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Abstract

Ever since the emergence of the independent Church of England in the sixteenth century, the Catholic Church has treated its orders as invalid. This practice was affirmed in 1896 by Leo XIII who for the first time published authoritative reasons for the practice. He has been widely misunderstood, not least in the formal response of the English Archbishops (1897). The Anglican formularies, especially the service of Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-Nine Articles, show a determination on the part of the English Reformers to abandon what they regarded as the erroneous doctrines of the Church of Rome. A “receptionist” theology of the Eucharist emerged within Anglicanism which was taught and deepened by the Classic Anglican theologians. The first Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) claimed that its agreement on all important doctrinal matters with respect to Holy Orders and the Eucharist gave rise to a new context for a favourable re-evaluation of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church. This re-evaluation never happened. Close attention to the ARCIC documents reveals that the agreement was not as complete as was believed. The new Anglican liturgical books show a determination to preserve the core elements of Anglicanism which have always distinguished it from Catholicism. There is no new context which will allow the Catholic Church to recognise the validity of Anglican Orders.
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Is there a new context which will allow the

Catholic Church to recognise the validity of

Anglican Orders?

1 Literature review

In 1896 Pope Leo XIII issued the Apostolic Letter *Apostolicae curae* in which he determined that Anglican orders were invalid i.e. that the rites in use by the Church of England were incapable of making a man a priest with the power to consecrate and offer sacrifice. There was a detailed response issued by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in the following year.¹

In 1979 the *Final Report* of the first Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission claimed to have reached substantial agreement on the questions of the Eucharist and Ministry. There was therefore a “new context” in which Anglican orders could be recognised as valid by the Catholic Church. This thesis will examine the ARCIC documents and the official responses to them to see if this new context exists. To do this it is necessary to examine the teaching of *Apostolicae curae* as well as classic

¹ NOTE ON STRUCTURE: To avoid unnecessary repetition, this thesis employs cross-references, usually in the form “See [chapter] 1 [above/below], in the passage referred to by fn.1.” The first number is to the chapter or section number, the second number is to the footnote number in the body of the text unless otherwise indicated. It is an anchor point. It is assumed the reader will read above and below it. Sometimes a range of footnotes is given. The abbreviations “fn.” and “fnn.” always refers to footnotes in this document. Reference to footnotes in citations is by “footnote”.

Chapter 1
and contemporary Anglican understandings of the Eucharist and Holy Orders.

The structure of *Apostolicae curae* is very simple and is a useful guide to the subject. After an introduction and a discussion of the background of the document, Leo XIII discusses the history of the Catholic rejection of Anglican orders at the time of the Reformation and afterwards. Then he discusses the theological arguments against Anglican Orders in the words of the rite (the “defect of form”) and the intention of the minister. Finally he gives his decision and ends with a plea for Catholic minded Anglicans to join the Catholic Church. ARCIC’s “new context” derives from a substantial agreement which it found between Anglican and Catholic theology of the Eucharist and Ministry. ARCIC’s remit was not the resolution of the question of Anglican orders but it did claim that the substantial agreement gave rise to a resolution of the defect of form found by Leo XIII. Since the other arguments of *Apostolicae curae* rely on this defect of form it was supposed to be possible for the Catholic Church henceforth to recognise Anglican orders. It is sometimes suggested that it was simple intransigence on the part of the Roman authorities which led to the denial of ARCIC’s claimed substantial agreement and hence the lack of the new context. This thesis examines the theological reasons for the Roman decision and attempts to justify the continued practice of the Catholic Church in treating Anglican orders as null and void. This will be achieved in three ways: (1) an exposition of the theological reasons for Leo XIII’s decision in chapters three to five; (2) the doctrine of the Anglican Archbishops (in their reply to *Apostolicae curae*) and the Anglican
formularies in chapter six; (3) an outline of Anglican theologies of the Eucharist and priesthood in chapter seven; (4) an exposition of The Final Report of ARCIC I and the Catholic response to this.

For the purposes of this thesis “Anglican” is the usual adjective for the Church of England, although phrases such as “the invalidity of Anglican orders” refer to the invalidity of the orders of all members of the Anglican Communion. “Catholic” always refers to (member, doctrine of) the Church in full communion with the Pope.²

1.1 *Apostolicae curae: for and against*

The most important work for this thesis is *Apostolicae curae*, which is often, particularly in older sources referred to as “the Bull”. There are three English translations known to me. One was issued at the same time as the Bull and was printed in *The Times* just over a week later.³ It was published by the English Catholic publishers Burns, Oates and Washbourne.⁴ In 1943 it was republished in English by the Anglican Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge together with the English translation of the Anglican response to the Bull.⁵ In 1946, the Catholic Truth

---

² See 2.2 below.
⁴ The 1896 translation was done by Mons. Raphael Merry del Val with Dom Aidan Gasquet OSB, Canon John Moyes and Fr David Fleming OSF. Merry del Val was secretary to the 1896 Vatican Commission on Anglican orders, the others were the nominees of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster to it. John Jay Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void: The Papal Condemnation of Anglican Orders 1896*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968), p.198.
Society published a pamphlet (H.311) containing a new translation by
Canon G. D. Smith. In 1967 the former Jesuit Francis Clark revised
Smith’s work. The 1896 translation has the famous phrase “absolutely null
and utterly void”, Smith and, following him, Clark has “completely null and
void”. Smith introduced something which is lacking in other older
Magisterial documents: paragraph numbers. All references to *Apostolicae
curae* in this thesis are in the body of the text by the Smith-Clark paragraph
numbers.

Modern Papal documents (and many Curial documents as well)
are nowadays published in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (AAS). According to
canon 8 a law comes into force three months after it is published in the *Acta.*
This implies that it is the gazette for Papal decrees and provides the
definitive text of them. The AAS came into existence in 1908. Before that
there was a similar publication called the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* (ASS).
*Apostolicae curae* was published in *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 29 (1896 to 1897)
p.193. However it is not the definitive text. Francis Clark follows G. D.

---

6 *Apostolic Letter (Apostolicae Curae) of Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Ordinations* (13th September, 1896), translated by Canon G. D. Smith from the Latin text as published in *Leonis XIII Acta* vol.XVI (Typ. Vat. 1897) with commentary (in footnotes) by Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D., (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1946). [NOTE ON AUTHORLESS WORKS: Some works (such as this) have the name of the author within the title or have no author named at all. They are listed alphabetically by title in the bibliography.]
7 *Apostolicae Curae: Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Orders*, J. D. Smith (trans.) & Francis Clark (rev.), (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1967). A note at the beginning says “This translation is based on that of the late Mgr J. D. Smith, revised and annotated 1967 by Francis Clark, D.D.” “J. D.” is clearly a misprint for “G. D.”
8 Where there needs to be comparison between different translations it is to “original”, “Smith”, “Clark”.

Chapter 1
Smith in noting that it is a translation of the text given in “Leonis XIII Acta vol.XVI (Typ. Vat. 1897)”.

The acts of Leo XIII were republished beginning in 1887 in Bruges by Desclée, de Brouwer & co. This edition reached the documents of 1896–1897 in 1900. The text as signed was different by one word, sometimes interpreted as meaning the decision is “merely disciplinary”, from the text as drafted. This word, “disciplinae” is found in ASS, but it was removed when the Bull was published in the Acta Leonis. It is not found in the text of the Bull as published in the source materials for the 1917 Code of Canon Law by Pietro Cardinal Gasparri. Where the Latin text is quoted in this thesis it is always from the Desclée edition. The papers of the 1896 Anglican Orders Commission have recently been published as part of the series Fontes Archivi Sancti Officii Romani from the archives of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Many of them were already published by Giuseppe Rambaldi SJ in the 1980s. English translations of the most important documents were published by Bishop Christopher Hill.

---

9 It has been impossible to trace a copy of this volume, assuming it was ever widely published. We know that the text in ASS is not definitive since at the foot of the first page of the Bull is a reference to “Acta Tom. XXIX. fasc. CCCXL.” which implies that is the definitive text.


12 Alejandro Cifres (ed.), La validez de las ordenaciones Anglicanas. Los documentos de la comisión preparatoria de la bula “Apostolicae Curae”. Tomo II: Los documentos de 1896, (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012). This book is fantastically rare and was not consulted for this thesis.


Chapter 1
and Edward Yarnold SJ in their *Anglican Orders: the documents in the debate*.

This book, which is still in print, also contains the Francis Clark translation of *Apostolicae curae* as well as the translation of *Saepius officio*.

The Bull was signed on 13 September 1896. The Archbishops of the Church of England issued a response on 19 February 1897. This work is known as the *Responsio* or “the reply of the [English] Archbishops” or (more recently) by its opening words *Saepius officio*. The Latin text was republished with the Latin text of the Bull (from ASS) in 1932 by the SPCK. Quotations of the Latin text of *Saepius officio* are taken from this edition. The *Responsio* was divided into chapters on publication. References to it are by these chapter numbers (in the body of the text) and the page reference in *Anglican Orders (English)* (in footnotes). The history of the drafting of the *Responsio* can be traced in the letters and diaries reproduced in the early biographies of the bishops concerned.

For convenience, references to and quotations from statements of the Catholic Magisterium (apart from *Apostolicae curae* itself) are to the

---

17 *Anglican Orders (Latin)*, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1932).
latest bi-lingual edition of Denzinger where they are given there.\textsuperscript{19} They are referred to in the footnotes by “DS” followed by the paragraph number. Otherwise they are taken from the most authoritative source, typically the \textit{Acta}. The Latin name for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is normalised to that given in John Paul II’s Apostolic Constitution on the Roman Curia \textit{Pastor Bonus}: Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei.\textsuperscript{20} Elsewhere, it is sometimes given as Congregatio \textit{pro} Doctrina Fidei.\textsuperscript{21} Problems have been raised with different aspects of the Latin text of (especially) \textit{Apostolicae curae}. The first and only edition of \textit{A Latin Dictionary} edited by the American Scholars Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short and published at Oxford in 1879 is still in print and includes citations of the Latin of the Vulgate and the Church Fathers.\textsuperscript{22} The modern \textit{Oxford Latin Dictionary} does not.\textsuperscript{23} All citations of the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} are from the online edition.\textsuperscript{24} Where translations are my own the original text is given in the footnotes.


Chapter 1
The CDF in 2001 and 2008 issued decrees on the invalidity of Baptisms conferred by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, or by certain inclusive language formulas.\textsuperscript{25} Although neither decision contained any reasoning, they were published in \textit{L’Osservatore Romano} (the official newspaper of the Holy See) with essays by staff of the CDF. Luis Ladaria SJ’s article on Mormon Baptisms makes an argument that can be closely matched with \textit{Apostolicae curae}.\textsuperscript{26} It is true that neither Fr Ladaria’s essay from 2001, nor the corresponding essay by Mons. Antonio Miralles from 2008 are in themselves Magisterial teaching. Nevertheless it is important not to fall into an excessively schematic understanding of authority whereby decisions are categorised as “infallible” or “non-infallible” and infallibility is seen as a matter of fulfilling certain conditions which are understood in an external sense. Fr Ladaria was at that point a Professor at the Pontifical Gregorian University and a member of the International Theological Commission (a body set up to advise the Pope and the CDF), and would later become Secretary General of the ITC, and then Secretary of the CDF. He was publishing an essay in \textit{L’Osservatore Romano}, co-ordinated with the release of a formal decision of the CDF. It is difficult to see his essay as nothing but a freelance attempt of no account,


merely guessing at the reasons for the decision, instead of a statement, in the
academic mode, of those reasons, by somebody closely involved in the
decision itself. The same can be said of Mons. Miralles, a Professor in
Dogmatic Theology at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross and a
consultor to the CDF.


There are a number of Catholic authors who argue that *Apostolicae curae* was wrongly decided. The most prominent are John Jay Hughes and George H. Tavard. Hughes’ work in particular is very influential. In my judgment most authors who attack *Apostolicae curae* do so either by a partial presentation of the evidence or by a misapprehension of what the Bull says. On its own terms the Bull’s position is unassailable because it is in fact well founded on traditional Catholic theology and dogma. Indeed many Evangelical Anglicans have argued that the only way

---


29 Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void; John Jay Hughes, Stewards of the Lord: A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1970); Tavard, *A Review of Anglican Orders*. Hughes’ numerous articles from the late 60s are mostly drawn from his books, which were written as a doctoral thesis.

30 See fn.115 below.
to respond to it is to deny Leo XIII’s premises in the doctrines of the
Sacrifice of the Mass and the Catholic Priesthood.\textsuperscript{31} Earlier drafts of this
thesis included an extended discussion of \textit{Apostolicae curae} nn.7–22 on the
precedents. One would have assumed that a Pope, with the resources of the
Roman Curia, could be expected to give an accurate account of the
documents of his own predecessors. Nevertheless opponents of the Bull
insisted that it must have been drafted in English\textsuperscript{32} or that one of its
precedents must have relied on a false report of the Anglican ordination
rite.\textsuperscript{33} Nevertheless once the relevant documents were published it became
clear the Bull was drafted in Italian and that the documents in the Gordon
case show an exact grasp of the nature of the Anglican rite.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1995 a conference of Catholic and Anglican theologians was
held in New York to commemorate the imminent centenary of \textit{Apostolicae
curae}. Its papers were published in the following year.\textsuperscript{35} Almost all the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} William Edward Collins, \textit{The Internal Evidence of the Letter “Apostolicae Curae” as to its own Origin and Value}, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1897), 17–31. Collins was Professor of Ecclesiastical History at King’s College, London and later Bishop of Gibraltar. There is no need to seek among fringe figures for a firm grasping of the wrong end of the stick.
\textsuperscript{33} T. A. Lacey, \textit{A Roman Diary and other documents relating to the Papal Inquiry into English Ordinations MDCCCXCVI}, (London: Longmans, Green, and co., 1910), pp.279–282.
\textsuperscript{35} Franklin (ed.), \textit{Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896–1996}.\end{flushright}
Catholics rejected the Bull. The collection *Reuniting Anglicans and Rome* includes essays by Anglo-Catholic writers discussing the way forward following the decision to ordain women in the Church of England. It also reproduces some of the official statements made by the Catholic Church in England and Wales, including those around the decision to confer a conditional ordination on Graham Leonard. Mons. Leonard was the former Anglican Bishop of London. To date he remains one of only two former Anglican clergy not to receive an absolute ordination when becoming a Catholic.

The most important Catholic theological work supporting *Apostolicae curae* is that of Francis Clark. His *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* is primarily a study of n.33 of the Bull on the defect of intention. Clark had been a Professor at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. He was familiar with the older style of theology and is able to explain the technical aspects of the Bull. Clark’s work is so formidable that Hughes was reduced to making an absurd charge of academic dishonesty. Paul Avis footnotes his remark, ‘Catholic scholars have tended to decline to defend the more specific claims of *Apostolicae Curae*,’ to *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* with no page number –

---

36 The exception was Sr Sara Butler MSBT, whose paper on the ordination of women does not discuss *Apostolicae curae*.


38 The other is John Jay Hughes, see 6.1 below in the passages referred to by fnn.292–295.


i.e. a work dedicated to a study of half a page of the Bull is supposed to refuse to defend it specifically.\(^{41}\) Bernard Leeming’s *Principles of Sacramental Theology* is a systematic study of the Sacraments.\(^{42}\) Although it is by no means a “mere” work of reference its principal value to this thesis is explanation of older terminology especially with regard to intention.

This thesis does not address the question, what is the true nature of the Christian Ministry? There is no space for a direct discussion of the Catholic theology of the Eucharist, the Sacraments and the Priesthood. However, in the discussion of ARCIC’s *Final Report* there is no disagreement about what is Catholic teaching. The disagreement is on the relative importance of its parts. Hence, in this thesis, the discussion of Catholic theology is limited to elucidation of the points made by authors discussing Anglican orders or the Bull. All citations of the works of St Thomas Aquinas, apart from the *Supplementum*, are to the online *Corpus Thomisticum*.\(^{43}\) References to other classic works of Catholic theology are taken from secondary sources although they are verified from scans of printed editions. References to “PL” and “PG” are to Jacques-Paul Migne’s multivolume editions of the Latin and Greek Fathers.


Part of *Apostolicae curae*’s method is to track the changes between the English pre-Reformation liturgical books and the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal. A family of Liturgical Uses were used in England, predominantly the Sarum Use.\footnote{See below 2.4.1, in the passage referred to by fn.146.} There have been several editions. I have consulted those of William Maskell.\footnote{William Maskell, *The ancient Liturgy of the Church of England According to the uses of Sarum York Hereford and Bangor and the Roman Liturgy arranged in parallel columns with preface and notes*, third edition, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882); – *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae: The occasional Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury the Prymer in English and other prayers and forms with dissertations and notes*, second edition, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882).} Many of the prayers are identical to those found in the Roman Rite, so that translations of the Sarum Pontifical can be taken from translations of the Roman Pontifical.\footnote{The Rite of Consecration of a Bishop, (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1956).} Where it is necessary to refer to the Roman Missal as it existed before the reforms of the twentieth century I have consulted one from the reign of Leo XIII.\footnote{Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editum Clementis VIII. Urbani VIII. Et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum, (Mechelin: H. Dessain, 1900).} All references to “Missale Romanum” are to this volume. In general, and where possible, I have preferred to refer to the much more widely available English translation of the modern Roman Missal, even where this is anachronistic.\footnote{The Roman Missal Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, Promulgated by Authority of Pope Paul VI and Revised at the Authority of Pope John Paul II. English translation according to the third typical edition. Approved for use in the Dioceses of Australia, England and Wales, and Scotland by the Bishops’ Conferences of Australia, England and Wales, and Scotland and Confirmed by the Apostolic See, (London: Catholic Truth Society, 2011).} All references to “Roman Missal” are to this volume. Enzo Lodi’s *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum* is a compendium

---

44 See below 2.4.1, in the passage referred to by fn.146.
47 Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editum Clementis VIII. Urbani VIII. Et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum, (Mechelin: H. Dessain, 1900).
of many editions of different sources of Christian worship, primarily from the first millennium.\textsuperscript{49}

All quotations of scripture are taken from the second Catholic edition of the Revised Standard Version.\textsuperscript{50} Abbreviations of scriptural books are taken from the same volume.

\section*{1.2 An Anglican Magisterium?}

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Church of England has been using the collection of liturgical books Common Worship. The vast majority of Anglican parishes have elected to do so, although the Book of Common Prayer is still an option. Common Worship contains a Declaration of Assent made by all clergy on ordination and at each new appointment. The Preface to this is as follows:

\begin{quote}
The Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith \textsuperscript{[1]} uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and \textsuperscript{[2]} set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in \textsuperscript{[3]} its historic formularies, \textsuperscript{[4]} the Thirty-nine Articles of\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{49} Enzo Lodi (ed.), \textit{Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum}, (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 1979); nn.3439–3457 of Lodi is the Holy Communion from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.


This is a formal and authoritative definition of Anglicanism, or at least a formal and authoritative guide to finding where Anglicanism is taught. [1] and [2] speak for themselves. [4]–[6] should be taken as an explanation of [3], i.e. the “historic formularies” are the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal.  

However this is not an exclusive list. Article 35 declares that both Books of Homilies ‘contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times’. Since they are cited in this way by the Articles, the Homilies are also treated as one of the historic formularies. The first book was published in 1547, the second in 1563. They are not easy to interpret. While still an Anglican, Newman argued that by the terms of Article 35, Anglicans were bound to the “doctrine” of the homilies, not to every single statement therein. The Homilies are nowadays largely ignored. There is not space in this thesis to

32 More formally the Thirty-Nine Articles are known as the Articles of Religion. The Book of Common Prayer is referred to as “the Prayer-book” (with varying punctuation), particularly adjectivally. The full title of the Ordinal is The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons according to the Order of the Church of England.
33 BCP p.626.

Chapter 1
discuss them, although the arguments against the Sacrifice of the Mass in the ‘Homily of the worthy Receiving of the Sacrament’ would tend to confirm Leo XIII’s judgment that the Church of England deliberately rejected the Catholic doctrine.\textsuperscript{57} In any case the Homilies are not one of the primary formularies of the Church of England.

The Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Ordinal emerged separately.\textsuperscript{58} The first recension of the Book of Common Prayer was issued on the authority of Edward VI in 1549.\textsuperscript{59} The Ordinal was issued in 1550. Both were revised in 1552 but were abolished when Mary I succeeded her brother.\textsuperscript{60} Elizabeth I reinstated the Edwardine books, with a few small but important changes in 1559.\textsuperscript{61} Further changes were made in 1604.\textsuperscript{62} After the Restoration of the Monarchy and the episcopal Church of England in 1660, there were a series of discussions about the Prayer Book which resulted in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662. Since 1662 there have been no changes which could be said to affect the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{63} Unless explicitly noted, references to “the Book of

---

\textsuperscript{57} Homilies Book II.15 (no. 27 in the continuous series), part one, in: Griffiths (ed.) Book of Homilies, e.g. p.444, ll.15–20.

\textsuperscript{58} For a more detailed overview see 2.4.1, 2.4.4 and 6.3 \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{59} I adopt the terminology used in the Liturgical Commission’s commentary on the modern Anglican Ordinal, \textit{Common Worship: Ordination Services Study Edition}, (London: Church House Publishing, 2007): ‘… the Church of England’s 1550 Ordinal and its successive recensions up to the Ordinal of 1662.’ “Recension” refers to one of the books of 1549, 1552, 1559, 1604 or 1662. There have of course been many more \textit{editions}, e.g. when changes are made at the accession of a new Monarch.

\textsuperscript{60} For differences between 1549 and 1552 see below 6.3.3; also 8.2.4.1, in the passages referred to by fn, 657–688.

\textsuperscript{61} See below 6.3.3, in the passages referred to by fn., 268–274.

\textsuperscript{62} See below 8.1.3, in the passages referred to by fn., 557–566.

\textsuperscript{63} A complete table of changes since 1662 is provided by the Society of Archbishop Justus: http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Variations.htm
Common Prayer” (“BCP” in the footnotes) refer to the current edition.\textsuperscript{64} To avoid confusion I refer to “changes made in 1662” or the “discussion in 1662” although all changes were decided in 1661 and many had been discussed for many years.

Brian Cummings produced an edition containing not only the 1662 BCP but also some of its predecessors.\textsuperscript{65} E. C. S. Gibson and Edward Benham produced editions of the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI and the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth respectively, using the original spelling. References to “First Prayer Book of Edward VI” and “Second Prayer Book of Edward VI” are to Gibson. References to “Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth” are to Benham.

The Thirty-Nine Articles were derived from a document drafted by Archbishop Cranmer and authorised in June 1553. They achieved their final number and form in 1571. They are invariably printed with the BCP. All references to “Article ##” refer to the Articles of Religion as printed in the 2004 edition of the 1662 BCP, i.e. the modern spelling version of those adopted in 1571. Hardwick’s \textit{History of the Articles of Religion} includes a side-by-side comparison of the text of each Article in each successive version.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches and the form or manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).


\textsuperscript{66} Charles Hardwick, \textit{A History of the Articles of Religion: to which is added a series of documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615: together with illustrations from contemporary sources}, third edition revised by Francis Procter, (London: George Bell & Sons, 1876).
The research method for the Book of Common Prayer adopted for this thesis was as follows: I went through the texts of the relevant portions (especially the Ordinal and the Holy Communion) with as many commentaries as I could obtain. One way or another they all informed the questions asked of later Anglican statements and especially of the ARCIC documents. Nevertheless most citations in this thesis come from the commentaries by J. H. Blunt, representing the Anglo-Catholic tradition, and by Charles Neil and J. M. Willoughby, representing the Protestant tradition. Paul F. Bradshaw wrote a detailed account of the history of the Anglican Ordinal which provides a more up-to-date commentary. The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer includes essays by separate authors on different phases in the development of the Prayer-book including false starts at reform and variants in worldwide Anglicanism.

The Book of Common Prayer of 1662 is still in force in the Church of England. However, since 2000 most parishes use Common Worship. This is a family of liturgical books for all aspects of public

---


Christian worship. It has services which have no equivalent in the Book of Common Prayer, as well as a wider variety of options for those that are found in its predecessor. It is an expression of the modern Anglican understanding of the Eucharist and Orders.70 “Common Worship” by itself can refer to any of the services given in the series but it usually (and always in the footnotes) refers to the “Main Volume” which covers much the same ground as the Book of Common Prayer and includes the entire Holy Communion. Its immediate predecessor was the Alternative Service Book (“ASB” in the footnotes) from which many of the services in Common Worship derive.71

1.3 The historical background

Eamon Duffy has written highly influential works on the history of the English reformation although his main concern is with popular piety.72 Francis Clark examines the period from the theological point of view.73 Where basic biographical information about individuals is given, especially dates of birth and death, it is drawn from the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography or the New Catholic Encyclopedia, unless otherwise

indicated. There is no consistent provision of dates. They are given to the degree of accuracy needed to make clear to what period the material under discussion belongs. It would be easy to ascribe the most startling doctrines to Anglicanism and Catholicism by careful selection of its representatives. Individuals’ positions, particularly in the Church of England (deaneries, bishoprics etc.), and the positions they later obtained, are given to show that the doctrine they profess is not so outlandish as to prevent advancement.

Mark Chapman’s *Anglicanism: A Very Short Introduction* provides an account of Anglicanism through its historical development.74 Despite the lack of footnotes it provides useful pointers for further research. The essays assembled by Stephen Sykes, John Booty and Jonathan Knight are the gateway to major contemporary scholarly study of Anglicanism.75

About half of *Apostolicae curae* is taken up by a discussion of the historical precedents. Many of the older histories of the Church of England, and biographies of the Fathers of the English Reformation, are still valuable for the primary sources, which they often give in their entirety.76
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Gerald Bray provides a useful collection of the most important documents.\textsuperscript{77}

The pre-eminent example is John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, popularly known as “Foxe’s Book of Martyrs”.\textsuperscript{78}

After the archives of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith were opened to scholars, the first publication was the first of two volumes on the documentary background to *Apostolicae curae*.\textsuperscript{79} This covered the precedents. Many of these documents had already been published, at least partially. Since ARCIC takes the entire judgment of *Apostolicae curae* for granted and pays no attention to the precedents, there is no space in this thesis to consider them.\textsuperscript{80} Nevertheless extensive research into the Marian restoration of the sixteenth century and the Holy Office cases of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries makes it possible to see where those who dismiss Leo XIII’s statements about his predecessors’ actions are simply unaware of vital pieces of evidence. When Tavard remarks that ‘no new enquiry was done in 1704’, one wonders if he even read *Apostolicae curae* n.19.\textsuperscript{81} The documentary evidence available to him

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
\textsuperscript{77} Gerald Bray (ed.), *Documents of the English Reformation*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994).


\textsuperscript{79} Gunten (ed.), *La Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*.

\textsuperscript{80} See 1.1 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.32–34.

\textsuperscript{81} Tavard, *A Review of Anglican Orders*, p.78; *Apostolicae curae* n.19: ‘In the second case the proceedings of the former were presented again and reconsidered; in addition further vota were obtained from consultors, leading doctors of the Sorbonne and of Douai were
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in the works of E. C. Messenger, which he does cite, show this statement to be false. Such obvious misstatements tend to undermine confidence where Tavard cannot be checked.

Nevertheless Tavard has supplemented, although not supplanted, John Jay Hughes as the prominent Catholic opponent of Apostolicae curae. The theme of Hughes’ first book, Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, is that there was something suspect in the 1896 investigation. On the evidence available to him he concluded that Mons. Rafael Merry del Val drafted Apostolicae curae. Hughes then refers to Merry del Val as the Bull’s author even though, considered as a document it is merely a very brief (if penetrating) treatment of a complicated subject. Its importance stems from the fact that Leo XIII signed it, giving it its juridical status. Hughes paints a picture of Merry del Val’s text receiving a few minor changes from some Cardinals in the Holy Office and then being ‘placed before an eighty-six-year old pope for his signature’. One contrasts this asked their opinion, and no measure which far-sighted prudence could suggest was neglected to ensure a thoroughly accurate knowledge of the question.’

82 Ernest C. Messenger, The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood : A Documented History with Special Reference to the Question of Anglican Orders : volume I : The Revolt from the Medieval Church, (London: Longmans, Green and co., 1936); —, volume II : Rome and the Revolted Church, (London: Longmans, Green and co., 1937).

83 Other errors: Catherine of Aragon, the mother of Mary I, is called Henry VIII’s ‘childless Queen’ (p.14); the Emperor Charles V is ‘the queen’s [i.e. Mary I’s] great uncle’ (p.35); he was her first cousin; the opening of the Vatican Archives for the reign of Leo XIII ‘allows anyone who cares to take a further look at the proceedings of 1895’ (p.7), no doubt, but they would be disappointed, for nothing of importance happened until 1896.

84 Hughes, Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, pp. 192–198. The documents for the reign of Leo XIII in the Vatican Archives were not released until 1978, i.e. ten years after Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, was published.

85 e.g. ibid. pp.259, 261.

86 Ibid. pp.269–270.
with Hughes’ other references to the youth of Merry del Val. The whole picture is exploded by George Tavard.

There is every reason to believe that the chief author of *Apostolicae curae* was not, as has been said, Merry del Val but the prefect of the Holy Office … Cardinal Mazzella. Tavard cites as evidence the manuscript of the first draft, which is in Mazzella’s handwriting, and has annotations by Leo XIII. Tavard never mentions who first claimed that Merry del Val was the author. Nor does Hughes notice, in his brief review of Tavard’s book, that one of the central contentions of his own book was destroyed by later discoveries.

1.4 Anglican Theologies

Apart from the historic formularies, Anglican theology has traditionally set great store by their classic theologians: in particular the Protestant Martyrs of the reign of Mary I as well as those who lived between the accession of Elizabeth I and the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II a century later. Just as it would be a separate thesis to explicate the early Papal documents on Anglican orders, so it would be a separate thesis to expound the history of Anglican theology in this area. Of necessity one is forced to follow secondary sources in the search for representative authors. Sykes, Booty and Knight’s *The Study of Anglicanism* is helpful for

---

87 e.g. *ibid.* p.261.
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...this. The massive two volume *Companion to Eucharistic Theology* by Brian Douglas (a priest of the Anglican Church of Australia) is an attempt to pull together a detailed account of the entire corpus of Anglican work on the subject. The ‘learned and judicious divine’ Richard Hooker is the obvious choice for the classic statement of Anglican Eucharistic theology. Brian Douglas discusses Hooker’s contemporary, the much neglected William Perkins. The latitudinarian Benjamin Hoadley’s *Plain Account* (published anonymously) was an attempt to promote a purely symbolic explanation of the Eucharist. Although it shows how far from the Catholic doctrine a powerful bishop was able to go and remain in good standing in the Church of England, Hoadley has few followers. He was answered by Daniel Waterland. Before the Tractarians the “highest” Anglican Eucharistic doctrine was found in the works of Lancelot Andrewes and John Cosin. It is useful to find out how closely they were prepared to approach Catholic Eucharistic doctrine. Andrewes (explicitly) and Cosin (implicitly) were writing in controversy with Catholic theologians.

---

91 Sykes et al. (eds.), *The Study of Anglicanism.*
95 *A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,* second edition, (London: James, John, and Paul Knapton, 1735)
97 Lancelot Andrewes, *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron, and Two Speeches in the Starr-Chamber,* (London: Richard Badger and Andrew Hobb, 1629) in: *Two Answers to Cardinal
The Tractarians introduced doctrines which were absent from previous Anglican theology. Robert Wilberforce’s *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* is indistinguishable from a Catholic work.\(^98\) Despite Wilberforce’s almost immediate secession to Rome, Douglas still discusses him among Anglican theologians. The doctrine of the Tractarians who remained within the Church of England is expressed by the Memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury of 1867.\(^99\)

### 1.5 ARCIC’s new context

All the relevant texts for ARCIC’s new context are in *The Final Report*.\(^100\) Two members of the first and second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commissions edited a book collecting the Catholic and Anglican responses as well as essays by ARCIC participants and theological experts, including a long article by Cardinal Ratzinger.\(^101\)

The two most important official Catholic responses to ARCIC’s *Final Report* are the *Observations* of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (as it was then still known) published in 1982 and the

---


Catholic Response published in 1991. In the letter sent with the Observations to the Catholic Co-Chairman of ARCIC, Bishop Alan Clark, Cardinal Ratzinger described the SCDF’s document as ‘its contribution to the continuation of this dialogue’. The Observations were not to be treated as an authoritative, final conclusion. On the other hand the Catholic Response of 1991 looks like it ought to be taken as such an authoritative statement. It was sent to both the Anglican and Catholic Co-Chairmen of ARCIC II with a letter not by Cardinal Ratzinger but by Cardinal Cassidy, the President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. Cardinal Cassidy notes that there had been wide consultation on ARCIC’s Final Report within the Catholic Church and the Catholic Response was the result. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith ‘had a determining role in drawing up the formal reply’. The English Catholic theologian, Canon John McHugh, in his marginal notes on the document for Bishop Clark points out that it was issued without any protocol. It is not signed and it was not published in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis. In this one can compare the CDF’s Doctrinal Commentary on the Profession of Faith which

---
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is signed by Cardinal Ratzinger and was published in the *Acta*.\textsuperscript{106} The

*Catholic Response* was published in *L’Osservatore Romano* but not in the section dedicated to any particular Vatican department.\textsuperscript{107} Canon McHugh points out that merely because it lacks the usual apparatus of Vatican documents it is absurd to say it ‘lacks the stamp of authority’.\textsuperscript{108} Another member of ARCIC I, Edward Yarnold SJ, says that although the *Catholic Response* was not signed by him, Pope John Paul II ‘referred to it as the “Official” Response, given at a “truly ecclesial” level.’\textsuperscript{109} For convenience it is described in this thesis as being published by the PCPCU. When ARCIC II gave an answer to the requests made in the *Catholic Response* it did so by sending it to the PCPCU’s then President, Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy.\textsuperscript{110}

Shortly after ARCIC published *The Final Report*, the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches met at Lima and published *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*.\textsuperscript{111} The Church of England’s response to the *Final Report* was published with its response to the Lima

---


\textsuperscript{108} McHugh, ‘Marginal Notes on the Response to ARCIC I’, p.331.


document of the WCC in *Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC* by the Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England. Since it is generally favourable to the ARCIC statements it is only discussed in this thesis in order to shed light on the SCDF’s *Observations* and the PCPCU’s *Catholic Response*.

1.6 Methodological approach

This thesis was proposed as a study of “the state of play” between Anglicanism and Catholicism with respect to the validity of Anglican orders. Accordingly the research method began with a close study of *Apostolicae curae* understood on its own terms and compared with the *Responsio* of the Anglican Archbishops. Works such as those of E. C. Messenger and T. A. Lacey were used as guides. This was rounded out with a study of Gregory Dix’s objections to *Apostolicae curae* and Anthony Stephenson’s answers to him.\(^\text{112}\)

The next stage was a close study, with commentaries, of the relevant portions of the Book of Common Prayer. The commentaries (described above) provided much material for understanding the historic debates about certain aspects of the Anglican formularies such as the Declaration on Kneeling, the Catechism, and the Articles of Religion. This

tended to be confirmed and enhanced by the modern works on Anglicanism I read.\textsuperscript{113}

The next stage was the work of Clark and Hughes.\textsuperscript{114} The debt this thesis owes to Clark, not just to the content of his work but to the way he makes clear the older theological method and Curial practice which underlies \textit{Apostolicae curae}, is on every page. On the other hand it is to be regretted that Hughes’ work has such a high reputation.\textsuperscript{115} It is disfigured by partisanship against anyone who does not agree that Anglicanism has been grossly and unfairly misunderstood by Catholics (especially in the matter of Orders). Hughes twice refers to Catholic works which assume the English Reformers to have been ‘evil men, “fallen priests” bent on destruction of the church which had ordained them’.\textsuperscript{116} In both places the footnote is to a passage by Francis Clark which never uses the kind of language (“apostates”, “fallen priests”) ascribed to him and in any case is about the first leaders of the Continental Reformation in general (with no explicit reference to the English Reformers of a later period) and about Martin Luther in particular. Clark describes Luther’s spiritual agony, in a narrative


\textsuperscript{114} Clark, \textit{Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention}; —, \textit{Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation}; Hughes, \textit{Absolutely Null and Utterly Void}; —, \textit{Stewards of the Lord}.

\textsuperscript{115} ‘John Jay Hughes’ lucid discussion of [Clark’s] claims…’ (Stephen Sykes, ‘“To the Intent that these Orders may be Continued”: An Anglican Theology of Holy Orders’, in: \textit{Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896–1996}, p.48); ‘Hughes left a case to be answered: that the real scholars on the Commission (Duchesne, Gasparri, and de Augustinis) … were overwhelmed by the perfervid ‘English party’ (Nicholas Sagovsky: Review, ‘Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold (eds.), \textit{Anglican Orders: the documents in the debate}’, p.416); ‘Hughes’s work decisively changed the state of the question and continues to influence ecumenical dialogue’ (Christopher Ruddy: Review, ‘John Jay Hughes, \textit{No Ordinary Fool: A Testimony to Grace}’, p.182).
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drawn from his letters and sermons, as he struggled with his feelings of unworthiness at offering Mass. Luther’s agony was only relieved when he rejected the received Eucharistic theology.\textsuperscript{117} It is as sympathetic a portrait as any Catholic could produce and yet Hughes offers it alone as an example of the sort of polemic which distorts Catholic understanding. That Hughes could have cited true examples of this sort of writing by other authors is not here relevant. Hughes acknowledges Clark to be the most formidable supporter of the Bull and he sets out to destroy him.\textsuperscript{118}

Hughes also has a recurring objection against anyone who contradicts the interpretations of things like the Black Rubric, the Articles of Religion and the Words of Administration found in the Anglo-Catholic Episcopalian tradition to which he belonged before becoming a Catholic.\textsuperscript{119} It is startling to read Hughes, writing as a Catholic, in a Catholic journal, making an unrestrained attack on an Evangelical Anglican who had the temerity to express the belief in the same Catholic journal that the Church of England became Protestant at the Reformation.\textsuperscript{120} But the chief problem with Hughes is not his polemical tone but the confusion in his thought. He argues that given the widespread abuses and superstitions surrounding the Mass before the Reformation and the inadequate theology used to defend it, the English Reformers were right to act as they did. However these abuses were corrected by the Council of Trent. Why then did the English

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Clark, \textit{Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation}, pp. 112–115.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Hughes, \textit{Absolutely Null and Utterly Void}, pp.285–287; —, \textit{Stewards of the Lord}, p. 33; cf. 3.2 below.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid.} pp.11 & 130–131.
\end{itemize}
Reformers reject Trent also? An Anglican can make a coherent answer that Trent’s teaching far from reining in abuses merely perpetuates them. But Hughes is a Catholic.\footnote{Hughes, Stewards of the Lord, pp.110–111; cf. Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, p. 291 & John Jay Hughes, ‘A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders?’, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. 161:6 (1969), pp.363–367.} It is hard not to regret the time spent going through the combined six hundred pages of his two books while thinking it might have been more productively spent elsewhere.\footnote{Hughes’ other work is very different. His gentle essays offering pastoral guidance are easily available on the internet. His memoir is self-deprecating, honest and moving: John Jay Hughes, No Ordinary Fool: A Testimony to Grace, (Mustang, Okla.: Tate Publishing & Enterprises, 2008).}

The research to this point had given some understanding of the Bull and of the Anglican formularies. The next stage was study of the new Anglican liturgical books and the official contemporary statements of the Church of England in related questions. A study of the ARCIC documents was originally planned as merely “a possibly fruitful line of enquiry” to understand current Anglican and Catholic theology in these areas. However from reading them it became clear that the clearest way to grasp “the state of play” was to seek an answer to the question “what happened to the new context?”.

The research was rounded off with a more detailed study of Anglican theologians. The essays in Sykes et al. The Study of Anglicanism are uneven, but the best of them, that is those which present a coherent argument citing their sources, both explain the doctrine of their predecessors and show how it continues.\footnote{Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, e.g.: Marion J. Hatchett, ‘Prayer Books’, 131–142; William R. Crockett, ‘Holy Communion’, 308–319; John Webster, ‘Ministry and Priesthood’, 321–332. On the other hand W. Taylor Stevenson (‘Lex Orandi—Lex Credendi’, p.92) notes that Pelagius was British, that this had an effect on Anglicanism and}
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that he is favourable to a “Pelagian flavour” he detects in the Puritan and Evangelical movements. It is difficult to imagine a deadlier insult.
2 Introduction

2.1 The presumptions of this thesis

This thesis considers whether the first Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) is right to argue that there is a new context in which the Catholic Church can recognise the validity of Anglican Orders. The highest ranking and most detailed judgment by the Catholic Church on Anglican orders is in the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII Apostolicae curae (13 September 1896). This thesis examines the theological reasons given in this document and compares them to the ARCIC statements to reach its conclusions.

