

THE  
CRITICAL REVIEW

OF

THEOLOGICAL & PHILOSOPHICAL  
LITERATURE

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., F.E.I.S.

VOL. VII.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1897.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LETTER APOSTOLIC OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII. CONCERNING ANGLICAN ORDERS	
ANSWER OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF ENG- LAND TO THE APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII. ON ENGLISH ORDI- NATION	By Professor C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York, . 387
HARNACK'S GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRIST- LICHEN LITTERATUR BIS EUSEBIUS	By Professor S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., Aberdeen, . . . . . 394
SETH'S MAN'S PLACE IN THE COSMOS, AND OTHER ESSAYS	By Rev. Principal CAVE, D.D., Hackney College, London, . . . . . 402
HOMMEL'S DIE ALTISRAELITISCHE UEBERLIEFERUNG IN INSCHRIFT- LICHER BELEUCHTUNG	By Professor A. A. BEVAN, M.A., Cam- bridge, . . . . . 406
DOUGLAS'S THE ETHICS OF JOHN STUART MILL	By Professor JAMES IVERACH, D.D., Aberdeen, . . . . . 415
BUCHNER'S A STUDY OF THE PSYCH- OLOGY OF KANT WITH REFERENCE TO THE CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY	By Professor JAMES IVERACH, D.D., Aberdeen, . . . . . 417
BUDDE'S DAS BUCH HIOB	By Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh, . . . . . 421
M'CURDY'S HISTORY, PROPHECY AND THE MONUMENTS	By Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh, . . . . . 430
GIFFORD'S THE INCARNATION	By Rev. F. B. AMBROSE WILLIAMS, B.A., Oxon., Richmond, . . . . . 432
BOVON'S DOGMATIQUE CHRÉTIENNE	By Rev. WILLIAM JOHNSTON, M.A., . . . . . 436
ARNOLD'S THE PREACHING OF ISLAM	By Rev. JOHN ROBSON, D.D., Aberdeen, . . . . . 444
WEGENER'S A. RITSCHL'S IDEE DES REICHES GOTTES IM LICHTE DER GESCHICHTE	By Rev. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc., Callander, . . . . . 446
COMMUNICATION ON THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF I. PETER	By Rev. FRED. J. BRIGGS, Ivybridge, S. Devon, . . . . . 449
ADAMNAN'S PROPHECIES, MIRACLES AND VISIONS OF ST COLUMBA	
MAGREGOR'S SAINT COLUMBA	
MASON'S THE MISSION OF ST AUGUS- TINE TO ENGLAND	By Rev. C. G. M'CRIE, D.D., Ayr, . . . . . 455
DALMAN'S ARAMÄISCHE DIALEKTPRO- BEN	By Professor GEO. G. CAMERON, D.D., Aberdeen, . . . . . 457
SOMERVILLE'S ST PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRIST	By Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D., Edinburgh, . . . . . 458

**Letter Apostolic of His Holiness Leo XIII., by Divine Providence Pope, concerning Anglican Orders.**

*Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Leonis Divina Providentia Papae XIII., Litterae Apostolicae de Ordinationibus Anglicanis.* London: Burns & Oates, 1896. 8vo, pp. 49. Price 6d.

**Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on English Ordination, Addressed to the whole Body of Bishops of the Catholic Church.**

London: Longmans, 1897. 8vo, sewed, pp. 48. Latin Version, 1s. French Version, 1s.

THESE two official documents are of great importance for the present and the future relations of the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Communion. The decision of the Pope is adverse to the validity of Anglican orders, and the Anglican Archbishops maintain their validity. From this point of view it seems as if an insuperable obstacle to reunion had been reached. Yet a more careful study of these documents makes it evident that a very great advance towards reunion has been made and a door to further opportunities is still open.

1. It is a decided gain that the Pope has narrowed the range of the discussion and concentrated it in his statement that "in pronouncing the decision in the Gordon case in 1704 weight was given to no other reason than the *defect of form and intention*"; and the Pope limits his re-examination of the case to these two points. Thus an immense amount of irrelevant material is swept out of the field of discussion for all future time.

