

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-1-1928

Church Polity up to 325 A.D. with Special Reference to the Apostolic Succession

Hugo Ness

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_nessh@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ness, Hugo, "Church Polity up to 325 A.D. with Special Reference to the Apostolic Succession" (1928).
Bachelor of Divinity. 718.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/718>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**CHURCH POLITY UP TO 325 A.D. WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION**

**A Thesis presented to the
Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary**

**in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of**

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Hugo Hess

OUTLINE.

	Ppg.
I: The Apostolic Age	2-24.
Definition of the Church	2.
Authority " " "	"
The Local Congregation	3.
Church Services	3-4.
Charismatic Manifestations .	5.
The Office of the Apostles	6.
" " " " "	7.
" " " Pastors and Teachers	8.
Specific Gifts	9.
The Regular Ministry	10.11.12.
The Office of the Deacons	12.13.
Deaconesses and Widows	13.14.
The Office of the Presbyter	14 to 18.
The Laity	19- 22.
Ordination	22.
II: The Post-Apostolic Age	24 to 30.
Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch.	24.
Polycarp of Smyrna and the Didache	25.
Pastor Hermas and Papias	26.
Justin Martyr	27- 28.
Original Sources of the Apostolic Canons	28.
Summary	29.
III: Later Developements up to 325 A.D.	30-48.
Tendency to Episcopacy	30.31.
The Bishops	31 to 33.
Cyprian of Carthage	34.35.
Presbyters	36.
Deacons	37.
Church Services	38.
Sacerdotalism	39 to 41.
External Organization	41.42.
Civil Authority in Relation to the Church	43.44.
The Laity	45.
Apostolic Succession	46 to 48.

**CHURCH POLITY UP TO 325 A.D. with SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE APOSTOLIC
SUCCESSION.**

today

Differences in church organization ^{today} are directly proportional to the differences in doctrine. As the actions of a man are but the result of his beliefs we are justified in ascertaining his tenets by observing his actions. But in any system of church organization the arrangement should be that by which the motive principle, i.e., faith, reaches its maximum of efficiency. And here, if anywhere, the doctrine lends the distinctive mark to the ^{organ-} organization. Thus, if fault is to be found, the root of the evil lies in false doctrine. And yet, to argue Church Polity on the grounds of theoretical doctrine alone, or doctrine ^{do-} aside from practice, if that is possible, would get us nowhere. We must study both doctrine and practice. And now we must decide what period in the development of Church Polity will give us the correct arrangement.

the

The Oxford Movement, having several axes of its own to grind, turned the searching glare of the light of scientific research on the Early Church. The means of search were perfectly proper and justifiable, yet the results did not furnish ^{'the} 'the one thing needful'. For, instead of studying the Church of the First Century, they devoted their time and energy to the Age of Nicea. Their efforts were vain as far as ^{as} their immediate needs were concerned. In the course of this essay we will endeavor to show that "the mystery of iniquity did already work" at that time and therefore their results were useless. We must go back farther than Nicea, we must go back ^{the} to the time when the Church was under the infallible guidance of the Apostles. Anything ^{later} later than that is unsafe since there is always the possibility of error. When ~~if~~ we have once gained an idea of their organization and practice we shall have the one and only correct standard of comparison for later ages. We shall then be able to see how the gifts of God to man, hampered and vitiated by the soiling touch of human hands, apparently lost all claims of spirituality and became empty, materialistic formulas to certain ends. We have divided our subject into three logical periods:

1:-The Apostolic Age as portrayed in Scripture.

2:-The Post-Apostolic Age as seen in the writings of the Fathers.

3:-Later developments up to the Council of Nicea, 325 A.D.

Before we have a starting point we must answer the question:

What is the Church? From N.T. passages it is obvious that there are various usages of the term *Ekklesia*. In the general or more comprehensive sense, the word includes all Believers in Christ, all Christians. This group is universal and invisible, it is not marked by any outward signs of organization, neither is it controlled by any barriers of age, race or sex. In short, it is the Kingdom of God on earth which will remain as long as the earth endures. In the narrower sense of the term it can only mean the local congregation. That is any group of believers in a certain locality organized for the purpose of carrying out their duties or privileges as a Body of Believers. And it is to such a group, according to Matth. 18, 17; 1 Cor. 5, 3-5 and 2 Thess. 5, 6, that the privileges and powers are granted that have been promised the Church at large.

Since every organization must have authority we must decide where this authority lies in the Christian Church. For we know that authority has been granted the Church by Christ in three well-known but very often misinterpreted passages: In Matth. 16, 13-19 Christ gives the authority to bind and to loose to Peter as the spokesman of the other disciples. Again, in Matth. 18, 15-20 the same thing is granted to the Twelve as the representatives of the Church that was to come into existence thru their ministry or better still, they received it as the first local congregation. The third passage is John 20, 21-23 where the same power is granted to all the disciples assembled together at that place. And that constitutes the authority that is the basis of the Christian Church, that as a visible group existing as a unity and practising fellowship, they should wield all the authority granted the Church as such. And the early churches also carried this out. The congregation at Jerusalem elected Matthias Acts 1, 26; the one at Antioch commissioned Paul and Barnabas to do missionary work Acts 12, 1f; and when Paul calls attention to the blameable state of affairs at Corinth he does not launch a decision or judgment as an inspired Apostle, neither does he demand that the Council at Jerusalem take the matter in hand, but he takes great pains to show the Christians that it is their duty to take the matter up and adjust it by virtue of their own authority. A later reference to this affair shows that this was done. But the local congregation was

be endowed with other powers besides that of authority.

The local congregation was to be the recipient of charismatic gifts, signs perceived by the senses as proof of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Children of God as promised by the prophets of old, Cf Joel 2, 28. In 1 Cor. 3, 22 the local congregation is promised: "All things are yours", likewise the virtues catalogued Gal 5, 22-25; according to Eph. 1, 17, 18 it is enlightened and in Eph. 4, 1 it is urged as a body to hold to its faith. Besides these general references are the Charismata of 1 Pet. 4, 10; 1 Cor. 12, 28 and Rom 12, 26 which we shall discuss more fully below. But from the foregoing we see that the local congregation is the organization desired by the Lord and arranged by the infallible Apostles. Furthermore, with that in mind, it must be admitted that if any authority or powers is promised the Church as such, the local congregation will be the recipient. And while we are discussing the individual congregation it may be well to say a word about their services.

The New Testament lays down no rules for worship, thus again stressing the difference and the superiority of the New over the Old Covenant. The only requisites are that all things be done 'unto edifying' and 'in decency and order'. Archbishop Whately, in his "Kingdom of Christ Delineated" has it that the same Omniscience, which so minutely recorded the First Dispensation, avoided anything like it in the New for this purpose that the New was for all races and peoples with all their differences. That is aptly stated. What we do know of the early mode of worship is this: The Faithful met in 'upper rooms' as it is stated in Acts which must have been private dwellings since there were no temples or churches at the time that would have "fraternized" to that extent. Both sexes attended and it is only natural to assume that young and old were present. An indication of the service proper is given Acts 2, 42 which may be rendered: "They were constantly attending the Apostle's teaching and the collection (or contribution) and the breaking of the bread and the prayers." That is, the sermon of the Apostle who happened to be present, the liberal free-will offering of the rich as well as the poor (Cf. 2 Cor. 8, 1-8); the Eucharist and the public prayers by the people. Hymns and spiritual songs are also mentioned 1 Cor. 14 and Eph. 5, 14. Kneeling is mentioned Eph. 3, 14 but it is doubtful whether the congregation knelt in prayer at worship. The 'lift

-4-

ing of hands' is mentioned 1 Tim 2,8 which is most likely a Jewish posture while praying. There is no evidence for a set form of prayer at this early time. The first day of the week was celebrated to commemorate Christ's resurrection John 20,19,26; Acts 20,7 but otherwise there is an utter lack of Festival Seasons or Holy Days. The Eucharist was usually preceded by the Agape, or Love-feast, a meal fostering the most intimate brotherly relations, the provisions at the Feasts showing God's love and providence while the oft-repeated simile of Christ, likening the Kingdom of God to a banquet, served to impress the diners with their position as Believers. However, due to abuses, which manifested themselves very early, 1 Cor. 11 the custom fell into disfavor and finally into disuse.

According to Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, there were three types of congregational meetings: The first is that for Exhortation and Prayer. This meeting usually opened with a benediction, then came the confessing of Christ as Lord followed by a general prayer and also the Lord's Prayer both of them being closed by an audible Amen of the worshippers; then came a hymn which was followed by a reading from the Prophets and a section on the suffering and death of Jesus; the instruction, then the Prophets were heard and the meeting was closed with a benediction. Sometimes, as 1 Cor. 14, 25 the case of a sinner was taken in hand. Cf. Lindsay, Pg 6. ----- The second type of meeting is that of the Eucharist, spoken of above, at which only the baptized were present very shortly after the founding of the Church and from which all those at variance with their neighbor were excluded. Cf. Didache 14. ----- The third type of meeting is that in which the business of the congregation was transacted for in a democratic organization of this kind there were many and varied matters to be attended to as a body. They sent letters 1 Cor 7, 1; they appointed delegates to represent them 2 Cor. 3, 1. 2; 8, 19 and most likely took charge of the raising of funds 1 Cor. 16, 1. 2. The final sentence of expulsion of a sinning member was also passed in this meeting 1 Cor. 5, 1-8. Besides this the whole body would consider the case of penitents 2 Cor 2, 6-9 and even arrange legal matters among themselves 1 Cor 6, 1. Their decisions were arrived at by a majority vote. It is significant that Paul always addresses his letters to a congregation, a certain church or some person about

whom the believers had gathered but never to an office-bearer. Now, according to 1 Cor 12,12 every one is in some way gifted by the Spirit and every Charisma is to be employed in edifying the congregation. But some gifts, as the miracles and healings of 1 Cor. 12,8 are not exactly suitable for worship and therefore 1 Pet. 4,10.11 distinguishes between gifts of ministering and gifts of speaking. But as soon as we speak of service to the congregation or the employment of gifts we are discussing the work of officials, in a certain sense, in this organization. And it will be our next task to decide who these officials were and in what sense they were office-bearers.

Before His ascension, our Lord had told his disciples to remain in Jerusalem until the Holy Spirit should be poured out on them. The story of the ^{First} Christian Pentecost is well known, the point to be remembered is that the working in visible signs of the Holy Ghost did not stop there but was carried on for many years in various ways until the purpose of the Lord was accomplished. From the ^{first} these gifts endowed a person with the ability to serve the body and as the Church is unique in that service is mark of leadership, these people who were gifted in a certain way, soon came to hold a more prominent place in the congregation. And altho ^{as the} these special gifts were indisputable signs of God's favor there was a tendency to despise them as we see from the warning in 1 Thess 5,19; "Quench not the ^{the} Spirit". These gifts covered both the spiritual and the material side of service to the congregation; the former being taken care of by the Apostles, Prophets and ^{the} Teachers while the local ministry took care of the latter. Of course we must remember that in the very beginning the Apostles took care of both while the presbyters also ministered in the Word and Doctrine. But these men who were endowed with special gifts were in no sense office-bearers; they merely employed the gift that was ^{grant-} granted them in the service of the Lord as it was granted them. Theirs was a ministry of reconciliation, of the Word of Reconciliation 2 Cor. 5,18 for the Old had given place to the New and a different Covenant was in effect or rather, the Original had been consummated. And now let us consider the two types of ministry more closely.

