

THE QUESTION
OF ANGLICAN ORDERS

LETTERS TO A LAYMAN

by

DOM GREGORY DIX

Monk of Nashdom Abbey^{''}
D.D., Oxon



dacre press
westminster

*A. and C. Black Ltd: Dacre Press
4, 5 and 6 Soho Square London W.1.*

*first published October 1944
reprinted 1945
reprinted 1946
reprinted 1948
revised edition 1956*

*Made and printed in Great Britain
by Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd, Alva*

These 'Letters' contain the substance of correspondence actually sent to more than one lay person, but not intended for publication at the time. They have been put together (with some changes) at the request of others besides the recipients who seem to have found the originals useful in various ways.

The Historical Notes contained in them are distributed as follows:

	PAGE
Preliminaries:	
A. What it is all about? - - - - -	15
B. Why has Pope Leo's decision such great importance?	18
Sacramental Signs - - - - -	35
The Essentials of Ordination to the Priesthood - -	41
Archbishop Cranmer's Rites for the Ordination of a Presbyter:	
A. The Sources of his Rites - - - - -	56
B. The English Ordinals of 1550 and 1552 - -	62
C. The Anglican Ordinal of 1662 - - - - -	65
The Roman Rejection of Anglican Ordinations - -	68
Appendixes - - - - -	91

Note to Revised Edition

These Letters are now reprinted in response to continuing requests since the author's death in 1952. A Note has been added on p. 89 on the Church of South India. Also three Appendixes, referring to the Gordon Case, to the Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius XII in 1948, and to a criticism of Dom Gregory's handling of Pope Leo XIII's objections to the Anglican forms through defect of expression of intention.

1956

Nashdom Abbey,
Burnham, Bucks.

18. xi. '43.

My dear Harry, Thank you for your letter and the enclosure. I am truly sorry to hear you are in such distress about it all, though I am not altogether surprised that such happenings have turned your mind towards Rome. I always thought it a pity they should have allowed this South Indian Scheme with its obviously controversial proposals to come to a head in the middle of a war, when everyone is much too distracted and busy to think clearly about it or even to give it any proper attention at all. But still I don't really see how the behaviour of the Upper House of Convocation can be supposed to cast much new light on the validity of Anglican Orders—that endless wrangle!—all the same. It is rather surprising that Father O'Dwyer set off along that line. After all, it is a commonplace of Church history that Bishops of the most ironclad validity have frequently behaved in a queer fashion before now—as it is a matter merely of observation that Christian Ministers who would not claim to be in any sort of Apostolic Succession frequently behave with great holiness and wisdom. St. Peter himself and St. Barnabas bewildered themselves into behaviour which St. Paul describes with obvious self-restraint as 'dissembling' (Gal. ii) over a matter which closely concerned the Faith, as well as the whole practical future of the Christian religion. After such a *contretemps* as that we shall hardly be dismayed beyond hope by the sort of thing which sometimes happens to our own Bishops when they are in a hurry.

The two questions are quite separate: (1) Are our Bishops and Priests really Bishops and Priests? (2) Are they always wise and faithful? The answer 'Yes' to the first no more commits us to the same answer to the second than the answer 'No' would commit us to the theory that they were all invariably and *ex officio* wicked and foolish. They have to be answered on quite different grounds—and by different people. You and I have not to judge the consciences of Anglican Bishops (do let us remember that!). But I suppose that once the first question has been raised clearly in one's own mind we all of us have to reach some sort of decision about it—even if only the practical decision to stay in the C. of E. or to leave it.

I don't quite know what to say about your request for 'help' about this. To be frank, I am not at all flattered by your saying that while I 'can tolerate the C. of E.' you suppose you ought to, too. My being an Anglican is no better a reason for your being one than O'Dwyer's being a Roman is for your becoming one. As it happens I don't 'tolerate the C. of E.' at all. I believe in it—which is quite a different thing—I believe in it sincerely and, I hope, for intelligent reasons, but at bottom probably rather passionately. It isn't just a matter of 'staying where you are because nothing else seems quite decisively better', as you put it. That might do for a temporary anchorage, but conditional loyalties weary a man's heart in the end. Hereditary attachment has a real claim upon *pietas* and affection, and we have a right to let it weigh with us, but only up to a certain point, if we have capacity and opportunity to form an objective judgement on other grounds. It can't alter *facts*. Nor could I personally cling to the C. of E. only or chiefly because of the singular graciousness and goodness of some aspects of its past. They are there, and the 'nobility' of mind which is the special mark of the seventeenth century and the Cavalier ideal has a haunting charm. But these things *are* now in the past, you know! If we face the facts, the C. of E. has changed a great deal in the last forty years, and much of the change consists precisely in the shedding of most of the relics of this tradition. We may well regret it. Even when the stately summer of the Carolines was over, the 'Whig grandee' Bishops of the eighteenth century and the 'Greek Play' Bishops of eighty years ago still had something for which the genial energy of a business man in gaiters does not always quite compensate. It was a dignified tradition, with much of solid good about it, in spite of its gaps. But the growing poverty of the clergy and the growth of great industrial dioceses have today made it permanently impossible to maintain something which was more a consequence of the social 'set-up' based on landed property in the aristocratic rural England of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries than a product of Anglicanism in itself. And the loss of the old *otium cum dig.* has brought with it a lowering of the general level of clerical scholarship, which counted for a good deal in the building up of that particular tradition.

No, my dear man! If you are only clinging to Anglicanism for the sake of the lovely and gracious things in its past, you are likely to be disillusioned before long. We are in for a difficult and muddling time. Unless you can believe in the C. of E. for the sake of what it *is* in itself and for the sake of its place in God's intention

for His Church, I don't think you can possibly ever be either very happy or very secure as an Anglican in the next few years. I entirely agree with what you say, that you 'feel you must be a Catholic first of all'. Of course! But if that means that we have to be 'Anglicans afterwards' or only with hyphens or apologies, then it means that we cannot be Anglicans at all. Unless we are 'Catholics' inasmuch as and *because* we are 'Anglicans', then we are not being 'Catholics'. Unless you believe that an Anglican is *as such* a fully living 'member' of the 'Body of Christ'—unless you believe that, not only emotionally but rationally, for intelligent and intelligible reasons, I don't think a man of your intelligence and awareness will be able to 'live to God' *as* an Anglican for very long—*i.e.* you won't be able, even as a layman, to go on steadily and quietly leading your spiritual life without being distracted and unsettled by shocks and controversies. The laity can as a rule leave these things aside to a considerable extent: they are remote from the worship and prayer and the moral endeavour to lead a good Christian life, which between them form the main *interest* of religion for the ordinary layman. But certain big clashes and strains seem to be unavoidable now in the position into which the C. of E. has allowed itself to drift. No educated or keen churchman will be able altogether to ignore them in the form they are taking. On the other hand, if you do believe in the C. of E., the kind of thing which is happening now about this S. Indian business will sometimes make your belief in it seem very academic and your hopes for it very unreal. But I don't think it will make them seem *untrue*.

I do think that the sort of intelligent belief in the C. of E. I am trying to indicate is necessary nowadays; and yet that it can be combined with the sort of loving discontent with things as they are now in the C. of E. which things as they are now certainly warrant. What we have to avoid is sinking into that sterile and embittered contempt for Anglican authority in its own legitimate field, and for 'the Bishops', which did so much to frustrate the old 'Anglo-catholic Party' of the 1920's. It really did harm to their own souls. (It was not all the 'Anglo-catholics' fault. They were handled by their betters not only unwisely but as it seemed to them in some respects irreligiously. Religious authority *can't* be exercised in the long run either by astuteness or by police methods but only by a candid and continual appeal to truth, to which authority must be as willing to submit and own itself to have been wrong as anyone else. That was where things went wrong.

But that is a stale quarrel. The point is that the effects of authority's reliance on policy instead of truth then did great harm to the 'rebels' souls, because they let it destroy an important motive in their own adherence to the C. of E.)

I think I do believe in Anglicanism that way—anyhow, I hope I do. That is why I wonder whether I am the right person to 'help' you in the way you ask just now. I don't particularly want to send you the sort of cut-and-dried 'answer' to O'D.'s typescript for which you ask, because I don't really believe that sort of way of dealing with things can ever ultimately 'help' anybody very much. I agree that the technical question about Anglican Orders must be an essential preliminary to any such belief in the C. of E. And from the technical point of view there *is* an answer to each one of O'D.'s points. (None of them are new—he is using a manual, supplemented by Messenger's book on *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*.) But the historical evidence is in some way a tangled business for both sides. O'D. and I could probably exchange brickbats about Cardinal Pole and Bishop Gordon 'across you' by letter for weeks or months, without either of us really 'helping' at all. If I were to try to do anything, I would much rather try to put the case 'constructively' than 'defensively', so to speak, and to leave you with materials for forming your own judgement. You would quite likely wonder what on earth some of them had to do with the question. But in the end I think you would probably get a clearer view of the real issues. It would be more trouble for you—and involve a lot more writing for me! And I dare say you are far too busy now at the Board of Trade preventing us all having things, to deal with it in that way. If you say so, I shall quite understand.

I ought to add—Don't think I am pretending to be impartial about this question! I do see that what is at issue in this particular controversy with Rome about our Orders is a *sine qua non*, the essential foundation, for any idea of Anglicanism worth an intelligent man's holding in these days, when 'the fountains of the great deep are broken up'. I should try to put before you a case for one side, an advocate's case, though as fairly as a man can who has come to a decided judgement on a disputed issue. But I don't believe that the real reasons for being an Anglican *begin* with that. They begin after that has been settled. I don't particularly object to controversy and argument about this sort of issue. But I fear that we clergy often behave rather badly and unfairly to the laity in dragging them into this sort of technical question, and I

suspect they are mostly either bored or bewildered by it. Clerics are usually rather argumentative people anyhow, and these things have a 'professional' interest and importance for us. Perhaps that makes our conduct in inflicting them on you at least human, if it does not quite excuse it. We enjoy talking our particular kind of 'shop', like most men. But we ought to remember that it is 'shop'.

Let me know what you want. I promise to try to be intelligible, at all events. But if you dislike the prospect of reading technical stuff, or if you are too busy, you needn't be afraid to say so. Yrs. ever *in Dño*, Gr. D.

II

25. xi. '43.

My dear Harry, Of course I understand the difficulty of finding time or energy to think seriously about anything just now. I haven't the least desire to thrust controversial stuff on you for its own sake. Leave the whole matter for the time being, if you want to. I've plenty of other things to do myself! If it comes up again so as really to harrass you at your prayers and communions, you know I will do what I can. Meanwhile, let us both get on with trying to be Christians in a world which is rather manifestly not so at present. . . .

III

31. i. '44.

My dear Harry, Thank you for your letter. . . . I am not in the least surprised to hear that your 'Roman difficulties have come back worse than before'. But I still don't see that the English Bishops' toying with S. India has so much to do with the matter—at present, anyhow. I should put it down to something else. Your first letter said you had twice talked about these things with Father O'Dwyer. (I know him a little—he is a pleasant person.) And you said you had read the book he lent you. And you had studied his type-script 'points'. And you 'found the case against our Orders very much stronger than you had ever supposed' and 'the whole thing rather disconcerted' you. About then you casually read that account of the November debate in Convocation on S. India in *The Times*, and realised there was a good deal of bother going on about it. And when you wrote to me you 'found

it very difficult to pray and especially to go to communion in this perplexity'. Afterwards you decided to leave the matter, for the time being at least. I didn't want to suggest anything which might increase your trouble. But I was half afraid the question would return soon, because you had not been able to face it fairly. (In the circumstances that was not your fault.) But by reading one side of the controversy (and that not the side you happen to find yourself 'on' at the moment) you had partly equipped your mind to 'stoke up' such doubts whenever spiritual dryness or even physical tiredness or other anxieties—our minds work very oddly—prepared you to encourage them. And now this rather scrappy account of the January debate on S. India in *The Times* has brought it all back. I don't in the least blame you for putting the question aside in November in present circumstances, and I did not press you to face it then, if you remember. I don't even do so now, though from what you say there isn't much need for anyone to do that at present! (Still, it was rather morbid of you to read about that second discussion of the proposals by the Bishops last week when you knew perfectly well the sort of sentimentalities some of them would talk, wasn't it?)

You say truly that I 'have never really told you anything about these things'. I am not particularly sorry about that. When I prepared you for your first Confession we had other things to talk about. I don't believe the defence of Anglican Ordinations has in itself much to do with saying one's prayers and worshipping God and leading the Christian life—and it was that we were concerned with then. But I quite realise that once the question has been fully raised in one's own mind, the answering of it can, and even should, become an essential condition of getting on with one's duty towards God without making a change. As for your remark that you do not 'want to give me all the trouble and tedium of it'—forget it! First, if you want help, I not only want to but ought to take 'trouble', both as your priest and as a friend. Secondly, it isn't really nearly as much trouble as it might look, because what I should be sending you is for the most part some notes I put together for someone else in the middle of last year. It is only a matter of copying them out and probably re-arranging them a bit. You can have them with pleasure, now or later on, if you want them. If not, they can stay in the drawer.

But if you really mean to follow the question now right through to a decision, as you say—if it has become so insistent I think you should—there is something I ought to add, as (having been?)

your director—and I hope you will not mind my adding it. The question of *motive* is important. This isn't just a matter of finding the right answer to an ecclesiastical conundrum, or of voting for the side which seems to score most points in a historical debate. It is a serious question, which bears nearly on your personal relation to God and your life as a servant of God. You have an education which makes it more or less a duty to seek intellectual conviction as at all events one motive for your decision. But that doesn't mean it is right to approach it just in a spirit of intellectual curiosity. (I am *not* trying to obscure the historical issue. I will be as rigidly evidential as you like once this is settled.) It is a question of where and how our Lord Himself desires that He should be served. You ought to begin by offering yourself sincerely and humbly to do His will *and nothing else* but His will. You do that every day, I know. But you ought to renew and try to purify this offering of yourself when you are setting out to seek more light and truth from Him Who is Light without shadow and Truth without query. You must mean either to 'go over' because only that way can He be served entirely as He wills, or to stay where you are because that way you will be able to serve Him completely, as He desires. Then you can carry on your intellectual study of the question calmly and seriously, as a service of God with your mind; and make your decision responsibly, as a service of God with your will and your living of your life. I am not trying to make a decision either way more difficult. Personally, I don't think your salvation could depend on your decision one way or the other. But it might conceivably depend on the motive for which you made it. A dishonest motive for doing or avoiding doing things which nearly concern our relation to God can penetrate very deeply into the soul. But you have only to be honest with yourself—not fussy or scrupulous—in looking into this.

Pray about it—of course—and especially pray humbly and simply and dependently—that He will shew you His will and strengthen you to do it, whatever it may be. But I shouldn't pray too long or too 'agonizedly' for 'guidance'. You aren't a Grouper! There is a danger of merely tearing one's soul to pieces with self-regarding excitement that way—instead of looking at God in His eternal security—the Unmoved Mover of your soul, Who draws your created being to His abyss of absolute Being by loving it. He *will* guide you, if you ask it sincerely, but He will not be hurried about it by your fussing or impatience. Because you are a rational creature—rather exasperatingly so at times—He will probably

do so as much through your intelligence as through your imagination. Anyway, you will know His guidance when He gives it by your own serenity of spirit—even in great unhappiness or trial—in following it. 'Love, joy, peace' are the first three fruits of the Holy Ghost working in your soul. Carelessness about *ordinary* duties in prayer (*e.g.* intercessions for others) to concentrate on praying about this one absorbing problem of one's own—or carelessness (extra carelessness?) about falling into venial sins—or continual bitter or contemptuous thoughts of other Christians (*e.g.* those Anglican hierarchs whose recent actions have brought on—or seem to have brought on—your own distress)—none of these things are signs that we are specially seeking the will of God or specially well prepared to see and do it. They are the ordinary symptoms of human excitement about a particular issue, which are much the same whether we are being excited about the things of God or the things of Hitler. Our Lord's will *only*! A short and 'all-out' resolution to do this, a little prayer for help and courage, an act of trust in His love and guidance—these form a better approach to a calm and serious attempt to follow His truth wherever it may lead, than any long bouts of indulgence in spiritual self-disturbance under the guise of 'prayer'.

I know for myself that everything does 'feel upside down', as you put it, at such a time, and that it is difficult to pray normally. But the effort ought to be made. If it is a real strain to keep the imagination in check and fight off distractions, try saying a psalm slowly—xxiii or lxxx or cxxi or cxxxix would do or choose for yourself—use the Bible version as less familiar than the Prayer Book—to make yourself think more about it. Or say the Litany of our Lady, if you like—and an act of penitence for all the graces you have misused in the past (in general—don't reminisce!). At such a time one often has the insistent suspicion that all one's past spiritual experience has been an 'illusion', or that one's lack of progress in prayer and the conquest of faults is the result of trying to be a Christian 'outside the True Church'—(Have I tried to use the graces given me?)—or that one had better 'go over' in order to start again securely, and never mind the reasons. All this begs the question. We know that God hears *any* prayer made in good faith in the Name of His Son. There is respectable authority for supposing that the prayer of the Publican, 'Lord be merciful to me a sinner' can be acceptably offered by the unbaptised sinner, let alone the baptised but (conceivably) unconfirmed one. Cling firmly to that truth in difficult moments, and go on with the pro-

cess of forming a judgement, and you will not regret it afterwards, whatever the judgement is. Briefly but often renew your intention of serving God quite faithfully—to do God's will *only*, and to do it as a true and living 'member of Christ' in His Body the Church, when you know where that is. You can be sure then that He will shew it you, and strongly help you to find it.

Let me know what you want of me and I will try to do it. Yours ever in *Dño*, Gr. D., O.S.B.

IV

2. ii. '44.

My dear Harry, I think it would split into four or five parts quite easily—Preliminaries; the Essentials of a valid Ordination; the Anglican *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552, which are the centre of the trouble; the Reasons for their condemnation by Leo XIII—something like that. I expect you know most of the Preliminaries in a vague way, and some you may think oddly irrelevant. Anyhow I would rather we got those things straight at the beginning than bother with them in the middle. I think I can let you have the first in a day or two . . .

V

4. ii. '44.

My dear Harry, Here it is. Preliminaries only this time. I hope you can read the last page, which was desperately scribbled to get the post. In haste, Gr. D.

Enclosure.

PRELIMINARIES

(A) *What is it really all about?* Here are the broad facts:

Ever since the first changes in the English rites of Ordination c. 1550 A.D. the Church of England in the *Preface* to the *Ordinal*—the collection of Ordination rites printed at the end of the Prayer Book, which was originally a separate book—has continuously claimed that in ordaining Bishops, Priests and Deacons by the rites which follow, the C. of E. intends to do and does essentially what the whole Catholic Church 'from the Apostles' time' until now has meant and accomplished by the Ordination of a Bishop,

Priest or Deacon. In the course of the last century there has been considerable discussion about this claim, both inside the C. of E. and outside it. Inside, because it has become much clearer than it was a century ago that it involves more than one idea about the Ministry which many people supposed had been 'abolished at the Reformation'; outside, because the mooted of the idea of Anglican Reunion with various other Churches has caused them to consider attentively for themselves just what sort of a body the C. of E. really is.

