

solved, but it is not solved except through that personal appeal to the conscience through which men and women see themselves as before God, and feel that the Rector speaks to them as if with a message from Him. It is at this point of contact that a spiritual teacher finds his truest helpers, and imbues them with his spirit.—JULIUS H. WARD, in *The Churchman*.

### APOSTOLIC ORDERS.

The Venerable Archdeacon Lefroy delivered his fourth Donnellan Lecture before the University of Dublin, in the College Chapel, on Sunday morning, March 18. His text was 1st Corinthians xii. 28, "God hath set some in the Church, helps, governments." He claimed to have established in the preceding lecture that his hypothesis of a ministry, general and itinerant, was Scriptural, historical, credible, and workable. He then examined all the evidence supplied by Apostolic literature, in order to see whether or not a kindred hypothesis could be sustained, viz., whether the Apostles were conscious that the itinerant ministry was transitional, and whether, if it was, they made arrangement for a permanent ministry. The preacher covered all the ground from the Day of Pentecost to the publication of the Didache, the Pastor of Hermas, and up to the date of the Ignatian Epistles. The result of the inquiry was that the theory of a permanent ministry was, he considered, proved, and if so, the question arose what was the constitution of that ministry? He believed it was three-fold—local, permanent, and unequal—and if the diaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate, fell into the categories of helps and of governments, he could not hesitate to regard them as of Divine appointment. The contention of Professor Cunningham was severely criticised. He, Professor Cunningham, held that no church was either the better or the worse for having or for not having deacons. They had no *jus divinum*. They were instituted to relieve poverty and to meet an emergency which might not arise again. If so, why did not the Apostles select *volunteers* to meet the necessities of the occasion? There were Barnabas, Barsabas, Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, the seventy and others. But these were passed, a solemn service, engaged in imposition of hands, and everything which was likely to solemnize the event was observed. The only explanation of this was that supplied by the whole spirit of the passage. The Apostles were led by the Spirit of God. They acted for all time. The Church of Rome was wrong in limiting the number of deacons to seven. The Church of Rome, to be consistent, ought to give the same names to their deacons as the same number, and Professor Cunningham's theory required us to believe that a dead level of poverty prevailed in every Church in which there were deacons. Dr. Hatch declared it was difficult to discern the difference in the Pastoral Epistles between the deacons and the Bishop. Difficulty was a relative term. He could not tell what was difficult to Dr. Hatch, but it was perfectly clear to whoever studied his book that *rashness of statement* was not among his difficulties. He begged the students to test the difficulty when they left the chapel. Take a sheet of notepaper. On one side place a column, and insert in it the Pauline qualification for the episcopate. On another insert those for the diaconate. The former would run to about sixteen, and some would overlap. The latter would run to about eight. Five were common to both. The Bishop was required to be apt to teach and to be able to rule the Church of God. Both these were absent from

the qualification of the deacon. He was amazed at Dr. Hatch's statement. It was as startling as another discovery of his, that in the Clementines for the first time the president of the Church—the Bishop—appeared as the custodian of the faith. The Clementines were about 225. St. Timothy was regarded as the custodian of the faith about 63. He was charged by St. Paul to "take heed unto himself and unto the doctrine." The preacher then referred in a most exhaustive manner to the episcopate office. After a careful examination of all the New Testament passages on the subject, he was bound to conclude that episcopacy was *ab apostolis, in apostolis, sub apostolis*. Presbyterian parity was not Scriptural. The seventy were not equal to the twelve, nor the presbyters of Ephesus Oreta, or Jerusalem to James, to Titus, to Timothy. It was not historical, for before St. John's death, and after the publication of the Ignatian Epistles, episcopal government prevailed in Christendom. Even D'Aubigne declared that Zwinglius, in the city of Zurich, began, as did Calvin in Geneva, and Knox and Melville in Scotland, a new ecclesiastical constitution. It was useless to ignore the witness of Scripture, of patristic literature, of centuries of history. The *imparity* of Christian ministry was *Scriptural, apostolic, historical, continuous*. The theory of Dr. Hatch, as to finance being the primary duty of the *episcopos*, was next handled. He ridiculed the idea that because *episcopos* was the title given to financial officers in Grecian municipalities, it had the same significance in a spiritual society. You might as well say that because Christ said "*Considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt, or Considerate corvos*," he taught astrology, or that he said consult the stars about the lilies, or consult the stars about the crows. If such principles as the learned author he was criticising had adopted were allowed a place in literature, history would be a chaotic mass, and he doubted if religion could survive. Towards the close of his lecture Archdeacon Lefroy drew a brilliant picture of the battle of Chalons, in the fifth century, when Attila was defeated. The legend ran that when the broad plains were soaked with the bravest blood in Europe, and night flung her pall upon a scene of horror, the conflict was continued high in the heavens. The huge Scythian cavalry, harnessed horses, and panoplied warriors were seen to fight in the firmament. The conflicts of the Church of Christ was being carried on now in the planes of a civilization which had advanced, is advancing, and shall advance. They dared not change the orders of the battle. They could only do God's work in God's way. His Word was the grand weapon. All the victories in the romantic history of the Church was won by the Word of God. He believed when this world ceased to make history, and the great bell of time struck its last stroke, victory would be most of all to that expression of the Church of Christ, which continued the conflict with unswerving regard to the Holy Word of God, and with unfaltering faith in the orders which God had appointed, and which he had approved, and these orders he believed to be threefold—deacon, presbyter, and bishop. The work which this apostolic, permanent, localised, and unequal ministry was instituted to perform would engage their attention in the closing lectures.—*The Family Churchman*.

