

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

THE ARCHBISHOPS' REPLY TO THE POPE.

To the Whole Body of Bishops of the Catholic Church,
from the Archbishops of England, Greeting:

(Concluded from last week).

That the Pope should also have been unaware of this change is no matter of wonder: but the fact is worthy of your attention. For we note that he shows some hesitation in this part of his letter, when he suggests that the form of 1662 ought perhaps to be considered sufficient if it had only been a century older (§ 7). He also seems to adopt the opinion of those theologians who believe that the form does not consist of one prayer or benediction, whether "precativ," as they call it, or "imperative," but in the whole series of formulas which are bound together by a moral union. For he goes on to argue about the help which has been "quite recently" (as he believes) sought for our case from the other prayers of the same ordinal; although this appeal on our part is by no means recent, but was made in the seventeenth century when first the argument on the Roman side about the additional words was brought to our notice (4). Nor do we suppose that the Pope disagrees with Cardinal John De Lugo in his teaching that the whole ordination service is a single action, and that it makes no difference if the matter and form are separated from one another (as is the case in the Pontifical), if what intervenes makes up a moral whole (5).

XVI. The argument, however, which the Pope appears to consider of chief importance and stability is not that which concerns the addition of any words to our form, but that which lays to our charge the removal of certain acts and prayers from the rest of the rite. His letter says (§ 7):—

For, to put aside other reasons which show these (prayers) to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all (1): from them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and offices (2) of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the Sacrament which omits (3) what it ought essentially to signify.

And a little later he adds words which are in one way untrue and in another very likely to mislead the reader, and are unfair to our fathers and ourselves:—

In the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the Sacramentum (4), and of the powers of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things . . . was deliberately removed and struck out (§ 8).

In another passage he speaks (with great ignorance of the facts, we regret to say) of—

That small (5) section of the Anglican body, formed in recent times, whose contention is that the said Ordinal can be understood and interpreted in a sound and orthodox sense.

Next he declares that we deny or corrupt the sacrament of order, that we reject (viz., in the Ordinal) all idea of consecration and sacrifice, until at last the offices of presbyter and bishop are left "mere names without the reality which Christ instituted."

The answer to these harsh and inconsiderate words has already been partly made when we gave the warning that he who interprets the acts of our Church by mere conjecture and takes it upon himself to issue a new decree as to what is necessary in

XV. (4) See Burnet, *Vindication*, pp. 8, 71, who writes that the additional words are not essential to ordination, but are merely explanations "of what was clear enough by the other parts of these offices before"; and Prietoux, *Eccl. Tracts*, p. 147, who quotes the prayer *Almighty God in full*, and argues from it. Bramhall had written similarly in 1658, *Works*, A.C.L., iii., pp. 162-9, Oxf. 1844.

XV. (5) *On the Sacraments in General*, disp. ii. sec. v. sec. 99, t. iii. p. 293-4, Paris, 1892.

XVI. (1) *Latin instar omnium*.

XVI. (2) *Latin officia*. The English version inaccurately has "office."

XVI. (3) *Latin reticet*.

XVI. (4) This word is left untranslated.

XVI. (5) *Latin non ita magna*.

the form of Order, condemning our lawful bishops in their government of the Church in the sixteenth century by a standard which they never knew, is entering on a slippery and dangerous path. The liberty of national Churches to reform their own rites may not thus be removed at the pleasure of Rome. For, as we shall show in part later, there is certainly no one "Catholic rite," but even the forms approved by the Roman Church vary much from one another.

The Pope says nothing, however, of the well-known intention of our Church set forth in the preface to the Ordinal, and nothing of the principle which our Fathers always set before themselves and which explains their acts without any adverse interpretation.

XVII. Now the intention of our Church, not merely of a newly formed party in it, is quite clearly set forth in the title and preface of the Ordinal. The title in 1552 ran, "The fourme and manner of makinge and consecratinge Bishoppes, Priestes and Deacons." The preface immediately following begins thus:—

It is evident unto all men, diligently readinge holie Scripture and auncient auctours, that from the Apostles tyme there hath bene these ordres of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishoppes, Priestes and Deacons: which Offices were enenmore had in suche reuerent estimation, that no man by his own private authoritie might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and knowen to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also, by publique prayer, with imposition of hands, approued, and admitted thereunto. And therefore, to the intent that these orders should be continued, and reuerently used and esteemed, in this Church of England; it is requysite that no man (not beyng at thys presente Bishoppe, Priest nor Deacon) shall execute anye of them, excepte he be called, tryed, examined and admitted, accordyng to the form hereafter followinge.

Further on it is stated incidentally that "every man which is to be consecrated a bishop shal be fully thyrtye yeres of age." And in the rite itself the "consecration" of the bishop is repeatedly mentioned. The succession and continuance of these offices from the Lord through the Apostles and the other ministers of the primitive Church is also clearly implied in the "Eucharistical" prayers which precede the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Thus the intention of our Fathers was to keep and continue these offices which come down from the earliest times, and "reverently to use and esteem them," in the sense, of course, in which they were received from the Apostles, and had been up to that time in use. This is a point on which the Pope is unduly silent.

