

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TOWARDS THE MINISTRY OF NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES

Church Association Tract 424

J. T. TOMLINSON

The Constitution of the Church

At the dawn of the Reformation in England, when tentative efforts were made to introduce the use of services in the Mother tongue, written questions were put to the divines as to how far the various usages and beliefs then current rested on the warranty of Holy Scripture. This is seen in the preliminary enquiries to which written answers were elicited before the drafting of "The Institution of any Christian Man" (A.D. 1537) and "The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition" of 1543. In the former of these the conclusion reached was—"The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops. Nor is there any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this sacrament; but only of prayer, and the imposition of the bishop's hands" (*Formularies of Faith*, p. 105). The re-actionary book of 1543 said, "And of these two orders only, that is to say, priests and deacons, scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred of the apostles by prayer and imposition of their hands" (p. 281). The received belief among the "schoolmen," who were the builders-up of Latin theology, was that the distinction of bishops from presbyters was not one of "Order," but simply of dignity and function, a distinction which had originated in natural selection and local convenience. Mr. Dimock, in his valuable pamphlet on "Christian Unity" (p. 20, note), observes that "in the Church of Rome" (meaning by that phrase, the local church at Rome), "perhaps by reason of its faithful adherence to the truth, the development of Episcopacy was exceptionally tardy," and he quotes Bp. Lightfoot, who says, "The episcopate, though doubtless it existed in some form or other in Rome, had not yet (it would seem) assumed the same sharp and well-defined monarchical character with which we are confronted in the eastern churches." Canon Robertson, the historian, when speaking of church government in general, says, "We do not refuse to acknowledge that the organisation of the Church was gradual; we are only concerned to maintain that it was directed by the apostles . . . and that in all essential points it was completed before their departure" (*Hist. I.*, 12). It is only in that sense that the Preface to our Ordinal asserts that "from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." That statement does not allege that these orders are of divine obligation, or that any one of them is essential to the very being, or to the definition of a "church," though it does, by inference, lay claim at least negatively to apostolic sanction.

No Stereotyped Hierarchy under the New Covenant.

Deacons and Presbyters (Elders) were directly appointed by the Apostles who habitually gave to the presbyters the title of "bishops." These titles were borrowed not from the Old Testament Hierarchy, which had a direct divine appointment, and whose exclusive claims were repeatedly vindicated by miraculous interpositions, but only from the Synagogue, whose ritual and worship had a merely human ecclesiastical authority. The very title of "elder" shows that no more was claimed for the office.

Canon Carter (of Clewer) says, "Scripture is in truth silent as to the specific ministrations, as well as the distinctive name, of the second order of the Ministry" (*Doctrine of the Priesthood*, 2nd edition, p. 119).

Some who, like Timothy, had been appointed “with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery” (I Tim. iv., 14) were sent here or there by one of the apostles with a sort of Legatine authority *ad hoc* to exercise jurisdiction over the local clergy, and to “ordain others also.” All missionaries who happen to be the first heralds of the glad tidings necessarily exercise authority over the new converts until they have “set in order the things that are wanting” to an infant “church;” but the exact form which the ministry took varied with the special needs and circumstances of the people and the locality. The church officers seem to have been elected by the votes of the church members given by “show of hands” (*Cheirotonia*) and were afterwards formally co-opted into the appropriate rank (*Ordo*) by the laying on of the hands of the church officers (*Epithesis Cheiron*, or *Cheirothesia*). In the case of bishops, therefore, where bishops in the modern sense had come into being, this laying on of hands was naturally restricted to bishops. Hence, too, in our English Ordination of priests, the priests present “lay their hands severally on the head” of the elected candidate. When episcopacy became universal, the powers wielded by “the President of the Brethren,” as Justin Martyr called him, varied from time to time and from place to place, so that the phrase “the historic episcopate” covers a very vague and variable idea—and this would not have been the case had the office been, from the first, a direct institution of the Founder of the Catholic Church. St. Augustine, in applying the prophecy of Psalm xlv. 16, to the Christian Church, says “the Church has brought forth sons and *has appointed them (constituit eos)* as princes instead of her own (*suis*) fathers.” And Jerome says, “The apostle teaches us that bishops were not distinct from the elders. If in process of time, one was chosen to hold authority over the others, this was done to guard against schism” (Comment on Titus i. 5, quoted in Pressense’s *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*, p. 50).