First and foremost of course are the Apostles. Their calling was for life, their doctrine is to remain the norm of faith for all time and they usually worked in virgin territory. The original Twelve were the only Apostles in the strict sense of the term because of their intimacy with and commission from the Lord. But with Judas' defection another had to be taken into their ranks and so Matthias, ^{was,} a man having the same training and the same degree of intimacy but with a different Call, was chosen. Paul is another exception for while he was prepared by the Lord Himself, his Call too was different. But beside these Thirteen there were ^{other} other Apostles. These men were called by the Lord who also blessed their work and are given the title: the Apostles of the Churches, the glory of Christ' 2 Cor 8, 23; others of the same type are Barnabas, Andronicus and Junias of Rom 16.7 and still others like Silas, John Mark, Timothy and Titus. Because John Mark ~~only~~ alone worked in virgin territory some would reject all of these last four except him but that is precarious as we shall see. Besides these men some would also include James of Acts 12, 17 altho the missionary labors are also lacking in his case. Bishop Lightfoot has listed the qualifications of an Apostle in this way: They were required to be a witness of the Resurrection, which was granted Paul by a miracle; to be commissioned by the ^{Lord} Lord Himself or by the Church as Matthias and Paul (Acts 13, 2) and Barnabas, and to have a fruitful ministry. And the signs of an Apostle were gifts of patience, self-denial, effective preaching, signs, wonders and mighty deeds; as the Bishop sees it: "Not who they were but what they did" counted.

One point that must be noticed is that even the Apostle's service is called Diakonia. The original Twelve, with Judas' place filled by Matthias, ^{was,} were to start their labors in Jerusalem where they acted as pastors and teachers of the flock in the Temple and in the homes Acts 6, 4. As the infallible teachers their doctrine is to remain the norm for all time and there are no successors to them in this respect. For when James Zebedee Acts 12, 2 was martyred there was no successor chosen as in the case of Judas. No single local congregation had ^{claim} a claim over the services of these men and when they left a local group of believers the presbyters took care of things, Acts 18, 18; 20, 1. Scripture makes their authority spring from the Lord 2 Cor 10, 8 and their doctrine the norm 2 Cor 13, 10.

But even these men wielded no other authority over the congregation other than that of the Word 2 Cor.1,24.To this class of the Prophetic Ministry the Evangelists also belong as ~~Philip~~ Philip in Acts 8,5 since they also covered new fields. However, the term Evangelist is not so much a distinct office or rank as it is a description of the work. The next class of ministers is very closely bound up with the Apostolate.

That is the second group and is formed by the Prophets. Like the Apostles they were inspired and wielded authority in all departments but unlike ^{the} former, their sphere of activity was a Christian congregation. While they were ^{quite} naturally also teachers, their distinguishing mark was the foretelling of future events Acts 13,2;15,28, and had full control of themselves while they were prophesying 1 Cor 14,29-33. As seen from the Didache 14,1 they were itinerant and supported by the Church. They were under no restraint, the Church was to hear their message 2 Cor 8,29-33 but that was subject to the Gift of Discernment of the congregation 1 John 4,1-3; 1 Cor 14,24. ^{here} is no evidence whatsoever that they were office bearers in any strict sense of the term altho, of course, an officer might prophesy. The question might be asked: What was the nature of their message? In Eph. 2,20 we are told that they spoke revelations of mystery which can be either intelligible or not, besides giving words of warning, comfort and predictions. It is to be noted that women also prophesied as the daughters of Philip at Caesarea Acts 21,9. Of all the types of the Prophetic Ministry, this gift of ~~Prophecy~~ ^{Prophecy} is perhaps the most transient and therefore illusive in a study of this kind. While we are sure that there were hundreds of divinely inspired men speaking of the future to the early congregations, we would still hesitate to say that every one of them received his calling or gift for life. It seems more likely that the Spirit came upon them at intervals. And even tho the the ability to ~~prophecy~~ ^{prophecy} came directly from ~~the~~ the Lord, the fact that His instrument of the time retained full possession of all his faculties allowed the possibility to creep in of making an especial show of the favor shown by the Spirit and so it might very easily degenerate into senseless emotionalism. And it seems that is exactly what happened. for we find signs of ~~of~~ discrediting this gift very early. While 1 Thess. 5,20 exhorts the Christians:

FRANKLIN MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

"Despise not prophesyings", the whole tenor of Jude and 2 Peter seems to indicate a flourishing state of false prophecy. But that is to be expected where men will insist on subjecting the plans of God to their own approval and we cannot consider God's gifts weak or impotent for that reason. These two classes, Apostles and Prophets, were the ^{our} Mouthpieces of the Holy Ghost and so their authority was ^{- above} supreme, while their ministry lasted, or rather where they were in direct control, the ^{Church} Church was a perfect theocracy. But besides these two, there is still another type of the Prophetic Ministry.

2 This is the class of Pastors and ^{- tion} Teachers. These held their position, not by an election of the congregation nor by immediate inspiration, but rather by ^{by} virtue of their inherent ability to grasp and impart divine truths. And so it ^{real-} really was an endowment of the mind 1 Cor. 14,15; James 3,1. They carried ⁱⁿ in their work both publicly and privately 1 Cor 14,26 and Gal 6,6 while the things to be taught by them were given by Word and Epistle 2 Thess. 2,5. According to Eph 4,15.16 Paul expected each congregation to supply its own teachers. However, later we see that highly gifted men like ^{Tatian} Tatian and Justin Martyr went from one congregation to another like the Prophets. While the 'office' of teaching was in some respects ^{less} less magnificent than that of prophecy, the former lasted longer and was entirely taken over by the local ministry. While ^{Harnack} Harnack identifies prophets and teachers, it seems the evidence will warrant a distinction between foretelling and forthtelling. Quite naturally, not everyone could teach, especially not a woman 1 Cor 12,4.6.29 And Eph 4,11 makes pastors and teachers the same and since the Apostles and ^{proph-} prophets were present only at intervals, the work of instruction devolved upon these men capable of teaching. But like the Prophets', the Teachers' work was ^{- 20} discredited by the harm wrought by false teachers 1 Tim. 3,2; 4,1; 6,3; Titus 1,9. They are called the guardians of the faith Acts 20,28-31; Titus 1,9-11 and so the ^T Teacher merges into the Episcopos, or rather, their functions overlap. The ^{Didache} Didache pictures ^{Prophets} Prophets and ^{Teachers} Teachers still side by side, but also shows the bishops and deacons performing the duties of prophets and ^{Teachers} Teachers. Didache 14,1. This will bring us into the ^{the} field of the ^{Regular} Regular offices. But before we enter that field it might be in place here to say a word regarding individual special Charismata.

A catalogue of ²Special Gifts is given Eph. 4,11. as discussed above. Besides these Rom. 12,6-8. gives us different aspects of these manifestations and it is to be noted that the original text employs abstract terms forcing us to abandon the idea that these are offices. They must be taken as special temporary manifestations of the Spirit's work. Verse 7 mentions 'ministry' as one of these and it will be hard for those who hold that these are permanent and distinct offices, to explain the meaning of ministry in this list in view of the fact that this word is used of practically every branch of Christian service. Another catalogue is found 1 Cor.12,28. where helps, governments, miracles, gifts of healings, diversities of tongues are mentioned beside Apostles, Prophets and Teachers. The passage itself distinguishes in the importance of these various offices in the sequence as found. The functions of 'helps', 'governments' are taken over ^{chiefly} entirely by the local ministry. But this ability to serve, like every other, is a gift of God to the Church and so they were then; the others are special ability to meet special needs and when they were no longer necessary they passed away. One thing is evident and that is that these special endowments were to have their place in the life of the congregation and the regular ministry was subject to them. Yet over all was the authority of doctrine. 1 Cor. 14,32.33.

Thus the work of the Lord was carried on by these men in some way especially endowed to fill the needs of the ²Believers. But the two chief officers, ²Apostle and ²Prophet, were itinerant and it is evident that someone must have been there to carry on the work in their absence. Furthermore the time was not far distant when the Apostles would die, and as we have seen there were to be no successors, the ²Prophets and ²Teachers were discredited; an age of ²seeking after ²New Beliefs degenerated into scepticism and the authority of the ²Prophetic Ministry waned. But all the functions formerly carried on by this ministry were taken over by the local ministry. What was this ministry and by what right did it exist?

We have seen above that the local congregation is the organization sponsored by the inspired apostles and vested with all the authority and gifts promised the Church at large. And chief among its powers was the authority to ^{elect} form its own clergy. If the congregation exists by divine appointment, then the authority vested in it to produce its own ministry is divine. For Scripture speaks of officers that serve the congregation and the terms used are always of correlatives. For example Acts 20,29 speaks of a Shepherd which demands a flock as complement; 2 Cor.3,3. mentions 'servant' which demands someone to be served; Rom. 10,14. mentions preacher which demands an audience. Now we have shown the 'flock', 'those served' and the 'audience' to be by divine right and, by the same line of thought, their servants exist by the same right. Furthermore, Heb. 13,17. expressly states that 'those that watch over you' (the congregation) must give account (to God) and thus the authority to 'watch over' must be of divine origin. And the congregation used their authority in this matter. It can be established beyond the shadow of a doubt that these Regular Officers did not come into being after the Prophetic Ministry had passed away but that it existed from the very beginning alongside of and contemporaneously with the original ministry. We conclude this from the following considerations:

- 1) Acts 6 we see 'Seven' appointed as helpers, servants, deacons.
- 2) Gwatkin, Hasting's Dict. of the Bible, finds "elders" at Jerusalem in 44,50 and 58; they are mentioned by James and Peter, appointed by Paul and Barnabas in every church they founded and they are seen at Ephesus in 58.
- 3) Bishops and deacons are found at Philippi in 63 while Phoebe is seen as a Deaconess at Cenchrea in 58.
- 4) Timothy and Titus are placed in charge of four groups: Bishops or Elders, Deacons, Deaconesses and Widows.
- 5) The 'Young Men' of Acts 5,6, altho not officers, for the contrast is between young and old, are still helpers.
- 6) The position of Timothy and Titus at Ephesus and Crete respectively was a

local ministry.

- 7) The indefinite "Prohistamenoi" of 1 Thess. 5,12 and the "Hegoumenoi" of Hebrews 13,7,17 also show the existence of resident officials.
- 8) The same point is brought out by refer^Ning to the Angels of the Seven Churches in Revelation.

From these considerations it is plain that these officers were contemporaneous with the Prophetic Ministry and so it has not merely Apostolic sanction but their express commands. Furthermore, as we have seen above, the divinely arranged local congregation must provide its own ministers and these ministers and their congregation form the arrangement desired by God. But in case we should, for some reason or another, dispense with these considerations, we have still ^{still} more potent proof, which is found in Scripture passages relating especially to the ministry.

One group of these passages makes the office of the ministers like that of the Apostles. 1 Cor. 4,1,6; 1 Pet. 5,1; Col. 4,7; 1 Cor 3,5; Acts 15,22. Both have the same duties, which are: teaching, exhorting, shepherding as it was done by the Apostles John 21,15-17; 2 Tim. 1,11; 2,2 and it is expressly stated that this was also done by the bishops or elders: Acts 20,28; 2 Tim. 2,2; Titus 1,9; 1 Pet. 5,2; and Heb. 13,14 and we are justified in referring Heb. 13,17 to the local ministry and so the authority ^{is the same} while 1 Cor. 3,5 shows that the purpose was identical. Besides this it is God's plan that capable men administer His Word Titus 1,5; 2 Tim. 2,2; 1 Tim. 3,1; we must also refer 1 Cor. 12,28 to the ministry whether ^{Prophetic} or ^{Local} for it shows that these officers are by God's appointment. Finally, there is also a group of passages in which our Lord has outlined the relationship that should exist between a congregation and its pastor or ministers. ^{to} They are 1 Pet. 5,2; Acts 20,28; Hebr. 13,17; James 5,14; 1 Thess. 5,12,13; 1 Tim. 5,17,18; and 1 Cor 9,14. There can be no doubt that these conditions must be fulfilled to meet the approval of the Lord who founded this arrangement. And so we conclude that the office of the ministry is by divine command and altho not an absolutely essential mark of a Christian congregation, it is nevertheless the desirable condition. For this is the arrangement under the inspired Apostles;

we see that this office is the required complement for an arrangement like the local congregation and finally we see how the Holy Spirit, thru the inspired ^{by} writers has given divine and express commands regarding it. But in a review of this subject it is necessary to study the individual offices more closely.

