

CHAPTER VIII

ORGANISATION OF WOMAN'S WORK OTHER THAN THE DIACONATE; AND THE DIACONATE IN THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION

LET us now cast a rapid view backward on *the ministry of women other than the Diaconate.*

The two divisions of widows in the Apostolic Church, the one comprising such widows as received Church support, and the other made up of those who discharged certain social and domestic duties for the Church, occur to us. Those two divisions were probably never quite distinct. Those who worked would often receive some salary; those who received support would try to do such work as they could. Their work was mainly social and domestic; their sphere was among the Christian women and families round their doors; evangelistic labours and distant embassies, such as those of Priscilla and Phoebe, were probably unknown to them. But, nevertheless, there grew up a great reverence for those widows, who were "widows indeed," and servants of the Church. In the West it prevailed to such extent that no other order of women-workers could hold its

own against the widowhood. Women who were not widows coveted and appropriated the name; though some of them were girls, as in the case Tertullian mentions; some of them were Deaconesses, as we have seen, three centuries later in Gaul. In Julian's time widows were reckoned among the clergy¹ (see before, p. 138, note 2). But they were not to be teachers or preachers. They were to be the "Altar of God," from which prayers constantly ascend, but they were not to gad about, "for the Altar of God never runs about, but is fixed in one place" (*Apost. Constit.* iii. 6).

This order too was swallowed up in Monasticism: but there was always—or at least from an early age—an unwarranted order of *Church virgins* who formed an easy foothold for monastic theories. Earlier than Tertullian, there are obscure references to holy virginity; but Tertullian's fiery praise of a celibate life in his Montanist days left a permanent impression on the African Church. Cyprian counts virginity higher than marriage; Athanasius points to virgins as a proof of the grace of God. Though the Apostolical Constitutions enumerate widows and virgins as separate orders, we could not find much upon the date of the injunctions regarding them which occur in that composite document; but there can be no doubt that from Tertullian and Cyprian in the West, and Athanasius in the East, had grown up such reverence for those who dedicated themselves to a virgin life that Constantine assigned them support from the State, which Julian called upon

¹ Compare *Apost. Constit.* ii. 25 (end).

them to refund. They had a distinctive dress; they took a veil; they were counted the "brides of Christ," and bridal ceremonies, even a bridal feast, marked their marriage to the Divine Bridegroom.¹ This in the fourth century; and at this time female monachism became the rule. A convent was no great change from a "choir of perpetual virgins" attached to a particular church, and kept apart in a building of their own. Soon the Church, which had nursed the order, was under the necessity of restraining its ambition. "Women were never really priests,"² says Epiphanius: "Women must not ascend the Altar," says a Council: "Abbesses must not give the veil, nor assume sacerdotal functions," says another Council: "Women must not approach the altar nor handle the sacred vessels," says a third.³

To this day the restricted yet widespread honour paid to women who have taken a vow of perpetual celibacy is one of the most notable and successful parts of the organisation of the Roman Catholic Church.

Yet celibacy was not the only or the universal law. As early as the tenth century there began to be found societies or alliances of widows and unmarried women who were not ordained, who were under no vows of celibacy, under no special vows at all, but who were

¹ The Council of Carthage, whatever its exact date, required widows or virgins consecrated to God who were to be employed at the baptism of women to be able to instruct the catechumens as to the vows of baptism, and as

to the mode of their life afterwards. See on Council, p. 142 (note).

² Epiphanius, ii. 2. c. 3, and c. 21.

³ Councils of Autun about A.D. 670; Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 817; Paris, A.D. 829.

united for prayer, meditation, and good work. They lived in their own homes, and found their work around their own doors. Soon they made schools and orphanages where they taught the young, and hospitals where they nursed the sick. In the twelfth century they were formed into corporations of some sort: but the Belgian Beguinages, where in the common house each has her own dwelling, and leads a semi-independent life of industry and charity while her strength lasts, seem to be what they were like all over Western Europe seven hundred years ago. They were a natural result of the Crusades. In that time of excitement and suspense, women whose husbands or lovers had fallen, or were at the war, naturally betook themselves to a life of Christian contemplation and activity without taking a monastic vow. Similar communities of men sprang up in various places. But those of women being a more natural outcome of the times, were more useful, and lasted longer. In many respects the Rules or Customs of the Beguines¹ might serve as a model for Protestant Deaconesses. Their combination of freedom and rule, of industry and charity, of individual life and common purpose, has much to commend it. That it was a natural growth of the times, not merely a church Order,