Co-operation of the Reformed Churches.

At the English Reformation the Protestant bishops, so far from holding aloof from the Continental Reformers on the ground of their lacking Episcopal leadership, corresponded with them fraternally on equal terms, sought their advice and assistance, and borrowed freely from their reformed Liturgies, appointing some of them as Divinity professors at the two Universities, while the Primate earnestly endeavoured to bring about concerted action for joint opposition to the Council of Trent. Peter Martyr, in particular, took an active part in framing our Articles of religion directed expressly against the papal heresies, and assisted (under a Royal Commission) in drafting the *Reformatio legum*. During the Marian persecution the English Protestant clergy were scattered abroad at Frankfort, Embden, Zurich, Basle, Strasburg, Berne and other Protestant centres. Naturally, therefore, on their return from exile they cherished grateful memories and affectionate regard for the ministers of the reformed churches whose guests the English refugees had been. It is true that the preface to the Reformed Ordinal forbade any to minister in that church who had not been ordained under its “form”. But in each case this rule was limited by the words “not being *at this present* bishop, priest or deacon.” As this same wording was adopted at different dates, 1550, 1552, 1559, 1604, up to 1662 they were evidently equivalent to “already in holy orders.” Both Elizabeth herself and her principal advisers cherished a warm sympathy with the “Reformed” Churches. Her high esteem for John à Lasco, and her desire to have Peter Martyr in England after reading his Treatise on the Eucharist is testified by Bp. Jewel who wrote to the latter:—“The Queen, of her own accord, eagerly perused both your letter and the book itself, and wonderfully commended both your learning and character in general She was altogether desirous that you should by all means be invited to England, that as you formerly *tilled*, as it were, the University, by your lectures, so you might again *water* it by the same.” (*Zurich Letters*, I-54). Mr. Gorham in his *Reformation Gleanings*, p. 392, says this invitation was “repeated but declined in 1561.”

“The Act for Ministers to be of Sound Religion.”

The Act of 13 Elizabeth, c. 12 making subscription to the 39 Articles compulsory enacts that “every person under the degree of a bishop, which shall pretend to be a Priest, *or Minister of God’s holy word and sacraments*, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering than the form set forth by Parliament or now used” shall sign the Articles of religion, under pain of deprivation. These words, of course, applied to the mass-priests, some of whom still clung to their

benefices even so late as 1571, but the alternative wording “or ministers of God’s holy Word and Sacraments” shows that certain incumbents in 1571, other than mass-priests, had not then been “ordered” under the English Ordinal.

Of this designed contrast in meaning of the two words we have innumerable examples from that period. Thus, Hooker says “he cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart which . . . can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests” (Sermon v. 7, p. 666, Keble’s edition, Vol. iii.).

Bishop Christopherson when chaplain to Mary Tudor, in denouncing the Edwardian clergy, said, “then was the holy order of priesthood utterly disannulled, so that the name of ‘Priest’ should not any longer be used, but such as should preach and minister the sacraments, should be called Ministers’ and not Priests.” (*Exhortation to take heed of Rebellion.* Brit. Mus. “697 a. 17.”) In the Diary of the English College of Douay, are many entries of beneficed ministers who had afterwards become priests, and the Examination of John Chapman by the Bishop of Winchester shows how he had become a Priest, though “before a minister” beneficed for six years in Dorsetshire, “and being asked why he left the mynysterye, he sayth hys conscience only was the cause” (Estcourt’s *Anglican Ordinations*, lxvii.)

John King, Bishop of London, when asked by a Romanist, “Are you a priest?” replied “No,” adding “I am a priest, but not a massing-priest.” (Dimock’s *Missarum Sacrificia*, p. 88.)

