

**ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS:
A DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL
SUCCESSION AND PRIESTHOOD
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
FOUNDED ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE
BEST ROMAN CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649695423

Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders: A Defence of the Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England, Founded on the Testimony of the Best Roman Catholic Authorities by Montagu R. Butler

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

MONTAGU R. BUTLER

**ROME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS:
A DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL
SUCCESSION AND PRIESTHOOD
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
FOUNDED ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE
BEST ROMAN CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES**

24
10/2

ROME'S TRIBUTE
TO
ANGLICAN ORDERS:

167334

A DEFENCE OF THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION AND PRIESTHOOD
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, FOUNDED ON THE
TESTIMONY OF THE BEST ROMAN
CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES.

BY

REV. MONTAGU R. BUTLER,

*Author of "The Mennonite Brethren: a Brief History of the Baptists,"
"Protestant Recruits," etc., etc.*

THIRD EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.
(WITH AN INTRODUCTORY CRITICISM OF CERTAIN ATTACKS MADE
ON THE SECOND EDITION).

London:
THE CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION,
9, BRIDGE STREET, WESTMINSTER.

1894.

PREFATORY NOTE.

“**R**OME'S TRIBUTE TO ANGLICAN ORDERS” first appeared in the pages of the *Indian Church Quarterly Magazine* in the year 1889. The interest evinced in it at the time, as also many subsequent applications for a reprint, led the compiler to obtain the editor's kind permission for the publication of the treatise in an enlarged and revised form.

Various works have appeared from time to time proving the validity of Anglican Orders from the *Anglican* standpoint. A very handy little volume on the subject is furnished in Canon W. R. Churton's "Defence of the English Ordinal." For a more exhaustive treatment of the subject such a work as the Rev. Arthur W. Haddan's "Apostolical Succession in the Church of England" may be consulted with advantage. The present little publication adopts the method of producing concurrent testimony of learned members of the *Roman* Communion respecting the facts which Anglican writers have upheld. To the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee's interesting volume, "The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England," the compiler is indebted for some valuable testimonies, whilst his attention has been drawn (in part by the same work), to many other sources of information. He desires also gratefully to acknowledge the important aid which has been personally afforded him in his researches by the Rev. C. H. Ross Lewin and other members of the Priesthood, both English and Roman.

Kilgus 10-28-71

INTRODUCTION.



THE second edition of this compilation, which was published on January 1st, 1893, apparently caused no little alarm among some of the adherents of the Italian propaganda in England, who were unable to share the views of their co-religionists to which I had drawn attention. The first indication of this reached me as early as February 14th of the same year, in a communication which spoke of a certain Father Clarke, S.J., as having "announced at the Hall in connection with the Pro-Cathedral" that he was going to examine my publication at a meeting that week. Whether the meeting took place at Kensington, or what was the character of this gentleman's investigation, I have not heard. However, on April 28th I received a letter from another quarter telling me "Father Breen is lecturing at Archbishop's House, Westminster, next Monday at 8 p.m. on 'Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders.'"

Judging by the press notices of the Westminster Meeting on May 1st, 1893, no efforts were spared by the Roman brethren to make it a success. The chair was taken by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan (Archbishop of Westminster), who was supported by the Right Rev. Monsignor James Laird Patterson (Bishop of Emmaus); Right Rev. Monsignor Daniel Gilbert, D.D. (Provost of the Metropolitan Chapter and Vicar-General); Very Rev. Monsignor Martin Howlett, D.D. (Registrar of the Deceased Clergy Association); Very Rev. Canon Moyes, D.D.; Rev. Philip Fletcher, of Watworth (Master of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom); Rev. W. Croke Robinson (of the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington); Rev. Father Breen, O.S.B.; Rev. Richard Clarke, S.J.; Rev. Father Gurdon, Rev. John S. Vaughan, and Rev. Luke Rivington. And all this august assembly was called together to discuss a little publication which one of their own