DEACONS: *Deacons*

When the word of the ^aapostles began to bear such abundant fruit it soon became necessary to obtain helpers to take care of some of the duties arising with the increasing numbers. Acts 6 tells us that the work grew to such proportions that it could not be carried on efficiently without added help and so the congregation chose seven picked men for "the service of tables". This detail of the early ecclesiastical organization has given rise to ^{these} interpretations that run the gauntlet of a divine institution of the Diaconate down to some ^{vague} notions of a temporary, unofficial and individual act. But let us consider the case as it is found in Scripture. The word "service", *Diakonia*, is used in many ^{ways} ways in Scripture; of discipleship in general John 12,26; of the ability to serve because of special gifts Rom 12,7; 1 Cor. 12,5 and in 1 Pet. 4,10.11; of the ^{lay} ministry of the Word Acts 6,4; Eph 4,12; 2 Tim. 4,5; it is even used of the work of the Apostles Acts 1,17;20,24;21,19; it is also used of a ministry not of the Word, at least not publicly Acts 6,1; 11,29; 12,25; Rom 15,25.31 and in 2 Cor. 8,4.19.20. Now, these Seven of Acts 6 were ^elected for the "service of tables", evidently the material details of the work which however had been done at first by the ^{lay} Apostles, such things as the care of the poor and administering charity. One thing is quite evident and that is that the deacons of Acts 6 did not perform a secondary service as the Deacons of the third and fourth Century did. Lindsay identifies the deacons of Acts 6 with the presbyters who received the collection from Paul and Barabas Acts 11; and Boehmer, Ritschl, Lange and Hastings also allow this. When we compare the passages discussing the deacons work and that of the presbyters there is a striking similarity. This will ^{clearly} be brought home all the more clearly by comparing Paul's requirements in the Pastoral Letters for these two offices. There the only noticeable difference between the two is that whereas the presbyter is to be "apt to teach", this is not required of the deacon. But that difference does not militate against identifying these two offices.

Furthermore, shortly after these Seven were elected, the congregation was dispersed and Acts 8,5 shows Philip, one of them, carrying on the work of an Evangelist, and in Samaria at that. That is hardly in keeping with the idea of the deacons being a lower 'Order' performing secondary service. And when we consider that $\frac{1}{2}$ these men were elected before 35 A.D. and that the next that we hear of an office, supposed by some to be similar, by others identical, is Rom 16,1 where Phoebe is spoken of as a deaconess which is about 58 A.D. And the next occasion on which deacons as such are spoken of is at Philippi in 63 A.D. How does that agree with the contention that this was a regularly instituted distinct office? Gwatkin (Cf. Bibliography) makes the interesting point that there is no trace of an office like that of the Diaconate in the Epistles of Paul at all. These considerations, then, make it difficult to hold that Acts 6 is the institution of a distinct office or order. Pelliccia (Cf. Bibliography) is not as clear as the dogmatical tenor of his remarks would indicate when he says, Pg 28: "At the beginning of the Church only the Deacons discharged the office of Christian ministers" while, a few pages later, he has the remark: "The Deacons, instituted Acts 6 by the Apostles, were restricted to helping administer the Sacraments to the Faithful and taking charge of the common property of the Church". Harnack is also extreme when he divides the administrative functions between the Episcopi and Deacons who had the special gifts of 'government and service', taking part in the services of public worship but were also members of the Presbytery. Of a different view is Loening (Cf. Bibliography) who identifies presbyters and deacons. And that is the conclusion that is demanded by a review of the facts. If the two offices, presbyter and deacon, were not exactly similar, the differences are not sharply enough defined to warrant the existence of a separate and distinct office. And since these "deacons" of Acts 6 performed duties that had been done by the Apostles before that, we conclude that they are the same as the officials that appear later as Episcopi, Presbyteri etc etc.

DEACONESSES: A group of female helpers, called Deaconesses is also found in the early Church. The most notable example is that of Phoebe at Cenchrea Rom 16,1. We know only this that she was of assistance to Paul on one of his missionary

enterprises but aside from that we know very little. Hatch's theory, that she acted as "patron" for the lower ~~///~~ classes, as the Law allowed a person of higher rank to ^{do} be, is very interesting and may very well fit the case. Taking the conditions of the time into consideration, especially the seclusion of the female sex in Oriental countries and the position of women in general, it will be perfectly plain why all serious Christian women should take it upon themselves to perform deeds of love and charity toward their more unfortunate sisters. From the Epistle to Timothy we see that they even formed associations to carry out this work more efficiently but there is not the slightest similarity between these and the Sisterhoods of a later Age. It may also be well to note here that 1 Tim 3, 11 speaks of deaconesses and not of the wives of deacons for Gynaikas, without the article cannot mean the latter.

WIDOWS: *Widows:* Another group of female helpers is that of the ~~Widows~~. According to 1 Tim. 5, 9 these women are to be older than 60 for the younger ones were liable to disgrace their service by performing it in a worldly spirit. We may well assume that these consecrated women took care of these special tasks besides those in their own households. Of these female helpers Pelliccia has a very interesting remark to make: "Deaconesses were considered a Clerical Order, ordained by Episcopal imposition of hands and not without clerical privileges... but in the course of time in the Western Church the order of Deaconesses was gradually abolished by decrees of councils after the Sixth Century because of their incontinency and it ceased to be reckoned among the Clerical Orders". If the first part of the statement were correct, this would be another instance of the improvements that Rome has ushered in. But these women were by no means a Clerical Order, for the whole idea of Orders is contrary to the spirit of the New Testament.

DEACONS: *Presbyters:* And now we come to the chief, if we may use that term here, of the local ministers, the presbyters. They are found for the first time Acts 11, about 44. These constitute the regular local ministry, taking over the functions of the Prophetic ~~Ministry~~ as it died out, but even before that had taken place they were recognized for the position they held in the Church. One thing seems clear, and is accepted by the majority of scholars with the exception perhaps of Hatch

and Harnack, and that is, that the Episcopi and Presbyteri are identical. But before we furnish our reasons for this stand it may be well to discuss some more general aspects.

Loening, as was shown above, identifies presbyters and deacons thruout but maintains that one pastor was at the head not by ^Aeliction of the deacons, nor according to the analogy of the heathen confraternities so ably presented by Hatch, but by the analogy of James, the ^ULord's brother, being Head of the Church at Jerusalem. Thus, these individual "heads" were not the successors to the ^{-L-}Apostles but the representatives of Christ. To this we will say that Loening seems to be stretching the analogy a trifle. There were other centrally located churches as Corinth and Ephesus and Asia Minor with Apostles who, at least at the beginning, had more authority and prestige than James. Why did the pastor not turn out to be a successor to the ^AApostles rather than a representative of Christ? It surely is more comprehensible for a man to consider himself the successor to an Apostle rather than a successor of the Lord's blood relative. Hatch, on the other hand, starts out with a group of presbyters able to guide in all things because of their age and then derives his individual head from the similarity of the ^{Church's} organization to that of the heathen religious fraternities under which arrangement the Episcopos had charge of the finances. And this function added so much more prestige to the one officer that he soon came to be president of the other presbyters. The Episcopos very likely did handle the finances, that is part of a pastor's duty; furthermore, it is very likely that an officer like the Episcopos handled the finances in the heathen fraternities. But Hatch forces a similarity into existence between the Church and these guilds that does not exist. For Acts 20, 28 and 1 Pet 2, 25 prove conclusively that there was something else besides finances involved. What is more; Scripture gives all prominence to the ministry of the Word and very little to the financial end of it. Above all else, however, we must remember that the vital impulse of the Church was something hitherto inexperienced; it could not be taken care of in the usual manner; it had to work out its own organization and only its own impulses could blaze that trail. Is it not rather a large order to believe that the Church, springing from and among the Jews

as it did and then outgrowing Judaism, should nevertheless be dominated by an empty shell like the religious guilds? For these latter were pitiable makeshifts even when compared to the temporary and antiquated Old Covenant. Dr. Harnack also distinguishes between Episcopos and Presbyteros. According to him, the latter formed a court of arbiters, having charge of the morals and discipline of their fellows while the Episcopi and deacons had the administrative functions in their charge, i.e. the reception and distribution of the offerings and the worship of the congregation. Against the stand taken by the very learned Doctor we will array some conclusions of Prof. Loofs:

- He maintains that both Hatch and Harnack are unsuccessful in their attempt to associate the Episcopos of the Church with the financial official of the fraternities or with civil officers. He states that the title "Episcopos" is no more an office than Poimen or Hegoumenos and on Pg. 268 he says: "Episkopos ist eine Funktionsbezeichnung und ins endende zweite Jahrhundert hinein gehen die Spuren davon dass man ein Bewusstsein davon hat, dass Episkopos weniger Amtsnahme als Amtsbeschreibung ist". And in conclusion we shall submit evidence which will force us to take this view also:

Presbyters are called Episcopi, or bishops Acts 20, 17, 28. After telling Timothy to appoint presbyters Paul enumerates the qualifications of a bishop and therefore we must identify the two in this case. The description of their duties Acts 20, 28 makes the term Shepherd very appropriate Eph 4, 11. And this term Pastor is the one commonly used in the congregation as we see from 1 Pet 5, 1-4 for this Epistle was written to strangers thruout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia and reminds them that their Elders are to 'feed the flock'. We also see elders at the conference Acts 15, 6 and with James ^{def.} 21, 18. Is it not contrary to experience to entrust a mission like this to a subordinate? Furthermore, the First Epistle of Clement identifies them at Rome; the Peshitto Version consistently translates Episcopos with Elder, and Jerome, Comm. on Titus 1, 17 identifies them. In general we see that the qualifications of bishops and presbyters are the same especially in the Pastoral Letters. Lightfoot thinks they were called Episcopi exclusively in the Gentile congregations where the people were acquainted with the

presiding official of the political and religious clubs of the day. As for the term Presbyter, that seems to be an outgrowth of Jewish usage (antecedent probability) even tho the Gentile world had its aged and experienced men form its councils.

The party holding to the divinely instituted order of bishops will of course separate the bishop from the presbyter long before that development took place. They will bolster their cause, as they imagine, by citing the examples of James at Jerusalem, Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete and the Angels of the Seven Churches. But James became the leader because of his life and the nearness to the Lord. The latter would carry a tremendous influence among Easterners but that is still a far cry from an episcopal office. Of course, later times might see fit to use his case as an example but as long as there is no evidence for the existence of an office in this case it must remain as we have stated. The cases of Timothy and Titus are also different. They did new work and therefore the Apostle ordained them rather than the congregation which they served; that congregation was yet to come into being; besides this we will point out that Titus was not connected with any city and so his case will furnish very little proof for an episcopal arrangement. These two were Apostolic Vicars sent on special missions, the Epistles to them are calling them from their work 2 Tim 4, 9; Titus 3, 12 and there is no evidence of a return. The reference to the Angels of the Churches proves very little for they can be taken as mere personifications of the Churches rather than as bishops. Or, if the literal interpretation seems preferable, it becomes another point for dating the Apocalypse shortly before the close of the First Century for already then did the tendency to Episcopacy assert itself. And so we think Lindsay is right when he says, Pg 163: "...before the close of the First Century bodies of presbyters existed as ruling colleges in the Christian congregations over a great part of the Roman Empire. The Epistle of Clement proves this for the Roman church; 1 Peter proves it for Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia while Revelation proves it for Ephesus, Pergamos, Smyrna, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea and Acts, of course, for Jerusalem".

