

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Episcopacy in the Second Century

BY THE REV. H. CHADWICK, M.A.

THIS article contains nothing new. The problem of the precise nature of the organization of the early Church in the period between the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the middle of the second century has been the subject of innumerable discussions by learned persons. In these pages we shall attempt an outline of the fundamental facts, and try to give some idea of the present state of the question.

I

It is well known that in the New Testament the titles of "bishop" and "presbyter" are apparently applied to the same people.¹ In writing to the Philippian Church Paul mentions in the opening salutation "the bishops and deacons" (Phil. i. 1). Were there only two orders at Philippi? Again, in the Acts (xx. 17) Luke relates that Paul summoned the "presbyters" of Ephesus to Miletus, who are then addressed as "bishops." The identification of bishop and presbyter appears clearly again in the Pastoral Epistles, as in Titus i. 5-7, where directions are given "to appoint presbyters in every city, as I gave thee charge; if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe, who are not accused of riot or unruly; for the bishop must be blameless, as God's steward . . ." The conclusion from such passages as these is obvious enough. The evidence makes it possible to evade it only by special pleading.²

The development of the threefold ministry is difficult to describe for the reason that the sources for this earliest period of the Church's history do not provide adequate information for any certain account of the matter. It will be convenient to take in turn those churches for which we have some evidence, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria.

II

Little is known of the early history of the Church at Rome. It is probable that there were Christians in Rome before A.D. 48, which is perhaps a year or two after Paul's first missionary journey. From the Epistle to the Romans it is probable that the Church contained elements influenced by the Jewish synagogue, and that it was already of sufficient importance for Paul to undertake a long apologia for his Gospel to explain his position to them; by A.D. 64 the Church there had grown to a substantial size. At the end of the first century we have a document of great importance, the First Epistle of Clement,³ a letter written about A.D. 96 to the Church of Corinth where there had been disorders. Some of the presbyters in charge of the congregation had been deposed for reasons which are not specified, and the Roman Church wrote remonstrating with them for this unseemly behaviour. "It is disgraceful, brethren, very disgraceful, and unworthy of Christian conduct, that of the stable and ancient Church of the

Corinthians, thanks to one or two persons, it should be reported that it revolts against its presbyters" (47. 6). "For it will be no small sin on our part, if we depose from the episcopal office those who have in blameless and holy wise offered the gifts" (44. 4). In fact, "our Apostles also knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. So for this reason, since they had perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons (*i.e.* bishops and deacons) and subsequently gave a direction (*epinomen*), so that, if they should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry. Men, therefore, who were appointed by the Apostles, or subsequently by other eminent men, with the approval of the whole Church, and have ministered blamelessly to the flock of Christ . . . such men we consider unjustly deposed from their ministry" (44. 1-3).

The difficulties of the last passage are notorious. It is not clear whether Clement means that the "other approved men" should succeed the apostles, or if he means that they should succeed the apostles' successors. Even more obscure is the question of the identity of the "other eminent men" who have appointed bishops. Clement, however, is primarily trying to assert the divine authority of the ministry; the grammatical constructions we may here leave on one side. These persons received their authority from the apostles or their successors. "The Apostles received the Gospel for our sakes from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent from God; Christ therefore is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ; in both cases all was done in good order according to God's will. So . . . they went out in the confidence of the Holy Spirit, preaching the Gospel, that the Kingdom of God was about to come. So, preaching in country and city, they appointed their firstfruits, having tested them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe. And this was no novelty, for long ago it had been written concerning bishops and deacons. For the Scripture says in one place: 'I will establish their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith'" (42).

The Christian ministry, says Clement, has as much divine authority as that of the old covenant. "The high priest has been given his own proper services, and the priests have been assigned their own place, and Levites have their own ministrations. The lay man is bound by the lay ordinances" (40. 5). This Old Testament illustration is significant. It would hardly be suitable unless the presbyters deposed at Corinth exercised liturgical functions, which could also be described as *episcopate* (44. 4). It seems, then, that, although no conclusions can be reached about the deacons, the *episcopoi* were presbyters.

