

THE
CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1902.

ART. I.—“OUR UNHAPPY DIVISIONS”—I.

IT is becoming a usual practice among many of the excellent of the earth to speak of the various Christian denominations in our land as “the Churches.” It is a manner of speech which can hardly fail to suggest sometimes such inquiries as these: Is it according to the Scriptures of the New Testament, or is it by the teaching of the Scriptures according to the will of God, that there should be a variety of Churches, living side by side, in a state of separation one from another? Will a confederation of such bodies fully satisfy the Scriptural idea of Christian unity? Is it quite a true view and a full view of the New Testament idea of *Schism* that would represent it as having to do only with spiritual separation from a spiritual bond of a spiritual society, excluding altogether the notion of a division in, or separation from, a visible Body?

And if these questions are fairly and honestly asked and answered, may they not legitimately lead on to another inquiry?—Is there any society in these lands which (altogether apart from “Establishment”) can make good a claim to be regarded as the Church of England, in a sense, such as cannot in strictness be applied to other so-called Churches which live round about?

There is evidence, we believe, that such inquiries have been long, deeply if silently, strongly if quietly, exercising the thoughts of many of God’s faithful servants. And it is not to be wondered at if now they are finding utterance distinctly if not very loudly.

The object of the present paper is not at all to contend that to a spiritual mind the general answer to such inquiries is perfectly simple and may be given off-hand: it is rather to indicate that there are two sides to be heard, and to put in a caveat against too hasty conclusions. I venture to express

the opinion that the matter is one on which all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity should be asked to suspend judgment for a while, and to wait upon the Lord in much prayer and supplication, that they may be guided by the Holy Spirit into a right judgment in all things pertaining to this very important subject.

Let me venture, at the outset, to ask to be allowed to recall attention to some extracts from a review which appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* of July, 1887 :

"If we take into view the facts made known to us in the Epistles of St. Ignatius and the writings of Irenæus, then, whatever interesting questions may remain questions still, there can be, or there ought to be, no question at all about the truth of the statement which the English Reformers have set in the Preface to our Ordinal: 'It is evident, unto all men diligently reading the 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.'

"If only the Epistles of Ignatius, as printed by Bishop Lightfoot, are genuine . . . Episcopacy must have had fast hold of the Christian Church in the period closely or immediately following the Apostolic Age, and this most conspicuously in the parts especially connected with the closing years of the last of the Apostles.

"Yet let it not be supposed that the maintenance of this position requires us to treat as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel all Christian Churches which are not under Episcopal regimen. We could heartily wish that an unbiassed examination of the arguments in favour of Episcopacy might lead many non-Episcopal Christians to reconsider their position. Is it too much to hope that at some future time a modified Episcopate—an Episcopate less after the mediæval and more after the primitive type—an Episcopate with more of Episcopacy and less of prelacy—an Episcopate thoroughly true to the principles of the Reformation—may yet be a centre of union for those who are now so sensible of disunion?

"But meanwhile we feel assured that, even if it could be clearly shown that Episcopacy was distinctly and directly a Divine appointment, great allowances should be made for those who have had to choose, or have been persuaded that they had to choose, between Episcopacy (with sinful terms of communion) and the truth of the Gospel. We may not, indeed, make light of any Divine ordinance, but a sanctified common-sense which distinguishes between God's ordinance of mercy and God's ordinance of sacrifice will never fear rebuke from Him Who said, 'If ye had known what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.' We feel sure it was wisely done, and we have no doubt that it was designedly done, done out of a spirit of Christian charity, that the Articles of the Church of England have not been made to say a word about Episcopacy in their definition of a Church or their teaching concerning ministering in the Congregation.¹ And ably

¹ "Hooker says: 'Although I see that certain Reformed Churches—the Scottish especially and French—have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture—I mean the government that is by Bishops, inasmuch as both those Churches are fallen under a different kind of regimen; which to remedy it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during the present affliction and trouble; this their defect and

