

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume VI

JULY, 1902

Number 3

THE ORIGIN OF HIGH-CHURCH EPISCOPACY.*

By ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT,
New York, N. Y.

It is the purpose of this article to trace and explain the origin of the theory known as high-church episcopacy—the theory which maintains that episcopacy is of divine appointment and is essential to the very being of the Christian church; that only he is a true bishop who stands in the direct line of apostolic succession, and is consequently in possession of grace handed down from the apostles in unbroken sequence; that episcopal ordination is not simply expedient, but necessary to the constitution of the clergy; and that the sacraments through which alone the grace of Christ ordinarily operates can be validly performed only by one episcopally ordained. In a well-known work on apostolic succession we find the essential features of the system concisely summarized as follows: "It means, in few words, without bishops no presbyters; without bishops and presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments; without sacraments no certain union with the mystical body of Christ, namely with his church; without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation."¹

*The present article contains the substance of a lecture on the validity of non-episcopal ordination, which was given at Harvard University on the *Dudleian* foundation in 1901.

¹ HADDAN, *Apostolic Succession*, p. 14.

a footnote, speaking of the Cæsarean harbor!—as well as Lydda (Diospolis), swarm with them. But they are also found in other places, and are everywhere the cause of much mischief, of heartburnings, of patriarchal severities, and of the insidious heresies of the "Alexandrian" agada. Space forbids to do more than draw attention to a plagiarism (pp. 125, 126) from Jellinek (*cf.* Beth Ha-Midrash, III); to some peculiar remarks on Hebrew grammar (pp. 219–23); to a sample of our author's Greek (γένικος ἄνθρωπος = "der sinnliche Mensch"); or to his fondness for "proving" well-known commonplaces. These are mere trifles when compared with the habit of disingenuousness with which texts are altered and twisted so as to testify falsely in behalf of a pet theory. For example see pp. 75, note 110; 84, note 133; 167, note 31; 168, note 34; 213, note 163; 247, note 228; 255, note 4; 260, note 7; 261, note 10; 264, note 19.

We hope not to exaggerate in saying that such "contributions" belong to the debit side of the ledger, and that a fair number of them will rapidly land any science in the hands of a receiver.

EPHRAIM FELDMAN.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
Cincinnati, O.

HANDBOOK TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By FREDERIC G. KENYON. With Sixteen Facsimiles. New
York: Macmillan, 1901. Pp. xi + 321. \$3.25, net.

DR. KENYON has been assistant keeper of manuscripts at the British Museum since 1889. He has made himself well known wherever Greek letters are cultivated, by his editions of papyrus texts deposited in the British Museum, and by his *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, published in two volumes, issued, respectively, in 1893 and 1898. The results of his study of the papyri he has summed up also in an excellent sketch of *The Palæography of Greek Papyri*, published in 1899. His interest in the biblical text has shown itself in an admirable popular volume on *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, which reached its third edition in 1898, and in a series of *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts in the British Museum* which appeared in 1900. The treatise which he now gives us profits, of course, from his long and close occupation with Greek diplomatics.

The book is divided into eight chapters. The first of these is a brief introductory precis of "the function of textual criticism." The next three give a full account of the Greek manuscripts preserving

the New Testament text. These are followed by chapters on "The Ancient Versions" and the "Patristic Quotations." The volume closes with two chapters treating respectively of "Textual Criticism in the Past" and "The Textual Problem." It is throughout admirably written: it is clear and precise in style and thoroughly well informed in matter. The task which it sets itself could hardly be better accomplished. A great part of it is, of course, merely a careful summary of former writers; but the best writers are selected for summarizing, and the work is carefully and admirably performed. The information, moreover, is everywhere brought fully up to date. Nor are original features wanting. It may even be said that Dr. Kenyon, out of his own stores of first-hand knowledge, has added a whole new chapter to the external history of the New Testament text. He is able to prefix to the periods of uncial and minuscule transmission a previous period of propagation on papyrus, of a duration of some four hundred years. He has naturally drawn largely upon his previous writings on Greek papyri for his description of this period. It makes a notable addition to the current account of the early transmission of the New Testament text.

The best thing about Dr. Kenyon's book is its eminent sobriety. An air of balance and good judgment pervades it; and the reader finds no difficulty in trusting himself to the guidance of a writer who is obviously circumspect in forming his opinions and prudent in expressing them. These qualities are conspicuously exhibited in the closing chapters, in which the theories of the past and of the present come under discussion. These are treated with the most transparent fairness and are estimated in scales of evident righteousness. It is a great comfort to read a writer who reins himself in and prefers sanity to brilliancy, when dealing with topics which have been made of late the peculiar field of over-acute speculation. The result of his survey of past and present discussion of the textual history of the New Testament is to settle down upon substantially Dr. Hort's reading of it. There has been as yet no real advance made upon either Dr. Hort's construction of the history of the text, or Dr. Hort's methods of criticism.

But in speaking of the textual problem we are approaching the limitations of Dr. Kenyon's good book. He is content to remain the historian of this problem. He offers no efficient help toward solving it. In effect his book deals only with the externals of New Testament criticism, and has little to say about the theory or practice of the art. Remarkable for the excellence of its contents, it is even more remark-

able for the extent and nature of its omissions. It offers itself as an attempt "to provide a serviceable handbook to the textual criticism of the New Testament, for the use of students who are comparatively new to the subject" (p. vii). But it is framed on a somewhat defective theory of what is needed in a "serviceable handbook." "The function of a textual critic" it considers to be summed up in these two operations: "first, to collect documentary evidence, and, secondly, to examine it and estimate its value" (p. 15). It would seem, then, that it is no part of the function of the textual critic to criticise the text; and no part of the function of a handbook to textual criticism to instruct the tyro how to proceed in criticising the text. When the external evidence is collected, and its value estimated, the critic is to stop short, and make no effort to apply this evidence to the actual criticism of the text. It is on this conception of its task that Dr. Kenyon's handbook is framed. Accordingly all that concerns the act of criticism is omitted: we look in vain for any adequate account of "various readings" in their origin or nature; and equally in vain for any exposition of critical method—for any discussion of the various kinds of evidence and their use, even for any presentation of the right methods of applying external evidence itself. From this *Hamlet* certainly *Hamlet* is left out.

It may be said that we are blaming the book for not being something else than it is. This is in a measure true. If it professes to be a handbook to the *externalia* of textual criticism only, it deserves nothing but appreciation. It puts into the hands of the prospective critic a great deal of most interesting information connected with his craft, and it does this charmingly. But it seems to present itself as a practical handbook to textual criticism, designed for beginners. And it is not unfair to the book, and only fair to the beginners, to say frankly that, so considered, it is fatally defective. It does not teach the *principia* of the art. If Dr. Kenyon, writing with the same admirable sobriety with which he has compiled these chapters on its *externalia*, would only add further chapters on the processes of textual criticism—illustrating each process from the treasures of his large experience with classical texts—then he would give us the handbook we had hoped for from him. If he will not do this, we shall have to wait for another.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.