

No Sacrifice — No Priest or, Why Anglican Orders Were Condemned

By Mgr. Arthur Stapylton Barnes

London Catholic Truth Society No.cts0030 (1897)

Introduction

One who undertakes to write a brief account of the reasons which lead Catholics to deny absolutely the validity of Anglican Orders finds himself at once in a difficulty on account of the variety of the arguments which are available for his purpose. "All roads," says the old proverb, "lead to Rome;" and in like manner the inquirer, whatever path he may take to lead him to the truth on this subject, will find himself irresistibly brought to one and the same conclusion, namely, that Anglican clergy can in no sense be considered real priests.

It would almost seem, indeed, as if there were no necessity to discuss the question at all, for it is settled by the common sense and universal opinion of mankind, which in such a matter is scarcely likely to make a mistake. There are not, indeed, many points of religious controversy on which so universal an agreement can be found to exist as on this: that Anglicans are not Catholics, and that their clergymen are not priests. Here, at any rate, Roman Catholics are at one with the East, Lutherans with Calvinists, Jews with infidels.

Within the Anglican Church itself, a full half would agree with the rest of the world, and would deny that they possessed a real priesthood in any sense whatever, while an overwhelming majority would view the words which would not explain away or empty of all meaning. The claim is made seriously only by the High Church party, and only by the "advanced" or Ritualistic section of that party. The English nation is but a fraction of Christendom; the Established Church claims a bare half of the English nation; the High Church party certainly does not include one half of the members of the Established Church; the section which believes in any real sense in the sacrifice of the Mass, and in its correlative idea the Christian priesthood, is but a fraction of the High Church party.

Yet it is these men, a fraction of a fraction within a body which itself comprises but a portion of a single nation, who set themselves up against the universal voice of Christendom, and not only of Christendom, but of the world. They are refuted by the arguments not only of opponents, but also of the large majority of those who make up their own communion. Others might well be excused if they declined, on the ground of its absurdity, the task of examining into a claim so preposterous. Here, if anywhere, it may be said, the maxim of St. Augustine against the Donatists must apply — *Securus Judicat Orbis Terrarum*. It is not likely that all the world is wrong, and this handful of men is right, on such a point as this.

The matter, however, is not one which we can thus lightly dismiss, because there is involved in it the honour of our Divine Lord in His holy Sacrament. To say that Anglican clergy are not true

priests would, if they do really possess that character, involve the doing of dishonour to the person of our Lord, present in the Sacrament by virtue of their consecration of the bread and wine. To say that they are true priests when they really are not would result in the not less terrible consequences of leading Christians to commit a material idolatry by worshipping as their present God what is nothing more than bread and wine, and, further, of causing them to rely on the grace of imaginary sacraments which are really only empty forms and barren ceremonies.

The question, therefore, is not one which can be set aside, still less one which may be decided on grounds of mere expediency or politeness. Those who think a late Papal Bull could have been inspired by such motives probably do not consider all that is involved. To accuse the Pope or his advisers of having been consciously swayed in their judgment on this matter by motives of mere expediency and worldly policy is to accuse them of putting the interests of party before the honour of God, of subjecting our Lord in His Sacrament to contumely and insult; renewing, so far as that is possible, His Passion and His Cross; and playing the part, to put the matter in a single word, of devils rather than of men.

It is a question which every Catholic must approach with the full realization of the fact that there is here involved no matter of mere ecclesiastical policy, no question of expediency or the reverse, but nothing less than the honour and the protection of our Blessed Lord Himself in the Sacrament of His love.

Four Lines of Argument

There are at least four main lines of argument on which we may proceed in our discussion of the matter:

1. We may show that in the Anglican Church the clergy are not made real priests, since the "form" and "intention" of the Ordinal are alike defective;
2. We may show the same thing with regard to the bishops, in which case the priesthood also fails for lack of a lawful minister to confer it;
3. We may betake ourselves to the historical argument, and show that there is no certain proof of even a material succession of laying on of hands, so that the chain may be broken, and there can be no security that the grace has been continued;
4. We can leave the theological and antiquarian arguments alone, and satisfy ourselves by the mere inspection of the Anglican Church as it is, and still more as it was, that we can draw no other conclusion than that a ministry which has so neglected its central function, and for whole centuries so failed in realizing its lofty prerogatives, cannot possibly possess the powers and graces which it has so systematically ignored and denied.

