

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

The Origins of the Permanent Deacon

EDWARD P. ECHLIN

WHEN REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANS convene in a solemn synod the promptings of the Spirit in the church are intensified.¹ In the eventful years since Vatican II historians, theologians, and bishops themselves have become aware that the fuller meaning of decrees and doctrines promulgated under the Spirit's inspiration is discerned only through subsequent reflection and dialogue.² At an ecumenical council the Spirit often outdistances theologians who are normally well in advance of God's people in proposing new formulations of doctrine and new forms for the life of the church.³ Theologians no less than bishops must often discern the reasons for and meanings of conciliar decisions *after* these decisions have been promulgated. The conciliar decision that concerns us here is the restoration of the permanent diaconate to the collegial ordering of the church.⁴ Clearly this was one of the most dramatic and daring decisions of the council. Yet now that permanent deacons are offering themselves to the service of God's people, questions are raised, even by bishops who voted for the restoration, about the role, function, purpose and forms the permanent diaconate should take.⁵

The restoration of the deacon to his historic place within the *permanent* hierarchical ordering is a decision taken under the guidance of the Spirit and one that offers hope for richer service of Christians among themselves and to the modern world. But God's people, especially bishops and theologians, must discern together the meaning of this momentous renewal of the church. Such discernment will involve knowledge of the past biography of the deacon of history and an application of the essential diaconal idea to the unprecedented needs of the secular age.⁶

In this paper we hope to discuss the slim evidence we possess of the primitive origins of the Christian deacon as a *particular* office of service in the church. We suggest, however, that the meaning of the deacon will be best ascertained only within the context of the full ministry.

This means that all Christians, reformed as well as Catholic, must renew their understanding of the triadic Catholic ministry against the normative experience of the origins of the ministry itself.⁷ The deacon already performs a great service to Christian self-understanding, to the growing communion of churches, and to the unified service of the world by these churches, if he catalyses a more sophisticated and ecumenical understanding of church order than has prevailed since at least the 14th century.

For the contemporary hierarchy of bishop, priest and deacon is not of immutable law. The hierarchy as Catholics now know it is not the only church order the church has known. Catholic bishops, under the guidance of the Spirit, could change this triadic order; they could rediscover the relevance of an earlier church order for a future situation not foreseen today. Just as the Church of Rome allowed the permanent diaconate to decline and at Vatican II restored it, so the church could make more radical adjustments in the hierarchical order. The church today is in the process of recognising other orders within Christian pluralism as apostolic orders with fully 'valid' eucharists.⁸ This rediscovery and recognition of non-Roman and even non-episcopal ministries as apostolic is significant for the understanding of the permanent deacon. For this diaconate is not restored because it is essential to the *esse, bene esse, or plene esse* of the church.

Nor is ordination of 'apostolic succession' through imposition of hands the only way the church may order itself. Ordination through imposition by those previously ordained arose at an early date as the original apostles were passing away. It is a hallowed and effective sign of the apostolicity, unity and catholicity of the church. But there have been other ways in which the church ordered itself and these ways too must be respected as valid and apostolic. As Edmund Schlink observes, 'It is right that ordination should now be conferred through ordained people only. Yet we should not exclude the other ways as a matter of principle, for they too correspond to the relationship between apostle and Church and were a means of securing the growth of the Apostolic Church'.⁹

The triadic order, as known in the Catholic tradition today, is the result of 'a very complex development' (Küng) which occurred largely within the time of the revelation event. As such it seems the best, if not the only, possible order for God's people. Because of its apostolic credentials it seems the permanent diaconate should be a fully functioning part of this order. The full hierarchy of service seems the optimum means to express and effect the internal unity and outgoing service of the church. Lukas Vischer remarks that 'it has proved its worth in the course of history. It has shown itself to be a uniting link and is well-suited to express the unity of Christendom past and present. Consequently it would certainly be a mistake to cast it aside unthinkingly'.¹⁰ When Catholics admit that this order is not the only

possible apostolic order and when Evangelicals admit the legitimacy of the triadic development, admissions which theologians of both traditions are making, we believe the time has come for the churches to unite around the hierarchical order of bishop, priest and deacon.¹¹

