

THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH  
A Defence of the Catholic Priesthood  
by Michael Davies  
1979 AND 1993

Sacredos in æternum secundum Ordinem Melchisedech

## CONTENTS

Foreword

Author's Introduction

CHAPTER I: THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD

CHAPTER II: THE PROTESTANT POSITION

CHAPTER III: NEW IDEAS AND OLD MISTAKES

CHAPTER IV: ANGLICAN ORDERS-----ABSOLUTELY NULL AND UTTERLY VOID

CHAPTER V: THE ANGLICAN-CATHOLICS

CHAPTER VI: AGREEMENT ON THE MINISTRY

CHAPTER VII: THE NEW CATHOLIC RITE OF ORDINATION

CHAPTER VIII: AN ANGLICAN RESPONSE

CHAPTER IX: TOWARDS A COMMON ORDINAL

CHAPTER X: BLURRING THE PRIESTHOOD

APPENDIX I: THE SUBSTANCE OF A SACRAMENT

APPENDIX II: MINISTERIAL INTENTION

APPENDIX III: PARTICIPATION OF PROTESTANT OBSERVERS IN COMPILATION OF  
NEW LITURGICAL TEXTS

APPENDIX IV: THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

APPENDIX V: THE POWER TO CONFIRM AND ORDAIN

APPENDIX VI: PAPAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO ANGLICAN ORDERS

APPENDIX VII: SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

APPENDIX VIII: ARCIC-----THE VATICAN RESPONSE

APPENDIX IX: THE REVISED ORDINAL OF 1989

APPENDIX X: THE INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

APPENDIX XI: THE FORM FOR THE ORDINATION OF A PRIEST

WORKS CITED

VIEW AN IMAGE OF ABRAHAM AND MELCHIZEDEK

Foreword

On 30 June 1968, pope Paul VI pronounced his Credo in which the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass "celebrated by the priest in the Person of Christ in virtue of the power he received in the Sacrament of Order" was very clearly, unambiguously, and correctly expressed. Twelve days earlier, Pope Paul VI had signed the Apostolic Constitution in which he approved and imposed the new ritual of the ordination of deacon, priest, and bishop. In this book the author examines the new rite of ordination to the priesthood and exposes its differences with the former one used in the Roman rite for a number of centuries, enjoying the highest authority.

There can be no doubt of the validity of the New Rite but there are certain features which the author deplores. A number of prayers and ceremonies have been suppressed which, in the Old Rite, served clearly to express the most essential character and duty of priesthood: to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass. This is a sign of a tendency which can be observed in other official liturgical innovations (not to mention illegal ones). It is a matter of great concern for many Catholics that this and similar things are done at a time when the sacrificial character of what is now commonly called the "celebration of the Eucharist" is questioned or even denied by many who do not leave the Catholic Church.

Mr. Davies gives an impressive exposition of the facts and the meaning he attaches to them in the light of Trent, the Pontifical letter *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII, other official documents, and also the Canterbury Declaration on Ministry and Ordination in the Anglican and Catholic Churches. He rightly rejects the latter completely as a totally ambiguous document.

This is a rich and scholarly book which should be in the hands of all who study post-conciliar developments in the official Roman Catholic Church, the Church of Christ.

J. P. M. van der Ploeg, D.P.  
Nijmegen (Holland), 11 May 1978.

NOTE: Professor van der Ploeg is a Doctor and Master of Sacred Theology, Doctor of Sacred Scripture, Professor of Old Testament Studies in the Catholic University of Nijmegen, Holland, a Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of the Netherlands, and a leading authority on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

#### Works Cited:

Some of the books referred to in the notes have been abbreviated as follows:

AMO Anglican Methodist Unity----I, The Ordinal

AOWF Anglican Orders----A Way Forward? E. Yarnold, S.J. (CTS, 1977).

CCAO The Catholic Church and Anglican Orders, F. Clark, S.J. (CTS 1962).

CCT Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by McHugh and Callan (New York, 1934).

CD Catholic Dictionary, Addis and Arnold (London, 1928).

CDT A Catholic Dictionary of Theology, ed. J. Crehan, S.J. (London, 1962).

CGO Crammer's Godly Order, M. Davies (Angelus Press, Kansas City [to be reprinted in 1994]).

D Enchiridion Symbolorum Denzinger (31st edition).

ESR Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, F. Clark, S.J., (Oxford, 1967).

IWA I Am With You Always, M. Davies (Neumann Press, 1986)

LPE Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?, T. Lloyd (Grove Books, 1977).

OIR The Ordinal and its Revision, P. Toon (Grove Books, 1974).

PAC The Popes and the Ordinal, A. Barnes (London, 1896).

PJC Pope John's Council, M. Davies (Angelus Press, Kansas City, 1992).

QAO The Question of Anglican Ordinations, E. Estcourt (London, 1873).

RMP The Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood, E. C. Messenger (2 vols., London, 1936).

TCC The Teaching of the Catholic Church, ed. G. Smith (London, 1956).

VAC A Vindication of the Bull "*Apostolicae Curae*", The Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster (London, 1898).

WP Why Priests? H. Küng (London, 1972).

THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH  
A Defence of the Catholic Priesthood  
by Michael Davies  
1979 AND 1993

Author's Introduction

The Order of Melchisedech was first published in 1979 and was very soon out of print. There has been a continual demand for a second edition since that time, but it is only now in 1993, fourteen years later, that I have been able to complete all the revisions and additions necessary to make this possible. Each time that I thought that this had been done some new development would take place relating to one of the key topics in the book which necessitated yet further revision. All of these developments have vindicated a position that I adopted in the first edition, in some cases in a very dramatic manner.

The Nature of the Priesthood

On the occasion of Holy Thursday, 1979, Pope John Paul II sent a letter to the bishops and priests of the world reaffirming the traditional Catholic doctrine of the priesthood. I am much encouraged by the fact that the explanation of the priesthood given in this book, which remains unchanged from the first edition, corresponds exactly with the teaching of the Holy Father, and, like the teaching of His Holiness, is completely incompatible with that contained in the Agreed Statements of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC).

ARCIC

In March 1966 Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury agreed to initiate a serious ecumenical dialogue. This resulted in the establishment of ARCIC which published the Agreed Statements on the Eucharist, the Ministry, and Authority between 1971 and 1977. Elucidations intended to clarify the meaning of the Statements were also published, and the entire ARCIC output was combined in its Final Report in 1980. Chapters V & VI, unchanged from the first edition, analyse the ARCIC Statements on the Eucharist and the Ministry and condemn them as a betrayal of the Faith on the part of the Catholic delegates. In 1980 I was invited to meet Cardinal Seper, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (SCDF), who had read The Order of Melchisedech. The SCDF was charged with evaluating the ARCIC agreements, and, as I explain in Appendix VIII, I was able to provide the Cardinal with documentation proving beyond any possibility of doubt the ambiguous nature of the Agreed Statements which enabled the Catholic and Anglican delegates to interpret them in a contradictory manner. The Cardinal assured me that there was no possibility of his Congregation ratifying the ARCIC Statements.

In May 1992 the SCDF under its new Prefect, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, published its observations on The Final Report, Cardinal Seper sadly having died in the interim. The SCDF Observations constituted a devastating critique of ARCIC which left the ecumenical bureaucracy shocked, shaken, and outraged. Where the Agreements on the Eucharist and the Ministry are concerned, the criticisms made by ARCIC are virtually identical to those found in Chapters V & VI of this book. The SCDF laid stress upon the unacceptability of formulations in the report which "are not sufficiently explicit and hence lend themselves to a twofold interpretation."

But the ecumenical bureaucracy did not abandon hope. The SCDF Observations carried only the authority of the Congregation, albeit that it is exceeded only by that of the Pope himself. The verdict of the Pope would be delivered in a final response to ARCIC carrying the authority of the Holy See itself. In an effort designed to pressure the Pope into reversing the SCDF verdict, The Final Report was sent to all the hierarchies of the world for their evaluation. The ecumenical

bureaucracy, with a confidence that proved to be well-founded, was confident that most contemporary Catholic bishops would side with ARCIC rather than the SCDF.

As far as I have been able to discover, not a single hierarchy aligned itself with the SCDF and repudiated ARCIC. This included the hierarchy of England and Wales. Its endorsement of ARCIC must constitute its most shameful act of cowardice and compromise since the reign of Henry VIII, when St. John Fisher was the only bishop willing to die rather than acknowledge the king as "supreme head in earth of the Church of England". But on this occasion, whatever individual bishops may have said in private, there was not a single instance of public dissent from their collective endorsement of the ARCIC betrayal, even though upholding the faith would not have involved beheading, but only a Tablet editorial censuring a lack of ecumenical enthusiasm.

Pope John Paul II could hardly have been placed in a more embarrassing situation. As an exponent of collegiality he had to decide between the SCDF and virtually every bishop in the world. But Our Lord has promised to be with His Church always, and, if anything, the official Vatican Response was even more devastating than that of the SCDF. Dr. George Carey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, lamented publicly that the Vatican rejection of ARCIC, and its refusal to accept the ordination of women, have, in effect, brought to an end any hope of organic reunion between Anglicans and Catholics.

The ARCIC debacle proves, if further proof is needed, the abysmal level to which post-conciliar Catholicism has sunk. If any Catholic----layman, priest, or bishop----had been asked, prior to the Vatican Response in 1991, whether, in matters of fundamental Catholic doctrine, the judgment of a Catholic layman could prevail against that of almost every successor of the Apostles throughout the world, the question would have been met with derisory laughter in which I would most certainly have joined. And yet, incredible as it may seem, the Vatican response has proved this to be the case. The condemnation of ARCIC in this book, which preceded that of the SCDF, was eventually vindicated by the Holy See, and the endorsement of ARCIC by the world's bishops repudiated.

I was, of course, only one of many British Catholics who were able to see the defects of the Agreed Statements, but although I have personal letters from bishops who deplored their ambiguity, public criticism of the documents was confined to priests and laymen. Our bishops are now shackled by a false concept of collegiality which has led them to believe that they must abide by majority decisions of the national hierarchy. Cardinal Ratzinger has stressed the falsity of this concept and urged bishops to have the courage to act as individual successors of the Apostles and speak out as individuals where the faith demands it. All the ARCIC developments subsequent to the publication of the first edition are explained in detail in Appendix VIII.

Hans Küng

In Chapter III and Appendix IV, unchanged from the first edition, I provide more than sufficient documentation to prove that by no possible stretch of the imagination could Hans Küng be considered to be a Catholic theologian, but, as is noted in Chapter III, he was, at that time, permitted to hawk his heresies around the Catholic world with apparent immunity from Vatican sanctions. This deplorable situation continued until the death of Pope Paul VI. Pope John Paul II was elected to the See of Peter in 1978, and made the case of Küng one of his priorities. On 18 December 1979, the SCDF withdrew Küng's *missio canonica*, his authority to teach as an officially accredited Catholic theologian. My judgment that Küng's teaching was incompatible with Catholicism was, therefore, like my censure of ARCIC, eventually vindicated by the Holy See. The SCDF stated that:

Professor Hans Kung, in his writings, has departed from the integral truth of the Catholic faith, and therefore he can no longer be considered a Catholic theologian nor function as such in a teaching role.

In a gesture of scarcely credible arrogance, Küng rejected an invitation to present his case before the SCDF, and then, after his condemnation, had the effrontery to attack the Pope for condemning a person whom he had not heard! The 4 January 1980 issue of *The Universe* quotes him as claiming that: "The Roman maxim *audiatur et altera pars* (the other side should also be heard) seems to have no validity in Rome."

In an act of charming ecumenical courtesy, the Anglican Church Times asked whether Pope John Paul II is going to turn out to be the Ayatollah of the West (11 January 1980). Dr. Stuart Blanch, the Anglican Archbishop of York, claimed that Küng is a great theologian who has put the whole world in his debt! Liberal theologians throughout the world vied with each other in publishing and signing manifestoes insisting that Küng is indeed a Catholic theologian. On 7 December 1981 he gave a lecture to a standing room only audience at the University of Notre Dame in the U.S.A. He was introduced by Father Richard McBrien, Chairman of the Theology department, as "a fellow Catholic theologian", a statement which can only be regarded as an insolent and cynical rejection of the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. Father McBrien was not disciplined and still occupies his influential post in 1993.

The *Tablet* published an editorial fulminating against the removal of Küng's *missio canonica*, comparing this action, to the pattern of life "under a communist regime". It praised Küng as a "noble thinker", and actually demanded the abolition of the SCDF. I gave this editorial to Cardinal Seper who was highly amused and remarked that *The Tablet* is a journal that "used to be Catholic". In its 20 March 1993 issue, *The Tablet* published an article entitled "Giant among Theologians" on the occasion of Küng's sixty-fifth birthday. It described with great enthusiasm a *Festschrift* published in his honour in which 45 contributors testified to what they considered to be his brilliance and profundity. *The Tablet* considers that this alleged brilliance and profundity is established beyond the least possible doubt by the fact that among the contributors "there are representatives of Anglicanism, German Protestantism, Methodism, Buddhism, Islam and Judaism and the founder of the World Economic Forum." That Pope John Paul II considers Küng to be neither brilliant, nor profound, nor a Catholic theologian is of little consequence to *The Tablet*. After all, what is the opinion of the Vicar of Christ worth when set beside that of the founder of the World Economic Forum? The article concludes with a quotation by a Swiss theologian who assures us that his compatriot will be rehabilitated in Heaven, and that the Pope should anticipate this heavenly justification upon earth! What the article does not mention is the book *The Historic Credibility of Hans Küng* by Father Joseph Costanzo, S.J. (Massachusetts, 1979), which proves, with meticulous documentation, that not only is Küng devoid of credibility as a Catholic but also as a serious scholar. Küng has become no more than an anti-Catholic propagandist who is prepared to distort historical truth in the most cynical manner to bolster up his animus against the Church: "Küng's use of ecclesiastical history is one-sided, partial, biased-----whatever subserves his predetermined purpose (p. 275)."

Needless to say, *The Tablet* is still sold in Catholic churches with the approval of the hierarchy, Cardinal Hume in particular, but one could hardly expect it to receive anything but support from bishops who insist that the ARCIC agreements are compatible with the Catholic faith. The 19 May 1990 issue of *The Tablet*, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary, published a tribute from Cardinal Hume praising the journal which had led British opposition to *Humanae Vitae* for preserving the best traditions of the past and gaining credit and importance month by month. Well, it is a point of view-----not a very Catholic one, but probably that of most English bishops today.

## The 1968 Ordinal

The basis of my criticism of the 1968 Catholic Ordinal, contained in Chapters VII to IX, is that there is not one mandatory prayer in the new rite of ordination itself which makes clear that the essence of the Catholic priesthood is the conferral of the powers to offer the sacrifice of the Mass and to absolve men of their sins, and that this sacrament imparts a character which differentiates a

priest not simply in degree but in essence from a layman, as Vatican II teaches with admirable clarity in no. 10 of *Lumen gentium*. As is explained on page 81, the form in the traditional rite, carried over virtually unchanged into the 1968 Ordinal, is indeterminate. There is not a word in it that is incompatible with Protestant belief. But this indeterminate form was given an unambiguously Catholic connotation by other prayers and ceremonies in the traditional rite, prayers and ceremonies which were all removed or considerably modified in the 1968 Ordinal.

My condemnation of the ambiguity of the 1968 Ordinal was vindicated by three remarkable testimonies. The first was a letter from an English bishop praising my book and assuring me that my reservations concerning the new Ordinal were shared by the hierarchy of England and Wales which had protested to Rome at its imposition in 1968 (the faith still meant something to these bishops, most of whom had been appointed before the Council). The second vindication can be found in a long review of my book by Dr. Francis Clark, who is certainly one of the greatest of all living authorities on the Sacrament of Order. While Dr. Clark accepted that my criticism was justified, he insisted that the Catholicity of the 1968 Ordinal was guaranteed by a number of *ex adiunctis* factors, an argument which I accept. Some of his comments will be cited at length later in this introduction. The third, most authoritative, and most dramatic confirmation of my thesis is that of a spokesman for the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (CDWS) in the February 1990 issue of *Notitiae*. In 1989, following continued criticisms of the ambiguity of the 1968 Ordinal, a second typical edition was published with a number of revisions. It may even be possible that my book, which was presented to twelve of the more traditional cardinals in the Curia, played some small part in this decision. The CDWS accepted the fact that whereas the Catholic theology of the priesthood was made explicit in the Traditional Ordinal this was no longer the case in that of 1968. It admitted that the New Ordinal had "aroused frequent criticism from both bishops and priests as well as the ordinands themselves", and went on to claim that its 1989 revision had rectified its deficiencies. It is my contention that the 1989 Ordinal is only marginally better than that of 1968, and that it is still far from adequate as a liturgical expression of the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood. The 1989 Ordinal is examined in great detail in Appendix IX. The frank admission by the CDWS of the deficiencies of the 1968 Ordinal vindicates fully my criticisms of it in this book.

### Criticisms of the First Edition

In a long review which appeared in the June 1979 issue of *Christian Order*, Dr. Francis Clark expressed the opinion that the analogy that I had drawn between Cranmer's Ordinal and the 1968 Catholic Ordinal could not bear the weight that I had put upon it, and broke down at a certain point:

The new English rites composed in the reign of Edward VI had an objective anti-sacerdotal stamp because history demonstrates that the supreme authority which ordered and sanctioned the liturgical changes, imposing them by the combined power of State and Church, was determined to eliminate the Catholic Mass and priesthood. The authors of the Anglican Ordinal were themselves part of the politico-religious regime that vested it with authority, and the total anti-sacerdotal significance of the rite stems above all from that official stamp. But when we look at the other term of Mr. Davies's analogy we find the case is altered. Even if some of the promoters of the new Roman rites in the decade following Vatican II were animated by a questionable theological liberalism, even if Protestant "observers" were accorded a role which enabled them to influence (informally but effectively) the deliberation of the Roman Consilium which drafted the new rites, there is not the slightest doubt that the supreme authority that sanctioned the changes, the Holy See, was determined to maintain intact the full Catholic doctrine of the Mass and the priesthood. The new forms, liturgically impoverished though they are, are nevertheless still vested with the sacred significance which the supreme authority of the Catholic Church attaches to its sacraments, ministry, and rites. The documents of the Second Vatican Council and the teaching of Pope Paul VI are the contemporary overall context which objectively supplies the due meaning which is no longer explicit in the ritual forms. This is the overriding *determinatio ex adiunctis* which safeguards

the sacramental significance and validity of the new rites. Leo XIII's reasoning (which Mr. Davies so ably expounds) about "the native character and spirit" of the Anglican Ordinal, is still irrefutable; but the same argument cannot be alleged to invalidate the new Roman rite of ordination. On page 100 of his book Mr. Davies quotes the words of *Apostolicae Curae*, which explains how "the native character and spirit" of the Anglican Ordinal was manifest from the deliberate excisions and omissions made in the rite in order to turn it into an instrument of the Reformation campaign against the Mass and Catholic priesthood. His pointed challenge is "to ask any reader to demonstrate to me how the words which Pope Leo XIII wrote of Cranmer's rite cannot be said to apply to the new Catholic Ordinal". With respect, I would answer by referring him to some words of my own, which he himself quotes with approval later, on page 123:

"The wording of an ordination form, even if not specifically determinate in itself, can be given the required determination from its setting (*ex adiunctis*), that is, from the other prayers and actions of the rite, or even from the connotation of the ceremony as a whole in the religious context of the age."

I would stress the concluding clause which I have now put in italics. The religious context of our ecumenical age is very different from that of the embattled mid-sixteenth century, when drastic liturgical changes were instruments of policy in a total socio-religious revolution. Granted that present-day ecumenism can be a chameleon; granted that the proceedings of the Roman Consilium which drafted the new Catholic Ordinal may well be questionable, granted that there are in this age many restive spirits who seek to shake off the credal constraints of traditional Catholic orthodoxy; granted that there are those who would blur or deny the difference between Catholic belief and Protestant belief on the Eucharist and ministry. But none of these things, and none of the regrettable changes and omissions made in the time-honoured rite, can avail to give the new Catholic Ordinal a heterodox significance. The reason, if I may repeat it, is that the teaching and authority of Vatican II and Pope Paul VI provided for the Ordinal of 1968 an overreaching "religious context" of meaning decisively different from that which was provided for Cranmer's Ordinal by the tenets and authority of the victorious anti-Catholic regime which imposed it.

It is not without significance that in order to establish that the form of the 1968 Ordinal possessed "the required determination from its setting (*ex adiunctis*)", Dr. Clark did not draw upon "the other prayers and actions of the rite", but found it necessary to resort to external factors, "the teaching authority of Vatican II and Pope Paul VI". This is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the CDWS has admitted that the Catholic theology of the priesthood was not made explicit in the 1968 rite. I believe that this admission, the letter from the English bishop revealing that the hierarchy of England and Wales had protested to the Holy See about the omissions in the 1968 rite, together with Dr. Clark's needing to resort to factors external to the rite to provide an *ex adiunctis* setting for the indeterminate form, more than vindicates the basis of my criticism of the 1968 Ordinal, i.e. not that it was invalid but that the extent to which the traditional rite has been purged of prayers and ceremonies similar to those removed by Cranmer from the Sarum Pontifical certainly undermines the case against the validity of Anglican Orders by blurring the fact that the essence of the Catholic priesthood is found in the conferral of the power to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. The welcome given to the 1968 Ordinal by Anglicans is documented in Chapter VIII, and to this can be added a demand made by the Reverend Douglas Carter in his introduction to a 1977 edition of *Saepius Officio* (London, 1977), the reply of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury to *Apostolicae Curae*. Mr. Carter notes correctly that "*Apostolicae Curae* finds the essence of the priesthood in the power to consecrate and offer the eucharist, and faults the English ordinals for not specifying this." He notes with satisfaction that this teaching has "received correction in the reformed Roman ordination rites of 1968", and insists that this supplies grounds "for a further appraisal of the bull" (p. iii). The Catholic members of ARCIC were more than happy to put their names to an identical demand in their June 1979 *Elucidations* which called "for a reappraisal of the verdict on Anglican Orders in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896)". The 5 August 1988 issue of the *Catholic Herald* reported Derek

Worlock, the Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, as stating that he regarded "the historical basis of Pope Leo XIII's famous 'absolutely null and void' judgment as being no longer relevant." An editorial in the 14 April 1989 issue of the same journal, which the hierarchy permits to be sold in our churches, contained an explicit demand for the recognition of Anglican Orders. It claimed that: "At grassroots level we do recognize Anglican orders." Unfortunately, this claim is probably only too accurate where some (or many) English bishops are concerned. Cardinal Hume, for example, not only attended the enthronement of Dr. George Carey as "Archbishop of Canterbury" in April 1991, but actually read a lesson, and behaved to all intensive purposes as if this married Protestant layman were a Catholic bishop. This is hardly surprising in view of some alarming and astonishing statements made by the Cardinal in an interview published in the *Anglican Church Times* on 28 July 1978:

I could not in practice dismiss all Anglican Orders as "null and void" because I know that a number of Anglican Bishops have in fact had the presence at their ordination of an Old Catholic or an Orthodox bishop, that is, somebody who, in the traditional theology of our Church, has been ordained according to a valid rite.

One presumes that the Cardinal is claiming that these Old Catholic or Orthodox bishops acted as co-consecrators, but what he evidently does not understand is that Pope Leo XIII ruled irrevocably that due to a defect of form the Anglican ordinal is incapable of transmitting valid orders even if used by a bishop whose own orders are valid (this is explained later [Chapter IV]). If Cardinal Hume used the Anglican Ordinal himself, with the specific intention of ordaining a priest with the power to celebrate a valid Mass and to absolve men of their sins, nothing would happen. The man he intended to ordain would be a layman before and after the ceremony. The transmission of valid orders requires both a validly ordained bishop and an ordination rite recognized as valid by the Catholic Church. I have been assured by an Orthodox priest in London that, to the best of his knowledge, no Orthodox bishop has ever or would ever act as a co-consecrator in an Anglican ordination. Cardinal Hume continued:

As far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned, I think it needs to look carefully again at *Apostolicae Curae* and its status. We need to discover whether the historical background upon which it was working and the argumentation upon which it was based is consonant with historical and theological truth as theologians and historians see it today.

There is, of course, no need whatsoever to look again at *Apostolicae Curae*, because, as Pope Leo XIII made clear beyond any possible doubt in his letter to Cardinal Richard of Paris, cited in full in Appendix VI, the encyclical settled the question of Anglican Orders finally and without any possible appeal. One wonders, too, who the theologians are whose theories have so impressed Cardinal Hume. Is he perhaps referring to Hans Küng or to the Catholic members of the now totally discredited ARCIC? An authoritative decision of the Magisterium does not need to be re-evaluated each time a liberal theologian calls it into question. If this were the case there is not a truth of our faith from the Resurrection to the Real Presence that would not need to be looked at carefully again. One hopes that Cardinal Hume is aware of the fact that theologians do not form part of the Magisterium. Liberal Catholics who seek to undermine the authority of *Apostolicae Curae* state frequently that it is not infallible. This is untrue as is made clear in Chapter IV.

On a more encouraging note, the English bishop, whose approbation of my book I have already cited, also remarked:

I don't think you need worry about ARCIC's request for a reconsideration of *Apostolicae Curae*. Anyone who reads the Bull of Leo XIII and the letter to Cardinal Richard on the authority of the pronouncement can be in no doubt that the matter is now beyond question. This is one of the reasons that your book which contains these documents will do untold good. I shall recommend it to our priests. It deserves much recognition.



The 1991 Vatican Response to ARCIC (see Appendix VIII), and the 1993 decision of the Holy See about any Anglican ministers seeking admission to the Catholic priesthood following the decision of the Church of England to ordain women, vindicated the good bishop's judgment in the most emphatic manner possible.

### The New Rite is Valid

In order to remove the least possibility of misunderstanding, I wish to affirm that I am absolutely certain that both the 1968 and the 1989 Catholic rites of ordination to the priesthood are valid in the Latin and English versions. I accept Dr. Clark's *ex adiunctis* argument without qualification. Readers who might have reservations concerning the teaching of Vatican II and Pope Paul VI should study the doctrine of the priesthood and the Mass found in the conciliar documents *Lumen gentium* and *Presbyterorum ordinis*, together with Pope Paul's *Mysterium Fidei* and his *Credo* of the people of God. No objective reader of these documents could deny that the authentic Catholic doctrine on the priesthood and the Eucharist is stated in them unambiguously. It must also be noted that the liturgical context of the new ordination rite in 1968 was that of the Tridentine Mass. When first writing this book I possessed only a cursory knowledge of the doctrine of the indefectibility of the Church. I might add in my defence that very few Catholics, priests or laymen, possess a thorough understanding of this fundamental doctrine which proves beyond any possibility of doubt that any sacramental rite approved by the Pope must certainly be valid, at least in its original (typical) Latin version. An explanation of the doctrine of indefectibility is provided in Appendix X.

### An Error of Fact

In the first edition I stated that the matter and essential form for the ordination of a priest, designated by Pope Pius XII in *Sacramentum Ordinis*, remained unchanged in the 1968 rite. I was mistaken. The Latin conjunction *ut* found in the traditional form is absent in the 1968 rite. This mistake has been corrected in the present edition. The removal of the conjunction *ut* has no theological significance and does not have the least effect upon the validity of the rite. A very small number of very confused Catholics imagined that the omission did cast doubt upon the validity of the new rite, and in the hope of reassuring them the question of the missing *ut* is examined in Appendix XI.

### The Bishop's Charge

Father Brian Harrison, O.S. wrote to me stating that I have placed too much stress upon the fact that the Bishop's Charge in the 1968 rite is not mandatory, but only a model homily: "It is perfectly clear that what is being presented as 'optional' at this point in the liturgy is not the doctrine expressed in the model homily, but only the choice of words with which the bishop may choose to express this doctrine." I accept this as a valid criticism, and I have taken it into account in my comments on the Bishop's Charge in Appendix IX. But I am sure that Father Harrison would accept that the fact that this model homily is not mandatory is used by many bishops as an excuse for delivering homilies which would be more appropriate for the commissioning of a Protestant minister or even the presentation of a diploma to a social worker. Father Harrison would certainly agree that this happens, but would argue that the blame must be apportioned to these bishops rather than to the Ordinal. Strictly speaking he would be correct, but this does not alter the fact that the failure to make this model homily mandatory, as was the case with the Bishop's Charge in the traditional rite, has played into the hands of neo-Modernist prelates. Wittingly or unwittingly the authors of the New Rite have placed a weapon in the hands of those who wish to downplay or even deny the sacrificial ethos of the Catholic priesthood.

Father Harrison shares my abhorrence at the scandalous extent to which specifically sacrificial texts have been removed from the new ordinal: "Not that Catholics have to approve of Paul VI's decision

to omit those prayers, of course. We are quite free to hold-----as I hold too-----that it was deplorable to make such confusing, ambiguous, and even scandalous omissions." But he insists, as Dr. Clark does, and as I accept without reservation, that Pope Paul VI did not have Cranmer's heretical intention in excising these prayers. Father Harrison believes the Pope's motives to have been a "zeal for ecumenism" which prompts the expression of Catholic doctrine in a "way that gives as little offence as possible to the separated brethren. Ill advised? Many of us would say so. Invalid? No way."

## Conclusion

I am, if anything, even more adamant than I was in 1979 that the new rite of ordination in both the 1968 and 1989 versions represents an unacceptable ecumenical compromise. In this respect the closing passage of Dr. Clark's review is very pertinent:

Time after time Mr. Davies brings into the open questionable tendencies, reforms gone awry, and areas of theological confusion within the Church, of which most of the faithful are scarcely aware. There is need for much more vigilant scrutiny of what is being done to the Church's heritage of faith, worship, ritual and devotion in the name of post-conciliar renewal. This book sharpens the scrutiny. By asking very awkward questions Mr. Davies is not opposing but serving the cause of authentic post-conciliar renewal.

Given that the New Catholic Ordinal, even in its amended 1989 version, represents an unacceptable ecumenical compromise, what should be the attitude of Catholics who believe that maintaining authentic Catholic Tradition necessitates not simply the preservation of the pre-conciliar liturgical books but their restoration as the norm in the Roman Rite? It would be unrealistic to hope for the abrogation of the New Ordinal in the foreseeable future. The Vatican has never liked to admit that it has erred, let alone erred gravely. The most realistic policy for obtaining the eventual complete restoration of the Traditional Ordinal is to press for its use on every possible occasion now that it has become a Vatican-recognized option since the publication of the *Motu proprio "Ecclesia Dei"* in 1988. It is of no little significance that the use of the Traditional Ordinal alongside the new one would certainly impart a very important *ex adiunctis* signification to the new rite, as its weak doctrinal content would have to be interpreted within the unambiguous sacrificial ethos of the Traditional Ordinal. The fact that the Tridentine Missal is now recognized by the Holy See as an authorized rite within the Church performs the same function for the 1970 Missal.

The background to *Ecclesia Dei* is as follows. On 5 May 1988, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, on behalf of the Vatican, joined with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in signing a protocol designed to bring the Society of St. Pius X, founded by the Archbishop, back within the official structures of the Church. All the Society establishments, seminaries, schools, churches, priories and convents would have been given official recognition, and "the Fraternity would have been given the faculty to use the liturgical books in use until the post-conciliar reforms" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition, 27 June 1988). Other traditional communities not recognized by the Vatican were also given the opportunity to accept the protocol. Archbishop Lefebvre eventually decided not to go through with the agreement as he had grave doubts as to the resolution which the pope would show in implementing its terms when faced with the almost universal opposition of the world's bishops. Other communities did accept the protocol, and new ones have been set up since the promulgation of *Ecclesia Dei*, which means that the Traditional Ordinal and all the pre-conciliar liturgical books are now being used with increasing frequency with the full approval of the Vatican. There seems to be no reason, apart from malice on the part of their superiors, why ordinands from any seminary should not have a request to be ordained in the traditional rite granted. Every Catholic who loves the Church must pray earnestly that the day will not be long delayed when the Vatican is able to negotiate an acceptable basis for the recognition of the Society of St. Pius X. When this happens the ordinations which take place in the Society's six flourishing seminaries will raise the number of officially recognized priests ordained with the Traditional Ordinal to a very significant proportion

of those ordained each year.

I wish to acknowledge the invaluable help that I have been given in preparing this second edition by my dear friend Norah Haines who went through the complete text for me, made many corrections, and gave many helpful suggestions. She also prepared the new index, which was no easy task as the pagination from the first edition could not be kept and a great deal of new material needed to be incorporated. I also wish to acknowledge help on the part of members of The Priestly Association of St. John Fisher, an association of young priests working in dioceses and religious orders who are dedicated to the restoration of the traditional liturgy, to Brother Patrick Doyle of the London Oratory for his help with the translations, and to Professor J.P.M. van der Ploeg and Dr. Eric M. de Saventem for giving me their comments on some of the new material.

When I completed the first edition of this book in 1978 there seemed to be no hope of any papally approved restoration of the Traditional Missal or the Traditional Ordinal. Fifteen years later a significant if limited restoration of both liturgical books is an established fact. Is it too much to hope that by the time another fifteen years have passed they may have become the most widely used rites within the Roman Rite? Nothing is impossible with prayer.

I am concluding this introduction on the Feast of St. Leo the Great, who upheld the Catholic Faith while the Empire of the West was crumbling about him. In the year 425 it seemed certain that Rome would be laid waste by Attila the Hun. Humanly speaking there was no force that could resist him, but St. Leo did. St. Leo, one of only three popes to bear the title "great", placed himself between the Holy City and the Barbarian, and, overawed by St. Leo's combination of Roman and Christian majesty, Attila concluded a peace and retreated beyond the Danube where he died. Let us, then, invoke the intercession of St. Leo that his successor, Pope John Paul II, will be given the courage to confront the liturgical barbarians who wish to destroy the Roman tradition, and ensure that this tradition is preserved as a precious treasure for future generations. These generations would indeed call the present Holy Father blessed if he could in this way echo the words of St. Paul: Tradidi vobis quod et accepti-----"I have handed on to you that which I received".

Michael Davies 11 April 1990  
St. Leo I, Pope, Confessor, Doctor of the Church.

## Chapter I The Catholic Priesthood

A characteristic of the heresies which have plagued the Church of Christ since her foundation is that they are frequently exaggerations of true doctrine. Thus, an exaggerated insistence upon the Divinity of Christ has led to a denial of His humanity and vice versa. A danger for those who uphold truth in the face of heresy is to react so strongly against a particular error that they minimize the valid aspect of Catholicism which the heretics had exaggerated, and thus risk falling into error themselves. Protestants laid such stress upon the universal priesthood of the faithful that they ended up by denying that there is any distinction in essence between a layman and an ordained priest. Today this error has been widely embraced by Catholic Modernists and it is hardly surprising that some traditionalists tend to react suspiciously whenever the priesthood of the laity is mentioned. As is almost invariably the case, the Catechism of the Council of Trent can be referred to for a balanced exposition of the Catholic position. The teaching of this Council is explained in its Catechism as follows:

As Sacred Scripture describes a two-fold priesthood, one internal and the other external, it will be necessary to have a distinct idea of each to enable pastors to explain the nature of the priesthood now under discussion.

Regarding the internal priesthood (*interius sacerdotium*), all the faithful are said to be priests, once they have been washed in the saving waters of Baptism. Especially is this name given to the just who have the Spirit of God, and who, by the help of Divine grace, have been made living members of the great High Priest, Jesus Christ: for, enlightened by faith which is enflamed by charity, they offer up spiritual sacrifices to God on the altar of their hearts. Among such sacrifices must be reckoned every good and virtuous action done for the glory of God. 1

It is also perfectly correct to state that during the Mass the faithful join with the ordained priest at the altar in offering the Divine Victim. In his sublime encyclical *Mediator Dei*, Pope Pius XII wrote:

The fact is clear enough from the statements of some of our Predecessors and of some Doctors of the Church . . . The rites and prayers of the Mass show no less clearly that the offering of the Victim is made by the priest together with the people . . . Moreover the prayers by which the Divine Victim is offered to God are said for the most part in the plural, and they more than once indicate that the people have a part in this sacrifice as being offerers of it . . . And there is no wonder that the faithful are accorded this privilege; by reason of their Baptism Christians are in the Mystical Body and become by a common title members of Christ the Priest: by the "character" that is graven upon their souls they are appointed to the worship of God, and therefore, according to their condition, they share in the priesthood of Christ Himself.

But not only do the faithful join with the priest at the altar in offering Christ. Pope Pius XII explains that:

if the oblation whereby the faithful in this Sacrifice offer the Divine Victim to the heavenly Father is to produce its full effect, they must do something further: they must also offer themselves as victim. 2

After explaining the universal priesthood of all the faithful, the Catechism of the Council of Trent deals with the external priesthood-----sometimes termed the visible or ministerial priesthood.

The external priesthood, on the contrary, does not pertain to the faithful at large, but only to certain men who have been ordained and consecrated to God by the lawful imposition of hands and by the solemn ceremonies of holy Church, and who are thereby devoted to a particular sacred ministry. This distinction of the priesthood can be seen even in the Old Law (the Mosaic priesthood) . . . Now

as the same distinction (of a twofold) priesthood may be noted in the New Law, the faithful should be cautioned that what we are now about to say concerns that external priesthood which is conferred on certain special individuals. This alone belongs to the Sacrament of Holy Orders.

The office of a priest, then, is to offer sacrifice to God and to administer the Sacraments of the Church. This is proved by the very ceremonies used at his ordination. When ordaining a priest, the bishop first of all imposes hands on him, as do all the other priests who are present. Then he puts a stole on his shoulders and arranges it over his breast in the form of a cross, declaring thereby that the priest is clothed with power from on high, enabling him to carry the cross of Christ Our Lord and the sweet yoke of God's law, and to inculcate this law not only by words but also by the example of a most holy and virtuous life.

He next anoints his hands with holy oil, and then gives him the chalice with wine and the paten with a host, saying at the same time: "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses, both for the living and the dead." By these words and ceremonies the priest is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, which indeed must be regarded as the principal function of the priesthood.

Lastly, placing his hands a second time on the head (of the person ordained) the bishop says: "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained" (John 20:22), thus communicating to him that Divine power of forgiving and retaining sin which was given by Our Lord to His disciples. Such, then, are the special and principal functions of the sacerdotal order. 3

#### THOMAS CRANMER

Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury 1533-1556. From the signed painting by G. Fliccus in the National Portrait Gallery.

In its Twenty-Second Session (17 September 1562) the Council of Trent gave the following account of the Institution of the Priesthood and of the Sacrifice of the Mass:

As the Apostle Paul testifies, there was no perfection under the former Testament because of the insufficiency of the Levitical priesthood. It was, therefore, necessary (according to the merciful ordination of God the Father) that another priest arise according to the order of Melchisedech, Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who could perfect all who were to be sanctified and bring them to fulfillment. He, then, Our Lord and our God, was once and for all to offer Himself by His death on the altar of the Cross to God the Father, to accomplish for them an everlasting redemption. But death was not to end His priesthood. And so, at the Last Supper, on the night on which He was betrayed, in order to leave for His beloved spouse, the Church, a sacrifice that was visible, as the nature of man demands, declaring Himself constituted a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, He offered His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine to God the Father and He gave His Body and Blood under the same species to the Apostles to receive, making them priests of the New Testament at that time. This sacrifice was to re-present the bloody sacrifice which He accomplished on the Cross once and for all. It was to perpetuate His memory until the end of the world. Its salutary strength was to be applied for the remission of the sins that we daily commit. He ordered His Apostles and their successors in the priesthood to offer this sacrifice when He said: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught (D. 938).

The teaching of Trent is reiterated on a number of occasions in the documents of Vatican II and an examination of the footnotes to the relevant passages will find numerous references to Mediator Dei, Trent and other Councils, and Patristic and Scriptural sources. 4

Some Catholic ecumenists have used a phrase in the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (Presbyterorum Ordinis) to give Protestants the impression that the Catholic Church now considers

the proclamation of the word to be the most important function of a priest. In a letter published in an Evangelical Anglican journal, Father Edward Yarnold, S.J., commented that "the Second Vatican Council listed preaching first among the duties of bishops and priests." 5 What, in fact, the Decree states is that preaching is the first duty of a priest in the order of time, not in the order of importance, since people must believe before they can receive the Sacraments. The passage in question reads:

For since nobody can be saved who has not first believed, it is the first task of priests as coworkers of the bishops to preach the Gospel to all men (para. 4).

But in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church it is stated specifically that it is in the celebration of the Eucharist that priests

exercise to a supreme degree (maxime) their sacred functions; there, acting in the person of Christ and proclaiming His mystery, they unite the votive offerings of the faithful to the sacrifice of Christ their head, and in the sacrifice of the Mass they make present and apply, until the coming of the Lord, the unique sacrifice of the New Testament, that namely of Christ offering Himself once and for all a spotless Victim to the Father. 6

The Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests itself specifies the powers conferred by the Sacrament of Order in the same terms as Trent, and cites Trent as its source in a footnote: "These men (priests) were to hold in the community of the faithful the sacred power of Order, that of offering sacrifice and forgiving sins, and were to exercise the priestly office publicly on behalf of men in the name of Christ." 7

Vatican II also repeats that the ministerial priesthood differs "essentially and not only in degree" from the common priesthood of the faithful. 8

Vatican II follows Trent in teaching that the powers given by our Lord to His Apostles at the Last Supper were permanent and meant to be transmitted to their successors by the laying on of hands. This power was to continue without interruption and has indeed been handed down without a break to our present-day bishops who are the lawful successors of the Apostles in the Church which is hierarchically structured. The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church states specifically that "by the imposition of hands, they (the Apostles) passed on to their auxiliaries the gift of the Spirit which is transmitted down to our own day through episcopal consecration." 9

The fact that the power of Order is conferred by means of a sacramental ordination, the Sacrament of Order, transmitted through the ages from Christ via the Apostles and their successors down to the present-day hierarchy, is one which needs to be kept in mind continually when examining a theory popular with Protestants and Catholic Modernists.

This theory holds that apostolic succession does not mean what they refer to as the discredited "pipeline" theory, but teaching the same doctrine as the Apostles. Thus any act claiming to teach what the Apostles taught can call itself apostolic and claim to possess the apostolic succession. The statement on the Ministry published by the joint Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission is quite compatible with this theory, and clearly can be used as a means of circumventing *Apostolicae Curae* and making possible the recognition of Anglican Orders. This was made quite clear by Father Edward Yarnold, S.J., in a pamphlet entitled *Anglican Orders-----A Way Forward?*, which is discussed at some length in Chapter V. Father Yarnold is member of the joint International Commission and his pamphlet was published by the Catholic Truth Society. It is quite clear that the ecumenical establishment will be advancing this absurd hypothesis with increasing frequency and so it is examined in some detail in Appendix IV.

1. CCT, p. 330. Among the scriptural tests cited in support of this teaching are: Apoc. 1:5, 6; 1 Peter 2:5; Rom. 12:1; Ps. 50:19.
2. Mediator Dei (C.T.S. edition), paras. 90, 91, 92, and 103. Those who refer to the encyclical will find that Pope Pius XII gives a number of examples to illustrate the points made here.
3. CCT, pp. 330-332.
4. See Sacrosanctum Concilium, 47; Lumen Gentium, 10, 26, 28; Presbyterorum Ordinis, 2, 5, 13; Encyclical Letter of Pope Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 27, 28, 31, 33.
5. *The English Churchman*, 17 June 1977, p. 2.
6. Lumen Gentium, para. 28.
7. Presbyterorum Ordinis, para 2.
8. Lumen Gentium, para. 10.
9. Lumen Gentium, para. 21.

## Chapter II

### The Protestant Position

The basis of Protestant teaching lies not in affirming the common priesthood of all the faithful but in denying that there is a difference in essence between this common priesthood and the ministerial priesthood conferred by the Sacrament of Order. For a Protestant, ordination is simply a public ceremony in which an individual Christian is appointed to perform a particular function within the Church. There is no question of the ordained man (or woman) receiving new powers which he did not possess before. He is simply given the authority to exercise publicly an office for which he was already qualified in virtue of the common priesthood of all believers. Martin Luther has explained the Protestant position with admirable clarity:

All of us alike are priests, and we all have the same authority in regard to the word and the sacraments, although no one has the right to administer them without the consent of the members of his church, or by the call of the majority (because when something is common to all, no single person is empowered to arrogate it to himself but should await the call of the Church). 1

Nor is it considered necessary for appointment to the ministry to be made by a bishop or even by an ordained man. Cranmer taught explicitly that "if it so fortune that all the bishops and priests of a region were dead" then "the king of that region should make bishops and priests." 2 Over four hundred years later a Congregational minister insisted that "as a matter of propriety and order, the pastor always presides at the Lord's Supper; but there is nothing in the New Testament to prevent a church from celebrating the Sacrament in the absence of its pastor." 3

There is now considerable debate within the Anglican Communion as to whether laymen (and women) should be allowed to preside at Holy Communion. Prebendary Peter Johnson, the president of the Islington Conference (an association of Evangelical Anglicans), made the following request in his presidential address in February 1975: "I want to ask . . . that we give very serious consideration to the question of authorizing laymen to celebrate the Holy Communion." 4 In February 1976 he followed this up by saying: "I have been asked to elaborate on the subject, and I gladly do so. There is no indication in the New Testament as to who should be the celebrant at the Eucharist . . . I would wish to see a lay person, recommended by the incumbent (or Rural Dean) and also recommended by the P.C.C. as being acceptable to the congregation, duly authorized by the bishop to administer the Holy Communion (i.e. to celebrate the Eucharist) in the absence of the clergyman, and only in his home church." 5

In an essay opposing the appointment of "lay-presidents", an Anglican theologian, Douglas Davies, lays stress on the fact that his opposition is in the interests of good order, and continues:

To say this is not to adopt the Catholic notion of priestly character, the doctrine that in his ordination the priest receives specific power and authority from the ordaining bishop standing in a proper episcopal succession, for the proper celebration of the Mass . . . To permit lay celebration is, then, to allow disorder to enter the church community, to allow one not fully subject to the life of minister to engage in the central activity of the gospel. Of course every believer has the right to do these things if so called by the church and the Spirit, the one publicly, the other privately. 6

There is nothing novel in these views, which long predated the English Reformation and are found in the heresies of the Lollard sect. One of the articles for which John Browne and other heretics in Kent were condemned in 1511 was that "no power is given of God to priests, of ministering Sacraments, saying Mass, or other private service more than to laymen." 7

C In his magisterial work, *The Question of Anglican Ordinations*, Canon E. E. Estcourt has



probably come as close as is possible to presenting a consensus of Protestant teaching on the priesthood. He traces a common doctrine through Wycliffe and Huss to Luther, Melancthon and others who adhered to the Confession of Augsburg. Canon Estcourt summarizes this consensus as follows:

That all the faithful are priests, and can offer spiritual sacrifices to God, and that there is no other priesthood or sacrifice instituted by Christ in the Church; and that the office of Ministers in the Church is to preach and dispense sacraments, not to offer sacrifice.

That bishops and presbyters are one and the same. That it is a matter of propriety, though not of necessity, that certain persons should be appointed to teach the Word of God, and administer the sacraments; but that, though not ordinarily lawful, there is nothing to prevent anyone of the faithful from discharging those functions in case of necessity.