The next document of the Roman Church is the *Shepherd of Hermas*, a work of much interest, which shows every sign of being a deliberate, calculated attempt to break down the "rigorist" attitude of the authorities in the Roman Church who would not recognize the possibility of repentance for sin committed after baptism. The date of the work is uncertain, but it may be assigned with good reason to the period A.D. 130-40.⁴ Here the Church is under the control of a college of presbyters (Vis. 2. 4. 3). Apparently some of these had special functions. Good "bishops" according to Hermas are "hospitable people who gladly received into their houses at all times the

servants of God without hypocrisy. At all times without ceasing they sheltered the needy, and the widows in their ministrations, and conducted themselves in purity at all times" (Sim. 9. 27. 2). It is the office of deacons to assist the bishops in this work (Sim. 9. 26. 1). Evidently in Hermas' time the bishops have financial control, and some are abusing this (Sim. 1. 8ff.). Furthermore, all is not well among the presbyters. Hermas is instructed to "say unto the rulers of the Church that they direct their paths in righteousness" (Vis. 2. 2. 6). The presbyters are divided among themselves; "they have a certain emulation with one another about first places and about glory of some kind or other" (Sim. 8. 7. 4; cf. 9. 31. 5-6).

It is accordingly probable that about A.D. 130 the presbyters of the Roman Church were quarrelling about precedence. Was it strife about the introduction of the monarchical episcopate? Perhaps at that time the *episcopoi* all belonged to the college of presbyters; it does not necessarily follow that all the presbyters were *episcopoi*. At any rate, there is reason to suppose that Hermas was familiar with an organization of the Church in which the monarchical episcopate was rapidly developing. About A.D. 150 we have the evidence of Justin Martyr, who taught in Rome, that the whole Church assembled in one place on Sundays; at this meeting passages were read from the prophets and from the writings of the apostles; "the president" then preached to the congregation; and this was followed by the eucharist in which the president celebrated; all those present received the bread and wine, while it was the office of the deacons to take a portion to those absent. Again, it was the president's duty to assist the orphans and widows, any who were ill or in prison, and to entertain visitors (*Apology* i. 67).

Fifty years later the development at Rome is complete. The distinguished and learned presbyter of the Roman Church, Hippolytus, so disapproved of the contemporary bishop, Callistus, that he went into schism and set himself up instead of Callistus who in his view had ceased to be bishop. He drew up a Church Order entitled "The Apostolic Tradition"* (the title is a direct hit at his opponent whom he regarded as an innovator) which is a source of the first importance for the history of liturgical practice at the end of the second century. Hippolytus gives detailed instructions for the consecration of a bishop. First, the whole congregation must choose a man, and the choice must be ratified at the Sunday meeting, "the people being assembled with the presbytery and such bishops as may attend." It is pointedly stated that in the consecration the presbyters are to have no part: "The bishops shall lay hands on him, and the presbytery shall stand by in silence" (*et praesbyterium adstet quiescens*). After silence in which all pray for the descent of the Spirit, one of the bishops lays his hand on the elected candidate, and prays according to the prescribed form. The consecrating bishop prays that God will pour forth the power which He gave to Jesus, which He in turn gave to the apostles, and empower "this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen for the episcopate to feed Thy holy flock and serve as Thine high priest, that he may minister blamelessly night and day, that he may unceasingly propitiate Thy countenance and offer to Thee the gifts of Thy holy

Church ; and that by Thy high priestly Spirit he may have authority to forgive sins according to Thy command, to ordain according to Thy bidding,* to loose every bond according to the authority Thou gavest to the apostles ; and that he may please Thee in meekness and a pure heart, offering to Thee a sweet-smelling savour . . . ”

Thus by A.D. 200 at the latest the Church at Rome reached a position in which the unique place of the bishop is secure, and the presbyters are definitely in a subordinate rank. Hippolytus feels it necessary to lay down expressly that a presbyter “ has no authority to ordain.”

III

Although much less is known of the Church at Antioch in Syria during the second century than of the Roman community, much light is thrown upon the development of the ministry there by the epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who was martyred at Rome early in the second century (the precise date is quite unknown, though Eusebius would put it in the time of Trajan, A.D. 98-117). The epistles of Ignatius are the earliest source to speak of a monarchical bishop, and the assertion of the three grades of ministry could not be more explicit. The bishop stands alone at the head of the Church, under him the presbyters and the deacons. No writer has ever asserted the authority of the episcopate in such unmeasured terms. “ We ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself ” (Ign. Eph. vi. 1). Ignatius’ constant refrain is the necessity of subjection to the hierarchy. It is clear that among some of the Churches in Asia Minor to which he writes there are centrifugal forces at work. Against the movements to heresy and schism Ignatius affirms that divisions can only be avoided by following the bishop. “ Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be ; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast ” (Smyrn. 8). The bishop’s authority rests in the fact that he is the counterpart of God on earth ; he presides “ after the likeness of God, and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the apostles, with the deacons also . . . who have been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ ” (Magn. 6). “ Let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a church ” (Trall. 3. 1).

