

the "other devotions of the people," but it is hard to see the motive at work in the middle of the seventeenth century to exclude the other aspect of the presentation upon the Table. In the Sarum and Roman Missals, as in all the ancient Liturgies, the bringing in of the bread and wine prepared for consecration was attended with no little ceremony, as if they were already made sacred by the object to which they were devoted, and the Caroline divines regarded this presentation as part of the Eucharistic sacrifice. The American Prayer Book has followed the English service, while the Scotch Offices have uniformly followed the Office of 1687. And the Non-jurors' Office falls back upon the rubric of 1549, which it takes almost *verbatim*, only omitting, that is, any mention of "the Corporas," and directing that the addition of the pure and clean water be done "in view of the people." The mixing with the water was a distinctly ceremonial action, and to be participated in by the people, as the "setting both the bread and the cup upon the altar" was. The offering of the bread as already "the immaculate host," and the mixed cup as "the cup of salvation," was a distinct feature in both the Sarum and the Roman rituals, and our word "Oblations," which is so peculiarly sacrificial, may bear some distant memory of the old observance, as it seems so far-fetched in its non-eucharistic application. We have no offering now in kind, so that the Oblations must simply be the portions of the money that are not to be given to the poor, and there is no little risk of unreality in the priest's use of the words "Alms and Oblations" in our ordinary service. The application of the word "Oblations" is probably not fixed and to be used with a certain latitude beyond the *animus imponentis*. But the difficulty does not end here, as the side-note directs the occasional omission of the words "to accept our Alms and Oblations." When are we to omit "Alms," when "Oblations" and when both "Alms and Oblations"? Many churches make no distribution to the poor, and yet the offering of *Alms* goes on, and some omit "Oblations" when there is no celebration, thus giving the word an interpretation which it hardly bears. Each clergyman has probably his own custom, and all must feel that there is room for a diversity of opinion and practice.

The next two rubrics that we shall take up for consideration are so closely related that they must be taken together, and they suggest some curious thoughts. Preceding two Exhortations the rubrics are: "At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament, the Priest shall say this Exhortation, 'Dearly beloved in the Lord,' etc." "Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the Holy Communion, 'Ye that so truly,' etc." What is the exact relation of the second rubric to the first, and in how far is it to be addressed either to the same company or to a more select body within the larger? Are they to communicate as they are thus "conveniently placed," or are they then so "conveniently placed" as to join in the service and afterwards go forward for Communion? Our present practice gives the latter interpretation of the second query, but the rubric does not seem inconsistent with the post-reformation practice of distributing the Holy Sacrament to the communicants in the pews: the later rubric, which relates to the act of communicating, only prescribes that the Communion be delivered "to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling," and there is no direction anywhere for their kneel-

ing at the altar rails, although the practice is seemly and has come to be usual. In the rubrics there are other two distinct features which throw us back upon much earlier facts, the placing of the people and the people addressed. They are too important for the end of a paper.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EPISCOPATE.—*Concluded.*

If the considerations already urged are of the weight which we have assigned to them, then there is an end to the theory that the Episcopal office came into existence by a kind of natural development after the time of the Apostles.

THE POWER OF ORDINATION.

But an objection of an historical character has been urged against the claim of the Bishop to possess the sole power of ordination. It is somewhat curious that only one case has been alleged; and therefore it will be sufficient for us to subject the facts connected with it to a careful examination.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

It is with no ordinary reluctance, however, that in following this inquiry, we find ourselves constrained to differ from an authority so eminent as that of the late Bishop of Durham, the learned and gifted Dr. Lightfoot. It may, however, be well first to point out that this distinguished writer does not really differ from the conclusions at which we have already arrived. Thus, in the later editions of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, he declares that he entirely accepts the statement of the English Ordinal, that bishops have existed in the Church since the time of the Apostles; no recantation of his earlier opinions, as some imagined, since his original statements on the subject substantially agree with the conclusions stated above.

HIS SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE.

Speaking of the evidence for the "early and extensive adoption of Episcopacy in the Christian Church," he proceeds to call attention "to such indirect testimony as is furnished by the tacit assumptions of writers living towards and at the close of the second century. Episcopacy," he goes on, "is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like Irenæus and Tertullian, that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not. Even Irenæus, who was certainly born and probably had grown up before the middle of the century [the italics are ours], seems to be wholly ignorant that the word bishop had passed from a lower to a higher value since the Apostolic times. Nor is it important only to observe the positive though indirect testimony which they afford. Their silence suggests a strong negative presumption, that while every other point of doctrine or practice was eagerly canvassed, the form of Church government alone scarcely came under discussion." (Com. in Phil. 2d. ed. p. 225.)