That there are two kinds of vocation to the ministry-----one internal and immediately from God, such as that of Apostles and Prophets; the other external by means of men placed in authority, as magistrates and communities of people. One or other ought to be had by one who is to teach in the Church. And as a matter of regulation, no one is to be suffered to preach without being called or ordained. That the calling of ministers should come from the people, or be made by princes or magistrates in the name of the people. And that this calling or appointment is sufficient without ordination or consecration.

That it is proper, though not of necessity, that one of the pastors should be elected as Superintendent, and that the ministers, when called and elected by the people or magistrates or patrons, should be presented to this Superintendent for trial and examination, and if approved, should be admitted to the ministry by prayer and imposition of hands.

That in such ordination, the charge given to those admitted to the ministry, ought not to be to sacrifice for the living and dead, but to teach the Gospel and administer the sacraments.

That ordination is not a sacrament, nor is any sacramental grace conferred in it, but is merely the public approval of persons as truly called, and possessed of the proper qualifications for the ministry, and admitting them to the lawful exercise of their functions. 8

Canon Estcourt also shows that Bucer and the Strasbourg school of divines, and Zwingli and his followers, did not differ from this standpoint in any important respect. He also points out that the principal theses of continental Protestantism were accepted by the English Reformers, whose doctrines were a mixture of Lutheranism and Zwinglianism learnt in their travels abroad together with elements of Wycliffe's teaching which had descended to them at home. 9 The extent to which the English Reformers accepted the heresies of their Continental counterparts is fully documented in Cranmer's Godly Order. I will not repeat it here beyond citing Cranmer's explicit statement, that the difference between priest and layman is not that the priest alone has the power to offer sacrifice "and distribute and apply it as him liketh. Christ made no such difference, but the difference that is between the priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministration; that the priest as a common minister of the Church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's Supper unto other, and other receive it at his hands." 10

Precisely the same point was made by a contemporary Anglican bishop in the 1976 General Synod debate on the theology of ordination. The Bishop of Guildford said:

In discussing our proposals (the Guildford ones) with people, we found that the one question which came up time and time again was, "What difference does ordination make to a person?" If we believe in the ministry of the whole Church shared by the whole people of God, if lay people are authorized to do all kinds of functions in the ministry of the Church-----such as preaching, pastoral

care, leadership of worship and so on-----what difference does it make for a person to be ordained? We tried to answer that by . . . "In ordination a person is given authority to act on behalf of the whole Church". 11

An important study entitled *Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?* was published in 1977. It is a booklet which every Catholic could study with profit as it expresses the viewpoint of a body of Anglican opinion which is growing in strength.

The Reverend Trevor Lloyd contributed an introduction favouring the appointment of "lay-presidents" for the Eucharist in which he makes the following points:

In what does presidency consist? If you have a doctrine of consecration which implies a "moment" of consecration, whether by words or by manual acts, then you need someone to do and to say those things with sufficient authority, given him by the Church to do so. If, however (and many would say we had now moved into this position) there is no "moment" of consecration and it is the whole action that gives significance to the bread and wine, it could be argued that there is no longer any definitely "presidential" act. If there is, what is it? It surely cannot be the "compering" function many presidents at parish Eucharists seem to have. And it is difficult to see it simply as the recital of one prayer . . . it would seem far less damaging to license a number of leading lay people as Eucharistic presidents, recognising the extreme diversity of gifts and ministries in the Church of England (as in the Church in the New Testament), than to insist on "ordination" for such people. 12

There is also ample testimony available to prove that contemporary Lutherans have not departed from any of their founder's fundamental axioms. In 1958 the United Evangelical Church of Germany published an officially approved report entitled *A Declaration concerning the Apostolic Succession*. 13 Among the points made in the report is that apostolic succession in the Catholic sense can be accepted as a sign of "the real apostolic succession" if understood as "appropriate but not objectively necessary". It will not accept this system of episcopal succession as the exclusive means for transmitting the full authority of office.

. . . the mission to a pastoral office cannot be established in a uniform way of transmission and succession from person to person, a real mission and authorization thereto can be effected by the Holy Spirit through extraordinary means. Restriction of the transmission of authority to office holders in the line of historical succession is contradictory to the sovereign freedom of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the frailty of the earthly existence of the Church. Moreover, it accentuates a separation of clergy and laity that is not in keeping with the reciprocity of the services between the spiritual authority of the special office and that given to all believers.

The declaration states specifically that:

Indeed, the maintenance of the Church in the succession of the apostolic faith can also be preserved by special acts of God, who in exceptional circumstances awakens true shepherds outside the institutional succession of offices in the Church. They carry on the pure apostolic preaching.

Because episcopal succession in the Catholic sense is not accepted as the exclusive means of transmitting the apostolic succession, denominations which do not practise it would not be required to adopt it in the event of reunion.

We do not regard as necessary . . . the further extension of such an episcopal succession to churches which do not already have it. Indeed such a policy could even be dangerous because it might give rise to the misunderstanding that ordination in churches without episcopal succession is not fully valid.

All this is commendably frank and is particularly relevant to the Agreed Statement, Ministry and

Ordination, published in 1973 by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. This Agreement (The Canterbury Statement) is totally compatible with the views of the Lutheran theologians which have just been cited, and yet it was signed by two Catholic bishops. The Canterbury Statement is examined in detail in Chapter VI.

In 1563 the Twenty-third Session of the Council of Trent condemned a series of errors current among the Protestant Reformers on the subject of Holy Orders. These condemnations are infallible and irrefutable----as are all anathemas of a General Council ratified by the reigning Pontiff. They are just as applicable today to the same errors still being propagated by the spiritual descendants of the heresiarchs who first devised them. Sadly, it is clear that a good number of those now claiming to be Catholics (and even some bishops) must be numbered among these spiritual descendants of the Protestant Reformers.

The canons anathematizing the Protestant errors which were promulgated by the Council of Trent need to be studied carefully and kept in mind throughout the reading of this book.

#### The Canons of the Council of Trent on the Sacrament of Order

CANON I. If anyone saith that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all; let him be anathema (D. 961).

CANON II. If anyone saith that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and minor, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made unto the priesthood; let him be anathema (D.962).

CANON III. If anyone saith that Order, or sacred ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and of the Sacraments; let him be anathema (D. 963).

CANON IV. If anyone saith that, by sacred ordination, the Holy Ghost is not given; and that vainly therefore do the bishops say: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" or that a character is not imprinted by that ordination; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman; let him be anathema (D. 964).

CANON V. If anyone saith that the sacred unction which the Church uses in holy ordination is not only not required, but is to be despised and is pernicious, as likewise are the other ceremonies of Order; let him be anathema (D. 965).

CANON VI. If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by Divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests and ministers; let him be anathema (D. 966).

CANON VII. If anyone saith that bishops are not superior to priests; or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or that the power which they possess is common to them and to priests; or that Orders, conferred by them, without the consent or vocation of the people, or of the secular power, are invalid; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained, nor sent, by ecclesiastical and canonical power, but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the word and of the Sacraments; let him be anathema (D.967).

CANON VIII. If anyone saith that the bishops who are assumed by the authority of the Roman pontiff are not legitimate and true bishops, but are a human figment: let him be anathema (D. 968).

With regard to Canon VII, some amplification is necessary. This canon certainly does not teach that a priest cannot be given the authority to confirm. It is also possible that the Pope has the authority to empower a priest to act as an extraordinary minister of the Sacrament of Order. These points are discussed in Appendix V.

1. Pagan Servitude of the Church, cited in LPE, p.22.
2. Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments (1540) in Miscellaneous Writings (Parker Society, 1846), p. 117.
3. R. W. Dale, A Manual of Congregational Principles (1889). Cited in LPE, p. 9.
4. LPE, p. 19.
5. Ibid.
6. LPE, p. 24.
7. J. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. V, p. 648.
8. QAO, pp. 15/16.
9. QAO, pp. 16-18.
10. The Works of Thomas Cranmer (Parker Society), vol. I, p. 350. A much longer extract is included in CGO, pp. 39/40.
11. LPE, p. 10.
12. LPE, p. 8 & p. 10.
13. Erklärung zur Apostolischen Sukzession, in Infonnationsdienst der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands (1958).

## Chapter III

### New Ideas and Old Mistakes

In his essay, *The Reason Why*, G.K. Chesterton remarked that:

Nine out of ten of what we call new ideas are simply old mistakes. The Catholic Church has for one of her chief duties that of preventing people from making those old mistakes; from making them over and over again for ever, as people always do if they are left to themselves . . . She does dogmatically defend humanity from its worst foes, those hoary and horrible and devouring monsters of the old mistakes.

Hans Küng is described by his English publisher as "the young protégé of modern theology"; he is "one of the world's leading theologians . . . the calmly authoritative spokesman on behalf of large sections of the Church".<sup>1</sup> It is not necessary to devote a good deal of time to studying his works to discover that his modern theology consists of little more than a series of very old mistakes. This can be proved by examining some of his modern theology in the light of the canons of the Council of Trent anathematizing the Protestant heresy, as cited at the conclusion of the preceding chapter.

Canon IV anathematizes anyone who claims that a character is not imprinted by ordination. Küng informs us in his book *Why Priests?* that the concept of a sacramental character was "invented" by St. Augustine and that "later Latin theology took over the idea without verifying the existence of such a character."<sup>2</sup> Apparently we can no longer accept the medieval idea that the recipient of ordination is "marked with a 'character' which distinguishes him from the laity".<sup>3</sup> It is a "baseless notion".<sup>4</sup>

Canons III and VI anathematize anyone who denies that either the priesthood or the hierarchy are of Divine origin, directly instituted by Christ. According to Küng: "However, one cannot assert that ordination ('ordination to the priesthood') was 'Instituted by Christ', since everyone knows that it is neither mentioned nor implicit in any Pauline text. There is not the least proof for this institution."<sup>5</sup> For Küng, the tradition and infallibly defined teaching of the Church not constitute proof. It is alarming to note that he is able to cite Vatican II in favour of his ideas. About Canon VI he comments:

Vatican II makes three corrections to this canon: (i) the Council of Trent used the non-biblical term "hierarchy", which Vatican II replaces by the expression "church ministry" (*ministerium ecclesiasticum*); (ii) whereas at Trent "*divina ordinatio*" would seem to have referred, too, to a division of ministries among bishops, presbyters and deacons, at Vatican II "*divinitus institutum*" refers without any possible confusion to the ecclesial ministry as such; (iii) whereas at Trent the hierarchy "consists" (*constat*) of bishops, presbyters and deacons, for Vatican II the ecclesial ministry is "exercised" (*exercitur*) by those who from antiquity (*ab antiquo*), and therefore not from the origins, "have been called" (*vocantur*) bishops.<sup>6</sup>

It was pointed out in Chapter I that ample support can be found in the documents of Vatican II to uphold the traditional teaching of the Church, but what Küng has written here certainly highlights a comment by Professor Oscar Cullmann, the most distinguished of the Protestant Observers at the Council, that "the definitive texts are for the most part compromise texts. On far too many occasions they juxtapose opposing viewpoints without establishing any genuine internal link between them."<sup>7</sup>

Küng is unwilling to permit the use of the term "priest" if it implies the existence of a ministerial priesthood distinct in essence from the universal priesthood of the faithful.

"The New Testament shows that the word 'priest'-----like 'ecclesiastic' and 'cleric', as a special and

exclusive term for anyone responsible for an ecclesial service-----ought really to be dispensed with; as far as the New Testament is concerned, all believers are 'priests', 'clerics', or 'ecclesiastics'." 8 He insists that ordination cannot be termed a Sacrament in the proper sense of the term: "If 'institution by Christ' has to derive from the New Testament, then ordination cannot be called a sacrament." 9 These views are condemned by Canons I and III.

Küng would like to see the term "priesthood" replaced by terms that "describe functions". 10 Time and again he makes explicit his belief that contrary to Trent (Canon I), and in accord with the Protestant Reformers, ordination does not impart powers which distinguish the priest not simply in degree but in essence from the layman, but that the priesthood is "only an office". Therefore the term "priest" must be dropped in favour of "terms that describe functions . . . If a more general term is needed that can be used for all these functions, 'service of leadership' or 'presidency' would seem appropriate (one might speak of the person 'responsible for' or the 'president of, a parish, diocese or local or national church, and so on)." 11

Küng is not opposed to a service of ordination as long as it is seen simply as an appropriate sign by which the community acknowledges that a particular individual has received a call from God to exercise an office which is not necessarily permanent. 12 Ordination must not be regarded as the only "means of access to the services of leadership". 13 The ecclesial ministry can be a sole profession or second occupation, it can be undertaken for life or for a short period, it is open to men or women, married or unmarried. 14 It is an appropriate sign of continuity with "the apostolic; succession", but "the apostolic succession is primarily a succession to the faith and creed of the apostles, and to apostolic service and life." 15 There is "no question of tracing things back to 'divine institution' or to 'institution by Jesus Christ'." 16 (See Canons III & VI.) He claims that there are other modes of entering the apostolic succession apart from ordination, a theory examined in detail in Appendix IV. This makes possible valid celebrations of the Eucharist where no priest is available and the "recognition of the validity of ministries and sacraments in a Church whose presidents do not historically enjoy the special 'apostolic succession'." 17

Not only is Küng's "president" simply the holder of an office 'but it is an office primarily (or solely) concerned with preaching' (see Canon I). Even celebrating the Eucharist can be interpreted as no more than an extension of preaching the word:

In preaching in all its diverse forms, the president of the community serves the Church which is, despite all differences, and by virtue of the word, a community of faith and the profession of that faith. His preaching is decisive in the orientation of the Church; he prompts and he suggests. In the most various situations he returns to the major questions: where do man and the world come from? where are they going? why? and to what purpose? Perhaps he will pose the true questions more often than he will supply all the answers. He addresses the community in this way, searching among those who are in search of something; a fisher among fishers. 18

Küng is adamant that "the ecclesial ministry should not be exclusively masculine: it should not be an all-male league." 19 However, not everyone could perform the office of "president". Certain qualifications are necessary, among which "experience of group management" figures prominently.

Evidently this is not an obvious task that just anyone could fulfill. One has to have the right gifts and aptitudes for the job; one has to have experience of group management and coordination; a certain training, even if a scientific training (though very often useful) is not indispensable. 20

In order to make more specific the type of person he envisages as the ideal community leader Küng states that "for detailed individual models we have to go to actual servants of the Church . . . John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Dag Hammarskjöld-----all three convinced Christians who are still living charismatic examples, precisely because they were assassinated while carrying out their service." 21

The situation described by Chesterton at the beginning of this chapter has certainly not changed. Old mistakes are still being hailed as new ideas. What has changed is the attitude of the Catholic Church. "The Catholic Church," wrote Chesterton, "has for one of her chief duties that of preventing people from making those old mistakes . . . ". The German edition of *Why Priests?* (*Wozu Priester?*) was published in 1971. In 1978 Hans Küng was still functioning as an accredited teacher of Catholic doctrine, and the only action taken by the Vatican was to state that it did not see how some of his opinions could be reconciled with the teaching of the Church. No steps were taken to protect the faithful from this priest who denies that there is any priesthood and purveys the most outmoded heresies of Protestantism as if they represent a legitimate interpretation of the Catholic faith. [NOTE] One possible objection to what has been written in this chapter might be that I have condemned Hans Küng, but have not answered his arguments beyond stating that they must be wrong because they conflict with the defined teaching of Trent. Küng argues that the teaching of Trent is not contained explicitly in the Bible and therefore we cannot be required to believe it. I would reply that, as Catholics have been required to believe it under pain of excommunication for four centuries, if Küng is correct the claim of the Catholic Church to teach infallibly is untenable. As his book *Infallible?* makes clear, he certainly does believe both that he is correct and that the traditional concept of infallibility is untenable. What Küng is doing, in fact, is to adopt the classical Protestant position of sola scriptura----the Bible alone is the source of truth----failing to recognise that unless the Bible is interpreted by an infallible teaching authority we have no means of deciding with certainty what it teaches. The ultimate logic of this position is that every individual is entitled to interpret the Bible according to the dictates of his own reason; in their words it must lead to rationalism. Küng also fails to make due allowance for the development of doctrine. In his essay on this subject Cardinal Newman explains that:

Certain doctrines come to us, professing to be apostolic, and possessed of such high antiquity that, though we are only able to assign the date of their formal establishment to the fourth, or the fifth, or the eighth, or the thirteenth century, as it may happen, yet their substance may, for what appears, be coeval with the Apostles, and be expressed or implied in texts of Scripture. Further, these existing doctrines are universally considered, without any question, to be the echo in each age of the doctrines of the times immediately preceding them, and thus are continually thrown back to a date indefinitely early, even though their ultimate junction with the Apostolic Creed be out of sight and unascertainable. Moreover, they are confessed to form one body with another, so that to reject one is to disparage the rest; and they include within the range of their system even those primary articles of faith, as the Incarnation, which many an impugner of the said doctrinal system, as a system, professes to accept, and which, do what he will, he cannot intelligibly separate, whether in point of evidence or of internal character, from others which he disavows. 22

However, lest it be thought that Küng's appeal to the New Testament cannot be answered because it is unanswerable, apart from what he would probably term a "fundamentalist" appeal to Trent, the fact that the traditional doctrine of the priesthood has a sound scriptural basis is made clear in Appendix VII. This has been written by Professor J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O.P., a Professor of Scripture at the University of Nijmegen (Holland), a scholar of international repute particularly celebrated as an authority on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Apart from this refutation by a modern scholar, it is possible to answer Küng by citing St. John Fisher who refuted Luther's attack upon the priesthood well before the anathemas of Trent. In a work published in 1525, and entitled *Defence of the Sacred Priesthood against Luther*, St. John Fisher showed that should Luther be correct in his accusation of falsity against a doctrine attested to by such an impressive consensus of the Fathers of the Church, and accepted and taught so long and so universally, then the entire credibility of the Christian religion would vanish. The quotation which follows comes after an impressive list of citations from the Fathers attesting to the traditional doctrine. The relevance of what St. John Fisher wrote to the present situation can be gauged simply by substituting the name Küng for that of Luther wherever it appears.

From the unanimity of so many of the Fathers we may conclude with the fullest certainty that the priesthood was instituted, not in recent times, but in the very cradle of the Church. Wherefore, since Luther can adduce no orthodox writer who in any book that has ever appeared gives contrary witness, nor can quote a single syllable of Holy Scripture in opposition to the assertions of the Fathers, we lay down with the utmost justice against Luther as a matter of prescriptive right the truth of the priesthood.

The only point that Luther has for his heresy is that the New Testament never uses this term, namely that it never gives the name "priests" to those to whom today we give it. But this will have little or no force for one who carefully weighs the reason why the Apostles avoided the term, viz., because the ancient! priesthood was still in existence and daily sacrifice was offered in the Temple. Therefore, so that there might be no confusion between the two priesthoods, they thought it wise for the time being to use other terms for the new priests. Therefore, as is clear from Scripture, they called them at one time presbyters, at another ministers, sometimes bishops and pastors, until that time when, together with the Temple, the ancient priesthood was utterly destroyed. After that occurred it became usual for all men to call our presbyters priests.

I would have you, dear reader, hold this as a most certain truth, that from the Scriptures Luther has not one jot or tittle which contradicts a visible priesthood, not a single one of the orthodox prelates of the Church who even once gives any support to his teaching, but on the contrary that they all unanimously and emphatically testify to the exact opposite.

Here, then, is our first rejoinder to Luther. Whereas the truth of the priesthood is abundantly and unanimously witnessed to by all the Fathers through the whole history of the Church, and whereas there is no orthodox writer who is not in agreement, and no word of Scripture that can be quoted against it, therefore all must clearly see how justly, against Luther, we claim the truth of the priesthood as the prescriptive right of the Church.

It would indeed be incredible that when Christ had redeemed His Church at so great a price, the price of His Precious Blood, He should care for it so little as to leave it enveloped in so black an error. Nor is it any more credible that the Holy Ghost, Who was sent for the special purpose of leading the Church into all truth, should allow it for so long to be led astray.

Nor is it credible that the prelates of the Church, who were so numerous even in the earliest period of her history, and who were appointed by the Holy Ghost to rule her, as we shall afterwards prove, should have been enveloped in such darkness through so many centuries as to teach publicly so foul a lie.

Finally, it is beyond belief that so many churches throughout the various parts of Christendom, hitherto governed with such careful solicitude by Christ and His Spirit, and by the prelates appointed for the purpose, should now unanimously fall into an error so foul and a lie so ruinous, according to Luther, that it does an injustice to the very testament of our Lord.

But consider diligently Christ's care for us: consider the certain truths of the presence and the activity of the Holy Ghost in the Church: consider the numberless clear testimonies of the prelates of olden times, illustrious not only by their holiness but also by their learning and miracles: consider the unanimous agreement of all the churches, with no single exception through so many centuries. How now can it be imagined that at length for the first time has shone upon Luther the light of a truth that no one of the early Fathers could so much as have suspected, the contrary, indeed, of what they have unitedly asserted from the very beginning?

For if for so long the truth had remained imprisoned in darkness, waiting during so many centuries for Luther, and him only, to set, it free, then Christ's solicitude for our Fathers in the faith was in



vain; in vain, too, the coming of the Holy Ghost to teach them all truth; in vain their prayers and devout search for the truth, if all along they were unanimously teaching to the churches so dangerous a lie.

And if there was an error in a matter so vital to the faith, then in vain, if I may use the language of Tertullian, were so many millions of men Baptized; in vain were wrought so many works of faith and miracles, in vain so many graces given, so many functions of the priesthood performed; in vain did so many Martyrs suffer, if indeed they all died in a false faith. For without the true faith, no one of them could please God.

Now that you see, dear reader, the source whence that doctrine has come unchanged down to us, namely from men of the greatest sanctity and learning, some of whom were of the apostolic age and undoubtedly received it from the Apostles themselves, whereas Luther can quote nothing of the kind for his opinion, as we shall soon clearly show, who will be so reckless of his salvation as to leave these safe guides and endanger his soul with Luther? Who does not know that we must zealously follow the safer path, especially as it is written: "He that loveth danger shall perish in it" (Ecclus. 3:27). And how shall not that path be safer which one follows in the company of the Fathers, so eminent in learning and holiness, than in opposition to all these in the company of Luther alone? 23

NOTE: Pope John Paul II was elected to the See of Peter In 1978 and made the case of Hans Küng one of his priorities. On 18 December 1979, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith withdrew Dr. Küng's *missio canonica*, i.e. the authority by which he instructed future priests in fundamental theology. The Sacred Congregation stated that Küng could no longer be considered a Catholic theologian nor function as such in a teaching role. Küng had refused an invitation to appear before the Sacred Congregation to explain his position in person. In an act of charming ecumenical courtesy the Anglican Church Times asked whether Pope John Paul II "is going to turn out to be the Ayatollah of the West" (11 January 1980). Dr. Stuart Blanch, the Anglican Archbishop of York, claimed that Küng was a great theologian who had put the whole world in his debt! On 7 December 1981, Küng gave a lecture to a standing-room-only audience at the University of Notre Dame in the U.S.A. He was introduced by Fr. Richard McBrien, Chairman of the Theology Department at the University, as "a fellow Catholic theologian," a statement which can only be described as an insolent and cynical rejection of the judgment of the Sacred Congregation. Fr. McBrien was not disciplined and still occupied the same position in 1992.

1. WP, Publisher's information.
2. WP, pp. 46/7.
3. WP, p. 66.
4. WP, p. 69.
5. WP, p. 66.
6. WP, pp. 41/2, citing *Lumen Gentium* para. 28.
7. PIC, p. 56.
8. WP, p. 29.
9. WP, p. 68.
10. WP, p. 29.
11. WP, pp. 29/30.
12. WP, pp. 67-9.
13. WP, p. 67.
14. WP, pp. 68/9.
15. WP, p. 31.
16. WP, p. 34.
17. WP, p. 35.

18. WP, pp. 79/80.
19. WP, p. 59.
20. WP, p. 62.
21. WP, p. 87.
22. *The Development of Christian Doctrine*, Chapter 3, Section 1.
23. *Defence of the Priesthood* (London, 1935), pp. 17-20.

## Chapter IV

### Anglican Orders-----Absolutely Null and Utterly Void

As Chapters I and II should have made clear, the Catholic and Protestant concepts of the priesthood are totally incompatible. They are mutually contradictory: both cannot be true. The only manner in which Catholics and Protestants could reach genuine agreement is by one of the parties abandoning its position and adopting that of the other. But a spurious form of reconciliation is also possible. One or both parties could adopt the device of ambiguity to facilitate unity. This has now become the practice of many Catholics engaged in ecumenical dialogue. Doctrinal statements are formulated in such a manner that teaching unacceptable to Protestants is never affirmed, even if not expressly denied, and at the same time the liturgical expression of doctrines which Protestants reject is reduced to the absolute minimum or totally abolished. Before examining the extent to which this has been the case with the new Catholic rite of ordination it is necessary to examine the reasons which prompted Pope Leo XIII to state quite irrevocably, in his Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of 1896, that Anglican Orders are invalid. It will then be possible to decide the extent to which features that the Pope declared unacceptable in Cranmer's ordination service have been reproduced in the new Catholic rite.

In order to understand clearly the meaning of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* on Anglican Orders, it is necessary to know something of the historical background to the Anglican Ordinal.

After the break with Rome in 1534 no change was at first made in the method of ordination. Throughout the reign of Henry VIII, and the earlier part of that of Edward VI, the Sarum Pontifical [The Pontifical is the book containing the rite for consecrating a bishop and ordaining men to all the major and minor orders.] was still in use. Bishops were consecrated and priests ordained under the old forms of the Church, though variations were sometimes made without authority. But, soon after the appearance of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, Cranmer turned his attention to the rite of ordination.

The introduction of the new Ordinal was certainly the most important event in the English Reformation. A bill to provide for it was introduced into the House of Lords on 8 January 1550. It was to obtain approval in advance for an ordinal which would be composed by "six prelates and six other men learned in God's law". A simple majority of this committee would suffice to approve the Ordinal and, as it would have a Protestant-minded majority, the result was assured in advance.

The bill was finally voted in the Lords on 25 January and was delivered to the Commons. After various amendments it was passed on 30 January.

On 31 January it was again before the Lords, who passed it in its amended form. Less than half the bishops were present and the voting was six to five in favour of an ordinal which had not yet been officially composed by a committee which had not yet been named. The Protestant bishops who voted for the bill were: Cranmer, Goodrich, Barlow, Holbeach, Ridley, Ferrar. The Anglo-Catholics who voted against it were: Tunstall, Aldrich, Heath, Thirlby, Day. Two of the most dedicated Anglo-Catholics, Gardiner and Bonner, were in prison. 1

Although the Ordinal had not yet been composed officially, there can be no doubt that the real work of the Committee was not to compile an ordinal but to approve one which had already been compiled. On 8 February 1550, Heath, the only Anglo-Catholic appointed to the Committee, had been called before the Council, "for that he would not assent to the book made by the rest of the bishops and clergy appointed". He was imprisoned and deprived of his see for refusing to subscribe to the new Ordinal. 2 Thus, it is clear that the new Ordinal had been completed within six days of the appointment of the Committee. It had actually been printed by 7 March 1550.

The background to the new Ordinal lies in the fact that Cranmer invited Martin Bucer to stay with him for several months during the summer of 1549. Bucer's extreme Protestant views are referred to on p. 107, and also in Cranmer's Godly Order. Among the works which Bucer brought with him was one on ordination, *De Ordinatione Legitima*. Father Messenger notes that the Edwardine rite "is inspired throughout by Bucerian ideas, and that to an enormous extent it merely paraphrases or rather translates his Latin Lutheran rite".<sup>3</sup> The Rev. C. Smyth confirms from an Anglican standpoint that "it is almost certain that the function of the Commission was not to devise a new Ordinal, but to accept or suggest improvements to one that had already been drawn up, presumably by Cranmer and Ridley, on the basis of a draft made by Martin Bucer."<sup>4</sup>

The 1550 Ordinal was revised in 1552, the principal difference being found in the service for the ordination of a priest in which the ceremony for the delivery of the chalice and paten was removed. Even in the 1550 rite the signification of this ceremony had been reduced to giving authority to minister the Sacraments and not the power to offer sacrifice.

The two Ordinals were in use for about four years and were utilized for the ordination of a good number of priests and the consecration of six bishops: Poynt, Hooper, Coverdale, Scory, Taylor, and Harley. Another bishop, Ferrar of St. David's, had been consecrated before the issue of the 1550 Ordinal but with an amended version of the Sarum Pontifical.

#### MARY TUDOR

When Queen Mary ascended the throne, and a reconciliation with Rome was effected, the Pope appointed Cardinal Pole as his legate. Among the many problems facing the Cardinal-Legate was the problem of the priestly ordinations and episcopal consecrations which had taken place during the schism. The clergy could, in the main, be placed in one of three categories:

1. Those who had been ordained before the schism.
2. Those ordained during the schism but according to the Pontifical.
3. Those ordained according to the new Ordinal.

With regard to the first and second classes, their ordination was certainly valid and all that was necessary was that they should be absolved from the guilt of schism and given the Church's authority to use the orders they had received. For this purpose dispensations would be needed but nothing more.

With regard to the third class, the case was different. They had been ordained according to a rite which had not been approved by the Church and their status was a matter of admitting of considerable doubt. There were a number of possibilities, some quite technical and complex, as to what precisely this status might be. The three most likely possibilities were:

1. The ordinations could be accepted as valid and satisfactory.
2. They could be accepted as of dubious validity and necessitate conditional reordination.
3. They could be invalid.

Cardinal Pole decided to ask for guidance from Rome before making his decision. The matter was entrusted to Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, who left for Rome in February 1555. He had been consecrated with the rites of the Pontifical during the reign of Henry VIII and therefore had full knowledge of all that had taken place under both kings. He had, moreover, made a public protest against the new Ordinal when it was introduced into the House of Lords. He carried all the relevant documents with him, including a Latin translation of the essential parts of the Anglican Ordinal. These documents are still filed in the Vatican archives.

On 20 June 1555, Pope Paul IV issued his Bull *Praeclara Charissimi* in which he ruled that "those who have been promoted to Ecclesiastical Orders . . . by anyone but a bishop validly and lawfully ordained are bound to receive those Orders again." The Bull was received in England and duly promulgated, as is recorded in Cardinal Pole's register (preserved at Douai) under the date 22

September 1555. The relevant sections of the Bull are included in Appendix VI. However, it was felt that the Bull did not make the matter clear enough and further guidance was sought from Rome. An explanatory Brief was issued on 30 October 1555, the relevant sections of which are also included in Appendix VI. The Brief explained that the intention of the Bull had been:

That it is only those bishops and archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church that can not be said to be duly and rightly ordained, and therefore the persons promoted by them to these Orders have not received Orders, but ought and are bound to receive anew the said Orders from their ordinary according to the tenor and content of our aforesaid letters.

The Brief then explains that those who had been ordained or consecrated according to the Pontifical had received valid orders and could exercise them after receiving the dispensation of His Holiness from the Legate.

The receipt of this explanation settled the matter for England. The orders conferred under Cranmer's Ordinal were in no case recognised and even Ferrar, who had been consecrated as bishop using a modified version of the Pontifical, was declared to be no more than a simple priest. Those who wished to be priests had to present themselves for ordination again. The number was not great, many of those ordained with Cranmer's Ordinal had married; others would clearly have been regarded as unsuitable. But nevertheless, Episcopal Registers contain records of the reordination of sixteen clergy who had previously been ordained using the Edwardine Ordinal, but not a single instance has been produced of a cleric who had received only Edwardine Orders being authorized to continue his ministry without reordination. Commenting on these facts, Dr. Francis Clark remarks:

The old plea that Anglican Orders were not set aside as invalid in Mary's reign had its vogue in the nineteenth century before the documents that discredited it were brought to light, but it is strange that it should still linger on today. 5

The attitude of contemporary Catholics to the validity of Orders conferred by the Anglican Ordinal was made very clear in a sermon preached by Bonner in 1555 in which he refers to "the late made mynysters in the time of the scysme, in theyr newe devised ordination, havinge no authoritie at all given them to offer in the Mass the Body and Bloude of our Saviour Chryste."

As was shown in Cranmer's Godly Order, apart from Gardiner, Bonner was the most courageous of the Catholic-minded Edwardine bishops and eventually suffered imprisonment for his defence of Catholic belief. Like Gardiner, he was restored to his see under Queen Mary, and among his homilies the one just cited is of particular importance. It proves that contemporary Catholics had not the least doubt that the Edwardine Ordinal was invalid in both its 1550 and 1552 forms. The lengthy extract from this sermon which follows merits extremely careful study as an antidote to attempts by nominally Catholic apologists for the Protestant Reformation to falsify history in the interests of superficial unity.

Bishop Bonner knew exactly what the Reformation was about-----he lived through it and suffered for his Catholic belief. Yet according to the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, there is no substantial difference between Catholic and Anglican belief concerning the priesthood and the Eucharist. They are asking us to accept that there was really no question of belief involved in the English Reformation-----that, in fact, when Cranmer imprisoned Bonner and then, in a reversal of positions, Cranmer went to the stake under Mary, both men had the same beliefs but were at odds over a different manner of explaining them; that the English Reformation was no more than a question of semantics! Let Bishop Bonner provide the truth in his own words:

Priestes beinge amongst other thynges called to the mynystration of the sacramentes and the chiefest and most pretiouse of all sacramentes being the Sacramente of the Aultare, in mynystration wherof the priests ought bothe to consecrate and to offer. Therefore the late made mynysters in the

tyme of the scysme, in theyr newe devised ordination, havinge no authoritie at all given them to offer in the masse the Body and Bloude of our Saviour Chryste, but bothe they so ordered (or rather disordered), and theyr schismaticall orderers also, utterlye dispising and impugninge not onely the oblation or sacrifyce of the Masse, but also the reall presence of ye Body and Bloude of our Saviour Chryste in the Sacrament of ye Aultare; therefore I say that all suche bothe dampnably and presumptuously dyd offende against Almyghtye God, and also most pitefullye begyled the people of thys realme, who by thys meanes were defrauded of the most blessed Body and Bloude of our Saviour Chryste, and the most comfortable fruyte thereof, and also of the sacrifyce of the Masse, and of the inestimable fruyte which commeth therby. And seing that every man (be he never soo simple) maye sufficientlye hereby perceyve howe these late counterfetid mynysters have in so weightie a matter deceyved the peple, concernynge eternal salvation, and greatly abused them and brought them into a most lamentable state, you may thereby consider bothe what thanks you owe to Almyghtye God who hath restored unto you the right use of the sacramentes agayne, and also howe much you ought to esteme the right priesthode, nowe brought home agayne, by which, as an ordinary meanes, God worketh hys grayces amongst you. 6

Pope Leo XIII delivered the final judgment on Anglican Orders in *Apostolicae Curae*. What was it that prompted him to promulgate this Bull in 1896? Contrary to a widespread opinion today, he was not motivated by any animosity towards the Church of England. Quite the contrary! The Pope had been convinced by an ecumenically minded French priest, the Abbé Fernand Portal, that the Church of England was Catholic in all but communion with Rome, and that there was a great desire for union with Rome among Anglicans. While on holiday in the island of Madeira in 1889 the Abbé had met, quite by chance, Lord Halifax, a leader of the Anglo-Catholic movement. Had it not been for this meeting *Apostolicae Curae* would never have been written.

The Abbé was astonished by the picture of the Church of England conveyed to him by Lord Halifax, and eventually came to England as his guest. He was taken to visit Anglo-Catholic parishes, convents, and shrines, but was protected by careful screening from contact with militantly anti-Catholic Evangelical Anglicans or, incredible as it may seem, English Catholics! He even declined a luncheon invitation from Cardinal Vaughan at which he would have met some Catholic theologians with an expert knowledge of Anglicanism. The Abbé did, however, find time to visit the Archbishop of Canterbury!

Lord Halifax himself made it clear that it would have been impossible to find a pope more sympathetically disposed towards the Church of England than Pope Leo xm. He stated in public:

Oh, if English Churchmen could only see Leo XIII, if they could only know what he is and how much depends upon him, they would realize there is no prayer they should make with greater earnestness than that it should please Almighty God to prolong his days. We can never hope to see a Pope more ready and anxious to take generous steps in regard to the English Church! 7

Word reached Cardinal Vaughan that such was the Pope's enthusiasm at the prospect of bringing the Church of England back into Catholic unity that he was on the point of writing a personal letter to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. The Cardinal later discovered that the Pope was also considering offering conditional ordination to convert Anglican clergy, and thus accepting the possibility that their orders could be valid.

Cardinal Vaughan went to Rome and told the Pope bluntly that he should neither write the letter nor offer conditional ordination without making a thorough investigation into the question of Anglican Orders. Pope Leo had the humility to accept this advice, and in March 1896 he convened an international commission to meet in Rome and examine and report upon the question of Anglican Orders. The good will of the Pope towards the Church of England was made clear by the lengths to which he went to ensure that the reconsideration of Anglican Orders was carried out in accordance with the strictest standards of scholarship and impartiality. A commission of scholars, specially known for their learning in the matter, was convened with a mandate to conduct the most thorough

possible investigation.

The original commission of six members was divided equally between theologians who accepted and rejected the validity of Anglican Orders. The three pro-validity members were assisted throughout the discussions by two Anglican theologians, the Reverend T.A. Lacey and the Reverend F.W. Puller. They remained in Rome throughout the sittings of the Commission with the approval of Cardinal Rampolla, the Vatican Secretary of State, and the Anglican Archbishop of York. Mr. Lacey accepts that three of the theologians, the Abbé L. Duchesne, Msgr. P. Gasparri, and Father de Augustinis, S.J., were all appointed after submitting pro-validity memoranda to the Pope, which proves that Leo XIII was determined to have an absolutely impartial enquiry. The three pro-invalidity scholars were all English priests, Father F.A. Gasquet, O.S.B., Canon J.C. Moyes, and Father D. Fleming, O.F.M. Father J.B. Scannell, one of the few English priests favouring validity, later joined the first group, and Father J. de Llevaneras, a Spanish Capuchin, was added to the second.

Mr. Lacey accepted that the relationship of the Anglican theologians to their sympathizers on the Commission could be compared to that of a solicitor to a counsel he has briefed, but he stressed the fact that they had not engaged the pro-validity Catholic theologians as advocates to petition for a recognition of Anglican Orders, and that the Commission had not been set up at the request of the Church of England which had no doubts concerning the validity of its orders. He explained that: "We did work as solicitors work when instructing counsel: we supplied information, we prompted arguments, we held consultations." 8 It is thus certain that every argument favourable to the validity of Anglican Orders was put before the Commission.

The sittings of the Commission extended over six weeks, during which time twelve sessions were held at the Vatican, every possible facility being given for the examination of all documents in the possession of the Vatican or Holy Office, many of which were still unknown or unpublished in England.

Every detail of the controversy was fully discussed. 9 The Commission held its last meeting on 7 May 1896, and its findings were submitted to the Cardinals of the Holy Office who devoted two months to examining the evidence. They met to reach their decision on the solemnity of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Thursday 16 July, with the Holy Father himself presiding, a sign of the particular importance that he attached to this question. At this meeting the Cardinals were unanimous in condemnation. There was not one who, after going through all the evidence, was not convinced of the invalidity of Anglican Orders.

But the Pope was under no obligation to endorse their decision or even to issue a pronouncement upon Anglican Orders. Day by day for nine days he made a Novena to the Holy Ghost, asking for special help and enlightenment in making his own decision. The Pope also offered his Mass each day for the intention that he might do what was best for the Church of God in putting forth or withholding a fresh authoritative decision upon the subject.

At the conclusion of the Novena his mind was clear. The Bull was prepared and on Friday 18 September 1896 *Apostolicae Curae* was published, pronouncing finally and irrevocably that Anglican Orders "have been, and are, absolutely null and utterly void."

In his classic work, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Francis Clark explains that:

In the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of 1896, pronouncing Anglican orders invalid, Pope Leo XIII singled out one factor as vital; on it his central argument depends. It is the "native character and spirit" of the Ordinal, the anti-sacerdotal and anti-sacrificial connotation, which, he declared, the new rite acquired from the circumstances of its origin and which rendered its wording incapable of serving as a sacramental form for ordination. 10

Pope Leo XIII noted the manner in which the Anglican Reformers brought their new Ordinal into line with the Protestant heresy:

For the full and accurate understanding of the Anglican Ordinal, besides what we have noted as to some of its parts, there is nothing more pertinent than to consider carefully the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorised. It would be tedious to enter into details, nor is it necessary to do so, as the history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church; as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects; and as to the end they had in view. Being fully cognisant of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between "the law of believing and the law of praying", under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted the Liturgical Order in many ways to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason, in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood (sacerdotium), and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice but, as We have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out (para. 30).

Some Anglican apologists have protested that this passage is unjust as the word "priest" occurs throughout the Anglican Ordinal. But the essence of the Catholic priesthood can only be defined with reference to its primary function of offering sacrifice. A Catholic priest is a sacrificing priest; he is a man who is ordained, as the traditional rite expresses it, "to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate "Mass, both for the living and the dead." To use the term "priest", when referring to a "priesthood" vitiated in its essential character, has about as much meaning as the use of the word "democratic" in the official titles of communist dictatorships. Nor can there be any doubt that most Anglican ministers would reject with indignation the least suggestion that they were sacrificing priests. The Reverend G. Lampe, Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, writes that the loyal Anglican should be thankful that his Orders are not valid in the sense of Catholic theology. 11

The Reverend T. H. L. Parker is equally forthright. Criticizing attempts by Anglo-Catholics to prove that Cranmer's Ordinal was not a totally Protestant rite, he comments:

But the plain fact about the Edwardine Ordinal was its Protestant character. It was a Reformation rite springing out of and expressing a Protestant concept of Church and Ministry . . . No doubt the debate will continue. Loopholes will still be found, new variations of old arguments brought forward; but all this cannot really hide the fact that Anglo-Catholics are in a most unenviable dilemma. 12

It is true that the Anglican Ordinal, like Cranmer's 1549 Communion Service, did not specifically exclude or deny the Catholic concept of the priesthood. As Pope Leo XIII makes clear, the key to the whole understanding of Anglican Orders lies in an accurate appreciation of the historical setting in which the Ordinal was composed.

. . . the history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church; as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects; and as to the end they had in view (para. 30).

The history of the period and the sentiments of the authors are documented fully in Cranmer's Godly Order.

In a reiteration of the traditional Catholic teaching regarding the substance of a Sacrament, Pope Leo explains that the matter in itself can be indeterminate: ". . . the imposition of hands, which, indeed, by itself signifies nothing definite, and is equally used for several Orders and for Confirmation" (para. 24). The sacramental signification "pertains chiefly to the form". Where the



operative words of the form do not specify the grace and power of a Sacrament, this can be determined by prayers in other parts of the rite, namely by *determinatio ex adiunctis*. (See Appendix I for the meaning of this term.)

Pope Leo XIII proved beyond any possible doubt that the Anglican rite was not intended to ordain sacrificing priests; its signification points in the very opposite direction. His chief argument in proof of this is contained in the following paragraph:

In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of Anglican Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all. From them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That "form" consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the Sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify (para. 27).

Francis Clark has summarized the essence of the Pope's argument as follows:

A Sacrament of the Catholic Church is a sacred sign which by Divine power is made an effective instrument for bestowing God's gifts and grace upon men. Since the outward Sacrament is essentially a sign, it must signify what it effects inwardly. For the Sacrament of Holy Order, therefore, every valid ordination rite must in some way, explicitly or implicitly, signify the bestowal of the Catholic sacerdotal office. [Bold emphasis added by the Web Master.] But the Anglican ordination rite has never signified this, since by its very origin it was stamped with an antisacerdotal significance. 13

"Signification" here refers to what the rite is intended to effect, sometimes referred to as the "intention of the rite". But Francis Clark does not approve of the latter term, as it leads to confusion with the ministerial intention. The Pope declared Anglican Orders to be invalid for two reasons: the Anglican Ordinal is defective in form (sacramental signification), and the ministerial intention of those who first used it was defective. Where the term "defect of intention" is used, the Pope is referring to a defective ministerial intention. 14 Pope Leo XIII explained the position as follows:

With this inherent defect of "form" is joined the defect of "intention", which is equally essential to the Sacrament. The Church does not judge about the mind and "intention", in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. A person who has correctly and seriously used the requisite matter and form to effect and confer a Sacrament is presumed for that very reason to have intended to do (*intendisse*) what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptised, provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament (para. 33).

This is the "positive contrary intention" referred to in Appendix II.

Anglicans can demonstrate with perfect accuracy that there have been and are Anglican bishops who both believe what the Catholic Church believes and intend to do what the Catholic Church does. Therefore, they have the correct ministerial intention. This has no bearing on the validity of their rite by reason of its defect of form (sacramental signification). As Fr. de la Taille makes clear, in the making (confection) of a Sacrament, the (ministerial) intention is concerned only with the application of a form, complete in itself, to matter which is of itself sufficient. "One thing, however, the ministerial intention can never do: it can never confer on the form a signification the form in itself does not possess. In other words, should the signification of the form be in any way deficient

the intention (of the minister) will not supply this deficiency" 15 That is to say, a defective rite can never be used to confect a Sacrament, even when used by a lawful minister with the correct intention.

The question of ministerial intention is incidental to Pope Leo's case, since defect of form alone is sufficient to render the Anglican rite invalid. All that the Pope is doing is to point out that when Queen Elizabeth I instituted her new Protestant hierarchy with the "consecration" of Matthew Parker as "Archbishop of Canterbury" in 1559, the re-introduction of the Cranmerian Ordinal, with its pronounced anti-sacerdotal signification, in place of the Sarum Pontifical (which had been restored under Queen Mary), manifested an external intention incompatible with the conferring of the Catholic Sacrament.

Apologists for the validity of Anglican Orders have made much of the slight revisions made to the Ordinal in 1662. The words "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands" were added to the indeterminate form of the 1552 Ordinal. The complete 1552 form read:

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.

The word "priest" does not occur in this form, which remained unchanged when the 1552 Prayer Book was restored to use with some revisions under Elizabeth I in 1559, after the return to the traditional rites during the reign of Queen Mary. The failure to use this word in the form itself, although the word priesthood is used elsewhere in the rite, is of considerable significance. Apologists for the validity of Anglican Orders lay great stress on the fact that an ancient form has now been discovered (The Sacramentary of Seraphion), 16 where the word is also not used. The comparison is irrelevant as there is far more significance attached to the removal of the word from an existing form than its failure to appear in an ancient one.

The same apologists also lay considerable stress on the fact that Pope Leo claimed that the addition of the extra words in the 1662 revision showed that Anglicans themselves realized that the 1552 form was inadequate. They allege that the Pope was mistaken and that these changes were made to rule out the claim of Presbyterians that the Orders of bishop and priest are really one and the same. Nothing is lost in conceding this argument; it does not affect the theological point at issue, namely the Pope's judgment that these changes were not capable of imparting validity to an invalid rite.

The complete 1662 form reads as follows:

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 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.

It will be noted that, even with this addition, it is simply a case of an "office" being "committed" to the ordinand, and the assistance of the Holy Ghost is invoked to help him fulfill it worthily. There is no suggestion here (or anywhere else in the rite) that new powers which he did not possess before have been conferred upon him. "Committed" is not a sacramental word. The Church does not "commit" Sacraments, she "confers" them.

