

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

BY THE RIGHT REV. J. W. DIGGLE, D.D.,

Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

(Continued from p. 193.)

THUS the position of the Church of England is altogether unmistakable in respect both to Sacraments and discipline. The doctrine of Christ is her rule in all things. She allows neither Sacraments nor discipline to be ministered except as the Lord hath commanded. And this is the Lord's commandment concerning absolution: that if men forgive, they are forgiven; if they forgive not, neither can they be forgiven. This commandment, together with other commandments concerning forgiveness taken out of Holy Scripture, the priest is to declare. Such declaration is one of the main purposes of his ordination. Publicly he is to preach it with all the authority that his commission, his knowledge, his experience can combine to confer. Privately he is to tell it, without scruple or doubtfulness, to disquieted penitents. At the dying bed he is to proclaim with no uncertain sound, but with all the power derived to the Church from Jesus Christ her Lord—a great and living power so long as the Church abides in Christ, but apart from Him a withered, lifeless impotence—that to the truly believing, the truly penitent, the truly charitable, those who make amends to them they have injured, and from the bottom of their hearts forgive those who have offended them, there is certain forgiveness, unquestionable absolution—the Father's kiss, the best robe, the Father's ring.

We see, then, that neither the discipline nor the Sacraments of the Gospel may be ministered in the Church of England otherwise than God's Word doth allow. The dispensing of the Word, as in Holy Scripture, takes precedence of the Sacraments. In the formularies of the Church of England the second never usurps the place of the first, nor is the first relegated to the position of the second. In the Ordering of Priests the

Bishop delivers a Bible into the hand of the ordinee, but neither paten nor chalice, as in some communions, and as in the Church of England in her mediæval, sacerdotal age. At the Reformation the Church of England broke away from this, as from some other similar ecclesiastical erroneous customs. And why did she thus break herself free from them? Not through any disparagement of the Sacraments of the Gospel. No one who knows the Church of England—her historic sense; her Apostolic continuity; her devotion to whatsoever things are beautiful, just, reverent, and true—can hurl at her any such false accusation as this. No, the Church of England is a sacramental Church—not primarily, because the Sacraments are not the prime things in Scripture, but deeply, truthfully, reverentially, and according to Divine proportion. It is because of her reverence for the Sacraments and the Divine Author and Giver of the Sacraments that she keeps them in their proper place—the place which the Lord and His Apostles assigned to them.

The New Testament is perfectly explicit as to the due and rightful position of the Sacraments in the economy of the Gospel. The ministry of the Lord is characteristically a ministry of the Word. The Lord Himself was baptized, but Himself never baptized. He did not even institute the Christian Sacrament of Baptism (a sign of new birth, an instrument for grafting into the Church, a pledge and witness of initiation into Christian discipleship) until after his Resurrection. The Sacrament of His Holy Supper He did not ordain till the eve of His great Passion and redeeming death. All the remainder of His ministry on earth was devoted to the Word—*i.e.*, the declaration and unfolding of the power and justice, the righteousness and love, the goodness and severity, the will and purpose, the sovereign mercy and infinite care, the essential mind and fatherly heart, of God. By example, by action, in conversation and conduct, in private talk with His disciples, in public preaching in the synagogue, by the seaside, and on mountain-tops—anywhere, everywhere, and always—this was His grand mission, the burden of His ministry: to teach men the things concerning

the kingdom of God, to show men the Father. His characteristic title among His contemporaries was "Teacher." By no other term is He so frequently designated in the narratives of the Evangelists as this. He Himself gloried in the designation. "Ye call Me Teacher and Lord," He said, "and so I am." Teaching, like redeeming, was of the quintessence of His ministry.