and well as our theologians have upheld the Episcopacy of the Church of England, it will be found, we believe, that our great Reformed Divines, before the Restoration (with very few, if any, exceptions), never maintained that Episcopacy was absolutely of the essence of a Church. There is a broad line of distinction to be drawn between a desire strictly to adhere to, and faithfully to maintain, an Order which we may believe to have arisen under Apostolic authority guided by the Holy Spirit, and a readiness to condemn those who from circumstances or from prejudice have failed to retain such a form of government. It is quite possible to uphold as a basis of our Churchmanship the historical continuity of the Christian Church, and to regard a ministerial succession¹ as the backbone of this historical continuity, and to recognise this succession as normally a succession of Bishops, without attempting to defend the position—a position very difficult indeed to maintain—that the succession must always and everywhere be traced only through Episcopal consecration. Some, indeed, of those Anglican Divines who have been regarded as the strongest in their assertions on the subject of Episcopacy (including such men as Andrewes, Bramhall, and Cosin) will be found to be very cautious, indeed not to be understood as seeming to excommunicate the Reformed Churches on the Continent. It may be worth while just to refer to the case of Bishop Overall, who has sometimes been regarded as most uncompromising in maintaining the claims of Episcopacy, but of whom we have most satisfactory evidence that he was willing to admit to an English benefice one who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Leyden.”²

In these extracts there are one or two statements which at the present time, it seems very desirable to examine somewhat more closely, that we may see well if they are defensible; and if we are satisfied that they may be and ought to be maintained, to defend them in a spirit of meekness, forbearance, and charity.

It is not meant, of course, to call in question the statement of our Ordinal nor the evidence alleged in support of the primitive antiquity of Episcopacy. We would rather hope

imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men, oftentimes without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best, and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.”—(“Eccles. Pol.,” book iii., ch. vi., § 16; Works, vol. i., p. 409; edit. Keble.)

¹ “Clemens Romanus most distinctly asserts that the Apostles themselves not only appointed a ministry in the churches, but made provision for a succession of approved persons to fulfil the office of the ministry [ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν, ch. xlii.]. The presbyters at Corinth, who had been ejected from their office, had some of them been appointed directly by the Apostles, and some by the persons thus immediately connected with the Apostles (see Lightfoot’s *Clemens R.*, p. 137). Their office is called (p. 138) ἐπισκοπή. And Rothe (the able Presbyterian advocate of Episcopacy) assumes on insufficient grounds that Clement here is describing the establishment of Episcopacy properly so-called. This view is not accepted by Lightfoot (see *Philipp.*, p. 203).”

² Pp. 7, 14, 15. I quote from a reprint, “The Apostolic Fathers and the Christian Ministry” (Elliot Stock).

that an examination of the claims of this form of Church government may lead before long to the breaking down of some traditional prejudices.

But in present circumstances it seems very desirable to submit to careful and candid consideration what has been said concerning the position that "the [ministerial] succession must always and everywhere be traced only through Episcopal consecration." I have ventured to say concerning this that it is "a position very difficult indeed to maintain."

If this statement is one which at first sight may seem offensive to many, I hope I may, without offence, offer for consideration some arguments, which, as it seems to me, may fairly be urged as giving it some very substantial support.

I wish to rely not so much on the application of the results of critical inquiries—on which learned controversialists may differ—as on well-attested historical facts seen in the clear light of Christian common-sense. There may be a tendency sometimes to have our attention turned away from a wide field of evidence which should be regarded in its length and breadth, while we are scanning through a critical microscope some minutiae of details which are interesting rather than important in their bearing on the point to be investigated.

It is admitted that in Apostolic and sub-Apostolic times, and in the writings of the New Testament (and not in these alone), the names of Bishops¹ and Presbyters were applied to the same persons. They were different words signifying the same Order or office. The evidence of this is well stated by Jerome, and has often been reproduced by subsequent writers. There is nothing in this fact that can fairly be alleged as against Episcopal regimen, nor even as against Apostolical authority for Episcopacy.² But I venture to think that there is here something which affords a certain presumption against such a theory of the Christian Church, and of its rightful ministry, as requires us to believe that the validity of its Sacraments depends on such an essential difference between the two Orders,

¹ Bishop J. Wordsworth writes: "The titles [Bishops and Presbyters] in the Christian Church are used in a most perplexing way in its early literature. . . . But this may fairly be said: that, whenever the two are differentiated, the title 'Bishop' tends to be the higher, and to be limited to a single person" ("Ministry of Grace," pp. 118, 119. See also pp 125-128).

² "These, after the Apostles deceased, succeeded them in their charge of government, which was ordinary, successive, and perpetual. . . . These were those whom posterity called *Bishops*. But in the beginning, regard was not had to distinction of *Names*. The *Authority* and *power* was ever distinct" (Bishop Andrewes, in "Certain Brief Treatises," p. 37; Oxford, 1641). See Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book vii., ch. ii., § 2; Works, vol. iii., p. 148; edit. Keble.

that without Episcopal succession¹ and Episcopal ordination no true ministry can be ever exercised and no valid Eucharist ever be received. It is not easy to believe that, if such a theory were to be true, and were to be understood as an axiomatic tradition to be held in the Church of Christ from the beginning to the end, we should not have had some clear intimation of this in the scriptures of truth, instead of a use of words which would seem little adapted to prepare us for receiving it.

