

CATHOLICS  
AND  
ROMAN CATHOLICS  
BY

AN OLD CATHOLIC.  
[ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE]

BEING A REVIEW OF THE LECTURE, LATELY  
DELIVERED IN  
BUFFALO, BY THE RT. REV. DR. RYAN,  
ETC., ETC., ETC.

BUFFALO:  
MARTIN TAYLOR.  
1874.  
[52 pp]

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HOUGH I here subjoin my name as author of this review, two reasons have influenced me to withhold it from the title page. First, I desire to avoid all appearance of personal controversy, and second, I wish to make prominent my position as an OLD CATHOLIC, for my criticisms are based on ancient Catholicity.

My sermon lately preached in Erie, was, in no just view of it, an attack on Romanism. Only incidentally was I forced to refer to Roman Catholics, to the novelties of their Theology, and, the crimes of the Jesuits. As compared with what has often been poured forth from Roman Catholic pulpits, in the form of direct and personal assaults upon Anglicans, my strongest words were moderate, and they had no personal bearings even in remotest thought. Indeed, from me they could not have such bearings, for I have no animosities, and I cherish the rights of others as dearly as I do my own.

Why my sermon should have been made the occasion for a very extraordinary assault upon myself, I cannot understand. It was preached in another city and another State. It made no allusion, whatever, to the Rt. Reverend Dr. Ryan: none to any of his flock. Yet in a lecture delivered on a Sunday evening (Feb. 22, 1874) in his Cathedral-church, and for which public curiosity had been stimulated by active notes of preparation, I find myself assailed publicly, by name, in a very unusual manner, and I must add in a very unjustifiable one. Were I weak enough to retort in the same way, prostituting my pulpit and the Lord's Day, to the purpose of assailing my neighbour by name, and deriding his official character, I could doubtless amuse the multitude, and I might turn it to the profit of some favourite object should I further imitate him by a sale of tickets for the occasion. But, what a state

of things would thus be engendered among fellow-citizens and fellow-Christians. Though I have, not infrequently, been called to endure personal attacks of this kind, from Roman Catholic pulpits, I have never rejoined in any way; and if I do so now, quietly, through the press, and without discourtesy, it is only because there must be a limit to patience itself, and because the lecture of Dr. Ryan has been spread before the public by the press, and so becomes a proper subject of reviewal. I think, also, I can so remark upon it as to glorify God and give free course to His Truth. Though I have thus spoken of the assault of my neighbour, whom I have never offended by word or deed, I take pleasure in saying that his lecture is, by no means, of that abusive and grosser sort of which I have never condescended to take notice. I think it proceeds from sincerity and from that kind of ignorance which the Old Catholics of Germany assure us is common among otherwise accomplished men, who have received their education in Roman Catholic seminaries. Learned in what is Roman, they are left mere children in all that is Catholic. Of the ancient Catholic Constitutions they know nothing, because they are not even permitted to learn that such Constitutions exist. The brilliant von Schulte, who was so long the favourite Canonist of the Pope himself, has inflicted a deep wound upon the Papacy, by joining the "Old Catholics;" and he is reported to have said that he was honestly enslaved to the Vatican till he woke up to the fact that the whole system he had been supporting is based upon the forged Decretals and other spurious documents which he had always been taught to accept as genuine. This discovery and the exposure of these facts, by Döllinger and his associates, has lighted a spirit of REFORMATION in Germany, which is extending to other countries of Europe and will not long be kept down in America.<sup>1</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> See *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus. (Translation.) London:

publication of the suppressed speech of Dr. Kenrick, of St. Louis, must do much to stimulate his friends to reading and inquiring. Is it too much to hope that Dr. Ryan himself may be led, by the argument of his brother prelate whom he so highly praises, to examine his own position and to carry on the work which Dr. Kenrick may have the credit of beginning, and which cannot long be repressed by the despotism to which he seems to have succumbed.

I make one explanation which I am sure Dr. Ryan will be happy to accept. He seems to imagine that I used the word *aliens* with some reflection upon the foreign nationality of many Roman Catholics. Such an idea never entered my mind. The word occurs in the English version of the text I was quoting (Heb. xi. 34.), and I used it textually, with reference to the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and without one thought of any earthly citizenship.

In the following pages I have sometimes used pleasantries, but no words of ill-will, and as Dr. Ryan indulges in "joking," even in the pulpit,<sup>2</sup> he will not complain of a few lively phrases in a review. God grant that all Christians may be led by His Spirit not only to mutual charity, but to that Catholic Unity which was once known and read of all Christians in unambiguous terms. In these pages it will be seen that I believe in that Unity, as it was understood of old in Rome, which, in those days, held but the one Creed Christendom, commonly called Nicene.

A. CLEVELAND COXE,

*Bishop of Western New York.*

BUFFALO, March, 1874.

---

Rivingtons, 1869.

<sup>2</sup> See the Lecture, in "The Catholic Union."

THE CATHOLIC'S LIFE AND DEATH.  
*(From the Prayer Book.)*

1. Serving the Lord in our generation;
2. With the testimony of a good conscience;
3. In the Communion of THE CATHOLIC CHURCH;
4. In the confidence of a certain Faith;
5. In the comfort of a reasonable, religious and holy hope;
6. In favour with our God;
7. And in perfect charity with the world. AMEN.

## REVIEW.

The peace and happiness of the American people must perish if religious differences are allowed to beget personal controversies. Such is the multitude of religions among us, that this principle is apparent. And the good sense of our community has always respected it. The common law is that every preacher, in his own place or pulpit, has the fullest liberty to defend his own faith and to point out the errors of others, as he views them, provided only he abstains from personalities. This is a law from which the Bishops of Western New York have never departed. But, I am sorry to observe that Roman Catholic prelates do not recognize these rules of conduct.

A bishop is bound by his sacred calling to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." We concede to others an equal liberty. We live in a country where all things are subject to a free examination, and our people will not be deprived of their privilege to get all the information they can, on all the questions of the day. Now, the late Vatican Council has made certain matters the grand subject of contemporary thought. They must be discussed in America as elsewhere, and they are daily forced upon our attention by the aggressive attitude of Roman Catholics themselves. But, if these discussions are to become personal, it is impossible to foresee the calamities that are in store for us. We regret, therefore, that many Roman Catholic prelates seem to be restrained by no laws of courtesy or reciprocity. When they merely misrepresent our religion, the press is open, and we can review in print what we find reported in the newspapers. But, when they assail us by name, in their pulpits, they commit a social wrong, and set an example which it would be madness to copy. They practice largely on the forbearance of their fellow-citizens. Yet we cannot even exhibit the facts of history, or

expose the immoralities of their casuists, without subjecting ourselves to such assaults; a calamity which comes of the oath which is exacted of Roman Catholic prelates at their consecration. They swear to “persecute and impugn” all whom they regard as heretics.<sup>3</sup> When they choose, therefore, to make us the object of this intolerant vow, we are placed at an apparent disadvantage, by the loving spirit of our own Church. Our bishops have sworn the very different oath, which she exacts of all her priesthood,<sup>4</sup> to “maintain and set forward as much as lieth in them, quietness, peace and love, among all Christian people.”

Keeping this promise in view, but as one under solemn obligations to defend the Faith, I proceed to review Dr. Ryan’s lecture as I find it in his official newspaper, “The Catholic Union,” of February 26, 1874.

The main point in this lecture seems to be a charge of inconsistency against the Bishop of Western New York. The author admits that the Bishop has produced a conclusive argument, from the Scriptures, for the Corporate Witness of the Apostles, as designed for all lands and for all time, and as continued in the Catholic Episcopate. But he assumes that such a doctrine can only be consistently maintained in the Roman Communion: and that in order to sustain it effectively a Christian Bishop should be recognized as such by the Papacy.

On the contrary, I propose to show in few words, that nobody is allowed to maintain the doctrine of the Corporate Witness in the Roman Communion. Hence, the Bishop of Western New York is consistent in his position, and Dr. Ryan has admitted in words what he is forbidden to support in practice. He forgets that, in his Communion, the Episcopate is no longer, even nominally, “the teaching body of the Church.”

---

<sup>3</sup> “Persequar et impugnabo.” See Pontifical, p. 63: Rome, 1818.

<sup>4</sup> See Prayer Book, Ordinal.

The doctrine of the Corporate Witness is that all bishops as successors of the Apostles hold an undivided share in the Universal or Catholic Episcopate. Hence, the entire Episcopate is the Supreme Witness in the Church; not any one bishop, however eminent his See; but, all the bishops as co-equals and co-ordinate. This co-equality is *not inconsistent with any primacy or presidency, which the Church itself may have instituted or regulated by Canons*; but it absolutely forbids any Supremacy of one over the others, such as is claimed by Popes. Thus, Christ gave a primacy among the Apostles, to St. Peter; but he limited it by rebuking the inquiry “who should be greatest,” and by commanding them to call no man master, they being all brethren, with one Father in Heaven.<sup>5</sup> St. Peter himself was rebuked as a “Satan” the moment he departed from the words of Jesus.<sup>6</sup>

In place of the Corporate Witness, however, the modern Roman Church, which is as diverse as possible from the primitive Roman Church, in its Catholic purity, makes its bishop “a corporation sole.” It reduces all other bishops to the rank of mere presbyters, admitted by him, as “Universal Bishop,” to certain Episcopal functions, but not to the Episcopal Order. The modern Theology of Rome has abolished the Episcopal *Order*<sup>7</sup> and maintains nothing but an Episcopal Office, which is held, at the nod of the pontiff, by a class of men in the order of presbyters, who are mere Vicars of the Pope, in their several dioceses. As Papal Vicars, they are very powerful, because they are the arm and voice of a despotic pontiff; but, as true bishops, they have no power at all. They are not permitted to bear any Corporate Witness, whatever; and when summoned to meet the Pope in council, it is only to tremble around his throne,

---

<sup>5</sup> St. Luke, ix. 46. St. Matt., xxiii. 8.

