REVIEWS

The Early History of the Church and the Ministry. By various writers.
 Edited by H. B. SWETE, D.D. (Macmillan & Co., 1918.)

THIS is a volume written with a purpose, one defined in its preface; and in that light it ought primarily to be judged. It arose out of an appeal by Canon J. M. Wilson for a fresh examination of the questions which 'gather round the origin and early development of Episcopacy, and the nature and degree of the sanction which it possesses', particularly as a ground for refusing to recognize and treat 'non-Episcopal bodies as true branches of the one Catholic Church'. Is it right, asks Dr Wilson, to say Episcopal Christians 'alone have a divinely commissioned fellowship, and that others have their ministry and their sacraments from below, that is, from human appointment'? To this appeal the Primate suggested that a response should be made; and Dr Swete organized a group of Anglican essayists 'to collect and state in as precise a form as possible the latest results of scholarly research bearing on the subject'. But no complete answer to Canon Wilson's questions, as cited in Dr Swete's preface, was undertaken. 'This volume deals only with a part, namely, the questions relating to Church life and policy on which light is thrown by the history of the first three or four centuries'. Nor even within this field are all the relevant problems dealt with, especially as regards the ideas and principles underlying the development described. Yet these are the very things which matter most for the practical deductions to be drawn to-day, and so for the aim of Dr Wilson's appeal.

There is, too, a wide difference between some of the essays in respect to adequacy to the task in hand. Canon Mason's essay on the fundamental subject of 'Conceptions of the Church in early times' is disappointing. It is in fact useless for the purpose in hand, where not positively misleading as tending to confuse the real issues. He proves what is not denied by Nonconformist scholars, and passes over or treats superficially the points that count most in their eyes. Almost on every page the reader is forced to exclaim, *Distinguo*; and the exposition of principles, so far as it exists, is loose and often hardly *ad rem*. Take the following statement. 'That the Church was a divine, and not a human, institution, was a proposition which they (the first Christians) could not have doubted.' But neither is it doubted by 'non-Episcopal bodies', if 'Church' be taken in the sense agreed among scholars to be characteristic of primitive Christians, viz. as the spiritual Israel of God, the people of the New Covenant or Gospel

in succession to that of the Old Covenant or Law. Further he does not grasp the full bearing of his own observation that 'as the Church became predominantly a Gentile Church, the force of this conception grew more faint. Probably after the middle of the second century few of those who read the word *Ecclesia* were aware of its early religious history' (p. 9). Had he followed up the line of thought suggested by this contrast, he would have got nearer the root of the whole matter, namely the predominance of Hebraic conceptions, both of Church and Ministry, in 'primitive' Christianity properly understood—say before the age of the Greek Apologists—and the waning of these, along with the waxing of Greek or Roman conceptions, perceptible in the early 'Catholicism' of Irenaeus and already marked in that of Cyprian.

Again what need to prove that there was 'no difference made in ancient times between an "invisible" and a "visible" Church?' It has no bearing on the problem of reunion between bodies claiming equally to be branches of the visible Church. But having undertaken in this connexion to examine the teaching of 2 Clement, Hermas, and Clement of Alexandria on the pre-existent or heavenly Church as distinct from the Church on earth, Dr Mason might have executed his task more accurately,¹ especially in the case of Clem. Alex., who seems to have in view a heavenly or angelic prototype of the later earthly or human society of spiritual beings.

It is only with his proposition, 'The Church was the visible *organization* which bears that name', that Dr Mason begins to get to grips with his real subject. Unfortunately, however, it is just here that he most exhibits lack of exact thought and discrimination touching the very points where these are most necessary for the end in view. Among such points are the following. There is the distinction between Catholic unity as a spiritual fact, like that of Catholic Judaism, taking effect spontaneously and without ministerial and hierarchical organization specially meant for the purpose—a unity nowhere more evident than in the prayers of the *Didache* and in Abercius's epitaph, neither of which implies any but local organization—and unity in the organized, quasi-legal sense characteristic of fourth-century 'Catholicism', with its episcopal synods armed with virtually coercive authority over local 'churches', each of them 'representing the entire Divine Society',