¹ The name Beguine is of uncertain origin. It seems to have begun in France, and to derive its name from Lambert de Begues, a preacher in Liège in the twelfth century. There is probable trace of similar institutions

in Flanders a century earlier. Beguine and Baghad=Methodist—any one noted for piety. Two Popes ordered their suppression; the Inquisition set to carry it out; the Beguines for a time adopted St. Francis' Tertiarian vow.

is clear from similar developments elsewhere. Thus the Tertiarians,¹ or those who followed the third Rule of St. Francis, *ie.* who took a vow of Christian charity for religion's sake, which did not require them to leave their home or their ordinary work, prevailed over Europe. Some of the Tertiarians became ordinary monastics,² but many of them did not. And all of them were devoted to charity rather than to contemplation; thus anticipating the activities which mark the later centuries. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Hospitaller nuns were the precursors of our modern nursing-sisters; and no modern sisterhood can have a more beautiful vow than that of the sisters of La Pontoise: "To be all their life, for the love of Christ, the servants of the sick poor, and so far as in them lay to do and to hold until death."

There are now several forms of the organisation of women's work in Protestant countries; but it cannot be said of most of them that they are part of the organisation of the Church. They are Protestant, or at least they are not Roman Catholic Sisterhoods and Deaconess Institutions, but they are not recognised among the "orders" or offices of the Protestant Church. Some of the best-known among them sprang from the mind of one man, as great monastic orders sprang from the minds of Francis and Dominic, but they did not,

¹ See chapter iv. page 73. Elizabeth, Countess of Thuringia, is said to have been the first Tertiarian nun. The Tertiarian nuns took Saint Elizabeth as their

patroness (Sohäfer, *Die Arbeit der Weiblichen Diakonie*).

² Helyot, ii. c. 4. 3.; Ludlow p. 143.

like the Roman Catholic societies, find their next stage in the approval of the Church and in incorporation with it. The Protestant Church has indeed never shown the same power of adopting, or even of tolerating new organisations as the Romish constantly shows. There are also more organised sects within the bosom of the Greek Church than a Protestant, whose new organisations so frequently lead to secession, can even imagine. Popes have risked their predecessors' credit for infallibility by adopting new theories against which those predecessors had fulminated; some of them have even turned their backs upon their own former declarations. In churches which are despotisms, as both the Greek and Romish churches really are, the only ultimate law is the present will of the autocratic Head; but in Constitutional Churches there is an old abiding law in creeds and other documents of which all existing Church authorities are only interpreters; and in those Constitutional Churches every new thing causes a conflict between its advocates and its opponents, both appealing to the documentary law. Thus comes the strange result that Protestant Churches have made comparatively few constitutional changes in three hundred years. Luther and Calvin and their colleagues did not provide for the organisation of woman's work, with one or two doubtful and short-lived exceptions;¹ and the Reformed

¹ The Reformed Church of the Lower Rhine, mainly composed of refugees from the Low Countries, established the office of Deaconess in 1588. The congregation of

Wesel had "Deaconesses" for thirty-five years, 1575 to 1610, who were officially employed by the Presbytery among the poor and sick. Those women were

Church has not, in its corporate capacity, organised it. Moravians (1745) appointed Deaconesses, the Baptists in Holland had them, but they never were a prominent feature. Fliedner (1833) found them in the Dutch Baptist Churches. The Anglican Church, which may be regarded as a Protestant Church, neither Lutheran nor Calvinist, has of late years largely employed the labours of Sisterhoods and Deaconesses, and first individual Bishops began to sanction and legalise them. The Deaconess Institutions are subject to the Bishops. Then two archbishops and eighteen Bishops recommended the female Diaconate in 1871. It was, notwithstanding, not yet a part of the Anglican Church system. Dean Howson, whose long life was largely occupied with the commendation of the female Diaconate, says in his posthumous work, published in 1886: "What we want is the thing itself—an authorised official Diaconate of women, as an integral part of our Church system—a body of Deaconesses co-extensive with the Church itself, ready for service wherever they are needed—and the needs are very

formally chosen and appointed. But it appears that the Scripture qualifications of Deaconesses were mixed up with those of widows; for at first married women were excluded, and at a later date they were appointed; and what with the requirement that they should be sixty years of age, and what with the growing prevalence of the idea that their work was civic rather than ecclesiastical, the institution languished and died.