Strictly speaking the effect in Catholic theology of Leo XIII’s judgment that Anglican Orders are null and void, is that the Church of England is not a Church at all, because it has no clergy and especially because it has no bishops. Nevertheless, in ordinary English, Anglican clergy are called “deacons”, “priests” and “bishops” and they are said to belong to the “Church of England”. It is simple discourtesy (and also confusing) to insist on other terms.

\[124\] Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Declaratio Dominus Iesus de Iesu Christi atque Ecclesiae unicitate et universalitate salvifica’ (6 August 2000) pp.758–759, n.17 (DS 5088): ‘The Churches which, while not existing in perfect communion with the Catholic Church, remain united to her by means of the closest bonds, that is, by apostolic succession and a valid Eucharist, are true particular Churches.* … On the other hand, the ecclesial communities which have not preserved the valid Episcopate and the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic mystery,† are not Churches in the proper sense; however, those who are baptized in these communities are, by Baptism, incorporated in Christ and thus are in a certain communion, albeit imperfect, with the Church.’ References: *Conc. Vat. II, Decr. Unitatis redintegratio, nn.14 and 15; CDF, Litt. Communionis notio, AAS 85 (1993) pp.848–849, n.17. † Conc. Vat. II, Decr. Unitatis redintegratio, n.22; ‡ Ibid. n.3.
This thesis is about conflict between two religious confessions on gravely important subjects. Nevertheless there is no intention to revive or perpetuate the phenomenon of odium theologicum. To describe (the rejection of) a doctrine as “a heresy” is to say, in as few words as possible, that it is, in the judgment of the Church so describing it ‘the obstinate denial or obstinate doubt … of some truth which is to be believed’.\textsuperscript{125} To describe someone as “a heretic” is to say, again in as few words as possible, that he believes in a heresy so defined; it is not to pass judgment on the likelihood of eternal salvation for anyone. The denial or contradiction of the faith gives rise to certain problems in the administration of the sacraments which need to be addressed and circumlocutions are always long-winded and sometimes misleading.

2.2 Definition of terms

The Church of England traces its origin to the mission of St Augustine of Canterbury, sent by Pope St Gregory the Great to preach the Gospel to the English in 597. It defines itself as ‘part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit’\textsuperscript{126}. It acknowledges what it invariably calls the Roman Catholic Church—those Christians in full communion with the Bishop of Rome, or at least such as use the Roman Rite—as also part of the wider

\textsuperscript{125} Canon 751 used simply as a definition of heresy, whether or not one agrees with the claims of the Catholic Church, in: John P. Beal, James A. Coriden, Thomas J. Green (eds.), \textit{New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law}, (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), p.915.

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England}, p.xi.
Catholic Church. On this account, the difference between the two is that the Church of England is said to be both Catholic and Reformed.\footnote{Cyril Garbett, \textit{The Claims of the Church of England}, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1955), pp.13–14.}

For the purposes of this thesis the word “Anglican” usually means something or someone pertaining to the Church of England, which is the Christian body of which the Monarch of the United Kingdom is the Supreme Governor. Anglicanism has spread throughout the world and there are many independent Churches which are in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury, forming the Anglican Communion. This body has no legal power over the teaching of its members. The decennial meetings of the Lambeth Conference are not a synod in the accepted ecclesiastical sense; still less is the Archbishop of Canterbury a Pope. There are also a number of entirely independent Churches which are historically related to Anglicanism and usually have the word “Anglican” in their names. They were founded because of dissatisfaction with the doctrine taught in one or other of the Anglican Churches remaining in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury. These are known as “continuing Anglicanism” or “the Anglican continuum”. In this thesis for a doctrine to count as “Anglican” it must be so in accordance with the way the Church of England understands a doctrine to be “Anglican”.

The reasons for this are in part practical—to avoid considering the different doctrinal statements and histories of almost forty separate bodies—but there is a further consideration. Pope Leo XIII, in 1896, determined the invalidity of Anglican Orders on the basis of Catholic
doctrine as applied to events in the sixteenth century, long before any of the other members of the Anglican Communion (or their offshoots) came into existence. Because the other hierarchies derive their orders from England, then Leo XIII’s judgment applies to them also. There are doctrinal differences between the different members of the Anglican Communion but these are reflected within each member of the Communion, and certainly within the long history of the Church of England.

The groupings in Anglicanism can only be fully understood historically. For the purposes of this thesis there are two: the Anglo-Catholic and the Evangelical. Broadly speaking the former protested against Leo XIII’s judgment that the Church of England did not have priests in the Catholic sense, while the latter welcomed *Apostolicae curae* as demonstrating that the Church of England was firmly Protestant.\(^\text{128}\) The word “Puritan” was adopted by advocates of the Anglican settlement as suggesting unreasoning fanaticism on the part of radicals.\(^\text{129}\) Since the Civil War it has had the taint of “regicide”. Historically one refers to such radicals as “Puritans”. Those who defend typically Puritan doctrine in the modern Church of England are known as “Evangelicals”.

Those opposed to the Puritans and their doctrinal successors, particularly from the time of Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626) onwards, are often referred to by Anglican authors as “Catholic”. This thesis prefers the term “Anglo-Catholic”. In ordinary English, the word “Catholic” always

\(^{128}\) The pre-eminent example of the former is the Anglican Archbishops’ *Responsio*; of the latter: *Some Criticisms by the Council of the Church Association on the ‘Answer’ to Pope Leo made by Archbishops Maclagan and Temple.*

applies only to those in full communion with the Bishop of Rome. This
thesis adopts that usage. Only Anglicans refer to members of the grouping
within Anglicanism as “Catholics”; non-Anglicans use “Anglo-
Catholics”. Moreover, all Anglicans claim the name “Catholic” in that
they all use the Nicene creed. When discussing Anglican objections to the
doctrines taught by the Popes, words used historically by Anglicans, such as
“Roman” and “Romanism”, are used.

2.3 Understanding *Apostolicae curae*

*Apostolicae curae* occupies a unique place among works
discussing Anglican Orders. It is a juridical document from an authority
claiming to be able to pronounce definitive and final judgment on all
questions of faith or morals. The striking thing is that, with one exception,*
*Apostolicae curae* is not seeking to persuade anybody of anything, just to
provide sufficient reasons for the decision and then let the matter rest.

Part of the argument (nn.19-21) relies on unpublished
documents in the archives of the Holy Office. The Pope does not quote from
them or even describe them, except to say they are ‘integrae fidei’ – ‘of
incontestable authority’. In their reply the Anglican Archbishops expressed
disappointment (with a hint of suspicion) that the documents were not

---

131 See the reply of John Bradford to Nicholas Harpsfield’s warning that he was ‘out of the
catholic Church’: ‘No, though you have excommunicated me out of your church, yet am I
in the catholic church of Christ, and, am, and by God’s grace shall be, a child, and an
obedient child of it for ever.’ Cattley (ed.), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, vol. 7,
p.172 (on the other hand, Foxe earlier, p.131, refers to a devotional book from the reign of
Mary I as ‘this Catholic Primer, called our Lady’s Matins’, an early example of an
Anglican describing as “Catholic” what the Reformation rejected); on Bradford see 7.2.2,
in the passage referred to by fn.477.
However, Leo XIII does not see it as his task to astonish scholars with a discovery of new evidence, nor even to convince non-Catholics but to find and provide an authoritative juridical basis for action. The only question worth asking is “are we committing the blasphemy of duplicating sacraments by insisting on the unconditional ordination of convert Anglican clergy?” The only exception to Leo XIII’s neglect of the arts of persuasion is his clear determination that everybody will believe that this decision is final. Two months after the Bull, when advising the Archbishop of Paris to suppress the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, which continued to treat the question of Anglican Orders as open, he pointed out that the decision of *Apostolicae curae* was to be treated as ‘for ever, valid, firm and irrevocable’.

The question of the status of *Apostolicae curae* will be considered below.

*Apostolicae curae*’s nature as a juridical, as opposed to an academic, or even polemical, work gives rise to a number of important principles in discussing it. To begin with complaints such as those of *Saepius officio* simply fail. The Pope is not arguing a thesis but handing down a judgment. Of necessity this means it can only persuade those who already accept the authority of the Pope. Furthermore, *Apostolicae curae*’s

---

132 *Saepius officio* Appendix, *Anglican Orders (English)*, p.64, cf. ch.VI on the Marian restoration: ‘We see that he has nothing to add to the documents which are already well known.’ *Anglican Orders (English)*, p.26. William Collins wrote an entire tract on this point: Collins, *The Internal Evidence of the Letter “Apostolicae Curae”*, see especially pp.4-8.


134 See chapter 4.
contribution is first and foremost to Catholic theology. Catholic theologians are permitted to hold a wide variety of opinions with the only proviso that they must be consistent with, and may not contradict, the formal teaching of the Church. According to Francis Clark, the Curial style employed in the Bull is to compose a document which does not exclude theological opinions that are in the technical sense, probable; it should be noted that in traditional theological parlance “probable” means that a theologian may support such a doctrine (Latin probo), it does not mean that it is statistically likely.

One result of this wise tolerance is that the phrasing of an ecclesiastical document, so couched that it takes account of a number of different hypotheses, can appear involved and even cryptic to those to whom the technical background is unfamiliar.

A number of criticisms of the Bull fail because they simply do not advert to the technical language being employed. This means that interpretations and defences of the Bull are not a regrettable necessity to fix a botched job, but are foreseen from the outset. A Catholic is obliged to assent to such a teaching as that proposed by Apostolicae curae and therefore must believe that the teaching is capable of reasoned defence. If a Catholic attacks a

---

135 ‘[Theologians] serve the Church through research done in a way that respects theological method. They seek to understand better, further develop and more effectively communicate the meaning of Christian Revelation as transmitted in Scripture and Tradition and in the Church’s Magisterium. … At the same time, since theology seeks an understanding of revealed truth whose authentic interpretation is entrusted to the Bishops of the Church*, it is intrinsic to the principles and methods of their research and teaching in their academic discipline that theologians respect the authority of the Bishops, and assent to Catholic doctrine according to the degree of authority with which it is taught†’. Ioannes Paulus Pp. II, ‘Constitutio Apostolica Ex Corde Ecclesiae de Universitatibus Catholicis’ (15 August 1990), Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. 72 (1990), p.1492, n.29; translation in: Apostolic Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on Catholic Universities, (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990), p.24, n.29.


136 Clark, Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention, p.xv.
given interpretation of the Bull, he must offer another, better interpretation in its place. On the other hand it is coherent (although it may reveal a misapprehension of Catholic teaching) for a non-Catholic to conclude that the Bull is incapable of any reasonable interpretation.

By contrast, the Responsio’s task is to persuade. Its audience is ostensibly ‘all Catholic Bishops’, by which the authors mean all Anglican (and Episcopalian) bishops, all bishops in Communion with the Pope, and all Orthodox and Oriental bishops. Its purpose is persuasion and it uses a number of the arts of persuasion—such as irony, damning with faint praise and retorsio argumenti—to make its case. Apostolicae curae does none of these things, which shows the difference between the Bull and the Responsio; a difference which arises from the different natures of the two works.

Apart from critics who object that the Bull does not do what it does not claim (and was never meant) to do, the arguments it does make elude some authors. In correspondence with the co-chairmen of ARCIC II, Cardinal Willebrands, the President of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, reveals a startling misunderstanding of the structure of Leo XIII’s argument, discussed below.¹³⁷ Two members of ARCIC I, Edward Yarnold SJ and the Anglican priest Henry Chadwick summarised Apostolicae curae in a popular pamphlet as follows.

Pope Leo seems to have reached this decision on the grounds that the Anglican Church had lacked the apostolic succession since the reign of Elizabeth I for two reasons: first because the bishops who performed

¹³⁷ See 8.1.6 below.
ordinations at that time did not have the requisite intention, since they intended not to ordain priests who would offer the sacrifice of the Mass; secondly, because the rite of ordination itself was not sufficiently explicit in this respect.  

This gets the Bull’s arguments backwards. In his theological examination of the Ordinal, Leo XIII begins by finding the Anglican forms of ordination to be insufficient, then he examines the other prayers of the rite and the doctrinal basis of the Ordinal as a whole, and judges that the Ordinal certainly suffers from a defect of form (nn.25–32). Only then does he consider the defect of intention which is deduced from the adoption of a defective form (n.33). The failure of the Apostolic succession is treated by Leo XIII entirely as a consequence of the defects in the Anglican rites, it is not relied on to deduce these defects (nn.3, 26).

The Catholic theologian Edward P. Echlin complained in 1970 that:

The history of the Anglican orders controversy is further complicated by Rome’s arguments for invalidity which were often based on the questionable methodology of a vertical view of apostolic succession, the surmisal of

---


139 Three years later Yarnold’s introduction to the Willebrands/ARCIC II correspondence would give a much more accurate summary of the Bull: Edward Yarnold (ed.), *Anglican Orders—A New Context*, (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1986), p.2. In the later text Yarnold does not qualify the summary with the invidious word “seems”. *Apostolicae curae* is comprehensible to the ordinary reader although it requires specialist theological knowledge to understand every turn of phrase. This is in keeping with its nature as a juridical as opposed to a polemical or historical work.

140 See 3.1 *passim*. 
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“Rome” has only published arguments for invalidity in *Apostolicae curae*. The precedents cited by Leo XIII were limited in their published form to decrees for absolute reordination of convert Anglican clergy. As with Yarnold’s and Chadwick’s pamphlet, everything is backwards. The failure of apostolic succession is put first followed by the defect of intention and then the defect of form. In a review of Hughes’ *Stewards of the Lord*, John Coventry SJ concedes (although Leo XIII would beg to differ) that the Ordinal ‘cannot be called objectively defective’.

There is, first, the historical absurdity of supposing, without evidence, that all ordination forms used from the time of the apostles must have contained certain elements. Such a supposition would be historically absurd, but Leo XIII does not make it. He never lays down what constitutes a valid form of priestly or episcopal ordination. He merely rules that the Anglican form is insufficient. He is not discussing other rites at all.

---

142 cf. *Apostolicae curae* n.20.
144 See 3.1.5 below. A similar argument is made by the Anglican Archbishops in *Saepius officio* ch.XX, *Anglican Orders (English)*, pp.59–60.
2.4 The historical background to the question of Anglican Orders

2.4.1 The Edwardine liturgical books

So far as the Catholic Church’s negative assessment of Anglican Orders is concerned, the decisive action is the restoration in and after the reign of Elizabeth I of the liturgical books first issued in the reign of Edward VI. Under Henry VIII, the problem from Rome’s point of view was schism, but under Edward VI heresy was added to schism. It is accepted that Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury from 1533, was the main author of the Reformed English liturgies. Before the Reformation, liturgy in the English Church was conducted according to one of several variants of the Roman Rite, called “Uses”, deriving from one or other of the dioceses. The most widely used was the Sarum Use, from Salisbury. We also have detailed evidence for the Uses of Hereford and York. All three are similar enough to each other, and to what is now called the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite, for comparison between them to be easy. Each Use consisted of several books of which the only two relevant for this thesis are

the Missal for the celebration of Mass, and the Pontifical which contained all rites celebrated by a bishop, including the Sacrament of Orders.

In 1548, under the authority of the Sacrament Act 1547, Edward VI issued the Order for Communion.\(^{147}\) This was simply a supplement to the Sarum Order of Mass, designed to ensure regular reception of the Eucharist under both kinds, including a rubric for consecrating more wine, but not (presumably due to an oversight) more bread, if it should run out. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI was issued in 1549 and swept away all other liturgical forms for public use.\(^{148}\) It included a simplified Communion Office, ‘The Supper of the Lorde and holy Communion, commonly called the Masse’.\(^{149}\) In March 1550 ‘The Forme and maner of makyng and consecratyng of Archebishoppes, Bishoppes, Priestes and Deacons’ was issued and was bound up with later printings of the 1549 Prayer Book. This book, the only Anglican liturgical book to be considered in *Apostolicae curae*, is always referred to as “the Ordinal”. To distinguish between those ordained using the traditional forms and those ordained using the Edwardine rites which replaced them, it is usual to refer to “Pontifical” priests and bishops and “Ordinal” priests and bishops.

A revised Prayer Book, the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, was issued in 1552. This included dramatic changes to the Communion Office. The Ordinal was also modified. Among many other rituals, the Sarum Pontifical had included anointing with oil at the Ordinations of


\(^{149}\) First Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.212–230.
priests and bishops as well as the *traditio instrumentorum*, that is the ritual bestowal of things associated with the new ministry being conferred (the Book of the Gospels for deacons, the paten and chalice for priests, the Book of the Gospels, crosier, mitre and ring for bishops).\(^{150}\) The 1550 Ordinal abolished all the anointings but preserved the *traditio*, adding a bestowal of the Bible to priests.\(^{151}\) In 1552 all vestiges of the Catholic *traditio instrumentorum* were abolished in favour of the bestowal of the New Testament ondeacons and of the Bible on priests and bishops.\(^{152}\) The 1552 Communion service preserved a rubric enjoining kneeling.\(^{153}\) Objections were raised by prominent Protestants. As a result Edward VI issued by proclamation a “Declaration on Kneeling”. This is known as “the Black Rubric”. It was inserted as a separate sheet in some printings of the 1552 Book while in others the text was added to the main body of the type. In some printings it is completely lacking. It survives in the definitive 1662 recension of the Book of Common Prayer and has been the arena for fierce discussion of the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist.\(^{154}\) The Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal were suppressed after Mary I succeeded her half-brother on 17 July 1553 and set about restoring Catholicism. She died on 17 November 1558 and was succeeded by her half-sister, Elizabeth I.


\(^{151}\) First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.301 (deacons), p.312 (priests), p.317 (bishops).


\(^{153}\) “Then shal the minister first receyue the Communion in both kyndes hymselfe…and after to the people in their handes kneeling.” Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.389.

\(^{154}\) For the Black Rubric see 6.3.3 below.
2.4.2 The emergence of the reformed Church of England

The decisive events for the emergence of the Church of England as an institution entirely separate from the authority of the Pope, took place in the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. On 29 April 1559, Elizabeth gave her assent to what is now known as the Act of Supremacy 1559 and which abolished the jurisdiction of any ‘foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, spiritual or temporal … within this realm’.155

It was the third attempt to pass such an act and it is from a phrase in the oath prescribed by it—to be taken by anybody holding or assuming ecclesiastical or temporal office—that each Monarch of what is now the United Kingdom is known as “the Supreme Governor of the Church of England” and not (as Henry VIII and Edward VI had claimed) “the Supreme Head”. The Act of Supremacy was immediately followed by the Act of Uniformity, which abolished all Catholic forms of worship, and restored the liturgy as it existed at the end of the reign of Edward VI with one or two small, but important, modifications, which did not affect the Ordinal.156

Although on the Continent there had been some suggestion that the Church needed no bishops, and although such ideas had spread to England, Elizabeth was determined to establish an episcopate. The

---

Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole, had died on the same day as Queen Mary. Elizabeth chose as his replacement Matthew Parker, who had served both her parents as chaplain and, until the reign of Queen Mary, had risen at Cambridge University to be vice Chancellor and Master of Corpus Christi College. In Mary’s reign he had been steadily deprived of all his ecclesiastical offices but he never went into exile on the continent.\footnote{David J. Crankshaw & Alexandra Gillespie, ‘Parker, Matthew (1504–1575)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.} It took two attempts to gather enough bishops to confirm Parker’s election and consecrate him. On 6 December 1559 Elizabeth issued a second commission addressed to the last remaining diocesan bishop, Anthony Kitchin (all the others had been deprived for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy) and six others who had been either diocesan or suffragan bishops in previous reigns but had been deprived of their Bishoprics under Mary.\footnote{For the commission see: John Bramhall, Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated, (The Hague: 1658), p.450, in: The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. sometime Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland. With A Life of the Author and a Collection of His Letters. Vol. III, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), pp.74–75.} Kitchin refused the commission, but the next four on the list accepted it, confirmed Parker’s election and then ordained him Archbishop of Canterbury.

Matthew Parker then participated in the confirmation and (where necessary) ordination of the rest of Elizabeth’s episcopal appointees. Thus, after the passage of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, his elevation to Canterbury is the second event which is decisive in the establishment of the Church of England in its post-Reformation form.
2.4.3 The beginnings of Catholic polemic

From 1604 onwards, a staple of Catholic polemic was the story of the Nag’s Head ordinations. This is the fiction—often referred to as “the Nag’s Head Fable”—that Matthew Parker went through a farcical ordination ceremony in the Nag’s Head Tavern in Cheapside to become Archbishop of Canterbury. In fact numerous contemporary documents prove that the consecration was performed in the chapel of Lambeth Palace according to the rite of the second Ordinal of Edward VI (1552) on 17 December 1559. The consecrators were William Barlow, John Scory, Miles Coverdale and John Hodgkin. Barlow and Hodgkin were Pontifical bishops, consecrated in 1536 and 1537 respectively. Barlow fled to Europe during the reign of Queen Mary. Hodgkin conformed to the restored Catholic Church although, because he was married, he was suspended a pontificalibus (that is, forbidden to act as a bishop) by the Papal Legate Cardinal Pole. Scory and Coverdale were Ordinal bishops, consecrated in 1551.  

Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Hodgkin were acting in accordance with Elizabeth’s second commission for the consecration of Matthew Parker. This document contained an important saving clause, known as the “supplentes clause”, which begins: ‘Supplying nevertheless by our supreme authority royal…’ It purports to rectify any breaches of the law necessary to get Parker ordained in accordance with the Edwardine

\[159\] For the case against the Nag’s Head Fable see Hughes, Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, pp.12–24; for the status of the consecrators see Messenger, The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood, vol. 2, p.235.
Ordinal.\textsuperscript{160} It may have been intended to cover any number of irregularities, such as that none of Parker’s consecrators were competent (in that none of them were diocesan bishops) or that the Act of Uniformity may not have authorised the Ordinal as well as the Prayer Book.\textsuperscript{161} It relies not on any Act of Parliament or specific rule of law, but on Elizabeth’s \textit{suprema auctoritas regia}—an extreme example of Erastianism. The entire document, including this clause, was included in the official record in the Register. It is precisely the embarrassing Erastian nature of this clause which shows that the document could not possibly be a forgery.

\textbf{2.4.4 The development of the Book of Common Prayer}

From the accession of Elizabeth I to the accession of Charles II a century later there were comparatively few changes made to the Book of Common Prayer. Elizabeth I modified the words of administering Holy Communion. In her brother’s reign dissatisfaction had been expressed by some radicals with the pace of reform. Early in Elizabeth’s reign this dissatisfaction coalesced into a movement which came to be known as “Puritan” and had a decisive, although not always intended, influence on the Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{162}


\textsuperscript{161} Messenger, \textit{The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood}, vol. 2, pp.233–234.
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In the 1549 Prayer-book a short Catechism had been included in the order for administering Confirmation.\(^{163}\) It covered the Creed, the Ten Commandments and the Lord’s Prayer. On 24 March 1603 James VI of Scotland succeeded his first cousin twice removed, Elizabeth I, as James I of England. In January 1604 he summoned a conference at Hampton Court to hear Puritan objections to certain practices allowed or compelled by the Church of England.\(^{164}\) The most famous result of this conference was the Authorized Version of the Bible published in 1611. It was also decided, at the Puritans’ request, to add a discussion of the Sacraments to the Catechism. John Overall, the Dean of St Paul’s and prolocutor of Convocation, was deputed to draft it.\(^{165}\) Puritan power continued to rise, eventually leading to the overthrow of the monarchy and the episcopal Church of England at the end of the English Civil War (1642–1651). Following the restoration of Charles II in 1660, the Book of Common Prayer underwent its final major revision. Changes were made to the Ordinal to deal with Puritan objections. For the purposes of this thesis, the relevant changes are to the essential form for ordaining priests and bishops in the Church of England. Since it will be necessary to refer to these many times the original formulas are given here with the modified versions authorised in 1662.

\(^{163}\) First Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.247–250.


\(^{165}\) Nicholas W. S. Cranfield, ‘Overall, John (bap. 1561, d. 1619)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; for the Catechism see below 8.1.3, in the passages referred to by fnn.557–565.
2.4.5 The form of Anglican ordinations

Until 1662 the formula for the ordination of a priest in the Church of England was (in modern spelling) this:

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.\textsuperscript{166}

From 1662 onwards it became:

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.\textsuperscript{167}

Until 1662 the formula for the ordination of a bishop in the Church of England was this:

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.\textsuperscript{168}

From 1662 onwards it became:

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. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of

\textsuperscript{166} First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.311, Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.457, Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth p.175.
\textsuperscript{167} BCP pp.581–582.
our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.\textsuperscript{169}

In both cases the 1662 formula makes it plain that a new order is being conferred during that very ceremony, with the mention of its title (priest or bishop), the words ‘now committed unto thee’ and (for bishops) the words ‘by this imposition of our hands’.

\section*{2.4.6 The origins of \textit{Apostolicae curae}}

Long before \textit{Apostolicae curae}, the consistent policy of the Catholic Church (which continues today) was to deny the validity of Anglican Orders. The most obvious effect of this policy was that Anglican clergy who converted to the Catholic Church and who wished to serve as priests had to be ordained again. Despite a constant exchange of theological and historical arguments between the two sides, the policy never wavered. Leo XIII mentions at the beginning of \textit{Apostolicae curae} that ‘especially during the past few years, a controversy has arisen whether sacred ordinations performed according to the Edwardine rite possess the nature and efficacy of a sacrament’ (n.3).\textsuperscript{170} In response to this in March 1896 he appointed a commission of theologians to investigate the question giving it full access to the relevant archives (n.5).\textsuperscript{171} The Commission reported to the Holy Office which discussed the matter before the Pope. The unanimous decision was to confirm the previous practice. Nevertheless Leo XIII

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{169} BCP p.594.
\item \textsuperscript{170} For details see: Hughes, \textit{Absolutely Null and Utterly Void}, pp.28–104.
\item \textsuperscript{171} This is known as the “Anglican Orders Commission” or “Leonine Commission” or “1896 Commission” etc.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
reserved the matter for private reflection before deciding whether to deliver
judgment (n.34). The result was Apostolicae curae which declared that
‘ordinations performed according to the Anglican Rite have been and are
completely null and void’ (n.36).

2.4.7 The Archbishops’ Response

Edward Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, agreed to a plan
that a reply to Apostolicae curae would be prepared by John Wordsworth
the Bishop of Salisbury. Benson died with the first complete draft unopened
on his desk. Preparation of what became known as the Responsio stalled
while Frederick Temple was translated from London to Canterbury.\(^{172}\) He
was closely involved in preparing the final text. As Wordsworth put it,
Archbishop Temple ‘was determined from the first that every trace of
bitterness should be eradicated from the draft’, or in his own words he ‘cut
out all the thunder’.\(^{173}\) More recently this document has been known as
Saepius officio. The theological discussion in Apostolicae curae turns
tightly on the interpretation of the Anglican Ordinal. Saepius officio replies
with arguments drawn from the Ordinal as well as (in ch.XI) the Order for

---

\(^{172}\) For details see: Creighton, Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton, vol. 2, pp.179–180;
John Wordsworth, ‘Archbishop Temple and the Responsor Archiepiscoporum Angliae ad
litteras apostolicas Leonis Papae XIII., dated Friday, February 19, 1897’, in: Memoirs of
Archbishop Temple by Seven Friends, vol. 2, pp.391–393; Benson, Life of Edward White
(London, England), Thursday 22 October 1896 (Issue 35028), p.6; Peter Hinchliff,
Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: A Life, (Oxford: at the University Press,

\(^{173}\) Wordsworth, ‘Archbishop Temple and the Responsor...’, p.393; George Forrest Browne,
p.261.
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Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer. This may have been the work of Archbishop Temple.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{174} Hinchliffe, Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: A Life, p.267; for ch.XI of \textit{Saepius officio} see 6.2.
3 The Bull and its critics

3.1 *Apostolicae curae* on the defect of form

3.1.1 Leo XIII and what is needful to confer orders

Leo XIII’s theological assessment of Anglican ordinations presupposes the traditional division of *matter* and *form*. In baptism the *matter* is the pouring of water onto the body (normally the head) of the candidate while the *form* is the words, ‘I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit’. Bernard Leeming quotes one of St Augustine’s descriptions of Baptism: ‘What is the Baptism of Christ? A washing in water by the word. Take away the water and you have no Baptism; take away the word, and you have no Baptism.’\(^{175}\) This is why Leo XIII remarks that from the *matter* used in Anglican ordinations alone—the laying-on of hands—one could equally conclude that the sacrament was confirmation (n.24). The form is meant to make plain what is happening. It makes the difference between a bath and a baptism.

This method of analysing the sacraments is an analogy from concepts in Aristotle’s *Physics*. According to Leeming, the first to apply the analogy was Stephen Langton (c.1150–1228) who was later Archbishop of

---

Canterbury.  The analysis cannot be used indiscriminately. Leeming himself cites Aquinas and Franzelin (as a comparatively modern example) as a caution ‘against extending the analogy’. He notes that Eastern Orthodox theologians are cautious about it and points out on the one hand that both the Councils of Florence and Trent ‘omitted the terminology with regard to Marriage; and applied it in a mitigated sense to Penance, speaking of quasi-materia’, and on the other that Leo XIII himself in *Apostolicae curae* (n.24) simply says the essential part of a sacrament ‘appellari consuevit’ – ‘is usually [or customarily] called’ the matter and form.  

### 3.1.2 Leo XIII and the 1662 Ordinal

In the Edwardine Ordinal, the formulas for ordination to the priesthood and episcopate are fifty-three and thirty-nine words long respectively. From 1662 they were expanded (respectively) to seventy-six and eighty words in length. It is not often noticed that Leo XIII ignores all but the first four words, although he does briefly note the changes. The most prominent difference between the Anglican ordination formulas of 1550 and those adopted in 1662 is the addition of the words ‘for the office and work of a priest/bishop’. According to the seventeenth century Dean of Norwich, Humphrey Prideaux, the reason for this change is that in 1662 the Puritans argued that there is no difference between the offices of priest and bishop.

---

177 *Ibid.* pp.405–407, n.431 (Aquinas), n.432 (Franzelin), n.433 (Eastern Orthodox), n.434 (Florence, Trent, Leo XIII). For the Councils on Marriage see DS 1327 (Florence) and DS 1797–1812 (Trent), on Penance see DS 1323 (Florence) and DS 1673 & 1704 (Trent).
178 See 2.4.5 above.
and that this was confirmed by the lack of distinction between the two in the
ordination rites.\textsuperscript{179} Leo XIII is often attacked for asserting that the changes
were made to meet Roman objections.\textsuperscript{180} However what he actually says at
n.31 is:

\begin{quote}
It was in vain that from the time of Charles I some men attempted to admit
some notion of sacrifice and priesthood, and that, later on, certain additions
were made to the Ordinal.
\end{quote}

He simply says the changes were in vain. He says nothing about the reason
why they were made.

From the Anglican point of view (i.e. assuming that the Church
of England is part of the Catholic Church), Prideaux’s explanation shows
that the Anglicans in 1662 were trying to vindicate Catholic truth: that there
is an essential difference between priest and bishop. Although answering
Romanists might not have been in their minds at all, the vindication of
Catholic truth against the presbyterians is logically the same thing as
vindicating the Catholic identity of the Church of England against Roman
Catholics who denied it. Given the change, Leo XIII is right to say that it
‘rather proves that the Anglicans themselves had recognized that the first
form had been defective and unsuitable’ (n.26). That in defending their
doctrine the Puritans were able to exploit the 1550 formulas shows that the
formulas were both those things.

\textsuperscript{179} Humphrey Prideaux, \textit{The validity of the orders of the Church of England, : made out
against the objections of the papists, in several letters to a gentleman of Norwich, that
At p.43 Prideaux says Peter Gunning (1614–1684, later Bishop of Chichester and then Ely)
and John Pearson (1613–1686, later Bishop of Chester) were the ‘prime advisers of the
change’; cf. \textit{Saeptius officio} ch.XV, \textit{Anglican Orders (English)}, p.45.

\textsuperscript{180} e.g. Walter K. Firminger, \textit{The Alterations in the Ordinal of 1662: Why were they made?},
(London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1898), pp.6–8; Dix, \textit{Question of
Leo XIII now gives a theological explanation for the judgment that Anglican ordinations are invalid. Using the traditional distinctions from Catholic theology, he points out that we can distinguish between the ceremonial and the essential parts of a sacrament. It is the essential part which is important, and it consists of matter and form which go together. For the Sacrament of Order the matter is the laying-on of hands, but this is not decisive since it is used to administer minor orders and confirmation too (n.24). Therefore the crucial thing is the form.

Now the words which until recent times have been generally held by Anglicans to be the proper form of presbyteral ordination — ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’ — certainly do not signify definitely the order of the priesthood (sacerdotium) or its grace and power, which is pre-eminently the power ‘to consecrate and offer the true body and blood of the Lord’ in that sacrifice which is no ‘mere commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the Cross’. (n.25)

Those are quotations from the Council of Trent. First from Session 23 (15 July 1563) Canons on the Sacrament of Orders:

Can. 1 If any one says, that there is in the New Testament no visible and external priesthood or that there is no power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins, but only the office and bare ministry of preaching the gospel; or, that those who do not preach are not priests at all, let him be anathema.\(^{181}\)

The second is from Session 22 (17 September 1562) Canons on the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass:

Can. 3 If any one says that the sacrifice of the mass is merely offering of praise and of thanksgiving or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice

\(^{181}\) DS 1771.
accomplished on the Cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, or, that it benefits only those who communicate; and that it should not be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfaction, and other necessities, let him be anathema.\textsuperscript{182}

The Anglican formula introduced in Edward VI’s first prayer book, suspended in the reign of Mary I and reinstated by Elizabeth I, makes no mention of this sacrifice.

3.1.3 The Anglican form of ordination

Apart from rejecting the 1662 changes as having any effect Leo XIII concentrates on the words ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’. He is not using these four words as a short hand for the whole text. He describes them as ‘verba quae … habentur … tamquam forma propria ordinationis presbyteralis, videlicet’ – ‘the words which … have been held … to be the proper form of ordination, namely…’ After the word “videlicet” (used in English as \textit{viz.}), which in Clark’s translation is represented by an em dash but in the original translation was rendered verbally as “namely”, it is very hard to take the quotation as anything other than the entire text of the form being condemned.\textsuperscript{183} Not only is he ignoring the rest of these formulas but he claims ‘until recent times [they] have been generally held by Anglicans to be the proper form’. This is a startling claim which is in fact true.

To begin with it should be noted that Leo XIII is considering the right part of the service. We do not need to be looking somewhere else. The

\textsuperscript{182} DS 1753.

\textsuperscript{183} \textit{Anglican Orders (English)}, p.9; cf. Lewis and Short, \textit{A Latin Dictionary}, p.1988, s.v. \textit{videlicet} II.
rubric before the formula for ordaining priests directs the bishop and priests present to lay hands ‘upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order’ while ‘the receivers’ remain kneeling.\textsuperscript{184} Clearly they have not received Orders up to this point, and there is only the delivery of the Bible left before the Ordination is over and Holy Communion is celebrated. It is even clearer with the formula for ordaining bishops since the equivalent rubric refers to ‘the elected bishop kneeling’, then after the delivery of the bible he is referred to as ‘the new consecrated Bishop’.\textsuperscript{185} Moreover it was with precisely these formulas that the revisers in 1662 chose to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders against the Puritans.\textsuperscript{186}

The greatest of Anglican theologians, Richard Hooker (1554–1600), can be shown to have thought the same as Leo XIII. Hooker’s \textit{Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity} was written to oppose Puritanism and to show that the Elizabethan settlement was not merely “Popery”. The fifth book includes a discussion of the sacraments, especially the Eucharist and Holy Orders. Of the latter he remarks with regard to the Puritans that ‘[a] thing much stumbled at in the manner of giving Orders is our using those memorable words of our Lord and Saviour Christ, “Receive the Holy Ghost.”’ The gift of the Holy Ghost includes the gift of ‘the very authority and power which is given men in the Church to be ministers of holy things’.

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{184} BCP p.582.
\item \textsuperscript{185} BCP pp.594–595.
\item \textsuperscript{186} See 3.1.2 above.
\end{footnotes}
Therefore ‘he which giveth this power may say without absurdity or folly “Receive the Holy Ghost”’. 187

Hooker’s contemporary, Lancelot Andrewes, who later became Bishop of Winchester, was Bishop of Ely when he preached the Pentecost sermon at Greenwich before King James I in 1616. He tells the congregation on what occasion they might have seen Pentecost for themselves.

Now what is here [at Pentecost] to do, what business is in hand, we cannot but know, if ever we have been at the giving of Holy Orders. For by these words are they given, “Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye remit, &c.” Were to them [Apostles], and are to us, even to this day, by these and by no other words…

It seems that Andrewes is, to a slight extent, contradicting Hooker by including ‘&c.’, but after noting that the only reason Roman orders are valid ‘for all their Accipe potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis’, is because the Pontifical includes this formula ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum peccata…’, he goes on to discuss the extent to which Ordination is properly called a sacrament. Underlying this is the insistence of Article 25 that Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are the only “Sacraments of the Gospel” whereas Orders is only among the five ‘commonly called sacraments’. 188

For these are the very operative words for the conferring this power, for the performing this act. Which act is here performed somewhat after the manner of a Sacrament. For here is an outward ceremony, of breathing, instar


188 BCP pp.621–622.
elementi; and here is a word coming to it, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” That some have therefore yielded to give that name or title to Holy Orders. As indeed the word Sacrament hath been sometime drawn out wider, and so Orders taken in; and others have plucked in narrower, and so they left out, as it hath pleased both the old and the later writers.\(^\text{189}\)

He is clearly appealing to Augustine’s distinction between “the word” (or “form”) and “the matter”.\(^\text{190}\) And “the word” is simply the words ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’.

The following year, Andrewes again preached the Pentecost sermon before the King, this time at Holyrood. He discusses the purpose for which the Holy Spirit descended on Christ, that is for anointing and for mission:

> And mark well this, that the Holy Ghost came upon Christ alike for both, that there is the Holy Ghost no less in this sending than in the anointing. The very calling itself is a “grace,” expressly so called, Romans the twelfth [Rom 12:3], and Ephesians the third [Eph 3:7], and in divers places else. Every grace is of the Holy Ghost; and goeth ever, and is termed by the name of the Holy Ghost usually. And in this sense the Holy Ghost is given and received in Holy Orders, and we do well avow that we say, “Receive the Holy Ghost.”\(^\text{191}\)

It does seem that two of the most important figures of Anglican theology, when seeking to be precise about the form of the Anglican ordination rite,

\(^{189}\) Lancelot Andrewes, ‘A Sermon preached before the King’s Majesty at Greenwich on the nineteenth of May, A.D. MDCXVI, being Whit-Sunday’, in: Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by His Majesty’s Special Command, Vol. III, pp.262–263.

\(^{190}\) See 3.1.1 above.

refer to the same four words discussed exclusively in that connexion by Leo XIII.

To determine that a form is insufficient, one must first identify the form being assessed. Many of those discussing the Bull, even those who reject its conclusions, do not notice that Leo XIII not only makes a precise identification of the Anglican forms, but that he also claims that this identification is agreed to by Anglican authorities generally. Leo XIII’s claim can be verified from two of the greatest Anglican theologians. They are by no means particularly representative of the less Catholic traditions in the Church of England. Both Hooker and Andrewes were opponents of Puritanism. When Leo XIII notes that ‘from the time of Charles I some men attempted to admit some notion of sacrifice and priesthood’ in Anglicanism (n.31), Andrewes would be admitted on all hands to be among them.

Although Leo XIII is often interpreted as laying down the true form to confer the Sacrament of Order, as a matter of fact he is entirely concerned with the Anglican rites. The only Catholic texts he cites are from the Council of Trent. He takes these as an expression of Catholic truth, not as legal decrees to which a rite set out in 1552 is supposedly made subject. Hence, the Archbishops’ remark in ch.XI that the canons of 1562 and 1563 ‘were promulgated after our Ordinal was composed’ is entirely beside the point.\footnote{Anglican Orders (English), p.34.} Leo XIII’s objection to the Anglican forms is not that they are inconsistent with a later Council but that they were composed to be inconsistent with the known teaching of the Catholic Church.\footnote{See 3.1.5 below, in the passage referred to by fn.211.}

---

\textsuperscript{192} Anglican Orders (English), p.34.
\textsuperscript{193} See 3.1.5 below, in the passage referred to by fn.211.
Just as none of the documents by Julius III, Paul IV or Cardinal Pole lay down ‘what is essential for the validity of sacred ordinations in general’ (n.8)—as Leo XIII himself points out—so *Apostolicae curae* itself is not a treatise, even in summary, of the Sacrament of Order. The reason why Leo XIII concentrates on “Receive the Holy Ghost” as the only candidate for the Anglican form of ordination is precisely that it is in the imperative mood. It was thought that, to convey the power of orders, it was necessary to use some kind of command, addressed to the candidate. In his lengthy history of the theology of the Eucharist in the period before, and at the time of, the Reformation, Francis Clark discusses the compilation of the 1550 Ordinal.

In the case of the two higher orders the new Anglican form included the words, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’, which had been contained in the Exeter Pontifical as well as in the Roman, and was thought by many schoolmen to be the sacramental form for conferring orders.¹⁹⁴

This is confirmed in *Saepius officio* ch.XIX, where the Archbishops discuss how ‘our Fathers’ compiled the Ordinal from the medieval pontificals. And inasmuch as at that time there was nothing known for certain as to the antiquity of the first prayers, but the opinions of learned men assigned all efficacy to the “imperative” forms, they turned their attention to the latter rather than to the former.¹⁹⁵

In ch.XV they describe the rest of the Anglican ordination prayer (‘And be thou a faithful dispenser etc.’) as evoking “the power of the keys”. This idea derives from Matthew 16:19:

---

¹⁹⁵ Anglican Orders (English), p.54.
I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on
earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be
loosed in heaven.