XVIII. But all this and other things of the same kind are called by Pope Leo "names without the reality instituted by Christ." But, on the contrary, our Fathers' fundamental principle was to refer everything to the authority of the Lord, revealed in the Holy Scriptures. It was for this that they rescinded ceremonies composed and added by men, even including that best known one, common to the modern Latin and Eastern Churches, though unknown to the ancient Roman Church (1), of holding a copy of the Gospels over the head of one about to be ordained bishop during the utterance of the blessing and the laying on of hands.

Thus, then, our Fathers employed one matter in imprinting the character, viz., the laying on of hands, one matter in the commission to minister

XVIII. (1) See *Apost. Const.* viii. 4 and *Statutes of the Ancient Church*, can. 2, which appear to be of Gallican origin from the Province of Arles, although they are sometimes published with the false title of the Fourth Council of Carthage. That this rite was foreign to the Church of Rome is clearly testified by the writer of a book, *On the Divine Offices*, which is included in the works of our Alcuin, and is perhaps of the eleventh century. (The rite) is not found in either authority, whether old or new, nor in the Roman tradition" (ch. xxxvii., Migne's *P. L.*, vol. 101, p. 1237; and so Amalarius, *On the Offices of the Church*, ii. 14, *P. L.*, 105, p. 1092). On its use in the consecration of a Pope, see Mabillon, *Ord.* ix., 5.

publicly and exercise powers over the flock entrusted to each, viz., the delivery of the Bible or Gospels. This last they probably borrowed from the office of inaugurating a new bishop, and similar rites; thus in the Pontifical the Gospels are still delivered to the bishop after the ring is given. Other ceremonies of somewhat later date and imported into the ancient Roman Ordinal from sources for the most part foreign and especially Gallican, such as the delivery of the instruments and ornaments, the blessing and unction of hands and head, with the accompanying prayers, they cut out as they had a full right to do. The porrection of the instruments came, as is well known, from the formularies of minor orders, and was unknown to any Pontifical before the eleventh century, which appears to be the earliest date of its mention in writing. When it was reformed, the new formula, "Receive the power of offering sacrifice to God and of celebrating Mass (or, as in the Roman Pontifical, masses) on behalf of both the quick and dead," was likewise dropped. The prayer for the blessing of the hands could be said or omitted at the discretion of the bishop even before the sixteenth century. The anointing is a Gallican and British custom, not Roman at all. Not only is it absent from the "Leonine" and "Gelasian" Sacramentaries, but also from Mabillon's Eighth and Ninth Ordines and those of St. Amand, which apparently represent the custom of the eighth and ninth centuries.

Furthermore we find Pope Nicholas I. writing in the ninth century (874) to Rudolf of Bourges that in the Roman Church the hands neither of priests nor deacons are anointed with chrism (2). The first writer who mentions anything of the kind is Gildas the Briton (3). The same may be said of the anointing of the head, which clearly came, in company with much else, from an imitation of the consecration of Aaron, and makes its appearance in the ninth and tenth centuries outside Rome (4), as may be gathered from Amalarius (*on the offices of the Church*, bk. ii., 14) and our own Pontificals.

There remains to be mentioned the Gallican Benediction, *Deus sanctificationum omnium auctor*, which was added superfluously to the Roman Benediction (cap. xii.) and was rejected like the rest by our Fathers. This prayer, which is manifestly corrupted by interpolation as it stands in the Roman Pontifical, seemed to favour the doctrine of transubstantiation, rejected by us, and is in itself scarcely intelligible, so that it was singularly inappropriate to a liturgy to be said in the vulgar tongue for the edification of our own people. And yet this very prayer, whatever it may imply, teaches nothing about the power to offer sacrifice.

XIX. What wonder then if our Fathers, wishing to return to the simplicity of the Gospel, eliminated these prayers from a liturgy which was to be read publicly in a modern language? And herein they followed a course which was certainly opposed to that pursued by the Romans. For the Romans, starting from an almost Gospel simplicity, have relieved the austerity of their rites with Gallican embellishments, and have gradually, as time went on, added ceremonies borrowed from the Old Testament in order to emphasize the distinction between people and priests more and more. That these ceremonies are "contemptible and harmful," or that they are useless at their proper place and time, we do by no means assert—we declare only that they are not necessary. Thus in the seventeenth century,

(Continued on page 232.)

XVIII. (2) Migne *P. L.*, vol. 119, p. 884, where the letter is numbered 66. Cf. also Martenne *On the Ancient Rites of the Church*, bk. i., c. viii., art. ix., §§ 9 and 14. This reply of Nicholas, beginning "Præterea sciscitaris," is inserted in Gratian's *Decree*, dist. xxiii., c. 12.

XVIII. (3) *Letter* § 106, p. 111 (Stevenson's edition, 1838). He mentions "the blessing by which the hands of priests or ministers are dedicated" (initiantur). The anointing of the hands of presbyters and deacons is ordered in Anglican Sacramentaries of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

XVIII. (4) Cf. *Council of Trent*, Sess. XXIII., *On the Sacrament of Order*, can. v. which, though it apparently admits that unction is not requisite in ordination, anathematizes those who shall say that this and other ceremonies of order are "contemptible and harmful."