There remain, however, 'tunnel periods' in our evidence for the origins of Catholic order in which the hierarchical genesis goes underground only to emerge in a more developed form. Despite the occasional rediscovery of such documents as the Dead Sea Scrolls, I Clement and the Didache it now seems that the exact details of ministerial development will remain shrouded in the veils of history despite the industry of scholars, even presuming that technocratic 'Christendom' will continue to support the services of theological scholars.

The veiled origins of the diaconate are interconnected with the veiled origins of the ordered ministry.¹² In the Jerusalem Church, for example, there are the twelve, Matthias who was chosen by lot, Paul who experienced the Risen Lord, Barnabas and other apostles, and the mighty James who was brother of the Lord, and the Jerusalem Presbyters who gathered with James, Paul and the twelve at the famous Jerusalem Council (Acts 15). There was the apparently charismatic order at Corinth which nevertheless enjoyed charismata of leadership and administration as well as the service of Paul and probably Timothy (1 Cor. 12). There is Paul's puzzling and intriguing greeting to *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* at Philippi (Phil. 1:1); just who were these officers and what connection do the latter have with the Hellenes of Jerusalem (Acts 6) and the later *diakonoi* compared to Christ by Ignatius of Antioch? There is the commission by imposition of hands on Timothy and Titus of the Pastorals and the more or less monarchic and more or less residential oversight of these apostles. How monarchic and how residential were these delegates of Paul? Later there are the authoritative tones of Clement writing to a more structured Corinth and, suddenly, the surprisingly structured triadic order of Ignatius. How did this development to a hierarchy in Syria occur? And why was the same development more gradual at Rome and Alexandria? Early in the third century there is at Rome the liturgy of Hippolytus which puts emphasis on apostolic succession through the rite of imposition of hands. If the order reflected by the conservative Hippolytus developed in the second century, as it seems it did, how far back into that century does it go?

These are but a few of the condundrums in the origins of the ministry that have confronted Christian theologians throughout Christian history. The purpose of mentioning them here is to illustrate that the origins of the triadic ministry and therefore of the permanent deacon are less than clear in their details. The fully triadic ministry restored by Vatican II is solidly based on primitive apostolic order, but the genesis of triadic order is very complex and some of the details of its development, because of the early tunnel periods, will remain

forever wrapped in the elusive mists of Christian origins.

Nor are the roles, functions and powers of the ministry in any given historical period, even the first period of church history, normative for all later epochs.²³ There is indeed an essence to the ministry, but the roles and functions of the hierarchy are adapted to the situations and needs of each succeeding age. We notice, for example, that in some times and places the deacon was exclusively the bishop's assistant, but that in other situations he served God's people by assisting the priest. Similarly, we notice that in Rome of Justin the deacon administered communion under both species while in the later Rome of Hippolytus it was urged that the deacon's ministration normally be confined to distribution of the bread. In the primitive church ministers were primarily servants of the word, but already with Cyprian we see a nascent sacralisation wherein bishops and priests were esteemed primarily as priests of the new law (Eph. 1:1-2; 2:1-2).

In discerning the meaning of the revised permanent diaconate we can learn from the normative experience of our Christian origins. We will also learn from the experience of the modern deacon as his role evolves and develops under the guidance of the Spirit. The Spirit speaks not only in Scripture but within and outside the contemporary church. What is important is to recognise God's ongoing revelation and to measure new insights against the norm of Scripture. In Scripture we experience the church ordering itself and distributing functions; the forms these functions take today may differ from the forms of the apostolic church. The deacon of the secular age, while maintaining continuity with the deacon of history, will serve in forms appropriate to the secular age—and some of these forms and functions will be different than those of deacons in any preceding age. Further, diaconal service in one region will differ from that of another. The deacon is a witness to pluralism in the ministry, pluralism in the present, with the past, and with the future.

