

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

I AM asked to criticise Dr. Sanday's luminously written papers on the origin of the Christian ministry. As I understand my task, it is not to offer an independent opinion on the same subject, but to criticise the account that he has given.

And as I may be supposed to have been asked to do this because I had the premature courage to break a lance on the same field of battle against Dr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, perhaps I may begin by saying that I have no quarrel with Dr. Sanday's criticism on that attempt.

Next let me notice Dr. Sanday's preliminary statement of recent theories—Lightfoot's, Hatch's, Harnack's—in their continuity, only to express the gratitude all must feel for its clearness and carefulness, as a piece of literary history.

It is interesting, with reference to the history of opinion, to learn that Dr. Hatch did not mean "to lay any exclusive or even especial stress upon the financial character of the ἐπίσκοποι." Perhaps his explanation given to Dr. Sanday and his communication to Dr. Harnack (see *Dogmengeschichte*, bk. i., p. 155, note 1) may allow us to suppose that he would not, since the discovery of the *Didaché*, even take substantial exception to the position of the latter that "the Episcopi and Diaconi were primarily officers of worship," or at least that "their functions were as wide as the system of functions comprised in the community—care of the poor, worship, correspondence; in a word, administration in the general sense of the term" (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, ii., 2, p. 144).

But we may notice that Dr. Harnack expresses an opinion somewhat different from that which Dr. Hatch communicated to Dr. Sanday (p. 22, note 1 (3)), on the question whether the Episcopi were *permanent* officers

from the first in the Christian community.¹ As elected, the Presbyters, he thinks, were without doubt removable. But as endowed with a special "charisma," the Episcopi and Deacons exercised a ministry which was "almost without control, and ranked as charismatic. Hence it is without doubt that the officers in the Christian communities occupied from the first a position altogether different from that which they held in the *θίασος*." (*Analecten zu Hatch*, p. 235.)

It should of course be borne in mind that Dr. Harnack's views are based upon conclusions as to the authorship and date of the Pastoral Epistles and Acts, as well as other New Testament documents, from which Dr. Sanday dissents, holding the ancient position, and on which Dr. Hatch has never expressed his mind clearly.

I leave the history of modern opinion, and come to the paper in which Dr. Sanday speaks "more directly in his own person." Here first let me express substantial agreement with what Dr. Sanday says (pp. 23-28, div. I.) on the origin of the name and office of the *ἐπίσκοπος*. Plainly however the contemporary use of the term to describe officers of guilds or clubs, and the use in the LXX., are influences not mutually exclusive. Scriptural authority and contemporary usage would have combined to determine the

¹ As bearing on this question Dr. Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, v., note 51) has called attention to a fifth-century Galatian sepulchral inscription (*δὲς γενόμενος πρεσβύτερος*). I do not think it is fair to quote only these words. The man there buried—Tarasis by name—is described as *δὲς τενομένος* (sic) *πρεσβ^ς και παραμοναριος παροικησας εν τω τοπω τουτω*. The *παραμονάριος* or (more commonly) *προσμονάριος* is the Latin *mansionarius* (see canon 2 of Chalcedon, and Bright's *Notes*, p. 129 seq.). He is a "residentiary" in charge of some institution belonging to the Church. This Tarasis was twice appointed "presbyter and residentiary" (of a particular church or monastery). Is this a basis for a theory of double ordinations, otherwise unheard of in the Church? If the words "*δὲς . . . πρεσβύτερος*" had stood alone, as Dr. Hatch quotes them, I should have preferred to understand them in the light of the schismatical re-ordinations of the Arian and Donatist bodies. Cf. *Libellus Precum Faustini*, etc. (*Bibl. vet. Patr.*, v., p. 659 B.) "egregius ille bis episcopus." Tombstone inscriptions, one may notice, have in all ages expressed the ideas of a lax popular theology. Recent investigations in Egypt, Syria, and Asia emphasise this.

choice of the term; and the term, quite vague in itself, would have got a new Christian connotation from the first, in proportion as the Christian society was conscious in itself of being a new thing, demanding a novel sort of superintendence.