The upshot of all this discussion at present is as follows: The C. of E. itself still officially stands by the *Preface* to its *Ordinal*. Some of the Eastern Orthodox Churches after examination of the basis of the claim have accepted its truth; others have as yet come to no decision upon it, though none have rejected it. The Protestant bodies have all found this claim among the chief obstacles to any Reunion with themselves, since it differentiates the Anglican Ministry very sharply from their own. They repudiate all conception of any special 'priesthood' or 'sacerdotal power' conveyed by Ordination alone and not essentially shared by the laity. (We will go into that in a moment.) On the other hand, the Roman Church after a detailed enquiry has solemnly and formally rejected that claim, and declared that Anglican Ordinations must from the Catholic standpoint be considered 'null and void'; *i.e.* that they are not meant by the Anglican Church to be the same thing, and in the eyes of God do not effect the same thing, as the Ordinations of the Catholic Church. On this view the Anglican Church has retained the titles of 'Bishops', 'Priests' and 'Deacons' for its Ministers, but it really means by these names something recognisably different from what the Catholic Church 'from the Apostles' time' had always meant by them.

This decision was published by Pope Leo XIII in A.D. 1896, in a Bull cited by its first words as *Apostolicae Curae*. It was not in effect a new decision. As a matter of practice the Roman Church probably never had accepted Anglican Ordinations as the equivalent of her own since about 1590 or earlier. This practice had

been fortified as time went on by two decisions of a very important Roman tribunal, the Holy Office or Inquisition. But the Bull *Ap. Curae* was a solemn declaration that what might formerly have been regarded only as a matter of established Roman practice and done as a matter of precaution, was really a matter of theological principle, and to be regarded henceforward as such. This is what Fr. O'Dwyer means by 'the irrevocable condemnation of Anglican "orders" owing to the defective intention and form of the rite'.

The 'defective intention' here refers to Pope Leo's conclusion that the Anglican Church *means* (or at least meant in the sixteenth century) by its Ordinations something different from what the Ordination of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon had meant in, say, the third or the thirteenth century. The chief reason he gave for thinking so was that the Anglican *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552 were considerably different from the rites which had been in use in England in the first half of the sixteenth century. Strictly speaking, it was necessary that he should have examined into the reasons for making those changes—which in the Bull he omitted to do—since not all changes of rite can be supposed automatically to signify a change of 'intention'. There have in the course of time been considerable changes, *e.g.* in the Roman rites of Ordination, some of which had important theological consequences. But it would be unfair to suppose that these signified any change in the 'intention' of the rites.

The 'defect of form' he alleged in the Anglican rites were (a) That the *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552 did not sufficiently make it clear to which Order, Bishop or Priest, a man was being ordained, because (b) They did not anywhere mention the special 'grace and power' of that Order. This last the Pope defined as being in the case of the episcopate, 'the high-priesthood'; and in the case of the presbyterate, 'the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of our Lord' in the eucharistic sacrifice.

I will go into all this a little more later. But first I want to deal with something else, which forms the real background to the

whole discussion, though it is nearly awlays left out of account because it does not directly concern it.

(B) *Why has Pope Leo's decision such great importance?*

Admittedly, it settled the question for Roman Catholics, and they are a full half of Christendom. That in itself is a weighty matter. But why should Anglicans be vitally concerned about it? Some Wesleyans in the U.S.A. have Superintendents whom they style 'Bishops' in the same sense as those of the Roman or Eastern Churches. But they go on quite happily leading their spiritual lives as Wesleyans without worrying about that. Why shouldn't we as Anglicans do the same?

The answer lies in the most fundamental differences between the Protestant and Catholic accounts of Christianity. These are not, as we often pretend, to be found in such questions as whether the Body and Blood of Christ are or are not substantially present in the consecrated Sacrament of the Altar (Luther, the original Protestant, sided with the Catholics on that point against the Protestants) or whether others besides Bishops can ordain, or whether we ought to say the Hail Mary or use incense in church, or the other side-issues on which English Protestants and Catholics usually concentrate. These things are only superficial symptoms. The really profound differences—and they are very profound indeed—all centre around the word 'Justification'. One does not often hear it mentioned to-day in religious arguments or even in serious theological discussions. But when the Reformation was actually happening—in the sixteenth century—that word provided the dynamite for the whole terrific explosion. Every Protestant leader insisted time and again that this and this alone was 'the article of a standing or a falling church', and that in comparison with this no other point in controversy was of final importance. (This would still be the case now, if Protestantism had not so greatly changed from its original principles during the nineteenth century.)

'Justification' is the technical term for the fundamental process in the religious life of any Christian man or woman: *i.e.* that by

which fallen man, a creature born in a state of alienation from God and therefore prone to sin, unable of himself altogether to avoid actually sinning to some extent in this life, is through Redemption by Christ brought into union with an infinitely holy God, to serve Him in righteousness, to love Him with his whole being and ultimately to enjoy Him eternally. You will see that this concerns the very heart of the Christian religion—and it was about this that Protestants and Catholics differed violently in the sixteenth century. *How* does the ‘Justification’ of the sinner through Christ happen?

The Protestant answer was unanimous and simple. It happened through a man’s total surrender to one particular idea and to the emotion it evoked; it happened entirely and completely inside a man’s own mind. Protestantism sprang from a radically and unrelievedly pessimistic estimate of human nature. This was the personal invention of Martin Luther but it became the common presupposition of all Protestant teaching. Luther taught and Protestantism believed that man is *totally and incurably corrupted* in his nature by the effects of ‘original sin’, and that this ‘original sin’ is to be simply identified with ‘concupiscence’, *i.e.* with that susceptibility to temptation which we all know in ourselves. If this identification is accepted, there is no hiding the fact from ourselves that this ‘total corruption’ always persists in us, even in the ‘justified’ and those who appear to be leading and are trying to lead a holy life. It is so irremediable, so ‘total’, that even a man’s apparently ‘good works’ are in themselves in the eyes of God damnably sinful. Nothing that a man can do in itself ever have the least value in the eyes of God, on this theory.

Man has therefore but one hope of salvation. God the Father sent His only Son to become Man and be crucified outside the gates of Jerusalem in the first century A.D.; thus He offered the one, true, perfect, sufficient and complete sacrifice to atone for all human sin. To the end of time anyone, however sinful, who believes and fully accepts that fact, and trusts altogether and only to the merit of that sacrifice, is forthwith ‘Justified’ in the sight of God. He needs nothing more, can do nothing more, than be

conscious of *feeling* that confidence in the merits of Christ's sacrifice. He must cling to that *feeling* of confidence, for it is all that stands between him and eternal torment. Yet even so, he must always remember that this feeling of confidence cannot really undo the terrible effects of 'original sin' in his soul. The fact that he feels this confidence does not render anything he does or could do in itself pleasing to God. He is not in any way *made holy* even by 'justifying faith'; otherwise his own actions would aid in his own redemption and sanctification; grace would no more be the absolutely *free* gift of God, but something man had at least partially 'merited'. He is therefore emphatically not *made holy* but simply 'accounted holy' by God, for the sake of Christ, Whose righteousness is 'imputed to' the believing sinner by God through a sort of fiction. But in himself the redeemed and 'justified' sinner remains an entirely sinful sinner still, and only the *consciousness* of his own faith in the redeeming merits of Christ stands between him and the damnation his own inescapable sinfulness entails. That is the famous doctrine of 'Justification by faith alone', which in the eyes of all Protestants was the very essence of Protestantism. 'Justification' was a matter of surrendering unconditionally to that one idea, something any individual can do—but can *only* do—for himself alone, in the absolute isolation of his own mind and heart.

I have put it briefly, because I have no intention of criticising it here or of pointing out its great differences from the Catholic doctrine of Justification, except under one aspect. (I will only say in passing that it is a one-sided deduction from some parts of St. Paul's teaching, and that it is partly a development of and partly a reaction against teaching on the subject which was current during the fifteenth century in that mediaeval Latin Church, which we are always apt to forget was the nursing mother of all the Reformers.) But this root-idea of Protestantism had many consequences and ramifications, though it has in itself—granted its catastrophic premises—a majestic and logical simplicity—too simple indeed to be adequate either to the profundity of the New

Testament or to the complexity of fallen human nature. All I want to point out here is that it denied that thorough 'renewal of the inward man' by the action of God's grace as a consequence of Redemption by Christ, with which the New Testament fairly rings and thunders. And it left out altogether the ideas of the Church and the Sacraments from the whole operation of Redemption and Sanctification.

True, Protestants could not help seeing that the New Testament represents our Lord as having instituted the Church, and appointed His Apostles to act in the Church in His Name and Person. It also records that He deliberately ordered and instituted certain external actions and signs for His followers as having a vital relation to their *being* His. Neither of these facts was easily reconcilable with the doctrine of 'Justification by faith alone', which insisted not only that a man needed nothing more but actually could do nothing more than *know* the story of Redemption in the first century A.D. and put his entire trust in that. Yet the New Testament made it impossible not to retain the Church and the Sacraments in some sense. Protestants therefore kept them both, but they were forced to empty them of much of their Scriptural meaning.

The idea of 'the Church' was reduced to the only one compatible with Protestantism—it was regarded chiefly as the divinely-founded society for continually proclaiming the history of Redemption as it had happened long ago in Judaea, and so challenging every individual in other ages and countries than first-century Palestine to make that personal act of faith which alone saves. The only necessary equipment for such a task was of course the authoritative account of how Redemption had actually happened—the Gospels—and the authoritative explanation of it and commentary upon it in the Old Testament and the other Apostolic writings. *This alone* was what could provoke the saving act of faith in individuals, and the Church existed to thrust it upon their individual notice. You see how directly the doctrine of 'Justification by faith alone' led to the idea of 'the

Bible and the Bible alone the religion of Protestants'. If the Church was necessary to present the Bible in every generation, yet the Church existed for the Bible, not the Bible for the Church. (In point of fact the Church had existed before the Bible and had compiled the Bible and authorised the Bible. Between 150 and 200 A.D. the Church began to select those particular documents which now make up our Bible out of many others, Jewish and Christian, then in circulation, all professing to be more or less authoritative. These alone were after that to be received by the Church as 'inspired' and authoritative 'Scriptures'. The 'Old Testament' was a selection from books then currently accepted as 'Scripture' among the Jews. The grounds for inclusion in the 'New Testament' were partly historical—evidence that these particular documents had genuinely come down from the Apostolic age and their competitors had not; partly doctrinal—that these documents agreed with the standard Christian teaching which had been going on in the Church ever since the Apostolic age, and their competitors did not. Thus there was a time when the teaching of the Church had been quite independent of our present Bible, viewed as a *collection*; and there was also a time when the documents of the Bible had been judged by the teaching of the Church and not *vice versa*. This was really fatal to the Protestant view both of the Bible and the Church. But the facts were not all known in the sixteenth century, and those that were known were ignored.)

Thus Protestantism retained the idea of the Church, despite its awkwardness in the Protestant scheme of thought. But the New Testament idea of the Church as the 'Body of Christ', not only His instrument to proclaim His gospel, but His Body, one with Him, living with His life, holy with His holiness, energising with His Spirit, so that her worship is *His* worship of His Father, her mission is *His* mission to men, her faith is *His* unclouded vision of God, her action is *His* Redemption—all this was fatally impoverished. In the New Testament the Church is the 'fulfilment' of Christ (Eph. 1. 23) without which He Himself is in-

complete and fruitless, but with which and through which alone He is 'Redeemer'. A doctrine of 'Redemption' which had no logical place for all this, which made of the Church only the secondary instrument of a Redemption which is completed in the recesses of the individual's own mind, in essential independence of the life of Christ in the Church and through the Church, such a doctrine was something artificial and new. It could not regard the Church as the 'organism' of Christ, a *life* into which one *must* be incorporated to live 'in Christ' at all. It was bound to regard the Church as at the best an 'organisation' to serve Christ. And there was no sufficient reason why it should not be regarded as ultimately a purely 'voluntary organisation' for that end, with which the 'Justified' individual could dispense entirely if it did not seem to him to be serving that end; or which he could re-fashion to do so as seemed to him good, in order the better to proclaim the Gospel as he himself had found it in the Scriptures. In any case such an 'organisation' has and can have no further claims on his obedience than he himself chooses to give it.

You see once more how central in Protestantism is its doctrine of 'Justification'. It leads directly and inevitably to the typical Protestant conception of 'the Church', as something to which a man adheres in so far as he finds it helpful to his personal religious life, not as something which embodies the God-given 'redeemed' life of souls into which the individual *must* come to share that life. You see, too, how it leads directly to the untrammelled religious individualism and the insensitiveness to schism which mark Protestant Church life. It leads, too, to the repudiation of all finally authoritative standards of doctrine other than 'the Scriptures', and these uninterpreted. For the Church's mission is only to 'proclaim' the self-sufficient Scriptures, and no human ecclesiastical authority can be allowed decisively to limit their meaning by imposing its own particular interpretation upon them.

It is the same with the Sacraments. Few other Protestants have had the courageous logic of the Quakers in simply disregarding

the facts that our Lord instituted certain external or material signs, actions and forms for His followers, and that the New Testament plainly attributes to these an *operative* significance in the life of grace. They were retained by most Protestants, but emptied of their Scriptural significance as signs which *cause* what they signify, and regarded instead as mere 'tokens' (either to the receiver himself or even only to other people) of a grace received wholly independently of them by psychological operations of the believer's own mind. It is no wonder that in course of time they have sunk to the position of 'optional appendages' to the practice of Protestant piety.

Thus the rite of baptism is no longer for most modern Protestants what it is in the New Testament, the actual 'putting on' of Christ, the 'incorporation' into Him, so that the baptised are truly '*one with*', '*members of*', Him. So far as this mystical union is envisaged, it is attributed to the act of faith or to 'conversion'. Thus it is not baptism which makes a man a 'member' of most Protestant Churches, or even the fact of being a communicant, but his own voluntary 'adherence'. And his reception of these ordinances is nowadays regarded as an optional element in that adherence. Such use as he chooses to make of them is a consequence, not a *cause*, of his life and membership in that Church; and most English Protestant bodies no longer limit their administration of them strictly to their own 'adherents', but welcome to them any 'believer' who may present himself for them. Any other view would be incompatible with 'Justification by faith alone'; for on any other view there would be in such sacramental actions an element of human co-operation, of man's own 'good works' *combining with* the divinely-given confidence in the finished sacrifice of Christ, to bring about his 'Justification' and Sanctification. On the Protestant principles this is wholly inadmissible.

So the gift of the Holy Spirit is not regarded by Protestants as something definitely imparted by an external sacramental act which may be done or refused by Christ's human representatives

acting in His Name and Person (as *e.g.* in Acts), but as an inspiration which any man receives in answer to his own interior desires, which is guaranteed to him by his own emotional and volitional response. So absolution from sin is for Protestants no longer something to be bestowed or withheld by Christ's representatives (as in John xx) but something which any individual claims to obtain for himself at need in secret from God. So the Gospel rite of the unction of the sick (Mk. vi. 13) has virtually been silently banished from Protestant practice, because the whole idea of God acting in response to or through an ecclesiastical material rite either to give bodily healing or (still more) healing of the soul by the forgiveness of sins (James v. 15) is repugnant to the essential Protestant principle. Earnest prayer by individuals, *i.e.* prayer made with great psychological 'attention' by those praying, would be the only means to which a sincere Protestant would naturally look for such results.

There is left therefore only the organisation of opportunities for corporate prayer and praise as the main field of Protestant Church life. Corporate worship undoubtedly provides and safeguards certain 'religious values' which individual worship cannot easily supply. But by no means all men equally appreciate the need of those particular 'values'. If they do not want them or if they can find them for themselves in other ways, there is literally nothing which a Protestant Church can do for them which even a believing and religious man may not feel he can equally well do for himself, and which a spiritually slothful or undisciplined man will not claim to do for himself. The Church in such circumstances can have as such no decisive claim whatever on even the Christian life of its members. So far as individual Christians are concerned, it can only be at best or a convenience of the spiritual life for those who find it so. For others, stronger souls, it is something which they may have a duty to help and support, because *it needs them*, but which for themselves they could dispense with at will.

It is the same with the Ministry. Since the Sacraments do not *cause* grace in those who receive them but are only 'tokens' that

the receivers have obtained grace in another (wholly individual) way, the Sacraments can no longer be conceived of as actions of Christ and His Body the Church (or better, of Christ through His Body the Church) really exercising His redemptive work on the receivers. They are actions of the receivers themselves, and only of them. Their administration is a set of ecclesiastical occasions for the edification of individual Christians, many or few, at which these can and should exercise their own faith and piety. There is therefore no need, nor indeed possibility, of a 'priesthood', of men authorised (as others are not) to act in the Name of Christ and His whole Church to perform these corporate actions of the Body towards individual members. The commission of the Christian Ministry is wholly other than this. They are men set apart to fulfil the function of proclaiming the fact of the Redemption accomplished in the first century A.D., which challenges individuals to make the saving act of faith. This is what the Church is for, and its Ministry is essentially only a *preaching* ministry. As Luther said, Ordination is 'a solemn ceremony for the appointment of public preachers in the Church'. Since the celebration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is in fact only a species of preaching by symbolical actions, it is fitting that they should normally be conducted by those to whom the preaching office is committed. But in doing this they exercise no supernatural power or authority from Christ and His Church which other Christians have not received. All Christians are 'priests' (I Pet. ii. 5). Any confinement of the performance of these actions to the ordained ministers is only for purposes of seemliness in their administration and the good order of the Christian society. This is the classical Protestant conception of the Ministry. (But it is right to say that all Calvinists have always laid much more emphasis on the disciplinary authority of those set apart for the discharge of the preaching ministry than have the Lutherans and Independents. And, in Scotland especially, Presbyterians since the seventeenth century have recovered from the Catholic tradition a definite doctrine that ministerial authority is derived from God by their ordination

at the hands of other ministers, and not from the Church by the fact of their choice by the congregation.)

You will see, I hope, how central is the doctrine of 'Justification by faith alone' in the whole Protestant conception of Christianity, and how directly all the rest of the Protestant system flows from it, so that if that is removed the other ideas are left as it were rootless—mere negations. (This is as a matter of fact what largely happened to classical Protestantism in the nineteenth century, when the whole notion of 'Justification' and 'Original Sin' was lost under the impact of the Liberal notion of 'Progress' and the idea of 'Evolution'. Hence that growing disintegration of Protestantism as a *system of thought* by the elimination of its positive elements which has been so noticeable since about 1870.) But what, you must be asking, can all this have to do with Anglican Orders?

This much: That in the sixteenth century, when 'Justification by faith alone' was a watchword that was arming Europe into rival camps and breaking up the very foundations of civil society in some countries, there could be no mistaking the fact that Protestantism and Catholicism were different religions. They differed fundamentally about the very nature of man and the process of his union with God; that is to say they differed over the very idea of 'religion' itself. No one could then suppose that a difference so immense could be bridged over by a few superficial arrangements about restricting Ordination to men called 'Bishops' and other institutional compromises of that kind. On the real issues one would have to make up one's mind, one way or the other.

