

VI.) from which present-day Anglican Orders are derived (through Parker); and (2) the defect of proper intention on the part of the persons ordaining and consecrating. For the reason stated the papal Bull made no reference to the grave historical doubts as to whether Barlow (who consecrated Parker) was really a bishop at all. These doubts, which I have sufficiently indicated, remain precisely as they were before the issue of the Bull, and any Catholic writing a treatise on Anglican Orders would necessarily take cognisance of them.

And now as to the defect in the Anglican form of ordination of priests and consecration of bishops. There has been a belated attempt to establish a parity between an alleged (but perfectly orthodox) vagueness (improperly so called) in early Christian ordination and consecration forms and the deliberate and culpable vagueness of the form of ordination and consecration drawn up by Cranmer for the express purpose of utterly rooting out of England the Catholic idea of an episcopate and of a sacrifice and a sacrificing priesthood, in all of which he had ceased to believe. Cranmer took and

Mutilated the Old Catholic Ordinal

with this deliberate intent. Our High Church friends who contend for a priesthood, etc., in the Catholic sense lose sight of a plain and irresistible fact which I may summarise as follows in another's words: This fact is, 'that the Anglican Ordinal stands a solitary exception to all others—not only in its character as being formed by intentional mutilation of an orthodox form, but also in its deficiency, seeing that, out of all ordination forms, ancient or mediæval, Eastern or Western (Canons of Hippolytus included) there is not one in which the essential form (the prayer connected with the laying on of hands) does not contain the specific mention or determination of the Order conferred—the Anglican Ordinal alone excepted. These two chief and fatal flaws—heretical mutilation and non-determination of the essential form—can never be taken away.'

But this mutilation and this failure to specify the Order conferred were merely part of the general movement of the 'reformers' in England and in Germany against a sacrifice (in the Catholic sense) and a sacrificing priesthood. Following the example of the new religion 'made in Germany,' the English 'reformers' deliberately tore every reference to Sacrifice, every sacrificial expression, out of the Mass. There were twenty-four references in the Mass to Sacrifice and to the Lord's Real Presence. They were mercilessly cut out and flung aside. For the old Catholic Sacrifice of the Mass there was substituted a communion service. This was the first and chief work of the Reformation in England. 'The Anti-Sacrificial campaign,' as Gasquet well remarks, 'was much too thorough not to go farther. The Catholic Sacrificium (Sacrifice) was inseparably bound up with the Catholic Sacerdotium (priesthood), and the English Reformation pursued its enemy, the Sacrificial idea, from the Missal into its source in the Pontifical' (the book containing rites to be performed by bishops, such as Ordinations) 'which gave to the Church a sacrificing priesthood. Hence Cranmer promptly followed up the introduction of a new Prayer Book by that of a new Ordinal' (a book containing forms and ceremonies for conferring Orders). While maintaining the distinction of three Orders of bishops, priests, and deacons—in the sense in which he and his fellow-revisers believed them to come down from the Apostles—he removed from the ordination services all that expressed or implied the conveyance of sacrificial powers, or the idea that those who were ordained were in any sense sacrificing priests empowered to offer a sacrifice upon the altar. In the ordination service of the Catholic Church there are no less than sixteen different parts in which the sacerdotium or sacrificial character is clearly expressed. Of these, not one was suffered to remain in the new Ordinal. Thus, taking the Ordinal with its natural accompaniment, the Communion Service—corresponding to the Missal and the Pontifical which they replaced—there are forty distinct cases of

Deliberate Suppression

of anything that would indicate a Sacrifice of the Mass or a Sacrificial Priesthood empowered to offer it.' Cranmer's own writings (as published by the Parker Society) are filled with expressions of quite extraordinary bitterness and violence against these two ideas—he admits no Sacrifice except one of prayer, praise, etc.