As a matter of fact, the earliest use of the term *ἐπίσκοπος* certainly suggests "pastoral" functions, functions, that is, of a spiritual order. If the salutation in Philippians i. 1 has no implication, if "taking care of the Church of God" (1 Tim. iii. 5) is indefinite, yet the ideal of the *Episcopus* in Titus i. 7 as "the steward of God" carries unmistakably spiritual associations (cf. Luke xii. 42), and must be taken with the not less unmistakable language of Acts xx. 28, where the episcopate is coincident with the "pastoral care." And St. Peter's language about God as "Shepherd and *Episcopus* of souls," or in His relation to the ministry as "chief Shepherd" (1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4), suggests the same idea of general spiritual supervision. The *Episcopi*, in fact, "watched for souls as they that shall give account." In the *Didaché* the *Episcopi* and Deacons are to be elected with special reference to the Church worship, and to that spiritual ministry of the Prophets and Teachers in which they have a real though a subordinate share (cap. xv. 1; see Sanday, pp. 14, 15). In the *Epistle of Clement* the characteristic function of the *Episcopus* is not more the ministering to the flock of Christ than it is the presidency of worship, which is expressed in the "offering of the gifts."¹ This sort of language seems to me very much too clear in its implications to allow of Dr. Sanday saying that "before the *Ignatian Epistles* there is only very slight evidence that either the Christian Presbyter or Bishop exercised what we should call spiritual functions" (p. 32).

¹ See Harnack on this phrase, *Texte* u.s.w., p. 144, note 73: "Beyond a doubt the *προσφέρειν δῶρα τῷ Θεῷ* in the sense of the offering the sacrifices (*Opferdarbringung*) appears as the most important function of the *Episcopus*."

I think such functions are necessarily involved in the pastoral care or stewardship of God, understood in a Christian sense. If by "spiritual functions" is meant the conduct of worship or performance of sacramental acts, all the presumption is in favour of supposing, where there is no positive evidence, that such functions fell to the local ministers in the absence of the higher orders. It is a spiritual ministry after all, though accompanied by physical effect, that the Presbyters perform for the sick man in St. James v. 14. Again, the evidence of the *Didaché*¹ and St. Clement's epistle cannot be said to suggest the idea that liturgical functions were a recent addition to episcopal duties and privileges. Of course the local minister had not at first much of the teaching office. But a ministry can be spiritual without a large measure of that, and there is really no evidence at all that an Episcopus would not from the first have been required to be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2).

I pass to Dr. Sanday's second head (II., p. 28), "the non-equivalence of the terms *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*." Here again I can agree substantially with him. It is curious to find Dr. Harnack, from the point of view of the most advanced criticism, reviving in a new form a distinction only recently abandoned by the most conservative. The idea is in itself attractive. It may be urged on its behalf that something must be involved in difference of name, and something in the closer connexion of the Deacon with the Episcopus than with the Presbyter. "It must be wrong," we may allow ourselves to say with Dr. Sanday, "to press the identification too closely." But on the other hand, all the positive evidence of the first century documents requires us to recognise it as substantially true that the Presbyters (in the official sense) and the Episcopi were in fact the same

¹ No argument can be drawn from the exhortation "not to despise (overlook) the bishops" (*Did.* xv. 2), any more than from the parallel exhortation, "Despise not *prophesyings*" (1 Thess. v. 20).

persons—nay more, that the offices were regarded as identical. This is involved in the “quite unequivocal” transitions from one name to the other in Acts xx. 17 and Titus i. 5-7.¹ And if the offices are identical in the Epistle to Titus, can we argue that they are distinct in the epistles to Timothy? Nowhere, again, do we find the two offices mentioned as co-existing in distinction. We have Presbyters mentioned in St. James, Episcopi in the Church of Philippi. No doubt St. Paul had ordained Presbyters there as elsewhere, but no salutation is sent to them as distinct persons. Episcopi, again, are mentioned in the *Didaché*, but no Presbyters. On the whole, Dr. Sanday meets the theory with a modified negative, and the evidence will not certainly allow us to meet it with anything nearer to acceptance.

Now I come to Dr. Sanday's third head, “the account that is given of the origin of the more spiritual functions of the Christian ministry, and their gradual transition to the officers who now exercise them” (p. 31). Here I can agree in the main with the significance which Dr. Sanday attributes to the *Didaché*—a document which, however inadequate in its doctrine, is an important witness in the department of Church history; but I have already expressed disagreement as to the unspiritual character of the functions of the primitive *ἐπίσκοπος*, and in other ways Dr. Sanday seems here to neglect important considerations. Let us see how the matter stands.