This might be thought (according to Catholic theology) to apply to the Pope
alone, but it is applied to all the Apostles by Christ in Matthew 18:18. The
source for the Anglican formula, and the text used in the Roman Pontifical,
is John 20:22–23. Although there is no explicit reference to the “keys of the
kingdom” here, the idea is similar:

And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said to them, “Receive
the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain
the sins of any, they are retained.

The concept of “the keys of the kingdom” appears in Aquinas’
commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard:

And since every grace and remission in a mystical body comes to it from its
head, it seems that it is essentially the same power whereby a priest can
consecrate, and whereby he can loose and bind, if he has jurisdiction, and
that there is only a logical difference, according as it is referred to different
effects… And because the character of the priestly order is nothing else than
the power of exercising that act to which the priestly order is chiefly ordained
… therefore the character, the power of consecrating, and the power of the
keys are one and the same essentially, but differ logically.196

---

196 Thomas Aquinas, Super Sent., lib. 4 d. 18 q. 1 a. 1 qe. 2 ad 1. Aquinas died before
completing the Summa Theologica. Reginald of Piperno (d.1291) prepared a supplement,
covering the remaining topics, gathered from Super Sent. Accordingly this passage is found
in Supplementum Tertiae Partis Summae Theologiae..., q. 17 a. 2 ad 1, p.34 B II.64–75.
The quotation is from a translation of the Supplementum in: The “Summa Theologica” of
St. Thomas Aquinas: Third Part: Literally Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican
Province: Fourth Number, (Qq. LXXXIV—Suppl. XXXIII), (London: R. & T. Washbourne,
Ltd., 1917), p.244.
Like Aquinas, Trent’s first canon on the Sacrament of Orders puts consecration and oblation of the Eucharist on the one hand, and forgiving and retaining of sins on the other, on an equal level.

If any one says, that there is … no power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins … let him be anathema.\(^{197}\)

They each imply the other.

Elsewhere Leo XIII does not reject in principle the idea that the Catholicity of the form “Receive the Holy Ghost” could be safeguarded by other texts in the Anglican rites (nn.27, 28, 32). He simply says the texts cited are inadequate for that purpose. In that case it is all the more surprising that he ignores “Whose sins thou dost forgive…”

One could construe the entire formula for priests as a single imperative or as an imperative followed by some kind of purpose clause: “Receive the Holy Ghost in order that you may forgive and retain sins”. In all the printings of the earlier recensions of the Anglican Ordinal these formulas form only one sentence divided by colons.\(^{198}\) Even if it is a bare indicative, if other texts can be allowed to provide interpretation of “Receive the Holy Ghost” then surely the texts which immediately follow it and are said while the ordaining bishop’s hands are still laid on the candidate, that is while the matter is still present, surely they can be allowed to provide an interpretation? Given how clear it is, from reading the documents in the “Gordon dossier”, that Leo XIII’s description of the Holy

---

\(^{197}\) DS 1771; quoted in full in 3.1.2 above in the passage referred to by fn.181.

\(^{198}\) First Prayer Book of Edward VI, pp.311, 316–317; Second Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.457, 462–463; Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth pp.175, 180.
Office cases (nn.18-21) is an exact summary of them and their drift, his neglect of the full ordination formulas is disappointing.\(^{199}\)

However the omission cannot be said to be fatal. From the other arguments about defect of form in *Apostolicae curae* it is clear that it would make no difference had Leo XIII discussed the formulas in full.

### 3.1.4 Leo XIII’s interpretation of the Ordinal

Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent clearly treat the power of consecration and oblation on the one hand, and the power of forgiving and retaining sins on the other, as interrelated and interdependent. Indeed Aquinas treats them as the same in essence. Nevertheless the Ordinal, as such, does not. Since the Anglican liturgy, including the Ordinal, was compiled from pre-existing texts, it is possible to observe, as Leo XIII does, that the other prayers in the Ordinal:

- have been deliberately stripped of everything which in the Catholic rite clearly sets forth the dignity and functions of the priesthood. It is impossible, therefore, for a form to be suitable or sufficient for a sacrament if it suppresses that which it ought distinctively to signify. (n.27).

A valuable method of interpreting the Anglican Formularies is to track the changes made to them. A notable feature of the rites of ordaining Priests and Bishops before the Reformation is the anointing of the hands of priests and the head and hands of bishops. This rite was explained by Aquinas as a consecration ‘for the purpose of handling the sacrament, wherefore the anointing is done to the priests alone who touch the body of

Christ with their own hands’.\textsuperscript{200} Maskell quotes a tenth-century writer saying that the anointing is to strengthen the priest with the hands of Christ so that ‘through Him, with Him and in Him the whole sacrifice is carried out’.\textsuperscript{201} The first Edwardine Ordinal excluded the anointing altogether. The reason for this was plain from what was left in and in what way. For the \textit{tradicio instrumentorum} was preserved in 1550. The newly ordained priest received the Bible and ‘the Chalice or cuppe with the breade’ but without the imperative formula—which a number of writers, including Aquinas, treated as the form of ordination—to ‘receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass for the living and the dead’.\textsuperscript{202} This was reduced to the injunction ‘to minister the holy Sacramentes in thys congregacion’.\textsuperscript{203} This was in itself clearly a rejection of the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice (hence we can see anointing was abolished for the same reason) but, to make things clearer, in the second recension of the Ordinal the \textit{tradicio} of the chalice and ‘the breade’ (presumably the paten with the bread on it) were left out and only the Bible was to be bestowed.

Leo XIII rejects the form for the ordination of bishops on slightly different grounds (n.28). First he notes that the formula “Take the Holy Ghost” was ‘too late amplified’ by the additions of 1662 but that the


\textsuperscript{203} First Prayer Book of Edward VI, p.312.
word “bishop”, as used in the Anglican Ordinal ‘must be judged otherwise than in a Catholic rite’. This is a hint that an important statement is going to be made although both it and the statement are often overlooked by modern commentators.\textsuperscript{204}

The Ordinal leaves out entirely the first half of the lengthy “Prayer of Consecration” in the Sarum Pontifical said before the anointing of the candidate’s head. This prayer begins ‘Deus, qui Moysen famulum tuum’.\textsuperscript{205} It expresses the doctrine of the high priesthood that belongs to the Catholic episcopate. It was familiar to Leo XIII because it is found in the same place in the Roman Pontifical. It recalls the role of Moses in teaching Aaron, the first High Priest of the Old Law, the ‘garb of mystical meaning’.\textsuperscript{206} It goes on to say that even at the time of the Exodus these rich vestments were meant to teach the virtues which they symbolised but now our experience of the reality is much clearer and a bishop’s dignity (‘Pontificalem gloriam’) lies in the beauty of his soul, not in his vestments. Hence the prayer begs for the grace once typified by gold and gems to be lavished on the candidate. Finally, in an imperative addressed not to the candidate but to God, the prayer asks ‘fulfil in this priest of thine the perfection of thy ministry’.\textsuperscript{207} In 1947, Pius XII would determine that for the future (his ruling explicitly makes no judgment settling past controversy) this imperative sentence would be the essential part of the form.\textsuperscript{208}

\textsuperscript{204} See below 3.1.5, in the passage referred to by fn.212.
\textsuperscript{205} Maskell, \textit{Monumenta Ritualia}, vol. 2, pp.275–276.
\textsuperscript{206} \textit{Ibid.} p.275. The translation is in \textit{The Rite of Consecration of a Bishop}, pp.17–18.
\textsuperscript{207} \textit{Ibid.} p.276.
\textsuperscript{208} Pius Pp. XII, ‘Constitutio Apostolica \textit{Sacramentum Ordinis de sacris ordinibus diaconatus, presbyteratus et episcopatus}’ (30 November 1947), \textit{Acta Apostolicae Sedis},
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The prayer in the Pontifical stops here, to be resumed after the anointing of the head, with nothing more than a ‘Domine’ to indicate the addressee. This confirms the interpretation that this is the second half of a longer prayer. In the Sarum Pontifical the candidate at this point is still called ‘the one who is to be consecrated’ (although according to Pius XII, after 1947 he is certainly now a bishop). After his head is anointed the Prayer of Consecration resumes with a petition that, just as the chrism flows over his head, so the power of the Holy Spirit may fill his soul. Some of the themes of the rest of this part of the Prayer of Consecration are found in the Ordinal’s ‘Almighty God and most merciful Father’:

Grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant such grace, that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with thee; and use the authority given him, not to destruction, but to salvation; not to hurt, but to help: so that as a wise and faithful servant, giving to thy family their portion in due season, he may at last be received into everlasting joy.

It is impossible to see anything specifically belonging to the episcopate, especially not in the sense of the High Priesthood. The Ordinal prayer does not include from its source the latter’s specific request for the “Power of the Keys” and a lengthy elaboration of the Gospel, ‘whatever you bind on earth…’ Nor is there a specific request that the candidate never ‘pass off’ light for darkness, darkness for light, good for evil, evil for good. In other words the canonical jurisdiction of a bishop (the “Keys”) and his pastoral

Vol. 40 (1948), p.7, n.5, DS 3860; on non-retroactivity cf. DS 3859: ‘…if other provisions have been legitimately made in the past at any time, We now determine that at least in the future…’; DS 3861: ‘The disposition of this Our Constitution does not have retroactive force.’

209 After all these prayers are completed, one who is still called ‘qui consecratur’ is instructed in the rubrics to extend his hands for them to be anointed: Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. 2, pp.284–285.
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responsibility are played down to such an extent that the prayer could be used at the ordination of a priest. Most important is the rejection of the petition that the candidate be given an episcopal throne to rule the church, and the people entrusted to him, with the Lord as his authority, power and strength. Hence Leo XIII concludes that from this prayer ‘in like manner the words which denote the “high priesthood” have been eliminated’ (n.28).

This thesis prescinds from the question which was one of those at the root of the struggles of the Reformation: what is the true nature of Christian ministry? To that extent it does not matter if Leo XIII’s doctrine is true (although of course it does matter once, as must happen, the question itself is addressed). For *Apostolicae curae* to be right, he simply has to show that Anglican and Catholic ideas of the ministry are totally different. Once attention is paid to the changes that were made to the rites when the Ordinal was first drafted, and to the changes made to the Ordinal in 1552 it is clear that it is a text which does not bear Catholic interpretation. For this reason, even if Leo XIII had paid attention to the declaratory statement in the Anglican form for the priesthood (‘whose sins thou dost forgive etc.’), his conclusion could only be that, even though (as Trent teaches) the forgiveness and retention of sins is a vital part of the Catholic priesthood, the power to consecrate and offer sacrifice is no less an important part, and that this “two-fold power” is specifically excluded by the formularies of the Church of England.

Leo XIII is not going to enter into the question of whether the episcopate is the complement of the priesthood or a distinct order (n.29). It had always been an open question whether the episcopate is the fullest
expression of the priesthood or a separate order. The question was settled by
the Second Vatican Council, which taught that by the episcopal
consecration the plenitude of the sacrament of order is conferred.\textsuperscript{210} In fact
that is the way Leo XIII is leaning.

It is quite certain in any event that the episcopate by Christ’s institution
belongs most truly to the sacrament of Order and is the priesthood in the
highest degree … Therefore, since the sacrament of Order and the true
priesthood of Christ has been totally expunged from the Anglican rite, and
since accordingly the priesthood is in nowise conferred in the episcopal
consecration of the same rite, it is equally impossible for the episcopate itself
to be truly and properly conferred thereby; the more so because a chief
function of the episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy
Eucharist and for the sacrifice (n.29).

It is impossible to confer the plenitude of something that one does not
confer at all. The Anglican Ordinal does not confer the priesthood, whether
ordaining priests or ordaining bishops, therefore it does not confer the
plenitude of the priesthood in the episcopate. Since there is no trace of a
priestly (that is sacerdotal, i.e. of one who offers sacrifice) ordination in the
episcopal consecration it follows there can be no episcopal ordination either.

\textbf{3.1.5 Leo XIII’s assessment of the Ordinal}

Leo XIII continues the theological discussion of the Anglican
form by looking at the Ordinal as a whole. He finds:

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
no clear mention of sacrifice, of consecration, of priesthood, of the power to
consecrate and offer sacrifice, but ... every trace of these and similar things
remaining in such prayers of the Catholic rite as were not completely
rejected, was purposely removed and obliterated (n.30).

It is not the absence of ‘these and similar things’ which is decisive, but the
fact that they were removed ‘de industria’ – ‘purposely’. Leo XIII is often
taken to be laying down the conditions for a sufficient form of ordination.
The Anglican Archbishops assume that. At the climax of the Responsio they
point out that the conditions Leo XIII is supposed to be making are not even
fulfilled in the older Pontificals used at Rome so that therefore ‘in
overthrowing our orders, he overthrows all his own, and pronounces
sentence on his own Church’ (ch.XX).\footnote{Anglican Orders (English), pp.59–60.} This would be a devastating
argument were it not beside the point. It is not that Leo XIII is identifying
any one thing as the essential part of the rite. His argument is that the
Reformers removed those parts of the rite which were supposed on all sides
to be essential for ordaining sacrificing priests. They did this because they
rejected the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass.

That Leo XIII is not laying down the essential form for
ordination is clear from a comparison between the discussion of the defect
of form in nn.25–32 and those sections where he does lay down generally
applicable rules. In n.24 he summarises the standard scholastic analysis of
any sacrament. First he gives the general principle and then he applies it to
Holy Orders. Again in n.33, discussing the defect of intention, he begins by
summarising the traditional rule for determining the sufficiency of a
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minister’s intention in any sacrament, before enunciating a refinement of the rule, called the principle of positive exclusion by Francis Clark, which applies to Anglican orders. He never does anything like that for the defect of form. He simply says that the words of the Anglican form ‘certainly do not signify definitely the order of the priesthood’ or the power to offer the sacrifice of the Mass (n.25). The implication is that whatever is the essential form, the Anglican Ordinal certainly does not contain it.

Once the rite had been altered in this way then it is no good simply reinserting words that might bear a Catholic meaning. The best Leo XIII can say is ‘…even though some words in the Anglican Ordinal as it now stands may present the possibility of ambiguity…’ (n.31). The words could be Catholic, but they might not be. It is true that the Anglicans call their clergy Bishop, Priest and Deacon and in fact these words are used in the forms of ordination. But, he says, this is in vain.

[O]nce a new rite has been introduced denying or corrupting the sacrament of Order and repudiating any notion whatsoever of consecration and sacrifice, then the formula, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’ … is deprived of its force; nor have the words, ‘for the office and work of a priest’ or ‘bishop’, etc., any longer their validity, being now mere names voided of the reality which Christ instituted (n.31).

*Nomina sine re quam instituit Christus.* Leo XIII’s claim is stark. When the Ordinal uses the words “priest” and “bishop” it uses them in a radically different sense from the Catholic Church. This is the judgment he was
foreshadowing when saying that the Ordinal’s use of the word “bishop” ‘must be judged otherwise than in a Catholic rite’ (n.28).\footnote{212}

Supporters of the validity of Anglican orders often refer to Leo XIII’s supposed ignorance (or worse) that the Ordinal uses the words “priest” and “bishop” several times with reference to “its intention”. This is itself based on another misapprehension of the Bull. After judging the Ordinal invalid through defect of form (nn.25–32), Leo XIII goes on to state that there is also a defect of intention (n.33). He is referring not to the intention of all ordaining bishops in the Church of England but to those who ordained Archbishop Parker. He is certainly not referring to the intention of the Church of England nor to the intention of the Ordinal.\footnote{213} However he is often taken to be referring to the latter, particularly by Anglicans.

In order to refute this image of *Apostolicae curae*’s arguments, writers in favour of Anglican Orders often invoke the Preface to the Ordinal. This begins by acknowledging that the Church has always had bishops, priests and deacons without going so far as to claim that the ordained ministry is of Christ’s institution. It goes on to say that nobody has ever exercised any of these ministries without some public rite.

> And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued … in the Church of England; No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England … except he be … admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.\footnote{214}

\footnote{212} See 3.1.4, in the passage referred to by fn.204.  
\footnote{213} Clark, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, pp.42–56, 71–77, see 3.2 below.  
\footnote{214} BCP p.553.
The Anglican Archbishops cite this at the end of ch.XVI, when discussing Leo XIII’s ‘harsh and inconsiderate words’ that in the Ordinal, the words “priest” and “bishop” are ‘voided of reality’.

The Pope says nothing however of the well-known intention of our Church set forth in the preface to the Ordinal, and nothing of the principle which our Fathers always set before themselves and which explains their acts without any adverse interpretation.\(^\text{215}\)

But that simply begs the question. It is impossible to prove that the Ordinal protects the traditional res simply by citing a use of the traditional nomina. It is necessary to show that by “priest” and “bishop”, the Church of England means substantially the same as the Catholic Church. To be fair to the Archbishops they do make such an attempt in ch.XI but with little success.\(^\text{216}\)

Early on in The Question of Anglican Orders, Gregory Dix makes a fair summary of Leo XIII’s argument that the Anglican Church ‘really means by these names [of “priest” and “bishop”] something recognisably different from what the Catholic Church “from the Apostles’ time” had always meant by them’.\(^\text{217}\) However later he fails to see the force of this argument when he comments that ‘[i]t is almost unbelievable, but Apostolicae Curae makes no reference of any kind even to the existence of this Preface in its discussion of the Anglican “Intention”.’\(^\text{218}\) More recently Christopher Hill has said of the Bull:

\(^{215}\) Anglican Orders (English), p.48.
\(^{216}\) See below 6.2, passim.
\(^{217}\) Dix, Question of Anglican Orders, p.16.
\(^{218}\) Ibid. p.78.
To ignore the Preface to the Ordinal when trying to discern its intention was a curious, serious and fatal error: a point rightly emphasised in the *Responsio* of the Anglican Archbishops.219

Leaving aside the irrelevance of the concept of “the intention of the Church of England” to Leo XIII’s discussion of sacramental intention (which is what Dix and Hill are attempting to address) the mere fact that the Church of England has ‘the intent that these Orders may be continued’ is insufficient if in fact the orders she possesses are not the same as those of the Catholic Church. It is an important component of this thesis that the most important part of *Apostolicae curae* is the often overlooked judgment that the words “priest” and “bishop” in the Anglican Ordinal are ‘now mere names voided of the reality which Christ instituted’ (n.31).

### 3.2 *Apostolicae curae* and intention

Leo XIII finds a defect of intention from the use of a defective rite (n.33). ARCIC’s new context for the recognition of Anglican orders arises from a claimed substantial agreement between Catholic and Anglican theology in the Eucharist and Holy Orders. This would transcend specific problems with any ambiguity in the Ordinal and any corresponding defect of intention would fade away. Accordingly it is not strictly necessary for an assessment of the new context to address Leo XIII’s half-page discussion of the defect of intention, and for reasons of space it has been left out.

---

However it is worth mentioning some important points.

Leo XIII’s concern is entirely with a defective intention alleged in an Anglican bishop precisely in the administration of Anglican orders.\textsuperscript{220} He is not concerned with the intention of the compilers of the Ordinal, nor that of the Church of England, nor of the objective meaning of the rite.\textsuperscript{221} Because the bishops at the ordination of Matthew Parker used the 1552 Ordinal in order to introduce a non-Catholic rite and repudiate the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders, then they not only lacked the necessary intention, but they also had an intention ‘which is adverse to and incompatible with the sacrament’. Francis Clark calls this the principle of positive exclusion. He traces its development from its origins in the theologians of the Counter Reformation to its formal expression in \textit{Apostolicae curae} and into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{222}

John Jay Hughes attempted to counter this by arguing that Clark “suppressed” unfavourable evidence, ignoring those passages where earlier theologians apparently contradicted the principle of positive exclusion, even if they mentioned it at all.\textsuperscript{223} It is important to mention this because Hughes’ claims, when mentioned, are rarely contradicted. Clark actually spends more

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{220} Clark, \textit{Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention}, pp.78–97.
\item \textsuperscript{221} Ibid. pp.13–17, 42–56, 71–77.
\item \textsuperscript{222} Ibid. pp.120–153.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
than two pages discussing passages in Alphonsus Liguori’s *Theologia Moralis* which appear to teach that in a case like that of the bishops ordaining Matthew Parker, their intention would have been sufficient for sacramental validity.\(^{224}\) Far from ignoring unfavourable evidence, Clark squarely addresses the counter-argument that could be made from the work of a Doctor of the Church. Hughes never mentions this.\(^{225}\) He does not realise that far from contradicting Clark, his discovery of the passages which Clark does not cite confirms Clark’s case. Maurice Bévenot SJ reviews Hughes’ work and concludes that he misses the whole trend of Clark’s argument, which is that the earlier treatment of sacramental intention has now been transcended as the result of further study and experience.\(^{226}\)

Clark does not claim that the principle of positive exclusion emerged fully formed, but that it developed over two hundred and sixty years. It is *Apostolicae curae*’s enduring contribution to Catholic dogma and theology.\(^{227}\)


\(^{225}\) On p.245 of *Stewards of the Lord*, he quotes a different passage of Liguori on the validity of the sacraments of a heretical minister.

\(^{226}\) Bévenot, ‘A Rescue for Anglican Orders?’, p.299.

4 The status of the Bull’s decision

The final responsibility for the judgment of *Apostolicae curae* belongs to Leo XIII. Although the Cardinals of the Holy Office unanimously agreed that the customary practice of the Church with regard to convert Anglican clergy was sound and should be preserved, Leo XIII did not ratify that decision at once, but postponed it for further reflection on whether it was ‘fitting and expedient to make a further declaration’ (n.34). Of course, had he decided not to make any declaration then *Apostolicae curae* would not exist.

Therefore adhering entirely to the decrees of the Pontiffs Our Predecessors on this subject, and fully ratifying and renewing them by Our authority, on our own initiative and with certain knowledge, We pronounce and declare that ordinations performed according to the Anglican rite have been and are completely null and void (n.36).

It is a question worth asking, what is the status of this decision? After an appeal to Anglo-Catholics to listen ‘to the promptings of Christ’ and to ‘return to His one fold’, Leo XIII concludes with an even more intimidating formula.

We decree that the present Letter … cannot at any time be attacked or impugned on the ground of subreption, obreption, or defect in our intention, or any defect whatsoever; … and that it is to be inviolably observed … by all persons of whatsoever degree or pre-eminence; and we declare null and void any attempt to the contrary which may be made wittingly or unwittingly … all things to the contrary notwithstanding (n.40)
T. A. Lacey is correct in his observation that these are but ‘the common forms of the Chancery’ which may tend to astonish those ‘unfamiliar with that remarkable dialect’. However it is necessary to ask if his conclusion is also correct. ‘It is pretty safe to assume that in the Bull itself there is nothing to prevent a reopening of the question.’ Even if Lacey’s assumption is false, he does at least understand the point. Nobody should suppose that the incantation of such a solemn formula in itself makes the decision “infallible” or, to use the more precise term, “irreformable”. It is the content and nature of the decision which tells us that.

4.1 The language of the Bull

In an article published between Absolutely Null and Utterly Void and Stewards of the Lord, Hughes considers the Brief of Clement XIV of 21 July 1773 Dominus ac Redemptor which suppressed the Jesuits. He points out the striking similarity in the language used by Clement XIV with that of Apostolicae curae before drily noting that the Brief was revoked by Pius VII on 7 August 1814. More recently two Jesuit theologians, J. L. Russell and O. Rafferty, have compared the language used in Apostolicae curae with that used in Leo XIII’s earlier Apostolic Letter Deus Omnipotens (1 November 1884).

---

228 Lacey, A Roman Diary, p.271.
229 Hughes, ‘A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders?’, pp.360–361. Hughes misstates the *incipit* as *Dominus et redemptor noster*. “Ac” and “et” both mean “and”.
organised an investigation into the historicity of the supposed relics of St James the Great which were buried in the basilica. He had asked Leo XIII to confirm the results of this investigation. Leo XIII did so, and in *Omnipotens Deus* issued a sweeping statement declaring the authenticity of the relics.

> We will, moreover, that these Letters … shall at no time be charged with any fault of subreption or obreption, nullity or invalidity, or of intention, or with any other defect, or be impugned; but shall have and obtain their full and entire effect: and that they shall be so held by all persons of whatsoever degree, order, preeminence, and dignity: … \(^{231}\)

Russell and Rafferty attempt to connect the facts of the two cases: just as Leo XIII was (as he says) merely confirming the findings of the Cardinal Archbishop of Compostela, so also (they claim) the Roman investigation into Anglican Orders was merely a ratification of the findings of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

Both these Apostolic Letters were concerned primarily with the interpretation and evaluation of historical evidence and in both the final judgement was couched in similar terms. However it is interesting to note that in each case there was something of a ‘hidden agenda’. \(^{232}\)

Russell and Rafferty go on to compare the essentially historical basis of both questions and to compare Leo XIII’s desire to increase devotion and pilgrimages by *Omnipotens Deus* and his desire to increase conversions by *Apostolicae curae*. This is a bogus argument. Not even Hughes, who wrote a detailed account of the 1896 inquiry, claims that Leo XIII was merely ratifying decisions taken in England. He quotes Cardinal Vaughan saying in

---


1895 that ‘I have earnestly pleaded that it be thoroughly re-examined in Rome’.  

Even a casual reading of *Apostolicae curae* will reveal that it is not concerned simply with historical questions. Its decision is a dogmatic fact: ‘A judgment of fact by which the deposit of revealed truth is applied to contingent realities, i.e., to particular persons, objects, and occurrences.’ This is certain not from any formulas used, but from the fact that it concerns divine revelation of the nature of sacraments, and especially of Orders, and applies that to the history of the English Reformation. That it is not to be taken as a casual utterance is deduced not from “all things to the contrary notwithstanding” but from the fact that Leo XIII goes into some detail about the nature and extent of the investigation.

Both Russell and Rafferty on the one hand, and Hughes on the other, refer to the letter Leo XIII wrote to the Archbishop of Paris in November 1896 pointing out that the decision of *Apostolicae curae* was to be treated as ‘for ever, valid, firm and irrevocable’. The former take this as yet another example of Leo XIII’s ludicrously excessive language. It is telling that they never explain why *Apostolicae curae* is not definitive. Instead they trade on the similarity of the language between the Bull of 1896 with that of 1884, and scarcely even assert, much less prove, that (it is universally accepted that) St James the Great is not buried at Compostela.

The implied reasoning is either that, since the forceful language does not

---

233 Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void*, p.95.
make the decision certain, it actually makes the decision provisional; or that
the language is forceful even though *Apostolicae curae*’s decision is
provisional, therefore the forceful language means nothing because the
decision is provisional. Such reasoning is circular.

Hughes however takes the sending of the letter to the
Archbishop of Paris as proof that Leo XIII had to act immediately to shore
up the pretensions of *Apostolicae curae*. He does not mention that the
occasion of the letter was the continued insistence of the *Revue Anglo-
Romaine* (founded to pursue the cause of Anglican Orders) that the question
was open. Nor does he notice Lacey’s observation that the language is not
supposed to make any difference because it is simply ‘the common forms of
the chancery’. Therefore, finding it in a papal document which was clearly
reformable (because eventually reversed) does not prove that *Apostolicae
curae* is also reformable. Hughes refers to Lacey’s work many times across
both his books.

### 4.2 Not merely disciplinary

In the sentence in n.35 beginning ‘And now, taking into
consideration the fact that this matter ['idem caput'] …’, it does seem that
the authentic text, as signed by Leo XIII said ‘idem caput disciplinae’ – ‘this
disciplinary matter’. Von Gunten makes a strong case for believing that this
expression did not exist in the drafts. This claim is borne out by the fact

---

237 Gunten (ed.), *La Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, p.58.
that the text in the officially published Acta Leonis XIII omits ‘disciplinae’. It should be remembered that the printed source which includes ‘disciplinae’, Acta Apostolicae Sedis 29, is on its own account not an authentic text. Clark says the omission was ‘lest any should claim that the Papal decision was merely a disciplinary regulation and not a doctrinal pronouncement’. It is not commonly noticed. E. C. Messenger provided footnotes for G. D. Smith’s 1946 translation of the Bull. He says that the word ‘has been appealed to by those who regard the Bull as a non-infallible pronouncement’ but he does not name anyone. John Hunwicke is now a priest of the English Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham. While still an Anglican priest he made the argument that Apostolicae curae ought to be seen as God’s judgment on Anglican arrogance:

His way of telling us that for centuries we persecuted other Christians and then, when we finally realized that they had been largely right all the time, we couldn’t even be decently apologetic and humble about it. Therefore Anglicans should be prepared to submit humbly to ‘this disciplinary decision—idem caput disciplinae’. A citation of the supposed proof text in the Bull that its decision is “merely disciplinary”, interpreting it in that sense, is used to say that Anglicans should submit to it anyway.

The omission or inclusion of “disciplinae” makes no difference.

At no point in his account of the history of Catholic treatment of Anglican

238 See 1.1 above, in the passage referred to by fn.11.
240 Clark translation p.22 footnote 10.
241 Smith translation p.22 footnote 29.
Orders does Leo XIII suggest or concede that the practice of reordination was merely disciplinary. If it had been he would have cited prudential reasons for preserving the practice, not doctrinal ones. In suppressing the Jesuits, which was a purely disciplinary act, Clement IV relied partly on considerations ‘suggested to Us by the principles of prudence and which We retain concealed in Our breast’. Leo XIII never refers to prudential principles except in discussing the establishment of the Anglican Orders Commission (nn.4–5) and in considering whether to make the decision (n.34). This one word ‘disciplinae’ is not enough to obliterate the nature of the matter under consideration, the way in which it was discussed by the Commission and by the Holy Office, nor the entirely separate letter to the Archbishop of Paris.

4.3 *Apostolicae curae as a dogmatic fact*

For a long time those holding office in the Church, including theologians, have been required to make declarations of faith. The present form dates from 1989. This Profession of Faith consists of a profession of belief in the Nicene Creed, followed by the Creed itself, followed by three short paragraphs. The second of these reads: ‘I also firmly accept and hold each and everything definitively proposed by the Church regarding teaching on faith and morals’. Although the other two paragraphs had corresponding

---


The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith’s 1998 commentary on the 1989 Profession of Faith, included the following on the second paragraph:

> The truths belonging to this second paragraph can be of various natures, thus giving different qualities to their relationship with revelation. There are truths which are necessarily connected with revelation by virtue of an historical relationship, while other truths evince a logical connection that expresses a stage in the maturation of understanding of revelation which the Church is called to undertake.\footnote{Ibid. p.547, n.7; translation in: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Texts of the Magisterium regarding the “professio fidei”*, p.17.}

After discussing the effect and the target of each of the three paragraphs, the commentary then suggests examples.

> With regard to those truths connected to revelation by historical necessity and which are to be held definitively, but are not able to be declared as divinely revealed, the following examples can be given: the legitimacy of the election of the Supreme Pontiff or of the celebration of an ecumenical council, the canonizations of saints (dogmatic facts), the declaration of Pope Leo XIII in the Apostolic Letter *Apostolicae Curae* on the invalidity of Anglican ordinations…\footnote{Ibid. pp.550–551, n.11, ellipsis in the original; translation in *ibid.*, p.21.}
The ellipsis mark (in the original) indicates that the examples could be multiplied. The words ‘dogmatic facts’ in brackets seem to be misplaced and should be between the phrases ‘the following examples’ and ‘can be given’. The definition of dogmatic fact by A. E. Green given above continues with the following examples:

- the reigning pontiff is the authentic successor to St. Peter; Vatican II was an ecumenical council; the Canon of the Mass is free from doctrinal error; the propositions contained in a particular book concerning the faith are in error;
- this version of the Bible faithfully reproduces the sacred writings.^[249]

A strict reading of the Commentary on the Profession of Faith at this point would suggest that the legitimacy neither of the Pope’s election nor of an Ecumenical Council are to be considered dogmatic facts. However on the principle that the common opinion is never overturned, even by Magisterial documents, without an explicit statement, the words ‘dogmatic facts’ apply to Papal elections and Ecumenical Councils, and therefore also to Leo XIII’s decision that Anglican ordinations are null and void. The commentary does not specify the election of any particular Pope, the celebration of any particular Ecumenical Council, the canonization of any particular Saint, in which Catholics must believe. The decision of Apostolicae curae is the only specific example of a dogmatic fact mentioned. This reflects both the widespread rejection of Apostolicae curae by theologians and the determination of the Holy See to correct this.

^[249] See 4.1 above, in the passage referred to by fn.234.
5 The reception of *Apostolicae curae*

Although Leo XIII says that the precedents of the Marian restoration and the Holy Office cases are decisive in determining the invalidity of Anglican Orders, *Apostolicae curae* was the first (and so far only) time the Magisterium has given reasons for this judgment. Leo XIII’s method in the sections on defect of form and intention is to declare Catholic teaching and then compare the Ordinal with it. Those who have rejected *Apostolicae curae* have not tended to do so by rejecting what might be called Leo XIII’s “major premise”, that Catholic teaching is thus and so. Instead they have rejected the “minor premise”, i.e. the application of this teaching in the Anglican case. *The Final Report* of ARCIC holds out the promise of a new context for the assessment of Anglican ordinations on the basis of a convergence in the doctrine. In other words the “major premise” disappears. *Saepius officio* denies the “minor premise” with its discussion in ch.XI of the Eucharistic theology of the Book of Common Prayer. Accordingly ch.XI of the *Responsio* will be discussed in the next chapter, together with other aspects of Anglican theology of the Eucharist and Holy Orders.

However a number of important objections have been raised against the “major premise” of *Apostolicae curae*. These objections are important because they come from *Saepius*, from its principal draftsman Bishop Wordsworth, and from two major twentieth-century Anglo-Catholic theologians, Gregory Dix and Eric Mascall.
5.1 Correctly translating Leo XIII’s definition of the Catholic form of ordination

Leo XIII’s rejection of the Anglican form of ordination is based on the fact that the words “minime sane significant definite ordinem sacerdotii vel eius gratiam et potestatem”—“certainly do not signify definitely the order of the priesthood or its grace and power” (n.25). The Archbishops discuss this in ch.XII onwards. They take it to be a general formula for testing all forms of ordination and that Leo XIII is claiming that only those forms which both mention the order being conferred and its grace and power can suffice for a Catholic rite. They then point out a number of unquestionably Catholic rites from the past that used forms which fail to mention either the order or the grace and power.\(^{250}\) The Catholic *Vindication* addressed to the Anglican Archbishops replies:

> You have failed to observe the word ‘or’ in the proposition in which the Bull states what the requirements are. The proposition is disjunctive. The rite for the priesthood, the Pope says, “must definitely express the sacred Order of the priesthood or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord.” You do not seem to have perceived the importance of this little word ‘or,’ and have taken it to be the equivalent of ‘and.’\(^{251}\)

Of all the replies to the *Responsio*, the Archbishops replied only to the *Vindication*. In his recollection of the events, Bishop Wordsworth...

\(^{250}\) *Anglican Orders (English)*, pp.37–42.

observes that he was overseas at the time and was not consulted about the form of any reply. Had he been asked, he says he would have included a response on this point. He is referring to the fact that the Latin word “vel”, which is usually translated “or”, can mean “and”, so that Leo XIII is to be interpreted as demanding a valid form fulfil two conditions. In a letter to the *Dublin Review* in 1945, Gregory Dix insisted against E. C. Messenger that this is the correct understanding of Leo XIII. He refers to ‘Forcellini s.v. II: “=et”’ and to ‘Ducange s.v.: “saepe pro conjunctiva, et”’. Forcellini’s *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis* (1771), formed the basis for many subsequent dictionaries of Classical Latin. Ducange’s *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (1678) was the first, and may possibly still be the most comprehensive, dictionary of later Latin. These are weighty authorities but that does not mean we cannot test them. To begin with, the extracts from these two dictionaries which Dix provides both suggest that “and” is a secondary meaning for “vel”. In Forcellini it is in the second part of the entry; in Ducange the remark ‘often for the conjunctive “et”’ suggests that at least sometimes “vel” is disjunctive.

Latin has several words for “or”. The main two are “vel” and “aut”. Summarising the difference between them, Lewis and Short say at the very beginning of the entry for “aut”:

> [In general *aut*] puts in the place of a previous assertion another, objectively and absolutely antithetical to it, while *vel* indicates that the contrast rests

---


Chapter 5
upon subjective opinion or choice; i.e. aut is objective, vel subjective, or aut
excludes one term, vel makes the two indifferent.  

At the very beginning of their entry for “vel”, after pointing out that it is the
archaic imperative of “volo” – “I wish”, they say:

As disjunctive conjunction, to introduce an alternative as a matter of choice
or preference, or as not affecting the principal assertion (while aut introduces
an absolute or essential opposition…”

From the definitions already quoted, it is possible to see how
“vel” adopts a secondary sense of “and”. The Oxford Latin Dictionary even
identifies a sense of “aut” ‘(introducing a question, especially the second of
two, and often not distinct from et) Or, and’, with ten examples. On the
other hand Lewis and Short report that “vel” (in the primary group of
meanings) ‘d = aut, or else’. They list even more examples including one
where Tacitus uses “vel” in a contrast paralleled to another contrast (in the
same sentence) which uses “aut”. It does seem that the distinction between
“vel” and “aut” is not so great that we can identify the former with “et” but
the latter not at all. The reason Wordsworth and Dix wish to press this point
is that they argued there was at least one indisputably Catholic rite, of great
antiquity, which neither mentions the office being conferred, nor its “grace
and power”, the fourth-century Sacramentary of Serapion.

254 Lewis & Short, A Latin Dictionary, p.210, s.v. aut I.
255 Ibid. p. 1963 s.v. vel I.
256 Oxford Latin Dictionary, p.219, s.v. aut 4. Lewis & Short appear not to cover this sense.
257 Lewis & Short, A Latin Dictionary, p.1963, s.v. vel I A 2 d.
5.2 Defect of form and the Sacramentary of Serapion

St Serapion was Bishop of Thmuis in northern Egypt and a collaborator with St Athanasius. An eleventh-century manuscript contains thirty liturgical prayers including some for the celebration of the Eucharist and of Holy Orders. Dix quotes no.13 with the title “Laying-on of hands of the making of Presbyters”. The following translation from the Greek original is by John Wordsworth with Dix’s paragraph numbers.\(^{258}\) The scriptural references are given by Anthony Stephenson SJ and Enzo Lodi.\(^{259}\)

(a) We stretch forth the hand, O Lord “God of the heavens” [Neh 1:4], Father of thy only-begotten, upon this man, and beseech thee that “the Spirit of truth” [Jn 15:26] may dwell upon him. Give him the grace of prudence and knowledge and a “good heart” [Lk 8:15].

(b) Let Divine Spirit come to be in him that he may be able to be a steward of thy people and “an ambassador” [\(\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\) \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\) 2 Cor 5:20] of thy divine oracles and “to reconcile” [\(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\) 2 Cor 5:18-20, cf. Eph 2:13,16] thy people to thee, the uncreated God, who didst give “of the Spirit” of Moses “upon the” chosen ones, even holy “Spirit” [Num 11:17,25].

(c) Give a portion of holy Spirit also to this man from the Spirit of thy only-begotten, for the grace “of wisdom and knowledge and right faith” [1 Cor 12:8,9], that he may be able to serve thee “in a clean conscience” [1 Tim 3:9].

\(^{258}\) Wordsworth, Bishop Sarapion’s Prayer Book, p.73; Dix, Question of Anglican Orders, pp.43–44. Both Wordsworth and Dix spell the name “Sarapion”, others spell it “Serapion”.

\(^{259}\) Stephenson, Anglican Orders, p.27; Lodi, Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum, pp.345–346, n.576. Lodi does not give references but does mark out certain words and phrases with quotation marks in the Greek text and italics in the Latin translation. The references were gathered from word searches on Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (http://www.tlg.uci.edu). Wordsworth includes the reference to 1 Tim 3:9.
(d) Through thy only-begotten Jesus Christ, through whom to thee (is) the glory and the might in the Holy Ghost, both now and for all the ages of the ages. Amen.