In the sixteenth century the Church of England had to take its stand on this matter, and as soon as it was allowed to make its voice heard, it did so, unmistakably. What it said about 'Justification' is in itself orthodox (though hesitantly phrased) and much of it is an anticipation of what the Council of Trent had to say on the matter. (See A. H. Rees, *The Doctrine of Justification in the Anglican Reformers*, S.P.C.K., 1939.) On the most obvious

practical application of this doctrine, the part of the Sacraments in the life of Grace, the Anglican stand was entirely decisive, when it was taken. Article XXV of the *XXXIX Articles* (A.D. 1562) defined Sacraments as 'not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather . . . *effectual* signs of grace'—*i.e.* signs which *cause* the grace which they signify—the definition of St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologica*, III. lxii. 1. *ad i.*)—a statement no Protestant could have made. The whole treatment of Sacraments in the Anglican *Catechism* (A.D. 1604) agrees with this. A Sacrament is 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace' and 'a *means whereby* we receive' the grace of which it is a sign, as well as 'a pledge' or assurance that in that sign we have received it. The reception of Baptism and the Eucharist are declared to be 'generally *necessary* to salvation'—another repudiation of the cardinal basis of Protestantism. This repudiation of Protestantism in the reign of Elizabeth is very important, because it was the first time that the Reformed Anglican Church had ever been allowed to make any doctrinal pronouncement whatever since the beginning of the upheaval in the reign of Henry VIII. This may be surprising but it is a fact. Let me explain.

The old 'High Church' apologetic for Anglicanism was sincere and consistent but also a little deficient not only in plausibility but in candour, in its treatment of the Reformation in the time of Edward VI. It was always tempted to represent Archbishop Cranmer and his colleagues as premature Tractarians, or at all events as forerunners of the Carolines. But the written works of these men remain, in which they represent themselves as genuine Protestants, sincerely desirous of introducing Protestantism of the Swiss or 'extreme left-wing' variety into the Reformed Church of England. (The attempt to explain this as due to confusion of mind or feebleness under the pressure of foreign refugee scholars and the government, or even deliberate concealment of their real opinions, cannot be sustained by the evidence. They were outspoken, conscientious and brave men, who died for their beliefs.)

But it is no less clear that they were a minority even among the bishops, and that the vast bulk of the laity and clergy were against them. In the result these men were able to affect very considerably the liturgical forms of the *Book of Common Prayer* because they succeeded in keeping the composition of the new forms in their own hands. But, as they themselves lamented, they had to go very carefully; they could not risk going as far as they wanted in making liturgical changes. Even so they never dared to submit their new productions to any sort of public discussion by the Church. The most important of them were thrust upon the Church without any sort of possibility of a pronouncement upon them, by the direct authority of Acts of Parliament put through by the aid of the Privy Council, which in the minority of the boy-king was exercising the whole semi-despotic authority which Henry VIII had acquired for the Crown. Others came out only as Royal Proclamations. It used, indeed, to be claimed that the first of these documents, the *First Prayer Book* of 1549, was submitted to Convocation, but there is no solid evidence for this and the claim seems to be rejected by all recent secular historians. In any case the position is clear with regard to the *Ordinal*, with which we are here concerned. An Act of Parliament passed on January 31st, 1550, empowered the King to nominate twelve Commissioners to produce an English *Ordinal*. On February 2nd an Order in Council gave authority to the Commissioners to proceed, but without naming them. On February 9th it was announced that they had completed their work, and on March 3rd the printed *Ordinal* appeared under the authority of a Royal Proclamation. There was no possibility of public discussion at any stage. The Church was never consulted. Parliament had no proposals before it, nor even had the Privy Council. The Commissioners—if in reality there were any—can have had little chance of discussing or amending the *Ordinal* during the week in which it was supposed to be before them, for it must have been already complete and probably even already printing to have been published early in March. Similarly at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign the

Second Prayer Book of 1552 with six changes was imposed by the government through an Act of Parliament in 1559, without any sort of consultation of the Church, even about the changes made on this occasion.

I am afraid all this must seem to you very long-winded, but it has a vital bearing on the whole question. In the reign of Edward VI no sort of sanction was obtained *from the Church* for the changes then made, and no *doctrinal* pronouncements were ever arrived at. All that happened was that Archbishop Cranmer and a few of his friends composed services which the Government compelled the clergy to use by the machinery of the law; but there was no definition of their meaning or of the doctrine they were intended to express, except such as was actually involved in the contents of the new service books themselves. The one document which had something of the character of a doctrinal pronouncement, Cranmer's *XLII Articles* of 1553, was published as having been 'agreed upon by the Synod at London'. But as Cranmer admitted at his trial, it had never even been submitted to that body. The policy of the *fait accompli* was the only method employed by the Reformers under Edward VI.

But this fact that Cranmer never even attempted to get any sanction from the Church of England for his new rites has every important theological consequences. The new rites were used by the Church, willingly or unwillingly. To that extent they had the Church's authority. But the 'intention' with which they were used by the Church of England was a matter which only the Church of England could declare, which until 1562 the Church had absolutely no opportunity of doing. It is a commonplace of all theology, Roman or Anglican, that no public formulary of the Church can be or ought to be interpreted by the private sense attached to it by the compilers. Its own contents and any official authoritative comment made upon it by the Church corporately are alone what determine its meaning. (This is a sensible rule applied to all public documents, and adopted *e.g.* by the English courts of law in interpreting Acts of Parliament.) Cranmer personally was prob-

ably seriously heretical about the meaning of Ordination (*cf. e.g.* his *Works*, ed. Parker Soc., ii, 1846, p. 116). It might well be true, therefore, that he personally intended to express an heretical intention in his new Ordination rites. But that has simply no bearing whatever on the theological question of Anglican Orders. We are not 'Cranmerists' but Anglicans, for whom he is not personally an authoritative source of doctrine (as *e.g.* Luther is for Lutherans or Calvin for Calvinists) any more than any other individual theologian (*e.g.* his personal opponent, Bishop Gardiner). The Church of England is committed only to what it has itself authoritatively and officially said, and the Church of England never committed itself in any way whatever to his personal interpretation of the rites he had compiled, which the State compelled the Church to use. On the contrary, on the very first occasion possible the Church of England officially and formally repudiated Cranmer's personal teaching about the Sacraments and has continued officially to repudiate it ever since.

That opportunity came with the compilation of the *XXXIX Articles* in 1562, the *first doctrinal statement* the Reformed Anglican Church was ever able to make. Cranmer in his *XLII Articles* had formally denied the Catholic doctrine that Sacraments have their effect *ex opere operato*; he had barely tolerated Infant Baptism; and he had expressly affirmed that a faithful man ought not to believe in any form of Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Church of England in its own Article XXV expressly contradicted Cranmer on the first point; in Article XXVII it asserted that Infant Baptism is 'most agreeable with the institution of Christ'; and in Article XXVIII it substituted for Cranmer's flat denial the assertion that 'the Body of Christ *is given*' in the Eucharist. Bishop Guest, who was the actual author of this Article, afterwards publicly insisted that it meant and was intended to mean that the communicant does 'take Christ's Body in his hand, receive it in his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally . . .' but does not 'see it, feel it, smell it or taste it'. It would be hard for anyone to be more explicit than that

in asserting the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament. And the *XXXIX Articles* further added in Article XXXVI a defence of the *Ordinal* against Protestants who considered it 'superstitious', and a statement that it was intended for the 'Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops and Ordering of Priests and Deacons', a matter on which Cranmer's Articles had been significantly silent.

I have gone into all this so as to be able to get it quite clear what it is that we have to investigate. It is *not* Cranmer's private opinions as to the meaning of Ordination or of the character of the rites he drew up. These bulk largely in many popular presentations of the Roman attack on Anglican Orders, but they can have no bearing whatever on the theological issue. An entirely orthodox person might draw up a rite which was as a rite defective, just as a heretic could draw up a rite which was as a rite sound. Those compiled by Nestorian and Monophysite heretics are in themselves quite valid, and Rome therefore accepts the orders of those ordained by them in these heretical churches as valid orders. Because Cranmer never received from the Church of England any confirmation whatever of his personal opinions about Ordination, his personal opinions are entirely irrelevant. All that matters, theologically speaking, is the intention of the Church of England in using the rites he compiled and their adequacy in themselves for the fulfilment of that intention. Put it in another way: Is the Anglican rite of Ordination, viewed simply as a rite, a *possible* Catholic ordination rite? And, What was and is the meaning which the Church of England officially has given and gives to that rite?

One last point. You will see now that *Apostolicae Curae* has an intrinsic importance for us as well as for Roman Catholics. It was a ruling on a controverted point from a very weighty authority, given after deliberation. That in itself we are bound to ponder seriously. But its importance goes further than that. If the Pope was right, then *on its own principles* the Anglican Church is more or less of a bogus church, even though in good faith. It proclaims the general *necessity* to salvation of partaking of the eucharist not

in token or in figure, but in the full Catholic reality. It has continuously refused to allow those ordained otherwise than by bishops to celebrate at its altars, to secure this very thing. Yet in reality, though it did not know it, it has been utterly incapable since the death of the last Marian priest of ever providing this necessity of salvation for its children. If Pope Leo was right, then all Anglicans are bound *by their own beliefs* forthwith to leave the Anglican Church and seek the 'effectual signs of grace' where they are to be found; or the Anglican Church as at present constituted must, as it were, 'disband' (or cease to pretend to exist) by procuring valid orders where it can, and reconstituting itself as a Church which can at least do what it teaches must be done by any Christian Church. Where the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is accepted, there the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood is a logical and absolute necessity. No orders, no Eucharist! Once that question has been raised, we are bound to find a sufficient answer to it or in very loyalty to our own Church to leave it! We Anglicans cannot just ignore *Apostolicae Curae*, if only because it puts us *as Anglicans* in such a very awkward dilemma—if the Pope was right about the facts.

VI

9. ii. '44.

My dear Harry, Thank you for your letter. I am afraid it was rather a mouthful, but I wanted to get those points out of the way to start with. I meant really to have put in an explanation of 'Intention' and 'Form' as well, but it was long enough (in all conscience!) as it was, and I forgot in my hurry to get the post. I will enclose them in this. But first about the prayers.

I shouldn't worry if the thought *does* come back that you have 'never received a valid Sacrament in your life'. It very likely will come back. It is tormenting—and also quite untrue, *i.e.* it has the trade-mark of its real author stamped all over it. You were baptised, you know! I think you once said you were 'done' by old Archdeacon Hampshire, who later on prepared you for Confirmation. He was a truthful and careful old man, and he put you in the register as having been baptised. The Anglican 'Form' and

'Matter' of Baptism are quite certainly valid on any showing. Even if he wasn't a 'valid' Priest, it doesn't matter a bit. Anyone can baptise. Even if by some unimaginable accident you weren't validly baptised (*e.g.* the water is supposed to 'flow' on the forehead—suppose it didn't—though this is not strictly *absolutely* necessary for the Sacrament)—you still had the 'Baptism of desire', as the primitive church said of catechumens who could not get Baptism before they died. You are certainly of the Body of Christ. In this matter you are in the same position as any R.C. baptised in infancy, in that you have to rely on the evidence of others that you received this Sacrament.

As for the rest, your Confirmation and your Communion and Confessions, even if they were invalid, still they were received in good faith. God would not deceive you by a sort of technical trick, because He is not that sort of a God. Even if they were not what you sincerely supposed, He still gave you grace 'with' them if not 'by' them. That 'God is not limited (or "bound") to the Sacraments' in the bestowal of grace is a maxim of Catholic theology. Be comforted! Your experience of God has been *true* so far as it went, be the right answer about Anglican Orders what it may.

As for your suggestion of hearing Mass on Sundays in a R.C. church instead of at St. Luke's, I don't think it is a very good one. I understand your trouble of mind at doubting and worrying all the way through whether it *is* the Mass really at all. It is horribly distressing, and I quite understand the desire to avoid it. But that remedy is not a very good one. There is a certain spiritual unreality about it. The Mass is the offering of those who are *one* in Christ. By our Baptism we are fundamentally one with the Roman Catholics in the Body of Christ, I know. But theoretically anyone in that congregation who is fasting and in a state of grace is quite at liberty to get up and present himself for communion at that Mass—all except you! The Mass is the Mass wherever it is offered, and each of us has individually a duty to be present at it on Sundays somewhere. But it is not good to treat the offering of a Mass simply as the focus of your own individual devotion and the occasion of your fulfilment of a personal duty, regardless of the *corporate* aspect. If you *could* not in any case communicate at it, you have not a real right to join in the corporate offering. I don't positively forbid you to do it, because we have never worked along those lines. But I hope very much that you won't—partly for the reasons I have given, partly be-

cause I think that you would only be indulging your own doubts about Anglican Orders, which—at this stage, anyhow—I think you have no right to do—rather than solidly doing your best to worship God as a Catholic. I should hear Mass at St. Luke's, committing any uncertainties to God, Who is merciful to human blindness. From your letter I should say that you are quite justified in making your communion. You are doubting Anglican Orders, but doubt is not *disbelief*, or there would be no trouble or conflict in your own mind. You haven't decided at all yet whether to 'go over' or not, and you would not be receiving Anglican Sacraments with any profane intention, but for the glory of God and the good of your own soul, so far as they can serve this end.

But if you feel it a great strain, don't make your communion. Just hear Mass, and make a spiritual communion afterwards. *Don't* omit this last. And prepare for communion as carefully as usual on Friday and Saturday. Our Lord will understand why, if, when it comes to the point, you only make a spiritual not a sacramental, communion, and will reward that. But the devil will be on the watch for any slackness in your spiritual life at such a time, and will take advantage of it to bewilder and harass you still further. So don't let yourself off any of your accustomed pieties, but take trouble over them, and then—if you feel you absolutely must for conscience sake—modify them in such a way as to avoid actually 'taking sides' for or against Anglican Orders at present. But I think you will do far better to go on absolutely normally until you have definitely made up your mind. You are quite entitled to, from the moral point of view.

Yes, I will pray for you; and do. But I shall *not* pray, as you suggest, 'against your Poping'. Since the clause was dropped from the Litany for deliverance 'from the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities' such prayers have been out of fashion with Anglicans. I shall pray that you may serve God as wholeheartedly—and as happily—as He wants you to, and leave Him to interpret it. Please pray for me. Yours ever *in Dño*. Gr. D. P.S.—Herewith the technicalities on Sacraments you ask for. Sorry I left them out last time.

Enclosure.

SACRAMENTAL SIGNS

The Prayer Book Catechism says that 'a Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace'. Article

XXV says it is an '*effectual* sign of grace', *i.e.* a sign which causes the grace it signifies in those who rightly receive it. We also said that a Sacrament is really an action of Christ through His Body the Catholic Church, *i.e.* the Minister who performs it does not do so in his own name and person, or only on behalf of those present, but in the name and on behalf of Christ and the whole Church in all ages and places—(for the whole totality of the Church is the mystical Body of Christ, not just particular congregations or even all the Christians now alive, but *all* the Church, the Saints in heaven, and the souls in purgatory as well).

For the due ministration of a Sacrament, therefore, there are needed, besides the receiver or 'subject', four things: (1) A proper 'Minister', *i.e.* someone adequately authorised to perform that action in the Name of Christ and the Church; (2) A proper 'Intention', *i.e.* the Minister must be intending to perform that action in the Name of Christ and the Church; (3) A proper 'Form', *i.e.* the words he uses must be such as to convey the significance of that particular action of Christ and the Church suitably and sufficiently; (4) A proper 'Matter', *i.e.* the sign must really 'signify' the grace which it causes, in such a way that the Church can *recognise* the action in that particular case as being her normal action.

This may sound rather complicated, but it is only common sense if you think about it. No! It isn't magic, either. It is not magic to require a proper Minister, any more than it is magic to insist that the Riot Act must be read only by a magistrate, not by anyone else, for that ceremony to authorise the suppression of a disturbance by military force. It is not magical to require an intention, any more than it is magical to insist that if a Judge of Assize says to his wife in a moment of great exasperation at breakfast 'You be hanged!' it shall not carry the consequences which in certain other circumstances it might. It is not magical to require that a policeman shall make a plain statement that he is carrying out the symbolic ceremony of 'arresting' a man before allowing the consequence that anything he says may be taken down and used as evidence against him. It is not magical to keep to the rule that if a

man has not put his own material signature to a receipt, that document is not valid evidence that he received the goods. These are in one sense all conventions, rather arbitrary limitations to place on the significance of free human actions. But in the conditions of human life they are all reasonable conventions, of a sort practically necessary for the use of such 'signs' or 'significant actions' at all among human beings.

Let us look at these four Catholic conventions for a moment.

(i) We need not say much about the 'Minister'. He is an obvious necessity if the sacramental action is to be the act not of certain individuals but of Christ and the whole Church. He is authorised to act thus in the Name of Christ and the Church by his Ordination. The Church does not profess to give the same authority by every Ordination. A Deacon is not authorised to do all the things that a Priest is authorised to do, nor a Priest all that lies within the fulness of sacramental authority which is given to a Bishop. Thus *e.g.* a Bishop is the *creative* organ in the Body of Christ, making 'clerics' by Ordination and 'laics' by Confirmation. 'As we have many members in one (human) body, and all members have not the same function, so we (Christians) being many are one Body in Christ, and every one members of another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is given us.' (Rom. xii. 4 *sq.* Cf. I Cor. xii. 4 *sq.*) That is, briefly, the 'organic' doctrine of the New Testament about the Body of Christ.

(ii) Obviously, the Minister must be intending to act in the Name of Christ and the Church, to act as the authorised doer of their action. But it is very easy to exaggerate what is required for this. Put technically, the 'Minister must intend to do what the Church *does*' by that Sacrament, *not* 'intend to do what the Church *intends*'; *i.e.* he must intend to perform what Christ and the Church require, but need not mean and understand by it all that Christ and the Church understand by it. (Otherwise a stupid or cranky cleric could secretly frustrate every sacramental action he ever performed by holding muddle-headed or perverse ideas about it.) As a Roman Catholic scholar, writing with the *imprim-*

atur, once put it: 'People who are not theologians never seem to understand how little *intention* is wanted for a sacrament (the point applies equally to minister and subject). The "implicit intention of doing what Christ instituted" means so vague and small a thing that one can hardly help having it—unless one deliberately excludes it. At the time when everyone was talking about Anglican orders, numbers of Catholics confused *intention* with *faith*. Faith is not wanted. It is heresy to say that it is (this was the error of St. Cyprian and Firmilian against which Pope Stephen I, A.D. 254-257, protested). A man may have utterly wrong, heretical and blasphemous views about a sacrament and yet confer or receive it quite validly.' (Adrian Fortescue, *The Greek Fathers*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1908, pp. 94-95, n. 2.) That is only a provocative way of saying what in substance every Catholic theologian has always said since the third century. The important thing to remember is that the Minister is acting as a 'minister', as the *servant* of Christ and the Church to do *their* will in the matter, not his own. That is all he has to 'intend'.