Of these four lines of argument, the first two are theological and conclusive. They alone are spoken of in the recent Papal pronouncement, and the facts make them for Catholics decisive of the matter. Either by itself is amply sufficient for our purpose. The third, the argument from history, is wearisome and endless, and as it can scarcely lead to anything but a probable conclusion, we may safely prophesy that we shall hear less of it in the future than we have done in the past, the principal office of this, together with the fourth argument—that, namely, which is drawn from experience—being to confirm, by the consideration of actual facts, the theoretical conclusions arrived at on a

priori grounds. In the present pamphlet we confine ourselves entirely to the first of these lines of argument, and say nothing about the others.

Priesthood and Sacrifice

Priesthood is the correlative of sacrifice. Where there is no sacrifice there can be no reason for the existence of a priest, just as where there is no priest there can be no sacrifice. This is clearly laid down in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where St. Paul argues that the Eternal Priesthood of our Blessed Lord necessitates the existence of a sacrifice which He may offer. "Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (Heb. viii. 3).

To offer is the essential function of a priest—the only function which is essential to the idea of his office. A priest may, indeed, have other functions. He may be further commissioned, for instance, to minister sacraments, to bless, and to give absolution. But these functions are no essential part of his office as a priest; they are separable from it—at any rate, in idea—and he might be a priest, in the full sense of the word, if these powers had never been given to him. On the other hand, the chief end of priesthood, and that which forms its essential idea, is sacrifice, and that alone. A priest is a man who has power to offer sacrifice, and every man who has power to offer sacrifice is thereby constituted to be a priest.

Now in appointing to any office which carries with it powers or authority of any kind, it is customary among men to confer it, either by directly naming the office to which appointment is made, or by some formal transfer, either verbal or symbolical, of the powers that are to be conveyed. Indeed, it is difficult to see how, in the case of any public office, it could be done in any other way.

We shall therefore expect to find that our Lord, when He ordained His apostles, acted in the same manner as He did in the case of the other sacraments — more humanhumano— and made use of some form of words to signify the gift of grace and the transfer of power which was taking place. And as priesthood consists mainly in this gift of power to offer sacrifice, we shall expect to find that the words used by our Lord signify this gift and the conferring of this power.

Nor are we disappointed. Our Lord did actually ordain His apostles by giving them power to offer the Sacrifice of the New Law. *Do this*, He said, *in remembrance of Me*. The ordination carried with it by implication the authority to do all that is contained in the idea of the Christian priesthood—to baptize, to bless, to absolve, to excommunicate. But these powers were not at this time given explicitly. One power alone is mentioned, and that one, as we should have expected, is the only one which is really essential to the idea of the priesthood—the power to offer sacrifice. *Do this in remembrance of Me*.

The Time of Ordination

Now we have here the very kernel of the whole controversy. Anglicans generally, being ignorant of Catholic theology on this point, think that our Lord ordained His apostles on the evening of the first Easter Day, when He breathed upon them, saying, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, &c.* They cannot understand, therefore, what Catholics mean when they contend that the Anglican Ordinal is defective in "form" and in "intention." "We use," they say, "the very words that

Christ Himself used when He ordained His apostles, and if they are not sufficient, how can any form of words possibly be more so?"

A Catholic, on the other hand, for whom the matter has long been settled by the teaching of the Church, and into whose mind the idea has never entered that any one can entertain so perverse a notion as that the apostles were made priests by receiving explicit authority to absolve—a function which is not essential to the priesthood at all, and might conceivably have been given to laymen had Christ so willed—cannot understand how it is that Anglicans do not see at once that as Christ ordained His apostles by giving power to offer sacrifice, so also the Church must do now if she desires to perpetuate the office which Christ founded.

The whole divergence of opinion on this matter really springs from, and is the result of, this difference in the teaching as to the time and manner in which Christ actually ordained the apostles. It will be well for us, therefore—nor will the time be misspent—if we pause in the argument until we have thoroughly established this point, after which we may proceed to argue further upon the question at issue.