Dix points out that whether the form is taken to be (a)–(c) together or simply (b) alone there is no statement of the Order being conferred. Although it is named in the title of the prayer in the manuscript, ‘that would hardly be read out at the actual performance of the rite’.260 He goes on to argue that the elders appointed in Numbers 11 were not sacrificing priests. He connects “to reconcile” in (b) with the injunction in 1 Corinthians 7:11 to a separated woman either to remain single or to reconcile with her husband.261

In reply, Stephenson examines the typology. In this prayer, he argues, Moses who consecrates Aaron is a type of the High Priest whose assistants ‘here, as in the old Roman and early medieval Western rites, typify the holders of “the office of second merit” in the New Law, i.e., Catholic priests’.262 He also argues that the references to “reconciliation” are meant to evoke Paul’s language of the reconciliation of the cross using the same Greek verb καταλλάξαι or in this case a compound of it:

**Eph 2:16**: and [Christ] might reconcile [ἀποκαταλλάξῃ] us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end.

Stephenson does not notice that the Greek word for “ambassador” (πρεσβευτής) is cognate with the word for “old man, elder” (πρέσβυς). In the New Testament it is always used in a comparative form πρεσβύτερος,

260 Dix, *Question of Anglican Orders*, p.44.
261 Ibid.
which in Latin (and therefore English) becomes “presbyter”. It seems that
the ordination prayer of Serapion is referring primarily to this passage from
the New Testament:

2 Cor 5:18-20: 18 All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to
himself [καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ] and gave us the ministry of
reconciliation [τῆς καταλλαγῆς]; 19 that is, God was in Christ reconciling
[καταλλάσσων] the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against
them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation [τῆς καταλλαγῆς]. 20
So we are ambassadors [πρεσβεύομεν] for Christ, God making his appeal
through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled
[καταλλάγητε] to God.

It may well be an intentional pun: an elder or πρεσβύτερος is also an
ambassador or πρεσβευτής. Stephenson connects this use of (the cognates
of) καταλλάξαντος to the Anaphora given in the same manuscript. 263 This has
an epiclesis straight after the Sanctus asking the ‘Lord of Hosts’ to
fill also this sacrifice with your power and your participation; for to you have
we offered this living sacrifice, the unbloody offering. To you have we
offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the only-begotten. This bread is
the likeness of the holy body “since the Lord Jesus Christ, on the night he
was betrayed…” 264

After the consecration of the bread the priest prays:

Therefore, making the likeness of the death, we have offered the bread and
we pray by this sacrifice be reconciled [καταλλάγητε] with all of us … We

263 Ibid. p.27; Lodi, Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum, pp.338–342,
nn.563–569.
264 'πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μεταλήψεως· σοὶ γὰρ
προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν «ζωαν θειαν», τὴν προσφέραν τὴν ἀναμμέκτον, σοὶ
προσηνέγκαμεν τὸν ἁρτον τούτον, τὸ ὠμοσιμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ὁ ἁρτος
ὀντος τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος ἐστιν ὠμοσιμα, «ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἐν ᾗ νυκτὶ
παρεδίδοσθο…»’. Lodi, Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum, p.340, nn.565–
566.
have offered also the chalice, the likeness of the blood, “since the Lord Jesus
Christ took the chalice…”

It is not doubted this text is all the work of the one man. It is clear that the
work of reconciliation for which the presbyter is ordained is precisely the
sacrifice of the cross, represented in some way by the Eucharist. The
Anglican Archbishops’ attempt to locate a doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice
in the Book of Common Prayer is worthy of discussion; but it can be noted
here that nowhere in the Ordinal or the Holy Communion is there such an
overt connection between the Sacrifice of the Cross and what the priest does
in the liturgy, as there is in the Sacramentary of Serapion.

5.3 The validity of Methodist Baptisms

Some defenders of Anglican orders cite the decision of the Holy
Office in 1872, concerning the validity of baptisms performed by
Methodists in Oceania.\(^{267}\) The Apostolic Vicar for Central Oceania sent a
dubium to the Holy Office about the baptism of converts from Methodism.
The Holy Office was asked if the converts’ Methodist baptism was doubtful
since Methodism teaches that Baptism has no effect on the soul and
therefore their Ministers lack the ‘intention to do what Christ willed’.\(^{268}\) The

\(^{265}\) ἰδία τοῦτο καὶ ἰμὲς «τὸ ὄμωσμα τοῦ θανάτου» ποιοῦντες τὸν ἄρτον προσηνέγκαμεν, καὶ παρακαλῶμεν διὰ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης καταλλάγηθι πάσιν ἤμων ... προσηνέγκαμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, τὸ ὀμωσμα τοῦ αἵματος, «ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς λαβὼν ποτήριον...»: Ibid. pp.340–341 n.566.


\(^{268}\) DS 3100.
Holy Office replied (18 December 1872) that Methodist Baptisms were valid. On the face of it this decision is contradicted by *Apostolicae curae* and it gives rise to the complaint among Anglicans that Leo XIII was determined to reject their orders at any cost.

In the reasoning for its decision the Holy Office cites the theological work of Benedict XIV, Cardinal Bellarmine and Innocent IV to draw the following conclusions: that a bishop should be loath to declare the validity of a baptism simply because the minister does not believe in baptismal regeneration; that the required intention is for the act itself, not for the purpose of the act, for Trent’s words were ‘the intention at least of doing what the Church does’ not ‘what the Church intends’; that even a non-Christian who certainly believes nothing apart from washing happens in baptism can validly baptize ‘provided he intends to do what others do when they baptize’. In an 1865 letter to Simeon Wilberforce O’Neill, who was then considering becoming a Catholic, Newman explained the background.

They are very jealous at Rome of any such custom of baptizing Protestants on their reconciliation. For the Church has right over all baptized persons; and, to say that the English are unbaptized would be to destroy those rights in their case.

The Catholic Church could not rely on Augustine’s dictum that the sacraments belong to God and his Church if, from time to time and for no

---

269 DS 3102.
270 DS 1611.
271 DS 3102.
good reason, she refused to claim ownership of these sacraments.\textsuperscript{273}

Newman goes on to explain that the policy of the Vicars Apostolic in England (and later the Catholic hierarchy) of conditionally baptising all converts was adopted because it was known how often doubtful baptisms were administered in the Church of England. He gives examples such as ‘the cap, not the infant being baptised’, or former dissenters who had received a rite called “baptism” which involved no water. \textit{Apostolicae curae} judged all Anglican orders invalid for defect of form and intention. On Newman’s account the reason the English Catholic Church was permitted to administer conditional baptism was because of the likelihood of defect of matter, an approach rejected by Leo XIII for Anglican Orders. (Newman may have been wrong on the historical reasons for the practice, but the point is the theological principle upon which he relies.) It was only conditional and not absolute because it would be hard to achieve certainty in a given case: these were converts who had been baptised as infants many years before. It is much more practicable to prove defect of form from the text of the rite and, in an ordination, from the knowledge of the one to whom it was administered.

In response to arguments of inconsistency, Stephenson pointed out that in the Central Oceania case the \textit{dubium} only alleged defect of intention, not defect of form. Leo XIII deduced the defect of intention from the change of rite with the purpose ‘of repudiating that which the Church

\textsuperscript{273} ‘We do not acknowledge any Baptism of [Donatists]; for it is not the Baptism of schismatics or heretics, but of God and the Church, wheresoever it may be found, and wheresoever it may be transferred.’ Leeming, \textit{Principles of Sacramental Theology}, p.515, n.603, cf. pp.512–516, nn.600–603; quoting and translating Augustine’s \textit{De Bapt. contra Donatistas}, Lxiv.22, PL vol. 43, p.121.
does and which is something that by Christ’s institution belongs to the nature of the sacrament’ (*Apostolicae curae* n.33). But the Methodist ministers were not changing the form. Moreover in an instruction to the Bishop of Nesqually (now the Diocese of Seattle) of 24 January 1877, the Holy Office pointed out that the 1872 decision merely declared that heretical beliefs did not raise such a general presumption of invalidity that in every case one could justify the repetition of the rite without further enquiry.\(^{274}\) The decision does not provide a blanket assurance of either validity or invalidity. Stephenson goes on to suggest how a false belief might vitiate a valid form. However a much more recent case both clarifies the rulings of 1872 and 1877 and provides a suggestive parallel to the condemnation of Anglican Orders.

Between 1991 and 2008 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued four decisions concerning the validity of Baptisms. On 9 March 1991 and 20 November 1992 it issued responses to *dubia* concerning the validity of the baptisms performed by the Rudolf Steiner Community and the Swedenborgian Church, respectively.\(^{275}\) Both responses were in the negative. They were signed by the Prefect Cardinal Ratzinger. The next two decisions were signed by the Prefect with a stereotyped formula declaring that the response was published at the order of the Pope. On 5 June 2001 the Congregation issued a response to a *dubium* on the validity of Baptisms

---

\(^{274}\) DS 3126. Stephenson (*Anglican Orders*, pp.43–44) describes this as a “coda” to the 1872 decision, which misleadingly suggests that it formed part of it.

performed by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons).

The answer in the negative was signed by Cardinal Ratzinger with the explicit approval of Pope John Paul II.\textsuperscript{276} Finally on 1 February 2008 the Congregation issued a response to \textit{dubia} on the validity of baptisms conferred with the formulas “in the name of the Creator, and of the Redeemer, and of the Sanctifier” or “in the name of the Creator, and of the Liberator, and of the Sustainer”.\textsuperscript{277} The Congregation answered in the negative and added that all baptised by these formulas would have to be rebaptised absolutely. This was signed by the new Prefect Cardinal Levada with the explicit approval of his predecessor, who was now Pope Benedict XVI. The \textit{dubia} presumably came from several sources; but in Australia the parish of St Mary’s in South Brisbane was known to be doing this. For convenience I will therefore refer to Baptisms dealt with by the Response of 1 February 2008 as “Brisbane Baptisms”. It is noteworthy that the formulas are given in English, although the rest of the document is in Latin, suggesting the \textit{dubia} came from the English-speaking Church.

Unlike the 1872 case, none of the four decisions included any reasoning. However the decisions concerning Mormon and Brisbane Baptisms were accompanied by essays published in \textit{L’Osservatore Romano} by priests on the staff of the Congregation.\textsuperscript{278} Luis Ladaria SJ begins his

\textsuperscript{276} Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Responsum ad propositum dubium’ (5 June 2001: Mormon Baptisms).

\textsuperscript{277} Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Responsa ad proposita dubia’ (1 February 2008: Brisbane Baptisms).

essay by traversing the history of the doctrine that even non-Catholics can administer baptism. He connects this to provisions in the 1983 Code of Canon Law and the Catechism of the Catholic Church.

Precisely because of the necessity of Baptism for salvation the Catholic Church has had the tendency of broadly recognizing this right intention in the conferring of this sacrament, even in the case of a false understanding of Trinitarian faith, as for example in the case of the Arians.\textsuperscript{279}

He goes on to point out that the Church has always treated the Mormons as another variety of Christian community which emerged from the Reformation.\textsuperscript{280} Since they used the correct matter and form, the Baptism of Mormon ministers was considered valid, by analogy with that of other non-Catholic groups. However, in the twentieth century the details of Mormon teaching about God began to become clear, and it was this which led to the 2008 ruling. The form of a Mormon Baptism is, on the face of it, Trinitarian: ‘Being commissioned by Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit’. However the Mormons have a completely different notion about the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. They are not three persons subsisting in the one Godhead but three gods who form one divinity. … The very word divinity has only a functional, not a substantial content, because the divinity originates when the three gods decided to unite and form the divinity to bring about human salvation.\textsuperscript{281}

\textsuperscript{279} Ladaria, ‘The Question of the Validity of Baptism Conferred in the “Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints”’, p.4 col.2.
\textsuperscript{280} Ibid. Ladaria refers to ‘the so-called Reform of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century’. The Italian “cosidetta” does not have the sarcastic sense of “so-called”. It is used to qualify any commonly used descriptor (in this case ‘riforma’) with which the speaker happens not to agree.
\textsuperscript{281} Ibid. p.4 col.4. Ladaria’s references to the sources of Mormon doctrine are removed.
In Mormonism man and the divinity share a nature and are equal in substance. Even God the Father is an exalted man who has relatives and a wife. The offspring of their union is Jesus Christ. 

Even the Holy Spirit is the son of heavenly parents. The Son and the Holy Spirit were procreated after the beginning of the creation of the world known to us.  

Ladaria argues that the differences between Catholicism and Mormonism are so great that it is not even possible to think of the latter as a heresy of the former, for its teaching 'has a completely different matrix'. On the way to this conclusion he points out that to the similarity of titles there does not correspond in any way a doctrinal content which can lead to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The words Father, Son and Holy Spirit, have for the Mormons a meaning totally different from the Christian meaning.

The language of Leo XIII could very easily be applied to the Mormon Baptisms by way of Ladaria’s essay. The Mormons may well use the word “baptism”, just as Anglicans use the word “priest”, as a name ‘voided of the reality which Christ instituted’. Just as the Anglicans stripped out the full notion of Sacrifice from the Eucharist, so the Mormons have denied the truth of the One God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (‘there is no other’ Isaiah 45:5), leaving fragments of Christian doctrine behind. They have replaced the Incarnate Word, ‘eternally begotten of the Father’, with a Son, the child of God the Father and his wife. The fact that the Mormons continue to use the words “Father, Son and Holy Spirit” avails nothing. In

\[282 \text{Ibid.}\]
\[283 \text{Ibid.}\]
\[284 \text{Ibid.}\]
Mormonism, these words mean something completely different from the traditional understanding of God. That is why in fact they do not profess Christianity but a completely different religion. Likewise, in Anglicanism (although its loyalty to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity is not in question), the words “bishop” and “priest” mean something completely different from the traditional understanding. On the other hand the Methodists do believe in the One True God, in the Three Persons of the Trinity, and in the Incarnation. It does not matter what the Minister believes about Baptism. Because he baptises in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit and does not deny the true meaning of those words, therefore there is no automatic failure in his intention to baptise which can be known \textit{a priori}. In the baptisms performed by Methodists in Oceania, “Father”, “Son” and “Holy Spirit” were \textit{nomina} that possess the reality revealed by Christ.
6 Anglican Orders, Apostolic Succession and the Eucharist

6.1 Anglican Orders and Apostolic Succession

Leo XIII refers to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession twice in the Bull. In the introduction he describes the common theological opinion that ‘the true sacrament of Order as Christ instituted it, and therewith the hierarchical succession, lapsed in England’ because of the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal (n.3). Later on, in commenting on the amplification of the Ordination formulas from ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’ to ‘Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest/Bishop’, he says that even if the new formula were sufficient (a point he does not actually concede), the change was made too late when a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal and when, consequently, with the hierarchy now extinct, the power of ordaining no longer existed (n.26).

In both cases he deduces the failure of the Apostolic Succession in the Church of England from the invalidity of Anglican Orders. Unlike the Catholic apologists who discussed the ordinations of Matthew Parker and William Barlow, he never relies on the failure of the Succession to prove invalidity.

Since the promulgation of *Apostolicae curae* there have been several important changes to the status quo addressed by Leo XIII. One is that Bishops from the Union of Utrecht, known as “Old Catholics”, have
been involved in the consecration of Bishops of the Church of England since the Bonn Agreement of 1931. The Union of Utrecht, formed in 1889, consists of a number of national Catholic Churches in Holland, Germany and Poland each established because of some dissatisfaction with the Papacy. The argument is that, given the Catholic revival in Anglicanism affecting the doctrines of the Eucharist and Holy Orders, it is much harder to maintain the invalidity of Anglican Orders now that undeniably valid Bishops have been involved in Anglican Episcopal Ordinations. Anglican Bishops have also taken part in Old Catholic Episcopal Ordinations.

Since this mutual exchange of ministers did not begin until both sides already recognised the validity of each other’s Orders, the public claim is that this was not done in response to Apostolicae curae. ‘The practice was never viewed as a kind of covert, supplemental ordination.’ The purpose of the Bonn Agreement was that, at each involvement of an Old Catholic Bishop at an Anglican Episcopal Ordination, the Old Catholic would sign a protocol in Latin, declaring what he had done, and that in doing so he intended to transmit the Episcopal Succession of his Church. Christopher Hill does not mention what John Hunwicke (who describes examples he has seen) reports, namely that not one but two protocols were drafted. The first was to be signed by the Old Catholic Co-consecrator; the second by the

---

Anglican bishop whom he had ordained, each time that this new bishop participated in the Ordination of another Anglican bishop, reciting the words ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum’ in Latin, ‘taken from the Pontifical of the church of the Old-catholics’.  

Hunwicke interprets these protocols as constituting

a tacit reference to *Apostolicae Curae* and imply a willingness to address that Bull as a significant reality in ecclesial life. In a sense, they say, “We care about Pope Leo’s condemnation of our Orders; and we are remedying the alleged defect in ways that (we hope) will be acceptable in his terms”.  

It does seem that those who arranged the involvement of Old Catholic Bishops in Anglican Episcopal Ordinations did so to remove any doubt introduced by *Apostolicae curae*. (One can accept the fact of a judgment even if one thinks the ruling unsound.) If there was no concern about the Bull at all, it would not have been felt necessary to establish beyond doubt not only that a Bishop had been ordained by an Old Catholic co-consecrator, but also that the Anglican Bishop concerned himself went on to ordain other Anglican Bishops. On the other hand, the fact that the formula prescribed for this Bishop to use is the very one rejected by Leo XIII, although taken by the Old Catholics as sufficient, points in the opposite direction. It appears that the second Protocol has rarely been used and Hunwicke even doubts that its conditions (audible recitation of the formula in Latin) have been met on each and every occasion on which it might have been executed.  

---

John Jay Hughes was ordained an Episcopalian Priest in the United States on 3 April 1954. He had long agonised about becoming a Catholic. In 1959, while still an Episcopalian, he submitted to the Holy Office the details of his own ordination, and those of the Bishops who had ordained him Deacon and Priest, for a judgment on the validity of his orders. These Bishops stood in the line of succession from Old Catholic Bishops. He received a reply from a commissioner of the Holy Office which said that although he could not be “received in his orders”, he could receive a conditional ordination. In 1968, on the strength of that reply, the Bishop of Münster ordained him priest sub conditione. In 1995, recalling his conditional ordination and the fact of Old Catholic involvement in Anglican Episcopal consecrations, Hughes remarked: ‘To date the Holy See has declined to take official notice of this new situation.’ This is probably true in his own case, since the reply from the Holy Office was private rather than public. Nevertheless in 1994 the Holy See had in fact very publicly taken ‘official notice of this new situation’.

In 1992 the Anglican Bishop of London, Graham Leonard, became a Catholic and prepared to enter the Catholic priesthood. In 1994, at

---

292 Hughes, *No Ordinary Fool*, p.137.
294 *Ibid.* pp.239–241. It is surprising that in the following year he published his article ‘A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders?’, arguing *inter alia* that the forceful language formulas at the end of *Apostolicae curae* showed an attempt to shore up a weak case. His own experience should have taught him that the dire threats against anyone impugning the Bull’s authority did not mean what they appeared to mean and were simply the language of the Curia (see 4.1 above). The Bishop who ordained him later became Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne.

Chapter 6

The details of his ordinations, and of those who had ordained him, had been submitted to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. His petition to the Pope specifically included the fact that he had been ordained, like Hughes, by Bishops in the Old Catholic line of succession. Accordingly ‘Cardinal Hume was instructed by the Holy See to ordain Dr Leonard to the priesthood conditionally’ and to do so by using the formula (in Latin) ‘if you are not already validly ordained’ immediately before the imposition of hands.\footnote{297}{Michael Jackson, ‘The case of Dr Leonard’, *The Tablet*, Vol. 248 No. 8021 (30 April 1994), pp.541-542. Jackson is maddeningly imprecise as to which Curial body issued the instruction and in what form.}

All other conditional ordinations, including the cases referred to by Leo XIII (n.21), and that of John Jay Hughes, were presumably carried out by the ordaining Bishop eliciting a conditional intention and not by modifying the form. The texts of the old Roman Pontifical are too complicated for it to be straightforward to make them grammatically conditional. This problem would have been magnified when there was no certainty as to what was the essential form.\footnote{298}{After Pius XII determined the form for the future in 1947, administering a conditional ordination by modifying the form would have been easier: see 3.1.4 above, in the passage referred to by fn.208.}

In Leonard’s case the ‘official notice’ did not amount to a declaration that the validity of his Anglican priestly ordination was probable (nothing was said about his episcopal ordination) but to an acknowledgement that there was, in the words of Cardinal Hume, ‘a
“prudent doubt” concerning the invalidity of priestly ordination received by an individual Anglican minister ordained in this line of succession’. 299 This is not so much a suspicion that the individual’s orders might be valid, as a doubt whether they are certainly invalid. John Hunwicke has suggested that the Roman authorities may have been led to take only this limited approach by the chaotic and patchy nature of the paperwork such as he himself has seen. 300

Although the involvement of Old Catholic Bishops in Anglican Episcopal Ordinations is indisputable, there is still a large question of fact as to what has been done, by whom, and with what intention. It is probably for this reason that there have been no other conditional ordinations of former Anglican clergy. In 1995 Edward Yarnold reported a rumour that two other former Anglican priests had received conditional ordination. 301 It is possible that any other such conditional ordination has only been performed under the strictest secrecy. However, it seems unlikely that such secrecy would be maintained for long. We can conclude that John Jay Hughes and Graham Leonard are the only examples of Anglican clergy receiving merely conditional ordination. Therefore any suggestion that the involvement of Old Catholic Bishops in Anglican Episcopal ordinations might have automatically restored the Anglican Hierarchy to the Apostolic Succession seems false, for former Anglican clergy have apparently all received ordination absolutely. In considering whether there is a new context for

recognising the validity of Anglican Orders, ARCIC ignored the involvement of Old Catholic Bishops, and instead concentrated on convergence of doctrine in the Eucharist and Holy Orders.

6.2 The \textit{Responsio} and the doctrine of the Eucharist

Citing two canons of the Council of Trent, Leo XIII rejects the Anglican form of presbyteral ordination “Receive the Holy Ghost” because it signifies neither the priesthood, nor the power to consecrate the Eucharist and offer the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is not ‘a bare commemoration of the sacrifice accomplished on the Cross’ (n.25).\textsuperscript{302} In reply, the Anglican Archbishops say that although they do not accept the teaching of the Council of Trent,

\begin{quote}
we make provision with the greatest reverence for the consecration of the holy Eucharist and commit it only to properly ordained Priests and to no other ministers of the Church. Further we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a “nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross,” an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council (Ch.XI).\textsuperscript{303}
\end{quote}

The defect of form found by Leo XIII stems from the fact that throughout the Ordinal there is ‘no clear mention of sacrifice, of consecration, of priesthood, of the power to consecrate and offer sacrifice’ (n.30). The defect of intention is deduced from the adoption of the defective rite. Therefore the

\textsuperscript{302} DS 1771 and 1753. See 3.1.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.182.

\textsuperscript{303} Anglican Orders (English), p.35.
chapter of *Saepius officio* which gives their doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is its doctrinal heart.

Immediately after the passage just quoted, they begin their account with a complex sentence (main verb governing an infinitive) divided by a parenthesis. Parts of the latter raise serious difficulties in understanding the Archbishops’ doctrine, so it will be discussed separately.\(^{304}\)

However we believe it enough, in the liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist, … to signify [significare] the sacrifice which [sacrificium quod] occurs [fit] in the service [ibidem] as follows [ita].\(^{305}\)

The Archbishops give an overview of the Holy Communion, in lesser and then greater detail, without explicitly tying any statement to any particular text.

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.\(^{306}\)

These words allude to the beginning of the Prayer of Consecration: ‘[Christ commanded] us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death,

\(^{304}\) See 6.2.1 below.

\(^{305}\) *Anglican Orders (Latin)*, p.31: ‘Satis tamen credimus in liturgia nostra qua in S. Eucharistia celebranda utimur, … sacrificium quod ibidem fit ita significare.’ The official translation is unsatisfactory. *Anglican Orders (English)*, p.35: ‘But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy Eucharist, … to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these.’ This gives rise to two questions: at what point in the service? and in such terms as what? “Ibidem” means “at the same point in space” (*Lewis & Short*, s.v. I, p.875 col.2), by transference it means “at the same point in time” (*Ibid.* II A) or “in the same matter” (*Ibid.* II B). The official translation suggests meaning II A; but a “moment of sacrifice” seems to be precisely what the Anglican communion service was designed to avoid. “Ita” (“thus or so”) can either refer to what precedes or to what follows (*Ibid.*, s.v. I A & B, p.1006, col.1). It cannot refer here to what precedes, since that is a discussion of a dictum of the Council of Trent rejected by the Archbishops; so it must mean “as follows”.

\(^{306}\) *Anglican Orders (English)*, p.35.
until his coming again.\textsuperscript{307} References are also made to the Passion in the Exhortations to receive Communion, particularly the third.\textsuperscript{308} The Archbishops then go into greater detail:

For first [1] we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next [2] 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 [3] we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures.

Items [2] and [3] clearly refer to the Prayer of Consecration and the two post-communion thanksgiving prayers respectively.\textsuperscript{309} However, it is difficult to connect item [1] to anything in the Holy Communion. Other Anglican writers describe the entire service as a “gratulatory sacrifice”; but the Archbishops must have a more precise reference because it is said to come before the “pleading and representing” which is before the “offering of the sacrifice of ourselves”.\textsuperscript{310} The \textit{Gloria}, which in all other liturgies is found at the beginning of the service, is, in the Book of Common Prayer, placed at its end, after the people have received communion.\textsuperscript{311} The phrase

\textsuperscript{307} BCP p.255.
\textsuperscript{308} \textit{Ibid.} pp.249–250, especially: ‘…ye must give most humble and hearty thanks … for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ … who did humble himself, even to the death upon the Cross, for us miserable sinners … . And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us … he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries … for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.’ Because of the history of the Anglican liturgical books, the first two Exhortations are located immediately prior in the text. They would only be said, if at all, on the days preceding the day on which the Holy Communion was being held, and never during the service itself.
\textsuperscript{309} BCP pp.255–256, 257–258.
\textsuperscript{311} BCP p.259. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI preserved the traditional arrangement, p.213. The change was made in 1552: Second Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.389–390.
“sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” is found in the first of the two alternative post-communion thanksgiving prayers, immediately before the *Gloria*.\(^{312}\) Otherwise item [1] can only be a reference to the Prayer for the Church Militant, said at the time of the Offertory, which begins: ‘Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks, for all men…’\(^{313}\) The recurring themes of the Holy Communion, until the people receive the Eucharist, are repentance (calling the Passion to mind) and petition. Themes of praise and thanksgiving begin appearing in the words of administration and onwards.\(^{314}\) An alternative interpretation is to take items [1] to [3] as an analysis of the first post-communion prayer:

> … [1] accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that [2] by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, [2] we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, [2] and all other benefits of his passion. And here [3] we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee … And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee [3] to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences… \(^{315}\)

On this interpretation, the sentence beginning ‘We continue a perpetual memory…’ refers to the Prayer of Consecration. The difficulty with such an interpretation is that, according to the rubrics, the first post-communion

---

\(^{312}\) BCP pp.257–258, quoted below.
\(^{313}\) BCP pp.244–245.
\(^{314}\) BCP pp.256–257.
\(^{315}\) BCP pp.257–258.
prayer is one of two alternatives. It need not be said at all. On the other hand, the Archbishops’ conclusion seems to rule this out: ‘This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.’ The Archbishops are clearly considering the entire communion service. If the Eucharistic sacrifice consists only of the parts of the Holy Communion from the Prayer of Consecration until the post-communion prayers, then what is the rest of the rite?

6.2.1 Consecrating the offerings

The parenthetical phrase in the opening sentence is particularly hard to interpret satisfactorily.

However we believe it enough, 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 occurs in the service as follows.  

The Holy Communion has a dialogue before the Prayer of Consecration like that in the Roman Missal before the Eucharistic Prayer, which includes the

---

316 A strained reading of the second post-communion prayer, and even the Gloria, might allow one to allocate the Archbishops’ “For first … then next … and lastly” to them as well, but this will not be attempted here.

317 ‘Satis tamen credimus in liturgia nostra qua in S. Eucharistia celebranda utimur,—corda habentes ad Dominum, et munera, quae antea oblata sunt, iam consecrantes ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiant Domini nostri Jesu Christi,—sacrificium quod ibidem fit ita significare.’ Anglican Orders (Latin), p.31; cf.: ‘But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy Eucharist,—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these.’ Anglican Orders (English), p.35.
instruction ‘lift up your hearts’. By ‘consecrating the gifts’ the Archebishops are clearly referring to the Prayer of Consecration. The problem is that at this point in the service there is nothing which has been ‘already offered’. This phrase is a translation of ‘quae antea oblata sunt’ – ‘which beforehand have been offered’, so there is no room to interpret it as referring to something occurring later on. ‘The Offertory’ in the Holy Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer refers to a series of scriptural sentences said while the Churchwardens collect alms for the poor and while the priest places bread and wine ‘upon the Table’. The elements are not offered to God as they are in the Sarum Use and the Roman Rite, nor is there any prayer accompanying the placement of the bread and wine.

The lengthy Prayer for the Church Militant, which is said by the priest after the placing of the alms and the bread and wine, includes the petition ‘most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations’.

To modern eyes ‘alms and oblations’ means ‘money and the bread and wine’ but that is not what was intended. In older English, in Ecclesiastical contexts, the phrase actually refers to all offerings for the poor whether money or goods. Neil and Willoughby quote a number of sources where “oblations” refers to whatever is given to the poor, including Hooker and Andrewes as well as three of those involved in the 1662 revision: Matthew Wren, John Cosin and William Sancroft.

John Cosin himself made a proposal for the revision, to

---

318 BCP p.252; cf. Roman Missal, p.566 (The Order of Mass, n.31).
319 BCP p.244.
320 Neil & Willoughby, The Tutorial Prayer Book, p.316. Matthew Wren (1585–1667) was a survivor, having been Bishop of Ely in the reign of Charles I and imprisoned by the Commonwealth 1642–1660. William Sancroft (1617–1693) was John Cosin’s chaplain and
restore some sense of oblation of the bread and wine, that there be a rubric for the priest to ‘offer up and place’ the bread and wine.\textsuperscript{321} So his use of “oblations” to mean “money” could hardly have been actuated by malice against the concept of offering the bread and wine. Moreover the rubrics state that the words asking God ‘to accept our alms and oblations’ are to be left out if there are no offerings for the poor. Indeed the entire Prayer for the Church Militant is to be said whether or not a Holy Communion is to be celebrated.\textsuperscript{322} Nevertheless it does seem that the Archbishops are thinking of this prayer in the context of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

### 6.2.2 Becoming the Body and Blood of Christ

The Archbishops say that Anglican priests consecrate ‘the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ’.\textsuperscript{323} In the Latin text of the \textit{Responsio} the phrase is ‘ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiant Domini nostri Jesu Christi’.\textsuperscript{324} This appears to be an allusion to Missale Romanum (in the Canon of the Mass) ‘ut nobis Corpus, et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi’.\textsuperscript{325}

---


\textsuperscript{322} Buchanan, \textit{An Evangelical Among the Anglican Liturgists}, pp.130–138, esp. p.136 footnote 65; cf. ‘in Cranmer [1552] “offertory” has nothing to do with the sacramental action or elements’, p.133.

\textsuperscript{323} \textit{Anglican Orders (English)}, p.35.

\textsuperscript{324} \textit{Anglican Orders (Latin)}, p.31.

\textsuperscript{325} Missale Romanum, p.256
allusion is unjustified. The Book of Common Prayer has the priest pray not that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, but ‘that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine … may be partakers of his most Blessed Body and Blood’. This phrase goes back to the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. The First Prayer Book has the priest pray that the gifts ‘maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy most derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe’.

Although there is controversy over whether it was validly authorised, in 1560 Queen Elizabeth issued a Latin edition of the Book of Common Prayer for use in the Universities and at the Colleges of Eton and Winchester. This 1560 translation has ‘ut … participes simus sanctissimi corporis & sanguinis ejus’ – ‘that we might be partakers of his most holy body & blood’. We can compare this with the Canon of the Mass and the Latin of the Responsio. The Latin Book of Common Prayer uses a first person verb ‘ut … simus’ – ‘that we may be’. The Canon uses a third person verb ‘ut nobis … fiat’ – ‘that it may become for us’. The Responsio uses not a first person verb but a third person verb ‘ut nobis … fiant’ – ‘that they may become for us’. This is a serious misrepresentation of a doctrine which was one of the major battle grounds of the Reformation: whether or not the bread and wine were changed during the Eucharist liturgy.

---

327 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.389.
328 First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.222.
In 1550 Archbishop Cranmer published *A Defence of the True and Cathlick Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*. Stephen Gardiner, the bishop of Winchester, wrote an answer, while in prison for resisting the religious changes of Edward VI, defending traditional teaching. Cranmer published a reply, including Gardiner’s text (so that he could rebut it point by point) and his own original book. Gardiner claimed that the Book of Common Prayer (what we call the First Prayer Book of Edward VI) agreed with him. In the 1549 Holy Communion the priest, in language very similar to the Canon of the Mass, prays for God to bless and sanctify ‘these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe.’

Although in 1552 this prayer was modified to the form found in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, Cranmer denied even that the 1549 rites contained Catholic (“Papist”) teaching:

we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so, that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and truth we may be spiritually nourished.

According to Cranmer, ‘unto us’ in the First Prayer Book must be understood subjectively as “for us, but not for unbelievers or non-...

---

330 First Prayer Book of Edward VI; p.222, cited by Gardiner in: Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation, devised by Stephen Gardiner, Doctor of Law, late Bishop of Winchester, against the true and godly doctrine of the most holy sacrament, of the body and blood of our saviour Jesus Christ*, (London: John Daye, 1580) in: *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, p.79.

331 Cranmer, *An Answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation...,* p.79.
communicants” even though the grammatically similar ‘nobis…fìat’ in the Canon must be understood objectively as “it may become for our benefit”. The Archbishops can be saved from a charge of misrepresenting Anglican doctrine if the words “to us” when they say ‘that they may become to us the Body and Blood’ are understood in a similar subjective sense. However this is not the language of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Not only was a parallel between the Canon of the Mass and the Prayer of Consecration not intended to exist, Cranmer tells us that there was an explicit intention for the parallel not to exist. The change in 1552 was to remove any chance of misunderstanding. The whole passage of the Responsio from ‘But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy…’ to ‘…we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice’ makes much more sense as a commentary on 1549’s ‘The Supper of the Lorde and holy Communion, commonly called the Masse’ rather than on 1662’s ‘The Order for the Administration of The Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion’.

6.3 The Anglican formularies on the Eucharist

In the Holy Communion of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, straight after the Prayer for the Church Militant are printed three Exhortations to the people, on the need of receiving the Eucharist, followed by an invitation to the communicants to ‘draw near with faith’. It is clear from the rubrics that the first two Exhortations are not to be said during the

---

333 BCP pp.245–251; p.251.
celebration; and it is at least arguable that, if only those who will communicate are remaining, the third is also omitted.\textsuperscript{334} If the Holy Communion rite had been composed in 1662 as it now stands, one would expect to find these Exhortations printed either at the beginning or in an appendix. The reason they are found here is due to the history of the Anglican liturgical books. The First and Third Exhortations, as well as the Invitation, were composed for the 1548 Order for Communion.\textsuperscript{335} Since this was a supplement to the Missal, for use immediately after the priest’s communion at a celebration of the Sarum Mass, it makes sense that they are found together in appropriate chronological order, even if the timing of the First Exhortation was several days before the parishioners were to receive communion together.

The Exhortations were part of the Reformers’ campaign to reorient piety from adoration of Christ in the Host to devout reception of Christ at Holy Communion.\textsuperscript{336} That is why they were not printed as an appendix (or introductory matter), for there must be no excuse for their being ignored. Nobody could have expected the campaign of reorientation to have succeeded by the time the first Book of Common Prayer was issued only a year later. Hence they were still given together in that book, placed

\textsuperscript{334} P. G. Medd & John Henry Blunt, ‘The Order for the Holy Communion, with Notes’ in: The Annotated Book of Common Prayer: being an historical, ritual, and theological commentary on the devotional system of the Church of England, p.382, note to ‘§ The third Exhortation’. However the modern book of worship used in the Church of England (although the BCP is still fully authorised) includes the third Exhortation in an annex to Order Two for Holy Communion, Common Worship, p.245. This suggests that it has been continuously used and not just if non-communicants remain in the Church.

\textsuperscript{335} Maskell, The ancient Liturgy of the Church of England…, pp.294–299.
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before the offertory. In 1552, they were moved to their present location after the Prayer for the Church Militant. What is now the Second Exhortation was added and placed first in order. The position of the Exhortations within the text is an obvious sign that the Holy Communion was not freshly composed in 1662, and that the rite has a history. (The text of the Exhortations also underwent some changes between 1548 and 1662 reflecting theological changes in the Church of England). None of the chief Anglican formularies—the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Ordinal—first emerged in the form in which Anglicans now use them. To interpret them it is necessary to pay attention to the changes that were made and, so far as possible, to the reasons for which they were made.

6.3.1 From 1549 to 1552

The alternative title given for Holy Communion in 1549 is ‘commonly called the Masse’. Its structure is very close to the Sarum and Roman forms of Mass. It begins with the Collect for Purity followed by the Kyrie and Gloria (in English). There are then two proper readings selected from the New Testament, the second always from the Gospel followed by the Creed and a Homily. Next come the Exhortations

---

338 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.382–386.
339 First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.212.
341 Ibid. p.214.
followed by the offertory, and then the dialogue and preface. The Prayer of Consecration which follows consists of three parts. The first is a prayer ‘for the whole state of Christes churche’; then follows the consecration itself, with a rubric forbidding the elevations of the Sacrament; and finally there is a prayer of oblation. Between the Prayer of Consecration and the Communion itself comes the Lord’s Prayer, followed by the Invitation and a series of prayers and scriptural sentences designed to encourage the people to receive. After the Communion are more scriptural sentences and prayers of thanksgiving followed by the Dismissal. The most striking change in 1552 was the breaking up and dispersal of the Prayer of Consecration. The first part of this, ‘for the whole state of Christes churche’, became the Prayer for the Church Militant. The optional references to the ‘alms and oblations’ were added, but almost half of this text—prayers referring to the ‘the commemoracion of the most glorious death of thy sonne’ and the cult of the Virgin Mary and the saints, and prayers for the dead—was removed. The third part of the 1549 Prayer of Consecration, the oblation at the end, was moved to after the communion to be one of two alternative post-communion prayers (the prayer already in this position had no alternative). In the process it lost a clear expression of the teaching that the Eucharist represents the Passion, in a reference to

---

342 Ibid. pp.214–221
343 Ibid. pp.221–222 (Christes churche: in 1549 the phrase appears to apply to the entire Prayer of Consecration but it is later applied just to the first section before the words of institution), 222–223 (consecration), 223 (oblation).
345 Ibid. pp.226–228.
346 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.382.; on the Prayer for the Church Militant see 6.2.1 above in the passage referred to by fn.319.
347 See 6.2.1 above, in the passage referred to by fn.318.
these thy holy giftes, the memoryall whyche thy sonne hath wyllde us to
make, havyng in remembraunce his blessed passion, mightie resurreccyon,
and gloryous ascencion.348

Another petition—

Yet we beseche thee to accepte thys our bounden duetie and service, and
commaunde these our prayers and supplicacions, by the Ministery of thy holy
Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the syght of thy
dyvine majestie; not waiyng our merites…349

—becomes

…yet we beseche thee to accept this our bounden duetie and service, not
weighing our merites…

Thus a prayer, derived from the old *Te Igitur* (at the beginning of the Canon
of the Mass) loses its specific character of an oblation of the Eucharist and
becomes a general offering of the ‘duetie and service’ of God’s people. ‘The
striking omissions of 1552 combine with the significant change of position
to display what Frere terms “the revolutionary revision” of that date.’350

Holy Communion in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer preserves the
structure established in 1552. Individual Anglican clergy, even Bishops,
would privately rearrange the prayers to be closer to the 1549 form; but
attempts to formalise this in 1662 were rejected.351

348 First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.223.
349 Ibid.
351 See 8.2.4.2 below, in the passage referred to by finn.680–689.
6.3.2 The repetition rubric

The purpose of the 1548 Order for Communion was to ensure that all those attending Mass communicated, and did so under both kinds. Although the Order left the Mass intact, it introduced something which struck against the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. A rubric at the very end provides for the case when ‘the wyne halowed and consecrate dooth not suffice’: the priest may return to the altar ‘and reuerentlie and deuoutlie prepare and consecrate an other’ and as many more as are necessary, using the words of consecration of the chalice from the Canon ‘wythout any leuacion or lyftyng vp’. According to the modern Catholic Code of Canon Law (c.927) ‘nefas est’ – ‘it is absolutely forbidden’ to do this ‘even in extreme urgent necessity’. The word used by the Code, “nefas”, in pagan Latin particularly refers to breaches of the divine law and the worst sorts of crimes (including sacrilege). The Code uses it in only three other places.