We believe the essence of diaconal service involves service in the church's sacramental life combined with practical charity. In current parlance we might say the deacon always bridges sacred and secular worship. Without worship there is no practical charity, without charity there is no worship in spirit and truth. The deacon is and has ever been a sign in his ministry of Christ at the Passover worship washing his companions' feet. Within the traditional diaconal functions of liturgy, word, charity, the deacon's role will evolve. We may hope that in permanent deacons, in ways known at present only to God, we will find reconcilers of traditionalists and modernists now dividing the church. The deacon, moreover, may hasten the desacralisation of the priesthood now under way and place the ministry where it was in the beginning, within collegial communion with all God's people.

As already noted, the origins of the diaconate are part of the enormously complex origins and development of the triadic ministry.

Yet there is much to learn about today's deacon from the first century church. We see evidence of the church gradually structuring the diaconal function. This ordering was concerned with vital services the later deacons were to perform. The Ante-Nicene church determined the roles and functions of the deacon from the evidence of the New Testament which records the halting origins of the ministry of special service. It is of course anachronistic to look for the deacons of the second century, when the hierarchy was developed, in the first century church. As Robert Nowell remarks, 'the difficulty comes really from forgetting that the early church was an organic growth: we are apt to expect to find already precisely formulated at a very primitive stage structures and offices that only developed gradually in response to circumstances and needs. It seems safer to start from the assumption that the diaconate evolved gradually . . .'.¹⁴

The terms *diakonos* (servant) and *diakonein* (to serve) are used broadly in the New Testament, at least before Paul's mention of *diakonoï* (deacons) in his greetings to Philippi in AD 57. We note this generalised use of words for service in Christ's famous warning to his apostles about the uniqueness of Christian authority: 'Whoever would be great among you must be your servant (*diakonos*) . . .; even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many' (Matt. 20:26-28). *Diakonia* was used for the original apostolic office itself (Acts 1:17, 25), for the collection for the Jerusalem Church (2 Cor. 8:14; 9:1, 12), and very intriguingly, for one of the *charismata* in Paul's famous list of these gifts in Romans 12:6-8.

It is not clear how much the first century church based itself on Judaism in assigning the functions of deacons.¹⁵ Yet there are instructive parallels; and here too these parallels are important because of the use the later church made of them in defining the special ministry of service. In the Old Testament there was a definite connection between worship and service of the neighbour, between *leiturgia* and *diakonia* (Deut. 10:12-19; Isa. 1:10-17). The fact that *leiturgia* is frequently used for manward service in early Christian writings (e.g., 1 Clement) should not blind us to the fact that this term has connotations of Godward worship.¹⁶ In Old Testament Jewish festivals the rich shared with the poor and ate together with them in anticipation of the future (Deut. 14:26-29; 2 Sam. 6:19). Paul may have had this in mind when he chastised the Corinthians for their lack of charity in connection with the Eucharist. It is equally significant that the early church compared the deacon's service to that of Christ's washing the apostles' feet, a messianic service that took place in connection with the Passover meal (John 13:2f.). The letter of James calls the service of widows and orphans 'pure, untainted religion', words that customarily were applied to cult (Jas. 1:27). Early Christianity, like Judaism, posited an inseparable connection between worship and temporal charity. The deacon in his person was destined to be a sign and agent of this connection.

