *Vita S. Gregorii*, book iv. c. 84.

² See Duchesne, *op. cit.*, E.T., p. 390, note by translator. (*See Frontispiece.*)

³ For a list of the occasions on which the Pall was worn by the Archbishops of Canterbury, see Maskell, *Mon. Rit.*, iii. p. 302.

of the occasions on which the Pall should be worn that Gregory the Great quarrelled with John, the Bishop of Ravenna, a Roman by birth, and a personal friend, the Pope having dedicated to him his book on the "Pastoral Rule." It was reported that he not only wore the Pall at Mass, but on other occasions as well, e.g. in solemn processions through the city. Gregory issued orders through his agent at the Court of the Exarch that this should cease, but John remonstrated, claiming that he so wore it in accordance with the custom of his predecessors, and in virtue of a privilege issued by a previous Pope. Gregory replied that there was no trace of such a grant, and demanded the production of documentary evidence, and as John was unable to do this, he submitted. The controversy is of interest since Ravenna was the capital of the Imperial possessions in Italy, and the residence of the Exarch, its Bishops aiming at an ecclesiastical dignity corresponding to the civil rank of the city, and resisting any domination on the part of the Roman See.

The question of the origin of the Pall is one of some difficulty, and it is impossible to say when it was first introduced as a liturgical garment. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, it was first used in the first half of the

fourth century, for that book says that Pope Marcus († 336) conferred the right of wearing it on the Bishop of Ostia because the consecration of the Pope appertained to him. In the fifth century, St. Isidore of Pelusium († 440) regarded it as the symbol of the spiritual authority and watchfulness which the Bishop, in imitation of the Good Shepherd, exercises over his flock; and informs us that at the Eucharist, when the Gospel was read, the Bishop laid his Pall on one side, as then the Lord Himself, the Chief Shepherd, was speaking directly to His flock.¹ It is evident that by the sixth century its use was a custom of long standing, the mosaics at Ravenna plainly showing that the Bishops of that city wore it at that time.

Various theories have been proposed in explanation of its origin. It has been traced to an investiture by Constantine the Great, or one of his successors; it has been regarded as an imitation of the Hebrew ephod; traced to a liturgical mantle worn by early Popes, and in course of time folded in the shape of a band; to the custom of folding the ordinary mantle-pallium, which was an outer garment worn in imperial times; to an imitation of the omophorium, worn in

¹ See Lowrie, *Christian Art and Archæology*, p. 409.

the East by all Bishops ; and, again, to an imperial robe which Byzantine emperors allowed great ecclesiastics to wear without incurring the penalty of high treason which attended the assumption, without leave, of an imperial garment. Denny says that its very form betrays its civil origin, and that it is not an ecclesiastical garment at all,¹ while Roman Catholics are by no means agreed on the matter. Van Espen said that "when and how the use of this ornament began, is sufficiently obscure, whether we look at the Greek or Latin Church."² Father Braun's conclusion is that "the correct view may well be that the Pallium was introduced as a liturgical badge of the Pope, and it does not seem improbable that it was adopted in imitation of its counterpart, the Pontifical omophorion, already in vogue in the Eastern Church."³ Duchesne believes that it appears to have originated in an imperial concession, a view which is, he points out, corroborated by the fact that it was still, at the end of the eighth century, the opinion of the fabricator of the "Donation of Con-

¹ *Papalism*, p. 691.

² "Quando et quomodo usus illius ornamenti in-cœperit sat obscurum est, sive Græcum sive Latinam ecclesiam spectemus" (*Jus. Eccl.*, i. 169).

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 429.

stantine"; while he also believes that the Pall, with its Eastern counterpart, the omophorium, and also the orarium, stole, and epitrichalion, "all have a common origin. They are distinguishing marks of dignity, introduced into ecclesiastical use during the fourth century, and resembling those described by the Theodosian code for certain classes of functionaries."¹ Dom Baudot adopts the opinion of Ducange, and considers that it originated at the time when the Church was divided up into Provinces or Patriarchates, and as there were insignia to distinguish Priests from Deacons, and Bishops from Priests, so the Pall distinguished the Bishops of the great Episcopal Sees from ordinary Bishops; the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople possessing it by the mere fact of their election to these Sees. Each Patriarch could grant it to the metropolitans of his Province, and thus exercised a certain preponderance over them.²

III

These last words lead on to an important consideration, for in early days the Pope was

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 379 (E.T., p. 394).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

by no means the only person who possessed the power of conferring the Pall on others, while its bestowal had nothing to do with jurisdiction, and was not confined to Archbishops. Even at the present time the Pope grants it to certain Bishops (e.g. it is worn by the Bishop of Coutances) as a mark of honour, and it is clear that originally it was nothing but a symbol of honour even when conferred upon metropolitans. If, in those early days, any meaning was attached to it when given by the Pope, it "signified simply union with the Apostolic See, and was a symbol of the ornaments of virtue which should adorn the life of the wearer."¹ Duchesne also points out that in the sixth century, when the Pope conferred it upon Bishops who were subjects of the Greek Empire, he usually first of all obtained the permission of the Emperor to make the grant.² Thus Pope Virgilius wrote in A.D. 543, deferring the grant of the Pall to Auxanius of Arles until the Emperor's permission had been obtained, and in a letter written two years later granted the honour, the necessary permission having by that time been received.³ The same Pope did the same thing in the case of Aurelian of

¹ Braun, *op. cit.*, xi. p. 428.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 371 (E.T., p. 385).

³ Migne, *P.L.*, lxi. 26.

Arles, and if similar permission is not mentioned in other cases, the reason, according to Duchesne, is that "it is possible that, in the end, the authorization was granted in perpetuity for the Bishops of Arles."¹ In the same way the permission of the Emperor was obtained before the Pall was given to Virgilius of Arles, the consecrator of Augustine of Canterbury, as also when Gregory the Great bestowed it upon the Bishop of Autun; while in some cases it appears that it was obtained direct from the Emperor, an illustration of this being furnished by Marcus of Ravenna who, in the seventh century, received it from the Emperor Constans II.

As proof that it was not intended to symbolize the grant of jurisdiction, the following facts may be noted:

1. It was sent as a mark of honour to Bishops or Archbishops, whether metropolitans or not, Gregory the Great sending it to the Bishops of the Sees of Syracuse, Messina, Palermo, and Autun. When sent to Syagrius, the Bishop of Autun, not only did the Pope obtain the permission of the Emperor Maurice,² but he explained that

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 371, n. I. (E.T., p. 385).

² "Serenissimi domini imperatoris . . . prona voluntas est, et concedi hoc omnino desiderat."

the Pall was being given on account of the Bishop's preaching, and the help which he had rendered to Augustine in connexion with his mission to the English.¹ With the Pall, he gave, not jurisdiction, but precedence among the Sees of his Province. Similarly, he sent it to Leander, the Metropolitan of Seville, who had held his See for more than twenty years before the receipt of a Pall. He was a friend of Gregory's, and letters written in A.D. 591 and 595 are in existence, though it was not till A.D. 599 that the Pall was sent to him.² Evidently the Pope did not regard the Pall as necessary for the exercise of metropolitical functions.

2. There were three Sees, Syracuse, Messina, and Ostia, to the Bishops of which the Pall was regularly sent as a matter of custom. Ostia has already been mentioned, its Bishop receiving it as the consecrator of the Pope; while Gregory's letters conferring it upon Donus of Messina and John of Syracuse are in existence.³ These three Sees were in the region over which the Pope acted as metropolitan. With regard to the extent of the Roman patriarchy, Rufinus, freely rendering the sixth of the Canons of Nicæa, de-

¹ See Migne, *P.L.*, lxxvii. 952, *cf.* lxxvii. 1058.