organs, the *Catholic Times*, says contains "all the old fairy tales of history, as though they had never been refuted and disposed of"! Surely there must be some mistake here, or why all this excitement? Is it reasonable to suppose that the company of prelates and priests met at the Cardinal's house, like so many children, to hear fairy tales? The *Univers* tells us that "the Lecture Hall was crowded to its utmost limits," and the *Echo* records that the audience "followed Father Breen's dry-as-dust citations with all the enthusiasm of first-nighters at a play." The *Catholic News* tells of how "very grateful" the Cardinal was to Father Breen for his "admirable" paper, and gives an account of an after-discussion in which Canon Moyes is represented as delivering himself of the statement that "the word schism means an authoritative act by which the Church cuts off what it believes to be a peccant member of its own body." The Cardinal spent "a very pleasant evening."* Of Fr. Breen's lecture itself a long account is given in the *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion*, which speaks of him as "the learned Benedictine," and characterises his utterances as "skilful treatment" and "eloquent peroration." However, from August to October in the same year, a conspicuous series of articles appeared in the *Church Review* in reply to this lecturer, which disposed of his extraordinary statements in so trenchant and masterly a way, as to leave me no necessity to deal with them. I do not know the writer of the articles (which are signed "Vincentius"), and their appearance was wholly unexpected by me; but I desire to express my gratitude to him for his kind and able defence of "Rome's Tribute."

But the matter did not rest here. So anxious were some of the Anglo-Roman clergy to hinder any small influence which my humble publication might exercise, that they busied themselves writing letters in different parts of the country to private individuals begging them not to give heed to it. Others set themselves the task of publishing their views by means of pamphlets and articles in Roman Catholic journals. Among these it may be well that I should notice, in the first place, an attack made on me by Fr. William Humphrey, S.J. It took

* *Catholic News*, May 6, 1893.

the form of a pamphlet,* the whole burden of whose 14 pages is to denounce me for a quotation to which I had drawn attention. But it is particularly noticeable that Mr. Humphrey suppresses the fact that the quotation (as shown in a foot-note of "Rome's Tribute," page 44) is not mine, but that of the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer in his "Sketches of English Nonconformity." I accordingly published the following letter in the *Illustrated Church News*, and posted copies to Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Dyer. It appeared in the issue for December 23, 1893.

SIR,—In a work entitled "Sketches of English Nonconformity," by the Rev. A. Saunders Dyer, that author writes, "Even some Roman Catholics are able to see that the English Church is a continuous Church, and that the Reformation did not destroy that continuity. A member of the congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles, in a book bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning, is just enough to confess 'I do not defend the position (i.e., the position of the Roman Church in England), I do not think,'" &c. The passage which had struck Mr. Dyer seemed to me also, as quoted by him, to furnish the *presumption* that the writer (the Rev. W. Humphrey) at least believed in the continuity of the English Church, and consequently in the validity of her orders. It was in this sense only that I drew attention to the passage in "Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders."

I was, however, careful in a foot-note to show that the words were given on the authority of Mr. Saunders Dyer's quotation only. I, of course, merely produced Mr. Humphrey's words for what they might be worth, in no way setting forth that I attached any *special* importance to them. I have just received from Mr. Humphrey a little tract called "Dishonest Controversy," in which he attacks me with much acrimony about the passage; but, for reasons best known to himself, ignores my foot-note. To his own work I had not had opportunities of direct access, and I had no reason to believe that the above-mentioned utterances of Mr. Dyer respecting the passage were "dishonest." I can only conclude that Mr. Dyer had not noticed certain other passages to which Mr. Humphrey now refers in his little tract—passages which express contempt for the idea of any true continuity in the English Church. In them, by his own showing, he heaps insult on the Church and ridicules her clergy.

Under the circumstances, I can quite understand Mr. Humphrey's annoyance that an impression arising from the indicated passage, meant more than he intended to imply; and I am sorry if I have seemed unjust in accrediting him with a larger measure of kindly sentiment respecting the English Church than he claims to possess.