The early church also compared permanent deacons to the landless Jewish Levites who, after the conquest, were dependent on the other tribes for support (Deut. 18:23). The Levites were distinguished from other ministers when the central centres of worship at Bethel and Jerusalem attracted people from the lesser shrines. The Levites, therefore, were not always necessary for specialised *priestly* services. They became assistants to the priests in the temple (Ezek. 24:6-14), helpers to the Sons of Aaron (Num. 3:6-9). After the exile they assumed subordinate tasks at worship and menial functions in the temple (Neh. 11:17; Num. 8:19). The Levites became chanters, administrators, custodians of vessels and loaves, door-keepers, and custodians of the vegetables. It is important to notice that they were also teachers, appointed men who insisted on their hereditary status, even though circumstances after the exile made this status a subordinate, although important, one. The early church with good reason soon compared the deacons to Jewish Levites (Ignatius of Antioch, *Trell*. 7:2). While it is true that ministry in the early church was unique and a clear break from Judaism,¹⁷ the first Christians, in ordering the fledgling church, looked for a starting point to the ministry the Jewish Christians knew best; and that ministry was the Jewish one. The similarity between the functions of the second and third century deacons and those of the post-exile Levites are too striking to be dismissed as coincidental.¹⁸

In Paul's Epistle to the Romans we confront our first Christian deacon—and to our surprise we confront a woman. We observe again that it is anachronistic to read into Scripture the fully developed triadic hierarchy of subsequent centuries. What we do see in the New Testament is the church ordering itself, assigning definite functions, and therefore providing for the needs the deacon will soon fill. It is noteworthy, however, that the same letter that refers to the *diakonia* of Phoebe later includes *diakonia* as one of the charismata (Rom. 12:6-8). And no less an authority than Schlink believes this charisma is to be understood in a *special* sense.¹⁹ Paul's mention of this gift has been frequently overlooked in contemporary discussions of the charismatic church—as for that matter has his mention of gifts of leadership in the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 12:4).²⁰ If Schlink is correct, the deaconess Phoebe fulfilled special functions that, in the second century, would be the special functions of the deacon who assisted the *episkopoi*.

Phoebe may well have been the bearer of the letter to the Romans;²¹ and bearing letters was to be another function of the deacon. Paul commends this valiant woman, who doubtless will receive much attention in the next few years, as follows: 'I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae. Give her, in union with the Lord, a welcome worthy of saints, and help her with anything she needs: She has looked after a great many people, myself included' (Rom. 16:1-2).

We will never know much more about Phoebe than is disclosed in these few enigmatic words of Paul. We notice that her service was primarily *practical charity*, the service of Christ who washed his companions' feet. Because of this service, so vital for the viability of any society, Paul demands for her a warm and provident welcome. She who has served the needs of other saints is worthy of 'anything she needs'. From this recommendation we see clearly the value placed by Paul on the diaconal function. More significantly still, we can safely conclude that Phoebe, like later deacons and deaconesses, combined service at worship with practical charity. When Paul was alive the Eucharist was celebrated in the same homes where other needs were met. And Paul specifies that Phoebe has looked after his needs—needs that customarily for Paul were practical charity (food and shelter) and a place for Christian worship. The restoration of the diaconate may bring out the importance of women in the church; for Phoebe is reminiscent of another great Christian woman, the Mother of John Mark who also looked after a great many people (Acts 12:37). However, the classical text for deacons, and one to which the church has returned repeatedly, is the famous text about the appointment of the seven Hellenists (Acts 6:1-6). Because of the importance of this text for subsequent determination of the diaconal role we quote it in full:

Now in those days when the disciples were increasing in number, the Hellenists murmured against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily distribution. And the twelve summoned the body of the disciples and said, 'It is not right that we should give up preaching the word of God to serve tables. Therefore, brethren, pick out from among you seven men of good repute, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint to this duty. But we will devote ourselves to prayer and the ministry of the word'. And what they said pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch. These they set before the apostles and they prayed and laid their hands upon them.