And the use which Jerome makes of his argument certainly seems to indicate that he recognised some such presumption, and attached some considerable weight to it.

But now, before we go farther, let us beware of conveying a false impression concerning Jerome and his doctrine. It would be nothing but a mistake to suppose that Jerome was influenced by any strong anti-sacerdotalist tendencies. He uses languages which the earlier centuries did not use, and which, I rather think, in some earlier centuries hardly would have been used.² He sets the threefold Order of the Christian ministry as ranking in line with the Old Testament Order of High Priests, and Priests, and Levites, and this too by Apostolic tradition. His words should be well noted: “*Ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi et Presbyteri et Diaconi vindicent in Ecclesia*” (Ep. cxlvi. Ad Evang., Op., tom. i., c. 1083. Ed. Vallarsius. Venetiis, 1766). And it is still more important (in view of our present subject) to observe that he is far from conceding to Presbyters an ordinary right of ordaining. He asks “*Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione*”³ Episcopum, quod Presbyter

¹ See Editor's Preface, p. lix, in Hooker's Works; edit. Keble.

² Perhaps the earliest approach to such language is to be found in Tertullian, who had written of the “*Summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus*” (“De Bapt.,” § 17). So in the Clementine Liturgy the celebrant is called *ἀρχιερεύς*. And in the “Apostolic Constitutions” the three Christian Orders are compared to the three Jewish Orders (lib. ii., cap. xxv.), though in an earlier part of the same chapter the Bishops are spoken of as the *ιερείς*, offering bloodless sacrifices — *διὰ Ἰησοῦ τῶν μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως* (in Cotelerius, tom. i., p. 237).

³ Elsewhere Confirmation also is excepted, but this exception is regarded by Jerome as “*ad honorem potius Sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis*” (“Adv. Lucif.,” § 9). See Chrysostom, “*I. Ep. ad Tim.*,” hom. ii., Op., tom. xi., p. 604: *Τῆ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβιβήκασι [ἐπισκόποι], καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκῶσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.*

Mr. Mossman, referring to the form of Episcopal Ordination in “Apost. Constit.,” lib. viii., cap. v., says: “There is not a word from beginning to end to show that he [the Bishop] was admitted by Episcopal Consecration into a separate Order; nor is there even so much as a hint that his peculiar and distinctive function was to be henceforth the exercise of a power to confer the priesthood” (“Hist. of Cath. Ch.,” p. 48). But in cap. xxviii.

non faciat?" (c. 1082). And he holds that "Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet" ("Advers. Luciferianos," § 9, tom. ii., par. i., c. 182).

Nevertheless, in this same epistle—arguing against the arrogance of rich deacons, who in the pride of riches would set themselves above Presbyters—he gives us his view of the origin of Episcopacy as arising from the need of a remedy against schism. And it is as an introduction to this that he gives us his argument from the Scriptures as to the original oneness of the office borne by those who were named alike Bishops and Presbyters, and the essential inferiority to these of those who served in the Church by the name of deacons.¹

And following upon this, in support of the same position, he proceeds to inform Evangelus of an ancient custom which (he says) prevailed in Alexandria from the time of the Evangelist Mark up to the Episcopate of Heraclas and Dionysius—that is, to about the middle of the third century.² In this matter his words have been variously interpreted, and, no doubt, sometimes misinterpreted.³ But in their natural and obvious—though not necessary—meaning they indicate that during this long and most important period the Presbyters

the distinctive positions and functions of Bishops, Presbyters, and deacons will be found clearly expressed. See Cotelerius, tom. i., pp. 410, 411. There we are told Ἐπίσκοπος . . . χειροτονεῖ. Πρεσβύτερος . . . οὐ χειροτονεῖ. See also "Canones Hippolyti," p. 62; edit. Achelis.

Indeed, the regulation which confined ordination to Bishops appears to have been very strict (see Bingham, "Antiquities of Chris. Ch.," book ii., ch. iii., § 5), though it is quite possible that this may have been "an acquired and not a primary function of Bishops" (see Smith's "Dict. of Ch. Antiquities," vol. ii., p. 1703, as well as the article "Ordination").