2. A further gain is in the position taken by the Anglican Archbishops when they say: "We acknowledge therefore, with the Pope that laying on of hands is the matter of ordination; we acknowledge that the form is prayer or blessing appropriate to the ministry to be conferred; we acknowledge that the intention of the Church, as far as it is externally manifested, is to be ascertained, so that we may discern if it agrees with the mind of the Lord and His Apostles and with the Statutes of the Universal Church." This still further limits the range of difference to the questions, what constitutes valid form and intention in ordination, and

whether the Anglican form and intention are so defective as to render ordination invalid.

3. The question is in part an historical question, and is to be decided on matters of fact by historical evidence. The Pope re-opened the case which had been decided in 1704, and reviewed the evidence with the help of twelve judges, "whose opinions in the matter were known to be divergent." They had access to "all documents bearing on this question which were known to exist in the Vatican archives," and had authority "to search for new ones, and even to have at their disposal all acts relating to this subject which are adduced by learned men on both sides." There can be no reasonable doubt that the case was considered in a careful, calm and judicial manner. It was unanimously decided on the evidence before the court, and then after further deliberation this decision was ratified by the Pope. And yet the Pope's decision cannot be accepted by the Christian world as final. The best words in the Answer of the Anglican Archbishops are those in which they challenge the evidence and demand its publication. "Therefore all those documents ought to be made public if the matter is to be put on a fair footing for judgment." "The documents are preserved in the keeping of the holy Office and ought to be published if the interest of historical truth is to be consulted."

There is no reason to doubt the goodwill of the present Pope—his intent to give the case a careful, honest, and upright consideration and to make an equitable final decision. But the Anglican Archbishops contest the accuracy of the evidence and its sufficiency. How could the Pope be certain that all his evidence was accurate and that all the evidence was before him? It is quite possible that the Anglican Archbishops might invalidate some of the evidence, and that they might present valuable counter-evidence from the archives of Great Britain if they had the opportunity. This demand for the publication of the evidence is a righteous demand. There is no valid reason why the Pope should not comply with it. It is greatly to be desired that he should, in the interest of historical truth, and for the vindication before the world of his own decision. Then if the evidence can be impeached, the Anglicans must do it; if they have other evidence they must adduce it. Then the Pope may be justified in re-opening the case. He must do so, according to Canon Law, if a sufficient amount of new evidence is presented to materially alter the case. He would doubtless do so gladly under any such circumstances. At present the Anglican Bishops have the advantage of the discussion at this point, and they will retain this advantage until the Pope yields to their reasonable request and publishes his evidence. Then it is altogether probable that the advantage will pass over to the papal side; for it is im-

probable that any evidence of importance can be produced which has not already been duly considered by the papal courts. The historical question after all is simply this, whether the form of ordination in the Edwardine Ordinal was valid. As the Pope says, "the judgment of the Pontiff applies universally to all Anglican ordinations, because, although it refers to a particular case (that of Gordon) it is not based upon any reason special to that case, but upon the *defect of form*, which defect equally affects all these ordinations." The defect, according to the Roman opinion, is a defect in the Ordinal itself and not in any particular thing in the ordination of Gordon. This is sound reasoning. Unless the Archbishops can show that the Edwardine Ordinal contains a valid form of ordination, they have no case. The Pope well says :

"The words, which, until recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination, namely, '*Received the Holy Ghost*,' certainly do not in the least definitely express the grand order of priesthood or its grace and power. . . . This form had, indeed, afterwards added to it the words, '*for the office and work of a priest*,' etc., but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form was defective and inadequate. But, even if this addition could give to the form its due significance, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal ; for as the Hierarchy had become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining." The Anglican Archbishops seek to avoid this powerful argumentation in this way ; they say : "This form, then, whether contained in one sentence as in the Roman Church, or in two as in ours, is amply sufficient to create a Bishop, if the true intention be openly declared, which is done in other prayers and suffrages (which clearly refer to the office, work and ministry of a Bishop), in the examination, and other like ways." But this argument was anticipated by the Pope when he says : "In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show these (prayers) to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all : from them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and offices of the priesthood in the Catholic rite." In other words, the plea that "true intention" is expressed in other parts of the services is overcome by the contention that that intention itself is void of the essential significance of priesthood. Thus the whole question rests, according to the Anglican Archbishops, on the "true intention" of the other parts of the ordination service.