¹ Dr Mason fails to bring out the undue hypostatizing tendency implied in 2 Clement. Lightfoot's remark, which he cites, that 'this doctrine of an eternal Church seems to be a development of the Apostolic teaching which insists on the foreordained purpose of God as having elected a body of men to serve Him from all eternity', affords a good illustration of the way in which Biblical ideas underwent unconscious change in their conceptual form as the mental environment altered, as noted above.

the Church. Then there is the distinction overlooked in the statement that 'at no period can any sign be discerned that the churches were conceived as independent and self-contained entities' (p. 22). In a spiritual or religious sense, as descriptive of the attitude of each particular church to its fellows, as parts of the One Church indwelt by the same Spirit, this would be asserted by Congregationalists no less than by Ultramontanes. But Dr Mason seems to mean far more than this, and to assert, in Dr Swete's words, that there was 'no self-governing power in the local congregation apart from the authority of the whole Body of Christ'. Even Cyprian asserted the opposite as regards matters not touching the essentials of faith. It is a pity, then, that our essayist does not distinguish stages in the process by which local church autonomy was gradually limited and overborne by the coercive authority of the corporate consciousness, as defined by the collective episcopate.

In so saying, we have hinted at a third needful distinction, that between conceptions of the Church and the Ministry marking off several stages in early Christianity from each other. As Dr C. H. Turner shews so clearly in 'the case of the notion of Apostolical Succession, Catholicism in the age of Irenaeus had one conception of the Episcopate as guarantee of the Church's unity, viz. that of the public guardian of its central tradition as to essential Christian belief, whereas only a little later, beginning from the age of Cyprian, it added another conception of a different order. Yet it is this latter, even the germ of which cannot be traced earlier than Hippolytus, which as an element in the 'Catholic' notion of the Episcopate, and its relation to ministerial orders and to Church unity, alone stands to-day as an insuperable barrier to reunion between so-called Episcopal and non-Episcopal bodies of Christians. For with Irenaeus's type of Episcopate, viz. the pastorate of a single chief presbyter, first among his peers of the presbyterial *ordo* (cf. Harvey's ed. V xl 2, xli 1 *fin.*), and as such having the chief 'teaching position' (*locum magisterii*) in each church, as the Apostles once had it in the Church generally (*ib.* III iii 1), non-Episcopal Christians have no difficulty. It is only when it is assumed further that such bishops have also a quasi-apostolic 'understanding'¹ of the truths to which they are to witness', and a special sacramental power, due in both cases to Episcopal ordination as continuous with Apostolic communication of Grace by laying on of hands—it is only then that what is styled 'the historic episcopate' becomes

¹ As Dr Mason seems hesitatingly to suggest (p. 47), taking Irenaeus's *charisma veritatis certum* in a subjective sense alien to his general usage in relation to the *veritas* possessed by authorized heads of churches, and even alien to the context in which that phrase occurs (V xl 2).

a hindrance to union, as including elements due to historic changes that go deeper than the needs of organized unity.

In fact Dr Mason seems not to reckon in practice at all with the varying stages through which the functions and the idea of the Episcopate passed during the first four centuries. It is such vagueness of conception,¹ characteristic of the essay throughout, that enables him to declare, 'however far back the history is traced, no date can be assigned, however roughly, for the appearance of Catholicism in the Church'. But in fact the connotation of 'bishop' as an element in the Church's 'Catholicity' underwent momentous changes between Irenaeus and Cyprian. Of one change Lightfoot and many Anglican scholars are very conscious, viz. the new 'sacerdotal' and 'hierarchical' significance given to the bishop as such, within the sphere of his own local church—whether the people or the rest of the ministry. Another is that in the conception of the Apostolic Succession traced by Dr Turner to the same epoch. But in addition to these, Cyprian's type of Catholic thought, as a later essay shews, exhibits serious change also in the conception of 'bishops' in relation to the unity of the Church universal, as if this were dependent on their collective or corporate being. It is such changes in the 'Catholic' Episcopate, together with their relation to the grace of the Sacraments, as conditioned by Episcopal ordination (itself now regarded as a sacrament), which determine the whole attitude of non-Episcopal Christians to the Anglican 'historic Episcopate', as claiming identity with the 'Catholic' Episcopate of the fourth and fifth centuries.