In Clement of Rome the bishops were divinely authorized by the fact that they stood in the divine succession : God—Christ—apostles—bishops. In Ignatius we meet with no such doctrine. The authority of the bishop is supported by the thesis that in his monarchy he is the earthly counterpart of the Divine Monarch, and he is to be obeyed just as Jesus Christ obeyed the Father. Ignatius seems to have adapted to his own purposes the Hellenistic commonplace that things on earth are copies of things in heaven.

The ideas of Ignatius are taken up by the Syrian Church Order of the third century, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*. "The bishop sits for you in the place of God Almighty. But the deacon stands in the place of Christ. . . . The deaconess shall be honoured by you in the place of the Holy Spirit; and the presbyters shall be to you in the likeness of the Apostles" (trans. R. H. Connolly, p. 88). Nothing is said in this work about bishops standing in the succession of the apostles, although a substantial proportion of its contents are devoted to the office and work of a bishop. The only "rationalisation" of the bishop's authority is that already supplied by Ignatius. It is reasonable to deduce that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession was not born on Syrian soil.

IV

We must now turn to another document, probably produced in Syria, the *Didache*, or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." This remarkable work has often been made the starting-point of investigation in the question of the early Christian ministry; the difficulty about such procedure is the absence of agreement among scholars concerning its date and purpose, so that its significance differs according to the various views which have been taken of its origin. It may be assigned with good grounds, however, to the middle of the second century.' Here the picture is of wandering apostles who go from place to place, staying a day or two (not more) at each. There are inspired prophets who are "the chief priests" of the congregations, and who pray at the eucharist without being tied down to any particular liturgical form; they live on the firstfruits supplied by the members of the Church. The Church also has teachers who (as in the New Testament) are associated with the prophets. Besides these the Church is instructed to appoint "bishops and deacons," on the ground that "they also perform the service of the prophets and teachers." The bishops and deacons are felt to be so far inferior to the prophets and teachers that the *Didachist* has to give specific instructions not to look down on them: "Despise them not; for they are your honourable men along with the prophets and teachers." There is no mention of any presbyters. If the *Didache* were certainly a Church Order which was actually put into practice by some primitive Christian community, it would lend some support to the theory that the early history of the ministry was one of tension between the official and the "charismatic" persons in the Church. This, however, is far from certain. It might be reasonable to suppose that, if the *Didachist* had been familiar at his own date with the fixed threefold ministry, he might have attributed its origin to the apostles. But conclusions derived from this problematic document cannot be treated with any absolute confidence.

V

The position at Alexandria, the third great city of the Roman Empire, is obscure since there is nothing in the contemporary sources upon which history can be reconstructed. Certain authorities of a later date throw an interesting light on the relation of the bishop to his presbyters. We may take first the well-known passage in Jerome (ep. 146):*

“ Even at Alexandria, from the time of Mark the evangelist to the episcopates of Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters used always to appoint as bishop one chosen out of their number, and placed on the higher grade, as if an army should make a commander, or as if deacons should choose one of themselves . . . and call him archdeacon.”

We also have a letter of the sixth century by Severus, the great Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, written after his banishment (most of which he spent in Egypt), in which he says :

“ The bishop also of the city renowned for its orthodox faith, the city of the Alexandrines, was in old times appointed by presbyters. But in modern times, in accordance with the canon which has prevailed everywhere, the solemn institution of their bishop is performed by bishops ; and no one makes light of the accurate practice that prevails in the holy churches and recurs to the earlier condition of things, which has given way to the later clear and accurate, deliberate and spiritual injunctions.”

These two sources are certainly independent of one another. Also independent, although much later in date, is the account in Eutychius, Melkite patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century. According to him Mark the evangelist, first bishop of Alexandria, appointed twelve presbyters to be with the patriarch, “ so that, when the patriarchate was vacant, they should choose one of the twelve presbyters, and that the other eleven should lay their hands on his head and bless him and make him patriarch ; ” the first to alter this was Alexander, predecessor of Athanasius.¹⁰ Eutychius is a late writer, and his reliability in matters of historical fact is far from great. His statement, valueless by itself, shows that the tradition known to Jerome and Severus still survived as late as the tenth century, though in a distorted form.

