

It is necessary to make this protest against the publication of *Born Catholics*, because, while not being an important book, it is likely to be widely read. It will certainly be easily read, and its parts are interesting not only as personal records but as bearing witness to the diversity in unity which is the Catholic Church.

STANISLAUS PARKER, O.P.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Gerard Culkin. (Paternoster Publications; 6s.)

Father Culkin's small book is that of a scholar, but it is not written for scholars. It is in fact a concise summary of Reformation history from Henry VIII to Elizabeth packed into a hundred-odd pages; a book for students new to the subject apart from history text-book reading, for instruction of converts and for sixth forms, with plenty of reference for further reading. As such it is excellently done. It is free from partisanship and sneers, though certainly not impartial in any colourless sense, or uncommitted. Father Culkin is prepared when necessary to call a spade a spade. Of course, owing to limitation of space some statements seem rather stark and without the kind of qualification that deeper and more extensive treatment would have made; this however is not an adverse criticism. What he says is generally an incentive to further study.

One statement nevertheless does seem to be in need of clarification. On page 54 Father Culkin says: 'It may well be that the form used in the Ordinal (of Edward VI's second Prayer Book, 1552) would be sufficient for a valid ordination if the bishop using that form intended to ordain according to the mind of the Church'. The words 'using that form' in this sentence will be taken to mean 'using the rite in which that form occurs', since the sacramental form in ordination is never isolated from the rite which contains it. Moreover the introduction, at this point, of the ministerial intention of the bishop increases the ambiguity by seeming to imply that valid intention *of this kind* can render the intention *inherent in the form* valid. The result of the ambiguity will be that, read in this natural and obvious way, the sentence will be taken to mean that a validly consecrated bishop might well himself be validly ordaining when using the Anglican Ordinal; it would entail the possibility that in 1559 Bishop Barlow validly consecrated Archbishop Parker in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, and that in consequence Anglican Orders are not certainly null and void as Leo XIII declared in *Apostolicae Curae*, but possibly valid.

In that famous Bull the Pope, excluding from consideration the internal ministerial intention required in every sacrament, concentrated his whole argument upon the sacramental *form* in ordination, in so far

as it expresses externally what is intended to be done by the rite which contains it. The *form* in the Anglican Ordinal is declared inherently defective and incapable of conferring Catholic orders because of the meaning implicit in the words which express its purpose. The sense of these words is determined by the whole heretical context of the new Ordinal; the changes made in the old rites, from which in part it derived, being evidence of a change of intention concerning what was to be done. Ministers called bishops and priests were indeed to be made by it, but not bishops and priests in the sense in which the Catholic Church understands those words.

The ambiguity of this single sentence of Fr Culkin's would be resolved if it were emended by substituting for the words 'if the Bishop using that form intended to ordain according to the mind of the Church', the words of *Apostolicae Curae* itself, 'if it were contained in a Catholic rite approved by the Church', and its sense thereby determined.

HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.

A HISTORY OF THE CRUSADES; Volume III: The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades. By Steven Runciman. (Cambridge University Press; 35s.)

With this third volume Mr Steven Runciman has brought his masterly story of the Crusades to an end. In his concluding pages he permits himself a departure from his normal objectivity and indulges in some general considerations on the whole of the epoch he has pursued. 'The Holy War itself', he says, 'was nothing more than a long act of intolerance in the name of God, which is the sin against the Holy Ghost.' It is a pity that so intelligent an historian should fall into this old logical trap and, in Dr Johnson's words, become 'a bigot for laxity'.

Apart from this, there is little to be said against Mr Runciman's conclusions and nothing whatever against his presentation of the facts. Indeed, this will surely remain for long the standard and classic of Crusading histories. He rightly emphasizes the military stupidity of the Crusaders which led them into defeat from precisely the same causes, from the first Crusade to the last, over a period of centuries. He seems, on the other hand, to underrate the Latin Kingdom of Acre as an early manifestation of the ability of East and West to live harmoniously together and the whole Crusading movement as an astonishing revelation of the innate dynamism of the West. It is interesting to contrast the impotence of the Latin world in the year 1000 with the shocking aggressiveness of the Fourth Crusade in 1204.

As in his two earlier volumes, Mr Runciman has laid his detail in the centre of a broad canvas which stretches from the Great Wall of China