The work of these Elders consisted in governing and teaching. According to 1 Tim. 5, 17 some did not hold the office as teachers but the same passage

shows that teaching was a part of their ministry. All the communications between the various churches took place thru them Acts 11,30;15,2.4.6;21,18.¹ They were the Ministers of the Word in the true sense for they taught, exhorted and admonished 2 Tim. 1,11;2,2; Titus 1,5.7.9 and Hebr. 13,14.² theirs is a unique office, for it is not to be handled by all 1 Tim 3,1 but by capable men who are able to teach others also 2 Tim. 2,2; they are to serve their own flock Acts 20,28; 1 Pet. 5,2 and Titus 1,5 and their flock is to support them.³ Despite the fact that Paul practiced a trade as a means of livelihood he wished his case to be considered exceptional and have the ministers in all other cases be supported by their hearers 1 Cor 9,14; 1 Tim 5,17.18. This office is also permanent for we see that these officers were considered necessary in a congregation. And if the Church is to endure for all time then this office is to be found. For while the Lord saw fit to allow the Prophetic Ministry to die out and while there is no divine command to appoint deacons, as a distinct order, our evidence shows that the presbyteral office is divine in origin and essential to the life of the Church. But while it is true that the authority of the presbyter or bishop exists by virtue of the authority vested in the body which he represents, we cannot hold that the congregation created this office. It was instituted by the inspired Apostles as a means of spreading the Gospel and it must remain that. Even if a congregation vests some of its authority in a committee or a representative other than this officer, as it has a perfect right to do, the powers and privileges distinctive of both pastor and flock should not be confused nor permanently abrogated. And where the Church has created an office which has assumed some of the functions of the presbyter, it is a flagrant violation of Apostolic precept and example. Because of some failing in the mind of man it seems very difficult for them to conceive of a spiritual leader in other than a sacerdotal role on the one hand, and on the other, as a simple temporary and representative function. The office of the pastor is midway, and the basis of this misunderstanding is the lack of a true perception of the Gospel. The Christian pastorate is as unique a position as the Work and Word of Him who founded it. As there is no analogy in History to the Work of Christ, so there is no analogy to the men in charge of those who rely on this Work. But in striving to give the

ministry its due, it may seem as if we are depriving the laymen of some of their privileges.

LAITY:

Laity: Among the ^{the} Hearers of the Word there existed a remarkable state of equality for they had the most moving of common interests. They have the distinctive ^{- true} liberty of the Children of God, each and every one of them priests in their own right 1 Pet. 2, 9. As Guericke puts it: "That which the ^{the} Priesthood before Christ had only typified and prefigured was now accomplished for all, and the duty of constant- ^{- act -} ly realizing it by the oblation of his own heart became the priestly duty of each individual Christian". (Trans. by Jacobs). For this reason the Church does not consist of a union of clergy and laity but is one group with the promise: ^{'all'} "All things are yours". Since every organization essentially requires order, the ^{- the} ministry was chosen by the Apostles as the means for securing this. On this point we differ with many others: The arrangement of the ministry and the Church, the relation of the bishop to his flock is Apostolic; the office itself, comparatively speaking, is of no account of itself; were there no congregation, there would be no office left. To say that the office in itself has the inherent power of imparting a character to whomsoever it is given is contrary to the New Testament. There is no act which the laity could not perform for even up to Jerome's time the laymen could baptize. Jerome, Ad Luciferianos: "...ius baptizandi; quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam laicis licere."

One point in which the later Church erred grievously is that relating to the election of officers. The early church had this right and it is still the right of the congregation alone Acts 6, 1, 15, 22. From Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians we see that he recognized this right for he appeals to the ^{congre-} congregation to restore a presbyter whom they had deposed, not because they did not have this right, but because of the injustice of the case itself. The fact that we have no mention of a congregational vote in appointing Timothy to Ephesus and Titus to Crete is most probably due to the fact that these Believers were not organized as yet and in those cases it was customary for the Apostles to appoint someone.

The congregation is also judge in the matter of doctrine and practice. When Peter preached to the Gentiles he was asked to explain his action to the

to the congregation at Jerusalem which he did Acts 11,1-4 and in the same way the congregation decided the question regarding the ~~the~~ circumcision of the heathen. In Gal 2,1 we see Paul, the other Great Apostle, submitting his case to the brethren at Jerusalem. As Jacobs points out, the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, altho full of doctrine are given to laymen. Those in Galatia are to stand fast in their liberty, those in Thessalonica are to prove all things and to hold that which is good, according to their ideas, but the plainest statement is made by John 1 Epistle 4,1: "Beloved, believe not every spirit but try the spirits whether they are of God". The warnings of the Apostles against false doctrine also indicate that they wished the congregation to test the doctrines. But perhaps the strongest proof for our point is that of Acts 15 where we are forced to assume that the laity took part in the discussion on circumcision. It is to be noted that inspired Apostles are present here and yet the laity has a voice. If the people were not to take part in the discussion, why did not the Apostles, as infallible teachers, simply decide the question and let it go at that? But there is yet another point that must be brought out.

Today the part that the congregation ought to play in church discipline is neglected entirely too frequently, and by many of the more conservative church bodies at that. In 1 Thess. 4,14,15 some general rules are laid down as warning the unruly, comforting the feeble-minded and supporting the weak. All this shows a love for the neighbor that could only spring from the Gospel. The three stages of discipline mentioned by the Lord Matth 18 also obtain here. The first stage is admonition and this is the duty of everyone. It must always be done however in a spirit of love and goodwill otherwise this most rare of all privileges will degenerate into an outlet for the meanness of the ignorant and impious. The second stage is the break in friendly relations but still considering the erring one as a member of the congregation. On this point we find Apostolic council to this effect: "Mark them which cause divisions among you and avoid them" or "withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly" and the purpose is also given: "if any man obey not the Apostles' word, to note that man and to have no company with him that he may be ashamed". Here again we see that the entire spirit is one of assisting love for

the purpose is to bring the erring one to realization of his fault. And the last stage is the complete severance of all relations with the Church, "Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican". Cf 1 Cor. 5, 4. But in case he should repent the erring brother is to be reinstated immediately 2 Cor 2, 6 and neither in this place, nor anywhere else is there a suggestion of penance nor anything like it. The congregation was the tribunal 1 Cor. 5, 13 and not even the Apostles overrode their rights 1 Cor 5, 3-5. While the Church is really made up of only those that believe, the actions of a man are the only indications of his faith, and according to these is he to be judged. Altho the manifest and unrepentant sinner is to be cast out Titus 3, 10; 1 Cor 5, 13, yet, to call in the Civil Arm to mete out punishment is as great a wrong, if not greater, as to allow such a one the benefits of the Church. Excommunication is to be the last resort in showing a man his sin 2 Thess. 3, 6, 14 and if he does not repent then the Church has done its duty. And altho the Church has the authority to withhold forgiveness, where is the authority granted to mete out punishment? For there surely is a distinction that ought to be observed.

Another province of the congregation was that of charity work. To a world which considered mercy a despicable weakness the love of one's fellow-man according to the Word of Christ came as cool water on a fevered brow. The Gospel was preached to the masses, but the masses were poor. The admonitions to the rich are rare in the New Testament and yet there are some as 1 Tim 6, 17, 18 shows. The rapid growth of the congregation at Jerusalem carried with it some dire consequences for many of the new converts, who, being Jews, were even then in danger of losing their inheritance and friends. And if this happened how were they to gain a livelihood? If these identical conditions did not prevail in all the churches, there were similar conditions and so beneficence became a very important part of the Church's functions. And those who were able to give did so Acts 4, 34, 36; yes, even the rank and file gave altho they were very poor 2 Cor 8, 12; 9, 10. We also see that the whole Church supported the brethren at Jerusalem Acts 11, 29; 1 Cor. 16, 1 and 2 Cor 8, 1-3 which some take to be three separate collections. And so it was customary from the earliest times to make contributions for the care

of the poor and needy 1 Cor.16,1.2 which the deacons then administered 1 Tim. 3,8-13. In the early church beneficence was a sign of real spiritual life and it is to be regretted that the wealthy of our day see no other obligation on this respect than that of any other social function.

Thus we see that in the election of officers, in doctrine, in discipline and in doing good works the congregation is the one and only factor. Any deviation from this practice is a misinterpretation or defiance of Apostolic example and any change in any of these factors can be characterized as losing the liberty with which Christ has invested us. But we must again hark back to the officers. If the laity has all these privileges, by what act or ceremony is one of their number to be set apart as an officer?

Ordination: *Continued* The Roman Church has a ceremony of ordination which for all time distinguishes the person ordained from the rest of the body by granting him the so-called "Character Indelibilis". The New Testament also has its ceremony and we shall see how that differs from the Sacrament mentioned in the foregoing sentence. First of all, there are no rules laid down for it. In the case of Paul and Barnabas Acts 13 it was done with fasting, prayer and laying on of hands. From this case we see too that others besides the Apostles had this privilege of granting ordination. Before we go any farther we will say that ordination does not grant any special powers, but it does grant ecclesiastical authority. Lindsay offers conclusive proof that the word 'ordain' in the New Testament merely means to convey authority for whatever special function or duty a person is selected. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the mere laying on of hands conferred special gifts. The case of Simon Acts 8 seems to ^{be} convincing evidence that such was not the case. And if the case in 1 Tim. 4,14 seems contrary to this we must remember that this was given Timothy by express divine direction and not by laying on of hands, but with, together with the laying on of hands. When Paul tells Timothy 'to lay hands suddenly on no man' it is evident that the person to be ordained cannot be chosen at random, he must possess certain qualifications that fit him for the office. Considered as divine gifts, these qualifications are the thing that gives a person power but ordination itself merely confers authority. The ceremony was performed

publicly by the ministers in the name of the Lord and was by no means a rite to Holy Orders for there were none. But Cf. Hatch, s.v. Ordination Pg. 122.

SUMMARY: *Summary:* As a recapitulation for the Apostolic Era we will take a comprehensive view of the development in the organization. Lindsay lists several factors, that, without a doubt, left an impression on the young and pliable Church. First are the Seven 'deacons' of Acts 6. Seven were supposedly chosen due to the custom in the Jewish towns of having their ruling body consist of seven elderly men. The selection of elders, Acts 11, is both Jewish and Gentile custom since it is a universal practice to have the aged and experienced wield authority. The next step is the position of leadership held by James in Jerusalem. Eusebius II, 1, 2, 3; III, 11, 1, 2. Many take this as an Oriental influence according to which succession to an office is controlled by the custom of having the next male descendant succeed to an office. The many duties that had to be taken care of in a congregation would produce the men able to take care of them due to some special gift. These needs ran all the way from being patron as Phoebe seems to have been Rom. 16, 1, to offering one's home for services as De Rossi has shown it to have taken place. The religious clubs, such a large factor in Hatch's study, did undoubtedly exert some influence in the development of the organization of the Church but the new moral force would always remain supreme. The Synagogue also exerted an influence especially in regard to the officers and their functions. While the Synagogue and the religious club had points in common, the Church has points common to both. But why waste time disputing on which organization exerted the most influence? The point is that no matter what organization the new convert had been acquainted with, whether the guild of the Synagogue, his previous training would enable him to use the rights and privileges granted him as a member of the Church. Lindsay states that if the churches at Corinth and Rome do not seem to be properly organized, since officers are ignored, it shows that the congregation could exist without the ministry and could carry out all its functions. But as we have shown above, s.v. Presbyter, a congregation without a ministry can exist but it cannot carry out all its functions or fulfill all its duties. And in view of the emphasis laid on the officers in Scripture, especially Paul's instructions to Timothy regarding the

the men to be selected, is it not more reasonable to assume that there were officers there?

Such is the picture of the Church while guided by the unerring hand of the Apostles. Let us keep that picture in mind as we watch the same organization pass thru the trials and troubles of the next 250 years or more.

RT II:

Part 77:

THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE.