Catholics, then, believe that Christ ordained His apostles at the Last Supper, and with the words, *Do this in remembrance of Me*. They do so for reasons principally drawn from the following considerations:

1. The Person of the Speaker

The words of our Blessed Lord were the words of God, and were therefore words of power effecting that which they asserted, and giving power to fulfil what they commanded. Just as we believe that by the words *This is My Body* there was effected the change which those words express, so also we believe that by the words *Do this in remembrance of Me* the apostles were not only commanded, but also empowered to offer the Christian Sacrifice.

2. The Nature of Priesthood

Since a priest is one who is empowered to offer sacrifice, our Lord could not have made any of His followers priests, save by giving them this power. Had He used any words on this occasion which did not imply this, He might, indeed, have given them other and supernatural powers, but He would not have made His apostles priests in the proper sense of the term.

3. The Definition of a Sacrament

The words "Do this in remembrance of Me," gave power to offer the Sacrifice of the New Law. But to give power to offer sacrifice is to ordain a priest. And since the Sacrament of Order confers character and cannot be repeated, it is clear that the apostles, having been made priests on Maundy Thursday, could not have been again ordained on Easter Day. Hence it follows that what our Lord did on Easter Day was not to ordain priests, but only to give explicitly a power which He had already given implicitly in the act of ordination.

Just in the same way the Western Church now uses these same words of our Lord in the ordination of her priests, not, however, as the act of ordination, but only after ordination is complete and the newly ordained have joined with the bishop in their first Mass; thus doing exactly what Christ did and giving at a later time explicitly and in words powers which have already been conferred implicitly, and, in fact, in the act of ordination itself.

4. The Tradition of the Church

It would be impossible in a pamphlet to transcribe all the words of the Fathers bearing upon the point. We must content ourselves with a few, from Fathers of the Eastern as well as the Western Church:

Justin Martyr (A.D. 139): "For the apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have delivered that Jesus gave them injunction, as follows, that having taken bread and given thanks, He said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' ...and that He distributed to them alone" (*Apol.* i. 66).

St. Hippolytus (A.D. 222): "It is not lawful for a deacon to offer up sacrifice. Christ, having become man for our sakes, and offering up to God and His Father the spiritual sacrifice before His Passion, to us alone did He give commission to 'do this,' ...although there were others like unto us who had believed on Him, but not by any means was every one that believed at once appointed a priest" (*De Char. Trad. Apost.*, n. 26; Gallandi, tom. ii. p. 512).

St. Cyprian (A.D. 248): "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, he Himself the great High Priest, and first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded to do this in remembrance of Himself assuredly that priest who imitates what Christ did, truly acts in Christ's stead; and he then offers in the Church to God the Father a true and complete sacrifice, if he so begin to offer according as he sees Christ Himself did offer" (*Ep.* lxii. ad Caecilium).

St. Gaudentius (A.D. 387): "He would have His benefits be permanent amongst us. He would have souls be at all times sanctified by His own precious Blood... and for this cause does he enjoin on His faithful disciples, whom also He constituted the first priests of His Church, to use unceasingly those mysteries of eternal life, which must necessarily be celebrated by every priest in every Church of the world until Christ shall come again from heaven" (*De. Pasch. obs.*, Tr, ii.)

Apostolical Constitutions (A.D. 270): "For this reason do you also, now the Lord is risen, offer your sacrifices, concerning which He gave an ordinance to go through us, saying, *Do this in remembrance of Me*" (Lib. V. c. xix.).

Theodore (A.D. 424): "If, then, other sacrifices are needless, why do the priests of the New Testament offer up the mystic sacrifice? It is clear to those who have been instructed in the Divine things, that we do not offer up any other sacrifice, but celebrate the memorial of that one and saving Sacrifice. For this did the Lord Himself appoint unto us: *This do in remembrance of Me*" (t. iii. *Interp. in Ep. ad Heb.*, c. viii.).

St. Chrysostom (A.D. 387): Commenting on 1 Cor. x. 16, *Do this in remembrance of Me*, "Here He hath transferred the sacred office to that which is far more awful and glorious, changing the very Sacrifice itself, and instead of the slaughter of irrational creatures, commanding to offer up Himself" (*In 1 Cor.* x. 16, Hom. xxiv. § 3).