The 1548 rubric was not reproduced in the Book of Common Prayer until 1662, when an explicit injunction to consecrate more bread, should that run out also, was added. However the rule appears to have been enforced in the meantime. In February 1574 Robert Johnson, who was a

---

353 When P. Clodius Pulcher violated the female-only rites of Bona Dea in 62 BC, the Roman Senate decreed that it was “nefas”, i.e. sacrilege: Cicero, Letters to Atticus, I.13.
354 Beal et al. (eds.), New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law, p.119; Gerard Sheehy, Ralph Brown, Donal Kelly, & Aidan McGrath (eds.), The Canon Law: Letter & Spirit, (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1995), pp.508–509. It is “nefas” to: reveal the contents of somebody’s sacramental confession (c.983 §1); coerce someone into receiving Holy Orders or deter someone who is canonically suitable (c.1086); sell holy relics (c.1190).
Puritan preacher at St Clement Danes in London, was tried before the Church Commissioners for a number of crimes against Church of England ritual, including administering unconsecrated wine. At his trial he argued (in effect) for a moral unity between his recitation of the words in the Prayer of Consecration and the wine he administered from store after it ran out. He was informed that the mere fact the 1548 rubric had not been preserved did not mean the practice it enjoined was forbidden, and he was imprisoned for a year.\footnote{Walter Howard Frere, \textit{The Principles of Religious Ceremonial}, (London: Longmans, Green, and co., 1906), p.217; Frere confuses Johnson, the Preacher at St Clement Danes (who may have been the father of the playwright Ben Jonson) with a Cambridge theologian of the same name, the founder of Oakham and Uppingham Schools. See: Patrick Collinson, ‘Johnson, Robert (d. 1574)’, \textit{Dictionary of National Biography}.} Johnson’s case presumably lies behind one of the provisions of the Anglican Canons of 1603:

Furthermore no Bread or Wine newly brought shall be used: but first the Words of Institution shall be rehearsed when the said Bread and Wine be present upon the Communion Table.\footnote{\textit{The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical (Made in the year 1603, and amended in 1865;)} to which are added the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1900), p.13, c.21.}

The modern Catholic Canon against repeating the consecration is almost exactly the same as c.817 of the 1917 Code. The full \textit{editio maior} of this Code includes notes on the sources of all the legislation, edited by Cardinal Gasparri. For the source of c.817 (1917), Gasparri cites a number of paragraphs of \textit{De Defectibus}, the detailed instructions on what do to in case of mishap during Mass which were printed at the end of the General Rubrics in the old \textit{Missale Romanum}.\footnote{\textit{Codex Iuris Canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus: Benedicti Papae XV Auctoritate Promulgatus: Praefatione, Fontium Annotatione et Indice Analytico-Alphabetico ab Emo Petro Card. Gasparri Auctus}, (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1918), p.20.}

These paragraphs and others in \textit{De
Defectibus show a striking similarity with those in a section of the Sarum Missal called the “Cautelae Missae” in the details of the problems foreseen and the solutions proposed, indicating that they are drawn from the same case histories.\textsuperscript{358} This shows that the ‘De Defectibus’ section is not just the product of rubrical experts in Rome, but that the Catholic Church has always guarded the integrity of the one Sacrifice of the Mass so that repetitions are only permitted (‘lest the sacrament remain incomplete’) if in fact they serve that integrity. The people’s communion, even today, is not regarded as part of the Sacrifice, and therefore repeating the consecration to allow more people to communicate cannot be permitted.

On the other hand, the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, including the Holy Communion with its repetition rubric, is still used in the Church of England. In fact, most Anglican parishes use Common Worship (2000), which proposes a variety of orders of service and Eucharistic prayers, some in contemporary, some in traditional language. All variations foresee the possibility of the ‘consecrated elements’ proving insufficient, in which case standard prayers in contemporary and traditional language are prescribed.\textsuperscript{359} Anglicans should not be regarded as blasphemers, heedless or otherwise, for this. Repeating the words of consecration in order to meet an unexpected number of communicants is entirely consistent with the doctrine implicit in

\textsuperscript{1918}, p.235, ad c.817; Missale Romanum, tit. ‘De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus’, pp.lvi-lviii: III.5–6; IV.5,8; X.3.  
\textsuperscript{358} The Sarum Cautelae and the Roman De Defectibus both deal with the ‘musca vel aranea’ (fly or spider) falling into the chalice. They give identical, and almost identically worded, solutions: Missale Romanum, tit. ‘De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus’, p.lx: X.5; Maskell, The ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, pp.243–244.  
\textsuperscript{359} Common Worship, p.296.
the Book of Common Prayer. This doctrine is explicit in the great Anglican theologians of the Elizabethan and Stuart period, who show a remarkable consistency in their approach to Christ’s presence in the Eucharist and the Eucharist as a sacrifice.\textsuperscript{360}

6.3.3 The revision of the Declaration on Kneeling

The 1552 Communion service preserved a rubric enjoining kneeling to receive the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{361} As it went to press, objections were raised by some radicals. The question was resolved by a “Declaration on Kneeling” printed at the end of the service, which insisted that kneeling would continue but added that

\begin{quote}
we dooe declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyved, or unto anye reall and essencial presence there beeyng of Christ’s naturall fleshe and bloude.\textsuperscript{362}
\end{quote}

The declaration is known as “the Black Rubric”.\textsuperscript{363} It was inserted as a separate sheet in some printings of the 1552 Book while in others the text was added to the main body of the type. In some printings it is completely lacking. It was not reproduced in the 1559 Prayer Book. After modifications

\textsuperscript{360}See chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{361}‘Then shal the minister first receyue the Communion in both kyndes hymselfe…and after to the people in their handes kneeling.’ Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.389.

\textsuperscript{362}Ibid. p.393.

\textsuperscript{363}Suggestive reasons are offered for the nickname: e.g. the red ink (usual for rubrics) ran out; black was used by mistake (but it seems all rubrics were printed in black); it was printed in black letter (but so was the rest of the book). Images of examples of the Declaration as first printed are given at the foot of the webpage on the 1552 Holy Communion provided by the Society of Archbishop Justus: http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bercp/1552/Communion__1552.htm (accessed 5 August 2014).
(including to the sentence quoted), it was restored at the request of the Puritans in 1662. 364

The 1552 Declaration was a Royal proclamation. The subject of ‘we doe declare’ is King Edward VI. In 1662 this was transposed to an impersonal construction:

It is here declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. 365

In the section on Holy Communion in a classic Anglo-Catholic commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, Medd and Blunt analyse the change thus:

the Revisers of 1661 … made the important change of substituting the word “corporal” for the words “real and essential.” Thus they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, whilst they removed all risk of the Declaration, or “Black Rubric,” as it was sometimes called, being misunderstood as even an apparent denial of the truth of the Real Presence. 366

The background to this is the Anglo-Catholic theory that the 1552 Book of Common Prayer was the nadir of Protestantism in England. This theory has some validity. As Cranmer’s debate with Gardiner shows, the 1552 Book was meant to leave less room for those holding to the traditional doctrine. 367 It could not but be more (or more clearly) Protestant than its predecessor. For example, in 1549 the words of administering ‘the Sacramente of the body of Christe’ and ‘the Sacrament of the bloud’ were:

365 BCP p.262.
366 Medd and Blunt, ‘The Order for the Holy Communion, with Notes’, p.399; Hughes, Absolutely Null and Utterly Void, p.141, makes a similar point.
367 See 6.2.2 above. This is the received interpretation. For a powerful counter-theory see Buchanan, An Evangelical Among the Anglican Liturgists, pp.71–113.
Even this must be read in conjunction with the rubrics forbidding the elevations during the Prayer of Consecration. It is difficult to overstate the importance in pre-Reformation Western Christendom of adoring Christ (“gazing at” in Protestant polemic) present in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{369} Forbidding elevation could be understood as nothing other than a blow against the traditional doctrine of Christ’s presence, whatever was being put in its place.\textsuperscript{370} Nevertheless the 1552 Book went further, and expressed a starkly Zwinglian doctrine at the delivery of ‘the bread’ and ‘the cup’:\textsuperscript{371}

\begin{quote}
Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy heart by faythe, with thankesgeuing.

Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ’s bloude was shed for thee, and be thankefull.\textsuperscript{372}
\end{quote}

The solution adopted in 1559, one of the very few changes made in that book, was to combine the words of administration from 1549 and 1552 into one for ‘the breade’ and ‘the cuppe’ (the withdrawal from Zwinglianism did not go all the way), using the copula “and”:\textsuperscript{373} In 1662 the “and” was removed for the administering of what is still referred to as ‘the Bread’ and ‘the Cup’:

\textsuperscript{368} First Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.225–226.
\textsuperscript{369} For England, see Duffy, \textit{The Stripping of the Altars}, pp.91–102.
\textsuperscript{370} Duffy quotes primary sources showing the measures taken (driving people from chancels, erecting screens) to ensure this devotion was stopped: \textit{Ibid.} pp.471–472.
\textsuperscript{372} Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.389.
\textsuperscript{373} Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth p.103
The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.\textsuperscript{374}

This solution resolves nothing except to make clear that both doctrines are acceptable within the Church of England.

The changes to the Ordinal in 1662 were done to vindicate the Episcopacy against the Puritans.\textsuperscript{375} Given that the Puritans asked that the Declaration on Kneeling be restored in 1662 (presumably without also asking for any adjustment in wording), it seems like a calculated insult to do so with a (supposedly) anti–Reformation change, when (to adapt the words of Charles II) the need was to ‘mollify distempers, abate sharpnesses, and extinguish jealousies.’\textsuperscript{376} It seems unlikely that the change to the Declaration on Kneeling was of this kind. The Confession before the Prayer of Consecration in 1549 had ‘we knowlege and bewaile our manyfold synnes and wyckednes’.\textsuperscript{377} The use of “knowledge” as a verb was preserved

---
\textsuperscript{374} BCP pp.256–257.
\textsuperscript{375} See 3.1.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.179.
\textsuperscript{377} First Prayer Book of Edward VI p.224.
in 1552 and in most editions of the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth.\footnote{Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.386; Cummings (ed., The Book of Common Prayer, pp.lxi-lx, 399) says that the correction in the edition by Richard Grafton was not followed in later printings.} In 1662 it had become an archaism, and was changed here to “acknowledge”. It seems that the change in the Declaration on Kneeling from ‘reall and essencial presence’ to ‘Corporal Presence’ was simply because of such a shift in the language.\footnote{Neil & Willoughby, The Tutorial Prayer Book, p.366.}

John Jewel, preaching at Paul’s Cross in November 1559, laid out twenty-seven Roman doctrines and challenged his opponents to prove any of them, including that in the first six hundred years of Christianity ‘the people was then taught to believe that Christ’s body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament’.\footnote{John Jewel, ‘Challenge Sermon Preached at Paul’s Cross’ (1559) in: The Works of John Jewel, D.D. Bishop of Salisbury in eight volumes vol. I, p.35.} In debate with the Catholic Thomas Harding in 1565, he asserted the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist against ‘any real, or corporal presence’.\footnote{John Jewel, ‘Of Real Presence’ (Fifth Article of A Reply unto M. Harding’s Answer [1565]), in: The Works of John Jewel, D.D. Bishop of Salisbury in eight volumes vol. II, p.375.} It is clear that far from being in opposition, “real” and “corporal” with respect to the Eucharist are used synonymously by Jewel. The Forty-Two Articles prepared by Archbishop Cranmer in 1553 are the origin of the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563–1571. They were probably drafted in Latin, and were issued concurrently in Latin and English at the very end of Edward VI’s reign. Article 28 of the Thirty-Nine Articles began as number twenty-nine of the Forty-Two. This included a paragraph (which did not survive in 1563) on the impossibility of Christ’s body being present in more than one place, so
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that a faithful man ought not, either to beleue, or openlie to confesse the reall, and bodilie [Realem et Corporalem] presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude.\textsuperscript{382} Not only do we find “real” and “corporal” as synonyms but we do so in a passage, like the Declaration on Kneeling, that invokes the axiom that it is ‘against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one’\textsuperscript{383}

On the other hand Archbishop Laud, debating with “Fisher the Jesuit” in 1622, argues ‘that the learned Protestants in Queen Mary’s days did not deny—nay, did maintain—the real presence, will manifestly appear.’ He then quotes the answer given by John Frith (executed for heresy under Henry VIII) on the question of the presence of Christ’s natural body in the Eucharist, but adds, ‘Archbishop Cranmer comes more plainly and more home to it than Frith.’\textsuperscript{384} He then quotes (from Foxe) one of the documents prepared by Archbishop Cranmer when he, Latimer, and Ridley were brought to take part in a disputation at Oxford in April 1554:

In the first conclusion, if ye understand by this word “really,” re ipsa, i.e. “in very deed and effectually,” so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of his passion, is in deed and truly present to all his true and holy members.

But if ye understand by this word “really” corporaliter, i.e.

“corporally,” so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and

\textsuperscript{382} Hardwick, \textit{A History of the Articles of Religion}, p.330.
\textsuperscript{383} BCP p.262.
organical; so the first proposition doth vary, not only from usual speech and

the phrase of scripture, but also is clean contrary to the holy word of God and

christian profession… 385

It is clear that although “real presence” and “corporal presence” were taken
to be synonyms, Protestant theologians could conceive a difference between
them, and that by the time of Archbishop Laud this difference was
beginning to become actual. Among later generations of Protestants, the
“real presence” became the term for the doctrine they defended, while
“corporal presence” remained the term for the doctrine they opposed.

Dimock gives a catena of quotations showing this. 386 Their opinions did not
change, the words to express them did. Often they themselves notice the
change.

6.3.4 The Thirty-Nine Articles and the Council of Trent

In discussing the finding of defect of intention by Leo XIII,

Gregory Dix slides between interpreting this as a condemnation of the
intention of the Church of England and as a condemnation of that of the
Ordinal, and therefore of its chief compiler Thomas Cranmer. 387 To rebut
this he makes a surprising move. Anglo-Catholics are expected to “make

385 John Edmund Cox (ed.), *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1844), p.395; the proposition referred to is on p.394: ‘In the sacrament of the altar is the natural body of Christ conceived of the virgin Mary, and also his blood, present really under the forms of bread and wine, by virtue of God’s word pronounced by the priest.’ (Cattley (ed.), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, vol. 6, pp.446, 445).


387 Dix, *Question of Anglican Orders*, p.17.
their stand” on the Book of Common Prayer which in its final revision was largely the work of men like them. By contrast, Evangelicals are expected to rely on the Thirty-Nine Articles. To an extent the arguments in the Gorham case work in that way. This was an Ecclesiastical case from 1845 between the Bishop of Exeter and a clergyman (G. C. Gorham) whom he refused to institute to a living, because the latter rejected the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Certainly Sir Herbert Fust ruled in favour of Bishop Phillpotts in the Arches Court (the highest Ecclesiastical tribunal in the Church of England) on that basis. However, Dix argues that, properly speaking, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal before 1662 were never the acts of the Church of England at all. They were imposed on the Church by an elite minority wielding the force of the secular state. This means that the Articles of Religion passed by the Canterbury Convocation in early 1563 were ‘the first doctrinal statement the Reformed Anglican Church was ever able to make’. In doing so, he claims, this Church put a decisively Catholic stamp on all her doctrine. Putting aside the exactness of Dix’s arguments, the Articles of Religion certainly were and remain a formal statement by the Church of England and they are not imposed by Act of Parliament or Royal Proclamation. The Gorham case went to the Privy Council where it was held that the Gorham’s doctrine was permitted within

389 Dix, Question of Anglican Orders, pp.28–31.
390 Ibid. pp.31–32.
the Church of England.\(^391\) The decision of the Privy Council can be read as an interference by the secular power in the affairs of a “Church in bondage”; but the Articles were a free act of its synod. Accordingly it is worth looking at some aspects of this free act.

The crucial events took place in January 1563.\(^392\) On 11 November 1562, Elizabeth summoned the two Convocations by writ to meet on 12 January 1563. Meanwhile Archbishop Parker worked with several other bishops on preparing a ‘Formulary of Faith’ to be dealt with by the Canterbury Convocation. As a point of departure, they used the text of the Forty-Two Articles drafted by Cranmer and published in 1553.\(^393\) Seven of Cranmer’s articles were rejected, four new ones were added, and the text of most of the others was modified. At some point before the Articles were passed by Convocation, what is now Article 29 (‘Of the Wicked which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper’) was removed, probably at the insistence of the Queen to avoid antagonizing her more Catholic minded subjects.\(^394\) Convocation was

---

\(^391\) ‘The writers whom we have cited are not always consistent with themselves, and other writers of great eminence and worthy of great respect have held and published very different opinions. But the mere fact that such opinions have been propounded and maintained by persons so eminent and so much respected, as well as by very many others, appears to us sufficiently to prove that the liberty which was left by the Articles and Formularies has been actually enjoyed and exercised by the members and ministers of the Church of England.’ The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered March 8, 1850, reversing the decision of Sir H. J. Fust, (London: Seeleys, 1850), p.16.

\(^392\) Since at the time the New Year did not begin until 25 March, the date was reckoned as January 1562. The date of the writ summoning Convocation (November 1562) fixes the months in which Convocation was held as January and February 1563 by modern reckoning.

\(^393\) Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion, pp.122–123. See 6.3.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.381.

\(^394\) Ibid. p.141.
dissolved on 12 February, and the Thirty-Eight Articles were published
soon afterwards.

In the previous year the Council of Trent had met in two
sessions. In Session 21 (16 July 1562), in its Canons on Communion under
Both Kinds, it had said:

Can. 1: If anyone says that, by reason of God’s command [“ex Dei
praeceto”] or out of necessity for salvation, each and every one of Christ’s
faithful must receive both species of the most holy sacrament of the
Eucharist: let him be anathema.\textsuperscript{395}

In Session 22 (17 September 1562) in its Canons on the Mass it had said:

Can. 4 If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass constitutes a blasphemy
[“blasphemiam irrogari”] against the most holy sacrifice that Christ
accomplished on the Cross or that it detracts from that sacrifice, let him be
anathema.\textsuperscript{396}

The 1553 Articles did not cover the withholding of the chalice
from the laity, but Cranmer’s Article 30 ‘Of the perfeicte oblation of
Christe made upon the crosse’ did say that

[t]he offeringe of Christe made ones for euer, is the perfecte redemption, the
pacifiying of goddes displeasure, and satisfaction for al the sinnes of the
whole world … Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the whiche, it was
commonlie saied, that the Prieste did offre Christe for the quicke and the
dead … were forged fables [“figmenta”], and daungerouse deceiptes.\textsuperscript{397}

In early 1563, six months after Trent anathematised anyone who said that
communion under both kinds was ‘ex Dei praeceto’, the southern
Convocation of the Church of England passed the Latin text of what we

\textsuperscript{395} DS 1731.
\textsuperscript{396} DS 1754.
\textsuperscript{397} Hardwick, \textit{A History of the Articles of Religion}, pp.332–334.
now know as Article 30, ruling that ‘both the parts of the Lord’s Sacrament, by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, [“ex Christi institutione et praecepto”] ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.’ Moreover, four months after Trent anathematised anyone who called the Mass a “blasphemia”, what we know as Article 31 ‘Of the One Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross’, modifying Cranmer’s Article 30, said:

The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world … Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead … were blasphemous fables [“blasphema figmenta”], and dangerous deceits.

The contemporary English translation said ‘forged fables’, but the Latin text was the definitive one. It does seem likely that the wording of Article 31 was adopted as a specific rejection of the doctrine of the Council of Trent.

In any case it was known that when Trent came to treat of the Mass any canon would likely take this form. Eleven years earlier, in January 1552, draft canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrament of Orders were submitted to the Council for discussion, including the following:

IV. If anyone says that it constitutes a blasphemy [“blasphemiam irrogari”] against the most high sacrifice that Christ accomplished on the Cross, or that it detracts from that sacrifice, [a blasphemy that is] committed by those who

398 Ibid. p.333; Translation in BCP p.624.
399 Ibid.; Translation ibid.
400 That this is the official text of one of the formularies of the Church of England is no barrier to it being in Latin. The Articles themselves are not covered by Article 24’s strictures against liturgical use of ‘a tongue not understood of the people’. Article 9 has a Greek phrase, φρόνημα σαρκός, with a series of possible translations.
believe that the Son of God is offered by priests in the Mass to God: let him be anathema.\textsuperscript{401}

However the Council was prorogued, and the draft Canons were suppressed. Dimock quotes a primary source reporting that, despite the best efforts of the Papal Legate, copies of this draft decree were leaked. He argues that news of this might have reached England in time to affect the drafting of Cranmer’s Article 30.\textsuperscript{402} The draft could certainly have reached England by 1563, and quite possibly the final decree, passed in Session 22, had as well.

In any case the Articles were revisited by the Southern Convocation in 1571.\textsuperscript{403} This was after the promulgation of Pius V’s Bull \textit{Regnans in Excelsis} excommunicating and deposing the Queen.\textsuperscript{404} Convocation took this opportunity to restore the Article ‘Of the Wicked which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper’. In this way the Thirty-Nine Articles took their final form. Dimock argues that if the insertion of ‘blasphema’ was not intended to reject Roman doctrine, it would have been necessary to correct the word in 1571, but in fact the reverse happened:

\begin{quote}
[T]he English version was also altered to bring it distinctly under the anathema of the Roman Canon, and the words “forged fables” were made to give way to the expression “blasphemous fables.” … And if the Article had not been intended to touch the doctrine as there determined, it would have
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{402} \textit{Ibid.} pp.62–64, with p.62 footnote 2.

\textsuperscript{403} The Archbishop of York and his suffragans signed with the southern bishops in 1563. The convocation of York would not formally approve the Articles until 1605. Hardwick, \textit{A History of the Articles of Religion}, p.140, footnote 1.

been easy, and it would surely have been a duty, to remodel its statement that
it might clearly appear to be condemning no doctrine of Rome.405

Dix was right to take the Articles seriously as an act of the Church of
England. But by Article 31 the Church of England was firmly rejecting one
of the doctrines that lie beneath the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders and
Apostolicae curae’s rejection of Anglican Orders.

405 Dimock, ‘Dangerous Deceits’, pp.69–70.
7 Anglican theologians on the Eucharist

7.1 Receptionism: the dominant theological position

Even though from the seventeenth century Protestants became happy to describe their doctrine of the Eucharist as “the Real Presence”, they still did not accept the teaching of Trent that Christ is ‘truly, really, and substantially contained under the appearances of those perceptible realities’.\(^\text{406}\) In the Catholic doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice, the representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross is closely identified with the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine. The twentieth-century Jesuit theologian, Matthias Scheeben, argued that ‘transubstantiation formally constitutes the real sacrificial action proper to the Eucharistic sacrifice’.\(^\text{407}\) Thomas Aquinas, in discussing whether a priest can refrain from offering Mass unless he has care of souls (since he does not need to celebrate other sacraments unless he has such a position), replies:

> The other sacraments are accomplished in being used by the faithful. And so he alone is bound to minister them who has undertaken the care of souls. This sacrament, however, is accomplished in the consecration of the Eucharist in

\(^\text{406}\) DS 1636, cf. 1651.
which a sacrifice is offered to God, and to this a priest is obliged on account
of the Holy Orders he has received.\footnote{Thomas Aquinas, \textit{Summa Theologica}, III\textsuperscript{a} q. 82 a. 10 ad 1 in: ---, \textit{Summa Theologiae Volume 59 Holy Communion} (3a. 79–83), (London: Eyre & Spottiswode, 1975), p.129.}

This explains why the \textit{De defectibus} section in the old Missal gave different rules depending on whether a problem arose before or after any consecration had occurred, and why, in the event of violence or natural disaster, if consecration had occurred a priest was permitted to omit all other rites and consume the sacrament.\footnote{Missale Romanum, \textit{De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus}, p.lxviii: X.2; See 6.3.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.357.}

The Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist as expressed in the Formularies and discussed by Anglican theologians connects the sacrament and the sacrifice more loosely and in a different way. There is a common idea that whereas Anglo-Catholics are enthusiastic about some kind of doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, Evangelicals reject it utterly. To an extent this is true. John Jay Hughes refers to the Holy Communion services he attended as an Anglican as “Mass”.\footnote{Hughes, \textit{No Ordinary Fool}, pp.53–54;} He describes the Anglo-Catholic Leader Lord Halifax attending Mass at home and Mass on the continent, ‘in the local Roman Catholic Church’, without noting that the former celebrations were Anglican and had not been officially described as “Mass” for more than three centuries.\footnote{Hughes, \textit{Absolutely Null and Utterly Void}, pp.29–30.} On the other hand the Church Association rejected the doctrine expounded in \textit{Saepius officio}:

“\textit{This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.”}
The “we” all through this pamphlet must mean the two individual writers, for certainly the Church of England has never used such language to describe the “whole action”. 412

It is true that the expression “Eucharistic sacrifice” does not appear in any formal Anglican document, or at least not in any issued before the time the Church Association published its pamphlet. However it is also true that Anglicans of all persuasions and in all periods have thought of the Eucharist as some kind of sacrifice, often explicitly connecting this to the Sacrifice of the Cross. The starker distinctions in more recent times might be traced to an Evangelical reaction against the (“excesses” of the) Oxford Movement and Ritualism.

Richard Hooker, writing in the 1590s, argues that the doctrine of Zwingli and Oecolampadius that the Eucharist is merely ‘a shadow, destitute, empty and void of Christ’ has run its course, and that there is now a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely the real participation of Christ and of life in his body and blood by means of this sacrament. 413

He rejects the consubstantiation of the Lutherans and the transubstantiation of the Catholics as needless distractions from the “what” of the Eucharist because of curiosity about the “how”. 414 St Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 10:16:

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?

412 Some Criticisms by the Council of the Church Association..., p.7.
From this Hooker concludes that the bread and wine are not the body and
blood of Christ simply because they have become the body and blood of
Christ.

   The bread and cup are his body and blood because they are causes
instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of his body and blood
ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor
improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in
the effect which growth from it.415

The main aim of the Anglican liturgical changes under Edward VI was to
to get people to receive communion at the celebration of Holy Communion.
The 1549 Book even introduced a truncated form of the Holy Communion
service to be celebrated in the homes of the sick so that there was no need to
receive from the reserved sacrament.416 Hooker sums up the underlying
doctrine: ‘The real presence of Christ’s most blessed body and blood is not
therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the
sacrament.’417 He points out that the Eucharist was instituted first by the
words ‘take and eat’, which were only then followed by ‘this is my body’.418

   I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and
where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart
and soul of him which receiveth them. … If on all sides it be confessed that
the grace of Baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive
it although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it,

---

416 First Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.266–268.
417 Hooker, Laws, V.67.6, vol. 2, p.84.
418 Matthew 26:26.
what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs
be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it?  

Baptism was instituted with an imperative: ‘Baptize them in the name of the
Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit…’ The form of baptism is
created by switching this imperative to the indicative: ‘I baptize you…’ If
the analogy were as close as Hooker suggests, the form of the Eucharist
would be ‘I do this in memory of Him’. By ignoring the difference in the
institution and celebration of the two sacraments, Hooker is able to compare
the water in the one to the bread and wine in the other: the point is the grace
effected by administering them.

Hooker is teaching receptionism, which ‘remained the dominant
theological position within the Church of England until the Oxford
Movement in the early nineteenth century, with varying differences in
emphasis’. Receptionism is not analogous to transubstantiation or
impanation as ways to understand the “how” of the Real Presence, instead it
is ‘a doctrine of the real presence which relates the presence primarily to the
worthy receiver rather than to the elements of bread and wine’. This is the
document, expressed in embryo by Cranmer in debate with Gardiner, which
had been presupposed by the Prayer of Consecration since 1552:

419 Hooker, Laws, V.67.6, vol. 2, p.84.
420 Matthew 28:16, the participle “baptising” in RSV-CE (and the Greek) is grammatically
a repetition of the mood of the main verb “make disciples”. This prescinds entirely from
such questions as where in the Gospels Baptism was instituted, what counts as a form of
baptism etc.
421 Crockett, ‘Holy Communion’, p.311.
422 Ibid.
423 See 6.2.2 above. It should be acknowledged that Anglicans derive the doctrine from
their reading of the Church Fathers.
Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.\footnote{BCP pp.255–256.}

Not only do the Archbishops contradict the text of the Book of Common Prayer in ch.XI of the \emph{Responsio}, but in doing so they appear to part company with the most important Anglican theologian.\footnote{See 6.2 above, \emph{passim}.}

Although the reputation of William Perkins (1558–1602) faded after his death, the works of this Puritan contemporary of Hooker were published in many languages all over Europe during his lifetime.\footnote{There is a list in Breward (ed.), \textit{The Works of William Perkins}, pp.613–632.} He taught a similar doctrine of the real presence to Hooker:

\begin{quote}
We hold and believe a presence of Christ’s body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper and that no feigned, but a true and real presence which must be considered two ways: first in respect of the signs, secondly in respect of the communicants.\footnote{William Perkins, \textit{A Reformed Catholic: Or, A Declaration Showing how near we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundry points of Religion: and wherein we must for ever depart from them}, in: \textit{The Work of William Perkins}, p.556.}
\end{quote}

Christ is made present in the same way that when a word is uttered ‘the thing signified comes to the mind’ of the hearer.

Even so at the Lord’s table bread and wine must not be considered barely, as subsistences and creatures, but as outward signs in relation to the body and blood of Christ. And this relation, arising from the very institution of the Sacrament, stands in this, that when the elements of bread and wine are present to the hand and to the mouth of the receiver, at the very same time the
body and blood of Christ are presented to the mind. Thus and no otherwise is

Christ truly present with the signs.\(^{428}\)

The distinction is subtle. Perkins sees Christ present to the mind (but it is ‘a true and real presence’) as the bread and cup are held up to the recipient and (presumably) the words of administration are spoken.

The second presence is in respect of the communicants, to whose believing hearts he is also really present. It will be said, what kind of presence is this?

Ans: Such as the communion in the sacrament is, such is the presence: and by the communion we must judge of the presence.\(^{429}\)

Perkins then examines the nature of the communion.

God gives ‘the whole Christ, God and man’ in the Eucharist. So far this agrees with Trent.\(^{430}\) But Trent teaches that ‘the whole Christ, God and man’ is substantially present ‘in virtue of the natural connection and concomitance’.\(^{431}\) Perkins denies this.

The godhead is not given in regard of substance or essence, but only in regard of efficacy, merits and operation conveyed thence to the manhood.\(^{432}\)

(This is in a part where he is trying to define where the Protestants and Rome agree.) However Perkins does have a certain doctrine of concomitance, even if it is bedevilled by the Protestant notion that the Catholic doctrine is that Christ has to leave the Father to be present in the sacrament.\(^{433}\) The entire manhood is given in the sacrament.

\(^{428}\) Ibid. pp.556–557.

\(^{429}\) Ibid. p.557.

\(^{430}\) DS 1636, quoted above in the passage referred to by fn.406.

\(^{431}\) DS 1640.

\(^{432}\) Perkins, A Reformed Catholic, p.557.

\(^{433}\) BCP p.262 (Declaration on Kneeling).
For the two distinct signs of bread and wine signify not two distinct givings
of the body apart and the blood apart, but the full and perfect nourishment of
our souls.434

On this account the only reason for requiring administration of the Eucharist
under both kinds is that it is ‘by Christ’s ordinance and commandment’
(Article 30), not because of the nature of the sacrament.

Unlike Perkins, Hooker is not seeking common ground with
Catholics. He can afford a studied agnosticism as to the mode of presence.
Whether transubstantiation or consubstantiation are true (and Hooker does
not think either is) it makes no difference

because our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-
operation of His omnipotent power which maketh it His body and blood to
us, whether with change or without alteration of the element … we need not
greatly to care nor inquire.435

Chapter sixty-seven of the fifth book of the Laws (quoted up to this point)
concludes with a theological reverie set off by double quotation marks in the
margin, meditating on the folly of “curiosity” about the Eucharist. Hooker
compares consubstantiation, transubstantiation and receptionism, arguing
that the last contains nothing but what the former two both affirm, what
Christ’s words ‘are on all sides confessed to enforce’, what the whole
Church has always thought necessary, what alone is sufficient for all
Christians, what all of antiquity and every church agrees with.436 The tone is
of dismay at the unpleasant and pointless labour required of the adherents of

434 Perkins, A Reformed Catholic, p.557.
transubstantiation and consubstantiation. Hooker certainly accepts

Eucharistic realism:

Let it therefore be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord’s table to
know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the
manner how Christ performeth His promise.\footnote{Ibid. p.91.}

The sacraments ‘as nails’ fasten us to the cross so that we can draw out
as touching efficacy, force and virtue, even the blood of his gored side … we
there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is
satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched… what these elements are in
themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are
the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth.\footnote{Ibid. p.92.}

On the way to this peroration he remarks:

As for His dark and hidden works, they prefer as becometh them in such
cases simplicity of faith before that knowledge, which \textit{curiously sifting what
it should adore}, and disputing too boldly of that which the wit of man cannot
search, chillett for the most part all warmth of zeal, and bringeth soundness
of belief many times into great hazard.\footnote{Ibid. p.91, emphasis added.}

The context is precisely the sacrament of the Eucharist, and Hooker wants
to avoid seeking the knowledge which chills all zeal and imperils orthodoxy
‘curiously sifting what it should adore’. This can only mean that
‘knowledge’ (i.e. the Catholic or Lutheran theologian) should adore the
Eucharist. Adoration of the Eucharist is at the very least despised by the
Articles of Religion:

\textbf{Article 25}: The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or
to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.
Article 28: The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. It is flatly forbidden by the Black Rubric:

It is here declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood.

Hooker’s realism is such that—even in a disconnected clause which could be removed without violence to his argument—he naturally thinks of adoring the Eucharist as better than ‘sifting’ it.

7.2 Anglican theologians and the Eucharist

7.2.1 Hoadly and Waterland

Benjamin Hoadly (1676–1761), successively Bishop of Bangor, Hereford and Winchester, in his anonymously published Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper presents the starkest theory of the Eucharist. Discussing the institution narratives he argues that

the whole Tenor and Form of this Institution, is in the Figurative Way of Speaking: and that All Expressions in it of the same sort, ought to be understood in the same manner.

440 BCP pp.622, 623.
441 Ibid. p.262. It could be argued that the Black Rubric was no longer in force, and therefore adoration of the Eucharist was permitted. However when the Bishops initially rejected the Puritans’ request in 1661 that it be restored, they said ‘the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th article of the Church of England’, Edward Cardwell, A History of Conferences and other proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the year 1558 to the year 1690, (Oxford: at the University Press, 1849), p.354.
He instances the fact that in the accounts of Luke and Paul, Jesus says “this cup is my blood” and that obviously mention of “the cup” signifies the wine that is in it. The wine (he claims) ‘is allowed by All’ not to be the new covenant

but only to be the Memorial of the New Covenant. So, if the cup is the wine in it and if the wine is not itself the new covenant, tho’ declared to be so as expressly as the Bread is declared to be Christ’s Body, or the Wine his Blood: it follows, by all the rules of Interpretation, agreeably to the Way of speaking throughout the Whole, that the Bread and Wine are not the Natural Body and Bloud of Christ, but the Memorials of his Body and Bloud.443

Hoadly is attempting to reach this conclusion by logical deduction but his argument is an obvious example of begging the question by assuming to be true (‘allowed by all’) what he then claims to prove, that the bread and wine are mere memorials of the body and blood. Hoadly reinforces this argument by pointing out that despite ‘I am the door’ (John 10:9) and ‘I am the true vine’ (John 15:1) nobody thinks Jesus is either of those things.444 He does not consider why not, and, if not, why nevertheless people do identify the bread and wine with Christ’s body and blood.

Daniel Waterland the Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge replied to Hoadley in 1737 with A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Citing St Paul, he argues that following the consecration, the bread and wine ‘do thereby contract a relative holiness or sanctification’.445 He explains this

442 A Plain Account... p.17.
443 Ibid.
444 Ibid. p.18.
445 Waterland, A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, p.90; 1 Tim 4:4–5: ‘For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer.’

Chapter 7
by analogy with things belonging to the Temple in Jerusalem, or the way

throne rooms, orbs, sceptres take on the royalty of their possessor.

[A]s to things common becoming holy or sacred, I say, a holy or sacred
relation is conveyed to them by their appropriation or use; and that suffices.
The things are in themselves just what they before were: but now they are
considered by reasonable creatures as coming under new and sacred
relations, which have their moral effect.446

He goes on to explain this ‘moral effect’:

They are now no more common bread and wine, (at least not during this their
sacred application,) but the communicants are to consider the relation which
they bear, and the uses which they serve to. … [The elements] contract a
relative holiness by their consecration and that is the effect.447

This is why irreverence towards what Waterland calls the ‘sacred symbols’
amounts to ‘profaning the body and blood of the Lord’.448 In response to
some Anglicans who had appeared to argue that the Holy Spirit descended
on the gifts, Waterland explicitly cites Hooker’s receptionist doctrine given
in the passage cited above.449 The Holy Spirit, like Christ, is present to the
receiver. For Waterland the words of consecration carry a rule or promise
‘for all succeeding ages of the Church’. The elements are sanctified ‘into
representative symbols of Christ’s body and blood’ and the worthy
recipients ‘partake of the true spiritual food upon receiving the symbolical’.
What the Sacrament was at the Last Supper ‘in meaning, virtue, and effect’
so it is now. What it was or is in itself is not a question one need ask.450

446 Ibid. p.91.
447 Ibid. p.92.
448 Ibid.; 1 Cor 11:27.
449 Ibid. p.94; See 7.1 above, in the passage referred to by fn.417.
450 All ibid. p.98.
By the consecration the elements are ‘relatively holy, on account of their relation to what they represent, or point to, by Divine institution’. 

God makes them holy ‘by the ministry of the word’. This is to be distinguished from the sanctification of the communicants ‘though they are often confounded’. For what is improperly called making the symbols become the body of Christ ‘really means making them his body to us; or more plainly still, making us partakers of our Lord’s broken body and blood shed at the same time that we receive the holy symbols’. 451

Waterland recoils from any interpretation that this is ‘really and literally that body in the same broken state as it hung upon the cross, and that blood which was spilled upon the ground 1700 years ago’, nor is it Christ’s glorified body ‘which is as far distant from us as heaven is distant’. On the other hand he rejects the interpretation of ‘a bare commemoration, or representation’ as not consonant with the words. 452 A sacrament, he argues, is like a deed for conveyance of land. It is not the land itself; but ‘the right, title, and property (which are real acquirements) are, as it were, bound up in it, and subsist by it’. 453

It appears more reasonable and more proper to say, that the bread and wine are the body and blood (viz. the natural body and blood) in just construction, put upon them by the lawgiver himself, who … is able to make it good. The symbols are not the body in power and effect … but, suitable dispositions supposed in the recipient, the delivery of these symbols is, in construction of

451 All ibid. p.100.
452 All ibid. p.148.
453 Ibid. p.147.
Gospel law, and in Divine intention, and therefore in certain effect or consequence, a delivery of the things signified.\textsuperscript{454}

A deed is to all appearances a piece of parchment with some writing and wax on it. But it represents something of great value by operation of law. Similarly, being the body and blood of Christ is imputed to the elements when they are delivered to the communicant, precisely because God promised it.

Waterland then connects this argument to the Anglican tradition. After discussing a number of the early Fathers where he finds the same idea, he quotes Cranmer at length from the preface to the \textit{Answer} to Stephen Gardiner.\textsuperscript{455} He praises the early Anglican theologians (including Latimer, Ridley, Bradford and Jewel) for being careful to distinguish between the crucified body and the glorified one, and between manucation and union: ‘the former relating properly to Christ considered as crucified and slain, and the latter to Christ considered as glorified and living for evermore’.\textsuperscript{456} He quotes Henry Aldrich (1648–1710) Canon and later Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

Wherefore it is evident, that since the body broken, and blood shed, neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten or drank; nor can we really receive them, but only the benefits purchased by them.

Strictly speaking receptionism is not to be understood as a sort of temporary literal presence.

\textsuperscript{454} \textit{Ibid.} p.149.

\textsuperscript{455} See 6.2.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.330.

\textsuperscript{456} Waterland, \textit{A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist}, p.188.
But the body which now exists, whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified body: which is therefore verily and indeed received. It is really present though locally absent ‘because a real participation and union must needs imply a real presence, though they do not necessarily require a local one’. Aldrich offers the example of the giving up of title deeds which could take place anywhere and not necessarily anywhere near the land concerned.

Waterland considers Romanism, Lutheranism, Calvinism and Zwinglianism each in turn, rejecting ‘all such needless suppositions and needless perplexities’ in favour of ‘this plain doctrine’: that we eat Christ crucified in this Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of his death: and if we thus have part in his crucified body, we are thereby ipso facto made partakers of the body glorified.

The Eucharist is precisely a sacrament, and it is a strict axiom of Protestant theology that the sign of a sacrament cannot be what it signifies. Hence Article 28 says that transubstantiation ‘overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament’. We eat Christ crucified in the Eucharist in as much as we share in the merits of his death. From Christ’s death follows his resurrection and glorification, so by having a share in it we also have a share in his glory.