Pope Leo XIII took the 1662 changes into consideration but ruled that they could not be considered as imparting validity to a rite which had never been valid:

Any words in the Anglican Ordinal, as it now is, which lend themselves to ambiguity, cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite. For once a new rite has been initiated, in which, as we have seen, the Sacrament of Order is adulterated or denied, and from which all idea of consecration and sacrifice has been rejected, the formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost," no longer holds good, because the Spirit is infused into the soul with the grace of the Sacrament, and so the words "for the office and work of a priest or bishop," and the like no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted (para. 31).

A factor which has considerable bearing on the question of the validity of Anglican Orders is the attitude of the Orthodox Church. Writing in 1898, Cardinal Vaughan remarked:

Another point, which, in my opinion, ought to be dwelt upon in discussing with Anglicans the question of their Orders, is this: that they stand absolutely alone and isolated from both Western and Eastern Christianity. Leo XIII, in his condemnation of the validity of their Orders, condemned them on grounds which are common to us with the Russian, the Greek, and all the great Eastern communions. We Catholics differ from these various communions upon certain specific doctrines, but upon others we remain in perfect agreement. Among the points of agreement are the sacramental doctrines, and notably the doctrines of the Objective Real Presence, the Priesthood, and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Here we are all at one, to the exclusion of Anglicanism. And no honest handling of the Anglican Ordinal of 1552; no honest interpretation of the language used by Cranmer and his colleagues concerning the Real Presence, the Priesthood, and the Mass; no honest explanation of the destruction of the Altars and of the substitution for them of the Tables in all the Churches that were in England wrested from the jurisdiction of the Holy See, can bring the Anglican Body into line with the Catholic Church and the Eastern Communions. 17

It should also be noted that an attempt by the Church of England to have its Orders recognized by the pan-Orthodox Conference of 1948 was rejected in no uncertain terms. The answer given was:

The teaching of faith contained in the "Thirty-nine Articles" of the Anglican Church definitely differs from the dogmas, faith, and tradition confessed by the Orthodox Church . . . Therefore, if the Orthodox Church cannot agree to recognise the rightness of the Anglican teaching on Sacraments in general, and on the Sacrament of Holy Order in particular, neither can she recognise Anglican ordinations as valid. 18

The fact that Old Catholic bishops have taken part in Anglican ordinations has no bearing upon the validity of the Orders received if the Anglican Ordinal was used. As should have been made sufficiently clear already, even an authorized minister with the correct intention cannot confer a Sacrament validly by using an invalid rite. Hence, valid Orders would not have been conferred even in such cases as the participation in the consecration of George Montaigne as Bishop of Lincoln (14 December 1617) by Marco Antonio De Dominis, the apostate Bishop of Spalato (Split) in Dalmatia. Pope Leo XIII has already been quoted to the effect that even taking the 1662 additions into consideration:

Any words in the Anglican Ordinal, as it now is, which lend themselves to ambiguity cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite (para. 31).

This is a point of crucial importance, since if the additions of 1662 had made the rite adequate, then when used by bishops with valid Orders (for example, Old Catholics in 1932, 1933 and 1947) the Sacrament would have been conferred validly. But the judgment of Pope Leo XIII (which is irrevocable) was that:

We pronounce and declare that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican Rite have been, and are, absolutely null and utterly void (para. 36).

But it does appear that some Anglican clerics have managed to obtain valid Orders. There have, apparently, been cases of Anglican ministers persuading Old Catholic Bishops to ordain them using the Old Catholic Ordinal. In such cases, valid orders would be received-----although it is hard to explain the mentality of men who are content to adhere to a denomination when they have so little confidence in the validity of its Orders that they find it necessary to undergo a second ceremony outside its boundaries.

To sum up, the defective sacramental signification of the Anglican Ordinal derives not from any explicit rejection of the sacrificing priesthood but from a rejection which though implicit is unmistakable. This is proved by the composition of an ordination rite which, although retaining some traditional features, rejected everything from the pre-Reformation rite which clearly expressed the essential consecrating and sacrificial function of the Catholic priesthood. The outstanding Catholic historians of the English Reformation (Gasquet, Bishop, Estcourt, Barnes, Messenger, Hughes, Clark) all lay special emphasis on Cranmer's technique of introducing doctrinal innovation through the liturgy, not by explicit heresy but by the omission of prayers and ceremonies which could not be reconciled with Protestant belief. Their judgment on such omissions is unanimous-----that what is not affirmed is considered to be denied. This was a key point in the Vindication of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* published by the Catholic Bishops of the Province of Westminster in 1898. They warned against omitting or reforming

anything in those forms which immemorial Tradition has bequeathed to us. For such an immemorial usage, whether or not it has in the course of ages incorporated superfluous accretions, must, in the estimation of those who believe in a Divinely guarded, visible Church, at least have retained whatever is necessary: so that in adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas, if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps be abandoning just that element which is essential. And this sound method is that which the Catholic Church has always followed. That in earlier times local churches were permitted to add new prayers and ceremonies is acknowledged. But that they were also permitted to subtract prayers and ceremonies in previous use, and even to remodel the existing rites in the most drastic manner, is a proposition for which we know of no historical foundation, and which appears to us absolutely incredible. 19

As was made clear in the introduction, the authority of *Apostolicae Curae* is now being questioned even by Cardinal Hume, Cardinal Vaughan's current successor as Archbishop of Westminster. There is not the least doubt that the decision made by Pope Leo XIII is irrevocable. In November of 1896 Pope Leo sent a letter to Cardinal Richard of Paris, which is quoted in full in Appendix VI, to state precisely the authority carried by his Bull:

It was Our intention thereby to deliver a final judgment and to settle absolutely that most grave question about Anglican Orders, which indeed was long since lawfully defined by Our predecessors, but by Our indulgence was entirely reheard. And this We did with such weight of argument and in such clear and authoritative tones that no prudent or right minded man could possibly doubt what Our judgment was, and so all Catholics were bound to receive it with the utmost respect as being finally settled and determined without possible appeal.

The most frequently cited argument used by those wishing to question the binding authority of the Bull is that it is not infallible. An infallible pronouncement, in the strict sense of the word, pertains only to what is contained in the deposit of Divine revelation, which is known as the primary object of infallibility. It is evident that Our Lord gave us no revelation as to the validity or invalidity of Anglican Orders. But there is a secondary object of infallibility which involves truths connected with revelation, including historical facts. It is an infallibly revealed truth that Our Lord instituted a sacrificing priesthood, but it is absolutely essential for the faithful to know who is or who is not a priest. When a convert priest celebrates Mass his congregation has the right to know that his Mass is valid. Thus, when the Church pronounces upon the validity of the ordinations of any Christian

communion, we can know with infallible certainty that its decision is true. Convert priests from Orthodoxy are accepted without reordination, but, because the Church accepts the validity of their orders, we need have no scruples about assisting at their Masses. Decisions relating to this secondary area of infallibility are what is known as dogmatic facts, and *Apostolicae Curae* comes into this category. There is no possibility that Pope Leo XIII was mistaken, and there is no possibility that his decision will ever be reversed. The verdict of the Bull is not simply final but infallible.

It is of great importance that the consequences of a reversal of *Apostolicae Curae* should be understood clearly. Pope Leo XIII assured Cardinal Richard that with *Apostolicae Curae* the question of the validity of Anglican orders had been "finally settled and determined without possible appeal." If Pope John Paul II now informed us that this was not correct, and that Anglican Orders are valid, what possible grounds could we have for being certain that he was right if Pope Leo XIII was wrong, and that a future pope would not reverse his decision and pronounce in favour of invalidity again? It is no exaggeration to claim that the entire credibility of the papacy would be undermined by any reversal of the judgment of *Apostolicae Curae*, and we can be quite certain that no such reversal will ever be made. Christian unity is a goal for which every Catholic has the duty to work and pray, but never at the expense of Catholic truth.

As a conclusion to this chapter I would like to make it clear that nothing included in it (or in the entire book, for that matter) is intended to cause offence to Anglicans. If there is to be fruitful ecumenical dialogue, the first essential is for each party to state its position fully and truthfully. The official teaching of the Catholic Church is that Anglican Orders are invalid, and fair-minded Anglo-Catholics will certainly accept that it is no more uncharitable for Catholics to uphold this position than for them to maintain that various Nonconformist denominations do not have valid Orders. One reason why Anglo-Catholics have so strenuously opposed the Ten Propositions proposed by the Churches' Unity Commission (see Chp. IX) is that it would involve placing Anglican Orders on a par with the various Nonconformist ministries. The same was true of the unsuccessful attempt to achieve Anglican-Methodist Unity without the ordination of Methodist ministers by Anglican bishops.

I certainly know members of the Anglican clergy whose lives could provide a pattern of Christian living that is equalled by few of my Catholic acquaintances. Furthermore, I know some who accept far more Catholic teaching than do the growing number of liberal Catholic priests. In belief, traditionalist Catholics and Anglicans have far more in common with each other than they do with the liberals in their own communions. This places Anglo-Catholics in the invidious position of being closest in belief to those Catholics who will not recognize their Orders.

As Cardinal Manning made clear in his book *The Workings of the Spirit in the Church of England*, "No Catholic ever denies the workings of the Spirit of God or the operations of grace in it (the Church of England)." 20

Father A. S. Barnes, an authority on Anglican Orders, wrote similarly: "God may be giving grace abundantly to them and to their flocks while they remain in good faith, even though they are not priests and their sacraments are not valid." 21

Those who have read the story of Cardinal Newman's spiritual development will need no further proof of the working of God's spirit within the Anglican Communion. Nor could anyone claim that his reception into the Catholic Church marked a transition from error to the truth; it marked, rather, a development from a less perfect to a more perfect apprehension and acceptance of God's truth. I was recently asked to edit a volume of Newman's sermons which would assist Catholics in resisting the ravages of Liberalism within the Church today. 22 I was able to do so by relying entirely on sermons written while he was an Anglican, and yet it would be hard to fault these sermons as truly sublime expositions of Catholic belief.

Cardinal Manning was equally insistent that the manifest goodness of so many Anglicans must be attributed to the grace of God.

To ascribe the good lives of such persons to the power of nature would be Pelagianism. To deny their goodness would be Jansenism. And with such a consciousness, how could anyone regard his past spiritual life in the Church of England as a mockery? I have no deeper conviction than that the grace of the Holy Spirit was with me from my earliest consciousness. Though at the time, perhaps, I knew it not as I know it now, yet I can clearly perceive the order and chain of grace by which God mercifully led me onward from childhood to the age of twenty years. 23

Father Barnes explains that the Anglican sacraments can certainly be occasions of grace for those who assist at them with sincerity and devotion, quoting Newman to illustrate his point.

No Catholic has any desire to deny that God may be actually giving grace today through Anglican sacraments. Why should He not? *Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum*. "Grace is given for the merits of Christ all over the earth; there is no corner even of Paganism where it is not present, present in each heart of man in real sufficiency for his ultimate salvation. Not that the grace presented to each is sufficient to bring him at once to Heaven, but it is sufficient for a beginning. It is sufficient to enable him to plead for other grace, and that second grace is such as to impetrate a third and thus the soul may be led on from grace to grace and from strength to strength," even outside the Church. But such grace is *ex opere operantis*, the reward of the devotion of the individual worshipper, and is no evidence of the validity of the means which in good faith he is using. "When a member of the Establishment (Church of England) has accepted God's word that He would make Bread His Body and honoured God by the fact that he has thus accepted it, is it not suitable to God's mercy if He rewards such a special faith with a quasi sacramental grace, though the worshipper has unwittingly offered to a material substance that adoration which he intended to pay to the present but invisible Lamb of God?" God, we must always remember, is not bound by the sacraments which He Himself has instituted-----but we are. 24

In the face of the accelerating drift to neo-paganism throughout the west, every Catholic must be grateful for all that so many Anglican clerics do to uphold so much of the essential Christian faith in the face of so much discouragement, not least from the liberals within their own Communion. While we can pray that one day they will come to the fullness of truth, we can rejoice in the truth that they already embrace. But while we can rejoice in what unites us we would be failing in charity towards our Anglican brethren to gloss over what separates us-----and this is just what we would be doing if we gave the Anglo-Catholic clergy the impression that we believe they have valid orders and are sacrificing priests in the Catholic sense. Indeed, the great majority of Anglican clerics would reject with indignation any suggestion that they were sacrificing priests.

1. RMP, vol. 1, pp. 448-451.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 451.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 456.
4. Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI (Cambridge, 1926), p. 229.
5. ESR, p. 204.
6. Bonner's Profitable and necessarye doctryne (London, 1555), p. 40; cited in QAO, pp. 58/9.
7. PAD, p. 21.
8. T. A. Lacey, *A Roman Diary and Other Documents* (London, 1910), p. 8.
9. PAD, pp. 23/4.
10. ESR, p. 16.
11. *The Churchman*, March 1962, pp. 23-30.
12. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, March 1957, pp. 109-11.

13. CCAO, p. 8.
14. CCAO, pp. 24-28.
15. *The Mystery of Faith* (London, 1950), pp. 455/6.
16. See B. Botte, *The Sacrament of Orders* (London, 1962).
17. P AO, p. 2.
18. Chrysostom, Autumn 1974, p. 26.
19. V AC, pp. 42-44.
20. London, 1890, p.11.
21. *No Sacrifice-----No Priest* (C.T.S., 1933), p. 24.
22. *Newman Against the Liberals*, Introduction by Mgr. P. Flanagan, (Roman Catholic Books, 1992).
23. Op. cit., Note 20, p. 14.
24. Op. cit., Note 21, pp. 25/26.

## Chapter V

### The Anglican-Catholics

Most readers will know something of the Anglo-Catholic Party in the Church of England. Anglo-Catholic clergy believe that they are priests with valid orders, intent upon restoring Catholic doctrine and practice to the Church of England; some are also dedicated to achieving reunion with Rome. Since Vatican II we have seen the emergence of an Anglican-Catholic Party within the Catholic Church. This Anglican-Catholic Party is motivated by the belief that the most urgent task of the Catholic Church is to achieve visible unity with the Anglican Communion. It would be more accurate to speak of an obsession rather than a belief, and it is an obsession to which any Catholic doctrine or tradition must be sacrificed if it is an impediment to unity. Official discussions to achieve visible unity have been conducted by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, which has produced the three notorious Agreed Statements. As the Catholic members of this Joint Commission clearly adhere to the Anglican-Catholic Party, it would be more accurate to term it the Anglican/Anglican-Catholic International Commission. Matters could, in fact, be simplified by doing away with all pretence and calling it the Anglican International Commission, since the Agreements it produces consist of straightforward Anglicanism. Father Edward Holloway has remarked, apropos the Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist:

In the Agreed Statement of the Commission no evidence whatever can be found of a convergence of doctrine which has any definite meaning. Nothing in it can be found which would distinguish Roman Catholic from Anglican doctrine, or either of these from Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, or Congregationalist doctrine for that matter. To speak therefore of a "substantial agreement" which would satisfy Roman Catholic Eucharistic doctrine is totally an illusion. One does not wish to use the stronger words which come to mind. Good intentions and earnest desires are not a substitute for honest theology or for spiritual integrity. 1

Fr. Holloway considers that the fact that the Agreement does not affirm the Eucharist to be a sacrifice constitutes

a betrayal of the Catholic Faith, and hence also a betrayal to our Anglican brothers of that sincere portrayal of the essential Eucharistic Faith of the Roman Catholic Church, which the Catholic delegates, and especially the bishops concerned, were accredited to present. 2

One of the bishops concerned is Bishop Alan Clark, joint Chairman of the International Commission. In an interview on Independent Television on 17 July 1977, he made public his most ardent desire. "I look forward," he said, "to the day when I can call myself an Anglican-Catholic."

Bishop Clark is also Chairman of the Catholic Truth Society, which now appears more concerned with propagating Agreed Statement ecumenism than Catholic Truth. Bishop Clark has not hesitated to ban from sale in the C.T.S. bookshops books or journals which do not toe the ecumenical line. It appears that a book is no longer judged by its truth or orthodoxy but by whether it will promote or impede ecumenism. If the truth is likely to impede ecumenism then it must be suppressed. It is no small irony that the present policy of "openness, pluralism, and tolerance" needs to be enforced by a policy of repression and rigid censorship.

The facilities of the C.T.S. were put at the disposal of Fr. Edward Yarnold, S.J., who has produced a pamphlet entitled: Anglican Orders-----A Way Forward? Fr. Yarnold is, like Bishop Clark, a member of the joint International Commission and an ardent ecumenist.

Incredible as it may seem, Father Yarnold has unearthed some of the most out-of-date arguments used by Anglo-Catholics in an effort to prove that they have valid orders. Time and again these arguments have been shown to be quite untenable by Catholic, scholars, not least in C.T.S.



publications.

Father Yarnold summarises Catholic teaching on the priesthood and the Mass as follows:

- (1) Holy Orders are not a human invention; bishops and priests exercise a commission which derives from the commission which Christ Himself gave to His apostles.
- (2) The Eucharist is not only a source of grace and unity for Christ's followers; it is a sacramental action by which the Church is associated with Christ's unique sacrifice on Calvary.

Fr. Yarnold then adds with considerable satisfaction that "both these points are contained in official Anglican teaching".<sup>3</sup> And why should they not be? For what Fr. Yarnold has written about Holy Orders and the Mass does not safeguard the Catholic position on a single point; it is Modernism of a nature ambiguous enough to be acceptable to any and every Protestant sect without actually denying the teaching of the Church.

Fr. Yarnold suggests that the Preface to the 1552 Ordinal "seems" to express the intention of doing what the Church does in this Sacrament.<sup>4</sup> The section of the Preface to which he refers merits close analysis. It reads as follows:

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.

This passage simply states as a matter of historical fact that these orders have existed from apostolic time. It does not state that they are of Divine institution or that they are absolutely necessary.

The Preface continues:

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 the imposition of hands approved and admitted thereunto.

This passage certainly does not state that Ordination is a Sacrament; that it confers new powers on the person ordained (to consecrate and forgive sins); that it is anything more than a ceremony denoting the bestowal of authority to exercise an office within the community, or that it is even absolutely necessary for the exercise of this function. It is fully in accord with Lutheran teaching that, while bishops are the appropriate persons to ordain, where necessary the local community could ordain its own presbyters and superintendents (bishops). The Preface continues:

And, therefore, to the intent that 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 time present Bishop, Priest or Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted according to the form hereafter following.

The important point here is that once more there is no reference to the conferring of specific powers not already possessed by the ordinand. He is simply given authority to "execute" (namely, exercise) an office within the Church. He is "admitted" to an office in accordance with Luther's teaching that ordination does not confer new powers but simply the authority to exercise an office.

With regard to the claim that "these Orders should be continued" in the Church of England, Father Messenger is not only citing the consensus of Catholic opinion but straightforward common sense when he comments that it could not possibly have been Cranmer's intention to continue the

threefold ecclesiastical ministry as it had existed in this country hitherto but:

. . . a ministry of the word and sacraments, and not, as hitherto, a sacrificial priesthood . . . Only thus can we reconcile Cranmer's statement that he intends to "continue" the threefold ministry with the patent fact that he at the same time draws up an entirely new rite of ordination, in which the sacrificial function, so prominent in the ancient rite, is not merely put into the background, but, as we shall see, is altogether excluded, and excluded in such a way as to make it plain that its exclusion is deliberate and is equivalent to a denial that any such powers belong to the Christian ministry. 5

As regards Cranmer's use of the word "continue", the Catholic Dictionary of Theology notes that:

This ambiguous word could possibly mean "to keep on with an existing practice", but it also bears the meaning "to take up again; from a point of interruption", and it was exactly this taking up again from the apostolic age that Cranmer had in view . . . In his Miscellaneous Writings (p. 117) there is a paper he wrote in 1540 where in answer to a question he says: "In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture; for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." He puts the case that in some regions all bishops and priests have died, and says that it is not forbidden by God's law that the king of that region should make bishops and priests, so that the Word of God should not remain unpreached (ibid.). 6

Father Yarnold argues quite correctly that a false belief about what the Church does in a Sacrament does not by itself prove an absence of the intention to do what the Church does. This is a fact which is examined in Appendix II. Had Cranmer continued to use the Catholic rite, even his known heretical belief might not have been sufficient to invalidate his ordinations, but by introducing a rite intended to exclude the essence of the Catholic priesthood he made manifest and public his intention to do other than the Catholic Church does. As was shown in the last chapter, this was a factor of which Pope Leo XIII took full cognizance when pronouncing Anglican Orders to be invalid, and it is scarcely credible that Father Yarnold should have considered it worth raising in his pamphlet.

Father Yarnold also advances the fact that the Edwardine Ordinal contains the words "be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments" as an argument in favour of the validity of Anglican Orders. 7 On the contrary, it indicates precisely the opposite.

When considering the liturgical texts of the Protestant Reformers, it is essential to do so within their historical context and within the entire corpus of their writings. For example, it would be possible to extract certain statements by Cranmer to give the impression that he believed in the Real Presence in the Catholic sense but, as I have shown in Cranmer's Godly Order, such a procedure is not only dishonest but manifestly unjust to Cranmer. When a man is willing to die for a particular belief he should at least be given the credit for actually believing it.

In 1530 the Emperor Charles V ordered the Lutheran princes to present a statement of their beliefs at a diet to be held at Augsburg. Accordingly, the famous Confession of Augsburg was drawn up. It was mainly the work of Philipp Melanchthon, but the text received Luther's approval. The Lutheran position was put in somewhat muted tones, in fact with deliberate ambiguity, in order to disguise the radical break from Catholic teaching. Article 5 was headed The Ecclesiastical Ministry and stated that there had been instituted "a ministry of teaching the gospel and of giving the sacraments (ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta)". Superficially the statement appears to be orthodox, but it was clarified in the following year by Melanchthon, in his Apology for the Confession, when he set this phrase in specific opposition to the Catholic concept of a sacrificing priesthood.

Our opponents (in other words the Catholics) understand the priesthood to be, not the ministry of

the word and the sacraments to others, but the power to offer sacrifice, as if it were necessary in the New Testament to re-establish the Levitical priesthood charged with sacrificing to obtain the forgiveness of sins. 8

The description of a minister as "a dispenser of the Word and sacraments" became firmly established in Protestant (not simply Lutheran) theology. In a scheme of Church government drawn up by Lutheran divines at Wittenberg in 1545, and subscribed to by Luther and Melancthon among others, it is stated that:

The mandate given in ordination should be to teach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, and not other works such as sacrificing for the living and the dead. 9

Calvin anathematized those who claimed that a priest was ordained to offer sacrifice. He insisted that: "True priests are ordained by the mouth of Jesus Christ to be dispensers of the Gospel and of the sacraments." 10

The phrase had achieved such notoriety that it was actually condemned by the Council of Trent in the canons anathematizing the Protestant heresy (see Canon III in Chap. II). The inclusion of this phrase in Cranmer's Ordinal can be construed as nothing other than a rejection of Catholic teaching on the priesthood, and yet Fr. Yarnold actually puts it forward as proof that Catholic teaching is safeguarded in this Ordinal!

Fr. Yarnold's pamphlet is so replete with errors that it would require a disproportionate amount of space to deal with each one individually. Perhaps the most serious is his acceptance of a theory popular with Hans Küng and other Modernists, that there is an extraordinary means of entering the apostolic succession, simply by seeking to be faithful to the teaching of the Apostles. 11 Those who do so, it appears, automatically acquire valid Orders. This absurd hypothesis is dealt with in Appendix IV.

Fr. Yarnold is also seriously at fault for failing to alert his readers to the fact that there is an influential body of opinion within the Church of England which holds the straightforward Protestant belief that there is no difference in essence between an ordained priest and a layman, and that there is no reason in principle why a layman should not preside at the Eucharist.

As Chapter II establishes, there are Anglican ministers who believe that lay people should be allowed to preside at the Eucharist. This view was put very bluntly by the Reverend John Goldingay, Director of Studies at an Anglican theological college preparing students for the ministry. It would probably tax even Father Yarnold's ingenuity to reconcile Mr. Goldingay's position with that of Trent.

There are no pointers in the New Testament that suggest it would be appropriate to concentrate any specific functions (such as presiding at the Eucharist) in one man . . . This is not to say that the creative contribution of a gifted leader will not be of key importance to the growth of a church; nor that a theologically equipped leader and teacher will not play a big part in the maturing of a church; nor that in our society a church may not function much more efficiently if it has a full-time stipendiary executive officer; nor even (for the sake of argument) that the presidency at the Eucharist may not be located at least normally in one particular person. It is rather to say that we should not look for all functions to be fulfilled by the same person, but rather that should be a genuinely corporate leadership of the local cl exercised by its elders. There is no place for the traditional concept of the clergyman. There is no theology of ordination. The emperor has no clothes. 12

Appendix VI contains the text of a letter sent by Pope Leo to Cardinal Richard of Paris. He explains that it was his intention to deliver a formal judgment on the question of Anglican Orders with his

encyclical and that

all Catholics were bound to receive it with the utmost respect being finally settled and determined without any possible appeal. We must, however, confess that certain Catholics have not responded to it, a matter which has caused Us no little sorrow. We have written this to you, beloved Son, because it especially applies to a certain journal called the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, published in Paris. There are some amongst its writers who, instead of defending and illustrating this Constitution, try instead to weaken it by explaining it away. Wherefore you must see that nothing is put forth in this journal which is not in full accordance with Our Statements, and it will certainly be better for it to cease and be silent rather than bring difficulties against these excellent statements and decisions.

Few of those who knew the Catholic Truth Society before Bishop Clark became its chairman would have believed that in 1977 what Pope Leo XIII had written concerning the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* would be applicable to the C.T.S. But there could be no more accurate assessment of Anglican Orders-----*A Way Forward?* by Edward Yarnold, S.J., than as an attempt to weaken and explain away the encyclical *Apostolicae Curae* which, Pope Leo XIII has stated in its concluding passage,

. . . shall be always valid and in force, and shall be inviolably observed both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and preeminence, declaring null and void anything which, in these matters, may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever, by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

1. *The Eucharist: Unity or Truth?* (Faith-Keyway Publications, 1973), p. 28.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
3. AOWF, p. 7/8.
4. AOWF, p. 13.
5. RMP, vol. I, pp. 458/9.
6. CDT, vol. III, p. 362.
7. AOWF, p. 13.
8. RMP, vol. I, p. 145.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
10. *Institutes*, Lib. IV, cap. xix, 28, col. 780.
11. AOWF, p. 1 1.
12. *Authority and Ministry* (Grove Books, 1976), p. 24.

## Chapter VI

### Agreement on the Ministry

In 1973 the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission issued its second Agreed Statement. It was entitled Ministry and Ordination and sub-titled A Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry Agreed by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Canterbury 1973. 1

Catholic teaching is not affirmed in this Statement in a single instance where Catholics and Protestants have differed on the nature of the priesthood. On every crucial issue the Catholic position is either passed over in silence or the Protestant position is affirmed. A study of this document makes only one conclusion possible: the Catholic signatories have betrayed the faith they claim to hold. Among the Catholic signatories are two bishops, Bishops C. Butler and A. Clark. This in itself is quite scandalous, but equally scandalous is the fact that not a single English bishop has shown sufficient zeal for the Catholic Faith to denounce the Statement in public. We have no contemporary St. John Fisher. Most regrettable of all was the failure of the Vatican to repudiate the Statement until 1991 (see Appendix VIII).

On 9 October 1977 the B.B.C. broadcast a programme in favour of ecumenism in general and the Agreed Statements in particular. No Catholic critic of the Agreed Statements was permitted to put his viewpoint; the case for and against the Statements was put by Bishops Clark and Butler. Bishop Butler explained that some Catholics had been confused because the old truths which the Statements contained were not phrased in the familiar language of the Catechism. The truth is, as this chapter will prove, that not one of the doctrines which separate the Catholic Church from the Church of England was affirmed in this Statement in any form of language. However, Bishop Butler commented upon the silence of Rome with considerable satisfaction. After pointing out that the Catholic members of the Joint Commission had been appointed by Rome he added that:

The Statements were communicated to Rome before they were published. The first of these Statements has now been before the world for six years and if we have seriously compromised the Catholic faith or shown intentional or unintentional disloyalty to it, all I can say is that it's about time the Church authorities stepped in and either sacked us or showed that they disapproved.

Here is one point at least on which I am in total agreement with Bishop Butler.

Since the Second Vatican Council, Catholic teaching on the priesthood and the Mass has been insidiously and inexorably undermined from within the Church. An endless stream of books and articles casting doubt on or openly denying the traditional teaching has appeared in every Western country, with sanctions rarely if ever taken against the authors. Some of those authors occupied and still occupy official positions in the post-conciliar commissions which have spread like a malignant rash over the body of the Church in the West. Those writings have been reflected in, and to a certain extent endorsed by, the postconciliar liturgical reform; not simply in its illegal abuses (rarely followed by sanctions) and heterodox but official translations of the new texts, but by the officially promulgated Latin texts themselves. Chapter X will show the extent to which the existence of a priesthood, distinct not simply in degree but in essence from that of the faithful, has been obscured; even in the official texts.

Those who have read Cranmer's Godly Order will realize the manner in which, to a large extent, the orthodox bishops and priests found themselves drawn into an almost inevitable process of compromise during the English Reformation. In the initial stages, Cranmer was intelligent enough not to provoke large scale clerical resistance by formulating his demands in a manner which would amount to a formal denial of the Catholic faith. But the longer this process continued the less likelihood there was of those who had been drawn into it ever making a stand. Just as has been the case since Vatican II, four hundred years earlier there was large scale lay resistance, very little

clerical resistance, and practically no open resistance on the part of the bishops. Gardiner and Bonner were notable exceptions. I have described in Cranmer's Godly Order how Bishop Bonner reached the point where he realized that he must either stand up for what he believed to be true or abandon any claim to personal integrity.

Eventually, on 15 September, 1549, Bishop Bonner felt that his failure to make an explicit public protest against the reforms "might unto some be an allowance of heretical doctrines". He had been forced to allow a Protestant to preach in his own Cathedral of St. Paul and when, in the sermon, the preacher declaimed "against the Holy Sacrament, denying the verity and presence of Christ's true Body and Blood to be there" the bishop rose from his place and left the Church.

Four days later he explained to Cranmer "three things I have, to wit, a small portion of goods, a poor carcass and mine soul: the first two ye may take (though unjustly) to you; but as for my soul, ye get it not quia anima mea in manibus meis semper". That same night he was conveyed to the Marshalsea prison. 2

The Agreed Statement on the Ministry appeared in 1973. Five years have passed since then and not a single bishop in England and Wales has had the courage to repudiate it publicly. There is no Bonner in the present-day hierarchy. And what do orthodox bishops have to fear? Not prison, but criticism in the Modernist press, the disapproval of the ecumenical establishment. I know for a fact that there are bishops who deplore the Canterbury Statement but will not criticize it publicly, since such criticism would reflect upon their two confreres who signed the document. They see themselves as members of the episcopal trade union in which loyalty to the other members, even if they are in the wrong, comes before loyalty to the Catholic Faith which, as bishops, they have a duty to defend even at the cost of their lives.

The Agreed Statement on the Ministry is of particular relevance to the question of Apostolicae Curae and Anglican Orders. Its clear objective was to provide a way around Apostolicae Curae by rendering obsolete the criteria upon which Pope Leo XIII based his final and irrevocable decision that Anglican Orders are invalid.

We decree that these letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason of fault or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption of Our intention, but are and shall be always valid and in force and shall be inviolably observed both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and preeminence, declaring null and void anything which, in these matters, may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever, by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding (para. 40).

The Agreed Statement explains (para. 17):

We are fully aware of the issues raised by the judgment of the Roman Catholic Church on Anglican Orders. The development of the thinking in our two Communion regarding the nature of the Church and of the Ordained Ministry, as represented in our Statement, has, we consider, put these issues in a new context.

Pope Leo XIII condemned Anglican Orders as invalid, inter alia, because Cranmer's Ordination and Communion rites clearly rejected the concept of the Mass as a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and of the priest as a man upon whom the Sacrament of Ordination had conferred powers denied to the rest of the faithful, to transform bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ by an immaculate blessing, and to absolve men of their sins. Furthermore, as a result of this denial, the Anglican ordination rite was devoid of the power to confer orders so that the apostolic succession was broken and the power to ordain lost to the Church of England.

The Agreed Statement makes *Apostolicae Curae* obsolete by a very simple process. The Mass is not affirmed to be a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore those who deny this cannot be condemned. A priest is not affirmed to possess powers denied to the laity, and therefore those who deny that he does cannot be condemned. It is not affirmed that the priesthood is conferred by the laying on of hands in a process which has continued without interruption since the time of the Apostles; and it is not even affirmed that the episcopate is an essential office in the Church. To be in the apostolic succession is simply to teach what the Apostles taught; Anglicans do this, ergo they have valid orders.

In a commentary upon the Canterbury Statement, Dr. Julian Charley, an Anglican member the Joint Commission, remarked that the problem of *Apostolicae Curae* has certainly been placed "in a new context" by the Statement, and he asks: "Were the categories employed (by Leo XIII) the right ones at all? Not only Anglicans but many Roman Catholics also would answer 'no' to this question today" (p. 24). The Catholic members of the Joint Commission clearly believe that the time has come when it is no longer necessary to make even a pretence at discretion in proving Dr. Charley to be right. Bishop Clark, who is not only Co-Chairman of the joint Commission but Chairman of the Catholic Truth Society, has put the facilities of that Society at the disposal of Fr. Edward Yarnold, S.J., another member of the joint Commission, to publish a pamphlet advocating a recognition of Anglican Orders on the basis of the Agreed Statement concept of apostolic succession (see Chapter V). Theoretically, this pamphlet is a case of flying a kite. It is claimed that Fr. Yarnold speaks only as an individual----but it would be hard to imagine a kite being flown in a more official manner. If we were not living in a Church that has temporarily taken leave of its senses, our bishops would have taken instant action to have the pamphlet withdrawn, Fr. Yarnold disciplined, and the Catholic Truth Society removed from Bishop Clark's control. As it is, the Bishops have not taken and will not take any action. Nor is there the least hope of any intervention from the Vatican-----such is the state of the Church today.

It is now necessary to document some of the allegations made in this chapter. I do not propose to document them myself but to allow one of the members of the Joint Commission to do so for me. His testimony will carry far more weight than mine. In 1973, Dr. Julian Charley, a leading Anglican theologian on the Joint Commission, published a commentary on the Canterbury Statement. It includes the complete text of the Statement and a detailed commentary explaining the significance of certain ambiguous passages. It must be conceded at once that his interpretation is not the only one possible. As will be shown, he concludes that because it is not affirmed that a priest has powers denied to a layman, then it is accepted that he does not. It could, presumably, be argued that because it is not denied that a priest possesses powers denied to a layman, then he can be presumed to possess such powers. However, plain common sense dictates that agreement can only be reached on what is positively affirmed. This principle lies at the basis of all legal agreements. It is also the basis of Pope Leo XIII's decision that Anglican Orders were invalid. Neither Cranmer's Ordinal nor his Communion Service formally denies Catholic teaching on a single point. Another Anglican theologian, the Rev. Colin Buchanan, has noted that Cranmer could have signed the first Agreed Statement on the Eucharist (The Windsor Agreement) while his opponents could not, and that the statements "about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament go very much with his use of language, and the footnote explaining away transubstantiation without committing anyone to it would have made him chortle".<sup>3</sup> Cranmer could not only have signed the Canterbury Statement with a clear conscience, he could quite easily have written it.

It is therefore quite reasonable to agree with Dr. Charley that where the Statement does not affirm a particular belief to be essential to the understanding of the Ministry reached by the members of the joint Commission, then those members do not consider it to be an essential attribute of the ministerial status. In fact, according to the Statement, there is no priestly status of which to possess attributes.

What, then, does the Statement say, or rather, what does it fail to say, about the crucial issues which

have separated Catholics and Protestants since the Reformation? The reader might find it helpful here to refer to the summary of Protestant belief contained in Chapter II.

Protestants teach that ordination is not a Sacrament but simply the public authorization for a person to exercise a function within the Church, namely teaching the Word of God and administering the Sacraments. It is a matter of propriety though not of necessity that only ordained persons should fulfill these functions, but in an emergency they could be discharged by anyone of the faithful.

Can the Canterbury Statement be reconciled with these Reformation axioms? Dr. Charley most certainly concludes that it can. He explains that an ordained minister is

. . . the most appropriate person to preside at the celebration of the Eucharist. The Statement says nothing about a "priestly character" necessary for such a responsibility, by which an ordained man is empowered to do something which no layman can do. It speaks rather of what is right in the light of the nature of both the Eucharist and the ministry. The Lord's people gather together around the Lord's table. If the minister is the focus of the people's unity, who could be more fitting to act as president? It was this realization that undoubtedly accounts for the early confining of this task to the one who exercised oversight in the Christian community. The New Testament itself tells us nothing about who should preside (p. 21).

When asked whether this meant that if no ordained minister was available a layman could act as celebrant he replied, "I can find, if I am honest, no ultimate theological reason why in exceptional circumstances a layman could not be the celebrant."

Paramount among the reasons which prompted Pope Leo XIII to pronounce Anglican Orders invalid was the systematic elimination of every reference to the sacrificial nature of the Mass from Cranmer's Communion and Ordination rites. This is a fact which I have documented in very great detail in Cranmer's Godly Order and will not repeat here. The Reformers were prepared to accept that the Eucharist was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and nothing more. Is the Statement compatible with Protestant teaching? Dr. Charley writes:

Any suggestion of the sacrifice of Christ being somehow continued in Heaven and represented by priests at altars on earth is positively excluded. Here there is reiterated and elucidated what was said in the Commission's former statement on the Eucharist (The Windsor Agreement). Priestly language to describe the presiding minister must never be allowed to obscure the fact.

Referring to the Windsor Agreement, Dr. Charley explains:

The Statement on the Eucharist claimed to be a "substantial agreement" from which, according to the Chairmen in the Preface, "nothing essential has been omitted". That Statement spoke explicitly of the sacrifice of Christ, but it never described the Eucharist as a sacrifice. Even a "substantial agreement" did not require that. This present Statement on the ministry is "the consensus of the Commission on essential matters" (para. 17). There is a straight acknowledgment of the absence from the New Testament of priestly epithets for the ministry. Why this terminology was accepted later among Christians is explored very carefully. No claim is made for the ministry of a priestly role derived from Christ, for His High Priesthood is unique. There is no suggestion of a continuance or repetition of His priestly sacrifice, for what He did was unique and unrepeatable. All that is said is that the priestly role of Christ is "reflected" in the presiding minister, which is a very different matter. Put the substance of all these facts together, taken from two agreements claiming to include all essentials, and you have a very notable result (p. 23).

The Council of Trent took great pains to make it clear that the forgiveness of sins when absolution is pronounced by a duly authorized priest is a real judicial pardon. It is not simply a statement of fact, namely that God has forgiven the sins of the penitent. Although the priest is dispensing God's



bounty, sins are forgiven in virtue of the words of absolution which he pronounces "after the manner of a judicial act by which the sentence is pronounced by him as by a judge" (D. 919). The essential fact here is that the priest also has the power to refuse absolution, to retain the sins of the penitent.

The teaching of Trent was in opposition to the practice of some Reformers who preserved a rite resembling the Catholic Sacrament of Penance in which, when the minister pronounced forgiveness of the penitent's sins, he was simply reminding him that his sins had been forgiven through the merits of Christ; there was no question of a power exercised by the minister in virtue of the Sacrament of Order. To quote Calvin:

It not seldom happens that he who hears general promises which are intended for the whole congregation of the faithful, nevertheless remains somewhat in doubt and is still disquieted in his mind, as if his own remission were not yet obtained. Should this individual lay open the secret wound of his soul to his pastor, and hear these words of the Gospel, "Son be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee," his mind will feel secure and escape from the trepidation with which it was previously agitated. 4

Cranmer, along with Latimer and Jewel, did not believe that the presbyter possessed any special power to absolve sin. 5 The clear teaching of the Catholic Church is that in the Sacrament of Penance a duly authorized priest has the power to remit or retain the sins of the penitent, and not simply state that God has forgiven him. This teaching was reiterated in the documents of Vatican II and by the 1971 Synod of Bishops. 6 The Canterbury statement claims:

Authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sin, given to bishops and presbyters at their ordination, is exercised by them to bring Christians to a closer communion with God and their fellow men through Christ and to assure them of God's continuing love and mercy.

It will be noted that this is the Protestant concept of ordination as the authority to exercise an office, as opposed to the Catholic teaching that it confers powers not possessed by the unordained. It will also be noted that the Statement does no more than repeat the Protestant teaching that a minister is empowered to pronounce the fact that God has forgiven the sins of the penitent.

Dr. Charley comments:

Similarly, with this context in mind, "the authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sin" (para. 11) should not be open to misconstruction. The relationship of such a ministry with the word of God is fundamental. The forgiveness is God's, not ours, for sin is primarily an offence against God Who alone therefore can offer pardon. As in the Anglican Prayer Book, where the Absolution is either a prayer to God or a statement about God, so here the minister is simply said to "pronounce" it. This is based upon the authority given by Jesus to his first disciples (Mt. 18:18; Jn. 20:23). Absolution is an extension of the ministry of the word (p. 21).

Vatican II follows Trent in teaching that the Sacrament of Order in the Catholic Church is of Divine institution. Our Lord made His Apostles priests of the New Testament at the Last Supper. The powers He gave them were permanent and meant to be transmitted to their successors by the laying on of hands. This power was to continue without interruption, and has indeed been handed down without a break to our present-day bishops, who are the lawful successors of the Apostles in the Church which is a hierarchically structured society. 7

Every proposition listed here is de fide teaching, and if the Church should ever accept that she has been wrong in even one of these propositions then her entire history and witness would be meaningless. It would, in fact, be a straightforward admission that there is no Catholic Church. Not one of these propositions is affirmed in the Statement. Some are even openly denied. What it states

must be assessed in the light of the theory that to be in the apostolic succession means to teach what the Apostles taught. The Statement has this to say:

The Church is apostolic not only because its faith and life must reflect the witness to Jesus Christ given in the early Church by the Apostles but also because it is charged to continue in the Apostles' commission to communicate to the world what it has received (para. 4).

Within the New Testament ministerial actions are varied and functions not precisely defined. Explicit emphasis is given to the proclamation of the Word and the preservation of apostolic doctrine, the care of the flock, and the example of Christian living. . . . with the growth of the Church the importance of certain functions led to their being located in specific officers of the community (para. 5).

The early churches may well have had considerable diversity in the structure of the pastoral ministry, though it is clear that some churches were headed by ministers who were called *episcopoi* and *presbyteroi*. While the first missionary churches were not a loose aggregation of autonomous communities, we have no evidence that "bishops" and "presbyters" were appointed everywhere in the primitive period. The terms "bishop" and "presbyter" could be applied to the same man or to men with identical or very similar functions. Just as the formation of the canon of the New Testament was a process incomplete until the second half of the second century, so also the full emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon required a longer period than the apostolic age. Thereafter this threefold structure became universal in the Church (para. 6).

It hardly needs stating that this is a straightforward contradiction of the teaching of Trent (Denzinger 961-968. See pp. 14/15).

An essential element in the ordained ministry is its responsibility for "oversight" (*episcopo*). This responsibility involves fidelity to the apostolic faith, its embodiment in the life of the Church today, and its transmission to the Church of tomorrow. Presbyters are joined with the bishop in his oversight of the church and in the ministry of the word and the sacraments; they are given authority to preside at the Eucharist and to pronounce absolution (para. 9).

The distinction made here between the necessity for the community to select certain officers to exercise "oversight" (authority) in the Church, which is considered essential, and the fulfilling of this role by bishops (*episcopoi*), who are not essential, is basic to an understanding of the Canterbury Statement. The agreed formula is "episcopo necessary, *episcopoi* optional". This distinction is made not simply to prepare the ground for Catholic/Anglican unity but for unity with bodies which do not include bishops as part of their system. It would not be possible to carry the Evangelical Anglican clergy in a formula of union which insisted upon the Divine institution and necessity of the episcopate. Many of them simply accept that the exercise of "oversight" by bishops is the way of conducting affairs in the Church of England, without accepting that the episcopate was instituted by Christ or that it is the only acceptable means of exercising "oversight". Similarly, the preface to Cranmer's Ordinal simply recognizes the threefold ministry as an historical fact without affirming that it is essential (see p. 50). Dr. Charley makes the following comments:

Anglican theology has generally drawn a clear distinction between the essential nature of ministry and the policy practised to safeguard it. For instance, the Anglican Reformers of the sixteenth century argued initially for episcopacy and the threefold ministry on historical and practical rather than theological grounds. Even at the height of the Puritan opposition, when Hooker and Bancroft asserted the Divine origin of the episcopacy, they appeared reluctant to regard it as an essential mark of the true Church. Now the Commission's Statement emphasizes "oversight" (*episcopo*) as an essential element in the ordained ministry (para. 9). It does not say the same about "bishops" (*episcopoi*). Instead there is a description of Anglican and Roman Catholic practice-----what happens and why it happens (e.g. para. 9). No exclusive claim is made for possessing the only

acceptable form of Church order. This is implicit in the words of the Co-Chairmen about "respecting the different forms that the ministry has taken in other traditions" (Preface). It leaves wide open the question whether other denominations would be obliged in any future rapprochement to take episcopacy into their system (pp. 16-17).

Ministry evolved in accordance with the needs of the Church in any given locality. There was no imposed blueprint. No proof exists for a direct pipe-line transmission of ministerial authority from apostles to bishops and so down to the present day. Such theorising remains completely unsubstantiated . . . the Church was well able to survive and grow in its early stages without the threefold structure of bishop, presbyter and deacon that became universal after the apostolic age (p. 18).

Dr. Charley's position is quite understandable for a Protestant who accepts that the Scriptures alone provide the sole source of what we must believe and that, ultimately, the criterion for deciding what the Scriptures do or do not teach is his own reason. The existence of the threefold ministry in Apostolic times, let alone its divine institution, cannot be proved from the Bible to his satisfaction, therefore it cannot be essential. There are Scripture scholars of the very highest calibre who would differ from him on this point (see Appendix VII) but, be that as it may, from the Catholic standpoint, Tradition as well as Scripture is the source of our belief and the fact that the Council of Trent teaches categorically that the threefold ministry is of Divine institution, and therefore existed from apostolic times, is proof. The fact that a convincing case can be drawn from Scripture to make the same point can be cited as a useful illustration of Trent's teaching, but should not be put forward to prove this teaching. The teaching of Trent is true of itself; it would be true if not one word in the Bible could be found to confirm it. There is no biblical account of the Assumption of Our Lady, but this is a truth which the Church teaches with infallible certainty and requires us to accept.

As was stated, from Dr. Charley's standpoint his attitude is totally reasonable. But it is not simply unreasonable but scandalous for Catholic bishops who have a solemn obligation to uphold the teaching of Trent to put their signatures to a document which can be interpreted in this manner. Dr. Charley continues:

. . . ordination is "an act in which the whole Church of God is involved" (para. 14). To view the clergy as some kind of exclusive, self-perpetuating club is therefore wholly erroneous . . . the Statement nowhere says that bishops (episcopoi) are essential to the Church but it does affirm that oversight (episcopo) most certainly is . . . The Statement says nothing about apostles appointing bishops and thus establishing an unbroken chain down to the twentieth century: the fact is that there are too many links missing for such an assertion (p. 19).