It has been needful to deal thus fully with this essay simply because its subject is so fundamental, and because its failure, one must submit, to fulfil adequately the function assigned to it, detracts so much from the value of the volume. But there follow contributions to parts of the whole subject which it is a pleasure to signalize as really advancing knowledge and in a measure supplying what Canon Wilson asked for. The first of these specific discussions is that on the Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods, by the Dean of Wells. Its chief significance is that its author can report that, broadly speaking, Lightfoot's findings of half a century ago still hold the field. These were mostly against the negative or exclusive answers to Canon Wilson's questions as to whether 'non-Episcopal bodies' could be recognized by

¹ At times there are glimpses of more historical insight, as when he writes (pp. 54 f): 'It is very possible that, as time went on, more stress was laid than at the outset upon the contents of the faith and less, in proportion, upon the believing habit of soul. For the purposes of unity and fellowship it was easier to reckon by notes which were comparatively external.' But he does not ask whether and how far a similar change in practice and thought as regards collective organization as essential to the Church's religious unity, did not accompany the change in question.

Anglicans 'as true branches of the one Catholic Church', so far as the validity of their ministry, and so of their sacraments, is concerned. But while the Dean associates himself with Lightfoot's findings, he devotes most of his energy to correcting an exaggerated theory of the antithesis between 'charismatic' and official or localized ministries in primitive Christendom. His discussion is in terms of Harnack's statement of the case, which is marked by the Teutonic 'vigour and rigour' of which Matthew Arnold complained. This, for the purpose of these essays at least, seems a pity, seeing that the use made by English scholarship of the antithesis is, generally speaking, hardly open to the criticism as here made. Further, he seems himself by reaction to transgress the 'just mean' in suggesting that there is no real force in the antithesis, as also by his belittling of the *Didache* as a witness to primitive conditions, at least in Syria (including Palestine). Of course this document is an immense rock of offence to those who start from the other end of the historical developement, the manifestly 'Catholic' order of things, and try to read it back into the beginnings. But that was not Lightfoot's method; neither was his estimate of the *Didache* theirs, nor yet the Dean's own of more recent years. Lightfoot, in his latest published judgement,¹ assigns it to the period A.D. 80-110, preferably A.D. 80-90, and describes the effect of its witness on his own theory of primitive ministry as follows. It 'seems to me in almost every respect to confirm the view which I have taken, and any alterations which I might have to make would be chiefly in the way of elucidation and supplement'. Thus 'there is no trace of the Episcopal office as distinct from the presbyteral (a phenomenon which points to the first rather than the second century). Moreover, the picture which it presents of the temporary and the permanent ministry working side by side—the latter encroaching upon the former—is the same which I have set forth as characteristic of the later decades of the Apostolic age . . . The temporary ministry is represented in the *Didache* by "Apostles" and "prophets"; the permanent by "bishops" and "deacons". But we are told that the latter "likewise minister the ministration of the prophets and teachers". This is an illustration of what I have said as to the gradual transference² of the function of teaching from the missionary preachers to the local officers of the congregations'.

Here we have the main features of the situation reflected in the *Didache*; and the account agrees in essentials with Harnack's view,

¹ 'Additional Note on the Christian Ministry,' at the end of his *Philippians*, 1890.

² Lightfoot does not view this as having taken place by any formal devolution from the unordained missionary or prophetic ministry to the ordained local ministry, but simply as a fact in the Church's life, where alone spiritual continuity in the matter is to be sought.