---

459 Ibid. p.193.
460 BCP p.623.
7.2.2  The Eucharistic sacrifice

In the 1549 Book a number of prayers and rites followed the consecration of the bread and wine. From 1552 onwards the Prayer of Consecration was reduced to a much shorter prayer dominated by the words of institution. This was immediately followed by the communion, the Lord’s Prayer, and one of two post-communion prayers. The American Episcopalian priest Marion J. Hatchett observes that:

The first of these was a truncated version of the 1549 Eucharistic prayer, the second a revised form of the 1549 Postcommunion prayer. The act of receiving Communion thus occurred in the midst of the revised 1549 prayer at precisely the place occupied by the elevation in the medieval rite—a deliberate attempt to substitute a piety centered on receiving the sacrament for one based on adoration of the consecrated elements.\textsuperscript{461}

Even if—in the disorientation introduced by the introduction of English and other changes—not everyone noticed, it is not too far-fetched to suggest that Cranmer precisely intended this effect. The reception of communion is connected to the Sacrifice of the Cross in all three of the Exhortations. The First Exhortation was introduced in the Order for Communion of 1548:\textsuperscript{462}

I purpose, through God’s assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; to be by them received in remembrance of his meritorious Cross and Passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven.\textsuperscript{463}

\textsuperscript{463} BCP pp.245–246.
The Second Exhortation was introduced in 1552, for encouraging the negligent.\textsuperscript{464} It functions as a short homily on the Parable of the Wedding Banquet (Matthew 22:1–14):

\begin{quote}
And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the Cross for your salvation; so it is your duty to receive the Communion, in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself hath commanded.\textsuperscript{465}
\end{quote}

It might not be theologically accurate, but it must have been thought pastorally effective to appeal to a sense of duty in this way. There is a similar appeal in the Third Exhortation (also from 1548), which might actually be said during the service. The priest warns the congregation against unworthy reception of communion, and urges repentance and gratitude to God for their salvation.

\begin{quote}
And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us; he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.\textsuperscript{466}
\end{quote}

In the Third Exhortation it is precisely the reception of the Eucharist which is the memorial of Christ’s death.

John Cosin (1595–1672), Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge and Bishop of Durham after the Restoration, compiled three separate series of notes on the Book of Common Prayer. The notes predominantly consist of extracts from other authors whose ideas Cosin adopted. In the second series,

\textsuperscript{464} Second Prayer Book of Edward VI pp.382–384. 
\textsuperscript{465} BCP p.249. 
\textsuperscript{466} BCP p.250.
against ‘this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving’ in the first post-communion prayer he wrote: 467

That is, this sacrifice of our Eucharist. In which regard, as in divers other besides, the Eucharist may by allusion, analogy, and extrinsecal denomination, be fitly called a sacrifice, and the Lord’s table an altar the one relating to the other; though neither of them can be strictly and properly so termed. 468

Cosin argues that Scripture describes the worship of God under the New Covenant in terms which strictly belong to the old, citing amongst others Hebrews 13:10: ‘We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat.’

And indeed, the Sacrament of the Eucharist carries the name of a sacrifice, and the table whereon it is celebrated an altar of oblation, in a far higher sense than any of their former services did, which were but the types and figures of those services that are performed in recognition and memory of Christ’s own sacrifice, once offered upon the altar of His Cross. 469

Noting that Romanists apply Malachi 1:11 to the Mass, he applies it to ‘the act of our praise and thanksgiving for the sacrifice of Christ once made for us upon the Cross, (as here we use in the Church of England.)’ 470

A doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice is certainly present in the thought of a wide range of Anglican theologians. Preaching in 1626 at the

467 BCP p.257; See 6.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.315.
469 Ibid. p.348.
470 Ibid.
funeral of the Anglo-Catholic Bishop of Winchester, Lancelot Andrewes,

John Buckeridge the Bishop of Rochester said:

Here is a representative, or commemorative, and participated sacrifice of the
passion of Christ, the true sacrifice, that is past; and here is an eucharistical
sacrifice; but for any external proper sacrifice, especially as sacrifice doth
signify the action of sacrificing, here is not one word.471

On the other hand, Richard Baxter was a Puritan priest who served as a
Chaplain in the Parliamentary army during the Civil War. On 24 August
1662 Charles II’s Act of Uniformity came into force, which had the effect of
ejecting from Anglican ministry any clergyman who would not make a
public declaration of ‘unfeigned assent, and consent’ to the entire Book of
Common Prayer, Psalter and Ordinal, or was bound (or considered himself
still bound) by the ‘Solemn League and Covenant’ (an oath of loyalty
administered in the Parliamentary army), or was not episcopally ordained.472

Although Baxter was episcopally ordained and had never taken the oath,
and did not even object in principle to prescribed forms of worship, he did
object to compelling others to assent to them. Therefore he allowed himself
to be deprived of his Anglican ministry.473 Yet Baxter shows a
comparatively rich notion of the Eucharistic sacrifice:

He did institute this Sacrament of his body and blood at his last supper, to be
a continual representation and remembrance of his death, and therein of his

471 John Buckeridge, ‘A Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Right Reverend Father in
God, Lancelot Late Lord Bishop of Winchester’, in: Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right
Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, sometime Lord Bishop of
Winchester. Published by His Majesty’s Special Command, Vol. V, p.267.
472 14 Charles II c.4 in: Cummings, (ed.), The Book of Common Prayer : The Texts of 1549,
1559, and 1662, p.196 (assent), p.198 (League), p.200 (Episcopal Ordination). Also in,
n.06 (League), p.553, n.09 (Episcopal Ordination).
Biography.
own and his Father’s love, until his coming: appointing his ministers, by the
preaching of the Gospel, and administration of these sacraments, to be his
agents without, and his Spirit within effectually to communicate his grace. 474

If there is such a doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice in
Anglicanism, then it is puzzling that Anglican orders have been rejected
because of its lack. But the distinction between the Anglican and Catholic
doctrines of Eucharistic sacrifice has always been plain. From 1610,
Cardinal Du Perron engaged in an epistolary debate with King James I. His
last contribution was a long work published in 1620, after his death, to
which Bishop Andrewes replied. Du Perron argued that the early Church did
not just believe in a Eucharistic sacrifice ‘but also a propitiatory sacrifice by
application of that of the Cross’. 475 In reply Andrewes said:

1. The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament, and
   as a Sacrifice. 2. A Sacrifice is proper and appliable only to divine worship.
3. The Sacrifice of Christ’s death did succeed to the Sacrifices of the Old
   Testament. … [Points 4 and 5 are on the Sacrifice of the Cross] … 6 In a
word, we hold with Saint Augustine in the very same chapter which the
Cardinal citeth: ‘Before the coming of Christ, the flesh and blood of this
sacrifice were foreshadowed in the animals slain; in the passion of Christ the
types were fulfilled by the true sacrifice; after the ascension of Christ, this
sacrifice is commemorated in the sacrament.’ 476

474 The communion office from Baxter’s *Reformation of the Liturgy*, also known as the
Savoy Liturgy since it was prepared for the Savoy conference of July 1661, quoted in
475 ‘…non seulement sacrifice Eucharistique, mais aussi sacrifice propitiatoire par
application de celuy de la Croix.’ Du Perron, *Replique à la Response du Roy*, p.83 in
476 Andrewes, *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron*, pp.19–20; quoting (in Latin) Augustine,
*Contra Faustum*, 20.21, PL vol.42, p.385: ‘Huius sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum
Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem
redd ebatur; post ascensum Christi per Sacramentum memoriae celebratur.’
Andrewes’ first and second points are the only relevant ones, and neither asserts that the Anglican Eucharistic sacrifice is propitiatory. The sixth point begs the question, since it is the meaning of statements like Augustine’s ‘sacramentum memoriae’ which is in dispute.

The question of the propitiatory character of the Eucharistic sacrifice came up in the investigations of Protestants under Mary I. John Bradford was condemned to death at the end of January 1555 but execution was delayed until July to allow time to convince him to recant. In February, Nicholas Harpsfield, the Archdeacon of Canterbury and Cardinal Pole’s representative in that Diocese, made an attempt. Foxe reports the dialogue from the conference between the two.

Harps.:—“… the Canon is not the greatest part of the masse: the greatest part is the sacrifice, elevation, transubstantiation, and adoration.”

Brad.:—“I can away with none of those.”

Harps.:—“No, I thinke the same: but yet ‘hoc facite’ telleth plainly the sacrifice of the church.”

Brad.:—“You confound sacrifices, not discerning betwixt the sacrifice of the church, and for the church. The sacrifice of the church is no propitiatory sacrifice, but a gratulatory sacrifice; and as for ‘hoc facite’, is not referred to any sacrificing, but to the whole action of taking, eating.” etc.

Bradford is clearly repeating (whether consciously or not) the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer, the doctrine of which the Anglican

\[\text{footnote}{Cattley (ed.), The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, vol. 7, p.173; for “can away with” see Oxford English Dictionary s.v. Away: ‘16. a. = Get on or along with, put up with; tolerate, endure, bear. … 1526 Bible (Tyndale) Matt. xix. f. xxvijv. All men can not awaye with that saynge.’ The RSV for Mt 19:11 is “Not all men can receive this precept…” “Hoc facite” is a quotation of Lk 22:19 ‘Do this in remembrance of me’. “Gratulatory” means “of thanksgiving”, Oxford English Dictionary s.v.: ‘†2. Expressing gratitude or thanks; made as a thankoffering. In theological language, spec. applied to sacrifices “of thanksgiving” as opposed to propitiatory sacrifices. Obs.’ The OED then quotes this passage as an example.}\]
Archbishops would make such a muddled presentation three hundred and forty years later, that the Protestants (calling them Anglican would be anachronistic) held the Eucharist to be a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and not unique at that.

During the disputation at Oxford in April 1554 (mentioned above), Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley were all challenged to defy the proposition that ‘in the Mass is the lively sacrifice of the church, propitiable and available for the sins as well of quick as of the dead’. When it was his turn to debate, Latimer proved himself acute in engagement with Hugh Weston, the Prolocutor of the lower house of the Convocation of Canterbury, who presided.

Weston:—“Origen, Homily thirteen, upon Leviticus.”

Latimer:—“I have but one word to say: ‘panis sacramentalis,’ the sacramental bread, ’is called a propitiatio, because it is a sacrament of the propitiation.”

They seem to be referring to a passage of Origen discussing Leviticus 24 on the Showbread. For our purposes it shows an important distinction between the Catholic view of an individual celebration of the Eucharist being propitiatory and the Eucharist being the sacrament of the propitiation of Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross. The Council of Trent expresses the distinction by insisting on the belief that ‘in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice’ is offered to God.

478 See 6.3.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.385.
480 DS 1751.
7.2.3 The Tractarian influence on Anglican Eucharistic doctrine

Robert Wilberforce the archdeacon of the East Riding in Yorkshire was the son of William Wilberforce the abolitionist, and the older brother of Samuel Wilberforce, successively Bishop of Oxford and Winchester. He was a leader in the Oxford Movement and, with Archdeacon Manning, led it after Newman’s secession to Rome in 1845. \(^{481}\) In 1853 he published *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ‘the first scholarly and systematic treatment of the Eucharist by a Tractarian’. \(^{482}\) Wilberforce builds his argument on a distinction between the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti* which is sometimes expressed by others as between *sacramentum tantum* and *res tantum*. The *sacramentum* is that which is an object of the senses (“this is bread”) and the *res sacramenti* is that which is an object of faith and the mind (“this is the body of Christ”). \(^{483}\) Waterland had argued that what the Christian receives at Holy Communion is ‘in meaning, virtue, and effect’ the same as that which Christ distributed to the Apostles at the Last Supper. And he argued that just as, although it is absurd to suppose that parchment title deeds actually contain the land they convey, they have a great value derived wholly from that which they convey, so the Eucharist does not contain Christ yet it conveys him to us. \(^{484}\) Wilberforce insists ‘that Christ’s presence in the Holy Eucharist is a real presence … that


\(^{482}\) Douglas, *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology Volume 1…*, p.610


\(^{484}\) See 7.2.1 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.450–454.
consecration is a real act, whereby the inward part or thing signified is
joined to the outward and visible sign; and that the Eucharistic oblation is a
real sacrifice’. He maintains a distinction between the sign and the thing
signified, but the two are joined in such a way that Waterland’s analogy of
deeds and land is meaningless.

Trent taught that the Body and Blood of Christ are both present
under both species. ‘Moreover, the divinity is present because of its
admirable hypostatic union with the body and the soul.’ Inasmuch as
Christ was True God and True Man from the moment of the Incarnation, the
Eucharist contains both natures of Christ. William Perkins, trying to
reconcile Catholicism and Protestantism, argued that ‘[t]he godhead is not
given in regard of substance or essence’ and that it is only present ‘in regard
of efficacy, merits and operation conveyed thence to the manhood’.

Wilberforce agrees with Trent.

... His Manhood was the medium through which His whole Person was
dispensed.

His book is a fulfilment of a promise in an earlier work implied by the
remark that ‘sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation’.

---

486 DS 1640.
489 Ibid. p.1.
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The Declaration on Kneeling concludes with (and relies on) the axiom that it is ‘against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one’. Wilberforce does not feel the force of this objection at all.

If Our Lord’s Humanity had no other than that natural presence which belongs to common men, His Real Presence would in like manner be confined to that one place which He occupies in heaven. But by reason of those attributes which His Manhood possesses through its oneness with God, He has likewise a supernatural presence; the operations of which are restricted only by His own will. … He is present Himself, and not merely by His influence, effects, and operation; by that essence, and in that substance, which belongs to Him as the true Head of mankind. And therefore He is really present; and gives His Body to be the res sacramenti, or thing signified.

This is the bread and wine becoming the Body and Blood of Christ. They are not merely so ‘unto us in that holy mystery’ (Cranmer); nor are they merely ‘causes instrumental … whereof the participation of his body and blood ensueth’ (Hooker); nor are the elements merely ‘[contracting] a relative holiness by their consecration’ (Waterland); nor are they merely ‘in meaning, virtue, and effect’ (Waterland) nor merely ‘in regard of efficacy, merits and operation’ (Perkins) the same as the Last Supper.

For Wilberforce, as for Aquinas, the real and substantial presence implies the Eucharistic sacrifice:

---

490 BCP p.262
It remains to notice a particular of great importance, which grows out of the truth of Christ’s real Presence, i.e., that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice as well as a sacrament. 493

“Offering” and “sacrifice” implies something presented to God and slaughtered to obtain his favour.

Now, in this full sense, there is no other sacrifice or offering which can be brought before God, except that Body of Jesus Christ Our Lord, with which He paid the price of our salvation. … If the Holy Eucharist, therefore, is to be called in any peculiar manner the Christian Sacrifice, it can only be by reference to that one perfect propitiation upon the cross, by virtue of which we have in heaven an abiding sacrifice. 494

Bradford argued that the Church’s sacrifice ‘is no propitiatory sacrifice, but a gratulatory sacrifice’, Latimer allowed that the sacramental bread ‘is called a propitiation, because it is a sacrament of the propitiation’, Buckeridge called the Eucharist ‘a representative, or commemorative, and participated sacrifice of the passion of Christ, the true sacrifice, that is past’ (denying any abiding sacrifice in heaven), Cosin called it a sacrifice ‘by allusion, analogy, and extrinsecal denomination’. 495 Wilberforce insists on its reality.

If it were the sacramentum only, or external sign, which was presented before God in this service, it could have no greater value than pertains to the corruptible productions of this lower world: but since it is also the res sacramenti or thing signified, it is that very sacrifice which Our Lord has

493 Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, p.346; Aquinas, Summa Theologica, IIIª q. 82 a. 10 ad 1, referred to by fn.408 above.
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rendered perfect by the taking it into Godhead, and available by offering it upon the cross.496

Pace Cosin, the Real Presence “implies an intrinseca denomination” of sacrifice. ‘[T]he sacrifice of the Altar’ is an application of ‘that acceptance, which He purchased through the sacrifice of the cross’.497

In support of this Wilberforce quotes from the first series of Cosin’s notes to the Book of Common Prayer.498 Cosin’s note is on the Prayer of Consecration, ‘Sufficient sacrifice … of that his precious blood’.499 It includes (in the passage cited by Wilberforce) a quotation from the Catholic humanist George Cassander (1513–1566) which speaks of the making effectual ‘and in act applied unto us’ of the propitiation obtained on the Cross. The sacrifice of the Cross is not so much remembered ‘as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by Christ now in heaven … and thereupon was and should be still the Juge sacrificium [continual sacrifice] observed here on earth, as it is in heaven.’500 Although this is a private document, not intended for publication, and quotation does not necessarily imply full agreement, it does suggest broad agreement. Cosin’s own remarks prefacing the quotations from Catholic authors — ‘the Mass-book hath no more than we have here’ — suggests he does not think there is any difference between Romanism and Anglicanism.501

497 Ibid. p.352.
499 Sic. The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, like its predecessors and successors has ‘precious deathe’, p.103.
500 Cosin, Notes and Collections … 1619, p.108
501 Ibid. p.106.
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However Cosin clearly changed his opinions between the first and second series of notes. Wilberforce cites the notes as printed by William Nicholls in his *Comment on the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1710), not as given in the fifth volume of Cosin’s works printed for the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Nicholls combined all three series into one, although he did mark each note’s source. The first series is in an interleaved Book of Common Prayer printed in 1619. ‘The prevailing character of the notes of this period is deference to Catholic Antiquity, and an exhibition of the substantial agreement between the Reformed Church of England and the Latin Church.’ 502 Cosin’s editor guesses that the first series was compiled between 1619 and 1638 since the second series is in a Book of Common Prayer printed in the latter year. He goes on to note that ‘[t]he character of the later part … of this second series of notes is to oppose the Anglican view of doctrine to the Roman, and there is a controversial tone in them … in marked contrast with that of the former series.’ 503 He points out that Cosin’s son became a Catholic in 1651, ‘much to his father’s grief’. 504 It is not surprising that Wilberforce can find support for his arguments from the first series of Cosin’s notes, even though they would be contradicted by the second series, quoted above. 505 Since Cosin probably left off the third series of notes in 1640, the year of the arrest of Archbishop Laud, and since he

---

502 *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin, ... Volume the Fifth.*, p.xvii.
505 See 7.2.2 aboves, in the passage referred to by fnn.467–470.
seems to have continually added to the second series, then they presumably represent the maturity of Cosin’s thought.\footnote{506 According to the LACT editor, Cosin ‘speaks [in the third series] as if the Church was in possession of her ordinary powers’, \textit{The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin, ... Volume the Fifth}, p.xix. On pp.372–373 of \textit{The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist} Wilberforce quotes Cosin: ‘we offer and present the death of Christ to God, that for His death’s sake we may find mercy, in which respect we deny not this commemorative Sacrifice to be propitiatory’. This is from the second series of notes in a passage which concludes: ‘But a true, real, proper, and propitiatory sacrificing of Christ, \textit{toties quoties} as this Sacrament is celebrated, which is the popish doctrine, and which cannot be done without killing of Christ so often again, we hold not; believing it to be a false and blasphemous doctrine;ounding ourselves upon the apostle’s doctrine, that Christ was sacrificed but once, and that He dieth no more.’ Cosin, \textit{Notes and Collections ... 1638}, p.336. By this time Cosin saw a significant difference between Anglicanism and Romanism.}

In order to interpret the relevant passages of scripture (particularly the Epistle to the Hebrews), Wilberforce asks: ‘Did the ancient Church look upon the Eucharistic service as a Sacrifice, and speak of it as the means whereby men participated in the one atonement?’\footnote{507 Wilberforce, \textit{The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist}, p.367.} He suggests three answers: (1) the Eucharist is not a sacrifice; (2) it is a sacrifice but what is presented is the devotion of the communicants, i.e. a sacrifice of praise; (3) the \textit{sacramentum} (bread and wine) is what is offered not the \textit{res sacramenti}.\footnote{508 \textit{Ibid}. pp.367–368.} Wilberforce points out that all have been entertained but that (2) resolves into (1) since devotion is common to all religious offices. He also rejects (3):

But to allow the Holy Eucharist to be a sacrifice, yet suppose that nothing is offered but its external shell and covering— that the Church honours God by presenting to Him the empty husk of its victim— … is to substitute the shadows of the Law for the realities of the Gospel.\footnote{509 \textit{Ibid}. pp.373–374.}

\textit{Chapter 7}
He concludes his chapter on the Eucharistic sacrifice saying that it ‘is not
the offering of the *sacramentum* only, the first-fruits of nature, but much
more that of the *res sacramenti* the *reality* or thing signified’.\(^510\)
Since Wilberforce insists on the *res sacramenti*, which Hoadly rejects,
which Waterland regards as too far away, and about which Hooker
maintains a studied agnosticism, he is able to argue that offering the
consecrated bread and wine is offering the Body and Blood of Christ.

In his discussion of the Anglican approach to Scripture,
Reginald Fuller suggests that the Tractarian recovery of the Patristic
interpretation of Hebrews ‘received quasi-official formulation in the
archbishops’ reply to the 1896 papal Bull condemning Anglican orders’.\(^511\)
In his analysis of the history of Anglican Eucharistic theology in the same
volume, William R. Crockett acknowledges the contribution of the
Tractarians who ‘saw a closer connection between the real Presence of
Christ in the Eucharist and the elements’ and ‘went decisively beyond the
earlier Anglican theology in making a clear distinction between the presence
of Christ in relation to the elements and the presence of Christ in relation to
the worthy communicants’.\(^512\) Specifically citing Wilberforce, he notes that
in Tractarianism, ‘[a]fter the consecration Christ is objectively present in
relation to the elements’.\(^513\) Crockett tends to downplay the gulf between
Wilberforce and his predecessors. According to Crockett it is as though
Wilberforce emphasises doctrines which his Anglican predecessors barely

---


\(^{512}\) Crockett, ‘Holy Communion’, pp.314,315.
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noticed. However Hooker and Waterland (among many others) did not just notice the notion of objective presence: Hooker professed to know nothing one way or the other, Waterland firmly rejected it. Properly understood, Wilberforce was presenting the Church of England with a dramatic shift in Eucharistic doctrine. It is striking that neither Crockett nor Brian Douglas mentions the fact that in the year after the publication of *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Wilberforce became a Catholic.\(^{514}\) He died in Rome training for the priesthood in 1857.\(^{515}\)

### 7.2.4 The Tractarian Memorial

In 1867 the leaders of the Oxford Movement, including Edward Pusey, submitted a memorial to Charles Longley the Archbishop of Canterbury on the occasion of the first Lambeth Conference. The Memorial consists of a series of repudiations, each paired with an affirmation. Brian Douglas publishes paragraphs 1–3.\(^{516}\) Paragraph 2 repudiates ‘the notion of any fresh sacrifice’ in the Eucharist, but affirms that ‘in the Holy Eucharist that same body once for all sacrificed for us and that same blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest’. Without the theological language, and in the context of clear belief in the real presence as something continuing beyond communion, this is the conclusion reached by Wilberforce.\(^{517}\)

---


\(^{515}\) Newsome, ‘Wilberforce, Robert Isaac (1802–1857)’.


\(^{517}\) See 7.2.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.510.
Paragraph 1 rejects any conception of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist ‘which implies the physical change of the natural substances of bread and wine’, while affirming that Christ’s body and blood ‘are present really and truly but spiritually and ineffably’ under the appearances of bread and wine. Paragraph 3 rejects adoration either of the bread and wine ‘regarding them with the reverence due to them because of their sacramental relation to the body and blood of our Lord’ or (quoting the Declaration on Kneeling) any ‘presence of His body and blood as they “are in heaven”’. ‘We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly but spiritually and ineffably present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored.’

Traditional Anglican theology had preserved the Real Presence by adding “for the faithful recipient”, insisting that the very definition of Communion is reception, and refusing to consider the mode of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist any more than in the water of Baptism. 518 Waterland had refused to go any further than adopting the analogy (which he acknowledges had been used before him) of title deeds whose value derives from the property but clearly is not the property. 519 Wilberforce had gone further, because he was prepared to allow the full effect of his premise that ‘the inward part or thing signified is joined to the outward and visible sign’. 520 The Memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury is trying to have it both ways. On the one hand it relies on the receptionist focus on the purpose of the Eucharist for communion, which makes it natural to reject the need to

518 See 7.1 above.
519 See 7.2.2 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.452–458.
520 Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, pp.6–7; See 7.2.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.485.
posit some change in the substance. On the other it insists that Christ is
‘spiritually and ineffably’ present, and is to be adored.

7.2.5 The end of the sacrificing priest

The Archbishops in *Saepius officio*, Gregory Dix and
Christopher Hill all insist that the Preface to the Ordinal shows the
preservation of Catholic Orders in the Church of England.\(^{521}\)

> And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued … in the
> Church of England; No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful
> Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England … except he be …
> admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had
> formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.\(^{522}\)

In the 1662 rites for the ordination of priests and of bishops the words
“priest” and “bishop” occur about fifteen times each in reference to the
candidate. Leo XIII judged this not to be enough: these words are ‘now
mere names voided of the reality which Christ instituted’ (n.31).\(^{523}\) Some
prominent Anglicans would have agreed.

John Whitgift the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, was
Prolocutor of the lower house of Convocation from 1572. In May of that
year two radical London clergy published *An Admonition to Parliament*,
accusing the Elizabethan Church of “Popery”. Archbishop Parker persuaded
Whitgift to respond. By the time Whitgift published the *Answer to a Certain
Libel entitled, ‘An Admonition’*, Thomas Cartwright, who had taken his BA

\(^{521}\) See 3.1.5 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.214–219.
\(^{522}\) BCP p.553.
\(^{523}\) See 3.1.5, in the passage referred to by fn.212.
degree on the same day as Whitgift, and who had been stripped successively of the Lady Margaret Professorship and his own Fellowship of Trinity at Whitgift’s behest, had published *A Second Admonition*, giving a fuller case for what came to be known as Puritanism. Whitgift quickly issued a second edition to meet Cartwright’s work. In 1573 Cartwright published the *Reply to an Answer of Dr Whitgift* and in 1574 Whitgift published *The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition Against the Reply of T.C.* This work contains Whitgift’s *Answer*, Cartwright’s *Reply* as well the new material.524

Cartwright had objected to the continued wearing of the surplice (a white overgarment, like an alb), tippet (a scarf, like a stole) and cap by clergy in the Church of England, for these vestments had been worn by priests before the Reformation: ‘They have the shew of evil (seeing the popish priesthood is evil)’. Whitgift demurs:

> When they were a sign and token of the popish priesthood, then were they evil, even as the thing was which they signified; but now they be the tokens and the signs of the ministers of the word of God which are good, and therefore also they be good. No man in this church of England is so ignorant but that he knoweth this apparel not to be now the signs of a massing priest, but of a lawful minister; wherefore it is a shew of good.525

There is a radical difference between a “popish” priest and a priest in the reformed Church of England.

---


The original Admonition had objected to the Prayer-book’s use of the word “priest”:

To call us therefore priests as touching our office is either to call back again the old priesthood of the law, which is to deny Christ be come, or else to keep a memory of the popish priesthood of abomination still amongst us.\(^{526}\)

Cartwright added to this.

Seeing therefore a priest with us and in our tongue doth signify, both by the papists’ judgment in respect of their abominable mass, and also by the judgment of the protestant in respect of the beasts which were offered in the law, a sacrificing office, which the minister of the gospel neither doth, nor can execute, it is manifest that it cannot be without great offence so used.\(^{527}\)

Whitgift replied: ‘As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for a sacrificer, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for a minister of the gospel.’\(^{528}\)

Hooker, also, discussed Cartwright’s argument in book five of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. The authors of the Admonition had argued that the mere name “priest” was offensive. Hooker thinks they have no reason to be offended, but he is prepared to avoid the word to keep the peace.

Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the church ministry how should the name of Priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh [1 Cor 14:39] unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature


\(^{527}\) Quoted in: ibid. p.351.

\(^{528}\) Ibid.
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another thing. … The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of
speech call usually the ministry of the Gospel Priesthood in regard of that
which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely the
Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have
properly now no sacrifice.\textsuperscript{529}

It does not matter if Hooker is correct in his interpretation of the Fathers.
This passage shows that he took the ministry of the Church not to be
sacrifice, properly speaking, and therefore that those called priests in the
Church of England were not sacrificers either. In fact, to speak even more
strictly, from Hooker’s point of view nobody had been able to offer an
acceptable sacrifice to God since at least the destruction of the Temple of
Jerusalem and possibly since the Crucifixion. The objection to the offering
of the sacrifice of the Mass was not that it was doing something which
ought not to be done, but that it was pretending to do something which
could not be done. He is speaking somewhat loosely when he says ‘sacrifice
is now no part of church ministry’, implying that until recently (as was well
known) it was part of it. He is not rejecting the sacrifice, since (on his
terms) it was impossible, but he is rejecting the (on his terms) \textit{purported}
sacrifice of the Mass.

As for the people when they hear the name 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 upon old age or to imagine that every one so termed
must needs be ancient because years were respected in the first nomination of
both.\textsuperscript{530}

\textsuperscript{529} Hooker, \textit{Laws}, V.78.2, vol. 2, p.179.
\textsuperscript{530} Ibid.
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It does not matter if Hooker is right in his assessment of what the word “priest” suggests to people. This passage shows what he thinks: the fact that “senator” and “alderman” are derived from Latin and English words for old age does not imply anything about the age of those bearing those titles; therefore (according to Hooker) the word “priest” does not necessarily imply sacrifice, and it can therefore be used by Anglicans. Both John Whitgift, the collaborator of Archbishop Parker (and Parker’s successor at one remove), and Richard Hooker, the Church of England’s greatest theologian, agree with Leo XIII that in the Ordinal the word “priest” has been voided of what it had contained before the Reformation. They would say “false popery”, he would say “the reality instituted by Christ”. On their terms, it is impossible to rely on the Ordinal to prove that the presence of the same doctrine of the priesthood exists in both the Church of England and the Catholic Church.
8 ARCIC and the new context

On 24 March 1966, Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey met at the Basilica of St Paul Outside the Walls and issued a Common Declaration announcing their intention to inaugurate a dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion. The result was the Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission, or ARCIC, which had thirteen week-long meetings from 1970 until 1981. ARCIC issued statements on Eucharistic Doctrine (Windsor 1971); Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury 1973); and two statements on Authority in the Church (Venice 1976 and Windsor 1981). ARCIC later published Elucidations to accompany each of the first three statements.

8.1 The ARCIC statements and elucidations

8.1.1 ARCIC on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist

ARCIC summarises the Eucharist as follows:

---

533 ARCIC, The Final Report contains: Eucharistic Doctrine (Windsor 1971); Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury 1973); Authority in the Church I (Venice 1976); Authority in the Church II (Windsor 1981); Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979); Ministry and Ordination: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979); Authority in the Church: Elucidation (Windsor 1981).
In the whole action of the eucharist, and in and by his sacramental presence given through bread and wine, the crucified and risen Lord, according to his promise, offers himself to his people.\footnote{ARCIC, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine (Windsor 1971)}, p.13, n.3.}

It then turns to the relationship between the Eucharist and Christ’s Sacrifice, beginning with the caveat that Christ’s death on the cross … was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world … Any attempt to express a nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the eucharist must not obscure this fundamental fact of the christian faith.\footnote{Ibid. pp.13–14, n.5.}

ARCIC then stakes out its position: the Eucharist is God’s ‘means through which the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the church’. In order to establish this, it invokes the concept of ‘\textit{memorial} as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ—i.e. the making effective in the present of an event in the past’.\footnote{Ibid. p.14.}

ARCIC is here referring to \textit{ἀνάμνησις}, the Greek translation of the noun derived from the Hebrew root \textit{zkr} ‘recalling or representing before God an event of the past so that it becomes present and operative in the here and now’.\footnote{F. A. Brunner & Editors, ‘Anamnesis’, \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia}, Vol. 1, p.383.} The word “anamnesis” is used of a particular section of many Eucharistic prayers in which our salvation is recalled; but it also is the word in this kind of Eucharistic theology denoting the Eucharist’s purpose. It is this more general sense which ARCIC uses.

‘The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance, but the church’s effectual proclamation of God’s
mighty acts. 538 The first half of this sentence reveals the force of “effectual” in the second half. The Eucharistic anamnesis is not the process whereby a modern person might recall (e.g.) that the omphalos at Delphi (where the Sibyl sat to deliver prophecy) is the stone given to Kronos in place of his son Zeus, to eat. That is a mythological fact for a religion in which one does not believe. Instead the Eucharist is a proclamation which is effectual, making what is remembered present in the here and now.

In the Introduction to The Final Report, ARCIC says that its concern is ‘not to evade the difficulties’ in the differences between Catholic and Anglican teaching ‘but rather to avoid the controversial language in which they have often been discussed’. 539 ARCIC is so concerned to avoid technical vocabulary that in the initial statement from 1971, the word “anamnesis” occurs only in parenthesis:

Christ instituted the eucharist as a memorial (anamnesis) of the totality of God’s reconciling action in him. In the eucharistic prayer the church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ’s death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering. 540

The classic Anglican theologians did not understand “memorial” in this way. When Baxter called the Eucharist ‘a continual representation and remembrance of his death, and therein of his own and his Father’s love, until his coming’, there is no sense that it is the remembrance in the Eucharist which makes (or even through which is made) Christ’s death and

539 ARCIC, The Final Report, p.5, n.3.
the Father’s love effectual.\textsuperscript{541} Buckeridge, preaching at Bishop Andrewes’ funeral, called the Eucharist a ‘commemorative, and participated sacrifice of the passion of Christ, the true sacrifice’ and denies that it is ‘any external proper sacrifice, especially as sacrifice doth signify the action of sacrificing’.\textsuperscript{542} It is not that they rule out a sense of “remembrance” or “commemorative” which would include “anamnesis” as used by ARCIC (‘the making effective in the present of an event in the past’), it is just that they do not advert to that meaning at all. On the face of it, this formula is at least consistent with the teaching of the Council of Trent that the Mass is the unbloody re-presentation of the bloody sacrifice of the Cross; but nevertheless the Catholic response to ARCIC’s Final Report would find it lacking in this respect.\textsuperscript{543}

### 8.1.2 ARCIC on the Presence of Christ

Having dealt with the Eucharistic sacrifice, ARCIC turns to “The Presence of Christ”:

Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery, become his body and blood.\textsuperscript{544}

The classic Anglican theologians had analysed the Eucharist in accordance with its purpose: to participate in Christ and in his body and blood by

---

\textsuperscript{541} See 7.2.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.474.
\textsuperscript{542} See the passage referred to by fn.471.
\textsuperscript{543} DS 1740, 1743; see 8.2.2.
receiving Holy Communion.\textsuperscript{545} Hence for Perkins the words of institution and administration make the body and blood of Christ present to the mind,\textsuperscript{546} while for Aldrich and Waterland Christ is really present only in the sense that title deeds really convey land.\textsuperscript{547} The Book of Common Prayer prays ‘that we may be partakers’ of Christ’s body and blood.\textsuperscript{548} If ARCIC’s statement represents Anglican belief, then there is a shift in two respects. On the one hand there is an explicit statement of change, by using “become” instead of “be”; on the other the change is stated to be in the elements becoming Christ’s body and blood.

In a footnote at this point, ARCIC discusses the word transubstantiation, ‘commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements’. ARCIC takes it as merely ‘affirming the fact of Christ’s presence’ and ‘the mysterious and radical change’ taking place. ‘In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining how the change takes place.’\textsuperscript{549} Both the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Church of England’s \textit{Towards a Response} make important observations on this.\textsuperscript{550} It is enough for the moment to observe that ARCIC denies what nobody affirms. Nobody pretends to understand how transubstantiation occurs (as though some divine “miracle manual” were available for inspection). The Council of Trent defines it as

\begin{footnotes}
\item[545] See 7.1 above, especially the passage referred to by fn.413.
\item[546] See the passage referred to by fn.428.
\item[547] See 7.2.1 above, in the passages referred to by fnn.452–454 and 457–458.
\item[548] BCP p.256; Cf. 6.2.2 above.
\item[550] See 8.2.1 below.
\end{footnotes}
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the change of the substance of the bread into the substance of Christ’s body
and the substance of the wine into the substance of Christ’s blood, which
change ‘the holy Catholic Church has fittingly and properly named
transubstantiation’.

8.1.3 ARCIC’s Elucidation on the Eucharist

ARCIC’s statement on Eucharistic Doctrine was published immediately. This gave opportunity for concerns to be raised which
ARCIC I itself was able to address in Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation
(Salisbury 1979). There had been concern specifically with the words
“anamnesis”, “become”, and “change”. This was related to another
concern. ‘Does the language of the Commission conceal an ambiguity
(either intentional or unintentional) in language which enables members of
the two churches to see their own faith in the Agreed Statement without
having in fact reached a genuine consensus?’ It is fundamental to the
conclusion of this thesis that the process chosen by ARCIC of avoiding
controversial language amounted to a refusal to engage with genuine
historic differences in belief. In this light, the brief discussion of
transubstantiation appears to be mere hand-waving which does justice
neither to the genuine Catholic understanding and use of that word, nor to
Anglican objections to it, whether or not Anglicanism rejects it in the sense
in which Catholics use it. The fear of ambiguity, or, to be more precise, of

551 DS 1642, cf. DS 1652.
552 ARCIC, Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979), pp.17–18, n.3.
553 Ibid. p.18 n.4.
equivocation, which ARCIC acknowledges, seems to be well founded. Therefore the claimed new context in which the Catholic Church might recognise the validity of Anglican orders does not exist.\textsuperscript{554}

In defence of the use of the word “anamnesis”, ARCIC begins by pointing out that it is used in the Bible (1 Corinthians 11:24–25, Luke 22:19) in the writings of St Justin, and in the ancient liturgies.\textsuperscript{555} Moreover, Session 22 of the Council of Trent on the Sacrifice of the Mass used “memoria” and “commemoratio” (which translates “anamnesis” in the Vulgate) in the same sense as “anamnesis”.\textsuperscript{556} ARCIC also finds this sense in the short Catechism to be used to prepare candidates for Confirmation in the Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{557}

\textit{Question.} Why was the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ordained?  
\textit{Answer.} For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.\textsuperscript{558}

Taken in isolation, this answer of the Catechism suggests an understanding of the Eucharistic sacrifice which might be consonant with traditional Catholic doctrine. It has been so taken by some Anglo-Catholics as well as ARCIC.\textsuperscript{559} Douglas cites Evan Daniel as one who interprets “remembrance” here as meaning not only “in memory of” but also “to plead before God a

\textsuperscript{554} See 8.2 passim.  
\textsuperscript{555} ARCIC, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation} (Salisbury 1979), pp.18–19, n.5.  
\textsuperscript{556} DS 1740, DS 1753.  
\textsuperscript{557} ARCIC, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation} (Salisbury 1979), p.19, n.5; on the Catechism see 2.4.4 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.163–165.  
\textsuperscript{558} BCP p.295.  
memorial sacrifice".\footnote{Douglas, \textit{A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology Volume 1}...} On this theory, the 1604 Catechism was a recovery of Catholic doctrine in the Church of England against the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, in line with, and going further than, the modification of the Words of Administration in 1559.\footnote{See 6.3.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.368.} However, this interpretation of the Catechism, at least as it was drafted and received, is probably false. The full title in the Book of Common Prayer is ‘A Catechism, that is to say an instruction to be learned of every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop’.\footnote{BCP p.289.} The rubrics at the end of it state that it is to be used to prepare children and (presumably uneducated) servants and apprentices for Confirmation.\footnote{BCP p.296.} It is not meant to be a systematic exposition of Anglican belief, even of the subjects covered. By contrast, the \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church} is described in its promulgating document as ‘a sure norm for teaching the faith’, which ‘is meant to encourage and assist in the writing of new local catechisms’.\footnote{John Paul II, ‘Apostolic Constitution \textit{Fidei depositum} on the publication of the \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church} prepared following the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council’ (11 October 1992), in: \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church}, pp.5,6, n.3.} It is ‘primarily intended’ for Bishops.\footnote{John Paul II, ‘Apostolic Letter \textit{Laetamur magnopere} in which the Latin typical edition of the \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church} is approved and promulgated’ (15 August 1997), in: \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church}, p.xv.} The Catechism in the Book of Common Prayer has a much more limited purpose and audience. Its interpretation must be subject to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the rest of the Book of Common Prayer.

Chapter 8
The Prayer-book Catechism’s mention of ‘continual remembrance’ can be connected with the Third Exhortation. This was first used in the 1548 Order for Communion, and was preserved in all recensions of the Book of Common Prayer thereafter:

And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ… he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries…

There is no reason for thinking that either of these passages, as written, and as used by Anglicans for centuries, has the objective sense on which ARCIC relies. Anglicans can adopt such an interpretation; but it is insufficient to cite this answer in the Catechism to persuade other Anglicans to adopt it also.

ARCIC explains its use of “becoming” by denying that it implies either ‘material change’, or the same presence as Christ had in his earthly life.

What is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses realities of this world to convey the realities of the new creation: bread for this life becomes the bread of eternal life. Before the eucharistic prayer, to the question: “What is that?”, the believer answers: “It is bread.” After the eucharistic prayer, to the same question he answers: “It is truly the body of Christ, the Bread of Life.”

In discussing the question of Eucharistic reservation, ARCIC begins by distinguishing between those who allow reservation for a short period to enable bringing communion to those unable to attend the celebration of the Eucharist and those ‘who would also regard it as a means

---

566 BCP p.250 See 7.2.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.466.
567 ARCIC, Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979), p.21, n.6 (b).
of eucharistic devotion’ The former ‘is rightly understood as an extension of
that celebration’, while the latter ‘should be regarded as an extension of
eucharistic worship, even though it does not include immediate sacramental
reception, which remains the primary purpose of reservation’.\footnote{568} In support
of this it cites the 1967 Instruction \textit{Eucharisticum Mysterium} of the Sacred
Congregation of Rites, which teaches that in worshipping Christ in the
sacrament, the faithful must remember that the presence derives from the
Mass and is directed at sacramental and spiritual communion.\footnote{569} In order to
make plain the relationship between the reserved sacrament and the Mass,
the Instruction provides that at least solemn and prolonged expositions
ought to begin with Mass (omitting the closing rites).\footnote{570} Finally, Mass
before the Exposed Host is forbidden because it is unnecessary, for the
Mass is a more perfect way of bringing about in the faithful the internal
communion which is the intention of exposition.\footnote{571}

ARCIC then continues by noting that despite such precautions

others still find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament

unacceptable. They believe … that this devotion can hardly fall to produce

such an emphasis upon the association of Christ’s sacramental presence with

the consecrated bread and wine as to suggest too static and localized a

presence that disrupts … the balance of the whole eucharistic action (cf.