Eutychius has the further information that until the time of Demetrius (A.D. 189-232) the bishop of Alexandria was the only bishop in Egypt ; Demetrius appointed three bishops, and his successor Heraclas twenty more. In detail this may perhaps be incorrect, but the substance has probability,¹¹ and is confirmed by Pamphilus' apology for Origen (quoted by Photius, *Bibl.* 118) according to which when Demetrius wanted to secure the condemnation of Origen's presbyteral orders he first called a synod of bishops and some presbyters ; the synod, however, did not deprive him and only said that he must not remain in Alexandria ; Demetrius only had his way at a second council with “ certain Egyptian bishops.” This suggests that Demetrius got the decision he wanted out of the few bishops in the province, all of whom depended on him for their position. Even in the fourth century the absolutism of the Alexandrian bishop was such that he could apparently appoint or depose bishops in Egypt without any synodical action.¹²

Further evidence about the peculiar position of the Alexandrian presbyters is found in the late fourth century known as “ Ambrosias-ter,” according to whom “ in Alexandria and in all Egypt, if the bishop is absent, confirmation is given by the presbyter.”¹³

Finally there is the rather earlier witness in the story from the

"Sayings of the Fathers": "Once there came certain heretics to Poimen, and began to speak against the archbishop of Alexandria, (*i.e.* Athanasius), saying that he had been ordained by presbyters. But the old man made no reply, but called to his brother and said: Lay the table and give them food, and send them away in peace."¹⁴ This story may be connected with the Arian attacks on Athanasius' consecration, and not be relevant to our enquiry.

All the evidence for Alexandria shows that there the threefold ministry was in force. Clement and Origen are both clear about the three orders, bishop, priest, and deacon, though Clement can still use the title "presbyter" as of a bishop (*Q.D.S.* 42. 4), a usage which is common in Irenaeus and other ante-Nicene writers. Nothing is said by Clement or by Origen about the consecration of the Alexandrian bishop.¹⁵

VI

We have seen that the idea of Apostolic Succession first appears not in the documents of the Syrian Church but in the first epistle of Clement. The emphasis on the succession is in fact specifically Roman. We next find it in Hegesippus, a contemporary of Irenaeus, who tells us (in Eusebius, *Church History* 4. 22. 3) that he came to Rome and there "made for himself a succession-list" as far as Anicetus," who was followed by Soter, and he in turn by Eleutherus. The doctrine was taken up by Irenaeus of Lyons in the eighties of the second century in his struggle against the Gnostics. The latter claimed that their fantastic theosophy was derived by unbroken tradition from the apostles, and faithfully represented what Jesus had revealed to his disciples during the forty days after the Resurrection; it was they who with their secret tradition stood in the true apostolic succession. It was precisely to combat this claim that Irenaeus argued that the apostolic doctrine was to be found conserved in those churches where the apostles had been in person; in the bishops, the successors of the apostles in the teaching office, there was a continuous line back to the apostles themselves. Thus, according to tradition (which may be historically correct) Peter and Paul both died in Rome. Irenaeus gave a list of those who had succeeded them there and so preserved the apostolic doctrine uncontaminated. It is not unlikely that the names he gives are right, particularly in the latter part of the list. But we may notice here, in the first place, that the development of the idea of Apostolic Succession derives its impetus from the necessity of making a counter-claim to the Gnostics; and, secondly, that in Hegesippus and Irenaeus,¹⁷ as in Clement of Rome before them, there is no trace of any emphasis on a sacramental succession depending on the laying on of hands in consecration. The first writers in whom this conception is undoubtedly explicit are Hippolytus and Cyprian towards the middle of the third century. The earlier conception was of succession in the teaching chair.¹⁸

VII

So much for the basic historical evidence. How is it to be interpreted?