We sometimes hear the plea that Cranmer's mutilations of the old Catholic Ordinal were directed, not so much against the Catholic idea of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as against alleged theological exaggerations or abuses connected with it. 'To that,' says Gasquet, 'it is enough to reply that if the authors

of the Prayer Book and the Ordinal believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrificing Priesthood, nothing in the world would have been easier for them than to have said so. There was absolutely nothing to prevent their shortening and simplifying and translating the ancient services as much as they wished, and still expressing the sacrificial and sacerdotal idea. A single sentence in each book would have sufficed for the purpose. Moreover, had the reformers been striking at mere abuses or exaggerations, it is a matter of common sense that, in that case, they would have felt bound to have been all the more careful to safeguard the true sense of the sacrificial doctrine, as marked off from the abuse; and they would have recognised the necessity for such safeguarding as all the more imperative, knowing, as they did, that the whole sacrificial idea was utterly denied and denounced in France and Germany, and by the reforming party in England. So far from making any attempt to safeguard it, they strike it out wherever they find it, and they borrow and make their own the very words which the German and Swiss reformers have used to deny it.'

A sweeping and terrible interpretation was put upon Cranmer's words by the wild fury which soon vented itself in England, not alone upon the Mass, but upon every accessory of the Mass. Everywhere the

Altars were Demolished

and plain, movable wooden tables (of the kitchen type) set up. The altar-stone (the consecrated stone of Sacrifice) was made the object of special fury—they were everywhere defaced, broken, or turned to vile or common uses. Vestments, Mass bells, Missals, were destroyed; every ceremony connected with the sacrificial action of the Mass, or indicating belief in the Real Presence, was abolished; lighted candles were forbidden; and the most searching efforts were made, by order of the visitation articles of the new style of bishops, to root utterly out of the minds of the English people every trace of the Holy Sacrifice that had been for ages their joy. Parliament and the Crown (the supreme arbiters of the doctrine and discipline of the new religion) enacted a code of penal laws of unexampled severity—plying rack and rope and knife—against the Mass, and against Massing priests, and against persons attending Mass. In a word, the Reformed English Church and State spared no effort, left absolutely nothing undone, to destroy utterly in England every trace and memory of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Reformation in England was a war to the knife against the Mass and the 'Massing priest.' And the London Times of September 3, 1908 (p. 7) quite correctly voiced the British Protestant tradition when it declared that the recent Eucharistic Congress, by its cult of the Mass, was a direct challenge to the Reformation, which (it said) was 'based on the repudiation of the Sacrifice of the altar, and all that it involves, and to the Church of England in particular, which condemns "the Sacrifices of Masses" as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."'

All the acts enumerated above were part and parcel of the general movement of the Protestant Reformation in England against the idea of a Sacrifice and of a sacrificing priesthood. The reader is now in a position to estimate at its true value the nature and purpose of the mutilations which were made by Cranmer and accepted by the Protestant Reformed religion in England. Cranmer's Ordinal supplied the form of words to which the clergy of the new English Reformed creed trace their Orders. But that form, as stated, is insufficient to confer Orders and create a sacrificing priesthood on an episcopate in the Catholic sense of these terms. Nay, more—as has been sufficiently seen, and as will be further seen later on—such an intention was excluded by, and utterly repugnant to, the framers of Cranmer's Ordinal. As has been pointed out, in both the Eastern and Western rites, the imposition of hands (which is the essential matter of Ordination) has ever been accompanied by a form of words—a prayer—in which the Order to be imparted is defined, either by its accepted name, or by equivalent terms—namely, by words expressive of its grace and power. And in the case of the Sacrament of priestly Order, this grace and power is chiefly the power to offer in Sacrifice the real Body and Blood of our Lord and Savior under the outward appearances of bread and wine. But (as has been shown in a previous article) the Edwardine Ordinal, as drawn up by Cranmer and his fellow-revisers, contained in the rite for the consecration of a bishop no words whatever, in the 'form' that accompanied the imposition of hands, to indicate or define

What Order was Being Imparted.

The consecrating bishop said: 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' But he did not say whether it was for the office of deacon, priest,