### BISHOP BICKERSTETH AND THE REAL PRESENCE.

Extract from a review of a sketch of the life and Episcopate of the Right Rev. Robert Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop of Ripon, 1857-1884, by his son Montague Cyril Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's Padsey, Leeds, in the *Guardian*, London, of Jan. 11, 1888.

"He (Bishop Bickersteth) was an uncompromising Evangelical, but his Evangelicalism was

of the good old type, which recognized and valued the Church as a divine institution; desired to do honour to the sacraments (one of Bishop Bickersteth's first innovations at Clapham was to institute early celebrations of the Eucharist); and recognized the good work and loyalty to Church principles of those of his clergy whose doctrines and ritual were much in advance of his own. It is indeed curious that so clear a mind and so devout a spirit did not manage to lead him out of the confusion as to the doctrine of the Real presence, which pervades the charge which he delivered in 1867, and which his son and biographer quotes at length. The Bishop insists on the view that it is the faith of the communicant which constitutes the Real presence in the sacrament, without realizing that his theory would make the Prayer of consecration an empty, not to say profane, form. The province of faith is to receive a gift existing already independently of it. It cannot cause that to be present, which was not present before; it can only appropriate it. On the Bishop's theory there would obviously be no sacrament at all in the not impossible case of communicants all of whom lacked the necessary faith. In that case there would only be the outward and visible sign; neither the "*res sacramenti*," nor the "*virtus sacramenti*," which are of the essence of the sacrament, and which exist quite apart from the faith of the recipient. Faith is the receptive and assimilating organ of the spiritual life; but it no more creates the food which it receives than does the digestive organ of the human body. It is surprising that the Bishop did not see that this doctrine is more in accordance with the language of the twenty-eighth article than the view in support of which he cites that language. The article says that "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, &c." But in order to be "given and taken," it must be there already. Indeed it is pretty evident that Bishop Bickersteth did not quite grasp the doctrine which he set himself to refute, and we believe that much of the apparent differences existing in matters of doctrine between High Churchmen and Evangelicals is due to a misunderstanding of each others meaning."

### FURTHER TESTIMONY.

A Lady in Ontario, renewing her subscription, says: "We could not do without its (The *GUARDIAN*'s) welcome visits."

A Clergyman in the Diocese of Quebec writes: "I prize the *GUARDIAN* highly as a disseminator of true Church principles."

A Clerical subscriber in the Diocese of Toronto writes:—"Allow me once more to express my entire satisfaction with the tone of your valuable paper, and wish it continued success."

Another Subscriber in Nova Scotia writes:—"The contents are generally very useful as well as interesting, and the *CHURCH GUARDIAN* as handmaid to the Church is very much to be prized."

An Ontario subscriber, renewing for self and another, writes: "I have ceased to take the ——— and am very well pleased with your paper, THE *CHURCH GUARDIAN*, and more so with its truly Catholic spirit."

A Layman in Newfoundland renewing subscription writes:—"I am much pleased with this publication (The *CHURCH GUARDIAN*), and earnestly hope that the number of its subscribers may steadily increase during the coming year and thus greatly encourage its warmest and most sanguine promoters."