¹ So elsewhere Jerome says: "Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit, esse subjectos: ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in communione debere Ecclesiam regere" ("Ep. ad Tit."). This is regarded by Morinus as a rhetorical exaggeration ("De Sacris Ord." par. iii., exercit. iii., cap. iii., § xxii., p. 35; Ant., 1695). For Hooker's observation on it see "Eccles. Pol.," book vii., ch. v., § 8.

² According to Eutychius of Alexandria, whose testimony is by no means so good as that of Jerome, the custom was not changed till the time of Alexander, the Patriarch of Alexandria in the Council of Nice. But even in the time of Epiphanius there may have been old men whose fathers could well have remembered the Episcopate of Dionysius.

³ See Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book vii., ch. v., §§ 4-7. On Renaudot's view of the matter, see Goode, "Divine Rule," vol. ii., pp. 256, 257. There is some support for the statement that the new Patriarch of Alexandria "always interred his predecessor: and before doing so, placed his dead hand on his own head" (Smith's "Dict. of Ch. Ant.," vol. i., p. 50). An able reply to the unnatural interpretation of Jerome's words will be found in Mossman's "History of the Catholic Church," pp. 100-103. Jerome's statement is found in "Ep. ad Evang.," Ep. 146, Op., tom. i., col. 1082; edit. Vallarsius, 1766.

of the Church elected one of themselves, who took then the office of Bishop by nomination (not by consecration), as deacons might by election appoint one of themselves to bear the title and dignity of Archdeacon (c. 1082).

Now, it may be worth remarking that this statement is not made by Jerome as on the authority of any uncertain tradition which had reached his ears. He speaks of it simply as a fact. And in weighing his testimony it should be remembered (as Bishop Wordsworth has taught us) that Jerome was a friend of Epiphanius, who was conversant with all that concerned the Church of the Egyptians.¹

It need not, of course, be questioned that the fact had been received by tradition—very possibly by tradition alone. But in any case the tradition appears to be very fairly attested.² Origen's silence on the subject is, no doubt, remarkable. But it would be much more remarkable if we could be persuaded

¹ “Epiphanius, the friend and contemporary of St. Jerome, knew Egypt well, and was, I imagine, Jerome's authority for the statement above recorded” (“Ministry of Grace,” p. 137).

² It is doubtful, perhaps, whether much weight is to be attached to the saying of Poemen the Hermit (see Bishop Gore, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1902, p. 280); and it is possible, no doubt, to make too much of the testimony of Eutychius, yet it has been well observed that, though he lived in the tenth century, he “may be supposed to have known more about the ancient customs of his see, in a land like Egypt, than those who have decried him” (Smith's “Dict. of Ch. Ant.,” vol. i., p. 49). Moreover, his inaccuracies seem to show that the tradition he represents (unlike that of ninth-century writers) is independent of that given by Jerome, so that in the points of agreement we may be said to have in him and in Jerome the confirmation of “two witnesses.” (His account may be seen in Goode's “Rule of Faith,” vol. ii., p. 255.) But recently the statement of Jerome has been confirmed by the appearance of a third and very important witness in the person of Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch in the early part of the sixth century (see *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1901, pp. 612 *sqq.*). For other witnesses who accept the statement of Jerome (including Pseudo-Alcuin, Amalarius, Hincmar, and Anselm), see Morinus, par. iii., exercit. iii., cap. ii., § vi. *sqq.*, p. 33.

Full weight should, indeed, be given to the difficulties stated by Bishop Gore from the life and writings of Origen, who lived and taught at Alexandria till A.D. 231, and who, though he “assumes for the Episcopate a completely stable and traditional position clearly distinct from the Presbyterate,” makes no mention of any gradual exaltation of the Episcopate, and does not “represent the Alexandrian Church of his experience as differing from other Churches.” But this difficulty may, perhaps, be more than balanced by the difficulty of supposing that Jerome's statement and that of Severus should never have called forth a denial if they had not been founded on fact, and the following words of Bishop Gore are worthy of being well noted: “I see no ecclesiastical reason which should hinder us . . . from accepting the evidence. Severus of Antioch, in recording the tradition, shows that in his mind it carried with it no consequences such as modern controversy has sometimes attached to it” (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1902, p. 282).

that certain modern theories had been ancient, or primitive, beliefs. And it may possibly be outweighed by the not less remarkable silence of all who might have been expected to deny or disprove the tradition if they were well assured that it had originated in error.