Now the apostolic office was undoubtedly unique and unrepeatable, but the apostolic mission continues, for it will last until the end of the world (Mt. 28:20). To succeed the apostles is to heed their witness and to continue their ministry . . . Thus the true tests of apostolicity are a loyalty to apostolic doctrine, a continuance of the apostolic mission and a following of the apostolic example (p.26).

Dr. Charley notes that although "the pipe-line theory" has been "so widely repudiated, it still gains tacit admission in the Vatican n documents" (p. 27). He quotes with great approval from a book by Dr. W. Telfer who asserts that:

So these Latin churchmen created a historical myth, the unhistorical nature of which they were secure from discovering. This was to the effect that the apostles had provided for the future of the Church by creating an order of monarchical bishops. The first of these they ordained, according to this myth, with their own hands, and sent them to govern the several churches with which they were concerned. 8

As a final point, it is worth citing another quotation brought forward by Dr. Charley to demonstrate why it is essential for the credibility of Protestantism that Christ should not have instituted the Sacrament of Order to be transmitted in unbroken succession by the laying on of hands. He quotes (p. 29) a statement made by Archbishop Bancroft when he re-established episcopacy in Scotland in 1610. The Archbishop stated:

Where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.  
9

To sum up, the significance of the Canterbury Statement lies in the following fact. If the traditional Catholic teaching on the Sacrament of Order and the apostolic succession is correct, then the Protestant denominations are in conflict with the will of Christ and rarely if ever possess valid Orders. Reunion could only be achieved by their admitting this truth and accepting re-ordination for their ministers. This is a step that they would not take and, therefore, if the ecumenical movement is to progress it can only do so by requiring the Catholic Church to abandon her teaching on the priesthood and consequently her claim to be the one true Church founded by Christ, whose solemn teaching is guaranteed by Him to be infallibly true.

The Catholic delegates had a choice to make between the Catholic priesthood and ecumenical progress. They opted for the latter. May God forgive them.

1. The complete text together with an important commentary by the Rev. J. W. Charley is available from Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts. It is entitled: Agreement on the Doctrine of the Ministry. This is by far the most useful edition to obtain, and Mr. Charley's commentary is cited on a number of occasions in this book.
2. CGO, p. 129.
3. What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing? Grove Books, see page 7.
4. Calvin, Letters, Vol. 1, pp. 160/1, quoted by J. L. Ainslie, The Doctrines of the Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches, p.81.
5. OIR, p. 7. See also: R. T. Beckwith, Priesthood and Sacraments, 1964, pp. 30/31.
6. D. 902, 919; Lumen Gentium, 22; Presbyterorum Ordinis, 2.
7. D. 938; Lumen Gentium, 20, 21, 22; Christus Dominus, 2, 4, 16; Presbyterorum Ordinis, 2.
8. The Office of a Bishop (London, 1962), p. 119.
9. Quoted in N. Sykes, Old Priests and New Presbyters, (Cambridge, 1957), p. 101.

## Chapter VII

### The New Catholic Rite of Ordination

On 30 November, 1947, Pope Pius XII promulgated his Apostolic Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* specifying what constituted the matter and form of the Sacrament of Order. He made no change whatsoever in the traditional ordination rite contained in the Roman Pontifical. In fact, Pope Pius XII laid considerable stress upon the fact that no change whatsoever was to be made in the traditional rite. At the conclusion of *Sacramentum Ordinis* he wrote:

Finally, it is not lawful to understand what We have above declared and established in the sense that other rites contained in the Roman Pontifical may be neglected: in fact, We command all that is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical to be religiously maintained and observed. 1

This Constitution is closely examined in Appendix I and will not be referred to in any detail here. The importance of the Constitution lies in the fact that it settled for the future the precise matter and form of the Sacrament of Order. Principally, the Pope ruled that the sole matter of the Sacrament was the imposition of hands and not the "tradition" of the instruments. The ceremony of the traditio (handing over) consisted of the handing over to the candidate of those things used in the exercise of the Order in question, namely the chalice containing wine and the paten with bread for the Priesthood, and the book of the Gospels for the diaconate.

Pope Pius X also decreed that the sole form consists of the words of the Preface of the rite, the essential words being:

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to this Thy servant, the dignity of the Priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within him, that he may hold from Thee, O God, the second rank in Thy service and by the example of his behaviour afford a pattern of holy living.

Pope Paul VI promulgated the new ordination rites for deacon, priest, and bishop with his Apostolic Constitution *Pontificalis Romani recognitio* of 18 June 1968. Where the rite for ordaining a priest is concerned, the first point to make is that the matter and essential form designated by Pius XII in *Sacramentum Ordinis* remain virtually unchanged (see Appendix XI). This is a point in favour of the new rite. It is the only point in its favour. The traditional rite of ordination has been remodelled "in the most drastic manner", and, following Cranmer's example (see Chap. IV), this has been achieved principally by the subtraction of "prayers and ceremonies in previous use", prayers and ceremonies which gave explicit sacerdotal signification to the indeterminate formula specified by Pius XII as the essential form. This formula does indeed state that the candidates for ordination are to be elevated to the priesthood-----but so does the Anglican. Within the context of the traditional Roman Pontifical there was not the least suspicion of ambiguity-----within the new rite there most certainly is. While the new rite in no way suggests that it is not intended to ordain sacrificing priests, where (and it) it does refer to the sacrifice of the Mass it does so in muted tones, and considerable stress is laid on the ministry of the Word-----a change of emphasis well calculated to please Protestants, as will be shown in Chapter VIII. It is very significant that the Preface of the traditional Roman Pontifical containing the sacramental form has been altered in the new rite immediately the words specified by Pope Pius XII as constituting the form have been completed. A new conclusion is added. It reads:

May they be our fellow-workers, so that the words of the Gospel may reach to the farthest parts of the earth, and all nations, gathered together in Christ, may become one holy people of God.

There is clearly nothing unorthodox in this passage, and equally clearly there is nothing to which any Protestant could take the least exception.

Pope Leo laid considerable stress upon the historical circumstances in which the Anglican Ordinal

"was composed and publicly authorized". He makes particular mention of

the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects; and as to the end they had in view. Being fully cognisant of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between "the law of believing and the law of praying" (*legem credendi et legem supplicandi*), under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted the Liturgical Order in many ways to suit the errors of the reformers (para .30).

Every informed Catholic now knows of the six heterodox (Protestant) consultants whose help was invoked by Archbishop Bugnini in his "reform" of the Catholic liturgy. Every informed Catholic is aware of the historical climate during which the new rites originated and were publicly instituted----a climate which, as Pope John's Council shows, was permeated by a spirit of false ecumenism ready to minimize any Catholic belief or tradition in order to placate Protestants. But although Protestant experts were consulted, the world-wide Catholic episcopate most certainly was not consulted----as Cardinal Heenan has testified. During the first full meeting of the Westminster Pastoral Council on the 26th April, 1969, Cardinal Heenan

spoke with particular force about the lack of consultation between Rome and the local hierarchies and said that it is a matter he hopes to take up in Rome during the Bishops' Synod in October. He cited as an example of this sort of thing the new form of ordination ceremony which is to come into force immediately:

"The bishops saw this for the first time a few days before they were due at an ordination. This is the kind of thing that breaks their hearts."

The Cardinal added that in his view the new form is also much less attractive. 2

Similarly, the Argentinian Bishops objected to the spiritual impoverishment of the ordination rite in its new form, which tended to obscure the essence of the Catholic priesthood. At the request of the Episcopal Conference, its President, Archbishop Tortolo of Parana, wrote a letter to the Congregation for Divine Worship requesting that each ordaining bishop should be left free to decide whether he would use the old or new rite. The request was neither granted nor rejected----there simply was no reply at all from the Congregation.

I have also been reliably informed of a case in which one British bishop agreed to the request of some ordinands to be ordained in the old rite as they had grave doubts concerning the validity of the new one.

Before proceeding to make a more detailed examination of the new ordination rite, it is worth noting that Cranmer abolished the subdiaconate and minor orders and replaced them with a ministry in three degrees----bishops, priests, and deacons. 3 The Council of Trent taught that the Subdiaconate was a major Order and pronounced anathema upon anyone who denied "that besides the Priesthood there are in the Catholic Church other Orders, both major and minor, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made to the Priesthood" (D. 962).

Cranmer's reform has been followed not simply in the composition of a new Ordinal, denuded of almost every mandatory reference to the sacrifice of the Mass----the very term "sacrifice of the Mass" does not occur in either the Latin or vernacular version of the 1968 Catholic rite----but in the abolition of the Subdiaconate and the minor orders by the *Motu Proprio Ministeria Quaedam* of August, 1972. This action was taken, according to the *Motu Proprio*, to conform to "contemporary needs" and in accordance with "the contemporary outlook". The same *Motu Proprio* instituted what are described as the "ministries" of lector and acolyte, in a newly-devised rite which in no way confers the minor orders with the same name.

The most objective manner of comparing the old and new rites of ordination is to examine them both in the light of the criticism of Cranmer's Ordinal made by Pope Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae*. The basis of this criticism is that:

in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood (*sacerdotium*), and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice but, as We have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out (para. 30).

As has already been made clear, the use of the word "priest" in itself in no way denotes an acceptance of the Catholic concept of the priesthood (*sacerdotium*), as this word is used frequently throughout Cranmer's Ordinal. Reference to the *sacerdotium* must be looked for in specific references to the powers of a priest ordained to consecrate and offer sacrifice. Incidentally, it is worth pointing out that the Latin word *presbyter*, used to denote priest in the Latin texts of both the traditional and new ordinals, is translated as "presbyter" in numerous places in the I.C.E.L. translation. At no time in any English-speaking country have Catholic priests been referred to as "presbyters". The term *presbyter* is also used in the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal.

In order to appreciate the extent to which the new Catholic Ordinal has been revised in a Protestant direction it is necessary to list the more important prayers and ceremonies of the traditional rite. The new rite can then be examined within the context of the changes made in this rite.

#### The Traditional Ordination Rite (The Roman Pontifical)

A brief outline of the traditional rite will now be provided, including the complete text of some of the prayers most clearly incompatible with a Protestant concept of the priesthood or the Lord's Supper. The modifications made in the traditional rite to provide the new Catholic rite of ordination are examined in some detail in the next section, but some brief comments are also included here.

The Rite of Ordination of a Priest follows the order of Mass up to the Collect, after which the candidates for ordination (*ordinands*) are called by name and presented to the Bishop by the Archdeacon, who declares that as far as human frailty may judge he considers them worthy of ordination.

The Bishop then "charges" the people to declare any possible objection to any of the *ordinands*, reminding them that:

Not for nothing did the Fathers ordain that even the people should be consulted in the choice of those who are to minister at the altar. For sometimes what is unknown to the many of the life and conduct of a candidate may be known to the few, and a more ready obedience is given to a priest when assent has been given to his ordination.

There is no provision for the people to give a sign of formal consent to the ordination; this is manifested simply by silence.

In the new rite the reference to "the choice of those who are to minister at the altar" has been eliminated. It has been replaced by a statement that the candidates are to be ordained "for the office of *presbyter*". The people give a formal consent by saying: "Thanks be to God" or "give their consent according to local custom".

The Bishop then addresses the *ordinands* and his "charge" to them includes the following:

For it is a priest's duty to offer sacrifice, to bless, to lead, to preach and to Baptise.

This admonition has been abolished.

The Litany of the Saints then follows. It has been left in the new rite in a drastically curtailed form, omitting such unecumenical petitions as the following:

That Thou wouldst recall all who have wandered from the unity of the Church, and lead all unbelievers to the light of the Gospel.

After the Litany comes the silent imposition of hands by the Bishop and then by all the priests present. The imposition of the Bishop's hands constitutes the matter of the Sacrament.

Then a number of prayers follow, including a lengthy Preface which incorporates the form of the Sacrament:

We pray Thee, Almighty Father, confer the dignity of the Priesthood on these Thy servants; renew in their hearts the spirit of holiness, that they may obtain the office of the second rank received from Thee, O God, and may, by the example of their lives, inculcate the pattern of holy living. It is clear that neither the matter nor the form is in the least incompatible with Protestant teaching. As is made clear in Appendix I, this is a case where the signification of the rite must be deduced from other prayers and ceremonies surrounding the matter and form, what is referred to by theologians as *determinatio ex adiunctis*. (See Appendix I for the meaning of this term.)

The newly ordained priests are then vested with a stole and chasuble, in each case to the accompaniment of an extremely beautiful prayer. The vesting remains in the new rite but the prayers have been abolished. The Bishop then says another long prayer which includes the following:

Theirs be the task to change with blessing undefiled, for the service of thy people, bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Thy Son.

This prayer has been abolished. The *Veni Creator Spiritus* is then intoned while the Bishop anoints the hands of the new priests. Dipping his right thumb into the oil of the *Catechumens* he anoints the opened hands of each one in the form of a cross by tracing two lines, one from the thumb of the right hand to the index finger of the left, the other from the thumb of the left hand to the corresponding finger of the right. He then anoints the palms all over. While anointing each priest he says:

Be pleased, Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands by this anointing, and our blessing.

Then he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of each priest and continues:

That whatsoever they bless may be blessed, and whatsoever they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

This prayer has been abolished and replaced by one which will be examined in the next section. The palms are still anointed, but no specific directions are given in the rubric which simply states that the Bishop "anoints with holy chrism the palms of each new priest who kneels before him". Pope Pius XII clearly set considerable significance upon this prayer, which he cites in *Mediator Dei*:

. . . the Sacrament of Order sets priests in a class apart from all other Christians who are not endowed with this supernatural power. They alone have entered this august ministry by a special Divine vocation, a ministry by which they are appointed to the sacred altar and made, as it were, Divine instruments to communicate the heavenly and supernatural life in the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. Moreover, as We have said, they alone are marked by the indelible character that



likens them to Christ the Priest; they alone have their hands consecrated so that "whatsoever they may bless shall be blessed, and whatsoever they may hallow shall be hallowed and consecrated in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ" (para. 46).

The rubrics for the traditional rite then state:

#### VIEW DETAIL OF A TRADITIONAL ORDINATION

The Bishop now closes the hands of each in succession, so that both palms meet, and one of the attendants binds them together with a white fillet; each priest then returns to his place. When this anointing and consecration of hands are finished, the Bishop cleanses his hands: and then delivers to each priest the chalice containing wine and water, with a paten and host upon it, which each takes between the fore and middle finger, so as to touch both the paten and the cup of the chalice, while the Bishop says to each:

"Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass, both for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord".

This beautiful ceremony and the exceptionally important prayer have both been abolished. In their place, the paten with the altar-breads, and the chalice with the wine and water to be used in the Mass, are placed in the hands of each new priest by the Bishop accompanied by a brief exhortation which will be discussed in the next section.

The new priests then concelebrate Mass with the Bishop. At the end of Mass, before the Post Communion, each new priest kneels before the Bishop who lays both hands upon the head of each in turn and says:

Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.

This ceremony and prayer have been abolished. The new priests then promise obedience to their bishop who "charges" them to bear in mind that offering Holy Mass is not free from risk (*satis periculosa est*) and that they should learn everything necessary from diligent priests before undertaking so fearful a responsibility. This admonition has been abolished.

Finally, before completing the Mass, he imparts a most moving blessing. The blessing of God Almighty, the Father CROSS the Son CROSS, and the Holy Ghost CROSS come down upon you, and make you blessed in the priestly Order, enabling you to offer propitiatory sacrifices for the sins of the people to Almighty God.

This blessing has been abolished.

#### The New Ordination Rite

As the previous section made clear, every prayer in the traditional rite which stated specifically the essential role of a priest as a man ordained to offer propitiatory sacrifice for the living and dead has been removed. In most cases these were the precise prayers removed by the Protestant Reformers, or if not precisely the same there are clear parallels. At this point some of the prayers introduced into the new Ordinal will be examined to assess the extent to which they make explicit the doctrine of the prayers which have been abolished. It must be remembered that this doctrine, as was made clear earlier, is not simply the doctrine of Trent but the doctrine of Vatican II.

The new rite contains an optional model for the "Bishop's Charge". After a lengthy exhortation on the duty of preaching and instructing, the I.C.E.L. (International Commission for English in the

Liturgy) translation includes the following:

In the same way you must carry out your mission of sanctifying the world in Christ. It is your ministry which will make the spiritual sacrifices of the faithful perfect by uniting them to the Eucharistic sacrifice of Christ. That sacrifice will be offered in an unbloody way through your hands. Understand the meaning of what you do; put into practice what you celebrate. When you recall the mystery of the death and resurrection of the Lord try to die to sin and walk in the new life of Christ.

In typical fashion, the I.C.E.L. has provided an inadequate translation of the Latin, which refers to the sacrifice being offered through the priest's hands upon the altar (*super altare*, omitted from the I.C.E.L. translation), and also instructs him to imitate what he handles. The Latin text reads:

*Munere item sanctificandi in Christo fungemini. Ministerio enim tuo sacrificium spirituale fidelium perficietur, Christi sacrificio coniunctum, quod per manus tuas super altare incruenter in celebratione mysteriorum offerretur. Agnosce ergo quod agis, imitare quod tractas, quatenus, mortis et resurrectionis Domini mysterium celebrans, membra tua a vitiis omnibus mortificare et in novitate vitae ambulare studeas.*

Where this passage is included (and it is only an option) the intention to ordain a sacrificing priest is made specific, though in muted tones when set beside the prayers in the traditional rite which have been abolished. This is a prayer which an Evangelical Protestant could hardly say with a clear conscience. In his study of contemporary ordinals the Reverend Peter Toon affirms that from his Evangelical standpoint the new rite still preserves the doctrine of the ministerial priesthood. <sup>4</sup> It would be an exaggeration to suggest that every prayer in the new Catholic Ordinal is totally acceptable to Protestants. It is, rather, part of a process of convergence, a step in the direction of a common ordinal, as will be made clear below. A direct transition from the traditional rite to a common ordinal would have been too drastic a step; but a transition from the new rite to a common ordinal would hardly be noticed.

Two passages from the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal will illustrate the extent to which Protestants are prepared to use terminology calculated to appease Catholics while remaining fully consistent with Protestant teaching. (The manner in which apparently Catholic terminology can be interpreted in a Protestant sense was documented in some detail in Cranmer's Godly Order.) Among a number of passages which could be cited, the two selected read:

(A Presbyter) is to teach, edify, and encourage, both by word and example, the people entrusted to his charge. He is to lead them in prayer and worship; to preside at the celebration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ and in his Name to absolve the penitent. <sup>5</sup>

These words are addressed to the ordinands during the Bishop's examination. The second passage comes immediately after the ordination ceremony itself:

Pour forth Thy grace upon these thy servants, we beseech thee O Lord, that within the royal priesthood of Thy people they may faithfully fulfill this their priestly ministry . . . Make them worthy to offer with all Thy people spiritual sacrifices acceptable in Thy sight, and to minister the sacraments of Thy New Covenant. <sup>6</sup>

Note carefully that this type of language has been drawn up by a joint Commission of Anglican and Methodist theologians and is intended not simply to satisfy Anglo-Catholics, who have a Catholic understanding of the priesthood and Eucharist, but also to satisfy Evangelical Anglicans and Methodists who most certainly do not. It is worth examining carefully as a masterpiece of studied ambiguity.

The question it poses is whether a Methodist who could accept this could not also accept the passage cited [above] from the new Catholic rite. It is worth repeating a point documented on several occasions in Cranmer's Godly Order, that Protestants do profess belief in a Eucharistic Sacrifice-----but one in which the offering is praise, thanksgiving and ourselves. 7

It must also be stressed that the Bishop's "charge", from which the passage from the Catholic rite has been taken, is only an option and that in the introduction to the I.C.E.L. version of the new rite stress is laid upon the fact that it is only an optional "model", that an effort should be made to relate the "charge" to whatever readings are used and that, unlike the traditional rite, "considerable flexibility is provided for the choice of readings."

The introduction insists that: "It is not intended that the model instruction should be read verbatim, as was generally done in the case of the ordination instructions of the Roman Pontifical, although the ordaining bishop may choose to use these texts."

The nearest the new rite comes to a mandatory reference to the power of offering sacrifice is in the following two passages. When the hands of the new priests are anointed the Bishop prays:

May Jesus Christ, Our Lord, Whom the Father anointed through the power of the Holy Spirit, keep you worthy to offer sacrifice to God and sanctify His people.

Note carefully that no reference is made to the "Sacrifice of the Mass" or to "propitiatory sacrifices". The Anglican reformers insisted that it was the duty of every Christian to offer sacrifice to God-----but a sacrifice of "laud, praise, and thanksgiving".

When the paten and chalice are presented to the new priest the Bishop says:

Accept the gift of the people to be offered to God. Realize what you are about, be as holy as your ministry, model your life on the mystery of the Cross of our Lord.

These two passages represent the sum total of explicit mandatory reference to the essential purpose of a Catholic ordination rite, to ordain a sacrificing priest. It will be made clear in Chapter VIII that both these prayers can be interpreted in a Protestant sense.

As is shown in Appendix I, none of the prayers which have been omitted from the traditional rite pertain to the substance of the Sacrament, or could be designated as essential to its validity. But nonetheless, their omission by the Protestant Reformers was taken by Pope Leo XIII to indicate an intention not to consecrate sacrificing priests. Perhaps the most astonishing omission is that of the prayer accompanying the "tradition" of the chalice and paten, the

Accipe potestatem-----Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass, both for the living and the dead in the name of the Lord.

In view of the significance attached to this prayer during the Reformation controversies, its omission from the new rite can only be understood by Protestants as a retreat from the fullness of Catholic Eucharistic teaching-----and it has been seen as such, as Chapter VIII will show. This is what Canon Estcourt has to say with regard to the omission of this prayer by the Lutherans-----his words merit careful study.

Considering that these words had been introduced into the rite with the view of impressing on the mind of the ordained that he did receive a power of offering propitiatory sacrifice; considering that the practice had been in use nearly five hundred years, and had been generally adopted throughout the Western Church; considering that the delivery of the chalice with these words had thus become

an integral part of the rite of ordination; considering that the Lutherans denied the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice and of the external Priesthood; considering that the omission was made on the express ground of objecting to the faith and doctrine signified by these words; it would seem that neither the bishop nor the persons ordained could have the intention of conferring or receiving such a priesthood as the Catholic Church understands and believes, and that therefore they would neither of them intend to do what the Church does. In this view the validity of the ordination would be extremely doubtful. Hence we come to the following principle: that the omission of the delivery of the chalice, or of the accustomed formula which accompanies it, if done purposely with the motive of denying the doctrine of the Church regarding the Holy Sacrifice, even if a rite otherwise Catholic and valid be used, renders the ordination at least of doubtful validity. 8

It is of great importance to note that Evangelical Protestants, who deny any distinction in essence between priest and layman, are prepared to accept a "tradition" of the chalice and paten provided it is not accompanied by any prayer suggesting that the newly ordained presbyter has been invested with a ministerial (external) priesthood giving him powers denied to the layman, particularly that of offering sacrifice. The Reverend Peter Toon writes that such a ceremony would indicate that the Church has given the new presbyter the right to "preside at the Holy Communion. If there is no hint of ministerial priesthood in the rest of the service, then no ministerial priesthood could be read into the delivery of the chalice." 9

Hence it is not the "tradition" of the instruments (which has been retained in a modified form in the new Catholic rite) which is unacceptable to the Protestants but the prayer "Accipe potestatem" which has been abolished. But, as will be shown in Chapter VIII, the new prayer accompanying this modified "tradition" is by no means incapable of a Protestant interpretation.

#### ADDENDUM

It is explained in Appendix XI that the only change made in the form for ordaining a priest in the new rite is the removal of one word *ut*, which has no theological significance. The Latin form for the new rite reads:

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

The provisional I.C.E.L. version was very similar to the one given [above] which is taken from a 1955 C.T.S. translation.

We ask you, all-powerful Father, give these servants of Yours the dignity of the presbyterate. Renew the Spirit of holiness within them. By Your Divine gift may they obtain the second order in the hierarchy and exemplify right conduct in their lives.

The unsatisfactory point here is the use of "presbyterate" instead of "priesthood". In English-speaking countries the priesthood has never been referred to as the presbyterate.

In the American Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy Newsletter of September 1977 it was stated that:

On 12 July 1977, the Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship received from the Cardinal Secretary of State the English translation of the sacramental forms for the ordination of bishop, priest, deacon as definitively approved by Pope Paul VI.

The form for the ordination to the priesthood was changed by I.C.E.L. in 1975, and approved by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1976. The Newsletter did not specify whether Catholic

bishops in any other country had been given the opportunity of approving the new translation. It reads:

Almighty Father, grant to these servants of Yours the dignity of the priesthood. Renew within them the Spirit of holiness. As coworkers with the Order of bishops may they be faithful to the ministry that they receive from You, Lord God, and be to others a model of right conduct.

The replacement of "presbyterate" by "priesthood" is obviously an improvement but the replacement of the phrase, "may they obtain the second order in the hierarchy" by, "may they be faithful to the ministry that they receive from you", is obviously fully in line with the Protestant concept of the ministry which has been explained in earlier chapters. Note Hans Küng's criticism of the "non-biblical term 'hierarchy'" in Chap. III.

I asked Professor van der Ploeg for his opinion on this translation and he commented that the phrase in question, *secundi meriti munus*, is not an easy one to render accurately in English; in themselves the words have a certain vagueness and could be interpreted in a number of ways. The word *munus* alone can be translated as (1) office, duty, task, work; (2) military service; (3) ministry, favour, grace; (4) gift. He added that the use of the word "hierarchy" in the other translations was rather more than the Latin expressed.

However, we can be certain that, even if it is an acceptable translation, the new form is more calculated to please Protestants than the old. It also illustrates the danger of attempting to translate vital sacramental forms into vernacular languages and indicates why, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Church has wisely refrained from doing this for up to fifteen hundred years.

1. The full text of *Sacramentum Ordinis* and of all papal teaching on the liturgy from the pontificate of Pope Benedict XIV is available in the Papal Teachings series, in the volume *The Liturgy*. This was published in English by the Daughters of St. Paul (U.S.A.) in 1962 but is now out of print.
2. *The Universe*, 2 May 1969.
3. CGO, p. 113.
4. OIR, p. 16.
5. AMO, p. 24.
6. AMO, p. 26.
7. COO, pp. 37 & 96.
8. QAO, pp. 264/5.
9. OIR, p. 21.

## Chapter VIII

### An Anglican Response

The most objective method of assessing the extent to which the new Catholic ordination rite has been brought into conformity with the theology of Cranmer is to examine the manner in which Anglicans have reacted to it: and in contrast with the remarks made by Cardinal Heenan, the Protestant reaction is one of considerable enthusiasm. A response to the new Ordinal appeared in the Anglican Church Times on 30 May 1969. It begins with an expression of surprise that the power to absolve, using words from St. John 20, has not been mentioned.

Though this omission happens to be of particular interest to Anglicans because our own Ordinal lays such stress upon the words from St. John 20:23, perhaps of greater significance are the other changes and omissions which show a distinct movement away from medieval and Counter-Reformation theology.

For instance, that prayer has gone which spoke of the power of the priest to "transform bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ by an immaculate blessing". The former words at the delivery of paten and chalice have also disappeared: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Masses for the living and the dead." Instead the bishop now says: "Receive the oblation of the holy people, which is offered to God. Be mindful of what you are to do, imitate what you shall accomplish, and conform your life to the mystery of the cross of Our Lord."

This reticence in precise theological definition of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is also apparent in the words which accompany the anointing: "May Our Lord Jesus Christ, Whom the Father anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power, Himself guard and keep you in your work of sanctifying Christ's people and of offering sacrifice to God."

Contrast this with the former final blessing: "May you offer to Almighty God propitiatory sacrifices for the sins and offences of the people" . . . Equally significant is the new emphasis upon the proclamation of the Word. The examination includes the question: "Will you worthily and wisely fulfill the ministry of the word, in preaching the Gospel and expounding the Catholic faith?" while the ending of the ordination prayer has been altered to the following form: ". . . that the word of the Gospel may reach unto the ends of the earth, and the fullness of the nations, gathered in Christ, may be made one holy people of God."

To sum up: it is an "ecumenical" ordinal in the best sense, in that it avoids much questionable terminology and is clearly expressive of the theological aggiornamento of Vatican II. For those who can read between the lines its language is so chosen that it is patient of being an inclusive document in which can be found a synthesis of some of the genuine insights of the Reformation and those equal insights which a balanced Catholic tradition has preserved.

In this it has basically a close relationship to the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal, and indeed to the whole theological rapprochement between Catholic and Reformed thought which is so very evident in Roman Catholic circles on the Continent today. (My emphasis throughout).

Little comment is necessary upon this Anglican response. It will be noted that the two prayers I have cited as coming closest "to a mandatory reference to the power of offering sacrifice" are in turn cited by the Church Times with considerable approval. They are clearly sufficiently "reticent" to arouse no Protestant objections. Dr. John Macquarrie, a Protestant theologian, has made it very clear that the prayer said during the presentation of the chalice and paten presents no obstacle to a Protestant interpretation ("Accept the gift of the people to be offered to God"). In his book, *Principles of Christian Theology*, he writes:

The offering of the bread and wine before consecration is something that is done by all, and, as already mentioned, recent liturgical reform has tended to stress the people's part in the offertory. The bread and wine which are brought to the altar, the products of human labour and the means of human sustenance, stand for the people themselves. They offer themselves in this act, so that their lives may be submitted to God and transformed by His grace. 1

The extent to which the offertory prayers in the new Mass can be reconciled with such an interpretation should also be noted. It is worth mentioning that the omission of all the explicitly sacerdotal prayers which I have cited from the traditional rite is praised in the *Church Times* as a welcome step in the direction of the Reformation.

As was the case with the new Mass, the overwhelming majority of the Catholic clergy (where they still maintain orthodox belief themselves, which is by no means always the case) have preferred to overlook the deficiencies of the new ordination rite, where they have had an opportunity of seeing it, and read into it only what they wish to see. Cranmer's *Godly Order* has documented the result of such an attitude among the English clergy during the Reformation. The *Church Times* stated explicitly that for those who can read between the lines the new Catholic Ordinal is an inclusive document patient of more than one interpretation. It is not in the least inappropriate to apply to the new Catholic Ordinal the judgment made by Francis Clark with regard to Cranmer's Ordinal.

The Ordinal, although unmistakably framed in furtherance of the Reformation conception of the ministry, did not contain any express condemnation of the priestly function that it was designed to eliminate. Skillful practitioner as he was of the art of devising formularies which would achieve his purposes while leaving a loophole for the consciences of conservatives and waverers, Cranmer retained several traditional features in his new ordination rite. Although he and the party in power were at that very time waging an intensive campaign against the belief that the Christian priesthood is essentially ordained to bring about the Real Presence of Christ by the Eucharistic consecration and to offer Him thus objectively present in a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, no words in their new ordination rite expressly contradicted that belief . . . As in the new communion service, so in the ordination rite, it was not what was expressed but what was suppressed that gave significance to the whole . . .

The purport of all these suppressions and alterations in the ordination rite is evident from the historical context. The new rite for initiating ministers in the English Church was to make them presbyters in the sense of Reformation theology, instead of consecrating and sacrificing priests in the sense of the Catholic Church. 2

Finally, in order to set the new ordination rite firmly in its historical context it must not be considered in isolation from the pattern of the entire post-conciliar "renewal". The new ordination rite was quickly followed by a new Mass which can be celebrated officially in such a way that Protestants in good faith can recognize their own theology in it; by new catechetical programmes in which the sacrificial nature of the Mass is hardly, if ever, mentioned, but has been replaced by an obsessive preoccupation with a meal in which Christ is present because the Christian community has gathered together in His name; and by the now notorious *Agreed Statements on the Eucharist and Ministry* which, as an Anglican commentator has pointed out with considerable relish, nowhere state that the Apostles appointed bishops and established an unbroken chain down to the present day, that a priest has any powers denied to a layman, that the Mass is a sacrifice, and that a priest has the power to absolve sinners. 3 And finally, it has been followed by a series of Vatican-approved innovations which blur the distinction between priest and layman, notably the introduction of Communion in the hand and the appointment of "lay-ministers" of Holy Communion.

The tactic of all apologists for the post-Conciliar reform has been to justify each change in isolation.

When the changes are considered as a whole it seems impossible to believe that any Catholic of integrity could deny that the parallel with Cranmer's reform is evident and alarming. It is quite obvious that there are powerful forces within the Catholic Church and the various Protestant denominations determined to achieve a common Ordinal at all costs; further evidence of this is provided in Chapter IX.

The sixteenth century Protestants changed the traditional Pontificals because they rejected the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood. Archbishop Bugnini and his Consilium changed the Roman Pontifical in a manner which makes it appear that there is little or no difference between Catholic and Protestant belief, thus undermining *Apostolicae Curae*. Chapter IX will make clear the extent to which major Protestant denominations are following a similar policy.

The doctrine of the Church's indefectibility, explained in Appendix X, requires us to accept the validity of any sacramental rite promulgated by a pope. Nonetheless, it is not without interest to note the extent to which some comments by Canon Estcourt concerning the Lutheran and Anglican reforms can be applied to the 1968 ordination rite-----without, of course, impugning its validity:

Though they retained the old names of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, they were careful to frame their statements of doctrine in a sense perfectly consistent with their Lutheran ideas, and also so to frame the language of their new forms as to avoid any expression that might imply any special gift of sacramental grace to be looked for or communicated through the rite. Some scanty portions of the ancient rite still appear; but in adaptations, mutilated and broken, robbed of their very spirit and life; for every word expressive of an interior sanctification, of a sacramental consecration, or of a gift of spiritual power, is studiously omitted; or else the sense is perverted, and no higher idea left than that of the grace for the faithful discharge of the duties of an office. The imposition of hands is retained, and is given with words taken from the ancient rite, viz. "Receive the Holy Ghost, etc.," both for the Priesthood and the Episcopate: but these words in themselves are ambiguous and do not clearly show that they are used in the sense of conferring a sacrament, and if judged by the context, such a sense is excluded from them. And to these words is added a formula invented by Luther to deny the grace of Holy Order and the power of the Priesthood. Then to this ambiguous form, so clogged and fettered already with mutilations and additions made in a depraved sense, and for the purpose of introducing error, the revision of 1662 made another addition, which tied and limited the meaning to that of receiving the grace of the Holy Ghost solely for the discharge of the office and work of a priest or bishop, but not as a sacramental character, or a spiritual power. Thus the due sense and right intention are absolutely excluded from the rite, and no one can be the minister or recipient thereof with the intention of conferring or receiving the Sacrament of Holy Order such as the Church believes and understands. 4

Canon Estcourt's book was published in 1873, twenty years before *Apostolicae Curae* (1896). It is interesting to note the conformity of his conclusions to those of Pope Leo XIII.

From them (the prayers of the Ordinal) has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and the office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the Sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify (para. 27).

The problem which the new ordination rite poses faithful Catholics is that it does not contain a single mandatory prayer signifying that the grace and power of the priesthood is chiefly the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord.

It is only fair to examine two arguments which have been put forward in defence of the new rite. Firstly, it is claimed quite correctly that the matter of the Sacrament is the imposition of the hands and that this ceremony is given greater prominence in the new rite. It is further argued, and again it can be conceded with some justice, that despite the decision promulgated by Pope Pius XII in



Sacramentum Ordinis (see Chap. VII), the traditional rite still gave the impression that the power to consecrate was conferred by the tradition of the instruments and the prayer *Accipe potestatem*, and the power to forgive sins by the second imposition of hands at the end of Mass and the prayer *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*.

Pope Leo XIII himself can be cited in answer to these objections. Firstly, he points out in *Apostolicae Curae* that the imposition of hands "signifies nothing definite, and is equally used for several Orders and for Confirmation" (para. 24). He shows that the matter in this rite must derive its significance from the form; that the 1552 Anglican rite contained no words "which definitely express the Sacred Order of Priesthood, or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power 'of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord' (Council of Trent, Session XXIII, de. Sac. Ord., Canon 1.)" (para. 25).

Now as is explained in Appendix I, where the words of the specific form itself do not signify the effects of a Sacrament, this must be looked for in other parts of the rite. But in the new Catholic rite there is no longer a single mandatory prayer signifying that the imposition of hands, which Pope Leo rightly points out signifies nothing definite, confers either the power to consecrate and offer the true Body and Blood of the Lord or to forgive or retain the sins of the penitent. Thus, while it is possible that with the old Ordinal some of those present at an ordination might have confused the precise moment at which the ordinand received the powers to consecrate and to absolve, at least they could have been in no doubt at all that these powers were conferred. In the new rite there is no mandatory prayer indicating that these powers are conferred. It is surely far less harmful (if, indeed, it is harmful) to mistake the precise moment at which the priestly powers are conferred than not to know that these powers are, in fact, conferred at all. It is also worth repeating, and this is a point that cannot be repeated too often or stressed too much, that it is alien to the whole ethos and tradition of Catholicism to omit or reform anything in forms bequeathed to us by immemorial tradition. The comment regarding this sound method which the Catholic Church has always followed, made by the Catholic Bishops in their defence of *Apostolicae Curae*, is extremely relevant here (see Chap. IV).

It is the ecumenical aspect of these omissions which is of crucial importance. If the new Catholic rite is considered satisfactory, then the entire case put by *Apostolicae Curae* is undermined, particularly with regard to the Anglican rite in its 1662 version containing the additional words "for the office and work of a priest". If the new Catholic rite, shorn of any mandatory prayer signifying the essential powers of the priesthood, is valid, then there seems no reason why the 1662 Anglican rite should not be valid too, and still less can there be any possible objection to the 1977 Anglican Series III Ordinal. It was explained in Chap. IV that the participation of Old Catholic Bishops in Anglican ordinations was irrelevant to validity where the Anglican Ordinal was used, as the rite itself is incapable of conferring valid Orders. However, in the light of the new Catholic Ordinal, Anglo-Catholics could quite logically argue that the 1662 rite must certainly be adequate and that, as a result of Old Catholic participation, many Anglican clerics now have valid Orders.

Bearing in mind the participation of Protestant Observers in compiling the new Catholic rite (see Appendix III), it seems quite reasonable to conclude that the omissions from the traditional rite have been made not to focus attention upon the imposition of hands but to undermine *Apostolicae Curae*.

It has also been argued that the new rite is clearly intended to ordain sacrificing priests, since it is incorporated within the context of a Mass which the new priests concelebrate with their bishop. Had the Mass not been modified so drastically this argument would have far more force. But it is now possible to celebrate the Mass in a manner which Protestants find quite acceptable, so great is the degree to which its sacrificial nature has been minimized. This is particularly the case where Canon II is used. [A detailed explanation of the extent to which Canon II is acceptable to Protestants is provided in Pope Paul's New Mass.] However, if it is conceded for the sake of argument that the

sacrificial nature of the Mass is safeguarded in Canon II (even if in the most muted possible tones), this has no bearing at all on the acceptability of the new Catholic rite as a step in the direction of a common ordinal, a factor to which the next chapter will be devoted. The new (1977) Anglican Ordinal makes provision for the newly ordained ministers to concelebrate ("join with the President in reciting the Thanksgiving"). 5

It is not the fact that a concelebration takes place that is important, but of precisely what the concelebration consists. There is nothing in the new Catholic Ordinal, and very little in the New Mass (where Canon n is used), to indicate that it is not simply a Protestant memorial.

An important qualification must be made here. The new Missal contains a Preface of the Priesthood for use during the Chrism Mass on Maundy Thursday. A passage in it states that Our Lord

chooses from among His brethren men who with the laying on of hands will share His sacred ministry. They will renew in His name the sacrifice of our redemption.

This passage is explicitly sacrificial but, like the passage cited from the Bishop's Charge, it is not mandatory. As with the inclusion of the Roman Canon as an option in the New Mass, the optional passage in the Bishop's Charge and the optional use of this Preface provide those who have misgivings about the new rite with an excuse for overlooking its deficiencies. The Preface itself is not part of the ordination rite----the Sacrament is conferred by the laying on of hands and the words of the form. [The fact that the Preface of the Priesthood is not mandatory can be proved by referring to the second Latin edition of the new Missal (1975) where it states (p. 742:d) "nisi dicenda sit praefatio magis propria, quando fit Ordinatio sacerdotum sumi potest praefatio quae habetur in Missa Chrismatis."] The prayers in the old rite which appear to confer the power to offer sacrifice or absolve sins only make explicit powers which were conferred implicitly when the ordinand was raised to the dignity of the priesthood.

As a final comment on the new Catholic Ordinal, I would like to quote a passage from *Apostolicae Curiae* and to ask any reader to demonstrate to me how the words which Pope Leo XIII wrote of Cranmer's rite cannot be said to apply to the new Catholic Ordinal, at least where mandatory prayers are concerned. Pope Leo wrote of the authors of the Ordinal

and the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects; and as to the end they had in view. Being fully cognisant of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between "the law of believing and the law of praying," under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted the Liturgical Order in many ways to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason, in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the sacerdotium, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice but, as We have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. In this way, the native character----or spirit, as it is called----of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself (paras. 30/31). [See the comment of Dr. Francis Clark upon this passage quoted in the Introduction.]

1. J. Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology* (London, 1955), p.423.
2. ESR, pp. 191-194.
3. J. W. Charley, *Agreement on the Doctrine of the Ministry* (Grove Books, 1973).
4. QAO, pp. 258/9.
5. *Ordination Services* (SPCK, 1977), p. 6.

## Chapter IX

### Towards a Common Ordinal

Proposition 6 of the Ten Propositions of the Churches' Unity Commission requires that admission to the ministry of the "United Church" of the future shall be by means of a common ordinal. The proposition reads:

We agree to recognise, as from an accepted date, the ordained ministries of the other covenanting Churches, as true ministries of word and sacraments in the Holy Catholic Church, and we agree that all subsequent ordinations to the ministries of the covenanting Churches shall be according to a Common Ordinal which will properly incorporate the episcopal, presbyteral and lay roles in ordination. 1

This is by no means a new idea thought up by the members of the Churches' Unity Commission for publication in their Ten Propositions in 1976. It is an idea which passed the theoretical stage and was implemented in practice in the Ordinal of the Church of South India, first published in 1958. This Church was formed by the unification of Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregationalist elements. The problem of composing an ordinal acceptable to all these denominations might appear insurmountable, some Anglicans having views on the apostolic succession, and a difference in essence between bishops and priests (and even as to what a priest is), which are totally unacceptable to Nonconformists. However, in true Cranmerian style, by passing over in silence what could not be stated ambiguously, a rite was finally agreed upon to which general but not universal consent was given. The fact that the Anglican Communion was prepared to accept the various Nonconformist ministries as equivalent to its own was found unacceptable to many Anglo-Catholics, who had insisted upon the Catholic nature of Anglican Orders, and a good number realized the inescapable logic of this situation-----that the Church of England was simply one Protestant sect among many-----and accordingly made their submission to Rome. The best known of these Anglican ministers was the late Hugh Ross Williamson. The influence of the Church of South India and its various rites upon the ecumenical movement and the liturgical convergence within the major denominations, has been far greater than is generally realized. During a lecture given at London Cornely on 11 November 1974, the Reverend Julian Charley, an Anglican member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, which produced the notorious Agreed Statements on the Eucharist, Ministry, and Authority, remarked that:

One of the very fascinating things that I don't know whether you are aware of is that if you do a little research on this you will find that in the Anglican Church with its Series III Communion and in the Roman Catholic Church with its new Eucharistic Prayers, the common ground behind them is in many cases the liturgy of the Church of South India. It's a very remarkable thing, if you study those documents you will find that the Church of South India-----a remarkable pioneer work-----in fact has influenced very substantially the liturgical work both of the Roman Catholic and of the Anglican Church, though neither of them seem terribly keen to admit that this is so. 2

The influence of the Ordinal of the Church of South India is nowhere more clearly seen than in the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal, published exactly ten years later in 1968, the same year as the new Catholic rite of Ordination. The similarity between the South India and Anglican-Methodist Ordinals is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the late Professor E.C. Ratcliff had considerable influence in the drafting of both. The striking similarities between these Ordinals and the new Catholic rite can be explained by the fact that two members of the Commission which drafted the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal were also among the Protestant advisers to the Consilium which produced the new Catholic rites of Mass and Ordination. The fact that the Protestant Observers were given every opportunity to influence the decisions of the Consilium is documented in Appendix Ili. The Observers in question were the Reverend A.R. George (Methodist) and Canon R.C.D. Jasper (Anglican). It was shown in Chap. VII that our own Catholic hierarchy was not

consulted in any way in the compilation of the new Catholic Ordinal. Our bishops were not even given the opportunity of seeing it before they were presented with it as a *fait accompli*. There is considerable irony in the fact that our "separated brethren" were far better informed than our own bishops. In the preface to the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal it is stated that:

Through Mr. George and Dr. Jasper we have been able to keep in touch with the Methodist Faith and Order Committee and the Church of England Liturgical Commission, and the same two scholars, being also observers at the Roman Catholic Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia, have kept us informed about the current revision of the Roman Catholic rites of Ordination. We have also consulted scholars of other communions on particular points. 3

A most important factor to look out for in recent or proposed ordinals is the absence or inclusion of imperative formulae when conferring ministerial status. Clearly, those who reject the traditional concept of apostolic succession do not accept that those presiding over the ordination rite (which they do not recognize as a Sacrament) possess any powers denied to a layman. It is impossible to convey non-existent powers. Thus even in the nineteenth century, some Low Churchmen wanted the imperative formula in the Anglican Ordinal, based on John 20:23 ("Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, etc."), rephrased as a prayer asking for the gift of the Spirit for the ordinands. This was in opposition to attempts by members of the Oxford Movement to use this imperative formula to interpret the Anglican Ordinal in a Catholic sense. 4

The manner in which the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal overcomes this problem deserves close study by all connoisseurs of ecumenical ambiguity. What happens is that the ordaining bishop simply tells the ordinand what Christ said.

Take this book (the Bible), a token of the authority which you have received from God to preach the Gospel of Christ and to minister the Sacraments of the New Covenant in the congregations to which you shall be appointed, and be mindful of the words of the Lord Jesus to the apostles which you heard in the Gospel, "Peace be with you. As the Father has sent Me, even so I send you. Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained."

In May 1977 the new Anglican Series III Ordinal was published. 5 It is useful as an indication of the degree of sophistication to which the process of calculated ambiguity found in the Ordinal of the Church of South India has now been brought. In the ordination rite for the priesthood it is manifest that every crucial passage has been phrased in such a manner that it does not exclude Catholic teaching, but could be totally acceptable to the most obdurate Nonconformist.

In the Introduction it is explained that there was no Series II Ordinal but that the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal ("which met with widespread approval") can be seen as occupying this position. It adds that many of the developments found in the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal are also found in the new Roman Catholic Ordinal (1968) and the draft revision of the Ordinal published by the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. in 1970. It also notes that a new Methodist Service, also based on the proposed Anglican-Methodist Ordinal, was published in 1975.

The introduction refers those seeking to study the theological background of the Series III Ordinal to the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal and the Statement on the Ministry and Ordination issued by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission in 1973. This Statement was examined in Chapter VI, where it was shown that in every important issue the Catholic delegates signed to a formula which Cranmer would have accepted without hesitation.