² *Ibid.*, 1050, 1051.

³ *Ibid.*, 801 and 810.

scribes the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome as consisting of the "suburbicarian Churches," i.e. those within the boundaries of the civil *Diæcesis Romæ* in the *Præfectura Italiæ*, that is, the ten provinces of Campania, Tuscia with Umbria, Picenum, Valeria, Samnium, Apulia with Calabria, Lucania and Bruttii, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. The Pope would naturally possess the right of granting the Pall to any of these Bishops, but this in no way conferred upon him the right of bestowing it upon Bishops in other patriarchates, for when the limits of a patriarchate required alteration this was done by means of an Œcumenical Council, but there has been no such Council which has enlarged the original extent of the jurisdiction possessed by the Bishop of Rome as Patriarch.¹ The reason why the Pall was not conferred by the Pope upon other Italian Bishops is given by Duchesne: "The Bishops of the suburbicarian diocese were in a much more subordinate position with regard to the Pope than other Bishops were with their metropolitans. They were obliged to come to Rome to be consecrated, and the consecration was performed by the Pope alone, without the concurrence of other Bishops. They

¹ See Denny, *op. cit.*, pp. 626-629.

had not the right also to found rural churches without the Pope's authorization. An examination of the registers of Gelasius, Pelagius, and St. Gregory will suffice to show the difference in the administration of the Roman province and that of Arles, for instance, or Milan. Like the African Bishops, the prelates of South Italy strike us as occupying the position of important parish priests, rather than that of actual rulers of dioceses.¹

3. The Bishops of certain Sees received the Pall with a grant of vicarial jurisdiction, which, however, requires to be carefully distinguished from metropolitcal jurisdiction. This was the reason for its bestowal on the Archbishops of Arles, for with it they were granted the power of acting as the vicar of the Roman See in Gaul. Thus Pope Symmachus (498-514) sent it to Cæsarius of Arles,² while when Gregory the Great despatched it to Virgilius of Arles, it was "according to the ancient custom," and in order that he might regard himself as the "vicar of the Apostolic See."³ The object of such grants of vicarial jurisdiction is plain, for the Roman See was endeavouring to extend its influence in Gaul at the expense

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 373 n. I. (E.T., p. 390).

² See Migne, *P.L.*, lxxvii. 1016.

³ *Ibid.*, lxxvii. 782.

of the See of Milan, which rivalled it to such an extent that Duchesne says that "the western episcopate recognized a two-fold hegemony—that of the Pope and that of the Bishop of Milan." The Popes had not been able "to exercise more than a feeble and intermittent influence" over the Bishops in Gaul, but by appointing the Bishops of Arles as their vicars, they were able to extend their jurisdiction at the expense of the See of Milan. It must, however, be added that the attempt was not altogether successful, for though the Bishops of Arles "from the time of St. Cæsarius and down to the end of the sixth century were careful to provide themselves with letters of vicariate, to which the distinction of the Pallium had then been added," these "were merely empty honours, and did not even result in securing precedence for the Bishops of Arles in the councils of the Frankish Empire."¹

4. The Pall was also worn by the Bishops in Africa, as a sign of dignity, the custom dating back beyond the invasion of the Vandals, without any permission being granted by Rome.

5. As a matter of ordinary custom it was sent regularly to all the metropolitans in

¹ See Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 38, 39 (E.T., pp. 32 and 39).

the parts of the West which were in close union with Rome, such as Milan and Ravenna.

6. In A.D. 581, the Council of Mâcon forbade Bishops to celebrate without the Pall.¹ Duchesne points out that the reading "Archbishop" for "Bishop" is an editorial correction, the manuscripts giving "episcopus." not "archiepiscopus."² Dom Baudot and others find this Canon difficult, and accordingly suggest that it alludes, not to the Roman, but to a Gallican Pall.³

The various donations of the Pall by Gregory the Great may be summed up in the words of Dom Baudot: "One sees by these examples that St. Gregory gives the Pall to Bishops, in different parts of the Church of the West, without their being any question of its conferring on them the powers of a Metropolitan"⁴; and again: "these dispositions of St. Gregory the Great do not allow one to suppose that the Pall was inherent to the charge of Metropolitan in the different parts of the Church of the West."⁵

The turning-point came in the eighth century, when the Council of Soissons (A.D. 742) ordered: "That unity may be better pre-

¹ "Ut episcopus sine pallio missas dicere non præsumat."

² Op. cit., p. 374 n. I. (E.T., p. 388).

³ Op. cit., p. 16. ⁴ Op. cit., p. 14. ⁵ Op. cit., p. 15.

served in the Church, Metropolitans should demand the Pall from the Holy See, and seek in everything to follow the orders of St. Peter." This order was not, however, at once acted upon everywhere, for "of the Metropolitans on whom the Pope intended to confer the Pallium, and who had been persuaded to apply for it, two afterwards refused it, probably in consequence of having further considered the obligations to Rome which it involved."¹ Even Lull, the special disciple of St. Boniface, had not made application for it eighteen years after his appointment as Metropolitan of Mainz in A.D. 742.² Similarly Tilpin, the Archbishop of Rheims, did not receive it for some years after his appointment to that See, obtaining it at length from Pope Adrian I (771-795), and when granted to him it was at the request of the Emperor Charles the Great.³

Under Pope Nicholas I (858-867) another step forward was taken, as is shown by his letter to the Bulgarians ("Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum") of the year A.D. 866, which ordered that any one elected to fill the charge of Archbishop should receive

¹ Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, iii. p. 74.

² See Denny, *op. cit.*, p. 693.

³ See Baudot, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

his privileges from Rome, and that he must not hold his See or perform any act of jurisdiction before having received the Pall from the Apostolic See, conformable to the conduct which all the Archbishops of Gaul, Germany, and other regions, follow.¹ It is worth noticing that Nicholas I was the first Pope to make use of the Pseudo-Isodorian decrees, in order to extend the pretensions of the Papal See, employing them in his dispute with Hinemar, the Archbishop of Rheims, with regard to the case of Rothad, the Bishop of Soissons, whom the former, as Metropolitan, had deposed.

A little later, at the Council of Ravenna in A.D. 877, Pope John VIII was even more explicit on the matter, ordering that every Metropolitan who, in the three months after his consecration, shall not have sent his profession of faith, with a view to receiving the Pall, unless through some grave impediment, shall be deprived of the dignity with which he has been clothed, so that he ought not to hold his See or exercise any function of his charge, until he shall have fulfilled the aforesaid formalities.²

Finally, in the thirteenth century, the question was definitely settled by the decree

¹ See Migne, *P.L.*, cxix. 1007.