<sup>6</sup> St. Matt., xvi. 23.

<sup>7</sup> See Catechism of the Council of Trent, Chapter VII., Questions xii., xxii., xxv.

accept his oracles, and renounce their own convictions at his command, or submit to be stripped of their dignities, such as they are.<sup>8</sup>

I have thus stated the two systems: that of the Catholic Church, as gathered from Holy Scripture; and that of the modern Roman Church, presented by way of contrast. I proceed to establish my position: that the doctrine of the Bishop of Western New York, which Dr. Ryan admits he has proved by Scripture, is the doctrine of Catholic Antiquity, and that the modern Roman doctrine is contrary thereto.

St. Cyprian (A. D. 250), on “The Unity of the Church,” lays down certain maxims, which in his day were universally accepted, thus:

1. Christ first gave His keys to Peter as a token of Unity, but, nevertheless, He gave *an equal power to all the Apostles*. What Peter was, they all were, endowed with an *equal partnership* of honour and authority.

2. This Unity, we who are bishops, who preside in the Church, are bound to hold and to maintain, that we may prove the Episcopate itself, one and undivided.

3. The Episcopate is one, of which an undivided part is held by each, in equal partnership.

4. The Episcopate is one, diffused in the concordant multitude of bishops.<sup>9</sup>

These maxims are supported by other primitive writers; thus by Tertullian:<sup>10</sup>

5. The Churches, so many and so great, are but that one primal Church which is from the Apostles, from which all proceed. For this reason, all are primitive, all Apostolic, whilst they are all shown to be one, in the communication

---

<sup>8</sup> See Documents illustrating the late Vatican Council, *passim*. Also, “Speech of Archbishop Kenrick,” which he was not permitted to utter, but which he published at Naples, 1870. Translated. New York, 1872.

<sup>9</sup> Cyp. de Unitate, pp. 8, 20.

<sup>10</sup> Præscript, Cap. xx.

of peace, the acknowledgment of brotherhood, and the interchanges of hospitality.

And again, St. Jerome:<sup>11</sup>

6. If one is looking for authority, the world is greater than one city. Wherever a bishop may be placed, whether at Rome or at Eugubium; whether at Constantinople or at Rhegium; whether at Alexandria or at Tanis; he has the same authority, the same worth, the same priesthood. The power of wealth, the lowliness of poverty render a bishop neither higher nor lower. All are successors of the Apostles.”

Such was the Corporate Witness, as understood by the ancient fathers, and as set forth from Scripture by the Bishop of Western New York. I come to the contrast presented by Dr. Ryan’s relations to the modern See of Rome.

Instead of holding, with St. Jerome, that a bishop in Buffalo is the equal of a Bishop at Rome, he says to his flock:

1. “You are, I know, not *nominal*, but staunch, thoroughgoing, practical, avowed Papists.” And, including himself, he says:

2. “As one man, we lay all our devotion at the feet of Pius the Ninth. ... If this is to be “minions” then minions we are, and we glory in the name.”

But, it is not the name which is so humiliating, in my opinion, unless the facts correspond with it. At the late Vatican Council, we find the *least submissive* of bishops from America, while imploring the pontiff not to press the question of Infallibility upon the assembly, using the servile language of Oriental satraps, at the footstool of a despot, rather than that of equals in the one Corporate Witness of the Apostolic Episcopate. They say:<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Epist. cxlvi.

<sup>12</sup> See Documents; Wallon, Paris. Also, “Inside View of the Council,” New York, 1872.

3. "Prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we humbly and earnestly entreat," &c.

This is the ceremonial of Buddhist priests before the Grand Lama, but it is not the attitude of the Catholic bishops of Antiquity towards their brother in the See of Rome, as I shall soon shew. And here is the place to quote St. Gregory, the last Bishop of Rome, who obeyed the Canons of the Church, in this respect. When a bishop flattered him with a pompous title of universal jurisdiction, Gregory rebuked the brother, kindly but sharply, in the following weighty words:<sup>13</sup>

"None of my predecessors would use *this impious word* (universal bishop), because, in reality, if a patriarch be called universal, this takes from all others the title of a patriarch. Far, very far from every Christian soul be the wish to usurp anything that might diminish, *however little*, the honour of his brethren. . . . Give not *to any one* the title of *universal*, lest you deprive yourself of your own due, by offering what you do not owe to him."

Compare this with the language of the present pontiff to the crouching prelates who kiss his feet.<sup>14</sup> He says:

"We teach and define that it is a dogma, divinely revealed, that the Roman pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra* .... is possessed of that Infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine, faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable, of *themselves*, and *not from the consent of the Church.*"

Until this dogma of Infallibility was thus defined, many Roman Catholics taught as follows:<sup>15</sup>

"No decision of his (the Pope's) can oblige under

---

<sup>13</sup> Epistles, V. 20, etc.

<sup>14</sup> Definition of July 18, 1870. Jean Wallon, Paris, 1872.

<sup>15</sup> Keenan's "Controversial Catechism," London.

pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced *by the teaching body, that is by the bishops of the Church.*”

But this Catholic doctrine is now heresy among Roman Catholics. Their “teaching body” is the Pope.

Surely, the proof is sufficient; the contrast between Catholic Antiquity and modern Romanism, is as absolute as possible. The Pope, as I have shown, is a “Corporation sole,” and the Corporate Witness of the whole Episcopate goes for nothing. Even the consent of the Episcopate is not of any consequence. With what propriety, then, can Dr. Ryan assert that in order to maintain his doctrine of the Corporate Witness, the Bishop of Western New York should join the communion of a pontiff who utterly denies it, and who thus enthrones himself over all nations and Churches as the sole arbiter of all truth, all belief, and all morality?

I have before noted that what thus appears, practically, to be the position of a Roman Catholic bishop, is dogmatically defined. The Pope holds him to be only a *presbyter*, as to his orders, and permitted to exercise Episcopal functions, only by favour of the Roman See.<sup>16</sup>

But, it has no doubt been observed that the word *Catholic* is used by Dr. Ryan in a sense widely different from that in which I speak of myself as a *Catholic*. The question next presents itself, therefore, who uses the word correctly? *Who are the Catholics?* We say in the Creed, “I believe in one Holy *Catholic* and Apostolic Church.” If the word thus used in the Creed means what is meant by the same word in Dr. Ryan’s lecture, there is nothing more to be said, and the Rt. Reverend lecturer must be regarded as having made good his main point against the Bishop of Western New York. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that the lecturer has restricted this noble word *Catholic* to express a novel idea, and to designate those who believe

---

<sup>16</sup> Catech, Council Trent, as before referred to.

what was never heard of in the primitive ages of Christianity, then he himself is at best an innovator, and the Catholic is he who adheres absolutely to the original meaning of the word, and so to “the Faith once delivered to the Saints.” Now, for the facts.

On the 15th of January, 1870, nobody was denied the name of a Catholic by the Pope himself, for repudiating the Infallibility of the Pope as a dogma of the Faith. In proof of this I quote the following language from a letter of that date, addressed to Pius the Ninth, by *five* archbishops and *twenty-two* bishops of the Roman Communion, from America:<sup>17</sup>

“Prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we humbly and earnestly entreat that the question of the Infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, as a dogma of the Faith, may not be submitted to the Council.”

And the first reason they assign for this entreaty is that “the discussion of this question will evidently expose the want of union and especially of unanimity among the bishops.”

And let this be observed, because it is all I shall reply to the reflections of Dr. Ryan upon the want of unanimity among Anglicans. It would be easy to retort, overwhelmingly; but, here is the fact. We are a Church of freedom, and encourage free thought within certain limits. Some abuse this freedom, no doubt. But, even among these Roman divines, who are tied and bound, by every imaginable device, to think nothing at all but what they are bidden, a similar spirit will at times break forth.

It appears, therefore, that the bishops themselves were not agreed as to any such doctrine. Eighteen hundred years after Christ, Rome itself had no settled belief on this point. Nay, the assertion, by Protestants, that Roman Catholics held any such doctrine was often resented. I

---

<sup>17</sup> Documents, &c. Wallon, p. 67.

quote, from a catechism authorized and circulated in England before the Council, and which Dr. Manning's own journal, *The Tablet*, has commended, the following passage:<sup>18</sup>

“*Quest.* Are not Catholics bound to believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?”

“*Ans.* This is a *Protestant Invention*, and is no article of the Catholic Faith.”

But, what was purely a “Protestant Invention” up to the 18th of July, 1870, became, on that day, part of “the Catholic Faith” as taught by the Pope and all his adherents. The same catechism now appears with this question and answer struck out.<sup>19</sup> To this Faith, *not yet four years old*, Dr. Ryan not only subscribes, but he denies that anybody is a Catholic who does not accept it. I, therefore, who hold nothing as a dogma of the Faith that is not eighteen hundred years old, am not a Catholic, in his opinion, because I refuse to accept a novelty, on which, four years ago, there was no unanimity in his own Church.