Moreover, the want of special training told against their success and permanency. Some other attempts at a Diaconate in English congregations in Holland about the same time had a similar history, but not so complete a conclusion. One in Amsterdam, where the Deaconess was subordinate to the Deacon, lingered on till the beginning of the nineteenth century (see Schäfer, vol. I. p. 83).

various—but appointed and directed by the Bishops and serving under the parochial clergy.”¹

Many steps in advance have been taken since certain very cautious Principles and Rules were suggested in 1871. The Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury passed a series of resolutions on May 7, 1890, of which the first was :—

“That Deaconesses having, according to the best authorities, formed an Order of Ministry in the early Church, and having proved their efficiency in the Anglican Church, wherever the Order has been revived, it is desirable to encourage the formation of Deaconess Institutions and the work of Deaconesses in our dioceses and parishes.”

And the second resolution is :—

“That a Deaconess should be admitted in solemn form by the Bishop, with benediction by the laying on of hands.”

The Order of Deaconesses after this took root in various dioceses in England, and received its crowning warrant in the formal approval of the Synod of Anglican Bishops at Lambeth in 1897. The words of the eleventh resolution are :—

“That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the revival alike of Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, and of the Office of Deaconess in our branch of the Church, and commends to the attention of the Church the report

¹ (“Diaconate of Women in the Anglican Church,” 1886). Similarly, Canon Seymour in 1881: “Some well-considered and solemn act of the Church is required both to promote such Institutions and to do them justice when established.”

of the Committee appointed to consider the relation of religious communities to the episcopate."

The third is:—

"That there should be an adequate term of preparation and probation."

The Episcopal Church in the United States of America has also approved of the Order of Deaconesses: each Deaconess to be appointed by a Bishop, who is to be satisfied by testimonials of her fitness, in particular that she has "adequate preparation for her work, both technical and religious, which preparation shall have covered the period of two years." She is to be set apart by the Bishop with imposition of hands, or by his authority, and, until an appropriate religious service is prescribed by the General Convention, the Bishop is himself to set her apart.

The well-known establishments on the continent are not Church Institutions. Kaiserswerth, the most famous of them all, was founded by Pastor Fliedner and his like-minded wife in 1833.¹ Its beneficent labours are potent in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Its trained

¹ Fliedner was not alone in his attempt to organise and develop the work of women. When Germany revived after the fall of Napoleon, Klönne (near Wesel) tried to set up the Order with enrolment for a few years; the great Baron von Stein tried to found an order, and Amelia Sieveking copied Vincent de Paul's ideas; and Count Adalbert von der Rocke-

Volmerstein tried it also, mainly with a view to foreign missions. These attempts all failed, but the project was in the air, and Fliedner's genius gave it form and success. There are now (A.D. 1905) 940 Deaconesses, 278 probationers, from Kaiserswerth alone. In Germany there are 81 Mother-Houses with 16,000 Deaconesses, and 5300 fields of labour.

nurses and teachers are, in many respects, models as well as pioneers. It reclaims the fallen, educates orphans, nurses the sick, heals or soothes the insane, is the minister of parochial care of the poor in their own homes. Its agents may well be called "sisters," so loving is their tending of human need, and "Deaconesses," so much are they the ministers of Christ, and the servants of those to whom Christ Himself ministered: but they are not "Deaconesses" as in the early Church, for they are not functionaries of *the Church*. "They have no vow, their bond of union is the Word of God." They are in close association with the ecclesiastical authorities; but as they were ultimately responsible to Pastor Fliedner and his fellow-directors all his life, they are now responsible to his successors and colleagues; everything is done to make co-operation with the Church easy and effectual, but it is co-operation. The Directing Committee is the supreme authority, and the Presidents of the Provincial Synods of Rhineland and Westphalia are, as such, always members of the Directing Committee.