At Antioch and in Asia Minor it is clear from Ignatius' letters that the monarchical episcopate was well established early in the second century. At Rome it seems to have been in process of development in the period A.D. 100-150. It is probable that Hermas was familiar with the arrangement by which, when the whole Church assembled in one place for the Sunday eucharist (that apparently being the occasion when all the house-churches met together), one of the presbyters in charge of the local communities presided, and the other presbyters sat on either side on the presbyteral bench. We do not know whether the president was always the same person every Sunday, but the advantages of such an arrangement would be sufficiently obvious to make its early adoption probable. And the process would be accelerated by the desperate struggle with heresy, which explains the violence with which Ignatius, for example, asserts the necessity of obedience to the one bishop.¹⁹

The position at Alexandria during the second century is obscure, but the traditions in the writers of the fourth century and later which we have briefly discussed above, have sufficient probability to suggest that, while the threefold ministry was clearly established by A.D. 200, the presbyters had considerable powers in the appointment of the bishop. Did they originally have similar powers at Rome also? It cannot be said to be unlikely in view of the pointed way in which Hippolytus feels it necessary to emphasize the subordinate position of the presbyterate. And in the early period when the bishop of Alexandria was the only bishop in Egypt, there were no bishops in the immediate vicinity who could perform the consecration of a successor. Nothing would be more natural than that the local presbyters should do this during the time before the conception arose of the necessity of sacramental succession. In the period when the Church of Rome was developing its monarchical episcopate, who performed the consecration of the bishop there? In Hippolytus' time it was done by the bishops from outside Rome. What happened earlier when there were no bishops near Rome? Was the position similar to that which seems to have prevailed at Alexandria?

That part of the Empire where the state of things is unambiguous is Syria and Asia Minor,²⁰ and it is therefore reasonable to return to Lightfoot's opinion that St. John had a lot to do with this development. Clement of Alexandria, telling a story about St. John which had almost certainly come to him from Asia Minor, says that the apostle travelled about from town to town, "in one appointing bishops, in another setting in order whole Churches, in another ordaining clergy" (*Q.D.S.* 42. 2). In his essay on the Christian Ministry in his commentary on Philippians Lightfoot held that the simplest interpretation of the complex evidence was that the episcopate was created out of the presbyterate by elevation, a development which was a gradual process in various churches, and which was most mature first in those regions where the latest surviving apostles (more especially St. John) fixed their abode (pp. 227-8). The essay was published eighty years ago. Although in certain details it would not be possible to maintain all Lightfoot's judgments, additional evidence such as the Church Order of Hippolytus having become available since then, nevertheless the

fundamental position of Lightfoot can still be reasonably held as the most satisfactory interpretation of the evidence.

VIII

Modern controversy has centred on the crucial question : What was the nature of the continuity between the apostles and the episcopate as we find it about 150 A.D.? Was there a tactual, sacramental succession by which the bishops were consecrated only by those who themselves received consecration from the apostles? In the recent essays edited by the Bishop of Oxford, *The Apostolic Ministry*, it has been argued by Dom Gregory Dix that in the sub-apostolic age there were "apostolic men" who had received consecration from the apostles and who went about appointing bishops; thus there was preserved an absolute and clear distinction between the essential and the dependent ministry. The former is represented by such people as Timothy and Titus in the type of organization reflected in the Pastoral Epistles, by the "eminent men" (*ellogimoi*) of Clement, and by Ignatius and Polycarp. By such people the early presbyter-episcopoi were ordained; they did not form self-recruiting bodies.

It is just conceivable that this theory may be right. The difficulty about it is the absence of evidence. We know next to nothing about these nebulous apostolic men, and it can therefore only remain an ingenious speculation.¹ In any event it is far too uncertain to make it the foundation of a dogmatic construction.

So we return to the question : What sort of continuity was there between the late second century bishop and the apostolate? There was certainly a continuity of historical succession; the bishop sat in the teaching chair which his predecessors had occupied, and the line could be traced back to apostolic times. In Asia St. John seems to have made specific arrangements for the episcopate in the local churches. But it is as well to be quite clear about the fact that there is no stress on the tactual succession by consecration until the third century. At first, it is probable that the presbytery had more to do with the consecration of their bishop than they did later after the general adoption of moniscopacy, and that some of the early presbyter-episcopoi were appointed by the apostles themselves. But the evidence is totally insufficient to allow dogmatic assertion of continuous sacramental succession. What interested the Church of the second century was the continuity of apostolic doctrine, and there is no reason to suppose that when Hegesippus and Irenaeus affirmed this they were far wrong.