St. Leo (A.D. 440): "That the shadows then might give place to the Body ...the old observance is taken away by the New Sacrament, sacrifice passes into Sacrifice, blood is taken away by Blood, and the legal festivity is at once taken away and completed" (*Serm.* 58, § i).

5. The Actual Decision of the Church

The words of the Council of Trent make the point *de fide* to all Catholics. The matter was very carefully discussed in several sittings and by a large number of bishops, whose speeches may be read in the *Acta* of the Council in Theiner's edition. The result was at length decided and embodied in a Canon:

"If any one shall say that by these words, 'Do this in Remembrance of Me,' Christ did not make His apostles priests, or that He did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His Body and Blood, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxii. Can. ii.).

This should be read in conjunction with Cap. i. of the same Session, where it is said that "Christ at the Last Supper offered His Body and His Blood to God the Father under the species of bread and wine, and under the same form gave them to be received by His apostles, whom He then constituted Priests of the New Testament, and bade them and their successors in the priesthood to offer likewise, saying, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' So the Catholic Church has ever understood and taught."

The Church's Practice Throughout the Ages

These arguments will probably be sufficient to establish even to non-Catholics the truth of the first point of our position, that it was at the Last Supper, and not after His Resurrection, that our Lord ordained His apostles priests, and that He did it by conferring power to offer sacrifice, and not by giving the merely secondary power of absolution. The extreme importance of this point, which is really the very keystone of the whole doctrine of the priesthood, will be sufficient excuse for our having gone so fully into the matter.

We now go on to the second portion of the argument, which is, that the Church has ever, in her practice throughout the ages, been faithful to the pattern then set her. Clearly it is always the function of the Church to do what Christ did, and to continue the office which Christ instituted. And as, in the matter before us, that office, by common consent, is the office of priesthood, and the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, we shall expect a priori to find that she has always done this in Christ's own way, either, that is, by actually naming the office of priesthood itself in the "form" by which the Sacrament of Order is conferred, or else, at the least, by the explicit mention in that "form" of the principal function of the priesthood, viz., the offering of the Holy Sacrifice.

There are extant, contained in the various Liturgies of the Church, a large number of sacramental "forms" which have actually been employed in the past, or else are now in use, for the ordaining of priests. Some of these are very ancient, and probably enshrine the actual words employed for this purpose in apostolic or sub-apostolic times. They are in many languages and have been in force in many and widely differing countries and circumstances. But in all, without exception, there is preserved the one special feature of a prayer of peculiar emphasis and dignity, closely connected with that laying on of hands which is universally acknowledged to be the essential act or "matter" of the sacrament.

This prayer, as is now generally admitted, is the sacramental "form"; and in every case, within the limits of this sacramental "form," though these forms differ widely from one another in actual wording, it is distinctly mentioned that the office which is being conferred is the office of the

priesthood, and the graces needed to fit the ordinand for the performance of the functions of this office of priesthood are duly impetrated on his behalf.

The matter is not difficult to prove if proof be called for. The crucial sentences from these various "forms," both for the priesthood and the episcopate, are collected and tabulated in the Appendix to this pamphlet. A reference to these "forms" will prove at once the truth of the assertion here made, that the Church has ever done what her Master first taught her, and has ordained her priests by the use of words which express, at the moment of the essential act, the sacred order of priesthood to which they are admitted.

The Holy Father implies in his Bull that less than this would suffice, if in default of naming the Order the "form" were to "express its grace and power, which is chiefly the power of consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord in that Sacrifice which is no nude commemoration of the Sacrifice offered upon the Cross." But, as a matter of fact, she has never failed to take the clearer way, and to name the office of the priesthood itself directly, though there is generally added, especially in the Eastern Church, a definition of that office, and of the Sacrifice which it is its special function to offer.

The Anglican Deficiency

Now we turn to the Anglican Church. How does the matter stand with her? Does she do as our Lord Himself did, and taught His Church to do? Not at all. She has abolished the old "form," and has adopted instead words which were not originally intended by Christ to ordain priests, and which the Church has never employed for that purpose—words, which indeed may confer a power given to none but priests, but which are absolutely insufficient to make priests or to express the whole priestly office.

