

left absolutely free to receive all coming who should not desire regular seats, and that no odious distinction should be made. At all Sunday services, and at others if so ordered, free-will offerings should be gathered from the congregation and laid on the altar, a distinction being made between offerings for the honour of God in the maintenance of the worship in His House, and other objects, such as missions and charities.

The worship should be daily, according to the Book of Common Prayer. It should always be reverent, animated, and hearty, quick in movement, clear and solemn in expression, with devout attitudes. The music should be made by many voices, either choral or congregational, or both, and, like all else pertaining to the spiritual ministrations, its character should be determined by the ecclesiastical authority. On Sundays there should be public worship three or four times, to suit all classes and conditions of people, each service having a character peculiar to itself. The Holy Communion should be celebrated every Sunday at some hour, and on all other days on which eucharistic provision is made in the Prayer Book. It should be the aim in the preaching to interest and instruct every class of every degree of intelligence. Short addresses would often accompany the Even Song service.—*Bishop Huntington.*

THE HISTORICAL EPISCOPATE.

BY REV. A. W. KNIGHT.

WHAT is the Church's teachings in regard to this subject?

***Concerning the authority of the ministry, its relation to the being of the Church, and its necessity in the validity of the Sacraments, or at least one of them, she has a very decided teaching. I do not take the two Sacraments together, because the Church herself separates them when she forbids her deacons from celebrating the Holy Eucharist, and yet permits them to baptize. To avoid confusion, I shall omit the Sacrament of Baptism in the further discussion of the question. To get at the real teachings of the Church we must examine her Prayer Book and her Constitution and Canons. The opinions of individual men in the Church must not be considered, for she has gathered together her teachings in these books, and it is here that we find her speaking with no uncertain sound. Let us first examine the office for ordination, which is in the Prayer Book. The preface begins on this wise: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in CHRIST'S Church—bishops, priests and deacons—which offices were evermore held in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he be first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite to the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authorities," etc., etc.

The Church here distinctly states that this ministry has existed from the time of the apostles, who received their commission from CHRIST. She also states that her authority for this belief is the Holy Scriptures, together with ancient authors. She not only commits herself to the

fact of an unbroken succession, but she also commits herself to a belief in the manner in which that succession is preserved. And she says that no man might presume to execute any of the offices of this ministry unless he be admitted in the manner prescribed. But the Church goes further than simply stating her belief in the fact of the ministry; her very prayers show it to be a deep-rooted belief. The collect in the ordination office, and with few verbal changes it remains the same for all three, begins: "Almighty God, giver of all good gifts, who by thy Holy Spirit has appointed divers orders of ministers in the Church, mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the office of priesthood," etc. Her belief, then, is, that the ministry is divinely instituted; and, being divinely instituted, it must have some authority and object. The questions next to consider, then, are the authority and object of the ministry. The Bishop, in laying his hands on the candidate, says: "Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacrament. In the name of the FATHER and the SON and the HOLY GHOST."

Or take the Alternative form: "Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father," etc.

In either of these forms he gives to the candidate authority. In presenting the Bible he gives license: "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the congregation, where thou shall be lawfully appointed thereunto."

Now, these forms deliver authority, and as the Church does not give herself to a *burlesque*, she must believe that the person giving the authority had such authority vested in him. The authority being given in the office, the question is, what is the *object* of the office? The commission distinctly states two things which appertain to the office: to preach and to administer the Holy Sacraments. Now, every priest has the authoritative preaching of the Word vested in him, has also the power to administer the Sacraments, and the Church in this form distinctly gives herself to the belief that these come through the office of ordination. Did she believe or think that they could come in any other way, or any simpler way, she would not have been so careful as to her form. That she believes her way to be the only way is distinctly shown in the care which had been taken in her Canons to throw every safe-guard about that ministry, and in forbidding any minister to officiate in her churches unless he have Episcopal ordination. That she believes the execution of these offices belong alone to those regularly ordained she shows in her Article XXIII: "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those ought we to judge lawfully called and sent which be

chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the LORD'S vineyard." In her ordination office she shows how a man may be lawfully called and sent; and here she says that no man may execute the office of preacher or administer the Sacraments lawfully unless he be lawfully called and sent. Surely the Church would not make a law contrary to her idea of Holy Scripture. She must have deemed it that this calling and sending were essential, else she would not condemn as unlawful all attempts to avoid it. She not only tells us here who are lawfully called and sent, but she also rebukes private judgment in the matter when she tells us whom "we ought to judge to be lawfully called and sent." Having touched upon the *authority* of that ministry, and its relation to the Sacraments, let us go one step further and examine what its relation to the Church is. First, let us see how the Church in her Articles defines the Church. In Article XIX, she says: "The visible Church of CHRIST is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to CHRIST'S ordinance, in all that of necessity are requisite to the same." Then the signs of the Church are a pure preaching and *duly administered* sacraments. She has shown in her ordination office who have the *authority* and *license* to preach, and of course this must be the channel through which the pure Word comes, else who is to be the judge. She has also shown us who have the *authority* and *license* to administer the Holy Sacraments through these channels, therefore, must come a duly administered sacrament "in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." If any body of Christians have not this pure Word of God preached, and have not duly administered Sacrament, then the Church unchurches them. There is no other alternative. The claiming, as she does, that a ministry "lawfully called and sent" is necessary to this pure preaching and duly administering, must give herself to a belief that this ministry is *essential*. One word further as to the essentialness of the ministry. The Church claims her ministry to be of Divine origin, and such being her claim, she cannot feel that God would have instituted it had it not been a necessity. I am far from saying that God could not have created His Church differently. I can here but use the illustration used by one of the speakers at the Church Congress which met at Detroit. "God might have made a better berry than the strawberry, but He did not." And so I say, "God might have made His Church without this ministry, but He did not." As to the position of this ministry in the Church, the Church has doubtless left something unsaid in a direct manner. But it bears much the same relation to the Church that the great unwritten common law gives to all laws. Her services, her constitutions, her canons, her very legislative bodies, all carry with them an inference in regard to the ministry, which is all the stronger for being unwritten and not laid down in a dogmatic manner.

And now, Mr. Editor, in regard to the salvability of souls not receiving the sacraments through this ministry, I could say much, but time and space fail me. I have this to say, however, that the decision in this matter does not come under this discussion. The Church sets not up herself to be a *judge*. She believes herself to be only a *means* of salvation, and she leaves the decision to God.