Now, let us hear what is the test of Catholicity, as set forth by St. Vincent, in the fifth century. He says:<sup>20</sup>

“The true and genuine Catholic is he who purposes, for his part, to hold and believe that alone which he shall have ascertained the Catholic Church to have held *universally and from of old.*”

So, also, the great Bossuet,<sup>21</sup> who continued in the Roman Communion, on a theory now condemned:

“The certain token of Apostolic doctrine is when it

---

<sup>18</sup> Keenan's “Controversial Catechism,” published by “The Catholic Publishing Co,” New Bond Street. On sale in Dublin as late as August, 1871.

<sup>19</sup> See English edition of Döllinger's Lectures.

<sup>20</sup> *Commonitor.* cap. xx.

<sup>21</sup> *Exposition, Works,* vii. 691.

is confessed by all the Churches of Christ, so that nobody can show when it was not so confessed.”

Now, I have shown that not even the Roman Church held this doctrine of Infallibility four years ago. He, then, is the Catholic who rejects this dogma, and not he who, with Dr. Ryan, accepts it, anathematizing all who refuse. For, says the same St. Vincent:<sup>22</sup>

“It is necessary for all Catholics who study to prove themselves *legitimate sons of Mother Church, to stick fast to the holy faith of the holy fathers* and abide in it; but to detest, abhor, pursue and banish all profane novelties of the profane.”

I presume Dr. Ryan would allow that “Protestant Inventions” are to be classed among “profane novelties of the profane.” But, such was this dogma of Infallibility, only four years ago, as I have already shown, and as I am prepared to show much more fully.

So far, then, I have proved that Dr. Ryan uses the word *Catholic* in a very different sense from that which it bore among ancient Catholics. But, I profess and accept it precisely as it was expounded by its great Latin doctor, St. Vincent of Lerins, who lived and wrote in the great Synodical period of Church-History, dying (A. D. 450) the year before the last of those four great Councils which St. Gregory professed to reverence next to the four Gospels.

What, then, has so greatly misled the learned lecturer? It is evident, from his lecture, that he imagines the test of a Catholic to be *whether he adheres or not to the Communion of the Bishop of Rome*. This appears from the entire lecture, and is essential to the argument, which he politely asks us “to investigate,” and which I will soon show that I have investigated very thoroughly.

The doctrine of St. Vincent is, that we are to bring the Bishop of Rome himself and all Christian bishops to the

---

<sup>22</sup> Commonitor. II. cap. vi.

test of the Holy Scriptures, according to the universal Primitive Faith, and not to make the doctrine of any one bishop, or any one See, the test of the Catholic Faith. Dr. Ryan reverses the rule of Vincent, and makes the person and See of Pius the Ninth the test of the Faith. Let me quote St. Vincent, expounding the language of St. Paul.<sup>23</sup>

“Though PETER—though Andrew, though John, though, in fine, the whole band of the Apostles should preach to you another gospel, besides that which we (St. Paul) have preached—let him be anathema. Tremendous blow: to spare neither himself nor his fellow-Apostles, in order to maintain the tenacity of the first faith. But that is little; though *an angel from heaven*, he saith, preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. .... He does not say if any one should preach unto you *something besides what ye have received*, let him be blessed, but he says—let him be anathema.”

Now, I have shown that Pius the Ninth, on the 18th of July, 1870, taught a new dogma, enforcing it under pain of damnation. Is he greater than Peter? Is he greater than an angel? If not, St. Paul says, “Let him be anathema;” and St. Vincent shows that such was the Universal doctrine of the Church, in the fifth century. But, Dr. Ryan not only adheres to this novelty, but he would have us to believe that, teach what he may, all Christians, on peril of damnation, must adhere to Pius the Ninth. On the contrary, I have shown that nobody can be a Catholic who remains in Communion with him, any longer.

But, as Dr. Ryan has given us the reasons which have induced him to think otherwise, I proceed to examine them, with the greatest consideration and respect.

He quotes several authorities who regarded it as a proof of their orthodoxy that they were in full Communion with the Bishop of Rome—who, in those days, remember,

---

<sup>23</sup> Commonitor. cap. viii.

was no Pope, except as all bishops were so called. Now, I will not pause to examine these quotations, carpingly, for I could cheerfully add to them several others, even more to this purpose. But what do they prove? Simply this, that *while the Bishops of Rome were orthodox*, they were pillars of Orthodoxy. This, I frankly allow; nay, this I delight to show. There was a time when the Faith of that See was justly spoken of throughout the world: but St. Paul, who attests this, warns the Romans<sup>24</sup> that they too may be “cut off,” and that they should not be “high-minded but fear.” Consequently, when a Bishop of Rome became a heretic, it was no advantage to any one to be in Communion with him. Dr. Ryan is bound, indeed, to exclaim, in pious horror, that such a thing cannot be; but, I shall prove from the greatest of all modern bishops,<sup>25</sup> who have lived and died in Communion with the Pope, that such is the fact, as thousands of Roman Catholics were free to acknowledge, four years ago. He says:

“Honorius being duly interrogated concerning the faith by three patriarchs, gave most wicked answers. He was condemned by the Sixth General Council, under anathema, previous to this anathema, he was sustained by the Roman pontiffs, his successors; but since *the supreme judgment of the Council*, the pontiffs have condemned him under the same anathema.”

From Bossuet, I could treat Dr. Ryan to much more of this sort, and to the same purpose; for that bishop had no mind to be a mere worshipper of Popes, and he held the consent of the Universal Episcopate to be above any Pope’s decrees. And so he proved it to have been in the ancient Church, when a bishop of Rome was thus condemned and anathematized by his peers. If Dr. Ryan desires it, I will enlarge my list of acknowledged heretical Bishops of

---

<sup>24</sup> Chap. x. 20-22.

<sup>25</sup> Bossuet, *Defensio*, cap. xxvii.

Rome; but, for the present, I beg him to study the above facts, and to ask where the Infallibility was in those days, when one Bishop of Rome taught heresy from his throne, and of his successors some upheld him and others anathematized him as a heretic.

Since Dr. Ryan is so unfortunate, however, as to direct my attention to the case of Athanasius, I cannot but ask why he forgot to mention Liberals, instead of Julius? Julius was orthodox and sustained Athanasius: Liberius fell away and condemned him. Now, was it the token of Catholicity to be in Communion with Liberius, when he turned Arian? On the contrary, let me quote the language of St. Hilary to this "Pope," from which may be gathered in what relations the holy and orthodox Bishop of Poitiers then stood to the Roman See. He says:<sup>26</sup>

"Anathema to thee, Liberius, to thee and to those who are with thee. I repeat—anathema! again, a third time, anathema to thee, thou prevaricator, Liberius."

In those days there was no *prostration of bishops* about the Roman throne: and if a Bishop of Rome presumed to teach a novelty, this is the way in which his brother bishops addressed him. It may be imagined what St. Hilary would have said to Pius the Ninth, on the 18th of July, 1870: and much as one feels for the amiable and venerable old pontiff, one wonders that there was nobody on hand that day to rise up before him and defend the Catholic Faith, against the fearful edict he was then induced to utter.

It follows that nobody is the less Catholic, when, like Athanasius, he is condemned by the Bishop of Rome, for adhering to Orthodoxy. This is what the "Old Catholics" have discovered to their infinite relief.

But Dr. Ryan thinks we confine orthodoxy to our own Communion and that we are a very small body. We

---

<sup>26</sup> S. Hilar. Fragmenta.

allow that Churches may be more or less corrupt, and yet be essentially Churches, as Christ himself has taught, in the Apocalypse.<sup>27</sup> But, St. Vincent teaches not only that true Catholicity *may be confined* to a very small body<sup>28</sup> adhering to antiquity, while the rest of Christendom falls away: but he asserts that it actually was so, once, in the times of the Arians, when he says, “The poison infected almost the whole world, so that *nearly all the bishops of the Latin tongue were misled.*”

What has happened once, may happen again. Liberius and almost all the bishops who belonged to the West, were misled. We merely assert the same of Pius IX., and “nearly all the bishops of the Latin tongue,” in our own times.

When, therefore, Dr. Ryan finds fault with the Church of England for saying that “Rome hath erred,” even as Antioch and the other Apostolic Sees, it is evident that he contends with a mere historic fact. So he must answer Bossuet, not me; and this being true, the main point of Dr. Ryan’s lecture is gone. The doctrine of the Corporate Witness cannot take any man to Rome, nor to any other single See, as his Rule. But what all these Churches together have held, always, from the beginning, that is their Corporate Witness, and that is what the Church of England accepts. The Bishop of Western New York remains, theretore, in possession of the field.

Two minor errors of Dr. Ryan must here be pointed out. He says of Julius, a primitive Roman bishop:

I. “A Pope in 342 is very similar to our own Pope in 1874, as to this claim of jurisdiction, over the whole Church, East and West.”

To which I answer, there was no such thing as a “Pope” in 342, in the sense here insinuated—a proposition I

---

<sup>27</sup> Revelations, chap. ii. 20.

<sup>28</sup> Commonitor. iii. 4.

will cheerfully prove, at large, if Dr. Ryan wishes the facts. But, the quotation, as Dr. Ryan gives it, is proof enough. Julius was claiming his *patriarchal primacy*, under the Canons, not a *Papacy* by Divine right, and these are evidently two different things. How does the lecturer's own quotation read:

“Know you not that *the Canonical rule* was to recur first to our authority,” &c.

We will not now inquire whether Julius wrote just this, nor whether he did not sometimes claim more than his due. As it stands, it is *an appeal to the Canons*. But where does Pius the Ninth, who claims *divine authority*, base his authority, on the Canons? When he does, let Dr. Ryan inform the Old Catholics,” and the restoration of Catholic Unity will be nigh at hand. Dr. Ryan says:

2. “This See was called, emphatically, the *Apostolical See*.”