When we pass to the Apostolic age, the same proportion between the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel is maintained. "Christ sent me not," says St. Paul, "to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." So tremendous was his inspired dread of the oversacramentalizing tendencies of his age, that he once actually cried out in thanksgiving to God for the fewness of the baptisms he had administered. Of all his converts, he seems to have baptized only Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas. In his Epistles the Holy Communion is only mentioned twice: once for the double purpose of emphasizing the unity of the faithful (all being partakers of the one bread),¹ and of warning Christian communicants against the perils of idolatry. The cup of the Lord, he says, is not to be confounded with the cup which Gentiles drink to demons. The Lord's table is not to be confounded with the table of demons. In the Christian Communion all fellowship with either the spirit or practices of idolatry must be avoided, there being no congruity, but a complete antagonism, between the sacrifices offered to idols and the Communion of the body and blood of Christ. To emphasize this antagonism the Holy Ghost guided him against the use of any terms which might tend to abate it, and so he uses neither the term "sacrifice" nor "altar" in connection with the Lord's Supper. Accustomed as he was from his earliest childhood to the use of these terms, both by the heathen around him and by the great Jewish Church of which he once had been so prominent and enthusiastic a member, he will adapt no such terms to the Christian feast. Israel after the flesh had sacrifices; Israel after the flesh had also a priestly altar; but Israel after the

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16 *et seq.*

Spirit has, according to St. Paul's inspired choice of terms, neither priestly sacrifice nor priestly altar. How altogether different, how much more grand and holy, would have been the history of the Christian Church if she had been loyal to this inspired choice of terms, and had not reverted to the use of pagan and Jewish nomenclature—a nomenclature which has drawn a whole host of pagan notions and Jewish traditions in its train!

The second occasion on which St. Paul adverts to the Holy Communion occurs in the same Epistle as the first.¹ Here the purpose of the mention is principally to inculcate the solemnity of the Supper—the exceeding need of self-control, self-examination, and the utmost reverence in eating the bread and drinking the cup, lest, in coming together to eat, men should be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. The Communion, according to St. Paul, is intended for a remembrance of Christ, and as a visible witness through all the ages of His death till the very end of time—“till He come.” Such an intention is sublime. Such a witness demands all the sanctity with which reverence can surround it, all the quietness and orderliness and seemliness which devotion can bestow. The necessity of this solemn and solemnizing spirit is the theme of St. Paul's second allusion to the Supper of the Lord. Nowhere else does he even refer to that Holy Supper. Neither is it referred to in any other part of the New Testament after the Gospels, except it be in the custom of the early Christians, who broke bread from house to house.

Now, what does this great reserve of the New Testament concerning the Sacraments mean? Does it mean that the writers of the New Testament were indifferent to the Sacraments—that they ignored and passed them by as unnecessary parts of the economy of the Gospel? Who that enters into their spirit and character, that appreciates their adoring love and loyalty to their Lord, can venture upon such a supposition? The words that Christ spake concerning the kingdom of God

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 20 *et seq.*

during the wondrous forty days of blessed converse between His Resurrection and Ascension must have sunk very deeply into their sensitive and devoted hearts. We have been permitted to know only a few of those sacred words, those Divine injunctions, but one of those injunctions has been left on record, either as an undisputed tradition or part of the Canonical Scripture—the injunction which commands the disciples to go to all the nations, discipleing them by Baptism into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. How strongly and firmly this injunction had seized upon the minds of the Apostles is evident from St. Peter's mandate to the 3,000 converts on the Day of Pentecost. "Repent," he said, 'and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Their Teacher's great saying to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," was no secret to the Apostles. They knew it well. Their practice proves how deeply they cherished its significance. Christianity was for them a new creation for man, a new birth—a birth from above. The Christian is a twice-born man. Naturally he is born of the flesh, and is flesh; spiritually he is born of the Spirit, and is spirit. And Baptism signified to them the instrument and seal of this new birth—this spiritual creation. Sometimes the Baptism followed the reception of the Holy Ghost, as in the instance of Cornelius and his company;¹ then it was a seal. Sometimes it preceded that reception, as with the converts at Ephesus; then it was an instrument. But in both instances the reception of Baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost are connected together: the heart was sprinkled from an evil conscience and the body washed with pure water. Baptism was no uncertain element in the teaching of St. Paul. "Know ye not," he asks, "that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ are baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised

¹ Cf. Acts x. 47, xix. 5, 6; Titus iii. 5; Heb. x. 22; Rom. vi. 3.