The Act of 13 Elizabeth was recognised at the time as admitting the validity of the position of incumbents who lacked episcopal ordination; and the Tractarian editor of Hooker recognises that “nearly up to the time when he wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination, and it appears by Travers’ Supplication to the Council that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th Elizabeth.” He goes on to suggest that “the apparent decision of the case by high authority in Church and State may account for Hooker’s going rather out of his way to signify that he did not dispute that authority.”

(Keble’s *Preface*, lxxvi.) Keble admits that his own line “was not in general the line preferred by Jewel, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper and others, to whom the management of that controversy was entrusted, during the early part of Elizabeth’s reign. . . . It is enough, with them, to show that government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its *exclusive* claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy Sacraments” (p. lix.) and this good sense and moderation of language was the more praiseworthy on their part, as the fanatical claims of the Puritan Presbyterians to a Theocratic basis for their own demands must have sorely tried their patience. Keble states his own view of the question as being “whether the charter granted by our Lord to the Twelve, was granted to them *and the whole Church*, or to them and the heirs for ever of their spiritual powers, set apart by laying on of hands” (p. lxiii.); but Hooker flatly contradicted his editor on that question.

LORD BACON, who could not be ignorant of the meaning of Elizabeth’s Act, disposed of the notion of “Divine right” by saying: “For the second point, that there should be but one form of discipline in all Churches, and that imposed by necessity of a commandment and prescript of the word of God; it is a matter volumes have been compiled of, and therefore cannot receive a brief redargution. I, for my part, do confess that in revolving the Scriptures I could never find any such thing; but that God had left the like liberty to the Church government, as he had done to the civil government; to be varied according to time and place and accidents, which nevertheless His high and Divine providence doth order and dispose. For all civil governments are restrained from God unto the general grounds of justice and manners, but the policies and forms are left free; so that monarchies and kingdoms, senates and seignories, popular states and communalities are lawful, and where they are planted ought to be maintained inviolate. So likewise in Church matters, the

substance of the doctrine is immutable, and so are the general rules of government; but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and discipline of churches, they be left at large." And with regard to our own question in England he said: "Some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonourable and derogatory speeches and censure of the Churches abroad; and that so far, as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers." (Quoted in Dean Goode's *Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations*, pp. 31,36.)

Testimony of the Elizabethan Bishops.

The Elizabethan bishops repudiated the notion that any one form of Church Government was of Divine obligation.

Archbishop Whitgift, though a strict disciplinarian, yet rested his authority on merely legal grounds. Thus he says, "That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it a church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny, and the reasons that move me so to do be these. The first is, because I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed and commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ, which no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter necessary unto the salvation of the Church. Secondly, because the essential notes of the Church be these only: the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the Sacraments. . . . So that, notwithstanding government, or some kind of government may be part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet it is not such a part of the essence and being, but it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government, and therefore the kind of government of the Church is not necessary unto salvation. . . . I deny that the Scriptures do . . . set down any one certain form and kind of the government of the Church, to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places without alteration" (Goode's *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*, II., 273, 274).

Bishop Jewel, who officially translated our 39 Articles, and whose "Apology" is described in the thirtieth Canon of 1603-4, as "The apology of the Church of England," goes further in showing the non-necessity of bishops. He says, "Now, if any man think it strange to hear a layman in any sense called a priest, may it please him to peruse some part of that hereafter followeth in this Defence. There shall he find, by the authorities of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hierome and St. Chrysostom, that whosoever is a member of Christ's body, whosoever is a child of the Church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth His name, is fully invested with the priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, 'Yea though they be only laymen, yet have they a Church'" (*Works*, III., 336).

Bishop Cooper, in his reply to the "Marprelate tracts," after describing the various forms of government in foreign non-episcopal churches, said "All these churches in which the Gospel in these days, after great darkness, was first renewed, and the learned men whom God sent to instruct them, I doubt not but have been directed by the Spirit of God to retain this liberty, that in external government and other outward orders, they might choose such as they thought in wisdom and godliness to be most convenient for the state of their country and disposition of their people. Why then should this liberty that other countries have used, under any colour, be wrested from us?" (Goode, p. 275).