² Mansi, xvii. p. 337.

of Innocent III, the Pope who pushed the papal claims to their extremest limits. Gautier had been promoted to the Archbishopric of Palermo, with the consent of Censius, the cardinal legate of the Pope in Sicily, without having first of all received his Pall from Rome. Gautier refused to submit, and was deposed, while to make such a thing impossible for the future, Innocent III decreed that the reception of the Pall was indispensable, that the plenitude of the pontifical office was conferred by and through it, and that no Metropolitan might bear the name of Patriarch, Primate, or Archbishop, or consecrate a Bishop, or call a Council, or ordain Clergy, or have his cross carried before him, until it had been duly received.¹

IV

No doubt mediæval English Archbishops fully believed that by the donation of the Pall jurisdiction was conferred upon them, though it deserves to be noticed that in the mediæval service used at its reception, there was no reference of any kind to jurisdiction in the prayer used when it was placed upon the primate's shoulders, so that if "lex orandi" is "lex credendi" it might be argued

¹ Ruinart, *De Pallio*, p. 466.

that even in late mediæval times the Roman theory was not accepted in this country. "Accipe pallium summi sacerdotii Domini Dei tui signum, per quod undique vallatus atque munitus, valeas hostis humani tentamenti resistere, et omnes insidias ejus a penetralibus cordis tui, divino munimine fultus, procul abjicere; præstante Domino nostro, Jesu Christo, qui vivit et regnat Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen."¹ It is important that these words should be contrasted with those used in the Roman Church: "To the honour of almighty God, the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, and the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, of our Lord Pope N, and of the Holy Roman Church, as well as of the Church of N which has been entrusted to thee, we deliver to thee the Pallium taken from the body of blessed Peter, in which is the fullness of the pontifical office, together with the name and style of Archbishop, that thou mayest use it within thy own church on the appointed days, which are set out in the privileges granted by the Apostolic See."² Rightly does Maskell comment that in the English service "we find no notice of that extraordinary claim which has been

¹ The English mediæval service is in Maskell, *op. cit.*, iii. pp. 292-302.

² See Thurston, *The Pallium*, p. 40.

introduced into the modern pontifical of the Church of Rome. Whatever may have been the actual practice of the primate of the English Church during the two or three centuries before the Reformation, the office appointed at the reception of the Pall did not recognize any other signification of it, in the Form at its delivery, than the ancient one of a mark of honour and dignity.”¹

Even if every mediæval Archbishop did believe that his jurisdiction was conveyed to him through the reception of his Pall, the continuity of the English Church would remain untouched, for the Reformation was a direct appeal to the early ages of the Christian Church, to a time when Roman developments were not yet in existence. It has already been pointed out that some of the early English Archbishops did not receive a Pall, but it remains to show that when received it was not regarded as conferring jurisdiction. Among the Archbishops and Bishops to whom Gregory the Great sent the Pall was Augustine of Canterbury. Was his the Pall of honour, or was it the mark of jurisdiction? Undoubtedly it must be regarded as the former, for he had already received his jurisdiction from his consecrator, Virgilius of Arles, and his temporal jurisdic-

¹ Maskell, *op. cit.*, iii. p. 301 n.

tion from Ethelbert the King of Kent, the civil ruler who alone could confer it. Dom Baudot, accordingly, rightly speaks of it as a sign of honour: "that which had been done in favour of St. Augustine of Canterbury by St. Gregory the Great was accomplished by his successors in favour of SS. Willibrod and Boniface; to similar apostolic success was accorded the same honorific insignia."¹ Even Dom Aidan Gasquet agrees, for when preaching on the occasion of the reception of the Pall by the late Cardinal Vaughan, he correctly called Augustine's the "pallium of honour."²

Gregory's letter to Augustine is conclusive on the matter: "Although it is certain that the ineffable rewards of the eternal kingdom are reserved for those who labour for the omnipotent God, it is, however, necessary for us to render to them the benefits of honours, that from this remuneration they may be able to labour more abundantly in the study of their spiritual works; and because the new Church of the English is brought to the grace of the Omnipotent God by the bounty of the same Lord, and by your labour, we have granted you the use of the Pall in the

¹ Op. cit., p. 17.

² See *The Anglican Brief*, p. 554.

same"; continuing, in the belief that London would be the metropolitan See of the South of England, "the Bishop of London ought always hereafter to be consecrated by his own synod, and may receive the Pall of honour (*honoris pallium*) from the holy and apostolic See which, by the grace of God, I serve."¹ It is evident that the Pall was not conferred on Augustine alone, but on his successors also, so that it should be their right to receive it as a normal custom, without any question of jurisdiction being raised. It was not only a mark of honour to a person, but also a mark of honour to a particular See.

There is, however, more to be said on this aspect of the subject. Augustine was consecrated by Virgilius of Arles, and he had exercised his functions as a Metropolitan for several years before receiving a Pall, which, as has been shown, was given him to symbolize his power to act as the vicar of the Roman See in Gaul. In their note to the letter of Gregory which conveyed the grant of the Pall to Virgilius, the Benedictine editors remark that "the theory of the necessity of the Pall had not up to that time been introduced; ecclesiastical authority did not as yet depend on that article of external

¹ Migne, *P.L.*, lxxvii. 1200.

worship ;”¹ while in their note to the eleventh letter of Gregory’s ninth book they comment : “ thenceforth the use of the Pall was permitted to those particularly to whom the apostolic functions were delegated, and to others also, whether Metropolitans or merely Bishops, from whom much support was expected for the good of the Church, as many as were prominent for their virtues, their good birth, or their high favour with kings. On this score Syagrius was presented with the Pall by Gregory the Great. This was approximately the method of granting the Pall until the pontificate of Zacharias. Undoubtedly by his orders a synod was convened by Boniface, Archbishop of Mainz, in the year 742, at which it was decreed ‘ that thereafter metropolitans should ask for the Pall from the headquarters at Rome, and should in all things observe the precepts of St. Peter,’ as Boniface himself writes, Epist. 105 to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury. And this ordinance gradually spread and began to be generally observed, first throughout the whole of Gaul, and then in Spain and other districts.”²

¹ Nondum ergo inducta erat pallii necessitas, nondum ab illo exterioris cultus instrumento potestas ecclesiastica pendebat ” (Migne, *P.L.*, lxxvii. 782).

² *Ibid.*, 951–952.

It has been shown that there has been considerable development in the meaning attached to the Pall. Is one, then, to conclude that, at all events from the eighth or ninth century onward, every Archbishop did regard it as the symbol of the jurisdiction conferred on him by Rome? By no means. In Ireland it was not until the synod of Holmpatrick in A.D. 1145 that it began to be received by the Irish Archbishops, but no one would maintain that they had not performed metropolitical functions up to that time, and been regarded as Archbishops of the Church Catholic. On the continent one finds a canonist like Fulbert of Chartres writing to Arnold of Tours in the year A.D. 1023 that if he be wrongfully denied the Pall, there is no reason why he should not exercise his ministry without it.¹ In the eleventh century there was the example of Lanfranc. He, one might have imagined, would have been scrupulously careful in his observance of the rules laid down by Rome, but one finds, on the contrary, that he certainly performed a metropolitical function before its reception, for he was consecrated

¹ "Respondemus itaque vobis, quia si pallium requisistis a Romano pontifice, et ipse illud sine causa legitima denegavit, propter hoc non est opus dimittere ministerium vestrum" (Migne, *P.L.*, cxli, 240).

in September, 1070, and later in the same year proceeded to consecrate Thomas to the See of York, though it was not until the following year that they both went to Rome together, and there received their Palls from Pope Alexander.¹ Last of all there is the example of Anselm, who was consecrated on December 4, 1093, and, on February 12 of the next year, proceeded, at Hastings, to consecrate Robert as Bishop of Lincoln, though his Pall did not arrive until June 10, 1095, when it was laid upon the altar of Canterbury Cathedral.

