

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPIATE.

The minds of certain persons in Capetown have apparently been very much disturbed by an address delivered by Father Osborne, in the Cathedral. It is but just to the preacher to remember that he did not correct the notes of his address which were made public, and that the newspaper reports may have conveyed his meaning in a way which he would have modified and altered if he had intended his address to be published. Be this as it may, we will accept his address in the form in which it was published, in commenting upon it.

We agree in the main with the criticism of a letter from a clergyman in the Cape Diocese, which will be found elsewhere in our columns.

We think that the preacher taught the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession of an Historic Episcopate in a somewhat crude and harsh manner. We regret that he did not make more definite mention of the graces and gifts of the Spirit of God, which are found in non-episcopal communions. In Canon Liddon's well-known sermon on the same subject we find the most broad-minded charity and the fullest acknowledgment of these gifts and graces. In a sermon by Cardinal Manning, preached in his Tractarian days, upon the rejoicing of S. Paul that "Christ was preached in every way," we find the freest and frankest admission of the good works which God has wrought by means of these non-episcopal communions. We wish Father Osborne had been as broad and tolerant as Manning and Liddon. Our sorrow that he was not equally wise in his utterances as these great men we have cited must not blind us to the fact that he undoubtedly set forth certain truths which all loyal Anglicans must admit. He states plainly the historic fact that our Bishops derive their Commission *by the direct and undoubted succession from the Apostles of our Lord*. He also stated in other words the truth proclaimed by one of the first scholars in Europe, the late Bishop Lightfoot of Durham, that the Episcopate is the "historic backbone of the Church." If it were not so believed that our Lord intended that the three-fold Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons should be the only true and valid form of ministry in His Church, we Anglicans should be committing an enormous sin against Christian unity in defending and asserting the Divine right of Episcopacy as we do.

If the Historic Episcopate is to us only an ancient and convenient form of Church Government, let us do away with it *at once*, sooner than allow it to form any longer a barrier between us and our non-episcopal brethren. If Church Government is merely a matter of *arrangement and convenience*, and if every community of Christians is free to adopt any form of Church government that it pleases, as the late Dr. Hatch thought, then the attitude of the English Church with regard to Episcopacy is as unreasonable as the Roman theory of Papal Infallibility.

It is true that Dr. Hatch was a nominal Anglican, and that he lived and died without formal censure from our tolerant authorities in England. But his position was *clean contrary* to the Prayer Book and to the position formally adopted by the 145 Archbishops and Bishops

who composed the Lambeth Conference of 1888.

The Anglican position is thus defined for us in the Preface to the Ordination Service: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and Ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons. And therefore to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted, or taken to be, a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon of the Church of England, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." The English Church, therefore, does *not* re-ordain a priest of the Roman Catholic or Greek Church, if he joins her Communion, *because* he has already received *Episcopal* Ordination.

She *does* re-ordain a Minister who joins her from the *non*-Episcopal Communions, *because* he has *not* received *Episcopal* Ordination.

A notable instance of this is to be found in the case of the present Bishop of Chicago.

Bishop Maclaren was formerly a well-known Presbyterian Minister in the United States. He received Presbyterian Ordination in 1860, and he joined the American Church and was ordained Deacon and Priest in 1872, and he was consecrated Bishop of Chicago in 1875. We have purposely chosen an American example of the doctrine of the Anglican Church on Holy Orders, because the American branch of our Church has been for 100 years independent of the State, and is entirely free from the Church and State precedents of the Church of England.

The teaching of the Preface to the Ordinal is a matter of *vital* principle throughout the Anglican Communion, and has nothing whatever to do with the Church of England as an established Church. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 accepted, with slight alteration, the four conditions of unity put forth by the American Bishops. The fourth of these conditions is the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate. The moral weight of this decision of the Lambeth Conference settles the question for all loyal Anglicans. It is a contemporaneous re-affirming of the doctrine of the Preface to the Ordinal by the 145 Archbishops and Bishops from England, America, Ireland, Scotland and the Colonies. We cannot palter with this *root truth* that the Historic Episcopate, with its Apostolic succession, is necessary to the *being* of the Church, and not only to its *well being*.

We can hold this truth with the utmost charity and tolerance to all those who do not receive it.—*The Southern Cross, Victoria.*

A TRUTH IGNORED.

There are many wonderful evidences of the fact that the offertory is not rightly regarded. In the opinion of a large class it is only a dignified way of raising money, and sure to be ineffective for the purpose intended. It will have to be supplemented in the week following by personal solicitation (at the hands of some one who has the courage to try that sort of work) or by some other means more or less questionable, as the case may be. Now one of the easiest

things to show from the Bible is that the offertory is a *kind of worship*.—In fact the very first act of homage to the Divine Being found in the Old Testament is of this kind. Cain and Abel brought, each, an offering unto the Lord. The one offered a sacrifice of the fruits of the ground, the other of the firstlings of his flock. Here was the first sacrifice, and of sacrifice a very essential part was a *gift* to God. But sacrifice, in one shape and another, is the truest and most frequent kind of worship rendered in the Old Testament. Every time a man offered a lamb or bullock or a pair of turtle doves or the first fruits of the harvest he *gave* something to God, and hence giving is plainly a kind of worship. Not only this, but Holy Scripture says so in set terms. "*Honor* the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase." So again we read in Acts x, 4, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." The two—prayer and alms—are taken together as of equal importance in God's sight. So we find in II Cor. ix, 13, St. Paul alluding to the liberality of the Christians at Corinth as a "professed subjection into the Gospel of Christ." He also speaks of their offerings as "thanksgivings," as "zeal" and as "righteousness." The Prayer book, following Scripture teaching, calls the alms "*the devotions of the people*" and instruct the priest to "humbly present and place" the offering on the holy table. Certainly then we may conclude, without more ado, that the offertory is an act of worship.

If this be so, then it is an act that should be performed in a *thoughtful and reverent spirit*. We should have our gift ready, having considered prayerfully what it is and what it is for, and above all who is to receive it. If we have this thoughtful, reverent spirit we are not apt to notice that "Jones was so reckless this morning as to put in a dollar bill," nor that "Susan Sniggs looked away when the plate reached her pew." Nor, if possessed of this spirit, will the wardens poke the plates at the minister as if they were handling so many basins of corn cobs and then rush back to their seats as if ashamed of their work. Nor, if this spirit prevailed, would the priest ever take those plates and slide them, in careless haste, upon the holy table! We would not think of so presenting our gifts even to the king of the smallest European principality, why then should we so demean ourselves in the presence of him who is the King of kings and Lord of lords? "Yes," says Brother Fighting-Low, "that's the stuff the Ritualists are always talking." Well, brother, is it not conceivable that a Ritualist may sometimes be in the right? And if I, who like Ritualistic performances about as well as I do syrup of ipecac, write good, sensible advice for thee shouldst thou not heed it? Go to, thou art too entirely set in thy ways, and to look at this matter from the other side will do thee good and will broaden thy deep, deep mind. Let us then make our offerings in a reverent, thoughtful spirit.

Not only this, but we should beautify our offering with a *thankful heart*. In so many ways has God blessed us! He has given us health, friends, food and raiment. He has put us in a Christian land and under Christian influences. He has showered his blessings so thick that we walk in them and know not of them. Well, let us try to think of all these blessings