The word priest does not occur at all in this "form" of ordination, as that "form" stood from 1559 to 1661. At this latter date a change was made, in consequence of the criticism, made alike by Catholics and Presbyterians, that neither the offices nor the functions of priesthood and episcopacy were therein expressed. The change, however, was made just a hundred years too late, for, as the Pope says, "Even if these additions could give to the 'form' its due significance, they were introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed... and therefore, as the hierarchy had become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining."

Again, there is not a single mention of the Christian sacrifice from cover to cover of the Prayer-book. The only sacrifice known to the Anglican Church is "the sacrifice of the lips," the sacrifice, improperly so-called, of prayer and praise and thanksgiving. Her "priests" are ordained without any allusion to the function which, if they are real priests at all, is the very object for which they exist. So far as can be gathered from any Anglican formulary, our Lord never instituted a permanent and external Sacrifice on earth at all—the clergy are spoken of as "preachers" and as "pastors," as "dispensers of God's Word and of His sacraments," but of the essential action of the priesthood, the offering of Sacrifice, there is not a word.

Nor is this omission the result of accident. It is intentional. The Anglican formularies, as we are all aware, have a certain relation to their Catholic predecessors. It is one of the points most insisted on by the advocates of the theory of "continuity," that the Anglican services are not wholly novel, but are the same as the Catholic, only with certain changes introduced. The Anglican Ordinal, it is quite true, is based upon the Pontifical. But every allusion, however faint, to the Christian Sacrifice, or

the power of offering, has been deliberately removed, as we should naturally have expected from the known heretical opinions of its compilers.

In the Anglican Church, by the evidence of its formularies, backed up by the almost unanimous opinion of its members—an opinion even more unanimously held in the past than it is in the present—there exists no Sacrifice, and because no Sacrifice, therefore no true priest. The Anglican Ordinal is fatally defective alike in its "form" and in its "intention."

The Retention of the Word "Priest"

Against this conclusion there can be urged practically but a single argument. It is based upon the retention of the actual word "priest," in spite of the elimination of all mention of the priestly function. If not in the actual sacramental "form" as it existed from 1552 to 1661, yet at least in other portions of the service of ordination the word "priest" was retained. The ordinand comes and is presented "to be ordained priest."

Hence, say the defenders of the Anglican position, it is clear that the office itself was intended to be retained. What matters, they ask triumphantly, the elimination of all mention of the priestly act if the priestly office itself is retained? By your own confession priest is the correlative of sacrifice—where there is a priest there must be a sacrifice. If the Church of England, as is clear, has retained the priest, she has clearly proved to have also retained the sacrifice which that office involves.

The answer to this argument is simple enough. It is not enough to come to receive a sacrament unless that sacrament is validly conferred. To bring a child for baptism avails it nothing unless it is duly baptized with valid "matter" and valid "form." To be truly married it is not enough to come to church for that purpose, but a valid contract must be duly made. And, similarly, to be validly made a priest it is not sufficient to have been presented for that purpose to the bishop, to have listened to a sermon on the duties of the office, to have knelt while litanies and prayers are said on one's behalf. All these things are but preliminaries, they effect nothing at all, and they might all be omitted without touching the validity of the sacrament in any point.

One thing alone is needful to make a priest: it is the explicit conferring of the office, or at least the bestowal of the power of offering sacrifice, and it is just this one essential which is utterly wanting in the "form" of the Anglican Ordinal.

The matter is well put by an anonymous writer in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, who was, however, identified by common report with one of the best and most highly placed theologians of Rome. He writes as follows: "The compilers of the Ordinal have kept what is superfluous while throwing away what is essential. They have forgotten no preliminary... but then, suddenly and at the decisive moment, the Ordinal fails us altogether, there is not a word to designate the order that is being conferred. All the preparations for the marriage are made, the bride and bridegroom stand at the altar, there and then, and in a hundred eloquent fashions, they express their mutual affections one for the other, and now that the instant has come for them to pronounce the decisive 'I will,' they both of them shut themselves up in the most obstinate silence."