Similar things may be said of other Institutions, as, *e.g.* Mildmay, or Dr. Guinness' or Dr. Barnardo's in the east of London, and others. Nor are the Sisterhood societies of the Church of England, however loyal in their deference to the clergy, and however completely restricted to the membership of that Church, necessarily subject to the Church. I quote from the words of the "Religious Community of the Sisters of the Church," whose Institution in Kilburn seems to me, as regards its

domestic and social details,¹ admirable in its combination of practical human wisdom with spiritual consecration : "To enable the sisters duly to carry out such a life of charity and devotion, they are united under a common bond of obedience. They agree to live together in submission to certain rules, and to be governed by superiors elected from their own body." Some are directly subject to the Bishop, but others are subject only to the head of their own Order.

Conclusion

We have thus seen how old and how acceptable and influential has been the ministry of women in the Church. In the days of the Redeemer's flesh, in Pauline churches, godly women working; then Deaconesses, Church widows, Church virgins; then, without speaking of convents and nunneries, the Beguines, the Hospital Nuns. Thus we come to the time when the tempest of the Reformation swept away the abuses of the Church, and there also disappeared from the Protestant part of Christendom the various forms of organisation of woman's work. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when, all over Europe, the sword was as much in hand as the Bible in name of religion, the ministry of women was little known. But in the end of the eighteenth century there began, with the revival of religion, a resuscitation of this dominant power of

¹ I can scarcely imagine better details, than in this great Institution, for schools, dormitories, sisters' rooms, and other

usefulness; and in the nineteenth century, as congregations were much more akin to the early Church in respect of activity than could have been said of any age since the fourth century, there was an extraordinary development of the helping power of womanhood. Ministers have comparatively little help from men. And thus there has gradually come about more or less considerable organisation of women as district visitors, members of clothing societies, and such like. The contemporary predominance of Bazaars, mainly for the sale of woman's work, is one of the signs of the times. A further step in recognition, sometimes in organisation, is taken in Women's Guilds. Women are working everywhere for the Church. Yet, notwithstanding, more is needed.

It is necessary that some general, and more or less uniform, systematic use of that work be made. It was so in the early Church; St. Paul's reference to certain other workers (Romans xvi.) may not imply more than individual activity, but the terms in which he mentions Phœbe, and elsewhere lays down rules for the character of Deaconesses irresistibly compel us to believe that Deaconesses of the Church, and widows enrolled for ministry, were a part of the organisation of the Apostolic Church.¹ There is no ground to doubt that when the "whole Church" was assembled to vote on a disputed point, or to sanction any mission, women, as

¹ Sisters of Charity are like Deaconesses in this that both rest on religious grounds. The difference is this: the Deaconess has no vow; the Sister of Charity has no church office (Schäfer, i. 237).

well as men, were constituent members of the Assembly. So it was in the Anglo-Saxon Church, when Abbesses were members of the Witenagemots and powerful in council. Five of them, for example, were present along with abbots, priests, and lords at the council of Beccan-celde (A.D. 694), called by the King of Kent.¹ Women were never elders or bishops in the Catholic Church, but that women were for many centuries in the Diaconate—the order and ministry of service for which they are specially qualified—that they were in it on as uniform a system as men were under their order in their respective grades, there is every reason to believe. That widows also were enrolled on a uniform system, or at least that the Church aimed at a uniform system, is also quite clear. It does not follow from this that the Church in any subsequent age is bound to go by that example, as though it were a regulation. The Church is free from the bondage of any letter in regard to her officials. The spirit of Christ which is in her is free to choose a mode of working adapted to the special needs of changing times.

But it is obvious that the present want of system in employing the services of women has many drawbacks. From want of recognition by the Corporate Church many individual workers lack somewhat of position even when fully employed; and they are frequently not

¹ Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, v. 147. It is worthy of note that women had always held an important place among the Britons, and this was continued.

