

or bishop. Such a form might equally apply for Confirmation, or for the appointment of a parish clerk or a beadle. I have already shown that Mr. Warren's authority, Canon Estcourt, is quite in error in supposing that this form of words has ever been accepted by the Catholic Church as sufficient for imparting either the priesthood or the episcopate.

The words of the 'form' of the Edwardine Ordinal for conveying the priesthood are likewise defective, and insufficient to convey the Order of a sacrificing priesthood. The words of the 'form' are these: '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.' In regard to this 'form,' I may make the following remarks: (1) This form of words does not discriminate between priest and bishop. (2) It professes to impart the power to forgive and retain sins; but this power, though a most important one, is only a secondary and incidental power of the priesthood, and not its primary and essential power, which is the offering of the Sacrifice of the real Body and Blood of Christ in the Mass. (3) It is urged by Mr. Warren that the headings and the context of the Anglican rites of ordination and consecration sufficiently indicate the Order to be conferred—thus, we have 'The form of ordering priests,' 'The form of consecrating an archbishop or bishop,' and such-like words in the prayers, etc. But (as Rev. S. Smith well remarks) 'none of the rites, ancient or modern, which the Holy See has ever recognised, lends any support to this theory of an indeterminate form determined by a remote context.' (b) Besides, the remote context does not determine the words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' to signify the bestowal of a true, sacrificial priesthood. On the contrary, as has been sufficiently indicated, they determine the words in the exactly opposite sense. For, as has been shown, all such idea was rooted up and flung to the winds (as far as they could uproot and fling them) by the English as well as the German reformers. (c) It by no means helps out the case for Anglican Orders to remark, as our friend Mr. Warren does in his esteemed communication, that the words 'priest, bishop, archbishop' appear in the course of the ceremonies. For every idea of the mystical and sacrificial powers of the priesthood was mercilessly torn out of the old Catholic Ordinal by Cranmer and his friends when they set about drawing up their Prayer Book and Ordinal. Of this I have sufficiently spoken. The

Old Names, 'Priest,' etc., were Retained

by them. But as foremost Anglican ecclesiastical writers declare (such as, for instance, 'the judicious Hooker,' *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V., lxxviii., 2) they were retained on this plea: 'As for the people, when they hear the name [priest], it draweth no more their mind to any cogitation of sacrifice than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think of old age, or to imagine that everyone so termed must needs be ancient because years were respected in the nomination of both.' All this sufficiently explains what Cranmer and his followers had in their minds when they spoke of ordering 'priests' to be 'dispensers of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments.' Whatever they meant, it is certain that they did not mean a Sacrifice and a sacrificing priesthood. And that is the only matter that concerns us here. The whole Reformation in England, as already stated, was, in fact, a war to the death—a war of no quarter—against the Sacrifice of the Mass and against the idea of a sacrificial priesthood. The pulling down and desecration of the altars, and the substitution thereof of kitchen tables, took place (as Ridley declared) in order that 'the form of a table shall more move the simple people from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper.' 'It was not the Prayer Book,' said a Protestant divine, 'that was taken out of the Mass, but the Mass that was cut out of the Prayer Book.' For fuller information on this theme, your readers are referred to the illuminating pages of Gasquet's *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*. Cranmer and his fellow-reformers never intended such a thing as a real, sacrificing priesthood or an episcopate as the sole channel of ordination, having ordinary jurisdiction, and standing in unbroken succession to the Apostles. No Elizabethan bishop ever, even in his writings, lays claim to these things. The following fact will clearly portray the mind of the Supreme Head and only source of jurisdiction in the Church of England on that point. The Bishop of Ely objected to the spoliation of his diocese by the Queen's command. Queen Elizabeth replied to him thus: 'Proud prelate, I would have you know that I, who made you what you are, can unmake you, and if you do

not forthwith fulfil your engagement, by God, I will immediately unfrock you.' (*Short History of the Catholic Church in England*, vol. iii.) To her the so-called priests and bishops were mere servants in a Government Department, and to her successors they have ever remained the same.

III.

The third point of Mr. Warren's letter deals with the defect of intention on the part of those who conferred Anglican Orders on Parker. And there he states that the intention, then, of the Church of England was to continue in her ordinations the things which have been in Christ's Church from the Apostles' time, with the same character and powers they had from the beginning. The intention of the Church of England at that time was, clearly, to carry on ordinations in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the new Ordinal devised by Cranmer and his associates. And that intention has been sufficiently indicated above—namely, to utterly do away with and destroy the idea of a Sacrifice and a sacrificing priesthood, such as was practically universal in Christendom up to the time of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. I may here state that, according to Catholic doctrine, it is necessary for the validity of a Sacrament that its minister (that is, the person administering it) should not alone employ a proper form, but should also have

A Proper Intention.

I may here usefully quote some apposite remarks that appear in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (vol. I., pp. 495-6), especially as it meets squarely the difficulty that has occurred to Mr. Warren's mind: 'Pole, in his instructions to the Bishop of Norwich (which Leo. XIII. cites in his Bull of condemnation), tells him to treat as not validly consecrated those pretending bishops in whose previous consecration ceremonies "the form and intention of the Church had not been observed," thereby implying that this double defect was present in the Edwardine consecrations. On this point the defenders of Anglican Orders urge that (1) to admit that the mental intentions of the minister can affect the validity of the Sacrament is to involve in uncertainty all ordinations—whatever . . . and (2) even granting this doctrine of intention, no defect of due intention should be imputed to the Anglican prelates of any generation, since, according to theologians like Bellarmine, even an heretical minister's intention is sufficient so long as it is a general intention to do what Christ does or His true Church does, whatever this may be. But, it is replied, it is impossible not to recognise that the minister's intention is an essential element. Why, for instance, is there a valid consecration at Mass when the priest pronounces the words, "This is my Body," but no valid consecration when he pronounces the same words in the presence of bread whilst reading from St. Matthew's Gospel in a community refectory? Still the Church trusts to the Providence of God to watch over all such defective intentions as are not externally manifested, and assumes that the minister's intention is correct in every serious administration of her own rites, even when he is—like Cranmer, for instance—a person of heterodox opinions. Where, however,

A Defective Intention

is manifested externally, she must deal with it, and that is what has happened in respect to the Anglican ordinations. The rite, as has been explained, was altered in Edward VI.'s time to give expression to a heterodox belief concerning the nature of Holy Orders, and was likewise adopted in this sense by the Elizabethan authorities. When, then, they proceeded to administer it, the only reasonable interpretation of their action was that they conformed their intention to their rite, and hence that, from a Catholic point of view, their acts were invalid on a twofold ground: the defect of the form and the defect of the intention.'

Cranmer leaves no more possibility of doubt than does Barlow as to his fierce and utter rejection of the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders, and of the Sacrifice of the Mass. I might cover entire pages of this paper with quotations, in point, culled from the Parker Society's big volume of Cranmer's *Writings and Disputations Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (pp. xxxii, 444, and 100, published at Cambridge in 1844). This article has, however, run into such a length that I cannot at present reasonably do so. Suffice it, therefore, to refer the reader back to what has been said about Cranmer's mutilation of the old Catholic Ordinal, the manner in which he eliminated therefrom every passage (forty, all told) having reference to a Sacrifice and a sacrificing priesthood, and the studied vagueness which he introduced into his new-fangled Ordinal in regard to the powers of the new reformed clergy. Briefly, he altered the