(iii) The 'Form' of a Sacrament is the words spoken by the Minister actually signifying its performance. Like 'Matter', it is simplest to deal with it by illustration, *e.g.* the 'Form' in Baptism is the words 'I baptise thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'

In a sense these are only a convention of the Church. Some Sacraments, *e.g.* Confirmation, have had quite different 'Forms' in different Churches and periods. Sometimes, as *e.g.* in the Roman rite of Ordination, it has been highly disputable and disputed among Catholics as to what the essential 'Form' in the rite used actually is. What is required is that the 'Form' shall somehow sufficiently and recognisably express what *the Church* intends by that Sacrament. Even when a 'Form' is found in Holy Scripture, it does not mean that no other will *possibly* be taken instead as 'valid'. Thus St. Matthew's Gospel (xxviii. 19) orders Baptism 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'. But it appears that in the primitive church Baptism was quite

often administered 'in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord'. Pope Stephen I in the third century and Pope Nicholas I in the ninth century both declared that this form was quite valid, if anyone happened to use it. It sufficiently expresses what the Church means by Christian Baptism. On the other hand Baptism 'in the Name of Christ and Buddha and Mahommed' could not possibly be accepted, because it manifestly puts our divine Lord Who is God incarnate into one category with two human false teachers, and seeks to bring the baptised into some sort of mystical union with all three, which is not at all what the Church does in Baptism. The determination of whether any given 'Form' (or any proposed 'Form') is sufficient and 'valid' really depends on its contents and its context in the whole rite.

(iv) The 'Matter' is usually some material thing used in connection with the 'Form' to signify the 'inward and spiritual grace' caused in the soul of the subject by worthy reception of the Sacrament. (But *e.g.* in Penance the 'matter' is the penitent's sins, or his avowal of them.) To take the illustration of Baptism again, the 'Matter' is the water which is poured over the subject by the Minister, to signify that 'cleansing' of the soul from sin which is inwardly and spiritually received *in consequence of* the outward and visible 'sign'.

The 'Form' and 'Matter' co-operate in the Sacrament; either without the other is insufficient. To say the words 'I baptise thee etc.' without any pouring of or dipping in the water would be untrue. To pour the water or dip the subject in it without saying any 'Form' would not recognisably 'signify' that Christian Baptism was being administered. It might be only an attempt to wash a smut off the body, or something of that kind.

The 'Matter' of the various Sacraments has historically been rather more strictly determined than the 'Form', though here again the history of *e.g.* Confirmation and of the Roman rite of Ordination provide illustrations of different 'Matter' in different Churches, and of disputes as to what actually constitutes the 'Matter' of a Sacrament between people using the same rite. The

determination of a sufficient 'Matter' in any given case would again appear to depend simply on its suitability to 'signify' the 'inward and spiritual grace' by the outward 'sign', as *e.g.* water suitably 'signifies' cleansing. But the question of alternative 'Matters', or of the possibility of substituting something else validly in an emergency—*e.g.* if there were no possibility of obtaining water could you validly baptise a dying man in wine?—can present some interesting theological puzzles. (We shall come on one or two in the question of Roman—not Anglican—Ordinations.) The main point would seem to be that the 'Matter' should *recognisably* 'signify' the grace intended by the Church to result from the Sacrament, so that the Church can recognise that Sacramental action as her own. You *might* conceivably baptise validly in wine if no water was possibly procurable (though St. Thomas says not). You quite certainly could not validly baptise a man with some invented ceremony of your own, *e.g.* tapping him on the head three times with a Bible.

I think if you will bear in mind the two facts that a Sacrament is (a) an action of Christ through His Body the Church, (b) that it is essentially a 'sign' causing what it signifies, you will not find it difficult to apply all that to the particular Sacrament of Ordination in what I send next time.

VII

13. ii. '44.

My dear Harry, Here is the next batch! It was pleasantly persistent of you to return me O'Dwyer's type-script again at just this stage. You are evidently determined I shall 'answer' it, so I will try—but in my own way. I see he confines all his remarks to the Anglican rite for the Ordination of a Priest, and says nothing about the Consecration of Bishops. For the moment, anyhow, I will do the same. We can tidy up any loose ends you find afterwards. But so far as I understand the matter I do not think the case is fundamentally different concerning the Priest and the Bishop, though as regards the latter there are one or two side-issues which complicate the matter, *e.g.* the Roman theology of

the Episcopate as only the full form of the Priesthood, instead of treating it, as we do, as an essentially different Order. (Both ways of regarding the question are found in the early church, though I rather think the latter is the normal way of looking at it in the second and third centuries and the former is somewhat later, beginning in the fourth century.) But for the present at all events we will concentrate on the Priesthood, the second order of the Ministry as we reckon it. That will be simpler—and shorter! I hope it is intelligible, but let me know if it isn't. *Cura ut valeas!* Yours ever *in Dño*. Gr. D.

Enclosure.

THE ESSENTIALS OF ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD

The usual method of arriving at the essentials of Ordination among theologians since the late seventeenth century has been to examine all the known ancient Ordination rites which the Church has accepted as sufficient, to discover the elements which are common to them all, and then to form a theory from those common elements. The mediaeval method was to start from the current rite as practised in the immediate surroundings of the writer, and to single out elements in that as constituting its essential, on the basis of some *a priori* theory about the nature of Ordination. The mediaeval method led in practice to great confusion, and it has been altogether invalidated by the discovery that all Ordination rites have a complex history, and that they have varied very considerably indeed in different Churches. We shall therefore follow the modern method, of which the pioneer was the French (Roman Catholic) theologian Morinus in his *Tractatus de Sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus*, published in 1655.

A. THE EARLIEST ROMAN RITE FOR THE ORDINATION OF A
PRESBYTER

Here is the Ordination of a Presbyter as described by the Roman St. Hippolytus *c.* A.D. 215: 'When a Presbyter is ordained the Bishop shall lay his hand upon his head, the Presbyters also touching him. And he shall pray over him . . . saying:

(a) 'O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all comfort, Who dwellest on high yet hast respect unto the lowly, Who knowest all things before they come to pass; Who didst give ordinances unto the Church by the Word of Thy grace; Who didst fore-ordain from the beginning the race of the righteous from Abraham, instituting princes and priests and leaving not Thy sanctuary without ministers; Who from the foundation of the world hast been pleased to be glorified in them whom Thou hast chosen:

(b) 'Pour forth that Power Which is from Thee of the princely Spirit, Which Thou didst deliver to Thy Beloved Servant Jesus Christ, Which He bestowed on Thy holy Apostles who established the Church which hallows Thee in every place to the endless glory and praise of Thy Name:

(c) 'Look upon this Thy servant and impart to him the Spirit of grace and counsel that he may share in the Presbyterate and govern Thy people in a pure heart,

(d) 'As Thou didst look upon the people of Thy choice and didst command Moses to choose Presbyters whom Thou didst fill with the Spirit which Thou hadst granted to Thy minister (*i.e.* Moses);

(e) 'So now, O Lord, grant that there may be preserved among us unceasingly the Spirit of Thy grace, and make us worthy that in faith we may minister to Thee, praising Thee in singleness of heart

(f) 'Through Thy Servant Christ Jesus, through Whom to Thee be glory, might and praise, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost in the holy Church, now and for ever and world without end.' (Hippolytus, *The Apostolic Tradition*, viii. 1; iii. 1-3; viii. 2-5.)

If we are to apply the (much later) ideas of 'Form' and 'Matter' to this rite, there can be no doubt about the 'Matter'. It is 'laying on of hands with prayer for the Holy Spirit'. There is no alternative.

The 'Form' might be open to more discussion; it could conceivably be found in (b) or in (c) or in both together. But (a) and

(b) are prescribed by Hippolytus to be said as the opening of the prayer for the Consecration of a Bishop as well as at the Ordination of a Presbyter. The 'Form' of the latter's Ordination ought therefore to be sought in the part peculiar to his own Order (for which a different equivalent is substituted in the case of a Bishop, *Ap. Trad.*, iii. 4 *sqq.*). The 'Form' may therefore be taken as found in (c) or in (c-e) as a whole. This clearly states the Order being conferred; but there is no mention whatever of offering the eucharistic sacrifice as the chief 'grace and power' of that Order, both of which Pope Leo XIII laid down as a necessity in the 'Form' of Ordination to the Priesthood in *Apostolicae Curae*. (There is in fact no mention of the performance of any sacramental functions at all. This is not surprising. The normal celebrant of the Eucharist in the pre-Nicene Church was the Bishop, not the Presbyter.)

B. THE EARLIEST EASTERN RITE FOR THE ORDINATION OF A PRESBYTER

St. Hippolytus gives us the oldest known Western Ordination rite. We may set beside this the oldest that is known from the East, which is attributed to St. Sarapion, the right-hand man of St. Athanasius in Egypt *c.* A.D. 340. It is certainly Egyptian, Catholic, and as it stands, from the fourth century.

'Laying on of hand for the appointment of Presbyters'

(a) 'We stretch forth the hand, O Lord God of the heavens, Father of Thy Only-begotten, upon this man, and beseech Thee that the Spirit of truth may dwell upon him. Give him the grace of prudence and knowledge and a good heart.

(b) 'Let Divine Spirit come to be in him that he may be able to be a steward of Thy people and an ambassador of Thy divine oracles and to reconcile (*katallaxai*) Thy people to Thee, the uncreated God, Who didst give of the Spirit of Moses upon the chosen ones, even Holy Spirit:

(c) 'Give a portion of Holy Spirit also to this man from the Spirit of Thy Only-begotten, for the graces of wisdom and

knowledge and right faith, that he may be able to serve Thee in a clean conscience:

(d) 'Through Thy Only-begotten Jesus Christ, through Whom to Thee (is) the glory and the might in the Holy Ghost, both now and world without end.' (*Sacramentary of Sarapion*, No. 13.)

The 'Matter' here is clearly 'the laying on of hands with prayer for the Holy Spirit', as in Hippolytus. The 'Form' might be in (a) (b) and (c) taken together, but (b) alone might be thought to give the essential statement. There is *no* explicit statement of the Order being conferred at all (though it is named in the title of the prayer in the MS.—but that would hardly be read out at the actual performance of the rite). It is clear enough from the parallel drawn in (b) with Moses that it is an ordination of Presbyters which is in question, though even here with a sort of perversity the prayer avoids actually saying that the 'chosen ones' were appointed to be 'Elders' or 'Presbyters'. Likewise there is *no* mention whatever of sacrifice as the essential 'grace and power' of the Presbyterate; nor even can any hint of it be drawn from the allusion to the Old Testament 'Elders', who were not sacrificing Priests. The word *katallaxai* means simply to 'reconcile', from a root sense of 'exchange'; cf. e.g. I Cor. vii. 11, of a woman separated from her husband, 'let her return to harmony with (*katallagētō*) her husband'. There is a reference to preaching in (a) and, conceivably, in the word 'steward' a hint of liturgical and sacramental functions (cf. I Cor. iv. 1, 'stewards of the mysteries of God', though this refers to preaching in the original). But the phrase 'stewards of Thy people' refers more naturally to administrative authority; cf. Hippolytus (c), 'govern Thy people'. This prayer does not satisfactorily fulfil either of the necessities required by Pope Leo XIII.

C. THE EARLY MEDIAEVAL ORDINATION OF PRESBYTERS IN THE WEST

The early mediaeval Roman rite for the Ordination of Presbyters is found in an almost verbally identical text in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* first compiled c. A.D. 500 (in which, however, it has

to be extracted from additional Frankish items introduced in the seventh century); in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, compiled c. A.D. 600; and in what is known as the *Leonine Sacramentary*, a book compiled as it stands in the seventh century, but containing earlier matter of uncertain date. There is good ground for dating the original composition of this rite round about the time of Pope S. Leo I (c. A.D. 450). Here is the *Gregorian* text (as being the best authenticated Roman version):

‘*Prayer for the Ordination of a Presbyter*’

(*Bidding*) ‘Let us pray, dearly beloved, to God the Father almighty that He will multiply heavenly gifts upon this His servant whom He has chosen for the office of Presbyter, by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ Who with Him liveth and reigneth, God (world without end).

(*Collect*) ‘Hear us, we beseech Thee, O Lord our God, and pour forth upon this Thy servant the blessing of the Holy Spirit and the power of priestly grace (*gratiae sacerdotalis virtutem*) that Thou mayest continually supply (*consequaris*—“follow up”) with the perpetual abundance of Thy gifts him whom we present (*offerimus*) before the face of Thy love to be consecrated; through etc.’

‘*Consecration*’

(a) ‘O Lord holy, Father almighty, everlasting God, Source (*auctor*) of honours and Distributor of all dignities, through Whom all things prosper, by Whom all things are established through the ever-multiplied increase unto good of our rational nature according to an order founded on and agreeable to reason:

(b) ‘Whence also the sacerdotal orders and the ordained offices of the Levites arose by mystic sacraments, that when Thou hadst set High-priests to rule Thy peoples, Thou mightest choose men of a lower order and secondary dignity to company with them and assist their labour:

(c) ‘So in the wilderness Thou didst multiply the Spirit for

Moses through the mind of seventy prudent men, that using them as his assistants he easily governed the innumerable multitudes of the people:

(d) 'So Thou didst pour forth also (*transfudisti*) upon Eleazar and Ithamar the abundance of their father's (*sc.* Aaron's) fulness, that the ministry of the Priests might be sufficient for the saving (*salutares*—"healthful") victims and the mysteries of a more frequent worship:

(e) 'By this providence, O Lord, Thou didst add unto the Apostles of Thy Son teachers of the faith to be their comrades, whereby with the help of their preaching they filled the whole world:

(f) 'Wherefore, O Lord, grant unto our weakness also such an assistance, who since we are weaker need more of such helpers.

(g) 'Grant, we beseech Thee, O Father, unto (*lit.* upon) this Thy servant the dignity of the Presbyterate: Renew within him the Spirit of holiness: Being accepted of Thee, O God, may he receive the office of second merit; may he teach seriousness of life (*cen-suram morum*) by the example of his behaviour: May he be a worthy assistant of our order; may the manifestation of all righteousness shine forth in him: That being able to render a good account of the stewardship entrusted to him, he may obtain the rewards of everlasting joy:

'Through etc.' (*Gregorian Sacramentary*, ed. H. A. Wilson, p. 6.)

Once more, the 'Matter' is clearly 'prayer for the Holy Spirit', presumably accompanied by the laying on of hands, though the rubrics do not actually state it. The 'Form' would appear certainly to be concentrated in (g), and all (a-f) to be prefatory, like (a-b) in the prayer of Hippolytus. One notes again the appeal to the precedent set by Moses in Numbers xi which appeared in the older prayers; but Eleazar and Ithamar in the Old Testament and the mission of the Seventy in the Gospels have been added to the Seventy Elders of Moses as additional examples.

The Order being conferred is clearly stated both in the initial 'bidding' and in what we must take as the 'Form' itself (g). The

'power of priestly grace' is referred to in the Collect before the actual Ordination, but it is not defined as the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice, though if we wish to we may regard that idea as implicit in that phrase. In the prefatory matter of the 'Consecration' Eleazar and Ithamar are spoken of as offering or assisting to offer animal sacrifices. But it is to be noted that this reference is only incidental. The primary reference is only to the increase in the *numbers* of the ministry, as in (c), (e) and (f). When the direct New Testament precedent (e) is cited, upon which the present Ordination is deliberately based in (f), there is no reference to sacrifice at all, but to assistance in preaching. One can hardly take a secondary reference to animal sacrifices in the supplementary parallel (d) as being the cardinal point of the whole prayer. Nowhere in the whole prayer or in the rite at large is there any explicit reference whatever to the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice as such, as the special 'grace and power' conveyed in Ordination to the Catholic Priesthood.

D. AN EARLY MEDIAEVAL EASTERN RITE FOR THE ORDINATION OF A PRESBYTER

The mediaeval Eastern rites of Ordination differed considerably among themselves, and are mostly very long and complicated, so that it is difficult to disentangle their essential 'Forms'. But fortunately the most widely used of them, the Byzantine rite, is more manageable, and may well be compared with that of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*. Here it is, as it is found in the oldest extant text, the *Barberini Euchologion*, a MS. written c. A.D. 800, though the rite itself is certainly older than that date:

The Byzantine Ordination of a Presbyter

(a) After the reading of the epistle the Ordinand kneels before the Bishop, who lays his right hand upon his head and proclaims aloud:

'The grace of God, which ever heals the weak and fills up what is lacking, promotes the most religious Deacon *N.* to be Priest: Let

us pray for him that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon him.'

(b) Then the Bishop signs him three times with the sign of the Cross and says secretly with his hand upon his head:

'O God Who art without beginning and without end, older than any creature, Who hast adorned with the title of "Elder" (*i.e.* Presbyter) those who have been found worthy in that order to sanctify the word of Thy truth: May it please Thee, O Lord of all, that he whom Thou hast been pleased to promote through me should receive also this grace of Thy Holy Spirit in blameless conversation and unswerving faith; and grant that he may shew himself a perfect servant unto Thee pleasing Thee in all things, since the power of Thy fore-knowledge has granted him this great honour of the Priesthood. For Thine is the power and the kingdom and the might and the glory, the Father's and the Son's . . .'

(c) Then follows a short litany of intercession, for peace, the Archbishop, the city, etc., which has nothing to do with the Ordinand. After this the Bishop again lays his hand on the head of the Ordinand and says aloud:

'O God, mighty in power, unsearchable in understanding and wonderful in Thy counsels above the children of men: Do Thou, O Lord, fill with the grace of Thy Holy Spirit this man whom Thou hast been pleased to (cause to) receive the Order of Priesthood, that he may be worthy to stand before Thy holy altar, to proclaim the gospel of Thy kingdom, to sanctify the word of Thy truth, to offer gifts and spiritual sacrifices, to renew Thy people through the fountain of regeneration: That meeting Thee at the second coming of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, he may receive the reward of a faithful stewardship of his Order in the multitude of Thy goodness.'

After this the bishop raises him to his feet and changes his stole from Deacon-wise to the manner of a Priest, exclaiming thrice 'He is worthy'. Then he puts upon him the chasuble, exclaiming 'He is worthy'.

Presumably the three signs of the cross before (*b*) and the vesting after (*c*) in this rite are merely decorative ceremonies, and the essential 'Matter' is the imposition of hands with prayer, as in the others we have examined. This is the teaching of the Greek Church itself.

The question of what is the essential 'Form' has been disputed. The Greek theologians all appear to hold that (*a*) alone is the 'Form' and that the other two prayers are only supplementary. Among the Latins who have discussed the matter Goar and Arcudius in the seventeenth century accepted the Greek opinion. But Morinus was disposed to see (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) together as constituting the 'Form' (chiefly because he held that any 'Form' must be in itself a 'prayer' and (*a*) alone hardly has this character). Cardinal Gasparri takes (*b*) alone as the 'Form'; Cardinal van Rossum takes (*c*) alone; Père Jugie agrees with Morinus. It seems reasonable to let the Greeks interpret their own rite, and take (*a*) alone as the 'Form'; more particularly as (*a*) is also found in the Armenian and Syrian rites (and among the latter is common to Jacobite, Maronite and Uniat rites) where also it is treated as the only essential 'Form'. (It may be suggested that (*c*) as a whole has the appearance of being an *addition* to the original rite, from which it is separated by the irrelevant litany. It may have come in in connection with the symbolic 'vesting', which is not likely to be much older than the sixth century as a ceremony. In this case the original form would be (*a*) with (*b*), a 'bidding' and an ordination prayer. The saying of (*b*) secretly would cause the weight of the *public* importance to fall entirely on (*a*) in the Greek liturgical tradition. I put this suggestion forward for what it is worth.)

