

but there are many others, and I fear I must apologise to the house for being unprepared, not having anticipated that this matter would be brought forward. But I will state this one. Supposing the bishop to agree to ordain a man to the Diaconate for a period of seven years, the bishop requires that the nominating priest shall engage to maintain him during those seven years. I know that from my own experience, and it is quite right that the bishop should do so, because we perfectly well understand what the law of the case is on that subject as regards the bishop himself. Now, would not that be a great hindrance to us, in addition to the pecuniary hindrances which I have already spoken of? Will it not also be a great further hindrance to us in regard to nominating such persons to any great extent, if we are to be obliged to pledge ourselves that for the whole period of that term in which the man pledges himself to serve in the Diaconate we will provide for his maintenance? Shall we not feel that it is a greater responsibility than we are able to undertake? Then a further difficulty appears, to arise from there being, as it were, two classes or orders of the same order. You must have, according to this scheme, one class of men of inferior education and of inferior condition of life, while at the same time you will have other younger men educated as clergymen now are, and as I most sincerely hope the clergy will long continue to be—for we cannot too strongly feel the vast importance of having a learned clergy—you must have another class of men younger than themselves, ordained one year to the Diaconate, and the next year to the priesthood, and settling down to their avocations, and not precluded from arriving at any office in their sacred order. Will not that of itself have a tendency to produce some dissatisfaction in the minds of these persons, who will say, and truly say, "We are deacons like you: why should you younger men, not better men, why should you, because you have been able to afford an University education, and are therefore able to pass a more learned examination, be put over our heads, and we be condemned to toil on in this humiliating condition from which you are exempt?" It seems to me that that would also present a very great difficulty indeed. Nevertheless, I beg to say that the other plan which has been contemplated by no means supersedes the practice, if the bishop should find, from examination of all the circumstances, that it is expedient and advisable to adopt it, and if the clergymen should in individual cases be disposed to pledge themselves to that effect—by no means supersedes the plan of admitting some such persons, with a less degree of learning, to the order of the Diaconate. The two plans are not inconsistent with each other. The latter might be adopted; only what I say is that that is not of itself sufficient, and that we shall never be able in that way fully to meet the wants which press upon us. I have been told, indeed, that some of these difficulties might be removed by legislation. It may be so. A law might be made by which it might be provided that Deacons so ordained shall no longer bear the title of "reverend," but should be called simply deacons. I really do not see how such a law could be passed, because the appellation of "reverend" is no title at all. There is no act of parliament which gives it, and therefore how can you have an act of parliament to say that some persons shall bear it and some shall not bear it? Then, again, it is said it might be proposed that such persons should be allowed to continue to follow a trade or some secular calling. Well, I feel at the best this is talking of that which is not within our own competency. We are not legislators, we cannot make the law, and according to that which I began

by saying—that we should consider what is best under existing circumstances, and not that which is absolutely best—it would seem to me to be speculating on some alteration of the law which it is doubtful if we should get, and if we should get, it is very doubtful whether we should approve of; because, supposing such a law were to be passed, you would still have two classes of deacons—a class of deacons allowed to follow secular callings, and a class not allowed to follow secular callings. How could you have a law to that effect? With our existing agencies, therefore, it is acknowledged that we are unable to grapple with the wants of the country, but let us inquire whether, consistently with the practice of the primitive church, and with the consent of the bishops, and by their co-operation, it may not be within our competency to resuscitate and call back other inferior agencies that formerly existed in the church. And in taking that question into consideration, I have to bring before your notice two circumstances—first, that the existence of a class of men somewhat similar to that which we now seek to employ is not unknown to this Reformed Church, but that they were for a short time called into operation by the bishops immediately after the accession of Queen Elizabeth—a proceeding which had the authority at that time of Archbishop Parker and of his fellow-bishops, which authority, with the rules that were prescribed to them on that occasion, is recorded in Archbishop Parker's manuscript existing in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and partially printed by Strype. Now, it is quite true that the object with which those orders, as they were called, were received was not absolutely that which we now require, but yet it does not appear to me therefore to follow that they were not the same class of persons, that they were not in fact the same order, one, so to speak, of the minor orders of the Christian Church; and if so, we might surely make use of them for a less purely ministerial office than that for which Archbishop Parker and his Suffragans were willing to use them. Archbishop Parker's plan was that such persons, receiving a direct appointment from the bishop, should be employed for almost all purposes of divine worship, to supply the scarcity of ministers that then existed in the church. We know that during the reign of Edward VI.—it is mentioned by the historian Hume—such were the great and grievous wants of the church with regard to ministers, such was the poverty of the clergy, that "many of the clergy turned carpenters and other tradesmen, and some kept alehouses:" that was immediately after the suppression of the monasteries and the withdrawal to a great degree of the resources of the vicars. It was in order to obviate that difficulty that—as appears from Archbishop Parker's manuscript, but does not appear in Strype, as I recollect—that the first decision of the bishops, when they met, was that they should endeavour to obtain, if possible, the restoration of the impropriate tithes. That was their first endeavour: but finding that hopeless, they resorted to this resource of appointing certain laymen, by direct episcopal authority, to exercise certain functions within those churches which were vacant, and were so poorly endowed that no clergymen could be found to fulfil their ministrations within them. Perhaps I may be permitted just to call attention to the rules that were given to these persons, and I cannot take up this paper without being reminded of one whose removal from among us we must all deeply regret—I mean the late Archdeacon Hardwick. It was from his kindness that I received extracts from the manuscript of Archbishop Parker, giving the following rules to be observed by this order of the clergy.—