Free women, married, and possessing five acres of land, voted in the public assemblies of Britain (Montalembert, *op. cit.* p. 221).

employed because it is not sufficiently known that they ought to be. Again, the standard of qualification is in many cases far lower than it would be if the mind of the Church were directed to fix it. Individual workers do not know how high might be their ideal, and pastors are not sufficiently solicitous about giving their work free scope. There will always be abundant variety in the estimate of a standard, but on the whole the average is higher with a standard than without one. It was in this way that the successful "Rules" of St. Benedict and others swept from the field the less regulated practices and customs of which they were developments.

There are several lessons taught by Church History as to the extent to which Regulation and System ought to go. St. Paul distinctly contemplates in "widows" (1 Tim. v. 11) a class of women with no domestic ties, who were able to devote themselves to a holy life of service in the Church. He regards their enrolment as a pledge that they would count this their calling for life; and he warns Timothy against enrolling them so young that they would be likely to fall from that prior pledge by marrying again. But, on the other hand, it is clear that there was no such requirement as sixty years of age in Phœbe the Deaconess, whose long and perilous journey was not one that an aged woman could undertake. For the special class of "widows"—far more numerous in those turbulent days than in our peaceful times—there were special arrangements: but in the case of Deaconesses there must have been quite

different qualifications. Now we have found that the Western Church erred by keeping the name of widows when Deaconesses were really meant: and that the Eastern Church erred by giving too much prominence to individual Deaconesses. Both churches—straining St. Paul's reference to the earlier pledge¹—gave undue honour to the unmarried, even to the extent of elevating Church virgins to a pinnacle of prominence for which there was less than no warrant in the New Testament.

We have seen that when women were subject to one another abuses crept in, and fair opportunities were lost. It seems that women administered baptism, and ordained one another, as an *imperium in imperio*. If women are to be a part of the Corporate Church they must be subject to it; and owe to it their standing and power. Timothy was representative of Church authority when he was directed by St. Paul to give honour to widows and elders. The only purpose for which we now cite this is to establish the principle that the Church—not the order of widowhood—is the fountain of honour. The orthodox Church in later days forbade women to be bishops or priests, and so prevented confusion.

But there follows from this also that women who are officials of the Church have a right to ordination from the Church. It is in vain that some writers try to make out that ordination of women did not mean ordination but only Benediction. As a matter of fact, early writers speak of it as the same with the ordina-

¹ πρῶτη πλοῦς.

tion received by men. The Apostolical Constitutions are clear and emphatic on this point. Those who try to make out a distinction have no higher authority than the hasty and inaccurate Epiphanius. Ordination means appointment to a function. Men like Barnabas and Saul, already honoured as Apostles, were set apart—ordained—by the prophets and teachers of the Church in Antioch to a special embassy of inspection. The solemn commending to God, involving His blessing, is the ordination coveted by dutiful servants of the Church. They are ambassadors, and they accept the delegated authority. They can have no higher authority than is possessed by those by whom they are accredited. In Apostolic times there was special revelation, and there were also visible gifts of the Holy Ghost. But for all times there is promised the abiding and enabling presence of the Redeemer, and where there is needed a special function there will also be a special grace. It is difficult to see why men are so afraid of the word "ordination," because the point of difficulty lies not in the word but in the function for which one is set apart. Has the Church a warrant to discharge this function? If it has, then has it also warrant to set some one apart to discharge it, as the delegate of the whole Body of Christ? If there be, in our time, a need of this ministration of women, then Christ's Church has ample warrant for ordaining women to discharge it. It may be for a limited term of years: it may be for one year, it may be for life. The Church is free to fix any conditions, though not "unreasonably free," for

true freedom cannot be unreasonable. It is for a wise expediency to decide how many such offices shall be instituted, and with what ceremonial or solemnity the officers shall be appointed. Men discuss "governments" as though there were no other function. There are also "helps" divinely appointed.¹

But there remains as a lesson of experience that there is great danger of such ordination conflicting with high natural duties. St. Paul makes it clear that no one on whom there were home claims had a right to hold a Church widow's place. "Let them first learn to show piety at home." The widow that marries again has denied her pledge, but "he that provideth not for his own is worse than an infidel." And many of the women named with praise in Holy Writ did the work of Christ in the Church and their own home-work at the same time. The tendency of the Church was to magnify the merit of those who had forsaken all