So men call the nearest Post Office, *emphatically* “the Post Office;” but does that prove there are no other Post Offices? In Egypt they called Alexandria “*the Apostolic See*.” In Syria they gave the same title to Jerusalem, or Antioch; in Western Asia, to Ephesus. All the dioceses founded by Apostles were “*Apostolic Sees*.” Western Europe had but one such See, and, in the nature of things, that gave Rome a Canonical primacy; out of which, by usurpation, Boniface III. began, and Nicholas I. completed, a Papacy.<sup>29</sup>

England, then, in rejecting a usurping Papacy, fell back on her ancient Catholic rights, and began to renew and to regain, as her old law, all her primitive relations with all the Apostolic Sees. She is not in Communion with Pius IX., for his new dogma rends him from Communion with all his own predecessors, and from all antiquity. But she is in Communion with all the Orthodox bishops of Rome that

---

<sup>29</sup> *The Papacy*. Guettée. Translated. New York, 1867.

ever lived; and that is the reverse of Dr. Ryan's position, who, in this point of Infallibility, has only a single one of all the Popes to sustain his faith. All the Councils too are against him.

And, had Julius addressed the bishops of Britain, A. D. 342, even in terms of patriarchal authority, they would have reminded him that his limit was Lower Italy. After Ephesus, they would have said that England, with Cyprus and other islands, was Canonically exempt from all such jurisdiction; which was and is the fact.<sup>30</sup> The ancient British bishops actually spoke thus of Gregory's patriarchate.

When Henry VIII. and his bishops, then, resumed this ancient position, even the Pope did not venture to separate his adherents from the Church of England, a fact which Dr. Ryan appears to forget, when he says the Church of England "*started* under Henry VIII." Bossuet,<sup>31</sup> be it remembered, speaks of "the Church of England," in the times of Honorius, that heretical Bishop of Rome, as "illustrious throughout the world;" and as at that early date she rejected the doctrine of Honorius, so she now rejects that of Pius IX. The Pope did not withdraw the Papists from the Church of England until the 20th year of Queen Elizabeth, and till this, all his adherents remained in Communion with their proper Church and also in his Communion. This fact proves that the Anglican bishops and clergy were fully recognized, at Rome, so long as the Popes had any hope of regaining power over them. It was not till 1570, that Pius V. issued his bull of excommunication against Queen Elizabeth, in which, also, he presumed to depose her, and to override all the laws of England, as to temporal matters. We attach the same importance to both instruments; his spiritual and temporal authority to do these things being both alike null and

---

<sup>30</sup> Canon VI. of Nice. Afterwards. Canon VII. of Ephesus.

<sup>31</sup> His. Univ., p. 352.

impotent. The Church of England stood on her ancient Canonical rights, by which the bishop of Rome had no authority whatever over her clergy and people.<sup>32</sup>

But, Dr. Ryan seems to think the Apostolical succession can be traced only through the line of Rome. I refer him to the unbroken line of our bishops, from the days of Warham to this day; and also to the fact that the series of bishops in the See of Canterbury is as historical as that of the Roman pontiffs, from the time of St. Gregory to this date.<sup>33</sup> So that the only objection to the Anglican Succession, which demands any notice whatever, is his assertion that the “formula of ordination is insufficient.” And the plain answer to this is—let him show where it is insufficient, and I will prove that his own consecration is equally invalid. The Roman Pontifical differs from the Ordinal by which Parker was consecrated, in nothing which any theologian has ever ventured to pronounce essential. The words “Receive the Holy Ghost,” are used in both, as sufficient to complete a solemnity, which preceding words have denoted to be the consecration of a bishop. The words added in our Ordinal in 1660, make the old formula more explicit, not a whit more sufficient, for the formula itself remains as it was in the old Ordinals and as it is still in the Romish Pontifical; So that on the same formula Dr. Ryan’s own claims to be a bishop, must depend. As for Dr. Milner’s ignorant assertions, this may answer them. In this, as in another matter where Lingard suggests that he “wrote hastily,” I trust he did no worse; only let me add that this same Dr. Milner’s own consecration is a most dubious matter. Will Dr. Ryan throw any light upon it? Who ordained this “Vicar Apostolic?”

But, I will give Dr. Ryan a still harder task, by asking him to shed a little light upon his own orders. Does

---

<sup>32</sup> Vote of Convocation, 1534.

<sup>33</sup> Registrum Anglicanum. Oxford, 1858

he derive from Dr. Walmsley, who consecrated the first Roman Catholic bishop for the United States, or from the nuncio Bedini, who consecrated Dr. Bayley, his present Archbishop? The first consecration was so defective that the Pope tried to mend it by this second succession, which only made matters worse, as we shall see. The facts are as follows:

1. Dr. Walmsley, a roving Vicar Apostolic, bearing the empty title of "Bishop of Rama," undertook to consecrate Dr. John Carroll<sup>34</sup> in England, without Canonical assistants, and with none besides to lay hands that even pretended to be a Bishop. The Pope had ordered him to procure the assistance of "two Ecclesiastics, *vested with some dignity*, in case that two bishops cannot be had." And such a "Nag's Head" beginning had the Roman Catholic Church in America, by the Pope's own leave, and as may be seen in the official account of the ceremony, published in London, in 1790.<sup>35</sup>

2. And the second, or Bedini consecration, is even worse. This unhappy man, sent to Buffalo by the Pope about the St. Louis Church difficulty, in 1853, fled the country in hot haste when exposed by the indignant Italians of New York, as "the Butcher of Bologna" and the virtual murderer of poor Ugo Bassi, their patriot countryman. By the ancient Canons,<sup>36</sup> a bishop suffering from the taint of bloodshed was incompetent to the administration of the holy rite; but, by such a character was the second Roman Catholic succession started, in New York.<sup>37</sup>

I know not from what source Dr. Ryan claims to

---

<sup>34</sup> Dr. Carroll was a most worthy prelate. I attach no importance to the story that he was never baptized, except by an Irish midwife; though the Bridget baptism and the Nag's Head story rest on similar documents.

<sup>35</sup> The original was before me when I made this extract.

<sup>36</sup> See e. g. Can. 31 of the Fourth Council of Toledo.

<sup>37</sup> *Civiltà Catholica*. No. xcii. p 249, xciii. 383.

hold his orders; but neither the Walmsley nor the Bedini ordination have any validity as establishing a Canonical Episcopate in this country. Our lawful bishops were already settled in their sees, according to the Catholic constitutions, having been duly elected by their own dioceses;<sup>38</sup> and no Italian prelate, whatever, could give any commission, in this country, without their consent, except in that defiance of all Canons which, for many years, has been habitual with the Popedom. Let it be added, that this Nuncio Bedini bore the empty title of “Bishop of Thebes,” in Bœotia, which certainly gave him no jurisdiction anywhere, much less here. Did he mistake America for Bœotia?

Let it be noted that *in no case*, in the reformed Anglican Succession has the Canonical number of *three* bishops, *at least*, been wanting. Dr. Ryan, in giving us the line of his own succession, will please indicate the *exceptions* to this rule, which disfigure and, in some degree, vitiate the Roman Catholic Succession in America, as in Ireland.

When Dr. Ryan, then, clears up the difficulties which hang about his own Orders, it will be time enough for me to relieve his further anxieties about others. Our Orders are not obscure, however, like his, but are before the world, in the clear light of History, to the more accurate study of which I commend the otherwise learned lecturer.

It is time enough to prove a thing when it is denied or misunderstood. Dr. Ryan affects surprise that the Bishop of Western New York did not undertake to prove that the line of Apostolic Succession “comes down continuous and unbroken from the Apostles” to himself. The answer is—neither did he attempt to prove that the line of physical generation conies down from Noah to himself. These were not the matters he undertook to discuss, though it is as easy

---

<sup>38</sup> In an appendix may be found the historic succession of the Anglo-America Bishops.

to prove the one as the other. The facts are supposed to be known to intelligent readers of history. Dr. Ryan, however, objects, and I will now examine his objections and show that he must have spoken without even the knowledge of his subject, which he might have derived from Roman Catholic authors. I should be sorry to accuse him of wilful mistake, though he is authorized by his Church to resort to such tactics in a multitude of cases. His infallible master has commended in a superlative degree the teachings of Alphonsus de' Liguori, by which he is instructed to *violate even an oath*, whenever "the good of the Church" conflicts with keeping it. It is lawful for a Roman Catholic "for a good cause to use equivocation, in the modes laid down, and *to confirm it with an oath.*" So says the Papal authority.<sup>39</sup> My reason for calling attention to this fact is that nobody can reasonably doubt that the authors from whom Dr. Ryan borrows his statements have adopted and freely used the license of Jesuit and Liguorian Morals.<sup>40</sup>

The historical succession from the Apostles rests on the same kind of proof by which we receive the Canon of Holy Scripture. In any given case a bishop must be able to prove his own succession by the highest moral evidence. In doing this, he must show that his consecrators derived their Episcopal Order from some ancient Apostolic line. If he can show this by undoubted registers, known and read of all men, like other legal documents, by which the succession is carried up to a period antecedent to modern controversies; and if, higher than this, the unquestionable records of history and the consent of numerous Churches, establish the regular succession of bishops in the particular Church which is relied upon as a Source, such Church being of acknowledged Apostolic origin and Catholic Communion, in Primitive ages; if he can do this, then his

---

<sup>39</sup> Liguori. Tom. ii, pp. 35-99. Paris, 1852.

<sup>40</sup> For specimens of Jesuit Morality, see Pascal's Letters.

share in the Corporate Witness is established. The Canon of Scripture rests on no evidence more explicit.