stated by the Dean as follows: 'A teaching ministry—Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers—was on the point of passing from its ancient and supreme authority, and bequeathing its honours and influence to the administrative class of Bishops and Deacons.' It is true that Lightfoot, writing in 1868, connected together 'teachers, helps, governments' (though 'powers, gifts of healings' intervene) in the list of 1 Cor. xii, on the strength of the seeming analogy of 'pastors and teachers' in the later list in Eph. iv. But 'teachers', as the truer analogy of Acts xiii 1 already suggested, and as the *Didache* and Hermas¹ fully bear out, go closely with 'apostles, prophets', who immediately precede them in 1 Cor. xii, as primarily ministers of 'the Word of God' rather than of administrative oversight, according to the contrast in Acts vi 2. Of course the distinction was not absolute; and the gifts qualifying for such practical ministries, like all functions in the Body of Christ, were also gifts of the Spirit. But the fact remains that inspiration with 'the Word' was essential to the 'Teachers' in question, as well as to Prophets (and Apostles), although in a less immediate and spontaneous form, recognizable in a less rapt and more reflective style of 'teaching'. The form of the Teacher's gift in the Word not being that *distinctive* of the prophetic type² of *charisma*, to which it yet belonged generically, the term 'teacher' naturally came to be used in two senses, a special and a general one. In this latter sense it might attach to men whose office was primarily practical or administrative, particularly 'pastors', otherwise called 'elders' or 'bishops', in order to describe their functions of instructional or hortatory teaching in the contents of the common tradition, as distinct from fresh vision or revelation. These functions, however, were *incidental* to the full performance of their ministry rather than of its essence; witness 1 Tim. v 17, 'elders who rule . . . , especially those who labour in (the) Word and instruction' (ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ). Such were not as a class 'gifted' in 'the Word', and so did not in general esteem rank as of the prophetic type, and so as 'charismatic'—according to the modern use of the term which Dr Robinson deprecates and which may well be dropped, if the truth it suggests is preserved; for 'the Word' in *manifestly inspired* form was, in connexion with the ministry, the 'charisma' *par excellence* (cf. 1 Cor. xiv 1).

¹ Sim. ix 15. 4; 16. 5; 25. 2 οἱ δὲ μ' ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ: οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ: and ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι οἱ κηρύξαντες εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ οἱ διδάξαντες σεμνῶς καὶ ἀγνῶς τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου . . . καθὼς καὶ παρέλαβον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

² Compare the description of Polycarp as διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς, in his Martyrium. The same principle seems to apply to 'evangelists', so explaining their place just after 'prophets' in Eph. iv, where they replace the 'teachers' of 1 Cor. xii.

Where such a *charism* of the Spirit was manifest no formal Church Commission¹ by appointment and ordination was needed. As directly authenticated by his 'charism', a 'Teacher', though in a lesser degree than a 'Prophet', was invested both locally and at large with an authority in the things of 'the Word' higher than that of the ordinary ministries for everyday practical guidance and help. With these latter the nature and conditions of their authority, a strictly local one, were different. It was entrusted to them by formal commission of the Church, as represented by the local church, acting in the first instance, in most cases at least, on the initiation and with the co-operation of its Apostolic founder (in the wider sense of 'Apostle'), but in his absence, either through circumstances or after his death, acting through its own local chief ministers on a method of orderly appointment, after popular election on the basis of personal qualifications for the office in question. But no early claim is made that such Church commission or ordination was more than a matter of order, and as such conformable to a divine principle in nature and history, both civil and religious. There is no suggestion, though it would have greatly added to the argument in the Roman Clement's letter, that such a humanly conditioned or ecclesiastical appointment conveyed any sacramental grace of orders. It simply conferred *representative* or corporate validity to the ministry of the divine gift recognized by the choice of the Spirit-bearing Church as present in its bearer. Accordingly, though 'charismatic' may not be a description of this contrast free from ambiguity, yet the facts in the main support Harnack rather than the Dean of Wells, save in so far as the former may attribute to the 'prophetic' type of ministry pre-eminence in the pastoral function of 'ruling', as well as in 'teaching' and offering Eucharistic prayer. Harnack's chief error is the common one of drawing too hard and fast lines, an error into which, as it seems, his critic himself falls in his effort to discredit the *Didache's* representation as to a special class of inspired Teachers.