The earliest Church ministry broadly divides itself into the apostolic or general, on the one hand, and the local, on the other. The apostolic ministry is engaged in the preaching of the gospel. When St. Paul declares this to be his characteristic duty (1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 14), he is saying

¹ The identity of the offices seems implied in St. Peter. The Presbyter is the “shepherd,” and the Chief Shepherd is also “Bishop of souls” (1 Pet. v. 1-4, ii. 25).

about his apostolic office what a local Presbyter-Episcopus could not have said: this commission to preach the gospel carries with it, not only the founding of Churches, but the ordaining of the local ministry, and the subsequent jurisdiction over them. When moreover the Apostle is on the spot, he supersedes the local officers in the ordinary ministration of the "breaking of the bread." To the local ministry of Presbyter-Episcopi and Deacons, on the other hand, falls the administration of local affairs, of discipline and worship. There is no reason to doubt that it involved also from the first a certain degree of teaching authority, though, as we shall see, this function would probably in the main have belonged to "the Prophets." When however we have learnt from the Epistle to Timothy that, on the one hand, the Episcopus was to be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2), while, on the other hand, there were Presbyters who seemingly did not teach (1 Tim. v. 17), we have pretty well come to the end of our evidence on this subject.

So far we have spoken of the Apostles as the chief representatives of the general ministry; but there are associated with them alike in the Acts and in the epistles of St. Paul the dimmer figures of Prophets, Teachers, and Evangelists. Amongst these the Acts would lead us to suppose difference of functions existed. The "Evangelist" Philip has not the power to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. The "Prophets and Teachers," on the other hand, at Antioch both exercise the ministry of worship and "lay on hands."¹ Barnabas and

¹ In what sense exactly need not be here discussed. St. Paul and St. Barnabas, who are Prophets in xiii. 1 are "Apostles" in xvi. 4; but St. Paul's language (Gal. i. 1), and the whole idea of the apostolate, would seem to preclude our supposing that he was *made an Apostle* by laying on of hands, in such sense as the grace of his order was in St. Timothy by the laying on of St. Paul's hands. But the apostolate was an office apart, and the laying on of hands, which at least gave Church ratification to St. Paul and St. Barnabas' mission, could have been performed only by those who were recognised as holding the function of ordaining to Church offices. The function of the prophetic office

Saul come under that head (Acts xiii. 1), and presumably at least Apollos. In fact, the apostolic office must be taken to include Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers. They together form the general ministry. The Church is built upon the foundation of "Apostles and Prophets,"—"Apostles and Prophets" have received the message (Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5). It should be noted that in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, amongst the "early Syriac Documents," "the Apostles" who originate "the ordination to the priesthood" are reckoned as "seventy-two" in number, and include St. Luke (*ad fin.*).

Of this broad distinction of the general and local ministry, of the existence of Prophets and Teachers side by side with the Apostles, and of the use of the term Apostle in a general as well as a special sense (Rom. xvi. 7), we had been conscious before the publication of the *Didaché*. What the *Didaché* has done for us is to supply a "missing link" in the history of the development of the sub-apostolic ministry by bringing out into clearer light the dim figures of the Prophets (or Apostles in a general sense) and Teachers. We see these "apostolic men"—men of the general ministry—fulfilling a very important office in the period of transition between the apostolic age and the Church of the later second century. Assuming that the *Didaché* represents a state of things in the last thirty years of the first century (probably in an out-of-the-way district), we find at that epoch side by side with, or rather above, the local ministry of Bishops and Deacons, a still general or errant ministry—with a considerable admixture of impostors in its ranks—in which the Prophets are the most clearly depicted figures.

in ordination (1 Tim. iv. 14, *διὰ*) is not quite clear. But we find the word *ἐπισηπλῆναι*, which seems to have a technical sense in connexion with apostolic visits (and with the "imparting of spiritual gifts" presumably by the laying on of hands?) used of "prophets" as well as apostles (Acts xv. 32, cf. xiv. 22; xv. 41, xviii. 23, cf. Rom. i. 11).

These Prophets, with their untrammelled right of "extempore prayer," supersede the local ministry in the celebration of the Eucharist where they are present. They are "the high priests" of the Christian communities. The "ministry of the word" is mainly in their hands. This picture may be compared with Eusebius' account of the activity of "Evangelists" in the sub-apostolic age, who, "holding the first rank of the succession to the Apostles"—*i.e.* immediately succeeding them in their general missionary functions,—went about as preachers, founding new Churches, ordaining local pastors, and passing on, themselves, into new fields (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 37; *cf.* iii. 20, Hegesippus' expression about the "kinsmen of the Lord," ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν). So far I can agree with Dr. Sanday.

