

pany with ourselves, on account of defective intention, who in the *Orthodox Confession*, issued about 1640 name only two functions of a sacramental priesthood—that is to say, that of absolving sins and of preaching; who in the *Longer Russian Catechism* (Moscow, 1839) teach nothing about the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and mention among the offices which pertain to order only those of ministering the sacraments and feeding the flock. Further it thus speaks of the three orders:—

The deacon serves at the Sacraments; the priest hallows the Sacraments in dependence on the bishop; the bishop not only hallows the Sacraments himself, but has the power also to impart to others by the laying-on of his hands the gift and grace to hallow them.

The Eastern Church is assuredly at one with us in teaching that the ministry of more than one mystery describes the character of the priesthood better than the offering of a single sacrifice.

This indeed appears in the form used in the Greek Church to-day in the prayer beginning, *O God, Who art great in power:—*

Fill this man, whom Thou hast chosen to attain the rank of presbyter, with the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be worthy blamelessly to assist at Thy sanctuary, to preach the Gospel of thy kingdom, to minister the Word of Thy Truth, to offer Thee spiritual gifts and sacrifices, to renew Thy people by the laver of regeneration, &c. (Habert *Greek Pontifical*, p. 314, ed. 1643.)

But let the Romans consider now not once or twice what judgment they will pronounce upon their own Fathers, whose ordinations we have described above. For if the Pope shall, by a new decree, declare our Fathers of two hundred and fifty years ago wrongly ordained, there is nothing to hinder the inevitable sentence that by the same law all who have been similarly ordained have received no orders. And if our Fathers, who used in 1550 and 1552 forms which, as he says, are null, were altogether unable to reform them in 1662, his own Fathers come under the self-same law. And if Hippolytus, and Victor, and Leo, and Gelasius, and Gregory have some of them said too little in their rites about the priesthood and the high priesthood, and nothing about the power of offering the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the Church of Rome herself has an invalid priesthood, and the reformers of the sacramentaries, no matter what their names, could do nothing to remedy her rites. "For as the Hierarchy" (to use the Pope's words) "had become extinct on account of the nullity of the form, there remained no power of ordaining," and if the Ordinal—

Was wholly insufficient to confer Orders, it was impossible that in the course of time it could become sufficient, since no change has taken place (1). In vain those who from the [VIth and XIth centuries] have attempted to hold some kind of sacrifice or of priesthood [and power of remitting and retaining sins] have made some additions to the Ordinal.

Thus, in overthrowing our orders, he overthrows all his own, and pronounces sentence on his own Church. Eugenius IV. indeed brought his own Church into great peril of nullity when he taught a new matter and a new form of order, and left the real without a word. For no one knows how many ordinations may have been made, according to his teaching, without any laying-on of hands or appropriate form. Pope Leo demands a form unknown to previous bishops of Rome, and an intention which is defective in the catechisms of the Oriental Church.

To conclude, since all this has been laid before us in the name of peace and unity, we wish it to be known to all men that we are at least equally zealous in our devotion to peace and unity in the Church. We acknowledge that the things which our brother

Pope Leo XIII. has written from time to time in other letters are sometimes very true and always written with a good will. For the difference and debate between us and him arises from a diverse interpretation of the self-same Gospel, which we all believe and honour as the only true one. We also gladly declare that there is much in his own person that is worthy of love and reverence. But that error, which is inveterate in the Roman communion, of substituting the visible Head for the invisible Christ, will rob his good words of any fruit of peace. Join with us, then, we entreat you, most reverend brethren, in weighing patiently what Christ intended when he established the ministry of His Gospel. When this has been done more will follow as God wills in His own good time.

God grant that, even from this controversy, may grow fuller knowledge of the truth, greater patience, and a broader desire for peace, in the Church of Christ, the Saviour of the world!

F. CANTUAR,
WILLELM, EBOR.

Dated on Friday, the 19th day of
February, A.D. 1897.

APPENDIX—THE CASE OF JOHN GORDON.

John Gordon, whose case we discussed briefly in Chapter VII., was consecrated bishop of Galloway, in the south of Scotland, in Glasgow Cathedral in 1688. He followed King James II. into exile, was afterwards received into the Roman Church, and was baptized afresh conditionally. He took in addition to his own Christian name that of Clement, who was then Pope. Gordon, as is well known, asked Clement in a petition or memorial, which is still extant, (1), that he might take orders according to the Roman rite. There is no need to go through all the arguments of his petition. It is enough to say that they are very far remote from the truth. Their basis is the fable about Archbishop Parker's consecration. Concerning the matter, form, and intention he writes:—

They use no matter, unless it be the delivery of the Bible, nor any lawful form: indeed, they have cast aside the Catholics' form and changed it into this: "Receive the power of preaching the Word of God, and of ministering His holy sacraments," which is essentially different from the orthodox forms. And what intention can they possibly conceive who deny that Christ or the early Church instituted any unbloody sacrifice?

He takes no account of the truer matter and form employed among us—namely, the laying-on of hands and the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," and all that then as now preceded and followed them. We do not know what prompted Gordon to commit this great fault.