This magisterial text demonstrates how a division of functions arose in the apostolic church. It also reveals a division of other sorts in the early 'love community' which Luke so often idealised. Apparently the Hellenic widows resident in Jerusalem were neglected. Jean Colson surmises that this neglect stemmed originally from the fact that Jerusalemite Jews at first monopolised the function of 'service at tables'.¹¹ And in a time when modern social welfare was unknown, the practical charity of service at table was a matter of life and death. Tightly knit communities, such as the primitive Christian fellowship, were accustomed to care for their own indigent. When women were less able to support themselves than they are today, widows and orphans were desperately dependent on the daily *diakonia* for the necessities of life.

However, the seven Hellenists were not appointed 'deacons' in the later sense of permanent hierarchical deacons. The evidence of Acts reveals that Stephen and Philip went on to perform the preaching, teaching and baptising then associated with the functions of the apostles. What makes this passage so important is that it again reveals how a division of functions gradually evolved in the church. As Joseph Fitzmyer remarks, it shows the 'need for a structure of the community'.³³ From the solemn designation of the seven we learn that in the Jerusalem church there were (in addition to the twelve, the other apostle, and the elders) the seven who, whatever their other functions, fulfilled the important role of practical charity to Hellenistic Jewish widows.

We also suggest that ministers of the secular age can profit immensely from meditation on the lesson of the appointment of Stephen and his companions. For the contemporary bishop and priest this text is a sharp and pointed two-edged sword. The twelve, from whom all Christian ministers profess to descend, imposed hands on the seven for practical charity because they, the twelve, were loath to neglect the word and prayer for practical charity or serving at tables. The task that would have distracted the twelve from their essential role was *diakonein* and what they knew they should never neglect was *diakonia*. Briefly and perhaps bluntly, the young priest of the secular age who neglects theology, homiletics, catechetics and prayer to be 'a man for others' as an activist among the admittedly important activists can learn much about his role from the delegation of the first seven, especially by reflection on the reason the twelve appointed the seven.

The imposition of hands on the seven was the expression of solidarity in power and function, in this case *diakonia* in a rather *general* sense. However, this was the beginning of the ordering of God's people and to the seven was committed the service of the neglected widows. It is also noteworthy that, except for the gospels and 1 Corinthians 15:5, this is the only passage in the New Testament in which the dramatic title 'the twelve' appears.³⁴

Among the Philippians, as early as AD 57, there were *diakonoi* who assisted the *episkopoi*. In a famous passage Paul mentions them specifically in his greeting: 'From Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ, together with their presiding overseers (elders?) and deacons. We wish you the grace and peace of God our Father and of the Lord Jesus Christ' (Phil. 1:1).

Paul does not describe the functions of these officers. Nor is it certain whether he is referring to *diakonia* in the general or specific sense. It seems probable, however, that we have here early evidence of the church setting aside certain men for a particular service as deacons. There is a development here, probably of Greek provenance, that was to continue as the hierarchy took shape, and that development is the close union between deacons and bishops. We believe, therefore,

that the two groups Paul refers to are different groups with different functions and that the deacons assisted the bishops in services of practical charity, administration, and worship. There is insufficient evidence to say that the order of deacons was clearly differentiated from *episkopoi* at Philippi. But ordering was under way and these two groups may later have coalesced with the presbyterium of Jewish origin to become the triadic order which appears so clearly in the letters of Ignatius fifty years later.

Earlier Paul himself may have taken with him a Philippian deacon named Epaphroditus. The Philippians had commissioned this man to assist Paul in Christ's work. It seems that Epaphroditus performed different functions than Timothy, another helper mentioned by Paul. Epaphroditus had become sick. Paul was sending him home: 'He was sent as your representative to help me when I needed someone to be my companion in working and battling. . . . Give him a most hearty welcome in the Lord; people like him are to be honoured. It was for Christ's work that he came so near to dying, and he risked his life to give me the help that you were not able to give me yourselves' (Phil. 2:25-29). Epaphroditus may well have been one of the *diakonoï* of Philippi. Certainly, the mention of overseers and deacons in Paul's greeting and his warm words about Epaphroditus induce caution about saying that special diaconal functions were not developing in the Pauline churches. Moreover, although Paul does not mention them in his letter to the Corinthians, these special charismata may also have existed at Paul's Corinth in the middle of the century, a period in which many contemporary authors believe Corinth enjoyed a church order free of special appointing.²⁶

When we come to the Pastoral epistles we see Catholic church order emerging. There is the apostle Timothy, delegated through imposition of hands, there is 'Paul', there are elders and *episkopoi* and *diakonoï*. The author of 1 Timothy does not give us direct information about the functions of the *diakonoï*, but he does indicate the qualifications necessary in aspirants to this noble office.

