

alive; and on the 22nd he was consecrated Archbishop.

We quote here the decree of Eugenius IV., as re-issued by Pole, because it shows how slippery and weak the judgment of the Church of Rome has been in this matter. Further, when Pope Leo extols the learning of Pole on this point and writes that it would have been quite irrelevant for the Popes to instruct the legate "as to the conditions necessary for the bestowal of the sacrament of orders," he seems wholly to forget Eugenius' decree, which he has silently thrown over in another part of his letter (cp. section 3 and section 5):

The sixth sacrament is that of order: the matter of which is the thing by the delivery of which the order is conferred: as for instance the order of the Presbyterate is conferred by the porrection of the chalice with wine and the paten with bread; the diaconate by giving of the book of the Gospels; the sub-diaconate by the delivery of the empty chalice with the empty paten on it; and in like manner as regards other orders by the assignment of things pertaining to their ministries. The form of priesthood is as follows: *Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And so as regards the forms of the other orders as is contained at length in the Roman Pontifical. The ordinary minister of this sacrament is the bishop: the effect, an increase of grace, so that a man may be a fit minister.

Here the laying-on of hands, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the candidates for orders, are not referred to even by a single word. Yet Eugenius, as is clear by his explanation of other sacraments, is not speaking of things to be supplied by the Armenians, as writers on the Roman side are sometimes fond of saying, but is teaching the Church, as if he were its master, in careful adherence to Aquinas, about what is absolutely necessary to the administration of the sacraments. So also he writes in the earlier part of his decree:

All these sacraments have three requisites for their performance, things as their "matter," words as their "form," and the person of the minister who celebrates the Sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does: and if any of these be absent, the Sacrament is not performed." (Conc. xiv., p. 1748).

Now in our Church from March, 1550, to Nov. 1st, 1552, though the delivery of the instruments still remained in some degree, i.e., of the chalice with bread in the case of presbyters, and of the pastoral staff in that of bishops, and of the Bible in both, yet the forms attached to them had already been changed very nearly into those which now are in use. In the year 1552 the delivery of the chalice and the staff was dropped and that of the Bible alone remained. King Edward died on the 6th July, 1553.

According to this decree, then, all the presbyters ought to have been reordained. But Pole's opinion scarcely agreed with his practice. Nor does Paul IV. himself, in his brief *Regimini universalis*, make any demands as to the form in which presbyters are ordained, though careful about "properly and rightly ordained" bishops. (See last page of Appendix.)

VII. The second, but scarcely stronger, foundation of the Papal opinion about the practice of his Court appears to be the judgment of Clement XI. in the case of John Gordon, formerly Bishop of Galloway, delivered on Thursday, April 17th, 1704, in the general Congregation of the Inquisition, or, as it is usually called, the Holy Office.

We here make a short answer on this case, inasmuch as it cannot be treated clearly on account of the darkness in which the Holy Office is enveloped, a darkness insufficiently dispersed by Pope Leo's letter. The fuller treatment of this has been relegated to the Appendix. There are, however, four reasons in particular for considering this case as a weak and unstable foundation for his judgment. In the first place, inasmuch as Gordon himself petitioned to be ordained according to the Roman rite, the case was not heard on the other side. Secondly, his petition had as its basis the old "Tavern fable," and was vitiated by falsehoods concerning our rite. Thirdly, the new documents of "incontestable authenticity" cited by the Pope are still involved in obscurity, and he argues about them as if he were himself uncertain as to their tenor and meaning (1). Fourthly, the decree of the congregation of the Holy Office, if it is to be considered to agree with Pope Leo's judgment, can scarcely be reconciled with the reply of the consultors of the Holy Office on Abyssinian ordinations, said to have been given

VII. (1) Compare the letter *Apostolicae curae*, sec. 5. "It is important to bear in mind that this judgment was in no wise determined by the omission of the tradition of instruments, for in such a case, according to the established custom, the direction would have been to repeat the ordination conditionally," &c. Which mode of argument differs widely from the quotation of a clearly expressed document. See the Appendix.

VII. (2) See Le Quien, *Nullity of Anglican Ordinations*, Paris, 1725, ii., pp. 312 and 315.

about a week before, and often published as authoritative by Roman theologians up to 1893. Therefore, all those documents ought to be made public if the matter is to be put on a fair footing for judgment.

Finally, it must be noted, that Gordon never went beyond minor orders in the Roman Church. That is to say, he only did enough to receive a pension for his support from certain benefices (2).

VIII. The Pope has certainly done well not to rest satisfied with such weak conclusions, and to determine to reopen the question and to treat it afresh; although this would seem to have been done in appearance rather than in reality. For, inasmuch as the case was submitted by him to the Holy Office, it is clear that it, being bound by its traditions, could hardly have expressed dissent from the judgment, however ill founded, which was passed in the case of Gordon.

Further, when he touches upon the matter itself and follows the steps of the Council of Trent, our opinion does not greatly differ from the main basis of his judgment. He rightly calls laying-on of hands the "matter" of ordination. His judgment on the "form" is not so clearly expressed; but we suppose him to intend to say that the form is prayer or benediction appropriate to the ministry to be conferred, which is also our opinion. Nor do we part company with the Pope when he suggests that it is right to investigate the intention of a Church in conferring holy orders "in so far as it is manifested externally." For whereas it is scarcely possible for any man to arrive at a knowledge of the inner mind of a priest, so that it cannot be right to make the validity of a sacrament depend upon it, the will of the Church can both be ascertained more easily, and ought also to be both true and sufficient. Which intention our Church shows generally by requiring a promise from one who is to be ordained that he will rightly minister the doctrine, sacraments, and discipline of Christ, and teaches that he who is unfaithful to this promise may be justly punished. And in our Liturgy we regularly pray for "all bishops and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth (God's) true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer (His) holy sacraments."