It is interesting to note that the term "priest" (not "presbyter") is used throughout the Series III Ordinal. The Bishop's declaration in the rite for the ordination of a priest begins by stating:

A priest is ordained within the historic succession of the Church's ministry, as the Church of England has received it.

To put it mildly, this sentence is capable of a very wide range of interpretations! The Declaration continues:

As a priest he is called by God to work with the bishop and with his fellow-priests, as a servant and shepherd in the place to which he shall be sent. He is to proclaim the word of the Lord, to call his hearers to repentance, and in Christ's name to absolve, and declare forgiveness of sins.

The key word here is "declare". Some Anglo-Catholics have claimed that the Edwardine Ordinal clearly intended to impart the power to absolve sins and therefore was intended to continue the Catholic priesthood. This argument was examined in Chapter VI, where it was shown that there is all the difference in the world between the power of a Catholic priest to absolve or retain the sins of a penitent and the function of a Protestant minister to declare to him that God has forgiven his sins.

He is to Baptize, and to prepare the baptized for Confirmation; he is to preside at the celebration of Holy Communion; he is to lead his people in prayer and worship, to intercede for them, to bless them in the name of the Lord, and to teach and encourage by word and example.

Needless to say, a Nonconformist minister presides at the celebration of holy communion.

One passage in this Declaration is of particular interest to Catholics. It reads as follows:

In the name of the Lord we bid you to remember the greatness of the trust now to be committed to your charge, about which you have been taught in your preparation for this ministry. You are to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord; you are to teach and forewarn, to feed and to provide for the Lord's family, to search for His children in the wilderness of this world's temptations, so that they may be saved through Christ for ever.

These are all duties of a priest and the passage is admirably biblical. The reader will note that, once more, it contains nothing to which a Nonconformist could take exception but its special interest comes from its historical background. The passage is taken almost verbatim from the Bishop's Declaration in the Edwardine Ordinal (1550):

And nowe we exhorte you, in the name of oure Lorde Jesus Christe, to haue in remembraunce, into howe hyghe a dignitie, and to howe chargeable an offyce ye bee called, that is to saye, be the messengers, the watchemen, the Pastours, and the stewardestes of the Lorde to teache, to premonishe, to feede, and prouyde for the Lordes famylye: to seeke for Christes shepe that be dispersed abrode, and for hys children whiche bee in the myddest of thys naughtye worlde, to be saued through Christe for euer.

The significance of this passage, and the fact that it has been retained in the new Series III Ordinal, derives from two reasons. Firstly, there is a corresponding passage in the Sarum Pontifical which it replaced, in which candidates are reminded that later the chalice and paten will be placed in their hands

that they may know that they have received the power to offer pleasing sacrifices to God, for to them it pertaineth to make the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord upon the altar, also to say prayers and to bless the gifts of God.

This office was used by Jesus Christ Our Lord, when, after the supper, He changed bread into His Body and wine into His Blood, in memory of His Passion. He also most excellently fulfilled this office when He offered Himself, Priest and Victim, to God the Father upon the altar of the Cross for

the sins of the human race, and through His Own Blood entered the eternal holy place, and made peace between Heaven and earth.

In this we see how excellent is the office of the priesthood, through which day by day the Passion of Christ is celebrated at the Altar, and guilty ones, being converted from their sins, are reconciled to God.

Secondly, the passage cited from the Edwardine Ordinal derives its significance not simply from the fact that it excludes all the specifically Catholic teaching in the equivalent passage in the Sarum Pontifical, but from the fact that it is a prayer composed by Martin Bucer for his Strasbourg presbyters. 6 There is no doubt that Martin Bucer was the Continental Reformer who exerted the greatest influence upon Cranmer during the composition of his new Ordinal. As Fr. Messenger points out, Bucer was actually Cranmer's guest for some months in the summer of 1549, precisely when the new Ordinal was being composed; the "new English rite is inspired throughout by Bucerian ideas, and to an enormous extent it merely paraphrases or rather translates his Latin Lutheran rite." 7

With reference to this particular admonition, Fr. Messenger writes:

This Reformed or Protestant Admonition presents a conception of the Christian Ministry precisely such as we should expect from a man like Bucer, who denied the Catholic doctrine of the objective Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrificial Priesthood. After the fashion of all reformed ordination rites, it duly mentions the pastoral office, while of the sacerdotium or Sacrificial Priesthood as such there is not a single word. 8

The retention of this passage in the Series III Ordinal will no doubt do much to win for it the approval of Protestant-minded (Evangelical) Anglicans.

Among other points of interest in the Series III Ordinal are the words spoken immediately after the ordination ceremony which do not differ to any significant extent from the parallel passage in the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal cited in Chap. VII:

Almighty Father, give to these your servants grace and power to fulfill their ministry among the people committed to their charge; to watch over them and care for them; to absolve and bless them in your name; and to proclaim the gospel of your salvation. Set them among your people to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable in your sight, and as you have called them to your service, make them by the gift of your Holy Spirit worthy of their calling. Give them wisdom and discipline to work faithfully with all their fellow servants in Christ, that the world may come to know your glory and your love. (Emphasis in original.)

The most significant development of all comes with the presentation of the Bible. As was noted above, the imperative statement which had preceded this act in the Edwardine Ordinal ("Receive the Holy Ghost," etc.) was reduced in the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal to simply quoting the words of Our Lord. It is not even included as a quotation in the Series III Ordinal. The following words accompany the presentation of the Bible:

Receive this Book, a token of the authority which you have received from God this day to preach the gospel of Christ and to minister the sacraments of the New Covenant.

As was shown in Chapter V, the office of "preaching the Gospel and ministering the sacraments" is a Lutheran formula devised to exclude Catholic belief in a sacrificing priesthood. Its inclusion in the Series III Ordinal should also evoke satisfaction among Evangelicals.

To sum up, there is nothing in the new Series III Ordinal to indicate that ordination represents

anything more than an appointment by the community to exercise an office within the Church. It is nowhere stated that the person ordained (and for Anglicans this must now include priestesses as well as priests) possesses new powers which the generality of the faithful do not possess. He or she can be seen simply as endowed with the authority to exercise powers already possessed by all the faithful. Most significant of all is the omission of any imperative formula which could suggest that the ordaining Bishop is able to transmit some new power by the imposition of hands.

On the other hand, the Catholic concept of the priesthood is nowhere specifically excluded, and Anglo-Catholics who claimed that the Edwardine Ordinal could confer valid orders should not have the least difficulty about making the same claim with regard to the Series III Ordinal. Their position will be greatly enhanced by the close similarity between the Series III Ordinal and the Catholic rite of 1968. Whereas the contrast between the Edwardine Ordinal (even with the 1662 additions) and the Roman Pontifical was so manifest that it is hard to see how anyone could claim in good faith that both were intended for the same purpose (i.e., to ordain sacrificing priests), the differences between the 1968 Catholic rite and the new Anglican Ordinal are so minimal that it is hard to believe that they are not intended for the same purpose (namely, to appoint men to the office of preaching the Gospel and ministering the Sacraments).

Lest any Catholic reader should begin to feel complacent after reading the Series III Ordinal, I suggest a very careful reading of the new Catholic Ordinal. It will be found that every imperative formula which could be interpreted as conferring any specifically sacerdotal power denied to the faithful at large has been carefully excluded from the new rite. It is not necessary to contest the fact that imperative formulae in the various Latin Pontificals (including the rites for Deacon and Bishop) only became current during the Middle Ages, and that prior to this the forms for the consecration of a bishop and the ordination of priests and deacons had been phrased as prayers. Nor is it claimed that imperative formulae are necessary for validity. What is at issue here is the removal of imperative formulae from existing rites, or the composition of new rites from which imperative formulae are excluded, to leave open the possibility that ordination is not a Sacrament conferring new powers but simply a service recognising admission to an office. An invaluable study of the evident convergence in the revision of ordinals has been provided by Peter Toon, an Evangelical Anglican minister. He notes that:

In particular, Cranmer held the following views. First, ordination is not a Sacrament but a public service of worship in which men are set apart for the work of the ministry and for which task they and the Church request of God the gift of the Holy Spirit. Secondly, the essence of ordination is a prayer to God accompanied by the laying on of hands. 9

What is at stake, then, is honesty rather than validity. Let those who share the views of Cranmer, and the Protestant Reformers in general, make their beliefs clear in their ordination rites. Even more, the Catholic Church should ensure that her ordination rite makes her wholehearted adherence to the teaching of Trent totally unambiguous. If Christians, whatever their denomination, cannot be honest, cannot let their yea be yea, and their nay be nay, then what right have they to expect non-Christians to take them seriously? The spectacle of churchmen of different denominations working together to produce formulae of calculated ambiguity can provoke no reaction but revulsion among ordinary and honest Christians, whatever their allegiance.

Mr. Toon's booklet is particularly valuable for its comparison of the various revised and proposed ordination rites. He has provided useful outlines of some of the new rites, the Catholic one included, and these outlines provide clear evidence of the convergence already achieved. The Common Ordinal desired by the Churches' Unity Commission may not be here yet----but it is only just round a far from distant comer.

A final point which merits careful study in all the new rites is the emphasis given to the acceptance of the candidate by the people. This conforms to the belief that the minister has been invested by the

community with the authority to undertake an office, as opposed to receiving special powers transmitted to him solely by the ordaining bishop and received in an unbroken succession going directly back to Christ Himself. This form of acceptance is a very different concept from that in the traditional Catholic rite in which by their silence the people indicate that they know of nothing in the life of the ordinand which renders him unsuitable for the priesthood. There is a world of difference between the people's not objecting to a candidate and their actually appointing him.

The new Catholic Ordinal gives far more stress to the assent of the people than did the Roman Pontifical, in which they signified their consent simply by remaining silent. Now the people express their consent vocally "according to local custom". It is interesting to speculate upon how various customary forms of giving vocal assent can exist when assent was not given vocally in the former rite.

1. Visible Unity: Ten Propositions, Churches' Unity Commission, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, London, SW1P 3NZ (1976).
2. For a detailed background to the Ordinal of the Church of South India, see: E. C. Ratcliff, "The Ordinal of the Church of South India." *Theology*, LXIII, 1960, pp. 7 ff. Also an article with the same title by T. S. Garrett in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XII, 1959, pp. 400 ff.
3. AMO, p. 3.
4. A. E. Peaston, *The Prayer Book Revisions of the Victorian Evangelicals* (London, 1963), pp. 25/6.
5. *Ordination Services* (SPCK, 1977).
6. RMP, vol. I, p. 471.
7. RMP, vol. I, pp. 455/6. Martin Bucer's ordination rite is now available in English. E. C. Whitaker, *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer*. (Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1974).
8. RMP, vol. I, p. 471.
9. OIR, p. 7.



## Chapter X

### Blurring the Priesthood

One contemporary trend which this book should have made clear is the tendency to blur the distinction between priest and layman, to minimize those powers of the ministerial priesthood which distinguish it not simply in degree but in essence from the universal priesthood of the faithful. In addition to the unofficial, but usually uncondemned, writings of Modernist theologians; the elimination of sacrificial language from the ordination rite; the convergence of ordination rites; and the Agreed Statements; some mention must also be made of the officially approved changes in the Mass liturgy. This has been done in detail in Pope Paul's New Mass and will be touched upon only briefly here.

Firstly, it is a most instructive exercise to go through the traditional Mass and make a note of all the prayers which distinguish the priest from the congregation, in which he acts in a personal capacity, in which he speaks in the first person. It will be found that, the *Orate Fratres* excepted, from the *Introibo*-----" I will go", to the *Placeat tibi* at the end of the Mass, almost every such prayer has been eliminated. Note, for example, that at the beginning of the new Mass the priest simply joins in an act of penitence with the congregation, as opposed to the double *Confiteor* in the traditional Mass. Even the *Orate Fratres* was falsely translated in its English version. The official English text reads: "Pray brethren that our sacrifice . . ."

Where Eucharistic Prayer Number II is used it is possible to see the Mass almost as a concelebration in which, at certain points, the priest acts as no more than a spokesman for a congregation of concelebrants. In keeping with this concept, unofficial developments are now taking place whereby some priests allow the congregation to join with them in pronouncing the words of the Canon.

In a book intended to defend the liturgical reform, Dom Guy Oury goes as far as conceding that it is a matter for regret that the new prayers do not differentiate between priest and laity as in the old liturgy. However, he tries to justify the change by pointing out that the Roman Canon is still available as an option and that this distinction is made within the Roman Canon. He insists upon the reform being assessed as a package, and a package which contains the Roman Canon. 1 It does not say much for the new liturgy if its only redeeming feature is what remains of the old.

The distinctive nature of the priesthood is further diminished by the following features: the introduction of lay readers; the presence of lay people apart from acolytes within the sanctuary; the fact that sacred vessels, which only a priest was formerly allowed to touch, are now handled indiscriminately by anyone; the introduction of Communion in the hand, which makes the consecration of the priest's hands in ordination meaningless; and above all, the appointment of lay ministers to distribute Holy Communion. This latter practice was given an enthusiastic welcome by Fr. J. D. Crichton, one of England's most enthusiastic apologists for the liturgical reform. Writing in *The Tablet* on 28 April 1973, he rejoices that the laity "will now be able to exercise their priesthood in a way that perhaps they had never envisaged." They will "not only visibly share the priestly office with the clergy, but will assist him in a wide variety of functions in the work of the Church." He regrets that "it may be presumed that there will be at first a certain amount of resistance to the new arrangement. People no doubt think that the giving of Communion is a peculiarly priestly act."

Although Fr. Crichton clearly does not consider the distribution of Holy Communion to be "a peculiarly priestly act", St. Thomas Aquinas most certainly does. In the *Summa Theologica* he writes:

I answer that, the dispensing of Christ's Body belongs to the priest for three reasons. First, because he consecrates as in the person of Christ. But as Christ consecrated His Body at the supper, so also

He gave It to others to be partaken of by them. Accordingly, as the consecration of Christ's Body belongs to the priest, so likewise does the dispensing belong to him.

Secondly, because the priest is the appointed intermediary between God and the people; hence as it belongs to him to offer the people's gifts to God, so it belongs to him to deliver consecrated gifts to the people.

Thirdly, because out of reverence towards this Sacrament, nothing touches It but what is consecrated; hence the corporal and the chalice are consecrated, and likewise the priest's hands, for touching this Sacrament. Hence it is not lawful for anyone else to touch It, except from necessity, for instance, if It were to fall upon the ground, or else in some other case of urgency. 2

Apologists for the liturgical reform attempt to explain away the blurring of the distinct nature of the ministerial priesthood by defending each change in isolation. Even so their case is very weak, but those concerned with upholding traditional teaching on the Mass and the priesthood must not allow them to evade the issues with this tactic. The changes cannot be considered in isolation: the reform must be considered as a whole. The new Mass, new ordination rite, Agreed Statements, Communion in the hand, lay ministers of Communion, the writings of Modernist theologians-----all are interlocking components of a coherent and coordinated whole. This unified movement must, in its turn, be set within the prevailing atmosphere in which so many priests (less so in Britain and the U.S.A. than in most western countries) are dressing in lay attire, abandoning weekday Masses, mixing with the laity on terms of unbecoming familiarity-----"Don't call me Father, call me Fred."

To give just one example, a friend from the United States has sent me a number of tapes of what is called a "Folk Mass" broadcast at 8.00 a.m. each Sunday from the Paulist Centre, 5 Park Road, Boston. What takes place appears to be a combination of Pentecostalism and the discotheque, with a few musical hall and circus acts thrown in for good measure; not even the official Eucharistic Prayers of the new Mass are used. The most bizarre compositions are recited, some of which the President appears to make up as he goes along. As the "Folk Mass" is broadcast each Sunday it must clearly have episcopal approval. One feature of the proceedings is the giving of testimonies, in Salvation Army style. Members of the congregation come forward and say what a Wonderful sense of community, liberation, etc. the Centre provides. One good lady explained how overwhelmed she felt at the fact that since coming to the Centre she had been made "co-chairperson" of a committee and was "going to be giving out the bread with Jim".

Equally serious is the increasing involvement of some priests in "community" work which is often unrelated to the specific needs of their parishes, to the detriment of their specifically priestly function of offering Mass, hearing confessions, and preaching sound doctrine. It is not surprising that when priests are seen to attach continually diminishing importance to their specifically sacerdotal function, so does their attachment to the priesthood diminish-----all too often the friendly, dynamic, socially conscious priest ends up by abandoning the priesthood for marriage.

This process was well summarized by Malachi Martin in 1972.

In the area of activism, we are at grips with the chief manifestation of the malaise which afflicts twentieth-century human society. The activism into which clerics, nuns, religious, and lay folk are plunging has no professedly or professionally Christian intent, purpose, or scope. It only means that there will be more politicians, more civil-rights workers, new Congressmen, fresh Presidential speech writers, more anti-Vietnam war demonstrators. Nor can it be construed as a carrying out of the clerical or religious injunction and undertaking to spread the Gospel of Jesus as professionals. It is a reduction of the Church's role to a purely secular one. The secular has transformed the religious role into being part of it. 3

In making this point, Dr. Martin was no more than echoing a warning issued in 1950 by Pope Pius

XII, that most percipient of popes. In his Apostolic Exhortation *Menti Nostrae* he warned:

During these years which have followed the long and dreadful war many priests have spent themselves, under the leadership of the bishops, in relieving material and spiritual distress. They were inspired by love of God and man; and We commend them as they deserve. But there are others for whom We must express Our anxiety; those who, to meet the peculiar circumstances of our time, have all too often become absorbed in the whirl of external activity, to the neglect of their primary duty, namely their own sanctification. As We have already publicly declared, It is necessary to correct the error of those who dare to suppose that the salvation; of men can be procured by what has been truly called "the heresy of action"; action, that is, which does not rely on grace and disregards the means of sanctification appointed by Jesus Christ. 4

The Reverend Colin Buchanan, an Anglican theologian, has noted the manner in which a process beginning with the appointment in the Church of England of laymen to the office of "Lay Reader" has developed to the extent where it is seriously argued that any distinction between minister and layman is meaningless. He writes:

This step recognized, regularized, and finally promoted the ministry of the word by laymen. And, although the steps to the present position were slow and halting, yet it is from that beginning that we have lately come to the point where a layman can officiate at Morning and Evening Prayer, can preach at any service, and can assist the celebrant with the administration at Holy Communion. There comes a point where the practical distinction between minister and layman is the ability to say one prayer at the communion service. And when the question gets put that way, it is not surprising that there are voices to say the distinction is meaningless. 5

It scarcely needs pointing out that this is precisely the point which has been reached in the Catholic Church, but for the fact that hearing confessions is still reserved to the priest.

The most alarming aspect of the present situation is that when young men with a vocation note the extent to which priestly functions are being taken over by laymen, and the increasing secularization of the priesthood itself, the less point they will see in making the sacrifices still required of anyone entering the Catholic priesthood. If they want to be community workers or social leaders, there are more direct routes than via the priesthood.

I am sure that I speak for every faithful Catholic when I say that the more closely our priests conform themselves to the essential nature of their priesthood, the more certain they can be of the love and the loyalty of the laity. There is no shortage of politicians and social workers. What we need are men to absolve us from our sins, preach sound doctrine in season and out of season, and, above all, to offer the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass for the living and he dead. No one has explained what the Catholic expects his priest to be more perfectly than Pope Pius XII in his *Apostolic Exhortation Menti Nostrae*. God grant us priests who will conform to this ideal.

A priest is called by God, appointed to a Divine office and endowed with Divine grace. He must collaborate diligently with Jesus Christ, the one, eternal Priest. He must follow and imitate Him whose ruling intention during His earthly life was to demonstrate His burning love for the Father, and to bestow on men the infinite treasures of His Heart.

The main motive force actuating a priest should be the determination to attain the closest union with the Divine Redeemer and to accept with docility the precepts of Christian doctrine in their fullness, and at all times to practise them so earnestly that the Catholic faith shall be the guiding light of his life, and his life shall in turn reflect the glory of the faith.

With the brightness of faith to guide him, let him continually keep Christ before his eyes. Christ's commands, actions and example he should follow most assiduously, in the conviction that it is not

enough for him to submit to the duties by which the faithful are bound, but that he must at a daily increasing pace pursue the perfection of life which the high dignity of a priest demands, according to the canon: "The clergy should lead a holier life interiorly and exteriorly than the laity and be an example to them by the standard of their virtue and right conduct" (Code of Canon Law, canon 124).

The priestly life takes its origin from Christ, and to Him, therefore, it should at all times be wholly directed. But Christ is the Word of God who condescended to assume a human nature, lived an earthly life to obey the will of the Eternal Father, shed around Him a sweetness as of the lily, lived in poverty, "went about doing good and healing all", (Acts 10: 38) and finally offered Himself as a victim for the salvation of His brethren. Beloved sons, you have before your very eyes, so to say, the sum of this wonderful life. Strive with all your might to reproduce it in yourselves, remembering the incentive offered: "I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so do you also." (John 13: 15). 6

1. La Messe de S. Pie Va Paul VI (Solesmes, 1975), p. 61. The distinction between the clergy and the congregation in the Roman Canon can be found in the prayer *Hanc igitur* which precedes the Consecration and the prayer *Unde et memores* which follows it. The clergy are referred to as God's servants and the congregation as His family or holy people. (The clergy are referred to in the plural due to the antiquity of the Roman Canon which envisages a papal concelebration). The prayer *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* at the conclusion of the Canon is also a specific reference to the priest at the altar.
2. ST, III, Q. LXXXII, art. 3.
3. Three Popes and a Cardinal (New York, 1972), p. 277.
4. *Menti Nostrae*, Apostolic Exhortation of Pope Pius XII on the Sanctification of the Priestly Life of 23 Sept. 1950, C.T.S. edition, p. 25, para. 58.
5. LPE, pp. 13/14.
6. Op. cit., Note 4, pp. 9/10, paras 12/15.

## Appendix I The Substance of a Sacrament

The Catechism of the Council of Trent, following St. Augustine and St. Thomas, emphasizes the nature of the seven Sacraments sacred signs, but signs which possess by Divine institution the power to effect what they signify. 1 They are, as the Penny Catechism explains, outward signs of inward grace. The outward sign of the Sacrament can be discerned by the senses, it is a sensible sign. This sensible aspect of the Sacrament constitutes but one sign, although this sign has two constituent parts----the matter, which is called the element, and the form, which is commonly called the word. 2 In order to bring the Sacrament to completion a third element is necessary, the minister of the Sacrament, who effects it with the intention of doing what the Church does. All three things are essential, "and, if anyone of these three is lacking, the Sacrament is not effected" (D. 695).

The Council of Trent declares that the Church has always possessed the power----in the dispensation or administration of the Sacraments-----to determine or to change those things which she judges to be more expedient for those receiving them or for the reverence due to the Sacraments themselves, according to the circumstances of time and place. An exception is made with regard to the substance of a Sacrament which the Church has no power to alter-----*salva illorum substantia*: provided their substance is retained (D. 93 1).

The question immediately arises as to what belongs to the substance of a particular Sacrament, and the answer will depend upon whether Our Lord instituted it generically (in genere) or specifically (in specie). In the former case, He left it to the supreme authority of His Church to decide the particular signs which should signify and effect the sacramental grace. Where Christ instituted a Sacrament in specie, as regards either matter or form, the Church has no power to change them. Our Lord chose water for the matter of Baptism and bread and wine for the matter of the Holy Eucharist; nothing else can ever be admitted. 3 But even here the Church enjoys a certain latitude in fixing the precise nature of the matter. Where bread for the Holy Eucharist is concerned, priests of the Latin rite are bound to use unleavened bread----just as Our Lord did at the Last Supper. But there are other rites, Uniate and Orthodox, in which leavened bread is used----and the Church recognizes this as equally valid. The Pope possesses the legal power to impose the use of unleavened bread upon the Eastern rites or of leavened bread upon the Latin Church----but until the reforms of Vatican II it had always been the Catholic custom to hold fast to the traditions which have been handed down, liturgical traditions in particular, and never to change them even in minor matters without a compelling reason for doing so.

With regard to the form of a Sacrament, some Catholics have mistakenly identified the form itself with a particular formula employed by the Church to express it, and have concluded that this formula cannot be changed without invalidating the Sacrament. Hence they have fallen into the error of believing that the Church has no power to make changes in the matter and form of any Sacrament, having mistakenly identified the matter and form in current usage with the substance of the Sacraments themselves, which Trent taught could not be changed.

The view that the Church can make no change in the matter and form of any Sacrament is historically indefensible. "The custom of the Church in different ages and countries shows that the form is not fixed in its particular words." 4 The Armenian Decree of the Council of Florence (1439) is sometimes cited in defence of the view that the Church cannot change the form of a Sacrament (D. 695-702). Apart from anything else, this decree is not an infallible pronouncement. The Council was not teaching the whole Church but only the Armenians, and it was simply setting forth for their benefit an authoritative interpretation of the sacramental rites which they were to accept and implement. The decree sets out sacramental forms which they are to use; it does not preclude the possibility of the Church modifying those forms without changing their essential meaning. Indeed, the Council of Florence clearly held that the Church has the power, within certain limits, to

alter the matter and form of some of the Sacraments. For example, after stating that the form for Baptism is: "I Baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost", it adds: "But we do not deny that true Baptism is given by the words: 'This servant of Christ, N., is Baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' ." The Council gave no explicit teaching on the extent of the Church's power to alter the matter and form of the Sacraments, but in justifying the variant forms of Baptism it clearly assumes that all permissible forms will be substantially identical in meaning. 5

The Sacrament of Order provides a clear example of the Church revising her teaching on what constitutes the matter and form of a particular Sacrament. The Decree to the Armenians states:

Its matter is that by the giving of which the Order is conferred; thus the priesthood is conferred by the giving of a chalice with wine and a paten with bread . . . The form of the priesthood is as follows: "Receive power to offer 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" (D. 701). 6

The matter, in this case, is the act of handing over, or "tradition" (traditio), of the instruments. The imposition of hands by the ordaining bishop had been the matter of the Sacrament in Apostolic times, and this practice has been retained as the sole matter down to the present-day by all the Eastern rites, with the exception of the Armenians. The Latin rite itself did not possess the ceremony of the "tradition" until the tenth century, and until that time the imposition of hands constituted the matter in the Western as well as the Eastern Church.

But from that time the ordination rites in the Latin Church were expanded and developed by the addition of other significant ceremonies, which both enhanced the solemnity of the occasion and also brought out the sacramental symbolism more clearly.

So, throughout the history of the development of the sacramental liturgy, the tendency has always been towards growth----additions and accretions, the effort to obtain a fuller, more perfect, more clearly significant symbolism. Thus many beautiful and highly appropriate ceremonies have from time to time been added to the ordinals in use in various parts of the Church, but nothing has been discarded; and notably, the imposition of hands holds in every one of them the same position, and has the same significance and import that it ever held and possessed. 7

The ceremony of the "tradition" consisted of the handing over to the candidate of those things used in the exercise of the Order in question, namely the chalice containing wine and the paten with bread for the Priesthood, and the book of the Gospels for the Diaconate, together with a form of words signifying the power conferred by ordination. By the thirteenth century the "tradition" of the instruments had been universally adopted throughout the Latin Church, so much so that the scholastics began to teach that this tradition of the instruments, with the respective form of words, belonged to the sacramental matter and form. 8 This was indeed the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas; Pope Eugenius IV cited his very words in instructing the Armenians (D. 701).

It is not necessary to study in detail the long and complex theological disputes which took place on this question. The obvious problem was that, if the "tradition" of the instruments was necessary for validity, what of all the ordinations which had taken place in the centuries prior to its introduction and of those in the Eastern rites where there was no "tradition"? Pope Pius XII settled the matter in his constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of 30 November 1947 (D. 2301). He decreed that the sole matter of the Sacrament is the imposition of hands and the sole form consists of the words of the Preface of the rite, the essential words being:

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to this Thy servant, the dignity of the priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within him, that he may hold from Thee, O God, the second rank in Thy service and by the example of his behaviour afford a pattern of holy living.

Pope Pius XII thus taught conclusively that the tradition of the instruments is not necessary for validity, but he did not pronounce on whether it had been necessary for validity within the Latin rites up to the promulgation of *Sacramentum Ordinis*. He contented himself with observing that "if at any time the delivery of the instruments has, by the will and enactment of the Church, been necessary even for validity, everybody knows that what the Church has once ordained she can change and abrogate." This final comment refers, of course, to those aspects of the administration of the Sacraments over which the Church does have power, and not to the substance of the Sacraments, which can never be changed.

Pope Pius XII made no change in the rite of ordination itself, in which the tradition of instruments was retained. In this respect it is worth noting that the essential form as laid down by the Pope simply states that the candidate has been admitted to the dignity of the Priesthood. It does not state in specific terms (*expressis verbis*) what powers have been conferred upon the priest, just as the essential form in other Sacraments does not always state their specific effects. For example, the form of Baptism does not state specifically that the candidate has been cleansed from the stain of Original Sin. However, the powers conferred upon a priest and the effects of Baptism are signified specifically in other parts of the traditional rites. Thus the form itself can derive its signification from other parts of the rite into which it is incorporated. Pope Leo XIII explained that the Anglican Ordinal did contain certain words which might conceivably "be held to suffice in a Catholic rite which the Church had approved."

It is possible to find ancient ordination rites whose validity the Church does not contest, in which the intention of ordaining a sacrificing priest is made explicit neither in the essential form nor anywhere else in the rite. The fact that these powers are nowhere mentioned *expressis verbis* has no bearing on the validity of the rite. As was explained above, the history of sacramental liturgy is a history of development towards a fuller and more significant symbolism. There is no parallel at all between a primitive rite which had not developed to the point of clearly signifying its effects and a rite, such as that of the Anglican Ordinal, in which such developments had been deliberately discarded to manifest a rejection of Catholic teaching. As St. Thomas Aquinas explains, additions or suppressions which change a rite from that which is recognized by the Church indicate an intention other than that of the Church and hence lead to invalidity. 9

Where the essential form, the "operative formula" of a sacramental rite, does not expressly mention the power and grace conferred by a Sacrament, but this power and grace is signified in other parts of the rite, this form of signification is termed *determinatio ex adiunctis*. Father Francis Clark explains that:

The sacramental signification of an ordination rite is not necessarily limited to one phrase or formula, but can be clearly conveyed from many different parts of the rite. These other parts could thus contribute, either individually or in combination, to determining the sacramental meaning of the operative formula in an unambiguous sense. Thus the wording of an ordination form, even if not specifically determinate in itself, can be given the required determination from its setting (*ex adiunctis*), that is, from the other prayers and actions of the rite, or even from the connotation of the ceremony as a whole in the religious context of the age. 10

All valid Sacraments are Sacraments of the Catholic Church and sacramental rites composed by separated Christians can be valid only in so far as their matter and form suffice to confect the Catholic Sacrament.

The only formulae that infallibly and necessarily contain the essential significance of a Sacrament are those which have been canonised by being instituted by Christ and His Church for that purpose. Such words, when exactly reproduced, are removed beyond the reach of ambiguity or private distortion. Thus for example the formula for Baptism and the words of consecration in the Eucharist

are always and necessarily a sufficient sacramental form, even if included in a rite of obvious heretical purport. 11

However, validity could still be nullified by defect of matter or ministerial intention. But where a form and matter not specified by Our Lord are involved the presumption of validity is considerably lessened. The one, true Church alone can pronounce on its validity, and can do so with certainty: "a certainty based on the 'practical infallibility' of the Church's determining decrees, which in the sacramental sphere effectively guarantee what they declare." 12

Thus, the very fact that the Church declares a rite to be valid or invalid is proof that this is the case.

1. CCT, p. 146.
2. CCT, pp. 150/1.
3. TCC, p. 1054.
4. CD, p. 745.
5. CDT, vol. I, p. 149.
6. The Latin text of this form laid down in the Decree is: *Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium in ecclesia pro vivis et mortuis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*. It is worth noting that this formula underwent some minor modifications as the centuries passed. In the text published by the C.T.S. in 1955 (*The Rite of Ordination*, Do 271) it reads: *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, Missasque qelebrire, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini*. The version set out in the Catechism of the Council of Trent also contains some very minor variations: *Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium Deo, Missasque celebrandi tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis*.
7. TCC, p. 1056.
8. TCC, p. 1053.
9. ST, III, Q. LX, art. 8.
10. CCAO, p. 21.
11. Francis Clark, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* (London, 1956), p. 183.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 10.



## Appendix II Ministerial Intention

The term "minister" is used here in the technical sense of the person who administers a Sacrament and not in the sense in which it is popularly used today, namely, a Protestant minister in contrast with a Catholic priest. It is also taken for granted that the term refers to a person who possesses the power to confer a particular Sacrament. An unbeliever can confer the Sacrament of Baptism by using the correct matter and form and intending to do what the Church does, but a man who had not been validly ordained could not celebrate a valid Mass even if he had the correct intention and used the correct matter and form.

Christ Himself, our great High Priest, is the primary minister of the Sacraments. As Pope Pius XII taught in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, "It is indeed He Who Baptises through the Church, He Who teaches, governs, absolves, binds, offers, and makes sacrifice." Hence the human minister of a Sacrament is acting as an instrument of Christ and, as the Council of Trent teaches, he must intend at least to do what the Church founded by Christ does. Ideally, he should be a man of great holiness who believes what the Church teaches, but this is not essential. In order to administer a Sacrament validly the minister requires neither faith nor the state of grace nor holiness of life. He need not believe that the Catholic Church is the true Church; nor that what the Catholic Church teaches concerning a particular Sacrament is true; nor that the Sacrament will effect what the Church teaches it will effect; he need not even believe in God or believe that the administration of a Sacrament will have any effect at all. Furthermore, even if the minister is a heretic and intends to do not what the Catholic Church does, but what his own denomination does, believing his own denomination to be the true Church, his intention is sufficient providing he does not specifically exclude what is essential in a Sacrament. Thus the Holy See has upheld the validity of Baptism administered by the ministers of heretical sects who have publicly denied the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration (D. 2304). This is because the ministers in question intended to do what Christ and the Church do in this Sacrament----a distinction was made between a failure to believe in Baptismal regeneration and a positive intention to exclude it (a positive contrary intention).

The consensus of Catholic theologians is that the correct and serious performance of a rite as approved by the Church, and because approved by her, is a sufficient indication of the internal intention on the part of the minister. In such cases there is no means by which the Church can pass judgment on his interior dispositions. Thus Pope Leo XIII states in *Apostolicae Curae*:

The Church does not judge about the mind and "intention" in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it.

A person who has correctly and seriously used the requisite matter and form to effect and confer a Sacrament is presumed for that very reason to have intended to do (*intendisse*) what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unBaptised, provided the Catholic rite be employed (para. 33).

Pope Leo's reference to the exterior manifestation of the intention of the minister is of crucial importance. Father Francis Clark explains that if the minister gives a clear indication, a deliberate act of will, directed against something essential to the Sacrament, "then the Church can judge with canonical certainty that his positive anti-sacramental intention necessarily vitiates and nullifies his whole ministerial intention." <sup>1</sup> He goes on to explain that this "principle of positive contrary intention", solidly established in Catholic theology, is essential for an understanding of Pope Leo's judgment on the ministerial intention of those who initiated the Anglican hierarchy by "consecrating" Matthew Parker in 1559. Had the Catholic rite been used as restored under Mary, then the Pope could not have pronounced with certainty that Parker's "consecration" would have been invalid, despite the notoriously heretical views of Bishop Barlow and his assistants who conducted the rite. However, by reverting to a rite designed specifically to exclude Catholic

teaching on Holy Orders, they provided an irrefutable external manifestation of their positive contrary intention. Apart from anything else, it would be manifestly unjust to those who first used the Cranmerian Ordinal to claim that they intended to perpetuate a sacrificing priesthood when they wished to do precisely the opposite-----as they indicated by using a rite intended to exclude any possibility of ordaining a sacrificing priest. Pope Leo writes:

On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament (Apostolicae Curae para. 33).

Finally, some mention must be made of the theory of Catharinus (1552), that where the minister freely and seriously carried out the rite in a context that excluded jesting, he could not invalidate the Sacrament even if he made a positive intention to exclude what the Church intended (a positive contrary intention), as opposed to simply not believing it would effect what the Church intended. This thesis has never been formally condemned but seems impossible to reconcile with the theology of the Sacrament of Matrimony. The ministers of this Sacrament are the spouses themselves and, even where the rite was conducted freely and seriously, proof that one of the parties entering upon a marriage did not intend to do what the Church does in that Sacrament is accepted as grounds for declaring the marriage null. Therefore it is not possible to be absolutely certain that the free and serious performance of a sacramental rite by a lawful minister guarantees its validity. But where the rite is performed in a free and serious manner the recipient can presume that the minister intends to do what the Church does, and has a moral certainty of receiving a valid Sacrament, though not the certainty of faith. The analysis of ministerial intention in this Appendix is based on the following works, to which reference may be made for a more detailed treatment: H. Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, Vol. III, Chapter 4; L. Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, pp. 341 ff; Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary* (1928 edition), see the entry: Sacraments of the Gospel; Canon G. Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, pp. 753 ff; *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, vol. III, see the entries "Intention" and "Ordination"; and *Summa Theologica*, III, Q.LXIV.

Among the points made by St. Thomas on this Question in the *Summa* are the following, which have already been incorporated into the Appendix but are added here in more detail, quoting St. Thomas directly.

St. Thomas explains in a previous Question (LXII, Art. 5) that:

Christ delivered us from our sins principally through His Passion, not only by way of efficiency and merit, but also by way of satisfaction. Likewise by His Passion He inaugurated the rites of the Christian religion by offering "Himself-----an oblation and a sacrifice to God" (Eph. 5:2).

Wherefore it is manifest that the Sacraments of the Church derive their power specially from Christ's Passion, the virtue of which is in a manner united to us by our receiving the Sacraments.

In Q.XLIV, Art. 5, St. Thomas explains that Christ is the principal agent of the Sacraments, the human minister simply acts as the instrument of Christ and the Church, and hence even a sinful minister can confer a Sacrament validly providing the correct matter and form are used.

The ministers of the Church do not by their own power cleanse from sin those who approach the Sacraments, nor do they confer grace on them: it is Christ Who does this by His Own power while He employs them as instruments. Consequently, those who approach the Sacraments receive an effect whereby they are enlivened not to the ministers but to Christ.

In Article 8 he answers a possible objection, that as the minister acts as Christ's instrument his

intention is not necessary for the validity of the Sacrament. St. Thomas phrases the objection as follows:

It seems that the minister's intention is not required for the validity of a Sacrament. For the minister of a sacrament works instrumentally. But the perfection of an action does not depend on the intention of the instrument, but on that of the principal agent. Therefore the minister's intention is not necessary for the perfecting of a Sacrament.

St. Thomas then replies:

An inanimate instrument has no intention regarding the effect; but instead of the intention there is the motion whereby it is moved by the principal agent. But an animate instrument, such as a minister, is not only moved, but in a sense moves itself, in so far as by his will he moves his bodily members to act. Consequently, his intention is required, whereby he subjects himself to the principal agent; that is, it is necessary that he intend to do that which Christ and the Church do.

St. Thomas explains that the minister acts not only as the instrument of Christ but as the instrument of the Church.

The minister of a Sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is; while in the words uttered by him, the intention of the Church is expressed; and that suffices for the validity of the Sacrament, except the contrary be expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the Sacrament.

In Article 9 St. Thomas answers the objection that if the minister must intend to do what the Church does he must believe what the Church believes, in other words, he must have faith.

St. Thomas answers:

Such unbelief does not hinder the intention of conferring the Sacrament. But if his faith be defective in regard to the very Sacrament that he confers, although he believe that no inward effect is caused by the thing done outwardly, yet he does know that the Catholic Church intends to confer a Sacrament by that which is outwardly done. Wherefore his unbelief notwithstanding, he can intend to do what the Church does, albeit he esteem it to be nothing. And such an intention suffices for a Sacrament: because as stated above (Art. 8 ad 2) the minister of a Sacrament acts in the person of the Church by whose faith any defect in the minister's faith is made good.

But St. Thomas stresses that for validity it is necessary to observe the form prescribed by the Church:

Some heretics in conferring Sacraments do not observe the form prescribed by the Church, and these confer neither the Sacrament nor the reality of the Sacrament.

1. CCAO, p. 27.

### Appendix III

#### The Participation of Protestant Observers in the Compilation of the New Catholic Liturgical Texts

On 3 May 1970 *Documentation Catholique* published the text of a speech made by Pope Paul VI to the members of the Consilium, the body responsible for implementing the very generalized principles of liturgical reform included in the Liturgy Constitution of Vatican II. I have shown in Pope John's Council the extent to which this reform not only failed to correspond with the revisions envisaged by the Council Fathers but acted in formal contradiction with both the Liturgy Constitution and the papally approved liturgical movement.

The cover of this issue of *Documentation Catholique* was devoted to a picture of Pope Paul VI posing with the six Protestant Observers who had been invited to participate in the work of the Consilium. This photograph proved to be a source of astonishment and even scandal to large numbers of the faithful who had had no idea that Protestants had played any part in the compilation of the new Catholic rites. It resulted in public controversy in a number of countries, which was followed by official denials that the Observers had, in fact, played any part in the compilation of the new rites. These denials have since been cited by apologists for the official reform as "refutations" of the allegation that Protestant Observers had taken an active part in the compilation of the new rites. There is, however, a considerable difference between a denial and a refutation, and these particular denials are totally gratuitous and contradict the available evidence.

In the July/August 1974 issue of *Notitiae*, official journal of the Consilium, Archbishop Bugnini (its secretary) claimed that the Observers confined their role simply to observing (pp. 249/50).

Here are his exact words:

What role did the "Observers" play in the Consilium? Nothing more than that of "Observers". First of all, they only took part in the study meetings. In the second place, they behaved with impeccable discretion. They never intervened in the discussions and never asked to speak.

On 25 February 1976 the Director of the Vatican Press Office gave the following reply to a question by the journalist Georges Huber as to whether the Protestant Observers had participated in the elaboration of the new Mass:

The Protestant Observers did not participate in the elaboration of the texts of the new Missal. This denial was printed in *La Documentation Catholique* on 4 July 1976.

In contrast with this Mgr. W.W. Baum (now Cardinal Baum), an ardent ecumenist, made the following statement in a personal interview with the *Detroit News* on 27 June 1967:

They are not simply there as observers, but as consultants as well, and they participate fully in the discussions on Catholic liturgical renewal. It wouldn't mean much if they just listened, but they contributed. (My emphasis).

In order to place this statement in its correct context it must be made clear that, at the time he made it, Mgr. Baum was executive director of the American Catholic Bishops' Commission on Ecumenical Affairs, and the first Catholic spokesman ever invited to address the General Synod of the United Church of Christ, an American Protestant denomination. During his address he revealed to the delegates that Protestant scholars "have had a voice" in the revision of the Catholic liturgy. As a follow-up to this revelation, Harold Acharhem, Religious Correspondent of the *Detroit News*, obtained the interview with Mgr. Baum from which I have quoted.

The account given by Cardinal Baum, and the denials issued by Archbishop Bugnini and the Vatican Press Office are clearly contradictory. In order to discover the truth I wrote to one of the

Observers, Canon Ronald Jasper. Before giving his reply it is necessary to explain the manner in which the Consilium did its work. Firstly, there were the study sessions during which the practical details of the reform were worked out, discussed and modified. Then there were the formal (plenary) meetings during which the draft rites which had been compiled in the study sessions were debated and voted upon. In my letter to Canon Jasper I explained that I was working on a series of books on the liturgical reform and that I particularly wished to know whether the Observers had had a voice in the new rites of Mass and Ordination. In his reply, dated 10 February 1977, he explained that the Observers received all the documents from the drafters of the new rite in the same way as did other members of the Consilium. They were then present at the debates when they were presented by the experts and debated by the Consilium, but the Observers were not allowed to join in the debate.

In the afternoon, however, they always had an informal meeting with the periti who had prepared the draft services, and at these meetings they were certainly allowed to comment and criticize and make suggestions. It was then for the periti to decide whether any of their points were worth taking up when the general debates in the Consilium were resumed. But, explained Canon Jasper in conclusion, these informal meetings were a complete free-for-all, and there was a very frank exchange of views.

Exactly the same process took place during the course of Vatican II. The Protestant Observers, while not allowed to speak in the plenary sessions, were able to take an active part in the informal discussions where the real work of drafting the documents was done. Their influence is visible in the finalized documents themselves, and evidence of it is provided in Chapter IX of Pope John's Council. In addition to this evidence, the following testimonies are extremely relevant.

Archdeacon Pawley, an Anglican Observer, reveals that in the course of the Council itself the fullest courtesies and opportunities for communication and exchange were allowed to the Observers at every stage, and traces of the process can be recognised in the documents themselves. 1

Robert McAfee Brown, a Presbyterian Observer, remarks that:

Particularly during the discussion on ecumenism, it was apparent that many bishops wanted to know what Protestant reactions were to statements in the schema about Protestantism, and wanted to elicit Protestant opinions on how the schema could be improved. Thus, although we had no direct "voice" on the Council floor, we did indeed have an indirect voice through the many contacts that were possible with the Fathers and their indispensable strong right arms, the periti. 2

Dr. McMee Brown also reveals that there were occasions when the Observers were able to have a direct voice on the Council floor. "Is there anything you Observers want said on the Council floor about De Oecumenismo?" one bishop asked. The Observers then put their views in writing, to be incorporated into written interventions made on their behalf by bishops. 3

Thus, although it could be argued that officially the Observers played no part in drafting the conciliar documents, as they could neither vote nor speak in the debates, it is clear that they were able to influence the final format of these documents. This is precisely what took place with the formulation of the new liturgical rites by the post-conciliar Consilium.

1. B. & M. Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries* (London, 1974), p. 343.

2. R. M. Brown, *Observer in Rome* (London, 1964), pp. 227/8.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 173.

## Appendix IV The Apostolic Succession

When during the recitation of the Nicene Creed we affirm our belief in the apostolicity of the Church-----Credo in apostolicam Ecclesiam-----we are referring to a threefold apostolicity. We are bound to believe that the powers which Our Lord bestowed upon the Apostles were in turn conferred upon their successors through the laying on of hands. These powers have descended by the same means to our present-day bishops in an unbroken succession. This has been expressed most recently in the Declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in defence of the Catholic doctrine on the Church against certain errors of the present day. It was ratified and confirmed by Pope Paul VI on 11 May 1973 and promulgated on 24 June 1973.

The Declaration states:

Christ, the Head of the Church, which is His Mystical Body, appointed as ministers of His priesthood His Apostles and through them their successors the bishops, that they might act in His person within the Church and also in turn legitimately hand over to priests in a subordinate degree the sacred ministry which they had received. 1

This is *de fide* teaching reiterated by Popes and Councils on numerous occasions, and it should be remembered that teaching which is presented to us as *de fide definita* is infallible and anyone rejecting it automatically ceases to be a Catholic. The essential point here is that this method of transmitting office is not a practice which developed within the Church during the first centuries. It was directly instituted by Christ Himself. This, then, covers two of the threefold aspects of apostolicity-----apostolicity of origin (*apostolicitas originis*), and apostolicity of succession in office (*apostolicitas successionis*). The third aspect is *apostolicitas doctrinae*, apostolicity in doctrine. The Church has always adhered to the teaching which she received from the Apostles; the apostolicity of succession guarantees the unfalsified transmission of doctrine. The original deposit of faith has naturally developed through the centuries, but always in fidelity to the original Gospel, the good news preached by the Apostles, not all of which is explicitly included in the New Testament. The deposit of faith, which it is the Church's duty to preserve intact and to preach to all men, has been formulated from two sources, written and unwritten.