Now, the Succession in the Church of England is of this kind and is more demonstrably Canonical and regular, in all particulars, than any other Succession in Christendom. This results from the great care which is taken, in England, of public records; from the proverbial purity of law and legal processes in England; from the tenure of property and legislative rights of bishops, which are sure to be challenged by statesmen, if any imaginable flaw exists in their title; from the jealousy with which, for three centuries, every step in the Anglican Communion has been watched by active enemies; from the fact that the law of the land exacts that the consecration of bishops should be absolutely conformed to the Anglican Ordinal; and from the fact that, in perpetuating the Anglican Succession nothing has ever been done in a corner. Everything done by jurists and statesmen, by divines and canonists, by Puritans and Papists, has been subjected to the closest observation: facts being thus made historical in printed pages, and thrown open to the eyes and inquiries of the most intelligent and truth-loving nation of the world. It is impossible that any deception should be carried on for centuries, under such conditions and in such circumstances; and it may be shown that nobody competent to form an opinion, and who has taken the pains to investigate the matter, has ever professed a doubt concerning the Anglican Succession. Gallios who “care for none of these things,” and Jesuits who reck not what they do or say to damage an adversary, are the only apparent exceptions to this fact. Now, Dr. Ryan, in professing disbelief as to our Succession, relies, entirely, *on this class of men*: paying no attention whatever to the more reputable characters, in his own Communion, who have scorned to participate in such “weak inventions of the enemy.” This I proceed to prove. First, let me state, however, that by the Ancient Canons of

Nicæa (A. D. 325) there must be at least three bishops concerned in the ordination of anybody to their Order.<sup>41</sup> Without this condition, the ordination may be valid, but it is irregular and defective. Nobody involved in such a consecration is in a position to object to the Orders of others. Second, let me add that the three bishops must unite in the laying on of hands, while using some form of words that has been accepted by Ancient and Apostolic Churches as sufficient to convey the Episcopate to an elected brother.

The artifices used by Jesuits and their friends for impugning the Anglican Succession have been desperate and various; their character and variety proving how impossible it is to rest an objection on any one good and sufficient reason. First, they object to any ordination not proceeding under warrant from Rome; but this would overthrow the Orders of St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine and St. Ambrose. Second, they assert that a particular consecrator was no bishop. If the record happens to be wanting, though this occurs in the case of Cardinal Pole and many other Roman prelates, then they assume this to be fatal; but, if the record is produced, then it is pronounced a forgery. When all other pleas fail, then they invent a story, which comes too late and is too full of contradictions to hold water, yet makes a convenient cavil. Finally, the more decent controvertist tries to prove that the form of words is defective, or to invent a flaw by some ingenious quibble, to which barren minds may give place. For three hundred years such have been the Jesuit practices; and Dr. Ryan, who is their partisan and eulogist, has evidently learned his lessons in their unscrupulous school. To an examination of his objections, I now proceed.

I. He assumes that if Parker was not properly consecrated, the Anglican Succession fails. Such is not the case, but I am willing to let it be assumed; for if Parker was

---

<sup>41</sup> Canon IV., q. v.

not duly consecrated, it is certain no bishop in Christendom can prove his Orders. Only, let it be observed, that, if any possible flaw could be found in Parker's case, the Succession communicated to us, in two instances, by De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, in Dalmatia, in the seventeenth century, transmits of itself a better and more valid Succession than that which the nuncio Bedini conferred on Dr. Bayley, the present Roman Catholic Metropolitan. But now, concerning the consecration of Parker Dr. Ryan ventures to say:

“It is very doubtful and cannot be proved that he was ever consecrated at all.”

Let this be compared with the well-weighed words on this subject of Dr. Lingard, the Roman Catholic historian.<sup>42</sup> Having stated the reverse of Dr. Ryan's amusing assertion,, Lingard says:

*“Though I despair of satisfying the incredulity of one who can doubt after he has examined the documents to which I referred, yet I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statements and the utter futility of any objection which can be brought against it.”*

The English Romanists were very much provoked to find their own partisan thus giving up their whole case and they attacked the Doctor with all they could conjure up to shake his verdict. He replied, at the close of a conclusive refutation of their objections:

“That opinion was the result of long and patient investigation; and I have yet to learn what reason there may be why I should doubt its truth or regret its adoption.”

Again they struggled with him, and again he patiently refuted all their pretences and closed with these words:

*“Of the consecration of Parker I never entertained a*

---

<sup>42</sup> His Letters are published in full in Lee on English Orders. London, 1869.

*doubt*. The discussion however has led me to the discovery of *additional proofs* and afforded me the opportunity of placing the whole argument before the eyes of your readers.”

2. But, concerning the official register, Dr. Ryan ventures to say:

“The Lambeth register is most probably a forgery.”

Dr. Lingard, who had examined all the facts connected with it, attests:

“The Register agrees in every particular with what we know of the history of the times, and there exists *not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery.*”

3. Dr. Ryan further says:

“It is very doubtful that Barlow was ever consecrated, or ever anything more than a bishop elect.”

But, Dr. Lingard, who had sifted this matter, testifies the direct reverse:

“Is there any positive proof that he was no bishop? None in the world. .... Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow and not that of Gardiner? I fear that *the only reason* is this: Gardiner did not consecrate Parker, but Barlow did.”

It must be remembered that it is of no real consequence whether Barlow was or was not a bishop; as he was only one of four bishops who laid hands, all pronouncing together the formula of ordination.

4. Dr. Ryan remarks very justly—but let him beware how his principle affects his own Orders:—

“Something more than valid ordination, or the laying on of hands, is necessary to perpetuate the Apostolic Commission.” Also,—“When a bishop or priest, or bishops and priests revolted against the Church in which they were ordained and commissioned, they were by the very fact deprived of all authority,” etc.

Very good. But (I) Dr. Ryan begs the question. He assumes that the Pope had lawful jurisdiction in England,

which, *before the Reformation began*, Convocation had voted to be false. Let Dr. Ryan show by what Canons he had jurisdiction there, if he can. (2) He forgets that the Church in which the reformers were “ordained and commissioned” was the Anglican Church, and not the Church of Rome—much less the modern “Roman Catholic Church,” to which they never belonged. Mary’s Bishops revolted from their lawful Church, but not Warham and Cranmer.

5. I might have spared Dr. Ryan the pains he has taken to show that some of the reformers, in Henry VIIIth’s time, had low views of the Episcopate. Of course they had, for how could they have known better while they were yet under the Papacy? Popes had taught them that bishops were only presbyters, in order to magnify themselves as the only and universal Bishops. Such was the common teaching of school-divines before the Reformation; it is Roman doctrine now, and to this we must refer all the Protestant divisions which are founded on this idea. The Pope himself is the Arch-Schismatic and must be responsible for all that has tended to destroy Christianity in Europe, since he refused the overtures for reformation which were made at Constance and Basle. This is my reply to Dr. Ryan’s declamation about the bad example set by our reformers. But with what face can Dr. Ryan object to their scholastic opinions which are now his own faith, according to the *dogmas* of his own Church, established by Infallible authority?<sup>43</sup> If Cranmer was once entangled in such Papal subtleties, he soon learned better by studying “Holy Scripture and ancient authors,” as appears in the preface to the Ordinal. But, what he or others may have held, as an opinion, is of no consequence, as to the fact of consecration. Dr. Lingard says:

---

<sup>43</sup> Liguori, who says some think the Episcopate, *probably*, an order. Tom. vi., p. 10.

“*That is nothing to the purpose.* The law required consecration. It was their option to refuse the mitre, or to submit to the ceremony. None, unless they had been previously consecrated, could obtain the office without the rite.”

6. It is really tedious to follow up a lecturer who has taken so little pains to understand what he is talking about. But I proceed. He says:

“Even if Barlow was a regularly consecrated bishop and went through the form of consecration, the form used, namely, that *devised*, as the Act has it, by Edward, was notoriously insufficient and invalid, so that acts of Parliament were deemed necessary to supply defects,” etc.

Here are mistakes almost as many as words—for I will not call them by a worse name. Yet where is the morality in throwing out such monstrous blunders, in assaulting the spiritual character of others? Look at these blunders:

a. Barlow was consecrated Bishop of St. David’s, in the 28th year of Henry VIII.—more than a year *before Edward was born*, and more than ten years before he ascended the throne. How could he have been consecrated by a form devised by Edward?

b. The form used in Barlow’s consecration was that of the *unreformed* Pontifical, to which Dr. Ryan can hardly object and which was in use during the whole reign of Henry. To this the Act of (1566) Elizabeth had no reference whatever.

c. Barlow had been thirty years a bishop when this Act was passed, nobody ever having uttered a word against his rightful Episcopate, and this Act having no bearing on his case.

d. A late Act of Parliament has removed certain legal objections to the position of Roman Catholic bishops in England. They are “Act of Parliament bishops,” therefore, just as much as those whose legal *status* this Act

of Elizabeth was meant to establish. In neither case does the Act touch the question of Orders.

*e.* What the Act did accomplish was, precisely what an Act of Parliament could do, and nothing more; that is, it made a consecration, allowed to be in all respects valid ecclesiastically, to be so by *the Law of the Land*; enabling the bishops so consecrated to hold their temporalities.

*f.* Dr. Lingard, to whom I refer for all these facts, shows that this Act of itself proves the consecration of Parker to have been, in all respects, regular and validly performed, according to the reformed Ordinal; for it undertook, merely, to obviate the possible objection of lawyers that Parliament had never expressly made the said Ordinal *the Law of the Land*. The Prayer-book had been legalized after Mary's reign; but the lawyers might say the Ordinal is not part of the Prayer-book. This minute technicality of law was the only point touched by the Act, and it forces the inference that nothing else whatever had been overlooked or needed remedy.