* "Dishonest Controversy; an exposure of "Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders." By Father Humphrey, S.J.

To the objections of a few other Roman writers I do not at present reply. They do not possess the same character as that which attaches to the objection made by Mr. Humphrey. I propose, however, to refer to them in the next edition of my little work, in which Mr. Humphrey's utterance (in justice to his present contention) will, of course, not appear.—THE COMPILER OF "ROME'S TRIBUNE," &c.

Another attack, of which it may be well to take a little more notice, is that of Fr. S. F. Smith, S.J.,* though some little difficulty in dealing with it arises from the fact that, within a few weeks, it appeared both in the *Month*, and with the same title, but with certain important differences, as a [Roman] 'Catholic Truth' Tract, under the editorship of Rev. John Morris, S.J. It will be necessary, in some instances, to indicate the two versions of "Rome's Witness" (by which in this case is meant, I presume, the opinion of Mr. Smith) by the letters *A* and *B*.†

Mr. Smith (Witness *A*) commences his attack with the bold assumption that my little work is "written against the Catholic Church." Its title describes it as "*a Defence of the Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England.*" Eastern Catholic Bishops and Priests have needed no further explanation as to its import. On reading it they have concluded (as have Bishops and Priests of the Anglican Communion) that it is drawn up as a small contribution to the interesting question of the re-union of Christendom.

Having set forth his own version of its import, Mr. Smith does me the honour of classing me, as a writer, with Dr. Littledale, Mr. Gore and Mr. Lane. Yet I should be the last to make a bid for the fame and importance with which he thus invests my occasional publications. Witness *B* contains the condescendingly gracious admission that the Anglican clergy are "earnest, devoted, and well-intentioned men," but Witness *A* is more chary of compliments. Both versions of Mr. Smith, with all the solemnity which attaches to a judgment coming

* *Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders*. An Article in the *Month*, July, 1893.

† *Historical Papers* edited by the Rev. John Morris, S.J., No. XIV., *Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders*. By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J., pages 44.

from that quarter, "pronounce Mr. Butler's tract to be 'simply a work of fraud.'" I need not further dwell on such language than by drawing attention to the following caustic remarks in the *Religious Review of Reviews*.—"The charge of deliberate fraud that he brings against Mr. Butler is a breach of controversial etiquette, that we can only attribute to the indignation of a Roman who finds so many of his co-religionists arraigned to defend what he believes to be the weak point in the Anglican position."

To build up castles and knock them down may, under some circumstances, be pleasant occupation to the one who is engaged in it, and yet others may think it rather childish sport. Now, Mr. Smith (Witness A) says that my little work claims to produce "all" the best Roman Catholic authorities. He knows very well that this would be quite impossible, and one glance will show my readers that he has misrepresented me by adding that word "all." I am quite ready to hope it was merely a *lapsus calami* on his part; but the simple addition of that little word changes a reasonable claim into a preposterous one. If Mr. Smith desired to make his attack entertaining, there was surely no need for a facetious vein to betray him into so unfortunate a slip. Let us suppose him, when housekeeping, to say to his servant, "I wish you to bring a loaf and some butter from Mr. Brown's, and remember to purchase the tea at Mr. Jones' shop." The instruction seems simple enough. But what would be the consternation of Mr. Smith if the servant returned with a cart laden with tea! He would certainly not be unreasonable in remonstrating, "I did not bid you to purchase all the tea in Mr. Jones' shop."

On page 8 of "Rome's Tribute" I have quoted Dr. Newman in relation to the English Episcopal succession, and have specially drawn attention to the "equivocal" and "uncertain" ring of this good man's words on the subject, his declaration that he cannot "by his own wit acquiesce" in the view that Anglican Orders are valid, and his ignoring the action of certain popes. And yet because I have said that the ambiguous character of the language makes one suspicious as to the true nature of Newman's personal view of the subject, Mr. Smith greedily snatches upon the passage as representing one of my Roman Catholic testimonies to Anglican Orders. I am entirely satisfied to leave it