It must be agreed that the force of these sober sentences is so great that they could not easily be resisted unless there were some prejudice existing against the conclusion to which they conduct us. But there is another point on which Lightfoot does not help us. He is an unquestionable authority on behalf of the Episcopal government of the Church; but he seems to regard the case of Alexandria as fatal to the opinion of the necessity of Episcopal ordination. It is therefore of the first importance that this case should be carefully examined.

THE CASE OF ALEXANDRIA: S. JEROME.

Let us take the statements of Bishop Lightfoot as they stand, and see if they can be maintained. "S. Jerome," says the Bishop (Com. Philipp. 228, 229), "after denouncing the audacity of certain persons who would give to deacons the precedence over presbyters, that is over bishops, and alleging scriptural proofs of the identity of the two, gives the following fact in illustration: 'At Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist down to the times of

the Bishops Heracles (A.D. 233-249) and Dionysius (A.D. 249-265), the presbyters always nominated as bishop one chosen out of their own body and placed in a higher grade: just as if an army were to appoint a general, or deacons were to choose from their own body one whom they knew to be diligent and call him Archdeacon.' Though the direct statement of this father refers only to the appointment of the Bishop, still it may be inferred that the function of the presbyters extended also to the consecration. And this inference is borne out by other evidence." We cannot admit the inference and we shall find the other evidence equally insufficient.

THE INFERENCE INADMISSIBLE.

Let us give S. Jerome's own words: "Semper unum ex se electum in excelsiore eloco collocatum, episcopum nominabant." There are two words here which describe the part taken by the presbyters in the appointment of a Bishop from their own number. They *elect* him, they *nominated* him, and they put him in a *higher place*. Shall we say, they enthroned him, or did something equivalent to what we should call enthroning? But here, at least, there is no hint of ordaining or consecrating. If there is other proof alleged of that it must be examined; but here there is absolutely none.

HILARY AND AMBROSIAS.

Bishop Lightfoot proceeds to adduce corroborative evidence as he regards it, and begins with Hilary, "an older contemporary of S. Jerome." Now Hilary tells us that "in Egypt the presbyters seal, if the Bishop be not present [*presbyteri consignant, si præseus non sit episcopus*]." And Bishop Lightfoot explains consignant to mean "ordain or consecrate;" but it is much more likely that it means "confirm." Ambrosiaster again, (that is, a writer whose works are bound up with those of S. Ambrose and were formerly by mistake attributed to him) writes that "in Alexandria and throughout all Egypt if there is no Bishop the presbyter consecrates or seals [Nam in Alexandria et per totam Egyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat (v. l. consignant) presbyter]." A very slender argument in defence of a custom which is contradicted by the usage of the whole Church. We have already noted the force of *consignant*; but *consecrate* might mean either the consecration of the Eucharist or the confirmation of the baptized.

TESTIMONY OF EUTYCHIUS.

Bishop Lightfoot agrees that the phrase might refer to the ordination of presbyters (which we do not admit) and not to the consecration of a Bishop. "But," he goes on, "even the latter is supported by direct evidence, which though comparatively late, deserves consideration, inasmuch as it comes from one who was himself a patriarch of Alexandria. Eutychius, who held the patriarchal see from A.D. 938 to A.D. 940, writes as follows: 'The Evangelist Mark appointed along with the patriarch Hananias twelve presbyters who should remain with the patriarch, to the end that, when the patriarchate was vacant, they might choose one of the twelve presbyters, on whose head the remaining eleven laying their hands should bless him and create him patriarch.' The vacant place in the presbytery was then to be filled up, that the number twelve might be constant. 'This custom,' adds this writer, 'did not cease till the time of Alexander (A.D. 813-826), patriarch of Alexandria. He however forbade that henceforth the presbyters should create the patriarch, and decreed that on the death of the patriarch the bishops should meet to ordain the (new patriarch), etc.' It is clear from this passage that Eutychius considered the functions of nomination and ordination to rest with the same persons."

CRITICISM OF THE TESTIMONY.

Bishop Lightfoot admits that even if this view should be correct, "the practice of the Alexandrian Church was exceptional." But he does more, he admits the general untrustworthiness of his witness. "The authority of a writer so inaccurate as Eutychius, if it had been unsupported, would have had no great weight; but, as we have seen, this is not the case." Now we venture to