7. When Dr. Ryan presumes to object to the Anglican formula of Ordination, I have only to reply that it is the same which was used in England, *before the Reformation*, and is essentially the same on which his own Orders depend—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost." As these were the only words used by Christ himself in giving the Apostolic Commission, it may be well asked what more can be needed to continue it. His own Pontifical<sup>44</sup> is certainly less explicit, in this point, than the Ordinal of Edward; for, while in both we have the formula, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, there is nothing more in the Pontifical: while the Ordinal goes on *with the very words of the Holy Ghost to A BISHOP*, thus defining the precise *charisma* bestowed by the laying on of hands. These are the very

---

<sup>44</sup> Pontificate Rom., p. 95. Mechliniæ, 1862.

words (II Tim., i. 6) cited by Roman Catholic divines<sup>45</sup> to prove the *promissio gratiæ* and sacramental character of Orders. Do they then detract from grace? The words added, in 1662, while they add something to the dignity of the rite, were never supposed by anybody in his senses to add anything to its validity. If the lack of them deprives the older Ordinal of validity, then the same lack must deprive Dr. Ryan's consecration of validity. Is Dr. Ryan ignorant that the Roman Pontifical is modern in many particulars and has been often changed? His own most learned authors can construct no argument in behalf of its present form, which does not equally cover our case. This I am prepared to show him, at large, when he presents me with such an argument.<sup>46</sup>

8. Dr. Ryan refers to a work of Dr. Kenrick, "the present learned and worthy archbishop of St. Louis," in which that respectable prelate has made the best of a bad case, in trying to disprove Anglican Orders. How Dr. Kenrick's argument looks in the eye of a jurist may be seen, however, in the examination to which it was subjected by that profound and learned ornament of the Maryland bar, the late Hugh Davey Evans.<sup>47</sup> It is not too much to say that the refutation is as complete as can be conceived. It leaves not a shred of Dr. Kenrick's cause untwisted or unrent. It exhausts the subject, and forces, on every candid mind, the conviction that so respectable a man as Dr. Kenrick could hardly have undertaken such a task except under some compulsion of superiors, to which, as in the late matter of Infallibility, he prostrated his own convictions under the remorseless dictation of Jesuits.

9. But, somebody has cruelly imposed upon Dr. Ryan in the matter of the "Nag's Head Fable," which I infer that he believes, though he does not absolutely say so. Let

---

<sup>45</sup> Liguori, vi. 10.

<sup>46</sup> Or, see "Lee on English Orders."

<sup>47</sup> Essays on Anglican Orders. Baltimore, 1844.

me inquire if he was not thinking of the story of "Pope Joan," which rests upon great and continuous authority of his own writers,<sup>48</sup> while all respectable Roman Catholics dismiss the story of the "Nag's Head" with contempt. I would instance Dr. Lingard, who has saved me from further labour in this matter by his scornful refutation which first appeared in the "Birmingham Catholic Magazine," 1834, to which I refer the lecturer for his answer. Let it be noted, however, that it must have been a desperate cause, in support of which, after forty years of ineffectual efforts to impeach the consecration of Parker, on other grounds, it became necessary to forge and utter such a brazen absurdity.

10. Dr. Ryan again quarrels with history when he asserts that the Popes never recognized as bishops those ordained by the Ordinal of Edward. On the contrary, Pope Paul IV., his legate, Cardinal Pole, and all the Papal bishops of England did this, in Queen Mary's time<sup>49</sup>—thus barring forever any such cavils as Dr. Ryan has collected. Rome never pretended to doubt the validity of the consecrations under the Reformed Ordinal, till she lost hope of regaining the Anglican Church.

What next? I will take up those minor points of the lecture which seem least unworthy of further remark.

I am very glad to agree with Dr. Ryan, to a great extent in his view of the character of Henry the Eighth; and I am equally glad of an opportunity to correct his impressions as to any disposition on the part of our Church to take him off of the hands of those to whom he exclusively belongs, the Roman Catholics. The Jesuits have been very successful in making the vulgar believe that the Church of England was founded by a man who would have burned every Anglican bishop of the reformed Church at

---

<sup>48</sup> See Bishop Hopkins' merry narrative. Letters to Dr. Kenrick; vol. II. p. 13. New York, 1854.

<sup>49</sup> On the testimony of Sanders, a R. C., and others. Lee, p. 244.

the stake for heresy, and whose faith agrees with Dr. Ryan's in all respects as nearly as it could three hundred years ago; for neither he nor the Popes themselves believed, in those days, what is required of modern Romanists, by their system of perpetual change and novelty. Let this be marked however: Henry the Eighth was of Dr. Ryan's religion, not mine: Rome nursed him; Rome bred him; in Rome's rites he made his last confession, and with the Roman Mass he was buried. In view of these facts, this at least may be said for his excuse: he was no worse than the Clergy that taught him, and he is almost pure as compared with several of the Popes whose abominable lives were the by-word of his times. It is amazing that Dr. Ryan should provoke this just retort. Can he be ignorant of the historical facts? Does he suppose that we are? Let me refresh his memory. The unhappy Henry was born under the Pontificate of Innocent VIII., a profligate, and the father of illegitimate children. Before Henry was a year old, the cardinals could do no better than elect, as Innocent's successor, the infamous Borgia, who, as Alexander VI., is the proverb of the world for every wickedness that can disfigure human nature, and in comparison with whose character even that of the heathen Nero looks less foul. After his reign of eleven years, a decent but dying old man was elected, for shame's sake, who survived only a few weeks, to be succeeded by Julius II. Of this pontiff, and of his successors down to the time of Henry's death, I will give the history if Dr. Ryan desires me to do so. They were not so bad as Alexander the Sixth; but, on the whole, it may be questioned whether Henry the Eighth was as bad as any of his infallible contemporaries. If such were the shepherds, what could be expected of the sheep; or, if you please, of such a goat as Henry?

Such as he was, however, in his faith and practice he belonged to these shepherds and not to us. I am glad to be able to prove this by so good an authority as Dr. Bayley,

the superior of Dr. Ryan, in the See of Baltimore. In a late lecture, in the City of Rochester, he is reported to have said as follows:<sup>50</sup>

“Henry VIII. was not a man likely to be canonized, but he never fully deserted his faith. He believed in his religion, but allowed his passion to blind his eyes and impel him to the greatest of scandals. He never attacked the Church, except in the way of confiscating its property. He got the support of several influential men by bribery. He confiscated the old monasteries, and divided their moneys and lands among the old families of England. He, however, *died in the faith, received the sacrament, and made arrangements for the saying of masses.* The reformation would not have gone on but for the confiscators.”

Dr. Bayley seems to have studied the history of this king with some success; and for further information I respectfully refer the lecturer to his primate and Metropolitan. We at least are well rid of Henry the Eighth, who “died in the faith” of Drs. Bayley and Ryan, and “made arrangements for the saying of masses.” Let me only add, that the masses were duly said for his pious soul, not only in England but at Notre Dame, in Paris; and if these were only said at a “privileged altar,” there can be little doubt that he has long since been delivered from Purgatory. “Though not likely to be canonized,” in the respectable judgment of Dr. Bayley, he is perhaps, in this respect, as well provided for as any of the Popes aforesaid.

The lecturer very carefully puts what he wishes us to infer on another point, into the shape of question, as follows: “Does not history show to any unbiased reader that the Church of England started with Henry VIII. making himself the head of the Church and source of all its authority and discipline,” etc.

This is a fair question, and I answer, most

---

<sup>50</sup> See *Rochester Democrat*, Feb. II, 1874.

emphatically, Nothing of the kind. I have shown, elsewhere, that “the Church of England” *started* some fourteen centuries before Henry was born; at present, we will look at this vulgar error about the “Head of the Church.” It is a title conceded, though with caution, to Henry VIII., not by Cranmer and a reformed Convocation, but by Archbishop Warham and others, who lived and died in the Papal Communion. It was borne and used very potently by the Popish Queen Mary, but it *was rejected under Elizabeth and has never since been resumed*. So that, whatever it meant, it is no concern of ours. Henry who “died in the faith,” and his bishops who did the same, must answer for it.

This title was given to Henry then in full Convocation in the year 1531, Warham being Archbishop of Canterbury, and presiding, amid bishops and abbots of the unreformed Church. The facts are thus honestly represented by a Roman Catholic writer:<sup>51</sup>

“Was it the work of Protestantism or not? I boldly answer *No*. It is a fearful and terrible example of a Catholic nation, betrayed by a corrupted Catholic hierarchy. . . It was in a solemn convocation, when England’s Churchmen were assembled, a reverend array of bishops and abbots and dignitaries, in orphreyed copes and jewelled mitres. Every great cathedral, every diocese, every abbey, was duly represented in that important Synod; and yet, the fear of a tyrant, and the dread of losing a few remaining years of wealth and dignity, so far prevailed, that they sacrificed the liberty of the English Church at one blow,—that Church whose liberties at their several consecrations, they had sworn to defend. The deed is signed. Harry is declared the *supremum Caput* of England’s Church; not *voce populi*, but by the voice of the Convocation, the Church is sacrificed, the people are sacrificed, and the actors in this vile

---

<sup>51</sup> The late Welby Pugin. “Earnest Address,” etc. London, 1851.

surrender are the true and lawful bishops and clergy of England. One venerable prelate, aged in years and worn with fasting and discipline, alone protests against this sinful surrender; his remonstrance is unsupported by his colleagues, and he is speedily brought to trial and execution. His accusers are Catholics, his judges are Catholics, his executioner is a Catholic, and the bells are ringing for High Mass in the steeple of St. Paul's, as the aged bishop ascends the scaffold and receives the martyr's crown. And yet how do modern Catholics ignorantly charge the death of this great and good man on the Protestant system, which was not even broached at this time. *All the terrible executions of this dreadful reign* were perpetrated before even the externals of the old religion were altered or its essentials denied."