In his pamphlet, *Anglican Orders-----A Way Forward?*, Fr. Edward Yarnold, S.J., states that

. . . it seems that apostolic succession has more than one strand. One of these strands is ordination by a bishop in the apostolic succession, which is a sign that the Order and the authority conferred come from Christ and are not matters of human convention, and also a sign that the new priest or bishop is in communion with other ordained ministers throughout the world and throughout time.

This statement is an example of Modernism at its most devious. There is not one word here which could provoke disagreement among Lutherans or Anglicans, who do not believe that ordination is a Sacrament instituted by Christ, and which therefore conveys grace *ex opere operato* [that the Sacrament works independent of the spiritual worthiness of the minister-----Note added by Web Master]. The grace in this case is the sacred character of the priesthood, which distinguishes a man who has received the Sacrament of Order not simply in degree but in essence from the laity. Lutherans and Evangelical Anglicans will accept that ordination is a sign of a person's appointment to the office of minister, even an appropriate sign. They will not accept that it is a Sacrament and that it was directly instituted by Christ.

Fr. Yarnold might well argue that a Sacrament is a sign-----and he would be correct. But not every sign is a Sacrament-----every car is a vehicle, but not every vehicle is a car. Fr. Yarnold might even protest that I have no right to presume that by the word "sign" he didn't mean "Sacrament"-----this

is the way the Modernist mind operates. I would reply that if he meant "Sacrament", then he should have said "Sacrament". However, there is more to it than this. Father Yarnold cites a source for the explanation of apostolic succession which he has given-----and it is none other than the Canterbury Statement on the Ministry and Ordination, which will certainly take its place among the classic formulations of Modernism, as Chapter VI makes clear. Father Yarnold continues:

But there is a second strand, namely a call coming from a community which seeks to be faithful to the teaching and commission of Christ handed down through the apostles to the whole Church. The first strand runs unbroken through time; the second strand does not necessarily consist of an unbroken succession in history, but of a conformity of mind and heart and life to Christ, a conformity which is the work of the Holy Spirit whom Christ bequeathed to His Church. If the first strand is broken it needs to be repaired by ordination conferred by bishops in valid Orders; if the second is broken it is repaired by a change of heart, mind and life towards Christ. Catholic teaching is that the first strand is necessary. But is it possible that its absence, though a grave defect, is not sufficient to invalidate Orders if the second strand holds? 2

The statements by Father Yarnold which have been cited above are contained in one paragraph in the original-----and it must surely be the most deplorable paragraph ever to appear in a Catholic Truth Society publication. The reasons for this are not hard to discern.

Firstly, it will be noted that in true Modernist style Father Yarnold does not commit himself-----he does not state a position, he simply asks a question. And how can it be unorthodox to ask a question?

Secondly, he is treating two distinct aspects of apostolicity as if they were one and the same. His two strand theory has no basis at all in Catholic theology, it is a novelty and, as is almost invariably the case with novelties, it is unorthodox. Apostolicity of succession can be conveyed in one way and one way only, through the Sacrament of Order instituted by Christ. This apostolicity of succession guarantees the apostolicity of the doctrine taught by the successors of the Apostles. We know that the doctrine is true precisely because it is being taught by those who, in virtue of the Sacrament of Order, are the successors of the Apostles in communion with the successor of Peter. It is ludicrous to attempt to transpose the terms and claim that because the doctrine is true those teaching it must have valid Orders within the apostolic succession. Once the authority of the Catholic Church is rejected no criterion for distinguishing between truth or falsehood remains beyond the private judgment of the individual Christian.

Thirdly, once the logic of Fr. Yarnold's position is accepted, we are bound to accept not only the validity of Anglican Orders but those of any and every Protestant sect. Presumably every Protestant denomination "seeks to be faithful to the teaching and commission of Christ handed down through the apostles to the Church", and so they must therefore have valid orders if a positive answer is returned to Father Yarnold's question.

The true position is that to be in total conformity with the teaching of the Apostles it is necessary to be in communion with the successors of the Apostles. Our Lord founded one Church and one Church only, and it is His will that all men should belong to that Church. This is an essential, perhaps the essential, message of the Apostles. Those who belong to bodies which were originally constituted in opposition to the one, true Church of Christ (no matter how sincere they might be) cannot in truth be held to be "of a conformity of mind and heart and life to Christ", Who willed that there should be one flock and one shepherd.

In addition to this, the Church of England is not only constituted in the state of schism, as are the various Orthodox Churches, but it embraces a virtual compendium of heresies. Ironically, it is in the Orthodox Churches at present that most of the basic Christian truths are upheld and proclaimed without the least trace of ambiguity. Within the Catholic Church, orthodoxy is proclaimed by the

Vatican while every form of heresy is permitted to rage unchecked throughout the Church. Indeed, it is with some embarrassment that I shall quote Cardinal Newman to make it clear that the theory that the Church of England has a doctrine in conformity with the teaching of the Apostles is quite untenable. It is embarrassing because his critique of Anglicanism in the eighteen-seventies is now applicable to Catholicism in the nineteen-seventies. In 1879 Cardinal Newman wrote to an Anglican lady who had questioned the role of the Catholic Church as the one, true Church founded by Jesus Christ. The Cardinal pointed out that God Himself has founded a Church in which we are to find salvation; that the word Ecclesia means an assembly, and that Luke taught: "The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). The Cardinal then cited Scripture to show that the Church is a body which teaches authoritatively, and added:

One note of the Church then is this clear authoritative teaching. There may be many opinions among its members on points which it does not teach, but not on those points which it teaches as the truth revealed. It teaches and its theologians believe only one and the same doctrine. There must be no differences as to the way of salvation.

Now can I trust my soul to the Church of England? Is it a teaching Church, considering hardly any two adjacent pulpits will proclaim the same doctrine, and that not in minor points, but in the way to be saved. This way of salvation is distinctly different in the Low Church, High Church, and Broad Church. Considering without faith we cannot be saved, have I not a right to ask, who in the Church can tell me what that saving faith is? Do clergymen even so agree in their belief of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as to give it the same sense or attach the same importance to the . . . Athanasian Creed? or attach the same idea to baptismal regeneration, etc., etc.

In consequence who has faith in the Church of England? Have you? You can have faith in the word of the Catholic Church. Can you in any other Church? 3

To sum up Father Yarnold's position, he has confused apostolicity of doctrine, which is a mark or characteristic of the Apostolic Church, with the means ordained by Our Lord to perpetuate the apostolic succession itself through the Sacrament of Order. Furthermore, he does not even posit apostolicity of teaching itself as a second means of imparting valid orders-----all that is needed is to seek to be faithful to the apostolic teaching.

The logic of his position is that any group, however small, can come together, state that it is seeking to adhere to the apostolic teaching (which all sects do), and the Catholic Church will then be bound to recognize the validity of the Orders of those whom the sect choose to appoint as ministers. Let those who support the Catholic Truth Society in any way note that, by promoting heretical opinions of this kind, it has departed radically from the principles of Catholic Truth which its own name pledges it to uphold.

Father Yarnold makes no attempt to claim personal credit for this absurd theory of apostolic succession. He refers us to *Structures of the Church* by Hans Küng. 4 However, those who refer to this book will find that Dr. Küng himself is simply citing a theory advanced by a Lutheran theologian, E. Schlink, in a book entitled: *Die Apostolische Sukzession*.

In his explanation of the theory, Hans Küng adopts a very cautious tone. Like his disciple, Father Yarnold, he insists that he is simply trying to raise questions, not to answer them. He assures us that the procedure laid down for the admission to ecclesiastical office by the Council of Trent must be accepted as valid for normal cases; all that he is asking is that the possibility of extraordinary routes to valid Orders must be examined afresh.

Will the door some day be opened to the possibilities of reaching an extraordinary route to ecclesiastical office? That cannot be predicted at the present time. What is certain, however, is that the definitions of the Trent decrees are completely valid for the normal case; normally admission to



office occurs as it was laid down at Trent; namely, through the ordination of the office holder. Schlink too considers that to be the ordinary procedure. In regard to eventual extraordinary ways, on the Catholic side, no more can be said at present than this: the question must be examined afresh in the light of the present state of the problems. 5

However, the thinking of Dr. Küng has now developed in a most striking manner and it is hardly surprising that Father Yarnold did not quote from some of his subsequent works such as *Infallible?* In this book Dr. Küng informs us that the traditional teaching on apostolic succession is unhistorical; that Catholic teaching on infallibility is untenable as it is based on this unhistorical theory of apostolic succession; that there is no essential distinction between priest and layman, it is simply an accident of history; and that the way to discover the true Gospel message is not for us all to listen to the Pope and the bishops but for us all, Pope and bishops included, to listen to the theologians. And how do we know that what the theologians are teaching is true? Why, it is true because they are teaching it. Let Dr. Küng speak for himself, taking note of the fact that where he refers to "prophets" or "teachers" in the early Church he means the equivalent of the present day theologians. It will be noted that he claims that the Church was founded on the twin pillars of apostles and prophets, and that the office of apostle has not been perpetuated while that of prophet has.

The Church "has the apostles (and the prophets) for its foundations", but there is no mention of any kind of personal or collegial infallibility or inability to fall into error.

Similarly, it is impossible to show that the bishops are in any direct and exclusive sense the successors of the apostles (or of the college of the twelve) . . . As the direct primary witnesses and messengers of Christ, the apostles are a priori irreplaceable and unrepresentable by any successors; it is they (and the prophets) and not the bishops who are and remain the founders of the Church . . . from the "collegiality" of an the faithful there emerged a collegiality of certain groups of ministries over against the congregation, resulting in the emergence of a distinction between clergy and laity. 6

. . . the attribution of infallibility to the college of bishops, based on the traditional, unhistorical theory of the bishops' direct and exclusive apostolic succession, stands exegetically, historically and theologically, on feet of clay. 7

As we have previously pointed out, it cannot be shown either is often claimed for them, the successors of the apostles (and still less of the college of the twelve): the modern order of three offices-----bishops, presbyters and deacons-----is a later historical development, and in itself a perfectly reasonable one. The apostolic succession applies primarily to the universal *Ecclesia apostolica*, in as much as every Christian should strive for agreement with the fundamental apostolic testimony (Scripture, succession in apostolic faith and confession) and for connection with the apostolic service (missionary progress in the world and the building up of the Christian community, succession in apostolic service and life). 8

However, the mission of "Church leaders or pastors" is a special one and "they enjoy a special authority and, when they fulfill their service in the spirit of the Gospel, they are entitled to count on cooperation and recognition of their authority." 9

What exactly does Dr. Küng mean by Church leaders fulfilling their service with that degree of conformity to the spirit of the Gospel which entitles them to our cooperation? (Note that we do not owe the bishops obedience in virtue of their office, they must earn our cooperation by the manner in which they exercise it). Dr. Küng is ready with an answer, but first emphasizes that he is not trying to abolish authority and leadership-----he just wants it exercised properly:

It is not no Church leadership that we need, but Church leadership in accordance with the Gospel.

We do not need less authority, but more qualified authority: authority based on service, and capable of subordinating itself to the subordinate if the latter has the Gospel and reason on its side. 10

Thus the bishops are entitled to cooperation and recognition of their authority providing they subordinate themselves to "the teachers" in the Church. Bishops and deacons were only chosen in the event of an insufficiency of prophets and teachers within the congregation. 11 The successors of those teachers are among us today and woe betide the Church if she fails to heed them!

What becomes of a Church in which the teachers are silent? The question will be better understood if, in accordance with present-day terminology, we speak of theologians instead of teachers. What becomes of a Church in which scholarly reflection on and interpretation of the original Christian message, the true transmission, the true translation of that message into the terms of the present day, have ceased? A Church in which the theologians had to be silent would become an untruthful Church. Its teaching might be very correct and unchanged and conscientiously handed on. Its faith might seem secure from doubt, and its teaching might seem to present no serious problems. Yet it would often be evading men's real problems, and would fail to notice that it was bogged down in an outdated theological system, that it was handing on superannuated ideas and the empty husks of traditional concepts as truth, and that both in teaching and in life it had departed from the original message. Meanwhile the leaders who did not want to listen to the theologians in the Church, having little interest or time for well-based theology because, perhaps through fear, they did not want to be disturbed in their faith, or naively believed that they already knew everything that mattered-----those leaders would in their ignorance the more confidently seek to impose their personal teaching as the teaching of the Church, confuse their antiquated ideas with genuine tradition, close their minds to learning anything and, though unqualified themselves, claim the privilege of judging the qualified. Then, though gifts are diverse, they would claim to be successors, not only of the apostles, but also of the teachers . . . how fruitful it can be for them and for the Church if they listen-----as the best of them have always done-----to the theologians who try to help the Church by critical examination of current teaching and by reference to the original message; who exercise their theological skill, not for their own sake, but for humanity, the Church and the world. 12

And so on.

Such is the enthusiasm of Dr. Küng for the virtues of theologians that once launched upon the topic he finds it necessary to express himself at very great length. It would be possible, but tedious, to cite expositions of this theory of apostolic succession from other works by Hans Küng and his fellow prophets. Hans Küng himself has now provided us with *Why Priests?*, which completes the task of "proving" that the ordained priest has no powers not shared by the universal priesthood of the faithful. A number of theologians have been active in expounding the theory that to be in the apostolic succession means to be faithful to the apostolic teaching, including Yves Congar, Raymond Brown, and Avery Dunes. Like Hans Küng, they are all permitted to propagate their heterodox theories without fear of sanctions from either the Vatican or their bishops.

NOTE: we removed the original footnote 2 as it referred to an appendix in Cranmer's *Godly Order* that we did not include since that work is excerpted only; thus we had to renumber the subsequent notes, having 12 footnotes rather than 13.

1. *Mysterium Ecclesiae* is available from the Apostolate of Catholic Truth, 52 Moorcroft Crescent, Ribblesdale, Preston, PR2 6DP, England.
2. AOWF, p. 11
3. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol. XXIX (Clarendon Press, 1976), p. 166.
4. *Structures of the Church* (London, 1965), p. 180.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

6. Infallible? (London, 1972), pp. 66/7.
7. Ibid., p. 70.
8. Ibid., p. 187.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 188.
11. Ibid., p. 190.
12. Ibid., pp. 190/1.

## Appendix V The Power to Confirm and Ordain

The teaching of the Council of Trent, that the power to confirm and ordain which belongs to bishops is not common to them and to priests, requires some explanation (see Chap. II). The canon in question must be understood as referring to the exercise of this power as a matter of ordinary jurisdiction in the case of confirmation and even, perhaps, in the case of ordination.

"Ordinary" jurisdiction is an ecclesiastical term used to denote authority attached to an office. A parish priest has ordinary authority to exercise those functions attached to his office, such as hearing the confessions of his parishioners.

Trent itself makes clear in the canons on confirmation that when referring to the power to confirm, it is ordinary authority which is in question. Canon III states: "If anyone says that the ordinary minister of Holy Confirmation is not the bishop, but any simple priest; let him be anathema." (D. 873). But in the Eastern Churches priests have acted as the ordinary ministers of Confirmation, and the validity of these confirmations has never been questioned by Rome. Since 1 January 1947, parish priests of the Roman rite have been empowered to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation under certain circumstances, for example where the recipient is in immediate danger of death. 1 The same faculty had been granted to some missionary priests long before that date.

Although there is no doubt that a priest can be granted the extraordinary power to confirm, it is a disputed question as to whether even the Pope has the right to grant a simple priest the authority to act as an extraordinary minister of ordination. It is certain that a few popes have delegated such authority to abbots who had not received episcopal consecration. 2

Some theologians believe these popes may have exceeded their authority and that isolated papal acts do not constitute a law or make a dogma. This view is held by Professor J.P.M. van der Ploeg, O.P. If correct it would mean that the ordinations performed by these abbots were invalid. The problem is discussed by Dr. Ludwig Ott in his *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. His view is that despite the fact that "most theologians, with St. Thomas, hold the opinion that a simple priest cannot validly administer the orders of the Diaconate and Priesthood, even with plenary power from the Pope", the more probable view is that a simple priest can act as an extraordinary minister of the Sacrament of Order.

Unless one wishes to assume that the Popes in question were victims of the erroneous theological opinions of their times (this does not touch the Papal infallibility, because an *ex cathedra* decision was not given), one must take it that a simple priest is an extraordinary dispenser of the Orders of Diaconate and Presbyterate, just as he is an extraordinary dispenser of Confirmation. In this latter view, the requisite power of consecration is contained in the priestly power of consecration as *potestas ligata*. For the valid exercise of it a special exercise of the Papal power is, by Divine or Church ordinance, necessary (p. 459).

Even if it is accepted that these ordinations by abbots were valid they do not provide an argument in favour of the validity of the orders of certain Protestant denominations conferred by men who had received priestly ordination but had not been consecrated as bishops (see p. 73). Given that a priest has the power to ordain, he could not do so validly without papal authorization. It is not even the case that the powers definitely conferred by the Sacrament of Order can always be exercised validly. The power to consecrate can always be exercised validly. An unfrocked or excommunicated priest can celebrate a valid Mass but would sin gravely in doing so. His Mass would be valid but illicit. But this is not the case with the power to absolve. There are a number of restrictions regarding the use of this Sacrament, and there are certain sins which the Pope and bishops have reserved to their own tribunals and which cannot be absolved validly by ordinary confessors unless the penitent is in immediate danger of death.

1. For a more detailed treatment of this question, see *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* by L. Ott, p. 369.
2. See CDT, Vol. I, the entry: Abbot, Ordination by.

## Appendix VI Papal Documents Relating to Anglican Orders

The translations of documents A to C are taken from *The Popes and the Ordinal* by Fr. A. S. Barnes (published in 1896). The numbering of the paragraphs in the text of *Apostolicae Curae* was not in Father Barnes' version but has been added to correspond with the numbering in the various translations published by the C.T.S. The documents contained in this appendix are:

- A) Faculties issued to Cardinal Pole by Pope Julius III in 1554.
- B) The Bull *Praeclara Charissimi* (1555) of Pope Paul IV.
- C) Declaratory Brief of Pope Paul IV (1555).
- D) The Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) of Pope Leo XIII. Click [HERE](#).
- E) Letter of Pope Leo XIII to Cardinal Richard of Paris explaining the authority of the Bull (1896).

A). Faculties Issued by Pope Julius III to Cardinal Pole, 8 March 1554

Beloved Son, etc.,

Some time ago when it was hoped that England, which had been separated from the Catholic Church, might return to the sheepfold of the Lord and the unity of the Church:

We appointed you our Legatus a latere to Queen Mary and the whole kingdom, and conceded faculties to you for, among other things, granting full absolution, etc., to all persons of either sex, both clerical and lay, and if the former whether secular or belonging to any of the religious orders, in whatsoever orders they might be, even Holy Orders; and whatsoever rank, as of bishops, etc., they might hold: who had professed any heresy or attached themselves to any new sect; on their acknowledging their errors and grieving for them, and begging to be received back into the orthodox faith:

And further, (we gave you permission) to grant them dispensations from all irregularity they might have incurred . . . so that provided that before their lapse into heresy they had been rightly and lawfully promoted or ordained, they might minister even in the ministry of the altar, and that in cases where they had not been so promoted they might now be promoted to all the orders, including Holy Orders and the priesthood, by their own ordinaries, provided they were found to be worthy and fitting subjects.

Besides these, we gave you other faculties by various letters, some under the Seal, and some in the form of Briefs, as in those letters is more fully set out.

Now, therefore, since you are now in Flanders, and likely to remain there some little time, and since doubts have been raised, perhaps over scrupulously, as to whether you can, while in those countries, use the aforesaid and other faculties which have been granted to you, and substitute and delegate the ordinaries of places in England, and other persons who are properly qualified, to use the faculties granted to you:

We by these presents do grant to your discretion full and free Apostolic authority, faculty, and power, so long as you remain in those parts, and your Legation continues, even while outside the Kingdom of England, to use all the said faculties, and all others which have been granted to you, and also those which are granted to you by these presents: on behalf of all Archbishops, Bishops, and other inferior clergy, and also on behalf of other persons who come or send to you in Flanders, with regard to Orders by them not at all or unduly received, and with regard to the gift of consecration conferred upon them by other Bishops and Archbishops who were heretics or schismatics, or otherwise unduly and not according to the Church's form, and this notwithstanding that they have rashly exercised such orders and consecration, even in the ministry of the altar . . . And further, freely and lawfully to grant dispensations to those who have received Cathedral and

Metropolitan Churches from the hands of laymen and schismatics, so that they may preside freely and lawfully as Bishops and Archbishops over such Cathedral Churches, or over others to which they may be lawfully translated, and may rule and govern such Churches both in spirituals and temporals, and may use the gift of consecration which they have received, or, in cases in which they have not yet received it, may now receive it from Catholic Bishops or Archbishops to be nominated by you:

And likewise to any who have already been temporally absolved and rehabilitated, so that, their past errors and excesses notwithstanding, they may freely and lawfully be appointed to any Cathedral or Metropolitan Church, and may rule and govern such Churches as Bishops or Archbishops, both in spirituals and temporals, and may be promoted to any orders, including Holy Orders and the priesthood, and may minister in them, or in orders which they have already though unduly received, even in the ministry of the altar, and likewise may receive the gift of consecration and use the same: All this notwithstanding, etc., etc.,

Given at Rome at St. Peter's under the Ring of the Fisherman, 8 March 1554. In the fifth year of our Pontificate.

B). The Bull "Praeclara Charissimi" of Pope Paul IV in 1555

Paul, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God. For the perpetual memory hereof.

The eminent piety towards God of the illustrious (sovereigns), Our most dear son in Christ, Philip, King, and of Our most dear daughter in Christ, Mary, Queen of England and France: their sincere devotion to this Holy See and their singular zeal in the recent bringing back of the Kingdom of England to the Unity of the Church, to the profession of the true Faith, and to the obedience of Us and of the Roman Pontiff, rightly move Us that We should confirm with the force of Our approbation those measures which have issued from Apostolic authority for the peace and tranquillity of the said Kingdom . . . The aforesaid Reginald, Cardinal and Legate . . . has used the dispensing power in favour of several ecclesiastical persons, both seculars and regulars of the various orders, who by the pretended authority of the supremacy of the English Church had in a way which is null and de facto obtained various grants, dispensations, favours, and indults concerning orders as well as ecclesiastical benefices or other spiritual matters and who, upon their repentance, had been restored to the Unity of the Church that they might be able to remain in their orders and benefices, and he has offered to dispense with others who labour under the like disqualification.

We, deeming that the reconciliation of the said Kingdom, upon which depends the salvation of so many souls bought by the most Precious Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquillity of the kingdom itself in the profession of the true Faith and the unity of the Catholic Church, ought not to be disturbed by any affection for earthly things, and having considered and diligently discussed the foregoing with several of Our brethren, the Cardinals of the Roman Church, and having had thereupon mature deliberation, all the dispensations, decrees, confirmation, remission, relaxation and will of Reginald Cardinal and Legate, and as they concern all and each by the said Reginald Cardinal and Legate in the foregoing done and executed and in the said letters contained.

Provided always that those who have been promoted to major as well as minor ecclesiastical Orders, by any other person than a bishop or an archbishop duly and rightly ordained shall be bound to receive the said Orders anew from their ordinary, and shall not in the meanwhile minister in the said Orders.

We, by the aforesaid Apostolic authority and with certain knowledge approve and confirm, and give to them the full and perpetual force of inviolable stability, making good all and singular defects of

law or of fact, if any such there should be in the same, and We decree all these things to be valid and efficacious, and to have their full effect. And notwithstanding, as a more ample precaution, We, by the same Apostolic Authority and as a special act of grace, dispense anew with all those things with which the said Reginald Cardinal and Legate as aforementioned has dispensed in the manner and form aforesaid; but so that those who have been promoted to the aforementioned Orders by any other person than a bishop or archbishop ordained as before mentioned, shall be bound to receive these Orders anew as aforementioned, and in the meantime, as We have said, shall not minister.

And all those things which the aforesaid Reginald Cardinal Legate has decreed, We decree, and to all things to which he has given the force of Apostolic stability, We also give the same force. . . .

Given at Rome at St. Mark's, in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord One Thousand Five Hundred and Fifty-five. The XII Kalends of July, and the first year of Our Pontificate.

#### C). Declaratory Brief of Pope Paul IV

For the future memory hereof.

Presiding, by the disposition of the Lord, albeit with merits insufficient, over the Government of the Universal Church, We gladly consider those things whereby all ecclesiastical persons may be enabled to minister with pure heart and sound conscience in the orders which they have received.

And whereas lately Our beloved son, Reginald Pole, Cardinal Deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin, Legatus a latere of Us and of the Apostolic See in the Kingdom of England, has used the dispensing power in favour of several ecclesiastical persons, seculars and regulars, of the various orders, who, by the pretended authority of the supremacy of the English Church had, in a way which is null and de facto, obtained various grants, dispensations, favours, and indulgences concerning orders as well as ecclesiastical benefices or other spiritual matters, and who, upon their repentance, had been restored to the unity of the Church, so that they might be able to remain in their orders and benefices, and that he has offered to dispense with others who labour under the like disqualification.

We, by Our other letters under seal executed, have approved and confirmed all dispensations of this kind and all singular matters as they concern the same, by the said Reginald, Cardinal and Legate in the aforesaid done and executed, and contained in the letters of the said Reginald, Cardinal and Legate, issued thereupon, provided that those who had been promoted to Orders, major as well as minor, by any other person than a bishop or archbishop duly and rightly ordained should be bound to receive the said Orders anew, from their ordinary, and should not in the meantime minister in these Orders, and by a special act of grace We have dispensed-----as in Our aforesaid letters as well as those of the same Reginald, Cardinal and Legate, is more fully set forth---with all those with whom the Lord Reginald, Cardinal and Legate as aforesaid, had dispensed, in the manner and form (aforesaid), provided that those promoted to Orders aforesaid by any other person than a bishop or an archbishop ordained as aforesaid should be bound to receive the said Orders anew as aforesaid, and in the meantime, as aforesaid, should not minister.

But whereas, as by several it has been lately notified to Us, that doubt has arisen as to what bishops or archbishops, during the course of the schism in the said Kingdom, can be said to be duly and rightly ordained, We, desiring to wholly remove such doubt, and to provide opportunely for the peace of conscience of those who during the aforementioned schism were promoted to Orders, by clearly stating the meaning and intention which We had in our said letters, (declare) that it is only those bishops and archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church that can not be said to be duly and rightly ordained, and therefore the persons promoted by them to these Orders have not received Orders, but ought and are bound to receive anew the said Orders from their ordinary according to the tenor and content of Our aforesaid letters; and that those on whom Orders were conferred by bishops or archbishops ordained and consecrated in the form of the



Church-----even though the said bishops and archbishops were schismatics and had received in times past the Churches over which they preside from the hand of Henry VIII, and Edward VI, pretended Kings of England-----have received the character of the Orders bestowed on them, and lack only the execution of the said Orders, and therefore the dispensation granted to them by Us and Reginald, Cardinal and Legate, has fully rehabilitated them to the execution, of these Orders, so that they may freely minister in the same even without their receiving these Orders anew from their ordinaries, according to the tenor of Our aforesaid letters, and that they are to be so considered by all and so adjudged by all whomsoever by whatsoever authority. And if otherwise in these matters shall happen to be attempted wittingly or unwittingly by whomsoever by whatsoever authority. We declare it to be null and void, the foregoing and Apostolic constitutions and ordinances and other things to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome at St. Mark's on the 30th day of October, 1555.

D) The Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) of Pope Leo XIII. Click [HERE](#).

E). The Letter of Leo XIII to Cardinal Richard on the Authority of the Bull

It is still, to some extent, a disputed question whether the Bull is to be ranked as an infallible document or not. That it is final and irreformable all theologians are agreed, and the distinction between such a decision and one that is formally infallible does not seem easy to draw.

Some theologians were inclined to argue at first that it was evident from the absence of certain customary expressions in the wording of the Bull that the Holy Father could not have intended to use his full power, and that, therefore, it was lawful for Catholics to minimize, as far as possible, the force of his words. Pope Leo XIII subsequently made his intention very clear by the following letter to Cardinal Richard which was published in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*.

To our well-beloved Son, Francis Mary, Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris.  
Beloved Son, salutation and Apostolic benediction.

Taking heed, as Our office is, to religion and the eternal salvation of souls among the English, We have lately put forth, as you know, the Constitution *Apostolicae Curae*. It was Our intention thereby to deliver a final judgment and to settle absolutely that most grave question about Anglican Orders, which indeed was long since lawfully defined by Our predecessors, but by Our indulgence was entirely reheard. And this We did with such weight of argument and in such clear and authoritative tones that no prudent or right-minded man could possibly doubt what Our judgment was, and so all Catholics were bound to receive it with the utmost respect, as being finally settled and determined without any possible appeal. We must, however, confess that certain Catholics have not so responded to it, a matter which has caused Us no little sorrow. We have written this to you, beloved Son, because it especially applies to a certain journal called the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, published in Paris. There are some among its writers who, instead of defending and illustrating this Constitution, try instead to weaken it by explaining it away. Wherefore you must see that nothing is put forth in this journal which is not in full accordance with Our Statements, and it will certainly be better for it to cease and be silent rather than to bring difficulties against these excellent statements and decisions.

In like manner, whereas certain Englishmen who dissent from the Catholic religion, appeared to be enquiring of Us in the spirit of sincerity what was the truth about their ordinations, but received that truth when We had declared it to them before God in a very different spirit, it clearly follows that the Catholics, of whom we have spoken, at least all the religious men amongst them, should know what their duty is. For it is no longer right or fitting for them to join in or assist in any way the plans of such people, for by so doing they might cause no small hindrance to the spread of religion which

they desire.

We therefore willingly confide these serious matters, beloved Son, to your tried prudence and wisdom, and as an auspice of Divine gifts and a proof of Our special goodwill towards you We affectionately impart to you the Apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, the fifth day of November, 1896, in the nineteenth year of our pontificate.

Leo PP. XIII

## Appendix VII

### Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Catholic Church

The text of a conference by Prof. I. P.M. van der Ploeg, D.P., given at Vaals in the Abbey of Saint Benedict to an international reunion of priests, 25/6/1975:

I have been asked to speak to you today on the doctrine of the ministerial priesthood in the Catholic Church, as it is taught us by that same Catholic Church. The doctrine of the priesthood is very wide, for the priest's functions are many. He is ordained to offer sacrifice, administer the Sacraments, be a shepherd of souls, preach the word of God. There is no question of dealing with all that now, even in summary. We wish to consider what is most essential in the priest, how and why he is called "priest," the translation of the Latin word "sacerdos."

It is clear that the very idea of priesthood comes to us, from the historical and even the doctrinal point of view, from the Old Testament, where the priest is called kohen. There was a hierarchy among the priests. At the moment when the new economy of salvation, brought by Jesus Christ, took the place of that of the Old Testament, there were in Israel a high priest, priests and Levites. We now know from scientific study of the Old Testament that the organization of the priesthood, as it was on the threshold of the Christian era and for several centuries before, was the fruit of a development. The history of that development, difficult to fix especially for the stages it has gone through, is not at the moment our concern. We are speaking of the Israelite priesthood only in relation with the Christian priesthood; and what matters, therefore, is the priesthood of the Old Testament as the nascent Church found it and for which she substituted her own.

In spite of the historical fact that the Old Testament priesthood had a history which is at the same time a chronicle of development, there are very old texts which already show the amplitude of the priest's function. In Deut. 33:10, we read in the blessing of Moses on Levi, in the passage dealing with the Levites: "They teach Thy judgments to Jacob and Thy laws to Israel; they make incense rise to Thy nostrils and put the holocaust on Thine altar." According to this text, the Levites have a double function: they teach and they sacrifice. In the course of time the second becomes the principal function, if it was not that already. In Our Lord's time, the doctors of the law were not necessarily priests or levites; it even seems that most of them were not. In Judaism at present, which is deprived of sacrifice, the rabbi has for a long time been taking the place of the priest-teacher, while the function of the kohen (the former priest) is limited to pronouncing the sacred words of blessing on the community at the end of meetings in the synagogue.

According to the current idea, the priest is defined by the sacrifice: he is the man, taken from among the rest, appointed to offer a sacrifice to the Divinity in the name of a community. That definition contains several elements of which the chief are the acts of sacrifice and mediation. However, it is not necessary that there be mediation: one can offer sacrifice just for oneself. Moreover, it is not necessary to be a priest in order to sacrifice. Abraham sacrificed in many places; he is sometimes called "prophet" but never "priest." But to be a priest without there being sacrifice is not possible. Here care is needed. In the study of comparative religion there are many problems of priesthood and sacrifice. But it is not under that aspect that we ask what is the meaning of the Christian priesthood and sacrifice. We deal with this problem or, rather, this fact of faith, starting from the Faith itself and therefore also from its sources, Scripture and Tradition, presented to us by the Magisterium of the Church and interpreted by it.

#### The Priesthood in Scripture

In the New Testament, only the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks explicitly of the priesthood of the New Law. That Epistle has been attributed by tradition to Saint Paul; but about that there was great hesitation (to say nothing else) in the West from the second century to the fourth. Doubts were cast

not only on the apostolic authenticity of the Epistle but also on its canonicity, the two things being thought to be connected. When she added it in the last place to the corpus of the Pauline Epistles, the Church expressed not only her faith in its canonicity but also her acceptance of its doctrinal value by which (apart from other arguments) it deserves to be given a place with the other Epistles of the great apostle. Its doctrine is part of the very foundation of Catholic and Apostolic doctrine.

Now it is precisely this Epistle which presents us with the doctrine of the priesthood of the New Law. That doctrine we know. According to the inspired author, there took place, in the economy of salvation, a transference of the priesthood of the tribe of Levi to Jesus Christ, the only High Priest of the New Law, Who offered Himself to the Father once and for all in the sacrifice of the Cross, sacrifice in which He is at one and the same time Priest and Victim. There, in a few words, is the doctrine of the Christian priesthood as it is put before us by the New Testament.

By that doctrine the words "priest" and "sacrifice" take on eminently Christian meanings, and we must start from them in speaking of the priesthood of Christian priests and of the sacrifice of the Mass. That is very important, and it closes the road against those who want to approach the doctrine of the Christian ministerial priesthood and of the sacrifice of the Mass starting from ideas of the priest and of his sacrifice which they find elsewhere. All the same, that is not entirely false, for, to speak of priests and sacrifice, one must have a general notion of them. But it is none the less true that it is from the affirmations of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews about the priesthood of Christ, outside which there is no Christian priesthood, and about the uniqueness of His sacrifice, that we must begin our effort to understand the ministerial priesthood and the sacrifice of the Mass, relating them to Jesus Christ.

Let us return to the Epistle to the Hebrews. We find there these words, which are almost a definition: "Every high priest is taken from among men and is ordained for men that he may offer up gifts (dora) and sacrifices (thusias) for sins" (5:1). Or again: "Every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices" (8:3). That is clear, and it is that which constitutes the very essence of priesthood as the Church understands it.

As for sacrifice, the Epistle teaches very clearly that Jesus Himself, high priest for ever "according to the order of Melchisedech" (5:6), is at the same time priest and victim; His sacrifice is the voluntary act by which He offered Himself to the Father by letting Himself be killed by men, for the salvation of the world. That sacrifice was offered only once, to take away the sins "of many," and it does not therefore need to be repeated, like the sacrifices of the old law. Jesus entered once into the sanctuary (Heaven) having obtained eternal redemption by His own blood (9:12). That is the great doctrine of the Epistle.

When the New Testament speaks in other texts of the Christian "priesthood," it is in a very different sense. It treats of what is now called "the priesthood common to the people of God." One such text is found in the First Epistle of Saint Peter, where the Apostle tells his readers that they are "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices ('pneumatikis thusias'), acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (2:5). A little further on he calls them "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people, that you may declare the virtues of Him Who has called you out of darkness into His marvellous light" (2:9). In the Apocalypse of Saint John, the author tells us that Jesus Christ "has loved us and washed us from our sins in His Blood and has made us a kingdom and priests for God His Father" (1:5-6). He repeats in substance the same words in the text of a canticle sung in Heaven (5:9-10), adding that they "will reign on the earth" (5:10). Towards the end of the work the author returns to the theme, emphasizing that those who will take part in the "first resurrection" "will be priests of God and of Christ with Whom they will reign for a thousand years" (20:6).

All these texts speak of the privileged position of those who are saved by the Blood of Christ, and the words "priest," "reign" and "kingdom" are not to be taken in the ordinary and literal sense. They

recall the Old Testament from which they have been taken, notably Exod. 19:6 and Isa. 61:6. These two texts speak of the great privilege of Israel, the one people chosen out of all the others, the only one called to draw near to its God, the one God, to serve Him in a very special way. Just as the priests, chosen from among the Israelites, draw near to God to serve His altar, so the whole of Israel, chosen from among the people of the earth, serves the God of Israel by doing His will. That position is transferred, in the New Testament, to the new people of God: the Church and the faithful. These latter are the new elect. They are therefore called "priests." They are brought together in a "kingdom" where all "reign," that is to say, they are invested with an almost princely dignity, which ranks them above all others. According to Saint Peter they should offer "spiritual sacrifices," that is, praise God and glorify Him with good works.

The New Testament, then, speaks explicitly of the priesthood and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ and also of the priesthood and the sacrifices of the faithful. Amongst those who are called "priests" (hiereis, plural of hieresus) in the technical sense, the sacred ministers of the New Testament are not included. The Council of Trent teaches us that at the Last Supper Jesus ordained His Apostles priests and gave them power to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice, but neither the word "priest" nor the term "sacrifice" is to be found in the Gospel narratives. The full meaning of the texts in question is fully certain only within the tradition of the Church. We shall come back to it.

The Acts and the Epistles several times mention the episkopoi and the presbuteroi (from which our word "priest" is derived), who are entrusted with important functions in the community of the Church; but they are not given the title of "priest." That title is reserved, in the literal sense, to Christ; but in the metaphorical and spiritual sense it is reserved to the faithful.

We know that Protestantism denied, and still denies, the institution of a ministerial priesthood by Jesus Christ. It could hardly do otherwise: having rejected the authority of the Church, above all her magisterium and consequently her tradition, Protestantism withdrew behind the rampart of the Bible; logically it rejects anything which is not there clearly expressed, and therefore the ministerial priesthood as the Church understands it.

We Catholics, however, accept Holy Scripture as an integral part of the living tradition of the Church; it is by her that we know it, it is by her that it is interpreted, it is she who teaches what the letter of the Bible does not say or does not say clearly enough (Con. Vat. II, De Revelatione, 8). For Saint Thomas Aquinas, the Apostles have transmitted to us many things concerning the Sacraments which have not been recorded in Holy Scripture (S.Theol. III, 72, 4 ad 1). It is above all in the doctrine of the Sacraments that he appeals to Apostolic tradition, which he rarely does elsewhere.

### The Priesthood in the Early Church

The nascent Church did not wish to give to her sacred ministers the name "priests," so as to avoid all misunderstanding. The old law of sacrifices having been abolished, a new economy of salvation had begun. It was not immediately desirable that the ministers of the new Law should be called "priests," still less "Levites," for those names were reserved for the priesthood of the old Testament. Outside Israel the word "priest" even had a pagan flavour. But the Church soon perceived the deep parallelism existing between the ministers of the two economies of salvation. In the second century we already come across the word sacerdos for the Christian priest, even summus sacerdos for the bishop, in the writings of Tertullian (160-after 220), who speaks of sacerdotalia munera, sacerdotale officium, being exercised in the Christian Church. Saint Cyprian (200/10-258; bishop in 248/9) knows the tripartite division of the ministers of the Church into bishops, presbuteroi, deacons; and to specify the first two categories he also uses the word sacerdos. To explain that, it seems unnecessary to have recourse to the parallelism Old Testament----New Testament; in Latin, presbyter was still a foreign word, and sacerdos was not. But if, early on, the presbuteroi began to be called sacerdotes, that, even so, proves that the term was well suited to their function. In the Churches of the East the words hieresus, hierosune (priest, priesthood), etc., appear very early to

designate the ministers of the New Testament, bishops and priests. In the Apostolic Constitutions, an apocryphal work of Syrian origin (c. 380), we read that, as Moses had instituted a high priest, priests and Levites, the Lord instituted in His Church Apostles-----James, Clement and others----- who all instituted "presbyters," deacons, subdeacons and rectors. The analogy with the priesthood of the Old Testament is clearly expressed (VIII:46,13). The author continues with an even clearer expression: "He who by His nature is the first pontiff (archiereus), Christ, the only Son, did not snatch the honour for Himself but was instituted by the Father; becoming man for our sake and offering to God His Father the spiritual sacrifice (thusian) before the Passion, He commanded only us to do that, though there are other men with us who have received the faith, but it goes without saying that it is not because a man has received the faith that he has already been instituted priest (hiereus) or has received the dignity of pontiff (archieratikes axias). After His Ascension, we ourselves (i.e. the Apostles), offering according to His command a pure and unbloody sacrifice, chose bishops and presbyters and seven deacons" (VIII:46, 14-15). A little further on the author tells his readers that Stephen, the first deacon, was never seen to do what did not belong to his ministry as deacon, "offering the sacrifice or laying hands on any one" (VIII: 46, 16).

There already is the whole doctrine of the priesthood of the ministers of the Christian cult, just as it will later be proposed, repeated rather, by the Council of Trent. The ministerial priesthood is there connected with that of Christ and there is an unbloody sacrifice which only priests can offer. Although the Apostolic Constitutions were written in the 4th century, probably in Syria, the author presents their doctrine as already old, as coming from the Apostles. He could not have done that had it been a complete innovation. It is true that the synod "in Trullo" (the Quinisextum, 692, not received by Rome) rejected the Apostolic Constitutions as "falsified by the heretics" (the author was Arian), but still it did make chapter 47 of book VIII its own, the so-called "Apostolic Canons" of which the second speaks of the sacrifice (thusia) which the bishop or the presbyters offer "on the altar of God."

Two eastern Fathers well known for their writings on the priesthood are Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint John Chrysostom. The first (320/30-390) was ordained priest by his father, bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia (Asia Minor), against his will. Yielding at first to the entreaties of the community, he soon withdrew from his new ministry by flight. To justify that, he wrote his "Apologia for my flight to Pontus," in which he set out the duties of the priest, especially his pastoral duties. In this exposition, the first of its kind in the East, bishop and priest are often given the name hiereus. Much better known is the celebrated work of Saint John Chrysostom (344/54-407), *Peri Hierosunes*, "On the Priesthood," in six books, written about 396. The work is pastoral and has had an enormous success down to the present day. For Saint John, the hiereus, the priest tout court, is the bishop. In Book III, chapter 4, there is a sublime passage which treats of his sacerdotal ministry. "Although the priesthood," he says, "is exercised on earth, its place is with the heavenly institutions. It is the Holy Ghost Who established it and Who wished that men of flesh should exercise the ministry of Angels. The priest therefore should be as pure as if he dwelt in Heaven with the Angelic powers. In the Old Testament, the adornments of the high priest struck fear into the Israelites; but we must say with the Apostle: "What, in that, was glorious is glorious no longer, because of the glory which excels" (2 Cor. 3:10); and the author continues: "When you see the Lord lying immolated (tethumenon), and the priest standing before the sacrifice (toi thumati) and praying, and all become red with this Precious Blood, do you think you are still on earth among men? Do you not, rather, feel lifted up to Heaven? . . . O admirable vision! o love of God for man! He Who is enthroned in the heights with the Father is at this moment touched by the hands of all!" "At the sacrifice of Elias on Mount Carmel"-----it is still Saint John Chrysostom-----"fire fell upon the holy sacrifice. With us, the priest brings down not fire but the Holy Ghost; grace comes down upon the sacrifice and sets on fire the souls of all. It is a terrible mystery; no human soul could endure that flame of the sacrifice if God did not help with His powerful grace."

A third author, this time from the West, who has treated at length of the ministry of the pastors of the Church is Saint Gregory the Great (540-604; Pope 590-604), in his *Regula Pastoralis* written in

590 when he was elected Peter's successor. It is addressed to the bishop of Ravenna. Like the two preceding works, this also is pastoral in character; the holy Pope is setting out his own programme as Pastor of the Church.

The meaning of the texts quoted is clear; but others are sometimes less so. When the Fathers and the old ecclesiastical writers speak of the Christian priesthood and sacrifice, one must always be careful to ask in what sense they use those words-----in the literal, or in a metaphorical and "spiritual" sense. Great circumspection is required when it is a question of finding Catholic doctrine with certainty. That is why some hesitate to quote in this context the famous text of the Didache, chapter 14 (which seems clear enough, but which is short), where the celebration of the Eucharist is called a sacrifice (thusia) by which the famous prophecy of Malachy (1:11) is fulfilled. Reluctance to interpret such a text has its roots in the Old Testament. After the exile there was an increasingly marked tendency in the people of Israel to give to prayer, above all the prayer of praise, a value equal to or even greater than ritual sacrifices. The great majority of the Jews, many of whom lived in exile, in the Diaspora, could assist at the temple sacrifices only rarely in their lives, or perhaps never. But the more pious had the custom of praying several times a day, turned towards the temple; and for them that sufficed: for them prayer took the place of sacrifice.

Saint Paul speaks of "the sacrifice (thusia) and the liturgy of our faith" (Phil. 2:17): that is faith itself, living in works. The material gifts of the Church of Philippi which Epaphroditus had just brought to the apostle in prison are called "an odour of sweetness (a sacrificial term, cf. Exod. 29:18, 41), a sacrifice (thusian) which God receives and finds acceptable" (Phil. 4:18). The apostle writes to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, brethren . . . to offer your persons a living sacrifice (thusian zosan), holy, pleasing to God; that is your spiritual worship" (ten logiken latreian humon) (Rom. 12:1). To the Hebrews: "By Him (by Christ) we offer to God a sacrifice of praise (thusian aineseos), that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing His name. As to deeds of kindness and the sharing of goods . . . it is in such sacrifices (thusiais) that God takes pleasure" (Heb. 13:15-16). The First Epistle of Saint Peter exhorts the Christians, called "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people" (1 Peter 2:9) "to offer up spiritual sacrifices (pneumatikis thusias) acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2:5); according to the author the whole of the Christian life should be a worship pleasing to God.

In the light of these texts from Holy Scripture there is clearly a difficulty in deciding the exact meaning of chapter 14 of the Didache and of certain other words of writers of Christian antiquity. The unexpected novelty of the new economy of salvation was not expressed at once in perfectly clear and unambiguous language-----which should surprise no one. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the Church became more and more aware of the whole content of the revealed truth entrusted to her by her Lord and God. As regards the Christian priesthood, this awareness was achieved very quickly, in a concordant and harmonious way. The texts quoted from the Apostolic Constitutions and from Saint John Chrysostom are proof of that. Is more required? The sacrificial character of the Eucharistic celebration is nowhere more vigorously affirmed and emphasized than in the old liturgy of the Nestorian Church which prefers to be called "The Church of the East" tout court. That affirmation is repeated throughout the ceremony. When the anaphora begins, the priest, instead of saying "Let us give thanks to the Lord," as in the other liturgies, sings aloud: "A sacrifice is offered to Almighty God." An anonymous commentator on this liturgy, writing in the 11th century, does not want more than one priest to celebrate ("concelebrare") at the altar, because there the priest is taking the place of Christ Who is the only High Priest of the New Testament. The Eucharistic liturgy is called not only qurbana, a word which could be translated strictly by "offering," but also debheta, a word which means a bloody sacrifice and which carries us back to the sacrifice of Our Lord on the Cross. The witness of the "Church of the East" is of special importance because that Church very early declared itself independent of the others (in 424, under Persian influence) and developed after that in isolation. If the doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is there so plainly asserted, it is because there we have an authentic Christian doctrine contained in the deposit of revelation.