Whether the 'Form' is to be found in (*a*) alone or in (*a*) and (*b*), or includes (*c*) as some Westerns have thought, it is clear that there is a specific mention of the Order conferred, the Presbyterate in each part. And for the first time in the prayers we have examined there is a mention of the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice as part of the 'grace and power' of that Order, though it is not

isolated from other functions. But this is mentioned only in (c), which the Greeks themselves reckon a subsidiary part of the rite, not in the essential 'Form'.

E. THE EARLY MEDIAEVAL SPANISH RITE FOR THE ORDINATION OF A PRESBYTER

With the East let us compare a rite from the extreme West. Here is the rite for the Ordination of a Presbyter from the *Liber Ordinum* of the Spanish Mozarabic rite. The MS. is of the eleventh century, but the rite (in its main elements at all events) is certainly older than that, probably by two or three centuries or even more. It begins with a rubric:

'When he who is to be ordained Priest is brought in, the stole is hung upon his neck and he is invested with the chasuble; and kneeling on his right knee before the altar, the Presbyters lay their hands upon him and so he is blessed by the Bishop with these three benedictions:

(a) *'Blessing'*

'Brethren, let us all pray together to God that this man who is chosen for our aid and for the service of your salvation may obtain the blessing of the Presbyterate by the mercy of God's gift, and so be made fruitful by the munificence of the Holy Ghost, and receive worthiness for this honour and virtue to be found in nothing blameworthy. Amen.'

(b) *'Prayer to Ordain a Presbyter'*

'O God, Who didst ordain that the order of Elders (*seniorum*) should be established to be over Thy Church for the tabernacle of Thy temple (*sic*), sanctify this Thy servant *N.*, whom we consecrate by the service (*officio*) of our hands to the honour of the Presbyterate in the church of *N.* May he keep the discipline of holy Church with the guard of a good life. May he fulfil the office committed unto him without sin and be glorious in the

proofs of a most righteous life. Teacher of his people and rector of those under him, may he hold rightly the Catholic faith and proclaim all the truths of salvation. May he also instruct himself in mind and make himself chaste in body. May he fulfil what he reads by his deeds and multiply his deeds by his reading. May his faith suffice for his life, his chastity for his Presbyterate and his quietness for humility; that living in chastity and faith he may instruct those committed to him by his teaching and also afford them an example by his works. Amen.'

(c) 'Conclusion (Completuria)

'Fulfil now, O Lord, the chief point (*summam*) of Thy mystery, and sanctify by the odour of the heavenly ointment Thy Priest adorned with the ornaments of all glory. Amen.'

'When this is finished (*explicita hac*), he gives him the "Manual" [a book for the administration of the Sacraments—what we should call a *Rituale*] and says to him this "Confirmation":

(d) 'Confirmation after the Ordination of a Presbyter (*Confirmatio post ordinatum presbyterum*)'

'Behold, brother, thou art made a colleague of our Order to teach the mysteries of Christ. Have therefore access and power to approach the altar of God. See that hallowing the holy mysteries in thy heart and consecrating them with thy lips thou dost distribute them to all the faithful for their sanctification. Amen.'

(*Liber Ordinum*, ed. Férotin, *coll.* 54 sq.)

The 'Matter' appears to be laying on of hands with prayer, but (c) might raise a doubt about this. The 'Form' is rather odd. There is no explicit prayer for the gift of the Spirit at all, but only an incidental reference to the Holy Ghost in the preliminary 'bidding' (a) (—which is mis-headed as *Benedictio* in the MS. It should be called *Missa* or *Praefatio* on the analogy of other Mozarabic formularies). There is also the single word 'sanctify'

in the actual Ordination Prayer (*b*). Clearly the scribe of the MS. —from the heading he gave to (*b*)—was of the opinion that this contained the actual ‘Form’ of Ordination. If any one phrase in this is to be singled out, it would have to be: ‘Sanctify this Thy servant *N.*, whom we consecrate by the service of our hands to the honour of the Presbyterate.’ This specifically mentions the Order conferred, and nothing else in (*b*) adds to it anything but good wishes.

But (*c*) the *Completuria* raises difficulties. *Completuria* is the normal term in the Mozarabic books for a ‘concluding prayer’ after the main element is completed—*e.g.* for the post-communion thanksgiving. But its wording here suggests that it is intended to accompany a physical anointing of the priest. Such a rite had been introduced, or was being introduced, into some French Ordination services in the period in which this MS. was written. Have we here an instance of a similar rite in Spain, and if so what was its significance? The anointing of Bishops at their Consecration was already a common rite in France, and had originated in Spain before the seventh century. But earlier Spanish sources (*e.g.* Isidore of Seville, *de Eccl. Off.*, ii. 26, *c.* A.D. 620) speak only of an anointing of Bishops not of Priests. The language here about ‘the *summa* of Thy mystery’ might suggest that such an anointing had already been introduced into the Spanish Ordination of Priests, and was now being taken as the most important element in the rite—that in fact this was regarded as the ‘Matter’ and the accompanying *Completuria* as the ‘Form’. But this seems hardly likely. There is no rubric suggesting a physical anointing (*explicita hac* can only mean ‘When the *completuria* has been said’). The prayer seems a little pointless if there is no actual anointing. (Could it possibly be intended as an expression of the hope that the newly-ordained will ultimately become a Bishop?) But if it does refer to a material unction, it can hardly be taken as the actual ‘Matter’—accompanied by the ‘Form’—of Ordination, because (1) the heading of the previous prayer (*b*)—*Oratio ad ordinandum presbyterum*—implies that this is the actual ordination; and (2)

the latter part of (c) itself appears to speak of the man as already a Priest.

It seems, then, that the 'Matter' is still 'the laying on of hands with prayer' and the 'Form' is probably to be found in the sentence 'Sanctify this Thy servant . . .', which clearly states the Order being conferred. But there is *no* mention of the eucharistic sacrifice as such anywhere in the rite. Even in (d), which comes nearest to the idea, there is a reference only to the *administration* of the Sacraments and 'power to approach the altar'. No one would suggest that the Spanish-Visigothic Church was in any way doubtful that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and that only a Bishop or Priest is empowered to offer it. But the fact remains that the statement of the 'grace and power' to offer it was not considered to be in any way necessary to the rite of Ordination.

From a comparison of these five rites certain things emerge:

(1) The universal 'Matter' of the rite all over Christendom seems anciently to have been 'the imposition of hands with prayer' by the Bishop—and in the West by the Presbyters also. There is no other. The rites differ endlessly in their details, the imposition of one hand or both, the posture of the candidate, the addition of symbolic gestures like crossings or imposition of vestments—but on this essential 'Matter' they all agree. Only in the latest of them, the Mozarabic, is there a possibility that the addition of a symbolic ceremony, the anointing, may be beginning to confuse the real essence of the rite. This is significant of a good deal which happened in the West during the later Middle Ages.

(2) It is much more difficult to make any clear statement about the 'Form'. Some reference to the appointment of Elders by Moses is found in several but not in all of them. A common structure of 'bidding' followed by the 'prayer of ordination' proper is found in some, but not in all of them. The 'Form' may be looked for in most cases in the body of this prayer, but the Byzantines find it only in the preceding 'bidding'. A direct

mention of the Order being conferred is found in most of them, but is missing from the oldest Eastern 'Form', that of Sarapion; and the mention of Moses' appointment of his assistants, which might be taken to supply the lack in this case, is an allusion only, which manages to avoid actually using the word 'Presbyters' or 'Elders'. In most cases the prayer is a direct prayer for the bestowal of the Holy Spirit; but in the Spanish prayer this is not found, unless it is to be inferred from the use of the word 'Sanctify' and the allusion to the Holy Ghost in the preceding 'bidding'. To use Pope Leo's expression, the 'grace and power' of the Order are described in various ways; but in every case there is an allusion to the Presbyter's office of 'teaching' or 'preaching'. The one thing which can definitely be said is that none of them in set terms refers to 'the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of our Lord' as the 'principal' (*praecipue*) characteristic of the Presbyterate, which Pope Leo XIII laid down as a necessity. There is a reference to standing 'before Thy altar' and offering 'gifts and spiritual sacrifices' in the Byzantine prayers, but only in conjunction with proclaiming the gospel and 'sanctifying the word of Thy truth'; and this only in a prayer which the Byzantines themselves exclude from the essentials of the rite, and which there is some ground for suggesting is a later addition to it. There is the Spanish reference to 'power to approach the altar' and to 'hallowing the holy mysteries . . . and consecrating them with thy lips', but with no allusion to sacrifice and, again, in a supplementary prayer 'after the Ordination'. And these two are the two latest of all the rites in point of attestation, while the earlier ones offer no parallel of any kind. If historical evidence has any bearing on the matter at all, then one thing is clear beyond dispute. If the conditions laid down for a valid 'Form' of Ordination to the Priesthood in *Apostolicae Curae* are indeed a necessity *sine qua non*, then there are now no valid orders anywhere in Catholic Christendom; for all the known forms for the first six centuries and more were as defective in this respect as the Edwardian *Ordinals* which *Apostolicae Curae* condemned.

VIII

22. ii. '44.

My dear Harry, Thank you for your letter. I ought to have explained the situation in 1896. I am sorry! The prayer of Hippolytus was actually known in 1896, but in an Ethiopic version only. Its date (and consequently great importance), its authorship and its Roman origin were all quite unknown. I can find no evidence that it was examined by the Roman Commission in its authentic text, but only in later and somewhat adapted versions. In any case, they could not be expected to attach importance to it when all the circumstances which gave it importance were still undiscovered. Hippolytus himself was a schismatic who left the Roman Church in his day *c. A.D. 215*, because of what he thought its unwarrantable innovations in practice and doctrine. His watchword was a rigid traditionalism and conservatism, and the prayers which he gives in *The Apostolic Tradition* are given as specimens of how things used to be done in the Roman Church itself before the 'modern innovations'. I think all scholars are now prepared to accept his claim that this was so, at all events in the main. This means that his prayer for the Ordination of a Presbyter may be accepted as typical of the sort of prayer used for the purpose by the Catholic Church in Rome at the end of the second century, and probably earlier still.

The prayer given as by Sarapion was not known in 1896. It is uncertain just what connection it has with Sarapion himself. Four of the prayers in this collection are attributed to him by name in the only MS., the remainder are anonymous. But it is certain that they all come as they stand from Egypt, from the fourth century and from the Athanasian or Catholic party, of which Sarapion was a minor leader. They seem to be a fourth-century revision of older Egyptian material, so that in many things they represent third-century ideas (or even earlier). This adds to their interest and importance.

The prayer of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* was known in 1896. But it had not long been known that the rite as I have given it was the *whole* of the Ordination rite at Rome *c. A.D. 500*, and that additional elements found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* are later Frankish additions to the simplicity of the real Roman rite. I doubt if the whole implication of this then recent discovery had been assimilated by some of the Consultors in 1896.

The Byzantine Prayers were known in 1896, but the Mozarabic

ones were not. Thus only two of the five rites were certainly then considered, and one (Hippolytus) may have been, though its importance could not then be understood. I think it is fair to say that the theologians of the first Commission in 1896 certainly intended to proceed by the 'modern' rather than the 'mediaeval' method of arriving at the essentials of Ordination. The second Commission of Cardinals seems to have proceeded by a mixture of the two, with confusing results. It is also fair to say that in the last fifty years there has been a considerable improvement in the way scholars and theologians handle the 'modern' method—and that we are now much better equipped with historical facts from which to work.

I enclose a paper which faces the worst that can be said about the Edwardian *Ordinals*. But the background—and really the explanation—of Cranmer's rites is the rite of the Roman *Pontifical*, so I have divided this paper into two parts, as you will see. Don't forget that Cranmer—like all the Reformers—is the product of the late Mediaeval tradition and that he is always *thinking in terms of that*, not of the 'primitive church', about which he knew less than he supposed. None of the five rites of Ordination I sent you last time was known to him in 1550, for instance. What is really the matter with his rite is not that it is defective, but that it is so narrowly mediaeval in some of its primary assumptions.

Let me know what you make of this, and I will do my best to answer any questions. Yours ever *in Dño*, Gregory Dix.

Enclosure.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER'S RITES FOR THE ORDINATION OF A
PRESBYTER

A. The Sources of his Rites

There was no 'standard' or authoritative Western *Pontifical* down to c. A.D. 1292 when Durandus of Mende (in S. France) drew up a *Liber Pontificalis*, which became the basis of the first edition of the 'Roman Pontifical', issued in 1485 A.D. Even after that most Bishops still continued to use MSS. drawn up according to their own personal ideas, though the contents steadily became more standardised in the early sixteenth century. Before Durandus there had been considerable variety of practice in the rites of Ordination. But one can trace certain stages in the evolution of the

general 'pattern' of the Ordination rites which he adopted. He has drawn heavily on an anonymous Italian *Pontifical* of the middle thirteenth century, and this in turn is only a new edition of a book put together in the middle of the tenth century at the monastery of Saint Alban at Mainz in the Rhineland. This was an unofficial compilation from many different sources, but it provided the main outline of the Ordination rites of the later Middle Ages in the West, and of the *Pontificale Romanum* of the present day.

This Rhineland outline of the tenth century is a combination of two different rites for the Ordination of a Presbyter. The one was the old Roman rite of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, with its roots in the old Roman tradition of the time of St. Leo (c. A.D. 450) and no doubt earlier still. The other was a French rite, put together, perhaps in Burgundy, in the seventh century, but quite possibly originally derived from Spain. It had five prayers, arranged thus:

Roman	{	(a) 'Dearly beloved . . .	}	Headed in MSS. <i>ad Ordinan-</i>	<i>dos Presbyteros.</i>
		(b) 'Hear us . . .			
		(c) 'O God the source . . .			
Gallican	{	(d) 'Brethren let us all pray...	}	„ „ „ <i>Consummatio</i>	<i>Presbyteri.</i>
		(e) 'Sanctificationum omnium...			
					<i>tio.</i>

In this combined rite (a) (b) (c) are the prayers of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, slightly touched up; (d) is the Mozarabic 'bidding' before the Ordination Prayer proper; (e) is a prayer which first appears in French sources about A.D. 700. Obviously since each of these two sets of prayers had originally been intended to be sufficient without the other, there was a good deal of duplication in their contents. Great confusion thus became possible as to whereabouts in the rite the actual 'ordination' took place, and consequently which was the real 'Form'. This was not made easier to distinguish by the fact that the compiler retained the imposition of hands, the 'Matter' of the rite, from *both* his sources, so there

were two impositions, at (c) and (e), with nothing to mark which he considered the primary one, the actual 'Matter' of the Sacrament. Many MSS. added a third imposition at (b) as well, making three repetitions of the 'Matter'.

But the possibilities of confusion were increased still more by the fact that many French Churches added to this duplicated rite certain symbolic ceremonies of a kind always dear to the Gallican religious sense. These took three main forms:

(1) Some desired to make more explicit in the rite the bestowal of the power of absolution. They therefore inserted a sort of reproduction of our Lord's bestowal of it on His Apostles, by adding yet one more imposition of hands with the words: 'Receive the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins thou dost remit they are remitted unto them; whosoever sins thou dost retain they are retained', from Jn. xx. 22 *sq.* (This is found for the first time in a Rheims *Pontifical* of the twelfth-thirteenth century.)

(2) Others, to symbolise the power of consecrating, introduced an anointing of the new Priest's hands, accompanied by the singing of *Veni Creator*. (This began about the end of the ninth century.)

(3) Others (beginning about the tenth century) in order to symbolise the power of 'offering' introduced a delivery of the chalice and paten to the newly ordained Priest by the Bishop, accompanied by the words 'Receive authority to offer sacrifice to God and celebrate Masses for the quick and for the dead'. (This was known as 'the tradition of the instruments'.)

These three ceremonies began to be inserted into the rite at various points, independently, by different Churches at different dates. But none of them is older than the ninth-tenth century anywhere. Thus *e.g.* (1) was sometimes placed at the beginning of the rite, sometimes at its close. Sometimes the Bishop alone laid on hands at this point, sometimes the Bishop and Presbyters together (in imitation of the traditional 'Matter' of the rite at (c)). The multiplicity of laying on of hands—at least three times in most rites—led to the obscuring of this as the original 'Matter', and one or more of these recent but striking symbolic ceremonies

began to be taken by many as *the* essential thing in the Ordination of a Priest. Thus St. Thomas takes (3) as the 'Matter' and the accompanying words 'Receive authority etc.' as the 'Form'. He was unfortunately followed in this by Pope Eugenius IV in his *Decretum pro Armenis*, issued in A.D. 1439. Yet even so weighty an opinion was not universally followed. At the end of the fifteenth century Bishop Durandus of Saint-Pourçain found that the rite of 'the tradition of the instruments' was still altogether missing in the Ordination of his Church, and wrote in the rubrics and formula for it with his own hand in the margin of the *Pontifical*, as he tells us. Other theologians insisted that this was *not* the 'Matter' at all, but that the unction was. (You will find examples, including a ruling by Pope Urban II, quoted by Louis Saltet, *Les Reordinations*, Paris 1907, p. 233.) Others argued for various combinations of (1), (2) and (3). (You will find examples quoted by Cardinal van Rossum, *de Essentia Sacramenti Ordinis*, Freiburg i-B., 1914, pp. 140 sqq.) Some—and this is interesting—took (1)—the imposition of hands accompanied by the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins . . . etc.'—to be the 'Matter' and 'Form'.

We may take as an example an official *Catechism* put out by the Council of Mainz in 1549—the year before the First Anglican *Ordinal*—which says 'A Bishop, therefore, in conferring Orders, looking attentively to the aforesaid promises and commands of our Lord, uses such a form of words as comes closest to promises and commands of such a kind. For being about to confer the Order of Priesthood (*traditurus enim Ordinem sacerdotalem*), 'Receive' he says 'the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins . . . etc.' There can be no doubt whatever from the context that this *Catechism* intends to state the 'Form' of Ordination to the Priesthood. This chapter, for instance, is headed *de Forma Sacramenti Ordinis*. There is no question of this perfectly orthodox Roman Catholic Council having any desire to 'alter' the 'Form' of ordination for heretical reasons. They were simply repeating *one* of the various doctrines in common circulation at the time.