We know that in the ninth century Jerome's account was accepted and evidently understood in what I have ventured to call its natural sense by Amalarius.¹ And the author of the treatise "De Divinis Officiis," which used to be attributed to Alcuin, undoubtedly appealed to it in the same sense.

Moreover, Morinus, to whose careful and laborious industry we owe so much in the way of the unravelling of the web of truth and error in the history of what pertains to the Orders and the ordinations of the Christian Church, not only accepts without question what Jerome has told us, but regards the view of Jerome as embodying the true traditional theory of the Western Church in the matter of Presbytery and its relation to Episcopacy.²

In this matter, indeed, the view of Morinus has been thought by some to be too sweeping. But it would not be difficult to multiply³ testimonies from scholastic and medieval

¹ Amalarius follows up his quotation from Jerome by saying: "Archidiaconi consecratio nobis notissima est. Archidiaconus eandem consecrationem habet, quam cæteri diaconi: sed electione fratrum proponitur" ("De Eccles. Off.," lib. ii., cap. xiii., In Hittorpius, p. 141). And Pseudo-Alcuin adopts the same language ("De Divinis Off.," cap. xxxvi., In Op. Alcuini, c. 1085; edit. Paris, 1617).

² The heading of his Chapter II. (Exercit. III.) contains the following: "Sententia S. Hieronymi de differentia Episcopi a Presbytero erat illo tempore in Ecclesia communis, et a posteris ad Scholasticos usque diserte et repetitis verbis ipsius asserta et prædicata. Alexandriae Presbyter electus Patriarcha non consecratur. Quia alia actione inauguratur. Episcopi et Presbyteri una Ordinatio" (p. 29).

Bishop J. Wordsworth says truly: "Morinus, indeed, goes so far as to endorse the judgment of Hilary the Deacon (1 Tim. iii. 8: 'Episcopi et Presbyteri una ordinatio est'), and to declare that it is the general opinion of the Latin Fathers ('De Sac. Ord.,' iii., p. 30 *sqq.*). We have seen the confirmation of this statement from the Roman Church Order, and, doubtful as it may be as a statement of general application, I believe that Morinus is right as regards Rome and Alexandria up to the beginning or middle of the third century" ("Ministry of Grace," p. 136).

³ Thus, Lombard (4 Sent., Dist. 24) declares that the Primitive Church had Bishops, priests, and deacons, yet knows but two *Orders*—Diaconate and Priesthood.

Bonaventura says: "Episcopatus deficit ab ordine" (4 Sent., Dist. 24, 9, 3).

Aquinas and Durandus teach that in a certain sense Episcopacy is an Order, not strictly distinct from priesthood, except as what is perfect is distinct from imperfect.

Dominicus Soto says: "Episcopatus non est sacramentum ordinis: est tamen ordo, hoc est, Dignitas et gradus altior sacerdotio."

authors to the view that, in a strict sense, Bishops and priests belong to one and the same Order, having powers differing not in their real essence, but only in respect of an ecclesiastical position and restraint. The tendency of the scholastics to insist upon this may probably, indeed, be accounted for in part by their anxiety to maintain the sevenfold division of the ministerial Order—a position which necessitated the counting of Bishops and priests as included in one Order.¹ If they were to be regarded as two Orders there would be eight Orders instead of seven.² But anyhow such was regarded as the traditional teaching of the Western Church.³

So much concerning the statement of Jerome, so much about the Alexandrine tradition. Perhaps the time has not

¹ Richardus says: "Non sunt nisi septem ordines in Ecclesia: quod non esset verum, si Episcopatus esset ordo."

Aureolus teaches that the Episcopate may be called an Order, yet not as distinct from the priesthood.

Navarrus affirms it to be the *common* opinion, and Fabius Incarnatus pronounces it the *more common* opinion that there are only *seven Orders*.

These abbreviated testimonies may be seen quoted at length in "Brief Treatises," pp. 142-146.

² Thus, the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches concerning the "Ordines Ministrorum Ecclesiæ" that "Majores vel sacri, sunt, ordo sacerdotalis, diaconatus, et subdiaconatus: ad minores referuntur acolyti, exorcistæ, lectores, ostiarii" (pars. ii., cap. vii., § 26). Here is no mention at all of Bishops, and consequently the Episcopal office is not regarded as an Order distinct from the priesthood; and in Sect. xlix., follows the instruction that there are "Quinque gradus in ordine sacerdotali," which are these: "Primus Sacerdotum . . . Secundus Episcoporum . . . Tertius Archiepiscoporum . . . Quartus patriarcharum . . . Quintus summi pontificis." All these are regarded alike as only different grades of the same Order. So Bellarmine, in his retractations, instead of maintaining "Presbyteros et Episcopos esse duos species Sacerdotum," says, "Rectius dixissem, esse unum ordinem, sed gradus diversos" (see "Brief Treatises," p. 157).