In our study of this age we beg leave to submit our evidence under the author rather than in an arrangement like that in the foregoing part. We shall restrict ourselves to those points in which our authors show striking differences either with their predecessors or successors. The first one to be considered is Clement of Rome (92 or 101 to --?) *C. G. H. H.*

ement:

Clement: Clement, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, makes no provision for an ^{office} office of bishop. When we speak of 'bishops' in this part of our treatise we shall endeavor to restrict ourselves to the conception which the term implies today. From this letter we infer that the elders are the highest authority in the congregation and the bishops he speaks of 42, 44 are merely temporary chairmen of the presbyteral board. Cf. Lightfoot. The deacons act as enquirers and accusers and form a court together with the presbyters. ^{Here} Here again there is very little difference between the deacon and the presbyter. The laity elected the officers for we read of "men ordained with the common consent and approbation of the whole congregation". The main point of the letter, to restore a deposed presbyter, shows that the laity had the right to depose their officers at this time. Our next authority is a trifle different.

Ignatius:

Ignatius Bishop Lightfoot associates this name with two others as leaders in the development of the Episcopacy. We shall discuss the others later. And the worthy Bishop is justified in this as we shall try to show. Ignatius calls himself and is called a bishop, he writes to a bishop, Polycarp of Smyrna and mentions three orders of the ministry. To him the bishop is the visible center of unity in the congregation and to be valued as a security for discipline and harmony. ^{He} He makes these claims in no uncertain terms, i. e. Eph. 6. "...clearly, therefore, we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself"; and again, Smyrn. 9: "...He that doeth anything

without the knowledge of the bishop serveth the devil".According to the Epistle to the Magnesians 6,1 the presbyters are the council of the bishop like the Lord and His Apostles.And in this way the bishop came to be considered the representative of the Lord.And if Ignatius himself did not mean just that,his readers of a later day were surely justified in assuming that he meant something very much like it.And altho it must be remembered that Ignatius wrote merely as one Christian to another,and that a bishop's influence at that time did not extend beyond his own parish,still the words of Ignatius bore their fruit whether they were misinterpreted or not.One point worthy of mention is that Ignatius mentions no Apostolic precept that will bolster his own episcopal claims despite the fact that his age was not far removed from that of the Apostles.Would it not be justifiable in this case to assume that he did not know of any such ordinance?Our next author is again different.

POLYCARP:

Polycarp: From Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians 6 we infer that there were no bishops at that time for he mentions only two orders,presbyters and deacons. The presbyters had supreme authority in the administration of affairs;they visited the sick,provided for the poor,brought back sinners and judged sins.¹The deacons were also part of a board with the presbyters.Polycarp's Letter is meager in detail but our next authority is correspondingly rich.

DIDACHE:

Didache: Due to its age,the Didache must remain the basic source for a study of this period.And the striking part of this review is,that despite the fact that there had been an influence like that of Ignatius',the Didache reveals a state remarkably like that of the Apostolic Age.And altho it speaks of the fore-runners of the later bishops,XIV,1,it still mentions members of the Prophetic Ministry,Prophets and Teachers.And XV,1 shows presbyters and deacons performing the functions of the last-mentioned worthies.Even at this early time we see that only members were admitted to the Eucharistic Service,XIV,1,excluding also all those at variance with their neighbors.The congregation is still the controlling body;they are to test the Prophets and the rules regarding baptism,fasting and prayer are given the people rather than to an officer.They,the people,are also to support the Prophetic Ministry,XIII,3.And altho the Prophets were still in existence,the

congregation was to elect bishops and deacons "for they too render you the service of Prophets and Teachers" XIV, 1.2; XV, 1.2. Nor does the Didache display any appreciable differences in the work of the presbyters and deacons. The Didache is the greatest proof against those that hold that the early organization was a matter of indifference, or that it depended on the local circumstances to develop it and shows that immediately after the Apostles' cessation of labors, the required organization was there in all its fulness. As this source is accepted by all historians of note as primary evidence, we will mention an author who has not been as fortunate.

Peter
PASTOR HERMAS: Due to the vagueness Pastor Hermas' writings, or rather, the writings that go by that name, he will serve our purpose in a small way only for he is not considered a primary source on this subject. And yet, we infer from him that he knew of but two orders, presbyters and deacons. The Prophetic Ministry is also alluded to in the warnings, given in the Mandata, against false Prophets.

Papias
PAPIAS: Papias is another of that type of writer whose efforts have largely been discredited by later ages. But we shall state the case as he puts it: He becomes a champion of the episcopacy at least in proconsular Asia, which, according to his story, was assigned to John. But this evidence again, is dependent on the report ^{found in} of Eusebius, III, 3 where we find the tradition that the Apostles, at the Council which elected ^{Symeon} ~~Cleopas~~ the successor of James also assigned Asia to John. We are forced to ask: Why is not such a momentous decision mentioned in Scripture? Furthermore, it seems that the tendency or the desire to see the work of the Church ^{Church} carried on as a highly organized movement is the product of a ^{later} later age. The age that produced this tradition was one which was first of all interested in organization; and who will say just how much value an example like this from the Apostles ^{to} themselves? Here ^{would have} again the wish was father to the thought and necessity was the mother of invention. If the Apostles stressed anything as being of no account it was the person by whom they had received the Word, the Word itself was the only essential; then again, these men were led by the Spirit directly, what need was ^{there} there of their deciding on a plan of action?

We must also consider the remarks of Eusebius II,1.23;IV,22 where he states that Symeon was followed by thirteen other bishops in less than 30 years. As Lightfoot points out, this could be possible only if these bishops were merely temporary chairmen. Seen in this light, what value has either Papias or Eusebius as exponents of an Apostolically instituted Episcopacy?

But while we are discussing Eusebius we might mention the fact that by 190 we have the bishops Theophilus of Caesarea, Sossius of Tyre, Clarus of Ptolemais and Narcissus of Jerusalem combining to produce an encyclical letter, V, 25. He also states that Pothinus was the first bishop of Gaul before 178. Our immediate point, however, is the period ending about 150 and we must add the testimony of Justin Martyr to complete our evidence.

Justin Martyr: Perhaps the most distinctive feature of Justin's contribution is the exact definition of the functions of both presbyters and deacons; now they are ~~of~~ distinguishable. The former were the ministers of the Word in the strict sense of the term, preaching, exhorting publicly and privately, administering the sacraments etc. The deacons were their assistants, distributing the elements of the Eucharist, caring for the poor, sick and other dependents. A question arising out of Justin's writings is this: What position did his Proestos(e) hold? Was he a regularly elected official, filling a distinct office, or was he merely a temporary chairman, one of many presbyters, performing individual functions simply because the nature of the functions demanded an individual? In view of the fact that Justin ^(knows) of only two orders of the ministry otherwise, and that the only place this Proestos(e) occupies is the leader in the Eucharistic Service, where an individual is required, we are forced to adopt an interpretation midway between the two extremes mentioned before; This Proestos(e) is merely one of the presbyters and not a higher official performing one of his distinctive functions. Justin has also been made an exponent of sacerdotalism but this is contrary to the evidence. For altho he does speak of eucharistic offerings and sacerdotal functions Apol. I, 13, 65, 66, 67; Dial. c. Trypho 28, 29, 41, 116, 117, he speaks of these as functions of the whole Church not as privileges of the Clergy exclusively. In the Dial. c. Trypho he says, 116, 117:

"So we, who thru the name of Jesus have believed as one man in God...are the true High-Priestly race of God, as God Himself beareth witness saying that in every place among the heathen are men offering sacrifices well-pleasing unto Him and pure. (Mal. 1, 11)". Justin also gives us a fairly complete picture of the services in his time. These were held in "worship rooms", either private or rented, and the whole congregation attended at the same time. Apol. I, 85. 87. Thus there is as yet no trace of the two part service known later as the Missa Fidelium and the Missa Catechumenorum. He mentions the voluntary contributions made every Sunday, Apol. I, 86. The Service itself consisted of a reading from the Gospels or the Prophets which was followed by the sermon; the congregation then rose for prayers in unison with the presiding officer and those which he prayed alone, all prayers, however being closed by the congregation's audible Amen. Then the collection was taken up and the Eucharist celebrated. The presiding officer repeated the Words of Institution and the elements were then distributed by the deacons even bringing them to those not present, Apol. I, 16. 87. And so we might say that Justin also holds to the organization and worship of Apostolic times. ----- This evidence will take us up to 150 A. D. at least. Now, what was the tendency immediately after Justin's day? Altho the evidence is meager in some points and confusing in others, there is one source from which we can gather enough details to gain a general idea of the development. These details are found in the Original Sources of the Apostolic Canons (Cf. Harnack; Texte u. Untersuchungen II, 2).

Sources of
Sources of Apostolic Canons:

The latest critical studies show that the compiler of these Canons used four sources; The Epistle of Barnabas, the Didache and two fragments from an ancient ecclesiastical lawbook. And these fragments constitute the first of the original sources. The value of this evidence, altho it is not as decisive or as definitely placed as we would like to have it, lies in this that it does give us an indication, at least, of the life in the Church from 140 to 180 (e) Cf. Harnack. We notice, first of all, that the names, pastor and bishop, are synonymous and that this officer was elected by the congregation. A neighboring congregation can send representatives to help another elect their pastor. The qualifications for this

office are given, both the desirable and the essential, and are of such a nature that this office could be filled by men naturally incapable of handling the position of bishop as it is seen some years later. And without a doubt it was handled by such men at the time of our Sources for provision is made for an unlettered bishop as we shall see later. Here again we have an individual set apart because of the expediency of having an individual, rather than a group, perform certain functions and not because a certain office with special authority and powers had to be filled to complete the organization. Besides this office the congregation is to elect at least two presbyters who are to have charge of discipline, including the conduct of the pastor. Three deacons, at least, are to be there to minister to the people in their homes. Our Sources also speak of a ministry of women; three are to be appointed and called widows, one of them to tend the sick, the other two, to persevere in prayer for all who are in temptation and also for special revelations when these are necessary. Lindsay sees in them the remnants of the Prophetic Ministry but whatever they were, the later Church has not preserved the office in that form. A Reader was also to be appointed who was to fill the place of an Evangelist and had to be able to expound Scripture. This is the provision for an unlettered bishop. And so these Sources agree with the majority of the Fathers in making the board of Presbyters the supreme authority and the bishop their representative, and thru them, the congregation's.

Summary:

It will be noticed, no doubt, that our last two authorities, Eusebius and these Canons, show signs of development away from the Apostolic Ideal. Yet the consistency with which the foundation of the Apostles is maintained in the Fathers is a voice that must be heard. Will we reject the evidence of four or five contemporaries because Ignatius disagrees with them? Under the circumstances, with no written rules of organization and such strange elements entering the Church, it is surprising to find the unanimity we do. And according to the evidence submitted, the Apostolic Ideal was maintained up to the time of Justin Martyr by the majority of the churches but after that its purity was impaired to a greater or lesser degree, from that of the Sources to the shocking arrogance of Cyprian of Carthage. The point that is of primary interest to us in studying this age is stated

by Lindsay, Pg. 196: "There is not a trace of sacerdotalism in the sense that the Christian ministry is a special priesthood set apart to offer special sacrifices. The ruling body has the bishop as chairman surrounded by elders, one is helpless without the other." Coming at the beginning of the Second Century, Ignatius is the champion of "the mystery of iniquity" that already worked in the Apostle's day; now, however, it is no longer a mystery but the most powerful influence in the Church. From Ignatius onward, take whatever Century we will, we shall find this tendency ever growing stronger and more pronounced, ever arrogating certain powers to a special class, by depriving the rightful legatees of their inheritance. One Century was worse than the next, there was no let-up so that mere human ambition will not explain this never resting urge or motive force; and that can only be seen in its true light by identifying it with 2 Thess. 2, 7-9. And even to our own day this mystery has worked, and when we shudder at the thought that the devil himself should take over the helm of the Church we must nevertheless abide by the word of the Apostle for he also offers us the only comfort available in the words; "...only he who now letteth will let, until he is taken out of the way." But the germs loosed by Ignatius caused a condition from which it is still a far cry to the perfected Kingdom of Anti-Christ. But its growth was just starting and in the next 175 years it was to burst into full bloom for all the fundamental errors of Rome were to find their beginning in this period. Let us now devote a few words to this last stage in the development of the organization of the Church.