But, after all, granting Dr Robinson's negative contribution to 'terminological exactitude' to be a useful *caveat*, his essay leaves untouched the main features of 'the Primitive Ministry' which tell against the later 'Catholic' reading of it. These were already established by Lightfoot, whom he claims to confirm. The crucial point is that 'the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation'. When, further, the

¹ The same principle survived into the third century, in the ancient Church Order cited in Dr Frere's essay, in the case of confessors who ranked *ipso facto* as Spirit-qualified for the 'presbyterate'; whereas the specifically representative office of a 'bishop', in addition to his presbyteral rank (*ordo*), could be conferred on a confessor only by formal appointment by the Church, including ordination to that office.

single 'bishop who exercised a permanent supervision over an individual congregation' actually emerged, during the last decade or so of the first century, in Asia, his specially representative authority was not dependent on any commission conferred through certain persons, outside or within each congregation, acting with quasi-apostolic authority derived from the Apostles themselves by devolution. Of any 'transmission of ministerial authority' in this sense there is no really early trace. Nor is there, on Lightfoot's theory, any trace of super-congregational functions in the primitive Episcopate, so as to be the cement, as Cyprian came to claim, of the Church as a unified organization. It is, then, a strange *non sequitur* from Lightfoot's principles when Dr Robinson ends by saying 'We need now, *as much as the sub-apostolic age*, a ministry which can hold the whole Church together'. For no ministry with that function then existed. The local bishop, as the official head of his own church, was in practice the primary organ of fellowship within 'the Brotherhood' as a whole; but he had no authority outside his own church. To say, as he does in his closing sentence, that 'at least for the purposes of unity, the episcopate is the successor of the apostolate' is to use 'the episcopate' in a different sense from the primitive one with which his essay deals. It was long ere even regular conferences of adjacent bishops for counsel became common, and ere organization between local churches became as regularized as it is even in modern Congregationalism, let alone Presbyterianism or Methodism. Non-Episcopal scholars agree with the Dean that 'the Christian Ministry was gradually evolved, in response to fresh needs which came with new conditions'; and they have no desire to argue that when the evolution had got a given distance all the Church's legitimate needs in the way of organization were once for all met. Thus while insisting that the early type of Episcopate which arose in the sub-Apostolic age, and lasted without radical change till the third century, cannot be an invalid type of Church organization to-day, they are ready to accept certain later forms of inter- and super-congregational organization, as developments in the Episcopate of value in the interests of corporate unity. Only it is 'terminological inexactitude' to describe the super-Episcopate of fourth-century provincial bishops (metropolitans), or of mediaeval and modern diocesan bishops, as part of 'the Historic Threefold Ministry' of bishop, presbyters, deacons, whose authority was originally and properly confined to their own local church. That super-Episcopate is really a fourth type of ministry, whose special function it was to organize and unify the life of the Church at large.

Of the essays generally the most important is that which comes next in order, Dr C. H. Turner's elucidation of ancient conceptions touching Apostolic Succession in the Episcopate, and of the problem of non-

Catholic orders as related thereto. It illustrates, and largely reveals the secret of, the change from the Episcopate in the 'primitive' sense to its 'Catholic' connotation, the very existence of which Dr Mason is at pains to deny. The first section, on 'the original conception' of Apostolical Succession, brings out the changes of emphasis and even of meaning through which the conception passed, marked by the names of Clement of Rome, Hegesippus and Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Cyprian, in particular. The notes of these three stages are apostolic order, doctrine, and priesthood, as represented by the Episcopate (in Clement of Rome still that of a college of presbyters) in succession to the Apostles. Further the manner in which those in the 'Succession' from the Apostles, by virtue of their legitimate headship of churches of apostolic foundation, and of their due ordination to their office or *cathedra*, were conceived as related to the Apostles by such succession, varied a good deal. Down to Tertullian's day 'bishops have their place in the Apostolic Succession only in connexion with the churches over which they preside. Sacerdotal language, strictly speaking, is entirely absent' (p. 129). Yet 'so far back as "succession" was emphasized at all', a second factor, besides lawful election by a particular church to its vacant *cathedra*, was in Dr Turner's opinion already thought to be involved, viz. 'to be lawfully entrusted with the *charisma* of the Episcopate by the ministry [of those already recognized as possessing it]'. It is doubtful, as shewn above, whether Irenaeus has any such idea in referring to the *charisma veritatis certum* as passed on from bishop to bishop in succession. Further our essayist says that 'when the neighbouring bishops met to bestow on the bishop-elect the laying on of their hands, they in fact ratified with the sanction of the Church at large the choice of the individual community'. But no evidence of such intervention of neighbouring bishops¹ exists prior to the third century. So that it is precarious to say that 'from the first', or even before Irenaeus's day, 'any claim to be a bishop in the successions from the Apostles' implied these twin ideas, and that 'without this *charisma* of his ordination he and his community had nothing to stand upon but their own basis'.