At length, in 1533, it was made illegal to send an application to Rome for the Pall, the "Ecclesiastical Appointments Act" (25 Henry VIII cap. 20) ordering that "no person or persons hereafter shall be presented, nominated, or commended to the said Bishop of Rome, otherwise called the Pope, or to the See of Rome, to or for the dignity of an Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or in any other of the King's dominions, nor shall send nor procure there for any manner of bulls, briefs, palls, or other things requisite for an Archbishop or Bishop, nor shall pay any sums of money for annates, first-fruits, nor otherwise, for expedition of any such bulls, briefs, or palls; but that by the authority

¹ See W. Malmesb., *Gest. Pontif.*, i. 25.

of this Act, such presenting, nominating, or commending, to the said Bishop of Rome, or to the See of Rome, and such bulls, briefs, palls, annates, first-fruits, and every other sums of money heretofore limited, accustomed, or used to be paid at the said See of Rome, for procuration or expenditure of any such bulls, briefs, or palls, or other things concerning the same, shall utterly cease, and no longer be used within the realm, or within any the King's dominions."

The last Archbishop of Canterbury to wear the Pall was Cardinal Pole, who assumed it on March 25, 1556, in Bow Church, and his sermon on the occasion shows how extremely wide of the mark he was in his appeal to history. "As to the ceremony of the pallium in the primitive Church, when an Archbishop was consecrated, by which there was conferred a power of such a nature as to be supreme after that of Christ's Vicar on earth, it was not lawful to exercise that power before the pallium was received; which, being taken from the body of St. Peter, signified that as the power proceeded from that body, so the Archbishop was bound to render a corresponding obedience, like members to head. Holy Mother Church, ever guided by the Holy Spirit, ordained this ceremony, lest Archbishops having such

great authority, and detaching themselves from their head, should trouble the Church instead of acknowledging their power to be held solely of Christ's Vicar the Roman Pontiff; so that by this ordination the unity of the Church might be preserved for ever. In times past this unity has been disturbed by Archbishops and Patriarchs who have been for a notable example together with the countries committed to their government. The patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria by a just judgment have passed under the intolerable yoke of the Turks; the Archbishop of Ravenna of yore greatly opposed this unity, but at length saw his error and was reconciled. The pallium is now made from the wool of lambs, and is consecrated by being placed near the body of St. Peter. It is in the form of a cross; it teaches that the wearer should be clothed in humility, charity, and patience."¹

That the Church of England was fully justified in its action is made clear by the history of the Pall. The fact that in the days when the English Church was founded it was merely a symbol of honour, and not a sign of jurisdiction, deprives it of the controversial value which is sometimes attached to it.

¹ Dixon, *op. cit.*, iv, pp. 557, 558.

CHAPTER VI

Co-Consecrators

I

THE question of the position of the assistant and assisting bishops at an episcopal consecration possesses an interest more than academical for English churchmen, on account of its bearing on the validity of the consecration of Archbishop Parker. He was consecrated on December 17, 1559, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, the rite being performed by Bishops Barlow, Coverdale, Hodgkyns and Scory, all of whom joined in the laying on of hands, and also in the repetition of the words "Take the Holy Ghost" etc., i.e. in both the "matter" and in the "form." It is argued, at times, that Barlow had not proceeded to episcopal consecration, and that he was unable, therefore, to hand on to Parker that of which he was not himself in possession. As a matter of fact there is not the slightest doubt that

Barlow was a truly consecrated bishop. But even if the opposite could possibly be proved, the validity of Parker's consecration would remain untouched, because of the presence and action of the three assistant bishops, who were, we may safely contend, not merely witnesses of the consecration, but co-consecrators, so that any imperfection on the part of the chief consecrating bishop would have been compensated for by their action. Such a statement requires proof, and to that we address ourselves.

First of all, however, it is important to bear in mind that Ordination is not the only service of the Church in which we find the presence of assistants. We are so accustomed to the Eucharist being celebrated by a single bishop or priest, that we need to be reminded that this was not the early idea of public worship. That idea has been expressed thus : " It was normally regarded, not as a simple function, performed by a minister for the benefit of a congregation, but rather as being a complex act of worship, to which many and various persons combined to contribute the various component parts." ¹ One way in which this solidarity

¹ Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 7.

was expressed was by means of the co-celebration of the Eucharist. If we turn to "Ordo Romanus Primus," which describes the Roman service in the eighth century, we find that at a solemn Eucharist the oblation was hallowed by the united prayers of the whole college of presbyters, voiced by the bishop as their chief. The clergy stood round their bishop, and, as a ninth century Gallican writer says, "give consent to his sacrifice."¹ The words of the "Ordo" are: "On festivals, that is to say on Easter Day, Pentecost, and Christmas Day, the cardinal presbyters assemble, each one holding a corporas in his hand, and the archdeacon comes and offers each one of them three loaves. And when the pontiff approaches the altar, they surround it on the right and the left, and say the canon simultaneously with him, holding their loaves in their hands, and not placing them on the altar, so that the pontiff's voice may be heard the more strongly, and they simultaneously consecrate the Body and Blood of the Lord, but the pontiff alone makes a cross over the altar."² It is quite clear that the assistants here are not merely witnesses, but

¹ *Gratiani Decreti*, iii. *De consec.*, I. cap. lix.

² § 48.

co-celebrants. It is interesting to note, in passing, that in the Celtic Church the rule was different, for at Iona the custom was for two or more priests to unite in the celebration of the Eucharist, the right to celebrate alone being reserved for bishops or individual priests specially selected and empowered on account of their holiness or eminence. This explains a passage in Adamnan's life of St. Columba: "At another time a certain stranger from the province of the Munimenses [Munster men] came to the saint, and in humility he disguised himself as much as he could, so that no one might know that he was a bishop; but yet this could not be hidden from the saint. For the next Lord's day, being bidden by the saint to consecrate Christ's Body according to custom, he calls the saint, so that, as two priests, they may break the Lord's Bread together. The saint thereupon, going up to the altar, suddenly looking on his face, thus addresses him: 'Christ bless thee, brother; break this bread alone with the episcopal rite, now we know that thou art a bishop. Why hast thou hitherto tried so far to disguise thyself that the veneration due to thee by us might not be rendered?' And when the humble guest had heard this word of the saint, he was greatly astonished, and revered Christ in

the saint ; and those who were there present, greatly marvelling, glorified the Lord.”¹

The custom still remains in the Eastern Churches, both orthodox and schismatic. In these, on any greater festival, the bishop says the Liturgy surrounded by his priests, who both consecrate with him, and receive with him. Moreover, as the Eastern rule is that there should be but one celebration on one day in a church, if several priests desire to celebrate on the same day, they do so by the act of co-celebration.

The custom also remains at the present time in the Roman Church in the service for the ordination of priests. The rubric of the Pontifical (*De Ordinatione Presbyteri*) orders the celebrating bishop to speak “slowly, and rather loud, so that the ordained priests may be able to say everything with him, and especially the words of consecration, which ought to be said at the same moment by the ordained as they are said by the pontiff.” To make it quite clear that this is a real co-celebration, Pope Benedict XIV ordered that the words should be said “*significative*,” i.e. with the intention of consecrating² ; while St. Thomas Aquinas defended the theological correctness of the act on the ground that “as priests do not consecrate except in the

¹ i. 44.

² *De S.S. Missæ Sacr.*, III. xvi. 6.

person of Christ, therefore it does not matter whether this sacrament is consecrated by one or by many.”¹ A relic only of the custom remains in our own Church, for whereas the newly ordained deacons are ordered to “tarry, and receive the Holy Communion,” the newly ordained priests are to “remain in the same place where Hands were laid upon them, until such time as they have received the Communion.”