Deacons must be respectable men whose word can be trusted, moderate in the amount of wine they drink and with no squalid greed for money. They must be conscientious believers in the mystery of the faith. They are to be examined first only admitted to serve as deacons if there is nothing against them. In the same way the women must be respectable, not gossips but sober and quite reliable. Deacons must not have been married more than once, and must be men who manage their children and family well. Those of them who carry out their duties well as deacons will earn a high standing for themselves and be rewarded with great assurance for their work for the faith in Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 3:8-13; cf. 1 Tim. 3:1-8).

From the qualifications for diaconal service and from the significant differences between these qualifications and those of presiding elders

(1 Tim. 3:1-8), we can learn something about the deacon's function. Further, since the author of this epistle was probably a contemporary of Ignatius, we can presume these functions were similar to those of the early second century deacon whose *particular* service of *diakonia* was a special order in the church.

Like the overseers the deacon must be trustworthy, sober, and not avaricious. He must be a true believer and he must submit to examination before he is admitted to his functions. Here we notice that some 'deacons' were successors of Phoebe. The author of the epistle includes women within the diaconal structure (cf. also 1 Tim. 5:9-15). Male deacons as well as overseers must be men of one woman. The author may mean that ministers should not remarry. However, he does recommend remarriage for young widows (5:14) and it is possible that the famous Pastoral strictures about marriage and ministry mean that a married minister should be wholly devoted to his wife.³⁶ Certainly the Pastorals insist that married elders and deacons should be well established and successful as spouses and parents. The fact that Paul dwells on this at more length for overseers than for deacons is an indication that the deacon's role was not that of a president. Of the presidents, Paul asks 'How can any man who does not understand how to manage his own family have responsibility for the Church of God?' (3:5). He does not develop this idea for the deacon. Rather, deacons are men who perform 'services'. For these tasks, which from the evidence of the early second century were almost certainly concerned with liturgy, word, and charity, the deacons will be honoured and rewarded. We notice that deacons are again, as at Philippi, associated with *episkopoi*. From the context it seems that the late New Testament deacons were assistants to the *episkopoi*, men whose integrity was as pure as that of their fellow ministers, and men whose particular functions of 'service' were esteemed by St. Paul. Also significant for the deacon's evolving role in the apostolic church and for his role in subsequent history is the fact that his services included responsibility for distribution of the community's money.

In conclusion, we may say that in the New Testament writings we see the church gradually structuring itself, a structuring that at the time of the Pastorals was developing into the triadic ministry of overseers, elders, and deacons. It seems anachronistic to see the second century deacons in the *diakonoi* of the New Testament. But the apostolic church did discern the necessity of designating worthy men and women for vital services of liturgy, word, and practical charity. These special services were assumed by deacons as assistants of the apostles and later of the *episkopoi*. The distinction of the deacon and his functions from *episkopoi* and presbyterium was almost complete in the later New Testament writings. The distinction *is* complete at least in Syria and Asia Minor in the first decade of the second century.