(4.) The essential question in debate is thus evidently that of *intention*. Here, again, we need not go further than the Edwardine

Ordinal. As the Pope says: "The history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church, as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects, and as to the end they had in view—under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted in many ways the liturgical order to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason in the whole Ordinal, not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood, and of the powers of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but, as we have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. In this way the native character, or spirit, as it is called, of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself. Hence, if vitiated in its origin, it was wholly insufficient to confer orders."

How do the Bishops meet this strong argument? It would have been their glory if they had said, Yes, it is true the Anglican Church took part in the Reformation. It became thereby a National Reformed Church. It removed all these Roman errors from the Liturgy. It was not the intention of the Reformers to ordain priests to offer sacrifices. But instead of this, the Anglican Archbishops try to maintain the validity of the intention of the Ordinal. They urge that the intent of the Edwardine Ordinal was to ordain priests to offer sacrifices. "We confidently assert that our Ordinal, particularly in this last point, is superior to the Roman Pontifical in various ways, inasmuch as it expresses more clearly and faithfully these things which, by Christ's institution belong to the nature of priesthood and the effect of the Catholic rites used in the Universal Church." Again: "For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice." This, then, is the priesthood and sacrifice which the Anglican Archbishops find in the intention of the Edwardine Ordinal.

(a) The first thing to be considered is whether the Anglican Archbishops have correctly interpreted the intention of the Edwardine Ordinal. This is an historical question, which can only be determined by the Ordinal itself, in the circumstances of its composition and use, and in the opinions of its authors and users.

The Anglican Archbishops are not competent witnesses for the reign of Edward the Sixth; they must present historical evidence from that reign. They do not, in their Answer, overcome the Pope's statements as to the "animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church," and the deliberate removal from the prayers of the Catholic rite, which they retained, of every trace of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood and of the powers of consecrating and offering sacrifice. The Archbishops are weak in their Answer at this essential point. It is of great importance that it should be made very clear by indisputable evidence whether the Edwardine Ordinal was intended to ordain priests to offer sacrifices, and if so, in what sense of priest and sacrifice.

(b) The Archbishops wisely say: "Too precise definitions of the manner of the sacrifice, or of the relation which unites the sacrifice of the eternal Priest and the sacrifice of the Church, which in some way certainly are one, ought in our opinion to be avoided rather than pressed into prominence." All who have at heart the Reunion of Christendom must sympathise with these words. At the same time, it is necessary that there should be a definition of priesthood and of sacrifice, which shall be at once historic and intelligible. If we recognise that priest and sacrifice may be used in various significations, we should seek a definition sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all these legitimate significations. That is the pathway to Reunion. The first question which emerges here is whether the terms priest and sacrifice are used by the Anglican Archbishops in their Answer in a legitimate sense. It is not sufficient to show that the sense given to these terms by the Archbishops is well known in the Church of England at this time, or that it has been a common Anglican opinion since the Reformation; no sense of priest or sacrifice can be legitimate which does not rest upon Biblical and Catholic usage. This is recognised by the Archbishops, as we understand them. They "confidently assert" that "our Ordinal, particularly in this last point, is superior to the Roman Pontifical in various ways, inasmuch as it expresses more clearly and faithfully those things which by Christ's institution belong to the nature of the priesthood and the effect of the Catholic rites used in the Universal Church." But it was not sufficient for the Archbishops to "confidently assert" this. They were called upon to prove it by indubitable evidence; for it is not evident in itself, and has not been recognised as yet by Roman Catholics, or indeed, so far as we know, by any but Anglicans, and not even by all Anglicans. We may be permitted to doubt whether the Archbishops would find it easy to prove their confident assertion to the minds of theologians of other Churches. In their Answer it is doubtful whether they have carried conviction of it to anyone but themselves.