up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Even the custom of Baptism for the dead¹ he did not condemn, but wove it into the great argument set forth in his First Epistle to the Corinthians for the truth of the Resurrection. For St. Paul Baptism meant the putting on of Christ.² Thus, although there is great reserve displayed about Baptism in the writings of the New Testament, and few allusions are made to it, yet those allusions are clear, definite, unmistakable, strong. The Apostles clearly recognized and firmly taught the ministry of Baptism, but they made that ministry secondary to—yea, dependent upon—the ministry of the Word. The Church, so they taught, can only be sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word.³ Apart from the Word the washing was nothing. No Church can be a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, unless the Word vitalizes the washing and the washing is in harmony with the Word. This Apostolic teaching is the true echo of their Master's doctrine and their Master's prayer: "Ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken to you." "Sanctify them through Thy truth. Thy Word is truth."⁴

And as with the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, so also with the twin Sacrament of the Holy Communion. Here again there is great and striking reserve manifested in the Apostolic teachings—a reserve greater far than in reference to Baptism, a reserve amounting almost to silence. This most wonderful reserve is an astonishing note of the New Testament teachings. It cannot be unintentional, for it pervades the entire Canon. Outside the narratives of the three Synoptic Evangelists—and each of their accounts is singularly brief—there are not half a dozen references to the Holy Communion in all the New Testament Scriptures. St. John, the fourth Evangelist, the disciple whom Jesus loved, the disciple whose unique and blessed privilege it was to lean on the Lord's breast at the institution of the Supper, never mentions the details of that

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 29.

³ Eph. v. 26, 27.

² Col. iii. 27.

⁴ St. John xv. 3, xvii. 17.

institution. Some New Testament scholars are, indeed, of opinion that in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel there is a kind of treatise on the Holy Communion. It is just possible, but scarcely probable, that this is so. And why? The word 'flesh' is consistently used throughout that discourse, "body" never; whereas in each of the records of the institution of the Supper the word "body" is always used, not the word "flesh." Moreover, the conversation recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John took place some time previous to the institution, and it would be at least strange—something, indeed, like a reversal of things—to expound and dilate upon an institution which as yet, in the course of the narrative, had not even been alluded to. Such an exegesis is anachronistic. Besides, if in his sixth chapter St. John had been conscious of any reference to the Supper, it is almost past believing that he would have omitted, somewhere in his Gospel, to record the circumstances of the institution itself. Like the other Evangelists, he records in detail the circumstances of the betrayal, the trial, the death, the resurrection of the Lord; but the Supper he barely and briefly mentions, and then only in connection with the betrayal by Judas Iscariot and the very significant action of the Lord in washing the disciples' feet. This wondrous washing of the disciples' feet St. John relates in minute and copious detail, but not the institution of the Supper. The washing, together with the great saying, "Ye should do to others as I have done to you," seems to have made a singularly profound impression on St. John's mind, as if the unspeakable humility of the Son of God had been for him a grander legacy to the Church than the Sacrament of the Supper.

Again, in the sixth chapter of St. John neither of the fundamental words "remembrance" or "testament" occurs; whereas in all the four accounts given of the institution one or another of these words is used with striking emphasis. And in the accounts given by St. Luke and St. Paul, not one alone, but both these terms are used with stress. Their omission by St. John is at least noteworthy, and deserving of serious con-

sideration in the interpretation of the sixth chapter of his Gospel. Indeed, the best guide to the interpretation of the sixth chapter is the fourth chapter of the same Gospel. Both chapters are cast in the same mould. The conversations in both arise out of incidents related as immediately preceding and causing them. The crucial point in both chapters is the Messiahship of Jesus. It was a common tradition among the Jews that when Messiah should come He would give them His flesh to eat. The phrase was familiar, and signified to their minds, accustomed, as all Orientals are, to the free and frequent use of imagery for the conveyance of great thoughts and spiritual truths, that the Messiah would impart at His coming His own great strength, His own great vigour, His own robustness to conquer, to the chosen race. The Jews had no difficulty whatever in understanding such expressions as "bread from heaven," "living water," "wells of water springing up into everlasting life"—bread whose nourishment should abolish hunger, and water whose refreshment should abolish thirst—"flesh to eat and blood to drink." All these expressions were intelligible enough to them. They were commonplaces in reference to the Messiah. Their difficulty—the insuperable difficulty to many of them—was the appropriation of these expressions by Jesus to Himself. In the question, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" the stress of all the emphasis lies on the words "this man." No emphasis attaches to the words "his flesh." The stumbling-block, the rock of offence, the insurmountable incredibility, was that "THIS man"—this Jesus of Nazareth, this carpenter's son, this man whose mother was a peasant woman, this obscure native of a mountain village from which no good thing had been known to come, this man whose brothers and sisters were quite ordinary people, this man despised by the religious aristocracy and rejected by the learned rabbis—that "THIS man," of all men, should declare that he would give his flesh as bread for the life of the world, and his blood that men might live for ever: this indeed was a stone of stumbling, crushing Messianic hopes to powder. The appropriation of these expres-