But I cannot but feel that he has an insufficient sense of the fundamental unity between the general and the local ministry and the close dependence of the latter on the former. For instance, the *Didaché* contemplates a Prophet settling in a Church (cap. xiii.). It goes on to speak of him as receiving as his due the tithes and firstfruits, because he is the Christians' high priest. When he was in the church he ministered the Eucharist. Can we doubt that on "settling" he would become the supreme pastor, or Bishop, in the sense (broadly) of Ignatius and Irenæus? Is it not, from the point of view of the *Didaché*, almost certain that the settling of prophets was an element at least in the formation of the episcopate in the later sense. What, in fact, was James but a prototype of the Apostle or Prophet who "settled" instead of moving about? What are Timothy and Titus, but men of the general apostolic and prophetic order, temporarily at least settled at Ephesus and in Crete, and exercising while they remained the functions of diocesan Bishops? Does not this settling of Prophets account in part for the episcopate being conceived of in the *Clementines*, in Irenæus, and in Hippolytus,

mainly as the "chair of the Teacher," having the *charisma veritatis*, the prophetic "high priesthood"? Now supposing the prophetic order to have "settled" into being presidents of the local episcopate, and become in a while *monepiscopi*, or Bishops in the later sense (by a change in the use of a title, facilitated, we may suppose, by St. John's influence in appointing single "Bishops" in the Churches of Asia), there would have been here no change of ministry, but an exercise of the same ministry (fundamentally) under changed conditions. The relation of Presbyter and Deacons to the diocesan Bishop was not fundamentally different from their earlier relation to the "apostolic man" or Prophet, the Timothy or Titus, when he was present.¹

Perhaps this sense of the connexion in the sub-apostolic age of the local with a still enduring "general" ministry may throw light upon the phenomena of the *Epistle of Clement*. Clement, at Rome, in his relation to foreign Churches, in his teaching office, in his freedom of prayer (if we may assume that the end of the epistle represents his free liturgical prayer gradually taking fixed shape and outline), has something perhaps of the office of a Prophet. At *Corinth* there are no indications of any one, or any body of men, above the Presbyter-Episcopi. But there are indistinct forms in the background of the scene. Who are

¹ Timothy and Titus ordained the local ministry by the laying on of hands. There is no mention in the *Didaché* of the "Prophets" ordaining the Episcopi and Deacons. But (1) the Acts and Clement's epistle both represent these officers as appointed *from above* (Acts xiv. 23; Clem. 44). (2) The narrative in Acts xiii. 1 represents the Prophet and Teacher as sharing the apostolic function of laying on of hands. (3) The implication of the Pastoral Epistles suggests the same idea. (4) The silence of the *Didaché*, both about "ordination" and about the "laying on of hands" which followed baptism (and which Heb. vi. 2 assures us was as a "first principle" in Jewish Christian communities) may be accounted for by the fact that the *Didaché* is a manual of directions only for the functions of the community, and does not presume to give directions for what was reserved for the *general* ministry.

the "men of distinction" (cap. xlv.) who in the interval since the apostolic age have appointed the Presbyters with the consent of the Church? Who are the "leaders" (*οἱ ἡγουμένοι, οἱ προηγούμενοι*) who are coupled on two occasions with the Presbyters, and are mentioned first, as superiors of the Church, who are to be objects of reverence? Does again the analogy of the high priest, priests, and levites in the Jewish Church suggest a high priesthood in the Christian Church, like that which is presented to us in the *Didachê*—a prophetic high-priesthood, such as Hippolytus sees in the episcopate later on? It seems at least possible that in Greece at the time of Clement's, or even of Polycarp's, epistle, the "general" ministry of Prophets and Teachers still held the first rank, and appears somewhat dimly in the background of the scene.