II

This short examination of the subject of co-celebration prepares us for the consideration of the subject of co-consecration. It presupposes us to believe that if the assistants at the Eucharist are to be regarded, not as mere witnesses, but as co-celebrators, so the assistants at Ordination are to be regarded in a similar manner. At least it effectually disposes of the objection sometimes made, on the ground that “of one sacrament there is but one minister.” If there can be more than one minister at the Eucharist, why not also at an episcopal consecration? We are concerned only with the consecration of bishops, though it is an arguable point

¹ *Summa*, III. lxxxii. a. 2.

whether the priests who join the bishop in laying hands on those about to be ordained to the priesthood ought not to be regarded in the same light. This was the opinion of Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury: "I feel great reluctance to acquiesce in the position that they are merely witnesses—although that is, I believe, the ordinary assumption. They represent the Presbyterate or "Sacerdotium" receiving new members into its order, and, whether they actually touch the heads of the ordinands or not, their presence and prayers are an ordinary part of the mystery of ordination considered as a means of grace."¹

The rule that a bishop should not be consecrated by a single bishop is of extreme antiquity. The Council of Arles (A.D. 314) ordered, in its 20th Canon, the presence of seven bishops, but when this was not possible the presence of three would suffice; whilst the 4th of the Canons of Nicæa (A.D. 325) ordered that a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops in the Province, but where this was encumbered by difficulties, either through urgent necessity or the length of the way, three at least must meet, and the absent ones give their consent and vote in writing; and once again, the Council of the

¹ *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 169.

Dedication at Antioch (A.D. 341) developed the Nicene rule, laying down in its 19th Canon that "a bishop is not to be ordained without the presence, or at least the written approval of the majority of the conprovincials, otherwise his ordination to be void."

The normal rule of the Church has, ever since, been the presence of three bishops at a consecration. There have, however, been plenty of exceptions. Bingham quotes Pope Pelagius, consecrated by two bishops and a presbyter, Dioscuros of Alexandria by two bishops, and these under excommunication, and Siderius the Bishop of Pataëbisca by one bishop alone, a consecration which was not only allowed by St. Athanasius, but the saint proceeded to promote him to the See of Ptolemais.¹ It is well known that St. Augustine of Canterbury asked this question of St. Gregory the Great: "Whether a bishop may be ordained without other bishops being present, in case there be so great a distance between them that they cannot easily come together?"² The reply to this question is discussed below, and it is enough, now, to note that Gregory allowed consecration by a single bishop; though when a similar question was asked of a later Gregory, Hildebrand, by Cyriac of Carthage, the reply was

¹ II, xi, 5.

² I, 27.

that the elected bishop should be sent to Rome for consecration.

In spite of these, and similar, exceptions the rule of the Church required the presence of three bishops, the only variation being in the case of the consecration of a bishop by the Pope. Mgr. Duchesne says that in this case, as in that of the ordination of deacons and priests, the Pope officiated by himself. He might have other bishops with him, and as a rule did so, but he performed the rite by himself. This departure from the rule that a single bishop should not consecrate another is mentioned in the sixth century in the Breviary of Ferrandus, who says "one bishop shall not ordain a bishop, except in the Church of Rome."¹ It is impossible to say when the custom arose, but it appears to be excluded by the words of Innocent I, who was Pope from 402 to 417, and wrote: "Let not a single bishop presume to ordain a bishop,"² without mentioning any exception; as by the Apostolic Canons, which, whatever their date, are earlier than the Council of Nicæa, and say: "Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops."

¹ *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 348 (E.T., p. 361), and see page 104, *supra*.

² Ep. ii. 2.

III

What, then, is the position of these assisting bishops? No doubt the original object of ordering the presence of assistants was the prevention of clandestinity, not the provision of an additional safeguard. St. Isidore (c. 601) expressed this quite plainly: "That a bishop should not be ordained by one bishop, but by all the conprovincial bishops, is known to have been instituted on account of heresies, and in order that the tyrannical authority of one person should not attempt anything contrary to the faith of the Church." Yet this interpretation does not exclude the other; in fact, we are justified in believing that the rule came into existence, in the wisdom of God, to provide an additional safeguard for the preservation of the succession of the ministry.

The evidence is of two kinds. In the first place there are the writers who speak of the bishop being "ordained" or "consecrated" by certain persons, as if the act was that of all the bishops together. The words of the Apostolic Canons and of St. Isidore have already been quoted, and to these may be added the witness of St. Cyprian, who speaks of Cornelius as "made bishop by very many of our colleagues then present in the

city of Rome.”¹ In the second place there is the evidence which directly and distinctly speaks of the assistant bishops as actually co-operating and co-consecrating with the chief consecrating bishop.

The Eastern Church is perfectly clear on the subject, and no matter what the modern Roman theory may be, the Easterns, whether orthodox or schismatic, are agreed that the assistants co-operate in the consecration of the bishop. The prayer used in the Greek Church at episcopal consecrations is quite precise on this point: “Strengthen by the descent and grace of Thy Holy Spirit this one elected and accounted worthy to receive the yoke of the Gospel and the pontifical dignity by the hand of me, a sinner, and of the ministers and fellow bishops present with me.”² Denny and Lacey quote from Nikolski the Russian view of the matter, and this is equally clear: “The consecration of a bishop is carried out by a council of bishops, three of whom, or at least two, must be present; for if all bishops equally possess the grace of priesthood, all have equal rights of spiritual power; whence

¹ Ep. iv. 6.

² *Euchologion* (Venice, 1869), p. 167. Morinus quotes a ninth century prayer, using the same words. *De Sacr. Ord.*, ii. p. 60.

it follows that consecration cannot be imparted by one bishop to another bishop, in other words by an equal to an equal. For the laying on of hands, which belongs to a higher power, is something proper to a council, for it is only a council which stands possessed of the higher grade of episcopal power.”¹ This is taken from his explanation of the sacred rites, which, says Father Puller, “occurs in a book usually recommended for study to candidates for Ordination by the Russian bishops of the present day.”²

The rest of the witnesses may be divided into two classes, Continental and English. In Carolingian times, Pseudo-Isidore, the author of the forged decretals, maintained that St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, was consecrated by SS. Peter, James and John. This is, we know, spurious, but it is good evidence as to the opinion of the ninth century -on the subject under discussion; while Pseudo-Anicletus refers to this statement and adds to it, maintaining that it was done by Christ’s own institution: “for if such a man was ordained bishop by not less than three Apostles, it is plainly evident that they handed down, by the institution of

¹ *De Hier. Ang.*, pp. 3, 4.

² *English Church Review*, Nov., 1910, p. 493.

the Lord, the form that a bishop ought not to be ordained by less than three bishops." ¹ In the same century, the words of Hincmar, in his letter to his namesake of Laon, are similar: "but it is for you, with others and myself, to ordain a bishop." St. Rembert, the second Archbishop of Hamburg, in his life of St. Anschar, his predecessor, says that the Emperor Lewis "caused our lord and father, Anschar, to be solemnly consecrated archbishop by the hands of Drogo, Bishop of Metz, Heligandus (Bishop of Verden) and Willericus (Bishop of Bremen) also assisting and consenting and equally consecrating him." The date of this consecration was 834.