But the intention of the Church must be ascertained "in so far as it is manifested externally"—that is to say, from its public formularies and definite pronouncements which directly touch the main point of the question, not from its omissions and reforms, made as opportunity occurs, in accordance with the liberty which belongs to every province and nation—unless it may be that something is omitted which has been ordered in the Word of God, or the known and certain statutes of the universal Church. For if a man assumes the custom of the middle ages and of more recent centuries as the standard, consider, brethren, how clearly he is acting against the liberty of the Gospel and the true character of Christendom. And if we follow this method of judging the validity of sacraments, we must throw doubt upon all of them, except baptism alone, which seems according to the judgment of the universal Church to have its matter and form ordained by the Lord.

IX. We acknowledge therefore with the Pope that the laying-on of hands is the matter of ordination; we acknowledge that the form is prayer or blessing appropriate to the ministry to be conferred; we acknowledge that the intention of the Church, as far as it is externally manifested, is to be ascertained, so that we may discover if it agrees with the mind of the Lord and His Apostles and with the statutes of the universal Church. We do not, however, attach so much weight to the doctrines so often decried upon by the schoolmen since the time of William of Auxerre (A.D. 1215), that each of the sacraments of the Church ought to have a single form and matter exactly defined. Nor do we suppose that this is a matter of faith with the Romans. For it introduces a very great danger of error, supposing any Pope or doctor, who may have great influence over the men of his own time, should persuade people to acknowledge as necessary this or that form or matter which has not been defined either in the Word of God or by the Catholic Fathers or Councils.

For, as we have said, baptism stands alone as a sacrament in being quite certain both in its form and its matter. And this is suitable to the nature of the case. For—inasmuch as the baptism of Christ is the entrance into the Church for all men, and can be ministered by all Christians, if there be a pressing need—the conditions of a valid baptism ought to be known to all. As regards the Eucharist (if you set aside, as of less importance, questions about unleavened bread, and salt, about water, and the rest), it has a sufficiently certain matter; but up to the present day a debate is still going on as to its full and essential form. But the matter of confirmation is not so entirely certain; and we, at any rate, do not at all think that Christians who have different opinions on the subject should be condemned by one another. The form of confirmation again is uncertain and quite general, prayer, that is to say, or benediction, more or less suitable, such as is used in each of our churches. And so with respect to others.

X. But this topic of confirmation requires to be treated rather more at large, for it throws much light on the question proposed by the Pope. He writes truly that laying-on of hands is a "matter" "which is usually used for confirmation." The matter, therefore, of confirmation seems, in his judgment, to be laying-on of hands, as we, too, hold in accordance with Apostolic tradition. But the Roman Church for many centuries has, by a corrupt custom, substituted a stretching-out of hands over a crowd of children, or simply "towards those who are to be confirmed," in the place of laying-on of hands to be conferred on each individual (1).

The Orientals (with Eugenius IV.) teach that the matter is chrism, and use no laying-on of hands in this rite. If, therefore, the doctrine about a fixed matter and form in the sacraments were to be admitted, the Romans have ministered confirmation imperfectly for many centuries past, and the Greeks have none. And not a few amongst the former practically confess the corruption introduced by their Fathers, having joined laying-on of hands to the anointing, as we have learnt, in many places, while a rubric on this point has been added in some Pontificals. And it is fair to ask whether Orientals who are converts to the Roman communion require a second confirmation? Or do the Romans admit that they, who have changed its matter, have had as good a right to do so as themselves who have corrupted it?

Whatever the Pope may answer, it is clear enough that we cannot everywhere insist very strictly on that doctrine about a fixed form and matter; inasmuch as all sacraments of the Church, except baptism, would in that way be rendered uncertain.

XI. We inquire, therefore, what authority the Pope has for discovering a definite form in the bestowal of holy orders? We have seen no evidence produced by him except two passages from the determinations of the Council of Trent (*Session XXIII. On the Sacrament of Order, Canon I., and Session XXII. On the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon III.*) which were promulgated after our Ordinal was composed, from which he infers that the principal grace and power of the Christian Priesthood is the consecration and oblation of the Body and Blood of the Lord. The authority of that council has certainly never been admitted in our country, and we find that by it many truths were mixed with falsehoods, much that is uncertain with what is certain. But we answer as regards the passages quoted by the Pope that we make provision with the greatest reverence for the consecration of the holy Eucharist and commit it only to properly ordained priests and to no other ministers of the Church. Further, we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice, and do not believe it to be a "nude commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross," an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that council. But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, Who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Further, since the Pope reminds us somewhat severely of "the necessary connection between faith and worship, between the law of believing and the law of praying," it seems fair to call closer attention, both on your part and ours, to the Roman Liturgy. And when we look carefully into the "Canon of the Mass," what do we see clearly exhibited there as to the idea of sacrifice? It agrees sufficiently with our Eucharistic formularies, but scarcely or not at all with the determinations of the Council of Trent. Or rather it should be said that two methods of explaining the sacrifice are put forth at the same time by that council, one which agrees with liturgical sci-

X. (1) In the so-called "Gelasian" Sacramentary (perhaps in the seventh century) we still read the rubric, *In sealing them he lays his hands on them with the following words:* then follows the prayer for the sevenfold gift of the Spirit. And in the "ordines" called those of St. Amand, which are perhaps of the eighth century, in ch. iv. the pontiff touches their heads with his hand. But in the "Gregorian" we read, *raising his hand over the heads of all, he says, &c.* In the ordinary editions of the Pontifical we read again, *Then stretching out his hands towards those who are to be confirmed, he says, &c.*