It was then on this petition, which only touched the form of the ordination of presbyters, that Clement XI. judged the case; and those who had only known the history from the book of Michael Le Quien naturally believed that he had simply judged according to Gordon's views. But the fact was really different, as is clear from the statement prefixed to the decree, which Estcourt printed as late as the year 1873, and which has been strangely overlooked in this controversy, and from the letter of Pope Leo XIII., who writes:—

And in order that the judgment concerning this form might be more certain and complete, precaution was taken that a copy of the Anglican Ordinal should be submitted to examination.

The statement, after first reciting the date of the consecration and similar facts, proceeds:—

The action was performed generally (*ferè*) as follows:—*First*, prayers were said according to the Anglican Liturgy. *Secondly*, a sermon was delivered

App. (1) See *Le Quien Nullity*, &c., vol. ii. App. pp. lxxix.—lxxv., Paris, 1725, to which the decree of the Holy Office is appended. Cp. E. E. Estcourt *The question of Anglican Ordinations discussed* (Lon., 1873) App. xxxvi., pp. cxv. foll., who also printed a different statement of the case and another form of the decree that follows with much care. The Royal Charter for the consecration is dated February 4th, 1686, (subsequent to the election), and sealed September 4th; the statement gives September 19th as the date of the consecration.

to the people about the dignity and office of a bishop. *Thirdly* the said John knelt down and all the aforesaid pseudo bishops laid their hands on his head and shoulders, saying, *Take the Holy Ghost and remember that thou stir up the grace which is in thee by imposition of hands: for we have not received the spirit of fear, but of power and love and of soberness*. *Fourthly*, after a few short prayers by way of thanksgiving, the action was terminated.

Then follows the form of decree which, in its earlier part, differs considerably from that supplied by Le Quien, though it does not contradict it. The copy of the statement and decree given in Estcourt's book issued from the Holy Office April 2nd, 1852, and is witnessed by Angelo Argenti, notary of the said office, so that it may be held to be a genuine document.

The judicious reader will note, *first*, that the form of Episcopal consecration alone is quoted here, though Gordon, in his petition, only referred (however untruly) to the form used in the ordination of presbyters. Hence a question at once arises whether the Holy Office accepted Gordon's assertions on that subject as true or not. If it believed them true, its judgment based on such a falsehood is worthless; if it believed them false, why did it not make more accurate statements about that form? *Secondly*, he will observe that the form here quoted is not that which was used, at least in England, in 1688, but the earlier one of 1550 and 1552. For it does not contain the words added in 1662—*For the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee, &c.*—and the words are said to be uttered by all the consecrators. Further, the form was compared so carelessly that *grace* was substituted for *grace of God*, and *we have not received for God hath not given us* (2 Timothy i. 7, as in St. Jerome's version). *Thirdly*, the description of what took place agrees in fact neither with the earlier books nor with the later. For laying-on of hands on the "shoulders" is nowhere ordered in our Ordinals; and many things, like the presentation, the examination, the hymn *Veni Creator*, are passed over in silence. But what is said under the fourth head in the statement is simply untrue. For after the words *take (or receive) the Holy Ghost, &c.*, follows the delivery of the Holy Bible, with the second imperative form, *Give heed unto reading, exhortation and doctrine, &c.* Then the Lord's Supper is celebrated, and lastly, in 1550 and 1552, there followed a single collect (*Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee to send down upon this Thy servant*), to which a second (*Prevent us, O Lord*) was added in 1662 together with the blessing (*The Peace of God which passeth*). The "few short prayers by way of thanksgiving" do not occur at all. Further, the sermon is not ordered in the books of 1550 and 1552, but first appears in the Ordinal of 1662, though it is probable that one was delivered. This comparison, then, of the Anglican Ordinal, whatever book was used, at least as far as it can be judged by the statement, was most careless, and perhaps did not extend to the ordination of presbyters. Certainly, whatever the reasons may have been, it says nothing about it. Lastly, we do not know what to say about the omission to mention the fact of the delivery of the Bible in the consecration of a bishop. The words "was performed generally as follows" seem to point to a carelessness which must be called culpable, considering the seriousness of the case.

So far we have drawn our information from documents already known. But the Pope now adds, from the secret archives, it would seem, of the Holy Office, something which was unknown to us before, "in the delivery of the decision this reason (*i.e.* the consecration of Parker) was altogether set aside, as documents of incontestable authenticity prove," and immediately afterwards, "nor was weight given to any other reason than the defect of form and intention." What, we ask, are these "documents of incontestable authenticity, what defects of form and intention, and if any, of what kind, do they record? Are they defects in the consecration of a bishop? or perhaps in the ordination of presbyters? or in both? These points are of the greatest importance if the

XX. (1) The English of this and the following sentence seems hardly to represent the Latin. "Quum tale ipsum permanserit" might rather be translated "since it (i.e. the Ordinal) remained such as it was." The following sentence might be rendered:—"And they laboured in vain who from the times of Charles I. onwards attempted to introduce (admittere) something of sacrifice and priesthood, by making some additions to the Ordinal."