

strict visitors. Tell them, first, you are working for souls; secondly, you are wishful to bring the souls into the Church. If possible, never enter a house without some act which shall be distinctly that of a clergyman. If it be not advisable to unite in prayer, at least ask, before leaving, a blessing upon the house. Say at least, "Peace be upon this house," if the son of peace be there your peace shall rest upon it, if not, it shall return to you again. That was our Lord's instruction when he sent forth the 70 for visitation. Leave a list of your church services, guilds, &c., in every house. As to the services in the church adapt them, not as your correspondent says a popular clergyman in New York does, to the tastes of the common people, but to the object for which the Church exists—to bring souls nearer to Christ. Let *worship* be stamped upon every act and word in your church. Teach the people by sight and hearing and example, that they are invited to 'worship' God. Insist, by the utmost reverence, by beauty and order in every service, that the church is not a common house, but is the House of God, having special promise of His special presence. All men love Jesus (even Renan), therefore teach them that He is present, and they who will not move across a block to meet you, will come one by one to meet Him. Remember of those who come to see you (the preacher) to return, perhaps, your visit to their house, by visiting you in your house (for they often speak of Mr. So and So's church) probably only a few will come a second time, whilst of those who come and find Christ present, or come to worship Him, very many will continue to come.

Free seats are an absolute necessity—for the pew rent system is unapostolic, a mere protestant innovation, immoral, and iniquitous—but free seats are not everything. Christ is everything. Show Him forth, not only by word of mouth in the pulpit, but by deed and in sight of all men at the altar. Never mind shortening your services—nor indeed your sermons if they are full of Christ—but separate the services as the Church has placed them in her directory, and see that you preach Christ and the Gospel of Christ, rather than abstract *isms*. People never tire of hearing about Christ and His Church, nor of kneeling where every gesture and word indicates that Christ is really present. A chief obstacle not touched by your former correspondent is this: The working men say (whether justly or not let each reader decide for himself) they do say, however, and I presume they believe it when they say it, that clergy and preachers are after the money. Get that out of their heads by your life. Teach by your daily life, "We did not embrace Holy Orders as a means of respectable and easy living." Say to them "I am a priest of the Church of the poor in spirit, an ambassador of the meek and lowly Jesus. I am here to minister at the altar and to give of the altar. My living I will take from the altar, when you have placed it there. If it be little, I can live on little, as did my Master. If it be abundant, I can still live on little, and have that wherewith to clothe the naked, to feed the hungry, and to beautify my Master's house and worship." Get hold of the children. Bring them to the Church—not to the Sunday School. Invite them to the church, and let your courteous and obliging ushers see that they are all given a place of welcome in the church which shall be consistent with the Master's invitation, "Suffer little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God." If the number of children that attend Sunday School were found in church, the churches would be filled to overflowing and the

presence of Christ would be more abundantly manifested in the midst of his little ones. Nay, more, "a little child shall draw them"—and parents would flock where their children drew them in. Never "fash" about your converts. They will come all right when you get your people. DWELL AMONG THE PEOPLE. LIVE AMONG THE PEOPLE.

### THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

CHAP. II.—Continued.

#### THE DIVINE MINISTRY BEFORE CHRIST.

##### HISTORICAL VIEW.

The more closely and the more deeply we study the religious systems and the religious history of heathenism and Judaism alike, the more clearly shall we perceive the presence and operation of these principles. Everywhere we may observe the action of one or other of those two tendencies; on the one hand to unite all the offices of ministry in one class or person when possible; on the other hand, to separate them and keep them distinct when that was inevitable. The same facts which reveal these tendencies also disclose the general idea of mediation of which all ministry is in various ways an embodiment, and at the same time show how ineradicable is the sentiment which demands such a ministry for the service of the sanctuary.

In a single chapter of a short treatise the illustrations must be few and brief; but they shall be to the point, and they might easily be extended.\*