Part III
LATER DEVELOPMENTS up to 325 A.D.

One of the most fundamental changes in this period is that the Prophetic Ministry loses all preeminence, due to the needs arising from the development in the organization the regular officers became the supreme authority. These needs changed the tenor of Church Polity entirely so that the presbyter and bishop, once identical, became something entirely different. According to the Clementines and the Apostolic Constitutions the bishop is in the place of Christ, the presbyters, in that of the Apostles.

In discussing the tendency to Episcopacy, historians are fairly well-agreed that it was only a natural growth. A group of presbyters would give occasion for disharmony and so it was desirable to have a single authority in their chairman. And from this temporary chairman it was but a step to a position of permanent authority. Quarrels with the Jews, the State and Heretics contributed in this development by bringing up points that had to be decided by an individual. Pg. 81 Jacobs says: "And the establishment of the episcopacy saved the Church whatever abuses were wrought later by perverting the system." But we shall see/ that, far from saving the Church, the Church had to struggle along as best it might despite the obstacles raised by this system.

Another fundamental change that affected the organization of the Church came with the change of the ministry to a mediating priesthood. Harnack has summarized the contributing causes very nicely, Didache II: "The sacerdotal character was ascribed to the clergy by an increasing solemnity of the service, a comprehensive adoption of heathen worship, of the Temple-service and its priesthood and ascribing magical powers to priestly acts; by granting everything of ancient dignity and rule to the priestly order and by either extinguishing or relegating the Charismatic Ministry to the background." But we are anticipating; let us consider the development of the individual officers in detail.

SEOPS:

Bishops: Book II, 28 of the Apost. Constitutions states that only a bishop may ordain presbyters and deacons. This is rather odd and becomes more so if we grant the Constitutions a date at the beginning of the Second Century rather than at the end for Jerome still says, Comm. on Titus 1: "... ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicae, veritate, presbyteris esse majores". And Lightfoot, Ep. to Phil. pg. 231, refers to a decree of the Council of Ancyra in 314 to the effect that neither the country-bishops nor the presbyters were to grant ordination without the permission of the diocesan bishop in writing. The point seems fairly well taken by Lightfoot that now even episcopal ordination was disregarded and only episcopal sanction was revered. It also shows that the city-bishops developed first and assumed authority over their brethren in the country. Yet Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria 876(c) in the "Origines Ecclesiae

Alexandrinae" translated from the Arabic by Selden, reports that as late as 325 the bishop at Alexandria was chosen from and by the customary twelve presbyters who then ordained him by the laying on of hands. This evidence, by its very conflicting nature, shows that the organization was bound to develop along the ideas laid down by certain strong individuals. With the rise of the Gnostic Heresy, the Church found itself forced to find a visible source of correct doctrine and found it by stressing its "authentic teachers", i.e. the descendants or successors of Apostolically trained men. Lindsay, pg. 270, has the following remark to make: "The succession of the officebearers in the churches was the guarantee for the correctness of the tradition suggested by Irenaeus, urged by Tertullian and apparently accepted by all who were neither Gnostics nor Marcionites, nor any of the smaller separate bodies of the Christians." And the axe that Tertullian had to grind shows a fine edge in his "De Praescr. Haer. 20." They then (the Apostles) founded churches in every city, from which all the other churches, one after another, derived the tradition of the faith and the seeds of doctrine and are every day deriving them that they may become churches. Indeed, it is on this account only that they will be able to account themselves Apostolic, as being the offspring of Apostolic churches... Therefore the churches, altho they are so many and so great, comprise but the one primitive church founded by the Apostles from which they all spring. In this way, all are primitive and all are Apostolic, whilst they are all proved to be one in unity by their salutation of peace and title of brotherhood and bonds of hospitality... rights which no other rule directs than the one tradition of the selfsame mystery."

Tertullian's fundamental mistake, and he is characteristic of the times, was that he stressed the teacher in place of the teaching. But we can alter very few facts of that age by expressing regrets today. As has been stated the Montanist Movement brought things to a climax. As some see it, the officers of the Montanists were the successors of the major officers of the Charismatic Ministry, if we may distinguish that way, while the officers of the Catholic Church were the successors of the minor gifts, governments and helps. That view is extreme for the officials of the Great Church were also the regularly instituted ministers of the Word and that ^{the} id the foundation on which they built their arrogant Tower of Babel. But since

the Montanists were commanded to make their Prophets subservient to the bishops they left the Church. This is the first noteworthy incident where orthodoxy is recognized by the bishops.

Another contributing factor was the tendency in Rome and Corinth to relax the pristine discipline in order to retain members. Calixtus, bishop of Rome 230(c) astonished his world by proclaiming that the clergy, as representatives of the Church, could grant pardon for any crime. We will not discuss the doctrinal side the statement here but the practical effect, under the circumstances, was more than an abuse. Yet it found favor despite Tertullian's stigmatizing it "a profitable fickleness", De Pudicitia 2,1. But under the strain and stress in times of persecution there were many and varied troubles with the lapsi. Some, of course, would deny their faith, others would make friends with the police, still others would forge certificates of exemption or would bribe the officials outright. On application for reinstatement each individual case had to be handled by the presbyters as a board of discipline. But what if the presbyters were also scattered? Then an individual officer would grant pardon. We see that this was the custom from the repeated commands that the presbyters were not to act without the consent of the bishop in such matters, Clem. Ep. ad Jacob. 2. Hatch pg. 103 says: "The rule (that a presbyter could act alone) was in many cases resisted... but it ultimately became so general that the bishops came to claim the right of readmitting penitents, not in their capacity as presbyters of the community, but as an inherent function of the episcopate." This is in full accord with Tertullian's contention that if the bishops are the successors of the Apostles in doctrine, then they are also their successors in discipline, De Pudicitia, 1, which claim he based on their succession to Peter. The same view is held by Cyprian Ep. 3, 65 and Firmilian of Caesarea from Cyprian Ep. 75.

Quite naturally all the disciplinary powers granted the bishops were only the result of their authority in doctrine. That was also done by Irenaeus who contended that the teaching of the churches founded by the Apostles was to serve as the norm of doctrine and that the bishops thus became the depositories of the Apostles doctrine, *Charisma Veritatis* being granted them with their ordination.

Cf Irenaeus IV, 26, 2. Also in the Clementine Recognitions 3, 85 the authority to teach is allowed only the bishop. Jerome took the "Charisma Veritatis" as the basis of his contention that the bishop was there primarily to preserve doctrine, Ep. 146 ad Evang. As it seems to us now there was a very clear conception of the end toward which all these leaders were striving but if such harmony did exist it was more by accident and the nature of the subject rather than by an agreement as to ways and means.

St. Symeon Thessal. in his De Sacris Ordinationibus, 6 made the claim in this way that the Apostolic Powers, especially those of binding and loosing, were not granted to the Church as such but to individuals by virtue of their being successors in an Apostolically ordained sequence. On the other hand Tertullian restricted it to those who were successors of Peter, to whom the Power of the Keys had been granted personally. Jerome, Ep. 41 also held this way of explanation. But Augustine was still different. In his Catech. Rud., 31 he held that this power had been granted to the Church. On top of all this we find that Chrysostom, Hom. 11 on 1 Tim.; Epiphanius, Haeres. 74, 4 and Jerome, Ep. 146 ad Evang. all maintain that the presbyters and bishops were equal except in this that the bishops had the right to appoint church officers. Something that will add to the confusion is the decree of the Fourth Council of Carthage (Stat. Eccles. Antiq.) which stated that any judicial action of the bishop without his presbyters might be declared invalid. Quite evidently, then, the development of the Episcopacy was not a concerted effort. And now, keeping Tertullian's irony, in regard to the titles assumed by the Roman bishops, in mind; remembering also that both Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus considered the episcopate the same function as the presbyterate, only in greater measure, ^{let us} ~~and then~~ consider Cyprian.

DECIAN:

Cyprianus: To him the bishop is the absolute vicegerent of Christ in things spiritual. A cultivated, and wealthy Roman-African, he was not baptised till middle-age 246. Two years later he became Bishop of Carthage only to have the Decian Persecution disrupt his flock after a short 18 months of being in office. While many were faithful in this time of trial, others recanted, bribed the officials etc. Once again the Church was confronted with the question: What was to be done with

the lapsi seeking readmission? Since Fabian, Bishop of Rome, had remained faithful to the last, his presbyters decided to act on their own and granted readmission to those lapsi in danger of dying. They also wrote to Carthage asking the church there to follow this procedure, which the Carthaginians did. While this was going on Cyprian had been in hiding, for it was perfectly plain that he was too valuable a man to risk a sudden end to such a promising career. But when he learned of this new practice he objected and in no uncertain terms, Ep. IX, 1.3; X, 1. Then followed more political and Jesuitical chicanery until Cyprian had persuaded both groups of presbyters that his sanction was required for any action on their part. His practical ends, without going into the details of the means by which he accomplished his purpose, were twofold: First, he denied the right of the martyrs and confessors to grant the lapsi pardon, despite the fact that many presbyters were martyrs or rather, many martyrs were presbyters; secondly, he insisted that under all circumstances the bishop alone had the right to grant pardon. To him the bishop was not one deriving his authority from the congregation but, according to an analogy of the Empire, as the Proconsul was responsible solely and directly to the Emperor, so the bishop was responsible only to the Lord. The way to gain this authority lay only in ordination, Ep. 54. But as Christ had been in the role of priest, so the bishop also was a priest. We quote from his 62 Epistle: "He offers a true and perfect sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered". But the bishop was the representative of Christ, above all else, because, Ep. 72: "They only who are set over the Church... can remit sins". He was the first to suggest that the Eucharist was a repetition of the agony and death on the Cross. Naturally he brought the attendant evils in also, De Speere et Eleemosynis: "...so that by almsgiving we may wash away whatever foulness we may contract." Now we can see how he went much farther than Irenaeus and Tertullian for where they held to a succession 'by appointment and succession to the Apostles', he held that each generation received its apostles in exactly the same position as that held by the Twelve. The logical result of Cyprian's line of thought, since he is bent on unity, is the *Episcopos Episcoporum* even though he himself opposed that idea strongly.

This review of Cyprian is a fine illustration of how the authority of the bishop over the people, their succession from the Apostles and a mediating and sacrificing priesthood go hand in hand. We have intentionally devoted a little more space to the development of the bishop since that set the pace and all other developments were subservient and secondary to that from the point of view of this essay. We have considered the growth of the Episcopacy in this section, for a review of criticism of, the section below on Apostolic Succession. To complete the picture we must also study the nearest officer to the bishop, namely the presbyter.

PRESBYTERS: *Presbyter:* With the rise of the bishop, the presbyteral office of course became separated from it. As our chief source of information we shall use the Canons of Hippolytus as found by Dr. Achelis: *Texte und Untersuchungen IV, 4 (1891)* We read that when the congregation had chosen their man as bishop he was ordained either by a neighboring bishop or a presbyter by the laying on of hands. It is not stated how the elders are to be chosen but martyrs and confessors are to be taken as candidates. A martyr's confession before a magistrate made him an elder, "his confession was his ordination". Besides these, all who had the gift of healing were to be taken, Canon IV, 14, 15. The Canons make the presbyter the equal of the bishop in everything but the right to ordain presbyters and deacons and the special seat in the church. Therefore the presbyters, filled with the spirit of the Apostles, are to be an example to the flock, be powerful in prayer, care for the sick, tend to disciplinary matters, and assist the bishop in public worship. In the service they placed their hands on the offerings while the bishop prayed thanks, stood on each side of the catechumens while they were being baptized and then introduced them to the congregation. According to the ninth Canon, visiting the sick, exercising by prayer, caring for the young and administering discipline were their distinctive functions. Lindsay also points out pg 337 that since it became customary for the bishop to control more than one congregation he might appoint a presbyter or deacon to do this for him. Harnack's supposition that the presbyters lost much of their original standing and became merely an advising council to the bishop and supporting him is also correct. But Hatch's contention that the Ministry of the Word, formerly not a prominent part of the presbyters duties, now

attained this prominence is altogether wrong. If anything, the presbyter lost his true position because of the bishop's usurpation of authority. But the presbyters were not the only ones to lose out in the course of the episcopal development.