(c) If, now, we should admit that the Archbishops are correct in their interpretation of the intent of the Edwardine Ordinal, and that the Anglican Ordinal is more faithful to the Biblical and Catholic conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice than the Roman Pontifical, there would still remain the question whether it is possible to reconcile the Roman conception of priesthood and sacrifice with the Anglican. This, after all, is the greatest question for the Pope and for the Anglican Bishops. The Roman doctrine is definite. It is open to the objection that it is "too precise." It has, however, this advantage in the question under consideration, that it was the doctrine of the Church of England before the Reformation, and it was deliberately rejected by the Church of England at the Reformation, and another doctrine—less precise and less definite—was eventually substituted for it. There can be no doubt that a serious change was made in the intention of the Church of England in the matter of ordination. It was a deliberate rejection of the pre-Reformation intention, and it was the substitution of a new intention, which may have been truer to the intention of the original institution and of the ancient Catholic Church, but which certainly was not the intention of the Church of England for centuries before the Reformation. The Pope makes a great deal of this. The Anglican Archbishops slip easily over it. It is not difficult for the Anglicans to recognise the intention of the Roman ordination as valid, for the reason that there can be no doubt whatever as to the form and intent of the ordination. It is "too precise," but it includes all that the Anglicans regard as essential. It is very different with the Roman Catholics. The Edwardine Ordinal had no intention of ordaining priests to offer the sacrifice of the Mass; but the Anglicans of the time deliberately rejected all that Roman Catholics regarded as essential to priesthood and sacrifice. The Anglican priest has not been ordained to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. He cannot offer that sacrifice unless he is ordained with the intention to offer it. He must be ordained with that intention, if he has not been ordained with that intention before. All that the Anglican Archbishops urge as to the Anglican conceptions of priest and sacrifice amount to little, because they are so essentially different from the Roman that they are incapable of reconciliation. From this point of view, it is difficult to see how the Pope could have made any other decision than he has made. There is no real priesthood and no real sacrifice in the Anglican communion which Rome can recognise.

(d) A still higher question remains, and that is of vast importance for the whole Christian world—namely, whether it may not be possible to comprehend the Roman conception of priesthood and sacrifice with the Anglican conception, and all other conceptions, in



some more comprehensive conception. Such a comprehensive conception has not yet been conceived, but it is possible that the time may come, in a new Reformation of the Church, when it may be conceived and commonly accepted as the solution of all the great problems which centre about that most essential institution of our holy religion, the Holy Communion in the Body and Blood of our Lord. It is a distinct gain that the attention of the world is again called to this supreme question, and that the question of sacrifice is made the central one in connection with the Reunion of Christendom. Theologians of all Christian communions should give it more profound consideration in mutual charity and Christian love, seeking to contribute to that solution of all our difficulties which in the order of Providence, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, will at last be made.

(5.) This question in debate between the Pope and the Anglican Archbishops is of interest to all Christian communions. Many Anglicans have been too arrogant in their claims as to the validity and superiority of their ordination over ordination in other Protestant communions. They will doubtless continue to set a high value upon their ordination. But they have received another and a very wholesome lesson, that in the eyes of all the rest of the Christian world, the ordination of the Church of England is of no more validity than that of the other national Churches of the Reformation. The other national Churches base their ecclesiastical right upon an appeal from the Pope to Jesus Christ. The Anglican Reformers agreed with the other Reformers in this particular. It would be wholesome if the Church of England would return to the principles of its own Reformers. Protestant orders all rest firmly on the ground of the right of reformation and revolution. History justifies that right. When the time of the greater Reformation comes, the Roman Church will recognise the right of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and then, and then only, will the mutual recognition of orders take place in a reunited and reconstructed Christianity.

C. A. BRIGGS.

---