The Anglican Understanding of Priesthood

In the primitive Liturgies, in the practice of the Catholic Church, and in that of the Eastern separated bodies the occurrence of the word priest, presbyter or sacerdos, in the Ordination "form"

is sufficient to designate the office, for by common consent in those Churches priest is the correlative of sacrifice, and one who is ordained "priest" is thereby understood to receive power to offer sacrifice. But it does not follow that the same will necessarily hold good of the Anglican Church.

Here we are dealing with the extraordinary and illogical action of a body of men who retain the name of "priest," while deliberately expunging from their liturgical books all mention of the sacrifice which it implies. How can we argue in such a case as this that the word priest implies a sacrifice? There is no magic about the word; it is used by men in a human way, and therefore it means just what they intend by it, and nothing more. They may be using it in some unheard-of fashion which does not imply a sacrifice, keeping for convenience sake the name while they have deliberately done away with the thing which it ordinarily implies.

The absence of all mention of sacrifice in the Anglican formularies implies that this is the case in the Church of England, and we are confirmed in this opinion by the writings of Anglican divines.

Among these, for instance, there is none that stands higher in general estimation than Hooker. He has held his own as one of their foremost authorities for more than three centuries, and to this day is given by almost every Anglican bishop to be studied by all the candidates for ordination. And this is the way in which he deals with the argument that the mere retention of the name of priest implies the retention of the Sacrifice and the power to offer. He is answering the Presbyterian argument that where the Sacrifice has been abolished, the name of priest should not be retained, and he does it by conceding their point that in the Anglican Church there is no sacrifice.

"Sacrifice," he says, "is no part of the Church ministry. The Gospel hath properly no sacrificer under the New Testament but Christ." The name, he says, may be retained without harm, for when men hear it, "it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think on old age" (*Eccl. Pol.* V. 78).

And Hooker was perfectly right. The Ordination Service itself proves his point that the word priest, as used therein, is used in a non-natural sense, and does not signify the possession of power to offer sacrifice. The Catholic rite of the Sarum Pontifical, as used in England before the Reformation, contained a definition of the priestly office. "It appertains to a priest to Offer, to Bless, to Preside, to Preach, to Consecrate the Eucharist, and to Baptize."

This definition was not, in spite of the alleged "continuity" of the services, retained in the new Ordinal. Another definition was substituted for it. They are now defined to be only "the Messengers, the Watchmen, the Pastors, and the Stewards of the Lord," and their office is "to teach, to premonish, to feed, and to provide for the Lord's family." Sacrifice as it is excluded from the service provided for Holy Communion, so also forms no part of the idea of a "priest" as that office is "continued" in the Anglican Church.

If it is objected that the word "sacrifice," like the word "priest," is not altogether excluded, although "altar" is, but that the "priest" is allowed, after the Communion has been received, to say a prayer asking God to receive "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," which words may be referred to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the answer is very simple. The words are carefully chosen to exclude the idea of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is no thing that has been offered, not the Body and Blood of Christ our Lord, not even bread and wine, but a sacrifice, improperly so called, of praise and thanksgiving.

And, that no doubt whatever may remain as to the meaning of these words, the Church of England employs them on other occasions, when there can be no real sacrifice, namely, when at Morning or Evening Prayer, or after the Litany, thanks are given for fine weather or for rain.

The Archbishops' Reply

Further, a proof that what we are urging now is no straining of a doubtful point by a hostile advocate, but the accepted doctrine of practically the entire Anglican community, has just been given to the world in the so-called "Answer" of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Apostolic Bull. Writing as the official representatives of the Anglican body to "all the Bishops of the Catholic Church," and with the expressed intention of "making plain for all time the doctrine of Anglicans about holy orders and other matters pertaining to them," they have committed themselves to a denial that the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in any real sense, exists among them.

"We think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father, and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things, which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice."

Exactly. In the Anglican Communion there is:

1. A sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.
2. An oblation of gifts and creatures.
3. A pleading of a Sacrifice that is past.
4. An offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies."

