

**BISHOP BARLOW AND  
ANGLICAN ORDERS:  
A STUDY OF THE  
ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649074679

Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders: A Study of the Original Documents by Arthur Stapylton  
Barnes

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](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**ARTHUR STAPYLTON BARNES**

**BISHOP BARLOW AND  
ANGLICAN ORDERS:  
A STUDY OF THE  
ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS**



**BISHOP BARLOW &  
ANGLICAN ORDERS**

*By the same Author*

THE EARLY CHURCH IN THE  
LIGHT OF THE MONUMENTS:  
A Study in Christian Archaeology.  
With Illustrations.

*(Westminster Library)*

---

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
LONDON      NEW YORK      BOMBAY  
CALCUTTA AND MADRAS

+

# BISHOP BARLOW AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

A STUDY OF THE  
ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS

BY  
ARTHUR STAPYLTON BARNES  
M.A.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD, AND TRINITY COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE; DOMESTIC PRELATE TO  
H.H. BENEDICT XV.

*A man is not made Bishop by consecration,  
but is pronounced so at Rome in Consistory;  
and he has no jurisdiction given him by  
consecration, but only the rights of his Order,  
namely, consecrating of children, et caetera.*

ARCHBISHOP WARHAM

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4

55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1922

All rights reserved

NIHIL OBSTAT

J. CANONICUS MOYES, S.T.D.

*Censor Deputatus*

IMPRIMATUR

EDM. CAN. SURMONT

*Vic. Gen.*

*Westmonasterii*

*die 27 Februarii, 1922*



611 1323

Inv. 4021

1831A

1831B

TO HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS AIDAN  
CARDINAL GASQUET

EMINENCE,—

Had this book, which you have graciously allowed me to dedicate to you, been published five and twenty years ago, by which time many of the preliminary studies for it had already been made, it would have been regarded as a controversial production. For at that time the question of the validity of Anglican Orders was still the subject of active discussion and was in process of examination by the Commission appointed by Leo XIII, of which your Eminence was so distinguished a member. Now that the question has been decided by authority at Rome, the book has no longer the same controversial value. The story of Bishop Barlow is, however, in itself so curious, and throws so much light on the inner workings of that historical period, that I hope its publication may be thought to be justified as a study purely historical, even if without practical influence in the controversies of to-day.

From the first the Catholic objections to Anglican Orders took two main forms, the one historical and the other theological. It was argued, that is, either that the historical chain had been broken and

Apostolical Succession thereby lost ; or else, that even if the material succession had been retained, the form of service employed had been insufficient to hand on the grace of Holy Order, so that the same result had followed. The Commission might, it would appear, have based its finding on either of these arguments or on both combined. But the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, the result of their deliberations and of the advice which they gave to the Pope, did in fact base its decision solely upon the second or theological argument—an argument which was never put more clearly or succinctly than by Sancta Clara, the Franciscan writer in the time of Charles I, who first tried to prove that there was no essential opposition between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Council of Trent. ‘ All ordinations,’ he wrote, ‘ which are celebrated in a form different from the Church, with an intention sufficiently expressed of opposition to her sense, are invalid.’<sup>1</sup>

The historical argument, this other being alone amply sufficient for the purpose required, was not needed, and therefore no appeal was made to it in the Bull. It remained, of course, exactly as cogent and decisive as before. To omit to use an argument, when others are available which are sufficient without its use, is not to throw any doubt upon its efficacy and power.

This, however, Anglican controversialists have never been able to see. Because Leo XIII did not care to use the argument from history, having all that he needed ready to hand in the argument from theology, they have spoken as if he had pronounced

<sup>1</sup> *An Encheiridion of Faith*, by Francis Coventry (2nd edit., Douai, 1655). ‘ Francis Coventry ’ was one of his pen names.

the historical argument unsound and devoid of utility, which is very far from being true.

Most of what is here set forth will be sufficiently familiar to your Eminence. But I flatter myself, even so, that you will find something new in the linking up of various facts and controversies and the demonstration that all alike, disconnected as they seemed, are really all portions of one continuous story, involving more bad faith and more discreditable actions than has hitherto been supposed. That Henry himself was the moving power in the matter has not, I think, been previously suggested, but it seems clear enough when the full force of the 'Signed Bill' of April 1535 is considered. That the singular absence of documentary evidence was due to deliberate action on the part of the authorities is also, I think, a new point, and seems to follow inevitably from the mutilated Patent Roll of 1536. The anachronism contained in Parker's Register, in the account of his consecration, seems to destroy all possibility of that document being of the same date as the ceremony whose details it records. These perhaps are the most important of the new points I have been able to bring forward.

I think, too, that one reason why so many writers have failed altogether to understand Barlow's case is that most of them have forgotten to take into full consideration the obvious truth contained in the quotation from Archbishop Warham which I have placed on the title-page. 'A man is not made bishop by consecration, but is pronounced so at Rome in consistory; and he has no jurisdiction given him by consecration, but only the rights of his Order, namely,