Archbishop Sandys, while disputing the *fact* of Dean Whittingham's ordination, was careful to show that it was not owing to any denial of the validity of the orders of the foreign Protestant Churches, and wrote to Lord Burghley to explain "the discredit of the Church of Geneva is hotly alleged. Verily, my Lord, that Church is not touched. For he hath not received his ministry in that Church, or by any authority or order from that Church, so far as yet can appear" (Strype, *Annals*, II., ii., 620). Dean Goode has no difficulty in showing that the earliest writers on the 39 Articles, Rogers, Burnet, Hey, Tomline, understood the 23rd Article to cover the case of non-episcopal churches (pp: 288-290).

Dean Sutcliffe said, "The Anglican church, and the German and French and Scotch and other churches, associated with us in the communion of faith, we doubt not to be true Churches, and to belong to the Catholic, or Universal Church." In reply to the Romish controversialist, Stapleton, he said, "The external succession, which both heretics often have and the orthodox have not, is of no moment. Not even our adversaries themselves, indeed, are certain respecting their own succession, which they so greatly boast of. But we are certain that our doctors have succeeded to the apostles, and prophets, and most ancient Fathers. And, moreover, if there is any weight in external *Succession*, they have succeeded to the bishops and presbyters throughout Germany, France, England, and other countries, and were ordained by them. They have succeeded, also, as it respects doctrine, to those pious men, who, amidst the darkness of the Papal synagogue, beheld the light, and boldly preached against its corruptions" (Goode, *Divine Rule*, p. 304).

Hooker, the greatest of the Elizabethans, goes to the root of the matter when he tells us that "the whole Church Visible being the true and original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain: howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways." "Those persons excepted which Christ did immediately bestow such power upon, the rest succeeding have not received power as they did, Christ bestowing it upon their persons: but the power which Christ did institute in the Church, they from the Church do receive." And he does not hesitate to say that "the Church hath power by universal consent to take it away. . . Wherefore, lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had authority to touch their states, let them continually bear in mind that it is rather the force of custom . . . than that any such true and heavenly law can be shewed, by the evidence of which it may of truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves." (Keble's *Hooker*, vol. III., pp. 165, 231, 398, 404, etc.)

Bishop Geste did not hesitate to say of the Lord's Supper "In respect whereof Paul spoke the self-same words unto the unpriested Corinthians, which Christ reported to his disciples. And bade them also perform all those things which Christ demanded to be performed of His disciples, which thing He would never have done, if the unpriested Corinthians might not [have] accomplished, and put in execution all matters concerning the Lord's Supper" (*Treatise against the Privy Mass*, reprinted by Dugdale, p. 99, c.f. pp. 110, 135). An original copy is in the British Museum, Press mark "696, a. 21."

Action of the Ordinaries.

We have seen that the Act of 13 Elizabeth recognised the existence not only of priests who had received their Orders prior to the first Reformed Ordinal of 1550, but *also* of "Ministers" ordained in other Protestant Churches. And it would seem that after the passing of that Act, a licence granted by the Ordinary to one of these last-named persons was accounted as a recognised dispensation under the terms of which such clerics might officiate in the National Church. The Visitation Articles of Grindal, Aylmer and Sandys, ask "Whether any person or persons not being ordered at least for a deacon, or licensed by the ordinary, do say Common Prayer openly in your Church." (Report of Royal Commission, 1868, Appendix F., pp. 407, 419, 430). The bitter separatist, John Penry, wrote an attack on the English clergy, describing them as having derived their orders from an Anti-Christian power. "That they do it either as they are deacon, priest, or [as] having a privileged immunity, licence or dispensation counterfeiting a deaconrie or a priesthood. I add this privileged licence because some one among ten thousand (it may be) being neither priest or deacon, by virtue of Licence from his Ordinarie doth serve a cure, yet (if there be any such they are not capable of any charge, and what they do they do it by the power of the beast." Again, he says, "no man in this land can take a spiritual living, either parsonage, Vicarage, curate-ship, but by virtue of this priesthood, deaconrie, or a *Popish licence equivalent unto this priesthood*." What is meant by this alternative of licensing by the bishop is illustrated by the case of John Morrison, whose licence, dated April 6th, 1582, ran as follows:—"Since you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years