But the Sacrifice of the Mass, in which Christ Himself is offered, a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice to God for the living and the dead—in that the Anglican Church has no part. It offers no sacrifice—it offers prayers, and gifts, and creatures—but not Christ. This confirms what we have contended, and no more overwhelming proof could possibly be given to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, to East as well as West, that the Pope was fully justified in his action.

By the solemn assertion of the two archbishops speaking in the name of the whole body, the Anglican Church stands convicted of having cast away the Sacrifice that Christ Himself ordained, and therefore by an infallible consequence of having lost the Priesthood which our Lord ordained to provide the ministers on earth for its perpetual offering. Where there is no Sacrifice there can be no need of priests.

The Subjective Appeal

This "Answer" of the two Archbishops ought to speak with overwhelming force to those members of the Church of England who have attained to a higher notion of the Eucharistic Sacrifice than is there set forth. Either they must protest against it or they must stand before all the bishops of the Catholic Church as sharing the thoroughly Protestant teaching of their official leaders. Catholics will watch with interest to see what they will do. Probably, however, they will do nothing. Reason and logic are not the principal motives which guide them to a decision.

The motive which is strongest in holding back Anglican clergymen from admitting what their reason is often convinced of, and from agreeing that their Church did not and does not in her Ordination Services intend to give power to offer sacrifice, or to make "priests" in the generally accepted sense of that term, is a purely subjective one. They feel they are priests. They feel that they themselves are better men and better Christians through the use they have made of the ordinances of their religion, and therefore they feel that those ordinances are true sacraments. They are not very learned in theology, and so they fail to understand that God may be giving grace abundantly to them and to their flocks while they remain in good faith, even if they are not priests and their sacraments are not valid.

Moreover, they are inconsistent in their treatment of others who advance the same plea on behalf of their feelings. No one can be harder than a High Church clergyman on the Methodist who feels he is saved, or on the unbaptized parishioner who feels he is in grace and needs not the Sacrament, or on the woman who has found out her marriage to have been null and yet feels she is married in the sight of God. In all these cases he is eloquent on the uselessness and the danger of trusting to mere feelings, and on the absolute necessity of a valid sacrament. But in his own case it is different, he feels he is a priest, and therefore, of course, he stands secure and without fear before God.

Conclusion

We have now stated as simply and with as little use of technical language as may be, a portion of the reasoning which led Pope Leo XIII., after the most careful and searching investigation, to "pronounce and declare that ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been, and are, absolutely null and utterly void." We know not how we can better end this short explanation of his action than by quoting at length the loving and forcible appeal with which the venerable Pontiff concludes his great decision.

"It remains for Us to say that even as We have entered upon the elucidation of this grave question in the name and in the love of the Great Shepherd, in the same We appeal to those who desire and seek with a sincere heart the possession of a hierarchy and of Orders. Perhaps until now, though aiming at the greater perfection of Christian virtue, and searching very devoutly the Divine Scriptures, and redoubling the fervour of their prayers, they have nevertheless hesitated in doubt and anxiety to follow the voice of Christ, which so long has interiorly admonished them. Now they see clearly whither He in His goodness invites them and wills them to come.

"In returning to His one only fold they will obtain the blessings which they seek, and the consequent helps to salvation of which He has made the Church the dispenser, and, as it were, the constant guardian and promoter of His redemption amongst the nations. Then shall they indeed 'draw waters in joy from the fountains of the Saviour;' that sacrament, that is, whereby His faithful

are truly remitted and are restored to the friendship of God, are nourished and strengthened by the Heavenly Bread, and abound with the most powerful aids for their eternal salvation. May the God of Peace, the God of all Consolation, in His infinite tenderness enrich and fill with all these blessings those who truly yearn for them. ...

"We ask and beseech, by the tender mercy of the Lord our God, all to strive faithfully to 'follow in the open path of Divine Grace and Truth.'"

Appendix: Comparison of Ordination Forms

In the following table will be found the essential sentence from the "forms" of every Liturgy which has been or is now recognized by the Catholic Church. In every case the words given are conjoined with the laying on of hands, which constitutes the "matter" of the Sacrament, and it will be seen at once how in every case the Office of the presbyterate or episcopate is formally expressed.