##### THE GREEKS.

The continued existence of the priesthood, in the secondary and more restricted meaning of the word, is the more remarkable that in certain cases they "had no religious doctrine either to preserve or to teach." (Döllinger *H. U. J.* iv. 1, 1.) In other words the prophetic and priestly offices were separated. This was true generally of priesthood among the Greeks. The priest attended to the temple worship, whatever its nature might be, and watched over the building and its furniture; but he was not a witness for the truth, and he was not required to have any special education or preparation to fit him for the office. And Plutarch (*Amator*, p. 469, ix. 59, Reisk; in Döllinger), when he enumerates the classes of men from whom religious instruction might be gained, says nothing of the priests, but names only the poets, the law-givers, and the philosophers. Still the mediatorial idea is always clear in the office, and, although high moral qualifications are not held to be essential, it is requisite that the priests should, in their origin and character, reflect something of the nature of their office. Thus Plato, in his ideal Republic, although he did not demand great spiritual endowments in the priests, required that they should be born in wedlock, should come from a blameless family, should be of unblemished body, and should be free from serious crime (Legg. p. 759; in Döllinger). Without dwelling upon the various qualifications for the office which were required in the Grecian system, we may observe that the office was hereditary and descended from father to son, either according to seniority or else by lot. And here, as in so many other places, we find evidence that the priesthood was never an office assumed by the person who bore it, but one that derived its sanction from some authority—either an authority which was supposed to reside in a particular family, or which was derived from the supreme ruler as representative of God and of the people, or which remained in the priestly body which added new members to itself by co-optation.

##### PROPHET AND PRIEST.

The prophetic office was, then, distinct from the priestly, and was exercised by persons not belonging to the priesthood. They were, however, sometimes found in union, and one instance of the exercise of such gifts by the priestess of Apollo holds a very prominent place in the religion and the history of Greece. The Pythia at Delphi was

\*Any authorities may be consulted. I have used principally Dr. Döllinger's great work, *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, although I have not neglected other sources of information.

a priestess, and her most important function was the utterance of the supposed inspiration of the god when she sat on the tripod that stood over the mystic cave. The qualifications required in her were of a character which brings forward her mediatorial place. It was not required that she should be educated, her inspiration coming not from herself, but from the god; but it was necessary that she should be of blameless life that she might be a pure medium for the communications which come through her from the god to his votaries.

##### THE PARSEES.

The general idea of priesthood among the Parsees was decidedly higher than that which prevailed among the Greeks. Although they had at first no temples, they had priests from the most remote period. At all times these priests seem to have been students and teachers of truth, but this aspect of their office became more prominent in later times when they were known by the name of Magi, instead of bearing the earlier name of Athrava. Although they were not actually associated with the government, they came very near to it, inasmuch as the instruction of the heir to the throne was committed to them, and he had to be examined by them as to his attainments and qualifications (Döllinger vi. 2, 51, 52).

##### THE EGYPTIANS.

In the Egyptian religion we perceive something like an approach to the earlier ideas of the divine ministry; for, although the various offices were not united in one person, there was a double approximation to this ideal, in the fact that the king was also the High Priest of the nation, and that, although the various offices of the ministry seem to have been kept distinct, the prophets were the highest order of the priests. In earliest times the kings of Egypt not only belonged to the priestly caste, but discharged priestly duties; and the temples of the gods were royal palaces and fortresses of considerable strength (Döllinger vi. 5, 104).

This tendency to combine various offices of church and state in the same persons had many illustrations; and this again led to the limits of the priesthood being very indistinct and indefinite. Members of the same family were at the same time priests and laymen, one brother being a soldier and the other a priest or a prophet.

##### THE ROMANS.

In the early days of Rome, while the state was yet governed by kings, the king was the supreme Pontiff, and after the suppression of the royal power, his place was occupied by a sacrificer. In the time of the Empire, the emperors not only were invested with the priestly office, but also belonged to the colleges of priests. To the priests of heathen Rome it belonged to preserve the ancient traditions of their religion, whether those which had been committed to writing or those which were handed down by oral testimony.

The history of the manner in which new members were received into the college of priests is of interest, not only as showing that some kind of authorization was required before any one could assume the priestly office or discharge its functions, but also as reminding us in some respects of the changes which have taken place in the election of Bishops of the Church of Christ.

The various colleges of priests seem always to have been independent of each other, and never to have been gathered into one corporation; and in earlier times they added new members to the colleges by co-optation, the existing body electing the new members. In the year 104, however, the right of election was transferred to the Comitia, and, although, after they had nominated, the college was supposed to elect, the nomination of the Comitia was as binding upon the college as the order sent along with the *Congé d'élire* is now binding upon a cathedral chapter when they proceed to the election of a Bishop, (D. vii. 2, 8, 98-97).

It is not necessary to pursue the subject further, or we might trace the same principles at work in the mythologies and religious systems of the northern and western nations of Europe. We must now turn to the subject of the ministry in Judaism.

(To be Continued.)