past, in the town of Garvet, in the county of Lothian, of the kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to the sacred Orders and the holy Ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland; and since the congregation of that county of Lothian *is conformable to the orthodox faith and sincere religion now received in this realm of England*, and established by public authority: We therefore, as much as lies in us, as by right we may, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment done in such manner aforesaid, grant to you a licence and faculty with the consent and express command of the most Reverend Father in Christ the Lord, Edmund [Grindal] by the Divine providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to us signified, that in such Orders by you taken, you may, and have power, in any convenient places in and throughout the whole Province of Canterbury to celebrate Divine offices, to minister the sacraments, etc., as much as in us lies, and we may *de jure*, and as far as the laws of the Kingdom do allow” Strype’s *Life of Grindal*, pp. 402, 596).

The Caroline Age.

The writers of the Seventeenth Century, though a period of reaction, were no less clear in their testimony.

Bishop Hall said (1641):—“The sticking at the admission of our brethren returning from Reformed Churches, was *not in case of Ordination*, but of Institution; they had been acknowledged ministers of Christ, without any other hands laid upon them; but according to the laws of our land they were not perhaps capable of Institution to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the statutes of this realm do require. And, secondly, I know those more than one, that by virtue only of that Ordination which they have brought with them from other Reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings, without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling” (Goode, p. 295). And the same bishop, preaching before the Synod of Dort, said, “We are one Body, let us be of one Mind”: and preaching to his clergy, said “Blessed be God! there is no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation . . . the only difference is in the form of outward administration, wherein we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a church, though much importing the well or better being of it according to our several apprehensions” (Dimock’s *Christian Unity*, p. 34).

Even Laud, at whose request Bishop Hall wrote, in his *Conference with Fisher*, the Jesuit, said, “Nor yet speak I this as if other Protestants did not agree with the Church of England in the chiefest doctrines, and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman Church: as appears by their several Confessions.” And, later he adds:—“For succession in the general I shall say this: it is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find anyone of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible and continued succession, a necessary sign or mark of the true church in any one place” (pp. 41, 322, ed. 1839).

Archbishop Bramhall was among those who took high ground as to Episcopacy, but added—“I do not make this way to be simply necessary but only show what is safest, where so many Christians are of another mind. I know there is a great difference between a ‘valid’ and a ‘regular’ ordination. For my part I am apt to believe that God looks upon his people in mercy, with all their prejudices; and that there is a great latitude left to particular churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment” (Goode, p. 300).

Archbishop Usher said, “The Churches in France, who living under a Popish power, cannot do what they would, and are more excusable in this defect then the Low Countries that live under a free State, yet for the testifying my communion with those Churches, which I do love and honour as true members of the Church universal I do profess that with like affection I should receive the blessed Sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers if I were in Holland, as I should at the hands of the French ministers if I were at Charentone” (Goode, p. 305). Mr. Denny affects to

disbelieve that any persons in foreign Protestant Orders were ever allowed to enter the ministry of the Church of England.

But Bishop Cosin, the darling of the Ritualists, not only communicated with the Reformed at Charentone, to the disgust of Queen Henrietta Maria, but testifies to the meaning of the Act of 13 Elizabeth above-mentioned. He said, "If at any time a minister ordained in these French churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance many others before my time) our bishops did not reordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe to the Articles established." (Letter to M. Cordel.) Cosin, as chaplain to Bishop Overal, testified that the latter held the same views on this matter. He wrote: "Dr. De Laune, who translated the English Liturgy into French being collated to a living and coming to the bishop . . . his Lordship asked him where he had his Orders. He answered that he was ordained by the Presbytery at Leyden. The bishop (Overal) on this advised him to take the opinion of counsel, whether by the laws of England he was capable of a benefice without being ordained by a bishop. The doctor replied that he thought his Lordship would be unwilling to reordain him, if his Counsel should say "that he was not otherwise capable of the living by law." The bishop rejoined, 'Re-ordination we must not admit no more than a Rebaptization; but in case you find it doubtful whether you be a priest capable to receive a benefice among us, or no, I will do the same office for you, if you desire it, that I should do for one who doubts of his baptism . . . Yet for mine own part, if you will adventure the Orders that you have I will admit your presentation, and give you institution into the living, howsoever.' But the title which this presentation had from the patron, proving not good, there were no further proceedings in it; yet afterwards Dr. De Laune was admitted into another benefice without any new ordination." (Goode, p. 293).