Ancient Catholic Forms

Liturgy	For the Priesthood	For the Episcopate
Ancient Roman (Leonine Sacramentary)	Bestow, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, on these Thy servants the dignity of Priesthood , and renew within them the spirit of holiness.	We beseech Thee, O Lord, to bestow upon these Thy servants whom Thou hast chosen to the office of the High Priesthood this grace...
(Supposed) Ancient Gallican	Do Thou, O Lord, lay the hand of Thy blessing upon these Thy servants whom we set apart to the honour of the Priesthood , so that...	As above in the Roman "form."
Greek	Do Thou, O Lord, fill this man also, whom Thou hast been pleased should take up the degree of Priesthood , with the gift of Thy Holy Spirit.	Do Thou, O Lord of all, strengthen this man also, who has been... held worthy... to undertake the dignity of the Episcopate ... with the coming and the virtue and the grace of Thy
Coptic	Look upon Thy servant, N., who is promoted to the Priesthood ... fill him with the Holy Ghost and with grace.	Choose, O Lord God, and mercifully promote this Thy servant, N., who... has been to-day presented from the Order of Deacons for the high and sublime degree of the Priesthood . Grant him...
Syro-Jacobite	As above in the Coptic "form."	Look upon these Thy servants, and choose them with an holy choosing for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost,... and choose them also to the Priesthood .
Maronite	Pour forth the power of Thy guiding Spirit, Whom Thou didst give to Thine apostles, and grant this same grace to this Thy servant, N., whom Thou hast chosen to the Episcopate , that he may feed Thy holy flock...	Send down upon this Thy servant Thy Holy and uncreated Spirit, to the end that he may feed and administer Thy Church,... may ordain priests... Grant him all the power of Thy Saints, that he may be a glorious Bishop...
Nestorian	Choose, O Lord, this Thy servant, with an holy choosing through the anointing	Perfect, O Lord God, Thy grace and Thy gift amongst us, and in this Thy servant

Liturgy	For the Priesthood	For the Episcopate
	of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be to Thee a perfect Priest ,... and that he may make by the power of Thy gift priests... for	and Bishop N., and grant to him, together with this imposition of hands, the influx of Thy Holy Spirit.
Armenian	Hear, O Lord, the voice of our prayers, and preserve this Thy servant, N., now ordained, whom Thou hast chosen, and hast received to the Presbyterate , faithful in that Priesthood to which he has been called. Grant him...	The Divine and heavenly grace which ever supplies the needs of the holy ministry of the Apostolic Church, calls this man, N., from the priesthood to the Episcopate in the ministry of the Holy Church. I lay hands upon him, do ye all pray.
Apostolic Constitutions	Look upon this Thy servant enrolled in the order of Priests by the vote and judgment of all the clergy, and fill him with the spirit of grace and counsel...	Grant, O God, to this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen to the Episcopate to feed in Thy name Thy holy flock... Grant him... to share in Thy Holy Spirit that he may have power... to provide clergy as Thou hast bidden...
Canons of St. Hippolytus	Look upon Thy servant, N., giving to him of Thy might, and the Spirit of power which Thou didst give to the Holy Apostles... Grant him, O Lord, the Priesthood , and...	Look upon Thy servant, N., giving to him of Thy might, and the Spirit of power which Thou didst give to the Holy Apostles... Grant him, O Lord, the Episcopate , and...

Anglican Forms

For the purpose of an easy comparison the Anglican "forms," as they were in the Edwardine book used from 1559 to 1662, and as they have been since 1662, are appended. The first is that which has been adjudged invalid, the second, which per se might suffice, came very late, for the succession had of course been already lost long before.

Period	For the Priesthood	For the Episcopate
1559 to 1661	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.	Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.
1662 to present time	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: and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given to thee by this imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.	Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The argument drawn from the defective character of the Episcopal Consecration, and the consequent failure of Apostolic Succession is treated at length in the Preface to "The Popes and the Ordinal," by the present writer.

It must always be carefully borne in mind that in these discussions it is not the present Anglican Ordinal that is in debate, but that Ordinal as it was prior to its alteration in 1662.

Bull of Pope Leo XIII., "Apostolicae Curae"