³ Morinus tells us that in the view most commonly held by the ancient scholastics it is held "Quidquid Ordinis proprie dicti, qua ratione dicuntur septem Ordines: quidquid Sacramenti et characteris habet, illud [Episcopatum] a Sacerdotio quo necessario ante Episcopatum imbutus esse debet, haurire. Sed Episcopatum per se nihil aliud dicere quam officium, dignitatem, potestatem, auctoritatem Sacerdoti datam multo amplioem, et augustiorem per consecrationem Episcopalem, ea quam per Sacerdotii characterem nactus fuerat" ("De Sac. Ord.," pars. iii., exercit. iii., cap. i., § 7., p. 6).

He approves the opinion which "Omnem illam potestatem et auctoritatem qua Episcopus Presbyteris eminet, Divinæ tribuit voluntati, quæ per consecrationem deputat e Presbyteris unum ut sit aliis superior, multaque agere possit virtuti illius deputationis et consecrationis, quæ non poterat dum esset tantum Presbyter" (§ 14).

And he quotes from Alexander: "Presbytero tolli non potest consecrandi potestas, quia pendet a characterem qui est indelebilis, sed tantum executio: Episcopo autem utrumque, et Potestas Ordinandi et executio, eo quod potestas Episcopalis qua talis, characterem non imprimit" (§ 15).

been altogether wasted in writing so much on this point, though it is much more than seems to me to be necessary or very important for my purpose.

For the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* I venture to hope that a simple common-sense argument will carry far more weight. And I wish strongly to insist upon this: that my common-sense argument does not at all depend on the truth of the tradition or the accuracy of Jerome.

The mere fact that such a tradition lived, and lived quietly, that it spread, and spread without producing an ecclesiastical earthquake, that not even a lightning-flash or a thunder-clap was ever caused by it—this is all that we need to build our argument upon. Could such an account have spread abroad and been believed, and lived peaceably, in such an atmosphere as some would have us regard as the only true atmosphere of true Church doctrine and sound Church principles? I must make bold to submit this inquiry to the consideration of all who would desire to form a true judgment on this matter.

It is not, of course, to be supposed for a moment that such a Church as that of Alexandria could have lived in anything like an isolated position with no inquiring eyes upon it from the rest of Christendom. And it would be a scarcely less serious mistake to suppose that in those days no account was likely to be taken of invalid or irregular ordinations.¹

If we are to suppose that certain modern theories are an inheritance received by tradition from pure and primitive Christianity, how are we to account for the fact that, in view of the acceptance and extension of such a report concerning such an important Church as that of Alexandria, no œcumenical condemnation was ever pronounced on an error so serious as to imperil its claim to be accounted a living branch of the Church of Christ? On such a supposition how is it credible that the report should be spread abroad and yet no synodal investigation, no episcopal inquiry, ever have been instituted? How could such an irregularity in such an essential matter ever have been spoken of and regarded simply as a singularity to be noted, and noted, perhaps, with more or less disapprobation, but not to be looked upon as affecting the very standing of Alexandria in the position of a Christian Church?

Have we any indication of anything at all like the feeling which might have said to the laity of Alexandria: "Alas! you have been mocked with unrealities in the sacred services of the Church, and even in very sacrifice of the Christian altar. You have had given you by the hand of a pseudo-Sacerdos (or of a 'no-Presbyter') mere bread and wine, when

¹ See Bingham, "*Antiquities of the Chris. Ch.*," book ii., ch. iii., § 6.

you ought to have been receiving from the hand of a true Priest the very Body and Blood, together with the very Soul and Divinity of the Incarnate Son of God"?

Yet the use of such language as this, would it not have been the kind thing, the only right thing, if only such words were held to be true words, or words whose terrible truth could only be modified by a charitable hope that God's overflowing mercies might even have somehow extraordinarily made good to them what human error had withheld from them in a compassion which might make the Church's soul extend beyond the limits of the Church's body?

I hope I have not overstated, I trust I have not desired to overstate, matters, or to misrepresent the attitude which certain modern opinions should consistently have taken up in respect of the practice of an ancient Christian Church, and which was not, I believe, taken up by the Christianity of earlier centuries: or I would rather say an attitude the conspicuous absence of which, in the history of early Christianity, can hardly be accounted for except by a candid acknowledgment that the position which requires for a true Church that the succession must always and everywhere be traced through Episcopal consecration is a position "very difficult indeed to maintain."