## The Priesthood and the Council of Trent

Let us now make a leap ahead and speak of the Council of Trent. For centuries, and all through the Middle Ages, the Church remained in peaceful possession of the doctrine of the priesthood and that of the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Protestantism of the 16th century brought that peace to an end. By their revolt against the Catholic Church, Luther and the other reformers rejected the magisterium of the Church and put the Bible in its place: sola scriptura. They rejected as well-----and that was logical-----the Divine origin of her hierarchy and the sacramental character of her priesthood. They denied that the bread and the wine are substantially and totally changed into the Body and the Blood of Christ and that the Mass is a true sacrifice. The Catholic Mass was even one of Luther's bêtes noires, and he fought against it all his life. Faced with such extensive disagreements, the Church had to affirm her age-long doctrine; and that she did in the Council of Trent.

When they dealt with the priesthood and the Eucharist, the Fathers of the Council pronounced first on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, in a dogmatic declaration dated 17th September 1562: "So that the ancient, complete, and in every way perfect faith and teaching regarding the great mystery of the Eucharist may be retained in the Catholic Church, and with the removal of errors and heresies may be preserved in its purity, the holy, ecumenical and general Council of Trent lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, instructed by the light of the Holy Ghost, teaches, declares and orders to be preached to the faithful what follows concerning the true and only sacrifice of the Eucharist" (D-S. 1738). Thus begins the teaching of the Council on the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In the first place it recalls the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ taught by the Epistle to the Hebrews and then that of the Last Supper when the Lord gave His Church a visible sacrifice to represent the bloody sacrifice offered on the Cross, the memory of which has been perpetuated through the centuries. It recalls the institution of the Apostles as priests of the New Law at the Last Supper, the new Pasch of the Church which the priests immolate under visible signs in memory of the death of the Lord. And it adds: "In this Divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass there is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ Who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross" (D-S. 1743). The Synod teaches that the Mass is truly propitiatory; it gains grace, the gift of repentance, and the remission of crimes and sins, however great they may be. "For the victim is one and the same (una enim eademque), the same now offering by the ministry of priests Who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different (sola offerendi ratione diversa)" (D-S. 1743).

Of the nine canons following this declaration we note the first three:

1. "If anyone shall say that in the Mass a true and real sacrifice (verum et proprium sacrificium) is not offered to God, or that this offering (offerri) is only in the fact that Christ is given us to eat: let him be anathema.
2. If anyone shall say that by the words: 'Do this in commemoration of me' Christ did not institute the Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His Body and His Blood: let him be anathema.
3. If anyone shall say that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross, and not propitiatory; or that it profits only him who receives Communion and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities: let him be anathema." (D-S. 1751-1753).

A year later, on 15 July, 1563, the same Council promulgated its text of the Catholic doctrine of order (the priesthood): "The true and Catholic doctrine . . . to condemn the errors of our time" (D-S. 1763). There we read: "Sacrifice and priesthood are by the ordinance of God so united that both have existed in every law. Since, therefore, in the New Testament the Catholic Church has received from Christ the holy, visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must also be confessed (tateri etiam



oportet) that there is in that Church a new, visible and external priesthood into which the old has been translated. That this was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood was given the power of consecrating, offering and administering His Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins, is shown by the Sacred Scriptures and has always been taught by the tradition of the Catholic Church" (D-S. 1764). That doctrine is also affirmed with anathema in the canons which follow, the fourth of which states that in Holy Orders a character is imprinted (D-S. 1774). In that teaching the Council repeats in part what it had already taught concerning the Sacraments in general: "If anyone shall say that in three Sacraments, namely Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, there is not imprinted on the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark (signum quoddam) . . . let him be anathema" (D-S. 1609).

The doctrine of the Council of Trent has the great merit of being clear, unambiguous, definitive. It is presented as the Catholic doctrine of all time; it demands our complete and unconditional assent. Apart from the Council of Trent the Church has never pronounced with its solemn and infallible magisterium on the ministerial priesthood and the sacrifice of the Mass which is indissolubly united with it. Until the Council of Trent there had been no need to do so; after the Council she felt no need, as the Council had expressed itself so clearly and so solemnly. It is important to notice that Trent pronounced first on the sacrifice of the Mass and only afterwards on the priesthood, in words partly the same. It is above all the sacrifice of the Mass which determines what the priest is. The power of offering it was given at the Last Supper-----doctrine which we have already met in the Apostolic Constitutions.

When Pope Pius IV formulated and promulgated the so-called "profession of faith of the Council of Trent" (1564, at the closure of the Council), he was careful to bring into it explicitly the doctrine of the Mass and the Eucharist (D-S. 1866); the priesthood is mentioned as one of the seven Sacraments, which cannot be repeated without sacrilege (D-S. 1864). The long formula of the profession of faith of the Council of Trent was superseded in 1967 by a shorter one (published in *Acta Ap. Sedis*, 20-12-1967, p. 1058). After the Credo of the Mass, it runs: "Firmiter quoque amplector et retineo omnia et singula quae circa doctrinam de fide et moribus ab Ecclesia, sive solemn iudicio definita sive ordinario magisterio adserta et declarata sunt, prout ab ipsa proponuntur, praesertim ea quae respiciunt mysterium sanctae Ecclesiae Christi, eiusque Sacramenta et Missae Sacrificium atque Primatum Romani Pontificis," "I firmly accept and believe each and all of the affirmations and declarations of the Church with respect to the doctrine of faith and morals, whether made by her solemn judgment or by her ordinary magisterium, as they are proposed by her, especially what concerns the mystery of the Holy Church of Christ, her Sacraments and the sacrifice of the Mass as well as the primacy of the Roman Pontiff." The doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is thus explicitly mentioned therein, and it is no other than that of the Council of Trent.

### The Priesthood in the 20th Century

Since the beginning of this century there have been several pontifical and conciliar documents which treat of the Catholic ministerial priesthood. Their content is above all pastoral. The principal ones are these:

1. Apostolic exhortation *Haerent Animo* to the clergy by Saint Pius X, 4 August 1908. It was published by the holy pontiff on the occasion of his golden jubilee as a priest. It is wholly pastoral. After the usual introduction and an exhortation to holiness for the priests, Saint Pius X impresses on them that the priest represents Christ as His delegate who has to win men for the doctrine and the law of the Lord; he must therefore practise holiness, and that above all (maxime) as His minister in the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass. The whole exhortation to the clergy is a call to the holiness demanded by the sacred ministry of the priest, who is shepherd of souls, and who administers the sacraments and offers to God the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

2. Encyclical *Ad Catholici Sacerdotii* of Pius XI, 20 December 1935. The encyclical begins by recalling that, since his elevation to the summit of the Catholic priesthood, the Pope has been striving to promote the education and the formation of future priests. The dignity of the priest comes from the power he has received over the Body and Blood of Christ which he offers on the altar, as well as his power over His Mystical Body by the administration of the other Sacraments, among which absolution from sins has a special place. The pontiff then speaks of the duty of priests to be holy; he gives particular mention to their celibacy; and, in the third part of the letter, he treats of the preparation for the priesthood of those who feel called to Holy Orders. The Encyclical, as is right, does not fail to stress the intimate and essential union which exists between the priest and the sacrifice of the Mass. He recalls the central position of sacrifice and priesthood in the law of the Old Testament, saying that the majesty and glory of its priesthood derive from the fact that it prefigures the Christian priesthood and sacrifice.

3. Encyclical *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII, 20 November 1947. This document deals with the sacred liturgy of the Catholic Church and treats at length of the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice and of the priesthood both ministerial and "common" (of the faithful). The doctrine of the Council of Trent is quoted and explained at length.

4. Apostolic exhortation *Menti Nostrae* of Pius XII, 23 September 1950. This exhortation to holiness for priests is a real gem; its doctrine far surpasses in profundity that of earlier documents of sovereign Pontiffs. At the beginning of the first part, the Pope recalls the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Priests, he says, are the ministers of the Divine Saviour, firstly and above all to offer to God the holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist. Representing the Person of Christ in that Sacrifice, and consecrating the bread and the wine, which are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, they can obtain from that source of supernatural life infinite riches of salvation and all the means they need for themselves and to accomplish their ministry among the faithful. The priest should sacrifice himself with Christ, he should unite himself with Christ, suffering in his interior and exterior life. The exhortation insists on that: the sacrifice of Christ, with which the sacrifice of the Eucharist is one, must be the centre of priestly life. The underlying idea is clear: the priest has been ordained firstly to offer the sacrifice; that is the first reason for his being what he is, a reason full of profound meaning and spiritual riches. No other document of the ordinary magisterium better brings sacrifice into relief as the fundamental reason for the priest's existence.

5. Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* of Paul VI, 3 September 1965. It treats of the doctrine of the Eucharist and speaks at length of the sacrifice of the Mass. The Pope quotes a text of Saint John Chrysostom, from one of his homilies (Enc. no. 38; Saint John Chr., P.G. 62, 612) which speaks of the unity of the sacrifice offered in the Church, whether it is Peter or Paul who offers it or the priests of today. The encyclical deals with the ministerial priesthood only indirectly or in passing.

6. Decree *Presbyterorum Ordinis* of Vatican II, 7 December 1965. This decree is pastoral, as the whole Council wished to be; but in it are to be found such passages as this: "Priests (presbyteri) must teach the faithful that in the sacrifice of the Mass the Divine Victim is offered to the Father." It is said also that priests (always called presbyteri) ordained by the bishop participate in a special way in the priesthood of Christ. In the celebration of Mass they offer the sacrifice of Christ in a sacramental way (sacramental iter) (all that is in no. 5).

7. Encyclical *Sacerdotialis Caelibatus* of Paul VI, 24 June 1967. This very important document is at once doctrinal, historical and pastoral. In the doctrinal part Paul VI explains how and why it is fitting that priests should observe celibacy. The encyclical says also, with good reason, that the Christian priesthood, which is new, can be understood only in the light of Christ, Pontiff over all, eternal priest, supreme, Who instituted the priesthood of His ministers as a true communication of His unique priesthood (no. 19). The ministerial priest participates in the mission of the eternal Mediator and High Priest.

In these documents we meet always the same doctrine, taught unflinchingly, and deepened in an extraordinary way in the Exhortation of Pius XII. That doctrine is explicitly present from the earliest times, and it has never been obscured. In the Catholic Church the image of the priest of Jesus Christ was never degraded to make him like a Protestant pastor, simply a preacher or a social worker. That has been reserved for our day.

That doctrine about the priest, in which the offering to God of the sacrifice of the Mass is the first and most necessary duty, is of prime importance in our time when it is tending to be obscured. The obscuring of this doctrine is matched by an obscuring of the idea of God, which is invading even the Church and affecting some of the clergy. For some of them, the article of faith that God, omnipotent Being and totally distinct from this world which He freely created and which must therefore serve Him, is no longer a very living truth; the idea grows weaker and even disappears. The result is that prayer, above all the prayer of adoration, tends to disappear. But sacrifice is par excellence the act of religion by which man manifests his subjection, his total dependence, before God. He bows profoundly before Him, adores Him, asks pardon from Him for his sins, and makes acts of reparation and satisfaction. That is already true of man's sacrifice. But the sacrifice of Christ is infinitely more: it is the act of perfect adoration, perfect thanksgiving, perfect satisfaction and reparation, perfect prayer. To be able to value and celebrate Mass as is fitting, it is necessary to be deeply imbued with that truth. But our contemporaries are less and less so imbued, for their attention moves away increasingly from God to turn to the world and its delights, often so deceptive and in any case fleeting. That is one reason why there is so much insistence on what is called "the meal-element" in the "eucharistic celebration," which becomes a community, or even a family, gathering in which adoration has no great place. The Divinity of Christ is less and less confessed by our contemporaries, even those who still call themselves "Catholics," and His humanity (if it is thought about at all) is put first. The result is that the priest, the man made for the offering of sacrifice, more and more loses the reason for his existence, and his importance. Holy Communion, participation in Christ sacrificed for us, becomes an act signifying union with the others rather than with Christ, Who is scarcely or not at all thought about once He has been received. All that holds together-----it is the logic of (false) ideas realized in acts. It is the logical consequence of the "humanization," the "secularization," of the priesthood. But our ministry is not "human" in that sense, it is essentially supernatural; our priesthood is a participation in the priesthood of Christ Himself and it originates only from Him. It is not governed by human laws or the manners and customs of the day, least of all of a day like ours, but by the law of Christ alone Who is the same yesterday, today and for ever. May the priest, poor sinner that he is, never forget his high dignity which brings him close to the Angels and puts him at the service of the men of God.

#### ADDENDUM

In the preceding pages we could have fully quoted and discussed St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian and a good number of other Fathers and ecclesiastical authors, in whose writings the doctrine of sacrifice (and therefore of priesthood) is clearly referred to the Eucharist. But we could not do this in our lecture because of the time we had at our disposition. We had to make a choice among texts which needed little or no interpretation. The doctrine of priesthood and (eucharistic) sacrifice is as old as the Catholic Church.

## Appendix VIII ARCIC-----The Vatican Response

The initials ARCIC stand for the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. It was established as a result of a meeting in 1966 between Pope Paul VI and Dr. Michael Ramsey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and its mandate was to examine the doctrines which separate Catholics and Anglicans and to see if, in at least some cases, a consensus could be reached which would facilitate the path to corporate reunion. The first two topics to be discussed were the Eucharist and the Ministry, and the resulting Agreed Statements are examined in Chapters V and VI. They were the only ARCIC documents examined in the first edition of this book. ARCIC published elucidations on the two agreements in 1979. It also published agreements on Authority in the Church in 1976 and 1981, and an elucidation of the first of these agreements in 1981. A chronological list of documents relating to ARCIC is included as an addendum to this appendix. This appendix will indicate the virtual identity between my criticisms of the agreements and the criticisms to be found in the 1991 Vatican Response.

Many Catholics regarded the entire ARCIC exercise with a profound scepticism which the 1991 Vatican Response proved to be more than amply justified. It is pointless to attempt to discover a consensus on the Eucharist and priesthood between Catholics and Anglicans in view of the fact that it would be hard to establish a consensus as to what Anglicans themselves believe concerning these Sacraments (they do not even believe that the priesthood is a Sacrament, and claim that Our Lord instituted only two, Baptism and the Eucharist). Some Anglo-Catholic ministers have a belief in the Real Presence equivalent to that of Catholics, even if they are reluctant to use the term transubstantiation. But the Evangelical clergy, and they are in the overwhelming majority, espouse the totally Protestant doctrine of Thomas Cranmer which has been described with complete accuracy as "the real absence", and, like Cranmer, they insist that the only sacrificial element in the Anglican Communion Service is one of praise and thanksgiving. Article XXXI of the Thirty-Nine Articles, to which all Anglican ministers must subscribe, teaches that:

Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

ARCIC published its Agreed Statement on the Eucharist in 1971. This first agreement was entitled the Windsor Agreement after the location in which the Commission pursued its deliberations, a practice adopted with its subsequent documents. Catholics with a knowledge of Anglicanism were astonished to learn that the Catholic and Anglican members of the Commission claimed to have reached substantial agreement as to the nature of the Eucharist. Astonishment turned to indignation when the text of the Agreement was published. The most charitable description of its content was one of calculated ambiguity. Although the Catholic teaching was never specifically repudiated it was never specifically affirmed. One was reminded of Newman's comment on the manner in which the Arians drew up their creeds: "Was it not on the principle of using vague ambiguous language, which to the subscribers would seem to bear a Catholic sense, but which, when worked out in the long run, would prove to be heterodox?"<sup>1</sup> The Windsor Agreement evoked a furore, and its critics were able to prove without difficulty that it was, as Father Edward Holloway expressed it, "a betrayal of the Catholic Faith" (see Chap. V). The Catholic members of ARCIC responded to their critics by using the tried and tested method employed by Catholic liberals whenever they have been criticised for undermining the Faith since Vatican II-----they simply ignored their critics and carried on as if they did not exist.

The critics of ARCIC were, then, well prepared for its second Agreed Statement reached (appropriately enough) at Canterbury in 1973. Without the least sign of embarrassment the co-chairmen proclaimed that substantial agreement had now been reached on the priesthood, and purported to prove this with yet another series of calculated ambiguities. The response of loyal

Catholics to what they saw correctly as a second betrayal of the Faith was even more indignant than that provoked by the Windsor Agreement (the basis for their indignation is set out in Chapter VI). The response of the Catholic members of ARCIC was once more to ignore the well-founded and well-documented case of their critics. It was manifest that their aim was no longer to see if there was a basis for agreement between Catholics and Anglicans on the Eucharist and the priesthood, but to reach such an agreement at any cost. The possibility of failure was one which they could not envisage. At Salisbury in 1979 ARCIC concocted what purported to be elucidations of the two Agreed Statements in the light of criticisms received, but the elucidations did no more than add insult to injury by the arrogant manner in which they not only insisted on the validity of the two Agreed Statements, but went even further by demanding the recognition of Anglican Orders despite the fact that the Catholic delegates knew very well that the encyclical *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII, which condemned them as invalid, is the final word on the subject and is completely irreversible.

ARCIC arrogance is well demonstrated in its elucidation of the Canterbury Agreement. It states that its agreements constitute the context in which the question of Anglican Orders must now be discussed:

This calls for a reappraisal of the verdict on Anglican Orders in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896). Mutual recognition presupposes acceptance of the apostolicity of each other's ministry. The Commission believes that its agreements have demonstrated a consensus in faith on eucharist and ministry which has brought closer the possibility of such acceptance. It hopes that its own convictions will be shared by members of both our communions; but mutual recognition can only be achieved by the decision of our authorities. It has been our mandate to offer to them the basis upon which they may make this decision.

Commenting upon the Elucidations in the 29 June 1979 issue of *The Universe* (Britain's largest circulation Catholic weekly), Father Edward Carey, an English theologian, wrote:

The labours of ARCIC have not brought Anglicans and Catholics nearer in doctrine. Rather, the specialized jargon, the ambiguities and even equivocations of the Agreed Statements have inhibited any real dialogue and provide no progress towards unity.

ARCIC had also produced the Agreement on Authority at Venice in 1976. An elucidation duly appeared in 1981, and a second Agreement on Authority was produced at Windsor in 1981. The level of convergence claimed for these agreements was much less than that alleged to have been achieved in the statements on the Eucharist and Ministry. This was because despite the scarcely credible concessions made by the Catholic delegates it was not possible to explain away the dogma of papal infallibility, or the infallible nature of the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, which the Anglican delegates would not accept at any price. The integrity of the Anglican delegates in this respect does them credit, and they insisted upon the following reservation being included in the Second Agreement on Authority:

The dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption raise a special problem for those Anglicans who do not consider that the precise definitions given by these dogmas are sufficiently supported by Scripture. For many Anglicans the teaching authority of the Bishop of Rome independent of a council, is not recommended by the fact that through it these Marian doctrines were proclaimed as dogmas binding on all the faithful. Anglicans would also ask whether in any future union between our two Churches, they would be required to subscribe to such dogmatic statements.

The entire credibility of the Catholic Church is involved in the certainty that these two dogmas are infallibly true in virtue of their having been proclaimed *ex cathedra* by the Sovereign Pontiff. There could never be any question of reducing them to the status of optional beliefs in order to facilitate

organic reunion with the Anglican Communion which, despite the fact that it is referred to constantly as such throughout the Agreed Statements, does not constitute a Church.

All the Agreed Statements, together with their Elucidations, were collected together in The Final Report in September 1981 and submitted for approval by the Holy See and the Anglican Synod. 2

### Twofold Interpretations

Catholics owe a profound debt of gratitude to the Reverend Julian Charley, an Anglican theologian appointed to ARCIC. It is Dr. Charley more than any other individual who has done most to prove that the ARCIC Agreements can be interpreted in a manner that is totally incompatible with the teaching of the Church. He did this in the commentaries that he wrote upon the first two agreements. When the Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist was published Dr. Charley and Bishop Clark both wrote commentaries intended to show that the Agreement was compatible with the beliefs of their respective communions. Their approach was as follows. Bishop Clark claimed that as the Agreement nowhere states that the Mass is not a sacrifice it clearly affirms that it is:

Though, as has been noted by several critics, there is no categorical assertion that the Eucharist is a sacrifice (for reasons which will become clear) neither has this been excluded. In fact the whole thrust of the reasoning here is that the Eucharist makes present the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ here and now. 3

Dr. Charley claimed that the Agreement taught the opposite:

Much of what Küng has called "the valid demands of the reformers" has now been met by the Church of Rome in the New Eucharistic Prayers, though even in these there remain echoes of the pre-Reformation language of Eucharistic sacrifice. However, the present Statement avoids any suggestion of re-presenting Christ's death. What is made present is not the historical sacrifice of Christ itself, but the efficacy of it----the making effective in the present of an event in the past. 4

Bishop Clark insists that the Agreement teaches that the Eucharist makes present Christ's sacrifice "here and now", and Dr. Charley insists that it "avoids any suggestion" of doing this, and that only the "efficacy of it" is made present in the Eucharist, a claim which could be reconciled with the Eucharistic teaching of such extreme Protestants as Bucer and Zwingli.

If this does not constitute proof of an ambiguous formulation it would be hard to know what does. Dr. Charley returned to the topic again in his commentary upon the Agreement on the Ministry: "The statement spoke explicitly of the sacrifice of Christ, but it never described the Eucharist as a sacrifice, even a 'substantial agreement' did not require that." 5 Another Anglican commentator, the Reverend Colin Buchanan, remarked that Thomas Cranmer could have signed this agreement, while his Catholic opponents could not, and that its statements about "the presence of Christ in the Sacrament go very much with his use of language, and the footnote explaining away transubstantiation without committing anyone to it would have made him chortle." 6

The critics of ARCIC were not in the least surprised when, in May 1982, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (SCDF) published its response to The Final Report to find that, despite a few platitudes acknowledging ecumenical progress, it showed that, where authentic Catholic teaching is concerned, the ARCIC documents were devoid of any credibility. 7 The ecumenical bureaucracy was outraged, and, astonishing as it may appear, it became clear that the members of ARCIC had genuinely expected the Congregation to ratify their ambiguities. Those living in ecumenical ivory towers are clearly out of touch with reality. In an attempt to camouflage the fact the the SCDF Response has sounded the death knell of The Final Report, ARCIC stressed the fact that these observations did not constitute "the Roman Catholic Church's official verdict on ARCIC's Report". 8 This must certainly constitute a classic case of a drowning man, or a drowning

international commission, clutching a straw. In its critique the SCDF listed a series of doctrines on which ARCIC claimed to have reached agreement but without formulating them in a manner that safeguarded Catholic teaching. The SCDF critique corresponded exactly with that found in Chapters V and VI of this book. It noted that:

Certain formulations in the Report are not sufficiently explicit and hence can lend themselves to a twofold interpretation, in which both parties can find unchanged the expression of their own position. This possibility of contrasting and ultimately incompatible readings of formulations which are apparently satisfactory to both sides gives rise to a question about the real consensus of the two Communion, pastors and faithful alike. In effect, if a formulation which has received the agreement of experts can be diversely interpreted, how could it serve as a basis for reconciliation on the level of church life and practice?

### The Response of the SCDF

The Congregation recommended that the dialogue should continue, having had little alternative in view of the internal politics of the Vatican at present. An ecumenical bureaucracy entrenched within what is now known as the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity is very powerful, and commentators have spoken with some reason of behind the scenes warfare between this Council and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. In a ploy probably designed to undermine the Congregation's ARCIC critique, The Final Report was sent to all the hierarchies in the world for their evaluation before Rome made its official response. The rationale behind this ploy was the belief that if many or most hierarchies found The Final Report acceptable the Vatican would have to do so in the present era of collegiality. In the meantime the Anglican Response was also awaited, and it came as no surprise that this consisted of an enthusiastic endorsement of The Final Report. In almost every case, the Catholic hierarchies which sent a response to the Vatican also found the ARCIC documents acceptable, including, to their shame, the Bishops of England and Wales who, one might have hoped, would have known something of the history and nature of Anglicanism. The favourable response from so many National Episcopal Conferences certainly posed a dilemma for the Holy See. ARCIC had been established as a result of an initiative by Pope Paul VI. It had received warm encouragement from Pope John Paul II. It had involved much time, much effort, and much expense, and had given many Anglicans the impression that organic union was a distinct possibility-----and now the prestige of most national hierarchies was attached to a Vatican endorsement of ARCIC. Was it possible that almost all the bishops in the world could approve agreements that were, to quote Father Holloway once more, "a betrayal of the Catholic Faith"?

### Anglican Endorsement

In contrast with the negative assessment of the SCDF the worldwide Anglican Communion gave The Final Report enthusiastic approval. All the various Anglican provinces gave the Report a clear "yes" in their individual responses. It was eventually endorsed overwhelmingly by the 1988 Lambeth Conference. One of the most lyrical speeches in praise of the report came from the then Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. George Carey, who assured the international gathering of Anglicans that the "Holy Spirit of God is leading us slowly but definitely towards agreement and reconciliation." Four years later, in 1992, he played the leading role in persuading the Conference to approve the ordination of priestesses which finally ruled out any possibility of organic reunion. 9

### The Vatican Response

In what it probably envisaged as a damage control exercise, the Holy See arranged for its final response to be produced jointly by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and The Council for Promoting Christian Unity. The hand of the latter is evident in some ecumenical platitudes giving a warm welcome to The Final Report, expressing its gratitude to the members of ARCIC, and hailing its work as "a significant milestone not only in relations' between the Catholic Church

and the Anglican Church but in the ecumenical movement as a whole." The hand of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is seen in the detailed analysis of the Agreed Statements, an analysis which differs in few respects from the 1982 critique of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which had so effectively set the orthodox cat among the ecumenical pigeons. It should be noted, however, that the 1991 Response comes not with the authority of the two Congregations which prepared it, but with the full authority of the Holy See itself. 10 In what way, then, does the Vatican find The Final Report of ARCIC wanting? It notes that the Report makes no claim to have reached substantial agreement on the question of authority in the Church, particularly with respect to papal infallibility, that no real consensus was recorded on the Marian dogmas, and that it claims incorrectly that the "assent of the faithful" is necessary to validate any magisterial decision. The Vatican explained in detail why the Report's attribution to Peter among the twelve of "a position of special importance" does not express the fullness of Catholic teaching on the papacy.

Regarding the Eucharist, the Vatican notes the failure of the Report to accept that the Sacrifice of Calvary is made present in the Mass "with all its effects, thus affirming the propitiatory nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which can also be applied to the deceased. For Catholics 'the whole Church' must include the dead. The prayer for the dead is to be found in all the Canons of the Mass, and the propitiatory character of the Mass as the Sacrifice of Christ, that may be offered for the living and the dead, including a particular dead person, is part of the Catholic faith." The incompatibility of Catholic teaching, reaffirmed here in refreshingly uncompromising terms, with that of Article XXXI of the Thirty-Nine Articles certainly requires no comment.

Where the Real Presence is concerned, the Vatican Response warns correctly that while such affirmations as the statement that the Eucharist is "the Lord's real gift of himself to his Church" can certainly be interpreted in conformity with the Catholic faith, they are insufficient to remove all ambiguity regarding the mode of the Real Presence which is due to a substantial change in the elements:

The Catholic Church holds that Christ in the Eucharist makes Himself present sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity.

On the question of the reservation of the Eucharist, the statement that there are those who "find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved Sacrament unacceptable", creates concern from the Roman Catholic point of view.

Where the priesthood is concerned, the Vatican Response tackles head-on the ambiguity made clear in the commentary and clarification of Dr. Charley, an ambiguity open to the possibility of a layman celebrating the Eucharist (see Chapter VI). It also refers directly to Anglican teaching that Our Lord instituted only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, and that the five other Sacraments of the Catholic Church are only of ecclesiastical institution:

Similarly, in respect of the ordained ministry, The Final Report would be helped if the following were made clearer:

----that only a validly ordained priest can be the minister who, in the person of Christ, brings into being the Sacrament of the Eucharist. He not only recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper, pronouncing the words of consecration and imploring the Father to send the Holy Spirit to effect through them the transformation of the gifts, but in doing so offers sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ.

----that it was Christ Himself who instituted the Sacrament of Orders as the rite which confers the priesthood of the New Covenant . . . The ARCIC document does not refer to the character of priestly ordination which implies a configuration to the priesthood of Christ. The character of



priestly ordination is central to the Catholic understanding of the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the common priesthood of the Baptised. It is moreover important for the recognition of Holy Orders as a Sacrament instituted by Christ, and not therefore a simple ecclesiastical institution.

The Vatican Response also demonstrates that the ARCIC concepts of the Apostolic Succession and the Interpretation of Scripture are incompatible with those of the Church. The Response concludes with some platitudes paying tribute to "the important work done by ARCIC" and expressing the hope that it will contribute to "the continued dialogue between Anglicans and Catholics". Cardinal Cassidy, President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, claimed that the Vatican Response is "a very positive document", and Father Edward Yarnold, S.J., a Catholic member of, and long-standing apologist for ARCIC, claims that the latest chapter in its history "does have a happy ending". The reverend gentlemen are both perfectly correct, but not in the sense that they intended. The Report is positive and the ending happy because the bubble of false ecumenism has been pricked finally and effectively. As was the case with liberal pressure for a change in Church teaching on contraception, in the final resort orthodoxy was upheld and is still upheld by the Vatican, even if its teaching is ignored by many Catholics. Just as they did in the case of contraception, the liberals gave the impression that Rome would not stand firm. But Rome can never fail to stand firm on any fundamental doctrine of faith or morals. No Catholic who loved or understood the Church ever imagined that the ARCIC ambiguities could ever be endorsed by Rome. Liberal disillusionment with the Vatican Response derives from the folly which impelled them to believe in their own illusions, and to encourage our Anglican brethren to believe in them too.

#### Disillusioned Liberals

Despite the attempts by ecumenical bureaucrats to put a brave face on what amounted to nothing less than a de facto rejection by the Vatican of the fruits of a quarter of a century of jet-setting ecumenical chit-chat in exotic locations, at the expense of the ordinary faithful, some leading liberals could not conceal their bitterness. "Unity Report Dismays Senior Bishop" read a front page headline in the 6 December 1991 issue of England's ultra-liberal Catholic Herald. The "senior bishop" in question was Bishop Alan Clark of East Anglia, and the first co-chairman of ARCIC. Bishop Clark stated that he was "naturally disappointed" by the Vatican Response, that Anglican members of the Commission "were depressed about it", that it would "make life difficult" for ARCIC in the future and that the Response "showed no interest in or understanding of the workings of the commission". One might respond that the Vatican had understood, or rather seen through, the workings of Bishop Clark's Commission only too well, which explains why it had been repudiated so emphatically. An editorial in the same issue of the Catholic Herald expressed liberal disillusionment with the Holy See very clearly:

The Vatican's reaction this week to the ARCIC Report has disappointed some and worried others, while those who said all along that ARCIC was nothing more than a talking-shop, and that Rome would never agree to its decisions are now basking in their superior knowledge. Catholics on the Commission feel their church has let down the Anglicans with whom they shared so much for so long, while some of the Anglicans wonder whether there is much point in going on with the discussions.

The Catholic Bishop of Brentwood, Thomas McMahon, wrote a letter to The Times, which was published on 7 February 1992, in which he took it upon himself to make what amounted to a public apology to Anglicans for the Vatican Response:

As Roman Catholics we need to examine our own conscience. For centuries, and even on occasions since Vatican n, we have implied, if not expressed, an "ecclesiological superiority" towards other churches, (sic) which must often have made them feel like second class citizens. Sadly, some may

be inclined to see the recent Vatican Response to the first Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, wrongly or rightly, as a further sign of this.

If any Anglicans feel let down the fault does not lie with the Vatican, which had no alternative but to uphold authentic doctrine, but, as Father Holloway pointed out, with those Catholic members of the ARCIC who failed to explain to their Protestant brethren the essential Catholic teaching that they were accredited to present. As to basking in one's superior knowledge, I have certainly been unable to refrain from taking delectation in the extent to which I am able to say "I told you so", having written, in addition to this book, numerous articles, letters to cardinals and bishops, and letters to the press specifying precisely the defects in the ARCIC Statements now delineated by the Vatican. In 1980 I had the privilege of being granted a very long audience with Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. We spent several hours discussing ARCIC, among other topics, in his private apartment. I was able to present him with copies of Dr. Charley's commentaries which he had not seen, and to alert him to the manner in which sixteenth century Protestants who repudiated Catholic Eucharistic teaching sometimes used language which gave the contrary impression. The Cardinal was extremely interested and took copious notes of all that I had to say (he had read this book before our meeting). Cardinal Seper gave me a categorical assurance that there was not the least possibility of his Congregation ever endorsing ARCIC, and I take great satisfaction in the fact that this has proved to be the case.

What is most astonishing, most alarming, is the fact that although these deficiencies were obvious to a layman like myself, with no specialized theological knowledge, almost every Catholic hierarchy in the world pronounced in favour of the ARCIC Statements. The gravity of this fact cannot possibly be exaggerated. Can there have been such a virtually universal failure of the Teaching Church (Rome excepted) since the Arian heresy?

But for those of us who are opposed to false ecumenism, not least because it impedes the return to Catholic unity of countless potential converts, one other point made in the Vatican Response gives a happy and positive ending to the entire ARCIC debacle. The Response pointed out the new obstacle to unity raised by the ordination of women within the Anglican Communion. It is, in fact, not simply an obstacle but an insuperable barrier. There is no possibility whatsoever of any Anglican province which has taken this fateful step reversing it, and there is no possibility of any denomination which ordains women achieving organic unity with the Catholic Church. On 11 November 1992 the General Synod of the Church of England took the fateful step of giving final approval for legislation to allow the ordination of women thus ruling out irrevocably any possibility of organic reunion with the Catholic Church. It might be argued that as Anglican Orders are invalid, and even Dr. George Carey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, is no more than a married layman who wears an episcopal costume, the ordination of women is irrelevant from the Catholic standpoint. The men ordained in the Church of England are not priests and the Women who are eventually ordained will not be priests, and so the current situation will not be changed. The relevance from the Catholic standpoint is that if a genuine doctrinal agreement had ever been reached, which could have resulted in organic unity, the male clergy of the Church of England could have received Catholic ordination, even if married, but as women are not capable of receiving the Sacrament of Order not even the Pope could ordain one using the Catholic ordinal, and, as has just been explained, the idea of a denomination which has opted for the ordination of women reversing the decision is simply not realistic.

Dr. Carey himself, in an historic admission at Malines in Belgium, on 13 February 1992, accepted that any hopes of organic union between the Church of England and the Catholic Church have faded away. He cast the blame, in rather bitter terms, upon the Vatican, citing in particular its Response to The Final Report of ARCIC and its repudiation of the ordination of women to the priesthood. "Dreams and visions seem to have faded into a mist of disappointment and a mood of resigned realism," he lamented. "Hopes for organic unity seem to have faded." 11

It seems somewhat unfair of Dr. Carey to blame the Vatican when not only Pope John Paul II but Pope Paul VI have made it clear that there could be no organic union involving the acceptance of women priests with any denomination whatsoever, and that it is the Anglican decision to ordain women which has ruled out irrevocably any hope of organic reunion. There is no small irony in the fact that Dr. Carey accepted the virtual demise of the movement to achieve organic unity between Catholicism and Anglicanism at Malines in Belgium, where it had been given birth in 1921 by the celebrated Malines Conversations between Catholic and Anglican theologians.

Sincere Catholics who were naive enough to believe in the possibility of organic reunion between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion should now remove their blinkers and, motivated by love for the truth and love for their separated brethren, spare no effort in praying and working for their individual conversion. I have the good fortune to possess a collection of unpublished letters written by Cardinal Edward Manning, one of the greatest of all converts from Anglicanism. Had Cardinal Manning remained within the Church of England, he would almost certainly have become Archbishop of Canterbury. One of these letters, written in 1868, three years after his appointment as Archbishop of Westminster, replied to a question from an Anglican concerning the validity of Anglican Orders (this was eighteen years before *Apostolicae Curiae* settled forever the fact of their invalidity).

The Cardinal answered that from the moment that he had been given the grace to accept Catholicism as the One True Faith, not only had the possibility of Anglican Orders appeared incredible to him, but he had come to regard Anglicanism as nothing more than another form of human error. This reply may appear uncharitable in these ecumenical times, but it is as true today as when the letter was written, and there can never be a conflict between charity and truth.

#### ADDENDUM

##### An ARCIC Time chart

1921-1925

The Malines Conversations. Catholic and Anglican theologians meet at Malines in Belgium, with the cognizance of the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the hope of reaching agreements that could bring about reunion. The conversations achieved no tangible results but stimulated a movement for organic reunion which culminated in ARCIC.

24 March 1966

The Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury agreeing to inaugurate a serious ecumenical dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion.

2 January 1968      The Malta Report. This report was issued after the third meeting of the ARCIC Joint Preparatory Commission and recommended that "adequate money, secretarial assistance, and research facilities should be given to the Commission".

21-28 Sept. 1970

Venice Meeting. Working papers on the Eucharist, Ministry, and Authority are prepared.  
7 September 1971

The Windsor Statement on the Eucharist.

30 August-7 September 1972

Draft Texts on the Ministry prepared at Gazzada, Italy.

13 December 1973

The Canterbury Statement on the Ministry.

20 January 1977

The Venice Statement on Authority published (Authority I).

7 June 1979

The Salisbury Elucidations on the Eucharist and Ministry.

25 August -3 September 1981

The Windsor Elucidations on Authority I and Authority Statement II published.

January 1982

The Final Report published.

May 1982

Observations of the SCDF on The Final Report.

August 1988 The Lambeth Conference gives an overwhelming endorsement to The Final Report. Dr. George Carey, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, claims that the "Holy Spirit of God is leading us slowly but definitely towards agreement and reconciliation."

December 1991

Official Response of the Vatican to The Final Report.

11 November 1992

The General Synod of the Church of England passed legislation to allow the ordination of women as priests, and thus ruled out any possibility of organic reunion between the Church of England and the Catholic Church.

14 February 1993

Dr. George Carey, now Archbishop of Canterbury, admits at Malines in Belgium that hopes of organic reunion have now faded, blaming the Vatican Response to The Final Report of ARCIC and its refusal to accept the possibility of female ordination.

30 April 1993

The Catholic Herald reports that Anglican clergy seeking to become Catholics and to be ordained to the priesthood, as a result of the 1992 General Synod decision to allow the ordination of women, would be required to accept unconditional ordination. Some Anglo-Catholic clergy, encouraged by a number of Catholic bishops, had formed the impression that they would be offered conditional ordination, which would have left open the possibility that their Anglican Orders were valid. The report also stated that: "There will be no global receptions for any groups or parishes which convert. Each member of the group will make a personal declaration." This decision represents an unequivocal affirmation by the Holy See that there can be no modification of the teaching of *Apostolicae Curiae* despite the ARCIC claim, eventually endorsed by the hierarchy of England and Wales, that its teaching can no longer be considered as absolute.

1. J. H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (London, 1864), p. 163

2. The Final Report (SPCK, Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, NW1 4DU, 1982).

3. A. Clark, *Agreement on the Eucharist* (Roman Catholic Ecum. Comm., 44 Grays Inn Road, London, WC1, 1972), p. 13.

4. J. Charley, *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist* (Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts, 1971), p. 17.

5. J. Charley, *Agreement on the Doctrine of the Ministry* (Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts, 1973), p. 23.

6. C. Buchanan, *What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?* (Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts, 1976), p. 7.

7. The full text was published in the 15 May 1982 issue of *The Tablet*.

8. E. Yarnold & H. Chadwick, *An ARCIC Catechism* (C. T. S., London, 1983), p. 33.

9. *The Tablet*, 16 August 1988, p. 910.

10. The full text was published in the 7 December 1991 issue of *The Tablet*.

11. *The Universe*, 21 February 1992.

## Appendix IX The Revised Ordinal of 1989

On 29 June 1989 the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments promulgated, with the approval and the authority of Pope John Paul II a revised edition of the 1968 Ordinal (*Editio Typica Altera*). Only the rite for the ordination of priests will be examined in this appendix. The first point that must be made is that the "native character and spirit" of the 1968 rite remain, and that the 1989 rite is manifestly inferior to the traditional rite as a liturgical expression of Catholic teaching on the priesthood, even if somewhat less inferior than that of 1968. Anglicans would be unlikely to modify to any great extent the enthusiastic welcome with which they greeted the 1968 Ordinal because it was "an 'ecumenical' ordinal in the best sense, in that it avoids much questionable terminology and is clearly expressive of the theological *aggiornamento* of Vatican II" (see Chapter VIII). By questionable terminology Anglicans mean, of course, prayers in the traditional rite which make explicit the fact that a priest is ordained primarily to offer sacrifice. The Anglican Church Times specified prayers in the traditional rite of which it disapproved, the suppression of which it claimed, with every justification, signified "a distinct movement away from medieval and Counter-Reformation theology" (*Ibid.*). It stated with considerable satisfaction that:

For instance, that prayer has gone which spoke of the power of a priest to "transform bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ by an immaculate blessing". The former words at the delivery of paten and chalice have also disappeared: "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Masses (*sic*) for the living and the dead."

The official teaching of the Church of England in Article XXXI of its Thirty-Nine Articles, to which every Anglican minister must subscribe in their strictest literal interpretation, is that the Mass is a "blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit". Cardinal Newman insisted, having tried to evade the literal meaning of the article himself in his Oxford Movement days, that this means the Mass itself is "in all its daily celebration from year's end to year's end, *toto orbe terrarum*, a blasphemous fable." 1

The prayer containing the form of the Sacrament of Order is referred to either as the *Oratio Consecrationis Presbyterorum* or the *Prex Ordinationis Presbyterorum*. For the sake of consistency the latter term only will be used, abbreviated to *Prex*. The traditional *Prex* is one of the most venerable texts in the liturgy of the Roman Rite. It can be found with only minor differences in the Leonine Sacramentary of the early seventh century. 2 This Sacramentary has been attributed to Pope Leo I, who died in 461, but his authorship is far from certain, although he may well have composed some of its prayers. It is, however, certain that the prayers it contains were already of great antiquity when included in the collection, some of them dating back in all probability to the fifth century and beyond. The manuscript itself is housed in the Chapter Library at Verona, and is hence referred to frequently as the Veronese Sacramentary. [See Special Note.]

The *Prex* itself in both the traditional and 1968 ordinals is, like the actual form of ordination which it contains, indeterminate. The form does indeed state that the ordinands are to be raised to the priesthood, but so does the form in the Anglican Ordinal. The traditional *Prex* is, the essential form apart, primarily of a narrative character. It describes the growth of the Old Testament hierarchy in which men of lesser degree and lower rank were chosen to be associates and helpers of the high priests. Reference is made to the fact that the priestly ministry of the Old Testament did not lack the means to offer sacrifices for the people's welfare and perform sacred rites, which could be taken as implying that the men about to be ordained would fulfill the same function, but this is not stated specifically. It could be argued quite reasonably that this passage in the *Prex* does no more than state what happened before the advent of Our Lord, whose Apostles are cited only as having teachers of the faith (*doctores fidei*) to assist them in their work of spreading the good tidings (*praedicationibus impleverunt*) the world over. No mention is made of any sacrifice being offered by the Apostles or by their teaching companions who are not actually designated as priests within

the text of the Prex. After the form which ordains the new priests has been pronounced there follows in the traditional rite a prayer expressing the hope that they will be "prudent helpers of their bishops", and in the 1968 rite, in the only significant change made to the Prex itself, this prayer has been replaced by one that the new priests may be fellow-workers of the bishops "so that the words of the Gospel may reach to the farthest parts of the earth", echoing the reference to those who helped the Apostles with their preaching (*doctores fidei*) in the prayer that preceded the form.

As was explained in Chapter VII, the traditional Ordinal contained numerous prayers which gave explicit sacerdotal signification to the indeterminate Prex, and every one of these prayers was removed during the composition of the 1968 rite. This meant that although the 1968 Ordinal still retained the Prex from the traditional rite virtually unchanged, the Prex no longer received a sacrificial connotation from the actual rite in which it was situated, but, as Dr. Francis Clark is cited as accepting in the introduction to this book, from a *determinatio ex adiunctis* external to the rite itself. He explains that this supplies "due meaning which is no longer explicit in the ritual forms". The allegation that I made in the first edition of this book that the indeterminate Prex of the traditional rite no longer received a sacrificial signification from other prayers of the 1968 Ordinal, an allegation confirmed by Dr. Clark, was also conceded in a very dramatic manner in an explanation of the rationale behind the revision given by a spokesman for the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (CDWS), written in Spanish, and published in the February 1990 issue of *Notitiae*, Number 283. The commentary was signed Pere Tena, and will be referred to throughout this appendix as the CDWS commentary. What I have termed a dramatic confirmation of the thesis of this book occurs in the following passage:

Until the year 1968, the theology of the Roman Prex was made explicit and otherwise corroborated by other elements occurring in the rite . . . With the reform of 1968 these elements which I have just mentioned disappeared in the *First Editio Typica*. . . . The theology of the Prex of the Veronese Sacramentary became isolated within the rite unconfirmed by eucharistical and ritual explanations, in order to express the identity of the priestly ministry in a more concrete fashion.

The CDWS also conceded that:

It must be admitted that the reception given to the text of the Prex ordinationis since the time of the *First Editio Typica* (1968) has not been totally positive. It has, in fact, aroused frequent criticism from both bishops and priests as well as the ordinands themselves.

Archbishop Bugnini, the principal architect of the 1968 rite, also conceded that the reception given to it was "not totally positive". He claimed that "the reformed rites of ordination were generally accepted as satisfactory",<sup>3</sup> but admitted that: "Some were of the opinion that the rite had been impoverished and was now less solemn and impressive. There were requests that the suppressed actions be restored, at least in some form".<sup>4</sup> As was explained in Chapter VII, among those who protested was Cardinal John Heenan, the Archbishop of Westminster, England. He expressed publicly his outrage that the bishops of the world had not been consulted during the reform of the Ordinal, and that it had arrived on their desks as a *fait accompli*. He protested that this was the kind of thing that broke the bishops' hearts, and insisted that the new form was far less attractive than the old (Chapter VII).

An English bishop who wrote to congratulate me on my book remarked:

Many of the omissions in the New Ordination Rite, e.g. "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass both for the living and the dead in the name of the Lord", and the reference to the forgiveness of sins at the end of the Mass are an impoverishment indeed. The Episcopal Conference of England and Wales was very upset about them. Cardinal Heenan wrote to ask if they could be retained. The reply received was an emphatic "No".