Article 28 of the Articles of Religion).

\footnote{568} \textit{Ibid.} pp.23–24, n.8.
\footnote{569} Sacra Congregatio Rituum, ‘Instructio \textit{Eucharisticum Mysterium}’ (15 August 1967),
p.567, n.50. ARCIC cites n.49 which merely explains the reason for reservation of the
Sacrament.
\footnote{570} \textit{Ibid.} p.570, n.60.
\footnote{571} \textit{Ibid.} pp.570–571, n.61.
Article 28 forbids Eucharistic worship outside of the reception of Holy Communion by implication: ‘The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped’.  

8.1.4 ARCIC on Ministry and Ordination

After reciting the history of the three orders in Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury 1973), ARCIC turns to their nature. As it began with the uniqueness of the Sacrifice of the Cross in the statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, so it begins with Christ’s unique priestly nature here:

The priestly sacrifice of Jesus was unique, as is also his continuing High Priesthood. Despite the fact that in the New Testament ministers are never called ‘priests’ (hieroi), Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in these ministers and used priestly terms in describing them.

The notion of “reflection” is too imprecise to provide a satisfactory account of the relationship between Christ and the minister, but ARCIC is not stopping there.

Because the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, the action of the presiding minister in reciting again the words of Christ at the Last Supper and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice.

What ARCIC is getting at is this. In all Christian traditions, what is visible and sensible on the table is bread, and not the dead nor the glorified body of Christ. The bread stands in some kind of relationship to Christ’s body as it was offered on the Cross, whether this is explained as merely a symbol

---

572 BCP p.623.
(with the bread unchanged), or as the outward visible sign of Christ’s body which is substantially present under the appearances of bread. (There is of course a range of opinions in between). Just as the bread is a sacrament of the sacrifice on Calvary, the minister is a sacrament of Christ offering himself on Calvary.

So our two traditions commonly used priestly terms in speaking about the ordained ministry. Such language does not imply any negation of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ by any addition or repetition.  

This glides past the insistence by Hooker and Whitgift that the use of the word “priest” in the Book of Common Prayer no more implies anything sacrificial than the word “senator” implies old age.  

### 8.1.5 ARCIC’s Elucidation of Ministry and Ordination

As with the 1971 statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, a number of different concerns were raised with the 1973 statement on Ministry and Ordination. In 1979, at the same time as its elucidation of the Eucharist statement, ARCIC issued an elucidation of its Ministry statement. The important points in the elucidation drew the attention of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and will be discussed below.  

In the 1973 statement, ARCIC had proposed that ‘the development of thinking’ in Anglicanism and Catholicism on ‘the nature of the Church and

---

574 See 7.2.5 above.
575 See 8.2.1 and 8.2.2.
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of the ordained ministry’ which was represented by that statement had put
the issues raised by *Apostolicae curae* ‘in a new context’. \(^{576}\) Since the 1973
statement on Ministry relies in part on the 1971 statement on the Eucharist,
then the new context also arises from that statement as well. This is clear
from the 1979 elucidation of the 1973 statement.

[ARCIC] believes that our agreement on the essentials of eucharistic faith
with regard to the sacramental presence of Christ and the sacrificial
dimension of the eucharist, and on the nature and purpose of priesthood,
ordination, and apostolic succession, is the new context in which the
questions should now be discussed. This calls for a reappraisal of the verdict
on Anglican Orders in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896). \(^{577}\)

As ARCIC points out, the reappraisal can only occur if the authorities they
represent find in its statements the faith which they teach.

### 8.1.6 The consequences of ARCIC’s new context

As noted above, Leo XIII concludes his detailed discussion of
the insufficiency of form with an examination of the Ordinal as a whole.
From the Reformers’ removal of all rites and prayers which were taken in
the sixteenth century to be expressive of the power to offer the sacrifice of
the Mass, he concludes that the ‘native character and spirit of the Ordinal, as
one may call it, is thus objectively evident’. John Hunwicke, writing while
still an Anglican priest, pointed out that the words ‘ut loquuntur’ – ‘as
people say’ suggest that the concept of “nativa indoles ac spiritus” – “native


character and spirit” is ‘not exactly a commonplace of the theological
textbooks’. 578 It is unfortunate that this phrase, wrenched from its context,
has been used as a summary of Leo XIII’s entire judgment of defect of form
or is even treated as the main reason he ruled Anglican orders to be invalid.
On this account, the rest of the Bull becomes irrelevant.

Fr Michael Jackson, the Press Secretary for the Diocese of
Westminster, used the phrase “nativa indoles ac spiritus” in such a way in
explaining the theological background to the conditional ordination of
Graham Leonard, the former Anglican Bishop of London. Jackson treats the
“native character and spirit of the Ordinal”, not as the summary of the
inadequate forms and maimed rites of the Ordinal, but as an element in its
own right which is susceptible of modification in a Catholic direction. (It is
as though one were to make people happy by administering the abstract
quality of happiness.) Although, says Jackson, ARCIC’s work has not yet
given ‘sufficient grounds for verifying such a change in the nativa indoles
ac spiritus of the Anglican ordinal’, yet it might have happened in an
individual case. For this reason Graham Leonard received only a conditional
ordination, since there was a doubt about whether his orders, as
administered by the Anglican bishop who ordained him, were invalid. 579

It was disingenuous for Hunwicke to treat an article by a Press
Secretary as ‘the currently fashionable argument against Anglican

578 Hunwicke, ‘Anglican orders rerevisited’, p.54; Hunwicke says ‘ut loquuntur’ is ‘not
reproduced in the CTS crib’. This shows he is using, in 1994, Smith’s 1947 translation, not
Clark’s 1967 revision. Smith does not translate ‘ut loquuntur’, Clark does: Smith p.20,
Clark p.19.

Orders’. It is unfortunate that Fr Jackson had an eminent authority for his argument. In 1985, while the Catholic Church was considering its response to The Final Report, Johannes Cardinal Willebrands, the President of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, wrote to the co-chairmen of the Second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission. The letter was written as a result of ‘some recent discussions’ between the Secretariat and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, as a result of which Cardinal Willebrands wished to draw ARCIC II’s attention ‘to certain aspects of the Roman Catholic Church’s position in this respect’.

Leo XIII’s decision rested on a doctrinal basis, a judgment that the doctrine concerning Eucharist and priesthood expressed in and indeed controlling the composition of the Anglican Ordinal of 1552 was such as to lead to defects both in the sacramental form and in the intention which the rite itself expressed.

It is astonishing that Cardinal Willebrands thinks that the defect of intention mentioned in Apostolicae curae is that of the rite. As Clark showed, the Catholic doctrine of intention in the sacraments, in all the theologians (even those who did not accept the principle of positive exclusion), is a personal intention of the Minister. It is not the meaning of the rite. Moreover Willebrands has the structure of Apostolicae curae backwards. Leo XIII begins by finding the Anglican forms of ordination to be insufficient: then

---

583 Ibid. p.5.
585 See 3.2 above.
he examines the other prayers of the rite, and only then does he consider the
doctrinal basis of the Ordinal as a whole.

Thus his decision that the orders thus conferred were invalid rested above all
on what he described as the “nativa insoles ac spiritus” (“native character
and spirit”) of the ordinal as a whole.\footnote{Yarnold (ed.), Anglican Orders—A New Context, p.5.}

This statement is wrong, or at best misleading. The decision did not rest on
the “nativa insoles”. It rested on the defective nature of the Anglican form
for ordaining priests (nn.25–26), which could not be rescued by other
prayers in the Ordinal (n.27), while the form for ordaining bishops failed in
the same way (nn.28–29). It is only after these judgments that Leo XIII
begins to consider the “nativa insoles”. He does so because there was a
common theological opinion that a form like ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’
which was insufficient or ambiguous in itself could be given sufficient
Catholic meaning from the context of the whole rite. This is known as
determinatio ex adjunctis.\footnote{Clark, Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention, pp.177–178.}

In drafting documents like Apostolicae curae,
the practice of the Curia was to take account precisely of the arguments of
those who were not on all fours with the final decision, so that ‘all parties
among Catholic theologians would recognize in the Bull arguments of
which they themselves had acknowledged the force’.\footnote{Ibid, p.163.}
One of the
theologians who taught that indeterminate forms can be determined ex
adjunctis was Pietro Gasparri, a member of the 1896 Commission, who

---

\footnote{Yarnold (ed.), Anglican Orders—A New Context, p.5.}
\footnote{Clark, Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention, pp.177–178.}
\footnote{Ibid, p.163.}
thought that practice with respect to former Anglican clergy could be modified to mandate conditional reordination.^^89

Cardinal Willebrands’ claim that Leo XIII’s decision ‘rested above all on … the [“native character and spirit”] of the ordinal as a whole” seems to have been suggested by a careless translation by Smith and (following him) Clark. The English phrase “above all” as applied to a cause for an event, or a reason for action, or a basis of a decision, suggests that it is the predominant one, almost the sine qua non, or even the sufficient cause. So for example, in understanding the reason for British settlement in New Holland in 1788, one might say that, although the need to deal with transported convicts had its part, the reason “above all” was the need to take for Britain, and deny to other powers, a useful base of operations in the Pacific.^^90

That seems to be the sense used by Cardinal Willebrands. He seems to have got the words from a little earlier in the Smith-Clark translation, after the discussion of the insufficiency of any of the individual texts in the Ordinal:

[1] But for a just and adequate appraisal of the Anglican Ordinal [2] it is above all important, [3] besides considering what has been said about some of its parts, [4] rightly to appreciate the circumstances in which it originated and was publicly instituted. (n.30, emphasis added).


^^90 Needless to say it does not matter what, if any, was the predominating reason for the sending of the First Fleet.
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In the rest of n.30 Leo XIII discusses the circumstances of the creation of the Ordinal. The doctrine of the Reformers led them to remove every trace ‘of sacrifice, of consecration, of priesthood’. Then at the beginning of n.31 comes the phrase used by Cardinal Willebrands: ‘The native character and spirit of the Ordinal, as one may call it, is thus objectively evident.’ These two parts of the Bull (nn.30-31) belong together. The native character and spirit mentioned in n.31 is a summary of what was discussed as ‘above all important’ in n.30. However “above all” in the Smith-Clark translation does not have the sense of overwhelming predominance (to the extent that one can ignore all other bases for the decision) required by Cardinal Willebrands’ use of it, since it is immediately followed by the clause ‘besides considering what has been said...’ In the Latin the clauses are ordered differently.


Clause [2] is the “above all” clause and it means “assuredly [profecto] nothing is so effective”. The word “profecto” which provides most of the force of “above all” could have been left out without significantly diminishing Leo XIII’s sense. A literal translation would be:

For a correct and truly full understanding of the anglican Ordinal, besides those things mentioned as to some of its parts, assuredly nothing is so effective than if it be rightly understood in what circumstances [i.e.: “than the
right understanding of the circumstances in which”] it was composed and
publicly authorised.\footnote{591
One has to assume that Willebrands (or his draftsman) was using a
translation, since nothing in the Latin text of nn.30–31 suggests that the
‘native character and spirit’ is, by itself, the basis of Leo XIII’s decision.
That this is the correct understanding of ‘nihil profecto tam valet’, and that
the basis of Leo XIII’s judgment of defect of form is in everything
discussed in nn.25–31, not just in some arbitrary finding about ‘the native
class and spirit’ (which, as Hunwicke observes, is a nonce phrase, and
not something drawn from the vocabulary of Catholic theology), is
confirmed by the text of Leo XIII’s judgment of defect of intention. The
principle of positive exclusion, as enunciated in \textit{Apostolicae curae} n.33,
rests not on any ‘nativa indoles’ but on the change of rite, with the double
purpose of introducing another rite, and of repudiating something the
Church does, which belongs to the nature of the sacrament by Christ’s
institution.

\textbf{Willebrands continues:}

Pope Leo saw this ‘nativa indoles’ as indicated by the deliberate omission
from the 1552 Ordinal of all references to some of the principal axes of
Catholic teaching concerning the relationship of the Eucharist to the sacrifice

\footnote{591 cf. the 1896 translation: ‘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
authorized.’ \textit{Anglican Orders (English)}, p.11. This keeps the order of Leo XIII’s clauses,
and its translation of ‘nihil profecto tam valet’ does not suggest that what follows is a
predominant overwhelming reason for the condemnation (which would contradict the
clause beginning ‘besides what…’ which immediately precedes it) which one can use to
summarise Leo XIII’s entire judgment of the defect of form, leaving everything else aside.
But that is what Cardinal Willebrands is trying to do.

\textbf{Chapter 8}
of Christ and to the consequences of this for a true understanding of the
nature of the Christian priesthood.\textsuperscript{592}

From Willebrands’ account, one might think that Leo XIII began by finding
the “nativa indoles”, and then discussed the 1552 Ordinal in terms of what it
omitted. In fact Leo XIII never mentions the 1552 Ordinal as such, since he
considers what is common to 1550 and 1552, the form of ordination
‘Receive the Holy Ghost’. That the 1550 Ordinal preserved the \textit{tradicio
instrumentorum}, abolished in 1552, does not mean it was valid since it did
not include from the Sarum Pontifical the words that went with the \textit{tradicio
conferring the power to offer sacrifice, and it completely excluded the
anointing of the hands taken to indicate the same power.}\textsuperscript{593}

After discussing developments in the theology of the Eucharist
and Orders since \textit{Apostolicae curae}, including ARCIC’s new context,
Cardinal Willebrands assures the co-chairmen that if the Anglican
Communion affirms ‘that it professes the same faith concerning essential
matters where doctrine admits no difference’ and if this faith is what the
Catholic Church also professes then the Catholic Church
would acknowledge the possibility that in the context of such a profession of
faith the texts of the Ordinal might no longer retain that ‘nativa indoles’
which was at the basis of Pope Leo’s judgment. … In that case such a
profession of faith could open the way to a new consideration of the ordinal
(and of subsequent rites of ordination introduced in Anglican Churches), a
consideration that could lead to a new evaluation by the Catholic Church of
the sufficiency of these Anglican rites as far as concerns future ordinations.\textsuperscript{594}

\textsuperscript{592} Yarnold (ed.), \textit{Anglican Orders—A New Context}, p.5.
\textsuperscript{593} See 3.1.4 above, especially in the passage referred to by fnn.200–203.
\textsuperscript{594} Yarnold (ed.), \textit{Anglican Orders—A New Context}, pp.6–7.
Cardinal Willebrands treats the “nativa indoles” as the basis of Leo XIII’s decision although it is really only something that can be observed by analysis of the several texts of the rites, the forms ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’, and by consideration both of what the Ordinal does not contain (although the Pontifical did) and of the circumstances of its composition. Even though his analysis is faulty, can it be rescued? The reply from the co-chairmen of ARCIC II suggests a way.

In general they sidestep Cardinal Willebrands’ faulty analysis, although they do think *Apostolicae curae* is entirely a judgment on the 1552 Ordinal in that it ‘embodied defects … in the intention which the Rite itself expressed’. They thus share Willebrands’ faulty understanding of the defect of intention discussed in *Apostolicae curae* n.33. After discussing the process of reception of ARCIC I’s *Final Report*, they repeat Willebrands’ suggestion about the effect of the new context, without relying on the ‘nativa indoles’.

In that case the problem at the heart of *Apostolicae Curae*, namely the need for a common faith concerning eucharist and ministry, would be resolved. That resolution would furnish us with a clear perspective with which to view the Ordinals used by our two communions.

---

595 Fr Michael Jackson, who is explicitly relying on Willebrands’ letter for his own analysis of *Apostolicae curae*, develops this for his idiosyncratic explanation of the reason that the Church broke long standing practice and administered merely a conditional ordination to Graham Leonard. He quotes the first half of the passage referred to by fn.594 in: Jackson, ‘The case of Dr Leonard’, p.541, col.2.


There is no suggestion that there be a modification of any of the Anglican Ordinals, whether of 1550, 1552, 1662 or of the Ordinals used elsewhere in the Anglican Communion, or of the Ordinal in the Alternative Service Book used in the Church of England for six years prior to this letter. What would have happened is that the *adjuncta* would have changed; and because they had changed, the insufficient or ambiguous forms of ordination would draw their sufficiency and precision from them.

### 8.2 The reception of *The Final Report*

Overall the official Catholic reception to the *Final Report* was not favourable. Although the unfavourable material in the 1991 *Catholic Response* can be connected to similar comments in the 1982 *Observations*, Francis Sullivan is probably not right to conclude that the positive material is all the work of the PCPCU.\(^{598}\) For one thing the SCDF made a number of positive affirmations throughout its 1982 document, as Cardinal Ratzinger pointed out in an article first published in 1983:

> Actually it is impossible to read through the ARCIC statements without feeling a sense of gratitude, for they show how far theological thought has matured in the last decade as regards shared insight.\(^{599}\)

There is one serious problem with the text of the *Catholic Response*. At one point it suggests that Catholic doctrine is that the bread and wine is

---


transformed into the body, blood, soul and divinity.\textsuperscript{600} In its requested clarification ARCIC II politely points out that, in Catholic teaching, the elements are not transformed into the soul and divinity: Christ’s soul is present by natural concomitance, his divinity is present by the hypostatic union.\textsuperscript{601} John McHugh suggests this may have been the result of the drafting process.\textsuperscript{602} Nevertheless the questions raised by \textit{Observations} and the \textit{Catholic Response} do reveal serious problems with ARCIC’s method.

Shortly after ARCIC published \textit{The Final Report}, the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches met at Lima and published \textit{Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry}.\textsuperscript{603} The Church of England’s response to the \textit{Final Report} was published with its response to the Lima document of the WCC in \textit{Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC} by the Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England. This was collated with the responses from all the other Anglican provinces in a report by the Anglican Consultative Council for the 1988 Lambeth Conference. On the basis of this report, the Lambeth Conference welcomed the statements on the Eucharist and on Ministry with no significant reservations.\textsuperscript{604} However the resolution of the Lambeth Conference only discusses the \textit{Final Report} in the most general terms.

\textsuperscript{600} ‘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 and Blood, Soul and Divinity’, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, ‘Catholic Response to The Final Report of ARCIC I’, p.50, col.2.

\textsuperscript{601} ARCIC II, ‘Requested Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry’, p.201; cf. DS 1640.

\textsuperscript{602} McHugh, ‘Marginal Notes on the Response to ARCIC I’, p.328.

\textsuperscript{603} World Council of Churches, \textit{Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry}.

\textsuperscript{604} ‘The 1988 Lambeth Conference: Resolution 8 and Explanatory Note regarding ARCIC I’, in: \textit{Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity}.
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Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC goes into considerable detail. Since it is generally favourable to the ARCIC statements, it will only be discussed in what follows in order to shed light on the SCDF’s Observations and the PCPCU’s Catholic Response.

### 8.2.1 Transubstantiation and reservation

The SCDF’s Observations begins with an overall evaluation in part A before moving to specific doctrinal difficulties in part B. It singles out for praise the summary of the sacramental presence given in *Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979)*: ‘Before the eucharistic prayer … the believer answers: “It is bread.” After the eucharistic prayer … he answers: “It is truly the body of Christ, the Bread of Life.”’ 605 ‘One notes with satisfaction that several formulations clearly affirm the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament’. 606 It is less happy with ARCIC’s downgrading of transubstantiation in the statement on Eucharistic doctrine, 607 and statements like this from the elucidation:

> His body and blood are given through the action of the Holy Spirit, appropriating bread and wine so that they become the food of the new creation already inaugurated by the coming of Christ. 608

Continuing from its expression of satisfaction the SCDF goes on to say:

---


607 See 8.1.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.549.

608 ARCIC, *Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979)*, p.21, n.6 (b).
Certain other formulations, however, especially some of those which attempt
to express the realization of this presence, do not seem to indicate adequately
what the Church understands by “transsubstantiation” (“the wonderful and
unique change of the whole substance of the bread into his body and of the
whole substance of the wine into his blood, while only the species of bread
and wine remain”). 609

The SCDF also finds fault with “[h]is body and blood are given through the
action of the Holy Spirit, appropriating bread and wine so that they become
the food of the new creation’, ‘the association of Christ’s presence with the
consecrated elements’ and ‘the association of Christ’s sacramental presence
with the consecrated bread and wine’. 610

These formulations can be read with the understanding that, after the
Eucharistic prayer, the bread and wine remain such in their ontological
substance, even while becoming the sacramental mediation of the body and
blood of Christ.

So despite the affirmation — “[b]efore the eucharistic prayer … the believer
answers: “It is bread.” After the eucharistic prayer … he answers: “It is truly
the body of Christ, the Bread of Life.”” — ARCIC elsewhere is suggesting
there is no real change and the difference between “before” and “after”
almost seems to be a mere stipulation.

The Anglican Board for Mission and Unity approaches a similar
set of passages from the opposite angle. It finds a convergence in
Eucharistic faith in the Lima text, but is concerned by a statement by
ARCIC which it thinks goes beyond, and hence contradicts Lima:

609 Sacra Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC’ (27
March 1982); citing DS 1652 (Council of Trent) and DS 4411 (Paul VI, Encyclical Letter
Mysterium Fidei), (3 September 1965)).
610 ARCIC, Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979), pp.21, 22, 24, nn.6(b), 7, 9.
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‘Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery, become his body and blood.’\textsuperscript{611} The Board comments:

However, in the light of the Elucidation with its insistence upon Christ’s presence in the elements never being divided from the encounter in the whole eucharistic celebration nor from the action of the Holy Spirit, the two texts may be seen not to be inconsistent.

The Board then quotes the very passage praised by the SCDF as an expression of Eucharistic realism, consonant with Catholic teaching, while leaving out the catechesis which gives it its pith.\textsuperscript{612} It continues:

It would seem sufficient and faithful to the belief of the Church through the ages to uphold the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and his body and blood truly received in the bread and wine without demanding further agreement on the mode of that presence in the elements.\textsuperscript{613}

Given that the Church of England insists that it believes in the Real Presence, it is surprising that it always expresses a suspicion not only of the word “transubstantiation”, but even of the very idea of considering how what appears to be bread can “really” be the body of Christ. The programme of the Reformation was to return to the doctrine and practices of the early Church. Yet if one grants that the Reformers were right to think this necessary, and that they were successful in their restoration of antiquity, this poses a serious problem for them and their successors. The doctrines

\textsuperscript{611} ARCIC, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine (Windsor 1971)}, p.14, n.6. This is the sentence to which ARCIC’s footnote about transubstantiation is attached, See 8.1.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.549. The passage of the Lima text is in World Council of Churches, \textit{Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry}, p.13, n.15 (with commentary).

\textsuperscript{612} Quoted in full above 8.1.2, in the passage referred to by fn.567; cf. the passage referred to by fn.605.

\textsuperscript{613} \textit{Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC}, pp.28–29, n.71.
and practices which they cleared away as errors, according to the Reformers’ own account, arose and developed naturally from the true primitive doctrines and practices which they claimed to restore. They developed much more naturally than did those of the Reformation, which was not a mass movement. There is no other word than “nervousness” to describe how the Board for Mission and Unity approaches ARCIC’s statement about the bread and wine ‘which, in this mystery, become his body and blood’. This was not followed by any statement of how the bread and wine became his body and blood: indeed the weight of the text is upon the reality of the presence and not upon the notion of how change takes place. The word transubstantiation is not employed in the text but is referred to in an explanatory footnote.

There does seem to be a feeling of relief at the relegation of the bogey (which ‘overthroweth the nature of a sacrament’) of Article 28. A little later the relief is palpable:

It is sufficient and faithful to the belief of the Church through the ages to uphold the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and his body and blood truly received in the bread and wine without any further agreement on the mode of that presence in the elements.

Now it is not just that they are avoiding ‘further agreement on the mode of that presence’ (which earlier was something they feared might be “demanded”), but they would prefer it if everyone else did too.

---

614 Saepius officio, tellingly, talks of a ‘dangerous popular theology on the subject of Eucharistic propitiation’. Anglican Orders (English), p.36.
616 Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC, p.72, n.190.
617 Ibid. p.73, n.192.
The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, in the *Catholic Response*, considers ARCIC’s statements that ‘the Eucharist is the Lord’s real gift of himself to his Church’, \(^{618}\) and that ‘the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ’. \(^{619}\) It notes that these phrases can be interpreted in a Catholic sense, but 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 and Blood, Soul and Divinity. \(^{620}\)

ARCIC’s discussion of Eucharistic reservation relies on the fact that the then most recent Vatican instruction proceeds on the assumption that it is necessary to prevent extra-liturgical Eucharistic worship from obscuring the pre-eminence of Holy Communion. \(^{621}\) ‘In spite of this clarification [says ARCIC], others still find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable.’ \(^{622}\) The PCPCU notes that this creates concern from the Roman Catholic point of view. This section of *Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidations*, seeks to allay any such doubts, but one remains with the conviction that this is an area in which real consensus between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is lacking. \(^{623}\)

---


\(^{619}\) Ibid. pp.15–16, n.10; the PCPCU actually cites *Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation (Salisbury 1979)*, p.20, n.6 which walks back the realism of the 1971 Statement.

\(^{620}\) Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, ‘Catholic Response to The Final Report of ARCIC I’ (6 December 1991), p.50, coll 1–2; cf. 8.2 above, in the passage referred to by fn.600.

\(^{621}\) See 8.1.3 above, in the passage referred to by fn.568.


The concern does not spring from the fact that Anglicans do not practice Eucharistic reservation. (Consuming all the consecrated species within each Mass is consistent with a firm belief in transubstantiation.) It comes from the fact that some Anglicans, despite qualifications and explanations, still regard worship of the reserved sacrament as unacceptable.

8.2.2 The propitiatory sacrifice and the nature of the priest

At the end of its discussion of anamnesis, ARCIC applies the concept to the celebration of the Eucharist:

In the eucharistic prayer the church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ’s death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering.624

In its 1981 Observations, the SCDF expressed serious dissatisfaction with this:

But one still asks oneself what is really meant by the words “the Church enters into the movement of [Christ’s] self-offering” and “the making effective in the present of an event in the past”.625

The expressions in The Final Report are not clear enough for Catholics to be able ‘to see their faith fully expressed on this point’.

625 Sacra Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC’ (27 March 1982), p.1066 B (I) (1). The second quotation is a few lines up from the first (cf. fn.624); it is discussed and quoted above: 8.1.1, in the passage referred to by fn.536.
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[ARCIC needs] to make clear that this real presence of the sacrifice of Christ, accomplished by the sacramental words, that is to say by the ministry of the priest saying “in persona Christi” the words of the Lord, includes a participation of the Church, the Body of Christ, in the sacrificial act of her Lord, so that she offers sacramentally in him and with him his sacrifice.\(^{626}\)

It is not a confusing coincidence that “the Body of Christ” means both the Eucharist and the Church. The priest celebrating Mass is not radically solitary. Christ offered himself at the Last Supper and on the Cross. Therefore the offering of the Mass is an offering by the Church. But the priest is a member of the Church, and himself an individual who has agreed to offer this Mass in this place for this intention. He does this in persona Christi. In its discussion of the Eucharistic sacrifice ARCIC does not mention the individual minister or the individual celebration. This is another place where Catholics are unable ‘to see their faith fully expressed’.

Moreover, the propitiatory value that Catholic dogma attributes to the Eucharist, which is not mentioned by ARCIC, is precisely that of this sacramental offering. Anglican theology describes the Eucharistic sacrifice as “propitiatory” by analogy or by extension.\(^{627}\) This is different from Catholic dogma which describes the Mass as ‘a true and proper sacrifice’.\(^{628}\) It is this sense which the SCDF finds lacking in The Final Report.

ARCIC’s 1973 statement on Ministry and Ordination had said little about the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the priesthood of all the faithful, because it was ‘a document primarily

\(^{626}\) Ibid.

\(^{627}\) See 7.2.2 above, especially the passage referred to by fn.478.

\(^{628}\) DS 1751.
concerned with the ordained ministry'. 629 ARCIC discussed this distinction in the 1979 elucidation of that statement. First it summarises the explanation in sacramental terms of the relationship between the minster and Christ the High Priest. It then goes on to note a sacramental relationship between Christ and the congregation:

At the eucharist Christ’s people do what he commanded in memory of himself and Christ unites them sacramentally with himself in his self-offering. But in this action it is only the ordained minister who presides at the eucharist, in which, in the name of Christ and on behalf of his Church, he recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper, and invokes the Holy Spirit upon the gifts. 630

ARCIC is talking of the priest as one who presides at the Eucharist. The SCDF remarks that he is only a priest in the sense of Catholic doctrine, if one understands that through him the Church offers sacramentally the sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, it has been previously observed that the document does not explicitate such a sacramental offering. 631

Since the priestly nature of the minister depends on the Eucharist being a ‘true and proper sacrifice’, (which The Final Report does not make clear), ‘lack of clarity on the latter point would render uncertain any real agreement on the former’. 632

630 Ibid.
631 Sacra Congregatio de Doctrina Fidei, ‘Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC’ (27 March 1982), pp.1067–1068, B (II) (1). For “explicitate”, which does not appear in the OED, cf. J.-M. Tillard, ‘Sacramental questions: The Intentions of Minister and Recipient’, Concilium, No.4, Vol 1 (1968/1), p.61b: ‘[Instead of] trying to explicitate the positive content of their intention, we might do well to focus on the faith and intention of the communities in which and for which these rites were performed.’ It means “make explicit”.
632 Ibid.
Between the inception of ARCIC in 1966 and the 1979 elucidation, member churches of the Anglican communion had begun ordaining women, which ‘has created for the Roman Catholic Church a new and grave obstacle to the reconciliation of our communions’. 633 This is a surprising way of putting it. A unilateral act by (at this point) only a few members of a federation of churches creates an obstacle for reconciliation, not for them, nor for the federation of which they are a part, but for the partner in dialogue which has changed nothing, the Catholic Church.

ARCIC believes it can sidestep the problem:

for [the 1973 statement] was concerned with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question who can or cannot be ordained. Objections, however substantial, to the ordination of women are of a different kind from objections raised in the past against the validity of Anglican Orders in general. 634

In 1982, the SCDF rejected the distinction between the nature of a sacrament and who may receive it, citing the reasons the Catholic Church does not ordain women. 635 The 1991 statement goes into detail on the effect of the introduction of ordaining women in Anglicanism on ARCIC’s new context.

The view of the Catholic Church in this matter has been expressed in an exchange of correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which it is made clear that the question of the subject of ordination is linked with the

634 Ibid.
nature of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Differences in this connection must therefore affect the agreement reached on Ministry and Ordination.\textsuperscript{636}

Anglicans, whose Churches do ordain women, and Catholics, whose Church does not, can interpret the practice of the other in one of two ways. They can ascribe ignorance to the others, or they can assume the others know what they are doing. If a Catholic says that Anglicans should not ordain women because women cannot be ordained, that is the same as claiming that Anglicans are ignorant of their own Anglican theology. On the other hand, if an Anglican says that Catholics should ordain women because women can be ordained, then he is making the same claim about Catholics. It is one thing for Anglicans to claim that Catholics do not understand Anglicanism (and vice versa). It would be rash for Anglicans to claim that Catholics do not understand Catholicism (and vice versa). It is possible for both sides to acknowledge that the other knows what it is doing with respect to the capable recipients of ordination if “priesthood” denotes two different things in Anglicanism and in Catholicism. Of course that is the basis on which Leo XIII made his judgment.

\textbf{8.2.3 The response to the Roman response}

With some justice, ARCIC’s defenders consider that many of the Roman criticisms levelled against its documents are as much against its method as against its conclusions. The method ARCIC used was not to avoid difficulties, but in preparing its documents to avoid the controversial

language in which the difficulties had always been discussed. In commenting on the Catholic Response, both Edward Yarnold and Francis Sullivan point to a speech in 1980 by John Paul II to the members of ARCIC.

Your method has been to go behind the habit of thought and expression born and nourished in enmity and controversy, to scrutinize together the great common treasure, to clothe it in a language at once traditional and expressive of the insights of an age which no longer glories in strife but seeks to come together in listening to the quiet voice of the Spirit. Yarnold argues that the objections against ARCIC’s results amount to a contradiction of the method given to ARCIC by ‘some very high level directives’, that is by Paul VI and Archbishop Ramsey in their Common Declaration of 1966 and (here) by John Paul II. ARCIC in The Final Report speaks in several places of members from both sides having reached “substantial agreement” or “consensus”. “Substantial agreement” in The Final Report admits of a variety of synonyms. ARCIC uses a passage speaking of “consensus on essential matters” to define “substantial agreement” in the following passage. In its 1979 elucidation of the statement on the Eucharist, it defines “substantial agreement”:

It means that the document represents not only the judgement of all its members — i.e. it is an agreement — but their unanimous agreement “on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence”*

---

639 Yarnold, ‘Roman Catholic Responses to ARCIC I and ARCIC II’, p.246.
i.e. it is a substantial agreement. Members of the Commission are united in their conviction “that if there are any remaining points of disagreement they can be resolved on the principles here established”.†

The SCDF (writing in English) discusses ‘[t]he ambiguity of the phrase “substantial agreement”’:

The English adjective could be taken to indicate nothing other than “real” or “genuine”. But its translation, at least into languages of Latin origin, as “substantiel”, “sostanziale” — above all with the connotation of the word in Catholic theology — leads one to read into it a fundamental agreement about points which are truly essential (and one will see below that the SCDF has justified reservations in this regard). 641

To justify this claim of ambiguity, the SCDF then goes on to discuss a number of passages in the Final Report where a substantial agreement is ‘very extensive’ albeit ‘not yet complete’. The reference to the connotation of “substantial” in Catholic theology surely refers not only to Trinitarian theology (‘consubstantialem’), but also to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist (‘transsubstantiationem’). Yet a number of commentators on the Roman responses to ARCIC completely miss this point. Edward Yarnold, writing in 1993, describes the SCDF as making ‘particularly heavy weather of the phrase’ “substantial agreement”. He points out several places where ARCIC defined the phrase, or a definition can be inferred. He concludes that it ‘seems to imply that remaining points can be settled on the basis of the agreement reached and ought no longer to provide a reason for the

---


churches to remain disunited’.642 (Since unity presupposes mutual
recognition of ministries, the substantial agreement ARCIC claims to have
reached is a necessary part of the new context in which Anglican orders
should now be evaluated.) Yarnold admits that, because Catholics have a
greater number of detailed dogmatic statements than Anglicans do, ‘the
Catholic understanding of consonance [is] more rigorous’ than the
Anglican.643 He quotes the conclusion of the 1991 Catholic Response:

… the Roman Catholic Church was asked to … [answer] … the question: are
the agreements contained in this Report consonant with the faith of the
Catholic Church? What was asked for was not a simple evaluation of an
ecumenical study, but an official response as to the identity of the various
statements with the faith of the Church.644

Yarnold argues that for the 1991 document, “identity” is not verbal identity
but an agreement ‘in rigorous language which is incapable of
misinterpretation’.645 To take the second of the two examples Yarnold cites:

It is not sufficient to affirm that the Eucharist is Christ’s gift to the Church in
which the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ: one must
also state that Christ “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 and Blood, Soul and
Divinity”.646

642 Yarnold, ‘Roman Catholic Responses to ARCIC I and ARCIC II’, pp.239–240.
643 Ibid. pp.243–244.
644 Ibid. p.244, quoting: Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, ‘Catholic
added.
645 Ibid. p.246.
646 Ibid., quoting: Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, ‘Catholic Response to
fn.600 above.
Further down the same page ‘we are back with the question of substantial agreement’, and it is as though (‘heavy weather’) this is all a rather unhelpful digression. At no point does Yarnold notice that on the one hand ARCIC supposed that “substantial agreement” in its documents was a concept everyone was supposed to be able to grasp, but “transubstantiation” was a word to be kept at arm’s length (in a footnote) and reduced to an affirmation of ‘the fact of Christ’s presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place’.  

Yarnold’s ARCIC colleague, the Anglican priest (later bishop) Christopher Hill, also discusses the Catholic Response’s request for ‘the language of “substantial” change’, and asks

> can it really be wise to “canonise” the Aristotelian/Thomist philosophy of substance and accidents (without which the language of substantial change is either meaningless or dangerously close to physics) as if it were tantamount to revealed truth?

Well-instructed Anglicans, says Hill, might well understand why Trent called transubstantiation “convenient and proper” and “most apt”. ‘But they go on to question whether what was “most apt” then is necessarily most apt now and should be universally imposed ecumenically.’ In the same article, he also notices the PCPCU’s assumption that the “consonance” of a statement with the Catholic faith is the same as the “identity”. ‘They are not the same.’ He does not notice that according to his argument one can

---

easily apply a particular concept to statements of agreement ("substantial agreement"), but it is hard to apply it to things ("transubstantiation"), and an imposition to insist that others do so. A third member of ARCIC, the Anglican Henry Chadwick, also thinks “substantial agreement” a readily understood phrase. ‘Whether one thinks that on eucharistic doctrine ARCIC achieved such agreement depends on the way in which one defines “substantial.”’ The surrounding sentences make it plain that he is talking about agreements; but it is striking that he does not notice, although the SCDF pointed it out, that the word chosen (borrowed, he suggests, from St Anselm of Canterbury) has a technical usage in the very doctrine under discussion.

The concept of “substantial agreement”, suitably defined, can be properly applied to what ARCIC was seeking. The SCDF admits this, but argues that in fact it has not been reached. But if ARCIC uses that phrase, it cannot follow the trend of deprecating transubstantiation as well. It might have been more profitable for the Commission to have tackled head on what divides Anglicans and Catholics, and for each side to seek to understand not just the other’s doctrine but what the other understands of its own doctrine, and to have published the results of that inquiry.

At the beginning of its Observations, the SCDF makes some remarks on general problems with The Final Report. It notes:

> 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.

---

It argues that the possibility of a twofold interpretation puts any claimed consensus in doubt, for

if a formulation which has received the agreement of the experts can be
diversely interpreted, how could it serve as a basis for reconciliation on the
level of Church life and practice?

It also wonders who is the subject of phrases such as ‘the consensus we have reached’, and if it is merely ‘a conviction which the members of the Commission have reached and to which they want to bring their respective coreligionists’.\(^\text{651}\)

While discussing the Roman responses, both Yarnold and Chadwick appear to confirm this suspicion, while making clear that there was never any conspiracy. Yarnold explains how the members of ARCIC knew that any remaining difficulties could be resolved on the foundation of the agreement which had been reached. One reason, he says, was the ‘indefinable network of factors, arising from protracted discussion and the growth of intimate friendship’. Because of this, the members of ARCIC were able ‘to recognise their partners’ faith as so close to their own that, as far as the doctrine in question was concerned, there no longer seemed any justification for their churches to remain apart’.\(^\text{652}\) Chadwick hints at the procedure followed in the meetings.

Members of ARCIC I were themselves taken aback to discover how wide and profound was the resulting area of shared discourse. Question and answer, with no holds barred, elicited something that St Athanasius knew in

---


\(^{652}\) Yarnold, ‘Roman Catholic Responses to ARCIC I and ARCIC II’, p.241.
the fourth century, namely that Christians using different terms (in Athanasius’ time contradictory terms) could actually mean the same thing.\textsuperscript{653}

ARCIC’s meetings, whose members were mostly scholars and all of whom were used to academic procedure, proceeded partly on the basis of written contributions by both sides.\textsuperscript{654} Clearly from the way Yarnold and Chadwick talk of personal friendships arising among the participants, there were also face-to-face discussions. If such a thing had not happened that would have been cause for concern. If like-minded Catholics and Anglicans could not come together in charity, then there would be no hope for their Churches to do so. Chadwick talks of the discovery that is the beginning of friendship:

\begin{quote}
The ARCIC members had quickly discovered how deeply their partners in dialogue loved God and his Church. If they shared so much at the deepest level of faith, could they avoid hoping that in due time, by God’s grace, language would be given for expressing this sharing?\textsuperscript{655}
\end{quote}

Yarnold suggests that the reunion is like a man and woman falling in love: ‘it will come only at the end of a courtship during which the two churches have grown together in faith, life, worship and mission’.\textsuperscript{656} The trouble with these analogies is that courtship is discovery against a blank background or at least against a favourable early impression. Reconciliation between separated Communions is, as the word suggests, more like the return to a marriage broken up in a bitter divorce and poisoned by subsequent mutual recrimination. The parties do not just need to find their own faith in the

\textsuperscript{653} Chadwick, ‘Unfinished Business’, p.212.
\textsuperscript{654} The appendix to The Final Report, includes a summary of the thirteen meetings, pp.102–105. Papers were prepared for all of them.
\textsuperscript{655} Ibid. p.213.
\textsuperscript{656} Yarnold, ‘Roman Catholic Responses to ARCIC I and ARCIC II’, p.248.
commonly expressed formulas. They each need to know that the other side finds the same faith.