At the Reformation period it is possible to quote Hallier, who allows that all may be called co-consecrators, for the maxim that there can be but one minister of one sacrament does not forbid all to act together "in modum unius." ²

Martene, of the eighteenth century, has often been quoted in this connexion, for he asks the question "whether all the bishops who are present are co-operators, or merely witnesses of the consecration?" and

¹ Edit. P. Hinschii (1863), p. 75.

² *De Sacr., Elect., et Ordin.*, p. ii. sect. v. cap. ii. art. ii. n. 33.

answers, "that certainly they are not only witnesses but also co-operators, is to be asserted beyond any chance of doubt."¹

For a modern Roman opinion, Gasparri may be referred to, for he says: "The priests assisting by apostolic indulgence we deny to be assistants, but the bishops assisting are probably co-ministers with the bishop consecrating." He goes further than this, for he maintains that if the laying on of hands should be omitted by the chief consecrator only, but not by the assistants, then, if these latter be bishops, there is no need for the sacrament to be repeated. This plainly indicates that they would, in these circumstances, make up for his defect, which they could only do if they are themselves independent channels of grace.² Similarly, Mgr. Carinei, one of the papal Masters of Ceremonies, and Professor of Liturgy at the College of the Propaganda, replied thus to a question on this subject: "The assistants must do and say everything that appertains to the essence of the Consecration, and must have the intention of consecrating; hence they are ministers."³

¹ *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.*, I, viii. x.

² *Tractatus Canonic. de Sacr. Ord.*, vol. ii. p. 280, § 1112.

³ See letter in the *Tablet*, June 18, 1910, p. 975.

IV

When we turn to the evidence from England we are faced with the fact that our first witness is hostile, and is no less a person than St. Gregory the Great. The question addressed to him by St. Augustine regarding consecration by a single bishop has already been mentioned. In his reply he speaks of the assistant bishops as witnesses, and draws an illustration from the presence of married people at a wedding: "As for the Church of England, in which you are as yet the only bishop, you can no otherwise ordain a bishop than in the absence of other bishops; unless some bishops should come over from Gaul, that they may be present as witnesses to you in ordaining a bishop. . . . For, even in spiritual affairs, we may take example by the temporal, that they may be wisely and discreetly conducted. It is certain, that when marriages are celebrated in the world, some married persons are assembled, that those who went before in the way of matrimony, may also partake in the joy of the succeeding couple. Why, then, at this spiritual ordination, wherein, by means of the sacred ministry, man is joined to God, should not such persons be assembled, as may either rejoice in the advancement of the

new bishop, or jointly pour forth their prayers to Almighty God for his preservation ? ” ¹

But when we turn to Bede's description of the consecration of Cedd by Finan, and of Chad by Wini and two bishops of the British Church, his language makes it clear that he regarded the assistants as co-consecrators. In the case of Cedd he says that Finan, “ finding how successful he had been in the work of the Gospel, made him bishop of the Church of the East Saxons, calling to him two other bishops to assist at the ordination ” ² ; while in the case of Chad, he says “ and by him . . . was consecrated bishop, two bishops of the British nation . . . being taken to assist at the ordination. ” ³

Eadmer is perfectly explicit, for when describing how St. Anselm consecrated Malchus to the See of Waterford at Canterbury, in December, 1096, he speaks of “ two of his bishops, Ralph of Chichester and Gundulph of Rochester assisting and co-operating with him. ” ⁴ In the same way he describes the consecration by St. Anselm, in August, 1107, of William Giffard to Winchester, Roger to Salisbury, William Warelwast to Exeter, Reinelm to Hereford, and Urban to Llandaff, seven assisting bishops

¹ Bede, i. 27.

² iii. 22,

³ iii. 28.

⁴ *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, p. 77 (Rolls series).

“ministering and co-operating with him in that office.”¹

The mediæval service books of the English Church are equally clear. In the rubrics at the head of the Sarum office for the consecration of a bishop, it is ordered that “while that examination is being said or read, the archbishop and other consecrating bishops ought to have mitres upon their heads, but the one to be consecrated not so.”² The assistants did not, according to the Sarum rite, join in saying the words of consecration. The rubric is “while the ordainer pours over him the Benediction, let the remaining bishops who are present, touch the head with their hands, and let the ordainer say . . .” Then follow the prayers which are found in the Pontifical of Egbert (732–766), and which were without doubt in use before his time. This rubric is based on the *Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua* of St. Cæsarius of Arles, compiled in the sixth century, nearly a century before the arrival of Augustine in England. That Statute says: “while one pours over him the Benediction, let all the other bishops who are present, touch his head with their hands,” i.e. it appears that the chief consecrator alone recited the prayers, but did

¹ *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, p. 187 (Rolls series).

² See Maskell, *Mon. Rit.*, iii. 244.

not himself lay on hands ; or, in other words, the one supplied the " form," the others the " matter," clearly showing that the ordination was a composite rite performed by a group of persons. In the Exeter rite, however, the assistant bishops did say the words of consecration ;¹ and according to the Bangor Use they joined in the anointing of the hands of the bishop to be consecrated.²

Two Acts of Parliament of the early Reformation period are of great interest. The Bishop of Bristol rightly says that " the student of the history of the English Church will always do well to look closely into the wording of the statutes of Henry VIII. The affairs of England were managed by great men in his days. He himself was a great man, whatever else he may have been or have become in his later days. There were not more learned ecclesiastics anywhere than in England then." ³ To know what the learned canonists and ecclesiastical authorities thought on this matter we turn to the Suffragan Bishops Act of 1534 (26 Henry VIII, cap. 14), section vii of which orders : " provided always, that the bishop that shall nominate the suffragan to the king's highness, or the suffragan himself that shall

¹ Maskell, iii. p. 258.

² Ibid., 261 n.

³ *Augustine and his Companions*, p. 192.

be nominated, shall provide two bishops or suffragans to consecrate him with the archbishop." The language of the Ecclesiastical Appointments Act of the same year is similar: "The king's highness, by his letters patent under his great seal, shall signify the said election to one archbishop and two other bishops, or else to four bishops within his realm . . . requiring and commanding the said archbishop and bishops, with all speed and celerity, to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto."

There is also some interesting evidence in post-Reformation times. Bishop Andrewes touches on the question in his Reply to Bellarmine, where he says that "our bishops have been ordained in each case by three bishops, and by true bishops. I say by true bishops, for they were ordained by yours (unless yours are not true bishops). Nor has the Nicene canon ever been violated with us, nor the line ever interrupted."¹

Archbishop Bramhall also refers to the matter, and writing in 1658, replies to the Roman Catholic charge that "the assistants in the Protestant Church do not consecrate." His answer is: "Neither was Bishop Barlow

¹ P. 168.

the only man who consecrated Archbishop Parker ; neither was Bishop Hodgkyns a mere assistant in that action ; thirdly, who-soever do impose hands are joint consecrators, with us as well as with them.”¹

In his *Church Principles* Mr. Gladstone made some mathematical calculations in regard to the possibilities of the succession being invalidated by flaws in the status of any particular bishop, and taking the case of one bishop in twenty being either unbaptized or invalidly consecrated, showed that the chances were 8,000 to 1 against there being a flaw in the status of all three bishops ; while the probability would be 512,000,000,000 to 1 against this new bishop finding two others in the same condition as himself when he proceeded to hand on the succession by performing a consecration. He adds : “ But enough of this rather unworthy discussion, which can only justify the attention already given it from the fact that men of note and name have been misled by the fallacy in question.”²

Dr. Littledale believed that by the assistants at Parker’s consecration reciting aloud the formula of consecration when laying

¹ *Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated*, iii. p. 145.