sions by Jesus to Himself meant nothing less than the claim to Messiahship. And so it came to pass that the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well acknowledged Him as Messiah immediately after His promise to her of the living water which for ever quenches the thirst of men; and that Peter proclaimed Him as the Messiah, the Divine Messiah, the Son of God, immediately after His promise to give His flesh to eat and His blood to drink. In making these promises Jesus had Himself implicitly announced that He was Messiah, and it was the splendour of the Samaritan woman's believing privilege to be the first of the human race to accept and proclaim this announcement. As the Messiah was born of a woman, so by a woman was He first proclaimed. St. Peter was the second to proclaim Jesus as the Christ, and his proclamation went far beyond the first proclamation of the Samaritan woman, for he it was who, before all others, declared the Divinity of the Nazarene Messiah, the Christ of God. For this grand confession of the primal Christian faith—this heralding of the carpenter's son as the Son of God—Simon Bar-jonas was rewarded with the glorious title of Peter, the rock-man, the man who had revealed to the world the Messianic rock on which the Christian Church is built.

That rock is the Divinity of Jesus the Christ. The gates of hell can never prevail to break that rock. It is the rock of an eternal truth—the eternal truth which is the real key to the kingdom of heaven. No man can truly understand the glorious Gospel of the blessed God apart from the Divinity of Jesus Christ. He may understand parts of it, such as the beauty of its teachings, the perfection of its morals, the loveliness and heroism of its Central Figure; but its whole is unintelligible if Jesus Christ be not first acknowledged as God. Apart from the Divinity of Jesus Christ, Gethsemane is a red injustice, the Cross a cruel infamy, the Resurrection no better than a legend, the visible Ascension a myth, and, as St. Paul practically put it, the Apostles are false witnesses and the Christian faith a vain bubble, blown into existence by the breath of deceit. It is with the Divinity of the Messiah, and not with the Sacrament of the

Supper, that the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel is, as I believe, concerned. This interpretation falls in with the paramount purpose of the whole Gospel, which is the unfolding of the Divinity of the Lord. It liberates the discourse from anachronism. It takes away the incongruity which otherwise confronts the omission of any record by St. John of the institution of the Supper. It makes natural the proclamation by Simon Peter of His Master's Messiahship, directly after the Master had appropriated to Himself the great expectation that the Messiah would give to men His flesh to eat. It makes intelligible the difficulty of the multitude in continuing to follow Jesus. It explains why they went away. They had been eagerly expecting the Messiah to appear, but they had thought He would appear, not as a Nazarene artisan or a peasant teacher from Galilee, but with power and great glory. And when this rankless, simple Teacher, with little following and no force behind Him, appropriated to Himself Messianic attributes, thus claiming to be the Messiah, they found His sayings "hard"—hard, not in their significance, but in their application to Himself. It was because the meaning of His words was so clear that their application to Himself was so hard to receive. They would readily and with patriotic applause have understood and accepted the promise of flesh to eat and blood to drink if made by some conquering hero, some resistless warrior. Such a one they would have tumultuously hailed as Messiah. But "THIS man!" No! The saying was too hard; the claim a bitter and insupportable disappointment, a vain profanation. And therefore they went away. Just as in later days the same Apostle, who had first proclaimed the Divinity of the Messiah, denied that Messiah on his oath when the Messiah became the victim of the priests and Pharisees, so when the meek and gentle Jesus claimed by His language to be the Christ of God, the multitude forsook Him in faithless contempt and scorn.