Somewhat more which has to be said on what may be called another branch of this subject must be reserved for another paper.

I will only now very briefly address myself to an inquirer who may be supposed to ask, Is this all that has to be urged as against the notion that a "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" argument can fairly be urged in support of the necessity of Episcopal succession? And my answer must be that I believe this to be by no means the whole of the case from the witness of antiquity as against such a necessity. I incline to think that something very material might be added from the history of the Church of Rome,¹ yet I cannot but think that if my argument is valid it needs no further addition.

I will only then ask the reader's attention for a moment to a saying of Tertullian: "Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest" ("De Baptismo," xvii. Op., p. 231; edit. Rigaltius, 1689). This is said concerning baptism as lawfully to be administered by laymen, its administration by ministers only being a restriction "propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est." The same truth is still more strongly expressed by him elsewhere.² But it con-

¹ See Bishop Wordsworth's "Ministry of Grace," pp. 125-131.

² The memorable passage from the "De Exhortatione Castitatis" (§ vii.), "Differentiam inter Ordinem et Plebem constituit Ecclesiæ

cerns us rather to observe that this was no singular notion of Tertullian. It is distinctly enunciated by Jerome, who, speaking of the same restraint as needful for avoiding of schisms, adds: "Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita et dare potest" ("Adv. Luciferianos," § ix., Op., tom. i., par. i., c. 182; edit. Vallarsius, Venet., 1767).

It may be urged, no doubt, that in both these cases the application of the principle is only made to the case of lay baptism, the validity of which is commonly allowed. But the principle stated is one which certainly admits of an *extended* application. And if a baptized man, because he has received baptism, can *therefore* also administer baptism, it may fairly be argued that on the same principle one who has received the Order of Presbyterate has also the inherent power of ordaining to the Order of Presbyters. And I believe it will be found that such an application of the principle was subse-

Auctoritas, et honor per Ordinis consensum sanctificatus: adeo ubi Ecclesiastici ordinis non est consensus, et offers et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici" (Op., p. 522; edit. Rigaltius, Paris, 1689), is not quoted here, because it is not questioned that it was written after Tertullian had become a Montanist (though Bishop Kaye believed that he had not then embraced Montanism in all its rigour—"Writings of Tertullian," p. 61). The evidence of this is found in a passage where appeal is made to a prophecy of Prisca (§ x.). And Bishop Gore urges ("Christian Ministry," p. 206) that there can be little doubt of the genuineness of this passage. The question, then, naturally suggests itself: Why were these words, which "belong to the true text," omitted? They have no place in the edition of Rigaltius: "ad vetustissimorum exemplarium fidem sedulo emendata" (Paris, 1689). And I think we can hardly fail to see a hand pointing to the true solution of this *phenomenon* in the words of Manutius, who, in the Preface to his Roman Edition of the Fathers, professes that, in accordance with the Pope's injunction, they are issued "Sic emendati, ne qua supersit labes quæ imperitorum animos objecta falsæ doctrinæ specie possit inficere" (see Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. i., p. 205). And if it should be found, as I incline to think it will, though I have been hindered from fully investigating this point, that, after the work of the censor had eliminated the words which sounded of Montanism, these words were allowed to remain and pass current among the orthodox, which said, "et offers, et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus," then it will hardly be denied that there remains a very valid and important argument, showing that language which has so heretical a sound in the ears of some of our new teachers was not felt to be so abhorrent from the standpoint of more ancient Church principles. The words were afterwards, indeed, strangely *amended* by Pamelius, who acknowledged that he struck out the "non"; but they were restored by the honesty of Rigaltius, who added a note admitting that they recognised the power of a layman to administer Baptism and the Eucharist—a note which he was afterwards forced to withdraw (see Goode's "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 229).

quently allowed and sanctioned by approved writers in the Roman communion.