² Pp. 235, 236.

their hands on him they "thereby acted independently, though in concert, and thus any possible defect in Barlow was fully supplied."¹ Similarly Bishop Stubbs considered the question in its bearing upon the validity of Parker's consecration, and came to the conclusion that "the answer to the Roman Catholic argument must be found in the careful study of the record in which the consecration of the Elizabethan prelates is described, and in the analysis of the ritual used. It will then appear that Parker was consecrated by four bishops, all using the proper words of consecration, and joining in the act of transmission, three of them known, by actual record of day and place, to have been lawfully consecrated, and the one whose record of consecration is missing having been constantly recognized as a Bishop until a new controversy arose on other principles, and it being certain that, so far as circumstantial evidence can be of use, his consecration was a fact of legal and historical authenticity."²

Last of all there is the opinion of Dr. Bright, who wrote of "that artificial theory which would make the presiding bishop the *sole* agent in the conveyance of the episcopal

¹ *The Priest's Prayer Book*, p. 206.

² *Visitation Charges*, p. 191.

character, so that the assistant bishops were simply approving witnesses”¹; and again: “The theory which represents the assistant bishops as not really co-operating in the act of consecration is a mere technicalism, the result of Roman centralization.”²

¹ *Early English Church History*, p. 245 n.

² *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, p. 187.

INDEX

- Adrian I, Pope, 108
 Altars, consecration of, 37
 Andrewes, Bishop, 138
 Anglican Orders, 68, *seq.*
 Anglo-Saxon Church, position of, 32, *seq.*
 its Use, 35
 canonization in, 36
 consecration of altars in, 37
 dioceses in, 40
 appeals to Rome from, 40
 payment of Peter's pence, 42
 bishops' oath of allegiance in, 43
 Anselm, St., 26, 48, 54, 117, 135
 Antioch, Council of, 127
 Antiquity, The appeal to, 6, 8, 19, 55, 56, 88, 112, 119
 Apostles' Creed, 2, 20, 21
 Apostolic Canons, The, 129
 "Apostolicæ Curæ," 70, 72, 81, 86
 Appeals, Statute forbidding, 50, 59
 Ariminum, Council of, 16
 Arles, Council of, 126
 Arnold of Tours, 116
 "Articuli cleri," 49
 Arundel, Archbishop, 49
 Augustine, St., 9
 Augustine, St., of Canterbury, 34, 36, 60, 62, 91, 96, 102, 103, 112, 113, 114, 127, 136
 Aurelian of Arles, 101
 Auxanius of Arles, 101
 Barlow, Bishop, 72, 73, 74, 75, 82, 83, 120, 138, 140
 Basle, Council of, 16
 Baudot, Dom., 44, 100, 107, 113
 Beard, Mr., 60
 Becket, Archbishop, 60
 Bede, The Venerable, 36, 48, 135
 Benedict Biscop, 33
 Benedict XIV, Pope, 124
 Benson, Archbishop, 62, 67
 Benson, Mgr. R. H., 20
 Bernard, St., 24
 Bingham, 127
 Bishops, Appointment of, 37
 Blessed Virgin Mary, The, 23
 Boniface, St., 42, 44, 108, 115
 Book of Common Prayer, The, 51, 82
 Bramhall, Archbishop, 138
 Braun, Fr., 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 101.
 Bright, Dr., 140
 Browne, Bishop G. F., 137
 Bulletin de la Semaine, le, 61
 Cæsarius of Arles, 105, 106, 136
 Cabrol, Dom., 34, 39, 42
 Canonization, 36
 Canon Law, The Roman, in England, 29, 30, 54
 Canons of 1571, 31, 57
 Canons of Hippolytus, 78
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, 5
 Canute, 36, 91
 Carinci, Mgr., 133

- Cedd, St., 135
 Celibacy, Clerical, 26, 69
 Celtic Church, The, 33, 123
 Chad, St., 135
 Charles the Great, 38, 108
 Chelsea, Council of, 37
 Chichele, Archbishop, 49
 Church, The, its Divine Con-
 stitution, 28, 31, 46, 55
 in England, before the
 Reformation, 29, *seq.*
 and State in the Middle
 Ages, 52
 Cloveshoo, Council of, 36, 41
 Cockburn, Dr., 64
 Co-celebration, 121, *seq.*
 Co-consecrators, 75, 125, *seq.*
 Collins, Bishop, 32, 47, 67
 Columba, St., 123
 Communion in one kind, 27
 Compton, Bishop, 64
 Constantine, 98
 Continuity, 55, 57, *seq.*, 84, 89
 Convocation, 25
 Councils,—
 Antioch, 127
 Arles, 126
 Ariminum, 16
 Basle, 16
 Chalcedon, 15
 Chelsea, 37
 Cloveshoo, 36, 41
 Constantinople, 15
 General, 14, 15
 Nicæa, 14, 103, 126, 128,
 138
 Second of Nicæa, 37
 Pisa, 16
 Ravenna, 109
 Soissons, 107
 Trent, 21, 24
 Coverdale, Bishop, 72, 75, 120
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 56, 60,
 72
 Cuthbert, Archbishop, 115
 Cyprian, St., 12, 14, 129
 Cyril, St., 8

 Decline of the Roman Church
 in England, 5

 Denny, Mr., 7, 16, 31, 55, 99,
 130
 Dixon, Dr., 57, 74, 119
 Donus of Messina, 103
 Ducange, 100
 Duchesne, Mgr., 12, 23, 35,
 94, 99, 101, 104, 106, 128
 Dunstan, St., 36, 37, 40

 Eadmer, 135
 Eastern Churches, The, 3, 124,
 130
 Ecclesiastical Appointments
 Act, The, 117, 138
 Edward the Confessor, The
 Laws of, 42
 Edward VI, 51, 69, 72
 Egbert, King, 39
 Pontifical of, 136
 Elfnoth, Abbot, 96
 Elizabeth, Queen, 65
 Ems, Protest of Archbishops
 at, 91
 English Church Review, The,
 61, 131
 Episcopate, Origins of the, 11
 successors of the Aposto-
 late, 12
 Estcourt, 73
 Ethelwulf, 42
 Eusebius, 11

 Festivals of the Blessed Vir-
 gin, 23
 Filioque Clause, The, 3
 Finan, Bishop, 135
 Forged Decretals, The, 18,
 52, 108
 "Form," The, of Ordination,
 77
 Fortescue, Dr., 27, 28, 79
 Free Church Councils, The, 3
 Freeman, Professor, 32
 Frere, Dr., 69, 121
 Fulbert of Chartres, 116

 Gasparri, 76, 133
 Gasquet, Dom., 113
 Gautier of Palermo, 110
 Gelasius, 27
 Gladstone, Mr., 139