Leaving, then, the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel out of account in reckoning the instances in which the Holy Communion is mentioned in the New Testament, we find those instances are

as rare and reserved as the exhortations to preach the Gospel are frequent and clear. Again, let me repeat, this comparative silence concerning the Sacraments is no disparagement of the Sacraments, but it is unquestionably an inspired measure of their true proportion and their ministerial proclamation and administration in the Christian religion. To put the ministry of the Sacraments before the ministry of the Word is to destroy the revealed proportion of that ministry. Our Lord Himself seems to have gone out of His way (if we may use the phrase with adoring reverence) to save His Church from this sacerdotal reversion. Although He is the Great High-Priest of the Christian profession, yet He nowhere calls Himself a priest; and this for a quite evident reason—His priesthood was of a wholly new type. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it, the Messiah was designedly not born of the priestly tribe of Levi, but of the kingly tribe of Judah. Why? Clearly in order to get rid in the Christian Church of Jewish conceptions of priesthood. Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but after that of Melchizedek. What are the generic differences between these two priesthoods? The Aaronic priesthood was an hereditary priesthood; that of Melchizedek stood by itself. It had no lineage either of ancestry or descent. It had neither parentage nor succession. The Aaronic priests were subject to death; the priesthood of Christ, after the order of Melchizedek, endureth for ever—death hath no dominion over it. The priesthood of Aaron was transferable: it passed from priest to priest. The priesthood of Christ is an eternal consecration—unchangeable and such as cannot pass to any other. The sacrifices of the Aaronic priesthood were daily repeated; that of Christ is incapable of repetition, though not of sacramental remembrance. The one priesthood was full of defects and after a carnal commandment; the other full, perfect, and sufficient, endued with the power of an endless life. The old Levitical priesthood was powerless, notwithstanding all its sacrificial shedding of blood, to take away sins; the new priesthood of Christ by its one oblation hath perfected for ever them

that are sanctified. The old priests were mortal servants and subjects; the great Christian High-Priest is the Son of God—our invisible and immortal King; eternally Divine as touching His Father, of the royal non-priestly line as touching His mother.

Nothing could be more clear and convincing than the whole trend of the Epistle to the Hebrews of the inspired purpose of the New Testament to pull up and root out from the Christian Church, not only the name “Jewish priesthood,” but the thing itself. The only priest the Epistle recognizes in the New Covenant is Jesus Christ our Lord—Himself both Victim and Priest, who has passed into the heavens, now to appear in the presence of God for us. All the Levitical terminology and practices as applied to the Christian ministry are shown both by their complete absence in other parts of the New Testament and by the express teachings of this Epistle to be inappropriate, obsolete, and misleading. In the fulness of time they had decayed and waxed old, and at the Advent of the Messiah were ready, and obviously intended, to vanish away. And in so far as any branch of the Christian Church reintroduces Levitical notions and Levitical names as embodying these notions, that branch of the Christian Church, as surely as the Jewish Church in the day of Christ, whatever be its pomp and ceremonial and outward show of vigour, is archaic, decadent, and on the brink of perishing.

My firm conviction is that the Church of England, especially if she boldly allies herself with other reformed Churches, may yet be the means, under God, of delivering Christianity from these perils of decadence and ruin. All that she has to do in order to accomplish this great and wonderful end is to be true to herself—true to her teachings and worship interpreted in the light of New Testament revelation. Firm as the rock of the Incarnate and the Inspired Word, nothing can prevail against her. I have already shown how loyal to the Word she is, and how jealously she maintains the Divine proportion between the Word and the Sacraments in the ordering of her deacons and