However this may be, and it is certainly no more than a tenable hypothesis, at least the unity of the apostolic and prophetic ministry with the local is involved in the principle of the ministerial succession. Traditional Episcopacy has, it may be, in an uncritical age, written a rather "ideal" history of the development of the ministry, but it seems to me to have been true to fact in one, and that the most important, way. It had got hold of the principle of succession; and I do not think most modern critics are inclined to recognise how strong the conception of ministerial succession was from the first. We find it in Irenæus and Tertullian, with emphasis thrown upon it, at the latter part of the second century, and uncontested. It was present in the middle of the second century, when Hegesippus made his lists of the succession (*Euseb.* iv. 22). It is present in the Epistle of Clement. Clement does not verbally seem to make the Apostles have any successors to their *own* office—they stand as Moses to the Aaronic priesthood (cap. xlii.-xlv.); but he does make the ministry of his time to derive from the apostolic fount, to

be the outcome of that one mission, by which "Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ." The principle of succession is this: that no ministerial act is legitimate or "valid" (with secure ratification), except such as is done under commission, such as is covered by the commission received or implied at ordination—a commission which is directly or indirectly from the original apostolic authority. To that principle Clement, it seems to me, and Ignatius would have given their assent. When we go back to the New Testament, we seem to find, beyond a doubt, the idea that Christ instituted His Church with this broad and permanent differentiation of functions: there were to be pastors and their flocks, stewards and members of the household.¹ I cannot see that this distinction can be missed in the Acts of the Apostles; and the Acts interprets the Gospels, if these are supposed to admit of doubt. This pastorate or stewardship belonged, in the first instance, to the Apostles. It seems to have been understood to belong also to "Prophets and Teachers"; not only those who, like Timothy and Titus, were ordained by an Apostle and belong to the second generation, but to those also who were understood, in virtue of supernatural endowment, to be acting under Divine authorization, and to be part (so to speak) of the original equipment of the Church. But in the second stage the ministry was an imparted thing—a thing received from apostolic men. This truth seems to me to be as plain as can be on the surface of the narrative of the Acts, and to be involved indubitably in the Pastoral Epistles, which Dr. Sanday accepts. So far as prophetic gifts linger on in the Church, they are found, as in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, in a subordinate place; at least, they do not claim to usurp the functions of the regular ministry. Of course there is nothing about this succession in the *Didaché*.

¹ See Godet's note on St. Luke xii. 42.

But one who holds Dr. Sanday's position with reference to the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts must interpret the anonymous document with all its ambiguities in the light of those which are of so much greater authority; and of such interpretation the *Didaché* is quite patient. A probable reason has already been pointed out why nothing should be said in the *Didaché* about the laying on of hands by the Prophets, if they are the ordainers; and they themselves may either have been ordained like Timothy and Titus, or may belong to the original ministry. At least, the question seems to turn, not on the *Didaché*, so much as on the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles.

The Apostles and original Prophets then ordained Episcopi and Deacons, and these Episcopi shared essentially that stewardship, that pastorate which Christ had instituted. Surely the essential unity of the office of Apostles and the local ministry is implied in St. Peter's language (1 Pet. v. 1-5), where he classes himself with the Presbyters; in St. Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders; in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the same word is used (xiii. 7, 17) of those who originally delivered the Message and those who now "watch for the souls" of the Hebrew Christians; in the words of the *Didaché*, "Elect for yourselves Bishops and Deacons, . . . for they too minister for you the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers: . . . they are your honoured ones,¹ with the Prophets and Teachers." And surely it is impossible to doubt that St. Paul would have applied what he says about himself as a "steward" (1 Cor. iv. 1) to the "stewards" whom he directs Titus to ordain (Tit. i. 7). The function of the Apostles' office which perished with them was the *original* proclamation of the gospel, the *original* foundation of the Churches and their ministry.

¹ I.e., your regular officers, who receive the *τιμὴ καθήκουσα* (Clem. i.).

There is then, it seems, one ministry, which Christ instituted, with varying functions, of which the "Apostles and Prophets" were the primary representatives, and in which other men, and men of subsequent ages, share only so far as they have received commission directly or indirectly from the Apostles. So that "no man taketh the ministerial honour" to himself seems a principle of the new covenant as much as of the old. It is recognised in the New Testament. It is recognised in Clement as really as in Irenæus or in Cyprian.¹ Thus I cannot agree with Dr. Sanday that when the Montanists claimed a "priesthood of enthusiasm," which should be able to dispense with the ministry received by succession, they were making a claim which scriptural authority would justify. Nor does it seem as if they laid any stress on tradition. "It was this element of conservatism in it," Dr. Sanday says, "the fact that it spoke the language and re-affirmed the ideas of a bygone day, that gave Montanism its strength, and won over to it so powerful a champion as Tertullian." Such language seems to me to be quite contrary to the main indications of history. If one reads Tertullian's *De Virginibus Velandis*, cap. i., he must be struck with its unconservative tone. Tertullian the Catholic is *conservative* with reference alike to doctrine and ministry in the *De Præscriptionibus*. Ter-