CONS:

Deacons: The beginning of the Third Century saw the deacons as a minor office. The congregations at Rome confined themselves to seven and when more were required they instituted the office of sub-deacon. This was sanctioned by the Council of Neo-Caesarea. According to the fifth and seventeenth Canons of Hippolytus, the duties of the deacon are as follows: He is to remember that he is the servant of God, the bishop and the presbyter; he has special charge of the poor, widows, orphans and strangers; he is to instruct the catechumens and report to the bishop when his charges are ready for baptism. Only in their instructing the newly converted and young and in their care of the needy do they approach the original deacons. Yet Pelliccia can say pg. 28: "At the beginning of the Church only the deacons discharged the office of Christian ministers!"

The Canons also speak of Widows and Virgins who are to look after the women as the deacons do the men; they are independent and responsible to the bishop only. Here Pelliccia has a very interesting remark, pg 45: "Deaconesses were considered a Clerical Order, ordained by the episcopal imposition of hands and not without clerical privileges...but in the Western church the order of deaconesses ~~was~~ was gradually abolished by decrees of councils after the sixth century because of their incontinence and it ceased to be reckoned among the Clerical orders." As a Clerical Order the arrangement has no basis in the Apostolical Church but as recognized helpers of the regular ministry we see that these women were still in existence in the second and third Centuries. In this relation we may also throw in a word or two about the Services.

VICES:

Services: The development of Sacerdotalism was directly responsible for creating the Sanctuary and the Altar in the Church and the arrangement is still found in the Catholic churches today. Likewise the unbaptized were to be kept from the full-fledged members and they were relegated to the lower end of the auditorium. The last stage in this movement was the bringing in of lattice work around the altar making the Eucharist a sacrificial act possessing the appeal

to the senses of the mysteries of Paganism. And from the time that the Church had buildings of its own men were taught that prayers, spoken within their walls were especially efficacious and that the Divine Presence dwelt there. After Constantine's day, churches were no longer simply dedicated but consecrated. Incense also made its appearance at this time and while the Apostolic Constitutions allows the use of lighted lamps at the celebration of the Eucharist, the Council of Elvira forbade it. Crosses also came into prominence, floral decorations etc and by the Fourth Century we have distinct Liturgies. Cf Jacobs s.v. Abuses. The Canons speak of two types of Services, the Eucharistic and that of Exhortation. The latter consisted of prayers by the clergy, then psalms and hymns were sung by the congregation, and the Scripture-reading was followed by the Sermon. Evidently singing was a very important part of the Service for the candidate for Baptism was asked whether he had sung heartily in the services, Canon XIX. This service was held daily at cock-crow and all the clergy, except the bishop, was expected to be present. Lindsay infers that the deacons instructed the catechumens before the service. The laity who for some good reason could not attend were instructed to read some part of Scripture, Canon XXVII, 1. The Eucharistic Service was opened by a Scripture-reading which was done by Readers who relieved one another since the people were still assembling. If the bishop held the sermon it took place after this reading. He then took his place behind the Table of the Body and Blood with the presbyters on each side of him and the deacons brought in the elements. All the clergy was in white dress for this service. While the bishop and elders placed their hands on the cup, the former began the responsive prayers which were followed by a prayer over the Elements. After the elements had been passed around the usual offerings were brought forward and were distributed by the bishop.

On this source which we have used, Lindsay makes the following comment, pg 257: "It is very interesting to observe that there is nothing in the Canons which implies that the Holy Supper has any special and unique sacrificial conceptions attached to it; such ideas are markedly absent!" But this is another instance of the divergence of views on practice held at that time. The growth of the Episcopacy and the sacerdotal idea were of course the radical ideas of their

day and so we can very well expect to find the thought embodied in these Canons one that pursues the Golden Middle Way with perhaps even the shade of a bias in regard to the Conservative. If the conditions portrayed in these Canons were the depths to which the Polity and Practice of the Church had descended there would be no great cause for alarm. But here also the doctrinal errors, like the sacerdotalism of Tertullian and even of Ignatius, merely required time for assimilation. And as the practice is merely the result of these doctrines we can well understand why the polity might appear sound even while the doctrine was in a state of change for the worse. Thus it was here; the doctrinal errors of the one generation showed themselves in the next.

We have discussed the development of the organization with special regard to the Episcopacy. The other complementary factor in this development was the growth of sacerdotalism and we may well devote a paragraph to that phase of the subject here.

SACERDOTALISM: *Sacerdotalism* By the beginning of the Third Century the ministry had become a mediating and sacrificing priestly caste. Tertullian, De Bapt. 17 is the first to call the ministry a priesthood and he is followed by Cyprian as we have shown above. Later Jerome, Ep. ad Evagrium, made it a priestly Order after the likeness of the Levitical System. The factors influencing this growth were both pagan and Jewish. The latter asserted itself because the Old Testament was still considered the Bible and thus the Old Dispensation with its very important priestly system constantly before the eyes of the people; while the pagan came in because, after civil toleration was effected, discipline broke down as indoctrination suffered neglect. While the Apostles did borrow much from the Synagogue, there was nothing in the Temple-service that would fit the New Dispensation. Yet a later age and a different spirit would find the mysterious and awe-inspiring atmosphere of the Temple preferable to that which was simple and real as the Apostles has handed it down. And altho there was nothing like a divinely instituted order of priests, those so inclined almost found it by misinterpreting the custom of laying on of hands. Once the germs of the Character Indelibilis began to grow the Clergy was as far removed from the Laity as it could be. Another point which

would make good material for bolstering sacerdotal claims was aborted out of the Eucharistic Service. This development, the combination of a priest and his sacrifice, altho it is hopelessly out of harmony with the Gospel, is nevertheless a good reason against considering the Sacrament a mere representation rather than allowing the real presence of the Body and Blood. For is it not easier to arrive at the idea of a sacrifice from the starting point of the Real Presence than from a mere representation? We must bear in mind that the idea of a priest was there first, and from that the sacrifice-idea has its beginning in the Church. While the priest-idea is essential, the idea of sacrifice is only one of many ways of performing mediatorial rites. And once the sacerdotal character of the ministry ~~had~~ had been established, a sacrifice had to be found for it and it was found in this Sacrament. When Calixtus proclaimed that his clergy had the right to grant pardon for all sins, it involved something ^{far} ~~more~~ more than forgiving sins for with the sacerdotal idea the priest became the one sinned against; he not ~~only~~ only proclaimed pardon, he really forgave sins. And when Cyprian denied the right of the martyrs and confessors to grant pardon he not only struck the deathblow to the Prophetic Ministry but also to the right of each Christian to declare God's pardon. Now it had been established once and for all: The Clergy alone had the roadmap to Heaven. Cyprian was also responsible for stressing the pagan idea that the ministry was a special priesthood; that anyone, by virtue of the powers with which Ordination invested him, could stand as God toward his fellowman. Another pagan idea of his was that the Eucharist was an efficacious sacrifice without regard to the attitude of the worshippers. We call this influence 'pagan' intentionally for anyone understanding the Old Testament would realize how weak and ineffective they were simply because they were performed by human hands and so would not insert an idea like that into the Eucharist. We are furthermore justified in calling it pagan because essentially it differs from all acts of worship that imply surrender of self to God and self-denying love. And in this way the congregation ceased to exist as the unit of organization and the Clergy really became the Church.

Need it be said that such an exclusive sacerdotal system is directly contrary to the Gospel? It is not a continuation of the Aaronic Priesthood, it is

not commanded or mentioned in the New Testament and the Fathers are for the most part silent about it. On this point also there is a wide divergence of opinion among the champions themselves. Tertullian, De Praescr. Haer. 41, first mentioned sacerdotal claims when he referred to his enemies as ascribing sacerdotal functions to laymen. And altho Origen calls a minister sacerdos and Hieruus he is not nearly so far advanced as Tertullian for he saw this sacerdotal character as something that existed by virtue of their being representatives of the Body of Believers. But when compared to Cyprian both Tertullian and Origen are on the borderline only. He applied everything relating to the Old Testament ~~priesthood~~ priesthood to the New Testament ministry and thus the priestly caste was established in every detail. And now a word about the external aspect, the organization.

Organization:
ORGANIZATION:

From 250 to 325 we can easily notice a movement toward rallying around churches in a central and commanding position and looking to them for guidance and leadership. Rome and Alexandria are the earliest types of this. As we shall see this place of trust or prestige of certain churches was the result of councils. As early as Acts 11 we see the first congregation debating questions of doctrine and practice in public. Crises like that of the Montanist Movement and other heresy would demand a uniform policy and that could be gained only by consultation among the members of the orthodox church. One thing to be kept in mind is that the laity was present at these councils, Eusebius V, 16; XIV, 10. Irenaeus and Tertullian also agree to this, even Cyprian, Ep. 70 allows this of the African synods as late as 220. "Thus, in the Third Century, a Synod was a means open to every local congregation of acquiring aid and advice of the Church Universal", thus Lindsay. What is more, from Cyprian's 45th Epistle, we see that if the laity were not represented, the decisions of that council might be declared invalid; if the people were present, the decisions were authoritative at once. But this also was too close to the ideal to last, for once the Clergy became distinct the Laity lost out everywhere. Cyprian himself, by his demands for implicit obedience to the bishops, naturally wrought havoc with the rights of the congregation. His efforts developed from the bishop to the Metropolitan and finally to a Pope. With this development another went hand in hand. That started with the congregational meeting, developed into the district

synod and culminated in the Ecumenical Council. The councils were usually held in a centrally located city due to the ease of access and the resident bishop usually acted as chairman. This chairmanship grew by leaps and bounds into the all-powerful office of Metropolitan. But as more and more authority was heaped upon the individual, so the rights of the congregation diminished. But there is still another factor to be considered in the external development.

The State-religion, or Emperor-worship, was kept alive in the Third Century by a highly developed hierarchy extending throughout the Empire. The Pontifex Maximus was at Rome, a Metropolitan was over the provinces and Supervisors over the towns. In the provinces these priests or supervisors also held a high civil rating and only rich and influential men were chosen to perform this duty. The Metropolitan, due to the civil ranking which went with his office, was next in authority to the civil governor. The parallelism is so striking that one notices at once where the Church borrowed from the State religion, from the grades of bishops down to the added and readded lower ranks of the clergy. Pg 331 Lindsay says: "In Gaul the pagan organization was everywhere the forerunner of the Christian". And the same holds true of the councils. Mommsen, in his Provinces of the Roman Empire, says: "The conquering Christian Church took its hierarchic weapons from the arsenal of the enemy". And despite the fact that only a few decades before Tertullian had dubbed a certain high-blown bishop of Rome Pontifex Maximus, that title was now assumed for the Roman bishop with all of its former implications: spiritual supremacy over the entire Church. And so the movement for a powerful and distinct class in the Church went on, every new detail in its as yet inexperienced life was used as a means to this end and every age saw a corresponding decline in the rights of the congregation. Now we shall consider the pagan influence in the Minor Offices.