¹ With reluctance, but as a duty, I have to point out that in the Protestant Church there is a real danger that the Scriptural Order of Deaconesses may be overlaid or strangled by sisterhoods. The decree of the Church of England (see p. 156) recognises sisterhoods even before Deaconesses, and it is extremely likely that the comparative freedom of action in setting up a sisterhood will lead to the multiplication of such institutions, while Deaconesses, ordained one by one, with special solemnity, remain com-

paratively few. In the Church of Scotland there has been begun, of later date than Deaconesses, the appointment of "Parish sisters" to salaried office, without ordination or any action of a court of the Church, and, so far as I have ever heard, without the requirement of previous training by the Church. It is easy to see how they may be indefinitely multiplied, without the intervention of any court of the Church. The old problems of which we read in Church History are not unlikely to be revived in both Churches.

other relations and duties in order to become the servants of the Church, and eventually to confine the name of "religious" people to those who were under a monastic vow. But such is not the teaching of Scripture. The popularity of St. Francis' Tertiarians, and of Beguines, and Umiliati, and the rest, was the revolt of the Social Conscience from this unnatural state of things. The Reformation was a recoil from the monastery, as well as—even more than—a rebellion against the Papacy. And therefore, while we should not advocate the prohibition of life-vows and training institutions, we should certainly maintain that there ought to be no special or exceptional stress laid upon them, and that along with them, or apart from them, there should be enlistment, without fixing a term of years, and along with such enlistment, a free acceptance of capacity proved in work done for Christ by those who all the while continue in their own home. Christ came to sanctify and glorify natural ties. His mother and His brothers were His care as long as they severally needed it. He left them when that need ceased, and He was thereafter free to be always about His Heavenly Father's business. And His servants must be such as He. To one He said: Forsake all: Follow me. To another, Go home to thy friends and tell them the gospel. And in our days some may give up only their trade, some not even that: some may give up their houses, some may retain them: the Church is free to accept the service of them all.

The closing word might well be this: there has been

a tendency, in the case of women, as in that of men, to subordinate the functions of usefulness to love of honour and power. We read of disputes about seats in Church, of a special benediction, of women having to be formally debarred from priestly functions. We have seen that women-workers who were under the rulers grew more numerous by being favoured, so that nuns swallowed up all the orders,—Deaconesses, widows, virgins—the last with least change. At the Reformation the Reformers, in fear of this, abolished all "Orders." If they are now resuscitated, the lessons of the past ought to be kept in mind. The female Diaconate was not only not a Roman Order, it was a Scriptural Order never popular in the Church of Rome. It cannot lend itself to ecclesiastical assumption, as the Church-invented Orders did. Its essential characteristic, if preserved, will be its safeguard; it is not a dignified post of retirement, but a function of active usefulness.

ORDINATION, APPOINTMENT, AMONG THE CLERGY

THERE are some words, such as the above, in frequent use, to which one is at first sight tempted to affix definite meanings, based for the most part on their derivation. In Athens election was made by citizens voting, through stretching out their hands, or through use of the lot. Hence to stretch out the hand meant to vote—to appoint (*χειροτονέω*). There is another word meaning to "lay the hands on" (*χειροστίθῃμι*), and it is a natural word for the ceremonial of ordination. Hence it meant to ordain. Thus *χειροτονία* naturally meant election, and *χειροθεσία* meant ordination.

But it is impossible to maintain the distinction. Just as in English we may say *appoint* without dwelling on the mode of

appointing, so it was in Greek. The word *appoint* can be shown in many cases to mean *ordain*. Thus in the *Apostolical Canons* (i. 2) a bishop is to be ordained by two or three bishops; a presbyter may be ordained by one bishop; a bishop is not to be ordained under thirty years of age. In all these cases the word for ordain is literally *appoint*. So throughout that document. In the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341) a bishop is forbidden to go into the territory of another bishop for the ordination (literally for the *election*) of any one, and if he dares to do it his ordination (literally his imposition of hands) is void (Council of Antioch, c. xxii.). In the same Council (c. xix.) the word for election is the same as settlement (*κατάστασις*). In the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) it is said that a Deaconess is not to be ordained (literally elected) under forty years of age, and if she marries after being ordained (*lit.* after receiving the imposition of hands), and being for some time occupied in her service, she is to be anathematised along with her partner (c. xv.).