So far, however, there is no suggestion that 'succession from the Apostles' meant that bishops were 'themselves "successors of" the Apostles', 'sharers in the same grace of high-priesthood and teaching', as Hippolytus puts it. This fresh element in the conception is first found in a work of his from about A.D. 220, but becomes marked in Cyprian and gradually possesses itself of the Catholic mind generally. It means that 'the Church takes the place of the churches, so that the

¹ The *Ecclesiastical Canons* shews that the original nature and purpose of the intervention of 'three chosen men', from a sister church, were possibly quite different from what is here implied.

bishop is rather *a* bishop of the Church at large than *the* bishop of his own community . . . There is of course no necessary antagonism between these two conceptions, which when held in equipoise complement and correct one another. But the shifting of the emphasis on to one side of the truth can be felt at work from the beginning of the third century ; and it marks the first stage of a long and far-reaching development, in the course of which an integral element of the doctrine in its original form, namely the relation of the bishop to his own people . . . dwindled and disappeared' (pp. 129, 131 f).

Along with this new doctrine of Apostolic Succession went the corollary that it was confined to the One Catholic Church and was even forfeited by lapse into heresy or schism. Its *charisma*, that is, like the grace of any other sacrament—for such it was now conceived to be—existed only in the one Spirit-bearing Body of Christ as an organization. This conception of the nullity of all sacraments save 'in the Church', a point common to Cyprian and Novatian, like Hippolytus before them—though the three applied it very differently—is closely bound up henceforth with the doctrine of the validity of orders as related to Apostolical Succession, as Dr Turner shews in his striking contrast between Cyprian's and Augustine's doctrines on the point. This forms the most original part of his whole important contribution. Canon Wilson had desiderated light on the grounds of 'the separation' which 'grew up between the conditions for what is called a valid Baptism and those for a valid Eucharist, and the limitation of the latter to men episcopally ordained'. And it is to be feared that he will still be left waiting for a satisfactory, that is a consistent, answer to that great *crux* of 'Catholic' theory as to sacramental grace outside the visible Church, on the presupposition that it is the exclusive sphere of the Spirit's supernatural activity—unless one can accept Cyprian's own answer, which 'Catholicism' at large has rejected.

As regards the contrast between the Cyprianic type of Catholicism and the Augustinian, while Cyprian held all sacraments, including Apostolic Orders (as most Catholics after his day held all save baptism), outside the one Church to be null or worse, Augustine held in a sense the exact contrary. That is, he admitted the *validity* of *all* sacraments even outside the Church, if duly administered in form and substance, since their reality depends on Christ's institution and power, and not on the human agent. On the other hand their *efficacy* was conditional on the essential Grace of Love, which could not normally exist or be counted on outside the Church, among schismatics or heretics. Hence on the 'reconciliation' to the Church of a minister who had received orders in due form outside it, the corresponding grace hitherto potential became actual. This doctrine is really revolutionary of 'Catholic'

principle, in that it makes the subjective state of the recipients of sacraments, the charity of unity, as determined by the invisible action of the Spirit of Love in the heart, decisive for sacramental efficacy. No doubt he made that outward reconciliation the decisive thing for the Church's recognition of such efficacy in any case: but his spiritual principle itself could not be thus limited before God where divine love coexisted, as it might, with conscientious scruple against formal adhesion to one corporate body claiming to be 'the Church' rather than another. In fact, his compromise between the principles involved—the traditional Catholic one, which emphasized the external *opus operatum* aspect of sacraments, and his own return to more primitive principles, which made little of the human agent and laid stress on the spiritual state of the recipient, his spirit of unity and not of schism—was unsatisfactory. It was artificial in the merely formal value it gave to the objective rite, as correct in form, matter, and general intention; and it was 'something like a *reductio ad absurdum*' of the whole Catholic sacramental system, since it did not allow him with consistency to deny that a non-Christian could validly baptize. Thus it was so alien to primitive Christianity as to refute its own premisses: and yet, framed as it was to meet the new and patent facts of two almost equal bodies of African Christians claiming to be 'the Church', with the same creeds and the same Apostolic Orders, it seemed the only one which could save Catholic sacramental theory from a practical refutation. The *impasse* was indeed serious; and it is not clear how an issue from it can be found on any principles which would warrant denial of validity to orthodox non-Episcopal sacraments and ministries. Thus the general effect of Dr Turner's contribution is constructively eirenic in tendency.