- Gore, Bishop, 79
 Gregory the Great, 34, 36, 44,
 48, 90, 95, 97, 102, 103,
 105, 107, 112, 113, 114,
 115, 127, 134
 Gregory VII, 25, 26, 90, 127
 Grey, Archbishop Walter, 91
- Haddan and Stubbs, 37, 38, 43
 Hallier, 132
 Hefele, 14
 Henry VII, 52
 Henry VIII, 58, 63, 69, 72, 137
 Hilary, St., 9
 Hincmar of Rheims, 109, 132
 Hodgkyns, Bishop, 72, 75,
 120, 139
 Honorius, Archbishop, 92
 Hooker, Richard, 23, 68, 83
 Humphrey, Fr., 66
- Immaculate Conception, The,
 24
 Ina, 42
 Infallibility, Papal, 25
 Innocent I, 128
 III, 4, 52, 110
 Intention, The, of the Ordinal,
 82
 Ireland, late date of the
 Pallium in, 116
 Irenæus, St., 11
 Isidore, St., 98
- “Janus,” 7, 19
 John the Deacon, 95
 John, King of England, 52
 VIII, Pope, 109
 of Syracuse, 103
- Lambeth Conference, The,
 2, 57, 62
 Lanfranc, Archbishop, 54, 60,
 116
 Laurence, Archbishop, 92
 Leander of Seville, 103
 Leclercq Dom, 47
 Legates, Papal, 39, 49, 53
 Leo XIII, Pope, 23
 “Liber Pontificalis,” The, 97
 Lichfield, Archbishopric of, 38
- Lingard, 75
 Linus, St., 11
 Littledale, Dr., 139
- McCabe, Mr., 5
 Maitland, Professor, 29
 Makower, 41
 Manning, Cardinal, 19, 66
 Marcus, Pope, 98
 Martene, 76, 132
 Mary, Queen, 51, 69
 Maskell, 96, 111
 Mellitus, Archbishop, 92
 Milan, 106, 107
- Nag’s Head Fable, The, 60, 73
 National Churches, 4, 29, 47
 Newman, Cardinal, 66
 Nicæa, Creed of, 2, 20
 Council of, 14, 103, 126, 128,
 138
 Second Council of, 37
 Nicholas, I, Pope, 18, 108
- Oath of Allegiance to the
 Papacy, The, 43, 53, 89,
 90
 Offa, 38, 42
 Ogle, Mr., 53
 Oman, Mr. 38
 Ordinal, The, 69, 81, 85
 “Ordo Romanus,” I, 122
 Origen, 8
 Ostia, Bishops of, 99
 Oswy, 39
- Pallium, The, 44, 54, 89, *seq.*
 Papal Supremacy, The, in
 England, 56, 69
 Parker, Archbishop, 60, 69, *seq.*,
 82, 120, 139, 140
 Parliament, Royal Summons
 to, 49
 Paul III, Pope, 63
 Paulinus, Archbishop, 92
 Pelagius, Pope, 127
 Peter Damien, 25
 Lombard, 25
 Peter, St., 6 *seq.*, 10, 11, 13
 Peter’s Pence, 33, 42
 Phillpotts, Bishop, 65

- Pisa, Council of, 16 |
 Pius IV, Creed of, 20, 21, 22
 Pius IX, Pope, 25, 66
 Pole, Cardinal, 58, 60, 69, 71,
 72, 89, 91, 118
 Pontifical, The Exeter, 137
 the Roman, 81, 85, 96, 111,
 112, 124
 the Sarum, 81, 111, 136
 Præmunire, Statute of, 52
 Presbyterians, The, 82
 Priesthood and Sacrifice, 85
 "Protesting Catholic Dis-
 senter," 65
 Provisors, Statute of, 52
 Puller, Fr., 3, 25, 131

 Ravenna, 53, 90, 97, 107, 109,
 119
 Real Presence, The, 22
 "Regnans in Excelsis," 64
 Rembert, St., 132
 Reunion, 1
 Robert of Jumièges, 41
 Rock, The, 7 *seq.*, 15
 Rock, Dr. 37
 Roman Catholics in England,
 The position of, 64, *seq.*
 Roman Patriarchate, The, 103
 Rome, Pilgrimages to, 33
 Rufinus, 11, 103

 Sacraments, The number of
 the, 25
 "Satis Cognitum," 6, 19, 24,
 28
 Scory, Bishop, 72, 75, 120
 Scotland, the Church of, 2, 62
 Smith, Mr. A. L., 41
 Soames, 43
 Society for the Propagation
 of the Gospel, 64

 Soissons, Council of, 107
 Sokoloff, 84
 Statute forbidding Appeals
 to Rome, The, 50
 Stubbs, Bishop, 32, 140
 Suffragan Bishops Act, The,
 77, 137
 Syagrius, Bishop of Autun,
 102, 115
 Symmachus, Pope, 105
 Synods, Provincial, 41

 Talleyrand, 83
 Theodore, Archbishop, 39, 40,
 48
 Thomas Aquinas, St., 24, 83,
 124
 Tilpin of Rheims, 108
 Transubstantiation, 22, 87
 Trent, The Council of, 21, 24
 Treves, 96
 Tunstall, Bishop, 58
 Twysden, Sir Roger, 59
 Tyndale, 50

 Van Espen, 99
 Vaughan, Cardinal, 87
 Vincent of Lerins, St., 28
 Virgilius, Pope, 101
 of Arles, 102, 112, 114
 Vitalian, Pope, 39

 Walsingham, Thomas, 49
 Warham, Archbishop, 60
 Whitby, The Synod of, 33, 35
 Wighard, 39
 Wilfrid, St., 33, 40
 Willibrod, St., 44
 Wini, Bishop, 135
 Wordsworth, Bishop John,
 128

From ROBERT SCOTT'S List

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

By the REV. PROFESSOR T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc. Cloth, 5s. net.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By PROFESSOR EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D.
Cloth, 5s. net.

MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net,

By the REV. ROLAND ALLEN (Author of the most discussed
Missionary Book of the day—"Missionary Methods: St. Paul's
or Ours?").

AT CLOSE QUARTERS.

By the REV. JOHN A. HUTTON, M.A. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
"Mr. Hutton has a real message for the men of our day. . . . We
heartily recommend this volume to all."—*Glasgow Herald*.

THE HEAVENLY SESSION OF OUR LORD. An Introduction to the History of the Doctrine.

By the REV. A. J. TAIT, D.D. Cloth, 6s. net.

"Dr. Tait is a reliable scholar; . . . on this doctrine this is the best
available book."—*Expository Times*.

ANALYSIS OF HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTI- CAL POLITY. Book V. With Introduction, Notes, and Examination Questions.

By the REV. F. A. C. YOUENS, M.A. Cloth, 3s. net.

SERMONS IN A NUTSHELL: Outlines for Busy Speakers. With Indices to Scripture References and Titles of the Outlines.

By J. ELLIS. Cloth, 1s. net. Interleaved Edition, 1s. 6d. net.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

LIBRARY OF HISTORIC THEOLOGY

EDITED BY

THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.

Dean and Chaplain of Whitelands College.

Each Volume, Demy 8vo, Cloth, Red Burnished Top, 5s. net.

THE FOLLOWING VOLUMES ARE NOW READY:

MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY.

By the Rev. W. K. FLEMING, M.A., B.D.

THE RULE OF LIFE AND LOVE.

By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE.

By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE.

By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS.

By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By the Rev. Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. Vols. I and II.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

CHARACTER AND RELIGION.

By the Rev. The Hon. EDWARD LYTTTELTON, M.A.

THE CREEDS: Their History, Nature and Use.

By the Rev. HAROLD SMITH, M.A.

MISSIONARY METHODS, ST. PAUL'S OR OURS?

By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL (Hulsean Prize Essay). By the Rev. S. NOWELL ROSTRON, M.A.

“The ‘Library of Historic Theology’ is a project of great promise. Several volumes by eminent writers have already appeared and the issue of such a series amply demonstrates that there is no decline in the interest felt all through the ages in theological literature.”—*Homiletic Review*.

Further important announcements will be made in due course; full particulars may be obtained from the Publisher, Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