Thus Dr. Ryan is answered by one of his own faith, who, like him, mistakes the Mediæval system for "the Catholic Religion," but who is too well-read and too candid, to be imposed upon by the artifice which he so eloquently rebukes.

It is hardly worth while to follow up all the declamation which Dr. Ryan has hung upon the blunders which I have thus exposed. Whole paragraphs perish, as to their force, when it is thus found out where Henry and his Parliament really belong. But he says:

"If the Pope had consented to allow the uxorious Henry to divorce his lawful wife and marry whom he pleased and as many as he pleased," etc.

Let us stop a moment. We have here a new sense given to the word *uxorious*, as this class of men are generally the last to *divorce* a wife. But, it is more important to note that though the Emperor Charles V. would not let the Pope divorce poor Katherine, the pontiff did actually give Henry permission to have two wives at once, which was next to authorizing him to "marry whom he pleased and as many as he pleased." Dr. Lingard testifies

that the Pope signed an instrument,<sup>52</sup>

—“granting to Henry a dispensation to marry in the place of Katherine, *any other woman whomsoever*, even if she were already promised to another, or related to himself within the first degree of affinity.”

Bad as Henry was, he had more conscience, it would seem, than this compliant Pope, who, anxious to be on good terms alike with Henry and Charles, could only contrive to please them both, by authorizing Henry to practice bigamy.

But, having paused to correct Dr. Ryan’s view of Henry’s case and of the Pope’s position, I would not lose the opportunity of meeting the rest of his question. He asks, but for the Pope’s opposition to Henry’s divorce, etc.,— does any one believe—

“That there ever would have been in England a Church as by law, by king and parliament established?”

Now, it is a little unpleasant to be obliged to teach the elements of history to a lecturer, who is a Doctor of Divinity and an Ecclesiastical dignitary; but what does this question mean? Does not the lecturer know that Queen Mary the Bloody erected the Roman hierarchy by law, “by *Queen* and parliament,” while Henry VIII. never did anything of the kind, but merely continued the Church as he found it. Queen Elizabeth abolished Mary’s establishment, which never had any Canonical place in English Church history; but as for her establishing the Church of England in any sense other than that in which it was the law of the land under the Plantagenets and the Papacy, it is a very ignorant mistake. I quote an impartial secular authority<sup>53</sup> which treats this popular blunder, as

---

<sup>52</sup> Lingard, vi. 128, etc. New York.

<sup>53</sup> Saturday Review, Dec. 8, 1866.

follows:

“The historian and the lawyer both know better. They both know that the Ministers of the Established Church are not paid by the State, in the sense in which ignorant people often fancy. They know that there is a perfect legal and historical identity, so to speak, of person, between the Church of England before the Reformation, and the Church of England after the Reformation. . . . The candid Roman Catholic will probably acknowledge the mere outward and legal identity of the Church before and the Church after the Reformation. The High-Churchman will be best pleased of all, with the historical aspect of the case, and he has a perfect right to be so. It so happens that from the days of Augustine, until now, nothing has taken place which distinctly contradicts his theory. . . . As far as mere legal and historical facts go, the practical popular view (of a State Establishment) has nothing to stand on. . . . All this is perfectly sound, legally and historically. It is a complete answer to the ignorant gabble about a Church founded by Henry VIII. or Elizabeth, or a Church making a bargain with Henry VIII. or Elizabeth. If any bargain was made, it was made piecemeal with Ethelbert, King of Kent, and Bretwalda and other princes of the same remote time.”

But, I can hardly believe my own eyes when I read the following words in Dr. Ryan’s lecture:

“Its very legal title, the name imposed at its birth, belies the claim to Apostolical origin, stamps it as a royal foundation, a modern invention, a sect,” etc.

The “legal title” thus referred to, is “the Church of England,” used by St. Gregory (A. D. 597), but which he tells us, just before, “started with Henry VIII.” It is now time for me to show when, where, and how the Church of England was started.

When the Patriarch Gregory, Bishop of Rome, sent Augustine to convert the Saxons, the missionary found there an existing British Church, dating from Apostolic

times.<sup>54</sup>

Augustine was consecrated first Archbishop of Canterbury by Gallican bishops, and his Church became one, by fusion, with the ancient British. As gradually, by unlawful encroachments, the Papacy was formed in Western Europe, so gradually its usurpations extended to England. Yet, even in early and dark times, it was powerfully resisted and barred out by the Constitutions of Clarendon and other jealous safeguards of the Crown, and the National Church.

Henry VIII. would have been unable to assert his claims to supremacy had they been novel: they were based on ancient rights of the Crown, which he merely reassumed, according to the language of a Parliament and Church, *not yet reformed*.

The Church of England is so called in Magna Charta (A. D. 1215), and was never a "Roman Catholic Church" in England, as Dr. Ryan seems to imagine. Says Stephens, the jurist, in his Introduction to De Lolme:<sup>55</sup>

"The only descendant representative or successor of the ancient British Church, and of that which Gregory sent Augustine to plant among the Anglo-Saxons is the present Church of England; to which Church the property of the monasteries properly belonged, and the only portion of Church property to which the Roman Catholics can constitutionally claim, on the plea of identity of religion, is that, if any, which was given during the reign of Mary."

Has Dr. Ryan yet to learn that all the Churches of Europe, before the Council of Trent, existed as National Churches, in communion with the Papacy, but with constitutions as widely differing as possible from that of the modern Roman Catholic Church? In a word, then, before Queen Elizabeth's time, the Church of England was

---

<sup>54</sup> Bede, Hist. Eccles. Lib. I. cap. xxvi; Lib. II. cap. iii:

<sup>55</sup> Vol. I., p. 177.

at different periods, more or less, under the illegal, foreign dominion of the Papacy and shared many of its corruptions. Since then, the same Church has been free from the Papacy and has returned to the original purity of the Church. She is the same Church, though reformed, that she was before, preserving her own historical succession of bishops, unbroken.

But here, again, Dr. Ryan asserts that the Church of England had revolted from the See of Rome and consequently lost all legitimacy. He adds:

“As well might Jefferson Davis claim to be a lawful President of the United States and a legitimate successor to Washington.”

It is difficult to trace any analogy here. If we claimed to be legitimate successors to the Popes, there might be some force in the remark: but, as we only claim to be the lawful successors of the ancient bishops of the Church of England, it lacks point. Nor does it answer to beg the whole question by saying that the Pope’s authority over England was lawful; for that is what we deny, having shown that it was never lawful, anywhere. By the ancient Canons (A. D. 431) it was impossible for him to assert even a *patriarchal* authority in England, which enjoyed the insular privilege of entire self-dependence.<sup>56</sup>

When Dr. Ryan pronounces Macaulay “rather an unreliable historian,” I so fully agree with him that I care not to dispute what he says of Cranmer’s failings. They were many, ‘and Macaulay thinks he was nearly as bad as Wolsey and Gardiner. On this point, I have my own opinions. Lord Macaulay and Dr. Ryan too allow that, after all his misdoings under Henry VIII. while he was an unreformed prelate, he took an active part under Edward VI., in the changes then made; and this being granted, I ask no more. Dr. Ryan must think that he would have done

---

<sup>56</sup> Third General Council, Ephesus. Stephens’ De Lolme, I. p. 188.

better had tie established the Inquisition and placed England where Don Philip placed Spain; but, when I compare England and Spain, after three centuries of opposite systems, I make no apology for praising God for Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley, who preferred to perish at the stake themselves, rather than light the fires of persecution to establish Don Philip's policy among our forefathers.

But, Dr. Ryan asks me why I make such general charges against the Jesuits: "Why not particularize and prove home to them, *some one enormity*, some one crime." Really, if one must pause to prove all the known facts of history, to which he may refer, in a sermon, it is clear that preaching must cease. All that can be asked of a preacher, in such references, is that he should make none such that are fairly questionable. And in his case, I am surprised that Dr. Ryan ventures to ask my proof, for surely a Roman Catholic prelate should not be ignorant of what has been established by an Infallible Pope. Why should I undertake to prove what Pope Clement XIV. published to all Christendom, when he abolished the order, as an intolerable evil in the common judgment of Roman Catholic nations? This is all I have to say on that subject. For once the Papal Infallibility is on my side; and I refer all who wish to be satisfied to the famous Breve *Dominus ac Redemptor* of July 21, 1773. If Dr. Ryan chooses to attack the Pope for that Bull, I *will defend him*, and will show that no Pope ever did a better thing. Meantime, let me express my amazement that Dr. Ryan ventures to become the eulogist of a Society *which every Roman Catholic State in Europe has been forced to expel*, and which Pius the Ninth himself could not tolerate in Rome, in 1848. In America we tolerate everything, except such conspiracies as the Jesuits have hatched against other free States, and which the Papal Syllabus makes us anticipate here. It is true, they first explored our lakes and our great West, with military

obedience and with military purposes, like any other soldiery, hoping to enslave this Continent to France and to the Pope. What thanks do we owe them, for that? Thank God they failed, or we should have been as Mexico and Brazil. Even Columbus, who lived before the Reformation, and hence cannot be used against it, is a reproach to those in whose service Dr. Ryan has claimed him. Who loaded him with chains, crushed him with perfidies and ingratitude and grasped his new discovered world only to fill it with cruelties and unspeakable injustice? When Columbus discovered America, Borgia was Pope.