Thus Rosellus is quoted as saying: "It seemeth that a man confirmed, though he be a layman, and not in Orders, seeing he has received a character by his confirmation, may give that character to another by the Pope's mandate" (Rosellus "de potestate Imp.," par. iv., c. 16. See "Brief Treatises," p. 166). And again, "Volunt Doctores, quod Papa potest committere, cuilibet Clerico, ut conferat quæ habet ipse: ut si est Presbyter, possit ordinare Presbyterum, et diaconus diaconum" (*Ibid.* p. 167). And so Armachenus (Bishop Fitz-Ralph, 1347), "Videtur quod si omnes Episcopi essent defuncti, sacerdotes possent Episcopos ordinare" ("Sum. contra Armen.," lib. ii., cap. vii. See "Brief Treatises," p. 168).¹

And all this is nothing more than is distinctly asserted—and asserted as an application of the same principle—in one of the glosses which is found in the Decretum of Gratian. The gloss is read thus: "Tamen ex demandatione papæ quilibet conferre potest quod habet: unde ordinatus ordinem quem habet conferre potest, et Confirmatus Confirmationem" (par. iii., "De Consecratione," Dist. v., Can. iii.; "Manus quoque," p. 1343; edit. Venet., 1567).

It is scarcely necessary to ask the reader to observe that the Pope here is not supposed to be by Papal authority giving any man a power which he did not before possess. He is only releasing a man from restraints which have been laid upon him by ecclesiastical law or order, and so giving him authority to exercise a power which belonged to him before as being essentially inherent in the office and order which he had received.

Nevertheless there is nothing in all this that need militate with the view of an Apostolic origin (in some sense) of Episcopal Pre-eminence and Rule and Authority.² The messages

¹ On this subject see Bilson's "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church," pp. 160, 286, 322; edit. Eden, Oxford, 1842.

² On this subject see Jeremy Taylor, "Episcopacy Asserted," lect. 21, Works, edit. Eden, vol. v., p. 71, 72, where it is argued that, "by St. Hierome's own confession, Episcopacy is by Divine right a superior Order to the Presbyterate" (p. 72).

Whitgift says: "The Levitical priesthood is no figure of the ministry of the Gospel" (Works, vol. i., p. 368, P.S.).

This does not deny the *analogy* between priests in the Old Covenant and Presbyters in the New. Hooker says: "The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament making so much mention of them [Presbyters] doth not anywhere call them priests. The Prophet Esay, I grant, doth [lxvi. 21]; but in such sort as the ancient Fathers, by way of analogy" ("Eccles. Pol.," book v., ch. lxxviii., p. 3; Works, vol. ii., p. 472; edit. Keble). See Bilson, "Perpetual Government," p. 309;

of the Son of Man—the Living One, who became a dead man, and is now alive for evermore—were sent by His servant John to the "Angels" of the Seven Churches,¹ which Angels were represented by the Stars seen in His right hand, even as the Churches themselves were represented by "the mystery" of the Seven Golden Candlesticks, in the midst of which He was seen when His countenance was as the sun shineth in His strength.

"A Bishop" (says Hooker) "is a minister of God, unto whom, with permanent continuance, there is given not only power of administering the Word and Sacraments, which power other Presbyters have, but also a further power to ordain ecclesiastical persons, and a power of chiefly in government over Presbyters as well as laymen—a power to be by way of jurisdiction a Pastor even to Pastors themselves" ("Eccles. Pol.," book vii., cap. ii., § 3; Works, vol. iii., p. 148; edit. Keble).

Archbishop Ussher, "Original of Bishops," etc., Works, vol. vii., pp. 43-45; edit. Elrington.

Isa. lx. 17: "I will also make thy officers [*pekuddah*] peace, and thine exactors righteousness," is rendered by LXX.: *δώσω τοὺς ἀρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*. And Jerome writes: "In quo Scripturæ sanctæ admiranda majestas, quod principes futuros Ecclesiæ, Episcopus nominavit" (Op., tom. iv., c. 728; edit. Vallarsius). And Clemens Romanus had also seen in this text a reference to the Christian *ἐπισκόποι*, but with him the *ἐπισκόποι* are doubtless the Presbyters (see Lightfoot on Clemens Romanus, xlii., p. 133). Irenæus also had applied the passage to the Christian ministry ("Hær.," iv., 26, § 5). Compare Jer. xxxiii. 17-22, and see Dean Payne-Smith's note there.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, indeed, considers that, though "an Apostle or a Bishop is often called Presbyter and Deacon," yet "a mere Deacon or a mere Presbyter" is never "called either Bishop or Apostle" (Works, vol. x., p. 88; edit. Eden). This, however, is a position which can hardly be maintained (see "Speaker's Com." on Acts xx. 28, and Lightfoot on Clemens Romanus, xlii. 15, p. 133).

¹ See my "Apostolic Fathers," p. 10, and Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book vii., ch. v., § 2.

N. DIMOCK.