The years 236(c) to 300 saw a marked increase in the minor offices of the Church. Besides the bishops, presbyters, deacons and sub-deacons, the clergy consisted of Readers, Exorcists, Acolytes, Door-keepers and Janitors. The Reader, altho most likely a remnant of the Synagogue, was at first a provisional office so that in case the bishop were an unlettered man there would be someone there able to read and expound Scripture. In one way the Exorcists assumed part of the Presbyter's

functions and in another way, they were still members of the Charismatic Ministry. One thing common to both Readers and Exorcists is that they were chosen because of certain inherent abilities. The Acolytes and Door-keepers were simply imitations of Paganism. The former was the personal menial servant of the higher clergy. The pagan hierarchy had consisted of two classes of priests, the sacrificing and the menial and the Acolyte in the Christian Church is an adaptation of this, to its own conditions. According to Harnack, the Door-keepers were simply taken over from the pagan temple service and their duties even remained the same in the new environment. The Doctor makes the following remarks on this officer: "He had to look after the opening and the closing of the doors...refuse entrance to suspicious persons and in later times to close the doors after the dismissal of the catechumens against those doing penance and unbelievers". Their date is given as about 225 or as soon as there were buildings worthy of mention. Gravediggers, although no more than their name implies, are nevertheless officers also. Thus the Hierarchy in the Christian Church was self-developing, taking care of everything in a systematic way. Unlike the Aaronic Priesthood where a man was born into a certain rank to die there, this hierarchy was a ladder which the deserving could climb.

civil
L. AUTHORITY: The world in which the Church found itself exerted still another influence on the organization. While the bonds which bound the Church together in an external way still left a little to be desired before Constantine, his efforts on behalf of the Church changed things as it were overnight. For with civil toleration and recognition the Church found itself in a new element. Now unity could be enforced by means of the civil arm for heresy had become a crime. And this imperial unity was but the forerunner of the Papal. The State, supporting the associated churches by all the means in its powers, enforced the decisions of councils with civil pains and penalties and backed up sentences of excommunication and deposition with civil losses. It did its best to wipe out all churches outside of the Organization, and largely succeeded. This policy reached its climax when troops of the State butchered whole communities of the Montanists in Phrygia and the Donatists in Africa. And no amount of explaining will make out the role of the Church in this matter to be that of the innocent and helpless bystander. This

policy was endorsed wholeheartedly by leaders in the Church like Ambrose as we see from his letter to Theodosius demanding the suppression of all of those outside of the Church and forcibly stopping their meetings for worship, Migne's Patr. Lat. XVI, pg 940. Had the proud framers of the dictum "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus est" lived in the Third and Fourth Century they would not been before their day, neither would they have failed to have hit the mark by much even tho they were expressing a wish rather than a fact for the Third Century's close and especially the beginning of the Fourth saw every effort extended toward making the wish a reality. In a study of this period it almost seems as if the leaders of the Church had no time for doctrinal vagaries while the world was still considered a hostile force. But if decadence moved but slowly at first, its speed after recognition by the State more than made up for time lost/ and errors in doctrine and practice burst in like a flood. From the standpoint of the world, the years from 300 to 400 saw the greatest change in the attitude toward the Church. From 300 to 312 there was a very severe persecution; by 325 there was at least nominal toleration and by the end of the Century heresy was a crime. And now the clergy was not only a distinct but also the governing class. The causes contributing to this result were varied:

In the first place the State exempted church officers from civil duties, cf. Kuhn; Die staedt. u. buergerliche Verfassung des roem. Reiches, pg 83-123. This also sprung from the Church, for Cyprian says: "The ministers of the Church ought to serve exclusively the altar and the sacrifices and to give their whole time to supplications and prayers". Even Constantine had exempted the clergy to a certain extent, Eusebius X, 7. Since many immediately sought to join the clergy to avoid the exorbitant civil taxes this measure was opposed for a time and restrictions were placed on joining the clergy, Cf. Kuhn, pg 245. But the exemption was not repealed and in 341 the Council of Chalcedon made it an offense for a cleric to hold civil office. On top of that the State granted the clergy exemption from the civil courts, Codex Theod. 16, 2.41. That established the clergy as a class civilly distinct. And when the Church could hold property in its own name, the merit of bequests to the organization was preached with such good results that the

Church became a universal legatee. This custom also gave offense and steps were taken to remove the cause of trouble, Codex Theod. 16, 2, 20. Jerome expressed the reproach felt by all serious-minded churchmen when he said, Ep. ad Nepot. 52: "It is a shame that it is said that the Church accepts the heritage of pagan priests, nini, soothsayers and public women". Added to this were the buildings donated by Constantine and the land and temple-revenues, Sozom, H. E; I, 8, 10; 57. And now the clergy was not only distinct, religiously and civilly, but also socially and financially. But where did the laity find its place in all of these new developments?

Y:

Laity As soon as the sacerdotal idea crept into the Church, a difference in practice in regard to laymen had set in. At first he could not preach if the bishop were present; then he could not preach if any other officer were present and later not at all. This was not mere custom or anything like that but was formulated as an ecclesiastical law in the Stat. Eccless. Antiq.; in a similar way we may point out the fact that at first the laymen brought their offerings and communed, later, especially in the East, he could not even see the celebration of the Eucharist, of Diction. of Antiquities, s. v. Iconostasis. And the last vestiges of a lay vote in cases of discipline went by the board in the Fifth Century, of Ferrand: Breviatio Canonum. The clergy held the whip hand, the distinction between clergy and laity had now become one of power and the laity could only submit. Under such circumstances, is it any wonder that a notion like Asceticism should become so popular? At first this false moral ideal had been frowned upon but with the momentum gained in a slow start, once it began to move, it swept all aside in an irresistible rush, of Justin, Apol. 1, 15; Origen, Contra Celsam, 7, 41. Hatch is not very evangelical when he says in Lecture VI: "An effete age, they sought spiritual values after fleshly surfeitings; persecutions ceased, but the thought of merit in suffering continued". But the thought of merit in suffering was just becoming popular. In the same chapter he says: "The movement began in the East but spread rapidly to the West; and wherever, in East or West, the stream of life ran strong there were crowds of men and women who were ready to forsake all and follow John the Baptist into the desert rather than Christ into the world." But who can blame the flock when the leader has strayed? The fact that these people were willing to

follow the lead of the Church and perform feats nowhere demanded in the Gospel shows how sadly the Church, identified now by its organization and no longer by its doctrine, had abused its trust. The primary purpose of the Church, to save souls and speak the Word of reconciliation, had been forgotten in the pride of their organization. Can we wonder that a priestly caste with its attendant sacrifice produced frills in its organization like the ceremony of the Mass, Sacramentalism, Prayers and Masses for the Dead, Remission of sins by almsgiving, Intercession of and Prayers to Saints, Mariolatry, enforced Celibacy of the Clergy, Lying Wonders, Miracles and efficacious Relics, ecclesiastical Despotism and last, but by no means least, the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome? A study of the Church from this point onward can only be discouraging and depressing and only the anticipation of seeing the Light of the Reformation burst upon the darkened Prince-of-this-World's Kingdom will be incentive enough for one to continue. But we have gone far enough into the subject to see what a terrific assault the Gates of Hell did make on the Lord's Church. But He who has overcome the world saw fit to allow them temporary success only and we who live today can well be doubly thankful. And now a very few words on the so-called Apostolic Succession may serve as a summary of our essay:

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION:

Jacobs states the question as follows: "An Apostolical Succession means that all men who have a right to be considered duly appointed ministers of Christ have received from Him a commission to minister in His name, conveyed in an outward and visible manner ~~by~~ in a direct line from the Holy Apostles." The powers which Christ gave His ministers and which are thus transmitted are as follows: "to ordain ministers, to give them the power to administer the Sacraments and bestow the grace of absolution and perform other priestly acts. The only ones to succeed to this authority, namely to transmit these 'powers', are the bishops and of these only those who are ordained by an unbroken line are lawful ministers. Any break, no matter where, in this line, leaves no true Church, no true ministry and no validity in the Sacraments. Those who practice the office of a minister and are not ordained in this way are usurpers, heretics and schismatics, and constitute with their people a band of revolters and not a branch of the Church". Behold, how one error treads the heels of another!

We have endeavored to trace the rise of this tendency until it became a fact in our study of the later developments, (Part III). The remarks here will only be general.

The only thing that ever approached such an arrangement was the Old Testament priesthood, but that was by special divine command and was repeated time and again. Where is there a New Testament command analogous to this? There is no trace of it, and the conduct of the Apostles is directly opposite to what it would have been had this system obtained. Paul wanted the doctrine to be transmitted to 'faithful men who should be able to teach others also'; he wanted a succession of sound doctrine. Where is the suggestion of the fact that this could be obtained only by an unbroken chain of Apostolically ordained ministers? From the exponents' viewpoint, this doctrine should be the last word in guaranteeing certainty in all spiritual matters and yet, who can ^{ever} know as a certainty whether he is ordained in the required manner or not? As we have tried to show in the course of this treatise, the powers ascribed to the bishop were stolen from the congregation, of Part I. If the powers of binding and loosing together with the benefit of the Eucharist has been granted to the Apostles, simply as Apostles and not as the first Church, by what right do laymen receive the Lord's Supper? Why is such a succession not mentioned by the Apostles? They knew of nothing like it in their day and even of the Second and Third Century Lindsay says correctly: "There is no trace of Apostolical Succession in any form whatever, even in the poetic conception of the disciple-company it is the presbyters who represent the Apostles. Lastly, there is no trace of diocesan rule". That is the case exactly. This doctrine has justly been characterized as "a fiction invented and propagated in the Church to bolster sacerdotal superstitions". And it took the brains of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine, Roman ecclesiastics who had been trained to be lawyers, to develop this idea. And altho^t Tertullian and Irenaeus did not believe that the bishop alone had the Holy Spirit, it took the blundering radical Hippolytus to make the fatal plunge, Philosophumena, I: "But none will refute these heresies save the Holy Spirit bequeath^{ed} ed to the Church, which the Apostles having in the first instance received, have transmitted to those who rightly believed. But we, as being their successors, and

as being participators in this grace, high-priesthood and office of teaching, as well as being reputed guardians of the Church, will not be found deficient in vigilance, or disposed to suppress correct doctrine". And now compare the quotation of Tertullian's, De Praesor. Haer., 20 pg 32 of this essay. And strange to say, the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions contain no trace of an Apostolic Succession!

A last word is to be added as found in the Concordia Cyclopaedia, s.v. Apostolic Succession: "Opponents of the Apostolic Succession maintain that this view is based on a misunderstanding of Christ's commission, of the adherent power and efficacy of the Word, of the nature and character of the Church, of the Office of the Keys and the spiritual priesthood of all Christians. They further maintain that Christ, by commissioning His Apostles, did not create a distinct body within the Church, vested with inalienable authority, but merely charged them with the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, which Christ has laid upon the whole Church as their duty and function. Hence ministers of the Church perform their public and official functions not by right of Apostolic Succession, but by reason of their Call, thru which the rights, duties and privileges which Christ has given to all Christians are delegated to them for official execution in the name of the Church."

--- BIBLIOGRAPHY ---

- Jacobs, G.A: The Ecclesiastical Polity of the N.T. (T Whittaker & Sons, 1871).
Lindsay, T.M: The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries. (Doran CO).
Graebner, A.L: Theological Quarterly, 1903 s.v. Christian Archeology.
Hatch, Edwin: The Organization of the Early Christian Churches. (Longmans, Green & Co.-London, 1892)
Gwatkin, H.M: ~~Hasting's~~ Dictionary of the Bible s.v. "Church Government in the ^{Apost-} Apostolic Age".
Gayford, S.C: Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible s.v. "Church".
Lightfoot : Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. (Mc Millan & Co, London, 1892)
" Epistle to the Philippians.
Hodge, Charles: Discussions in Church Polity. (Scribner's Sons, New York, 1878)
Pelliccia, A.A: The Polity of the Christian Church. (Trans. by J.C. Bellett)
Lefroy, Wm: The Christian Ministry. (Funk and Wagnalls, 1891)
Harnack, Dr. A: The Mission and Expansion of Christianity, Vol. I (Trans. by J Moffatt). ^{et al.}
" Didache, Vol. II of Texte und Untersuchungen.
Loening: Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristentums, 1889.
Loofs: Studien und Kritiken, 1890.
Concordia Cyclopedia s.v. Apostolic Succession
Kretzmann, P.E: Church Government and Church Officers in a Lutheran Congregation. (C.P.H., St. Louis, 1928.)