

have been mentioned on the other side. There can be no reasonable question as to where the weight of scholarship lies.

What now is this modern position with reference to the Ministry? I must be brief and only attempt the most rudimentary outline :

1. In the first place it springs out of the historical method, and the application of the principle of development to the early history of the Church. With respect to the historical method I can say nothing, but I may refer you to an interesting chapter in Canon Storr's important work on "English Theology in the 19th Century." With respect to the latter, I may give one quotation from Bishop Lightfoot, and refer to an article in *The Expositor* some twenty-five years ago, by Dr. Sanday. Dr. Lightfoot wrote thus as his summing up of the origin of the Episcopate : "If the bishop was at first used as a synonym for presbyter and afterwards came to designate the higher officer under whom the presbyters served, the Episcopate properly so-called would seem to have been developed from the subordinate office. In other words, the Episcopate was formed, not out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation." (*Commentary on Philippians*, 8th ed., p. 196.) Dr. Sanday in the *Expositor* shewed that the old assumption of a fixed form of Church Government to be found in the New Testament was not borne out by the facts. The New Testament *imposes* upon the Church no one form of Government, whether Congregational, Presbyterian or Episcopal. The Church *passed through* the stages of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism on its way to Episcopacy. In complete harmony with the verdict of these two great scholars is the admission of Bishop Gore ("Orders