¹ Dr. Lightfoot says that Dr. Langen (*Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, p. 95 seq.) "gives an account of the origin of episcopacy precisely similar to his own as set forth in the essay" (on the Christian ministry). See *Ignatius*, vol. i., p. 376, note 1. But Dr. Langen interprets the facts (see p. 82) in the light of this principle of succession, and therefore, I think, more *historically* than Dr. Lightfoot. I have not discussed the development of episcopacy in general, except so far as Dr. Sanday has led the way. For example, I have said nothing about the witness of the *Ignatian Epistles*. But it seems to me that the principle of succession is of infinitely more importance than the question through what variety of arrangements it has worked out. Obviously, for instance, the principle is not impugned, supposing it is to be believed that there was an equal college of Presbyter-Bishops at Corinth and Philippi at the end of the first century, who all equally held the right of perpetuating their office. When they laid on hands they did what was covered by their commission. They did not, like some sixteenth century Presbyters, take that honour to themselves.

tullian the Montanist is still conservative in doctrine; but "*novitas*" is his watchword in matters of discipline. In this region he denounces *custom*: "custom which, taking its origin from ignorance or simplicity, is *strengthened by succession into a practice*, and then is appealed to against the truth. . . . It is not the charge of novelty, but the truth, which refutes heresies. Whatever is against the truth, this is heresy, even an old custom." The rule of faith indeed is immovable, but "the other matters of discipline and life admit the novelty of correction, because the grace of God works and advances to the end." There is a gradual development then in the Church as the Spirit—"the Lord's Vicar"—gradually works out His plan of discipline. This development has for its content "the direction of discipline, the revelation of scriptures, the improvement of our understanding, the advance to a better state of things." It is like the natural development of physical life. The infancy of mankind was under the law and the prophets; it came to its hot youth under the gospel; now, through the Spirit (*i.e.* the spirit which inspired the new prophets, the Montanist spirit, the spirit in virtue of which they set "the Church of the Spirit against the Church of the Bishops"), it is realizing the strength of manhood (*nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem*). True, this has no direct bearing on the claim to possess a substitute for ordination; but when I read this language, and contrast it with that used in the *De Præscriptionibus*, I ask myself, Is there any justification for seeking in Montanism a survival of an earlier state of things? Moreover, the farther one carries back the Montanist movement to its cradle in Asia, the more innovating does its whole character appear. This is, at least, the conception of it formed by its latest historian, Dr. Harnack. He certainly would not agree with Dr. Sanday's estimate.¹

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, pp. 320-330. Cf. especially p. 323, note 3, where he points

To sum up then the criticism in a word. It seems to me that, to make Dr. Sanday's account of the development of the ministry a complete representation of history, there would be wanted a fuller recognition on his part of the principle of succession, and [of the substantial identity of the later Church ministry with the apostolic; or, in other words, there would be wanted more regard for the continuous claim of the ministry from the first in interpreting its *origines*.

C. GORE.

THE NEW THEORY OF THE APOCALYPSE.

AMONG the various theories that have been held, in ancient and in modern times, among orthodox Christians and others, on the subject of the origin and character of the Apocalypse, there is one thing which, until the other day, was not seriously called in question. The book might be the work of the Apostle John, of another St. John, also a faithful disciple of the Lord, or of Cerinthus or some other Judaising heretic; it might date from the reign of Galba, of Vespasian, or of Domitian; it might be a true prophecy of events immediately impending, of the events that will come at the very end of the world, or of all history from one to the other, or, again, it might be a wild fancy destined never to be fulfilled: but that it was the work of one age and of one man was admitted by

out that the claim to represent a prophetic succession (*Euseb. v. 17*), or to restore a former state of things, was (so far as it was made) an afterthought, due to the later desire to get a recognition from the Church. The earlier chapters of the *De Monogamia* will shed a strange light on the desperate character of the claim to be a *restitutio*. There were some heretics who really did make the claim to be the true conservatives. They were the Humanitarians, or Adoptionists, of the third century (*Euseb. v. 28*). The *Little Labyrinth* makes the suggestive rejoinder, "What they said might have been perhaps convincing, if, first of all, the Holy Scriptures had not contradicted them."