I am not trying to suggest that they were right on the question as to what *was* the authentic 'Form' in the mediaeval *Pontificals*. That was probably—(I should say certainly, but some Roman theologians still dispute it)—the old Roman 'Form' of the prayer *Deus honorum omnium* in (c); as the 'Matter' was the accompanying imposition of hands. This is the nucleus of the rite, with its roots right back in the time of Hippolytus and before him. That must contain the *essentials*, simply because everything else came into the rite after it. Otherwise all Roman Orders have always been invalid (which incidentally would invalidate our own). The alternative would be to hold that at some point of time quite indeterminate, by some Gallican Bishop quite unknown, the 'Matter' of Ordination could be *changed*; and then by sporadic and unauthorised interpolations in liturgical MSS. the innovation could become essential at different dates in different dioceses. Meanwhile, what of the Roman recognition of the validity of Eastern Ordinations conferred without any of these novel ceremonies? It would involve us in a theory of two quite different 'Matters' of the Sacrament, not merely as between East and West, but as between different periods and Churches in the West itself.

But it illustrates the confusion into which the whole question had been brought by the mediaeval ignorance of history that Pope Eugenius IV had definitely committed himself to the theory that 'the tradition of the instruments' was the 'Matter' and the accompanying words the 'Form' of the Sacrament. The discovery in the seventeenth century that the East had never known this ceremony, and in the late nineteenth century that Rome itself had not known it either for the first thousand years of her history, caused Pope Benedict XIV in his *de Synodo Dioecessana* to turn away from it, and Pope Leo XIII to discard it in *Apostolicae Curiae*. But in the sixteenth century it was the dominant theory in the Roman Curia, though others were still held elsewhere by people reckoned good Catholics. The decree of Eugenius IV was expressly cited by Cardinal Pole in his Legatine Constitutions in England

in Mary's reign as governing the whole situation. Yet he himself did not always act in accordance with it.

The point to bear in mind is the general confusion in the sixteenth century as to what the 'Matter' and 'Form' of Ordination in the old *Pontificals* really were. So far as the Popes then had an official theory, it was one which modern Popes treat as a mistaken theory. There were at least three alternative theories of the 'Matter' (imposition of hands, tradition of instruments, unction) and at least four alternative 'Forms', each of which had supporters, besides various combinations of these. Even those who held that the imposition of hands was the 'Matter' disputed as to which particular imposition was 'the' imposition, the essential of the rite; and consequently as to which formulary was the 'Form'. Some books had an imposition at (a), (b) and (e), but not at (c)—the original one in the Roman rite. Others had one at (b), (c) and (e). A Bamberg Pontifical has one at (c), (d) and (e), but another Bamberg Pontifical has one at (b), (c) and (e). There was also the later insertion of an imposition of hands with the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins . . .', which in some books came before (a), in others after (d), and in yet others after (e). In some books the Presbyters joined with the Bishop in this imposition, but *not* at the original place in (c). (This is *e.g.* the case in the *Pontifical* of Archbishop Bainbridge of York *d. A.D. 1514.*) In others the Bishop imposed hands alone at (1), but the Presbyters joined with him, not only at (c), but at (e) as well.

All these practices, and the theological theories of the right 'Matter' and 'Form' which went with them, were competing with one another in the first half of the sixteenth century, and the different theories were not sorted out by the Council of Trent. But I do not recollect a single Catholic writer of the sixteenth century who decides for the imposition of hands and the prayer (c)—the old Roman 'Matter' and 'Form'—to which most Roman theologians now look. Everyone was then convinced that the 'Form' must be homogeneous and short, and for some reason all were then agreed that it must be 'imperative'. (It is difficult to see

why, on the analogy of other Sacraments, but they were so agreed.) This immense contemporary theological tangle over the 'Matter' and 'Form' of Ordination in the rite which everyone used was the background—and the source—of Archbishop Cranmer's ideas for his English *Ordinals*.

B. *The English Ordinals of 1550 and 1552*

Only one change of any importance was made between the Second and the First English *Ordinals*. They can therefore be analysed together:

1. The heading of the rite is *The Form of Ordering Priests*.

2. After the Gospel is sung *Veni Creator*, which in the Sarum rite had preceded the anointing.

3. (*Rubric*) 'Then the Archdeacon shall present unto the Bishop all them that shall receive the *Order of Priesthood* that day . . . the Archdeacon saying:

'Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present, to be admitted to the *Order of Priesthood*.'

4. There follows an interrogation as to their having been examined, after which: (*Rubric*) 'And then the Bishop shall say unto the People:

'Good People, these be they whom we purpose to receive this day unto the *holy Office of Priesthood* . . . ' and if anyone knows of any impediment, they are to declare it.

5. There follows the Litany with this Collect:

'Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in Thy Church, mercifully behold these Thy servants *now called to the Office of Priesthood* . . . '

6. There follows an exhortation on the dignity and importance of this Office, the great need of continual prayer, and so forth; after which follows an interrogation beginning: 'Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the order of this Church of England *to the Ministry of Priesthood*?' Answer: 'I think it.'

After this follow two more prayers.

7. (*Rubric*) 'When this prayer is done the Bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their hands severally on the head of every one that receiveth Orders, the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees and the Bishop saying:

'Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments. In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

8. (*Rubric*) 'The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible †in one hand and the Chalice or Cup with the Bread in the other hand† and saying:

'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God and to minister the holy Sacraments in the congregation where thou shalt be appointed.'

There follows the Creed, and the Eucharist proceeds.

9. There is a concluding *Rubric*: 'If the *Orders of Deacon and Priesthood* be given both upon one day', all is to be as 'appointed at the *Ordering of Priests*' except for the epistle.

This is the *Ordinal* of 1550. That of 1552 is verbally unchanged, except that the clause I have obelised in the *Rubric* of 8 is omitted.

One obvious motive which lies behind the extensive changes made in this rite from that of the mediaeval *Pontificals* is clearly the desire to get away from the muddle and confusion over the 'Matter' and 'Form' of the Sacrament in the *Pontifical*. To this end the compilers (1) have rejected the current idea that the anointing is the 'Matter' or part of it, and omitted it altogether. (2) They have rejected the current idea of the 'tradition of the instruments' as the 'Matter', and reduced it to a subordinate position keeping however an 'imperative' formulary for it. In 1550 they retained the mediaeval instruments and added a Bible. In 1552 they retained the latter alone, while keeping the 'imperative' formulary of 1550 with its 'authority to minister the holy Sacra-

ments'. (3) They have decisively accepted the imposition of hands as the 'Matter', and given it the *only* 'imperative Form' associated with a laying on of hands in the *Pontificals*—'Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose sins etc.' Mediaeval exegesis had been wont to treat John xx as describing the Apostles' 'Ordination'. A whole school of mediaeval theologians had treated this particular formulary in the mediaeval rite as the essential 'Form' of the sacrament, an opinion endorsed by the Council of Mainz not twelve months before the first *Ordinal* was compiled. It is likely, too, that the compilers were influenced also by the fact that this 'Form' alone, out of all the possible ones to be found in the *Pontificals*, was to be found in Scripture. They might well argue that a 'Form' used as such (as they supposed) by our Lord Himself was incontrovertibly secure. At all events, there is no ground whatever for the simple assertion by Leo XIII that the adoption of this particular 'Form' demonstrates an heretical intention in the compilation of the Anglican *Ordinal*, or that the use of it by the English Church was incompatible with a Catholic intention. It is evidence only of the adoption of *one* current and entirely reputable theory about the 'Form' and 'Matter' of the rite in the mediaeval *Pontifical*.

I do not suggest that it was necessarily a right theory about that rite. It may reasonably be denied that John xx describes the 'Ordination' to the Apostolic office; and it seems to me quite impossible to suppose that this formulary and the accompanying imposition of hands were the authentic 'Form' and 'Matter' of mediaeval ordinations; they were unknown before the twelfth century, and did not enter most Western books before the thirteenth. But is this a *possible* 'Form', given the proper 'Matter'? Pope Leo XIII said that it was defective, not only in its 'Intention', but *as* a 'Form', and he cited the alteration of it by the Anglicans themselves in 1662 as a recognition of its inherent defect. It is necessary, therefore, to consider this historical point before going on to consider the Roman arguments for the nullity of the 'Form' of 1550-52 in itself.

C. The Anglican Ordinal of 1662

At the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661-2 several small changes were made in the current *Ordinal* of 1552, of which this is the only one of any importance. The 'Form' of the rite—'Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose sins . . . etc.'—was expanded to: 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins . . . etc.' (A similar change was also made in the 'Form' for the Consecration of Bishops.)

A quite unnecessary mystification was made about this in *Apostolicae Curae*. The Pope appears to have supposed that 'Receive the Holy Ghost' and nothing more constituted the whole 'Form' of the rite in 1552—at least that is all he cites in condemning it. He then states that the addition made in 1662 shows that 'the Anglicans themselves saw' that the 'Form' of 1552 'was maimed and unsuitable'. The Pope does not decide whether the 1662 'Form' would in itself be a possible Catholic 'Form', but contents himself with observing that, that of 1552 being inherently invalid, a valid episcopate had already been lost to the Church of England long before 1662, so that there was no one to ordain with the rite of 1662, even if it were in itself a possible 'Form'. (The Anglican Bishops of the seventeenth century have usually been credited with considerable theological learning as well as a somewhat polemical insistence on the virtues of the Apostolic Succession. There is a disarming blandness in the Pope's assumption that they were all so naïve as to imagine that a new 'Form' could suffice to amend a radical defect of a century's length in their own Succession.)

The real reasons for the change in the 'Form' in 1662 are wholly other than Pope Leo imagined. A considerable number of Presbyterian ministers had obtained benefices under the Commonwealth without receiving Episcopal Ordination. These men were now being required to be ordained and to subscribe to the Anglican doctrinal formularies as a condition of retaining their

benefices. (Incidentally this is in itself a clear indication of the Anglican doctrine of Ordination.) This they strenuously objected to doing, on the ground that they had already been ordained by other Presbyterian ministers, and that there was no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter. In support of this contention they cited the fact that 'the words of ordination said nothing to him [*sc.* a man being consecrated Bishop] in the old Ordinal [*i.e.* 1552] which he had not already as a Priest'. It was to remove this Presbyterian cavil that the 'Form' was changed, to make it perfectly clear that there *is* a difference between Bishop and Presbyter, and that 'the office and work of a Priest *now* committed unto thee by the imposition of *our* hands' was something these particular ordinands were receiving for the first time.

There is ample contemporary evidence that this was the true purpose of the change in 1662. [See G. Burnet, *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England*, 1677, p. 71; *History of the Reformation*, Vol. II, 1680, p. 144; H. Prideaux, *Ecclesiastical Tracts*, 1687, pp. 15, 36, 69-72 (I cite from the second ed. of 1715); and the contemporary letter of the latter *ap.* Cardwell, *History of Conferences etc.*, Oxford, 1840, pp. 385 *sqq.*, n. 2.] It is indeed obvious from the insistence on the word 'now'. In point of fact Romanists in the seventeenth century do not seem to have ever previously brought up this particular argument against the Ordinal of 1552, but to have relied only on the fact that it did not contain the 'tradition of the instruments', and on the baseless story that Archbishop Parker had never even been through any form of Episcopal Consecration at all. But they were quick to take advantage of the change in 1662 for controversial purposes. A book by a Roman Priest entitled *Erastus Senior* was published in 1662 (after the changes in the Prayer Book) asserting that these changes proved that the Anglicans acknowledged the previous defect in their Ordinal. But this appears to be the *first* time this particular defect was ever alleged by a Romanist. It was at once denied that this was the reason for the change, and its real direction, against the Presbyterians, was stated. But the legend con-

tinued to be repeated among the English Romanists, until it eventually found its way into *Apostolicae Curae*.

IX

10. iii. '44.

My dear Harry, I am sorry for the long delay. I had to be away from the 25th to the 29th, and then I had a dose of 'flu. Hence that rather miserable postcard.

Surely, you were quite right to refuse to allow yourself to make a 'snap decision to go over without troubling about the reasons, just to end the matter'. In point of fact, Father O'Dwyer would probably have refused to 'receive' you, if you had told him that those were your motives. And rightly. But I equally dislike what looks to me like a 'snap decision' to stay where you are without further assurance, because work is so heavy and you are weary with that as well as with revolving this problem in your mind. I do understand and sympathise with the strain and tiredness, especially with the new crop of raids thrown in. But it is all very well to say that people like myself have gone into these things thoroughly, and you feel you can trust them. That will do for now, perhaps! But what about when you are less tired, or some fresh shock arises, *e.g.* a proposal to ordain 'priestesses' from some irresponsible Anglican committee? Or suppose you meet Father O'Dwyer again? I have met him. He is a charming person and, I should judge, a very holy man and priest. He also has gone into these things. If my being an Anglican suffices to retain you, why should not his being a Roman suffice to detach you? If you are going to let personalities settle the matter, you ought really, on balance, to 'go over', I think!

No, my advice to you would be, now that you have followed the matter so far, to go through with it to the end with a definite intention to make an intelligent decision. Anyway, I have put together the enclosed in the hope that you will do that. If you are bored with it, put it in the drawer in which you say you are keeping the rest, and look at it, if you ever feel again that you must take up the question seriously. If the turmoil in your own soul is subsiding for the present, so much the better. But the only final safeguard against its return in that particular form is to know the facts. Here, anyway, is the final instalment of the facts as I see them. As I said before, it is an advocate's presentation of

them on behalf of one side in a disputed question. But I do believe it is the side which has the truth and the right of the matter on this particular question. That is, so far as I can see into my own motives, the only reason why I am on it, and the only reason why I could wish to see you on it. It seems quite a good reason to me. Yrs. ever in *Dño*, Gr. D.

Enclosure.

THE ROMAN REJECTION OF ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS

For convenience this can be divided under four heads:

- A. In the Reign of Queen Mary.
- B. From Elizabeth to Charles I.
- C. From the Restoration to the Nineteenth Century.
- D. *Apostolicae Curae*.

A. The Reign of Queen Mary

Cardinal Pole, the Archbishop who succeeded Cranmer at Canterbury, received his 'faculties' (authorisations to act) as Papal Legate for regularising the situation of the English Clergy after the schism under Henry VIII and Edward VI, by a Bull of Pope Julius III in August 1553. He found himself confronted by different classes of cases:

(a) Clergy ordained before the first beginning of the breach with Rome.

(b) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Pontifical* after that breach had begun, but by Bishops appointed with Papal Bulls before the breach.

(c) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Pontifical* by Bishops consecrated by the rite of the *Pontifical* but appointed by Royal Mandate and not by Papal Bull (and therefore, from Pole's point of view, hopelessly 'irregular' canonically but unquestionably valid Bishops).

(d) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *First Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated as in (b).

(e) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *First Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated as in (c).

(f) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Second Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated as in (b).

(g) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Second Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated as in (c).

(h) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *First Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated by the *First Ordinal*.

(i) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Second Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated by the *First Ordinal*.

(j) Clergy ordained by the rite of the *Second Ordinal* by Bishops consecrated by the *Second Ordinal*.

(I am not sure whether any of this last class actually existed, but it was at least a theoretical possibility.)

Classes (a) to (c) all needed reconciliation from schism, and (b) and (c) absolution from different forms of 'irregularity'; the question of 'validity' or orders would only come up in cases (d) to (j). But it would come up in different ways, from Pole's point of view. The point of distinguishing between the two *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552 is that while neither contained the anointing which some people considered to be the 'Matter' of the rite, the First *did* contain the 'tradition of the instruments', which many, including Pole himself, believed to be the 'Matter' of the rite. It was accordingly possible to take alternative lines and to say that all clergy in classes (d)-(j) were invalidly ordained; or that all in (d) and (e) were valid but irregular, but (f)-(j) invalid; that (d), (e) and (h) were valid and the rest invalid; and so on. (Roman Catholic accounts of the matter usually speak as though the situation must have presented itself to Pope Julius and Cardinal Pole as a quite straightforward question—Was a particular man ordained with the Latin rite or the English? It was in fact a question which could have a large number of different *nuances*, and it is this which no doubt accounts for the obvious hesitations in their dealings with it.)

To add to Pole's difficulties, when his faculties arrived it was found that the powers they contained only extended to dealing

with the clergy in class (a). He accordingly asked for extended powers, which were granted in a Bull dated March 8th, 1554. Pole had sent a description to Rome only of the Second *Ordinal* (which did not contain any tradition of the instruments) and this seems to have been the only information about the English ordinations before Pope Julius III in framing the extension of the Legate's powers. These when sent contained authority to 'exercise a *dispensing and reconciling power*' in the case of those who had been ordained *non servata forma ecclesiae consueta*, 'without the observance of the accustomed form of the Church'. There were no distinctions between different classes of case; no suggestion that any one was to be re-ordained, with or without condition. All are to be merely 'dispensed' from irregularity 'and reconciled'. Had the Pope meant re-ordained, he would have said so. The inference is that Julius III accepted the rite of the Second *Ordinal* as valid (and all the more so that of the First).

So matters remained until the next Pope, Paul IV, was called on to confirm the general dispensation from irregularities committed during the preceding fifteen years, already provisionally given by the Legate. This confirmation was given in the Bull *Praeclara Clarissimi* on June 20, 1555. Pole had undertaken to receive 'in their orders' (*in suis ordinibus*) all who had obtained from the Crown 'petitions, dispensations, concessions, favours or indults, concerning either orders or ecclesiastical benefice' during the preceding fifteen years. Again there is no distinction made between those ordained by the Latin or either of the English rites. The Pope confirms the Legate's undertaking, but adds the general proviso that 'Those who had been promoted to Orders whether major or minor by any other than a Bishop or Archbishop duly and rightly consecrated (*rite et recte ordinato*) shall be bound to receive the same Orders afresh (*eosdem ordines . . . de novo suscipere teneantur*) from their own Ordinary nor shall in the meanwhile minister in those Orders'.

It is claimed that this is a condemnation of the *Ordinal*. It is impossible to see how this can have been the effect intended by

Paul IV. There is nothing whatever in this about anyone being ordained by a *defective rite*. The provision turns on the status of the ordaining Bishop, not at all on the rite which he used. If he was himself *rite et recte ordinatus* then the Orders he conferred are in all cases to stand, whether he used the rite of the *Pontifical* or that of either English *Ordinal*. Nor is the ground of this possible defect in the Bishop defined; the Pope does not even assert that such defective Bishops exist. He is safeguarding the principle that holders of benefices are to be properly ordained. It was, after all, not an uncommon thing in the sixteenth century for benefices to be held by laymen who drew the revenues and made little or no provision for the fulfilment of their obligations.