Archbishop Bernard's study of 'The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry' is strictly expository, and brings out clearly that 'Catholic' theory was far from one and the same from the first. Cyprian had the merit of putting things with a remorseless consistency which helps us to bring loose notions of 'Catholicism' to book. To him 'the bishops of the Catholic Church are a *collegium* which is to the whole Church what the individual bishop is to his own community' (Dr Swete's summary). This is new doctrine. Again, 'the unity of the Church is exhibited by the unity of the collective episcopate' (p. 253), a sort of mystic entity which manifests itself in synodal concord. And yet Cyprian was driven, in his fidelity to what he believed to be the true Catholic tradition and doctrine, to furnish a practical refutation of his theory of unity in the Episcopate by leading a division of judgement on the question of baptism 'outside the Church'—really a dogmatic issue, as involving the conditions of Sacramental Grace. Hence one may justly say that Cyprian was in practice the *enfant terrible* of the very 'Catholicism'

which he did so much to define in a new sense, in his doctrine of the Collective Episcopate as the 'cement' of the Church's unity, and whose later dualism in doctrine as between baptism and the Eucharist 'outside the Church', in point of the conferment of grace, he did so much to set in glaring relief. Thus in effect, if he 'shews that to be Catholic is not necessarily to be Roman', he shews also that 'Catholic' theory as to unity and the conditions of Sacramental Grace is a relative thing, not *quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus creditum est*.

Canon Wilson asked for some review of 'the early conceptions of ordination and consecration in the Church; to shew whether they did not lay more stress on the pastoral and teaching work of the ministry, and on the continuity of doctrine, and less on its sacramental functions and powers, than we now do'. The essay which takes up this question most explicitly is that on 'Early forms of Ordination' by Dr Frere. He deals first with the New Testament evidence; then with the earliest extant forms of ordination service, the 'Hippolytean' Church Order and the Sacramentary of Serapion; and then, in the light of these, returns to some collateral evidence of a less formal kind, before summing up the conception of ordination which lies behind the two services already cited. These are marked, he says, by 'the strong assertion of the episcopate as the sole authority that is empowered to continue the tradition' of a ministry continuous with that of the Apostles. This seems to go a good deal beyond the evidence even of the 'Hippolytean' Church Order. Among his functions, when truly chosen of God—through the Christian people's choice¹—is 'to bestow orders according to God's injunction (*διδόναι κλήρους κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμά σου*). Even this, taken as it stands (yet see below), hardly warrants the above statement. But in any case, as Dr Frere adds, 'this does not necessarily mean that the imposition of hands is itself the exclusive channel of the spiritual grace' of the ministry. 'The view of the *charismata* which is taken all through, is that God gives as He pleases: and the corporate consciousness of the Church recognizes those gifts whenever it sees them. It recognizes the initial grace by which a man turns from heathenism. . . . It recognizes in others the antecedent grace of vocation to the ministry . . . ; and then it gives him the consequent grace of orders, and his position in the ministry, praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, as the elect of God, in order that he may have the needful fullness of spiritual gift.'

Apart from the dubious use of 'grace of orders' as 'given' by the Church—an idea alien to the wording of this ordination prayer—this

¹ 'The popular election was not quite what we understand by the term: the people acted as the Spirit-bearing body, on behalf of God [subject to His fuller knowledge as *καρδιογνώστης*], and with a deep sense of responsibility' (p. 299).