In conclusion, I observe that Dr. Ryan thinks we do not and *cannot* deny the Apostolic Commission of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, in America. On the contrary, I deny it most emphatically. It is true, I *cannot* deny anything that he will prove; for I have no Liguori permitting me, by Infallible authority, to say anything but plain truth. If, then, he will show me the succession of bishops on which he relies, as I have shown that of the American bishops, I shall be glad to recognize in him what theologians call the *character* of a bishop. This will be liberal, seeing the Pope himself denies that he is in any higher Order than that of a presbyter. But to his "Commission" and that of his brethren, I positively demur. By whom was he elected? Who gives him mission, in America, where no Italian bishop ever had the slightest Canonical authority? On what grounds does he claim jurisdiction? I answer, if he claims under the Universal jurisdiction of Pius the Ninth, then, that claim resting upon nothing better than the forged Decretals, his own must go with it. Neither he, nor the hierarchy to which he belongs, has the least shadow of a claim to a part in the "Corporate Witness;" for, if they possessed it before, it is certain that they all *abdicated* and *avoided their claims*, when they accepted the Papal Infallibility, surrendering all Apostolic functions as witnesses for the Catholic Faith, to one person, and he an innovator and involved in heresy,

like Honorius and Liberius. No power on earth can qualify any one with such a Commission, who has thus refused to "hear the Church," in the discipline and doctrine of her primitive Constitution, as once delivered to the Saints. If he is impressed with the true *character* of a bishop, then it is his duty to seek for Mission where he can be allowed to do the work of the Episcopal Order under Christ as his only Supreme Head, and according to the Scriptures. Where no such Order is recognized, as is now the case in the Roman Communion, it must be evident that there can be no Apostolic Commission, no Corporate Witness.

I say this as due to truth, in answer to Dr. Ryan's challenge. I have shown that, whether he succeeds from Dr. Walmsley or the nuncio Bedini, he bears equivocal Orders at the best. I have now reminded him that by the Canons of the Catholic Church, he is devoid of Mission and jurisdiction; that his claims rest on the phantom of forged Decretals, and that his share in the Apostolic Commission is a nullity. Nor does it distress me, that, reasoning from his premisses, he has already said the same thing to the Bishop of Western New York. The question depends on facts. But, whether Dr. Ryan's premisses are facts may be inferred from the kind of evidence he regards as conclusive. Let me illustrate. The same official paper which publishes the Doctor's lecture, contains an announcement of the sale, at one of his churches, in Buffalo, in connection with the solemnities of Mass, of "the miraculous water of Lourdes." It is to be inferred that Dr. Ryan, who permits the poor; sheep of his flock to pay their hard earnings for this commodity, really believes in its miraculous powers, though many of his own Communion, in France, have protested against the imposture. Very well, then: Dr. Ryan's laws of evidence establish—(1) the miraculous water of Lourdes, (2) the Nag's Head story, (3) the Infallibility of Pius the Ninth. I admit that they all rest on precisely the same sort of proofs. And I must also admit

that our Anglican share in the Apostolic Commission rests on no evidence of this kind. I despair then of convincing the excellent lecturer, while he insists on having such testimony as he habitually accepts for almost everything which he is willing to believe.

But, as Dr. Ryan flatly asserts that “the See of Rome is the only Apostolical See whence it is at all possible for Christian prelate or priest to trace his priestly pedigree,” let me show him that, though our line goes direct to Rome, *by many points*, it is just there that the greatest confusion occurs; so that we do not think much of it. Thus, through Bouchier (1435), Neville (1427) and Chicheley (1408), our succession comes direct from Gregory XII., who consecrated Chicheley at Lucca.<sup>57</sup> But, in Gregory’s time, there were *three Popes at once*, dividing the Latin Obedience. Let Dr. Ryan tell us *which was the true Pope?* I shall insist on this question if he lectures us again. Where was Infallibility in the time of Gregory XII. when whole nations believed in his rival? What nations were exposed to damnation while the bishops of the Latin tongue were unable to decide this point?

And so I take my leave of him with entire good feeling and neighborly kindness. We differ essentially, but I have no other sentiment towards him and his people than those of a Christian charity, which I trust he will reciprocate. It is unfortunate for Roman Catholics in America that they have discarded their original professions and given themselves over to the Jesuits. Widely as I differ with even their earlier leaders I have ever maintained that Romanists of the school of Bossuet may be valuable American citizens, as well as exemplary Christians. With a Cheverus or a Carrol we could live on terms of the most cordial social intercourse. In the Latin Churches, as such, and aside from their artificial Constitutions as parts of a

---

<sup>57</sup> Registrum Anglicanum.

“Roman Catholic Church,” so called, I recognize nothing less than the elements of a restored Unity with us and with the East. And I pray God that Dr. Ryan may learn of his brother of St. Louis, if not of me, that the Jesuits are the foes of Truth and of the Church of Christ, if not of the human race. We shall soon stand together before the searching tribunal of Him whom we both claim to serve. To Him I remit my cause; with no more doubt as to His recognition of it, as the cause of truth and righteousness, than I have of the Creed itself—the Creed of Nicsea and of the Catholic Church. If the Rt. Rev. Doctor has contended against Truth, when he fancied he was only assailing a neighbour, I sincerely pray that this sin may not be laid to his charge.

## NOTE I.

When any one who claims to be a bishop is asked for his credentials, it is his duty to produce them, making the statement as clear as the History of the Canon of Holy Scripture.<sup>58</sup> Nothing can be an easier or more agreeable task to the Bishop of Western New York. He was consecrated by the late Bishop De Lancey, assisted by five bishops, January 4, 1865. The primate, or presiding bishop, Dr. Brownell, of Connecticut, being ill, had commissioned Bishop De Lancey thus to act for him.

1. Bishop De Lancey's consecration (1839) depends on that of Bishop Griswold and others assisting.
2. Bishop Griswold was consecrated (1811) by Bishop White and others.
3. Bishop White was consecrated (1787) by Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and others.
4. Archbishop Moore was consecrated (1775) by Cornwallis and others.
5. Cornwallis (1749), by Herring and others.
6. Herring (1737), by Potter and others.
7. Potter (1715), by Trelawney and others.
8. Trelawney (1683), by Sancroft and others.
9. Sancroft (1677), by Compton and others.
10. Compton (1674), by Sheldon and others.
11. Sheldon (1660), by Duppa and others.
12. Duppa (1638), by Laud and others.
13. Laud (1621), by Montaigne and others.
14. Montaigne (1617), by Abbot and others.

N. B.—Among these others was De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, who thus renewed the Latin

---

<sup>58</sup> See the Works of Bishop Wordsworth, Jer. Jones or Professor Stowe.

lines of succession. Another independent line was communicated to the English in 1616, when Hampton, Archbishop of Armagh, joined in the Consecration of Morton. Bishop Laud unites both these successions; and all who descend from him, as do all the Anglican Bishops in the world, have received their Commission by two lines entirely independent of Parker, pre-eminently precious and indisputable as that has been demonstrated to be.

15. Abbot was consecrated (1609) by Bancroft and others.
16. Bancroft (1597), by Whitgift and others.
17. Whitgift (1577), by Grindal and others.
18. Grindal (1559), by Parker and others.
19. Parker (1559), by Barlow, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale.

N. B.—Barlow's Consecration is historical, but not registered; such being also, the case of Cardinal Pole, as of others of the Roman party in English bishoprics. But Scory and Coverdale are historical and registered as well. Therefore we may continue through Scory.

20. Scory (1551), by Cranmer and others.
21. Cranmer (1533), by Longlands and others.
22. Longlands (1521), by William Warham and others.
23. Warham (1502), by Fox and others.
24. Fox (1487), by Morton and others.
25. Morton (1479), by Bouchier and others.
26. Bouchier (1435), by Beaufort and others.
27. Beaufort (1398), by Walden, Archbishop of Canterbury, and others.

N. B.—The Succession by which Christ himself "came in the flesh," is disfigured by many unworthy

names besides that of Rahab; and the Scriptures have reached us through many unworthy hands. I have now reached the name of one of the worst characters in the Anglican Succession; and Dr. Ryan cannot ask me to go further. For Beaufort was just the kind of bishop to please a Pope, and Martin V., one of the better class, made him a Cardinal. Our Succession, down to him, was therefore approved at Rome.

The first Archbishop of Canterbury was consecrated at Arles, in France (597), and thus introduced the Ephesine Succession from St. John, through Irenæus and Pothinus.

## NOTE II.

It is proper to add a brief table of accessible historical works, establishing the Succession of Anglican and Anglo-American bishops, which I do as follows:

1. Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. Oxford, 1858.
2. Haddan on the Apost. Succession. London, 1869.
3. Courayer—Defence of Eng. Ordinations. Oxford, 1844.
4. Bailey—Defensio. London, 1870.

N. B.—This latter costly work contains a *photographic* copy of the document which Dr. Ryan has ventured to impeach as a forgery. This shows how important the document is, for Dr. Ryan would not thus contradict his own historian, Dr. Lingard, in a matter of slight importance. The photographic art is as faithful a supporter of truth as it is a detector of counterfeits. I have deposited this photograph with the keeper of the “Grosvenor Library,” in this city, to be examined by any one who is a judge of MSS. of the sixteenth century, or who has any curiosity in the case. On the forged Decretals, see the German work by “Janus” (Translated). London: Rivingtons, 1869.