Chadwick surmises that the Roman authorities suspected that if nine reasonably literate Anglicans … could sign so deeply Catholic a document without one dissenting squeak, there must be some clever ambiguities or at the very least some discreet silences to make possible this surprising fact.

He connects this to ‘that familiar Roman Catholic hope that the Anglicans will turn out to be ordinary common-or-garden Protestants in the end’. The Curia, says Chadwick, fears that some Anglicans may be able to exploit so ambiguous a document. ‘Therefore there is a kind of search for unidentified submarines below the surface of apparently tranquil waters.’

To continue Chadwick’s metaphor, if the Roman Curia was looking for submarines it was because, within a century or so before the Final Report, the experiences of two former Anglicans who happened to become Cardinals (to take no other examples) had taught everyone of their existence. Newman’s membership of the Church of England was torpedoed when it was made plain that a Catholic interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles was the one interpretation forbidden to an Anglican. Henry Manning left when the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, through the judgment of her Privy Council in the Gorham case, made it clear that a non-Catholic doctrine of Baptism was permitted.

Christopher Hill argues that the Roman insistence on the propitiatory character of the Eucharist could have an unintended effect. ‘But many Anglicans will hear in this Tridentine language things that Rome is not actually intending to say, namely that Christ is being re-sacrificed.’660 It is not just Catholics who are looking for submarines. Hill thinks it will not take much to provoke Anglicans to do the same. On their own terms they would be right to do so. It is difficult for an Anglican to avoid concluding that at least part of the reason the Marian Martyrs were put to death was their rightful rejection of the blasphemy of purporting to repeat the sacrifice of the cross. Why should they not believe that this is still Catholic belief? On the other hand what else is a Catholic to conclude from the Declaration on Kneeling and the lack of Reservation than that Anglicans believe in the “Real Absence”? The members of ARCIC produced the Final Report only after the development of trust mentioned by Chadwick and Yarnold. Yet that document in effect asks all the other members of each Church to accept the conclusions reached on the basis of itself alone.

Cardinal Ratzinger (as he then was), writing as a theologian, mentions in passing something overlooked in the statements and elucidation on Authority in the Church. In 1927 the Church of England prepared a revision of the Book of Common Prayer which could not be lawfully adopted because Parliament refused (twice) to allow it.661 He concedes in a

footnote that since 1974 the Church of England has had total control of its own liturgical books. Nevertheless his point still stands, for the Church of England is still a State Church. The General Synod voted to allow women to be ordained priest on 11 November 1992. None were ordained until 1994, because the Synod’s decision could not take effect until Parliament passed the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993. He brings this up because ‘after there had been theoretical substantial agreement about authority in the Church’, meaning the two statements and elucidation, ‘the actual intervention of authority,’ that is the Observations of the SCDF, ‘resulted in misunderstanding and bad feeling’. 662 There is quite an irony in this.

Still considering authority, Ratzinger notes that ARCIC had denied that it was contradicting Article 21 663 by affirming that a General Council’s ‘decisions on fundamental matters of faith exclude what is erroneous’. 664 ‘But [ARCIC] does not explain anywhere what force these Articles and the Book of Common Prayer actually have.’ 665 The SCDF’s Observations made precisely this point, in the continuation of the passage quoted earlier: 666

In this regard it would have been useful … had ARCIC indicated their position in reference to the documents which have contributed significantly to the formation of the Anglican identity (The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, Book of Common Prayer, Ordinal), in those cases where the

662 Ibid.
663 ‘And when [General Councils] be gathered together … they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.’ BCP p.620.
666 Quoted and summarised in the passage referred to by fn.651 above.
assertions of the Final Report seem incompatible with these documents. The failure to take a stand on these texts can give rise to uncertainty about the exact meaning of the agreements reached.  

Catholics do not just seek their faith in ARCIC’s statements. They also want to know whether and how Anglicans find the same faith in them. (The reverse also applies.) Given that ARCIC on the Eucharist and on Ministry appears to contradict many of the doctrines drawn from the Formularies and the classic Anglican theologians (outlined in this thesis), one is entitled to ask how Anglicans cope with this. There is no suggestion that Anglicans are to be doctrinally imprisoned in Formularies which were created in quite adverse circumstances four or five centuries ago. If necessary they can be set in context, qualified or explained in some way. But given this had not been done, the SCDF and the PCPCU were right to deny that substantial agreement had been reached.

8.2.4 ARCIC’s reply to the Catholic Response

By the time the Catholic Response to the Final Report was published, the first Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission had been dissolved and replaced by its successor with a new mandate to study other topics. Henry Chadwick, Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold were among the continuing members. The Catholic Response sought clarification from ARCIC II on two points each on the Eucharistic and on the ordained Ministry. In the latter the clarification sought concerned the unique role of

---

the priest, the institution of the Sacrament of Order by Christ, and the
question of the sacramental character conferred. Since none of these points
are closely connected to anything cited in Leo XIII’s judgment on Anglican
orders, they will not be addressed here. Only ARCIC II’s *Clarifications* on
the Eucharist is relevant to this thesis.

### 8.2.4.1 The Comfortable Words and the Prayer of Oblation

The *Catholic Response* asked the Commission to affirm ‘that in
the Eucharist, the Church, doing what Christ commanded His Apostles to do
at the Last Supper, makes present the sacrifice of Calvary’.\(^\text{668}\) The
Commission did so, quoting the elucidation of the statement on the
Eucharist.

The Commission believes that the traditional understanding of sacramental
reality, in which the once-for-all event of salvation becomes effective in the
present through the action of the Holy Spirit, is well expressed by the word
*anamnesis*. We accept this use of the word which seems to do full justice to
the semitic background. Furthermore it enables us to affirm a strong
conviction of sacramental realism and to reject mere symbolism.\(^\text{669}\)

Having stated the doctrine, ARCIC II then ties this to the Book of Common
Prayer. After the bread and wine have been placed on the communion table
and the priest has recited the Prayer for the Church Militant, there follows


the third Exhortation and the Invitation beginning the Communion rites.\textsuperscript{670} Then the congregation makes a general confession, the priest pronounces absolution, then recites the Comfortable Words, then the \textit{Sursum Corda}, the Preface and the Prayer of Consecration.\textsuperscript{671} The Comfortable Words are four sentences from different books of the New Testament concerning God’s desire to relieve man’s burden (especially) of sin by forgiveness.\textsuperscript{672} ARCIC II comments on the last of these, 1 John 2:1–2 — ‘If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins’\textsuperscript{673} — describing this as ‘the words immediately preceding the \textit{Sursum Corda}’.\textsuperscript{674} It then quotes the beginning of the Prayer of Consecration with its recitation that Christ ‘did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again’.\textsuperscript{675} For the moment it is important to note that ARCIC II interprets “perpetual memory” as “anamnesis”.

The \textit{Catholic Response} also asked ARCIC II to affirm ‘the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased’.\textsuperscript{676} Again ARCIC II quotes the \textit{Final Report} when it says that through the eucharist “the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective” and the Church continues to “entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church”. This is precisely

\begin{footnotes}
\item[670] BCP pp.244–251; on the Prayer for the Church Militant See 6.2.1 above in the passage referred to by fn.319; on the Exhortations, See 7.2.2 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.462–466.
\item[671] BCP pp.252–256.
\item[672] Mt 11:28; Jn 3:16; 1 Tim 1:15; 1 Jn 2:1–2.
\item[673] BCP p.252.
\item[674] ARCIC II, ‘Requested Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry’, p.199.
\item[675] BCP p.255.
\end{footnotes}
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what is affirmed at the heart of the eucharistic action in both classical and contemporary Anglican liturgies. It then quotes the first of the two alternative post-communion prayers from the Book of Common Prayer. This prayer first appeared in the Holy Communion in 1552. It was derived from the part of the Prayer of Consecration in its predecessor after the consecration of the bread and the wine. In 1549 it formed what in modern liturgical analysis is called an anamnesis, recalling the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, and was recited while the Eucharist was on the communion table. In the transfer to its new position it lost much distinctively Catholic Eucharistic language, and became an optional prayer to be said after all have received and when (assuming the rubrics have been followed) there is nothing left. One might question whether this prayer truly is ‘at the heart of the eucharistic action’, since the Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer may reasonably be interpreted as having reception of communion at its heart, not any propitiatory prayer.

ARCIC II had an old and disputed precedent for citing the first Post-Communion prayer, as it stands in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, as evidence for Eucharistic sacrifice in Anglicanism. It was the practice of some senior clergy in the Stuart period to recite this prayer after the

678 On the first Post-Communion Prayer of the Book of Common Prayer see 6.3.1 above in the passage referred to by fn.348–351.
679 Hatchett, ‘Prayer Books’, pp.133–134; Crockett, ‘Holy Communion’, pp.309, 312–313. See also the passage quoted from Hatchett, referred to by fn.461 above. For the way in which the first Post-Communion reached its final form, see 6.3.1 above, in the passage referred to by fn.348–351. On receptionism as the dominant strand in Anglican Eucharistic theology see 7.1 above.
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consecration and before the communion, i.e. where its ancestor was placed in 1549. Medd and Blunt cite John Overall and Lancelot Andrewes.\textsuperscript{680} John Cosin in his first series of notes on the Book of Common Prayer reports and approves the practice of his mentor Bishop Overall.\textsuperscript{681} In the second series he remarks that ‘it would not have been amiss if that [1549] order had continued so still.’\textsuperscript{682} In 1637 the Book of Common Prayer for Scotland restored the entire Prayer of Consecration from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, reversing the rearrangements made in 1552. The 1637 Book was prepared by Scottish Bishops and authorised by Charles I with the approval of Archbishop Laud. It had a brief and unhappy life. A riot broke out in St Giles’ Cathedral when the Archbishop of Edinburgh inaugurated its use, and it was discontinued. Nevertheless this still-born book had a decisive influence on later Episcopal liturgies in Scotland and through them on those in the United States.\textsuperscript{683}

For the 1662 revision, John Cosin suggested returning the first Post-Communion Prayer, with additions, back to a position immediately following the Prayer of Consecration. This was rejected by the Bishops.\textsuperscript{684} Despite this setback, the order of communion in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI never lost its adherents. Marion Hatchett remarks that it was

\textsuperscript{680} Medd and Blunt, ‘The Order for the Holy Communion, with Notes’, p.353.
\textsuperscript{681} Cosin, \textit{Notes and Collections ... 1619}, pp.114–115.
\textsuperscript{682} Cosin, \textit{Notes and Collections ... 1638}, p.347
\textsuperscript{684} Cosin, \textit{Particulars to be considered...}, pp.517–518, footnote m.
‘idolized’ from the seventeenth century onwards. In the early twentieth century Convocation suggested again what Cosin had proposed. Viscount Halifax ‘even lobbied for the authorization of the 1549 eucharistic rite’. The interpretation which ARCIC II assumes, that the first Post-Communion prayer may be taken as an expression of a propitiatory sacrifice, has been trenchantly criticised. In the 1662 Book of Common Prayer it is optional. ‘It is scarcely conceivable that a doctrinal detail of such importance should be taught by a prayer whose use was left to the discretion of the individual minister.’ The fact that Anglo-Catholics wanted to restore this prayer told against the interpretation they offered.

The expressed desire to make this prayer obligatory in any new revision is evidence that those who would press the literal sacrificial meaning, recognize the hopelessness of so doing with the B.C.P. as it stands.

Writing in 1968, the Evangelical Roger Beckwith argued only three forms of sacrifice were left in the Holy Communion service:

- the offering of alms, the offering of oneself, and “the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving”—a phrase which is sufficiently explained by its reappearance elsewhere in the Prayer Book in a non-eucharistic context.

Although ARCIC II was now doing what the SCDF had suggested and connecting its statements to the Anglican Formularies, it was doing so in a highly partisan way.

---

688 Ibid. p.273.
689 Beckwith, ‘What are Anglican Orders?’, p.884; quoting the first Post-Communion, BCP p.257; referring to the Collect of Thanksgiving after a Storm, BCP pp.547–548.
8.2.4.2 The Real Presence and Reception

The Catholic Response also sought clarification from ARCIC II on the nature of the mode of the real presence, noting the admission in the elucidation of the Eucharist statement that many Anglicans find adoration of the reserved sacrament unacceptable: ‘one remains with the conviction that this is an area in which real consensus between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is lacking’. In reply ARCIC II observed that ‘[d]ifferences in practice do not necessarily imply differences in doctrine’ and that the Anglican difficulty is not with reservation as such ‘but with the devotions associated with it which have grown up in the Western Church since the twelfth century outside the liturgical celebration of the eucharist’. Extra-liturgical worship of the Eucharist is not found in the Eastern Churches. However ARCIC had affirmed that ‘the Christ whom we adore in the Eucharist is Christ glorifying the Father’. As a matter of fact (said ARCIC), the Church of England did allow reservation of the sacrament under the regulation of the diocesan bishop. It connects this with the rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer on what to do if by accident some of the Eucharist remains after all have communicated. The elements are to be placed ‘reverently’ on the Communion Table, and after the last blessing, the priest is to consume them ‘reverently’ with assistance from the Communicants. They conclude by quoting a modern Anglican Collect:

---

Grant us so to reverence the sacred mysteries of his body and blood, that we may know within ourselves and show forth in our lives the fruits of his redemption.  

It is striking that ARCIC is apparently not able to cite a prayer from the Book of Common Prayer, but instead quotes the Alternative Service Book of 1980. The 1662 rubrics were certainly an improvement on those of the 1552 recension. The older ones suggested that the priest could have anything remaining after Communion ‘for hys owne use’. Practices do vary, but some are more expressive than others. Reverent placement and reverent consumption are not simply different ways of expressing what is believed by (for example) genuflection and incensing. The former is entirely consistent with Waterland’s doctrine that the elements ‘contract a relative holiness by their consecration’. The latter is the honour due to the Presence of God.

The last word in the dialogue between ARCIC and the Catholic Church on the Final Report was uttered by Cardinal Cassidy in his reply acknowledging the Clarifications sent by ARCIC II. In this letter he only demurred on the claim that there are no devotions to the reserved sacrament in the East.

While there are differences in respect to devotions connected with the Reserved Sacrament, adoration of the reserved Sacrament is normal for both

---


692 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI p.292; it is possible that this rubric referred to unconsecrated bread when more was provided in advance of the service than was necessary for the communicants who came.

693 See 7.2.1 above, in the passage referred to by fnn.445–450.
Orthodox and Greek-Catholics. The “Clarifications” do not seem to make clear that this can be said unreservedly and uniformly for Anglicans.\textsuperscript{694} Cardinal Cassidy then goes on to point out that the concern was not with ‘the question of devotions … but with the implications of diverse Anglican practice regarding Reservation itself and attitudes towards the Reserved Sacrament’.\textsuperscript{695} The problem is not whether or not Anglicanism permits reservation, but that it is tolerant of beliefs that would rule it out as dangerous.

\textit{ARCIC’s Final Report} received the approbation of every Province of the Anglican Communion. So far as I am aware ARCIC II’s \textit{Clarifications} have never been put to any of them. To the extent that the \textit{Clarifications} do satisfy the Catholic Church, it cannot be said that they would certainly be accepted by Anglican Churches. In any case Cardinal Cassidy’s letter shows that the \textit{Clarifications} did not resolve everything. There is no new context in which the Catholic Church can reconsider its verdict on Anglican orders. As has been shown, the Anglo-Catholic interpretation of the Book of Common Prayer implied in ARCIC II’s arguments is probably not historically accurate. Nevertheless it is open to Anglicans to put such an interpretation on their formularies. But this must be made clear in a formal statement like the 1988 Lambeth Conference’s approval of the \textit{Final Report}. The Anglo-Catholic interpretation is not beyond dispute. Until Anglicanism makes plain that the typical doctrines of Evangelicals on the Eucharist and Holy Orders are to be rejected, the

\textsuperscript{694} ‘Letter by Cardinal E. Cassidy to the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC II’ (1994) in: \textit{Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity}, p.207.
\textsuperscript{695} Ibid.
Catholic Church is obliged, in justice, to consider Evangelical Anglicans to be as fully Anglican as Anglo-Catholics.

8.3 Common Worship and the New Context

In its 1993 Clarifications ARCIC II cited the Church of England’s Alternative Service Book, which came into use in 1980, as evidence of contemporary Anglican doctrine. As its title suggests, this book was presented as an alternative to the Book of Common Prayer. Legally it did not replace the Book of Common Prayer, but in practice it supplanted it more or less everywhere. The process of revision began almost immediately, culminating in Common Worship, which came into use in 2000.

8.3.1 The Ordinal in Common Worship

The Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer presumes the medieval theory that ordination is effected by an imperative verb, hence: ‘Receive the Holy Ghost…’ Later scholarship revealed that the most ancient rites did not use an imperative addressed to the candidate, but a prayer addressed to God.696 Nevertheless the compilers of the Ordinal for the Alternative Service Book acknowledged that ‘throughout the process of drafting the shadow of Apostolicae curae hung over the drafters’.697

---

result is that the central part of the rite is a long prayer said by the Bishop over the candidate, with the laying-on of hands taking place during one sentence, asking God to send the Holy Spirit upon his servant ‘for the office and work of a’ deacon, priest or bishop. This is taken to be the operative formula in this Ordinal. When more than one candidate is to be ordained, the compilers adopted something from the Ordinal of the Church of South India. The prayer is recited until the laying-on of hands, when the prayer to the Holy Spirit (‘for the office and work of…’) is repeated over each candidate. This method has been followed in Ordination rites in other members of the Anglican Communion.

The American Anglican liturgical scholar, Paul Bradshaw, argued at a conference to mark the centenary of Apostolicae curae, that Ordination rites in the early Church were a process rather than an event and repeating a single sentence over each candidate is equivalent to ‘repeating “This is my body” over each individual eucharistic wafer’. He called upon Anglicanism to reconsider what ‘can only serve to encourage the misleading conclusion that this alone is what is necessary to effect ordination’. Nevertheless, when the Common Worship Ordinal came into force in the Church of England it retained this method, presumably for convenience. The official commentary explicitly affirms that the entire prayer is

---

698 Alternative Service Book pp.349 (deacon), 362 (priest), 394 (bishop).
699 Bradshaw ‘The Liturgical Consequences of Apostolicae Curae for Anglican Ordination Rites’, pp.78–79. The equivalent prayer in Common Worship is explicitly stated to be in its entirety the essential part of the Ordination rite, Common Worship: Ordination Services Study Edition, pp.132–133, see fn.701 and the passage referred to by it.
700 Ibid. p.83.
understood to effect ordination. To make this plain to the members of the community, it proposes that they be invited to respond to each paragraph of the entire prayer with ‘Lord, send your Spirit’ or a similar invocation.  

In the context of *Apostolicae curae*, the most striking difference between the Alternative Service Book and Common Worship is in the ordination prayer for priests. The latter is a rearrangement of the former with some omissions and additions. In the Alternative Service Book, after the laying-on of hands, the bishop prays:

Almighty Father, give to these your servants grace and power to fulfil 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.

In Common Worship this becomes:

Through your Spirit, heavenly Father, give these your servants grace and power to proclaim the gospel of your salvation and minister the sacraments of the new covenant. … In union with their fellow servants in Christ, may they reconcile what is divided, heal what is wounded and restore what is lost.

The omitted passage is a prayer for holiness, wisdom and discipline in the candidate’s pastoral work which is found at the end of the earlier version, but the sentence beginning ‘In union with their…’ has no equivalent in the Alternative Service Book. Otherwise, at this point the difference seems to

---

be in emphasis, with ‘to absolve…bless…proclaim’ being replaced in
Common Worship by a series of verbs governing relative clauses. In the
Alternative Service Book, ministry of the sacraments comes in the next sentence.

Set them among your people to offer with them spiritual sacrifices acceptable
in your sight and to minister the sacraments of the new covenant.\footnote{705}

In 1980 the Church of England adopted an ordination prayer which
specifically mentions the priest’s power of offering sacrifice. This is not
clearly consonant (to use ARCIC’s term) with a Catholic doctrine of a
proper and propitiatory sacrifice; but it is striking all the same.\footnote{706} This is not
to be thought of as a botched attempt to satisfy \textit{Apostolicae curae}. It is an
expression of an Anglican doctrine of liturgical sacrifice which includes
(but not in any special way) Eucharistic sacrifice, although it is certainly not
limited to it. The priest is the one who enables the spiritual sacrifices of the
people.

In Common Worship the priest’s role in the offering of spiritual
sacrifices is not mentioned.

May they declare your blessings to your people; may they proclaim Christ’s
victory over the powers of darkness, and absolve in Christ’s name those who
turn to him in faith; so shall a people made whole in Christ offer spiritual
sacrifices acceptable to you, our God and Father…\footnote{707}

(The concept of absolution is taken from earlier on in the prayer in the
Alternative Service Book.) Now it is only the people who are mentioned as

\footnote{705}{ASB p.363.}
\footnote{706}{Immediately after this sentence, the ASB has the prayer, for holiness, wisdom and
discipline in the candidate’s pastoral work.}
\footnote{707}{\textit{Common Worship: Ordination Services Study Edition}, p.43.}
offering spiritual sacrifice as a consequence (‘so shall…’) of the declaration of the Father’s blessings, the proclamation of Christ’s victory, and the absolution in Christ’s name.\footnote{Wood, ‘The Church of England’s New Ordinal’, p.115.} It is probably not too much to see the offering of spiritual sacrifices by ‘a people made whole in Christ’ as particularly connected to the absolution ‘in Christ’s name’ of ‘those who turn to him in faith’. If this is so, then the much longer ordination prayer in Common Worship can be seen as an expanded expression of the form of ordination in the Book of Common Prayer, with its emphasis on absolution, ‘whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained’.\footnote{BCP p.582, quoted in 2.4.5 above, in the passage referred to by fn.167; cf. Wood, ‘The Church of England’s New Ordinal’, pp.117–118.} In this respect Common Worship rebalanced the ordination prayer of the Alternative Service Book.

The prayer in Common Worship that the priests ‘reconcile what is divided’ may be an allusion to the Sacramentary of Serapion, if not to the passage from St Paul (2 Corinthians 5:18-20) which lies behind it.\footnote{See 5.2 above.} Either Paul or Serapion is the source of the congregation’s response when a senior priest formally welcomes the new priest:

\begin{quote}
God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation.

\textit{All:} We welcome you as ambassadors for Christ: let the word of Christ dwell in you richly.
\end{quote}

St Paul says: ‘So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.’

\footnote{Common Worship: Ordination Services Study Edition, p.44; the footnote refers the first half of the congregation’s response to 2 Cor 5:18–20.}
8.3.2 Holy Communion in Common Worship

In 1997 the Bishops’ Conferences in the British Isles – of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland – combined to produce the document *One Bread One Body: A Teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the Church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing*. As the subtitle indicates, the document, drawing on the *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* promulgated by the PCPCU in 1993, deals with the circumstances in which Catholics in those countries may receive the sacraments from non-Catholic clergy, or non-Catholics may approach Catholic clergy for sacraments. Accepting the Catholic invitation to respond, the House of Bishops of the Church of England published *The Eucharist: Sacrament of Unity* in 2001. In their preface Archbishop Carey and Archbishop Hope welcomed the Catholic document, but were also glad of the opportunity to correct a number of erroneous assumptions by the Roman Catholic Church about the Church of England, the Reformation, Anglican teaching regarding the Eucharistic sacrifice and the presence of Christ in the sacrament, and Anglican ministerial and episcopal orders.\(^{712}\)

In the section expressing reservations with the Catholic document, the Anglican bishops object to the ‘rather specific and tightly drawn’ definition of the Eucharist found there.

A real and true communion with and participation in Christ through the sacraments is upheld in our liturgical texts, from *The Book of Common Prayer* to *Common Worship* (in the eucharistic prayers we pray ‘that … these

gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and blood’). But our divines have consistently been loath to speculate as to the mode of that presence and have been content to reverence the mystery.\footnote{Ibid. p.14, n.29; on the Anglican divines, see 7.1 above, passim.}

Common Worship offers eight different Eucharistic prayers, with three of them also given in traditional language. Four of the total eleven use the phrasing quoted by the Anglican bishops ‘may be to us his body and blood’.\footnote{Common Worship pp.185 (Prayer A), 216 (Prayer A in traditional language), 189 (Prayer B), 196 (Prayer E).} In Order Two, which is based on the Holy Communion of the Book of Common Prayer, and in Order One’s Prayer C (based on the Prayer of Consecration of the Book of Common Prayer), the priest prays that we ‘may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood’.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 192 (Prayer C), 220 (Prayer C in traditional language), 240 (Order Two), 261 (Order Two in contemporary language).} Prayers D, F and G of Order One have a similar idea, placed after the recitation of the words of institution.

Prayer D: Send your Spirit on us now that by these gifts we may feed on Christ with opened eyes and hearts on fire.\footnote{Ibid. p.195.}

As in classical Anglican theology, Prayer D focuses on the reception of communion. The prayer asks for the Holy Spirit to be sent on the people now so that they may feed on Christ.

Prayer F: As we recall the one, perfect sacrifice of our redemption, Father, by your Holy Spirit let these gifts of your creation be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; form us into the likeness of Christ and make us a perfect offering in your sight.\footnote{Ibid. p.199.}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid}. p.14, n.29; on the Anglican divines, see 7.1 above, \textit{passim}.}

\footnote{Common Worship pp.185 (Prayer A), 216 (Prayer A in traditional language), 189 (Prayer B), 196 (Prayer E).}

\footnote{Ibid. pp. 192 (Prayer C), 220 (Prayer C in traditional language), 240 (Order Two), 261 (Order Two in contemporary language).}

\footnote{Ibid. p.195.}

\footnote{Ibid. p.199.}
This is a striking expression of Anglican Eucharistic theology. The elements are ‘to us’ the body and blood of Christ; and hence we are to be what is offered to the Father. One thinks of the first Post-Communion prayer from the Book of Common Prayer: ‘And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee.’  

Prayer G: Pour out your Holy Spirit as we bring before you these gifts of your creation; may they be for us the body and blood of your dear Son.  

Like Prayer G, none of the Eucharistic Prayers offered in Common Worship speak of the bread and wine becoming the body and blood of Christ. It is reasonable to expect the published formularies of the Church of England, which were adopted after long consultation and debate, to reflect the mainstream of Anglican theology. Only a naïve reading of the ARCIC documents would lead us to expect anything else. The Catholic Response was right to perceive ambiguity in them.

718 BCP p.258.  
719 Common Worship p.203.
9 Conclusion

This thesis asks whether there is a new context which will allow the Catholic Church to recognise the validity of Anglican Orders? The Bull of Leo XIII on Anglican orders, *Apostolicae curae*, determined that ordinations carried out according to the Anglican Ordinal are null and void. This decision was well founded in Catholic theology. Leo XIII pointed out that the Anglican Ordinal in its original form did not even mention the name of the order being conferred, nor its ‘grace and power’ (n.25). The latter is not a distinct category, but a way of making clear that the order of priest and bishop fully correspond to the Catholic understanding of them. So even though those words are used elsewhere in the rite, or were added to the ordination formulas in 1662, they are in the formal judgement of the Catholic Church, names voided of the reality instituted by Christ (n.31). They were “voided” of that reality, and not merely lacking it, because the Reformers went to great lengths to remove references to consecration and sacrifice from the Ordinal.\(^{720}\) Since this was a judgment on the application of Divine revelation to the history of the Church of England, arrived at after long reflection, not just in 1896 but for centuries before, and since the absolute reordination of former Anglican clergy had always been the practice, then the decision of Leo XIII is a dogmatic fact.\(^{721}\)

---

\(^{720}\) 3.1 *passim*.

\(^{721}\) Chapter 4.

Chapter 9
The Anglican response to the Bull both stands on the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England while insisting that this is identical with Catholic teaching. In fact, the history of the Anglican Formularies shows a determination to reject and contradict what were regarded as the ‘dangerous deceits’ of traditional teaching. The mainstream of Anglican Eucharistic theology deepens the teaching implied (above all) by the Book of Common Prayer that what matters is reception of communion. It is a waste of time to attempt to understand how Christ is present, indeed it can easily be understood as an analogous presence. And just as Christ is present in (quasi-legal) effect, so the Eucharist is a sacrifice in effect, not a proper sacrifice. Theologians within the Church of England did not begin to embrace Catholic ideas in this area until the Tractarian movement. By the time ARCIC began meeting, Anglicanism was receptive to a number of typically Catholic themes. Members of the Anglican Communion were happy to embrace the concept of anamnesis, something which the great Anglican theologians had simply not addressed. ARCIC declared that there was substantial agreement where there could be no disagreement, and hence that there was a new context in which Anglican orders could be recognised. However there was still a reluctance to endorse not only transubstantiation, but even the attempt to discover the nature of

---

722 6.2 passim.
723 6.3 passim.
724 7.1.
725 7.2.1.
726 7.2.2.
727 7.2.3–7.2.4.
728 8.1 passim.
the true change which all parties were willing to accept. Accordingly the Catholic Church could not recognise its own faith in the *Final Report*, nor was it clear that Anglicanism as a whole recognised the same faith in the *Final Report*.

In order to clarify its position, ARCIC relied on a controversial and partisan interpretation of the Anglican formularies. There really was no substantial agreement; *and hence no new context.* Indeed the lack of a substantial agreement was revealed, so far as the Church of England was concerned, by the new liturgical books adopted at the beginning of the third millennium. And yet this historic attempt to heal a breach of more than four centuries has received its reward.

On 25 October 1970, Paul VI canonised the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales. In his homily the Pope looked forward to the reunion of Rome and Canterbury:

> There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and the worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church when the Roman Catholic Church—this humble “Servant of the Servants of God”—is able to embrace her ever beloved Sister in the one authentic communion of the family of Christ: a communion of origin and of faith, a communion of priesthood and of rule, a communion of the Saints in the freedom and love of the Spirit of Jesus.

It is not to be thought that this hope was deceptive. In 2009, by the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*, Benedict XVI established norms for setting up ordinariates for Anglicans entering into full communion.

---

729 8.2 *passim*.
730 8.2.4 *passim*.
731 8.3 *passim*.
communion with the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{733} He encouraged the continued use of the Anglican liturgical books ‘as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared’.\textsuperscript{734} There is even a verbal echo of Paul VI’s promise of the protection of the ‘worthy patrimony of piety’ with a call for a ‘formation in Anglican patrimony’ to be given to seminarians of the Ordinariate.\textsuperscript{735}

Leo XIII is often patronised by commentators for his expectation, or at least hope, that a definitive judgment against the validity of Anglican orders would bring in a wave of converts.\textsuperscript{736} Nevertheless \textit{Angicanorum coetibus} seems to have fulfilled the appeal in \textit{Apostolicae curae} nn.38–39.

\begin{quote}
For Our part We shall continue by every means allowed to us to encourage their reconciliation with the Church, in which both individuals and whole communities, as We ardently hope, may find a model for their imitation.
\end{quote}

The welcome of ‘individuals and whole communities’ is what the Ordinariates have been established to allow.


\textsuperscript{735} \textit{Ibid.} pp.988–989, n. VI §5; translation in \textit{ibid.} p.10.

\textsuperscript{736} Hughes, \textit{Absolutely Null and Utterly Void}, pp.74–76, esp. footnote 35; Russell and Rafferty, ‘St James the Great and Anglican Orders’, p.179.
10 Bibliography

Works of which individual chapters are also given in this bibliography but which were not otherwise cited or relied on in this thesis, and works with alternative authors or titles, are marked *.


Alberigo, Josephus; Dossetti, Josephus; Perikle, Joannes; Leonardi, Claudius; Prodi, Paulus (eds.), Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, third edition, (Bologna: Istitute per le Scienze Religiose, 1973).


Bibliography


Anglican Orders (English), (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1943).

Anglican Orders (Latin), (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1932).


Bibliography
‘Apostolic letters have at last been issued’, *The Times* (London, England),
Saturday 19 September 1896 (Issue 35000), p. 7

*Apostolicae Curae: Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Orders*,


* ARCIC, see also: Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission.


ARCIC, *Authority in the Church: Elucidation (Windsor 1981)*, in:


Bibliography


* ARCIC II, see: Second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission.


Worcester and Archbishop of Canterbury. The Third Portion,


Barrett-Lennard, R. J. S., The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Text for Students, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary,

(Bramcote, Notts: Grove Books Ltd, 1993).


Benham, Edward (ed.), The prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth, 1559, to which are appended some occasional forms of prayer issued in her reign printed from the originals in the British Museum, and other Public Libraries, (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1909).


Benedictus Pp. XVI, ‘Constitutio Apostolica Anglicanorum coetibus qua Personales Ordinariatus pro Anglicanis conduntur qui plenam

Bibliography
Bibliography


The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches and the form or manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).


Brown, Andrew J., Robert Ferrar, Yorkshire Monk, Reformation Bishop, and Martyr in Wales (c. 1500-1555), (London: Inscriptor Imprints, 1997).


Bibliography
Bibliography


Bibliography
Bibliography

Church Association, Council of, *Some Criticisms by the Council of the Church Association on the “Answer” to Pope Leo made by Archbishops Maclagan and Temple*, (London: Church Association, 1897).


* Clark, Francis. See also: *Apostolicae Curae: Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Orders*, J. D. Smith (trans.) & Francis Clark (rev.).


*Codex Iuris Canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus: Benedicti Papae XV Auctoritate Promulgatus: Praefatione, Fontium Annotatione et Indice Analytico-Alphabetico ab Emo Petro*


Bibliography
Bibliography


_The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical (Made in the year 1603, and amended in 1865;) to which are added the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England_, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1900).

Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin ... Volume the Fifth, pp.1–176


Cosin, John, Particulars to be considered, explained and corrected in the Book of Common Prayer in: The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin ... Volume the Fifth, pp.502-525.


Bibliography


*The Documents of Vatican II: with notes and Index*, (Vatican Translation), (Strathfield, NSW: St Pauls Publications, 2009).


Firminger, Walter K., *The Alterations in the Ordinal of 1662: Why were they made?*, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1898).


Bibliography
Gibson, E. C. S. (ed.), The first and second prayer books of Edward VI


Hardwick, Charles, A History of the Articles of Religion: to which is added a series of documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615; together with

Bibliography
illustrations from contemporary sources, third edition revised by

Francis Procter, (London: George Bell & Sons, 1876).

Hatchett, Marion J., ‘The Colonies and States of America’, in: Charles
Heftling & Cynthia Shattuck (eds), The Oxford Guide to The

Hatchett, Marion J., ‘Prayer Books’, in Stephen Sykes, John Booty,

Heftling & Cynthia Shattuck (eds), The Oxford Guide to The

* Heftling, Charles & Shattuck, Cynthia (eds), The Oxford Guide to The
University Press, 2006).

Hill, Christopher, ‘The Utrecht Connection’, The Tablet, Vol.248 No. 8022
(7 May 1994), 577–578.

Hill, Christopher, ‘The Fundamental Question of Ecumenical Method’ in:
Christopher Hill & Edward Yarnold (eds.), Anglicans and
Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity, 222–236.

Hill, Christopher, ‘Summary’ in: Christopher Hill & Edward Yarnold (eds.),
Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity, 335–338.

Hill, Christopher, ‘Anglican Orders: An Ecumenical Context’ in: R.
William Franklin, (ed.), Anglican Orders: Essays on the


House of Bishops of the Church of England, *May They All Be One: A Response of the House of Bishops of the Church of England to Bibliography*


Jewel John, ‘Challenge Sermon Preached at Paul’s Cross’ (1559) in:


John Paul II, ‘Apostolic Letter Laetamur magnopere in which the Latin typical edition of the Catechism of the Catholic Church is
approved and promulgated’ [15 August 1997], in *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, pp.xiii–xvi.


Laud, William, *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit*, by
the command of King James, of ever blessed memory. With An
Answer to Such Exceptions as A. C. Takes Against It, (London:
Richard Badger, 1639) in: The Works of the Most Reverend
Father in God, William Laud, D. D. sometime Lord Archbishop
of Canterbury Vol. II. Conference with Fisher, (Oxford: John
Henry Parker, 1849).

Leeming, Bernard, Principles of Sacramental Theology, second edition with

Leo Pp. XIII, ‘Litterae Apostolicae Deus Omnipotens quibus confirmatur
iudicium ab Archiepiscopo Compostellano latum super
identitate corporis S. Iacobi M. Apostoli, et ss. Athanasii et
Theodori discipulorum eius’ [1 November 1884], Acta Sanctae
Sedis, Vol. 17 (1884) 262–270.

Leo Pp. XIII, ‘Litterae Apostolicae Apostolicae curae de ordinationibus
Anglicanis’ [13 September 1896], Acta Sanctae Sedis, Vol. 29

Leo Pp. XIII, ‘Litterae Apostolicae Apostolicae curae de ordinationibus
Anglicanis’ [13 September 1896], Sanctissimi Domini Nostri
Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutiones,
Aliaque Acta Praecipua, vol. VI (1894–1897), (Bruges:
Desclée, de Brouwer & co., 1900), 198–210.

scriptores Ephemeridis Revue anglo-romaine’ [5 November

Bibliography


**Bibliography**


Bibliography
churchservicesociety.org/journals/volume-09-1936-37/reviews,

(accessed 9 July 2014)


Messenger, Ernest C., The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood : A Documented History with Special Reference to the Question of Anglican Orders : volume I : The Revolt from the Medieval Church, (London: Longmans, Green and co., 1936).


Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera*  
*Omnia, post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem,*  
castigata denuo ad manuscriptos codices Gallicos, Vaticanos,  
Belgicos, etc. necnon ad editiones antiquiores et castigatores,  
*opera et studio Monachorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti e*  

Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera*  
*Omnia, post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem,*  
castigata denuo ad manuscriptos codices Gallicos, Vaticanos,  
Belgicos, etc. necnon ad editiones antiquiores et castigatores,  
*opera et studio Monachorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti e*  

Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera*  
*Omnia, post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem,*  
castigata denuo ad manuscriptos codices Gallicos, Vaticanos,  
Belgicos, etc. necnon ad editiones antiquiores et castigatores,  
*opera et studio Monachorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti e*  

Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Ὅριγένους τα Εὐρισκόμενα Πάντα. Origenis Opera*  
*Omnia, ex variis editionibus et codicibus manu exaratis,*  
*Gallicis, Italicis, Germanicis et Anglicis collecta, atque*  
adnotationibus illustrata, cum copiosis indicibus, vita auctoris

Bibliography
et multis dissertationibus, opera et studio Dd. Caroli et
Vincentii Delarue, Presbyterorum et monachorum
Benedictinorum e congregacione S. Mauri, volume two,


Milton, Anthony, ‘Cosin, John (1595–1672)’, Oxford Dictionary of
www.oxforddnb.com.ipacez.nd.edu.au/view/article/6372,
accessed 10 July 2014].

Miralles, Antonio, ‘A New “Response” of the Congregation for the Doctrine
of the Faith: validity of Baptism’, L’Osservatore Romano
(Weekly English Edition), Wednesday 5 March 2008, No. 10 for

Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum S.
Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editum Clementis VIII. Urbani
VIII. Et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum, (Mechelin: H.
Dessain, 1900).

Neil, Charles & Willoughby, J. M. (eds.), The Tutorial Prayer Book for the
teacher, the student, and the general reader, (London: Church

a Selection from Tracts for the Times, pp.6–11.

Newman, John Henry, Anglican Difficulties, with an Introduction and notes
by Stanley L. Jaki, (Pinckney, Michigan: Real View Books,
2004).

Bibliography


* Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester.*

Bibliography
Published by His Majesty’s Special Command, Vol. III, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841).

*Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by His Majesty’s Special Command, Vol. V, (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865).

Opuscula Quaedam Posthuma Lanceloti Andrewes Episcopi Wintoniensis,
(Oxonii: Johannes Henricus Parker, 1852).


Bibliography


Prideaux, Humphrey, *The validity of the orders of the Church of England, : made out against the objections of the papists, in several letters*
to a gentleman of Norwich, that desired satisfaction therein,

(London: John Richardson for Brabazon Aylmer, 1688).


Ruddy, Christopher: Review, ‘John Jay Hughes, No Ordinary Fool: A Testimony to Grace, (Mustang, Okla.: Tate Publishing &


Bibliography
Bibliography


*Some Criticisms by the Council of the Church Association on the ‘Answer’ to Pope Leo made by Archbishops Maclagan and Temple,* (London: Church Association, 1897).


*The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas: Third Part (Supplement) (Qq. XXXIV—LXVIII): Literally Translated by Fathers of the*
Bibliography


_Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi M. De Ligorio fundatoris Congregationis Ss. Redemptoris ac olim episcopi S. Agatae Gothorum cui accedit dissertatio P. Zachariae et decreta Romanorum Pontificum morum materia respicientia editio omnium accuratior continens quidquid auctor in caeteris addidit reformavit vel explicavit_,
two volumes, (Augustinae Taurinorum: ex typis Hyacinthi Marietti, 1870).


Bibliography


Wordsworth, John, ‘Archbishop Temple and the *Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Papae*’

Bibliography
Bibliography


Bibliography