But the Bull caused trouble; a great deal of valuable property in the form of revenues and benefices was involved. Any Bishop consecrated in the past fifteen years *without Bulls* might be held *non rite et recte ordinatus*, and consequently all the benefices held by their ordinands (by the Latin or English rite) might be liable to be voided. The Pope therefore had to do something to clear up the situation. In the Brief *Regimini Universalis* (Oct. 30, 1555) he explained: 'It has recently come to our attention that many people are in doubt which Bishops and Archbishops can be said to have been *rite et recte ordinati*' during the schism; 'Only those Bishops and Archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated with the form of the church (*in forma ecclesiae*) cannot be said to be *rite et recte ordinati*', *i.e.* all bishops consecrated *in forma ecclesiae* are genuine. Does this mean that the Pope condemned the *Ordinal*, so far at least as concerns the Consecration of Bishops? It is pressing his words far beyond their meaning to say so. He does not state or even imply that such defective Bishops exist; the double negative implies a suggestion that the intention of the clause is to restrict its application so far as possible. Nor does he define what the *forma ecclesiae* may be. If he had meant to exclude the Edwardian *Ordinals* it was perfectly easy to say so. On the contrary, Paul IV goes on to say something which tells altogether the other way. Those ordained by Bishops who *were* consecrated

in forma ecclesiae, he says, have received 'the character of Orders' and are to be accounted ordained. There is no exception—no question of whether they were ordained by the old rite or the First *Ordinal* or the Second. They are *all* to be accepted. We can put the case concretely. There were seven Bishops on the bench in 1555 who had been consecrated with the Latin *Pontifical*, and were therefore unquestionably *rite et recte ordinati* by this definition. Some of these had for years been ordaining Priests and Deacons by the *Ordinal*. All these ordinands, says Paul IV, have received 'the character of Orders' and are to be accepted as Priests and Deacons. By implication he recognises the sufficiency of the *Ordinal*. Quite certainly he does not condemn it.

But, it may be said, it has been demonstrated that Pole himself re-ordained such men. Certainly it has—in thirteen cases out of the hundreds involved. In one case he supplied the anointing only—to a man ordained, apparently, with the First *Ordinal*. (There is evidence of this being done in other cases also by other bishops.) He himself seems to have held that the decree of Eugenius IV, making the 'tradition of the instruments' the essential 'Matter' was at least the official theory. But if on this account he had held the *Ordinal* to be certainly invalid, he must have insisted on a wholesale re-ordination and published instructions to that effect. This he never did, though the Legatine Council in 1556 offered an admirable opportunity. No doubt if anyone came to him with an uneasy conscience, he did gladly set the man's mind at rest with an unquestionable Ordination. But the very fact that his practice varied is enough to shew that he did not regard the rite of the *Ordinal* as necessarily insufficient—as, indeed, he could hardly do in the face of *Regimini Universalis*.

B. From Elizabeth to Charles I

In the reign of Elizabeth the Recusants continued for years to attend their parish churches. But since the majority of the clergy were still survivors from the days of the Latin rite, this does not bear on our question. The breach was only gradually made, and

there was no *official* condemnation of the Anglican *Ordinal* by Rome before 1685, though I suspect that the practice of re-ordaining 'convert' clergy goes back to the beginning of the seventeenth century and perhaps well into the sixteenth—I have been unable to find any evidence.

The *English Romanists'* denial of the validity of Anglican Orders in the seventeenth century seems to have been continuous and unanimous, but so far as I can find out down to 1662 it revolved always around two theses which neither of them figure in the Bull of Leo XIII:—(1) The 'Nag's Head Fable', a wild story that Archbishop Parker in 1559—a sort of 'bottleneck' in Anglican Orders—never went through any rite of consecration at all, but only a mock ceremony in the Nag's Head tavern. This was finally exploded by the Roman Catholic historian Lingard in the nineteenth century, and the slander is best forgotten now. (2) The other seventeenth-century argument was the absence from the Anglican *Ordinal* of 'the tradition of the instruments'. This was now the dominant theory of the 'Matter' in the Roman school, despite the influence of Morin's *Tractatus de Sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus*. It was only late in the seventeenth century that the custom came in of 'conditionally re-ordaining' ordinands of the *Latin* rite in whose case this ceremony had been accidentally omitted. (Such accidents could happen, apparently!) According to Pope Benedict XIV it only became the formally established rule between 1731 and 1740. When this theory was gaining ground abroad it naturally dominated the controversial tactics of the English Romanists, already disposed to follow Pole's acceptance of this 'Matter' and the accompanying 'Form' as the essential of the rite. Consequently they continually deny the validity of a rite which does not contain it, without considering whether a rite which substitutes the imposition of hands with prayer is a *possible* rite of ordination. This arguing at cross-purposes is only the post-Reformation consequence of the mediaeval confusion as to what exactly were the 'Matter' and 'Form' of the rite of the *Pontifical*, which had been going on ever since the twelfth century.

C. From Charles II to the Nineteenth Century

The change in the Roman attack on the *Ordinal* by *Erastus Senior* in 1662 opens a new phase, which concentrates attention for the first time (so far as I can discover) on the 'Form', 'Receive the Holy Ghost etc.' in the Anglican rite. But in 1685, when the first official 'condemnation' of Anglican orders took place, no notice seems to have been taken of this new line of attack. A young French Calvinist resident in England had been converted to Anglicanism and been ordained Deacon and Priest by the Bishop of London. He subsequently returned to France and was converted to Roman Catholicism. In 1684 he found that he wished to marry and applied to the Holy Office—the Roman tribunal which under the presidency of the Pope himself is charged with very important theological decisions—for a ruling on the validity or otherwise of the Anglican Orders he had received, in order to know whether they constituted an impediment to his marriage. Some care was taken about the question. A Consultor of the Holy Office named Genetti was sent to England to enquire into the rite used, though the published extracts from his report reveal some strange inaccuracies of description. The growing influence of Morin's work on Ordinations is seen in the fact that there was some comparison with Eastern rites, and that the Holy Office did not condemn the Anglican rite on the ground that it omitted 'the tradition of the instruments'. They did condemn it on the ground that it is defective in 'Form', and they seem to have disliked that 'Form' partly because it was not a 'prayer'. This might appear a very remarkable statement to make about the 'Form', 'Receive the Holy Ghost etc.' But though the documents have never been published in full, it has become clear since 1896 that what the Holy office in 1685 treated as the 'Matter' and 'Form' of the Anglican rite was the delivery of the Bible (which apparently the Holy Office was not then prepared to condemn as a possible 'Matter'!) and the accompanying words 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister

the holy Sacraments in this congregation . . .' (You will find what is known about the ground of the decision in T. A. Lacey, *A Roman Diary and other Documents*, London, 1910, pp. 278 sqq.) The real 'Matter' and 'Form' of the Anglican rite, the imposition of hands with 'Receive the Holy Ghost', do not seem even to have been mentioned. It was a natural mistake for a Roman congregation to make when the theory of 'the tradition of the instruments' and the accompanying words 'Receive authority . . .' as the essentials of the Roman rite was practically unchallenged in the contemporary Roman schools. But it further complicated the question.

The mistake was clinched by the Gordon case in 1704. James Gordon, who had been consecrated Bishop of Galloway by the Anglican rite, followed King James II into exile in 1688, and twelve years later became a Roman Catholic. He later petitioned the Holy Office to have his Anglican Orders declared null and void in order that he might receive Roman Orders. (He never proceeded beyond minor Orders in the Roman Church, which qualified him to hold certain benefices on whose revenues he subsisted till he died.)

Gordon's petition contained three grounds. (1) 'The Nag's Head Fable.' (2) What must be regarded as a wilfully inaccurate* account of his own ordination, in which he represents the 'Matter' as the tradition of the Bible and the 'Form' as 'Take thou authority to preach etc.' (3) An account of the private 'Intention' of the bishops who consecrated him. The Holy Office set aside (1) and (3). It based its decision solely on the lack of determination employed in the 'Form' of the Anglican rite, and of all designation of the 'power which it was intended to confer'. The documents of the 1684-5 case were brought into the question, but of course they added nothing new. They were entirely based on the same mistaken notion of what *was* the Anglican 'Matter' and 'Form'. One can only say that *if* the Anglican 'Matter' and 'Form' had ever

* The author would have wished to withdraw this aspersion. See Appendix I, p. 94.

been what the Holy Office supposed them to be in 1685 and 1704, they took a view of Anglican Orders which every instructed theologian, outside or inside the Anglican Church, would be absolutely bound to take. Fortunately—or unfortunately (according to the point of view)—the Anglican *Ordinal* from 1550 onwards had always contained a perfectly plain statement both as to what was to be regarded as its ‘Matter’ and ‘Form’, and also as to the ‘Intention’ of the rite. Of this we have as yet said nothing—a reticence shared not only by the Holy Office in 1685 and 1704, but unbroken by Leo XIII in 1896.

D. The Bull ‘Apostolicae Curae’

Between about 1890 and 1895 the question of the possible validity of Anglican Orders stirred a certain amount of scholarly interest and discussion in France, owing to the contemporary discoveries of Boudinhon and others that the ‘Matter’ and ‘Form’ of the Sacrament in the Roman rite for a thousand years had been simply imposition of hands with prayer, as in the Anglican *Ordinal*. The discussion attracted the attention of the authorities in Rome, and in 1895 Pope Leo XIII, to whom the Reunion of Christendom and any steps which could advance it were always objects of practical attention, of his own motion appointed a Commission of scholars to investigate the question. (There was no Anglican request for such an investigation.) This Commission met in March and held in all twelve sittings under the presidency of Cardinal Mazzella. Matters seem to have progressed normally till the discussion of the Gordon case was reached, when the Commissioners were informed that they were not to form or express any judgement upon the decision in that case, and that they were to end their labours after only one more session to be devoted to clearing up one or two minor matters left over from previous discussions. The whole question was being transferred to a new Commission of Cardinals, to whom the papers were to be transmitted. This new Commission turned out to be the Holy Office.

It had been freely said in Rome while the first Commission was

sitting that if the Holy Office dealt with the question it would certainly uphold the Gordon decision, since this tribunal is bound by its own precedents (like *e.g.* English courts of law). The Bull *Apostolicae Curae* fully justified this expectation. It makes the Gordon case the decisive point on which the whole question turns. By this decision the question 'was settled long ago by the Apostolic See. Perhaps it was in ignorance of this that certain Catholic writers have supposed the question to be still open to discussion'.

But the Holy Office was in a somewhat awkward position about the Gordon case. The 1685 decision, and the Gordon decision based upon it, had been arrived at on the assumption that the 'tradition of the instruments' and the accompanying 'Receive authority to offer etc.' were the essentials of the Roman rite of Ordination (at all events) and that the Anglican 'Matter' and 'Form' ought to be something equivalent to those. They had, of course, failed to find a sufficient equivalent in the Anglican rite. But in 1895 Roman opinion had markedly swung round to the idea that imposition of hands with prayer for the gift of the Holy Ghost were the essential 'Matter' and 'Form' of the Roman rite. These had been the Anglican 'Matter' and 'Form' all along. The Gordon decision was to be upheld, but quite different grounds had to be found for doing so. They were found, but from the time that *Apostolicae Curae* first appeared, it was obvious that the decision turned entirely upon the crucial question, *What was the 'Form' which the Holy Office condemned in 1685 and in the Gordon case?* The Bull itself does not answer that question, and the documents of the Gordon case have never been fully published, though the Holy Office has more than once been requested to do so. Extracts only from them were allowed to be quoted in an article by P. Brandi, S. J., in *Civiltà Cattolica*, November 11th, 1896, in defence of the Bull, which was being penetratingly criticised by T. A. Lacey in *The Contemporary Review*. From the point of view of the writer the extracts were disastrous, for they enabled Lacey to shew that the 'Form' rejected in the Gordon

case and the 'Form' rejected by Leo XIII were totally different, though Pope Leo professes to be only repeating the former decision.

What, then, were the new grounds of Pope Leo's decision? They reduce themselves to two—the 'defective Intention' and the 'defective Form' of the Anglican *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552. (It is explicitly allowed in *Apostolicae Curae* that their 'Matter' is sufficient.)

(1) Did the *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552 'intend' to institute a *different* Ministry under cover of the old titles of Bishops, Priests and Deacons? This is what *Apostolicae Curae* insinuates.

There is a statement of the 'Intention' of the rite of the most unambiguous clarity, which is substantially the same in the 1550, 1552 and 1662 *Ordinals*. It is contained in the *Preface* which in all three books is the authoritative interpretation of their contents. It runs as follows in 1550 and 1552 (*italics mine*):

'It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons: which Offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same: And also by public *prayer with imposition of hands* approved and admitted thereunto. And therefore, *to the intent these orders should be continued* and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England; it is requisite that no man (*not being at this present Bishop, Priest nor Deacon*) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted according to the form hereafter following.'

It is almost unbelievable, but *Apostolicae Curae* makes no reference of any kind even to the existence of this *Preface* in its discussion of the Anglican 'Intention'. Here that 'Intention' is stated in so many words. What Bishops, Priests and Deacons have been in the past, that it is the 'intent' that they shall 'be continued' to

be in the future. Those who are already 'at this present Bishop, Priest or Deacon' shall continue their ministry (a contrast with the contemporary Protestant practice of re-ordaining to the Protestant 'preaching' ministry Catholic Priests who came over to them). What their Orders have meant for them in the past, that they are to continue to mean for them, and also for those who are to be ordained as their colleagues by the rites to which this is the *Preface*. It is *not* something new which is intended, but what has been since 'the Apostles' time'—that and no more and no less. It would be difficult to state the Catholic 'Intention' in Ordination more succinctly, more clearly or more broadly than that. Pope Leo—I repeat it is almost unbelievable, but it is a fact—has not a word to say of the existence, let alone of the contents, of this *Preface*, but goes off instead into some vague reflections upon the private opinions and personal actions of the *auctores Ordinalis*, the 'compilers of the *Ordinal*'—as though these had any counter-weight to the expressed 'Intention' of the Church officially put upon the rite. (In point of fact the identity of the *auctores* is utterly unknown, except that it may be taken for granted that Cranmer had a great hand in it.)

(2) The other ground of the condemnation is the defect of 'Form', under two heads; that the Edwardian 'Forms' do not mention the Order being conferred; and that they do not mention the chief 'grace and power' of the Order, which in the case of the Priesthood is that 'of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of our Lord' in the eucharistic sacrifice.

Under the first head it is sufficient to say that it has never been required that the Order conferred should be named actually in the 'Form' itself. The prayer of Sarapion, for instance, does not do so. Those who supposed that 'Receive authority to offer sacrifice etc.' was the authentic 'Form' of the Roman rite certainly did not do so. The Order being conferred is named again and again in the course of the rite as a whole in the *Ordinal*, both in 1550 and 1552 (nine times in the case of the Priesthood). It is frivolous to say there could be any doubt as to what Order was being conferred.

Under the second head there is an answer which seems sufficient in itself: the power 'of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of our Lord' is not mentioned in the successive Roman 'Forms' of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, of the *Leonine Sacramentary*, of the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*; in the Eastern 'Forms' of Sarapion, of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and of half-a-dozen other documents; nor indeed in the Byzantine 'Form' if the Greeks' interpretation of their own rite be correct; nor in the Spanish Mozarabic 'Form'. Only these two latter have anything at all concerning a priest's liturgical functions as explicit as the Anglican 'Take thou authority . . . to minister the holy Sacraments . . .' Not one of them has anything so explicitly sacerdotal in its 'Form' as the power to remit and retain sins, found in the Anglican 'Form' itself. Yet all these rites are valid—and the Anglican is not.

It may be said that the original compilers of these rites believed in the eucharistic sacrifice, while the compilers of the Anglican rite did not. It is not possible in most cases to say what the original compilers of early Christian rites believed on this point, because we have no idea who they were; nor can we state what the compiler of the Anglican *Ordinal* other than Cranmer thought about the eucharistic sacrifice, for the same reason. But what have the personal opinions of the compilers to do with the objective validity of their rites in either case? What we do know is that the Catholic Church from the first century onwards has explicitly taught that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, though there were not even the beginnings of an authoritative definition as to *how* the eucharistic sacrifice is to be stated until the Council of Trent; and even the preliminary discussions on this did not begin at Trent until the 3rd of December 1551 and the decrees were not finally confirmed until January 1564. There is therefore no possibility of believing that either the *Ordinals* of 1550 and 1552 or the Anglican *Articles* which appeared in Jan. 1562 were intended to repudiate definitions which were still in the future. That Cranmer personally would have repudiated them if he had been alive when

they appeared is a likely hypothesis. But to suggest that the Church of England corporately can be condemned on the ground of what one theologian might have done if he had not been dead for ten years is to cease to talk theology and descend to talking ecclesiastical politics of a peculiarly unscrupulous kind. As things stand to-day and have always stood there is nothing whatever in Anglican formularies which is incompatible with the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice as it had been taught *e.g.* by St. Thomas Aquinas or as it is taught to-day by *e.g.* the Abbé Masure (see *Le Sacrifice du Chef*; *E.T. The Christian Sacrifice* by Dom I. Trethowan, London 1944). The Eucharist has never been offered among us by any but Bishops or episcopally ordained Priests (whether they had received their Orders at the hands of Eastern, Roman or Anglican Bishops, without distinction). In so far as the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice had always been a prerogative of the Christian Priesthood 'from the Apostles' time', the English Church has continuously affirmed that this it has been her 'Intention' in ordaining shall be 'continued and reverently used and esteemed'. No Christian Church can claim to do more than that.

It is partly true that, as Pope Leo somewhat exaggeratedly said in *Apostolicae Curae*, there is 'in the whole *Ordinal* no clear mention of sacrifice, consecration, priesthood and the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice'. (It would have been more accurate to omit all but one of these items—sacrifice.) There was a real intention and desire to repudiate the usual current formulation of the eucharistic sacrifice *c. A.D. 1550*, which involved not only the idea of a 'mactation', 'immolation' or at least a *status declivior* in the Mass, but a *fresh* sacrifice of Christ in every Mass. Trent carefully avoided committing the Church to any such theories, and they are abandoned by almost all Roman theologians to-day. The Anglican Church is not in bad company in taking the stand it took in the sixteenth century against 'the sacrifices of Masses' even though it has done little officially since to construct a sounder theory. Yet it has taken Rome, with its vastly greater resources of ordered thought and theological learning, more than

three centuries even to begin that task, which is not yet completed.

There was also a real desire in the construction of the *Ordinal* to restore the emphasis on the *pastoral* office of the priesthood which mediaeval teaching had much obscured. It can hardly be said that this was heretical. One has only to look at the Ordination of a Priest as St. Gregory left it in the *Gregorian Sacramentary* in a form which goes back, it is likely, to the time of St. Leo, and to examine the things for which these Pontiffs thought it most worth while to pray for their ordinands, to be aware that the Anglican preoccupations have a sound enough Catholic root. It cannot necessarily have been wrong to share the pastoral ideals of Popes St. Leo and St. Gregory. True that in the effort to bring these ideals once more into prominence, the Anglican *Ordinal* omits many things which had been inserted into the Ordination rite since their time. But these things can hardly have been *essential* to the integrity of the rite for the Ordination of a Presbyter, or these Popes would not wholly have omitted them. Or are we to say that once an inessential thing has ever been incorporated by unauthorised action into any sacramental rite, it can never again be omitted without utterly nullifying the validity of that rite—leaving the rites of other Churches which never contained that particular inessential still valid without it? That is what the argument of *Apostolicae Curae* amounts to in effect. What havoc such a doctrine would cause if it were ever to be applied, *e.g.*, to the rite of Baptism! Those who are tempted to argue along those lines will find a gentle, reasoned and wholly decisive dissuasive in the tenth chapter of the eighth book of *de Synodo Diœcesana* by Pope Benedict XIV.