Archbishop Wake wrote of the pastors of Geneva, "I could have wished that the episcopal form of church government had been retained by all of them (the Reformed churches). In the meanwhile, far be it from me to be so iron-hearted that on account of a defect of this kind . . . I should believe that some of them are to be broken off from our communion, or, with certain insane writers among us should assert, that they have no true and valid sacraments." (Goode, p. 321).

Change of Policy at the Restoration.

Unhappily, the mutual dislike amounting to exasperation resulting from the civil war induced Convocation in 1661 to introduce into the preface of the Ordinal the words "or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination." These words were apparently added as an after-thought, for on p. 520 of the "Annexed Book," they have been crowded in by more compressed writing and partly by means of an interlineation. At this time, too, the words "not being at this present, bishop, priest or deacon" were struck out.

Lord Clarendon, however, reminds us that "This was new, for there had been many, and at present were some, who possessed benefices with cure of souls and other ecclesiastical promotions, who had never received orders, but in France or Holland, and these men must now receive new ordination, which had been always held unlawful in the church, or by this Act of Parliament must be stripped of their livelihood which they had enjoyed in the most flourishing and peaceable time of the Church" (*Autobiography*, p. 152).

This "new" decision to exclude henceforth all Protestant ministers who had not submitted to episcopal ordination was due to passionate resentment for the wrongs suffered by the Episcopalian clergy during the 20 years of the Great Rebellion; but was purely insular and mainly political in its incidence, and the lowered relative position of Episcopalians in North America and their backward standing in the recent Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, are among the penalties of this retrograde exclusiveness, which modern scholarship finds unwarranted. The

Bishop of Hereford's charge in 1898 gives the conclusion reached by Professor Hort: "There is no trace in the New Testament that any ordinances on this subject were prescribed by the Lord, or that any such ordinances were set up as permanently binding by the Twelve or by St. Paul or by the Ecclesia at large. Their faith in the Holy Spirit and His perpetual guidance was too much of a reality to make that possible. Of officers higher than elders we find nothing that points to an institution or system, nothing like the episcopal system of later times. In the New Testament the word *Episcopos*, as applied to men, mainly, if not always, is *not* a title, but a description of the Elder's function. On the other hand, the monarchical principle, which is the essence of episcopacy, receives in the Apostolic age a practical though a limited recognition, not so much in the absolutely exceptional position of St. Peter in the early days at Jerusalem, or the equally exceptional position of St. Paul throughout the Ecclesiae of his own foundation, as in the position ultimately held by St. James at Jerusalem, and also to a limited extent in the temporary functions entrusted by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus when he left them behind for a little while to complete arrangements begun by himself at Ephesus and in Crete respectively. In this, as in so many other things, is seen the futility of endeavouring to make the Apostolic history into a set of authoritative precedents, to be rigorously copied without regard to time and place, thus turning the Gospel into a second Levitical Code."

Mr. Upton in his valuable *Outlines of Prayer Book History*, pp. 317-21, has shown that the changes made at the last revision, such as "Priest" for "Minister," or "Church" for "Congregation," were not due to any change of doctrine. Professor Swainson in his *History of the Act of Uniformity*, p. 11, shows that in 1662 it was for the first time made illegal by *statute* for a deacon to celebrate the Lord's Supper, or to be incumbent of a parish. Hence the substitution of "priest" for "minister" compelled the incumbents to take the authoritative share in a service at which a deacon curate could properly have but a subordinate position.