"MSS. C.C.C.C. (Synodal). Imprimis.—I shall not preach nor interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority.

"I shall read divine service appointed plainly, distinctly and audibly, that all the people may hear and understand.

"I shall not minister the sacrament, or other public rites of the church, but bury the dead, and purify women after their childbirth.

"I shall keep the register-book according to the injunctions.

"I shall use sobriety in apparel, and especially in the church at common prayer.

"I shall move men to quiet and concord, and not give them cause of offence.

"I shall bring in to my Ordinary, testimony of my behaviour from the honest of the parish where I dwell, within one half-year next following.

"I shall give place upon convenient warning, so thought by the Ordinary, if any learned minister shall be placed there at the suit of the patron of the parish."

I need go no farther, but those were the objects for which this class were appointed. It is true that to these appointments there were some objections afterwards, to which Strype refers, but the objections were that the people were dissatisfied with having unlearned persons to perform all the functions of the ministry, and that, of course, we should not for a moment think of proposing. It would be only proposed, as far as any notion that I have been able to form on the subject, that such persons should be employed in some subsidiary capacity. That is sufficient to show that the existence of such an order is not altogether new to the Church of England. Let us go a little further, to see whether it is now to the church at large, and what degree of primitive authority there is for such an appointment. It is true that we cannot trace it in the New Testament, but we may trace it to very early times indeed. We can trace it as far back as the Council of Carthage, and it is spoken of in the Apostolic canons; and, in speaking of the Apostolic canons, I may say that we have the authority of Bishop Beveridge, who says they were drawn up in the second or third century. His words are—

"Nullus tamen dubito, quin a viris Apostolicis, hoc est, secundo labente et incunte tertio a Christi nativitate seculo constituti passim deinceps innotuerint."

In fact, the expression seems to intimate that he thought they might have been earlier (the Greek name is *ἀναγιγνώσκαι*). Then these Apostolic canons say of this order of Readers—

"Sed neque reliquos Clericos Baptismum conferre volumus; veluti Lectores, aut Psalteres aut Janitores aut Ministros. Qui autem id presumpserint, Coritarum panes ferent. Non etiam potestatem damus Presbyteris, ordinandi Diaconos, vel Diaconissas, vel Lectores, vel Ministros, vel Cantores, vel Janitores. sed Episcopis solis. Hic enim est Ecclesiasticus ordo, et consensus."

That is sufficient to show the existence of such an office at that time. Then another of these Apostolic canons says—

"Istis qui cum essent catholici, ad Clerum promoti sunt, jubemus, ut soli Lectores et Cantores, si velint, uxores ducant."

That in according to the well-known usage of the Greek Church, that those who became clergy might marry before they were ordained, but restricting the marrying, except to the lower orders, afterwards. Then, again, St. Cyprian. I have not got the original quotation by me, but it is given by Bingham (page 27, First Edition), who speaks of them as an order, and he refers to Socrates and Sozomen, the former especially, and says that this office was sometimes filled by persons of the highest dignity, being laymen. And here