The demand of the contemporary debate on orders and unity can never be finally answered by the documents of the second century. For almost all the really crucial questions the evidence is not enough to warrant positive assertions. But at any rate, it may be said that Evangelicals are entirely justified when they affirm that the historical evidence for episcopal apostolic succession in a sacramental sense will not bear the weight which the modern Anglo-Catholic wants to impose on it.

¹ See Lightfoot's *Commentary on Philipians*, pp. 95-99.

² As against A. M. Farrer in *The Apostolic Ministry* (1946), pp. 150-70, see

S. L. Greenslade in *Theology* 50 (April, 1947), p. 136, and C. F. D. Moule in *The Ministry of the Church* (1947), pp. 47-52.

¹ The translation is that of W. K. L. Clarke (S.P.C.K., 1937), occasionally modified.

² The best discussion of the date and character of Hermas is by Dibelius in the additional volume of Lietzmann's *Handbuch z. Neuen Testament*.

³ The most satisfactory translation is by Dom Gregory Dix (S.P.C.K., 1937).

⁴ The Latin text in Dix's edition (p. 5) is wrongly transcribed here. For the correct text see R. H. Connolly, *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order*, 1916, p. 175; E. Hauler, *Didascalie Apost. Fragm. Ver. Lat.*, 1900, p. 105.

⁵ Cf. W. Telfer, "The Plot of the Didache," in *J.T.S.*, XLV, 1944, pp. 141-51.

⁶ Dom Dix (in *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 269, n. 1) curiously credits Jerome with the statement that "the bishop of Alexandria was the only bishop in Egypt until the times of the bishops Heraclas and Denys." Jerome says nothing of the kind.

⁷ E. W. Brooks, *Select Letters of Severus*, ii. p. 213.

⁸ The translation here and of Jerome above is from B. J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church*, i, pp. 266, 278.

⁹ See the important remarks of Schwartz, *Gött. Nachr.*, 1905, p. 182 f.

¹⁰ For appointments cf. Athanasius, Festal letter 19 (for 347); for depositions, Pap. Lond. 1914 line 47, in H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (1924). The four Egyptian bishops who wrote to Melitius the schismatic during the Diocletianic persecution affirm their utter dependence upon the bishop of Alexandria (text edited by Kettler in *Z.N.W.* XXXV., 1936, p. 160).

¹¹ Migne, *Patr. Lat.* XVII. 388 C; *C.S.E.L.*, L, p. 196.

¹² Migne, *Patr. Gr.* LXV. 341 B.

¹³ The attempt by Gore (in *J.T.S.*, III, 1902, p. 278 ff., and in *The Church and Ministry*, 1936 ed., p. 126 ff.) and Dom Cabrol to use this as an argument to discredit Jerome and Severus has been adequately refuted by K. Müller in *Z.N.W.* XXVIII, 1929, p. 278 ff., a discussion to which I am indebted.

¹⁴ The Greek text here is "hopelessly corrupt" (Schwartz, *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte* III, p. ccxxv n. 3) and must be treated with caution as a basis for construction.

¹⁵ Dom Dix (in *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 209) finds in Irenaeus 4. 26. 2 "something not found in Hegesippus or Tertullian—a new emphasis on the sacramental *charisma* received in ordination, as a supernatural guarantee of authentic apostolic teaching which can be secured by no other means." This ignores the fundamental discussion of the meaning of this passage by Karl Müller in *Z.N.W.* XXIII, 1924, pp. 216-222.

¹⁶ On the original conception of the apostolic succession see C. H. Turner's important essay in H. B. Swete, *Early History of the Church and Ministry* (1918).

¹⁷ For the rise of moniscopacy as a weapon to meet the centrifugal forces of heresy and schism cf. W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei* (1934) p. 65 ff. This is regarded as "the simplest answer" by H. Lietzmann, *The Founding of the Church Universal* (1938) p. 74.

¹⁸ The position was equally clear at Jerusalem where James was practically in the position of Pope. (Cf. Karl Holl, *Ges. Aufs.* ii p. 65, who remarks that it was Paul's action in breaking the dominating authority of the Jerusalem Church which ultimately opened the way for the Roman primacy). But the continuity was broken by the fall of the city in A.D. 70.

¹⁹ Cf. W. Telfer, reviewing Dix in *J.T.S.* XLVIII (July-October, 1947) p. 227: ". . . the basis is very misty and precarious."