priests to their ministry. Nor is that proportion less clear in her appointed form for the Consecration of Bishops. The keystone in this form—that which gives fixity, strength, durability, supreme significance to episcopal consecration—is the ministry of the Word. The introductory Collect prays that Bishops may have grace diligently to preach God's Word. The emphatic note of both the Epistles and the first of the Gospels rings forth the duty of teaching and feeding the Church of God. The second Gospel lays stress on the awe-inspiring fact that as the Father sent the Son, so—*i.e.*, in so far as sons of men can take their share in the mission of God the Son—the Son sent forth His Apostles. I cannot in this paper enter into the much-vexed question of the relation of the Bishops of the Church to the Apostles of Christ. I assume that Bishops are in a very real sense successors of the Apostles, and that their commission is, as far as the possibilities allow, a commission from Christ through the Holy Ghost, as was that of the Apostles. But all the inspired biographies of the Lord Jesus agree in testifying that the supreme factor in His work, apart from His Atonement and Resurrection, and other elements of our salvation wholly Divine, and therefore incapable of human imitation, was His teaching. Following His example, the Apostles made the duty of teaching their first and paramount duty. Their Apostolate was a preaching Apostolate. St. Peter could never forget the thrice-repeated command of His risen Lord, "Feed My sheep"; and, as his after-history proves, his courage and diligence in preaching were the best test of his Apostolic commission. The Church of England clearly accepts this test, forasmuch as she makes this commission to teach her first Gospel in the Consecration Form, although it occurs in a later chapter of St. John's Evangel than the second of the appointed Gospels, thus re-emphasizing her conviction, made apparent in the Ordering of Priests, that the commission to teach takes precedence of the power to absolve, and that the effectiveness of the latter power is conditioned by aptitude and diligence in the former duty. A Bishop, therefore, unapt to teach and feed his flock is also

unapt to remit and retain its sins. As the original Apostolate was a preaching Apostolate, so the modern Episcopate, if true to its succession, will be a preaching Episcopate. This is the great truth unfolded in the introductory portion of the Anglican Form for the Consecration of Bishops—a truth particularly prominent in the third of the alternative Gospels selected for this service, a Gospel in which the Sacrament of Baptism is mentioned, and (as I believe) the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is also implied among the things commanded to be observed, but in which the duty of teaching is twice over expressly bidden.

The subsequent portions of the Consecration Service are equally distinct and definite as to the supreme obligation laid upon Anglican Bishops to be diligent in edifying Christ's Church. What could be more weighty and solemn than the interrogatories addressed to the Bishop-elect—interrogatories in this particular practically identical with those addressed to ordinand priests? "Are you determined out of the Holy Scripture to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same? Will you faithfully exercise yourself in the Holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same; so as you may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to withstand and convince the gainsayers? Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?" Again, in the prayer following the *Veni Creator Spiritus* occur the words: "Almighty God, who gave Thy Son Jesus Christ to be the Author of everlasting life, who after He had made perfect our redemption by His death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down His gifts abundantly upon men, making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors [here, as in the previous office, the title "priest" is significantly omitted], to the edifying and making perfect His Church; grant to this Thy servant such grace, that

he may evermore be ready to spread abroad Thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with Thee.”

When the ministry of the Word has been thus clearly set forth as part of the fundamental—yea, the first essential—office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, there follows the imposition of hands and the grand petition for the gift of the Holy Ghost, without whom the episcopal office cannot be strongly discharged nor the work holily done. Then the Archbishop delivers to the consecrated Bishop, not chalice or paten, but the Bible, saying: “Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this Book. Be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. . . .” And finally, in the last Collect before the Benediction, we find the same note again, reverberating clear and full: “Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee, so endue Thy servant with Thy Holy Spirit, that he, preaching Thy Word, may be earnest to reprove . . . and such a wholesome example that, faithfully fulfilling his cause, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness.”

It is to me at least impossible to conceive how the Church of England could possibly have laid greater stress upon the ministry of the Word and its precedence before that of the Sacraments than in the construction of these Forms for the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In these forms there is, I again repeat, no depreciation of the Sacraments. In each of them the administration of the Holy Communion is an integral part. Every deacon and priest at his ordination, and every Bishop at his consecration, is required to receive that Holy Sacrament. It sets the seal upon his sacred ministry. It is the channel through which he receives that strengthening and refreshing of his soul which are needful for effective work in his ministry. But the reception of the Holy Communion is, by its place in the Ordinal, clearly regarded by the Church of England as a means to an end, and not the end itself. The ministry of the Word is the end; the ministry of the Sacraments a Divinely-appointed means in the attainment of that end.

(To be concluded.)