The most evident manner of overcoming the isolation of the Prex within a rite from which the CDWS admits the prayers imbuing it, with a sacrificial connotation had been removed in the First Editio Typica, would have been to restore at least some of these prayers' whose disappearance had so distressed the Bishops of England and Wales, while giving such satisfaction to the Editor of the Anglican Church Times. The restoration of the Accipe potestatem alone would have removed the ambiguity of the new rite by the inclusion of one unequivocally sacrificial prayer within the ordination rite itself. But, alas, the ecumenical ethos which evidently pervades the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments made such a simple and effective remedy unthinkable. The Fathers of this Congregation decided, incredible as it may seem, to attempt to remedy the deficiencies of the 1968 rite by making drastic changes in the only appreciable portion of it preserved intact from the traditional Ordinal-----the Prex itself. In its commentary upon the 1989 rite, the CDWS accepts the necessity for this Second Editio Typica to make "the actual celebration of the priestly Ordinal a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of the priests, who, through the ministry of the Bishop, Christ the Lord makes participants in His priesthood through the power of the Holy Spirit." In other words, the 1989 rite of ordination itself should make clear the nature of the priesthood without the need to resort to the kind of external ex adiunctis factors cited by Dr. Clark as imparting a Catholic determination to the indeterminate rite of 1968. The CDWS claims that the 1989 revision has achieved this aim, and it will now be examined in detail to discover the extent to which its claim is justified.

### The Bishop's Charge

It is explained in Chapter VII that the Bishop's Charge in the 1968 rite makes specific the intention of ordaining a sacrificing priest, although in muted tones when set beside the prayers of the traditional rite which have been abolished. No Evangelical Protestant could possibly use the Bishop's Charge with a good conscience. But, as is made clear in that Chapter, the words printed in the ordinal

constitute no more than a model homily, and the ordaining bishop is free to substitute his own homily for it. It is not mandatory as was the Bishop's Charge in the Traditional Ordinal. Nonetheless, even though not mandatory, the inclusion of this specific affirmation of the sacrificial nature of the priesthood within the New Ordinal must be considered as imparting a sacrificial signification to the rite as a whole. The 1968 Bishop's Charge remains unchanged in the 1989 rite except for two variations which are both insignificant. They occur in the opening paragraph and in the seventh paragraph beginning: *Munere item sanctificandi*. The changes are printed in italic. Wherever texts from the 1968 and 1989 rites are set in parallel columns the new material will be indicated in this way.

### 1968 Rite

*Fratres dilectissimi, cum isti filii nostri, quos inter propinquos vel amicos habetis, mox ad ordinem Presbyterorum sint provehendi, attente perpendite ad quale in Ecclesia gradum sint ascensuri.*

Dearly beloved brothers, these men, our sons, who are your relatives or friends, are about to be raised to the order of priest. You should therefore consider carefully the position in the Church to which they will be promoted.

### 1989 Rite

*Fratres dilectissimi, cum isti filii nostri, quos inter propinquos vel amicos habetis, mox ad ordinem Presbyterorum sint provehendi, attente perpendite ad quale in Ecclesia ministerium sint ascensuri.*

Dearly beloved brothers, these men, our sons, who are your relatives or friends, are about to be raised to the order of priest. You should therefore consider carefully the position in the ministry of the Church to which they will be promoted.

This change does nothing to clarify the nature of the priesthood.

Munere item sanctificandi in Christo fungemini. Ministerio enim tuo sacrificium spirituale fidelium perficietur, Christi sacrificio coniunctum, quod per manus tuas super altare incruenter in celebratione mysteriorum offeretur.

In the same way you must carry out your mission of sanctifying in the power of Christ. Your ministry will make perfect the spiritual sacrifices of the faithful by uniting them to Christ's Sacrifice, which is offered sacramentally through your hands upon the altar in an unbloody manner.

Munere item sanctificandi in Christo fungemini. Ministerio enim tuo sacrificium spirituale fidelium perficietur, Christi sacrificio coniunctum, quod una cum iis per manus tuas super altare incruenter in celebratione mysteriorum offeretur.

In the same way you must carry out your mission of sanctifying in the power of Christ. Your ministry will make perfect the spiritual sacrifices of the faithful by uniting them to Christ's Sacrifice, which is offered sacramentally through your hands in union with them upon the altar in an unbloody manner.

This change also does nothing to clarify the nature of the priesthood, but, if anything, could appear to endorse an error condemned by Pope Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*, that is to say that the sacrificial immolation of the Mass is not performed by the priest alone acting in persona Christi, but acting as the representative of the faithful:

To avoid any mistake in this very important matter we must clearly define the exact meaning of the word "offer". The unbloody immolation, by which after the words of consecration have been pronounced, Christ is rendered present on the altar in the state of victim, is performed by the priest alone, and by the priest in so far as he acts in the name of Christ, not in so far as he represents the faithful.

Pope Pius went on to explain that there is a perfectly orthodox sense in which the faithful can be said to offer with the priest:

But when the people are said to offer with the priest, this does not mean that all the members of the Church, like the priest himself, perform the visible liturgical rite; this is done only by the minister Divinely appointed for the purpose. No, they are said to offer with him inasmuch as they unite their sentiments of praise, entreaty, expiation, and thanksgiving with the sentiments or intention of the priest, indeed with those of the High Priest Himself, in order that in the very oblation of the victim, those sentiments may be presented to God the Father also by the priest's external rite. The external rite of sacrifice must of its very nature be a sign of internal worship; and what is signified by the Sacrifice of the New Law is that supreme homage by which Christ, the principal offerer, and with Him and through Him all His mystical members, pay due honour and veneration to God.

As the 1989 Ordinal has been approved by the Pope, our presumption must be that the words "in union with them" mean that the faithful offer with the priest in this orthodox second sense, but this does not alter the fact that the addition does nothing whatsoever to clarify the nature of the priesthood.

The Bishop's Charge must, then, be accepted as imparting a Catholic signification to the entire rite, but it cannot be considered as making "the actual celebration of the priestly Ordinal a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of the priests", which the CDWS claims is now the case. Some equally clear affirmation of the sacrificial ethos of the priesthood within the mandatory section of the ordination rite itself would be necessary to achieve this.



## The Examination of the Candidate

The questions put to the candidates contain very few changes from the 1968 Ordinal. There is one completely new question which does nothing whatsoever to clarify the specifically sacrificial role of the priest, which makes one wonder why it was added. It does, however, echo part of the explanation of the duties of a priest given by the bishop in the Anglican Series III Ordinal (see Chapter IX): "He is to lead his people in prayer and worship, to intercede for them, to bless them in the name of the Lord, and to teach and encourage by word and example."

### New Promise

Vis nobiscum misericordiam divinam pro populo tibi commissio implorare orandi mandato indesinenter instans?

Are you resolved to beg with us for Divine mercy upon the people entrusted to you, persevering in the commandment of prayer?

One of the promises has had words added which do refer specifically to the priestly vocation of offering sacrifice and absolving the faithful from their sins. The additional words are indicated in italic.

Vis mysteria Christi ad laudem Dei et sanctificationem populi christiani, secundum Ecclesiae traditionem, pie et fideliter celebrare?

Are you resolved to celebrate the mysteries of Christ for the glory of God and the sanctification of the Christian people, according to the Tradition of the Church, faithfully and religiously?

Vis mysteria Christi ad laudem Dei et sanctificationem populi christiani, secundum Ecclesiae traditionem, praesertim in Eucharistiae sacrificio et sacramento reconciliationis, pie et fideliter celebrare?

Are you resolved to celebrate the mysteries of Christ for the glory of God and the sanctification of the Christian people, according to the Tradition of the Church, especially the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Sacrament of Reconciliation, faithfully and religiously?

It is said that even here the compilers could not bring themselves to use the term "sacrifice of the Mass", but it would be unreasonable to conclude that anything else could be meant by the term "Eucharistic Sacrifice" in a rite approved by the Pope in which the nature of this sacrifice had been made clear in the Bishop's Charge, but this involves once more looking outside the actual rite of ordination to clarify one of its texts, whereas had the term "Sacrifice of the Mass" been used it would have removed the least trace of ambiguity. It is equally sad that the term "Sacrament of Reconciliation" is used rather than the traditional term "Sacrament of Penance" which had been used hitherto in official documents such as the Code of Canon Law. The term "reconciliation" is far more compatible with the Anglican concept of absolution as either a prayer to God or a statement about God, which was explained in Chapter VI. This is, as far as I can discover, the first time that the term "Sacrament of Reconciliation" has been used in a document of the Magisterium or in the editio typica of a liturgical text.

Up to this point, the only improvement in the mandatory text of "the actual celebration of the priestly Ordinal" has been the addition of the words praesertim in Eucharistiae sacrificio et sacramento reconciliationis, to a question in the Examination of the Candidates, and, as has been explained, despite the refusal to use the term "Sacrifice of the Mass", the term "Eucharistic Sacrifice" in this context is one which it could be imagined that Anglicans would find difficult to

use in good conscience, but is, in fact, a term which they could reconcile with their belief that in their own Eucharistic celebration their "priests" join with the people in offering spiritual sacrifices to God. The "form" for the Ordination of a Priest in the Anglican Series III Ordinal makes clear how easily this could be done:

The Bishop and priests lay their hands on the head of each candidate and the Bishop says:

Send down the Holy Spirit upon your servant N for the office and work of a priest in your Church.

When the Bishop has laid hands on all of them, he continues:

Almighty Father, give to these your servants grace and power to fulfill their ministry among those committed to their charge; to watch over them and care for them; to absolve and bless them in your name; and to proclaim the gospel of your salvation. Set them among your people to offer with them spiritual sacrifices acceptable in your sight and to minister the sacraments of the New Covenant. As you have called them to your service, make them worthy of their calling. Give them wisdom and discipline to work faithfully, with all their fellow servants in Christ, that the world may come to know your glory and your love. Accept our prayers, most merciful Father, through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with you and your Holy Spirit belong glory and honour, worship and praise, now and for ever.

The people say: Amen.

These words provide a very salutary reminder of the need for sacramental rites which are totally unambiguous, and which enshrine the principle *lex orandi, lex credendi*. Reading the Series III Anglican "form" it could easily be imagined that it was intended to ordain a priest in the Catholic sense of the word, i.e. one who differs not simply in degree but in essence from those who are not ordained, but nothing could be further from the truth. In a commentary upon the Series III Ordinal, the Reverend Michael Sansom, Tutor at Ridley Hall, Cambridge, stresses the importance of the use of the term "president" rather than "celebrant" in the Series III Communion Service which has very close parallels with the new Catholic Rite of Mass when it is celebrated with Eucharistic Prayer II:

It is more than a mere question of terminology, since the switch from "celebrant" to "president" underlines the priest's function as one of the whole celebrating congregation. Strictly speaking, it is the whole congregation that concelebrates; the priest is a member of the congregation performing a presidential function. [See Special Note 2.] 5

This explanation makes it clear that Mr. Sansom would certainly welcome the addition of the words *una cum iis* (in union with them) to the paragraph beginning *Munere* item in the Bishop's Charge of the 1989 Catholic Ordinal (see above):

If the essence of the Catholic priesthood, as enshrined in the traditional formula *Accipe potestatem*, has not been manifested without ambiguity up to this point, the question of the revised *Prex* now emerges. The CDWS assures us that the revisions made to the 1968 *Prex* are in themselves sufficient to make the 1989 Ordinal "a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of the priests who, through the ministry of the Bishop, Christ the Lord makes participants in His priesthood through the power of the Holy Spirit."

The *Prex*

In its commentary upon the revision of the *Prex*, the CDWS explains that: "The first line of revision in the *Prex* needed to address the problem of the lack of explanation of the functions of the priestly ministry." The complete text of the new *Prex* will be examined to discover how successfully this objective has been achieved, bearing in mind what has already been stated, that the function of a

priest could have been made clear by replacing some (or all) of the prayers which were removed in 1968. In the translations of the Prex for the 1968 and 1989 rites the singular is used, i.e. it is presumed that only one priest is being ordained.

#### 1968 Rite

Adesto

Come to our aid, O Lord, holy Father,  
almighty and eternal God, author of all honours  
the bestower of all dignities

#### 1989 Rite

Adesto

Come to our aid, O Lord, holy Father,  
almighty and eternal God, author of human dignity the bestower of all graces

Henri Fesquet, the liberal Catholic journalist, author, and commentator upon Vatican II was, according to Michael Novak, the writer who "set the mark against which other journalists of the world in reporting the Council measured themselves." 6 Fesquet was jubilant at the result of the final vote of the Council Fathers for *Dignitatis humanae*, the Declaration on Religious Liberty. He concluded that the affirmative vote for the Declaration represented the acceptance by the Council of the glorious motto of the French Revolution: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity". 7 Was Fesquet exaggerating?

It is, of course, incompatible with the French Revolutionary ethos for any person to possess honours and dignities not shared by all. Titles were abolished and the common designation "citizen" shared by those of every social class, although, as George Orwell has made clear in *Animal Farm*, after any revolution some citizens very quickly become more equal than others. Needless to say, the Church did not adopt the Revolutionary motto as its watchword in any official document, but a democratic ethos, in which honours, titles, and special marks of respect are an embarrassment, is certainly part of the all-pervasive "spirit of the Council"-----witness the abandonment of the papal tiara and the *sedes gestatoria*. There is no more effective manner of embarrassing a bishop today than by kneeling to kiss his ring. It is, therefore, not in accord with the "spirit of Vatican II" to refer to the priesthood as an honour or a dignity. The priesthood is now seen as a service performed by one equal member of the Christian community for other equal members of the community.

In its commentary on the Prex, the CDWS admits, without the least trace of embarrassment, that one object of the revisions is to "place the ministry within its ecclesiological context". It goes on to explain that: "The words honor and dignitas have been suppressed, because they are not acceptable in this context, in spite of their historical value." God is changed from the source (or author) of all "honours" to the source of "human dignity"; and from the bestower of all "dignities" to the bestower of all "graces" (or gifts) which, of course, He is, and the reference given is 1 Cor. 12:4. But, as Dr. Clark has observed with regard to Cranmer's ordination rite, "It was not what was expressed but what was suppressed that gave significance to the whole . . ." (see Chapter VIII). It is interesting to note that the CDWS actually used the word "suppressed" to describe the removal of the terms "honour" and "dignity" ("Se han suprimido los palabras honor y dignitas, que en la actualidad son dificilmente aceptadas en este contexto, a pesar de su valor historico.") The dignity of the priesthood is, in fact, referred to explicitly in the form for this sacrament later in the Prex. We must be thankful that the revisers stopped short of making changes here.

The suppression of "honours" to be replaced by "human dignity" constitutes the mutilation of a venerable liturgical text, and is a change that almost defies credibility. A footnote is provided in the official *Notitiae* commentary confirming that it is a direct quotation from *Dignitatis humanae*, the Declaration on Religious Liberty of the Second Vatican Council, and its most controversial

document. The footnote cites the first paragraph of the Declaration as the source for the innovation. One must wonder what degree if any of a true sensus catholicus is possessed by those who do not hesitate to mutilate an ancient rite by inserting into it a new phrase with no relevance to the ordination of a priest simply to impart credibility to a controversial document by using it as a liturgical source.

per quem

by Whom all things make progress, by Whom all things are strengthened, all that by an ordered progression develops rational nature to further excellence.

Unde

And so the priestly orders and the offices of the Levites, established with sacred rites, grew when Thou didst choose men of the next rank and dignity to be the associates and helpers of the high priests whom Thou didst appoint to rule the people.

Sic in eremo

Thus in the desert through seventy prudent men Thou didst spread abroad the spirit of Moses, and with their aid he was able to rule easily the vast multitude of people.

Sic in filios

So too the sons of Aaron Thou didst richly endow with their father's plenty, so that there should be sufficient priests to offer saving victims and perform the sacred rites more frequently.

per quem

by Whom all things make progress, by Whom all things are strengthened, and Who to fashion a priestly people, appoints ministers of Christ Thy Son, by the power of the Holy Spirit, to the different orders within it.

Iam in priore

Now in the former Covenant, offices, established with sacred rites, grew so that when Thou didst place Moses and Aaron in authority to rule and sanctify the people Thou didst choose men of the next rank and dignity to be their associates and helpers in the work of their order.

Sic in eremo

Thus in the desert through seventy prudent men Thou didst spread abroad the spirit of Moses, and with their aid he was able to rule easily Thy people.

Sic in filios

So too the sons of Aaron Thou didst richly endow with their father's plenty, that for the sacrifices of the tabernacle which were a shadow of good things to come, there should be sufficient priests according to the Law.

The changes in the prayers from the per quem to the Sic in filios cannot be said to clarify the nature of the Catholic priesthood which the CDWS accepted is absent from the text of the 1968 rite. The nearest that it comes to doing so is the allusion to Hebrews 10:1 and Colossians 2:17----*quae umbra erant futurorum bonorum* ("a shadow of good things to come") which could be interpreted as a reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass, but not necessarily, and would be perfectly acceptable to Anglicans as it is scriptural and, they would reason, must be in accord with their own doctrines. [See Special Note 3.]

Hac providentia

This same providence of thine, Lord, as companions of Thy Son's Apostles, provided teachers of the second rank who aided by them spread the faith the world over.

#### Novissime vero

Last of all, holy Father, Thou didst send Thy Son into the world, Jesus, Apostle and Pontiff of our faith. Immaculate, He offered Himself to Thee, through the Holy Spirit, and made His Apostles, sanctified in truth, participators in His mission, to whom Thou hast added companions for preaching and effecting the work of salvation the world over.

The prayer is entirely new, replacing the traditional *Haec providentia*. The new material in the *Novissime vero* is adapted from the Liturgy Constitution of Vatican II (n. 6) but does not specify that the essential function of a Catholic priest is to offer the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass as did, for example, the *Accipe potestatem*. It refers to Our Lord as Apostle and Priest, states that His Apostles participated in His mission, and that God gave them companions for preaching and effecting the work of salvation. This is all true and admirable, but there is not a word here that is not perfectly compatible with Protestantism. Catholics, of course, believe that participating in the mission of Christ, and effecting this work of salvation, includes pre-eminently making the Sacrifice of Calvary present daily upon the altars of the Church, but Protestants deny this, believing that their ministers participate in the mission of Christ and effect His work of salvation by dispensing faithfully His word and His (two) holy Sacraments. The CDWS lays great stress on the fact that the adaptation of the conciliar text "excludes any dichotomy between evangelization and liturgical celebration, and on the other hand stresses the intimate connection between the two aspects as part of a single mission in which what is proclaimed through the word is communicated through the sacrament." It is significant that the CDWS does not claim that the adaptation of the text made clear that what is proclaimed through the word is communicated through sacrifice and Sacrament. It could have done this easily by quoting from the very text of Vatican II that it cites. No. 6 of the Liturgy Constitution teaches with admirable clarity that:

Accordingly, just as Christ was sent by the Father so also He sent the Apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit. This He did so that they might preach the Gospel to every creature, and proclaim that the Son of God by His death and resurrection had freed us from the power of Satan and from death, and brought us into the Kingdom of His Father. But He also willed that the work of salvation which they preached should be set in train through the sacrifice and Sacraments, around which the entire liturgical life revolves (my emphasis).

How sad that ecumenical considerations prompted those who composed the prayer *Novissime vera* to censor even a text of the Council rather than include an unambiguous reference to the fact that the Eucharist is a sacrifice as well as a Sacrament.

#### Quapropter

Wherefore, O Lord, we beseech Thee  
to grant us this help for our weakness,  
our need is the greater because our strength is less.

#### Nunc etiam

Now also, O Lord, we beseech Thee  
to grant us this helper to support us in our weakness to exercise the apostolic priesthood.

The traditional *Quapropter* prayer asks for the bishop to be given help to support his weakness, and the new *Nunc etiam* asks for him to be given helpers, which amounts to precisely the same request. The change does nothing to clarify the nature of the Catholic priesthood.

#### Da, quaesumus

GRANT, WE BESEECH THEE, ALMIGHTY FATHER, TO THIS THY SERVANT THE  
DIGNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD:  
RENEW THY SPIRIT OF HOLINESS WITHIN HIM: MAY HE HOLD FROM THEE, O GOD,  
THE SECOND RANK IN THY SERVICE

AND BY THE EXAMPLE OF HIS BEHAVIOUR  
AFFORD A PATTERN OF HOLY LIVING.       Da, quaesumus  
GRANT, WE BESEECH THEE, ALMIGHTY FATHER, TO THIS THY SERVANT THE  
DIGNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD:  
RENEW THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS WITHIN HIM: MAY HE HOLD FROM THEE, O GOD,  
THE SECOND RANK IN THY SERVICE  
AND BY THE EXAMPLE OF HIS BEHAVIOUR  
AFFORD A PATTERN OF HOLY LIVING.  
The form of the Sacrament is identical to that in the 1968 rite.

Sint probi

May he be a worthy cooperator with our Order (the episcopate), so that the words of the Gospel may reach to the farthest parts of the earth.

Sint probi

May he be a worthy cooperator with our Order, so that the words of the Gospel may, through his preaching, bear fruit in the hearts of men, and by the grace of the Holy Spirit, reach to the farthest parts of the earth.

All that the new material in the Sint probi does is to emphasize the preaching function of the the priest, which could hardly be more in accord with Anglican doctrine. In its commentary the CDWS states that the amplification of this prayer "describes the collaboration of the priestly ministry with that of the bishop in evangelization, the celebration of the sacraments, and prayer for the people." Its explanation, like the prayer itself, could hardly be in more perfect accord with Anglican doctrine.

Sint nobiscum

May he, with us,  
be a faithful dispenser of Thy mysteries that Thy people may be renewed by the waters of Baptism and be refreshed from Thine altar, that sinners may be reconciled, and the sick raised up.

The new material in the Sint nobiscum would not simply be acceptable to but welcomed enthusiastically by Anglicans with its echoes of words from the "form" for ordaining a priest in Cranmer's ordinals of 1550 and 1552: "Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments." Nor would the word "altar" cause problems for Anglicans as it is included in the 1549 Communion Service.

and all nations gathered together in Christ, may become one holy people of God.

Per Dominum

Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, Our Lord, Who with Thee lives and reigns in the unity of the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. Amen.

Sint nobis

May he be united with us, O Lord, in beseeching Thy mercy for the people entrusted to him, and for the whole world.

Sic nationem

so that all nations gathered together in Christ,  
may become Thy one holy people gathered together in Thy kingdom.

Per Dominum

Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, Our Lord, Who with Thee lives and reigns in the unity of the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. Amen.

There is not one word in the rest of these amended prayers that would not be totally acceptable to Anglicans. The drastic changes made to the Prex, the only substantial portion of the traditional rite retained in the 1968 version, are both unnecessary and unjustified. The new Prex does indeed refer to the priesthood of Christ, a point which the CDWS stresses as of great importance in its commentary, but no Anglican, Cranmer included, ever denied the priesthood of Our Lord. How could any Protestant do so in view of the unequivocal teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews? What the new Prex nowhere makes clear is that Our Lord makes present the same sacrifice which He offered once and for all upon Calvary each time a validly ordained priest offers the Sacrifice of the Mass in His person (in persona Christi). It is nothing less than scandalous that the Prex from the Leonine Sacramentary has been sacrificed to compensate for what the CDWS accepted was "the lack of explanation of the functions of the priestly ministry" in the 1968 ordination rite, when there is not a word in the revised Prex that either clarifies this function or is not totally compatible with Protestantism.

Determination ex adiunctis

In order not to overlook any possible evidence that can be adduced in favour of the 1989 rite the full ex adiunctis case will be presented here. These arguments all deal with elements external to the rite and in no way concede the CDWS' claim that the revised Prex constitutes a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the nature of the priesthood. Dr. Francis Clark listed the most important of these factors in his review of the first edition of this book, which is cited at length in the introduction.

There is not the slightest doubt that the supreme authority that sanctioned the changes, the Holy See, was determined to maintain intact the full Catholic doctrine of the Mass and the priesthood. The new forms, liturgically impoverished though they are, are nevertheless still vested with the sacred significance which the supreme authority of the Catholic Church attaches to its Sacraments, ministry, and rites. The documents of the Second Vatican Council and the teaching of Pope Paul VI are the contemporary overall context which objectively supplies the due meaning which is no longer explicit in the ritual forms.

While stressing Dr. Clark's agreement with me that the nature of the priesthood "is no longer explicit in the ritual forms", I accept that the ex adiunctis case that he puts here cannot be contested. (It should be noted that his acceptance of the inadequacy of the ritual forms is based only on the 1968 rite and not the revised ordinal of 1989.) Other ex adiunctis factors in favour of the New Ordinal are the fact that in 1968 it was celebrated within the context of the Tridentine Mass. There are also prayers in the rite of Mass for ordinations found in the new Ordinal that must be accepted as imparting a Catholic ex adiunctis setting to the rite, above all the presence of the Roman Canon. The modifications made to it in the 1970 Missal do not detract from its explicitly sacrificial terminology. Even if the Roman Canon is not used for an ordination Mass, that Mass will be celebrated with an Ordinal which includes it.

The decisive factor where the validity of any sacramental rite is concerned is the approval given to it by the Pope. As Appendix XI makes clear, no Pope could impose or authorize for universal use any sacramental rite that was either invalid or intrinsically harmful to the faith. In Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention, the most authoritative examination of Anglican Orders written since *Apostolicae Curae*, Dr. Francis Clark explains that:

The ultimate test of the validity of sacramental rites is not to be found in scholarship and liturgical research alone. When the sufficiency or insufficiency of a rite is in question, the decisive norm is the acceptance or rejection of it by the Catholic Church. So it can be argued that when the head of the Church officially rejects a rite as incapable of mediating sacramental efficacy, as he did in the constitution *Apostolicae Curae*, he is not only judging authoritatively about a past dogmatic fact, but is also exercising in the present what may be called "practical infallibility". Even by itself, prescinding from anything that had gone before, this solemn act of the Holy See was sufficient to disown the Anglican rite as not a sacramental rite of the Catholic Church. Thus there has been since 1896 an added source of certainty about the invalidity of the Anglican rite-----a certainty based on the "practical infallibility" of the Church's determining decrees, which in the sacramental sphere effectively guarantee what they decree (my emphasis). 8

Needless to say, the authority of the Church is as decisive in affirming the validity of a sacramental rite as in affirming its invalidity. The papal approbation given to the Latin Typical Editions of all the post-conciliar sacramental rites places their validity beyond dispute.

The Latin Typical Edition of the 1989 Ordinal includes (page 216) a proper preface for the ordination of a priest which, after the traditional opening which states our duty of offering praise to the Father almighty, includes the following:

Who, by the anointing of the Holy Spirit, appointed Thine only Son as the High Priest of the new and everlasting covenant, and by a wonderful design, saw fit to ordain that His one priesthood be preserved in the Church.

For He not only adorns the people He has won with His Royal Priesthood, but He has also out of fraternal kindness, chosen men to share in His sacred ministry by the laying on of hands.

They are to renew, in His name, the sacrifice of man's redemption, by making present the Paschal Feast for Thy children, and to lead Thy holy people in charity, to nourish them with the Word, and refresh them with the Sacraments.

Offering their lives for Thy sake and for the salvation of the brethren, they are to endeavour to conform themselves to the image of Christ Himself, and steadily manifest to Thee their faith and love.

This preface has been included as an *ex adiunctis* factor testifying to the orthodoxy of the new ordinal as it states that ordination gives men a share in Christ's ministry by the laying on of hands, thus distinguishing the ministerial priesthood from the universal priesthood of all the faithful. It also refers to the fact that the ordained priest renews the sacrifice of man's redemption, which is good, but then claims that this is done by making present the Last Supper (*paschale convivium*), which is a depressing reminder of the extent to which the spirit of Archbishop Bugnini permeates the Congregation created in 1975 when Pope Paul VI suppressed the Congregation for Divine Worship of which he was secretary. 9 The promulgation of the New Order of Mass in 1969, prefaced by the General Instruction to the new Roman Missal (which was not published until the following year), caused great scandal. The General Instruction was so severely criticised for statements of dubious orthodoxy, and its entirely unCatholic ethos, that extensive and important revisions needed to be made to the version that prefaced the actual Missal in 1970. (A detailed examination of the original Instruction and the subsequent amendments is provided in Chapter XIII of my book *Pope Paul's New Mass*.) One of the most serious deficiencies in the original version was Article 48 which stated that it is the Last Supper that is made present whenever Mass is celebrated. The 1970 version of Article 48 corrected this by stating that "the sacrifice of the Cross is continually made present in the Church", whenever Mass is celebrated. It is, of course, in the original German Instruction, and not in the conciliar Liturgy Constitution, which it claimed to interpret, that the theological rationale



of the New Mass can be found. It is deplorable that the preface in the 1989 Ordinal, composed specifically for use in the ordination of priests, conforms to the uncorrected Article 48 by claiming that it is the Last Supper that is made present in the Mass where priests "renew, in His name, the sacrifice of man's redemption, by making present the Paschal Feast (paschale convivium) for Thy children."

### The Postcommunion

The proper postcommunion for the Mass of priestly ordination, found on page 207 of the Latin Ordinal, states with admirable clarity that the Divine Victim is offered in the Mass, and employs the word *hostia* for *victim*. The use of the word *sacerdotes* for priests is also welcome:

*Sacerdotes tuos, Domine, et omnes famulos tuos vivificet divina, quam obtulimus et sumpsimus, hostia, ut, perpetua tibi caritate coniuncti, digne famulari tuae mereantur maiestati.*

O Lord, may the Divine Victim which we have offered and consumed, bring new life to Thy priests and all Thy servants that, united with Thee in unceasing charity, they may merit worthily to serve Thy Divine majesty.

### The Profession of Faith

A final *ex adiunctis* factor is the Profession of Faith taken prior to ordination to the diaconate. The ordinand places his hand upon the Book of the Gospels while making the profession which begins with the recitation of the Creed, which is followed by these words:

Furthermore, I embrace and uphold each and every doctrine concerning faith and morals which the Church has taught and declared in solemn definition or by ordinary teaching authority and in the sense in which the Church has proposed such doctrine especially the teaching concerning the mystery of the Holy Church of Christ, the Sacraments, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Deacons must logically presume that the rite used to ordain them to the priesthood is intended to make them priests who will offer the Sacrifice of the Mass in the sense defined by the Church.

In its commentary upon the 1989 revision of the Prex, the CDWS accepts that: "The first line of revision in the Prex needed to address the problem of the lack of explanation of the functions of the priestly ministry." It concludes the commentary by praising the 1989 Prex with words which have already been quoted several times, as "an aid to the understanding of what this Second Editio Typica offers in order to make the actual celebration of the priestly ordinal a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of the priests who, through the ministry of the Bishop, Christ the Lord makes participants in His priesthood through the power of the Holy Spirit and for the service of the holy people of God."

The reader must judge for himself whether or not the revised Prex does constitute a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the nature of the Catholic priesthood. The full text in Latin and in English is available in this appendix for scrutiny. However carefully one examines it, and with no matter how much good will, the claim that it is a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of priests cannot be substantiated from the text itself. In order to do this it is necessary to resort to *ex adiunctis* factors. The nearest that the actual rite of ordination comes to an explicit mandatory affirmation of the nature of the Catholic priesthood is the question put to the ordinand and cited above, asking whether he is resolved to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Sacrament of Reconciliation faithfully and religiously according to the tradition of the Church. Even with considerable good will, and a resolve to interpret liturgical texts approved by the Pope according to the tradition of the Church, it can hardly be considered a sufficiently eloquent presentation of Catholic teaching when set beside the venerable and explicitly sacrificial prayers

expunged from the traditional rite by Archbishop Bugnini in 1968 and, alas, not restored in 1989.

If Cardinal Martinez, who was Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments when the 1989 Ordinal was published, insists that the actual celebration of the priestly ordinal now constitutes a sufficiently eloquent presentation of the mystery and identity of the priesthood, then perhaps he would be gracious enough to point out to us precisely where and precisely how.

A sacramentary was a liturgical book used in the celebration of Mass until the thirteenth century. It contained the Canon of the Mass and such prayers as the Collects and Prefaces, but not the Epistles and Gospels or such sung parts as the Gradual. It also contained ordination formularies, blessings, and other prayers used by bishops and priests. In order to simplify the celebration of the liturgy, Missals containing all the prayers and readings necessary to celebrate Mass began to appear from the tenth century, and all the ceremonies involving bishops began to be collected into Pontificals, and these two books eventually replaced the sacramentary completely. The sacramentary had been preceded by what were known as *Libelli Missarum*. They were small books containing the formularies for parts of the Mass for the Church in a particular diocese or locality, but not the Canon which was fixed, the readings, or the sung parts. They provided the intermediary between extempore celebrations and the fixed formularies of the Sacramentary. No actual examples are known to have survived, but the certainty of their existence is known through literary references and above all through the Leonine Sacramentary in Verona which consists of a collection of libelli. The uninterrupted use up to 1968 of a *Prex* that had come down to us virtually unchanged from a *libellum* originating in the mists of Christian antiquity provided a priceless link with our fathers in the faith which should have been preserved as a sacred trust to be handed on unchanged to future generations.

I have shown in my book *Pope Paul's New Mass* that the three new Eucharistic Prayers in the 1970 Missal have all been drafted in a manner that allows precisely such an interpretation, i.e. the priest is no more than a member of the congregation, differing from them in degree but not in essence, who does no more than preside at the Eucharist. Only the Roman Canon makes the necessary distinction between celebrant and congregation. The presence of the Roman Canon, now known as Eucharistic Prayer I, in the 1970 Missal, gives a Catholic signification to the ambiguities of the three new prayers.

The actual reference to Hebrews given in the *Notitiae* commentary (p. 118 [g]) is 8:5 which does not contain even the least allusion to *futurorum bonorum*, but the phrase does occur in 9:17 and 10:1; the latter is probably intended as it also refers to a "shadow".

1. *Via Media*, vol. n (London, 1901), p. 316.
2. *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum* (CLV. Edizione Liturgiche 00192 Roma. Via Pompeo Magno, 21, 1979, Italy), pp. 633-4.
3. A. Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1990), p. 721.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 70, n. 29.
5. M. Sansom, *Liturgy for Ordinations: The Series III Services* (Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts, 1978), p. 10.
6. H. Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II* (New York, 1967), p. xviii.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 814-15.
8. F. Clark, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* (London, 1956), p. 10.
9. The complete background to the suppression of the Congregation and "the "exile" of Archbishop Bugnini, as he described it himself, can be found in Chapter XXIV of my book *Pope Paul's New*

Mass.

## Appendix X The Indefectibility of the Church

The indefectibility of the Church is a teaching fundamental to the nature of Catholicism. It assures us that the Church is divinely constituted, and because Our Lord has promised that the gates of Hell will never prevail against it, its Divine constitution will endure unchanged until He comes again in glory to judge the living and the dead. In other words, the Church will remain in every essential respect precisely as Our Lord constituted it until the end of time. It will always be a visible, hierarchically governed Church whose bishops are in full Communion with the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ. It

will always teach faithfully the Gospel entrusted to it by Our Lord, and impart the grace necessary for the faithful to live up to the demands of the Gospel through the Sacraments instituted by Our Lord. The

doctrine of indefectibility guarantees that the supreme authority in the Church, the Roman Pontiff, could never impose or authorize for universal use throughout the Church any liturgical rite or practice that was contrary to sound doctrine, could invalidate the Sacrament, or undermine Catholic belief.

In this instance the Roman Rite can be considered as equivalent to universal as it includes the overwhelming majority of Catholics throughout the world, and is proper to the Holy See itself.

Thus, if

the Latin Ordinal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1968, or the Latin Missal promulgated by him in 1970, are examined carefully, they will be found to contain nothing incompatible with the Catholic faith. But

only the Latin typical editions of sacramental rites come within the scope of the Church's indefectibility. Vernacular translations are, by their very nature, not imposed or authorized for the universal Church, and the possibility that they may contain erroneous or harmful elements cannot be excluded. A vernacular version of a sacramental form could result in invalidity if it did not reproduce the exact sense of the Latin text. This does not mean that it must be an absolutely literal translation, but if it departs from the Latin to the extent of involving a significant change of meaning, then the Sacrament will not be valid. It is true that all vernacular translations receive Papal approval, but this merely indicates that the Pope and the curial department concerned presume that a national hierarchy, or group of hierarchies linked on the basis of a common language, has ensured that translations into their languages are accurate. The almost countless vernacular versions of sacramental rites in the world today preclude the least possibility of any pope being able to vet them all personally for reasons of time, apart from ignorance of almost all the languages concerned. Mass is now said in Esperanto and Pidgin English, a fact which almost defies credibility, and does indeed do so when one hears the Pidgin form of the Consecration.

The aftermath of Vatican II proves how prudent the Popes were prior to the Council to insist upon the use of uniform Latin text for sacramental rites throughout the world.

The Church could not be considered a perfect, visible supernatural society (and it is of Divine faith that the Church possesses these characteristics) if the possibility existed of it offering its members invalid Sacraments. If ever a pope approved an invalid sacramental rite the faithful would be deprived of a means of holiness necessary for their salvation, and hence the Church would have failed, and the gates of Hell would have triumphed. In other words, Our Lord would have made a promise that He could not keep and hence He could not have been divine, which would mean that our entire religion is a mockery.

This is precisely what is claimed by those alleging that any of the sacramental rites promulgated since Vatican II are invalid. Concessions such as the permission for Communion in the hand, granted to specific countries, are also excluded from the scope of indefectibility. Where the reception of Holy

Communion is concerned, the norm for the Roman Rite is still Communion on the tongue, even though in almost every country Communion in the hand has become the norm. But in every instance of the authorization of this practice the permission given has been from the norm of Communion on the tongue. It is perfectly legitimate to argue that by surrendering to the fait accompli of Communion in the hand in country after country the Holy See has contributed to the weakening of reverence for the Blessed Sacrament. True as this may be, and I have not the least doubt that it is true, it does not compromise the doctrine of indefectibility as no blanket permission for Communion in the hand for the universal Church has ever been given.

The doctrine of indefectibility most certainly does not require us to believe that new sacramental rites promulgated with papal authority are ipso facto superior to those that they are intended to replace. It

is perfectly permissible to claim that such a rite gives liturgical expression to the doctrine of the Sacrament it enshrines less effectively than its predecessor, thus weakening the principle *lex orandi lex credendi*. It is equally permissible to argue that the prayers and ceremonies of a new rite are less effective in raising the hearts and minds of the faithful to Almighty God, and evoking in them the sentiments and dispositions most likely to ensure fruitful reception of the Sacrament. All that the doctrine of indefectibility requires us to believe is that at the very least in its Latin Typical Edition, any sacramental rite approved by a Pope will be valid, contain no heresy, and nothing overtly harmful to the faithful participating in it.

Theologians make a distinction between the Pope 'sentiendo' (giving sentence) and the Pope 'disserendo' (giving an opinion). When Pope Paul VI promulgated the New Mass he "gave sentence" and guaranteed its validity. When, in his discourse of 19 November 1969, he claimed that it expresses Catholic Eucharistic teaching more clearly than the Tridentine Mass, he expressed an opinion. An opinion, even the opinion of the Sovereign Pontiff, deserves respect only to the extent to which it corresponds with reality.

The new sacramental rites promulgated since the Second Vatican Council can be seen as a paradigm of the Divine and human aspects of the Church. Pope Paul VI displayed lamentable human weakness in agreeing to replace rites whose origin is lost in the mists of Christian antiquity by the artificially concocted creations of committee advised by Protestants. The Divine nature of the Church, and the practical application of the doctrine of indefectibility, can be seen in the fact that the new rites are undoubtedly valid and convey the same sacramental grace as those that they have replaced, but which, we must hope, will be restored one day. Acceptance of the doctrine of indefectibility by no means precludes our working and praying for this end.

In his *Motu Proprio "Ecclesia Dei"* of 2 July 1988, Pope John Paul II required the implementation of the necessary measures to guarantee respect for the rightful aspirations "of those Catholic faithful attached to some previous liturgical and disciplinary forms of the Latin tradition." The *Motu Proprio* was soon implemented by authorizing the use of all the pre-conciliar sacramental rites by such orders as the Fraternity of St. Peter or the Benedictine Monks of Le Barroux, and so it is now beyond doubt that both the pre- and post-conciliar rites coexist within the Roman Rite. This must be regarded as no more than an interim measure in the process of their total restoration.

In his encyclical '*Iucunda Sane*' commemorating the thirteenth centenary of the death of St. Gregory the Great, Pope St. Pius X wrote:

Never throughout the course of the ages has supernatural power been lacking in the Church; never have the promises of Christ failed. They remain as powerful today as when they filled the heart of Gregory with consolation. Rather, having withstood the test of time and the change of

circumstances and events, they possess even greater assurance.

## Appendix XI

### The Form for the Ordination of a Priest

In the first edition of this book I stated that the matter and form of this Sacrament, as designated by Pope Pius XII in *Sacramentum Ordinis*, remained unchanged in the new rite. This was a mistake as one small change of no theological significance was made in the form of the 1968 Ordinal, and has been retained in the 1989 edition. The compilers of the 1968 Ordinal decided to restore the form to the version found in the Leonine Sacramentair. This change was quite unnecessary, but so were all the other changes made in the traditional rite to produce that of 1968. The compilers can at least be given credit for consistency.

The two versions of the form are as follows:

#### The Traditional Form

Da, quaesumus,  
omnipotens Pater,  
in hos famulos tuos  
Presbyterii dignitatem;  
innova in visceribus eorum  
Spiritus sanctitatis;  
ut acceptum a Te, Deus,  
secundi meriti monos obtineant,  
censuramque morum  
exemplo suae  
conservationis insinuent.

Grant, we beseech thee, almighty Father,  
to these Thy servants  
the dignity of the priesthood:  
renew the spirit of holiness within them,  
that they may hold from Thee, O God,  
the second rank in Thy service and by the example of their behaviour afford a pattern of holy living.

#### The 1968 Form

Da, quaesumus,  
omnipotens Pater,  
in hos famulos tuos  
Presbyterii dignitatem;  
innova in visceribus eorum  
Spiritus sanctitatis;  
acceptum a Te, Deus,  
secundi meriti monos obtineant,  
censuramque morum  
exemplo suae  
conservationis insinuent.

Grant, we beseech thee, almighty Father,  
to these Thy servants the dignity of the priesthood:  
renew the spirit of holiness within them,  
may they hold from thee, O God,  
the second rank in Thy service and by the example of their behaviour afford a pattern of holy living.

If the two forms are examined carefully, it will be noticed that the conjunction *ut* from the seventh

line of the Latin text does not appear in the 1968 form which has been restored to the exact wording of the Leonine Sacramentary, the background to which is explained in Appendix IX. The form from the Leonine Sacramentary is included in a collection of prayers which have been employed or accepted by the Church as valid forms for the ordination of priests in a book published in 1896, *The Popes and the Ordinal* by Father A.S. Barnes, which is included in the bibliography. He comments on page 146 that the form from the Leonine Sacramentary is "still found word for word in the *Pontificale Romanum*." Father Barnes had failed to notice the addition of the *ut* just as I had failed to notice its omission.

The form from the Leonine Sacramentary is also included in a similar list of forms recognized as valid by the Holy See in *A Vindication of the Bull "Apostolicae Curae"* by the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the province of Westminster (1898). The Bishops noted a common pattern in all the forms recognized as valid:

In each of the rites which the Catholic Church has recognized the "essential form" is contained in a "consecrating prayer" to accompany the imposition of hands, and these prayers are all cast in the same type, defining in some way or other the order to which the candidate is being promoted, and beseeching God to bestow upon him the graces necessary in his new state.

How did the *ut* come into the form? The answer is almost certainly through a copying error by a scribe, which was in its turn copied by other scribes and eventually became codified with the advent of the printed Pontifical. Its advent was of no theological significance, nor was its removal, but, nonetheless, the change was quite unnecessary and can quite rightly be condemned as deplorable in accordance with the observation of the English Catholic Bishops in 1898 in their condemnation of Cranmer's liturgical changes, that "in adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure." It is thus hardly surprising that a small number of Catholics, distressed by the prevailing atmosphere of liturgical anarchy, and evidently ignorant of the most basic principles of sacramental theology, concluded that this change rendered the 1968 rite invalid. The blame for their confusion must be apportioned to the liturgists who caused the confusion, and not to the faithful whom they confused. Untenable as the allegation of invalidity may be, it did obtain some circulation among traditional Catholics and so a brief explanation of why this could not possibly be the case may be of some value.

The doctrine of indefectibility, which was explained in Appendix X, renders untenable any argument alleging the invalidity of the New Rite of Ordination as it was approved specifically by Pope Paul VI, and promulgated with his authority. In its Latin version, at least, it must certainly be valid. While the doctrine of indefectibility does not guarantee the validity of any vernacular sacramental rite, a careful examination of the approved English translations of the form for the ordination of a priest provides no justification for questioning their validity.

The fact that the removal of *ut* restores the form to the version found in the Leonine Sacramentary places allegations of invalidity into the realm of the ridiculous. If the controversial *ut* is necessary for validity then no Roman Rite priestly ordinations could have been valid until it was included in the form! Those who claim that the removal of *ut* renders the rite invalid do so on the principle that no change can ever be made to the form of a Sacrament, which means that the addition of *ut* rendered all ordinations invalid from the time of its inclusion until the promulgation of the 1968 Ordinal restored the original form! But as is made clear in Appendix I, Our Lord instituted His Sacraments in two ways, generically and specifically. Where He instituted a Sacrament specifically, He specified the matter and form which can never be changed, but only the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist come into this category. In the five Sacraments which Our Lord instituted generically, He left it to the supreme authority of His Church to decide the particular signs which should signify and effect the sacramental grace. In these Sacraments the Pope has the authority to make changes in the matter and form or even to change them completely. Had the Pope so wished, the entire form from the pre-1968 rite could have been abolished and a completely new one



composed. In the new rite for the ordination of a bishop the form specified by Pope Pius XII in *Sacramentum Ordinis* has been completely discarded. I consider this to be deplorable, but there can be no doubt whatsoever concerning the validity of the new form. As Dr. Francis Clark is quoted as explaining in Appendix IX:

"The ultimate test of the validity of sacramental rites is not to be found in scholarship and liturgical research alone. When the sufficiency or insufficiency of a rite is in question, the decisive norm is the acceptance or rejection of it by the Catholic Church."

We have the assurance of the successor of St. Peter that all the new sacramental rites are valid. This should be sufficient to dispel any doubt felt by anyone laying serious claim to the title Catholic.

#### A Significant Change of Meaning?

If, for the sake of argument, we lay aside the fact that the doctrine of indefectibility rules out any possibility of the new ordination rite being invalid, could it be maintained that the removal of *ut* from the traditional form justifies the allegation of a significant change of meaning? I obtained the judgment of a number theologians and canonists competent to provide an expert opinion on the question, namely Professor J.P.M. van der Ploeg, D.P., Dr. Philip Flanagan, Dr. Francis Clark, Dr. H.J. Jordan, Dr T.C.G. Glover, Father William Lawson, S.J., and also Professor Cristine Mohrmann, one of the world's greatest authorities on Christian Latin. They all reached the identical conclusion, that the omission of *ut* did not change the meaning of the Latin form to the slightest extent, and did not cast even the suspicion of doubt upon the validity of the Latin form. Thus even if, *per impossibile*, a sacramental form approved by the Sovereign Pontiff could be invalid, there would be no case for alleging invalidity in the case of the form for the ordination of a priest in the 1968 Ordinal.