Thus the words elect and ordain are clearly often synonymous in ordinary use.

Were Deaconesses "among the clergy"? There can be no doubt of that, but the doubt is what it meant. To be "among the clergy," to be "on the church list," to be in the "ecclesiastical catalogue," what did those phrases mean? "So also regarding Deaconesses, and generally regarding those enumerated in the Canon"—thus says the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325, where it is clear that Deaconesses are so enumerated (c. xix.) (See before on the reference to Paulianists in this same Nicene chapter, p. 138, note). Among Paulianists it appears that Deaconesses were not ordained with imposition of hands, and therefore those Deaconesses were to be specially treated. As, however, the Council of Chalcedon says that Deaconesses were appointed with imposition of hands, and the *Apostolical Constitutions* furnish a form for their solemn ordination, we may conclude that to be "among the clergy," or to be on the "ecclesiastical roll," meant in their case to be ordained in the strict sense of the term.

But something more has to be said on the meaning of some of those synonymous phrases which speak of a canon or register of clerical names. There seems to have been in every organised church or congregation a list of officials. It is according to human nature that all churches were not equally particular in making up their lists, and that all lists were not equally well kept. To be "on the list" in one place was not proof of

being of the same grade as those on the list in another place. For what was "the list"? And who were "clerics"? A usual, though late, list of "clerics" other than Bishops is Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Readers, and Singers. The *Apostolical Constitutions* include Sub-deacons, Readers, Singers, and Doorkeepers. The *Apostolical Canons* say Sub-deacons, Readers, Singers. Some add even the Parabolani or Church attendants. Theodosius Junior did so. But all these names include only official men; and yet we have seen that Deaconesses were "on the list" and among the clergy. Nor only they, for Sozomen, v. 5, says Julian's heavy hand fell in exactions on virgins and widows, who, "on account of their poverty, were reckoned among the clergy" (*ἐν τοῖς κλήροις τεταγμέναις*). The other historian of the times, Socrates, i. 17, tells of Helena inviting, to receive her hospitality, the virgins *ἀναγεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κανόνι*, i.e. "enrolled in the register of the Churches." It is thus clear that ecclesiastical women of various names were sometimes in the Canon, and that this fact tells us little or nothing of their functions and the process which preceded their enrolment. The word *canon* (*κανών*) means the clerical body, *Nic.* 16, 17, 19, and *Chalc.* 2. But there is no authoritative interpretation of the term. Nor is there of *κλήρος*, or of the plural *κλήροι*. In Eusebius, iii. 23 (quotation from Clement), it means the body of Christian ministers, and the passage says St. John took a journey in some places to settle (*καταστήσων*) bishops, in some places to organise (*ἀρμόσων*) whole churches, and in some to "clarify" among the clergy some one of those designated by the Spirit."

It is thus quite clear that none of the words or phrases in such familiar use has such a definite meaning that we can hold by that meaning as helping us to solve difficult questions of order.

The words are:—

χειροτονία.

χειροθεσία.

καθίστημι (to settle, Eusob., *H. E.*, vii. 9 (*κατάστασις*)).

προχειρίζομαι (*Ap. Const.* iii. 15, twice, *Ap. Can.* 81).

ὁ κανών (*Ap. Const.* viii. 20).

ὁ κατάλογος ἐκκλησιαστικῶς ἱερατικῶς (*Ap. Const.* iii. 15).

κλήρος.

It ought to be added, though not necessary for our present purpose, that both the words at the beginning of our list may

possibly, in some cases, mean benediction and no more, but the passages are obscure. Later R.C. writers endeavour to maintain a distinction, but they cannot explain away the earlier synonymous usage. Information may be found in Suicer's *Thesaurus*, Bright's *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils* (especially p. 10, f.), and, above all, in the *Canons and Councils of Nicæa, Laodicea, and Chalcedon*. See *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien*, von Dr. Friedrich Lauchert, 1896. In Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, article "Ordination," Dr. Hatch learnedly collects many facts, but is all but silent on the ordination of women.