- ¹ Hans Küng, *Structures of the Church*, pp. 1-49.
- ² Robert Nowell, *The Ministry of Service*, London, 1968, pp. 40-43.
- ³ Avery Dulles, 'Official Church Teaching and Historical Relativity', in W. Pannenberg, A. Dulles, and Carl Braaten, *Spirit, Faith and Church*, Westminster, 1970, pp. 51-73; cf. also Dulles, 'Dogma as an Ecumenical Problem', in *Readings in the Theology of the Church*, Edward Dirkswager, ed., Englewood Cliffs, 1970, pp. 201-224.
- ⁴ *Lumen Gentium*, No. 29.
- ⁵ The American Bishops' Committee on the Permanent Diaconate has sought the assistance of informed members of the Catholic Theological Society of America. This in itself is an example of the collegiality among Catholic Christians brought about by the restoration of permanent deacons.
- ⁶ A noteworthy step in this direction but one that requires more pastoral application is *Diakonia in Christo: Über die Erneuerung des Diakonates*, Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, eds., Freiburg, 1962. Cf. also Wilhelm Schamoni, *Married Men As Ordained Deacons*, London, 1955, and Josef Hornef, *The New Vocation*, Cork, 1963.
- ⁷ Hans Küng, *The Church*, NY, 1968, pp. 3-30; 363-444.
- ⁸ Edward P. Echlin, 'Anglican Orders, A Case for Validity' in *The Anglican Theological Review*, April, 1970, pp. 67-76; cf. also Kilian McDonnell, 'Ways of Validating Ministry', in *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Spring, 1970, pp. 209-266, and Edward P. Echlin, 'The Validity of Anglican Orders', *ibid.*, pp. 266-282.
- ⁹ Edmund J. Schlink, *The Coming Christ and the Coming Church*, Edinburgh, 1967, p. 231.
- ¹⁰ Lukas Vischer, 'The Ministry of Deacons', in *The Ministry of Deacons*, Lukas Vischer, ed. (World Council of Churches Studies, No. 27), Geneva, 1965, p. 20.
- ¹¹ Echlin, 'The Validity of Anglican Orders', *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, pp. 280-282.
- ¹² Jean Colson, 'Der Diakonat im Neuen Testament', in *Diakonia in Christo*, Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, eds., pp. 3-22.
- ¹³ Piet Fransen, 'Orders and Ordination', in *Sacramentum Mundi*, Vol. IV, Karl Rahner, ed., NY, 1968, pp. 312-323.
- ¹⁴ Nowell, *The Ministry of Service*, p. 19.
- ¹⁵ Jean Paul Audet may exaggerate the independence of Christian Ministry from Judaism in *Structures of Christian Priesthood*, NY, 1967, pp. 77-85.
- ¹⁶ Gregory Dix, 'The Ministry in the Early Church', in *The Apostolic Ministry*, K. E. Kirk, ed., London, 1962 (2nd edition), pp. 194-196.
- ¹⁷ A. Gelin, 'The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews', in *The Sacrament of Holy Orders*, London, 1962, pp. 30-44.
- ¹⁸ Dix, 'Ministry in the Early Church', in *Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 243-253.
- ¹⁹ Schlink, *The Coming Christ and the Coming Church*, p. 189.
- ²⁰ Myles Bourke, 'The Catholic Priest, Man of God for Others', in *Worship*, Vol. 43, pp. 68-81.
- ²¹ *The Jerusalem Bible*, Alexander Hones, ed., NY, 1967, p. 290, note.
- ²² Jean Colson, *L'Évêque dans les Communautés Primitives*, Paris, 1951, p. 18.
- ²³ Richard J. Dillon and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'Acts of the Apostles', in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Raymond Brown, ed., Englefield Cliffs, 1968, p. 181. Cf. also Vischer, 'The Ministry of Deacons' in *The Ministry of Deacons*, p. 16.
- ²⁴ A. G. Herbert, *Apostle and Bishop*, London, 1963, pp. 41, 60.
- ²⁵ Küng, *The Church*, 393-417. But cf. Myles Bourke, 'Presidential Address' in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Spring, 1968, pp. 493-511.
- ²⁶ Audet suggests 'Undividedly attached to his wife' as the meaning of *mias gunaikos anēr* in *Structures of Christian Priesthood*, pp. 57-61.