There for the moment matters still stand about Anglican Orders. The Bull is the Papacy's latest word on the subject, and though it is not generally taken as emanating from the Pope's 'infallible *magisterium*', it does emanate from his 'ordinary *magisterium*'. This means that even though it may not actually bind the conscience of Catholics as a thing to be believed 'of faith', yet it does and ought to bind their practice and behaviour. No good

Roman Catholic ought to speak or write or act as though it were untrue. Nor ought we, in charity, to expect to try to persuade them to do so.

But—such is one consequence of the catastrophe of Christian schism—the question raised by the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* presents itself in two very different ways to the Roman and the Anglican student. To the Roman it is an abstract question, remote, of no personal consequence, which nowhere touches his vital religious concern at all. He can broadly yield his assent to the propositions it contains, in passing and without a pang. Even if he has some professional interest in discussing them, he can do it with that sort of theoretical interest only with which an Anglican scholar might discuss the possible validity or invalidity of the conferring of Confirmation *before* Baptism, which was undoubtedly the custom in the Syrian Church for the first five or six centuries. However interesting, nothing which touches himself is at stake either way.

But the practising Anglican with a knowledge of the facts who is considering, perhaps even preparing and wishing, to yield assent to the Bull, finds himself faced with the following propositions:

(1) The Anglican rite for the Ordination of a Priest is insufficient by defect of 'Form', because the Anglican *Ordinals* of 1550-2 did not sufficiently make it clear that it was the 'Priesthood' which was being conferred: *i.e.* When at a service called 'The Ordering of Priests' (different services being provided for Deacons and Bishops) the Archdeacon leads men before the Bishop and says 'I present these men to be ordained Priests'; and the Bishop says to the People 'These are the men I propose to ordain to the Priesthood'; and prays for 'these Thy servants now called to the Office of Priesthood'; and then asks the men publicly 'Do you believe that you have a vocation to the Priesthood?'—when all this has happened, and he then ordains them with the laying on of hands and prayer for the Holy Spirit and a commission to absolve or retain sins, and subsequently gives them authority to preach and celebrate the Sacraments, without specifically men-

tioning the Priesthood at that actual point of the rite, it is not sufficiently 'determined' that it is the 'Priesthood' which is being conferred.

(2) The Anglican rite for the Ordination of a Priest is insufficient by defect of 'Intention', because it does not make it clear that the 'Priesthood' (insufficiently) mentioned in the rite is intended to be 'Priesthood' as understood in all ages of the Catholic Church before the Reformation: *i.e.* When the Preface to the Anglican *Ordinal* says that there have always been Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Catholic Church since the Apostles' time, who have been ordained by the imposition of hands with prayer; 'and therefore, to the intent that these orders should be continued, used and esteemed in this Church of England' none but those already ordained Bishops, Priests and Deacons or those in future ordained to be so by imposition of hands and prayer is to act as a Bishop, Priest or Deacon—this really means that 'therefore, with the intention that these Orders should be discontinued, disused and repudiated in the Church of England and something esteemed better put in their place, no one but those already Bishops, Priests or Deacons or those in future ordained to be something different by the imposition of hands and prayer is to act as Bishop, Priest or Deacon.'

Any man might be forgiven for finding these statements difficult to believe. When he is required to make them *specifically on these grounds* about what has hitherto been the mainspring of the best things in his life, he may well find himself unable to do so, not through pride or perversity, but out of scruple for truth.

X

18. iii. '44.

My dear Harry, Thank you for your letter—and thank you for your thanks. But I was glad to have the chance of doing it since you wanted it, and anyhow it is part of my job. As for O'Dwyer's letter, I am sure that in fairness you ought to see him again since he says he wants to see you, and you ought to listen to anything he says with an open mind. I have said all along that what I was

giving you was an advocate's case, and that I should leave you to make your own judgement at the end. You can shew him anything I have sent you, and I shall be grateful for any corrections of fact or other criticisms he cares to make, either directly to me or through you.

But whether you see him or not, remember that I have only been putting before you what I regard as reasons why Anglicans have not that sort of obvious and imperative duty to leave the Church of England which *Apostolicae Curae* would imply, if it were true. If the C. of E. has valid Orders and Sacraments then it is *possible* to be an Anglican. But whether it is *right* to be an Anglican would depend on other considerations. As I said before, the positive reasons for being an Anglican begin only after that point is settled. I think there are such reasons—godly and weighty reasons (No! Don't be alarmed! I am not going to start all over again about a fresh subject) but we have hardly touched on them here at all. Only I don't want you to get the idea that belief in the C. of E. only means escaping on a sort of 'Not proven' verdict from the particular charges brought by Leo XIII, to resume a slightly shady career on the fringes of decent ecclesiastical society. As I also said before, only those who believe in the C. of E. as a genuine and living part of the Holy Catholic Church are likely to be able to lead their spiritual life securely and steadily within her in the next few years. Without that belief, based on genuine and informed conviction, you will find yourself too much harrassed and distracted by the continual controversies and upsets which it seems to me are inescapable in the very complicated situation which has slowly been growing up in the C. of E. for the last generation and more. The causes of it are intricate and many go back a long way. And the situation has got worse by degrees, through the adoption of a policy of always trying to avoid deciding any practical issue on grounds of doctrinal belief. That is always a dangerous and doubtful policy for any Christian to adopt, let alone a Church. (It can easily become immoral.) But it was adopted *faute de mieux* in the C. of E.—not merely because it saved trouble, but because in the circumstances of State Establishment any other policy was hardly a practicable possibility. But now that the accumulated consequences are working themselves out, we cannot expect that they will be comfortable or trivial.

It was by your own showing some inkling of all this which first upset you last year, and if you see Father O'Dwyer he is quite

entitled to face you with it. Indeed, I think that if I were a Roman controversialist I should stop looking for the Achilles' heel in the Anglican *Ordinal*, and concentrate all my arguments on the shyness of official Anglicanism of *acting like* a Catholic Church. (I don't mean in ceremonial things and trifles, but on doctrinal issues and principles of the first importance.) It is very apt in practice to reserve its Catholic beliefs solely as something to point to in self-defence against Roman Catholic controversy, and to trust to a purely opportunist policy and a rather ramshackle institutionalism to guide the actual life of the Church. As a rule Roman Catholic controversialists let themselves be hypnotised by *Apostolicae Curae* and pay attention only to that. It is natural, because it settles the question for them—and it is a 'short cut' (and was meant to be). But like so many short cuts it only increases difficulties for those who take it.

But if O'Dwyer takes the other line, it is a fair one to take, and you ought to consider it. I think that the real answer lies in the circumstances of the Reformation in England. When the Elizabethan government presented the Church of England with a *fait accompli* by simply imposing the third Act of Uniformity through Parliament in 1559 without even a pretence of consultation with the Church, there were two possible lines to be taken.—One was covert and unorganised refusal to accept the situation, which meant utter disruption. The government was in complete control of all the machinery of the Church. You have only to study the confusion and disorganisation of the Recusants in Elizabeth's reign to see the consequences of this if it had been generally adopted. It would have meant the end of organised Christianity in England in a welter of disintegration. The other was the attempt to work *through* the situation, if the essentials were there, and to do the best one could with those. The Recusants adopted the one course of action, and heroically endured the consequences. But I do not think that honest and devoted men like Archbishop Parker and Bishop Guest were to be blamed if they thought the other was the more constructively Christian line to take. Perhaps that was the first of our dangerous decisions by 'policy'. Yet there was much in the legacy of the Mediaeval Church which cried aloud for Reform. Politics—in certain respects very grubby politics—complicated the whole question. Neither Philip of Spain on one side nor Cecil and Leicester on the other are very attractive Christian protagonists, you know. Nor were either Elizabeth or Mary Queen of Scots, the Protestant and

Catholic candidates for the throne, looking solely to the spiritual profit of the causes they represented. And so the breach widened and deepened and hardened on both sides, and the blood of martyrs did not do anything to heal it. The two Churches developed very differently, largely through the fact of their separation. But the question really is, *were* the essentials there in the system which Parker and Guest and the others felt obliged to accept? That is a much wider question than Anglican Orders, and I am not going into it now. But I cannot see that they were not. And if they were, then for three centuries the C. of E. taught the essentials of the Catholic Faith and ministered the essential Catholic Sacraments to the ordinary English people, when no one else could, or would have been allowed by the State to do it. That is her title to exist, and I think a man could and should love her for that, even if he felt that he must leave her now, because it did not seem to him a title to an *independent* existence to-day.

You may say that the position is not quite the same now. There are proposals—you know of them and we need not go into them—by which that Catholic Faith and those Catholic Sacraments are not repudiated by the Church of England, but by which they are treated, for the first time in our history, as something 'optional'. It is suggested that those who do not believe in them and do not want them could contract out of them, to a greater or lesser extent, if they were disposed to come to some working arrangement with the machinery of the Church of England without them. The idea is that we should just treat them as things we want to keep for ourselves, but not as in any sense integral parts of the Christian revelation. The men who have planned this have hoped and prayed all their lives for Reunion. And Reunion with Rome is difficult, and the difficulties are not all on our side. So they have chosen the easy way (and another 'short cut'). Old men in a hurry to realise their dearest dreams can be very short-sighted. Though for a while it might not be admitted, Anglicanism would quietly have changed its position on all the fundamental questions which divide Catholicism from Protestantism. The Anglican Church and Ministry would have been equated with various Protestant societies and Ministries as slightly variant specimens of the same thing, by the process of ignoring all those differences which revolve around the idea of 'Justification' (of which I wrote before) with their immense effects on every aspect of the *living* of the Christian life. At present Anglicanism and Protestantism stand on opposite sides of this great division of

thought. But if these dreams came true, the stand first taken up in the *XXXIX Articles* and maintained ever since by the C. of E. would be bound to be reversed in the end. To take one instance out of many: You could not convincingly teach, as our Catechism now does, that Baptism is 'generally (*i.e.* universally) *necessary to salvation*', if you were not prepared to insist on it as necessary for receiving Holy Communion or even Ordination—as these proposals deliberately omit to insist on it. As regards the question of Orders, what these proposals amount to is an official Anglican admission that Pope Leo XIII was right after all in his fundamental contention in *Apostolicae Curae*. In spite of face-saving phrases about 'the Apostolic Ministry' and the future confining of the act of Ordaining to men styled 'Bishops', we should be committed to a formal declaration that by 'Bishops, Priests and Deacons' *could* be meant only the new sixteenth-century conception of the Ministry disguised under the old titles, and that anyone who chose to take it as meaning that would be fully justified in doing so. And whether we like it or not, that would be to justify Leo XIII in the teeth of all our own past history. Thus, if these proposals were to be put into practice, the whole ground for believing in the Church of England which I have outlined would have ceased to exist—within the Church of England thus revolutionised. Nevertheless, as regards *the past* the facts we have been considering would not therefore cease to be *true*. But those who accepted their truth would have to face the unhappy situation that there was no longer any legitimate place for them in the new Church of England, or in the Church of Rome either.

I said before that conditional loyalties weary a man's heart in the end. With a quite undesigned cruelty it is just such a conditional loyalty to the Church of England as she is which has been forced just now upon those who believe in the Church of England for what she is. I should be less than candid if I did not tell you that, not because you are going to see O'Dwyer, but because it is the fact. He does not believe in the C. of E. and therefore he can hardly understand or put before you this desperate unhappiness that only an Anglican can feel. I think some of us would never be altogether happy again if what these good and sincere men hope for in South India and elsewhere were to come to pass. We should have a choice of wildernesses in which to serve the Lord—and that would be about all.

I have been candid, because I know—nobody better—that it is a difficult loyalty in these days that I have put before you. But is

it more difficult to hold it sincerely than to accept sincerely the statements I put before you at the end of my last letter? (We need pass no hard judgements on Roman Catholics for holding to them. They have no need to analyse them or to do more than take the Bull for granted. It is otherwise with us.) This may not seem a very cheerful or triumphant conclusion. Yet for myself I find that our Lord is good to attempts to see the truth and follow it. But you will choose for yourself with the help that He gives you. Remember me to Father O'Dwyer if you see him. Yours ever
in Dño. Gr. D.

Editorial Note.—The South India Scheme of Reunion was one of the 'short cuts' of which Dom Gregory was thinking when he wrote this passage. It must be remembered that this was written in 1944 and many things have happened since then. Dom Gregory was a member of the Committee of Convocation which considered relations between the Church of England and the Church of South India; and in Convocation itself he advocated the regulations made in 1950, as a practical basis for meeting the difficult circumstances created by the establishment of the Church of South India. The following sentence from the report of a speech by the author printed in *The Chronicle of Convocation* of May 1950 (p. 260) is significant, though it should of course be read in its full context: 'He had come to the conclusion that the Church of South India intended orthodoxy and that its leaders and the bulk of its members were orthodox, but that they were themselves better than their formularies and a great deal better than some of their formularies.'

APPENDIX I

In considering the Gordon Case some time after writing *The Question of Anglican Orders*, the author was struck by the possibility that Gordon had in fact been telling the truth when he described his ordination (see *p.* 75), which would imply that he had not in fact been ordained under the Anglican ordinal. Unknown to Dom Gregory, this idea had already been put out by William McMillan in a review of Dr E. C. Messenger's 'The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood' in the Church Service Society Annual for 1936-7. The passage is as follows:

'We may draw attention to one point on which we think Dr Messenger has gone astray. He refers to the case of John Gordon, who had been consecrated in Glasgow Cathedral in 1688 as Bishop of Galloway. Gordon was afterwards received into the Church of Rome in 1704, and his case was the subject of an investigation by the authorities at Rome. He is referred to here as an *Anglican* bishop—a title which we are sure he would have repudiated. The Scottish bishops of the Second Episcopacy were more than usually sensitive to the accusation of Anglicanism. Similarly, Dr Messenger is quite certain that Gordon had been ordained according to the rite contained in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, but he gives no evidence for his statement, and we are of opinion that there is no such evidence to be had. This particular prayer book was never authorised for use in the Church of Scotland; and many of the prelates, including Archbishop Sharpe, were decidedly against giving it any recognition at all. The Privy Council, it is true, allowed it to be used in private families; but any use in churches was illegal. The note made by a Papal official in 1704 regarding Gordon's consecration indicates that it was not the 1662 ordinal which was used. The words of consecration are those found in the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI and as this book was in use in Scotland in the years immediately preceding and succeeding 1560, it may well have been used again in 1688. It is, however,

just as likely that it was the Scots ordinal of 1620 that was used; or that, following the ordinary usage of the time, the presiding Archbishop did not confine himself to any particular order.'

On this supposition, the decision as to the invalidity of Gordon's orders in 1704, which is quoted in *Apostolicae Curae* as the decisive precedent for the condemnation of Anglican orders, has in fact no bearing upon the validity of orders conveyed under the Anglican ordinal.

Further investigation of this question is important, particularly as there is considerable doubt as to what the Roman documents concerning Gordon really do say. On this subject, Dom Gregory Dix wrote as follows:

'I put forward a suggestion with diffidence, and only because I think it is time that we at least understood why we disagree. If some eminent Roman Catholic historian were to co-operate with an Anglican historian of known integrity in an investigation of the historical facts, I believe that it would be possible for them to produce a joint statement. They would disagree as to the theological conclusions to be drawn from these facts, no doubt. But it is possible that an agreed statement of the facts themselves would bring us all a long step nearer, if not to the liquidation of a controversy whose roots lie rather in our theology *de Ecclesia* than in our theology *de Ordine*, yet at least to the end of those mutual accusations of bad faith and unfairness which are no credit either to English scholarship or to our Christianity.'*

* Reference may also be made to 'Scottish Ordinations in the Restoration Period' by Dr Gordon Donaldson in *Scottish Historical Review*, Oct. 1954, Vol. XXIII, No. 116, pp. 169-175.

APPENDIX II

If the author were alive to revise the text of this book, he would undoubtedly have discussed the bearing on its subject of the Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius XII in 1948 on the Matter and Form of Sacred Orders, in which the Pope defines the laying on of hands as the matter of the Sacrament and passages from the ordination and consecration prefaces as constituting the form.

The passage thus defined as the form of the ordination of a priest is as follows:

'Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum tuum Presbyterii dignitatem; innova in visceribus eius spiritum sanctitatis, ut acceptum a Te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineat censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuet.'

A literal translation is as follows:

'Grant we beseech Thee, almighty Father, to this Thy servant the dignity of the Presbyterate: renew in his heart the spirit of holiness, so that he may obtain the gift of the second merit received from Thee, O God, and put forward a standard of holy behaviour by the example of his own way of life.'

The passage taken as the form for the consecration of a bishop is the following:

'Comple in Sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructam coelestis unguenti rore sanctifica.'

This may be translated:

'Confer on thy Priest the highest dignity of thy ministry, and furnished with every honour, sanctify him with the dew of heavenly unction.'

The bearing of this text on the Question of Anglican Orders has been discussed in a pamphlet by J. L. C. Dart entitled *'Anglican Orders and the Papal Decree of 1948'*, published by the Church Union. In default of anything from Dom Gregory Dix's pen, we may refer the reader to this.

APPENDIX III

Dom Gregory Dix has been taken to task by Roman Catholic controversialists over his handling of Pope Leo XIII's objections to the Anglican forms through defect of expression of intention. He wrote as follows, in answer to Dr E. C. Messenger's objections* on this point:

'There is one point of Dr Messenger's which ought to be taken up, a simple point of Latinity. In *Apostolicae Curae* Pope Leo XIII objected that the Anglican Forms of Ordination *minime significant definite ordinem . . . vel eius gratiam et potestatem*. Commenting on this Dr Messenger says absolutely, 'Vel means "or" not "and".' He rebukes me severely for misrepresenting the Pope by taking *vel* conjunctively here (*i.e.* as equivalent to *et*).

Strictly speaking, the disjunctive in Latin is *vel . . . vel*. Standing alone *vel* can be either disjunctive or conjunctive both in classical authors (cf. Forcellini s.v. II: '=et') and in later Latin (cf. Ducange s.v.: '*saepe pro conjunctiva, et*'). Which did Pope Leo mean it to be here? The immediate context in *Apostolicae Curae* (dealing with the Anglican Ordination of Priests) is not decisive, but in the next paragraph—(*De consecratione episcopali similiter . . .*) the meaning is plain. Pope Leo insists that it is of no use at all to bring in the prayers in the Anglican rite *Omnipotens Deus* (which specifically names the order of a 'bishop' being conferred) as a supplement to the Anglican form, since the prayer itself *pariter diminuta sit verbis quae 'summum sacerdotium' declarent*, and that *summum sacerdotium* is the principal *gratia et potestas* of the episcopate. I am not blind to the significance of *deminuta sit*. But it is clear that, in the Anglican rite, the Pope was not content with a form which did not express *definite ordinem ET ejus gratiam et potestatem*. I was concerned only to point out the devastating consequences of applying this requirement to the early Roman and other rites. Applied strictly and in the precise way in which

* *Dublin Review*, Vol. 217 (1945), pp. 93-97.

Pope Leo applies it here to the Anglican rite for the consecration of Bishops and intended to apply *similiter* to the Anglican rite for the ordination of Priests, it would cast doubt on every Ordination rite which has survived from the first Christian millennium.