conception of appointment and ordination to the ministry is one to which Protestants, whether Conformist or Nonconformist, have no serious reason to demur. But as regards the opening generalization touching exclusive episcopal powers, it is very doubtful if the conception of the Episcopate is the same in the 'Hippolytean' Church Order and Serapion's Sacramentary. Had Dr Frere quoted the prayer in the latter over a bishop, it would have been evident that neither powers of ordination nor specific sacerdotal functions are there attributed to bishops, but that God Himself is spoken of as 'ordaining holy bishops'. It is there, and not on any human agent, that the emphasis lies. Taken as it stands in Bishop Serapion's Prayer-book of c. A.D. 350, this prayer not only adds 'little or nothing' to the ideas of the other Church Order, but takes away much from its notion of the Episcopate, and may well suggest doubt as to the typical character assigned to it in Dr Frere's essay. Much in its emphasis, and particularly the exclusive claims made for the office of chief pastor, seems in fact local rather than typical at the date to which it belongs. These specific features, 'authority to forgive sins, to give orders,'¹ to loose every bond according to the authority given to the Apostles', are there connected with possession of 'the high-priestly spirit', which marks off the bishop as 'pastor' and 'high-priest' to God on behalf of his flock. This prayer, as it stands, *prima facie* represents some circle of Syrian Christianity, seeing that it occurs in a Church Order which as a whole has certainly received accretions and modifications to its Hippolytean basis in some such region.² The degree to which its ordination prayers for bishop, presbyter, and deacon have undergone change of this sort is still a moot point, though Dr Frere now accepts them as representing Rome in Hippolytus's day, and not only Syria in the latter part of the third century or even later. Hence the other alternative must still be left open and reckoned with, viz. that the most distinctive features of this Church Order's conception of a bishop and his powers are connected with the developement of hierarchical ideas in certain quarters during the third century which appears clearly in the doctrine of 'Apostolic Succession', as traced by Dr Turner.

The last essay, by Dr Brightman, on 'Terms of Communion and the Ministration of the Sacraments in early times', is a highly detailed study, marked by all its author's well-known learning and accuracy. To it

¹ Omitted not only in the Egyptian *Canons of Hippolytus* but also in the *Testament of the Lord*, the latter of which represents some region on the borders of N. Syria and Asia Minor as late as c. 400: so that there also this feature of the Episcopate was not emphasized.

² This is the view of Dr Frere himself not only as regards its latter part, but also as to the *Anaphora* which is closely connected with the ordination section for a bishop.

students will turn with profit again and again as to a dictionary of ecclesiastical usages. But it adds little, if anything, to the principles bearing on the questions which occasioned this volume. And so we pass on to sum up the effect of the whole as a contribution to the problems posed in a practical spirit by Canon Wilson.

Non-Episcopal Christians, whose status is the matter in question, should in my judgement welcome these essays, because, though one or two tend rather to 'darken counsel with words', others, and those the most important and fresh contributions, tend to minimize, if not to remove, hindrances in the way of Catholics who desire to go as far as history will allow them towards meeting non-Episcopal brethren who long for restored communion. On the other hand, while these latter gratefully welcome such features of the exposition in this volume as render modern Episcopacy more capable of becoming the chief element in a new ecclesiastical synthesis, they must make clear their claim already to have part and lot in the Episcopate of history to a far larger degree than these essays seem to recognize. Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists all hold that early Church history shews them to possess 'the threefold ministry' of the Ignatian type, that relative to the most natural and ultimate unit of local Church fellowship, the particular church; and that the Episcopate remained essentially on this basis until the third or fourth century, with the addition of a growing Presbyterian or synodal element, in which voting power, and then even attendance, was more and more limited to 'bishops' or pastoral elders. In modern Christendom both these forms of Episcopate—the Congregational and the Presbyterian—have been restored, and now claim recognition, along with the Church life which they have helped to organize, in any future system of reunion. This said, the true moral of these essays seems to the present reviewer to be that, when read with fairness to all its changing stages, the Church's early history returns as its verdict *nil obstat*. One would like Canon Wilson's own judgement now on the whole matter.

VERNON BARTLET.

Suffering, Punishment, and Atonement, by ERNEST W. JOHNSON, M.A., Tutor of Cheshunt College, Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co., London, 1919.)

Reconciliation and Reality, by W. FEARON HALLIDAY, M.A. (Headley Bros., London, 1919.)

BOTH these books are essays in constructive interpretation of experience, and incidentally are attempts at doctrinal reconstruction. They are both addressed to readers such as may possess little or no theo-